

早期基督教教義史

**HISTORY OF
EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE:
A READER**

September 2009

目錄
TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON	
《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統的信仰立場	1
Part One. History of the Canon	
第一部分：正典的歷史	1
Part Two. 第二部分	7
Part Three. 第三部分	9
Part Four. 第四部分	11
Part Five. 第五部分	13
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY	
三位一體教義發展簡史	20
Part One. Gnosticism	
第一部分：諾斯底主義（神智派）	20
Part Two. The Anti-Gnostic Fathers	
第二部分：反諾斯底主義的教父們	23
Part Three: The Alexandrian Fathers	
第三部分：亞歷山大的教父	31
Part Four. Monarchianism	
第四部分：神格唯一說	39
Part Five. The Trinitarian Controversy	
第五部分：關於三位一體的爭論	43
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST	
基督論的發展史	57
Part One. The Christological Controversies	
第一部分：基督論的爭辯	57
Part Two. The Second Stage of the Controversy	
第二部分：爭辯的第二階段	65
THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT: THE WORK OF CHRIST	
贖罪論的發展史：基督的工作	73
Part One. 第一部分	73
Part Two. 第二部分: 安瑟倫至宗教改革前的贖罪論.....	80
THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF MAN	
基督教人論簡史.....	91

THE HISTORY OF SOTERIOLOGY (part 1): THE DOCTRINE OF THE APPLICATION OF GRACE 拯救論的發展史：救贖施行的教義	114
Part One. 第一部分	114
Part Two. 第二部分：經院主義時期的拯救論	123
 HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH 教會論發展史	129
 HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS 聖禮論的發展史	141
 GNOSTICISM (Seeberg) 諾斯底主義（西波爾）	151
 THE LOGOS DOCTRINE (Early Apologists: Justin Martyr <i>et al</i>) (Seeberg) 「道」的教義（早期護教士：游斯丁等人）（西波爾）.....	155
 JUSTIN MARTYR ON CHRISTIANITY, HEATHENISM AND JUDAISM (Seeberg) 游斯丁論基督教，異教，猶太教（西波爾）	159
 ORIGEN (Seeberg) 俄利根（西波爾）	162
 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH GOD, THE FATHER, AND THE SON: WHAT WE BELIEVE 早期教會信仰真偽辨 上帝，聖父，聖子：我們的信仰	174
 TRUTH AND ERRORS IN THE EARLY CHURCH: THE DOCTRINE OF GOD AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF NICEA (325 A.D.) 早期教會教義真偽辨： 尼西亞會議 (325 AD) 前的上帝論，基督論	177
 NICENE CREED	188
 THE DEFINITION OF THE CHALCEDON CREED	188
 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH: DOCTRINE OF MAN, SIN AND GRACE 早期教會信仰真偽辨：人論，罪論，恩典論	189

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (1)
《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統的信仰立場（一）

Part One. HISTORY OF THE CANON
第一部分：正典的歷史

170-220 A.D.
主後 170-220 年

1. Factors which were instrumental in forcing the church, in a formal way, to reflect and decide upon what is Scripture for the church.

背景因素：催使教會正式地反省/決定教會的《聖經》究竟包括哪些書卷。

- a. Marcionism. Marcion went to Rome in 140 AD.

馬吉安。140 年到羅馬。

Marcion taught that the Old Testament God is not the same as the New Testament God.

馬吉安的教導：《舊約》的神與《新約》的神，是不同的神。

The Old Testament God is fickle, cruel, a despot.

《舊約》的神是殘酷的獨裁者，脾氣古怪。

The New Testament God is a God of mercy and love.

《新約》的神是一個慈愛，憐憫的神。

Marcion rejected the Old Testament entirely.

馬吉安完全拒絕《舊約》的神。

The Evangelists (authors of the gospels) and the apostles were blinded by Jewish influence.

他認為四福音的作者們與使徒們，都被他們的猶太教背景所影響，眼睛瞎了。

Marcion's own Canon included: 10 of Paul's letters (not including the Pastoral Letters), and a drastically edited Gospel of Luke.

馬吉安的『正典』包括：保羅的十封信（不包括《提摩太前後書》，《提多書》），與一本刪除很多部份的《路加福音》。

- b. Gnosticism.

諾斯底主義。

Gnosis – secret knowledge of God.

諾斯底 = 這個希臘名字，是秘密知識的意思。

The Gnostics produced a body of literature with equal authority and revelatory importance as the orthodox New Testament canon.

諾斯底派的領袖們，編了一套文獻，與《新約聖經》有同樣的權威，和同樣地有啟示性。

c. Montanism.

孟他努主義。

Montanus and his followers taught that a new and copious outpouring of the Holy Spirit began with Montanus himself.

蒙他努和他的跟隨者教導說，聖靈在當今(當時)有一次新的澆灌，由孟他努開始。

Similar to a “second blessing.”

像二十世紀靈恩派的“第二次祝福”。

A widespread movement in the late 2nd century, and early 3rd century.

孟他努派在第二世紀末與第三世紀初增長得很快。

Montanists received new revelation, and wrote them down.

孟他努派者宣稱他們收到新的啟示，然後筆之於書。

2. Response by the Church.

教會如何回應這些異端。

a. The view of Adolf Von Harnack (a liberal view). *Marcion and the New Testament*, John Knox Press 1942.

十九世紀新派神學家哈納克 (Harnack) 的看法。他寫的書，《馬吉安與新約》，於 1942 年出版。

Primitive Christianity is a religion of the spirit, not of the letter.

原始的基督教是靈的宗教，不是字句的宗教(聽起來很屬靈！)。

Primitive Christianity thrived on oral tradition.

原始的基督教有很多的口頭傳統(口傳)，因這些口傳而增長。

Heretics took up the idea of a collection of authoritative writings.

異端者就想出要收集一套有權威性的文獻這個觀念來。

Marcion created the New Testament canon!

意思是說，是馬吉安想出/搞出新約的正典來的！

The church then borrowed from Marcion the idea of a canon, but with different results.

後來，教會模仿了馬吉安的做法，也想收集一套正典 -- 當然，教會正典所包括的書卷是不同的。

Oral tradition became confused.

當時的情況是，口頭傳統非常混亂。

Written tradition increased in number, and the quality is different.

而書寫的傳統越來越多，可是素質參差不齊。

Therefore the church must distinguish between true and false.

因此，教會必須辨別真假。

It is lamentable that Christianity became bound by a book – it became a religion of the book. (Harnack’s view)

所以，結果教會(基督教)成為一個被一本書“綁著”的宗教 -- 而不是活的，屬靈的宗教。(這是哈納克的說法，是福音派不能接受的觀點。)

b. The orthodox view.

正統 (福音派) 的看法。

(e.g. Ned Stonehouse, Herman Ridderbos)

(二十世紀中期，費城威敏斯特神學院教授 Ned Stonehouse, 與荷蘭神學家 Herman Ridderbos 是代表者)

The origin or existence of the New Testament canon is not identical with the recognition of the New Testament by the church.

《新約聖經》的起源，《新約聖經》的存在是一回事；而教會承認《新約聖經》，是另外一回事。

From the very beginning – in the Apostolic Age – the church had a New Testament. The church had the Word of God!

從起初開始，就是，從使徒時期，教會就擁有一本<<聖經>>。教會從來就有神的話！

3. Sources for 170-220 AD.

170-220 年這個階段，我們目前有的文獻。

a. The Muratorian canon.

《穆拉多利正典殘篇》。

Muratoria, an 18th century Italian, discovered this canon.

穆拉多利是一位十八世紀的意大利人。他發現這分文獻。

180 AD, written in Latin.

約 180 年寫的，拉丁文。

It is the earliest list of canonical documents by someone on behalf of the church.

這是教會人士代表教會承認《新約聖經》書卷的最早文獻。

It listed: all of the New Testament except: Hebrews, James, 2 Peter.

這分正典殘篇列出了所有新約的書卷，除了：《希伯來書》，《雅各》，《彼得後書》。

Not sure whether I Peter is mentioned or not.

《彼得前書》有沒有被列出，我們不清楚。

b. Irenaeus, 130-200. He is a prominent spokesman for both the Eastern church and the Western church (the Greek church and the Latin church).

愛任紐，130-200。

他是東方教會，與西方教會的代言人。(東方教會用希臘文，

包括：亞細亞，希臘，埃及等。西方教會用拉丁文，包括：意大利，北非洲，法國等。)

Wrote *Against the Heresies*, against Gnosticism and Montanism.

愛任紐寫書反駁異端 -- 反駁諾斯底主義，蒙他努主義。

c. Tertullian, 160-220 AD. Represented the Western church. Lived in North Africa.

特土良，160-220。西方教會的代表。住在北非洲。

d. Clement of Alexandria, 150-215 AD.

亞歷山大的革利免，150-215。

e. Origen, 185-254 AD. Clement's student – became dominant church theologian in the 3rd century. Profoundly influenced the Eastern church.

俄利根，185-254。革利免的學生與繼承人。他們兩位都是第三世紀重要的神學家。對於東方教會的影響非常大。

4. The Attestation to the New Testament, 170-220 AD.

這些文獻對《新約聖經》的見證，170-220年。

a. The Gospels

文獻對福音書的見證。

i. Irenaeus – contrasted with Marcion (single gospel). With Gnostics (5th Gospel of Truth). With those who rejected the Gospel of John. 愛任紐 - 反駁馬吉安 (馬氏只有一本福音書)。也反駁諾斯底派 (後者有一本<<真理福音>>，是他們的第五本福音書。)

The Logos, who created the world, has given the church the perfect gospel in its 4-fold form.

愛任紐：道，就是創造世界的道，賜給了教會福音 -- 是四重的福音。

ii. Standard practice during this period to refer to the gospel as “the gospel” (to euaggelion), then “according to” (kata).

在這段時期，一般的作者都稱福音書為『福音』(單數)，然後說明是誰寫的 (按照誰 - according to, 希臘文 kata)。

iii. Tertullian, Muratorian canon mentioned forgeries (attributed to Paul). No mention of other gospels competing for a place in the canon.

特土良與《穆拉多利正典殘篇》提到一些偽經，冒充保羅寫的。沒有提到有哪本福音書與四福音『競爭』，在正典裡爭地位。

iv. Clement of Alexandria – broad minded. But distinguished the 4 gospels “entrusted to the church.”

亞歷山大的革利免 - 立場比較沒有那麼嚴謹。雖然如此，可是他也分辨出四本『交託給教會』的福音書。

Others who wrote or used apocryphal Gospel transformed the gospel.

其他的人寫了旁經，或用旁經，就把福音改頭換面了。

- v. Irenaeus knew of no time when another gospel, other than the 4, were used in worship. Nor when one of the four was disputed regarding its rightful place in worship.
愛任紐說當時在崇拜時用的(誦讀的), 只有四福音, 沒有其他福音書。而四福音書任何一卷, 從來沒有人懷疑是否應在敬拜時誦讀。
- vi. Irenaeus used Revelation 4:6-9 – the four living beings, 4 covenants, the four directions (E, W, S, N) and the 4 winds to explain why there are 4 gospels. A 4-fold collection.
愛任紐用靈意解經法, 解釋啟示錄 4: 6-9 四活物, 還有四個約, 四個方向(東, 南, 西北), 四風等等來解釋, 為什麼福音是四卷的。
- vii. Tatian. Syrian church. Diatessaron – “through four” – document at the end of the 2nd century. To replace 4 gospels with one. Four – no others – were to be the source of proposed product.
他提安。敘利亞教會領袖。『四位所寫的』 - 是第二世紀末的文件, 想要以這本取代四福音。可是這本『福音』所用上的材料, 都出自四福音, 沒有用其他文獻的材料。
- viii. Origen. “The church of God recognizes only 4 gospels.”
俄利根說: 『神的教會只承認四本福音。』

b. Paul's Epistles

文獻對保羅書信的見證。

All 13 were universally received. As a unit.

十三卷都被所有教會領袖承認。被視為一套整全的書卷。

Pseudo-Pauline literature existed, but never posed threat to the church.

當然, 當時也有冒充保羅寫的書信; 但是沒有一本威脅到教會(意思: 教會沒有相信這些是保羅寫的, 或以神的話來對待這些。)

c. Acts was universally acknowledged as the work of Luke. On the list after the Gospels, before Paul.

《使徒行傳》被所有教會領袖承認是路加所寫的。列在四福音之後, 保羅書信之前。

d. Indisputable books:

沒有疑問(被所有教會領袖接納, 承認)的書信:

4 Gospels 四福音

13 Pauline letters 十三卷保羅書信

Acts	《使徒行傳》
Revelation	《啟示錄》
1 Peter	《彼得前書》
1 John (2 & 3 John were associated with 1 John)	《約翰一書》(通常《約翰二書》， 《約翰三書》與《約翰一書》並列，或 聯在一起被提到)
Jude	《猶大書》

Challenged:

有疑問/被挑戰的書卷：

Hebrews	《希伯來書》
James	《雅各書》
2 Peter	《彼得後書》
Shepherd	《牧人書》
Didache	《使徒遺訓》
1 Clement	《革利免一書》
2 Clement	《革利免二書》

- e. **Summary: There was central agreement, with some disagreement.**
 總的來說，基本上大家同意大部份的書信，有少部份有異議。
The boundaries were fluid – this disproves the theory of the church responding to Marcion.
 教會所承認的新約正典，其“邊界”(定義)不是硬性的，有彈性。
 這個彈性剛好反駁哈納克(Harnack)的理論。
Free, organic development; idea was not coerced by ecclesiastical decision or authority.
 正典的被承認，是一個活的，有機的發展過程。正典這個觀念，
 不是教會開會決定，從上壓下來的。
Therefore: the church was conscious of a collection of documents. It was not thrust upon the church 150-170.

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (2) 《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統的信仰立場 (二)

140-170 AD. 主後 140-170 年

The young church was struggling for its existence.

教會還年輕，掙扎求存。

There were two directions in the writings of this period: Inward – against heresies.

這時候的寫作，針對兩方面：教會內部，要面對異端。

Outward – apologetic writings, aimed at heathen authorities and the masses.

而向外又要護教，面對異教與大眾對基督教的疑問。

No extant evidence of canon.

這時，沒有『正典』這方面的文獻。

With apologetic concern, there was naturally little reason or opportunity to reflect upon the canon.

教會要面對不信的，攻擊基督教的人士來從事護教，當然沒有精力，或機會，來反省正典問題。

The most helpful writings for our study of this period, are those from the heretics.

所以，這個時期的文獻，對我們研究正典這個題目最有幫助的，乃是異端的作品。

1. The Gospel of Truth. 《真理的福音》。

Gnostic writing. Author was Valentinus (Rome). In Latin.

是一本諾斯底派的作品。作者是華倫提奴(羅馬)，用拉丁文寫的。

Used the 4 gospels, Paul, Hebrews, Revelation.

這本書引用了四福音，保羅書信，《希伯來書》，《啟示錄》。

Acts? I John? I Peter?

(不確定有沒有引用：)《使徒行傳》，《約翰壹書》，《彼得前書》。

No use of extra-canonical writings.

重要的是：這本異端的書，沒有引用正典以外的書卷！

Documents convey “Good News” which Valentinus sought to reproduce.

這些書卷述說『福音-好消息，』華倫提奴嘗試從新解說。

Even Hebrews and Revelation were included.

連《希伯來書》和《啟示錄》都用上了！

Therefore: 140-150 Canon was used in Rome.

因此我們可以推論說：在 140-150 時期，新約正典的書卷，在羅馬被使用。

Written well before Marcion was condemned.

這本書是在馬吉安被定為異端之前好長時間。

2. Marcion's Canon. 馬吉安的正典。

Marcion worked on the Canon – trimmed it down for his own interests.

馬吉安處理正典這問題，他為了自己的原因，把《新約聖經》削減了。

He used the same structure as New Testament Canon.

不過，他的正典的結構（次序）還是與《新約聖經》的一樣。
 Gospel (Luke) – he incorporated elements from the other 3 gospels.
 Pauline corpus.

福音書(路加) - 他引用了其他三福音書的材料。
 保羅的所有書信。

No evidence of incorporation of apocryphal materials.
 沒有引用旁經的跡象。

He rejected the General Epistles – also rejected all of the Old Testament.
 馬吉安不承認普遍書信 - 同時拒絕了全部《舊約聖經》。

Therefore: Existence and structure of canon can be seen from Marcion。
 因此：我們可以從馬吉安的正典中，看出當時新約聖經的輪廓。

3. Justin Martyr, 100-165 AD. Apologist.

殉道者游斯丁。100-165。是一位護教者。

Described Christian worship. “Remembrances of the apostles and writings of the prophets were read.”

游斯丁描述了當時敬拜的情況。他說，『使徒們的回憶，和先知們的著作都被誦讀。』

He quoted Matthew, Mark, Luke – recognized them as the apostles’ writings.

游斯丁引用了《馬太福音》，《馬可福音》，《路加福音》，也承認是使徒們所寫的。

Also quoted extra-canonical writings.

游斯丁也引用了正典以外的書卷。

Prophets = Old Testament.

所謂先知 - 是指《舊約聖經》。

Apostles = on a par with prophets. (synecdochic reference)

因此，使徒們的作品，與先知們(舊約)平排並列。

Gospels = included.

這包括福音書。

By use and indirect inference, these included (Zahn):

所用上了的，或間接提到的，包括：

Romans	《羅馬書》
I Corinthians	《哥林多前書》
Galatians	《加拉太書》
Ephesians	《以弗所書》
Colossians	《歌羅西書》
2 Thessalonians	《帖撒羅尼迦後書》
Hebrews	《希伯來書》
1 Peter	《彼得前書》
Acts	《使徒行傳》
Didache	<<使徒遺訓>>

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (3)

《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統的信仰的立場 (三)

Before 140 AD.

主後 140 年之前

By 140 AD, the 4 gospels and 13 Pauline letters were seen as equally authoritative as the Old Testament.

到了 140 年時，四福音和保羅的 13 書信，已經被視為與舊約聖經同樣的有權威。

1. Sources before 140 AD.

140 年前的文獻

- a. 1st Clement. Bishop of Rome, 95-100 AD .
革利免 - 羅馬的主教，主後 95-100。
- b. 7 Letters of Ignatius (church at Antioch) ca. 115 AD to churches in Asia Minor.
安提阿的主教，Ignatius，約 115 年寫的七封信；寫給亞細亞的教會。
- c. Letters of Polycarp (Smyrna) to Philippi. Ca. 110 AD.
波理甲 - 士每那教會 - 寫給腓立比教會的信。約主後 110。
- d. Papias, 60-130 AD. More confident about oral tradition.
Papias，主後 60-130。對於口傳傳統比較有信心。
- e. The New Testament itself.
新約聖經本身。

2. Attestation.

這些文獻對正典的見證。

- a. Attestation to Paul's Letters. Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp – all 13 Pauline letters existed as authoritative, ca. 90-100. The New Testament – 2 Peter 3:14ff. v. 15 – a letter. 16 – all letters – put on the same level as the other Scriptures, i.e., the Old Testament.
對保羅書信的見證。
革利免，Ignatius，和波理甲：都承認，保羅的 13 卷書信是帶有權威的：時為主後 90-100 年。
新約聖經：彼得後書 3：14-16。15 節 - 保羅的一封信。
16 節：保羅所有的信。彼得把這些信，與舊約聖經視為等同。
- b. Attestation to the Gospels. Clement – the words of Jesus were at least equal (if not more) in authority as Old Testament prophets. “The gospel” (to euaggelion) – used before 140 AD to refer to the Gospels with authority. Quotes of the gospels were introduced by the formula: “legei ho kurios” (the Lord says), “he

graphe” (it is written), “gegraptai” (it is written). Silent agreement as to what makes up the Gospel.

對四福音的見證。

革利免：耶穌的話，與舊約先知們的話，同樣的帶有權威，或更加有權威。

『福音』 – 英文 the Gospel – 希臘文 to euaggelion – 單數。

這個觀念 (只有一個福音) 在 140 前已使用，用來指四福音的權威。

當作者引用福音書時，往往說：『主說』 – The Lord says – legei ho kurios；或『經上記著說』 – it is written – he graphe.

或：『記著說』 – it is written – gegraptai.

默默的承認了，福音乃以四福音書組成。

3. Conclusion. There were two collections recognized in this period.

結論：在這時期，教會已承認兩套書卷(舊約，新約)。

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (4)
《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統 的信仰的立場 (四)

3rd and 4th Centuries 第三, 第四世紀

The basic contour of the New Testament canon was clearly seen by the church, 180-220.
 《新約聖經》的基本輪廓，在 180-220 時期已頗清楚。

After this, there were two processes:

220 年之後，有兩方面的發展：

Fixing of limiting lines of the canon, with increasing exclusiveness;
 and (based on this), widespread recognition toward universal recognition.

第一，正典的內容（哪些書卷）越來越清楚，明確；

第二，越來多（差不多所有）教會領袖接受《新約聖經》的正典。

1. Origen. 185-254 AD. He is an overlap figure.

俄利根，185-254。他是一位過渡時期人物。

He traveled widely, and was well respected.

他週游列國，非常被敬重。

a. He made a distinction between the “homologoumena” – those confessed, agreed upon, and the “antilegomena” – those disputed, spoke against.

他分辨出那些被承認，同意的書，與那些被懷疑，反對的書卷。

b. The homologoumena were: 4 gospels, 13 letters of Paul, 1 Peter, 1 John, Acts, Revelation.

前者包括：四福音書，保羅十三卷書信，《彼得前》，《約翰壹書》，《使徒行傳》，《啟示錄》。

The antilegomena were: Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, James, Jude; Letter of Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas, Didache (The Teachings of the Apostles), Gospel of the Hebrews.

後者包括：《希伯來書》，《彼得後書》，《約翰二書》，《約翰三書》，《雅各書》，《猶大書》；還有：《巴拿巴書》，《黑馬牧人書》，《使徒遺訓》，《希伯來人的福音》。

2. Eusebius. 260-340 AD.

優西比烏，260-340。

Bishop of Caesarea. Made the same distinction as Origen.

該撒利亞的主教。與俄利根一樣區分兩種書信。

Homologoumena – 4 gospels, Acts, 14 letters of Paul (including Hebrews), 1 Peter, 1 John (perhaps Revelation).

前者：四福音書，《使徒行傳》，保羅 14 卷書信（包括《希伯來書》），《彼得前書》，《約翰壹書》（也可能《啟示錄》）。

Antilegomena – (a) to be accepted – James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John. (b) to be rejected: Shepherd, Barnabas, Didache, Apocalypse of Peter (perhaps Revelation).

後者包括 (一) 應被接納的：《雅各書》，《猶大書》，《彼得後書》，《約翰二書》，《約翰三書》。(二) 應被拒絕的：《牧人書》，《巴拿巴書》，《使徒遺訓》，《彼得的啟示錄》 (=《啟示錄》?)。

Homologoumena and antilegomena (to be accepted) together = 27 of our New Testament canon.

前者，與後者中應被接納的書信，加起來 = 27 本我們的新約書信。

3. Athanasius. 296-373 AD. Bishop of Alexandria.

阿他那修，296-373，亞歷山大主教。

Athanasian Creed – stated clearly the doctrine of the Trinity endorsed by the council of Nicea.

阿他那修的信經 - 清楚地說出尼西亞大公會議所訂下地三位一體教義。

Easter Letter of 367. Pastoral-official open communication to the church.

367 年復活節教牧書信。是主教寫給教區的公開信。

There is a section on the problem of the continued use of the apocrypha in his district.

信裡有一段處理在教區裡有人還用旁經的問題。

What makes up Scripture? Canonical – the 27 books of the New Testament.

那麼，《新約聖經》包括哪些書卷呢？就是 27 卷。

This is the first instance of maintaining only the 27 as the New Testament canon. First formal ecclesiastical decree.

這是教會歷史上，第一次教會正式的宣佈，《新約聖經》就是指這 27 卷。

There is a sharp line here, then:

27 卷之後有清楚的界限，然後：

Books worthy of reading: Old Testament apocrypha, Shepherd, Didache.

有些值得讀的書：舊約旁經，牧人書，使徒遺訓。

Then, a line not as sharp here, then:

之後又有一個界限(不過沒有前面的界限那麼清楚，嚴重)：

Books to be fully rejected.

應被拒絕的書卷。

Athanasius' letter took the status of a decree in the Eastern church.

在東方教會中，阿他那修的這封信，有教會官方決定的權威。

4. Council Decisions.

教會會議的決定。

Church councils in the western church: Synod of Rome, 382. 27 NT books.

西方教會的會議：羅馬會議，382。27 卷書。

Church councils in the eastern church: Synod of Hippo, 393; Synod of Carthage, 397.

東方教會的會議：希坡會議，393。迦太基會議，397。

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (5)

《新約聖經》的正典：歷史發展與正統的信仰立場 (五)

Part Two. WHAT WE BELIEVE CONCERNING THE CANON

第二部份：我們對正典的信仰

The Bible's inspiration is necessary for canonicity and its authority.

《聖經》是神所默示的；神的默示是《聖經》正典和《聖經》權威的大前提 (基礎)，是必須條件。

But: 不過：

- A. The church has not been able to establish criteria of canonicity.
教會不曾（從未）建立過能決定《聖經》正典的準則。
- B. The church cannot establish criteria for canonicity.
教會不可能建立能決定《聖經》正典的準則！
- C. God is canon.
神乃正典。
- D. The Structure of the Office of the Apostle.
使徒這個職位的結構。
- E. Redemptive history and the history of revelation.
救贖歷史與啟示的歷史。

- A. The church has not been able to establish criteria of canonicity.
教會不曾（從未）建立過能決定《聖經》正典的準則。

1. Apostolicity – as a criterion for canonicity.

可以用『使徒性』來決定正典嗎？

(意思是說：一本書只要是使徒寫的，就應在正典裡。)

Difficulties – Mark, Luke, Acts; Hebrews?, Jude, James?.

這個準則有它的問題：

《馬可福音》，《路加福音》，《使徒行傳》；（可能）《希伯來書》，《猶大書》，（可能）《雅各書》 --

These books were not (may not have been) written by apostles.

這些都不是(或可能不是)使徒親筆寫的。

The idea of “apostolic men” weakens the criterion of apostolicity for canonicity.

假如我們說，是使徒『佈道團』團隊裡的人寫就可以了 -- 那麼，『使徒性』這準則就削弱了。

I Corinthians 5:9 – Paul's letter to Corinthians;

林前 5：9 – 保羅還有（一封？）信寫了給哥林多教會的；

Colossians 4:16 – Paul's letter to Laodicea –

西 4：16 – 保羅寫信給老底嘉教會。

These were apostolic, but not in the canon.

這些都是使徒寫的，但是沒有列在正典(新約)裡。

2. **Antiquity. This criterion cannot stand.**
最古舊的書卷就應該列在正典裡。這準則不成立。
3. **Public lection (Zahn).**
一本書有沒有被公開誦讀 -這是 Zahn 提出的準則。
Difficulty – Didache, Shepherd ... were used in the church; read publicly.
這個準則也有困難。比方說，《使徒遺訓》，《牧人書》在教會裡被使用，被公開的誦讀！
2 Peter, 3 John, Jude were used before they were recognized.
而《彼得後書》，《約翰三書》在沒有被承認之前，就被使用了。
4. **Inspiration.**
默示的準則。
Inspiration is necessary to canonicity, but the two ideas do not coincide.
是的，默示對於正典是必須的。可是默示與正典是兩個不同的觀念。
Inspiration is necessary. But just inspiration is not sufficient.
默示是必須的。可是光是默示還不夠。
I Corinthians 5:9 – apostolic communications were inspired; but some are not extant in the canon.
林前 5：9 -使徒們有一些被聖靈靈感而寫的，沒有在正典裡。

- B. The church *cannot* establish criteria for canonicity.**
教會不可能建立能決定《聖經》正典的準則。
Attempts to establish criteria must fail.
若嘗試訂下這種準則，必然失敗。
They threaten to undermine the authority of Scripture.
因為這樣作，就威脅，削弱《聖經》的權威。
They destroy the New Testament as canon.
這樣作，就破壞了《新約聖經》的正典。
They subject canon to the relativity of historical study.
因為這樣作時，我們將《聖經》服在人的，相對的歷史學的研究下。
They attempt to control the canon by fallible human insight.
這樣一來，正典（《聖經》）就被有限的，可犯錯的人為思維控制了。
It is rationalization: we generalize upon a unique historical entity.
是理性的絕對化：我們把一個歷史上空前絕后的現象（《聖經》這本書），用一個更高低觀念含蓋它。
We try to get at the canon from above it.
我們嘗試從正典（《聖經》）的上面看下來。必然失敗！

The canon is self-establishing.
<<聖經>>的正典是自我建立的。

The canon is self-attesting.

《聖經》的正典是自我見證的。

The canon is self-validating.

《聖經》的正典是自我合法化的。

C. God is canon.

神乃正典。

God is the origin and author of the New Testament.

《新約聖經》源自神；神是《新約聖經》的作者！

The canon is not some impersonal process.

正典不是一個無情的歷史過程。

God is personally involved in the process.

神直接地參與，介入這過程。

[We must guard against some abstract view of history, as if God is not involved.]

我們必須提防，不能做法世俗的歷史觀：世俗的歷史觀的假設是：神沒有參與歷史。

Abstract view of history:

不承認《聖經》權威的歷史觀，必然是抽象的歷史觀，列表如下：

A priori idea of canon 一個抽象的(沒有神介入)的『正典』觀念

^ ^ ^ ^ ^
| | | | |
Apostolic church history 使徒時期歷史

X X X X X X X X X
(historical phenomenon) (個別歷史事件，現象)

Canon is not just some brute fact, hanging on the horizon of our past, i.e., on just pure contingency.

正典不是某個赤裸(孤存)的歷史事實，在我們過去的水平線上；意思是說，正典不是偶然的。

Biblical view of history:

合乎《聖經》的歷史觀是：

History is the realization and expression of God's eternal, predetermined plan.

人類/宇宙歷史，乃是神永恆的，預定的計劃的實現與表達。

The Bible is not a human anthology (collection).

《聖經》並不是一套人為的作品。

Therefore the Bible does not need to be verified.

因此，《聖經》並不須要由人(教會)來斷定/使它合法化。

The canon is closed – it is closed for our times, from the Apostolic Age to the Second Coming of Christ.

正典已經關閉(意思是：《聖經》已經寫成了)，從使徒時代知道主再來。

Canon is not some abstract, timeless idea/process.

正典(教會承認《聖經》)不是抽象的概念，不是抽離時間的概念/過程。

Therefore: GOD IS CANON.

因此我們說：神就是正典。(正典這個字，是指標準。原文是指一支尺。)

But – we must do justice to the fact that the New Testament is a historical phenomenon, with a historical origin.

可是，我們當然應該正視一個事實，就是：《新約聖經》的寫成，是一個歷史的事實。《聖經》有它在歷史中的起源。

(See above diagram: abstract view of history.)

Apostolicity is not a (sufficient) criterion for canonicity.

使徒性這個準則，對正典來說是不足夠的。

But canonicity cannot be asserted without apostolicity.

可是，沒有使徒性，我們也不能宣認正典。

D. The Structure of the Office of the Apostle.

使徒的職位的結構。

Apostolos – Hebrew shaliach.

使徒(希臘文) - 相對與希伯來文的 shaliach 這個字。

A technical term in intertestamental Judaism.

是在新舊約聖經之間的時期，猶太人用的一個專用名詞。

It is a legal term. A representative, with legally empowered authority.

是一個法律上帝用詞，知一個作法律上承認的，有權力的“代表人”。

In carrying out his commission, a shaliach is identified with his commission.

一個 shaliach 執行他的任務時，他與他的任務同為一。

Talmud (5th – 4th century, BC) – a man’s shaliach = man himself.

他勒目(猶太遺傳法典，主前 4, 5 世紀) - 一個人的 shaliach 等於他自己。

John 13:12ff, esp. v. 16 – Authority is derived. Identification with the sender.

約翰福音 13: 12 等，尤其 16 節：權威是被授予的。被授權的那位，與授權的那位認同了。

Apostolic authority is unique and full authority.

使徒弟權威，是獨特的權威。

使徒弟權威，是完全(充份)的權威。

The apostles were the foundation of the church.

使徒們是教會的基礎。

Apostolic gifts did not operate in isolation.

使徒使用他們的屬靈恩賜並不是在 1 真空裡使用的。

The church is the result of God's house-building activity in the exalted Christ.

教會的被建立，是因神自己在建造聖殿 - 都因主耶穌復活，被榮耀。

The church is realized between Christ's resurrection and Christ's return.

教會的實現，是在主耶穌復活之後，再來之前。

Apostles were the foundation of the church.

使徒們是教會的根基。

Ephesians 2:19, 20.

以弗所書 2: 19-20。

The ultimate foundation is Christ, but the foundation involves others (apostles and prophets).

教會至終的根基是耶穌基督。不過根基包括其他人：使徒們，和先知們。

Prophets were mentioned with the apostles, as the foundation of the church.

先知們與使徒們並提，為教會的根基。

There were New Testament prophets.

新約時期也有顯知的。

There was variety of offices and functions –

新約時期有不同的職位，不同的職位用不同的功能，

But the apostles were primary.

可是使徒是最重要的職位。

Apostles had a specific function within the context of redemptive history.

在神的救贖計劃，救贖歷史中，使徒的功能是獨特的。

見證基督的復活；作基督的代表，有權威；口傳，筆傳，行神蹟。

The office of the apostle was not perpetuated.

而使徒的職位沒有傳下去。

Apostolic witness = witness to the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

使徒的見證就是：耶穌已復活了！

Acts 1:21; 2:32; 3:15; 4:33; etc.

徒 1: 21, 2: 32, 3: 15, 4: 33 等等。

1 Thess. 2:13 Apostolic proclamation is equated with the Word of God.

帖前 2: 13 使徒所宣講的，與神的話等同。教會就這樣接受使徒所講的。

1 Cor. 11:23 Christ himself is the bearer of apostolic tradition.

林前 11: 23 基督就是使徒傳統的主人與內容。

John 15:26, 27 The Spirit's coming is for the purpose of apostolic witness.

約翰 15: 26, 27 聖靈要來，目的就是使使徒們能作見證。

Therefore from the apostolic matrix, new revelation is given.

因此，透過使徒的職位(和他們週圍的同工們)，神賜下了新的(新約時期)啟示。

Apostolic witness = the foundation of the church.

使徒們所作的見證 = 教會的根基。

Apostolic witness = preserved in the church, by the church.

使徒們所作的見證 = 在教會裡被保存，被教會保存。

Apostolic concern for preservation:

使徒們本身關切保存傳統這件事：

Apostolic witness = viewed as tradition, paradosis.

使徒們視他們的見證為傳統，希臘文： paradosis。

2 Thess. 2:15

帖後 2： 15 - 教訓， 原文是傳統。

2 Thess. 3:6

帖後 3： 6

1 Cor. 11:2

林前 11： 2

Apostolic tradition = both oral and written

使徒弟傳統乃是口傳遞，也是筆傳遞。

2 Thess.2 :15

帖後 2： 15

2 Thess. 2:2

帖後 2： 2

Paul to Timothy: Guard the paratheke – the thing entrusted.

保羅囑咐提摩太： 要護衛“所交託給他的” – 希臘文： paratheke.

1 Tim. 6:20

提前 6： 20

2 Tim. 1:14

提後 1： 14

2 Tim. 2:2

提後 2： 2

A more technical, stereotyped term – a specific entity.

這個是一個專用名詞。所交託的事，有一定的內容。

There was clear anticipation that:

我們可以說：使徒時期的教會關切到，預先看到，

As the apostles die off, as oral witnesses cease,

當使徒們去世後，當口傳停止時，

As apostolic control of oral tradition is no longer available,

當使徒們再不能控制口傳這個過程時，

The written apostolic witness will come into prominence,

使徒弟筆傳傳統就會顯為重要。

It will function as the foundation of the continuing church.

這個筆之於書的傳統就成為教會的根基/權威。

Complementary fact: Foundational significance of written apostolic witness = recognized.

與此同時的，相輔相成的事實是：教會承認，看見，使徒的寫作，在教會裡佔有“根基性”的重要性/權威。

E. Redemptive History and the History of Revelation.

救贖歷史與啟示歷史。

Redemptive revelation = verbal revelation.

神救贖的啟示，是話語的啟示。

Correlation between redemptive deed and revelatory word.

神救贖的作為，與塌啟示的話語 (曉諭) 之間有密切的關係。

Focus of verbal on the act.

神的話語的重點，放在他的救贖作為上。

Verbal revelation = parallel of, part of redemptive history.

神話語的啟示 = 與救贖歷史平衡，是救贖歷史的一部份。

Highpoints of redemptive history = associated with full outpouring of verbal revelation.

因此，當救贖歷史達到高潮的時候，神話語的啟示也會達到高潮。

(Exodus; rebuilding of Temple – Haggai, Zephaniah, Malachi)

(例如：出埃及；重建聖殿 - 哈該，西番雅，馬拉基)

The history of revelation is closed for us, until the Second Coming of Christ.

神啟示的歷史在目前是結束了；知道主再來。

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY 三位一體教義發展簡史

第一部份 諾斯底主義(神哲派) GNOSTICISM

諾斯底派的主要教義

The Main Teachings of Gnosticism

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 47-49; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 30-32。林慈信修。)

我們在此不討論諾斯底主義的各種派系, 如 Valentinus 與 Basilides 等; 我們只簡單地討論諾斯底主義的教義。他們的教義有『二元論』(dualism) 的特徵。宇宙有兩個原始原則, 或兩個神, 他們彼此敵對, 一個高於另一個, 甚至一善一惡。至高的神, 即善神, 是無可測度的深淵。祂在自己與有限的被造物中間, 造了一連串的中級存有者(middle beings, 或 aeons: 靈體), 都是從神性放射的 (emanations of the divine), 這些神聖的存有也被稱為分神。善神與這些分神總合在一起, 稱為『圓滿』(pleroma), 就是神性本質的豐滿 (fullness of the divine essence)。至高的神只能藉這些『分神』與被造物發生關係。世界並不是善神所造, 乃是因為神性豐滿中發生了墮落; 所以世界是一位低級的, 可能有敵意的神所造。這位低級的神被稱為『造物主』(Demiurge), 即是舊約的耶和華, 是一位較低的, 有限的, 有激情的, 有時也會報復的存有者。這位造物主與至高真神之間, 有著強烈的對照; 至高真神是至善, 至德, 至真之源; 祂在基督裡顯示出來。

We cannot discuss the various Gnostic systems, such as those of Valentinus and Basilides, but can only briefly indicate the teachings of Gnosticism in general. A trait of dualism runs through the whole system and manifests itself in the position that there are two original principles or gods, which are opposed to each other as higher and lower, or even as good and bad. The supreme or good God is an unfathomable abyss. He interposes between Himself and finite creatures a long chain of aeons or middle beings, emanations from the divine, which together constitute the Pleroma or fullness of the divine essence. It is only through these intermediate beings that the highest God can enter into various relations with created beings. The world is not created by the good God, but is the result of, probably, a fall in the Pleroma, and is the work of a subordinate, possibly a hostile, deity. This subordinate god, is called the Demiurge, is identified with the God of the Old Testament, and is described as an inferior, limited, passionate, and vengeful being. He is contrasted with the supreme God, the source of goodness, virtue, and truth, who revealed Himself in Christ.

物質世界既是這一位低等的, 可能是『惡神』所造, 因此物質本身是邪惡的。然而物質裡有靈界的餘種, 就是人的靈魂, 是從高級聖潔世界來的一道光。這餘種怎樣與物質纏在一起, 無人能解釋。靈魂得解脫, 只有藉善神的介入。有一個救法, 就是一位使者從眾光的國度差遣到黑暗的世界來。基督教的諾斯底主義通常認為基督就是這使者。關於基督, 他們有多種描述: 有時祂被視為一位屬天存

有，以一種幻影的靈體出現。有時祂又被視為一位屬世的人，暫時與一種更高的力量或靈體相連。物質既然本是惡的，這位高超的靈不可能有一般的人體。

The world of matter as the product of a lesser and possibly an evil god, is essentially evil. There is found in it, however, a remnant from the spirit-world, namely, the soul of man, a spark of light from the upper world of purity which in some inexplicable way became entangled in evil matter. Its deliverance can be obtained only through some intervention of the good God. A way of deliverance has been provided by the sending of a special emissary from the kingdom of light into the world of darkness. In Christian Gnosticism this emissary is regularly identified with Christ. He is variously represented, either as a celestial being appearing in a phantasmal body, or as an earthly being, with whom a higher power or spirit temporarily associated himself. Since matter is in itself evil, this higher spirit could not have an ordinary human body.

若要在救贖上有份，或勝過世界，必需參加諾斯底派，領受人教的秘密儀式。救贖之途徑包括以下各步驟：進入與基督結婚的奧秘，特殊的洗禮，神奧的名字，以及特別的膏抹。這樣才能獲永存的秘密知識 (*secret knowledge of Being*)。從這方面看，諾斯底主義近乎一種秘密宗教。人類分為三種：屬靈的人，是教會中高級委員；屬魂的人，是教會中一般的會友；屬物質的人，即所有的外邦人。只有第一類才能獲得更高的知識，因之有更高的福份。第二類藉信心與行為也能得救，他們只能獲得次等的福份。第三類是毫無盼望，失喪之人。

Participation in redemption, or victory over the world, was gained only through the secret rites of the Gnostic associations. Initiation into the mysteries of marriage to Christ, of peculiar baptism, of magic names, and of special anointing, by which the secret knowledge of Being was secured, formed the path of redemption. At this point Gnosticism became more and more a system of religious mysteries. Men are divided into three classes: the pneumatic who constitute the elite of the Church, the psychic consisting of the ordinary Church members, and the hylic or the Gentiles. Only the first class is really capable of higher knowledge (*epignosis*) and thus obtains the highest blessedness. The second class may be saved through faith and works, but can only attain to an inferior blessedness. Those belonging to the third class are hopelessly lost.

諾斯底主義的倫理哲學有兩種相反的結果：他們的倫理道德與他們的救贖觀有關。有時主張苦修主義，但也有人認為屬靈的人既有了屬天的祝福，肉體方面的行為並不能影響他們的救恩，所以不禁止肉體的情慾，過著放蕩的生活。諾斯底主義的教義完全忽視末世論，他們否認死人復活的教義。他們認為當人的靈魂離開物質的身體時，就進到『完滿』的境界，這就是人生的結局。

The ethics, or moral philosophy, accompanying these views of redemption, was dominated by a false estimate of sensuousness, which resulted either in strict ascetic abstinence or in low carnality, born of the assurance that nothing could really hinder those who were favoured of heaven. There was asceticism on the one hand and libertinism on the other. The ordinary eschatology of the Church had no place in this system. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead was not recognized. When the soul was finally released from matter, it returned to the Pleroma, and this marked the end.

附錄：諾斯底派的敬拜

- 從高到低 -- 從不變的本質 – 靈 – 到魂，到變與死，物質，到無有
- 每一種存有有沒有更好的事物：本質的不同
- 低的存有被更高的 (屬靈人) 毀滅

「當約翰見了福徒拿都的不變心靈時，說道：啊，那不變為較好的本性呀！啊，那停駐於愚頑的魂之泉呀！啊，那充滿黑暗的腐敗之本質呀！啊，那歡躍於屬死亡的他們之死亡呀！啊，充滿火燒的無果之樹呀！啊，那結著石炭之果的樹木呀！啊，那與物質的瘋狂及不信者鄰舍同住之物質呀！你證明了你是誰和總是跟你的兒女同被判決。你不知道怎樣贊頌較好的事物；因為你沒有它們。因而你的道路（？成果）怎樣，你的根底和你的本性也是怎樣。願你從那些信靠主的他們遭受毀滅，從他們的思想，從他們的心念，從他們的靈魂，從他們的身體，從他們的行為，他們的生活，他們的談話，從他們的工作，他們的職業，他們的謀略，從復活到安息於上帝，從他們的那你將不可分享的甘甜的滋味，從他們的信仰，他們的祈禱，從聖洗，從聖餐，從肉的餅，從酒，從衣，從愛，從看顧，從節制，從公義；從這一切，你那最不潔的撒但，上帝的敵人啊，我們的上帝耶穌基督必要即作為你和你性格一樣的人的審判官，必將使你們從以上所說的一切斬絕而至滅亡。」

(*<約翰行傳>*，第 84 章。《基督教早期文獻選集》，頁 465。)

諾斯底派對基督的贊歌

- 基督不是真有物質身體的
- 基督的人性，身體 = 幻影？舉身離地？
- 基督的事 = 神秘，無從言說

(約翰說) 眾弟兄，我又要告訴你們另一榮耀之事。當我把捉住他，我忽捉到一具物質的僵硬的身體，而另一時當我感觸了他，這實體卻又是非物質的，而像毫無存在的樣子。每當他被某個法利賽人請吃飯而允許去的時候，我們跟了他去，而主人在我們每一個人面前放了一塊麵包，他也跟我們一樣受了一塊；他祝福了他那一塊，而把它分給了我們；每一個人無不從那個小麵包吃飽了，而我們所有的一塊全都不吃了因而主人驚奇呆木了。我曾屢次跟他同走，想察看他的腳印是否留在地面上；因為我看他好似舉身離地，我從不曾見他腳蹤。眾弟兄，我告訴了你們這些事，為的是鼓勵你們對祂的信心；因為我們今日必不說到祂的大能和奇妙作為，由於它們實皆無可言說的，可能是，完全無從講起或聽到的。

(*<約翰行傳>*，第 93 章。《基督教早期文獻選集》，頁 467。)

第二部份 反諾斯底主義的教父們 **The Anti-Gnostic Fathers**

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 62-69; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 43-50。林慈信修。)

護教學的教父時期，很自然地轉入另一個時期，就是繼承他們的『反諾斯底主義的教父』(Anti-Gnostic Fathers)。其中最重要的有三位。

From the Apologists we naturally pass on to the anti-gnostic Fathers who succeeded them. Three of these stand out with great prominence.

愛任紐 (Irenaeus)

第一位反諾斯底主義的教父是愛任紐。他出生於東方，後來稱為坡旅甲的門徒，但他的一生大部份時間住在西方。他本是一位長老(presbyter, 即牧師)，後來成為里昂(Lyon)的監督。他的著作顯示一種實踐的基督徒精神，他的思想近於約翰的教義，但有時他的觀念中也會重視感情。他最主要的作品是《反異端》(*Against Heresies*)一書，其中特別批判諾斯底主義。從本書中可以看出他的才幹，他所論述的基督教的福音也非常純粹，中肯。

The first one that comes into consideration here is Irenaeus. He was born in the East, where he became a disciple of Polycarp, but spent the main part of his life in the West. At first a presbyter, he afterwards became bishop of Lyons. He evinces a practical Christian spirit in his writings, and represents a Johannine type of Christian doctrine, though not without some traces of a more sensuous conception. In his chief work, *Against Heresies*, he takes issue particularly with Gnosticism. It is a work marked by ability, moderation, and purity in its representation of Christianity.

希坡利達 (Hippolytus)

第二位是希坡利達，據說是愛任紐的門徒，他的思維取向很像他的老師。他也是一位非常單純，中肯，實踐的人。他雖不像愛任紐那樣有天才，但他很喜好哲學思想。他主要在羅馬附近事奉，據說在那裡殉道。他最重要的著作是《駁斥異端》(*The Refutation of All Heresies*)。他發現所有教義上的謬誤，是出於在哲學上的揣測。

The second of these Fathers is Hippolytus, who is said to have been a disciple of Irenaeus and greatly resembled his teacher in mental make-up, being simple, moderate, and practical. Less gifted than Irenaeus, he gives evidence of a greater fondness for philosophical ideas. After labouring in the neighbourhood of Rome, he seems to have suffered martyrdom in that city. His principal work is entitled *The Refutation of All Heresies*. He finds the root of all the perversions of doctrine in the speculations of the philosophers.

特土良 (Tertullian)

三位教父中最偉大的一位是特土良；他不但有深奧的智慧和豐富的情感，又有活潑的想像力。他的學問很高，又有敏銳的觀察力。他在迦太基作長老（牧師），因此是北非神學派系的代表。又因為他的性格非常激烈，所以他為基督教辯護時會用嚴厲的言辭。他本是律師，對羅馬法律非常熟悉，他的神學著作中也使用法律名詞與觀念。他與希坡利達一樣，認為所有的異端乃受希臘哲學的影響，因之他竭力反對哲學。他真誠熱切的本性，使他對時代的放蕩精神非常厭憎，後來甚至接納了厭世的孟他努主義 (Montanism)。他認為與異端辯論不會發生功效，因此認為處置異端最簡單的方法就是向他們提出異議。他是對西方神學思想影響最深的教父。

The third and greatest of the famous trio was Tertullian, a man of profound intellect and deep feeling, of a vivid imagination, and distinguished by acuteness and great learning. As presbyter of Carthage he represents the North African type of theology. Due to his violent temper he was naturally passionate in his representation of Christianity and somewhat given to extreme statements. As a lawyer he was familiar with Roman law and introduced legal conceptions and legal phraseology into theological discussions. Like Hippolytus he, too, was inclined to deduce all heresy from the philosophy of the Greeks, and therefore became a zealous opponent of philosophy. His native fervour reacted strongly against the lax spirit of the age, and even induced him to embrace Montanism in later life. Convinced of the futility of arguing with heretics, he said it was best to meet them with a simply demurrer. He influenced Western theology more than any of the others.

神論，人論，及救贖歷史

Their Doctrines of God, Man, and the History of Redemption

神的教義

Doctrine of God

他們認為諾斯底主義最大的錯誤，乃是將真神與創造主分為兩位。他們認為諾斯底主義是出於撒但的褻瀆；他們特別重視只有一位真神，祂不但是創造之主，也是救贖的主。律法由祂所賜，福音也是祂所啟示。這位神是三一真神；有三個位格 (three persons)，但只有一個本質 (a single essence)。特土良是教會歷史上第一個指出神有三個位格，也是首先使用“三位一體” (Trinitas) 專名的人。為了要駁斥神格唯一派 (Monarchianism)，他特別重視神是一位，但有三個位格；只有一個本質 (one substance)。雖在數字上是三位，但神的本體絕無分裂。雖是如此，特土良的三一觀仍是不太正確，因為他認為三位格中有等次之分。

They regarded the separation of the true God and the Creator as the fundamental error of the Gnostics, as a blasphemous conception suggested by the devil, and stressed the fact that there is but one God, who is both Creator and Redeemer. He gave the law and also revealed the Gospel. This God is triune, a single essence subsisting in three persons. Tertullian was the first to assert the tri-personality of God and to use the word

“Trinity.” In opposition to the Monarchians he emphasized the fact that the three Persons are of one substance, susceptible of number without division. Yet he did not reach the proper Trinitarian statement, since he conceived of one Person as subordinate to the others.

人的教義

Doctrine of Man

他們在人論上也反對諾斯底主義；他們特別指出，在人裡面的善惡，並不是天賦的本性的 (natural endowments)。假使物質是惡的，那麼人的本性是惡的，人就不能被視為有道德選擇的存有者 (a free moral being)。然而人是按著神的形像而造，並非不朽 (意即：並非完全)；但是人若順服，則可能獲得不朽。罪乃是叛逆，結果是死亡；正如順服神的結果是不朽。全人類都在亞當裡服在死亡之下。當時的教父們並沒有詳細指出我們的罪怎樣與亞當的罪有關，唯有特土良曾略為提到這一點。他說自從一個人出生，惡就在人的本性裡，這種光景藉著繁殖傳遞給人類。這是論到原罪的教義最早的記錄。

In the doctrine of man they also opposed the Gnostics by stressing the fact that good and evil in man do not find their explanation in different natural endowments. If evil is inherent in matter, and therefore in man as such, he can no more be regarded as a free moral being. Man was created in the image of God, without immortality indeed (i.e. without perfection), but with the possibility of receiving this in the way of obedience. Sin is disobedience and brings death, just as obedience brings immortality. In Adam the whole race became subject to death. The connection of our sin with that of Adam is not yet clearly apprehended, though Tertullian makes some suggestive statements on the subject. He says that evil became, as it were, a natural element in man, present from birth, and that this condition passes over through generation upon the whole human race. This is the first trace of the doctrine of original sin.

救贖歷史

History of Redemption

Irenaeus has something special on the history of redemption. He says that God expelled man from paradise and suffered him to die, in order that the injury sustained might not remain for ever. From the start God was deeply concerned for the salvation of the race, and sought to win it by three covenants. The law written in the heart of man represented the first covenant. The patriarchs were righteous before God because they met its requirements. When the knowledge of this law faded away, the Decalogue was given, representing the second covenant. On account of Israel's sinful disposition the law of ceremonies was added, to prepare the people for following Christ and for friendship with God. The Pharisees made it of none effect by robbing it of its chief content, namely, love. In the third covenant Christ restored the original law, the law of love. This covenant is related to the preceding as freedom to bondage, and requires faith, not only in the Father, but also in the Son, who has now appeared. It is not, like the preceding,

limited to Israel, but is universal in its scope. Christians received a stricter law than the Jews and have more to believe, but they also receive a greater measure of grace. To these three periods Tertullian, while an adherent of Montanism, still added the era of the Spirit.

基督的位格與工作

Their Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ

對於基督位格的教義，愛任紐與特土良大相逕庭；所以我們必需分別討論。Irenaeus and Tertullian differ considerably in their doctrine of the Person of Christ, and therefore it may be well to consider them separately.

1. 愛任紐

Irenaeus' Christology

愛任紐的基督論比特土良和希波利達更正確，他的基督論也影響了希波利達。他非常討厭對『道』的揣測，因為這樣只會帶來更多的揣測。他只指出『道』是永存的，也是藉著道而將父神顯示出來。他以歷史上顯示的神的兒子為真正的出發點。藉著『道成肉身』，道成為歷史上的耶穌；從那時起祂是真神，也是真人。他反對諾斯底主義的異端，就是說那位不能受苦的基督在十字架釘死之前與那位能受苦的耶穌分開了。他卻指出神與人性聯合是至為重要的。人類在第二亞當基督裡再次與神聯合。人類，無論是以往的或將來的人，在祂裡面得到恢復 (recapitulation)，這恢復使人類從亞當墮落後踏上之途挽回過來。這是愛任紐基督論的中心思想。他提到耶穌基督替死贖罪，但沒有太強調。基督工作的最重要因素是祂的順服，祂的順服抵消了亞當的不順服。

The Christology of Irenaeus is superior to that of Tertullian and Hippolytus and influenced the latter to a greater extent. He is averse to speculations about the Logos, because these lead at most to probable guesses. He merely asserts that the Logos existed from all eternity and was instrumental in revealing the Father; and then takes his real starting-point in the historically revealed Son of God. Through the incarnation the Logos became the historical Jesus, and thereafter was at once true God and true man. He rejects the heresy of the Gnostics that in His suffering and death the passible Jesus was separated from the impassible Christ, and attaches the greater significance to the union of God with human nature. In Christ as the second Adam the human race is once more united to God. There is in Him a recapitulation of mankind, which reaches backward as well as forward, and in which mankind reverses the course on which it entered at the fall. This is the very core of the Christological teaching of Irenaeus. The death of Christ as our substitute is mentioned but not stressed. The central element in the work of Christ is His obedience, whereby the disobedience of Adam is cancelled.

2. 特土良

Tertullian's Christology

特土良的基督論以『道』為出發點，發展出在歷史上很重要的教義。他說：基督教的『道』有實際的本質(a real subsistence)，是一位獨立的位格(Person)，是神所生，從神而出；不是從神流出，乃是自動生長(self-projection)，正像樹木從根生長出來一樣。祂的存在是有起點的(There was a time when he was not)。特土良強調『道』與父同質(substance)，但生存的形態(mode of existence)卻與父不同。祂有自己的位格。祂的存在不是由於和父神分隔開來(partitioning)，乃是藉自我彰顯(self-unfolding)。父是全部的本質，而子只是本質的一部份，因為子是演展出來的(derived)。特土良並沒有完全脫出子是低於父的觀念。特土良的長遠重要性，乃是因為他是第一位提出本質(substance)與位格(person)這個觀念者；後來制訂尼西亞信經(Nicene Creed)時，就用到這些觀念。我們可以說他擴大了『道』的教義，發展為三位一體的教義。為了駁斥神格唯一派，特土良強調神性中的三個位格只有一個本質。位格乃眾數，卻沒本體之別。可惜他並沒有完全講明三位一體的教義。他只看到『道』是在神裡面的『無位格理性』(impersonal reason)，在創造時才有位格。一個位格低於另一個位格這觀念，又以粗略的方式表達：第一位格參與神性的本質(substance)比較多，而第二位格的參與較少。

Tertullian takes his starting-point in the doctrine of the Logos, but develops it in a way that became historically significant. He stresses the fact that the Logos of the Christians is a real subsistence, an independent Person, who was begotten by God and thus proceeded from Him, not by emanation, but by self-projection, just as a root projects a tree. There was a time when He was not. He emphasizes the fact that the Logos is of the same substance with the Father, and yet differs from Him in mode of existence as a distinct Person. He did not come into existence by partitioning but by self-unfolding. The Father is the whole substance, but the Son is only a part of it, because He is derived. Tertullian did not entirely get away from the idea of subordination. His work is of lasting significance in connection with the introduction of the conception of substance and person into theology, ideas that were utilized in the construction of the Nicene Creed. It may be said that he enlarged the doctrine of the Logos into a doctrine of the Trinity. In opposition to the Monarchian theory he stressed the fact that the three persons in the Godhead are of one substance, susceptible of number without division. Yet he did not succeed in reaching the full Trinitarian statement. He too conceived of *the Logos as originally impersonal reason in God*, become personal at the time of creation. And subordination of the one person to the other is presented in the crude form of a greater and lesser participation of the first and second persons in the divine substance.

關於基督的神人二性，特土良與小亞細亞派的說法非常相似。關於基督完全的人性，除了麥利都(Melito)之外，他比其他教父們都講得更清晰。他清楚地分辨基督的兩性不混淆，神性人性都有各自的屬性。他認為兩性並沒有融合起來(fusion)，神人二性在基督裡聚在一起(conjunction)。他很重視耶穌基督的死，但沒有詳細解明，因為他並沒有強調耶穌受刑替死贖罪的必需性。他只注重罪人必需誠心悔罪。他雖認為神的公義有刑罰的因素，但特別高舉神的憐憫。同時，他的教導中有律法主義的趨向。他認為人受洗之後若犯罪，必須悔改或認罪，才能滿足神的要求。他又認為藉禁食及禁慾來治死罪(self-mortification)，能叫人逃避永刑。

Relative to the God-man and His two natures Tertullian expressed himself very

much as the School of Asia Minor did. He surpasses all the other Fathers, except Melito, in doing justice to the full humanity of Christ, and in his clear distinction of the two natures, each one retaining its own attributes. According to him *there is no fusion, but a conjunction of the human and the divine in Christ*. He is very emphatic on the importance of the death of Christ, but is not entirely clear on this point, since he does not stress the necessity of penal satisfaction, but only that of penitence on the part of the sinner. While he does recognize a punitive element in justice, he exalts the mercy of God. At the same time a certain legalism pervades his teaching. He speaks of satisfaction made for sins committed after baptism by repentance or confession. By fasting and other forms of mortification the sinner is able to escape eternal punishment.

3. 愛任紐論救贖的工作

Irenaeus on the Work of Redemption

在反諾斯底派的教父中，愛任紐對於基督救贖大功的描寫最詳細，但他的討論不完全一致。愛任紐是教父之中最正統的一位，但在他的著作中有兩種思想不合乎《聖經》：一是道德取向的，二是神秘主義取向的。前者乃是說：人若自動地揀選善 – 這是靠己力能做到的 - 他就能重獲得到永生的命運。基督聖工的真正重要性，是叫我們確實的認識神，因此強化了人的自由。後者，基督叫人類在祂裡面復原 (recapitulation)，在神人之間建立了新的關係，成為叫人類獲新生命的麵酵。

『道』藉著受苦受死與人類認同，也藉著使人類成聖與賜人不朽，使人類昇到更高的境界。祂使人類在祂裡面復原，挽轉了人類在亞當裡啟動的命運。祂賜給人類新生與不朽的的麵酵。這種說法可被解釋為：救贖是透過神秘的過程 (mystical process)，從道成了肉身直到人類神化 (deification)。愛任紐在這方面的強調，可能因為他受到約翰的影響，比保羅的影響更深。顯然地，愛任紐的用意並不是要教導救贖是完全神秘的，超肉體的。他雖特別重視基督與祂救贖的子民必須有生命的聯合 (living union) – 聖安瑟倫並沒有論到這一點 – 但他也提到這方面與救贖其他方面的關係：如基督為我們順服神，滿足了神的要求；祂為我們受苦，為我們付上罪債，向父神獻上挽回祭，挽回父神的忿怒 (propitiation)。祂也救贖我們脫離撒但的權勢。

Of the Anti-gnostic Fathers Irenaeus gives the fullest description of the work of redemption, but his representation is not altogether consistent. While he is regarded as one of the most orthodox of the early Church Fathers, there are two lines of thought present in his writings which are hardly Scriptural, the one moralistic and the other somewhat mystical. According to the former, man regains his destiny when he voluntarily chooses the good which he is still able to do. The real significance of Christ's work lies in the fact that He brought the sure knowledge of God and thus strengthened the freedom of man. According to the second Christ recapitulates the whole human race in Himself, and thus establishes a new relation between God and man and becomes the leaven of a new life in humanity. The Logos identifies Himself with humanity in His sufferings and death, and becomes instrumental in raising it to a higher level by sanctifying and immortalizing it. He recapitulates in Himself the whole human race and reverses the course which derives its impetus from the fall of the first Adam. He

communicates to it the leaven of a new and immortal life. This may easily be, and has frequently been interpreted as teaching atonement by a mystical process begun in the incarnation and resulting in the deification of man. The emphasis on this idea in the writings of Irenaeus may be due to the fact that he was influenced by the Johannean writings more than by the Pauline Epistles. It is quite evident, however, that Irenaeus did not mean to teach a purely mystical or hyper-physical redemption. While he strongly emphasizes the necessity of a living union of Christ with the subjects of his redemption – something which Anselm failed to do – he associates this with other ideas, such as that He rendered for us the obedience required by God, that He suffered in our stead, paying our debt and propitiating the Father, and that He redeemed us from the power of Satan.

救恩，教會，末世論教義

Their Doctrines of Salvation, of the Church, and of the Last Things

Irenaeus is not altogether clear in his soteriology. He emphasizes the necessity of faith as a prerequisite for baptism. This faith is not only an intellectual acceptance of the truth, but also includes a self-surrender of the soul which issues in a holy life. By baptism man is regenerated; his sins are washed away and a new life is born within him. He evidently has no clear conception of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, for his representation of the relation between faith and justification is different. Faith necessarily leads on to the observance of the commandments of Christ, and is therefore sufficient to make a man righteous before God. The Spirit of God endows the Christian with new life, and the fundamental characteristic of the new life is that it brings forth the fruits of righteousness in good works.

The works of Tertullian marks no particular advance in the doctrine of the application of the work of Christ. Moralism again appears in the view that the sinner by repentance earns for himself salvation in baptism. His representation of the doctrine of penance is of special interest, however, since he introduces legal terms here which were in later theology applied to the redemptive work of Christ. He regards God as a Lawgiver and Judge, who looks upon sin as transgression and guilt, and therefore demands satisfaction, and in lieu of satisfaction inflicts punishment. Sins committed after baptism require satisfaction by penance. If this is rendered, the punishment is warded off. In this representation we find the foundation for the Roman Catholic sacrament of penance. The legal terms employed, such as “Judge,” “guilt,” “punishment,” and “satisfaction,” were transferred to the work of Christ in the theology of the Church.

In their teachings respecting the Church these fathers reveal a tendency to yield to Judaism in substituting the idea of an external community for that of a spiritual fellowship. They sowed seeds which bore fruit in the Cyprianic or Roman Catholic conception of the Church. They do indeed still retain the idea that the Church is a spiritual community of believers, but represent this as coinciding with an external fellowship. In fact, they represent the visible organization as the channel of divine grace, and make participation in the blessings of salvation dependent on membership in the visible Church. They who separated themselves from the external communion of the

Church, which was of Apostolic origin and had its head the *sedes apostolicae*, thereby also renounced Christ. Due to the influence of the Old Testament the idea of a special mediating priesthood also came to the foreground.

The Anti-gnostic Fathers in general championed the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, and based it on the resurrection of Christ and on the indwelling of the Spirit. The end will come when the devil has succeeded in giving the entire apostate through a new head in Antichrist. Then Christ will appear, and the six thousand years of the world will be followed by the first resurrection and the sabbatic rest of the millennium. In Palestine believers will enjoy the riches of the land. After the millennium there will be a new heaven and a new earth, and the blessed will live in graded order in the mansions prepared for them.

第三部份 亞歷山大的教父

THE ALEXANDRIAN FATHERS

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 70-76; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 51-57。林慈信修。)

正如在第一世紀, 猶太教宗教思想與希臘哲學混合, 產生一派由斐羅 (Philo) 代表的思想; 同樣在第二, 第三世紀, 希臘哲學與福音真理混合起來, 形成了亞歷山大派的神學。當時有些傑出的神學家, 將諾斯底主義中最深奧的揣測, 用來建立教會的信仰。在這過程中, 他們用了隱喻法解釋; 《聖經》 (allegorical interpretation)。基督教真理成為一種用文學方式表達的學問。這派基督教學術中最重要人物, 乃是亞歷山大的革利免 (Clement of Alexandria) 與奧利金 (Origen)。

Just as in a former century Jewish religious learning and Hellenistic philosophy combined to produce the type of thought represented by Philo, so in the second and third centuries Hellenistic learning and the truths of the Gospel were combined in a rather astonishing way to give birth to the Alexandrian type of theology. The attempt was made by some of the leading theologians to utilize the profoundest speculations of the Gnostics in the construction of the Church's faith. In doing this they resorted to the allegorical interpretation of the Bible. The truths of the Christian religion were turned into a science couched in literary form. The most important representatives of this form of Christian learning were Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

亞歷山大的教父

The Alexandrian Fathers

亞歷山大的革利免

Clement of Alexandria

革利免與奧利金代表東方的神學, 這派比西方的神學更抽象。兩位都是亞歷山大教義學院 (School of the Catechetes) 的老師, 影響力至深。若與愛任紐和特土良比較, 我們可以說革利免不是正統基督徒。他沒有像愛任紐與特土良遵守信仰的準則 (The Rule of Faith)。他乃根據護教士的方法, 嘗試以自己對當日哲學的理解, 來配合基督教的傳統, 有時幾乎以哲學取代傳統教義。革利免與特土良不同, 他對哲學友善, 堅持基督教神學家必須在外邦學術思想與福音之間建立橋樑。他覺得《聖經》與理性 (他尤其高舉理性) 都是認識神之泉源; 又因採用隱喻 (靈意) 解經法, 引進許多人為的猜測。不過, 他對希臘哲學的估價並不一貫; 有時認為希臘哲學有啟示的成份, 但有時又譴責是從希伯來先知們剽竊而來。

Clement and Origen represent the theology of the East, which was ore speculative than that of the West. Both were influential teachers of the school of the catechetes at Alexandria. Clement was not an orthodox Christian in the same measure as Irenaeus and Tertullian. He did not adhere to the Rule of Faith as much as they did, but followed in the path of the APologetes in seeking to wed the philosophy of the day, as he understood it, to the Christian tradition, and sometimes practically substituted the former for the

latter. In distinction from Tertullian he was friendly to philosophy, and insisted on it that the Christian theologian should build a bridge between the Gospel and Gentile learning. He found the sources of the knowledge of divine things in Scripture and reason, exalted the latter unduly, and by his allegorical interpretation opened wide the door for all kinds of human speculation. His estimate of Greek philosophy is not altogether consistent. Sometimes he ascribes it to a partial revelation, and sometimes he stigmatizes it as plagiarism from the Hebrew prophets.

奧利金 Origen

奧利金的父母親是基督徒，小時受基督教教育。他非常早熟，年輕就開始嚴謹的苦修操練。他繼承了他的老師－亞歷山大的革利免，出任教義學院院長。為了裝備自己，他徹底研究了當時流行的新柏拉圖派哲學 (Neo-Platonism)，和當時最重要的異端，尤其是諾斯底主義。不久他就名揚四海，越來越多人參加他的講座。他是早期教會中最有學問，思想最深奧的思想家。他的教義非常抽象，後期被判為異端。他竭力反對諾斯底主義，也使神格唯一論受到極大的打擊。然而這些都是次要的；他主要的工作乃是建立一套基督教教義系統。他最重要的著作《原道》 (*De Principiis*)，是基督教最早的一部完整的系統神學。其中有一部份後來被定為異端，然而他對後來的教義發展有極大的影響。他似乎願意在信仰上作正統的基督徒；他堅持遵照神的聖道與信仰的準則，作為他詮釋的標準；認為若不出於《聖經》的教訓或是根據《聖經》的教義的推論，就當拒絕。雖是如此，他的神學深受新柏拉圖主義的影響，而他的隱喻法解經引致各樣的猜測與隨意解釋。

Origen was born of Christian parents and received a Christian education. He was a precocious child, and from early childhood practiced a rigorous asceticism. He succeeded his teacher, Clement, as catechist at Alexandria. To fit himself for the work he made a thorough study of Neo-Platonism, which was then coming into favour, and of the leading heretical systems, especially Gnosticism. His fame soon spread and large numbers attended his lectures. He was the most learned and one of the profoundest thinkers of the early Church. His teachings were of a very speculative nature, and in later life he was condemned for heresy. He battled against the Gnostics and also struck a decisive blow against Monarchianism. But this was all incidental to his main purpose, that of constructing a systematic body of Christian doctrine. His principal work, *De Principiis*, is the first example of a positive and well-rounded system of theology. Part of his teachings were afterwards declared heretical, but he had an enormous influence on the development of doctrine. It seems that he desired to be an orthodox Christian: he took his stand squarely on the Word of God and the Rule of faith as a standard of interpretation; and maintained that nothing should be received that was contrary to Scripture or to a legitimate deduction from Scripture. Yet his theology bore the earmarks of Neo-Platonism, and his allegorical interpretation opened the way for all kinds of speculation and arbitrary interpretation.

神論與人論

Their Doctrine of God and of Man

神論

Doctrine of God

如同護教士們，奧利金認為神是絕對的，是不可認知的，不可測度的，不可被動的；是自足的，超乎任何需要和缺乏的；他也像反諾斯底派的教父們那樣，反對諾斯底主義者將善神與『造物主』 (Demiurge) 分為兩位神。神是一位，舊約與新約的神是同一位神。神是絕對的第一因 (absolute causality)。因他認為神的屬性，如『無所不能』以及『公義』等，永遠是動性的 (eternally in action)，因此他提倡神永遠創造的教義 (eternal creation)。

Like the Apologetes, Origen speaks of God in absolute terms, as the incomprehensible, inestimable, and impassible One, who is beyond want of anything; and like the Antignostic Fathers, he rejects the Gnostic distinction between the good God and the Demiurge or Creator of the world. God is One, the same in the Old and in the New Testament. He ascribes absolute causality to God, and since he can conceive of such attributes as omnipotence and justice only as eternally in action, he teaches the doctrine of eternal creation.

「道」的教義

Doctrine of the Logos

亞歷山大的革利免對『道』的解釋甚不清楚。他認為『』是有位格地存在的 (personal subsistence)，與父同一 (oneness with the Father)，祂是父神在永恆中生的 (eternal generation)；但又稱『道』為神的理性 (divine reason)，次於聖父。他將『道』分為兩位，一位是『真的神的道』 (real Logos of God)，另一位是在肉身出現的『神子道』 (Son-Logos)。從起初開始，『道』是神啟示的媒介 (mediates revelation)，因為『道』在創造大工上加上神智慧的印記。『道』將理性之光賜予人類；為真理作了特別的啟示；並在基督裡道成肉身。『道』的光幫助外邦人，在他們來就福音完備之光上作踏腳石。

Clement of Alexandria is by no means clear in his representation of the Logos. He stresses the personal subsistence of the Logos, His oneness with the Father, and His eternal generation; but also represents Him as the divine reason, and as subordinate to the Father. He distinguishes between the real Logos of God and the Son-Logos who appeared in the flesh. From the beginning the Logos mediates the divine revelation by stamping divine wisdom on the work of creation, by imparting to men the light of reason, by making special disclosures of the truth, and by His incarnation in Jesus Christ. The light of the Logos serves the Gentiles as a stepping-stone to the fuller light of the Gospel.

奧利金說獨一神主要是聖父，但祂藉著『道』自我啟示，也藉著『道』來行事。『道』是有位格的，與父同永 (co-eternal)，是由父神一個永恆的作為 (one eternal

act) 而生。奧利金論子從父而生時，完全拒絕子是從父射出來 (emanation) 或分出來 (division) 的看法。但他雖承認子有完全的神性，但有時又好像說子是次於父 (subordination)。他雖說子是在永恆裡由父而生，但當他解釋這句話時，不單認為子在救贖計劃上次於聖父 (economic subordination)，而在本質上也次於聖父 (essential subordination)。他有時稱子為第二位神 (*Theos Deuteros*)。在道成肉身中，道與一個人的靈魂聯合，這靈魂在先存時 (pre-existence) 乃是純潔的。基督的神性與人性是有別的 (kept distinct)；但奧利金又說道復活與升天之後，將祂的人性「神化」了。

Origen says that the one God is primarily the Father, but He reveals himself and works through the Logos, who is personal and co-eternal with the Father, begotten of Him by one eternal act. In connection with the generation of the Son every idea of emanation and division is rejected. But though he recognizes the full divinity of the Son, he uses some expressions that point to subordination. While he speaks of *eternal* generation, he defines the phrase in such a way as to teach not merely an economic but an essential subordination of the Son to the Father. He sometimes calls the Son *Theos Deuteros*. In the incarnation the Logos united himself with a human soul, which in its pre-existence remained pure. The natures in Christ are kept distinct, but it is held that the Logos by His resurrection and ascension deified His human nature.

聖靈論

Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

革利免沒有嘗試解釋聖靈與聖父和聖子的關係。可是奧利金對三位一體第三位的教義，比他對基督的觀點更偏離大公教會的教義。他說聖靈是父藉子所造的第一位受造物。聖靈與聖父的關係沒有聖子與聖父的關係那麼親密。他更說：聖靈沒有在整個宇宙中運行；祂只在聖徒的生命中運行而已。聖靈的本質是善的，他使罪人更新與成聖，也是敬拜神者敬拜的對象 (object of divine worship)。

Clement does not try to explain the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other Persons of the Trinity, and Origen's view of the third Person is further removed from the Catholic doctrine than his conception of the Second Person. He speaks of the Holy Spirit as the first creature made by the Father through the Son. The Spirit's relation to the Father is not as close as that of the Son. Moreover, the Spirit does not operate in creation as a whole, but only in the saints. He possesses goodness by nature, renews and sanctifies sinners, and is an object of divine worship.

奧利金的人論

Origen's Doctrine of Man

奧利金論人的教義也非常獨特。因他持『永遠創造論』 (eternal creation)，所以他認為人是先存的 (pre-existence of man)，因為原本的創造只創造了有理性的靈 (rational spirits)，(與神)平等 (co-equal)，(與神)同永 (co-eternal)。今天人類的光景預設了一個先存的墮落，從聖潔墮落到有罪。物質世界就是在這先存的墮落時候被造

的。墮落了的靈，因之成為靈魂，穿上了肉體。物質之被造，是要為這些墮落的靈預備居所，使他們受管教，得以煉淨 (purgation)。

Origen's teachings respecting man are somewhat out of the ordinary. The pre-existence of man is involved in his theory of eternal creation, since the original creation consisted exclusively of rational spirits, co-equal as well as co-eternal. The present condition of man presupposes a pre-existent fall from holiness into sin, which was the occasion for the creation of the present material world. The fallen spirits now became souls and were clothed with bodies. Matter was called into being for the very purpose of supplying an abode and a means of discipline and purgation for these fallen spirits.

基督的位格與工作的教義

Their Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ

道成肉身的教義

Doctrine of the Incarnation

這兩位教父都認為道成肉身，就是道成了完全的人，有完整的人性，包括人的身體與靈魂，因此成了一個真實的人，即『神-人』。可是革利免脫不出『幻影說』。他說：耶穌基督吃東西，並不是因為他需要食物，乃是要藉此使人不能否認他的人性；他又說基督不可能有人的悲傷與喜樂等感情。奧利金堅持，基督的靈魂是『先存的』，如其他一切的靈魂一樣，他甚至說基督的靈魂在『先存的』狀態中，是與『道』聯合的。其實在道成肉身之前，基督的靈魂與『道』早已完全彼此融合 (complete interpenetration)。『道』所充滿的靈魂取了一個身體，甚至這個身體也被『道』穿入 (penetrated) 而『神化』 (divinized)。因為在基督裡神性與人性是如此混合 (mingling)，所以當祂被榮耀時，祂等於成為無所不在 (ubiquitous)。奧利金並沒有成功地維持基督裡神性與人性的完整性 (integrity)。

Both of these Fathers teach that in the incarnation the Logos assumed human nature in its entirety, body and soul, and thus became a real man, the God-man, though Clement did not entirely succeed in avoiding Docetism. He says that Christ used food, not because He needed it, but simply to guard against a denial of his humanity, and that he was incapable of emotions of joy and grief. Origen maintains that the soul of Christ pre-existed, like all other souls, and was even in its pre-existence united with the Logos. In fact, even before the incarnation a complete interpenetration had taken place between the Logos and this soul. The Logos-filled soul assumed a body, and then even this body was penetrated and divinized by the Logos. There was such a mingling of the divine and the human in Christ that by his glorification He became virtually ubiquitous. Origen hardly succeeded in maintaining the integrity of the two natures in Christ.

論基督工作的教義

Doctrine of the Work of Christ

他們對基督的工作有不同的看法。革利免認為基督獻上自己作為贖價 (ransom)，但他並沒有看到基督為人類的罪成了贖罪的挽回祭 (propitiation)。他特別重視基督為賜律的主，教師，能教導引致永生不朽的道路。對於他，救贖的工作並不是要使過去的罪得以赦免，而是叫人能從墮落的光景中昇高，過一種更完善的生活。奧利金論到基督救贖之工時，認為基督是大醫師，牧師，賜律者，並作我們最好的榜樣。祂對罪人說是醫師，對那些已經被潔淨的人是教師，對祂的百姓是賜律者，對那些跟從祂的人是道德生活的好榜樣。基督是大醫師，教師，賜律者，好榜樣，所以能使人因祂獲得神的性情。奧利金同時看到信徒的救恩完全靠著基督為我們受苦替死。基督因為能夠蒙蔽撒但的眼，而將信徒從魔鬼的權勢之下拯救出來。祂將自己交給撒但作為贖價，撒但接受了這個贖價，卻不知道因為基督是完全無罪的。撒但就無法將祂留住。基督之死是替罪死，是贖罪之祭，如此方能叫死人的罪得了代贖。『道』所作成的救贖功效，不但在今世，而且在來世也照樣有效。不但是古往今來的世人，就是那些墮落的靈，甚至撒但與牠的惡魔們也會受到基督救贖的影響。末日時，萬事都要復興。

There are different representations of the work of Christ, which are not properly integrated. Clement speaks of the self-surrender of Christ as a ransom, but does not stress the idea that He was a propitiation for the sin of mankind. He places far greater emphasis on Christ as the Lawgiver and Teacher, and as the way to immortality. Redemption does not so much consist in undoing the past as in the elevation of man to a state even higher than that of unfallen man. The dominant thought in Origen is that Christ was physician, teacher, lawgiver, and example. He was a physician for sinners, a teacher of those who had been purified, the lawgiver of His people, requiring obedience to God and faith in Christ, and the perfect example of a virtuous life for His followers. In all these capacities He makes sinners, as much as possible, partakers of the divine nature. At the same time Origen recognizes the fact that the salvation of believers is dependent on the sufferings and death of Christ. Christ delivers them from the power of the devil, and does this by practicing deceit on Satan. He offers Himself to Satan as a ransom, and Satan accepts the ransom without realizing that he would not be able to retain his hold on Christ, the Sinless One. The death of Christ is represented as vicarious, as an offering for sin, and as a necessary atonement. The redemptive influence of the Logos extends beyond this life. Not only men who have lived on earth and died, but all fallen spirits, not excluding Satan and his evil angels, are brought under redemptive influences. There will be a restitution of all things.

論教會的教義，論未來的事的教義

Their Doctrine of Salvation, Of the Church, and Of the Last Things

救恩的教義

Doctrine of Salvation

亞歷山大的教父們承認人有自由意志，所以當耶穌基督的救恩傳給他的時候，他就會接受救恩，棄惡從善。神將救恩賜下，人有權自由接納。但奧利金雖然一方面說信心是出於人意志的行動，但他也認為人有信心是由於神的恩惠。信心是得救過程中最初的步驟，因此，救恩的獲得是出於信心。然而信心不過是接受神啟示的第一步，此外還必須要提高到知識與悟性，也必須進到好行為的表現。信心使人得救，但信心的目標乃是行為。這些都很重要。奧利金常提到救恩的兩個步驟，一是信心（對外的），一是知識（對內的）。這兩位教父並沒有看到保羅所教導的信心與稱義的觀念。此外，奧利金特別提到信心並不是得救的唯一條件。在他看來，悔改比信心更重要，因為悔改是在神面前承認我們的罪。他所論的救恩是內在的，不是像西方的教父，尤其是特土良等，所著重的法律上的救恩。

The Alexandrian Fathers recognize the free will of man, which enables him to turn to the good and to accept the salvation that is offered in Jesus Christ. God offers salvation, and man has the power to accept it. But while Origen represents faith as an act of man, he also speaks of it as an effect of divine grace. It is a necessary preliminary step to salvation, and therefore salvation may be said to depend on it. However, it is only an initial acceptance of God's revelation, must be elevated to knowledge and understanding, and must lead on to the performance of good works. Faith saves because it ever has works in view. These are the really important things. Origen speaks of two ways of salvation, one by faith (exoteric), and another by knowledge (esoteric). These Fathers certainly did not have the Pauline conception of faith and justification. Moreover, Origen stresses the fact that faith is not the only condition of salvation. Repentance is even more necessary, which consists in the confession of our sins before God. He ascribes to it a more inward, and less legal, character than the Western Fathers, and particularly Tertullian.

教會論

Doctrine of the Church

Origen regards the Church as the congregation of believers, outside of which there is no salvation. He discriminates between the Church properly so called and the empirical Church. And while he recognizes all believers as priests, he also speaks of a separate priesthood with special prerogatives. Both he and Clement teach that baptism marks the beginning of the new life in the Church, and includes the forgiveness of sins. Clement distinguishes between a lower and a higher state of the Christian life. In the former man attains to holiness under the influence of fear and hope, while in the latter fear is cast out by perfect love. This is the life of real knowledge that is enjoyed by him to whom the mysteries are revealed. The eucharist bestows participation in immortality, for through it the communicant enters into fellowship with Christ and the divine Spirit. In Origen the

sacraments are spiritualized. They are symbols of divine influences, though they also represent gracious operations of the Holy Spirit.

末世論

Doctrine of the Future

According to both Clement and Origen the process of purification, begun in the life of the sinner on earth, is continued after death. Chastisement is the great cleansing agency and cure for sin. Origen teaches that at death the good enter paradise or a place where they receive further education, and the wicked experience the fire of judgment which, however, is not to be regarded as a permanent punishment, but as a means of purification. Clement asserts that the heathen have an opportunity to repent in hades and that their probation does not end until the day of judgment, while Origen maintains that God's work of redemption will not cease until all things are restored to their pristine beauty. The restoration of all things will even include Satan and his demons. Only a few people enter upon the full blessedness of the vision of God at once; the great majority of them just pass through a process of purification after death. Both of these Fathers were averse to the doctrine of a millennium, and Origen has a tendency to spiritualize the resurrection. He seems to have regarded the incorporeal as the ideal state, but did believe in a bodily resurrection. According to him a germ of the body remains and gives rise to a spiritual organism, conformed to the nature of the particular soul to which it belongs, whether it be good or evil.

第四部份 神格唯一說 MONARCHIANISM

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 77-80; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 58-61。林慈信修。)

神格唯一說的興起

Rise of Monarchianism

第二世紀最大的異端是諾斯底主義，而第三世紀最大的異端則是『神格唯一說』(Monarchianism)。護教士，反諾斯底主義的教父，及亞歷山大教父的『道的教義』，都不完全令人滿意。一般人認為『道的教義』有許多不當的地方。有人覺得傷害了神論；有些人又認為他們傷害了基督論。重視神論的人覺得『道的教義』認為『道』乃是另一位格，可能威脅了神的合一性，甚至一神論；而重視基督論者則認為『道』若次於父，就似乎妥協了基督的神性。因此有學識之士嘗試解決這兩個問題，一方面保持神的合一性，另一方面不能抹煞基督的神性。因此兩派思想興起，都被稱為『神格唯一說』（這個名稱是特土良所起）。雖然嚴格來說，這名稱只適合於那些要維護神的合一性的思想；然而到今天這名稱是兩派思想的總稱。

While the great heresy of the second century was Gnosticism, the outstanding heresy of the third century was Monarchianism. The Logos doctrine of the Apologetes, the Anti-gnostic Fathers, and the Alexandrian Fathers did not give general satisfaction. Apparently many of the common people regarded it with misgivings, since it seemed to impinge on their theological or on their Christological interests. Where the theological interest was uppermost, the doctrine of the Logos as a separate divine Person appeared to endanger the unity of God or monotheism; and where the Christological interest was in the foreground, the idea that the Logos was subordinate to the Father seemed to compromise the deity of Christ. In course of time men of learning took notice of the misgivings of the people and attempted to safeguard, on the one hand the unity of God, and on the other hand the deity of Christ. This gave rise to two types of thought, both of which were called Monarchianism (a name first applied to them by Tertullian), though strictly speaking it could justly be applied only to that type in which the theological interest was uppermost. In spite of its partial impropriety, the name is generally used up to the present time as a designation of both types.

動力的神格唯一說

Dynamic Monarchianism

這派『神格唯一說』的目標乃是維護神的唯一性；可以說，完全與以前的『愛賓派』(Ebionites)及近代的『獨神論派』(Unitarianism)如出一轍。有人認為這派思想最初出現於阿羅該(Alogi)一個不著名的派別。斯伯克(Seeburg)不同意這個解釋。此派比較可能的創始人，是被羅馬大主教維克德(Victor)革出教會的一位拜占庭人，名『提阿多達』(Theodotus of Byzantium)。此後一位『亞提蒙』

(Artemon, 在敘利亞出生) 試用《聖經》與傳統來證明這一類『神格唯一說』。然而亞提蒙的論證被一位佚名氏所著《小迷宮》(*Little Labyrinth*) 一書所駁斥。這一派的神格唯一說不久就煙消雲散。

This is the type of Monarchianism that was mainly interested in maintaining the unity of God, and was entirely in line with the Ebionite heresy of the early Church and with present-day Unitarianism. Some find the earliest manifestation of it in the rather obscure sect of the Alogi, but Seeberg questions the correctness of this. In all probability its earliest representative was Theodotus of Byzantium, who was excommunicated by Victor, the bishop of Rome. After that Artemon, a Syrian by birth, tried to prove the peculiar views of this type of Monarchianism from Scripture and tradition. His arguments were effectively refuted, however, in the publication of an unknown author, entitled the *Little Labyrinth*.

撒摩撒他之保羅 Paul of Samosata

動力的神格唯一論，後來又由安提阿的主教『撒摩撒他之保羅』(Paul of Samosata) 將之死灰復燃。這位主教非常屬世，也甚傲慢。他認為『道』是與父神同質 (*homoousios*, co-substantial), 但在神性 (Godhead) 中沒有獨立的位格。道可以與神同為一 (identified with God), 因為祂存在於神裡面，正如人的理性存在於人裡面。道是無位格的能力，存在於所有的人裡面，但特別在耶穌這個人裡面運作。因為道漸進地，獨特地完全滲透了耶穌的人性，這個神的能力逐漸地神化了耶穌。因為這位人耶穌是如此被神化，所以祂配有神的尊貴；然而嚴格說來祂並不應被認為是神。撒摩撒他保羅如此建構道的教義，保持了神的合一性；神的本性 (nature) 和位格 (person) 都是一，道與聖靈不過是神性 (Godhead) 中無位格的屬性 (impersonal attributes)。這種看法後來也被索西奴派 (Socinians) 及近代的獨神論派所採用。這些神格唯一的派別都嘗試維護神的合一性及耶穌真正的人性。馬基弗 (McGiffert) 認為這些異端 [譯注：撒摩撒他之保羅] 的目的，乃只是堅持耶穌的人性。

The sect gradually dwindled away, but was revived again through the man who became its most noted representative, Paul of Samosata, the bishop of Antioch, who is described as a worldly-minded and imperious person. According to him the Logos was indeed *homoousios* or consubstantial with the Father, but was not a distinct Person in the Godhead. He could be identified with God, because He existed in Him just as human reason exists in man. He was merely an impersonal power, present in all men, but particularly operative in the *man* Jesus. By penetrating the humanity of Jesus progressively, as it did that of no other man, this divine power gradually deified it. And because the man was thus deified, He is worthy of divine honour, though He cannot be regarded as God in the strict sense of the word. By this construction of the doctrine of the Logos Paul of Samosata maintained the unity of God as implying oneness of person as well as oneness of nature, the Logos and the Holy Spirit being merely impersonal attributes of the Godhead; and thus became the forerunner of the later Socinians and

Unitarians. Like them he was interested in the defence of the unity of God and of the real humanity of Jesus. McGiffert asserts that the latter was his primary interest.

形態的神格唯一說

Modalistic Monarchianism: Sabellianism

另一種神格唯一說，影響比較廣泛。這派一方面要保持神性的合一，但主要在基督論方面保持基督完全的神性。這派被稱為『形態上的三種形態』(modes)。西方教會稱此派為『聖父受苦說』(Patripassianism)，因為此說認為父神自己道成肉身成為基督，因此聖父在基督裡受苦，與基督一同受苦。東方教會稱此派為『撒伯流派』(Sabellianism)。撒伯流派與『動力神格唯一說』不同之處，乃在堅持基督真正的神性。

There was a second form of Monarchianism which was far more influential. It was also interested in maintaining the unity of God, but its primary interest seems to have been Christological, namely, the maintenance of the full divinity of Christ. It was called Modalistic Monarchianism, because it conceived of the three Persons of the Godhead as so many modes in which God manifested Himself; was known as Patripassianism in the West, since it held that the Father Himself had become incarnate in Christ, and therefore also suffered in and with Him; and was designated Sabellianism in the East after the name of its most famous representative. The great difference between it and Dynamic Monarchianism lay in the fact that it maintained the true divinity of Christ.

普拉克西亞與奴愛達

Praxeas and Noetus

特土良認為創始『神格唯一說』的是一位不太有名的『普拉克西亞』(Praxeas)，而希坡利達(Hippolytus)認為創始者是示每拿的奴愛達(Noetus of Smyrna)。可能兩人都對倡導此派學說有功。普拉克西亞完全反對神性(God)中可以有位格上的不同。特土良批判他，說：『他將保惠師趕走，又將聖父釘死在十架。』普拉克西亞似乎並沒有說聖父受苦；不過奴愛達就清楚的說出這點。希坡利達說：『他(奴愛達)說：基督自己就是聖父，乃是聖父自己降生，並受苦而死。』(“He said that Christ is Himself the Father, and that the Father Himself was born and suffered and died.”)按照希坡利達，奴愛達大膽地說，聖父改變了自己的形態(mode of being)，變成(became)祂的兒子。奴愛達自己是這樣說：『當聖父尚未降生時，祂當被稱為父；但祂按自己的美意，服在降世為人之下時，祂就出生，成為聖子；是祂自己(He of Himself)，並不是另一位(of another，成為聖子)。』

Tertullian connects the origin of this sect with a certain Praxeas of whom little is known, while Hippolytus claims that it originated in the teachings of Noetus of Smyrna. However this may be, both were evidently instrumental in propagating it. Praxeas was absolutely inimical to personal distinctions in God. Tertullian says of him: “He drove out the Paraclete and crucified the Father.” Praxeas, however, seems to have avoided the

assertion that the Father suffered, but Noetus did not hesitate at this point. To quote the words of Hippolytus: “He said that Christ is Himself the Father, and that the Father Himself was born and suffered and died.” According to the same Church Father he even made the bold assertion that the Father by changing the mode of his being literally became His own Son. The statement of Noetus referred to runs as follows: “When the Father had not yet been born, He was rightly called the Father; but when it pleased Him to submit to birth, having been born, He became the Son, He of Himself and not of another.”

撒伯流

Sabellius

『形態神格唯一說』最著名的代表是撒伯流。他的著作只有很少的片斷存留至今，我們因此不能詳細斷定他的教導。然而我們清楚曉得他特別重視神的本質是合一的 (unity of the divine essence)，祂的顯示則有多種 (plurality of its manifestations)。神的顯示如同戲劇中的各部份。撒伯流雖說到三個位格，但對於他，『位格』乃是指一個演員所裝扮的角色，或顯示的形態。按他的看法，父，子，靈這三個名稱，只不過是指唯一的神顯示自己的獨一神聖本質 (one divine essence) 的三個階段而已。神在創造，賜律法時以父顯示自己；在道成肉身中以子顯示自己；在叫人重生與成聖時，以聖靈顯示自己。

The most important representative of this sect was Sabellius. Since only a few fragments of his writings are extant, it is hard to determine in detail just what he taught. It is perfectly clear, however, that he distinguished between the unity of the divine essence and the plurality of its manifestations, which are represented as following one another like the parts of a drama. Sabellius indeed sometimes spoke of three divine persons, but then used the word “person” in the original sense of the word, in which it signifies a role of acting or a mode of manifestation. According to him the names Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are simply designations of three different phases under which the one divine essence manifests itself. God reveals Himself as Father in creation and in the giving of the law, as Son in the incarnation, and as Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification.

第五部份 關於三位一體的爭論

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY: THE TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSY

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 81-93; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 63-72。林慈信修。)

一. 爭論的背景

The Background

三位一體爭論的興起

Rise of the Trinitarian Controversy

三位一體的爭論，到了亞利烏與阿他拿修間之爭達到了高潮。這是有它的根源的。上面說過，早期教父並沒有清晰的三位一體觀念，有的認為『道』是非位格的理性 (impersonal reason)，在創造是才有位格。另一些教父們則認為『道』是有位格的，與父神同永，享有神的本質，但卻認為『道』從屬與父。在他們的討論中，聖靈並不重要；他們提到聖靈，主要是關於在信徒的生命中運行救贖。有人認為聖靈不僅從屬於聖父，也從屬於聖子。特土良是首先清楚說神是三個位格的教父，並堅持三位格在本體上同一。但連他也不能將三位一體的教義說清楚。

The Trinitarian controversy, which came to a head in the struggle between Arius and Athanasius, had its roots in the past. The early Church Fathers, as we have seen, had no clear conception of the Trinity. Some of them conceived of the Logos as impersonal reason, become personal at the time of creation, while others regarded Him as personal and co-eternal with the Father, sharing the divine essence, and yet ascribed to Him a certain subordination to the Father. The Holy Spirit occupied no important place in their discussion at all. They spoke of Him primarily in connection with the work of redemption as applied to the hearts and lives of believers. Some considered Him to be subordinate, not only to the Father, but also to the Son. Tertullian was the first to assert clearly the tri-personality of God, and to maintain the substantial unity of the three Persons. But even he did not reach a clear statement of the doctrine of the Trinity.

神格唯一論(Monarchianism)此時興起，強調神的合一性與基督真正的神性，實際上否認了真正的三位一體教義。西方教會裡有特土良與希坡利達 (Hippolytus) 駁斥神格唯一論；在東方，奧利金給予此異端致命的打擊。他們都維護《使徒信經》所表達的三位一體教義。但奧利金對三位一體的解釋並不妥當。他堅稱聖父與聖子都是神聖的位格 (divine hypostases)，都有位格的存在 (personal subsistences)。但他未能合乎《聖經》地講出神性中三位個與一本質之間的關係。奧氏雖然是第一位用「永遠生出」的觀念 (eternal generation) 來解釋父子關係，但是他的定義包含了第二位在本質上從屬第一位的意思。而聖父傳達給聖子(communicated) 的神性是次等的，可以稱為神 (Theos)，但不能稱為唯一的神 (Ho Theos)。奧氏有時甚至稱聖子為第二位神 (Theos Deuteros)。這是奧利金三位一體教義中最基本的缺點，為後來的亞利烏鋪路。另外比較次要的缺點，是他說子之生出實公費父神的必要作為 (necessary act)，而是出自父神主權的旨意 (sovereign will)。不過他小心地避開了

父子在時間上有先後 (temporal succession) 的觀念。奧氏的聖靈論就離《聖經》的教訓更遠了。他不僅將聖靈從屬於聖子，而且將聖靈當為子所創造的。在奧氏的言論中，似乎有一處說到聖靈只是受造之物。

Meanwhile Monarchianism came along with its emphasis on the unity of God and on the true deity of Christ, involving a denial of the Trinity in the proper sense of the word. Tertullian and Hippolytus combated their views in the West, while Origen struck them a decisive blow in the East. They defended the Trinitarian position as it is expressed in the Apostles' Creed. But even Origen's construction of the doctrine of the Trinity was not altogether satisfactory. He firmly held the view that both the Father and the Son are divine hypostases or personal subsistences, but did not entirely succeed in giving a scriptural representation of the relation of the three Persons to the one essence in the Godhead. While he was the first to explain the relation of the Father to the Son by employing the idea of eternal generation, he defined this so as to involve the subordination of the Second Person to the First *in respect to essence*. The Father communicated to the Son only a secondary species of divinity, which may be called *Theos*, but not *Ho Theos*. He sometimes even speaks of the Son as *Theos Deuterios*. This was the most radical defect in Origen's doctrine of the Trinity and afforded a stepping-stone for Arius. Another, less fatal, defect is found in his contention that the generation of the Son is not a *necessary* act of the Father, but *proceeds from His sovereign will*. He was carefully, however, not to bring in the idea of temporal succession. In his doctrine of the Holy Spirit he departed still further from the representation of Scripture. He not only made the holy Spirit subordinate even to the Son, but also numbered Him among the things created by the Son. One of his statements even seems to imply that He was a mere creature.

二. 爭論的性質

The Nature of the Controversy

1. 亞利烏與亞利烏派

Arius and Arianism

三位一體的大爭論，通常被稱為亞利烏派之爭論 (the Arian controversy)，因為是亞利烏反三位一體所引起的。亞氏為亞歷山大里亞的長老 (即牧師)，是辯論高手，但生命缺乏深度。他主要的思想觀念是神格唯一派的一神論原則，即只有一位神，祂不是被生的，是沒有源始的存有者，也沒有存在之始。亞氏將臨在神裡面 (immanent in God)，僅為神的一種力量 (a divine energy) 的『道』，與最終成為肉身的子或「道」加以區分。後者是有起頭的：祂是父神所生，用亞利烏的說法，就等於說基督是被造的。祂在創造世界以前從無被造出來，因此基督不是永遠的，也沒有神的本質。祂是一切受造物中最偉大，最初的；祂被造的目的，是藉著祂創造世界。因此祂是可變的，但因為祂預見的功德被神所揀選，也想到祂未來的榮耀，被稱為神的兒子，也由於祂被神認為義子，所以祂能受人的崇敬。亞利烏從《聖經》中到似乎說聖子次於聖父的經節，來支持他的見解，即如箴八 22 (在七十士譯本中)，太二十八 18，可十三 32，路十八 19，約五 19，十四 28，林前十五 28。

[a] Arius and Arianism. The great trinitarian strife is usually called the Arian controversy, because it was occasioned by the anti-trinitarian views of Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, a rather skilful disputant, though not a profound spirit. His dominant idea was the monotheistic principle of the Monarchians, that there is only one unbegotten God, one unoriginated Being, without any beginning of existence. He distinguished between the Logos that is immanent in God, which is simply a divine energy, and the Son or Logos that finally became incarnate. The latter had a beginning: He was generated by the Father, which is the parlance of Arius was simply equivalent to saying that He was created. He was created out of nothing before the world was called into being, and for that very reason was not eternal nor of the divine essence. The greatest and first of all created beings, He was brought into being that through Him the world might be created. He is therefore also mutable, but is chosen of God on account of his foreseen merits, and is called the Son of God in view of His future glory. And in virtues of His adoption as Son He is entitled to the veneration of men. Arius sought Scripture support for his view in those passages which seem to represent the Son as inferior to the Father, such as, Prov. 8:22 (Sept.); Matt. 28:18; Mark 13:32; Luke 18:19; John 5:19; 14:28; I Cor. 15:28.

2. 對亞利烏派的反抗

[b] The opposition to Arianism.

(一) 阿他那修 (Athanasius) 的勢力 Strength of Athanasius

亞利烏首先受到他自己的主教亞歷山得 (Alexander) 的反對，亞歷山得為聖子的真神性據理力爭，同時主張由父生出永遠之子的教義。然而亞利烏真正最大的敵對者，是他教區中的大主教阿他那修。歷史證明阿氏是堅強不屈不撓的真理鬥士。西波爾說，阿他那修的偉大能力，在於三方面：(a) 他偉大堅定不移的性格；(b) 他有穩固的根基，就是他堅持神合一的觀念，保守他不至於與當日最流行的從屬觀念 (subordinationism) 同流合污；與 (c) 他用正確的方法教導人承認基督位格的性質與意義；他覺得若以基督為受造者，就是否認相信祂而得救和與神聯合。

Arius was opposed first of all by his own bishop Alexander who contended for the true and proper deity of the Son and at the same time maintained the doctrine of an eternal sonship by generation. In course of time, however, his real opponent proved to be the archdeacon of Alexandria, the great Athanasius, who stands out on the pages of history as a strong, inflexible, and unwavering champion of the truth. Seeberg ascribes his great strength to three things, namely, (1) the great stability and genuineness of his character; (2) the sure foundation on which he stood in his firm grasp on the conception of the unity of God, which preserved him from the subordinationism that was so common in his day; and (3) the unerring tact with which he taught men to recognize the nature and significance of the Person of Christ. He felt that to regard Christ as a creature was to deny that faith in Him brings man into saving union with God.

(二) 阿他那修論聖父與聖子之關係 Athanasius on the Relation of the Son and the Father

阿氏特別強調神的合一性，並堅持在三位一體教義的解說上，不得影響此合一性。雖然聖父與聖子是屬於同一的，是神的本質，但在基本的神性上是沒有區分的；若說有次等的神是非常嚴重的錯誤。雖然阿氏非常著重神的合一性，但他也承認在神性中有三個不同的位格。他拒絕相信亞利烏派所說，聖子是在創立世界以前造的，並且主張聖子獨立，永遠位格上的存在。同時，他牢記神性中的三位格並非是分立的；若是分立則導致多神主義。根據阿氏，神的合一性以及存在祂本性中的區分，最好是用「本質上的一體」一詞來表明，這就清楚說明聖父與聖子是同質的，但也暗示二者也許在其他方面不同，例如在聖父與聖子的生存方面。阿氏如奧利金一樣，教導聖子是由父所生的，但與奧利金有別；阿氏描述此生出乃如神的內在行為，因此是必要的，永遠的，並非要依賴聖父主權旨意的作為。

He strongly emphasized the unity of God, and insisted on a construction of the doctrine of the Trinity that would not endanger this unity. While the Father and the Son are of the same divine essence, there is no division or separation in the essential Being of God, and it is wrong to speak of a *Theos Deuteros*. But while stressing the unity of God, he also recognized three distinct hypostases in God. He refused to believe in the pre-temporarily created Son of the Arians, and maintained the independent and eternally personal existence of the Son. At the same time he bore in mind that the three hypostases in God were not to be regarded as separated in any way, since this would lead to polytheism. According to him the unity of God as well as the distinctions in His Being are best expressed in the term "oneness of essence." This clearly and unequivocally expresses the idea that the Son is of the same substance as the Father, but also implies that the two may differ in other respects, as, for instance, in personal subsistence. Like Origen he taught that the Son is begotten by generation, but in distinction from the former he described this generation as an internal and therefore necessary and eternal act of God, and not as an act that was simply dependent on His sovereign will.

影響阿他那修，並決定他神學見解的，非僅邏輯一致性的要求；他對真理解說的主要因素，乃在於宗教的主要信念。他的神學教義是自然而然地從他的拯救論信仰上產生的，他的根本立場是主張，要與神聯合就必須得救，除了祂本身是神的那一位之外，沒有一個受造之物能叫我們與神聯合。因此西波爾說：『如果基督是神，祂來到人間，就是神來到人間。那麼藉著祂我們才能與神有交通，罪得赦免。祂把真理以及永生，確定地帶給世人。』（《教義史》，卷一，211頁）

It was not merely the demand of logical consistency that inspired Athanasius and determined his theological views. The controlling factor in his construction of the truth was of a religious nature. His soteriological convictions naturally gave birth to his theological tenets. His fundamental position was that union with God is necessary unto salvation, and that no creature, but only one who is Himself God can unite us with God. Hence, as Seeberg says, "Only if Christ is God, in the full sense of the word and without qualification, has God entered humanity, and only then have fellowship with God, the forgiveness of sins, the truth of God, and immortality been certainly brought to man." *Hist. of Doct.* I, p. 211.

三. 尼西亞會議 (Council of Nicea)

為了解決此爭端，尼西亞會議在主後 325 年召開。會議中討論的問題非常清楚明瞭，可用一句話表明，即亞利烏派拒絕永遠生出的概念，而阿他那修卻堅稱此點。亞利烏派說，聖子是從無中被創造出來的，而阿他那修主張，祂是從聖父的本質中而生出的。亞利烏派主張，聖子與聖父並非同質，而阿他那修堅稱，祂是與父同質 (*homo-ousios*)。

The Council of Nicaea was convened in AD 325 to settle the dispute. The issue was clear-cut, as a brief statement will show. The Arians rejected the idea of a timeless or eternal generation, while Athanasius reasserted this. The Arians said that the Son was created from the non-existent, while Athanasius maintained that He was generated from the essence of the Father. The Arians held that the Son was not of the same substance as the Father, while Athanasius affirmed that he was *homoousios* with the Father.

在爭論的雙方之外，還有一個較大的中間派，即優西比烏 (Eusebius) 所領導的，構成了中間派中的較大多數。優西比烏是教會中最有名的歷史家，此派又稱為奧利金派，因為他的思想是來自奧利金的原理。

Besides the contending parties there was a great middle party, which really constituted the majority, under the leadership of the Church historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, and which is also known as the Origenistic party, since it found its impetus in the principles of Origen.

尼西亞會議及其決定

奧利金傾向於亞利烏派，反對聖子與聖父同質的教義。該派事先由優西比烏起草了一項聲明，在此聲明中除了上述之外，一切都與亞歷山大與阿他那修相同，並建議用『似質』 (*homoi-ousios*) 一詞代替『同質』 (*homo-ousios*)，以此教導說，聖子與聖父有相似的本質。經過相當的辯論之後，皇帝最終運用他的權威，傾向阿他那修派，因而獲勝。會議就所爭論之點，採納了下列的聲明：『我們相信一位神，就是全能的父，有形與無形之物的創造者。又信一位主，就是耶穌基督，是生出而非被造 (*begotten, not created*)，與聖父同質 (*homoousios*)』等。這是非常清晰的聲明。『同質』一詞，除了聖子的本質與聖父相同以外，不能謬解作其他的意義，這樣就把聖子放在與聖父同等的地位，並非被造者，乃承認祂本身就是神。

This party had Arian leanings and was opposed to the doctrine that the Son is of the same substance with the Father (*homoousios*). It proposed a statement, previously drawn up by Eusebius, which conceded everything to the party of Alexander and Athanasius, with the single exception of the above-named doctrine; and suggested that the word *homoiouosios* be substituted for *homoousios*, so as to teach that the Son is of similar substance with the Father. After considerable debate the emperor finally threw the weight of his authority into the balance and thus secured the victory for the party of Athanasius. The Council adopted the following statement on the point in question: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of things visible and invisible. And in

one Lord Jesus Christ, begotten not made, being of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father,” *et cetera*. This was an unequivocal statement. The term *homoousios* could not be twisted to mean anything else than that the essence of the Son is identical with that of the Father. It placed Him on a level with the Father as an uncreated Being and recognized Him as *autotheos*.

四. 尼西亞會議爭論的後果

The Aftermath

1. 不圓滿的會議決定

[a] Unsatisfactory nature of the decision.

會議的決定並沒有止息爭端，只是成為爭端的開始。會議的決定是由於皇帝高壓手段的結果，未能達成圓滿，而且平息的期間也不太確定，使得基督教信仰的決定，似乎在於皇帝的善變與宮廷中的謀算。阿他那修本人雖然得勝，但對於此種解決教會爭論的方法，也深表不滿，他寧可藉著辯論的威力來說服對方。結果清楚證明，皇帝態度的改變，影響著結論的改變，佔優勢的一派可能立刻受到挫敗，這在以後的歷史中是屢次發生的事。

The decision of the Council did not terminate the controversy, but was rather only the beginning of it. A settlement forced upon the Church by the strong hand of the emperor could not satisfy and was also of uncertain duration. It made the determination of the Christian faith dependent on imperial caprice and even on court intrigues. Athanasius himself, though victorious, was dissatisfied with such a method of settling ecclesiastical disputes. He would rather have convinced the opposing party by the strength of his arguments. The sequel clearly proved that, as it was, a change in emperor, an altered mood, or even a bribe, might alter the whole aspect of the controversy. The party in the ascendancy might all at once suffer eclipse. This is exactly what happened repeatedly in subsequent history.

2. 半亞利烏派在東方教會中暫時的興盛

Temporary Ascendancy of Semi-Arianism in the Eastern Church

尼西亞會議後期的三位一體爭論中的偉大人物，就是阿他那修，他是當代位偉人，傑出的學者，擁有堅強性格的一位，也是一位為他的信念有勇敢抱負的人，隨時準備為真理受難。此時的教會，逐漸歸屬於亞利烏派，皇帝也隨風傾倒過去，所以當時有一句通俗流行的話：『一個阿他那修抵抗全世界。』這位神的忠實僕人，五次被放逐，其職位由一些不配的阿__者所取代，他們為教會帶來奇恥大辱。

The great central figure in the Post-Nicene Trinitarian controversy was Athanasius. He was by far the greatest man of the age, an acute scholar, a strong character, and a man who had the courage of his convictions and was ready to suffer for the truth. The Church gradually became partly Arian, but predominantly semi-Arian, and the emperors usually sided with the majority, so that it was said: “Unus Athanasius contra

orbem” (one Athanasius against the world). Five times this worthy servant of God was driven into exile and succeeded in office by unworthy sycophants, who were a disgrace to the Church.

(一) 對尼西亞會議決定的反抗 **Opposition to the decision of Nicaea**

對於《尼西亞信經》的反抗，分為不同的幾方面。甘寧漢說：『比較更兇悍，更誠實的亞利物派說，聖子是非本質的 (*heteroousios*)，是屬於與神完全不同的本質；又有的人說，祂不像父神；又有些人說（一般認為是半亞利烏派者），祂是有與父相似的本質 (*homoiousios*)；但是他們卻都異口同聲的拒絕《尼西亞信經》中所說的，因為他們反對《尼西亞信經》中聖子真正神性的教義。』（《歷史神學》，卷一，290 頁）半亞利烏主義在東方教會非常盛行，然而西方教會在此問題上才不同的見解，並且忠於尼西亞會議的決定。這在以下的事實上得到了說明，那就是東方教會受到奧利金從屬主義 (*subordinationism*) 的影響，意即聖子是在聖父之下的主義；而西方教會多受特土良的影響，並發展出一種神學，與阿他那修的主張趨於一致。然而除此之外，西方教會與東方教會之間的抗衡，也需予以檢討。當阿他那修從東方教會被放逐的時候，他受到西方教會的歡迎，其中羅馬會議（主後 341 年）與撒底迦 (*Sardica*) 會議（主後 343 年），都無條件地贊助他的見解。

The opposition to the Nicene Creed was divided into three different parties. Says Cunningham: “The more bold and honest Arians said that the Son was *heteroousios*, of a different substance from the Father; others said that He was *anomoios*, unlike the Father; and some, who were usually reckoned semi-Arians, admitted that He was *homoiousios*, of a like substance with the Father; but they all unanimously refused to admit the Nicene phraseology, because they were opposed to the Nicene doctrine of the true and proper divinity of the Son and saw and felt that that phraseology accurately and unequivocally expressed it, though they sometimes professed to adduce other objections against the use of it.” *Historical Theology* I, p. 290. Semi-Arianism prevailed in the eastern section of the Church. The West, however, took a different view of the matter, and was loyal to the Council of Nicaea. This finds its explanation primarily in the fact that, while the East was dominated by the subordinationism of Origen, the West was largely influenced by Tertullian and developed a type of theology that was more in harmony with the views of Athanasius. In addition to that, however, the rivalry between Rome and Constantinople must also be taken into account. When Athanasius was banished from the East, he was received with open arms in the West; and the Councils of Rome (341) and Sardica (343) unconditionally endorsed his doctrine.

(二) 安吉拉之馬賽路 (**Marcellus of Ancyra**)

由於馬賽路在西方教會晉昇為尼西亞神學的健將，因而導致阿他那修思想活動的逐漸沒落。馬氏又重回到神性中永遠的與非位格的道之間的古老區分上，次非位格的道，意即在創造之工上顯明為神的能力，而此道在道成肉身時成為位格。馬氏否認『生出』 (*generation*) 一詞可以用在先存的道上，因此把『神的兒子』這名詞，僅限於成肉身的道上；並且主張在祂道成肉身生活的末了，這個道 (*Logos*) 要

回到祂在創造世界以前與父的關係。馬氏的學說，明顯是屬於奧利金派或優西比烏派的見解，如此成為加深東西教會分裂的工具。

His cause in the West was weakened, however, by the accession of Arcellus of Ancyra to the ranks of the champions of the Nicene theology. He fell back on the old distinction between the eternal and impersonal Logos immanent in God, which revealed itself as divine energy in the work of creation, and the Logos become personal at the incarnation; denied that the term “generation” could be applied to the pre-existent Logos, and therefore restricted the name “Son of God” to the incarnate Logos; and held that, at the end of his incarnate life, the Logos returned to his premundane relation to the Father. His theory apparently justified the Origenists or Eusebians in bringing to charge of Sebellianism against their opponents, and was thus instrumental in widening the breach between the East and the West.

(三) 協調的努力 Reconciling Efforts

為了挽救分裂，曾有多方面的努力。在安提阿所召開的會議中，接納了尼西亞的定義，雖然有兩項重要的例外。他們堅稱，『似質』並子之生出，是由於父之旨意的作為。當然這不能滿足西方的教會。以後，又有其他的總會及會議，在這些會議中，優西比烏派要求西方教會不承認阿他那修的見解，並另起草一折衷的信經，均遭失敗。後來，康士坦丟斯登基，用一種狡猾的手段及勢力，強迫西方教會主教在亞勒爾與米蘭的會議上，與優西比烏派站同一陣線。

Various efforts were made to heal the breach. Councils were convened at Antioch which accepted the Nicene definitions, though with two important exceptions. They asserted the *homoiousios*, and the generation of the Son by an act of the Father's will. This, of course, could not satisfy the West. Other Synods and Councils followed, in which the Eusebians vainly sought a western recognition of the deposition of Athanasius, and drew up other Creeds of a mediating type. But it was all in vain until Constantius became sole emperor, and by cunning management and force succeeded in bringing the western bishops into line with the Eusebians at the Synods of Arles and Milan (355).

3. 潮流的轉變 The Turning of the Tide.

反抗的受阻 Disruption of the Opposition

不正當運動的得勝，再次證明此為一件危險的事，這事實上市反尼西亞派的疾候。這一派的中間分子，就是主張三位一體中之第二位不是生出來的，他們一旦傑出了外部的壓力，就顯露出內部的不合，這時非常明顯的事。亞利烏派與半亞利烏派並不相投合，後者並沒有組織上的合一，在 357 年底舍米安會議 (Council of Sirmium) 上，他們就想將各派聯合起來，將本質，同質與似質等名詞一邊不加理

會，認為這三名詞並非是人的知識所能及。為求解決這件事，深感棘手，至此亞利烏派原形畢露，就逼迫保守的半亞利烏派進入尼西亞陣營。

Victory again proved a dangerous thing for a bad cause. It was, in fact, the signal for the disruption of the anti-Nicene party. The heterogenous elements of which it was composed were united in their opposition to the Nicene party. But as soon as it was relieved of external pressure, its lack of internal unity became ever increasingly evident. The Arians and the semi-Arians did not agree, and the latter themselves did not form a unity. At the Council of Sirmium (357) an attempt was made to unite all parties by setting aside the use of such terms as *ousia*, *homoousios*, and *homoiousios*, as pertaining to matters far beyond human knowledge. But things had gone too far for any such settlement. The real Arians now showed their true colours, and thus drove the most conservative semi-Arians into the Nicene camp.

加帕多加三教父

The Cappadocian Fathers

此時新興的尼西亞派，為奧利金學派的弟子所組成，但對真理更完全的解釋，則有負於阿他那修與《尼西亞信經》。其中主要的人物就是加帕多加的三位教父，巴西流，尼撒貴格利，以及拿先斯貴格利。他們看出，使用本質 (*ousia*) 與位格 (*prosopon*) 等名詞，是導致誤解的根源，因此禁止用它們來指明聖父與聖子位格上的本質 (*personal subsistence*)。他們又想出一個方法不走阿他那修的路線，即不走在神裡面有一個本質 (本體) 的路線，這三位教父思想的出發點則集中在神性中的三個位格上，並企圖將此三位格置於神本質的觀念中。二貴格利將神性中的三位格與神性的關係比作三個人與一般人類間之關係。正因為他們強調神性中的三位格，所以他們才使尼西亞有關三位一體的教義，脫離了在優西比烏派眼中所看見的撒伯流主義的色彩，這樣一來，道 (*Logos*) 的位格就得到了充份的保障。同時，他們三人極力主張三位格在神性中的合一性，並多方予以說明。

Meanwhile a younger Nicene party arose, composed of men who were disciples of the Origenist School, but were indebted to Athanasius and the Nicene Creed for a more perfect interpretation of the truth. Chief among them were the three Cappadocians, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus. They saw a source of misunderstanding in the use of the term *hypostasis* as synonymous with both *ousia* (essence) and *prosopon* (person), and therefore restricted its use to the designation of the personal subsistence of the Father and the Son. Instead of taking their starting-point in the one divine *ousia* of God, as Athanasius had done, they took their point of departure in the three hypostases (persons) in the divine Being, and attempted to bring these under the conception of the divine *ousia*. The Gregories compared the relation of the Persons in the Godhead to the divine Being with the relation of three men to their common humanity. And it was exactly by their emphasis on the three hypostases in the divine Being that they freed the Nicene doctrine from the taints of Sabellianism in the eyes of the Eusebians, and that the personality of the Logos appeared to be sufficiently safeguarded. At the

same time they strenuously maintained the unity of the three Persons in the Godhead and illustrated this in various ways.

4. 關於聖靈的爭辯

[d] The Dispute about the Holy Spirit.

關於聖靈的早期見解

Early Opinions about the Holy Spirit

雖然關於這題目有許多不同的意見表露出來，但到目前為止，聖靈還沒有受到廣泛的注視。亞利烏主張，聖靈是由聖子所產生的頭一個受造者，此觀點與奧利金的非常符合，而阿他那修則堅稱，聖靈與聖父是同質的，但是《尼西亞信經》則僅包括一不確定的說明：『我信聖靈。』至於加帕多加教父則跟隨阿他那修，強烈主張聖靈與聖父的同質。在西方教會，有聖希拉流 (Hilary of Poitiers)，主張聖靈是為幫助人尋求神深奧之事，所以不可能沒有屬神的本質。康士坦丁堡的主教馬西頓紐斯 (Macedonius) 則發表了一完全不同的見解，他聲明聖靈是被造的，從屬於聖子；但他的見解被認為是異端，而其從者被人稱作『反聖靈派』 (Pneumatomachians)。主後 381 年，在康世坦丁堡大會席上，宣佈承認《尼西亞信經》，並在拿先斯貴格利指導下，接受有關聖靈的下列信條：『我們信主聖靈，是生命的賜予者，是從父而出，與聖父，聖子同得榮耀，並藉先知發言。』

Up to this time the Holy Spirit had not come in for a great deal of consideration, though discordant opinions had been expressed on the subject. Arius held that the Holy Spirit was the first created being produced by the Son, an opinion very much in harmony with that of Origen. Athanasius asserted that the Holy Spirit was of the same essence with the Father, but the Nicene Creed contains only the indefinite statement, "And (I believe) in the Holy Spirit." The Cappadocians followed in the footsteps of Athanasius and vigorously maintained the *homoousis* of the Holy Spirit. Hilary of Poitiers in the West held that the Holy Spirit, as searching the deep things of God, could not be foreign to the divine essence. An entirely different opinion was voiced by Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, who declared that the Holy Spirit was a creature subordinate to the Son; but his opinion was generally considered as heretical, and his followers were nicknamed Pneumatomachians (from *pneuma*, spirit, and *machomai*, to speak evil against). When in AD 381 the general Council of Constantinople met, it declared its approval of the Nicene Creed and under the guidance of Gregory of Nazianzus accepted the following formula respecting the Holy Spirit: "And we believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Life-giving, who proceeds from the Father, who is to be glorified with the Father and the Son, and who speaks through the prophets."

5. 聖三位一體教義的完成

[3] Completion of the Doctrine of the Trinity

聖靈由聖子而出

Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son

康世坦丁堡會議的聲明中，有兩點並不完善，令人不滿意：(1)「同質」一詞未能使用，所以聖靈與聖父是屬於同一本質的關係沒有說出；與(2)聖靈與其他二位格之關係未能確定。聲明中寫著說，聖靈由聖父而出，但這裡沒有確定也沒有否認聖靈也是由聖子而出，在這一點上沒有完全的一致性；若說聖靈之從聖父而出，這似乎是否認聖子與聖父在本質上帝相同 (Essential Oneness)；若說聖靈也是從聖子而出，那麼似乎又將聖靈置於依存聖子的地位上，並對聖靈的神性加以侵犯。阿他那修，巴西流與尼撒貴格利堅稱，聖靈由聖父而出，但並不反聖靈也由聖子而出的教義；而伊比法紐與馬賽拉斯也贊同此教義。

The statement of the Council of Constantinople proved unsatisfactory in two points: (1) the word *homoousios* was not used, so that the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father was not directly asserted; and (2) the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other two Persons was not defined. The statement is made that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, while it is neither denied nor affirmed that He also proceeds from the Son. There was no entire unanimity on this point. To say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only, looked like a denial of the essential oneness of the Son with the Father; and to say that He also proceeds from the Son, seemed to place the Holy Spirit in a more dependent position than the Son and to be an infringement on His deity. Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa, asserted the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, without opposing in any way the doctrine that He also proceeds from the Son. But Epiphanius and Marcellus of Ancyra positively asserted this doctrine.

一般西方教會都主張聖靈是由聖父與聖子而出；在主後 589 年的託理多會議 (Synod of Toledo) 上，又加上了「和子」(filioque) 這個字。東方教會則有大馬色約翰提出聖靈教義最終的信條，根據他所說，只有一個屬神的本質與三位格，而這三位格被認為是神性中的實體，並不像三個人彼此間的關係。除了他們存在的方式外，神一體中的三位，不論從那方面說都是合一的，而聖父的特性是『非生的』(non-generation)，聖子是『生出的』(generation)，聖靈則是『發出的』(procession)。三位格彼此間的關係，被描述為一互通的關係，並沒有混雜不清。大馬色約翰雖然極其反對從屬主義，但他仍然說到聖父為神性之源，並說聖靈是藉著道由父而出，這依舊是希臘從屬主義的遺物。東方教會從未採取託理多會議所附加的『和子』一字，這也是東西教會分離的主因。

Western theologians generally held to the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son; and at the Synod of Toledo in AD 589 the famous “filioque” was added to the Constantinopolitan Symbol. In the East the final formulation of the doctrine was given by John of Damascus. According to him there is but one divine essence, but three persons or hypostases. These are to be regarded as realities in the divine Being, but not related to one another as three men are. They are one in every respect, except in their

mode of existence. The Father is characterized by “non-generation,” the Son by “generation,” and the Holy Spirit by “procession.” The relation of the Persons to one another is described as one of “mutual interpenetration” (circumincession), without commingling. Notwithstanding his absolute rejection of subordinationism, John of Damascus still spoke of the Father as the source of the Godhead, and represents the Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Logos. This is still a relic of Greek subordinationism. The East never adopted the “filioque” of the Synod of Toledo. It was the rock on which the East and the West split.

奧古斯丁論三位一體 Augustine on the Trinity

西方教會有關三位一體的觀念，在奧古斯丁的巨著《論三位一體》(*De Trinitate*)中，達於最終的階段。奧氏也強調本質上的合一與位格上的三分，說三位中的每一位都擁有全本質，並與本質是同一的，且與位格中的其他二位也是同一的。聖父、聖子、聖靈並不像我們世間的三個人，只擁有出生人性的一部份；此外，三者不能缺一而獨立，即父不能沒有子，子不能沒有父，聖靈不能沒有子和父，祂們中間有相依存的關係。每一位都有屬神的本質，但具有不同的觀點，如使之出生、出生的，或者說由感化而存有的，這三位格之間，有一種互通、互住的關係。以『位格』一詞來指明三位之間彼此的關係，不能令奧氏滿意，但他仍然繼續使用，正如他所說：『我用這詞句，並不是為了表明三者之間之關係，乃是為了不甘寂寞。』論到三位一體這一方面的觀念，聖靈自然是由聖父而出，但也是由聖子而出。

The western conception of the Trinity reached its final statement in the great work of Augustine, *De Trinitate*. He too stresses the unity of essence and the Trinity of Persons. Each one of the three Persons possesses the entire essence, and is in so far identical with the essence and with each one of the other Persons. They are not like three human persons, each one of which possesses only a part of generic human nature. Moreover, the one is never and can never be without the other; the relations of dependence between them is a mutual one. The divine essence belongs to each of them under a different point of view, as generating, generated, or existing through inspiration. Between the three hypostases there is a relation of mutual interpenetration and interdwelling. The word “person” does not satisfy Augustine as a designation of the relationship in which the three stand to one another; still he continues to use it, as he says, “not in order to express it (the relationship), but in order not to be silent.” In this conception of the Trinity the Holy Spirit is naturally regarded as proceeding, not only from the Father, but also from the Son.

拉丁神學中的三位一體教義 The Doctrine of the Trinity in Latin Theology

羅瑟林論三位一體 Roscellinus on the Trinity

後期神學對三位一體的教義，並未作具體資料上的加入，只不過在形式上有所分歧，並在真理上予以重述而已。羅瑟林引用唯名派 (nominalism) 的理論，說普遍的概念僅僅是從屬於三位一體的觀念，如此而想要避免將數目的合一於一位神裏位格的區分的困難。他認為神性中的三位格好像本質上不同的個人，也可以說在屬性上是一個，而且只是在名義上；祂們的合一僅僅是意志與能力的合一。安瑟倫正確地指出，此立場不可避免的導致了三神論，並強調普遍的觀念可以提供真理與現實的事實。

Later theology did not add materially to the doctrine of the Trinity. There were deviations from, and consequent restatements of, the truth. Roscellinus applied the Nominalist theory that universals are merely subjective conceptions to the Trinity, and thus sought to avoid the difficulty of combining the numerical unity with the distinction of persons in God. He regarded the three Persons in the Godhead as three essentially different individuals, which could be said to be one generically and in name only. Their unity is merely a unity of will and power. Anselm correctly pointed out that this position logically leads to Tritheism, and stressed the fact that universal conceptions present truth and reality.

吉爾伯特論三位一體 Gilbert of Poitiers on the Trinity

假如羅瑟林是以唯名論來解說三位一體的教義，那麼吉爾伯特 (Gilbert of Poitiers) 就是以亞理斯多德式的溫和現實主義來解說三位一體的教義，而此溫和性的現實主義主張，普遍的觀念是存在於特殊觀念之中。吉氏在屬神的本質與神之間加以區分，而且又將此種關係與人和具體的人類之關係作一對比。屬神的本質並非是神，只不過是神的形式，或者說是使祂成為神。這個本質或形式，一般就是指著三位格，在哪方面說祂們是一個。這種區分的結果，是他被攻擊位四神主義者 (Tetratheism 此說教導神性中有三位格，另外又有一屬神的本質，而此屬神的本質，是神性中三位格的來源，這樣這教義就被解說為相信四個神)。

If Roscellinus gave a Nominalistic interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity, Gilbert of Poitiers interpreted it from the point of view of a moderate Realism of the Aristotelian type, which holds that universals have their existence in the particulars. He distinguished between the divine essence of God and compared their relation to that between humanity and concrete men. The divine essence is not God, but the form of God, or that which makes Him to be God. This essence or form (Latin *forma*, i.e., that which makes a thing what it is) is common to the three Persons and in that respect they are one. As a result of this distinction he was charged with teaching Tetratheism.

亞比拉論三位一體 Abelard on the Trinity

亞比拉論三位一體教義的方法，被人攻擊為撒伯流派。他似乎是把神性中的三個位格當作神的三個屬性，那就是能力、智慧與善良，其中以能力代表聖父的名字，以智慧代表聖子的名字，以善良代表聖靈的名字。雖然他也用暗示神性中真正位格上的區分的表詞，但是他也用一比方，使人明顯察覺他是走向形態主義。

Abelard spoke of the Trinity in a way that caused him to be charged with Sabellianism. He seemingly identifies the three Persons in the divine Being with the attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness. The name of Father stands for power, that of Son for wisdom, and that of Holy Spirit for goodness. While he also uses expressions which seem to imply that the distinctions in the Godhead are real personal distinctions, he employs illustrations that clearly point in the direction of Modalism.

在阿奎那的思想中，我們發現有關三位一體教義的代表說法，並且是當時教會界最盛行的觀點。

In Thomas Aquinas we find the usual representation of the doctrine of the Trinity, and this was the prevailing view of the Church at the time.

基督論的發展史(1): 基督論的爭辯
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST (1):
The Christological Controversies

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 101ff.)

基督論與三位一體之問題的關聯

Connection of Christological and Trinitarian Problems

基督論的難題可以從一般神學（譯注：神論）方面，與拯救論方面來加以研究。早期教父對基督論拯救方面的關係，雖未曾加以輕忽，但他們在重要的討論上卻沒有重視。在三位一體爭論的氣氛中，他們從一般神學（譯注：神論）方面來研究基督，乃天經地義的事，而三位一體爭論所導致的決定則是，基督為神的兒子，事與父同質的，因此祂是神。從此而發生的問題，就是基督神性與人性間之關係。

The Christological problem can be approached from the side of theology proper and from the side of soteriology. Though the early Church fathers did not lose sight of the soteriological bearings of the doctrine of Christ, they did not make these prominent in their main discussions. Breathing the air of the Trinitarian controversies, it was but natural that they should approach the study of Christ from the side of theology proper. The decision to which the Trinitarian controversy led, namely, that Christ as the Son of God is consubstantial with the Father and therefore very God, immediately gave birth to the question of the relation between the divine and the human nature in Christ.

早期基督論的爭辯，並未帶給人多大的造就，其中情感上的激動過於表面化，不正當的陰謀往往扮演著重要的角色，有時甚至出現暴一的場面。從外表上看來，在這種氣氛之下只會產生錯誤，沒想到這些爭辯卻導致基督位格教義的信條，就是到今天也還被認為是教會教義的標準。聖靈往往藉著羞恥與混亂引導教會進入更清楚真理的環境（譯注：境界）中。有些人聲稱，教會在定義根本難以解說的奧秘上實在是大費周章，可是我們應當注意，早期教會並沒有聲稱將這些偉大的真理予以全然瞭解，也並沒有在迦克敦會議上冒然的解說道成肉身的問題；該次會議僅希求保衛真理，抵抗各項異端，並提出了信仰上的條文，企圖避免各種顯然不合聖經對真理的解釋。

The early Christological controversies do not present a very edifying spectacle. The passions were too much in evidence, unworthy intrigues often played an important part, and even violence occasionally made its appearance. It might seem that such an atmosphere could only be productive of error, and yet these controversies led to a formulation of the doctrine of the Person of Christ that is still regarded as standard in the present day. The Holy Spirit was guiding the Church, often through shame and confusion, into the clear atmosphere of the truth. Some claim that the Church attempted too much when it tried to define a mystery which from the nature of the case transcends all definition. It should be borne in mind, however, that the early Church did not claim to be able to penetrate to the depths of this great doctrine, and did not pretend to give a solution of the problem of the incarnation in the formula of Chalcedon. It merely sought to guard the truth against the errors of theorizers, and to give a formulation of it which would ward off various, palpably unscriptural, constructions of the truth.

教會所希求的是有關基督的見解，以致不損及以下的各點：（一）祂的真實與本有的神性；（二）祂的真實與妥切、適當的人性；（三）神人二性聯合於一位格；與（四）神人二性在一位格內適當的區分。若是以上所提的要求未能達成，或僅僅達到一部份，那麼有關督的見解就是不完全的。早期教會中所興起的基督論的一切異端，都起因於未能將所有這些真理，在教義方面的聲明予以聯合。有些人完全或部份否認基督的神性，又有些人則完全或一部份的駁斥祂的真人性；有些人著重基督位格上的合一，但卻忽視神人二性上的區分，有些人則將二性分清，卻忽視了基督位格上的合一性。

The Church was in quest of a conception of Christ that would do justice to the following points: (a) His true and proper deity; (b) His true and proper humanity; (c) the union of deity and humanity in one person; and (d) the proper distinction of deity from humanity in the one person. It felt that as long as these requirements were not met, or only partly met, its conception of Christ would be defective. All the Christological heresies that arose in the early Church originated in the failure to combine all these elements in the doctrinal statement of the truth. Some denied wholly or in part the true and proper deity of Christ, and others disputed wholly or in part His true and proper humanity. Some stressed the unity of the person at the expense of the two distinct natures, and others emphasized the distinct character of the two natures in Christ at the expense of the unity of the Person.

I. 爭辯的第一階段 First Stage of the Controversy

[a] 背景 The Background.

基督論難題的興起

此爭辯是尤其根源的。愛賓派 (Ebionites)、非『道』派 (Alogi)、與動力的神格唯一派別 (Monarchians) 否認基督的神性；幻影派 (Docetae)、神哲派 (Gnostics)、與形態派別 (Modalists) 則拒絕基督的人性。他們只是把基督論難題重的名詞之一給取消了，而有些人則不那麼極端地將基督的神性或人性給否定掉。亞利烏派反對在基督裏成為肉身的道 (the Son-Logos)，說祂沒有絕對的神性。老底嘉主教阿波林 (Apollinaris)，否認耶穌基督的真實人性，與亞利烏對照下，他是擁護基督的真神性，企圖以道來代替人裏頭的靈，來確保祂的無罪，因阿氏認為，人的靈是罪的根據地，而一個完全的人性，自然就包括罪性在內；此外他企圖使著道成肉身容易為人的理性所接受，他推測在道的裏面又原初人的永遠傾向。但是阿波林的解釋不能令人滿意，正如賽德 (Shedd) 說：『如果從人減除理智的成份，那麼那人不是變成白痴，就是變成禽獸。』然而阿波林的目的是值得讚揚的，他是想確保基督位格合一與無罪。

This controversy also had its roots in the past. Ebionites, Alogi, and Dynamic Monarchians denied the deity of Christ, and Docetae, Gnostics, and Modalists rejected His humanity. They simply ruled out one of the terms of the problem. Others were less radical and denied either the full deity or the perfect humanity of Christ. The Arians

denied that the Son-Logos, who became incarnate in Christ, was possessed of absolute Godhead. And on the other hand Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (d. c.390), denied the true and proper humanity of Jesus Christ. He conceived of man as consisting of body, soul and spirit, and sought the solution of the problem of the two natures in Christ in the theory that the Logos took the place of the human *pneuma* (spirit). In his opinion it would be easier to maintain the unity of the Person of Christ, if the Logos were simply regarded as taking the place of the higher rational principle in man. Over against Arius he defended the true divinity of Christ, and sought to safeguard His sinlessness by substituting the Logos for the human *pneuma*, which he regarded as the seat of sin. According to him a complete human nature would naturally involve sinfulness. Moreover, he tried to make the incarnation intelligible by assuming an eternal tendency to the human in the Logos Himself as the archetypal man. But the solution of Apollinaris could not satisfy, because, as Shedd says, “if the rational part be subtracted from man, he becomes either an idiot or a brute.” His purpose was praiseworthy, however, in that he sought to safeguard both the unity of the Person and the sinlessness of Christ.

對阿波林的反抗

Opposition to Apollinaris

由於阿波林對問題提出了解決的論點，因而引起了相當的抗議。有加帕多三教父於西拉流主張，如果道沒有取得完整的人性，那麼祂就不能作我們的救贖主，既然全罪人需要重生，那麼基督就須具備完整的人性，而非僅是（不）重要的一點點。他們也在阿波林的教訓中，指出其中有幻影說的成份在內。如果基督裏沒有真正屬人的意志，那麼祂就不能夠在祂為人的生活中有真實的試驗與進步。然而，就是阿波林的論敵，雖然著重基督的完全人性，但也認為基督受到祂神性的影響。尼撒的貴格利也說，基督的肉體被改變了，藉著與神性的聯合，失去其一切功能。

There was considerable opposition to the solution of the problem offered by Apollinaris. The three Cappadocians and Hilary of Poitiers maintained that, if the Logos did not assume human nature in its integrity, He could not be our perfect Redeemer. Since the whole sinner had to be renewed, Christ had to assume human nature in its entirety, and not simply the least important parts of it. They also pointed to a docetic element in the teachings of Apollinaris. If there was no real human will in Christ, there could be no real probation and no real advance in His manhood. Even the opponents of Apollinaris, however, while stressing the complete humanity of Christ, conceived of this as overshadowed by His divinity. Gregory of Nyssa even says that the flesh of Christ was transformed and lost all its original properties by union with the divine.

在主後三六二年，亞歷山大亞的會議中，所討論的初步結果聲稱，在基督裏有屬人的『靈魂』 (soul)。『靈魂』一詞為會議所使用，認為包括有理性的範圍在內，就是阿波林所稱的『靈』 (*pneuma*)。

One result of this preliminary skirmish was that the Synod of Alexandria in 362 asserted the existence of a human soul in Christ. The word “Soul” was used by the Synod as inclusive of the rational element, which Apollinaris called *pneuma* or *nous*.

[b] 爭辯的各黨派

The Parties to the Controversy

(一) 涅斯多留派。

有些早期教父所用的表詞，似乎是否認在基督裏有兩性的存在，並且假定只有一個性，就是『成肉身並可尊敬的道』。從此觀點，馬利亞往往被稱為神之母。而亞歷山大學派特別表顯出此派的傾向。另一方面，安提阿學派走相反的路線，著在摩普綏提亞之狄奧多的教訓中可看出。

[1] The Nestorian Party.

Some of the early Church Fathers used expressions which seemingly denied the existence of two natures in Christ, and postulated a single nature, "the incarnate and adorable Word." From this point of view Mary was often called *theotokos*, mother of God. It was particularly the School of Alexandria that revealed this tendency. On the other hand the School of Antioch went to the other extreme. This appears especially in the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

摩普綏提亞之狄奧多。

他的出發點乃在基督完全的人性，以及祂屬人經驗的完全現實性，他說基督的確與人的情緒相搏鬥，經歷了試探而得勝；祂擁有勝過罪惡的能力：(a) 祂的生是無罪的；(b) 有屬神的道 (Logos) 與祂的人性聯合。狄奧多否認在基督裏道有實質上的存在，道住在裏面僅僅是名義上道德性的方式存在，在他看來，神在基督裏與在人裏面沒有什麼基要的區分，只是在基督裏的成份比較多一些而已。此一觀念實際上是以前道德的成份住在為人的耶穌裏面，來取代道成肉身。

雖然如此，狄奧多仍企圖避免由此見解所達到的必然結論，那就是在基督裏有雙重的位格，他說在兩位格間還有道德性的聯合存在，且此聯合是如此的密切，因此可以說成只有一位，正如丈夫與妻子可以成為一體一樣。

Theodore of Mopsuestia. He took his starting-point in the complete manhood of Christ and the perfect reality of His human experiences. According to him Christ actually struggled with human passions, passed through a veritable conflict with temptation, and came out victoriously. He owed the power to keep himself free from sin (a) to His sinless birth, and (b) to the union of His manhood with the divine Logos. Theodore denied the *essential* indwelling of the Logos in Christ, and allowed only for a mere moral indwelling. He saw no essential difference, but only a difference of degree, between the indwelling of God in Christ and that in believers. This view really substitutes for the incarnation the moral indwelling of the Logo sin the man Jesus. Nevertheless, Theodore shrank from the conclusion to which his view would seem to lead inevitably, that there is a dual personality in Christ, two persons between whom a moral union exists. He said that the union was so close that the two might be spoken of as one person, just as husband and wife can be called one flesh.

涅斯多留。

此安提阿學派見解的必然發展，可在涅斯多留派中發現。涅氏步狄奧多的後塵，否認『神之母』一詞能適當地應用在馬利亞身上，只因馬利亞不過是帶來了一個有道同在的人而已。涅氏雖然沒有從此立場推出一必然的結論，但反對他的人區

利羅 (Cyril) 卻一定要他為此結論負責任，區利羅指出：(a) 假如馬利亞不是神之母，那麼她就是人之母親，而那個人也就是屬神的人，且此被認為與道發生交通的人，取代了神的道成肉身；(b) 如果馬利亞不是神之母，那麼基督與人的關係就要改變了，祂就不再是人類有效的救贖主。涅氏的從者毫不遲延的下了這些結論，顯得非常草率。

Nestorius and Nestorianism.

The logical development of this Antiochian view is seen in Nestorianism. Following in the footsteps of Theodore, Nestorius denied that the term *theotokos* could properly be applied to Mary for the simple reason that she only brought forth a man who was accompanied by the Logos. Although Nestorius did not draw the inevitable conclusion that followed from this position, his opponent, Cyril, held him responsible for that conclusion. He pointed out (a) that, if Mary is not *theotokos*, that is, the mother of one person, and that person divine, the assumption of a single human being into fellowship with the Logos is substituted for the incarnation of God; and (b) that, if Mary is not *theotokos*, the relation of Christ to humanity is changed, and He is no more the effectual Redeemer of mankind. The followers of Nestorius did not hesitate to draw the conclusion.

對涅斯多留派的評估。

涅斯多留派在思想上是不健全的，並不是在基督兩性的教義上，乃是`在一個位格的教義上。真神性與真人性他都接受，但並沒有把這兩項認為是一真的合一，並且成為單一的位格。此派認為，這兩個性，也是兩個位格，但卻對共有的屬性與各自獨立生存的位格之區分，完全予以忽視，且沒有把神人二性混淆成為單一的自我意識，而使這兩性並行成為一道德上的合一。基督這人並不是神，乃是神性的持有者 (*theophoros*)，而基督被崇拜，不是因為祂是神，乃是因為神在祂裏面。涅斯多留的重點，就是在於強調基督的人性，並且認為是正當的，同時，他們這種作法完全與聖經的證據相違背。叫教會高舉耶穌基督的人格、敬虔與道德，但卻將祂位神又為人的救主，就是一切屬靈能力、恩典與救贖的根源，給抹殺了。

Evaluation of Nestorianism.

Nestorianism is defective, not in the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, but in that of the one Person. Both the true and proper deity and the true and proper humanity are conceded, but they are not conceived in such a way as to form a real unity and to constitute a single person. The two natures are also two persons. The important distinction between nature as substance possessed in common, and person as a relatively independent subsistence of that nature, is entirely disregarded. Instead of blending the two natures into a single self-consciousness, Nestorianism places them alongside of each other with nothing more than a moral and sympathetic union between them. The man Christ was not God, but God-bearer, *theophoros*, a possessor of the Godhead. Christ is worshipped, not because He is God, but because God is in Him. The strong point in Nestorianism is that it seeks to do full justice to all the scriptural proofs for the unity of the Person in the Mediator. It leaves the Church with an exalted example of true piety and morality in the human person of Jesus, but robs it of its divine-human Redeemer, the source of all spiritual power, grace, and salvation.

(2) 區利羅派。

涅斯多留最大的勁敵就是亞歷山大的主教區利羅。據他來說，為了要救贖人，道 (Logos) 取了完全的人性，同時又成為神而人的獨一位格，但他用此名詞，卻未加以澄清。一方面他似乎只教導說，道 (Logos) 取了人性，所以在基督裏有兩個性，者兩個性在道 (Logos) 的一個位格內找到了他們不可分解的合一，而兩性本身卻沒有任何的改變。但區氏也使用一詞句，藉著屬性的互通來強調在基督裏二性的合一，並且說到基督的位格就好像是由一結果而產生出合一性。區氏與涅斯多留相比較下，他著重之點乃在於強調基督位格的合一性，他強調的三點完全與當時大公教會的信仰相符合，即 (a) 二性不可分的聯合；(b) 人性 (manhood) 的客觀性與依存性，也就是道 (Logos) 用以為祂的工具（或手段、媒介）；與 (c) 在基督裏位格的合一性與繼續性。可是偶而地，區利羅用的一些詞句，似乎是認為後期地猶提乾派是正確的。他只把性用在道 (Logos) 上，而不用在基督的人性上，如此他用性 (phusis) 與位格 (hypostasis)，好像是異字同義的名詞。有時區氏要負擔起字基督裏只有一個神而人的性的教義（這是指著道成肉身以後說的），並可能叫人認為區利羅對基督一性說者 (Monophysites) 發生興趣，此派叫人相信基督只有一個位格，所以在中保內也有一個性。雖然區氏極力反對這兩性的混同，但他還是繼續不斷地對他們發生興趣。（譯注：應譯為：但是基督一性說者還是會訴諸區利羅來支持他們的說法。）以弗所會議提出了一個妥協的方案，一方面支持神之母 (theotokos) 一詞可能用在馬利亞身上，另一方面則又堅稱基督二性分清的教義。

[2] The Cyrillian Party.

The most prominent opponent of Nestorianism was Cyril of Alexandria. According to him the Logos assumed human nature in its entirety, in order to redeem it, but at the same time formed the only personal subject in the God-man. His terminology was not always clear, however. On the one hand he seemed to teach simply that the Logos assumed human nature, so that there are two natures in Christ, which find their indissoluble union in the one Person of the Logos, without any change in the natures themselves. But he also used expressions in which he stressed the unity of the two natures in Christ by means of a mutual communication of attributes, and spoke of the Person of Christ as if it were a *resultant* unity. His great significance lies in the fact that, over against Nestorianism, he stressed the unity of the Person of Christ. The three points which he emphasized above all were in perfect harmony with the catholic doctrine of the day, namely: (a) the inseparable conjunction of the two natures; (b) the impersonality and dependence of the manhood, which the Logos uses as His instrument; and (c) the unity and continuity of the Person in Christ. Occasionally he used expressions, however, which seemed to justify the later Eutychian error. He applied the term *phusis* (nature) to the Logos only, and not to the humanity of Christ, thus using it as a synonym of *hypostasis*. This gave some occasion to saddle on him the doctrine that, after the incarnation, there was only one divine-human nature in Christ, and made it possible for the Monophysites to appeal to him, when they wanted to prove that, as there was but one Person, so there was also only a single nature in the Mediator. They continued their appeal to him in spite of his strenuous denial of any mixture of the natures. The Council of Ephesus effected a sort of compromise by maintaining on the one hand that the term *theotokos* could be applied to Mary, and asserting on the other hand the doctrine of the two distinct natures of Christ.

[3] 猶提乾派。

許多區利羅的信者，都不同意猶提乾派的主張，因他們不接受兩性分清的教義。猶提乾為一很老的修士，其信念很不平衡，非常反對涅斯多留派，對於康士坦丁的亞歷山大神學、運動或主張，都拳拳服膺。根據狄奧多熱脫 (Theodoret) 所記載，猶氏事實上主張，基督裏的人性與基督裏的神性是相同的，所以祂的身體和我們的身體不是同質料的，實在說來祂並非是人。猶氏在主後四四八年的君士坦丁堡會議中被定為異端，但他不服，就上訴羅馬主教利歐，在利歐接到夫拉維安有關此案的全部報告後，發表了他對夫拉維安所講述的『大卷』 (Tome)。因為「大卷」深深影響到迦克墩信條，所以其中的重點應當注意，茲述之如下：(a) 在基督裏有二性，是永遠分清的。(b) 二性聯合於一個位格，而一個性在道成肉身的生活中，都行使其本身適當的功能。(c) 由位格的合一而產生的交通 (communication idiomatum)。(d) 救贖的工作需要一位既是人又是神、能朽壞又不能朽壞、受感的又不受感的中保。道成肉身是神那方面的屈尊行動，但是道 (Logos) 在道成肉身中，並未中止祂就是神。(e) 在基督裏的人性是永久的，並且否認此點，就暗示著一種否認基督的真實性，著實是西方教會基督論的清華之點。

[3] The Eutychian Party: Eutychus and Eutichianism. Many of Cyril's adherents were dissatisfied. They did not take kindly to the doctrine of the two distinct natures. Eutyches, an aged monk of rather unbalanced convictions and with a strong anti-Nestorian bias, espoused the cause of the Alexandrian theology at Constantinople. According to Theodoret he maintained in effect, either an absorption of the human nature in the divine, or a fusion of the two natures, resulting in a sort of *tertium quid*. He was of the opinion that the human attributes were assimilated to the divine in Christ, so that His body was not consubstantial with ours and He was not human in the proper sense of the word. Condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 448, he appealed to Leo, the bishop of Rome. After Leo received a full report of the case from Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, and was urged to express his opinion, he addressed to Flavian his celebrated *Tome*. Because this *Tome* profoundly influenced the Chalcedon formula, it may be well to note its main points, which are as follows: (a) There are two natures in Christ, which are permanently distinct. (b) The two natures unite in one Person, each one performing its own proper function in the incarnate life. (c) From the unity of the Person follows the communication of *attributes (*communication idiomatum*). [* this word was missing in the English original.] (d) The work of redemption required a Mediator both human and divine, passible and impassible, mortal and immortal. The incarnation was an act of condescension on the part of God, but in it the Logos did not cease to be very God. The *forma servi* did not detract from the *forma dei*. (e) The manhood of Christ is permanent, and its denial implies a docetic denial of the reality of the sufferings of Christ. This is really a compendium of western Christology.

3. 迦克墩會議的決議

在開過幾次地方性的會議之後，對猶提乾是毀譽參半，聯合大公會議於四五一年在迦克墩召開，並發表有關基督位格教義的重要聲明如下：

[c] The Decision of the Council of Chalcedon.

After several Councils had met, some favouring and some condemning Eutyches, the ecumenical Council of Chalcedon was convened in the year 451, and issued its

famous statement of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. This reads as follows:

「我們追隨聖教父，一致教導人承認一位聖子，我們的主耶穌基督，有完全的神性也有完全的人性，祂是真神也是真人，有理性的靈魂與身體；按神性來說是與父同質，按人性來說是與我們同質，在凡事上與我們一樣，但沒有罪；按神性說，祂在諸世代以前為父所生，按人性說，在末世是由童貞女馬利亞（神之母），為我們及我們的得救而生，也就是這位基督、聖子、主、獨生的兒子，被認為由兩性，不混淆、不改變、不可分的，而二性的分清不能由於聯合而消失，反而每一性的本質應被保存，同時發生在一個位格、一個生活方式中（譯注：一個生存形式中），並不是兩個位格，乃是一個，就是這同一的聖子，那獨生的子，為道的神，就是主耶穌基督；以上所說的正像先知從起初關於基督向我們宣佈的，與主耶穌所教導的，並聖父的信經所一脈相傳下來給我們的。」

“We then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and also truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly (asuggutos), unchangeably (atreptos), indivisibly (adiaretos), inseparably (achoristos), the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, the Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has taught us, and the Creed of the Holy Fathers has handed down to us.”

此聲明最重要的涵意如下：(1) 神人二性的本質可以歸屬於一個本質，例如無所不知於有限的知識。(2) 神而人 (God-man) 的受苦可以被認為是真實的無限，然而無感於神性的。(3) 基督位格的根基，是在於祂的神性，而非祂的人性。(4) 道 (Logos) 並非與一般人類中的個人聯合，乃與人性聯合。三位一體神之第二位，並不是首先和一個體的人聯合，這個聯合早在童女馬利亞懷孕耶穌基督的時候就聯合了。

The most important implications of this statement are the following: (1) The properties of both natures may be attributed to the one Person, as, for instance, omniscience and limited knowledge. (2) The suffering of the God-man can be regarded as truly and really infinite, while yet the divine nature is impassible. (3) It is the divinity and not the humanity that constitutes the root and basis of the personality of Christ. (4) The Logos did not unite with a distinct human individual, but with a human nature. There was not first an individual man, with whom the Second Person in the Godhead associated Himself. The union was effected with the substance of humanity in the womb of the virgin.

基督論的發展史 HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST (2)
爭辯的第二階段
The Second Stage of the Controversy

1. 迦克墩會議決定後的混亂

[a] Confusion after the Decision of the Council of Chalcedon

迦克墩會議關於基督論的爭辯，正如奈西亞會議關於三位一體的爭辯一樣，並沒有得到圓滿的效果。雖然羅馬已經成為正統信仰的中心，但是在埃及、敘利亞與帕勒斯丁等地，還包含著許多猶提乾派狂熱信仰的修道士。事實上，教義發展的程序，已迅速地從東方教會傳至西方。[譯注：其實教義的發展，很快地從東方教會轉移，落在西方教會的手中。]

The Council of Chalcedon did not put an end to the Christological disputes any more than the Council of Nicaea terminated the Trinitarian controversy. Egypt, Syria, and Palestine harboured many fanatical monks of Eutychian convictions, while Rome became ever-increasingly the centre of orthodoxy. In fact, the process of dogmatic development was fast passing from East to the West.

基督一性說派。

迦克墩會議後，區利羅與猶提乾的跟從者，都被稱為基督一性說派，因為他們承認在聯合之後，基督有一個混合的性，並否認祂有兩個分清的神人二性。正如他們所瞭解的，這分清的二性包含有雙重性格的可能性（譯注：這分清的二性必然導致兩個分清的位格的結論），在不同的派別之間有一長又不適當（不漂亮）的爭辯。就是在基督一性派之間，意見也不一致，他們又分為好幾個支流，歐爾博士 (Dr. Orr) 說，光是他們這幾個派的名稱，就叫人不寒而慄了。這些名稱就是父神受苦派 (Theopaschitists)；另一派則是基督人性合我們相似派 (Phthartolatrists)，此派主張與迦克墩信條很相近，強調基督人性與我們一樣的事實，因此祂能受苦，也因而說應崇拜那會朽壞的；和正與此相反的基督人性與我們相反派 (Aphthartolatrists)，此派主張基督的人性與我們不同質，乃賦有神的屬性，因此是無罪的，不可毀滅與不可衰殘的。

The Monophysites.

After the Council of Chalcedon the adherents of Cyril and Eutichus were called Monophysites, because they conceded that after the union Christ had a *composite* nature, but denied that He had two *distinct* natures. As they saw it, two distinct natures would necessarily involve a duality of persons. There was a lengthy and rather unseemly struggle between the different parties. Even the Monophysites were not all agreed among themselves. They were divided into several sects, of which the names alone, says Dr. Orr, "are enough to give one a cold hshiver." There were the *Theopaschitists*, who emphasized the fact that God suffered; the *Phthartolatrists*, who came nearest to the formulation of Chalcedon, and stressed the fact that the human nature of Christ was, like ours, capable of suffering, and were therefore said to worship that which is corruptible; and the *Aphthartodocetists*, who represented just the opposite view, namely, that the

human nature of Christ was not consubstantial with ours, but was endowed with divine attributes, and was therefore sinless, imperishable, and incorruptible.

拜占庭的李安迪。

迦克墩神學最能幹、顯著迪護衛者就是拜占庭迪李安迪，他在基督教義神學迪構造（譯注：基督論的建構）上有所加添後，又為大馬色約翰予以充分的發揮，所論之點乃是：涅斯多留派的反對，可能導致基督人性獨立客觀的存在，此一觀念是受到客觀的 (*anupostasis*) 與在位格內的 (*anupostasia*) 兩名詞所助成。因此李安迪強調，基督人性的事實是在位格內的，而非客觀性的，自從道成肉身的那一剎那開始，在神兒子的位格中，就有其個人的生存 (*personal subsistence*)。

Leontius of Byzantium.

The ablest and most prominent defender of the Chalcedonian theology was Leontius of Byzantium. He added an element to the dogmatical construction of the doctrine of Christ, which was more fully worked out by John of Dasmascus. The point is this: The rejection of Nestorianism might lead to the idea of an independent impersonal existence of the human nature of Christ. This idea was apt to be fostered by the use of the terms *anupostasis* and *anupostasia*. Therefore Leontius stressed the fact that the human nature of Christ is *enupostasia*, not impersonal but in-personal, having its personal subsistence in the Person of the Son of God from the very moment of the incarnation.

五五三年羅馬皇猶斯提念 (Justinian) 在君士坦丁堡召開第五此大公會議，定狄奧多所寫的為異端，使得情勢對基督一性說派有利。但是單單就基督一性說派咒詛那些聲稱迦克墩會議暫助其所定罪之錯謬這方面來說，對他們就不利。這件事並沒有另基督一性說派滿意，反而使他們與羅馬國帝國教會分離。

In 553 the emperor Justinian summoned the fifth oecumenical Council at Constantinople, which was favourable to the Monophysites in its condemnation of the writings of Theodore, but unfavourable to it in so far as it anathematized those who declared that the Council of Chalcedon countenanced the very errors which it condemned. This did not satisfy the Monophysites, but rather sealed their separation from the Church of the Empire.

2 · 基督一志說的爭辯。

[b] The Monothelitic Controversy.

不久就見出企圖在會議中解決基督一性說的事未能圓滿達成。幾項重要的問題尚未解決，在基督的二性不單指基督內的二性（譯注：基督內的二性如何是二性）時，另外又產生了一個問題，即在位格中包括多少，在屬性中又包括多少？且與此有關更重要的問題是，意志是屬於前者或是後者？這就等於問，基督裏是不是只有一個意志，還是兩個？若說只有一個，那似乎剝奪了基督有真正屬人的意志，因此就從祂人性的完整上有所減損；另一方面，若說有兩個意志，那又回到涅斯多留的陣營中了。

It soon became evident that the attempted settlement of the Monophysite controversy by the Council did not restore harmony. Several vital questions remained unanswered. Not only did the *how* of the two natures in Christ remain unsolved, but the

additional question arose, How much is included in the person and how much in the nature? In this connection the very important question was raised, whether the will belongs to the former or to the latter. This is equivalent to asking, whether there is but one will in Christ or two? To say that there is but one seems to rob Christ of true human volition, and therefore to detract from the integrity of His humanity. On the other hand, to say that there are two seems to lead right into the Nestorian camp.

基督一志說派。

結果從基督一性說派中又興起了一新的基督一志說派 (Monothelites)。顧名思義，該派的主張是由位格的合一開始，並宣稱基督只有一個意志。此教義具有兩種說法：一說是基督屬人的意志被屬神的意志合併了，所以只有屬神的意志在活動；另一說法則是，意志被認為是混合體，是由神的意志於人的意志注入的結果。反對基督一志說的人被稱為基督二志說派 (Dyothelites)，此派的立場是主張基督有二性，並宣稱在基督裏有兩個意志。而基督一志說派反對他們破壞了基督個人生活（基督位格的生命）的合一性。

Monothelites. The result was that a new sect arose among the Monophysites, called Monothelites. As the name indicates, they started from the unity of the Person and asserted that there is but one will in Christ. This doctrine also took two forms: either the human will was regarded as merged in the divine, so that the latter alone acted; or the will was regarded as composite, resulting from the fusion of the divine and the human. The opponents of the Monothelites were called Duothelites. These took their stand on the duality of the natures and asserted the presence of two wills in Christ. The Monophysites charged them with the destruction of the unity of the personal life of Christ.

有一個時期，能力 (energeia) 一詞在此次爭辯中先於意志 (thelema) 而被使用（譯注：比較更被接納），但不久『意志』一詞較『能力』一詞表達更為清楚，所以就取代了『能力』而被使用。但有一件事必須注意，就是『意志』一詞的意義非常廣泛。嚴格說來，當我們用『意志』的時候，意思是意願、自決、與選擇的功能；但此字也用在廣義方面，包括直覺、嗜好、願望、與愛情（譯注：情操），及其與之相反的意義。這些在從前的爭辯中，都包括在「意志」一詞中，所以就帶出了一個問題，即基督是否懼怕，並逃避苦難與死亡？若否認基督屬人的意志，那麼基督的人性就多少帶有幻影派的色彩。

For a time the term *energeia* (energy) was used in this controversy in preference to *thelema* (will), but soon the latter, as the more definite term, prevailed. It should be borne in mind, however, that the word "will" was used in a broad sense. Strictly speaking, we mean by "will" the faculty of volition, of self-determination, and of choice. But the word is often used in a broader sense, as including the instincts, appetites, desires, and affections, with their corresponding aversions. All this was covered by the term "will" in the ancient controversy, so that this included the question, whether Christ was capable of fear and of shrinking from suffering and death. The denial of the human will in Christ would therefore give His humanity a somewhat docetic character.

君士坦丁堡第六次大公會議（主後六八零年），具有羅馬主教的合作，採納了二意志、二能力教義為正統的信仰立場，但也決定了基督內屬人的意志必須被瞭解為從屬於屬神的意志。被公認的意見乃是說，在基督裏屬人的意志，並沒有因與

屬神的意志聯合而削減了人的成份，反而因著聯合而被提昇，並達於完全，此二者總是有一種完全協和的姿態一起活動。

The sixth ecumenical Council of Constantinople (680), with the co-operation of the bishop of Rome, adopted the doctrine of the two wills and two energies as the orthodox position, but also decided that the human will must always be conceived as subordinate to the divine. The established opinion was that the human will by its union with the divine did not become less human, but was heightened and perfected by the union, the two always acting in perfect harmony.

3·大馬色約翰的基督論

[c] The Construction of the Doctrine by John of Damascus.

希臘教會神學在大馬色約翰時的發占達於最高點，因此注意他對基督的位格教義的瞭解是非常重要的。根據他的說法，道 (Logos) 取了人性，並不是也耶穌這個人取了道。這意思就是說，Logos 是一個具有約束性的代理，目的在求得二性的聯合（譯注：Logos 是形成基督，控制基督位格的個體，二性因此合而為一），而並沒有取屬人的個人性（並沒有取一個個體的人），也沒有採取一般的人性（也沒有取人性的共相），乃是具有潛力的人（而是一個有潛力成為個體的人），亦即尚未發展成一位格的人性。藉 Logos 與具有潛力的人（人性），在馬利亞的腹中聯合，而後者需要（譯注：取得了）一個體的存在。雖然說基督的人性沒有祂自己獨立的位格，但是藉著 Logos 而有其個體的（位格的）存在，祂並非是位格的（譯注：祂並非是非位格的），但卻（而是）在位格之內。

In John of Damascus the theology of the Greek Church reached its highest development, and therefore it is of importance to notice his construction of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. According to him the Logos assumed human nature, and not *vice versa*, that is, the man Jesus did not assume the Logos. This means that the Logos is the formative and controlling agency, securing the unity of the two natures. The Logos did not assume a human individual, nor human nature in general, but a potential human individual, a human nature not yet developed into a person or hypostasis. Through the union of the Logos with this potential man in the womb of Mary, the latter acquired an individual existence. While the human nature of Christ has no independent personality of its own, it nevertheless has personal existence in and through the Logos. It is not non-hypostatic, but en-hypostatic.

祂將基督二性的聯合比作人身體與靈魂的聯合，認為在基督裏有一種神和人彼此互相存在的關係 (circumincession)，即神的屬性與人的屬性互相交通，所以屬人第性情被神化，也可以說是神在肉身受苦，而人性也只有在那種情形中有效，因此人性純粹是接受的，並且是被動的。神的兒子（包括祂的完全人性在內）乃是教會崇拜的對象，雖然有一減損基督人性到一僅為 Logos 之器官的傾向，但是卻承認兩性合作，並且一個位格在每一個性中都有所行動和意願。意志被認為是屬與本性的，但卻聲稱在基督裏屬人的意志，已成為道成肉身之神的意志。

He illustrates the union of the two natures in Christ by the union of body and soul in man. There is a circumincession of the divine and the human in Christ, a communication of the attributes to the human nature, so that the latter is deified and we may also say that God

suffered in the flesh. The human nature only is thus affected, and is therefore purely receptive and passive. The Son of God, now including His complete humanity, is an object of worship for the Church. Though there is a tendency to reduce the human nature of Jesus to the position of a mere organ or instrument of the Logos, it is admitted that there is a co-operation of the two natures, and that the one Person acts and wills in each nature. The will is regarded as belonging to the nature, but it is claimed that in Christ the human will has become the will of the incarnate God.

4 · 西方教會的基督論

[d] The Christology of the Western Church.

西方教會並未受到東方教會激烈爭辯的影響。整體的說來，似乎西方教會的思想，對於哲學的區分還沒有充分地瞭解，以致未能在問題的討論上採取主動參與，認為這些問題是如此地深奧於詭（微妙），以致使東方教會分裂。

The Western Church remained comparatively unaffected by the controversies that were raging in the East. It seems that on the whole the western mind was not sufficiently familiar with all kinds of fine philosophical distinctions to take an active part in the discussion of questions that were so deep and subtle as those that divided the Eastern Church.

嗣子說 (Adoptionism)。

在七、八世紀中，西班牙關於基督論又出現瞭一個新的運動，稱之為嗣子說的爭論。『嗣子』一詞在西班牙使為人所熟知的，因為在主後六七五年託理多會議中宣稱基督是神的兒子，是由於本性 (nature)，而非由於領養 (adoption 嗣子)。嗣子說教義的真正健將，就是俄基拉之主教非利士 (Felix of Urgella)，他認為基督在祂神性著方面（就是 Logos）當然是神的獨生子，但在人這方面說，乃是領養的神之子。他同時想要藉著強調耶穌在馬利亞腹中之時，人子與神的兒子就聯合的事實，來保守位格上的合一。

Adoptionism.

A new movement of Christological thought appeared in Spain, however, in the seventh and eighth centuries, called the Adoptionist Controversy. The term "adoption" was already familiar in Spain, since a Council of Toledo declared in 675 that Christ was the Son of God by nature and not by adoption. The real champion of the Adoptionist doctrine was Felix, bishop of Urgella. He regarded Christ as to His divine nature, that is the Logos, as the only-begotten Son of God in the natural sense, but Christ on his human side as a Son of God by adoption. At the same time he sought to preserve the unity of the Person by stressing the fact that, from the time of his conception, the Son of Man was taken up into the unity of the Person of the Son of God.

因此，此說是在自然為神的兒子（譯注：在本性上是神的兒子）與領養成為神的兒子間作了一區分，而前者是指著基督神性說的，後者是指著基督人性說的。非利士及其信從者將以下幾點作為他們信仰（立場）的根基：(1)根據基督裏兩性的區分，暗示著在子權裏兩種方式的區分（譯注：暗示著：基督作為『子』的位份有兩種形式）。(2)根據聖經中的經文，指出基督是個人，在聖父之下從屬於父神

(譯注：指出作為人的基督低於父神，從屬父神)。 (3) 根據信者被神領養，得兒子的名份，成為神的兒子，並且也成為基督的「弟兄」，這似乎暗示(譯加：在同一樣的意義上，) 基督在人性上也是神的兒子。為了在進一步地瞭解此意義他們就在基督在伯利恆自然的生與屬靈的生之間作一區分，而此屬靈的生是從耶穌受洗時開始，並在復活後中止(完結)；此屬靈的生使基督成為神的嗣子。

This theory therefore makes a distinction between a natural and an adoptive sonship, the former predicated of the divinity and the latter of the humanity of Christ. Felix and his followers based their opinion: (1) On the distinction of natures in Christ, which, according to them, implied a distinction between two modes of sonship. (2) On passages of Scripture which refers to the inferiority of Christ as man to the Father. And (3) On the fact that believers are sons of God by adoption, and are also called "brethren" of Christ. This would seem to imply that Christ as to his human nature was a Son of God in the same sense. In order to explain their meaning still further they distinguished between a natural birth of Christ at Bethlehem and a spiritual birth, which had its inception at the time of baptism and was consummated in the resurrection. This spiritual birth made Christ the adopted Son of God.

反對此見解的人雖然未能攻擊嗣子說派，說他們教導有關基督雙重位格的明顯錯誤，但他們卻堅稱此見解的必然結果就是有兩個神之子 (dual sonship) (必然結果就是基督的兒子位份有兩個)。查理曼時代的著名學者亞勒崑 (Alcuin)，就基督分有兩個兒子的問題與非利士大起爭辯，他主張沒有一個父親能夠有本性上是兒子，而同時又是領養的兒子，毫無疑問地，嗣子派將一種從外來的生疏的立場加諸於基督的人性上，只等到基督藉著一特殊領養的作為，才能成為神的兒子，這實是一種錯誤的想法。這個錯謬在主後七九四年的法蘭克福大會 (Synod of Frankfurt) 上被定為異端。

While the opponents of this view did not charge the Adoptionists with the explicit error of teaching a dual personality in Christ, they asserted that this would be the logical result of a dual sonship. Alcuin, the noted scholar of the days of Charlemagne, took issue with Felix and charged him with dividing Christ into two sons. He maintained that no father could have a son, who was such both by nature and by adoption. Undoubtedly, the Adoptionists were in error, when they assigned to the human nature of Christ a sort of alien position until He was made to partake of divine sonship by a special act of adoption. This error was condemned by the Synod of Frankfurt in AD 794.

後期基督論的檢討：中古世紀 THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

在中古世紀時期，基督位格的教義並未居於顯著的地位，而其他的問題如有關最於恩的教義、救贖工作的教義，都為當時人們注意的中心。簡單提示阿奎那對於基督解釋最顯著之點，將足以說明此問題在宗教改革時的情形。

During the Middle Ages the doctrine of the Person of Christ was not in the foreground. Other problems, such as those connected with the doctrines of sin and grace, and with the doctrine of the work of redemption, became the centre of attention. A brief indication of the most salient points of Thomas Aquinas' construction of the doctrine of Christ will be sufficient to indicate how the matter stood at the time of the Reformation.

阿奎那的基督論

Christology of Thomas Aquinas

至於在基督裏二性的聯合，阿奎那贊成過去教會所領受的神學立場。Logos的位格在道成肉身聯合的時候成為混合體，此聯合『阻礙』(hindered)了基督的人性，使之未能達於獨立的位格。由於與Logos的聯合，基督的人性領受了雙重的恩惠，即(1)聯合的(*gratia unionis*)，或謂從人性與神性聯合的結果而產生出的尊嚴，所以基督的人性也成為崇拜的對象；與(2)成聖的恩惠(*gratia habitualis*)，此成聖之恩是給予為人的基督，使之在與神的關係中做為對人性的支持(譯注：支持著基督人性與上帝的關係)。在基督屬人這方面的知識可分為兩種，即注入的知識(*scientia infusa*)與取得的知識(*scientia acquisita*)。由於前者使得基督能知道人所能知道的一切事，並由於啟示而得知的一切事，酒知識上來說是完全的，但是因為人是受造的，所以受到限制。由於後者，藉著理智的才能(譯注：功能)，基督因而知道一切所能知的事。在抽象的兩性之間沒有屬性的互通，但在位格上卻能有人與神的屬性(譯注：抽象的來說，兩性之間沒有屬性的互通，但可以說，位格裏有人性與神性)。基督的人性並非無所不能，而是受到人情感上的控制，即如憂愁、悲哀、恐懼、稀奇、與憤怒。在基督裏有兩個意志，但最終的因果關係乃屬與神的意志(譯注、譯加：但神的意志才是至終的成因，人的意志總是服在神的意志之下)。

As to the hypostatic union in Christ, Thomas Aquinas adhered to the received theology. The Person of the Logos became composite after the union at the incarnation, and this union "hindered" the manhood from arriving at an independent personality. A twofold grace was imparted to the human nature of Christ in virtue of its union with the Logos, namely: (a) the *gratia unionis* or the dignity that resulted from the union of the human nature with the divine, so that the human nature also became an object of worship; and (b) the *gratia habitualis*, the grace of sanctification which was vouchsafed to Christ as man, sustaining the human nature in its relationship to God. The human knowledge of Christ was twofold, namely, *scientia infusa* and *scientia acquisita*. In virtue of the former He could know all things that can be so known by men and all that is made known to them by revelation, a knowledge perfect in its kind but yet subject to creaturely limitation. And in virtue of the latter He knew all that can be known through the

intellectual faculties. There is no communication of attributes between the natures in the abstract, but both human and divine attributes may be ascribed to the Person. The human nature of Christ was not omnipotent, but was subject to human affections, such as sorrow, sadness, fear, wonder, and anger. There are two wills in Christ, but ultimate causality belongs to the divine will. The human will is always subject to the divine.

贖罪論的發展史：基督的工作 (1)
THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT:
THE WORK OF CHRIST (1)

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 165-170.)

I · 希臘教父的神學

The Atonement in Greek Patristic Theology

使徒時代教父論贖罪

使徒時代的教父往往以一般性的聖經觀點，來論及基督的工作，最具意義的陳述，是發現在戴格尼塔斯的書信 (Epistle to Diognetos) 中。在此書信中，概括了人有罪應當受刑，神差遣祂的兒子為贖罪祭，以及又基督的義遮蓋罪等概念在內。護教士論到贖罪的題目，並沒有深入的討論，所論及的也只是基督是救贖主，救人脫離魔鬼的權勢。神哲派說基督救人脫離了黑暗的國度，也就是脫離物質的世界。在馬仙的議論中，說基督的死是神的愛，將人從世界的創造主手中贖回來。

Apostolic Fathers on the Work of Redemption.

The Apostolic Father speak in general, usually Scriptural terms, of the work of Christ. The most significant statement is found in the Epistle to Diognetus. It combines the ideas of man's sin as deserving punishment, of God as giving His Son as a ransom for sin, and of the resulting covering of sin by the righteousness of Christ. The Apologists contain very little on the subject that is of importance. In so far as Christ is represented as a Redeemer, it is usually as a Redeemer from the power of the devil. In the Gnostic systems the redemption wrought by Christ is a redemption from the kingdom of darkness, the world of matter. In Marcion the death of Christ is the price at which the God of love purchased men from the creator of the world.

愛任紐論贖罪。

愛任紐是一位在東西方中間的神學家，他同意護教士的看法，說人是受到黑暗權勢的奴役，並且視救贖的一部份為從撒但的權勢下得拯救。他雖然不看贖罪為補償撒但的要求，但卻認為是從撒但權勢下得拯救。他的意思乃是基督的死滿足了神公義的要求，叫人得自由；同時他高抬恢復說 (Recapitulation Theory)，這意思就是說『基督在祂自己裏面，經過了人生的各階段，以及重述了各階段中的經驗，包括我們為罪人的情況。』（歐爾語）基督藉著祂的道成肉身，並且成為人，一反亞當由於罪所走的道路，使得人類重新開始，並在人類生命中產生新的原動力。基督對那些藉著信心與祂聯合的人，賜給他們不朽壞的生命，並在他生活中產生了道德上的變化，且由於祂的順服，補償了亞當的悖逆。

Irenaeus on the Atonement. Irenaeus, who stands mid-way between the East and the West, agrees with the Apologists in contemplating man as enslaved by the powers of darkness, and looks upon redemption partly as deliverance from the power of Satan, though he does not look upon it as a satisfaction due to Satan. His idea is rather that the death of Christ satisfied the justice of God and thus liberates man. At the same time he gives great prominence to the *recapitulation theory*, the idea “that Christ

recapitulates in himself all the stages of human life, and all the experiences of these stages, including those which belong to our state as sinners.” (Orr). By His incarnation and human life he thus reverses the course on which Adam by his sin started humanity and thus becomes a new leaven in the life of mankind. He communicates immortality to those who are united to him by faith and effects an ethical transformation in their lives, and by his obedience compensates for the disobedience of Adam.

亞歷山大的革利免與奧利金論贖罪。

在亞歷山大學派中，我們可發現幾個論點。在亞歷山大革利免一些不太著名的書中，說到基督的死乃是為罪人付上贖價，但在其重要的著作中卻論到基督為一教師，藉宣揚真知識來拯救人，並感化他們過有愛心且真實公義的生活。奧利金則提出幾個不同的見解，但並未併入綜合的整體教義中。基督藉著道成肉身，使人性神化；藉著自我犧牲的至高榜樣，如此可以啟發人作此同樣的犧牲；藉著捨命為贖罪祭；並藉著買贖人脫離撒但的權勢來拯救人。關於救人脫離魔鬼的權勢這個觀念，奧氏介紹了一個新的觀念，那就是在交易上魔鬼受了騙。基督把祂自己提出作為給撒但的贖價，撒但接受了這贖罪，未想到牠不能抓住基督，因為基督屬神的能力與聖潔。撒但吞了基督人性的餌，反被基督神性的鉤給鉤住了。這樣，全人類的靈魂 – 甚至那些在陰間的 – 就都脫離了撒但的權勢。

Clement of Alexandria and Origen on the Atonement.

In the Alexandrian School we find several representations. In one of his minor works Clement of Alexandria represents the death of Christ as a payment of man's debt and as a ransom; but in his main works he gives more prominence to the thought that Christ as Teacher saves men by endowing them with true knowledge and inspiring them to a life of love and true righteousness. Origen presents several different views without combining them into a synthetic whole. Christ saves by deifying human nature through the incarnation; by giving the supreme example of self-sacrifice, thus inspiring others to a similar sacrifice; by laying down his life as a sacrifice for the expiation of sin; and by redeeming men from the power of Satan. In connection with the idea of man's redemption from the power of the devil Origen introduces a new idea, namely that Satan was deceived in the transaction. Christ offered Himself as a ransom to Satan, and Satan accepted the ransom without realizing that he would not be able to retain his hold on Christ because of the latter's divine power and holiness. Satan swallowed the bait of Christ's humanity, and was caught on the hook of His divinity. Thus the souls of all men – even of those in hades – were set free from the power of Satan.

阿他那修論贖罪。

有關贖罪首先系統性的論述，當推阿他那修的道成肉身論，本書包括了幾項不同的概念：道成了肉身，叫人復活由於犯罪而失去有關神的真知識；成肉身的道，也代表替身，藉著擔當罪的刑罰，替人附上了罪債，此項滿足的需要，必須根據神的誠實，而非根據神的公義，且這贖價也不能說是付給撒但的。然而愛任紐的意思是說，道取了肉身，為的是使道成為神，並成為不朽，他這種觀點是非常突出的。同時，阿他那修的論述在另外兩項上與愛任紐不同：(1) 在得救的程序上，道成肉身與基督的死與復活有直接的關聯；(2) 在得救的程序上，著重點是在於道德方面，而非物質方面。基督藉著祂的道與榜樣在人心中作工。

Athanasius on the Atonement.

The first systematic treatise on the work of the atonement was Athanasius' *De Incarnatione*. This work also contains several different ideas. The Logos became incarnate to restore to man the true knowledge of God, which had been lost by sin. The incarnate Logos is also represented as man's substitute, who pays his debt for him by enduring the penalty of sin. The necessity of this satisfaction is based on the veracity rather than on the justice of God. It is not said that the price was paid to Satan. The idea of Irenaeus that the Logos assumed flesh in order to deify and immortalize it, however, is made particularly prominent. At the same time the representation of Athanasius differs from that of Irenaeus on two points: (a) the incarnation is connected up more directly with the death and resurrection of Christ in the saving process; and (b) the emphasis is on the ethical rather than on the physical element in the process. Christ operates by His word and example on the hearts of man.

5 · 尼撒貴革利與拿先斯貴革利論贖罪

阿他那修真正的繼承者乃是三位加帕多家的教父。巴西流對於贖罪論的貢獻無幾，他的小弟尼撒貴格利卻寫了一本書，名叫《大要理問答》（*Great Catechism*），是論到基督贖罪第二部非常重要有系統的工作，他又重複了撒但受騙的概念，並且根據以下的兩個理由來述說此概念的正當性：（1）當撒但受欺騙的時候，欺騙者就已經得到了所當得的；（2）撒但本身在末了時也得到了好處，因為綜結時牠也得救了（得到解脫）。《大要理問答》的基本思想，就是從阿他那修借來的，那就是說神藉著道成肉身，與人的性情連合起來，為的是釋放人脫離死亡。早期這本大要理問答中也指出，基督的死不但毀滅了死亡，同時也毀滅了罪。拿先斯貴格利對於付贖價給撒但的觀念予以痛斥並表示憤慨，所以他特別重複阿他那修的教訓。奎首吞與區利羅特別強調基督之死的無限價值，區利羅的主要貢獻乃在於基督之死，為一神格之死的無限價值。包珥則發現了我們實際上在基督得到完全滿足的概念，但與神以及屬神的義無關。

Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus on the Atonement.

The true successors of Athanasius are the three Cappadocians. Basil contributed little to the doctrine of the atonement. His younger brother, Gregory of Nyssa, is of far greater importance as the author of the second important systematic treatment of the work of Christ, the *Great Catechism*. He repeats the idea of the deceit practiced on Satan, and justifies the deceit on two grounds: (a) the deceiver simply received his due when he was deceived in turn; and (b) Satan himself benefits by it in the end, since it results in his salvation. The underlying thought of the *Great Catechism* is the idea, borrowed from Athanasius, that in the incarnation God joined himself to our nature, in order to free it from death. It is pointed out, however, that not only death but sin also was destroyed. Gregory of Nazianzus repudiates with scorn and indignation the idea of a ransom paid to Satan. But he also rejects the idea that God the Father required a ransom. For the rest he virtually repeats the teachings of Athanasius. John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria stress the immense value of the death of Christ. The main contribution of the latter lies in his emphasis on the infinite value of the death of Christ as the death of a divine Person. Baur finds that in him we have practically the full concept of satisfaction, except the express reference of it to God and the divine righteousness.

6·大馬色約翰論贖罪

希臘教父的神學，在大馬色約翰時達於最高點，他將以往論基督贖罪的思想歸納起來，但本人卻並無顯著的貢獻。為了歸納當前贖罪論思想的發展，我們可以說，在西方教會（希臘）神學有兩個主要的方面：(1) 一方面說，人得救被認為是道成肉身的直接結果，是神給人的一個新的啟示，或者是神給人的一個新生命。(2) 另一方面，救恩被看做達成某項客觀條件的結果，即如向神獻祭、滿足神的公義，或付贖價給撒但。假如我們提出什麼理論，來表明希臘教父時期的神學思想，我們就要指出向馬肯他須所說的：『西方教會的贖罪論，是對未識者的一大開放。』這是說到對撒但付代價的教義；他又稱之為『恢復的秘傳說 (The esoteric theory of recapitulatio)』。

John of Damascus on the Work of Redemption.

Greek patristic theology culminates in John of Damascus. He gathers up the previous thoughts on the work of Christ, but adds no distinctive contribution of his own. In summing up the development thus far, we may say that the doctrine of the work of Christ appears under two main aspects in Greek theology. (a) On the one hand salvation is contemplated as the direct result of the incarnation, as a new divine revelation given to man, or as (along with Christ's death and resurrection) communicating new life to mankind. (b) On the other hand it is viewed as the result of the fulfillment of certain objective conditions, such as that of a sacrifice to God, or of a satisfaction to the divine justice, or of a ransom paid to Satan. If we were to name any theories that are characteristic of the Greek patristic period, we would point to what Mackintosh calls "the great *exoteric* doctrine of atonement in the Greek Church," the doctrine of a ransom paid to the devil; and to what he styles "the *esoteric* theory of *recapitulatio*."

II·拉丁教父的神學

The Atonement in Latin Patristic Theology

特土良論贖罪

論到基督贖罪的教義，雖然在拉丁神學與早期的希臘神學中有相同的地方，可是近來卻有重要的不同之點開始復甦（譯注：可是，就算在這麼早的時期已經有不同之點顯明）。顯著的拉丁式神學起於特土良，他多少採用了愛任紐的重複說，但他對道成肉身的瞭解，主要還是限於基督藉教訓與榜樣來影響人類這方面，然而這整個觀念的勢力已漸消失。他比愛任紐還強調基督死在十字架上的中心意義，認為這是基督降世達成使命的最高點。關於基督之死教義上的制定，不能說特土良超越了愛任紐，他真正的貢獻，乃在於他把幾個正確的名詞，即如『罪孽』、『滿足』與『功勞』等介紹到神學裏面去，而這些名詞對基督贖罪的神學發展十分重要，但有一點值得注意，他並沒有把這些名詞用在基督贖罪的工作上，而用在人受洗之後又犯罪，應當悔改行善的情形上。他為天主教補贖教義的發展奠下根據。

Tertullian's View of Redemption.

Though the doctrine of the work of Christ in Latin patristic theology has several points in common with that of early Greek theology, yet even in this early period important differences begin to emerge. The distinctively Latin type of theology begins

with Tertullian. To a certain extent he adopts Irenaeus' recapitulation theory, but conceives of the incarnation as affecting mankind chiefly through precept and example. Yet this whole idea recedes somewhat into the background. He stresses far more than Irenaeus the central significance of the death of Christ on the cross, regarding it as the culminating point in, and as the real end of, the mission of Christ. It cannot be said that he went far beyond Irenaeus in the definite formulation of the doctrine of the death of Christ. His real significance lies in the fact that he introduced the use of several legal terms into theology, such as "guilt," "satisfaction," "merit," and so on, which were destined to play a great part in the theological development of the doctrine of the work of Christ. It should be noted, however, that he did not yet apply these terms to the sacrificial work of Christ, but to the repentance and good works that should follow sins committed after baptism. He laid the foundation for the development of the doctrine of penance in the Roman Catholic Church.

2 · 希拉流與安波羅修論贖罪

二者將希臘教父的思想介紹到西方教會。前者代表了希臘教父認為贖罪是藉著道成肉身，來恢復人類的這種觀念，但是這種觀念還是說到基督之死的重大意義，他甚至看基督之死為向神提出滿足，這點與特土良不同。基督的死是甘願的，為的是要滿足刑罰上的要求，希氏向阿他那修一樣，此滿足是從神的誠實而非公義引來的。安波羅修也有愛任紐的這種觀念，此外他又重複了奧利金認為基督是向撒但付上贖價，並且欺騙了撒但的這種觀念，同時他又強調基督的死乃是向神獻上祭物的事實，並且認為這個祭物是為滿足神在有罪的人身上所宣佈的死刑，可是他並沒有解釋為什麼需要獻這個祭。

Hilary and Ambrose on the Work of Redemption.

From Tertullian we pass on to Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose, who interpreted Greek thought to the West. The former represents more than any other the Greek conception of the restoration of humanity by the incarnation. But this does not prevent him from ascribing the most definite significance to the death of Christ. In distinction from Tertullian he even views it as a satisfaction rendered to God. Christ did voluntarily, in order to satisfy a penal obligation. He infers the necessity of this satisfaction, like Athanasius, from the veracity rather than from the justice of God. Ambrose also shares the view of Irenaeus, and in addition repeats the idea of Origen that Christ paid a ransom to Satan and practiced deceit on him. At the same time he strongly stresses the fact that the death of Christ was a sacrifice to God, and regards this sacrifice as a satisfaction of the divine sentence of death pronounced on sinful humanity. However, he does not explain why this sacrifice was necessary.

奧古斯丁論贖罪

一提起贖罪論，我們自然而然地會想到西方教會最偉大的教父奧古斯丁，對基督贖罪工作教義的偉大貢獻，其實不然，他主要的成就乃是在其他方面。歸納他以往的思想，可發現他有許多有關贖罪論不同的見解，（重譯：看奧氏如何歸納在他以前的贖罪論思想，可發現這段時期對贖罪論有不同的見解，）有些甚至自相矛盾。

有一個觀念是說，雖然只是一倫理上的方法，但藉著基督的道成肉身，使得人性得以神化；另一個觀念是說，撒但在人身上有一個要求，但這種觀念被另一個思想所補足，即撒但的要求被基督之死所消除。奧古斯丁的主要思想可以說是離了希臘教父的神學思想，他的前題與他的結論並不相合，而其中心思想則是有關原罪、因恩稱義，以及藉基督贖罪（重譯：基督的犧牲）與神和好。這個新的西方教會思想是在自圓其說、固執己見，而我們所遵循的則是使徒保羅的贖罪觀，（重譯：奧古斯丁代表了新的西方教會思想開始興起，這種思想是遵循使徒保羅的思想架構的，）即人被看作是承受神忿怒的，但基督的死（重譯：基督的犧牲）擔當了這一切的忿怒，教人與神和好。奧氏並沒有將以上的思想作成一完全的體系，他的說法還遠不如安瑟倫清楚的救贖論。奧氏在贖罪法律與更新的上層，沒有作徹底的區分（奧氏沒有徹底地區分救贖工作裏法律層面與更新人心的層面），他認為稱義的根基有的時候不在於藉著耶穌基督移除罪孽，乃在於聖靈成聖之恩的感化。再有，有時候他教導說，藉著基督而有的贖罪，是最適宜的救法，但神也可以用別的方法救罪人。如此一來把贖罪當作不是那麼地重要其實他的意思就是說，神的能力可能與祂的智慧有衝突。（重譯：如此一來，救贖的必須性就顯得是相對的；神的能力就有可能與祂的智慧有衝突了。）

Augustine on the Work of Redemption.

We naturally feel inclined to expect that Augustine, the greatest Church Father of the West, added greatly, both materially and formally, to the doctrine of the work of Christ. But this is not the case; his main accomplishments lie elsewhere. Summing up in himself the previous development, he presents a variety of views. There is the idea of the deification of human nature by the incarnation, though only in an ethical manner; and there is also the notion that Satan had a claim on man, complemented, however, by the thought that the claim of Satan was annulled by the death of Christ. But in what may be considered as his main line of thought Augustine is far removed from Greek theology. Both his presuppositions and his conclusions are different. The central ideas are those of original sin, of justification by grace, and of reconciliation by the sacrifice of Christ. The new Western type of thought is asserting itself and we find ourselves moving in a Pauline circle of ideas. Man is contemplated as subject to the wrath of God, and the sacrifice of Christ as placating this wrath and reconciling man to God. Augustine does not work out these thoughts into a complete system; his statement falls far short of Anselm's well articulated theory of the atonement. He does not sharply distinguish between the judicial and the renovating side of redemption. Justification is sometimes made to rest, not upon the removal of the guilt of sin by Jesus Christ, but on the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. Again, he sometimes teaches that, though the atonement by Christ was the most suitable way of salvation, God might have saved sinners in some other way, thus making the atonement only relatively necessary. This really means that God's power might have gone against His wisdom.

大貴格利論贖罪

在神學家中受奧古斯丁影響最大的人中，只有一人值得我們一提的，那就是大貴格利。在他的著述中有一段被稱為『古代拉丁神學論贖罪的大成』，其主要思想如下：『人在罪惡與死亡的轄制下，自甘墮落，唯有代替的犧牲才能除掉這樣的罪。但是到那裏去找這祭牲呢？牛羊是派不上用場的，那就只有人才行，可是找不

到沒有罪的人啊，因此神的兒子道成了肉身，取了人性，但卻沒有人的罪。那無罪者為我們成為祭牲，由於祂的人性才能視為犧牲者，並藉著祂的義才能夠使我們得潔淨。祂為我們償付了不是祂所應當得的死債，所以我們應當受的死就不致於傷害我們。』大貴格利的這一段話，可說是贖罪論思想中最清楚的一大進展。

Gregory the Great on the Work of Redemption.

Of the theologians that were strongly influenced by Augustine only one calls for special mention, namely, Gregory the Great. His writings contain a passage which has been called “the completest synthesis of ancient Latin theology on the atonement.” Its thought runs as follows: Man voluntarily fell under the dominion of sin and death, and only a sacrifice could blot out such sin. But where was the sacrifice to be found? An animal could not serve the purpose; only a man would do, and yet no man could be found without sin. Therefore the Son of God became incarnate, assuming our nature, but not our sinfulness. The Sinless One became a sacrifice for us, a victim that could die in virtue of his humanity, and could cleanse in virtue of His righteousness. He paid for us a debt of death which He had not deserved, that the death which was our due might not harm us. This statement of Gregory may be regarded as a distinct advance in the development of the doctrine of the atonement.

救贖論的發展史（二）：
安瑟倫至宗教改革前的贖罪論
**HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT:
THE WORK OF CHRIST (part 2)**

從大貴格利到安瑟倫的五百年中間，神學上對於贖罪論的貢獻無幾。贖罪論有系統的研究，乃是在安瑟倫時期，祂開創了贖罪論教義歷史的新紀元。

The theological discussion in the five centuries between Gregory the Great and Anselm were of such a nature that they did not contribute much to the development of the doctrine of the atonement. With Anselm the systematic study of the doctrine of the atonement began. He opens a new era in the history of this doctrine.

**I. 安瑟倫的贖罪論
THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN ANSELM**

1. 安瑟倫論贖罪。

坎特布理主教安瑟倫，在贖罪論上是頭一個向以和諧、一貫的方法來講述的人。『神為何成為人』(Cur Deus Homo) 是安氏劃時代的一本神學名著，他在本書中將形上學的深度與陳述的清晰，合一爐而冶之。該書的首段證明在寫出的當時，有很多人不明白為何要有贖罪論，也不明白贖罪論是什麼。此書也指出當時贖罪論多是從基督論這一方面來討論，當作道成肉身之必要性的問題來討論，當時提供幾個如下的問題：（1）神能不能用祂無所不能的大能力，就像創造天地時那樣容易的力量來拯救人呢？（2）慈悲的神能否乾脆赦免人的罪，不要求什麼來滿足祂自己呢？（3）如果需要一個中保，祂為何選擇祂的獨生子來作中保的工作，而不揀選別的人呢？一旦允許耶穌道成肉身，就覺得這是一件偉大驚人的緊急事態，才能說明道成肉身的重要。關於道成肉身的這個問題，就解說了安瑟倫用『神為何成為人』的題目的目的。

Anselm on the Atonement.

Anselm of Canterbury made the first attempt at a harmonious and consistent representation of the doctrine of atonement. His *Cur Deus Homo* is an epoch-making book, a masterpiece of theological learning, in which the author combines metaphysical depth with clearness of presentation. The opening portion of the work testifies to the fact that at the time of its writing many minds were occupied with the question of the nature and necessity of the atonement. It also indicates that the problem of the atonement was generally approached from the Christological side as a question respecting the necessity of the incarnation. Several questions were raised at the time, such as the following: Could not God have saved man by a mere act of His omnipotence, just as easily as He could create the world? Could not He, the merciful God, simply have pardoned the sin of man, without demanding satisfaction? And if a mediator was necessary, why did He chose His only-begotten Son for the work of mediation, and not some other rational being? Once the incarnation was admitted, it was felt that it could only find its

explanation in some stupendous exigency. This question respecting the incarnation explains the title of Anselm's work.

安瑟倫的整個神學思想的立場就是，贖罪的絕對必須，乃是為了要拯救人。安氏特別反對恢復說、付贖價給撒但說，以及基督之死僅僅彰顯神對人的愛，認為此三說是不能令人滿意的，因為這些學說不能適當地解釋贖罪的必要性。根據他的意見，耶穌流血贖罪的必要性，必須根據宇宙遍在的必要屬性而存在。安氏在神的尊榮裏找到了耶穌替人贖罪的根據。

The alpha and omega of the position of Anselm is the absolute necessity of the atonement for the redemption of man. He deliberately rejects as unsatisfactory the Recapitulation Theory, the Ransom-to-Satan Theory, and the idea that the death of Christ was merely a manifestation of the love of God to man, since these do not explain the necessity of the atonement adequately. In his opinion the absolute necessity of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ must be grounded in an immanent and necessary attribute of the divine nature. He finds the ultimate ground for it in the honour of God.

安瑟倫的正確立場，只能以他對罪與滿足的觀念了瞭解。人是神的受造者，應當將自己的意思完全服從神的意旨，當他以背叛的心拒絕這樣做的時候，他就是羞辱了神，並且虧欠了神的榮耀。神的榮耀受了虧損，不拘用什麼方法，這個榮耀都必須收回來，不能因神的慈愛而疏忽了罪，因為這樣一來變得不正規 [重譯：變得失常]，而且也是不公義的。只有兩個方法能叫神的尊榮得到衛護，就是藉著刑罰與滿足。神並沒有採用刑罰的方法，因為這樣做就毀滅了全人類，而且也令祂自己的目的 – 愛全人類，無法達成。於是祂選擇了滿足的方法，這方法包括了兩件事：

(1) 人向神提出有虧於神的甘願順服 (重譯：人應當還給神祂所應得的順服)；
 (2) 人應當補滿虧欠神榮耀的地方，如何補滿呢？就是要付上遠超於實際上所虧欠於神榮耀的債。(重譯：人應當付上比他的罪債更大的事物，來補償對上帝榮耀的虧欠。)但是縱使最小的罪 – 得罪了一位無限的神 (重譯：因為是得罪了一位無限的神) – 其重量也超過全世界而無法加以補償。恩賜 – 安瑟倫視滿足為一個禮物而不是一個刑罰 – 超越了一切非屬於神的，只能從神而來，只有神才能做這個真正的賠償，而祂的愛，藉著賜祂的兒子，來做此賠償。神提供了這個滿足還不夠，祂還必須成為人，就是成為欠下罪債之人中的一員，但祂本身沒有罪，祂擔當罪債並不是為祂自己，只有神而人的這一位，才能夠滿足這些要求，並且顯出神的公義。

The exact position of Anselm can be understood only in the light of his conception of sin and satisfaction. As a creature of God man was under obligation to subject his will absolutely and entirely to the divine will, and when he refused this in a spirit of revolution, he dishonoured God and thus contracted a debt. God was robbed of His honour and this must be restored in some way. His mercy could not simply overlook sin, for this would be an irregularity and an injustice. There were two and only two ways in which the divine honour could be vindicated, namely by punishment or by satisfaction. God did not pursue the way of punishment, since this would have spelled ruin for the human race and would have defeated His very purpose. He chose the way of satisfaction, which included two things: (a) that man should now render to God the willing obedience which he owed Him; and (b) that he should make amends for the insult to God's honour by paying something over and above the actual debt. But since even the smallest sin, as

committed against an infinite God, outweighs the whole world and all that is not God, and the amends must be proportionate, it follows that these are beyond the power of man. A gift – and Anselm looks upon satisfaction as a gift rather than as a punishment – surpassing all that is not God can only be God. God only could make true reparation, and His mercy prompted Him to make it through the gift of His Son. It was not sufficient that the one rendering satisfaction should be God; He had to be man as well, one of the human race that contracted the debt of sin, but a man without sin, who was not himself burdened with debt. Only the true God-man could satisfy these requirements and thus do justice to the honour of God.

神而人的這一位，必須向神提出人所沒有提出的順服，但這個還不足以維持神的尊榮，因為這只是人當盡的本份。在祂這方面說算不上什麼功德，可是以一個無罪者的身份來說，祂不應當受苦受死。在祂這方面說，絕對是出於自願的，而且為了忠實地履行祂對天父的本份，甘願受痛苦與羞辱的死，祂才將無限的榮耀交給神。這就是餘德的工作 (works of supererogation) [註：此名詞是根據路加 10: 35 的拉丁文翻譯 (quodcumque supererogaveris)。此名詞在中世紀時候才被使用，為宗教改革加所摒斥的教義。]，此餘德叫人得益處。公義要求一白白得來的禮物當受償賜，但是天父將其兒子賜給我們，並無任何希求，因為祂不需要什麼，因此所得到的賞賜就是叫人白白得益處，並且採取了罪得赦免，以及將來幸福得方式，使得那些按照福音命令生活的人得到益處。

It was necessary for the God-man to render the obedience which man failed to render to God. But this was not sufficient to maintain the honour of God, for in doing this He did nothing more than His duty as man, and this could not constitute merit on His part. However, as a sinless being He was not under obligation to suffer and die. This was entirely voluntary on His part, and by submitting to bitter sufferings and a shameful death in the faithful discharge of his duty to His Father, He brought infinite glory to God. This was a work of supererogation, which could accrue to the benefit of mankind, and which more than counter-balanced the demerits of sin. Justice required that such a free gift should be rewarded. But there is nothing which the Father can give the Son, for He needs nothing. Therefore the reward accrues to the benefit of man and assumes the form of the forgiveness of sins and of future blessedness for all those who live according to the commandments of the Gospel.

2·安瑟倫貢獻的評估

安瑟倫的學說，對於贖罪論的發展有非常重要的貢獻，其真實價值乃在於贖罪論客觀性的事實，並將其重要性奠定於神不變的根基上，這不變的屬性使得神不能夠容許干犯神榮耀的人不受刑罰。若將之與後來發展的刑罰代替說相比較，就可發現後者之不健全，有下列幾點：（1）刑罰與滿足，從神那方面來說是有選擇性的，這種說法是錯誤的。（2）說基督在受苦上擔當了罪的刑罰，這觀念是靠不住的，因為基督的受苦被認為是向上帝的榮耀所表示甘願的尊敬，是超餘的功德，能補償缺少德行的人。這正天主教將贖補的觀念應用在基督贖罪的工作上。（3）刑罰代替說一開始就是以私法或習俗原則說到贖罪，是矛盾的。根據這個原則，受害的一方可以要求他看為適當的滿足，若是這樣的話，為了建立贖罪的絕對必要性，就非公法的觀點所能及。（4）將贖罪僅限於基督的死，而否認其生活的意義，乃

是偏執一方的。(5) 該說將基督的功勞應用在罪人身上，僅屬外部的交易，並沒有暗示基督與其信徒之間神秘性的聯合。

Evaluation of Anselm's Contribution.

The theory of Anselm makes an important advance in the development of the doctrine of the atonement. Its real value lies in the fact that it establishes the objective character of atonement and bases its necessity on the immutable nature of God, which makes it impossible that He should permit the violation of His honour to go unpunished. It is defective, however, as compared with the later penal substitutionary doctrine, in several points: (a) It erroneously represents punishment and satisfaction as alternatives from which God could choose. (b) It has no place for the idea that in His suffering Christ endured the penalty of sin, since it regards the sufferings of Christ as a voluntary tribute to the honour of God, a superfluous merit which served to compensate for the demerits of others. This is really the Roman Catholic idea of penance applied to the work of Christ. (c) It is inconsistent in so far as it starts out with the principle of "private law" or custom, according to which the injured party may demand whatever satisfaction he sees fit, and then, in order to establish the absolute necessity of the atonement passes over to the standpoint of public law. (d) It is one-sided in basing redemption exclusively on the death of Christ, and denying the atoning significance of His life. And (e) it represents the application of the merits of Christ to the sinner as a merely external transaction. There is no hint of the mystical union of Christ and believers.

II · 亞比拉的贖罪論

ABELARD'S THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT

1 · 亞比拉論贖罪

亞比拉的理論除了在反對付贖價給撒但上與安瑟倫相同外，其他沒有一樣與安瑟倫同。他認為基督的死不能算做是一種贖價，甚至也不能算做是給神的贖價。亞比拉也反對安瑟倫所說，神藉著祂兒子的死與世人和好的論點，他認為神並不喜悅祂獨生兒子的死，作為罪得赦免的根基，而且也不需要這種根基，因為神是愛，不論有沒有什麼補償，祂都準備赦免人，祂唯一想從罪人身上得到的就是悔悟，而且祂也渴望饒恕那些願意悔改的人；同時我們也可以說，我們是靠基督的血得稱為義，與神和好。基督藉著取得人性，並為我們的教師與榜樣以致於死，來顯明神的愛，神的大愛喚起了罪人心中對神的愛，並且這是罪得赦免的根基（參路 7: 47）。這新被喚起的愛救贖了我們，使我們脫離罪的權勢，並且領我們進入神兒子的自由中，所以我們順服神是出於愛的動機。如此說來，罪得赦免是在我們心中的愛被挑起的直接結果，而基督的死只不過是間接的果實而已（重譯：而只不過是基督之死的間接後果）。

Abelard on the Atonement.

Abelard's theory has little in common with that of Anselm, except the denial that a price was paid to Satan. The death of Christ is not regarded as a ransom, not even as a ransom offered to God. Abelard rejects the Anselmian view that God was reconciled by the death of His Son. God could not take such pleasure in the death of His only-begotten

Son as to make it the ground for the forgiveness of sins. Moreover, no such ground was needed, since God is love and is quite ready to forgive irrespective of any satisfaction. All He requires is penitence in the sinner; and He is ready and even eager to pardon the penitent. At the same time it may be said that we are justified and reconciled to God by the blood of Christ. Christ revealed the love of God by assuming our nature and by persevering as our teacher and example even unto death. This great love calls for and awakens a responsive love in the heart of the sinner, and this is the ground for the forgiveness of sins, Luke 7:47. The newly awakened love redeems us by liberating us from the power of sin and by leading us into the liberty of the sons of God, so that we obey God freely from the motive of love. Thus the forgiveness of sins is the direct result of the love kindled in our hearts, and only indirectly the fruit of the death of Christ.

2. 亞比拉論點的評述。

亞比拉的理論與安瑟倫的贖罪論是大相逕庭的，他的論點非常主觀，且在他的論點中也缺少了道德的深度與內在的清晰性，而此二者正是安瑟倫贖罪論中的特性。在亞比拉的理論中我們可以發現今日贖罪論所謂道德感化說的典型代表，這種道德感化說是出自錯誤的原理，說愛在神裏面是統管一切的中心屬性，而忽視了神公義與聖潔的要求，況且此說也沒有提出基督受苦的適當理由。假如神不要求補贖就赦免了罪，那麼為什麼神還犧牲祂的兒子受痛苦與羞辱的死呢？神既然能用其他很多的方法，來喚起罪人對神的愛，那麼祂這樣做豈不是令人懷疑祂啟示愛的實際嗎？這種理論剝奪了基督受苦救贖的意義，而將祂降低僅僅為一個道德教師，藉著祂的教訓與榜樣來感化人。

Evaluation of Abelard's View.

In distinction from Anselm's doctrine of the atonement, this theory of Abelard is thoroughly subjective. It is sadly lacking in that moral depth and inner coherence that is so characteristic of Anselm's view. We have in it a typical representation of what is today called the Moral, or Moral Influence Theory of the atonement. It proceeds on the false principle that love is the central and all-controlling attribute in God, and ignores the demands of His justice and holiness. Moreover, it furnishes no adequate reason for the sufferings of Christ. If God could have forgiven sins without demanding satisfaction, why did He give up His Son to bitter sufferings and a shameful death? Was this not a very dubious revelation of love, seeing that He could have awakened the sinner's love in many other ways? This theory robs the sufferings of Christ of their redemptive significance and reduced Him to a mere moral teacher, who influences men by His teachings and by His example.

III · 伯納德論贖罪

REACTION TO ABELARD IN BERNANRD OF CLAIRVAUX

伯納德對亞比拉的理論加以批評，但自己卻沒有提出什麼有關贖罪論的觀點，同時他也不接受安瑟倫的見解。他特別攻擊亞比拉對於基督教理性化的解釋，並且也反對亞氏所支持基督的榜樣使我們成為聖徒，救想亞當的榜樣使我們成為罪人的論點。（重譯：他特別攻擊亞比拉，認為後者對基督教信仰的解釋是理性主義

的；伯納德認為，基督的榜樣使我們成為聖徒，就像亞當的榜樣使我們成為罪人一樣的不可能。）他十分願意承認基督之愛的榜樣與偉大，但只是在祂救贖的工作上採可以找到。（重譯：他十分願意承認，基督之愛的榜樣使偉大的是重要的，但這偉大與重要性只建立在祂救贖大工的基礎上。）事實上他這樣的見解與亞比拉相同，（重譯：事實上，在這一點上他的見解與亞比拉的是相同的），是在基督的人類生活與受苦上強調基督的愛，（重譯：就是他強調，基督的愛在祂人性的生活與受苦中被彰顯；）但他在此不僅看見神愛的啟示，也看見基督自己神性具有拯救能力的彰顯（重譯：也看見基督自己的神性在祂拯救大工上顯明出來）。

Bernard of Clairvaux criticized Abelard's theory, but did not present one of his own. Neither did he accept the view of Anselm. He took Abelard to task especially for his rationalistic interpretation of Christianity, and maintained that the example of Christ makes us saints just as little as the example of Adam made us sinners. He was quite willing to admit the greatness and importance of the example of the love of Christ, but only as founded in His redemptive work. In fact, it may be said that he had this in common with Abelard, that he stressed the love of Christ manifested in His human life and passion; but he saw in this not merely a revelation of the love of God, but the saving manifestation of Christ's own divinity.

伯納德的見解可以說是愛任紐與阿他那修贖罪教義在西方教會的翻版。他說道成肉身就是神進入人間，然而我們必須注意，他並沒有強調道成肉身的外在結果，即如帶來生命與不朽；他所強調的乃是在人心中的心理影響，即如在人心中心中啟發出像基督一樣的忍耐與愛心。同時，他並不以純主觀的觀念為滿足，而堅信一項作為主觀根基的客觀救贖，即天父並沒有要求祂兒子死，但接受祂自願的死作為祭物，而此祭物救贖我們脫離罪惡、死亡與羞辱（重譯：與撒但的權勢），並叫我們與神和好。

This idea of Bernard may be regarded as the Western counterpart of the doctrine of Irenaeus and Athanasius, that the incarnation was the transforming entrance of God into humanity. It should be observed, however, that he did not emphasize the physical result of the incarnation, as bringing life and immortality, but its psychological effect, as inspiring a patience and love similar to that of Christ. At the same time he did not rest satisfied with this purely subjective idea, but firmly believed in an objective redemption as the basis for the subjective. The Father did not require the death of His Son, but accepted it as an oblation; and now it serves to redeem us from sin, death, and the devil, and to reconcile us to God.

IV · 贖罪論的綜合見解

SYNCRETISTIC VIEWS OF THE ATONEMENT

在經院神學家中如蘭巴德、波拿文土拉與阿奎納，都受到安瑟倫與亞比拉的影響，他們都從此二人的理論中有所引證，但卻未能將此二人的思想組合，成為一致的理論。

In such Schoolmen as Peter the Lombard, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas, we

find traces of the influence of both Anselm and Abelard. They adopt elements from both, but do not succeed in combining them into an inner unity.

1 · 蘭巴德論贖罪

蘭巴德的彼得是以基督的功勞為理論的出發點。基督藉著祂敬虔的生活，為自己賺取了功勞，不致受苦，反而得榮耀，當祂受苦又受死的時候，祂是甘心樂意的，並非為祂自己，乃是為著罪人。因此，祂為罪人賺得了脫離罪惡、魔鬼與刑罰的救贖，並得進天堂。到目前為止，這些思想都是從安瑟倫而來的，但是問到基督的死如何影響到救贖的時候，他回答說這是顯明神對人的愛，藉著神對我們這樣的大愛，我們就受感動要愛神，如此使我們脫離了罪，更使我們成為義，當我們脫離罪的時候，我們也就脫離了魔鬼。

Peter the Lombard on the Atonement.

Peter the Lombard takes his starting-point in the merits of Christ. By His pious life Christ merited for Himself freedom from suffering and glorification, and when he entered into sufferings and death, He did it voluntarily, not for Himself but for sinners. He thereby merited for them redemption from sin, punishment, and the devil, and admittance to paradise. Up to this point the train of thought is Anselmian. But when the question is asked, how the death of Christ effects this deliverance, the answer is that it reveals to us the love of God. By so great a pledge of love to us, we are moved and prompted to love God, and are thus released from sin and made righteous. And when we are free from sin, we are also free from the devil.

2 · 波拿文土拉 (Bonaventura) 論贖罪

根據波拿文土拉，對於道成肉身的必要性，乃是為了要補償而存有的。僅僅一個受造者是不能為全人類的罪作補償的，而且從另一個族類，也不適宜擔當此任，因此必須有神而人的一位來作補償。基督藉著祂的功勞，就是祂藉著受苦而賺得的，作成了此補償。作補償就是向神付上神所當得的榮耀，藉著基督的受苦來完成此補償，作為安撫神最適宜的方法，這樣，神的慈愛與公義都得彰顯。可是他這樣說法是安瑟倫與亞比拉二人的合論，說基督受苦是最合適的方法，因為著最適於在人裏面喚起對神的愛。論到基督於教會的關係，波氏遠比安瑟倫解說的更好，他說明基督是教會的頭，祂才能將祝福傳遞給祂的肢體。

Bonaventura on the Atonement.

According to Bonaventura it was the required satisfaction that made the incarnation necessary. A simple creature was not able to make satisfaction for the whole human race, and it was nor proper that a creature of another race should be taken for that purpose. Hence it was necessary that the person rendering satisfaction should be both God and man. This satisfaction was rendered by the merits of Christ, which He won by acting and suffering. To make satisfaction is to pay the honour that is due to God, and this is done by the sufferings of Christ as the most appropriate means for placating God. Thus the righteousness as well as the mercy of God is displayed. With this Anselmian idea, however, the Abelardian is combined, that the passion of Christ was also the most fitting means, since it was best suited to arouse in man a responsive love to God. By developing the thought of Christ's relation to the Church as that of the Head to the members of the

body, Bonaventura explains far better than Anselm had done, how the blessings of Christ are transferred to believers.

3 · 阿奎納多馬論贖罪

經院學派最偉大的神學家就是阿奎那多馬，他比其他任何中古時期的神學家對前輩的神學思想更吸收的完全，因此我們在他的思想中看見安瑟倫與亞比拉的觀念是不足為奇的，而且論到基督贖罪的意見陳述上，他也沒有一致的論點。

Thomas Aquinas on the Atonement.

The greatest of the Schoolmen was Thomas Aquinas. He absorbed the thoughts of his predecessors more completely than any other mediaeval theologian. In view of this it is not surprising that we find in him traces of both the Anselmian and Abelardian views, and that there is no unity in his representation of the work of Christ.

在其意見陳述上使我們想起了愛任紐與亞比拉，他認為在基督人性中可發現一切恩典的豐滿性（重譯：一切恩典的豐盛住在基督的人性裏），因為祂是人類的元首，所說祂的完全與德行就傳給了那些願意順從頭的肢體。為一新人的基督，是新人類的原理，（重譯：基督是新人，是新人類的原理與『酵』，）我們可從其為教師，並藉其教訓、行動與受苦為人類榜樣的觀點來看救贖的工作。基督的受苦更顯明了神的愛，我們就受感動要愛神，如此使我們脫離了罪，更使我們成為義，當我們脫離罪的時候，我們也就脫離了魔鬼。

There is a representation that reminds us of both Irenaeus and Abelard. The fullness of all grace dwells in the human nature of Christ, and because He is now the Head of the human race, His perfection and virtue overflow to the members of the body in so far as they are willing to belong to the head. Christ as the new man is the principle and the leaven of the new humanity. The work of redemption is thus considered from the point of view that makes Christ the teacher and pattern of the human race by His teachings, acts, and sufferings. These sufferings reveal more particularly the love of God and awaken a responsive love in the hearts of men.

然而祂也有一項更屬安瑟倫的思想路線，也就是天主教會所遵循的。阿奎那主張救贖並非絕對必須，因為神可以讓人類在他們的罪中滅亡；（但）從神的屬性看來，他也認為這樣的作法是最合宜的。此外（如上文說的），他還有的意見就是，神不要求任何適當的補償也能救贖人類。他認為在人世間一般的審判官不可能忽視人對律法的干犯，但是在人犯罪的情形下神能這樣做（但在面對犯罪的人類的情形下神能這樣做），因為祂本身就是公義的來源，以目前的情形，祂是受害的一方（也同時是這個案中受害的一方）；且神本著祂自己的意志來決定何者為是，何者為非，並且祂無需補贖而赦罪，因為這（注：不補償而赦罪）並沒有得罪什麼人，然而神卻要求一定要祂的兒子道成肉身來做補償，因為一個人不能救贖所犯抵擋一位無限之神的罪。

However, there is also a more Anselmian line of thought, and this is generally followed in the Roman Catholic Church. Aquinas maintains that redemption was not absolutely necessary, since God might have permitted mankind to perish in its sins; yet he regards it as most fitting in view of all the attributes of God. Again, he is of the opinion that God could have redeemed man without demanding any adequate

satisfaction. He admits that a human judge could not simply overlook a violation of the law, but asserts that God could do this in the case of sinful humanity, since He is Himself the source of justice and also the injured party in the case under consideration. He Himself determined by an act of His will what was right in this case, and could very well have remitted sin without satisfaction, since this would have wronged no one. God chose to demand satisfaction, however, and this made the incarnation of the Son of God necessary, because a mere man could not atone for sin committed against an infinite God.

基督的功德遍及每一個動作、言語上，所以祂生活的所有行動，對救贖人的罪都有貢獻，這就是向神提出適當的補償。嚴格地說，基督的受苦與死是不必要的，可是卻有個適當地理由可以說明，神為何需要基督受苦與死所作成的救贖，理由是要保全祂的慈愛與公義，同時確保二者得到最大地彰顯。基督的死彰顯了神的大愛，給人立下了順服、謙卑、堅定不移的榜樣；基督的死不但救人脫離罪，也為人賺取了稱義的恩典與永遠的福氣，並提供給人抵擋罪有利的動機。

The merits of Christ extended throughout the whole time of His earthly existence, so that every action of His life contributed to the atonement of man's sin. And this was really all that was necessary to render to God condign satisfaction. The passion and death of Christ were, strictly speaking, not needed. There were special reasons of congruity, however, why God wanted full redemption to be wrought by the passion and death of Christ, namely, that this was in keeping with both His mercy and justice, and at the same time ensured the greatest possible effect. The death of Christ reveals the great love of God, sets man an example of obedience, humility, constancy, and so on; it not only delivers from sin, but also merits justifying grace and eternal bliss, and offers a strong motive for refraining from sin.

基督受苦對罪人得救有下列四點的影響：（1）藉著賺得救恩將福氣傳遞給罪人；（2）使神得到非常的滿足，也由於神秘的聯合，使信者蒙受恩益；（3）為一甘願的犧牲，使神喜悅；與（4）救贖罪人脫離奴役及刑罰。雖然人被魔鬼弄成為一屬靈的奴隸，但是魔鬼也沒有權柄要求贖價，所以牠也沒有得到這贖價。可是若沒有洗禮和補贖禮，那麼就靠基督超餘的恩典有多大，也不能救人，理由乃在於信者與元首耶穌基督神秘性聯合的必要性。

The passion of Christ effects the salvation of sinners in four different ways: (a) by meriting the blessings of salvation, which are passed on to sinners; (b) as a superabundant satisfaction well-pleasing to God, the benefits of which are communicated to the faithful in virtue of the mystical union; (c) as a voluntary sacrifice with which God was delighted; and (d) by redeeming sinners from slavery and punishment. Though man was reduced to spiritual slavery by the devil, the latter had no rightful claims, and therefore did not receive the ransom. The superabundant satisfaction of Christ does not save man, however, apart from baptism and penance; and the reason for this lies in the necessary "configuration" of the members to the Head in the mystical body of Jesus Christ.

阿奎那多馬論點的評述。

阿奎那的觀點與安瑟倫的極為相似，可是在某些方面的觀點低於安瑟倫的觀點，主要是未能顯出邏輯上的清晰度，也未能說出贖罪的必須性是根據神的屬性，

他只說出贖罪僅在乎神的旨意。這種武斷的內容就成為敦司蘇格徒滿意接受說的前身。而阿奎那的觀點優於安瑟倫的地方，乃在於論到刑罰性補贖的觀念，意思就是藉著刑罰來滿足神的要求；阿氏特別強調基督的功勞，在基督自動的順服於被動的順服間，加以清楚區分，並在神秘聯合的觀點上說明基督的功德傳給了信徒。

Evaluation of Thomas Aquinas' views.

While these views of Thomas Aquinas reveal considerable similarity to those of Anselm, they are in some respects inferior and in others superior to them. They are inferior, since they not manifest the same logical coherence and fail to ground the necessity of the atonement in the divine nature, making it dependent simply on the will of God, which might have chosen another way and might even have dispensed with satisfaction altogether. This element of arbitrariness readily became a bridge to the acceptilation theory of Duns Scotus. They are superior, however, in their approach to the idea of penal satisfaction, that is, of satisfaction through punishment; in their greater emphasis on the merits of Christ, in which the later distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ is anticipated; and in the introduction of the idea of the mystical union to account for the transmission of the merits of Christ to believers.

V · 敦司蘇格徒論贖罪

DONS SCOTUS ON THE ATONEMENT

敦司蘇格徒論贖罪。

阿奎那代表了多明尼加的神學，亦即天主教會公認的神學；而敦司蘇格徒則是方濟神學的創始者。敦氏的神學著作主要是批評性的與消極性的，他沒有像阿奎那一樣寫下了神學總論，但在他所寫蘭巴德嘉言錄的註釋中，提到了有關基督贖罪的見解。我們可以推測他接受了蘭巴德的贖罪觀，因為他並沒有更正蘭巴德錯誤的地方，而他這樣做為的是讓蘭氏的贖罪觀，有更積極建設性的成就。在一些重要的觀點上，他與以前的神學家像悖。

Duns Scotus on the Atonement.

While Aquinas represents the Dominican theology, which is the official theology of the Church of Rome, Duns Scotus may be regarded as the founder of the Franciscan theology. His work is primarily critical and negative. He wrote no *Summa* like Aquinas, but incorporated his views on the atoning work of Christ in his *Commentaries* on the *Sentences of Lombardus*. We may proceed on the assumption that he shares the views of Lombardus where he does not correct them. In this way it is possible to obtain a somewhat more positive construction of his view of the atonement than would otherwise be available. He differs in some important points from his predecessors.

敦氏使得贖罪觀完全依賴神武斷的聖旨意。（重譯：完全依賴神隨意的旨意。）他聲稱，向神提出補償單單是因為神的要求，是神要的；但是並不是說神一定要這補償，這完全是神的意外行動（重譯：a contingent act of God）。此外他還主張，縱使容許補償的必要性存在，那也不一定是說非要採取目前已經實際發生的外部方式（指基督被釘十字架），故提出補償的並不一定是祂，或比受造之物更大的一位。這樣說來，如果亞當能表現的敬虔一點，那他也可以救贖他自己初犯的罪

了；再者，敦氏沒有考慮到補償的證明，一定要由人提出，不然神也可能接受一位天使的工作，當做一充足夠用的救贖，因為這全在乎神決定性的旨意。

He makes the atonement itself, the character it assumes, and the effect which it has, depend altogether on the arbitrary will of God. He asserts that there was no inherent necessity for rendering satisfaction. This was necessary only because God willed it; a contingent act of God. Furthermore, he holds that, even if the necessity of satisfaction were granted, it would not follow that it had to assume the exact form which it actually took. It was not necessary that the one rendering it should be God, or should be greater than the whole creation. One pious act of Adam might have served to atone for his first sin. Again, he does not consider it capable of proof that satisfaction had to be rendered by a man. God might have accepted the deed of an angel as a sufficient atonement. It all depended on the arbitrary will of God.

然而神從永遠就預定了基督受苦，作為預定之人得救的方法。基督在十字架上所受的苦難，之所以有特別的價值與果效，只因為事先已預定為救人的方法，且神甘願視此方法為有效。敦氏否認基督功勞的無限價值，因為他說那是帶有人性的功勞，終究是有限的；然而，由於神旨意的決定，就接受了這些功德為有用的，即一項與所欠債務相稱的功勞，神也會接受，這就是通常所謂贖罪論的滿意接受說 (Acceptilation Theory)。但根據馬金他須，實在應稱為贖罪論的接受說 (Acceptation Theory)。

However, God foreordained from eternity the passion of Christ as the means for the salvation of the predestinated. This passion has a peculiar value and a special efficacy only because it was foreordained as the means of salvation, and because God was willing to accept it as effectual. Duns denies the infinite value of the merits of Christ, because they were merits of the human nature, which is after all finite. By an act of His will, however, God determined to accept them as sufficient. A merit that is not at all commensurate with the debt owed is willingly accepted by God. This theory is generally called the *Acceptilation Theory*, but according to Mackintosh (*Historic Theories of the Atonement*, p. 110 f.) should really be called the *Acceptation Theory* of the atonement.

THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF MAN 基督教人論簡史

第一部份 教父時期的人論

The Anthropology of the Patristic Period

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 63-64, 73, 127-130;
伯克富,《基督教教義史》,頁 45, 54, 99-102. 林慈信修.)

反諾斯底主義的教父 (愛任紐, 希波利達, 特土良): 人論

The Anti-Gnostic Fathers (Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian): Doctrine of Man

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 63; 伯克富,《基督教教義史》,頁 45. 林慈信修.)

他們在人論上也反對諾斯底主義; 他們特別指出, 在人裡面的善惡, 並不是由於天賦本性的狀態 (natural endowments)。假使物質是惡的, 那麼人的本性是惡的, 人就不能被視為有道德選擇的存有者 (a free moral being)。然而人是按著 shangdi1 的形像而造, 並非不朽 (意即並非完全); 但是人若順服則可能獲得不朽。罪乃是叛逆, 結果是死亡; 正如順服 shangdi1 的結果是不朽。在亞當裡面全人類都服在死亡之下。當時的教父們並沒有詳細指出我們的罪怎樣與亞當的罪有關, 唯有特土良曾略為提到這一點。他說自從一個人出生, 惡就在人的本性裡, 這種光景藉著繁殖傳遞給人類。這是論到原罪的教義最早的記錄。

In the doctrine of man they also opposed the Gnostics by stressing the fact that good and evil in man do not find their explanation in different natural endowments/. If evil is inherent in matter, and therefore in man as such, he can no more be regarded as a free moral being. Man was created in the image of God, without immortality indeed (i.e. without perfection), but with the possibility of receiving this in the way of obedience. Sin is disobedience and brings death, just as obedience brings immortality. In Adam the whole race became subject to death. The connection of our sin with that of Adam is not yet clearly apprehended, though Tertullian makes some suggestive statements on the subject. He says that evil became, as it were, a natural element in man, present from birth, and that this condition passes over through generation upon the whole human race. This is the first trace of the doctrine of original sin.

俄利根的人論

Origin's Doctrine of Man

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 73; 伯克富,《基督教教義史》,頁 54. 林慈信修.)

俄利根論人的教義也非常獨特。因為他所持的「永遠創造論」(eternal creation), 所以他認為人是先存的 (pre-existence of man), 因為最初的創造所造的只是有思想的靈體 (rational spirits), 是 (與上帝) 平等的 (co-equal), 也是 (與上帝) 同樣永存的 (co-eternal)。今天人類的光景, 乃預設了一個先存的墮落, 從聖潔墮落到有罪的光景, 這個墮落就是物質世界的創造。這些墮落的靈體, 因之成為靈魂, 穿上了

物質的肉體。物質之所以被造，乃是要使這些墮落的靈體有一個居處，使墮落的靈體受責罰，也因之使靈魂得以煉淨。

Origen's teachings respecting man are somewhat out of the ordinary. The pre-existence of man is involved in his theory of eternal creation, since the original creation consisted exclusively of rational spirits, co-equal as well as co-eternal. The present condition of man presupposes a pre-existent fall from holiness into sin, which was the occasion for the creation of the present material world. The fallen spirits now became souls and were clothed with bodies. Matter was called into being for the very purpose of supplying an abode and a means of discipline and purgation for these fallen spirits.

教父時期的人論：希臘教父的人論

The Anthropology of the Patristic Period: The Anthropology of the Greek Fathers

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 127-128; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 99-100. 林慈信修.)

希臘教父主要關切的，是在上帝論與基督論的範圍內；討論到人論的問題時，則輕描淡寫。他們有關罪與恩典的思想中表現了某程度的二元論，因此有點混亂；他們特別重視伯拉糾後期的教導，而忽視了奧古斯丁的教導。可以說，這些希臘教父為伯拉糾派預備了道路。...

The main interest of the Greek Fathers lay in the field of Theology and Christology, and while they discussed anthropological questions, they touched these but lightly. There was a certain dualism in their thinking about sin and grace, which led to rather confused representations with a preponderant emphasis on doctrines which show a manifest affinity with the later teachings of Pelagius rather than with those of Augustine. In a measure, it may be said, they prepared the way for Pelagianism. ...

他們對罪的看法，特別是在最初階段，因反對諾斯底主義(神哲派)而受到影響；諾斯底主義特別強調罪惡必然是物質的 (physical necessity of evil)，並且不承認人有自由意志。他們強調亞當按照上帝的形像被造這事實，但卻沒有道德的完全 (ethical perfection)，只有本性道德上完全的可能性 (moral perfectability of his nature)。亞當能犯罪，而且也真犯了罪，如此受了撒但，死亡，與罪惡敗壞的轄制。此種肉身上的敗壞傳給了人類，但它本身不是罪，並且沒有把人類陷在罪孽裡嚴格來說，並沒有原罪。他們並不否認人類的團結 (solidarity)，但承認人類與亞當在肉身方面的關聯。然而此種關聯只與肉體與感官的本性有關，就是由父傳給子；並與人性較高尚的，與理性方面無關。而每一個人的人性較高部份都是由上帝直接創造的。這關聯對人的意志沒有直接的影響，只能藉著人的理性間接地影響人的意志。罪，總是由於人的自由意志選擇而來的，並且是軟弱，無知的結果。因此嬰孩不能算是有罪的，因為他們所承繼的僅僅是肉身上的敗壞而已。

Their view of sin was, particularly at first, largely influenced by their opposition to Gnosticism with its emphasis on the physical necessity of evil and its denial of the freedom of the will. They stressed the fact that Adam's creation in the image of God did not involve his ethical perfection, but only the moral perfectability of his nature. Adam could sin and did sin, and thus came under the power of Satan, death, and sinful corruption. This physical corruption was propagated in the human race, but is not itself sin and did not involve mankind in guilt. There is no original sin in the strict sense of the

word. They do not deny the solidarity of the human race, but admit its physical connection with Adam. This connection, however, relates only to the corporeal and sensuous nature, which is propagated from father to son, and not to the higher and rational side of human nature, which is in every case a direct creation of God. It exerts no immediate effect on the will, but affects this only mediately through the intellect. Sin always originates in the free choice of man, and is the result of weakness and ignorance. Consequently infants cannot be regarded as guilty, for they have inherited only a physical corruption.

奧利金的人論

Origen's Anthropology

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 128; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 100. 林慈信修.)

然而我們應當注意, 有些人對以上這些看法意見不一。奧利金承認每個人人生下來的時候都有遺傳上的污穢, 這是因為人在出生前, 甚至在時間之前就墮落了。這與原罪的教義很接近。尼撒的貴格利 (Gregory of Nissa), 在此教義的教導上更為接近, 甚至阿他那修 (Athanasius) 與區索多模 (Chrysostom) 都積極審慎地避免以上所說的教義。

It should be noted, however, that there were some departures from this general view. Origen admitting that a certain hereditary pollution attached to every one at birth, found the explanation for it in a pre-natal or pre-temporal fall of the soul, and came very close to a doctrine of original sin. And Gregory of Nyssa came even nearer to teaching this doctrine. But even the great Athanasius and Chrysostom scrupulously avoided it.

奧利金的恩典論

Doctrine of Grace

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 128-129; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 100-101. 林慈信修.)

盛行於希臘教父教導中上帝恩典的教義, 自然受到他們罪觀的影響, 而大部份也是受到他們對罪看法的決定。一般說來, 主要的重點是在於人的自由意志, 而不在於上帝恩典的工作。在重生的工作上, 起帶頭作用的並不是上帝的恩典, 乃是人的自由意志。不過, 雖然自由意志開始了重生的工作, 可是若沒有上帝的幫助, 此工作無法完成。上帝的能力與人的意志合作, 並且使著意志轉離惡, 而行上帝眼中看為喜悅的事。這些教父並沒有在屬血氣之人 (natural man) 能作的事, 與需要聖靈能力所作之屬靈的善 (spiritual good) 之間作一區分。

Naturally the doctrine of divine grace that was prevalent in the teachings of the Greek Fathers was profoundly influenced and largely determined by their conception of sin. On the whole the main emphasis was on the free will of man rather than on the operation of divine grace. It was not the grace of God, but the free will of man that takes the initiative in the work of regeneration. But though it begins the work, it cannot complete it without divine aid. The power of God co-operates with the human will, and enables it to turn from evil and to do that which is well-pleasing in the sight of God. These Fathers do not always make a clear distinction between the good which the natural

man is able to do and that spiritual good which requires the enabling power of the Holy Spirit.

西方教會逐漸浮現的另一個觀點

The Gradual Emergence of Another View in the West

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 129; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 101. 林慈信修.)

此希臘的人論於二, 三世紀時, 也多少影響到西方教會, 但在第三, 四世紀時, 此教義的種子就盛行起來, 特別是在特土良 (Tertullian), 居普良 (Cyprian), 西拉流 (Hilary), 與安波羅修 (Ambrose) 的著述中呈現出來。

This Greek anthropology also influenced the West more or less in the second and third centuries, but in the third and fourth centuries the seed of the doctrine that was destined to become prevalent in the West gradually made its appearance, especially in the works of Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, and Ambrose.

特土良的貢獻

Tertullian's Contributions

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 129-130; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 101. 林慈信修.)

特土良 (Tertullian) 的傳殖說 (traducianism) 代替了希臘神話中的創造說 (creationism), 此說為本性之罪 (innate sin) 的教義鋪下了道路 (而此本性之罪, 與生來的惡 innate evil 是有分別的)。特土良有句名言說: 「靈魂的傳遞, 包括罪的傳遞。」(拉丁文: *Tradux animae, tradux peccati*, 英文: the propagation of the soul involves the propagation of sin.) 他把傳殖的教義與現實主義論結合在一起, 按照他的說法, 上帝創造了普遍人性 (generic human nature), 包括身體與靈魂, 而這人性是與每一個人藉著生而來的。在此過程中, 人的本性並沒有失去他特殊的性質, 每一個人乃是有智能 (intelligent), 有理性 (rational), 與有意志的 (voluntary); 所以人的活動仍然是有理性的 (rational) 與負責任的。原來人性的罪, 在所有個體的存在裏, 仍然是罪。特土良只能代表拉丁神學的最初階段, 他的言論中仍然帶著希臘教父教義的色彩。他說到嬰孩的無辜, 但也許這假設只是相對性的, 因嬰孩沒有實際的犯罪他也不否認自由意志。雖然他將人的有效性 (human efficiency) 減至最微的程度, 有時他所用的語詞有重生的合作說的意味 (synergistic theory), 意即在重生上, 上帝和人是合作的。

The traducianism of Tertullian was substituted for the creationism of Greek theology, and this paved the way for the doctrine of innate sin, in distinction from innate evil. His famous maxim was, *Tradux animae, tradux peccati*, that is, the propagation of the soul involves the propagation of sin. He wedded his doctrine of traducianism to a theory of realism, according to which God created generic human nature, both body and soul, and individualizes it by procreation. In this process the nature does not lose its distinctive qualities, but continues to be intelligent, rational and voluntary at every point and in every one of its individualizations, so that its activities do not cease to be rational and responsible activities. The sin of the original human nature remains sin in all the individual existences of that nature. Tertullian represents only the beginning of Latin anthropology, and some of his expressions still remind one of the teachings of the Greek

Fathers. He speaks of the innocence of infants, but probably assumes this only in the relative sense that they are free from actual sins; and does not altogether deny the freedom of the will. And though he reduces human efficiency to a minimum, he sometimes uses language that savours of the synergistic theory of regeneration, that is, the theory that God and man work together in regeneration.

居普良，安波羅修，西拉流

Cyprian, Ambrose, and Hilary

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 130; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 101-102. 林慈信修.)

在居普良 (Cyprian) 的著述中，對人有原罪及唯獨上帝能使人靈魂更新的教義 (monosynergistic renewal of the soul) 具有逐漸增強的傾向。他似乎主張原罪的罪孽 (guilt) 不如本罪 (actual sin) 來得重。而罪的本性 (與污穢的本性不同) 的教義在安波羅修與西拉流的著述中，有更清晰的陳述。他們清楚教導說，人在亞當裏都犯了罪，因此人生來就有罪。同時他們並不主張人的意志完全敗壞，結果就贊成了重生的合作說 (synergistic theory of regeneration)，雖然他們在此主張上較早期教父更模糊而矛盾。但一般來說，我們在這幾個人身上卻發現了為奧古斯丁救恩觀作逐漸準備的跡象。

In the writings of Cyprian there is an increasing tendency towards the doctrine of the original sinfulness of man, and of a monergistic renewal of the soul. He seems to hold that the guilt of original sin is not as great as that of actual sin. The doctrine of a sinful, as distinguished from a corrupt, nature is even more clearly asserted in the writings of Ambrose and Hilary. They clear teach that all men have sinned in Adam, and are therefore born in sin. At the same time they do not hold to an entire corruption of the human will, and consequently adhere to the synergistic theory of regeneration, though they appear to be more uncertain and contradictory in this matter than some of the earlier Fathers. All in all we find in them a gradual preparation for the Augustinian view of sin and grace.

第二部份

伯拉糾與奧古斯丁論罪與救恩之教義

The Pelagian and Augustinian Doctrines of Sin and Grace

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 131-139; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 103-110. 林慈信修.)

伯拉糾的罪與恩典觀：伯拉糾的罪觀

The Pelagian View of Sin and Grace: Pelagius' View of Sin

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 132-133; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 104-105. 林慈信修.)

伯拉糾與奧古斯丁的爭辯中，自由意志與原罪是最重要的問題。根據伯拉糾的看法，亞當被上帝所造，並未賦予，正面的聖潔 (positive holiness)。他最初的狀態是中立的，既非聖善，亦非有罪，乃是有行善或作惡的可能性。他有一個自由，完全不定的意志 (undetermined will)，使他有相等的能力可以任擇其中之一。他能夠按自己的判斷，犯罪或壓抑不犯罪。他的必朽性不能夠任由他的選擇，因為他被造是必死的，他已經被死的律所主宰。他的本性中並沒有先存的惡來決定他一生的路程；他犯罪，是自己的選擇。他墮落在罪中，損傷的不是他人，乃僅是自己；人性並沒有受到永久性的負面影響。人類並沒有罪性或罪孽的遺傳性傳遞。因之，也沒有原罪這回事。人類仍然出生在亞當墮落以前的情況中。他不僅沒有罪孽，也沒有罪的污染。在他的本性中，沒有任何惡的傾向或慾望，會使他無可避免地導致犯罪。他與亞當之間唯一的不同，就是他已有惡的榜樣在他面前。罪並不在於錯誤的情操或慾望，只在於意志個別的行動。每一次的犯罪，都在於人自願的選擇。其實，人並不需要犯罪；就如同亞當，他被賦予了完全的自由意志，有選擇的自由 (liberty of choice)，或稱中性的自由 (liberty of indifference)，所以在每任何情況中，可以選擇善或選擇惡。而在上帝吩咐他行善這事實上，足以證明人有行善的能力。他的責任就是他的（道德）能力的尺度。雖然如此，罪仍然是普遍的 – 伯拉糾認為是的 – 這也僅僅是由於錯誤的教育，不良榜樣和長久以來不可破的犯罪習慣。

The most important questions in debate between Pelagius and Augustine were those of free will and original sin. According to Pelagius, Adam, as he was created by God, was not endowed with positive holiness. His original condition was one of neutrality, neither holy nor sinful, but with a capacity for both good and evil. He had a free and entirely undetermined will, which enabled him to choose with equal facility either of these alternatives. He could either sin or refrain from sinning, as he saw fit. His mortality could not depend on his choice, for he was created mortal in the sense that he was already subject to the law of death. Without any antecedent evil in his nature, which might in any way determine the course of his life, he chose to sin. His fall into sin injured no one but himself, and left human nature unimpaired for good. There is no hereditary transmission of a sinful nature or of guilt, and consequently no such thing as original sin. Man is still born in the same condition in which Adam was before the fall. Not only is he free from guilt but also from pollution. There are no evil tendencies and desires in his nature which inevitably result in sin. The only difference between him and

Adam is that he has the evil example before him. Sin does not consist in wrong affections or desires, but only in the separate acts of the will. It depends in every case on the voluntary choice of man. As a matter of fact man need not sin. He is, like Adam, endowed with perfect freedom of the will, with a liberty of choice or indifference, so that he can, at any given moment, choose either good or evil. And the very fact that God commands man to do what is good is proof positive that he is able to do it. His responsibility is the measure of his ability. If notwithstanding this, sin is universal – and Pelagius admits that it is – this is due only to wrong education, to bad example, and to a long-established habit of sinning

伯拉糾的恩典觀

Pelagius' View of Grace

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 133; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 105. 林慈信修.)

人之棄惡向善, 並非由於上帝的恩典; 雖然恩典的作用無疑是非常有利, 並且會幫助他在生活中能戰勝邪惡。但是伯拉糾說到恩典的時候, 並非指上帝在人裡面運作的能力, 換句話說, 恩典並非指聖靈的工作, 影響一個人的意志, 加給人行善的力量。恩典僅是外在的恩賜和自然的賦予 (natural endowments), 就如同人的理智本性 (rational nature), 《聖經》中上帝的啟示, 與耶穌基督的榜樣。雖然在這樣的系統中, 幾乎沒有嬰孩洗禮的餘地, 但伯拉糾堅持嬰孩應受洗禮, 不過認為他們的洗禮僅是一種奉獻的儀式, 或作為將來蒙赦免的一個期待。他主張, 小孩子是被排除在天國門外的, 但是他們仍有某種低等的福份, 稱為永生; 這是非常不合邏輯的。

. In turning from evil to good, man is not dependent on the grace of God, though its operation is undoubtedly an advantage and will help him to overcome evil in this life. But the grace of which Pelagius speaks in this connection does not consist in an inward-working divine energy, or, in other words, in the influence of the Holy Spirit, inclining the will and empowering man to do that which is good, but only in external gifts and natural endowments, such as man's rational nature, the revelation of God in Scripture, and the example of Jesus Christ. Though there would hardly seem to be any place for the baptism of infants in such a system, Pelagius holds that they should be baptized, but regards their baptism merely as a rite of consecration or an anticipation of future forgiveness. Rather illogically, he takes the position that children are excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven, though not from a lower state of blessedness, which is called eternal life.

奧古斯丁的罪與恩典觀：奧古斯丁論人靠賴神的見解

The Augustinian View of Sin and Grace: Augustine on Man's Dependence on God

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 133-134; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 105. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁對罪和恩典的見解, 無疑是受他早年的宗教經驗, 與他相反的伯拉糾思想之影響; 但是主要的決定因素乃在於詳細研究《羅馬人書》, 及他對人類 (重譯: 人的靈魂) 與上帝的關係的一般概念。他認為人即在未墮落的景況中, 人未來的命運的實現也得完全依靠上帝。

Augustine's view of sin and grace was undoubtedly influenced somewhat by his early religious experiences and by its opposite in the Pelagian system, but was primarily determined by his careful study of the Epistle to the Romans and by his general conception of the soul's relation to God. He regarded man, even in his unfallen state, as absolutely dependent on God for the realization of his destiny.

奧古斯丁的罪觀

Augustine's View of Sin

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 134-135; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 105-106. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁反對摩尼教 (Manicheans), 他強調罪的自願性 (voluntary)。同時他相信, 是人的靈魂遠離上帝的罪行, 使靈魂陷入行惡的必然性裡。由於罪進入世界, 人就再不能意旨那源於上帝的愛的真善, 也不能實現他真正的命運。他在捆綁中越墮越深。這並不是說他已失去對上帝的一切意識, 因為事實上他繼續渴求上帝。

[a] *His view of sin.* In opposition to the Manichaeans Augustine strongly emphasizes the voluntary character of sin. At the same time he believes that the at of sin by which the soul cut loose from God brought it under an evil necessity. As a result of the entrance of sin into the world man can no more will the true good, which is rooted in the love of God, nor realize his true destiny, but sinks ever deeper into bondage. This does not mean that he has lost all sense of God for, as a matter of fact, he continues to sigh after Him.

奧古斯丁並不認為罪是一積極之物, 乃認為是消極的, 是一種缺乏 (privation)。罪不是一個有實質的惡, 加諸於人, 乃是善之缺乏 (*privatio boni*, privation of good)。他發覺罪的主要根源在於自愛 (self-love) 取代了對上帝的愛。人背叛的一般結果, 包括靈魂中強烈慾念, 感官慾望不正之轄制; 理性之律不再管制靈魂。罪以及它所帶來的衝擊的結果, 就是死。人被造是不朽的; 這並不是說他不會受死的影響, 乃是說他有身體不朽的可能性。他若證明自己的順服, 就會在聖潔裡得以堅定 (confirmed in holiness); 他就會從「能不犯罪」與「能不死」的境況中, 過渡到「不可能犯罪」與「不可能死」的境況中。但是他犯罪了, 結果他進入了「不可能不犯罪」與“「不可能不死」的境況中。

Augustine does not regard sin as something positive, but as a negation of privation. It is not a substantial evil added to man, but a *privatio boni*, a privation of good. He finds the root principle of sin in that self-love which is substituted for the love of God. The general result of man's defection is seen in concupiscence, in the inordinate power of sensuous desires, as supposed to the law of reason, in the soul. From sin and the disturbance it introduced death resulted. Man was created immortal, which does not mean that he was impervious to death, but that he had the capacity of bodily immortality. Had he proved obedient, he would have been confirmed in holiness. From the state of the *posse non peccare et mori* (the ability not to sin and die) he would have passed to the state of the *non posse peccare et mori* (the inability to sin and die). But he sinned, and consequently entered the sate of the *non posse non peccare et mori* (the inability not to sin and die).

藉著亞當與其後裔的有機關聯 (organic connection)，亞當將他墮落的本性 (包括了罪孽與罪污) 傳遞給他的後裔。奧古斯丁所了解的人類合一性，並非是盟約性的 (federally)，而是現實主義的 (realistically)。全人類的種子都在亞當一人裡；因此全人類都在他裡面實際上犯了罪。人類並不是個別地組成的，不是由眾多彼此獨立無關的個體組成的。人類乃是有機地組成的，意思是說，亞當裡有人類普遍的本性 (generic human nature)，而每一個個體 (individualizations) 都是在亞當裡已有的普遍本性的有機部份 (organic parts)。因此，人性的罪，乃是所有人類個體的罪。

Through the organic connection between Adam and his descendants, the former transmits his fallen nature, with the guilt and corruption attaching to it, to his posterity. Augustine conceives of the unity of the human race, not federally, but realistically. The whole human race was germinally present in the first man, and therefore also actually sinned in him. The race is not constituted individually, that is, of a large number of relatively independent individuals, but organically, that is, of a large number of individualizations which are organic parts of that generic human nature that was present in Adam. And therefore the sin of the human nature was the sin of all its individualizations.

由於罪，人完全墮落了，不能行任何屬靈的善事。奧氏並不否認意志仍有某一種本性的自由 (natural freedom)，人仍然能行出社會公認的善事，從較低的標準看來，甚至是值得稱賞的。不過，奧氏同時主張人與上帝分離，擔負罪孽，活在惡的權勢下，是不能意旨神眼中看為正的事。甚麼是神眼中看為正的事？就是從愛上帝的動機發生的事。

As the result of sin man is totally depraved and unable to do any spiritual good. Augustine does not deny that the will still has a certain natural freedom. It is still capable of acts that are civilly good, and from a lower standpoint even praiseworthy. At the same time he maintains that man, separate from God, burdened with guilt, and under the dominion of evil, cannot will that which is good in the sight of God. As he sees it, that only is good in the sight of God which springs from the motive of love to God.

奧古斯丁的恩典觀

Augustine's View of Grace

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 135-136; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 107. 林慈信修.)

人的意志需要被更新。這從始至終唯獨是上帝的工作：上帝恩惠的工作。在這裡我們要小心，可能會誤解。當奧氏把人的更新唯獨歸功於上帝的恩惠，而在這事上說到「不可抗拒的恩惠」時，他的意思不是說上帝的恩惠違背人是自由行動者 (free agent) 的本性，而勉強人的意志。上帝乃改變人的意志，使之甘願選擇善。人的意志被更新了，恢復了他的真自由。上帝的確在人的意志上運行，以致人的意志自由地選擇美德，聖潔。就是這樣，上帝的恩惠成為人裡眾善的源頭。

[b] *His view of grace.* The will of man stands in need of renewal, and this is exclusively a work of God from start to finish – a work of divine grace. It is necessary to guard against a possible misunderstanding here. When Augustine ascribes the renewal of

man to divine grace only, and in this connection speaks of “irresistible grace,” he does not mean to intimate that divine grace forces the will, contrary to the nature of man as a free agent, but rather that it so changes the will that man voluntarily chooses that which is good. The will of man is renewed and thus restored to its true freedom. God can and does so operate on the will that man of his own free choice turns to virtue and holiness. In this way the grace of God becomes the source of all good in man.

基於以上所說，奧古斯丁對重生的教義是完全靠上帝的恩典的 (monergistic)。在重生上，聖靈的運行是必需的，不僅供應人裡之不足，而且完全更新人內心的性情，以致人的靈完全的效法上帝的律法。賽德 (Shedd) 說：恩典賜給罪人，不是因他相信，乃是以致他信；因為信心本身是上帝的恩賜。在重生上，上帝的功效 (efficiency) 令致罪人回轉 (conversion: 譯注：回轉 = 悔改 + 信心)；回轉可以說是人的合作。奧氏把上帝恩典的工作區分為幾個階段：(一)預先的恩典 (prevenient grace)，(二)運行的恩典 (operative grace)，與 (三)合作的恩典 (co-operative grace)。第一種恩典，聖靈用律法產生罪與罪孽的意識。第二種恩典，聖靈用福音產生信心，使人相信基督和他贖罪大功，結果人被稱為義，與上帝和好。第三種恩典，人被更新了的意志與聖靈合作，終生作成成聖的功夫。上帝恩典的工作，使上帝的形象完全在人裡更新，上帝的靈完全改變罪人，成為聖徒。奧氏在他的教會論上似乎與他主要的教義不符：他認為教會是一個相當獨立支配神恩典(救恩)的機構 (an independent dispenser of grace)；他也相信洗禮使人重生 (baptismal regeneration)。

From what has been said it follows that Augustine’s doctrine of regeneration is entirely monergistic. The operation of the Holy Spirit is necessary, not merely for the purpose of supplying a deficiency, but for the complete renewal of the inner disposition of man, so that he his brought into spiritual conformity to the law. Says Shedd: “Grace is imparted to sinful man, not because he believes, but in order that he may believe; for faith itself is the gift of God.” The divine efficiency in regeneration results in the conversion of the sinner, in which man may be said to co-operate. Augustine distinguishes several stages in the work of divine grace, which he calls “prevenient grace,” “operative grace,” and “co-operative grace.” In the first the Holy Spirit employs the law to produce the sense of sin and guilt; in the second He uses the Gospel for the production of that faith in Christ and His atoning work which issues in justification and peace with God; and in the third the renewed will of man co-operates with Him in the life-long work of sanctification. The work of grace includes the entire renewal of man in the image of God and the spiritual transformation of the sinner into a saint. It is hardly in line with his main thought when he also represents the Church as a more or less independent dispenser of divine grace, and speaks of baptismal regeneration.

奧古斯丁的預定觀

Augustine’s View of Predestination

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 136; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 107-108. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁論上帝的恩典為得救有效之因 (efficient cause) 的說法，導致他對預定的教義。上帝在時間裡更新罪人的恩典之工，乃是祂在永恆計劃裡所意旨的。奧

氏在早期透露一種傾向認為預定是在乎 (contingent upon) 神的預知，以為上帝揀選那些他知道會相信的人。這實在是把上帝對人自由的行動的預知，當作上帝預定的條件。可是不久之後奧氏就看出，為了教義的一致性，和對《聖經》有關章節的公正解釋，必需認為人選擇行善，相信基督，本身都是上帝恩典的效果；因而修改了他的預定教義。他通常視預定與人的得救有關，甚至說預定就是從上帝永恆的觀點看救恩 (salvation viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*, from the point of view of eternity)。至於未被揀選者，他認為上帝在他的預旨中 (decree of God) 忽略了他們 (permissio)。遺棄與揀選是不同的，上帝的遺棄沒有任何上帝的直接功效伴隨著，來達成預期的效果。奧氏雖然是一位嚴格的預定論者，但是在他的教訓中也有有一點點不合乎他主要思想的成份，那就是重生之恩會再次喪失的觀念。他主張，只有那些重生而堅守，或重生後失喪又蒙恢復，才能至終得救。然而在他的說法中，還有一點可取的特徵，那就是說，蒙揀選者不可能在不重生景況中死去。

Augustine's representation of the grace of God as the efficient cause of salvation led on to his doctrine of predestination. What God does in time for the gracious renewal of the sinner, He willed to do in His eternal plan. At first Augustine manifested a tendency to consider predestination as contingent on divine foreknowledge, and to represent God as electing those of whom He knew that they would believe. This really makes predestination conditional on the foreseen free action of man. He soon saw, however, that consistency and a fair interpretation of the relevant passages of Scripture, demanded that he should consider man's choice of the good and his faith in Christ as themselves the effect of divine grace; and therefore modified his doctrine of predestination accordingly. He usually views predestination in connection with the sinner's salvation, and even held that it might be called this salvation viewed *sub specie aeternitatis* (from the point of view of eternity). With reference to the non-elect, he conceives of the decree of God as one of premissio only. Reprobation differs from election in this that it is not accompanied with any direct divine efficiency to secure the result intended. But while Augustine is a strict predestinarian, there is also here an element in his teaching that is foreign to his main thought, namely, the idea that the grace of regeneration can again be lost. He holds that only those who are regenerated *and perseveres*, or in whom, after loss, the grace of regeneration is restored, are finally saved. There is a redeeming feature, however, in his assertion that the elect never die in an unregenerate condition.

伯拉糾派與半伯拉糾派之爭辯

Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian Controversies

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 137; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 108. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁論罪與恩的見解，在伯拉糾的爭辯中受到考驗。因為所牽涉到的問題從未得到充分的討論，所以他的見解遭遇到抵抗，是不足為怪的。東方教會強調在人性中有自由的成份，而反對異教中命運的觀念；認為人的意志已敗壞，並成為撒但手下的俘虜，受情慾，試探，並死亡的轄制；認為新生命是從洗禮而來。一般說來，希臘的教父是贊成把神的恩典與人的自由意志視為平等的。

In the Pelagian controversy the views of Augustine on sin and grace were put to the test. Small wonder that his views met with opposition, since the problems involved

had never yet been discussed in a thorough manner. The Eastern Church preferably emphasized the element of freedom in human nature, in opposition to the pagan idea of fate or destiny. It was admitted that the human will was corrupt, and had become subject to Satan, to sensuous temptations, and to death; and that the new life was communicated in baptism. On the whole the Greek Fathers were content with placing the grace of God and free will side by side.

伯拉糾主義的傳播與定罪

Propagation and Condemnation of Pelagianism

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 137; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 108-109. 林慈信修.)

有鑑於此，奧古斯丁的信仰中認為，一切都是從上帝的恩典而來，包括自由意志在內；這當然與反對的趨勢，如伯拉糾所代表的反對趨勢相衝突，乃意料中之事。伯拉糾首先在羅馬，409 至 411 年，推行他的見解此後由他的門生色勒斯丟 (Celestius) 將此思想介紹到北非的教會中；同時，伯拉糾也到帕勒斯丁傳佈他的見解。伯氏叛離教會一致接受的教義這事，在數次教會會議中被提起公訴。412 年於迦太基 (Carthage)，色勒斯丟被判為異端，也由於他拒絕收回他的意見，他被逐出教會。而伯拉糾本人在耶路撒冷與狄奧波里 (Diopolis, 也在帕拉斯丁) 被定為異端，但由於他的巧言善辯，以及他對自己見解的多方解釋，終於令審判者滿意，而無罪開釋 (414-416 年)。主後 416 年，伯拉糾主義在麥爾威 (Mileve) 與迦太基 (Carthage) 總會上被定為異端，且此項決議至終為羅馬主教卓悉末 (Zozimus) 所簽署；在此之前，這主教曾在主後 418 年頒發信仰純正證書給伯拉糾。最終，於主後 431 年定涅斯多留主義為異端的以弗所大會，也通過了定伯拉糾為異端的判決。

In view of all this it was perfectly natural that Augustine's deriving everything, free will included, from divine grace, collided with the opposite tendency, as represented in Pelagius. The two systems were absolute antipodes. Pelagius advanced his views first at Rome from AD 409 to 411. His system was introduced into the North African Church by his pupil Celestius. At the same time Pelagius went to Palestine to propagate his views. The matter of his departure from the generally teachings of the Church was brought up in several councils. In 412 Celestius was adjudged heretical at Carthage, and was excommunicated when he refused to retract his opinions. Pelagius himself was accused of heresy before the Synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis (also in Palestine), but by specious explanations and by qualifying several of his statements he succeeded in satisfying his judges, and was acquitted, 414-416. In the year 416 Pelagianism was condemned as a heresy by the Synods of Mileve and Carthage, and this decision was finally endorsed by the vacillating bishop of Rome, Zozimus, who had first handed Pelagius a certificate of orthodoxy 418. Finally, in 431 the Council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorianism, also passed a sentence of condemnation on Pelagianism.

半伯拉糾主義

Semi-Pelagianism

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 137-138; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 109. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁主義與伯拉糾主義兩個極端之間，興起了一中間的運動，就是歷史上的半伯拉糾主義。事實上，只有像奧古斯丁那樣的思想，具有其堅強的邏輯一致性，才能成功地堅守本位抵抗伯拉糾的侵攻。半伯拉糾主義提出了一個至終失敗的企圖，想藉著給上帝的恩典與人的自由意志各佔一席之地，以作為人被更生的相輔因素(co-ordinate factors)，並以上帝預知的信心與順服作為預定的根基，而來解決問題。此派並沒有否認人的敗壞，但卻認為人性是軟弱的，有病的，並非是由於墮落而受了致命的損害。而墮落的人性因保有自由的成份，因此自由意志能與上帝的恩典合作。重生是兩個因素的共同產品，但實際開始工作的卻是人，而不是上帝。

Between the extremes of Augustinianism and Pelagianism a mediating movement arose, which is known in history as Semi-Pelagianism. As a matter of fact that halfway position served to bring out clearly – as nothing else could have done – that only a system like the Augustinian, with its strong logical coherence, could maintain its ground successfully against the onslaughts of Pelagius. Semi-Pelagianism made the futile attempt to steer clear of all difficulties by giving a place to both divine grace and human will as co-ordinate factors in the renewal of man, and by basing predestination on foreseen faith and obedience. It did not deny human corruption, but regarded the nature of man as weakened or diseased rather than as fatally injured by the fall. Fallen human nature retains an element of freedom, in virtue of which it can co-operate with divine grace. Regeneration is the joint product of both factors, but it is really man and not God that begins the work.

半伯拉糾的觀點特別在高盧(Gaul, 即法國南部) 傳開。他們的主要代表者是馬賽(Massilia, 即今天 Marseilles)修道院的院長凱仙 (Cassian); 雷之佛斯塔斯 (Faustus of Rhegium) 與馬賽之金納底斯 (Gennadius of Massilia) 則為最有力的衛護者。但由於他們論調缺乏一貫性，所以無法與思維嚴密又堅實的奧古斯丁主義相抗衡。此派在奧蘭治(Orange)的重要會議上被定位異端，同時肯定了溫和的奧古斯丁主義 (moderate Augustinianism)。

Semi-Pelagian views spread especially in Gaul. Their chief representative was Cassian, abbot of Massilia (Marseilles). They found able defenders also in Faustus of Rhegium and Gennadius of Massilia. But they lacked internal coherence, and could not hold out in debate against such a close-knit and compact system as Augustinianism. The system was condemned at the important Council of Orange, which vindicated a moderate Augustinianism.

為教會所接納的奧古斯丁主義

Augustinianism as Accepted by the Church

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 138-139; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 110. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁對罪與恩的教義，終為西方教會採納為正統的人論，雖然不是普遍地被接受。具有影響力的人物如利歐 (Leo) 與貴格利 (Gregory), 比德 (Bede), 與亞勒崑 (Alcuin)等，都堅持奧古斯丁的教義，雖然他們未能像奧氏一樣，堅稱上帝對失喪的人之被忽略 (perterition) 與遺棄 (reprobation)，但他們特別強調人類意志的奴役，並重生絕對需要神的恩典。大多數重要的領袖在奧古斯丁死後二、三百

年，仍然忠於奧古斯丁的人論。奧蘭治總會採納了一溫和的奧古斯丁主義作為教會之教義。伯拉糾主義與半伯拉糾主義都被定罪為違抗正統信仰。唯獨靠恩典而得救的奧古斯丁主義則得到勝利，但預定的不可抗拒之恩典 (*irresistible grace of predestination*)的教義，則為洗禮的聖禮之恩(*sacramental grace of baptism*)所取代。而雙重預定 – 即神預定義人得永生，也預定惡人得永死 – 於 529 年被放棄。天主教此後逐漸的衰弱，一般的傾向都導向於半伯拉糾主義，此主義在東方教會早已取得了立足之地。拉丁教會終於採納了希臘教會的人論，並一直堅守著。

Augustine's doctrine of sin and grace was adopted as the anthropology of the Western Church, though its acceptance was never general even there. Influential men, like Leo and Gregory, Bede and Alcuin, adhered to it, though they were not as strong as Augustine in asserting the preterition and reprobation of the lost. They placed great emphasis on the enslavement of the human will, and on the absolute need of divine grace in renewal. It may be said that the most important leaders of the Church remained true to the most practical part of Augustinian anthropology for two or three centuries after Augustine. And the Synod of Orange adopted a moderate Augustinianism as the doctrine of the Church. Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism were both condemned as contrary to the orthodox faith. The Augustinian doctrine of salvation by grace only was victorious, but the doctrine of the irresistible grace of predestination was supplanted by that of the sacramental grace of baptism. And the doctrine of a double predestination – predestination also to evil – was abandoned in AD 529. Gradually the general decline in the Roman Catholic Church led to a drift in the direction of Semi-Pelagianism, which had long before secured a rather sure footing in the East. In course of time the Latin Church adopted the anthropology of the Greek Church and adhered to it ever since.

第三部份 中古時期的人論

The Anthropology of the Middle Ages

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 140-146; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 111-117. 林慈信修.)

大貴格利的見解

The Views of Gregory the Great

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 140; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 111. 林慈信修.)

大貴格利 (Gregory the Great) 於主後 540 年出生於羅馬, 為耶柔米 (Jerome), 奧古斯丁與安波羅修 (Ambrose) 最勤奮的學生。他宗教敬虔的性向使他放棄了世界, 他父親過世之後, 將財富捐獻給慈善工作, 並為了促進靈性生活, 興建了修道院。在 590 年受全體一致的推選為教皇。他接受職份之前深覺自己不配擔當, 因而有些躊躇。他雖不是創意的思想家, 但卻是頗盛名的作者, 對傳播正統教義上大有貢獻。因此在教會中除了最具影響力的奧古斯丁以外, 無人再能出其右。事實上, 奧古斯丁在中古世紀初期之所以被人欣賞, 乃是因為大貴格利的解釋。因此中古世紀的教義必需從他開始。

Gregory the Great, born at Rome about AD 540, was a diligent student of Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose. His religious disposition prompted him to renounce the world, and after the death of his father he devoted his wealth to good works, and particularly to the building of cloisters for the promotion of the purely contemplative life. Unanimously elected Pope in 590, he accepted the position only with great hesitation. Though not an original thinker, he became an author of great repute and did much to disseminate sound doctrine. Next to Augustine he was the most influential authority in the Church. In fact, Augustine was understood in the early Middle Ages, only as interpreted by Gregory. For that reason the history of doctrine in the Middle Ages must begin with him.

大貴格利的人觀

Anthropology of Gregory the Great

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 140-141; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 111-112. 林慈信修.)

大貴格利的奧古斯丁主義, 多少被沖淡了一些。他解說罪進入世界乃是由於人的軟弱, 而亞當的初罪乃是一項自由行動 (free act), 在此自由行動中, 他把對上帝的愛給丟棄了, 然後就受制於屬靈盲目與屬靈死亡。由於亞當一人的犯罪, 所有的人都成為罪人, 並被定罪。這話聽來好像是奧古斯丁的思想, 但貴格利並沒有把這些觀念一貫地推理下去。他認為罪只不過是人的弱點或疾病, 並非罪孽 (guilt); 並教導說, 人並沒有失去自由, 只是失去了意志的善性 (goodness of the will)。他同時強調, 沒有上帝的恩典人就不能得救, 人也不能作出任何功德。救贖的工作是由

上帝的恩典開始的，上帝預備的恩典 (prevenient grace) 使人意旨行善 (will the good)，後來的恩典 (subsequent grace) 則使人能夠行善。人的改變是在受洗開始；洗禮產生信心，並終止過去所犯的一切罪孽。人的意志被更新，人心充滿了上帝的愛，這樣人才能在上帝面前有功德可陳。

The Augustinianism of Gregory was somewhat attenuated. He explains the entrance of sin into the world by the weakness of man. The first sin of Adam was a free act, in which he surrendered his love to God and became subject to spiritual blindness and spiritual death. Through the sin of the first man all men became sinners and as such subject to condemnation. This sounds rather Augustinian, but Gregory did not carry these ideas through consistently. He regarded sin as a weakness or disease rather than guilt, and taught that man had not lost the freedom but only the goodness of the will. At the same time he stressed the fact that without grace there can be no salvation nor any human merits. The work of redemption is begun by the grace of God. Prevenient grace causes man to will the good, and subsequent grace enables him to do it. The change in man is begun in baptism, which works faith and cancels the guilt of past sins. The will is renewed and the heart is filled with the love of God, and thus man is enabled to merit something with God.

大貴格利對預定的看法

His View of Predestination

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 141: 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 112. 林慈信修.)

大貴格利雖然保留預定的教義，但卻予以修正。不錯，他提到上帝不可抗拒的恩典；並說預定，在選民的確定數目來說，乃是上帝奧秘的旨意 (secret counsel)。可是這僅是根據預知的預定而已。上帝定了一些確定數目的人得救，因為祂知道那些人將接受福音。但沒有人能確定自己或別人是否被揀選的。

Gregory retained the doctrine of predestination only in a modified form. While he speaks of the irresistibility of grace, and of predestination as the secret counsel of God respecting the certain and definite number of the elect, this is after all only a predestination based on foreknowledge. God appoints a certain definite number unto salvation, since He knows that they will accept the Gospel. But no one can be certain of his own election or of that of any other person.

郭查克的爭論

The Gottschalkian Controversy: Gottschalk on Predestination

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 141: 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 112. 林慈信修.)

奧古斯丁有時提到雙重預定 (double predestination)，而艾索多 (Isidore of Seville) 的著作也說預定是雙重的。但在七、八、九世紀中，大多數奧古斯丁派的人士卻遺忘了預定的雙重性，而跟貴格利的解釋。後有郭查克 (Gottschalk) 出現，終在奧古斯丁的揀選教義中找到他心靈的安息。他誠懇的為雙重預定爭辯，意即神預定人得救，也預定人滅亡。然而他小心翼翼地將救贖的有效性予以限制，限制於救主的家譜與產生人的聖潔上。他並認為，罪只不過是上帝許可的預旨 (permissive

decree)的對象；不過，上帝的許可還是帶來罪的必然性。他特別反對根據預知的預定觀念，因為這樣山地的預旨就根據人的行動。預知僅是跟著預定，並且證明了預定的公正。

Augustine had occasionally spoken of a double predestination, and Isidore of Seville still wrote of it as being twofold. But many of the Augustinians in the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries lost sight of this double character of predestination, and interpreted it as Gregory had done. Then came Gottschalk, who found rest and peace for his soul only in the Augustinian doctrine of election, and contended earnestly for a double predestination, that is, a predestination of the lost as well as of the saved. He was careful, however, to limit the divine efficiency to the redemptive line and the production of holiness, and to regard sin merely as the object of a permissive decree which nevertheless rendered it certain. He explicitly rejected the idea of a predestination based on foreknowledge, since this makes the divine decree dependent on the acts of man. Prescience merely accompanies predestination and attests the justice of it.

對郭查克的反抗

Opposition to Gottschalk

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 141-142; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 112-113. 林慈信修.)

郭氏遭遇了許多不公允的反對。他的論敵並沒有十分地了解他，而攻擊說，在他的教義中有「上帝是罪惡之源」的意思，使得郭氏的主張於主後 848 年的梅安斯 (Mayence) 會議被定罪，並於此年受到鞭打，被判終身監禁。此後有一場辯論因他而起，在此辯論中有幾位具有影響力的神學家：普頓修 (Prudentius)，拉特蘭努 (Ratramnus)，熱米糾 (Remigius) 等人，擁護雙重預定為奧古斯丁的神學思想。可是拉巴努 (Rabanus) 與幸克馬 (Hincmar) 卻反對此教義。但此次爭辯證實僅為有關言詞而已，因為擁護者與攻擊者都是屬半奧古斯丁派，他們只是用不同的方式表達同一件事罷了。擁護者說到與奧古斯丁相同的雙重預定，但是說到遺棄則是根據上帝的預知。而攻擊者把預定一詞用在揀選人得生命上，並且也是根據預知來說遺棄。雙方都贊成聖禮之恩典的概念，並且擔心嚴格的預定論會剝奪了聖禮的屬靈價值，而使之成為一外表的儀式而已。

He met a great deal of unwarranted opposition. His opponents did not understand him and lodged against him the familiar accusation that his teachings made God the author of sin. His doctrine was condemned at Mayence in AD 848, and the following year he himself was scourged and condemned to life-long imprisonment. A debate ensued, in which several influential theologians, such as Prudentius, Ratramnus, Remigius, and others, defended the doctrine of a double predestination as Augustinian, while especially Rabanus and Hincmar of Rheims assailed it. But this controversy proved to be after all little more than a debate about words. Both the defenders and the assailants were at heart Semi-Augustinians. They expressed the same idea in different ways. The former spoke with Augustine of a double predestination, but based reprobation on foreknowledge, while the latter applied the term "predestination" only to the election to life, and also based reprobation on prescience. Both subscribed to the idea of sacramental grace, and feared that the strict theory of predestination would rob the sacraments of their spiritual value and make them mere forms.

齊澤 (Quiersy)與瓦倫斯 (Valence)會議的表決，都同意這些見解；前者支持了攻擊者的見解，後者則支持了擁護者。瓦倫斯會議的聲明如下：「我們承認揀選人得生命的預定，並惡人得永死的預定。但在得救者的揀選上，上帝的恩典是在善行的功之先；而在滅亡之人的被定罪上，惡行是在上帝公義的審判之先。但在預定中，上帝只決定了他將要作的事，不論是出於恩慈的憐憫或公義的審判。...但上帝預知惡人的惡，因為惡是從他們而來。上帝沒有預定惡，因為惡不是從上帝而來。」（以上為西伯爾所引證，《教義史》，卷二，頁 33。）這些會議於主後 853 (Quiersy) 及 855 年 (Valence) 召開。

The decisions of the Councils of Quiercy and valence were altogether in harmony with these views, the former reproducing the views of the assailants, and the latter those of the defenders. The statement of the Council of Valence reads as follows: "We confess a predestination of the elect to life, and a predestination of the wicked to death; but that, in the election of those who are saved, the mercy of God precedes good merit, and in the condemnation of those who will perish, evil merit precedes the righteous judgment of God. But that in predestination God has determined only those things which He Himself would do, either in gratuitous mercy or in righteous judgment ... But that in the wicked He foreknew the wickedness because it comes from them; and does not predestinate it, because it does not come from Him." Quoted by Seeberg, *History of Doctrines*, II, p. 33. These Councils met in 853 (Quiercy) and 855 (Valence).

安瑟倫的貢獻

The Contribution of Anselm

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 142-143; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 113-114. 林慈信修.)

中古世紀有一位偉大的思想家，就是坎特布里主教安瑟倫；他不但重新發表奧古斯丁的人論，並且也作出了積極的貢獻。

There was one great thinker during the Middle Ages who not only reproduced the Augustinian anthropology, but also made a positive contribution to it, namely, Anselm of Canterbury.

安瑟倫的罪觀

Anselm on Original Sin and Its Transmission

他強調原罪的教義，並著重「原」(original)字並不是指人類的起源，乃是指目前個人的狀態之起源。根據他的見解，原罪也可以稱之為「本性（自然）之罪」(*peccatum naturale*, natural sin)。雖然並非屬於人的本性，但是卻說明了從創造以來罪進入人性的情況。由於墮落，人成為有罪與污穢的，而罪孽與污穢就從父遺傳給子孫。所有的罪 – 原來遺傳的與本身所犯的 – 構成了罪孽。

[a] *His doctrine of sin.* He emphasizes the doctrine of original sin, but stresses the fact that the term "original" does not refer to the origin of the human race, but to that of the individual in the present condition of things. In his opinion original sin may also be called *peccatum naturale* (natural sin), though it does not belong to human nature as

such, but represents a condition into which it has come since creation. By the fall man became guilty and polluted, and both guilt and pollution are passed on from father to child. All sin, original as well as actual, constitutes guilt.

既然犯罪必需有自由意志，安瑟倫就提出了一個問題：說小孩犯罪，有什麼根據？為什麼為了赦免嬰孩的罪而給予施洗？他在一件事上找到了解釋，那就是人性在創造後背叛了上帝 (apostasy)。他像奧古斯丁一樣，認為每一個小孩子是亞當一般人性 (general human nature) 的個體部份，所以在亞當裡實際地犯了罪，因此有罪孽與罪污。如果亞當沒有墮落，人性也就不會背叛，聖潔的本性也將由父傳給子。可是在現今的情況中，所傳的是一個有罪的人性。因此，原罪的起源乃是一種「本性之罪」 (a sin of nature)，而後來的罪行完全是個人性的。

Since sin presupposes the exercise of free will, he raises the question, how sin can be ascribed to children, and why infants should be baptized for its remission. He finds the explanation in the fact that human nature apostatized after creation. Like Augustine he regards every child as an individualized part of that general human nature which Adam possessed, so that it has actually sinned in Adam and is therefore also guilty and polluted. If Adam had not fallen, human nature would not have apostatized, and a holy nature would have passed from father to son. In the present state of affairs, however, a sinful nature is propagated. Original sin therefore has its origin in a sin of nature, while later actual sin is altogether individual in character.

安瑟倫提出了一個問題：最近祖先犯的罪，是否像始祖亞當最初犯的罪一樣，歸給後裔呢？回答是否定的，因為這些罪並不是由於分享亞當的本性所犯 (by the common nature in Adam)。亞當的罪是特殊的，絕不能有第二人像他一樣犯罪。因為那次犯罪的人，在他裡面包括了全人類。無疑地，安氏的思想中有一弱點，因為所有由同一人性所犯的罪，雖然是個人的，但為什麼只有亞當最初所犯的罪才歸給他的子孫，而他後來所犯的罪卻沒有歸給他的子孫？安氏又注意到，在亞當裡人性的罪孽（即原罪），乃在於個人的罪孽 (the guilt of nature rests upon the guilt of the individual)；而在他的子孫中，個人的罪孽乃在於本性中的罪孽 (the guilt of the individual rests upon the guilt of nature)。亞當代表全人類受試驗，在這一點上安瑟倫接近後來「盟約」 (covenant) 的概念。

Anselm raises the question, whether the sins of the immediate ancestors are imputed to posterity as well as the sin of the first father. And his answer is negative, because these sins were not committed by the common nature in Adam. The sin of Adam was unique; there never was a second like it, because it was the transgression of an individual who included within himself the whole of humanity. This is undoubtedly a weak point in the system of Anselm, since all the following sins are committed by the same human nature, though individualized, and because it does not answer the question, why only the *first* sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity, and not his later sins. He further calls attention to the fact that in Adam the guilt of nature, that is, original sin, rests upon the guilt of the individual, while in his posterity the guilt of the individual rests upon the guilt of nature. In the person of Adam the whole human race was tried. At this point he approaches the later covenant idea.

安瑟倫的自由意志觀

Anselm on the Freedom of the Will

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 143-144; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 114-115. 林慈信修.)

安瑟倫也討論自由意志的問題，並提出有價值的建議。他聲稱，自由的一般定義是指犯罪或不犯罪的可能(*possibilitas utriusque partis*)，是非常不足的。且自由意志不能指聖天使而說：天使有完全的道德自由，然而不能犯罪。他主張，意志若不受外部的約束，本身有堅強正當的決心，不會離棄正途，這種的意志比起微弱的，能作好事但卻也會離開義路的意志，要自由的多了。若是如此，問題就來了：我們能否說，天使的背道，與我們始祖的背道是自由的行動？安瑟倫回答說，我們始祖的行為的確是自發的 (act of spontaneity)，純粹是出於自我意志(pure self-will)，但並非是真正自由的行動 (genuine freedom)。他們犯罪並不是因為他們的自由，乃是他們雖然自由 (in spite of freedom)仍犯罪；乃是由於他們有犯罪的可能性 (*possibilitas peccandi*, possibility of sinning)。他們若可能選擇不同的行為，並沒有得到更多的自由，因為在沒有這自由的狀況中，他們是自願地聖潔(voluntarily holy)的。安瑟倫將「真自由」與「意志的功能」(the voluntary faculty) 之間作一區分；前者已經失喪，但後者並未失喪。意志真正的目的，並非是選擇善或惡，乃是選擇善。上帝創造人的意志這功能，是要人意旨正當的事(to will the right)，而不是義旨其他的事。意志真正的自由，乃出於自我地決定過聖潔的生活 (self-determination to holiness)。因此，我們必需拒絕「自由即隨意，任意」(caprice)這觀念；也不可認為意志被造時，有毋寧兩可，可視為善或視為惡「自由」(liberty of indifference)。人的意志被造只限有一個選擇，就是聖潔。但是要接受這個目的，必需有內在的自我決定 (a self-determination)，而不是外來的強迫。用意志來作惡的能力(作惡的可能乃在試驗期所賜的)，削減了真自由的完全性，因為這樣就暴露自己有不正當選擇的危險。

[b] *His doctrine of the freedom of the will.* Anselm also discusses the problem of the freedom of the will and makes some valuable suggestions. He declares the popular definition of freedom as the power of sinning or not sinning, or as the *possibilitas utriusque partis*, to be inadequate. It does not hold with reference to the holy angels. They have perfect moral freedom, and yet are not able to sin. He held that the will which, of itself and without external compulsion, is so strongly determined to the right as to be unable to desert the path of rectitude, is freer than the will which is so feebly determined to the right as to be able to depart from the way of righteousness. But if this is so, the question arises, whether we can call the apostasy of the angels and of our first parents a free act. To this Anselm replies that he act of our first parents was certainly an act of spontaneity, of pure self-will, but not an act of genuine freedom. They sinned, not because of their freedom, but in spite of it, by virtue of the *possibilitas peccandi* (the possibility of sinning). The power to do otherwise than they were doing added nothing to their freedom, because they were voluntarily holy without it. He distinguishes between true freedom and the voluntary faculty itself. The former was lost, but the latter was not.

The true end and destination of the will is not to choose *either* good or evil, but to choose the good. The voluntary faculty was intended by the Creator to will the right and nothing else. Its true freedom consists in its *self-determination to holiness*. This means the rejection of the idea that freedom is *caprice*, and that the will was created with the liberty of indifference. It is by certain shut up to the choice of but one object, namely, holiness. But the acceptance of this end must be a self-determination, and not a compulsion from without. The power to choose the wrong, when given for the purpose of probation, subtracts from the perfection of real freedom, because it exposes to the hazards of an illegitimate choice.

天主教人論的特點

Peculiarities of Roman Catholic Anthropology

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 144-145; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 115-116. 林慈信修.)

天主教有兩個清楚的傾向，一即傾向半奧古斯丁派，一傾向半伯拉糾派。後者則逐漸地佔優勢，因篇幅所限不能詳論經院學派的思想，只提出逐漸顯明的幾項具代表性的教義。

The Roman Catholic Church clearly harboured two tendencies, the one Semi-Augustinian and the other Semi-Pelagian, of which the latter gradually gained the upper hand. We cannot follow the discussion of all the Scholastics here, and therefore merely state the characteristic teachings that gradually emerged.

天主教論原義

Rome on Original Righteousness

天主教中逐漸盛行的見解是，原義 (original righteousness) 並不是人所領受的自然恩賜，乃是超自然的恩賜。這個見解主張，人自然包括體與靈，並從這兩個相反的傾向生出了衝突 (concupiscence)。這些衝突往往使正當的行為顯得困難。為了補滿這本性上的缺陷，上帝又賜人一種特別的恩賜，就是原義。原義的功能乃制服人裡面低等的部份，服從高等的部份，而高等的部份則服從上帝。這原義是上帝超自然的恩賜 (*donum superadditum*, a supernatural gift)，是附加於人本性以外的，因為人被造時沒有正面的義 (positive righteousness)，但也沒有正面的不義。

The view gradually prevailed that original righteousness was not a natural but a supernatural endowment of man. Man, it was held, naturally consists of flesh and spirit, and from these diverse or contrary propensities there arises a conflict (concupiscence), which often makes right action difficult. To offset the disadvantages of this original languor of nature, God added to man a certain remarkable gift, namely, original righteousness, which served as a check to keep the inferior part of man in proper subjection to the superior, and the superior to God. This original righteousness was a supernatural gift, a *donum superadditum*, something added to the nature of man, who was created without positive righteousness, but also without positive unrighteousness.

天主教對原義喪失的看法

Its View of the Loss of This Righteousness

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 145 ; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 116. 林慈信修.)

罪進入世界之後，人喪失了原義。意思是說，人的背叛並不涉及人任何自然恩賜的喪失，僅是失去了超自然的恩賜。而此超自然恩賜是在人的本性 (essential nature) 以外。原義喪失了，人就陷入體與靈之間不受約束的衝突中。在人的本性裡，那高尚成份優於低等成份的優越性，已受致命的削弱。人又回到中立的情況中，在此情況中人既不是有罪也不是聖潔。但由於他這樣的構造 (constitution of nature)，他的本性受制於體與靈之間的衝突。

With the entrance of sin into the world man lost this original righteousness. This means that the apostasy of man did not involve the loss of any natural endowment of man, but only the loss of a supernatural gift, which was foreign to the essential nature of man. Original righteousness was lost and man lapsed back into the condition of an unrestrained conflict between flesh and spirit. The supremacy of the higher over the lower element in his nature was fatally weakened. Man was brought back to the neutral condition, in which he was neither sinful nor holy, but from the very constitution of his nature subject to a conflict between the flesh and the spirit.

天主教對原罪的看法

Its View of Original Sin

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, p. 145 ; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 116. 林慈信修.)

人類的始祖亞當既然被造為他後裔的代表，所以他的後裔都在他裡犯了罪，生到此世時就背了原罪的包袱。經院學派論到原罪性質時，看法雖然各有不同，有些人加上了積極的成份，就是對惡的傾向 (an inclination to evil)；但是盛行的見解是，原罪並不是什麼積極的事，乃是應有而沒有的事，特別是「原來的公義」 (original justice) 的喪失。所謂「原來的公義」，一些人的解釋是：原來另外特別為人加上的義。有些人則認為，除了原來的公義以外，還加了所謂「自然的公義」 (*justitia naturalis*)。這罪是普遍的，是自動甘願的，它乃從始祖得來，不能當作是情慾 (concupiscence) 或在人裡面的惡慾，因為這些東西嚴格來說，都不算是罪。

Since Adam, the head of the human race, was constituted the representative of all his descendants, they all sinned in him and come into the world burdened with original sin. While the Scholastics differ very much as to the nature of original sin, the prevailing opinion is that it is not something positive, but rather the absence of something that ought to be present, particularly the privation of original justice, though some add a positive element, namely an inclination to evil. By original justice some understand that original righteousness that was super-added to man, and others in addition to this also what is called the *justitia naturalis*. This sin is universal and is voluntary as derived from the first parent. It should not be identified with concupiscence, with the evil desires and lusts that are present in man, for these are not sin in the proper sense of the word.

天主教的神人合作說

Its Synergism

(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 145-146; 伯克富, 《基督教教義史》, 頁 116-117. 林慈信修.)

天主教不接受人在屬靈上是無能為力的，並且需要完全靠來上帝的恩典而得救的觀念。他們採取神人合作重生說 (synergism)，意即人在屬靈的更新上需要與上帝合作，並且人要預備自己 (he prepares, disposes himself) 接受上帝稱義的恩典。而此稱義的恩典，乃是上帝所注入的義 (infused righteousness)。宗教改革時期，改教家所提出的神恩獨作說 (monergism)，最受到天主教最嚴厲的反對的教義。

Roman Catholics reject the idea of man's spiritual impotence and his utter dependence on the grace of God for renewal. They adopt the theory of synergism in regeneration, that is, that man co-operates with God in the spiritual renewal of the soul. He prepares and disposes himself for the grace of justification, which is said to consist in infused righteousness. In the days of the Reformation the monergism of the Reformers was opposed by the Roman Catholic Church with greater vehemence than any other doctrine.

拯救論的發展史（一）：

救贖施行的教義

THE HISTORY OF SOTERIOLOGY (part 1): THE DOCTRINE OF THE APPLICATION OF GRACE

從討論贖罪的教義（或者說是藉基督完成客觀的救贖工作），進而討論信徒得到救恩的方法（或說是藉著聖靈的工作，基督功勞的主觀應用），這實是必經的時期（重譯：這是必經的思路）。

It is natural to pass from the doctrine of the atonement, or of the objective work of redemption through Christ, to a discussion of the method in which believers obtain a share in its benefits, or of the subjective application of the merits of Christ through the operation of the Holy Spirit.

I. 前三世紀的拯救論

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

若想在早期教父終尋找救贖工作應用的一個普遍、確定、完整與徹底發揮的觀念，實是不可能的。那些教父們的陳述確實是（譯加：不確定、）不完全，有時又錯誤百出且自相矛盾。迦尼斯 (Kahnis) 說：『事實顯明，所有奧古斯丁以前的教父教導說，得到救恩的方法，是藉者人的自由與神恩典的合作。』

It would be unreasonable to look for a common, definite, well integrated, and fully developed view of the application of the work of redemption in the earliest Church Fathers. Their representations are naturally rather indefinite, imperfect, and incomplete, and sometimes even erroneous and self-contradictory. Says Kahnis: "It stands as an assured fact, a fact knowing no exceptions, and acknowledged by all well versed in the matter, that all of the pre-Augustinian Fathers taught that in the appropriation of salvation there is a co-working of freedom and grace."

1. 早期教父論信心

為了與新約所說相符合，人得到救恩的祝福，是『藉著向神悔改與相信主耶穌基督』，這是早期教父所強調的條件。（重譯：早期教父強調：人得到救恩的祝福，是『藉著向神悔改與相信主耶穌基督』；這些條件是符合新約《聖經》的。）然而，這並不是說他們已經具有信心與悔改的完滿與適切的觀念。一般認為，信心是接受基督功勞的顯著工具，而且往往被稱為人得救的唯一方法。這種觀念的瞭解，乃包括在認識神的真知識上，並將自己交託給神，是耶穌基督及其贖罪寶血的特殊對象。（他們的理解是，認識神，信靠祂，把自己交託給祂，信心的特殊對象就是耶穌基督合祂贖罪的寶血。）這個信心被認為是稱義的方法，而不是靠律法的行為。信心包括真使徒時代的教父，一再地表顯出這種觀念，又為護教者再度提出。後期教父，如愛任紐與奧利金，也分享人靠信心得救的概念。而拉丁教父，如居普良與安波羅斯，在強調人完全墮落與因信稱義的必要上，遠超過他們以前的教

父。然而，這不能說有關信心的清晰觀念，在前三世紀中浮出。在他們著重信心上，教父們重複著他們在《聖經》上所發現的，但當他們說到信心是神什麼的時候，則完全不清楚。一種流行的觀念似乎是說，僅僅在頭腦裏同意真理，但在某些情況中，信心似乎包括自我降服的觀念。然而著與在耶穌基督裏有圓滿得救信靠的觀念還相差太遠。亞歷山大學派，有時候在信心與知識上相衝突，他們說前者為一初步的階段，一般說來知識對真理的接受；而後者則是較完全的階段，在此階段中才能瞭解二者的關係。

此外，早期教父雖然強調神的恩典與信心，作為領受救恩的媒體，可是也顯示出道德主義的色彩，這明顯與保羅的教訓不符。福音往往被描述為一新律法，而信心與悔改僅僅被說明為，要倚靠人的意志。這樣，救恩是靠神的恩典，同時又靠人自願地合作。

Faith in the Early Fathers.

In harmony with the New Testament statement, that man obtains the blessings of salvation by “repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,” the early Fathers stressed these requirements. This does not mean, however, that they at once had a full and proper conception of faith and repentance. Faith was generally regarded as the outstanding instrument of the reception of the merits of Christ, and was often called the sole means of salvation. It was understood to consist in true knowledge of God, confidence in Him, and self-committal to Him, and to have as its special object Jesus Christ and His atoning blood. This faith, rather than the works of the law, was regarded as the means of justification. These ideas are repeatedly expressed by the Apostolic Fathers, and re-occur in the Apologetes alongside of the idea that the new knowledge of wisdom revealed by the Logos has saving significance. Later Fathers, such as Irenaeus and Origen, share the idea that man can be saved by faith, while the Latin Fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Ambrose, even surpass them in stressing the utter depravity of man and the necessity of justification by faith. It cannot be said, however, that a clear conception of faith emerged in the thinking of the first three centuries. In their emphasis on faith the Fathers largely repeated what they found in the Bible. It is not altogether clear just what they meant when they spoke of faith. The prevalent idea seems to be that of a merely intellectual assent to the truth, but in some cases it apparently includes the idea of self-surrender. Yet it generally falls far short of the full and rich conception of it as saving trust in Jesus Christ. The Alexandrians sometimes contrast faith and knowledge, representing the former as the initial stage, the acceptance of the truth in a general way, and the latter as the more perfect stage in which its relations and bearings are fully understood.

Moreover, in spite of all their emphasis on the grace of God and on faith as the appropriating organ of salvation, the early Fathers reveal a moralism that is not in harmony with the Pauline doctrine of salvation. The Gospel is frequently described as a new law (*nova lex*). Faith and repentance are sometimes represented as being simply dependent on the will of man. Salvation is made to depend now on the grace of God, and anon on the voluntary co-operation of man.

2· 早期教父論悔改

與信心一樣，悔改也被認為是得救的初步條件。至於悔改一詞之真義為何，則頗令人置疑，這在初代教父的思想中透露了出來。到底悔改僅僅只是一種行動，或內心的一種狀態，或被認為是人生中的一種改善呢？這些都是不確定的，同時也清楚顯示，當他們說到悔改是一種行動的時候，他們就特別強調悔改者悔罪行為的外部表現。這些行為甚至被認為有洗禮之後所犯的罪的價值，有一強調善行必要的傾向，特別是捨己的善行，即如施捨、守獨身等等，都具有特殊的功能，與信心並駕其驅，作為得神恩寵的方法。這種善行的見解，是法理上的，並非福音上的。此種新約基督教道德上的曲解，在人心自以為義上，並在猶太法理主義進入教會開了門戶上，得以窺見。

Repentance in the Early Fathers.

Alongside of faith repentance was also regarded as a preliminary condition of salvation. There is some doubt as to the exact connotation of the term "repentance," as it is found in the early Fathers. It is uncertain, whether they conceived of it merely as an act or condition of the mind, or regarded it as including amendment of life. At the same time it is quite evident that, when they speak of it in the former sense, they attach great importance to its external manifestations in penitential deeds. These deeds are even regarded as having expiatory value in atoning for sins committed after baptism. There is a tendency to stress the necessity of good works, especially works of self-denial, such as liberal almsgiving, abstinence from marriage, and so on, to attach special merit to these, and to co-ordinate them with faith as a means of securing the divine favour. The view taken of good works is legal rather than evangelical. This moralistic perversion of New Testament Christianity found its explanation in the natural self-righteousness of the human heart, and opened a doorway through which a Judaistic legalism entered the Church.

3· 早期教父終的禮儀主義與行為之義

尚有一點值得注意，即前三世紀的教父，已經顯示一種向禮儀主義移動的傾向。洗禮帶著一種赦免以前所犯的罪，而洗禮以後所犯的罪，也能藉著補贖得到赦免的觀念，在他們中間廣為流行。此外，某人的善行，特別是殉道所受的苦難，可以贖別人的罪的思想，也逐漸的佔優勢。到這時期的末了，雖然有一些教父不太贊同，但大多數的教父，卻把一種超餘的價值，加諸在殉道者與其代求上。所麥(Sohm)認為，以上的觀念違背了《聖經》的教訓，且時間會顯示出這兩種根本不同的思想，將彼此發生衝突，這是不可避免的。

Ceremonialism and Work-Righteousness in the Early Fathers.

These is another point that deserves notice. The Church Fathers of the first three centuries already reveal an initial drift towards ceremonialism. The idea is widely prevalent among them that baptism carries with it the forgiveness of previous sins, and that pardon for sins committed after baptism can be obtained by penance. Moreover, the thought is gradually gaining ground that the good works of some, and especially the sufferings of martyrs, may serve to atone for the sins of others. Towards the end of this period an excessive value is ascribed to the intercessions of confessors and martyrs, though some of the Church Fathers discourage this idea. Sohm finds the explanation for

this departure from the teachings of Scripture in the fact that “the natural man is a born Catholic.” It was inevitable that in course of time these two fundamentally different types of thought should come into conflict with each other.

II. 教父後期的拯救論

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE REMAINING CENTURIES OF THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

1. 伯拉糾論神的恩典

伯拉糾較早期的任何教父，在論到救贖上更遠離《聖經》的教訓，甚至可以說是棄絕了《聖經》的根基，而這根基對早期教父來說，是神聖不可侵犯的。（重譯：伯拉糾比早期的任何教父，在論到救贖的施行上更偏離《聖經》的教訓，甚至可以說他棄絕了早期教父尊重的《聖經》根基。）伯氏又重申異邦哲學自足的原則，而他對罪的觀念，導致他否認靠神的恩典在基督裏得救的絕對必須性，他說人可以靠守律得救。他並沒有完全藐視『恩典的幫助』（*assistance of grace*），甚至認為這時應當有的，使厲行神的吩咐更為容易。但是他所說的恩典，並不是神使人重生，藉此人心得光照，人意志得到更新，以至向善追求聖潔得恩典，而只是包括在：（1）性善或自然界之美善（*good of nature*），即人生下來就有自由意志，所以他能行善或作惡；與（2）傳福音與基督的榜樣，二者都與人心並教導得救之法有關。神在自然界中所表現的恩惠使普遍的，且是絕對需要的，雖然能叫人容易得到救恩，但神在福音中的恩惠，既不普遍又不必須。自然恩典對善用自然能力的人而言，是隨處可得到的，因為這恩典並不直接行使在人的意志上，乃僅是行使在人的悟性上給予光照。此外，人也可能抗拒這恩典的行使。基督教被人認為是一個新的律法，與舊約相比，乃是一擴大的律法。真正基督徒是認識神的人，相信自己已被神悅納，並順服福音的訓誨，且效法基督的聖潔，而不是效法亞當的罪。

Pelagius on the Grace of God.

Pelagius deviated much further from the Scriptural representation of the application of redemption than any of the earlier Church Fathers. It may even be said that he forsook the biblical foundation which was sacred to them, and re-asserted the self-sufficient principle of heathen philosophy. His conception of sin and its results led him to deny the absolute necessity of the grace of God in Christ unto salvation, and to consider it quite possible for man to obtain salvation by obtaining the law. He did not altogether despise the “help of grace” or “divine assistance,” but even considered this desirable “in order that what is commanded by God may be *more easily* fulfilled.” But the grace of which he speaks is not the *gratia interna*, the regenerating grace of God by which the mind is enlightened and the will is inclined to goodness and holiness. It consists only in: (a) “the good of nature,” that is, man’s endowment with a free will, so that he can do either good or evil; and (b) the preaching of the Gospel and the example of Christ, both of which are directed to the mind of man and teach the way of salvation. The grace of nature is universal and absolutely essential or necessary, though rendering it easier for men to obtain salvation. It is given only to those who make a proper use of their natural powers. This grace does not operate *directly* and *immediately* on the will of man, but only on his *understanding*, which it illuminates, and through this on the will.

Moreover, it is quite possible for man to resist its operation. Christianity is regarded as a new law and, in comparison with the Old Testament, as an enlarged law. The real Christian is one who knows God, believes that he is accepted by God, obeys the precepts of the Gospel, and imitates the holiness of Christ rather than the sin of Adam.

2 · 奧古斯丁論神的恩典

奧古斯丁的出發點，與人本來自然的情況完全不同。他認為，人是完全敗壞的，根本不能行屬靈的善事。他也用客觀的意義來說到恩典，包括在福音、洗禮、赦罪中的恩典，但他知道這是不夠的，他並且也瞭解到罪人需要內在屬靈的恩典，一種神的靈超自然的感化，藉此人心得光照，意志被更新轉向聖潔。這恩典是神預定的果實，是按照神主權的美意，而非按著人的什麼功德，白白賜給人的，它是在人的功德之先，神所給的禮物。這恩典賜給人一顆新心，並光照你，叫你的意志轉變，離惡而就善，且生發信心，使人行屬靈的善事。到人重生以後為止，恩典的活動，絕對是神獨作的，亦即人的得救，絲毫沒有人的功勞成份在內。奧氏有一時間，以為人有相信的能力，但後來看到保羅在林前四7所寫的，就不再那樣想了。

Augustine on the Grace of God.

Augustine takes his starting-point in a radically different view of man's natural condition. He regards the natural man as totally depraved and utterly unable to perform spiritual good. He also speaks of grace in the objective sense, consisting in the Gospel, baptism, the forgiveness of sins, and so on, but realizes that this is not sufficient, and that sinful man has need of an internal, spiritual grace, a supernatural influence of the Spirit of God by which the mind is enlightened *and the will is inclined to holiness*. This grace, which is the fruit of predestination, is freely distributed according to the sovereign good pleasure of God, and not according to any merits in man. It is a gift of God that precedes all human merits. It renews the heart, illuminates the mind, inclines the will, produces faith, and enables man to do spiritual good. Up to the time of man's renewal its operation is strictly monergistic. Augustine at one time thought it was in the power of man to believe, but was taught otherwise by Paul in I Cor. 4:7.

奧氏在行動之恩 (*gratia operans*) 與協同之恩 (*gratia co-operans*) 間予以區分。前者是在人不願意之前就使其願意之恩；而協同之恩使在人願意之後使其意圖不致徒然的恩典，且此恩典使不可抗拒的。這意思並沒有強迫的意思，乃是說不可避免地要更新人的心意，以致意志才能甘願選擇正當的途徑。人藉著洗禮接受了恩典頭一部份的祝福，就是重生，或者說是內心初步的更新與罪的赦免，而這些祝福也有可能失掉，事實上，除非也得到保守之恩，不然二者都無法保守住。

He distinguishes between a *gratis operans* and a *gratis co-operans*. The former "goes before man when unwilling, that he may will"; the latter "follows him when willing, that he may not will in vain." This grace is irresistible, not in the sense that it constrains man against his will, but in the sense that it inevitably renews the heart, so that the will voluntarily chooses the right. Man receives the first blessings of grace through baptism, namely, regeneration or the initial renewal of the heart and the forgiveness of sins. Both of these blessings can be lost; in fact, neither of them can be retained unless the grace of perseverance is also received.

3 · 奧古斯丁論信心

論到基督徒生活的開始，以及所有善行的根源，信心都當居首要的地位。奧氏對信心的瞭解，乃在於對真理的理智上的認可，在他所寫對信心的看法中，比較氏屬於高尚理解的觀念。他把一般的信心於基督徒的信心，信基督與在基督裏有信心之間加以區分，認為只有當一個人愛基督，並在祂身上有所有的指望的時候，才算是信基督，且基督徒的信心所成就的，但是奧氏的信心觀念還沒有達到赤子之心那樣完全信靠的程度，而此赤子之心的信心才是真正的得救信心。奧氏認為，信心在罪人稱義上是有所作為的，因為他說人是因信稱義的，那就是因信心得稱為義。但奧氏並非是以純辯論的性質來瞭解因信稱義，雖然包括有罪得赦免的意思在內，但是並非是因信稱義的本質。在稱義中，神不僅宣佈，也是藉著改變罪人內在的本性，使著罪人成為義。奧氏在稱義與成聖之間未能作一清楚的分別，實際上他是把後者包括在前者之中。奧氏神學思想的主要特性，就是把所有的事都歸於神的恩典。

Augustine on Faith.

Great significance is attached to faith as marking the beginning of the Christian life and as the source of all good works. Augustine conceives of faith primarily as an intellectual assent to the truth, though in some passages he evidently rises to a higher conception. He distinguishes between faith in general and Christian faith, between believing Christ and believing *in* Christ. One really believes in Christ only when one loves Him and fixes one's hope on Him. Christian faith is a faith that works by love. His conception of faith does not yet give due prominence to that childlike trust in Christ which is the crowning element of saving faith. He does regard faith as functioning in the justification of the sinner, for he says that man is justified by faith, that is, obtains justification by faith. But he does not conceive of justification in a purely forensic sense. While it includes the forgiveness of sins, this is not its main element. In justification God not merely *declares* but *makes* the sinner righteous by transforming his inner nature. He fails to distinguish clearly between justification and sanctification and really subsumes the latter under the former. The notable feature of Augustine's doctrinal system is that he refers everything to the grace of God.

4 · 半伯拉糾派論神的恩典

半伯拉糾派採取中間立場，否認人的完全敗壞，但承認不用神恩典的幫助，人也可以作成得救的工夫；雖然神的恩典能夠光照人的心，並能扶佐人的意志，但人的自由意志則總是不能妥協。事實上二者在救贖的工作上，是彼此合作的。神的恩典雖然是普遍的，能為所有的人得到，但是必須在適當運用自由意志的人的生活中，神的恩典才發生功效。嚴格地說，決定其後果的乃繫乎人的自由意志；相信或繼續相信，乃在乎人，只有為增強信心的時候才需要恩典，根本沒有不可抗拒之恩惠這回事。伯拉糾主義被迦太基會議、以弗所會議、奧蘭治會議定為異端，這些虎疫也反對伯拉糾主義，使奧古斯丁主義在教會中大獲全勝。

Semi-Pelagians on the Grace of God.

The Semi-Pelagians took an intermediate position, denying the total inability of man to do spiritual good, but admitting his inability to perform really *saving* works without the assistance of divine grace. The grace of God illuminates the mind and

supports the will, but always in such a manner that the free will of man is in no way compromised. In fact, the two co-operate in the work of redemption. While the grace of God is universal and intended for all, it becomes effective in the lives of those who make a proper use of their free will. Strictly speaking, it is really the will of man that determines the result. It is up to man to believe and to continue in faith, and grace is needed only for the strengthening of faith. There is no such thing as irresistible grace. Pelagianism was condemned by the Synod of Carthage, by the Council of Ephesus, and again by the Synod of Orange, which also rejected Semi-Pelagianism; and, in a fashion, Augustinianism appeared triumphant in the Church.

5 · 奧古斯丁見解之修正

然而這並不是說，奧古斯丁的見解沒有受到修正，他本人的教訓包含著與人絕對倚靠神恩典的觀念相衝突的成份在內，並走向禮儀主義與行為之義，茲提數點如下：（1）有時靠教會及其聖禮來得神的恩典。（2）認為在赦罪與重生上，可能會再失去神的恩典。（3）對救法真正如此基要的因信稱義的教義，被說明為很難與白白恩典教義相協調。神白白賜給的恩典，主要並非在於罪得赦免上－事實上這乃是奧氏思想中的一個細節－乃在於重生，而將神的恩典注入人心中，使人能夠行善事，並賺得永生。信心所以被稱為義，並不是它支取到基督耶穌的義，乃是因為信心是由愛所促成的。人在恩典的工作與信心的恩賜以前，無功德可言，但是當重生恩典與信心在人心中作成的時候，他的行為才真正是功德的行為。因此根本上說，恩典只不過再一次使人能賺得救恩。

Modification of Augustine's View.

This does not mean, however, that the doctrine of Augustine did not undergo certain modifications. The teachings of this great Church Father himself contained some elements that were in conflict with the idea of man's absolute dependence on the grace of God, and pointed in the direction of ceremonialism and work-righteousness. The following points may be mentioned: (a) Participation in the grace of God is sometimes made dependent on the Church and its sacraments. (b) It is considered regeneration may be lost again. (c) The doctrine of justification by faith, so vital to a true conception of the way of salvation, is represented in a way that can hardly be reconciled with the doctrine of free grace. The grace of God freely given, does not consist primarily in the forgiveness of sins – which is in fact a minor point in Augustine's system – but in regeneration, in the infusion of a grace which enables man to do good works and to merit everlasting life. Faith justifies, not because it appropriates the righteousness of Jesus Christ, but because it works by love. Man, it is true, has no merits antecedent to the operation of grace and the gift of faith, but when the grace of renewal and faith is wrought in the heart, his works are indeed meritorious. Fundamentally, therefore, grace merely serves the purpose of making it possible for man once more to merit salvation.

以上所說的這些內容，實在不是奧古斯丁思想的主流，乃是教會中之一些人急於把握的思想，更屬於支持半伯拉糾主義的教訓。在奧古斯丁於半伯拉糾主義間的抗爭，為時已久，表明瞭對預定論、人的完全敗壞，以及不可抗恩惠的強烈抵抗。最後為教會所認可的信仰立場，乃是溫和的奧古斯丁主義。西波格 (Seeberg) 在其所著《教義史》一書中說：『唯獨靠恩典的教義佔了優勢，而預定論卻遭到遭』

棄。預定的不可抗拒的恩惠，被洗禮的恩惠所驅逐。恩典的教義於流行的天主教發生了關係，由於高舉善行，就成為得神恩典的目的。』（卷一，382頁）

Now these elements are certainly foreign to Augustine's main line of thought, but were early seized upon by some in the Church and gave countenance to teachings that were more Semi-Pelagian than Augustinian. There was a protracted struggle between Augustinianism and Semi-Pelagianism, which revealed a strong opposition to the doctrines of predestination, the total inability of man to do spiritual good, and irresistible grace. And the position that was finally sanctioned by the Church was that of a moderate Augustinianism. Seeberg says that "the doctrine of 'grace alone' came off victorious; but the doctrine of predestination was abandoned. The irresistible grace of predestination was driven from the field by the sacramental grace of baptism. The doctrine of grace was hereby brought into closer relationship with the popular Catholicism, as also by the exaltation of good works as the aim of the divine impartation of grace." *History of Doctrines*, I, p. 382.

6 · 教會中發生的不良影響

在教會中有些影響正活動著，就是以恩典所有屬靈祝福的恩典教義，與產生善行原理的信心教義相衝突的影響正活動著；另一些影響則引誘人高舉外部的行為，並堅持此行為的功德性，且忽略救恩的主觀條件，而強調行為。以下數點值得特別注意：（1）有一種把信心與信仰純正混為一談的趨勢，一位相信僅僅是主張一信仰純正的信條而已，而將注意力集中於一系列的教義上，只需要理智上的同意，但是卻遠離了作為一個人對神態度，並能結仁義果子的信心。（2）善行於自律深受推崇，且往往被描述為能補償信徒之罪的適當方法。（3）許多教父在神的吩咐與福音的輔導（重譯：勸導）間作一區分，因為前者絕對約束所有的基督徒，至於後者厲行與否則無關重要，但對於那些遵守的人，則必得大賞賜。此乃為了修道院主義的好處，才作此區分，意欲將人特殊的階級成為聖潔，這就是他們勤於外部行為的原因。（4）崇拜聖徒、依靠聖徒的代求，特別是依靠童貞女馬利亞代求的習俗有增無減，證明了對救恩屬靈的涵意有害無益。這就導致外部的行為主義，並靠人的行為。基本的觀念就是說，聖徒有了過剩的善行，可以轉讓給他人。

（5）有一種靠洗禮而得救的觀念不斷增強，這種觀念就是說進入除此以外別無救恩的教會。東方教會對於不受洗禮而能得救的可能性，大表懷疑，而在西方教會則是絕對否認不受洗而能得救的觀念，甚至奧古斯丁也教導說，沒有受洗而死亡的孩童是滅亡的。

Contrary Influences in the Church.

There were influences at work in the Church that were contrary to the doctrine of grace as the source of all spiritual blessings and of faith as the principle from which good works proceed; influences which induced many to exalt outward works, to insist on their meritorious character, and to stress them at the expense of the great subjective conditions of salvation. The following should be noted particularly: (a) There was a tendency to confound faith with orthodoxy in the assumption that to believe was simply to hold an orthodox creed. The attention was focused on a list of doctrines that required assent, and was diverted from faith as an attitude of the soul to God, productive of the fruits of righteousness. (b) Works of mercy and self-discipline were highly commended and often described as the proper way of making satisfaction for the sins of believers. (c) Many

Church Fathers distinguished between divine commands and evangelical counsels, of which the former were absolutely binding on all Christians, while compliance with the latter was a matter of choice, but brought greater reward to those who observed them. This distinction was made in the interest of monasticism, and tended to make eminent holiness the prerogative of a class that was diligent in the performance of certain externals. (d) The increasing practice of saint-worship and dependence on the intercession of saints, and especially of the virgin Mary, proved detrimental to spiritual conceptions of salvation. It led to externalism and to reliance on the works of man. The underlying idea was that the saints had a superabundance of good works, and could simply transfer some of them to others. (e) There was a growing tendency to make salvation dependent on baptism, which marked the entrance into that Church outside of which there is no salvation. In the East the possibility of being saved without baptism was doubted, and in the West it was absolutely denied. Even Augustine taught that children which die unbaptized are lost.

拯救論的發展史（二）：經院主義時期的拯救論
**THE HISTORY OF SOTERIOLOGY (part 2):
 THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE SCHOLASTIC PERIOD**

當我們來到經院時期的時候，關於得救程序的主要內容，即如恩典、信心、因信稱義、功德、與善行，我們看到許多各種不同的見解。一般說來，雖然在經院學派中顯示出半伯拉糾主義的傾向，但是教會的立場還是溫和的奧古斯丁主義。我們要簡略地看看這些主要的思想。

When we come to the scholastic period, we meet with a variety of opinions respecting the main elements of the saving process, such as grace, faith, justification, merit, and good works. On the whole the position of the Church was that of a mild Augustinianism, though there appears in the Schoolmen a drift in the direction of Semi-Pelagianism. We shall briefly consider some of the main concepts.

**I. 經院學派的恩典觀
 THE SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF GRACE**

1. 經院學派的恩典觀

有一點我們看出，在經院學派中盛行的見解，就是同意奧古斯丁派，而不同意伯拉糾與半伯拉糾派的見解。雖然後者說開始有信心與繼續有信心，乃在於屬血氣之人的能力，可是一般說來，經院學派都主張人若沒有神**充足**恩典 (Sufficient Grace) 的幫助，是無法有信心的。這就與奧古斯丁的思想同出一轍，可是不那麼完全，因為奧古斯丁說還必須有**有效**的恩典 (Efficient Grace)。在經院學派當中，關於恩典的題目，沒有普遍一致的見解。蘭巴德彼得德見解與奧古斯丁的見解，有著密切的關聯，同時廣被接受。蘭氏認為解釋恩典的性質，是一件非常困難的事，但是他寧願傾向於恩典乃為在人裏面行使的超自然能力，並在**行動之恩**（使人以信心轉向神）與**協同之恩**（與人意志合作，發生預期有效的結果）之間加以區分。唯有前者使最先賜給人的（只有前者是沒有人的行動而在人心中作成的），並且純粹是白白賜給人的恩賜。再進一步所賜給人的恩典，乃在乎人意志的同意與合作，不然無法得到。人的自由意志是唯獨靠神恩典的協助，才能有所活動，並且獲得預期的效果。

The Scholastics on Grace.

There was one point on which the prevailing opinion among the Scholastics was in agreement with Augustinianism rather than with Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. While the latter asserted that it lay in the power of the natural man to originate and increase faith, the Scholastics generally maintained that man could not do this without the aid of *sufficient* grace. But this is about as far as the agreement with Augustine went. And even here the agreement was not complete, for Augustine asserted the necessity of *efficient* grace. There was no general agreement on the subject of grace among the Schoolmen. The views of Peter the Lombard, which show an unmistakable affinity with those of Augustine, were rather widely accepted. He considered it difficult to define the

exact nature of grace, but preferred to think of it as a supernatural quality or power wrought in man, and distinguished between a *gratia operans*, which enables man to turn to God in faith, and a *gratia co-operans*, which co-operates with the will and is effective in bringing about the desired result. Only the former, and this merely as it is first bestowed on man, is wrought in him without any action on his part, and is purely a gift of gratuitous mercy. All further communication of grace to man is dependent on the active consent and co-operation of the will. The free will of man acts, but divine grace assists it as a co-operating principle, and thus secures the desired effect.

哈勒之亞歷山大的說法，與蘭巴德彼得是相一致的，但是他又提出另一個區分，就是經院神學的特性，他說到白白賜下的恩典 (*gratia gratis dans*)，施贈的恩典 (*gratia gratis data*)，與使人蒙悅納的恩典 (*gratia gratum faciens*)。阿奎納多馬以不同的意義來使用這些名詞，因此就決定了這些名詞後來的用法。他雖然使用「使人蒙悅納的恩典」這個名詞，是指著一切超自然的輔助，目的是叫領受者本身 *dedao* 補贖，但他卻把「施贈的恩典」這名詞，僅限於白白的恩賜，目的再為別人的好處，而非求領受的好處。論到『使人蒙悅納的恩典』，他在『運行的恩典』於『協同的恩典』之間作一區分。前者更新人的意志，而後者在合作上予以輔助；前者可稱之為 **充足的恩典**，而後者可稱之為 **有效的恩典**。

The representation of Alexander of Hales is in general agreement with that of Peter the Lombard, but he introduced another division, which is characteristic of scholastic theology, when he spoke of a *gratia gratis dans*, a grace giving freely (referring to the gracious activity of God), a *gratia gratis data*, a grace given freely (designating all actual graces and infused virtues), and a *gratia gratum faciens*, a grace making gracious (grace as a permanent quality of the soul, making it well-pleasing to God). Thomas Aquinas uses these terms in a somewhat different sense, and thereby determined their later usage. While he employs the term *gratia gratum faciens* as a designation of all the supernatural helps intended for the recipient's own sanctification, he restricts the term *gratis gratis data* to those gratuitous gifts that aim at the good of others rather than at that of the recipient. In connection with the *gratia gratum faciens* he distinguishes between prevenient or operating and subsequent or co-operating grace. The former renews the will, and the latter assists it in its operations; the former may be called *sufficient* and the latter *efficacious*.

II · 經院學派的信心觀

THE SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF FAITH

在經院時期，有一普遍的傾向，就是以知識為方式的信心（僅對真理的同意），與屬靈情感的信心（能夠產生善行）間有所區分。蘭巴德彼得在此作了三項區分，即信神、神的信實與基督徒的信。前兩項實際上的意思是說到一件事，那就是接受神所說的為真實；但後者是指深一層的信心，藉此信心我們才能與神有交通。蘭巴德說，信神是一回事，也就是信祂所說的是真的，與在神裏面有信心（重譯：信靠神自己，*faith in God*）是另外一件事，那就是說，相信祂就是愛祂，到祂那裏去就

近祂，並加入基督身體中成為肢體。他也在相信信經、教義的信，與因信稱義的信之間作了一個區分。

The Scholastics on Faith.

There was a general tendency in the scholastic period to distinguish between faith as a form of knowledge, a mere assent to the truth, and faith as a spiritual affection, productive of good works. Peter the Lombard makes a threefold distinction here, namely, *Deum credere*, *Deo credere*, and *in Deum* or *Christum credere*. The first two mean practically the same thing, that is, to accept as true what God says; but the last denotes faith in a deeper sense, by which we enter into communion with God. He says that it is one thing to believe God, to believe that what He says is true, and quite another to believe in God, that is, to believe so as to love Him, to go to Him, to cleave to Him, and to be joined to the members of the body of Christ. He also makes a distinction between the faith which is believed, that is, the creed or dogma, and the faith by which one believes and is justified.

在蘭氏以後，通常理智的信與為愛所形成的信之間又有所區分；此外，又特別宣稱理智上的信是為稱義作準備，只有為愛所形成的信才是使人稱義的信。同時，作神父的認為，叫信徒無條件的服從教會的權威，乃是信心主要的特性，所以有些神學家就鼓勵這種觀念。

After his day it became customary to distinguish a *fides informis*, consisting in a mere intellectual assent to the truth, and a *fides formata* (*charitate*), a faith which is augmented, vivified, and determined by the power of love, and of which love is therefore the formative principle. Moreover, it was emphatically declared that, while the *fides informis* was one of the preparations for justification, only the *fides formata*, which includes the right inward disposition and works by love, is the faith that justifies. At the same time the priesthood considered it advantageous to stress the idea that unquestioning submission to the authority of the Church was the main characteristic of faith, and some of the theologians rather encouraged that notion.

III · 經院學派的稱義與功德觀

THE SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF JUSTIFICATION AND MERIT

奧古斯丁對稱義與成聖的混淆，不但未加以澄清，反而為經院學派更為加強。他們的一般教訓就是說，神將成聖之恩注入人的心中，使著人得稱為義。在神那方面包括成聖之恩的注入與赦罪，在人這方面包括藉著信心與懊悔，將人自己的自由意志轉向神，當然，那最後的一部份並不包括嬰兒，因為在嬰兒裏面完全是神的工作，如此一來，因信稱義僅僅包括恩典的注入與原罪的赦免。

Augustine's confusion of justification and sanctification was not rectified but rather intensified by the Schoolmen. Their common teaching is that justification is effected through the infusion of sanctifying grace into the soul by God. It includes on the part of God the infusion of sanctifying grace and the forgiveness of sins, and on the part of man the turning of his free will to God through faith and contrition. Naturally, the last elements are not included in the case of infants, for in them justification is entirely the

work of God, and as such comprises only the infusion of grace and the remission of original sin.

1· 經院學派論稱義。

The Scholastics on Justification.

經院學派一般都同意在稱義中所包括的，但卻從未想過基督之義是僅僅歸給罪人的，然而，在稱義中各不同本質的次序決定上，則意見各殊。根據阿奎那多馬，最初是有恩典的注入，然後才有自由意志的轉向神，其次是將自由意志轉向抵擋罪，最後是罪得赦免。而哈勒的亞歷山大與波拿文土確主張另外一個次序，即轉離罪，恩典的注入，罪得赦免，與自由意志轉向神。但恩典注入的那一剎那，人就生發懊悔之心，罪就被恩典逐出。

The Scholastics were generally agreed as to what was included in justification, and never conceived of it as a mere imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the sinner. They differed, however, in their determination of the logical order of the various elements in justification. According to Thomas Aquinas there is first of all the infusion of grace, then the turning of the free will to God next the turning of the free will against sin, and, finally, the remission of guilt. Alexander of Hales and Bonaventura, however, contend for a different order, namely, attrition or turning from sin, infusion of grace, remission or expulsion of sin, and the turning of the free will to God. The moment grace is infused, however, attrition becomes contrition, and then sin is expelled by grace.

敦司蘇格徒則有完全不同的見解，他所瞭解的稱義包括兩項神的工作，那就是罪得赦免與藉成聖之恩內心的更新。實際來說，二者雖然是同時的，乃在次序上來說，罪得赦免在恩典的注入之先。

Duns Scotus has an altogether different opinion. He conceives of justification as consisting of two divine operations, namely, the forgiveness of sins and the renovation of the soul through sanctifying grace. While the two are simultaneous in time, in the order of nature the forgiveness of sin precedes the infusion of grace.

經院學派說稱義是立即的作為，但是天特總會卻說稱義是逐漸增進的。關於稱義之恩的確保，阿奎那主張這並不是一般信徒所共有的，必須根據恩典的外部表記，才能夠得到合理揣測的滿足，也只有那些為宗教緣故有所作為或多受苦難，又藉著特殊啟示的人，才能得到稱義的確信。

The Scholastics speak of justification as an instantaneous act, but the Council of Trent makes mention of a progressive increase of justification. With respect to the assurance of possessing the grace of justification, Aquinas maintains that this is not the common privilege of believers in general. These must be satisfied with a reasonable conjecture, based upon the signs of grace. Absolute assurance is given only to those who have accomplished or suffered much for the sake of religion, and then by means of a special revelation.

2 · 經院學派論功德 The Scholastics on Merit.

與自由恩典教義（重譯：白白恩典的教義）並行，並關係到稱義的，就是其次的功德教義。德性的功德素質，特別是在善行所表顯的，在中古世紀非常盛行，幾乎沒有任何著名的經院學派神學家反對。阿奎那多馬將功德分為兩類，就是「賺取的功德」(Merit of Condignity)，嚴格的公正上來說，得報償是應該的，並且這功德唯獨屬於基督；與『施贈的功德（而非賺取的）』(Merit of Congruity)，意思就是人能給予賞賜並且人也能得到這功德。然而他的門人多馬派卻更為極端，主張一個人在稱義之後，由於神恩典的幫助，才能賺取的功德，那就是使他在神面前有所作為、在神身上有所要求（重譯：使神必須給他的功德）。敦司蘇格徒的弟子否認此點，但主張在稱義前的善功，可以得到一致的功德，且根據這個而能得到恩典的增進。他們主張神性的完全，使得神不得不將人所賺得的恩典傳給人。

Alongside the doctrine of free grace, and in connection with that of justification, the doctrine of merit came to the foreground. The meritoriousness of virtue, especially as expressed in good works, was generally taught in the Middle Ages, and was hardly opposed by any scholastic theologian of note. Thomas Aquinas distinguished between two kinds of merit, namely, "merit of condignity," which in strict justice deserves reward and belongs to Christ alone, and "merit of congruity," which is fit to be rewarded and can be acquired by men. However, his followers, the Thomists, went so far as to assert that *after* justification a man may by the aid of divine grace acquire a merit of condignity, that is, can do something that gives him a claim on God. The followers of Duns Scotus denied this, but maintained that good works done *before* justification might obtain a merit of congruity and on this basis receive an increase of grace. They held that the perfection of the divine character would impel God to bestow on man the grace thus merited.

3 · 天主教拯救論最終得型態 Final Form of Roman Catholic Soteriology.

天主教論神恩之應用與支取上，採取了下列的形式。在教會之內所生的孩童，就已接受了重生的恩典，包括在洗禮時恩典的注入與罪得赦免。然而，在後來受福音感化的人，也領受到充足的恩典，那就是聖靈的光照悟性，並加強意志；他們能抵抗，但也要順服神的工作，並隨從聖靈的引導。藉著順服並與神合作，他們為稱義之恩預備自己，此種預備包括了下列七種成份：（1）同意教會所教導的真理；（2）看見自己有罪的景況；（3）盼望神的憐憫；（4）開始愛神；（5）憎惡罪；（6）決志遵守神的誡命；與（7）願意受洗。

The Roman Catholic doctrine of the application and appropriation of divine grace finally assumed the following form. Children born within the pale of the Church receive the grace of regeneration, including an infusion of grace and forgiveness of sin, in baptism. Others, however, who come under the influence of the Gospel in later years, receive sufficient grace, that is, an illumination of the understanding and a strengthening of the will by the Holy Spirit. They can resist but also yield to this work of God and follow the promptings of the Spirit. By yielding to it and co-operating with God they prepare themselves for the grace of justification (*gratia infusa*). This preparation consists

of the following seven elements: (a) Assent to the truth taught by the Church; (b) insight into one's sinful condition; (c) hope in the mercy of God; (d) the beginnings of love to God; (e) an abhorrence of sin; (f) a resolution to obey the commandments of God; and (g) a desire for baptism.

清楚看出，信心在此並沒有佔重要的地位，但卻與其他的預備程序相協調；信心只不過是對教會教義作理智上的同意 (*fides informis*)，並且是僅藉著愛所分賜的恩典 (*gratia infusa* 即澆灌的恩典，藉此稱為又愛所形成的信心)，而得到稱義的能力。這稱義的恩典才是稱義的根基，為七種預備程序中的首要項目。

It is quite evident that faith does not occupy a central place here, but is coordinated with the other preparations. It is merely an intellectual assent to the doctrines of the Church (*fides informis*), and acquires its justifying power only through the love that is imported in the *gratia infusa*, by which it becomes a *fides caritate formata*. It can be called justifying grace only in the sense that it is the first of the seven preparations, and in that sense the basis and root of justification.

在此七項預備程序之後，因信稱義就隨著洗禮而來。稱義在乎於恩典的澆灌（超自然的功德），然後才有罪得赦免，而此赦免得多寡程度又與實際上勝過罪的程度相稱。稱義是白白賜予的，而非靠那事先預備項目而賺得的，並且是藉著守誡命、行善事來保守稱義。在澆灌的恩典中，人領受了超自然的能力作善事，如此本著基督所賺得的功勞，才能得到所有其他的恩典和永生。因此，神的恩典再一次地使人賺得救恩，但卻無法確定這稱義的寶貴恩賜，將持續到多久，可能因不信或犯什麼大罪而失掉；然而，因為補贖之禮，包括懺悔、認罪、赦罪與補贖的工作，則又重新復得。罪孽與永遠的刑罰，藉著告解（罪得赦免）得以免除，但罪的暫時的刑罰，只能藉著補贖的工作得以消除。

After this sevenfold preparation justification itself follows in baptism. It consists in the infusion of grace (super-natural virtues), followed by the forgiveness of sins. The measure of this forgiveness is commensurate with the degree in which sin is actually overcome. It is given freely and is not merited by the preceding preparations. And it is preserved by obeying the commandments and by doing good works. In the *gratia infusa* man receives the supernatural strength to do such works, and thus to merit with a merit of condignity all following grace and everlasting life. The grace of God, therefore, serves the purpose of enabling man once more to merit salvation. But it is not certain that the precious gift of justification will be retained. It may be lost, not only through unbelief, but by any mortal sin. It may be regained, however, by the sacrament of penance, consisting in contrition (or attrition), confession, together with absolution, and works of satisfaction. Both the guilt of sin and eternal punishment may be removed by absolution, but the temporal penalties of sin can only be cancelled on the basis of works of satisfaction.

教會論發展史 HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

I. 教父時期的教會論 IN THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

1. 早期教父的教會觀 The Church in the Early Church Fathers.

有關教會的教義，在基督教早期的文獻中就有其根基了。在使徒時代的教父與護教者的文獻中，論到教會通常被稱為神產業的代表者（重譯：通常被稱為聖徒的交通 *communio sanctorum*，神的子民，神所揀選的屬民）。雖然說到神的子民為真以色列人，但是在歷史上的預備時期，卻往往不被人所瞭解。甚至在第二世紀，關於教會的觀念，也都有些可以覺察出來的變遷，那乃是由於異端的興起，使得真正大公教會外部的特性顯露出來。因為這樣的結果，大家都特別強調外部的特性，以茲區別何為真正的大公教會，結果教會被認為是一個外部的組織體，為使徒繼承者之主教所治理，並且擁有真正的遺傳（重譯：並且擁有真正信仰的傳統）。這種觀念頗為流行，認為世界所有普遍的教會，都是地方教會，也都有地方教會的歷史行，（重譯：認為普世教會就是所有地方教會在歷史上的本質 (*prius*)。）但是這個地方教會，不能被視為一分離的團體，應當被視為普遍教會的一部份（重譯：但是地方教會不能被視為不同分離的單位，而是有主教之普世教會的部份），只有這些分離單位的教會對大公教會盡忠、服從時，她們才被認為是真教會。

The doctrine of the Church also has its roots in the earliest literature of the Christian era. In the Apostolic Fathers and in the Apologetes the Church is generally represented as the *communio sanctorum*, the people of God, which He has chosen for a possession. While it is spoken of as the true Israel, its relation to its historic preparation in Israel was not always well understood. But even in the second century a perceptible change came about in the conception of the Church. The rise of heresies made it necessary to designate some external characteristics by which the true Catholic Church could be known. The result was that the Church began to be conceived as an external institute, ruled by a bishop as a direct successor of the apostles, and in possession of the true tradition. The idea became prevalent that the universal Church was the historical “*prius*” of all local churches. The local churches were not conceived as so many separate units, but as parts of the universal Church with the episcopacy; and they were regarded as true churches only as long as they were loyal and subject to the catholic Church as a whole.

2. 其他派別的教會觀 The Church in the Sects.

可是在其他派別裏（重譯：可是在一些異端的旁門裏），他們特別強調教友的聖潔，以此聖潔程度來定奪教會的真偽。主張此學說的人，即使第二世紀中葉的孟他努、第三世紀中葉的諾窪天，與四世紀初的多納徒派為代表，主因是由於他們

反對教會逐漸的世俗化於貪愛世界而產生的。孟他努派的領袖，猛烈地攻擊教會的鬆弛與世界化（世俗化），並且堅持苦修的生活習慣，他們說受洗以後所犯的大罪是不可赦免的，但是他們卻也說，藉著殉道能夠補贖大罪。諾窪天派並不同享孟他努派的說法，但卻贊同、遵循追求教會的聖潔，他們主張教會沒有權柄舌面 1 那些受逼迫而否認神信仰的人再加入教會，但卻發現有些主教接納這些人入教，並重新給予施洗。多納徒派在羅馬皇戴克里先迫害的時候，也有這樣的趨勢，他們有力地堅持教會懲誡，與純潔的教友制度，反對靈性上有缺乏的人作他們的牧師，拒絕政府干擾教會；但同時他們卻又力求皇帝的恩寵。

In the sects, however, another tendency manifested itself, namely, to make the holiness of its members the real mark of the true Church. It was represented by Montanism in the middle of the second, by Novatianism in the middle of the third, and by Donatism in the beginning of the fourth century. These sects were born of a reaction against the gradual secularization and the increasing worldliness and corruption of the Church. The Montanist leaders inveighed with prophetic authority against the laxity and worldliness of the churches, and insisted on ascetic practices. They spoke of gross sins committed after baptism as being unpardonable; but also of the possibility of atoning for the mortal sins by martyrdom. The Novatians did not share the prophetic claims of the Montanists, but followed their example in striving for the purity of the Church. They held that the Church had no power to forgive those who had denied the faith during the Decian persecution and sought readmission to the Church. Finding that many bishops readmitted such members, and that the churches in general were lax in discipline, they rebaptized those who joined their circle. The Donatists represented the same tendency during the persecution of Diocletian. They insisted on rigorous ecclesiastical discipline and pure church-membership, rejected unworthy ministers, and protested against State interference in religious matters; but at the same time themselves courted the favour of the emperor.

3· 居普良的教會觀

Cyprianic Conception of the Church.

教父們對於這些派別非常反對，並且強調教會的主教制度。居普良是特土良的學生，是頭一個倡導教會主教制的人。他認為，主教是由主自己所選召的，是使徒真正的繼承人，並主張根據馬太十六章 18 節，教會是建立在主教上，而主教是教會絕對的主宰，至於誰屬於教會的權力完全在乎主教，某人犯罪後想重新加入教會也是由主教決定；他是以神祭司的身份來領導教會崇拜，並以那個資格來獻祭。居普良是頭一個教導牧者有真正祭司職份的人，按他來說，主教可以成立一個教團，召開主教會議，（重譯：主教們可以成為一個教團，就是主教會議 *episcopate*，）如此可以代表教會整體的合一，他乃是以主教的合一作為教會合一的根基；他同時也主張各主教間地位的平等，並不將優先權讓給羅馬的主教；並稱背叛主教就等於背叛神，任何人不服從主教，就沒有資格和教會來往，結果那人的得救也遭到懷疑（重譯：結果那人就失去他的救恩），而真正的會友總是在教會內，教會以外沒有真正的救恩（重譯：總之，真正的會友總是在教會內，服從教會，因為在教會以外沒有救恩的可能。）。

The Church Fathers took issue with all these sectaries and emphasized ever increasingly the Episcopal institution of the Church. Cyprian, the disciple of Tertullian, has the distinction of being the first to develop the doctrine of the Episcopal Church. He regarded the bishops, chosen by the Lord Himself, as the real successors of the apostles, and maintained on the basis of Matt. 16:18, that the Church was founded on the bishops. The bishop was regarded as the absolute lord of the Church. It was up to him to decide who could belong to the Church and who might be restored to its fellowship. He conducted the worship of the Church as a priest of God, and in that capacity offered sacrifices. Cyprian was the first one to teach an actual priesthood of the clergy *in virtue of their sacrificial work*. According to him the bishops constituted a college, called the episcopate, and as such represented the unity of the Church. He based the unity of the Church on the unity of the bishops. At the same time he maintained the parity of the bishops and ascribed no primacy to the bishop of Rome. Rebellion against the bishop was regarded as rebellion against God. Anyone who refused to submit to the rightful bishop thereby forfeited his fellowship with the Church and consequently also his salvation. True members will always obey and remain in the Church, *outside of which there is no possibility of being saved*.

這種的教會觀使得居普良否認異端所施洗禮的有效性，很明顯地，對他來說，一個在教會以外的人，不可能吸引別人到教會來，而且他相信只有教會領袖才可領受聖靈 – 因他只有在教會內才分賜給人 – 才能將赦罪之恩分賜給人。這樣，居普良是首先發表大公教會觀念的人，清楚地包含所有基督教會地各分支，並且藉著有形的與外部的合一聯繫在一起。一位神學家說：『這是居普良導致教會錯謬與腐敗更深一層的貢獻。』

This conception of the Church logically caused Cyprian to deny the validity of baptism administered by heretics. To him it was perfectly evident that one who was himself outside the Church could not induct others into it. Moreover, he believed that only the leaders who received the Spirit – and He was received only in the Church – could impart the forgiveness of sins. Thus Cyprian was the first to bring out clearly and distinctly the idea of a catholic Church, comprehending all true branches of the Church of Christ, *and bound together by a visible and external unity*. This is what Cunningham calls “Cyprian’s grand contribution to the progress of error and corruption in the Church.” *Historical Theology*, I, p. 169.

4 · 奧古斯丁論教會 Augustine on the Church.

奧古斯丁的教會觀也是在以上所說的思想範圍內，他與多納徒派之思想間有一番掙扎，迫使他對教會的本質有更深一層的反應。說來可悲，他的教會觀與他所倡罪與恩典的教義不相一致，事實上在他的教會觀念上存在著二元論，一方面奧氏主張預定論，認為教會是蒙揀選者的集團，擁有神的靈並有真正的愛心，其中最重要的是在於實質，而非僅是外部的參加聖禮而已，且由於此團體的代求，罪就得到赦免，得到神的恩典（重譯：神賜予救恩的恩賜），因此聖徒（教會）真正的聯合

是無形的，但是（重譯：而且）此聯合只能在大公教會內，因為聖靈只有在教會內才工作，並且只有在教會內才有真正的愛。

Augustine moved in the same general circle of thought. It was his struggle with the Donatists that compelled him to reflect more deeply on the essence of the Church. Sad to say, his conception of the Church does not altogether harmonize with his doctrine of sin and grace. As a matter of fact there is a certain dualism in his idea of the Church. On the one hand he is the predestinarian who conceives of the Church as the company of the elect, the *communio sanctorum*, who have the Spirit of God and are characterized by true love. The really important thing is to belong to the Church so conceived, and not to be in the Church in a merely outward sense and to partake of the sacraments. It is through the intercession of this community that sins are forgiven and that gifts of grace are bestowed. The real unity of the saints and therefore of the Church is an invisible one. At the same time it exists only within the catholic Church, for it is there only that the Spirit works and that true love dwells.

另一方面，奧氏也是一個主張主教制的人（重譯：奧氏也是一位認同有形教會的人），一般說來他持守居普良的教會觀，認為真正的教會就是大公教會，而在這個教會中，使徒的權威透過主教的繼承而延續下去，且教會將不斷擴展下去；（重譯：真正的教會就是大公教會，在此教會中，使徒的權威透過主教的繼承延續下去。教會不斷在世界各地擴展；）而在教會之外就無救恩，因為人只有在教會內才能被愛充滿得著聖靈；而教會的聖禮不僅僅是一種象徵，乃神能力實際的應用（重譯：神的能力實際施展，），在洗禮中神真的藉此赦免人的罪，在主餐中真實地給人屬靈的復甦；在這個教會中雖有各形各色的人，（加：有好的也有邪惡的會友；）但是論到完全的純潔則在將來才會實現。

On the other hand he is the Church-man, who holds to the Cyprianic idea of the Church, at least in its general aspects. The true Church is the catholic church, in which the apostolic authority is continued by Episcopal succession. It is spread throughout the world, and outside of it there is no salvation, for it is only within its pale that one is filled with love and receives the Holy Spirit. Its sacraments are not merely symbols, but are also accompanied with an actual exertion of divine energy. God really forgives sins in baptism, and in the Lord's Supper actually gives spiritual refreshment to the soul. For the present this Church is a mixed body, in which good and evil members are present, but it is destined for perfect unity in the future.

多納徒派人士批評奧古斯丁將教會分成兩個：現今混雜的教會與將來在天上的純潔教會。奧氏為了回答他們，他主張現今的大公教會也有純潔性，但是在客觀的組織上，即在教會的職份，如大主教、主教、神父等，聖禮與管理上當力求純潔（重譯：他在客觀的組織上，即在教會的職份，如大主教、主教、神父等，聖禮與各種的事工上，尋找大公教會的純潔性；）；除此以外，奧氏也護衛一個主觀上的聖潔，雖然他承認教會中有好的有壞的信徒混雜一起，但是他卻主張這兩類人同時存在，並不具有相等的意義，雖然那惡的人不能從教會外部的組織上除去，但是就內部來說，他與真正敬虔的人氏分離的，他們雖屬於教會卻不在教會裏，他們氏即督身體裏的毒瘤，一定要被鏟除掉。如此在思想上奧古斯丁影響了多那徒派思想在生活中實踐的純潔性（重譯：如此，奧古斯丁實現了多那徒派試圖在生活上實踐的教會純潔性）。

The Donatists criticized Augustine by saying that he split the Church into two Churches, the mixed Church of the present and the pure Church of the future in heaven. In answer to them he maintained the purity of the one catholic Church also in the present, but sought it more particularly in the objective institution with its offices, sacraments, and ministrations. In addition to that, however, he also defended a certain subjective purity. While he admitted that good and evil members were commingled in the Church, he held that these two were not in it in exactly the same sense. While the wicked cannot be outwardly excluded, they are nevertheless inwardly separated from the pious: they belong to the house, but are not in the house; they are the evil tumours in the body of Christ that are destined to be sloughed off. Thus Augustine effected in thought the purity which the Donatists sought to realize in real life.

5 · 奧古斯丁論神國

Augustine on the Kingdom of God.

在這裏還有一點值得考慮的，就是奧氏論神國的教義。早期教父用「神國」一名詞來描述教會發展的結果與目標，也就是所說末世論的國度（重譯：即是末世的國度）。但奧古斯丁說：『教會在現今就是天國。』雖然他也把這意思用在教會的領袖身上，可是他說這話的主要意思是，聖徒組成了神的國。雖然神的國在本質上來說，是那些敬虔的生徒，但是也是有組織的教會，在上帝之城與世界之城間的對比，被認為是基督教與異邦主義、善與惡、教會內的聖徒與惡人、屬靈的與屬肉體的、蒙揀選與未蒙揀選之間的對照。

Another point to be taken into consideration here, is Augustine's doctrine of the Kingdom of God. The earlier Church Fathers used the term "Kingdom of God" to describe the result and goal of the Church's development, that is, as the designation of the eschatological Kingdom. But Augustine says: "The Church is even now the Kingdom of Heaven." By this he means primarily that the saints constitute the Kingdom of God, though he also applies the term to the leaders of the Church collectively. While the Kingdom is essentially identical with the pious and the holy, it is also the episcopally organized Church. The contrast between the city of God and the city of the world (or, of the devil) is regarded as equivalent to that between Christianity and heathenism, between the good and the bad (including angels and devils), between the saints and the wicked even within the Church, between the spiritual and the carnal, between the elect and the non-elect. The evil world is never represented as *equivalent* to the State, but since the *civitas Dei* may be and is frequently conceived as the empirical Church, it is possible that – as is frequently said – he thought of the *civitas mundi* as finding its concrete embodiment in the State.

奧古斯丁的觀念缺乏綜合性。

Want of Synthesis in Augustine's View.

在奧古斯丁有關教會分歧的觀念中缺乏綜合性，但值得懷疑的是，到底實際情況中是不是真能有綜合性呢？茲提出一些問題之三重回答來回答這些問題。可以說：誰在教會中？a. 一切預定得救的人，包括未悔改之人。 b. 一切信者，包括那

退後之人。c. 所有參與聖禮之人。可是問題又來了，那一個是真教會呢？是受洗禮者的外部交通，還是選民與聖徒的屬靈交通呢？抑或二者都是，因為在外部交通和屬靈交通之外沒有救恩？此外為選民組成的教會，與信者所組成的教會，怎麼能發生關係而有聯繫呢？我們可以清楚發現，因為信者當中有些人不是在被選之列，所以後來也是滅亡了，二者可說毫無關係。當奧古斯丁說，沒有一個人有了神為父而不在教會中的時候，他說的就是那有形的大公教會。自然問題又發生了，關於那些未曾加入教會的選民又將如何呢？再者，假如有形的大公教會，如奧古斯丁所主張的，就是基督的真身體，這豈不證明多納徒派所爭論，惡人與異端者不能容留於教會的論點是真實的嗎？再有，假如這個教會是以神預定的恩典為根基，那麼曾經接受重生之恩與在洗禮中罪的赦免的人，怎麼能再失去恩典而得救呢？最後，如果神是諸多恩典的唯一來源，而且此恩典優勢隨祂己意來分配的，那麼要把這個能力歸給有形教會的洗禮，又靠教會組織成為會員來得救，這樣做可以被認為是適當的嗎？關於這一點，可以說奧氏對預定的見解，使得他與他同一時代的人，遠離了聖禮主義的方向。

Augustine did not effect a true synthesis of his divergent views respecting the Church, and it may well be questioned whether such a synthesis is possible. Harnack calls attention to the fact that in Augustine “the *externa societas sacramentorum*, which is *communio fidelium et sanctorum*, and finally also the *numerus praedestinatorum* are one and the same Church.” *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, p. 362. Consequently a threefold answer may be given to the question, Who are in the Church? It may be said: (A) all the predestinated, including those who are still unconverted; or (b) all believers, including those who will relapse; or (c) all those who have part in the sacraments. But then the question arises, Which is the true Church, the external communion of the baptized, or the spiritual communion of the elect and the saints, or both, since there is no salvation outside of either? Moreover, how is the Church, as constituted of the number of the elect, related to the Church as the communion of the faithful? They are clearly not identical, for some may be of the faithful who are not of the elect and are finally lost. And when Augustine says that no one has God for a Father, who does not have the Church, that is the one visible catholic Church, for a mother, the question naturally arises, What about the elect who never join the Church? Again, if the one visible catholic Church is, as he maintains, the true body of Christ, does not this prove the contention of the Donatists that wicked persons and heretics cannot be tolerated in it? Once more, if the Church is founded on the predestinating grace of God, how is it possible that they who have once received the grace of regeneration and the forgiveness of sins in baptism, should lose this again and thus forfeit salvation? And, finally, if God is the only absolute source of all grace and dispenses it in a sovereign way, can it be considered proper to ascribe this power to the visible Church with its sacraments, and to make salvation dependent on membership in that organization? In connection with this point it may be said that Augustine’s predestination views kept him from going as far as some of his contemporaries did in the direction of sacramentalism.

II. 中古時期 IN THE MIDDLE AGES

（補譯：很突出的事實是，雖然中古世紀時期的神學家對於教會的言論很少，因此對教會論的發展並沒有太多的貢獻，可是教會本身發展成為一個有高度組織和絕對權威的架構。這事實的根源乃是居普良的著作，和奧古斯丁關於外部教會的教導。奧氏另外一個基本的觀念：教會乃是聖徒的交通 *communio sanctorum*，則完全被忽略。）

It is a striking fact that, while the theologians of the Middle Ages have very little to say about the Church, and therefore contribute but few elements to the development of the doctrine of the Church, the Church itself actually developed into a close-knit, compactly organized, and absolute hierarchy. The seeds for this development were found in the writings of Cyprian and in the teachings of Augustine respecting the Church as an external organization. The other and more fundamental idea of the great Church Father, that of the Church as the *communio sanctorum*, was entirely disregarded and thus remained dormant.

在中古世紀時期有兩項較顯著的觀念，那就是天主教的權勢佔了優勢，與以教會為神國的觀念。（重譯：那就是：（一）羅馬教會的權勢在所有教會以上，和（二）教會就是神國的觀念。）

Two ideas became very prominent during the Middle Ages, namely, that of the primacy of Rome, and that of the identity of the Church and the Kingdom of God.

1. 教皇觀念的發展。

Development of the Papal Idea.

在主後四、五世紀的時候，教會的遺傳非常盛行，說基督將那首要的權柄賜給了彼得，使他超過其他使徒以上，並且說彼得是羅馬天主教的第一任教皇；此外，據說這個首要的地位傳遞給了他的繼承者，就是帝國基層的主教（重譯：就是帝國首都羅馬的主教）。主後五三三年，拜占庭皇帝遮斯丁承認羅馬主教的權位，在所有其他區域的主教以上；貴勾利一世時拒絕「普遍主教」（重譯：『普世性主教』）的稱呼，但是在六零七年，這名稱又加給他的繼承者波尼法修第三，而波氏也接受了。此後，羅馬的基層主教屬靈的權勢在西方世界中廣被接納，這就是天主教教皇制度的開始。這樣一來，教會就接納了外部有形的元首，不久就演變成一個無上的主權者。

The tradition gained currency in the fourth and fifth centuries that Christ had given Peter an official primacy over the other apostles, and that this apostle had been the first bishop of Rome. Furthermore, it was asserted that this primacy was passed on to his successors, the bishops of the imperial city. This idea was not only fostered by successive bishops, but also appealed to the popular imagination, because at the fall of the Western Empire it seemed to contain a promise of the renewal, in another form, of the ancient glories of Rome. In the year 533 the Byzantine Emperor Justinian recognized the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the occupants of the other patriarchal sees. Gregory the Great still refused the title "Universal Bishop," but in 607 it was conferred on his

successor, Boniface III, who had no scruples in accepting it. From this time on the spiritual primacy of the succeeding bishops of Rome was generally honoured in the West, though strenuously resisted in the East. It marks the beginning of Popery. The Church thus received an external and visible head, who soon developed into an absolute monarch.

2·教會被認同為神的國。

Identification of the Hierarchical Church with the Kingdom of God.

隨之而來的發展就是大公教會即為神的國，因此天主教的管區就是屬世的國，這種觀念受到兩種偽造的鼓舞：君士坦丁的貢獻與偽造的教宗喻令。這二者在當時都是欺騙百姓，藉此來證明教皇的權威，是早在第三世紀時的教皇就頒佈授與的了。

Alongside of this the idea developed that the Catholic Church was the Kingdom of God on earth, and that therefore the Roman bishopric was an earthly kingdom. This notion was greatly encouraged by two notorious forgeries, the "Donation of Constantine" and the "Forged Decretals," both of which were foisted upon the people in the ninth century to prove that the authority then claimed by the Popes had been conferred upon, and exercised by, their predecessors as early as the third century.

把有形的與有組織的教會當成是神的國這件事，有很深遠的結果。如果只有教會是神的國，那麼所有基督徒的本份與活動就都必須投給教會，因為基督教說到這個國度，是所有基督徒所該努力的最高目標，而自然生活與社會生活對教會來說，不過是次要的生活而已；一切不受教會管轄的，都被認為是世俗的，若要拋棄或拒絕它，將被認為是虔敬的事；隱士與修道士的生活則被視為罪偉大的理想生活。

The identification of the visible and organized Church with the Kingdom of God had important and far-reaching consequences. If the Church alone is the Kingdom of God, then all Christian duties and activities must take the form of services rendered to the Church, for Christ speaks of the Kingdom as the highest good and as the goal of all Christian endeavour. Natural and social life thus assumed a one-sided churchly character. All that did not come under the control of the Church was considered as purely secular, and its renunciation became a work of special piety. The life of hermits and monks stood out as a grand ideal.

還有一個結果，就是將不當的意義加在教會外部的組織上，怎麼說呢？因為神的國在新約中，不但被解說為基督徒生活的目的，而且也是基督徒蒙福的總結，因此按照這種說法，救恩一切的祝福，藉著教會的條例、法令、儀式才臨到人，若沒有這些禮節上的用途（重譯：若不使用這些禮節），要想得救是不可能的。

Another result was that an undue significance was ascribed to the outward ordinances of the Church. The Kingdom of God is represented in the New Testament, not only as the aim of the Christian life, but also as the sum-total of Christian blessedness. Consequently, all the blessings of salvation were thought of as coming to man through

the ordinances of the Church. Without their use salvation was considered to be impossible.

將神的教會當成神的國的結果，導致了教會真正的世俗化，教會既然被認為是外部的國度，就自覺有責任解說、維護她與世界國度的關係，那麼久而久之就只關心政治，而忽略了人得救之事，世俗化代替了永世的追慕。教皇有鑒於神國至高的特質，以及神國包羅萬象的護理，所以認為應該透過要求皇帝服從教會的統治，來實現國度的理想。這就是諸如貴勾利第七、英諾森三世與波尼法修八世教皇的野心。

And, finally, the identification of the Church and the Kingdom led to the practical secularization of the Church. As an external kingdom the Church felt in duty bound to define and defend its relation to the kingdoms of the world, and gradually began to pay more attention to politics than to the salvation of souls. Worldliness took the place of other-worldliness. It was but natural that the Roman Pontiffs, in view of the superior character of the Kingdom of God and of its all-comprehensive destiny, should seek to realize the ideal of the Kingdom by demanding of the emperors subjection to the rule of the Church. This was the consuming ambition of such great Popes as Gregory VII (Hildebrand), Innocent III, and Boniface VIII.

3·羅馬天主教的教會觀。

Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Church.

在宗教改革之前，羅馬天主教的教會觀，就已經明確的規定了，後來在天特會議中，不敢討論教會的定義，乃因當權者還是願意教皇制度存在的緣故。他們還沒預備好要承認教會的權柄根本是屬於教皇的，也不承認主教是從教皇得權柄，但卻主張主教是由基督直接而得權者。這樣衝突的見解，使得他們要用明文來制定教會的意義到底是什麼。

（重譯：羅馬天主教的教會觀，要到宗教改革之後才正式規定下來。可是，要了解天主教的教會觀，最好是正視這時期定規的最後形式，因為在宗教改革已經這個觀念已經存在在天主教內；再者，若要知道基督教的教會觀，最好先有天主教的教會觀作為背景。天特會議沒有為教會作出一個定義；這是因為，雖然教會最高的領袖願意承認教皇制度，可是不少主教們的堅持主教的權力。後者不願意承認教會所有的權柄主要都在教皇手中，主教的權柄來自教皇；反之，這些主教認為主教的權柄乃直接來自基督。這兩種觀點的衝突，使為教會作出定義不很適當。）

It was not until after the Reformation that the Roman Catholic conception of the Church was officially formulated. Yet it is best to call attention to the form it finally assumed at this point, because the idea already found actual embodiment in the Church of Rome before the Reformation, and because the Protestant conception is best understood when seen against the background of the Roman Catholic idea of the Church. The Council of Trent did not venture upon a discussion of the proper definition of the Church. This was due to the fact that, while the highest officials of the Church desired recognition of the papal system, a great number of the bishops were thoroughly Episcopal in their ideas. They were not ready to admit that all ecclesiastical authority belongs primarily to the Pope, and that the bishops derive their authority from him; but held that the bishops

derive their authority directly from Christ. This clashing of views made it imprudent to attempt the formulation of a definition of the Church.

可是天特要理問答，卻把教會界說為「所有信者得團體，有一個無形的元首基督，及一個有形的元首，就是彼得的繼承者，佔有羅馬天主教的教區。」而天主教最有名的大主教伯喇爾明，也對天主教的教會觀提出了清楚的說明，根據他的說法，教會乃是「本著承認同一的基督信仰而結合，引用同一的聖禮，在合法牧師的指導之下，並基督在世上的代理人，即天主教教皇治理之下的團體。」這個定義的頭一句（承認同一的信仰），將不信的人排除在外；第二句（同一聖禮的使用），將使用規定不合者排除在外；第三句（服從天主教教宗），則將天主教以外的一切教派，（加譯：天主教認為這些是分裂教會分子，）如希臘的基督徒等排除在外。

The Tridentine Catechism, however, defines the Church as “the body of all the faithful who have lived up to this time on earth, with one invisible head, Christ, and one visible head, the successor of Peter, who occupies the Roman see.” Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621) surpasses all others of his day in giving a clear representation of the Roman Catholic conception of the Church. According to him the Church is “the company of all who are bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and by the use of the same sacraments and are under the rule of legitimate pastors and principally Christ’s vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff.” The first clause of this definition (profession of the same Christian faith) excludes all unbelievers; the second (use of the same sacraments), catechumens and those that are excommunicated; and the third (obedience to the Roman Pontiff) all schismatics, such as the Greek Christians.

論到天主教的教會觀，應注意下列幾點：

The following particulars should be noted in connection with the Roman Catholic conception of the Church:

a · 教會的有形性質

1. Visible Nature of the Church.

天主教教會特別著重教會的有形性，而認為教會有形性可見之原因，乃在於神聖聖道的具體化 (incarnation)。因為神的道不能降入人心，只能夠像人一樣在人中出現，並藉著人為有形的媒體來執行祂的工作；而教會甚至被認為是道成肉身的繼續，那麼基督自己藉著委派使徒，並且委任他們中之一人（彼得）為他們之首，就組織了教會。教皇就是彼得的繼承人，主教就是其他使徒的繼承人，前者持有直接於絕對的權威，而後者僅有從教皇而來一點點的權威。

The visible nature of the Church is strongly emphasized. The ultimate reason for the visibility of the Church is found in the *incarnation* of the divine Word. The Word did not descend into the souls of men, but appeared as a man among men, and in harmony with this appearance now carries on His work through a visible human medium. The Church can even be regarded as a continuation of the incarnation. Christ Himself provided for the organization of the Church by appointing the apostles and by placing one of them (Peter) at the head of the apostles. The Popes are the successors of Peter, and the

bishops, of eh apostles in general. The former possess direct and absolute authority, while the latter have only a limited authority derived from the Popes.

b · 教會的教導與信仰（重譯：教導的教會，相信的教會）

2. Teaching and Hearing Church.

在教導的教會與相信的教會之間，有一個很重大的區別，前者包括從其教會之首而來全部的教訓，後者包括尊敬牧師權威的所有信者。天主教認為教會最重要的屬性就是教導，因她認為自己是大公的、獨一的、屬使徒的、無謬的與永遠的教會，除此以外她都不承認別的教派為教會，因此她採取了毫不容忍的態度來反對其他的教會。而教會裏的聽眾，是以教導的教會為依存。

A very important distinction is made between the teaching church (*ecclesia docens*) and the hearing, learning or believing church (*ecclesia audiens, discens, or credens*). The former consists of the whole clerus with the Pope at its head; the latter, of all the faithful who honour the authority of their lawful pastors. It is primarily to the *ecclesia docens* that the Roman Catholic ascribes the attributes which he applies to the Church. She is the one only, catholic, apostolic, infallible, and perpetual Church, which denies all others the right of existence, and therefore assumes an intolerant attitude over against them. The *ecclesia audiens* is altogether dependent on it, and has part in the glorious attributes of the Church only in a derivative manner.

c · 教會的身體與靈魂

3. Body and Soul of the Church

教會像人一樣，是由身體與靈魂合成的，教會的靈魂就包括那些信基督，並藉著超自然的恩典、恩賜、與基督聯合的社團。並非所有的選民都在教會的靈體裏，也不是所有在教會靈體裏的人都是選民，因為至終有人墮落了；有些不在教會組織體裏的人，不一定不在教會的靈體裏，即如一些慕道友在沒有加入教會前已經得到了主的恩典。而教會組織體，就是那些承認真信仰的人們，不拘他們是罪人或義人，只有受洗的人是屬於教會的，但有些受洗的人卻還沒有屬於教會，亦即他還未受主恩典，還未成成為真教會之一員。

The Church is made up, like a human person, of body and soul. The soul of the Church consists at any particular time of “the society of those who are called to the faith of Christ, and who are united to Christ by supernatural gifts and graces.” Not all the elect are in the soul of the Church; neither are all those who are in it elect, since there are always some that fall away; and some of those who are not in the body of the Church may be in the soul, such as catechumens possessing the necessary graces. The body of the Church is the society of those who profess the true faith, whether they be just or sinners. Only baptized persons belong to the Church; but some baptized persons, such as catechumens, do not yet belong to it.

d · 教會分配救恩

4. The Church Dispenser of Grace

基督把罪人所賺的恩典與祝福分配給教會，祂乃是完全藉神父的代理來執行，結果教會這機構，在邏輯上來說是先於機體，換句話說有形教會是在無形教會之先。

In the Church Christ distributes the fullness of those graces and blessings which He merited for sinners. He does this exclusively through the agency of the clergy, that is, through the legitimate officers of the Church. Consequently, the institute of the Church logically precedes the organism, the visible Church precedes the invisible. The Church is a *mater fidelium* before she is a *coetus fidelium*. The *ecclesia docens* precedes the *ecclesia audiens*, and is far superior to it.

e · 教會是救恩的機構

5. The Church Institute of Salvation.

教會就是一個得救的機構（重譯：教會就是一個分配救恩的機構），即救人的方舟，這樣說來她有三項的功能：（1）藉著傳道來宣揚真信仰；（2）藉聖禮使人成聖；（3）遵照教會法規來治理信徒。只有教導的教會才能做這些事，因此嚴格說來，教會就是教導的教會，她在基督之下是人得救的唯一中保，她並將救恩分賜給眾人，是全人類得救唯一的方舟。得救的次序並不是神藉著祂的道印人道教會，正相反，是教會靈人明白道，而進入基督裏。

The Church is exclusively an institute of salvation, a saving ark. As such she has three functions: (1) to propagate the true faith by means of the ministry of the Word; (2) to effect sanctification by means of the sacraments; and (3) to govern believers according to ecclesiastical law. But it is only the *ecclesia docens* that can do all this. Strictly speaking, therefore, she constitutes the Church. She is (under Christ) the only Mediator of salvation, the depository and distributor of grace for all men, and the only ark of safety for the entire human race. The order in the work of salvation is, not that God by means of his Word leads men to the Church, but just the reverse, that the Church leads men to the Word and to Christ.

聖禮論的發展史
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS
 (from Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 242-256.)

I · 聖禮總論
THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

1 · 宗教改革前聖禮教義的發展
[a] Development of the Doctrine before the Reformation

『聖禮』(Sacraments)一詞，是從拉丁文 *sacramentum* 而來的，意思是指著基督教一切奇妙與難以瞭解的事，而這字原來是指著兵丁入伍時的宣誓。

(重譯：『聖禮』(Sacraments)一詞，是從拉丁文 *sacramentum* 而來的，武加大聖經用此字來翻譯希臘文的 *mysterion*；後者是新約聖經用來指舊約中沒有顯明的事。此字後來有另外的涵意，指基督教和其他宗教中所有奧秘與難以了解的事，包括奧秘的行動與事物。拉丁文的 *sacramentum* 一字後來也有了這重意義，而這個拉丁字本來是指兵丁入伍時所必須作的宣誓，或在律法控訴時作為保證金的款項；官司若打輸了，錢歸政府或歸諸神。)

The term “sacraments” is derived from the Latin *sacramentum*, by which the Vulgate rendered the Greek *mysterion*, which is used in the New Testament to designate something that was not revealed in the Old Testament, but later on it acquired another connotation. It became the designation of all that was mysterious and incomprehensible in the Christian religion and in other religions, including mysterious actions or things. This meaning of the term was also transferred to the Latin word *sacramentum*, which originally designated an oath required of a soldier, or a sum of money deposited as security in cases of litigation and forfeited to the State or to the gods, if the case was lost.

a · 早期教會的聖禮觀
Sacraments in the Early Church.

在早期基督教世代中，『聖禮』一詞有廣泛的應用，凡具有神聖意義的任何事，都可以用 *sacramentum* 一詞。特土良把創造之工、道成肉身之子的工作（特別是指著祂的死），都當做聖禮；至於十字架的記號、神父的封立。婚禮、趕鬼、守安息日，也都稱做聖禮。同時，這名詞主要是用在洗禮與聖餐上。

This accounts for the fact that the word “sacrament” had a rather wide application in the early Christian centuries. It could be used of anything to which the idea of sanctity could be attached. Tertullian applies it to the works of the Creator, and to the work of the incarnate Son, particularly His death. The sign of the cross, the salt that was given to the catechumens, the ordination of the priests, marriage, exorcism, the celebration of the Sabbath – they were all called sacraments. At the same time the term was applied predominantly to baptism and the Lord’s Supper. The same loose usage of the term is found in the writings of Augustine, Hilary, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and others.

b · 經院時期的聖禮（觀）

The Sacraments in the Scholastic Period.

大體來說，經院時期的學者是遵循奧古斯丁的聖禮觀，他們認為聖禮是一個可見的記號，是無形恩典的媒體。至於聖禮數目的多寡，則隨各主張而不同，有些甚至主張三十種之多，蕭俄 (Hugo of St. Victor) 就是其中之一；而蘭巴德是首先提出天主教七項聖禮的人，後來於一四三九年佛勞倫斯會議中，正式採納蘭氏的提案。這七項聖禮是：洗禮、堅振禮、聖餐禮、補贖禮、神父奉獻禮、婚禮與抹油禮。

On the whole it may be said that the Scholastics followed the Augustinian conception of the sacraments as visible signs and mediums of an invisible grace. There was no unanimity as to their number which ranges all the way from five to thirty (Hugo of St. Victor). Peter the Lombard was the first to name the well-known seven of the Roman Catholic Church. In virtue of the fact that his *Sententiae* became the general handbook of theology, his private opinion soon became a *communis opinio*, and finally the Council of Florence officially adopted these seven in 1439: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, priestly consecration, marriage, and extreme unction.

聖禮數目的範圍，當然是逐漸地減少，但聖禮屬靈成份卻未能清楚地加以解說，至於用什麼方法來執行聖禮，也沒有清楚的說明。奧古斯丁有的時候執行聖禮是根據領受者的信心，因此使得外部的聖禮，只不過成為神在人心中工作的印象而已，這種觀念在經院時期所盛行的見解中可清楚看出。而事實上這種觀念有的時候是很佔優勢，那也就是說，聖禮本身並不真包括神的恩典，只不過是象徵而已。此見解在波拿文土拉於丟蘭達斯的著述中可找到，又因為敦司蘇格徒 (John Duns Scotus) 的贊同，使得此種見解在中古世紀盛行起來。

This restriction of the number of sacraments naturally led to the delimitation of the concept. A doctrine of the sacraments was still a desideratum: the relation of the sensible to the spiritual element was not clearly defined; neither was there a clear representation of the manner in which the sacraments work. Augustine had occasionally made the operation of the sacraments so dependent on faith in the recipient, that the external sacrament became only an image of what God works in the soul. This notion was also clearly reflected in one of the views that was prevalent in the scholastic period and which, in fact, was dominant for some time, namely, that the sacraments do not contain but only symbolize grace, though God has covenanted to accompany the use of the sacraments with a direct operation of His grace in the souls of the recipients. This view is found in Bonaventura and Durandus, and became the prevailing one in the Middle Ages through the advocacy of Duns Scotus.

可是除了這種見解之外，還有另外一種見解，主張神的恩典真在有形的聖禮之中。這並不是說神恩典的永久能力存在可見的酒、餅、水中，乃是說『執行聖禮時，分別為聖的話語，在外部表記上發生屬靈的功效；屬靈的功效若沒有達到，在聖禮中就談不上有什麼神的恩典。』蕭俄與阿奎那多馬贊同此見解，最後也為教會所接納。

Alongside of this view, however, there was another, namely, that grace truly resides in the visible sacrament. This does not mean that it resides in the visible elements as a permanent power, but that “the words of the institution effect a spiritual *virtus* (efficacy) in the external sign, which resides in the latter until this *virtus* has accomplished its end.” Hugo of St. Victor and Thomas Aquinas advocated this view, which was finally adopted by the Church.

關於聖禮的執行是否在乎受禮者有否資格，或執行聖禮者有否資格的問題，經院學派趨向因功生效(*ex opera operato*) 的觀點，那就是說，乃在乎客觀上的執行。當然意思就是說，得到聖禮之恩補在乎領受者的屬靈狀況如何，也不在乎執行聖禮神父的品格如何，只要為了接受聖禮而準備好，就能得到報償。因功生效的聖禮行為，使得新約的聖禮被認為較舊約更優越。

In connection with the question, whether the operation of the sacraments depends in any way on the worthy or unworthy reception or administration of them, Scholasticism gravitated to the opinion that they are effectual *ex opera operato*, that is, in virtue of their objective administration. This means, of course, that the reception of sacramental grace is not dependent on the spiritual devotion of the recipient, nor on the character of the officiating priest, though a spiritual preparation for the reception of the sacrament will certainly bring its reward. The working of the sacraments *ex opera operato* was considered to mark the superiority of the New Testament sacraments over those of the Old Testament.

c · 天特總會論聖禮

The Council of Trent on the Sacraments.

天特總會關於聖禮，通過了幾項決議，以下是其中最重要的幾點：（1）聖禮對救恩來說是必要的，那就是說，人必須要接受聖禮，最低限度是那些想要得救的人，可是這不能說每個人都需要聖禮。（2）聖禮中包含了其所表明的恩典，並且藉著執行聖禮，把因功生效的恩典賜給願意接受聖禮的人，也就是說不犯大罪或其他惡行的人，就能得到恩典。（3）執行聖禮的神父，只要以誠實的心來執行聖禮，也就是行教會所要行的，那就能達到聖禮的有效性了，但若由不具神父職份的人來執行聖禮，那就犯大罪了。（4）洗禮、堅振禮或封立禮，在領受者的心靈這一方面已經留下不可抹滅的印象，所以不可以重覆施行。（5）只有神父才是聖禮合法的執行人，可是堅振禮和封立禮則只能由主教來執行，在特殊情況下，才可由平信徒來執行洗禮。

The Council of Trent passed several decisions respecting the sacraments, of which the following are the most important: (1) The sacraments are necessary unto salvation, that is, they must be received or at least desired by those who would be saved. It cannot be said, however, that they *are* all necessary for every man. (2) They contain the grace which they signify, and confer this *ex opere operato*, or through the act performed, upon one who does not present an obstacle to their operation, such as a mortal sin or some other obstacle. (3) The intention of the officiating priest to administer the sacrament in all sincerity, doing what the Church intends, is essential to its validity. He must intend to do what the Church does, but for the rest may be in mortal sin. (4) The sacraments of

baptism, confirmation, and order (or, ordination) impress an indelible character on the soul of the recipient, and therefore are not repeated. (5) The priests, and the priests only are the legitimate administrators of the sacraments. However, confirmation and ordination can be administered by bishops only, and baptism may in cases of necessity be administered by laymen.

在洗禮與聖餐之外，天特總會還承認以下的聖禮：堅振禮、補贖禮、抹油禮、封立禮與婚禮。現在簡單的分述如下：（1）堅振也是一個聖禮，由主教按手、抹油禱告，使得那些已經受洗的人，領受聖靈七樣的恩典，因此他們能夠有能力承認他們的信仰，並且能很忠實地將他們信仰活出來。（2）補贖禮也是聖禮，藉此能使受洗後所犯的大罪得到赦免。（3）抹油禮，就是為那些將近死期的信徒，藉著膏抹聖油、藉著神父的祈禱來領受特別的恩典，並靠賴神的憐恤，以抵擋魔鬼最後的攻擊與試探。（4）封立禮就是把神父職份的全權傳遞給受禮者，同時使受禮者也領受執行職務的特殊恩典。（5）婚禮，即男女雙方在婚約中的結合，並且領受必須的恩典，信實地來實行婚約中的義務，一直到死為止。

Besides baptism and the Lord's Supper the following sacraments are recognized: confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination (orders), and marriage. These may be briefly described as follows: (1) Confirmation is the sacrament in which, through the bishop's laying on of hands, unction, and prayer, those already baptized receive the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit, so that they may steadfastly profess their faith, and faithfully live up to it. (2) Penance is the sacrament by which forgiveness for post-baptismal *mortal* sins is obtained by those who are heartily sorry for their sins, sincerely confess them, and are willing to perform the penance imposed upon them. (3) Extreme unction is the sacrament in which those who appear to be near death, by the anointing with holy oil, and by the prayer of the priest, receive special grace to confide in the mercy of God and to resist the final attacks and temptations of the devil. (4) Ordination or Holy Orders is the sacrament which communicates to those who receive it the full power of the priesthood, together with a special grace to discharge their duties well. (5) Marriage is the sacrament by which a man and a woman are joined in holy wedlock, and receive the necessary grace to discharge the duties of their state faithfully until death.

以下數點值得注意：（1）天主教認為在聖禮中所傳達的恩典，使是一種灌入式的成聖恩典，提昇人至一超自然的境域，使領受者有分於神的性情，這些聖禮被視為一超自然的恩賜，是從外面臨到人的。一般說來在聖經中與洗禮有關的罪得赦免，在天主教的教義中佔著不太重要的地位。（2）聖禮與聖道的關係，實際上來說是受到天主教的忽視。道已經來了，但卻只是預備性的意義，在人心中只能生發純歷史的信心，除非用愛心來傳道，亦即有恩典的澆灌，不然實際上是不能救人的。（3）信心並不是接受聖禮所傳恩典的絕對條件，此外尚須成聖之恩，而成聖之恩在聖禮中是以物質的姿態出現，藉著物質的東西以因功生效的方式傳達出來，並且是以領受著不在聖禮的路上放下障礙（犯大罪）為前題，才能領受聖禮中所傳達的恩典。

The following points deserve attention here: (1) Rome conceives of the grace communicated in the sacraments exclusively as an infused sanctifying grace that raises man to the supernatural order and makes him a partaker of the divine nature. It is

regarded as a supernatural gift that comes to man from without. The forgiveness of sins, which is generally connected with baptism in Scripture, occupies a relatively unimportant place in the system of Rome. (2) The connection of the sacraments with the Word is practically ignored. The Word has some, but only a preparatory significance in that it works a purely historical faith, which cannot really save, except when it is informed by love, that is, by a *gratia infusa*. Since this love is communicated only by the sacrament, the latter acquires an independent significance alongside of the Word and really surpasses it in value. (3) Faith is not an absolute requirement for the reception of the sacrament. Sanctifying grace is present as a material element in the sacrament, is communicated by it *ex opere operato*, and presupposes at most that the recipient places no insuperable obstructions in the way.

II · 洗禮 BAPTISM

1 · 宗教改革前洗禮教義的發展

Development of the Doctrine before the Reformation.

a · 早期教會論洗禮。

Baptism in the Early Church.

洗禮是信徒加入教會，最重要的一個聖禮。在使徒時代的教父中，我們得知洗禮是罪得赦免與傳達重生的工具，因此有些早期的教父們教導洗禮的重生 (Baptismal Regeneration)，然而這種說法的範圍還是受到限制：(1) 他們主張洗禮只能實行在成人身上，亦即只有在這些成人內裏有這樣期望的時候才能領受、生效。可是特土良認為，只要一接受洗禮，罪就得到赦免，不論領洗之人的內心如何。(2) 他們不認為洗禮是得重生的必要條件，但卻視洗禮為達到更新的最後步驟。

Baptism was foremost among the sacraments as the rite of initiation in to the Church. Even in the Apostolic Fathers we find the idea that it was instrumental in effecting the forgiveness of sins and in communicating the new life of regeneration. In a certain sense it may be said, therefore, that some of the early Fathers taught baptismal regeneration. Yet this statement requires some limitations: (1) They held baptism to be efficacious in the case of adults only in connection with the right inner disposition and purpose, though Tertullian seemed to think that the very reception of the rite carried with it the remission of sins. (2) They did not regard baptism as absolutely essential to the initiation of spiritual life, or the life of regeneration; but viewed it rather as the completing element in a process of renewal.

雖然特土良反對嬰兒洗禮，他的理由是認為年輕孩子沒有能力履行所立的約，認為這是不當的，可是嬰兒洗禮在奧利金、特土良的時代卻非常盛行。一般的見解認為，洗禮只需一次，不必重復再做，但對那些被信仰不純者施洗的是否有效，則莫衷一是。羅馬天主教認為有效，但居普良反對此點，結果前者佔了上風，致所主張的成為一固定原則，凡奉三位一體之神名施洗的，都不必再重復一次，都

可算為有效。再洗禮的方式尚並無爭議，雖然浸禮再當時被人採用，但卻不是唯一的方式，當然也並不認為是洗禮的唯一本質。

Infant baptism was evidently quite current in the days of Origen and Tertullian, though the latter opposed it on the ground of the inexpediency of placing young children under the heavy responsibility of the baptismal covenant. The general opinion was that baptism ought in no case to be repeated; but there was no unanimous opinion as to the validity of baptism administered by heretics. The bishop of Rome asserted that it could be regarded as valid, but Cyprian denied this. The former finally gained the upper hand, and it became a fixed principle not to re-baptize those who had been baptized according to the Trinitarian formula. The mode of baptism was not in dispute. While immersion was practiced, it was not the only mode, and certainly was not considered to be of the essence of baptism.

b · 奧古斯丁論洗禮。 **Augustine on Baptism.**

自第二世紀以降，洗禮觀逐漸地有所變革，在有增無減地辯論中，洗禮帶著神秘作為的觀念逐漸得勢。雖然奧古斯丁主張成年人接受洗禮的必要條件是信心與悔改，但是祂對聖禮帶有神秘性的觀念也加以贊助。可是論到嬰兒洗禮，他卻是採因功生效的立場，他主張嬰兒沒有受洗禮就死了，是滅亡的；而那些本著教會信仰受洗的嬰孩，則因著帶領他的大人的信仰而得救了。雖然一般認為洗禮能將人的原罪移除，但他解說洗禮的功效卻無法將人的舊性情挪除。雖然殉道被認為完全等於洗禮，但是洗禮卻被認為是絕對必須的。由於以上的這些事實，就可以證明嬰兒洗在當時是普遍地被實施了。

From the second century on, the conception of baptism gradually changed. The idea gained ground ever increasingly that the sacrament works more or less magically. Even Augustine promoted this view to some extent, though he considered faith and repentance as the necessary conditions of baptism in the case of adults. In the case of infants, however, he seems to have assumed that the sacrament was effective *ex opere operato*. He held that children which die unbaptized are lost, and that in the case of those who are baptized, the faith of the Church, represented by the sponsors, can be accepted as that of the child. Moreover, he maintained that baptism in every case impresses on the child a *character indelibilis*, in virtue of which it belongs by right to Christ and His Church. He defined the effect of baptism more specifically than was customary by stating that, while it wholly removes original sin as a matter of guilt, it does not wholly remove it as a corruption of nature. In general, baptism was now considered as absolutely necessary, though martyrdom was regarded as a full equivalent for baptismal washing. In view of these facts, it stands to reason that infant baptism was generally practiced.

c · 經院學派論洗禮。 **The Scholastic Conception of Baptism.**

經院學派最早是同意奧氏對洗禮的主張，即洗禮只施在成人身上，是以信心為前題，但後來卻逐漸地認為聖禮是因功生效，並且忽視了主觀條件的重要性，如

此便為羅馬教的洗禮觀鋪下道路，根據天主教的見解，洗禮就是重生的禮，就是加入教會的禮。

The Scholastics at first shared the view of Augustine, that baptism in the case of adults presupposes faith, but gradually began to consider the sacrament as effective *ex opere operato*, and to minimize the importance of subjective conditions. Thus the way was paved for the Roman Catholic conception of baptism, according to which it is the sacrament of regeneration and of initiation into the Church. It contains the grace which it signifies and confers it *ex opere operato* on all those who do not put an obstacle in the way. The grace so conferred is of the utmost importance, since it includes: (1) the *character indelibilis*, which brings one under the jurisdiction of the Church. (2) Deliverance (a) from the guilt of original sin and from the guilt of sins committed up to the time of baptism; (b) from the pollution of sin, though concupiscence remains as the fomenting agent of sin; and (c) from eternal punishment and also from all temporal punishments, except in so far as these are the natural results of sin. (3) Spiritual renewal by the infusion of sanctifying grace and of the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and love. (4) Incorporation into the communion of the saints, and into the visible Church of believers. Because of this importance of baptism, it was deemed quite essential that it should be administered as soon as possible, and in cases of necessity by laymen or even by non-Christians.

III · 聖餐 THE LORD'S SUPPER

1 · 宗教改革前聖餐教義的發展

Development of the Doctrine Before the Reformation.

a · 早期教會論聖餐

The Lord's Supper in the Early Church.

新約時代最初的聖餐是伴隨著普通的飯食，這些食物是由信徒各自帶去，當作禮物獻上，由主教禱告後食用。隨著時日的過去，由於這種習慣，聖餐得到了以下的名稱：獻祭、供物、感謝祭，都用在聖餐上。這些事的本身並沒有害處，但卻導致一種危險的發展，就是當牧職的觀念加強之後，主教成為神父，神父也就相當於舊約時期的祭司的時候，危機就來了。以後感謝祭就被認為是聖餐中餅與酒的奉獻禮，而聖餐本身擁有從祭司（主教）那兒所帶來祭牲獻祭的性格，這樣一來就影響到聖禮聯合性的表明。奧利金、猶西比烏、巴西流、拿多模、大馬色的約翰等人所主張的基督血、肉與聖餐中的酒、餅聯合的教義所取代，而後此觀念又傳入了聖餐化質說中。

At first the Lord's Supper was accompanied with a common meal, for which the people brought the necessary ingredients. These gifts were called oblations and sacrifices, and were blessed by the bishop with a prayer of thanksgiving. In course of time names derived from this practice, such as *prosporai* (oblations), *thusiai* (sacrifices), and *eucharistia* (thanksgiving), were applied to the Lord's Supper itself. This was rather harmless in itself, but led to a dangerous development, when the clerical idea was strengthened and the bishop became a priest. Then the thanksgiving was regarded as a

consecration of the elements in the Lord's Supper, and the Supper itself assumed the character of a sacrifice brought by the priest (bishop). This, in turn, affected the representation of the sacramental union. The symbolical or spiritual conception found in Origen, and essentially also in Eusebius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and others, was supplanted by the doctrine that the flesh and blood of Christ were in some way combined with the bread and wine in the sacrament (Cyril, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, John of Damascus), and this again passed into the doctrine of transubstantiation.

b · 奧古斯丁論聖餐 **Augustine on the Lord's Supper.**

聖餐的教義在西方教會的發展比較緩慢，但結果還是一樣。奧古斯丁認為聖餐可以說就是基督的身體，因為聖經上常常說餅與酒為基督的身體與血；...

In the West the development of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was slower, but led to the same result. Augustine admitted that the sacrament was in a sense the body of Christ, and in the language of Scripture often spoke of bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ. At the same time he clearly distinguished between the sign and the thing signified, and asserted that the substance of bread and wine remains unchanged. He stressed the commemorative aspect of the rite, and maintained that the wicked, though they may receive the elements, do not partake of the body. He even protested against the superstitious reverence that was paid to the ordinance by many in his day. In fact, the views of Augustine retarded the full development of the realistic theory for a long time.

c · 經院學派論聖餐 **Scholastic Development of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.**

在中古世紀奧古斯丁所教導的聖餐教義，逐漸被天主教所教導的聖餐教義取代的時候，於主後八一八年，正式解說聖餐中的餅和酒，節著神的能力，已經真的變成基督的身體和血，而物質外部的外貌，經過奉獻禮之後，只不過成為掩人耳目的遮蓋物。這教義為當時最有名的神學家所反對，特別是毛拉斯與拉特蘭努，他們指出，這新的教訓混淆了標記與所表明之物，並且用物質代替了信心。但此新的教義為葛伯特 (Gerbert) 與一零零三年所擁護，不久以後又成為雄辯的主題。一零五零年有伯仁傑起而堅稱，聖餐中的確有基督的身體同在，不是在本質 (Essence) 上，乃是在能力 (Power) 上；聖餐的元素改變了，但是物質沒有改變；為了求得這個改變與能力，不僅要有奉獻之禮，還必須有領受聖餐的信心。他的見解為藍福克 (一零八九年)、韓伯特 (一零五九年) 所反對，韓氏勉勉強強的作了以下的生命：「基督的身體真的被祭司的手所握住、擘開，被信徒的牙所咀嚼。」這個觀點最終為海德勃 (一一三四年) 所解說，餅被指稱為聖餐化質說 (Transubstantiation)。當主後一二一五年，第四次拉特蘭會議的時候，正式採納聖餐化質說為信條。此項教義為經院派的學者提供了許多難題，如：關於變質期間所受的影響、餅與杯與接受者之關係如何、基督以何方式在餅與杯中出現，對聖餐的敬重等等。

During the Middle Ages the doctrine as taught by Augustine gradually gave way for the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. In AD 818 Paschasius Radbert formally propounded the doctrine that the material elements in the sacrament are by divine power *literally changed into* the very body that was born of Mary, the outward appearance of bread and wine being, after consecration, a mere veil that deceives the sense. This doctrine was opposed by the foremost theologians of the day, and particularly by Rabanus Maurus and Ratramnus, who points out that the new teaching confounds the sign with the thing signified and replaces faith by a gross materialism. The new doctrine was defended, however by Gerbert (1003), and shortly after that became the subject of a furious controversy. About the year 1050 Berenger of Tours affirmed that the body of Christ is indeed present in the Eucharist, not in essence, but in power; that the elements are changed but not in substance; and that, in order to secure this change and power, not merely consecration, but faith on the part of the recipient as well is needed. His views were strenuously opposed by Lanfranc (1089) and Humbert (1059), who made the crass statement that “the very body of Christ was truly held in the priest’s hand, broken and chewed by the teeth of the faithful.” This view was finally defined by Hildebert of Tours (1133), and designated as the doctrine of *transubstantiation*. It became an article of faith, when it was formally adopted by the fourth Lateran Council in 1215. This doctrine suggested a good many problems to the Schoolmen, such as those respecting the duration of the change effected, the relation of substance and accidents, the manner of Christ’s presence in both elements and in every part of them, the adoration of the host, and so on.

d · 天特總會論聖餐

The Council of Trent on the Lord’s Supper.

天特總會論到聖餐，是記載在天特諭令第十三次會議記錄中之第八章第十一條條款，要旨如下：耶穌基督在聖禮中，真實具體地臨在。根據基督復活後坐在天父右邊地實施，祂自然能在任何地方同時出現，雖然我們無法解說這件事，但是我們卻能知道祂具體地臨在聖禮中，是有可能的。神父將餅與杯祝謝之後，這整個的餅與杯的本質就變成了基督的身體和血，所以凡領受餅與杯的仁，就是領受了整個基督。基督不只是神父說話時才同在，就是在未領餅與杯前，基督就與領受的人同在了，因為主在最後晚餐上，還未分餅與杯給門徒前，就稱那餅未祂的身體了。由於基督在聖餐中的臨在，所以對聖餐的敬重與紀念基督聖禮節，乃為當然之事。聖餐禮主要的結果乃是：『成聖之恩的增添；實際特別的恩典－小罪之赦免，免犯大罪；以及永遠救恩的盼望。』

The Council of Trent dealt with the subject of the eucharist as recorded in Sessio XIII of its Decrees and Canons. The gist of what is contained in eight Chapters and eleven Canons may be stated as follows: Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the holy sacrament. The fact that He is seated at the right hand of God according to the natural mode of existence does not exclude the possibility that He may be present in several other places at the same time according to a higher, spiritual and supernatural mode of existence. We may not be able to explain how, but we can conceive of the possibility of His substantial and sacramental presence in several places simultaneously. By the words of consecration the whole substance of bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Christ. The entire Christ is present under each

species and under each particle of either species, so that he who receives one particle of the host receives the whole Christ. he is present not only in the moment of the administration, but even before the reception of the elements by the communicant, since the Lord called the bread his body even before the disciples received it. In view of this presence of Christ in the eucharist the adoration of the host and the festival of the *Corpus Christi* are but natural. The chief effects of the sacrament are: “increase of sanctifying grace, special actual graces, remission of venial sins, preservation from grievous (mortal) sin, and the confident hope of eternal salvation.”

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 (πλασμα) 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 Hilgenfeld, 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 aeon 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 aeon 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：『眾人之父愿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 (γνῶσις) 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 γνῶσις, 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 (ἐπιγνῶσις) 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.)

『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 ἁγίου), 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....

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" (διαμονία), 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. ii. 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 (), body, intellect, and soul. For whatever things the philosophers and lawgivers excellently uttered or invented were wrought out buy them through the co-operation of the Logos in discovery or contemplation" (Just. Ap. ii. 10). Only germs () 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 () 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. lli. 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 () 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.).

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，其出發點是神，一個抽象的存在。神用祂的『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神。』...

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，從神到靈魂；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，和象征追求歸向神。整個思想系統有著音樂式的節奏：從神到靈魂，從靈魂到神。

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，雖然俄利根不完全一致。不過，俄利根是一位正統的基督徒。對他來說，《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 praedicatione*. “It seems necessary before [treating of] these separate points to lay down a certain line and a plain rule.”

這些基要的元素被組織起來，加上應用《聖經》的教訓，或《聖經》的必需推論。

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

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. 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”). 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。

“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. “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

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.” 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.” 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”).

在神性中完全同等；可是子是【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**

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. 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.

聖靈不想道，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

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?

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；
 上帝的創造是永恆的，子是中介；
 所有沒有身體的靈體都有自由意志；
 可是人：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;

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

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.” 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

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

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**

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

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**

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: “earn 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

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

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，頒布律法者，榜樣

基督帶新律法到世上：給全人類的

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

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**

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**

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**

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

[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

[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

[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.” 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.

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.*

早期教會信仰真偽辨 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH

上帝，聖父，聖子：我們的信仰 GOD, THE FATHER, AND THE SON: WHAT WE BELIEVE

1 · 上帝：一位格，三位格

GOD: ONE, PERSON, PERSONAL, THREE PERSONS

只有一位真神。宇宙並沒有兩位神（創造主 + 至高至善神：諾斯底主義）。
There is only one God. There aren't two gods (creator-demiurge, plus the highest God: Gnosticism).

上帝是位格。上帝不只是祂的屬性的總和。

God is a person. God is not just a bunch of attributes.

上帝是有位格的。祂在永恆裏計劃要創造人，與人建立（約的）關係。

God is personal. He planned (decreed) to create man and to establish a relationship (covenant) with man.

上帝是既有位格的，也是無限的。

God is both personal and infinite.

上帝是不可測度的，可是可以知道，可以認識的 – 藉著啟示。

God is incomprehensible, but knowable, through revelation.

上帝是三個位格。

God is 3 persons.

上帝同時是一個位格（一本質，一神格），也是三個位格。

God is both one person (one substance, one godhead), and three persons.

2 · 聖子：上帝的兒子，上帝的「道」

GOD THE SON (LOGOS)

我們稱聖父為「上帝」。我們也稱三位一體的上帝為「上帝」。

By “God” we mean the Father; by “God” we also mean the 3 persons.

聖子是神，不僅僅是一個神。聖子與聖父同質。

The Son is God, not a god. The Son is of the same substance as the Father.

不錯，聖子啟示聖父。可是聖子是聖子。祂是祂自己，不僅僅是父的形象，不僅僅是父的啟示。聖子自己是位格，祂是位格。

While the Son reveals (mediates) the Father, the Son is the Son. He is himself, not just a revelation (image) of the Father.

聖子不僅僅是神的理性。聖子是有自己的位格的。

The Son is not just “divine Reason.” The Son is personal.

聖子是神，不僅僅是多神論中間的一個神。更不是另外一個神，不是低等的神。

The Son is God (ho theos), not just a god (theos): definitely not “a second god.”

聖子與聖父同有全部的神性。聖子從來不是一個次等的神。

The Son is equal with the Father in divinity. The Son is not a lower god.

聖子是子（不是女兒，母親，父親...）。聖子有祂自己的存在模式。祂是以「子」的身份在永恆裏存在的。

The Son is the Son (not daughter, mother, father...): He has his own “mode of subsistence”.

3 · 父生子：「獨生」是必須（必然）的，不是偶然的，不是上帝的「旨意」 **THE FATHER BEGETS THE SON: GENERATION IS NECESSARY, NOT FREE, SOVEREIGN DECREE**

聖父在永恆裏從來就是聖子的父。

The Father is always, in eternity, the Father of the Son.

聖子在永恆裏從來就是聖父的子。

The Son is always, in eternity, the Son of the Father.

從來沒有一時刻，聖子不存在。

There never was a moment when the Son did not exist.

聖父在永恆裏生子，不是父的自由、主權行動；不是上帝計劃的一部份。

The eternal generation of the Son (the Father begets the Son) is not a free sovereign act of the Father; it isn't part of God's plan.

聖父在永恆裏生子，是三位一體上帝存在的方式。父與子是同永的。

The eternal generation of the Son is the very way in which god the Trinity exists.

聖父在永恆裏生子，是必須（必然）的，不是自由的、主權的。

The eternal generation of the Son is necessary, not free/contingent.

聖父在永恆裏生子，不是神性的放射。

Eternal generation is not emanation.

聖父在永恆裏生子，不是父上帝本質（神性）的分割。

Eternal generation is not division of a part of the Father.

父生子，不等於說，子比父有更少的上帝的本質；子比父有更少的上帝的屬性。

Eternal generation does not make the Son have less divine substance, or less attributes, than the Father.

4 · 聖子：位格

SON: A PERSON

聖子是一個位格：有上帝的所有的屬性。

The Son is a person – with (God's) attributes.

父的一切屬性，子都有，聖靈都有。

Every attribute which the Father has, the Son has, the Spirit has also.

聖子是一個位格：有祂的思想、感情、意志、計劃、關係。

The Son is a person – with his mind, will, emotions, plan, relationship.

聖子是一個位格：道成肉身並沒有使聖子成為第二個，另一個「道」（子）。

The Son is one person; incarnation doesn't make him a 2nd logos.

5 · 道成肉身

THE INCARNATION

聖子道成肉身；聖父並沒有道成肉身。

The Son became incarnate; the Father didn't become incarnate.

道成肉身的聖子是：100% 神，100% 人。

The incarnate Son is 100% divine, and 100% human.

聖子道成肉身的時候，不是不再是神，不是不再是三位一體的第二位。

The Son does not stop being 100% God, the 2nd person of the Trinity, after the Incarnation.

道成肉身的聖子是 100% 人：身體與靈魂。聖子所穿上的，是一個人性，不是一個人，不是一個位格。

The incarnate Son's human nature is 100% human: body and soul.

道成肉身，

道成肉身的聖子的人性是 100% 人：可是完全沒有罪性。

The incarnate Son's human nature is 100% human, but not sinful whatsoever.

三位一體的第二位取了 100% 人性：祂並不是只取了人的身體。

The 2nd person of the Trinity took on this 100% human nature; he didn't just take on the body alone.

三位一體的第二位取了 100% 人性，包括人的靈魂：這不是發生在永恆裏，乃是發生在道成肉身的時候。

The 2nd person of the Trinity took on this 100% human nature, including the soul; this happened at the Incarnation, not in eternity.

道成肉身的結果是：一個位格，神人二性一位格，一位耶穌基督。

The result of the incarnation is one person, one divine-human person, Jesus Christ.

耶穌基督的神性與人性並不是混合，而是完全的融合、結合、聯合 (united)。

In Jesus Christ the divine and human nature are not just co-mingled, but united in a perfect union.

這位 100% 上帝、100% 人的耶穌基督從死裏復活，升天，今天在天上。這位道成肉身的耶穌基督有一天要在歷史結束的時候以神人二性一位格回來。

It is this 100% God and 100% man, Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is in heaven today. This incarnate Jesus Christ will return one day at the end of history: two natures (100% God, 100% man), one person – Jesus Christ.

早期教會教義真偽辨：
 尼西亞會議 (325 AD) 前的上帝論，基督論
**TRUTH AND ERRORS IN THE EARLY CHURCH:
 THE DOCTRINE OF GOD AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST
 BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF NICEA (325 A.D.)**

F = False 誤 T = True 正

諾斯底主義：上帝，人，與宇宙的真相

GNOSTICISM: GOD, MAN, AND THE UNIVERSE

1. 誤：（諾斯底主義的世界觀）：宇宙不只一個神。最高的神是「純神性」（純存有）。祂的神性放射（像太陽光放射）給不同的靈體；神與靈體造成「豐滿」。
 F (worldview of Gnosticism): There are many gods. The highest good is pure divinity (pure Being). His divine nature is emanated (like sun rays from the sun) from him to other spiritual beings. He + all other spiritual beings = pleroma.
 正（愛任紐，特土良）：宇宙只有一位神。祂的神性不與任何其他活物分享：不與天使或人分享。不過，上帝造人是按照自己的形象造的：有些上帝的屬性是可以傳遞的。人是有限的；在有限的範圍裏，起初人是聖潔的，公義的，智慧的等。這些可傳遞的屬性都因為亞當犯罪墮落的緣故，受了污染。總的來說，上帝的屬性是不放射的。
 T (Irenaeus, Tertullian): There is only one God. His divine nature is not shared with anyone, not angels, not humans. Man, however, is created in God's image – certain attributes are “communicable”, in the sense that man, on our finite level, was holy, righteous, wise, powerful, etc.; all these were marred by sin after Adam's sin. But God's nature is not emanated to us.
2. 誤：人裏有神性，因此人性與神性只是量的不同，不是質的不同。
 F: There is (a spark of) divine nature in man. Therefore man's nature and God's nature are different only in degree, not in essence.
 正：創造主與被創造者之間有著絕對無限的區別。人性就不是神性。
 T: There is an absolute, infinite distinction between the Creator and the creature! Human nature simply IS NOT divine nature.
3. 誤（諾斯底派的教會儀式）：若要得救必須領受秘密儀式。
 F (Gnosticism church rites): Salvation requires secret ceremonies.
 正：要得救必須信靠基督，認罪悔改。洗禮是公開的儀式，教會作見證人。
 T: Salvation requires faith and repentance. Baptism is not secret, but a public testimony in the company of the whole church.
4. 誤（諾斯底主義，一些宗教，部份基督徒）：物質是邪惡的。
 F (Gnosticism, some religions, some Christians): Matter is evil.
 正：物質被造的時候是好的。物質是好的；上帝要我們享受祂所賜給我們的恩賜（如：食物），以祂規定的方法來享用（要節制）。我們若認為物質是

邪惡的話，要就是禁欲主義，不然就是無律法主義（放縱）。唯有正確的了解、使用、順服上帝的律法，才能避免律法主義與非律法主義。

T: Matter was created good. Matter is good; we are to enjoy the good gifts God has given us (e.g. food), in the way God wants us to enjoy them (in moderation). If we regard matter as evil, we either become ascetic or lawless. Only if we properly understand, use and submit to the law of God, can we avoid legalism and lawlessness (antinomianism).

5. 誤（諾斯底主義）：有兩個上帝；至善的神（無底的深淵），和創造主（舊約的神），後者是有激情，是次神。

F (Gnosticism): There are two gods: the highest good God (a bottomless abyss), and the Demiurge = Creator = God of the Old Testament. The latter is a lesser god who has passions.

正：只有一位神，祂是創造主，也是至善的救贖主。

T: There is only one God – He is the Creator and the all-holy Redeemer.

基督（基督教）與哲學

CHRIST (CHRISTIANITY) AND PHILOSOPHY

6. 誤：為了向知識分子傳福音，就以哲學配合真理，甚至以哲學解釋真理，取代真理。（革利免，奧利金。）

F: Christians want to share the gospel with intellectuals; out of this motive, they often take philosophy and tag it onto the truth. They use philosophy as a bridge. They end up interpreting truth according to philosophy, or even substitute the truth with philosophy. (Clement of Alexandria, Origen.)

正：哲學需要被真理批判，然後真理來改造哲學，救贖哲學。

T: Philosophy needs to be critiqued by the truth. Then the truth (from Scripture) transforms, re-shapes philosophy, and in this way truth redeems philosophy.

7. 誤：《聖經》與理性都是認識真理的泉源，途徑。（革利免，奧利金。）

F: Reason and Scripture are both paths to understanding truth. Reason and Scripture are two sources of truth. (Clement of Alexandria, Origen.)

正：唯有上帝是真理的泉源。認識真理，必須靠上帝的啟示，包括普遍啟示與特殊（聖經）啟示。人的理性已經墮落，需要啟示來改造，光照，才能正確地理解真理。

T: God only is the source of truth. To understand truth, man needs God's revelation, including general revelation and special revelation (=Scripture). Man's reason is fallen, man needs God to re-make his reason, enlighten his reason.

8. 誤：一些神學家堅守「信仰的準則」（《聖經》的權威），卻受世俗哲學深深影響（奧利金，20世紀眾多中、西「福音派」神學家）。

F: Some theologians submit to “the rule of faith” (the authority of the Bible), yet they are deeply influenced by secular philosophy (Origen, numerous so-called “evangelical” theologians in the 20th century, both western and Chinese).

正：堅持《聖經》的權威，就要從《聖經》的立場來批判哲學。

- T: When a Christian confesses that he/she submits to the authority of the Bible, then secular philosophy must be critiqued.
9. 誤：「道」將理性之光賜予人類，「道」的光幫助外邦人認識真理，為他們來到福音面前作踏腳石。（奧利金。）
- F: The Logos imparts to men the light of reason. The light of the Logos serves as a stepping stone for Gentiles to come to the fuller light of the gospel. (Origen.)
- 正：「道」將理性賜人類，可是人類誤用了理性，理性墮落了。現在的哲學並不是人原有理性的正確使用的結果，乃是誤用的結果。因此人的理性需要上帝光照，理性需要悔改，來到上帝面前服在真理之下。理性須被上帝被改造（羅 12：2：心意更新而變化）。
- T: The Logos (Christ) indeed gave reason/mind to man at creation. But man has misused his reason. Reason has fallen. Philosophy today is not the use of man's original reason, but the misuse of it. Therefore man's reason needs a fresh illumination by God. Man's reason needs to repent, needs to come to God and submit under him, and be transformed by him (Rom. 12:2).
10. 誤：神學家研究了哲學，如：新柏拉圖主義（奧利金）；然後寫系統神學，把世俗的哲學思想寫進基督教的系統神學。（如：今天中西眾多神學家。）
- F: Christians study philosophy (e.g. Origen studied neo-Platonism), then they write their systematic theology. As they do so, they write ideas from secular philosophy into their theology.
- 正：研究哲學是為了護教，為了批判哲學。寫系統神學時要黑白分明，批判世上的小學。
- T: We study philosophy for the purpose of apologetic, so that we can critique philosophy. When we write systematic theology, we must distinguish between truth and error, and critique secular philosophies.
11. 誤：基督（上帝的兒子）=「羅格斯」（道）=希臘哲學的「道」。（這個「道的教義」從殉道者游斯丁的時代開始。）
- F: Christ (the Son of God) = the Logos = the "Logos" of Greek philosophy. (This "Logos doctrine" began with the period of Justin Martyr.)
- 正：基督 = 自我見證的主，祂就是真理本身。祂不是一個人想出來的觀念，如：「絕對真理」，希臘哲學的「道」，或中國《道德經》的「道」。
- T: Christ is the self-attesting Lord who is truth. He is not a man-made concept like "absolute truth," the Greek "Logos," or the Chinese Taoist "Tao."
12. 誤：基督 / 上帝的兒子 = 神聖的「道」=「神聖的理性」= 非位格的屬性、能力。正如人有理性和靈，上帝也有理性（道，子）和靈（聖靈）。
- F: Christ/the Son of God = the Divine Logos = "divine reason" = an impersonal attribute and power. Just as man has a mind and spirit, so God has his reason (Logos) and his spirit (Holy Spirit).
- 正：基督，上帝的兒子 = 上帝，擁有所有聖父的屬性，所有聖靈的屬性。上帝的屬性包括：祂是主，永恆，無限，不變；智慧，權能，聖潔，公義，良善（愛，忍耐，恩典），真理。
- T: Christ/the Son = God, who has all the attributes of the Father and of the Spirit. Attributes of God include: Lordship; God is eternal, infinite, unchangeable; wise, powerful/sovereign, holy, just/righteous, good/gracious/loving, truth.

我們的上帝，就是《聖經》所宣講的上帝，是無限的，又是有位格的。異教、非基督教的上帝，要就是無限但非位格的（如：希臘哲學的「形式 / 理念」，「道」），不然就是有限但有位格的（如希臘神話中的神祇，中國民間宗教的神：關公，觀音，黃大仙等）。

Our God, the God of the Bible is both infinite and personal. Pagan/non-Christian gods are either infinite but impersonal (e.g. Greek “form,” “idea,” “Logos”), or finite and personal (the gods and goddess of Greek mythology and Chinese folk religion, e.g. Guan Gong, Guan Yin. Wong Tai Sin, etc.).

13. 誤：基督（上帝的「道」）= 一切人間真理、智慧的來源，因此：所有真理都是上帝的真理。哲學，心理學，文學的成果都是上帝的啟示。

F: Christ/the Logos of God = source of all enlightenment, source of all truth in men. Therefore: All truth is God’s truth. All philosophy, psychology, literature, etc. = God’s revelation.

正：基督（上帝的「道」）= 所有真理的來源。上帝創造人的時候賜人智慧，真理，聖潔與公義（創 1: 26-28，弗 4: 24）。可是人犯罪，從他原有的智慧，公義，聖潔墮落了。因此，現在人所追求的，若沒有上帝的幫助，必然是愚拙（林前 1: 18-31），是世上的小學（西 2: 8）。人所能達到的 – 哲學，心理學，藝術，文學 – 都不是上帝的啟示，不可能是上帝的啟示，而是墮落的罪人對上帝普遍群啟示的回應。基督並不為罪人的哲學與文化中對真理的扭曲和錯誤觀念負責！

T: Christ/Logos = source of all truth. Man was endowed with wisdom, truth, holiness and righteousness (Gen. 1:26-28, Eph. 4:24) when he was created; but man fell from his original wisdom, righteousness and holiness. Therefore what man seeks, without God’s help, is ultimately foolishness (I Cor. 1:18-31). Thus what man arrived at, in philosophy, psychology, art, literature, etc. is NOT God’s revelation. It CANNOT possibly be God’s revelation. Rather, these are sinful, fallen man’s responses to God’s general revelation. Christ is not responsible for the errors and twisted “truths” in fallen sinners’ philosophy and culture!

上帝的不可知性與可知性

THE INCOMPREHENSIBILITY OF GOD AND THE KNOWABILITY OF GOD

14. 誤：上帝 = 完全不可知，無底的深淵。上帝是「全然的他者」。只有基督（「道」啟示上帝。）（古今中外各樣的非理性主義。）

F: God = all unknowable, unfathomable; God is the “Wholly Other.” Only Christ/Logos reveals God (All kinds of irrationalism, ancient to modern).

正：上帝是不可知的，若祂不親自啟示自己給我們認識的話。可是，上帝是可知的，因為祂計劃了自我啟示，也具體地透過（一）受造之物（大自然），（二）人地良心，（三）《聖經》自我啟示了。因此上帝是可知的。人需要聖靈的光照才能認識《聖經》的真理。

T: God is unknowable to us if he didn’t reveal himself to us. But God decided to, and did, reveal himself through (a) nature, (b) our hearts, and (c) Scripture.

Therefore God is knowable through revelation. The illumination of the Holy Spirit is needed to understand God's revelation in Scripture.

上帝的不變與動性

GOD IS UNCHANGEABLE, GOD IS DYNAMIC

15. 誤：上帝完全是動性的。（奧利金，當代的進程神學。）

F: God is always (eternally) in action. (Origen, today's process theology.)

正：上帝是不變的。可是他計劃了創造，掌管宇宙歷史，救贖，審判，因此他不斷執行他的計劃，從這角度來說，「我父作工至今。」可是上帝的動力，作為並沒有使祂的本性，計劃，與應許改變。

T: God does not change. However God in eternity planned to (a) create the world, (b) rule over history/the universe, (c) save sinners, and (d) judge the world. And he continues to implement his eternal plan. Thus "My Father has worked till now." But God is not active in a sense that He changes his being, plan, or promises.

人的問題

MAN'S PREDICAMENT

16. 誤：人性裏的善惡，不是天賦的本性。是永恆裏靈體的墮落因此有物質，有人的肉體。

F: Good and evil in man are not divine endowments. Since some spiritual beings sinned and fell in eternity, therefore matter exists (was created), therefore man's body exists.

正：人被造的時候是善的（包括身體，靈魂）。邪惡是因為人犯罪才存在在人間（羅 5：12）。

Man was created good (body and soul). Evil exists in man's world because of man's sin. (Romans 5:12)

17. 誤：人的問題，人為什麼需要救恩 = 因為人是有限的，生命短暫。

F: Man's problem, man's need for salvation = because man is finite, life is short.

正：人的問題，人為什麼需要救恩 = 人背叛了上帝。人的問題是宗教性的，屬靈的（與上帝的關係，背叛了上帝）；和道德性的（心的污穢，行為的不義）。「不虔，不義」（羅 1：18-21）。

T: Man's problem, man's need for salvation = because man has rebelled against God. Man's problem is spiritual (his relationship with God, rebellion against God) and moral (his heart is polluted, and his conduct is unrighteous). Man is "godless, unrighteous" (Rom. 1:18-21).

18. 誤：原罪藉著繁殖傳到全人類。（傳統天主教教義）

F: Original sin was transmitted to all mankind through procreation (traditional Roman Catholic teaching).

正：因為上帝對待亞當為人類的頭，人類的代表，因此上帝把亞當的罪歸算給全人類。結果，繁殖的後果是每一個生出來的嬰孩都有上帝所歸算的罪。

T: God treated Adam as the head and representative of all mankind. Therefore God “charged” (reckoned, imputed) Adam’s sin/guilt on all mankind. The result is: all babies born into this world have the imputed sin of Adam.

基督是上帝 CHRIST IS GOD

19. 誤：有兩個「道」。
- F: There are two Logos’es. (Origen.)
- 正：「道」，基督是一位。
- T: There is only one Logos, only one Christ.
20. 誤：有兩個「道」：上帝裏面的能力，和道成肉身的道（亞利烏）。
- F: There are two Logos’es: (1) the “divine reason” or energy which is immanent in God (inside the Godhead); and (2) the incarnate Logos (Arius).
- 正：三位一體裏的第二位（聖子）是一個位格；道成肉身並不改變這事實。
- T: The 2nd person of the Trinity is one person; the incarnation doesn’t alter this fact.
21. 誤：基督（上帝的「道」，上帝的兒子）= 從屬父上帝，本質上低於父（奧利金）。
- F: Christ/the Logos/the Son of God = subordinate to the Father in being. (Origen)
- 正：基督（上帝的兒子）= 與父上帝同等，同是上帝，同有尊榮，同是永恆，擁有所有上帝的屬性。但是，在永恆救贖計劃中，子甘願順服父，因此，在救贖計劃中，子從屬父。
- 本質上的 (ontological) 三位一體：父，子，靈同等；父是上帝，子是上帝，靈是上帝。
- 救贖計劃上 (Economy) 的三位一體：子，靈順服父。
- T: Christ/the Son of God = equal with the Father in deity, glory, eternity, and in all their attributes.
- However in the plan of salvation, which the Father, Son and Spirit planned together in eternity, the Son decided to obey/submit to the Father. Thus in the plan of salvation the Son is subordinate to the Father.
- Ontological Trinity: the 3 persons are equally God. The Father is God, the Son is God, the Spirit is God.
- Economic Trinity: in the plan of salvation, the Son and Spirit submit to the Father.
22. 誤：父生子不是必須的行動(necessary act)，而是自由的行動 (free act)（奧利金）。
- F: The Son’s eternal generation (the Father begetting the Son) is not a necessary act, but a free and sovereign act of the Father. (Origen)
- 正：父生子是三位一體在永恆裏必須的存在模式；是必須的，不是自由（主權）的決定、計劃、行動。

- T: The Father begetting the Son (eternal generation) is the very mode of existence and relationship of the 3 persons of the Trinity; it is necessary, not a free, sovereign plan/decision/act.
23. 錯誤：聖子是能變的（亞利烏）。
- F: The Son is mutable (changeable) (Arius).
- 正：聖子與聖父，聖靈一樣，是不變的神。
- T: The Son, like the Father and the Spirit, is God. He is unchangeable.
24. 誤：「道」與耶穌（人）的靈魂在永恆裏結合（奧利金）。
- F: The Logos and the human soul of Jesus = united in eternity (Origen).
- 正：「道」（耶穌基督的神性，三位一體的第二位）與耶穌基督的整個人性（身體，靈魂）在道成肉身的時聯合：聖靈感孕馬利亞的時候。
- T: The Logos/divine nature of Christ (the second person of the Trinity) united with the entire human nature of Christ (soul and body) at the Incarnation – when the Holy Spirit came upon the Virgin Mary.
25. 誤：基督的神性與人性混合，祂是混合品，兩性並沒有融合。
- F: The divine nature and human nature of Christ was composite. There is no union, no fusion between the two natures.
- 正：基督的神性與人性是完全地聯合 (union)。
- T: The divine and human nature of Christ united in perfect union.

基督是位格；子是父在永恆裏生的

CHRIST IS PERSON; THE SON IS ETERNALLY BEGOTTEN OF FATHER

26. 誤：基督與父同質，可是祂不是位格。只有一個位格，就是父。祂只是神聖的理性、能力（特土良，動力神格唯一說：撒摩撒他之保羅）。
- F: Christ is of the same substance as the Father, but he is not a person. God is only one person, i.e., the Father. He is divine power or divine reason (Tertullian, Dynamic Monarchianism: Paul of Samosata).
- 正：基督與父上帝同質。祂是位格，正如父是位格。（不要把「位格」當作屬性來看待！）子的生存形態與父不同（特土良）。
- T: Christ is of the same substance as the Father. But he is a person just like the Father is a person. But the Son has a mode of existence which is different from the Father's (Tertullian). (But don't treat "person," "personhood" as attributes.)
27. 誤：「道」是神裏的理性，到創造等時候才有位格。
- F: Logos is impersonal divine reason; only becomes personal at creation.
- 正：「道」（子）在永恆裏就是位格。
- T: Logos (Son) is person in eternity, from eternity.
28. 誤：子與父同質，可是只有父有全部的本質（特土良）。
- F: The Son and the Father have the same substance, but only God the Father has all the substance (Tertullian).
- 正：子與父同質，子與父同有所有上帝的本性。
- T: The Son and the Father are of the same substance. Each has full divine nature (complete divine substance).

29. 誤：父創造子（亞利烏）。子是父從無有創造出來的（亞利烏派，在尼西亞會議）。
- F: The Son is created (Arius). The Father created the Son. The Father created the Son out of nothing (Arians, at Council of Nicea).
- 正：子與父同創造宇宙。父生子，不是創造子。
- T: The Son is Co-Creator with the father of the universe. The Father begets the Son, the Father did not create the Son.
30. 誤：父生子，是永恆裏的作為（奧利金）。子有開始存在的時刻；有一段時間子並不存在（特土良）。
- F: The Father begets the Son as an eternal act (Origen). The Son has a beginning; there was a time when the Son/Logos was not (Tertullian).
- 正：父在永恆裏生子；子沒有開始存在的時刻。所有上帝所「計劃」，所作的「作為」，都是三位一體一起作的「計劃」與「作為」。
- T: The Father begets the Son in eternity; the Son has no beginning. Every “plan” and “act” of God, is the plan/act of the three persons in the Trinity together. 從來沒有一刻，子不是（不存在）的。
- There was never a moment when the Son was not.

人的被創造；基督的人性

CREATION OF MAN; CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE

31. 錯誤：人是在永恆裏被創造的。
- F: Man was created in eternity (eternal creation).
- 正：人是在七日的第六日被創造的；人是在時間的開始時被造的。
- F: Man was created on the 6th day of 7 days; man was created at the beginning of time.
32. 錯誤：基督不真正是人。基督吃東西，並不是祂真正需要食物，而是要藉此使人不能否認祂的人性（革利免）。
- F: Christ is not really a man. Jesus ate food, not because he needed food, but simply to guard against a denial of his humanity (Clement of Alexandria.)
- 正：人不能否認基督的人性，因為祂真正的是人。
- T: We cannot deny the humanity of Christ, because Jesus Christ was/is fully human.
33. 誤：「道」所充滿的靈魂取了一個身體，這個身體被「道」穿入而神化 (divinized)（奧利金，動力神格唯一說的：撒摩撒他之保羅，後來基督新教中反對三位一體的教派）。
- F: The soul, which was filled with the Logos, assumed a body. This body, penetrated by the Logos, is divinized (becomes divine) by the Logos (Origen, Dynamic Monarchianism: Paul of Samosata, Socinians, Unitarians).
- 正：「道」（三位一體的第二位）取了人性（靈魂與身體）。結果不是人性被神化，乃是：道成肉身的耶穌基督是一個位格，一位耶穌基督：祂是 100%神，又是 100%人。

- T: The Logos (The 2nd person of the Trinity) took on human nature (both body and soul). The result is not that the human nature of Jesus Christ becomes divine. Rather, Jesus Christ incarnate is ONE person, ONE Jesus Christ: he is 100% God, 100% man.
34. 誤：耶穌被父認（收養）為兒子，因此被人尊敬為上帝的兒子（亞利烏）。
F: Jesus is recognized/adopted by the Father as Son, therefore men esteem him as God's Son (Arius).
正：子在永恆裏就是父的獨生子。因道成肉身的基督成就了救贖大工，父上帝榮耀祂，高舉祂，承認/宣稱祂為愛子。可是這宣稱並不是基督成為上帝兒子的原因，而是聖子完成救贖大工的獎賞。
T: The Son was the only-begotten Son of the Father in eternity. When the incarnate Christ finished his work of redemption, the Father chose to glorify him, exalt him, and “adopt”/declare him to be Son of God. This declaration is not the reason why Jesus Christ is God's Son; rather it is the reward for the Son's completion of the work of redemption.
35. 誤：耶穌（人）取了「功德」，如：聖潔，對上帝的意識（士來馬赫）等。因此他成為上帝的兒子，被稱為上帝的兒子。
F: The man Jesus took on “meritoriousness” such as: holiness, consciousness of God (Friedrich Schleiermacher), etc. Therefore he became the Son of God.
正：上帝的兒子從來在永恆裏就是上帝的兒子，與父同等。祂在道成肉身（聖靈感孕馬利亞）的時候穿上了人性。
T: The Son of God was always God in eternity, and equal with the Father. He took on human nature at the Incarnation, when the Holy Spirit came upon Virgin Mary.

道成肉身、神人二性的基督是救贖主

CHRIST, THE INCARNATE GOD-MAN, IS THE REDEEMER

36. 正：基督若是上帝，那麼他來到世間，就是上帝來到世間。
T: If Christ is God, and only if He is God, in the full sense of the word, without qualification, God has entered humanity. (Reinhold Seeberg.)
37. 誤：基督只是教師，榜樣，賜律法者。
F: Christ is only a teacher, an example, the lawgiver.
正：基督來更為罪捨命。祂是救主。
T: Christ came mainly to die for sins as a substitute. He is the Redeemer.
38. 錯誤：基督藉著付贖價 (ransom) 給魔鬼來拯救我們：基督欺騙了魔鬼。
F: Christ rescued us by paying the ransom to the Devil. Christ deceived the devil.
正：基督的捨命，滿足了父上帝的公義和公義的要求，因此平息了父的忿怒（= 挽回祭的意義）。
T: Christ's death satisfied the justice and just requirements of God the Father, thus removed his wrath. (= propitiation)
39. 誤：基督的神性，在耶穌被掛在十字架的時候，已經離開耶穌（人）。

- F: Christ's divine nature left the human Jesus when the man Jesus hung on the cross.
 正：神人二性的耶穌基督在十字架上捨命。這是莫大的奧秘。
 T: Jesus Christ, the God-man, died on the cross (this is a profound mystery).
40. 誤：救贖就是神人合一：人能神化（愛任紐）。
 F: Salvation involves the union of man and God. Man is deified (Irenaeus).
 正：救贖是上帝與人和好。人不成為上帝！
 而只有神自己：只有一位自己就是上帝的救主，才能使我們與上帝聯合（啊阿他拿修）。
 T: Salvation is God reconciling himself with man. Man doesn't become God! And, only one who is himself God can unite us with God (Athanasius).
41. 誤：基督的神性與人性混合，因此基督升天的時候，就等於成為無所不在 (ubiquitous)。（奧利金，馬丁路德。）
 F: The Divine and the Human in Christ was so co-mingled, that by his glorification, he became virtually ubiquitous. (Origen, Martin Luther.)
 正：基督的神性與人性完全的聯合。基督的神性從來就是無所不在的。祂升天的時候，是以神人二性一基督的身份升天的。今天，道成肉身的神人基督在天上。
 T: Christ's divine nature was perfectly united with his human nature at the Incarnation. Christ's divine nature includes omnipresence; the 2nd person of the Trinity was always omnipresent. When Christ ascended into heaven, he ascended as 100% God and 100% man. The God-man, Incarnate Christ is in heaven today.
42. 誤：耶穌基督的人性，在升天的時候消失了。
 F: The human nature of Jesus Christ disappeared when he ascended into heaven.
 正：今天在天上的是神人二性的耶穌基督。
 T: Today Jesus Christ, in both his divine nature and human nature, is in heaven.

三位一體

THE TRINITY

43. 誤：三位一體的三位，好像戲劇裏的演員，角色，甚至像面具。（形體上的神格唯一說，即：撒伯流主義；參：周聯華，《信徒神學》。）
 F: The three persons of the Godhead are like three actors/roles in a drama, or one actor wearing three masks. (Modalism, or Modalistic Monarchianism, i.e., Sabellius; cf.: Rev. Chow Lien-hwa.)
 正：三位一體的三位，每一位都是位格，有別與其他兩位；每位都是上帝。
 T: There are three distinct persons in the Trinity, but there is only one God.
44. 誤：聖父道成肉身，被釘在十字架上。（聖父受苦說。）
 F: The Father became Incarnate, hung on the cross. (Patripassianism.)
 正：聖子道成肉身。
 T: The Son became Incarnate.
45. 誤：上帝是三位一體，「一體」或「同質」就像泥土，金，銀，木頭一樣。

F: God is three persons in one substance: substance is like clay, gold, silver, wood.

正：三個位格的「位格」，和一體的「體 / 質」，這兩個觀念都是廣泛的。我們可以說：上帝是三個位格，同時是一個位格。不過很少人這樣說，只有范泰爾 (Cornelius Van Til, 20 世紀最偉大的護教家) 這樣說。

T: “Person” (persona, hypostatis) and “substance” (ousia) mean “something” – God is “three of something” and “one of something.” We can say God is three persons and one person. Very few people say it this way, only Cornelius Van Til, the greatest apologist in the 20th century, says it this way.

《威敏斯特信仰告白》 第三章 論上帝與三位一體
Westminster Confession of Faith Chapter 3 On God and the Trinity

三、上帝是獨一的上帝，但祂裡面有三個位格，同屬一個本質，權能相同，同樣永恆，這三個位格就是：父、子、聖靈(三位一體的)上帝 (o)。父不屬於、不受生於、也不出於任何其他來源；子在永恆裏為父所生 (p)；聖靈在永恆裏由父和子而出 (q)。

3. In the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit (o). The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the e Son is eternally begotten of the Father (p) ; the Holy Spirit eternally proceeds from the Father and the Son (q) .

第八章 論中保基督 Chapter 8 On Christ the Mediator

二、上帝的兒子，三位一體中的第二位，正是永恆的上帝，與父同質、同等；當日期滿足的時候，就取了人性 (k)，並人性一切基本的性質、共通的軟弱，只是無罪 (l)；藉著聖靈的大能，在童貞女馬利亞的腹中成孕，有她的本質(m)。所以在耶穌裡面是兩個完整的、無缺的，且相異的性質（就是神性與人性），不可分地結合於一位格裡，沒有轉化、合成、混合 (n)。這個位格是真正的上帝，也是真正的人，卻是一位基督，神人之間的惟一的中保 (o)。

2. The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being truly and eternally God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time had come, take upon Him man's nature (k), with all its essential properties and common frailties, yet without sin (l). He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the virgin Mary and of her substance (m). In this way two whole natures, the divine and the human, perfect and distinct, were inseparably joined together in one person without being changed, mixed, or confused (n). This person is truly God and truly man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man (Romans 1:3-4).

The Nicene Creed

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made.

Who, for us men for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sits on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spoke by the prophets.

And I believe one holy catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

The Definition of the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD)

Therefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin; as regards his Godhead, begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards his manhood begotten, for us men and for our salvation, of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence, not as parted or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ; even as the prophets from earliest times spoke of him, and our Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us, and the creed of the fathers has handed down to us.

早期教會信仰真偽辨 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH
 人論，罪論，恩典論
 DOCTRINE OF MAN, SIN AND GRACE

奧利金與希臘教父

1. 誤：「永恆創造論」：人是先存的（奧利金）。
 正：「歷史的創造」：人是在時間的起初（第六天）被創造的。
2. 誤：最初的創造所造的，只是又思想的靈體（沒有肉體），是與上帝平等的，與上帝同樣永存的（奧利金）。
 正：起初上帝創造的，是靈魂與身體結合的人（創 1: 26-28, 2: 7），絕對不與上帝平等；絕對不與上帝一樣永存。人有起源（被創造的時刻）。
3. 誤：今天人類墮落的光景，是因有先存的墮落（靈體的墮落）- 奧利金。
 正：今天人類墮落的光景，是因在歷史（時間開始了之後）亞當的犯罪。
4. 誤：希臘教父：亞當按照上帝的形象被造，沒有道德的完全。
 正：亞當被造有聖潔，公義，真理（創 1: 28, 弗 4: 24, 西 3: 10）。
5. 誤：希臘教父：亞當只有道德上完全的可能性。
6. 誤：亞當本來就是完全的，若經得起上帝的考驗（順服的考驗），就可以永遠活在道德的完全（聖潔，公義，知識）中。
7. 誤：希臘教父：亞當將肉體的敗壞傳給後代，但它本身不是最，沒有把人類陷在罪孽裏。
 正：罪（罪孽）因一人進入到世界；因此死也進入到世界，因為世人都犯了（亞當一人的）罪（羅 5: 12, 15-21）。
8. 誤：希臘教父：人類與亞當只有肉體上的關係。
 正：人類與亞當除了有肉體上的關係，還有「約」中的關係；亞當在約裏，是人類的頭，人類的代表。
9. 誤：希臘的教父：人類與亞當的關聯，只與肉體與感官的本性有關；在人性比較高尚的方面，和理性方面沒有關聯。
 正：罪、審判、與死，由一人傳給人類；墮落是全人的，我們整個人：靈魂，身體，都死在罪惡過犯中（弗 2: 1）。
10. 誤：希臘的教父：人類與亞當的關係，與意志沒有關係。
 正：人類在亞當裏的墮落，牽涉整個人：理性，意志，情感，身體等。
11. 誤：希臘的教父：罪，總是由於人的自由意志選擇而來。
 正：罪，固然是人的真正選擇，但是罪的根源是罪性：人的心（靈魂）敗壞。因此，罪不僅是意志的選擇。
12. 誤：希臘教父：嬰孩不能算是有罪的。
 正：我們在母腹裏就是罪人（詩 139 篇）。
13. 誤：奧利金：人領受恩典，起點是人的自由意志，不是上帝的恩典。
 正：我們得救乃是本乎恩，藉著信（弗 2: 8-9）；起點是上帝的恩典。

- 14 · 誤：奧利金：自由意志開始了重生的工作；然後上帝幫助人，上帝的能力與人的意志合作，使著意志轉離惡，行上帝眼中看為喜悅的事。
正：上帝的大能改變人的意志（這就是聖靈重生的工作），使人的意志甘心情願地降服在上帝面前，認罪悔改，信靠基督。
- 15 · 誤：特土良：上帝創造了普遍的人性。然後上帝藉生殖個別化這普遍的人性 (God individualizes generic human nature by procreation)。
正：《聖經》說：上帝創造了人，《聖經》沒有提到「普遍的人性」。
- 16 · 誤：上帝與人在重生合作 (synergism)。
正：重生，是唯獨上帝的工作 (monergism)。

伯拉糾與奧古斯丁

人的被造

- 17 · 誤：伯拉糾：亞當被上帝所造，並未賦予正面的聖潔。他起初的狀態是中立的，既非聖善，也非有罪。
正：亞當被上帝所造，有聖潔，公義，知識；是無罪的。
- 18 · 誤：亞當有行善或作惡的可能性（比較誤導的說法）。
正：亞當在約中面對上帝的吩咐；他起初的聖潔，公義，知識是能變的。
- 19 · 誤：伯拉糾：亞當有一個自由，完全不被決定的意志 (free, un-determined will)。
正：人的意志是由上帝的旨意掌管（決定）的；而上帝向人啟示了祂的旨意，要人選擇遵守祂的話。因此人的意志不是完全不被決定，不是隨意的。
- 20 · 誤：伯拉糾：人有能力按自己的判斷，犯罪或不犯罪。
正：人不犯罪的能力是上帝所賜予的。
- 21 · 誤：伯拉糾：人被造是必死的，他已經被死的律所主宰。
正：人被造，是活在上帝的面光之中，在上帝的約裏，充滿著生命，福樂。
- 22 · 誤：伯拉糾：人的本性中沒有先存的惡來決定他一生的路程；人犯罪是自己的選擇。
正：不錯，人犯罪是自己的選擇，但是「先存的惡」有或沒有，是否由它來決定人一生的路程，是抽象的猜測，容易誤導人的思想。

人的墮落

- 23 · 誤：伯拉糾：人墮落在罪中，損傷的不是他人，僅是自己。人性並沒有受到永久性的負面影響。
正：亞當一人犯罪，以致罪、審判、死臨到全人類。
- 24 · 誤：伯拉糾：人類沒有罪性或罪孽的遺傳性傳遞。
正：人類在上帝的約（審判）之下，都被定罪。
- 25 · 誤：伯拉糾：人的本性中沒有任何惡的傾向或欲望，使他無可避免犯罪。

正：我們犯罪，是因為罪性導致（或住在我們裏面的罪發動）。我們裏面有犯罪的欲望（羅 7 章）。

人的罪，罪孽，罪性

- 26 · 誤：伯拉糾：人類仍然出生在亞當墮落以前的情況中，不僅沒有罪孽，也沒有罪的污染。
正：人完全污染了；也承受了亞當的罪孽（罪名）。今天的人類，與亞當墮落前的情況，是完全不同的。
- 27 · 誤：伯拉糾：罪，不在於錯誤的情操或欲望，只在於意志的個別行動。
正：人犯罪，是因為「心」（情操，欲望）壞透了。
- 28 · 誤：伯拉糾：每一次的犯罪都在於人自願的選擇。
正：每一次的犯罪在於人自願的選擇，可是不僅在於自願的選擇。
- 29 · 誤：伯拉糾：人並不須要犯罪。
正：墮落後，人不可能不犯罪；人受了罪的轄制。

人的自由，行善的能力

- 30 · 誤：伯拉糾：人與亞當一樣，被賦予完全的自由意志，有選擇的自由 (liberty of choice)，可稱為「中性的自由」 (liberty of indifference)。所以在任何情況中，人可以選擇善，或選擇惡。
正：墮落後的人，還是活在上帝的面光之中；人的自由墮落了，被污染了。人並不能完全按著自己的意願行事，特別沒有行善的自由 / 能力。
- 31 · 誤：伯拉糾：在上帝吩咐人行善這事實上，足以證明：人有行善的能力。
正：上帝吩咐人行善，只證明上帝的吩咐，並不證明人有行善的能力。墮落之後的人有否能力行善，完全要看《聖經》怎麼說。
- 32 · 誤：伯拉糾：人的責任就是他的道德能力的尺度。
正：人的責任和人的能力的尺度，都在乎上帝在《聖經》怎麼說。
- 33 · 誤：伯拉糾：罪的普遍性，僅僅是由於錯誤的教育，不良的榜樣，不可破的犯罪習慣。
正：罪的普遍性，是因為人的「心」壞了。

恩典

- 34 · 誤：伯拉糾：人棄惡向善，並非因為恩典。恩典僅是外在的恩賜和自然的賦予，如：人的理性，《聖經》中上帝的啟示，耶穌基督的榜樣等等。
正：人離棄罪，是因為耶穌基督救贖的大能，和聖靈的呼召，重生。

奧古斯丁：罪的本質

- 35· 誤：奧古斯丁：罪不是積極之物，乃是消極的，是一種缺乏(*privation*)。罪不是有實質的惡，乃是善之缺乏 (*privatio boni, privation of good*)。
 正：罪不是「物」，不過是「真」的。要按《聖經》，按上帝的判斷來判斷罪；罪的真實/實質來自上帝的判斷。罪包括（一）亞當不遵行 / 違反上帝的吩咐；（二）因上帝的審判，而有的罪孽；（三）人性的污染：犯罪的傾向；（四）我們的罪行。把罪說成太「具體」，反而成為更抽象。
- 36· 誤：奧古斯丁：罪的根源在於自愛 (*self-love*) 取代了對上帝的愛。
 正：罪當然包含人的心偏離上帝，愛自己，愛世界。可是罪也是干犯上帝的律法。罪是不榮耀上帝，不敬拜上帝。要維持三個角度來看罪：（一）準則：上帝的律法；（二）心態：愛；（三）目標：榮耀上帝，敬拜上帝。

奧古斯丁：慾念；「能 / 不能」行善或犯罪（這就是「自由意志」問題的癥結）

- 37· 正：奧古斯丁：人背叛的結果包括靈魂中強烈慾念 (*concupiscence*)：感官慾望不正之轄制；理性之律不再管制靈魂。
 修正：不錯，人的慾望轄制靈魂，人的靈魂不能正確運作。不過：情感（慾念），理性，意志，都墮落了。每一功能和它們之間的關係都扭曲、敗壞。
- 38· 正：奧古斯丁：人被造是不朽的；他不是不會受死的影響，乃是他有身體不朽的可能。他若證明自己的順服，就會在聖潔裏得以堅定 (*confirmed in holiness*)；就會從「能不犯罪」與「能不死」的境況中，過渡到「不可能犯罪」與「不可能死」的境況中。但是他犯罪了，結果他進入了「不可能不犯罪」與「不可能不死」的境況中。
 修正：「能」與「不能」犯罪，都在上帝的面光之中，都須從上帝的「約」的角度來看。
- 39· 正：奧古斯丁：人因為罪完全墮落，不能意旨 / 行出任何善事。不錯，意志仍有本性的自由 (*natural freedom*)，人仍然能行社會公認的善；不過人與上帝分離，擔負罪孽，在惡的權勢下，因此不能意旨神眼中正直的事。

奧古斯丁：亞當與人類的關係

- 40· 誤：奧古斯丁：亞當與人類有著有機的關聯 (*organic connection*)。人類的合一性不是盟約性的 (*federally*)，是現實主義的 (*realistically*)。全人類的種子都在亞當裡；人類不是個別地組成，乃是有機地組成：亞當裡有人類普遍的本性 (*generic human nature*)，而每一個個體 (*individualizations*) 都是在亞當裡已有的普遍本性的有機部份 (*organic parts*)。
 正：「普遍人性」太抽象；「盟約」(*federal*) 關係比較合《聖經》。
- 41· 誤：奧古斯丁：全人類都在他裏面實際上犯了罪。

正：全人類都因為「約」在亞當裏，亞當代表人類犯罪；從這意義上，全人類都犯了亞當的罪。不是「現實主義」，乃是「約」的觀念。

奧古斯丁：恩典

- 42 · 正：奧古斯丁：人的意志需要被更新：從始至終唯獨是上帝恩惠的工作。
- 43 · 正：奧古斯丁：人的更新唯獨歸功於上帝的恩惠；這是上帝「不可抗拒的恩惠」。可是神的恩惠並不違背人是自由行動者 (**free agent**) 的本性。上帝不勉強人的意志。上帝乃改變人的意志，使之甘願選擇善。人的意志被更新了，恢復了他的真自由。上帝的確在人的意志上運行，以致人的意志自由地選擇美德，聖潔。
- 44 · 正：奧古斯丁：重生是完全靠上帝的恩典的 (**monergistic**)。在重生上，聖靈的運行是必需的，不僅供應人裡之不足，而且完全更新人內心的性情，以致人的靈完全的效法上帝的律法。
- 45 · 正：上帝在人身上恩典的工作分三階段：（一）預先的恩典 (**prevenient grace**)：聖靈用律法產生罪與罪孽的意識。（二）運行的恩典 (**operative grace**)：聖靈用福音產生信心，使人相信基督和他贖罪大工，結果人被稱義，與上帝和好。（三）合作的恩典 (**co-operative grace**)。人被更新了的意志與聖靈合作，終生作成成聖的功夫。上帝恩典的工作，使神的形象完全在人裡更新，上帝的靈完全改變罪人，成為聖徒。

奧古斯丁：教會，聖禮

- 46 · 正：奧古斯丁：教會是支配神恩典的機構 (**independent dispenser of grace**)。
注：「支配恩典」這觀念，從宗教改革宗後的角度來理解。
- 47 · 誤：奧古斯丁：洗禮使人重生 (**baptismal regeneration**)。但是重生之恩會再次喪失。只有那些重生而堅守，或重生後失喪又蒙恢復，才能至終得救。

奧古斯丁：上帝的預定

- 48 · 正：上帝在時間裡更新罪人的恩典之工，乃是他在永恆計劃裡所意旨的。
- 49 · 誤：早期的奧古斯丁：上帝預定是在乎 (**contingent upon**) 祂的預知。
評：這其實是把上帝對人自由的行動的預知，當作祂預定的條件。
- 50 · 正：後期的奧古斯丁：人選擇行善，相信基督，都是上帝恩典的效果。
- 51 · 正：奧古斯丁：預定就是從上帝永恆的觀點看救恩 (**salvation viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*, from the point of view of eternity**)。
- 52 · 注：奧古斯丁：至於未被揀選者，他認為神在他的預旨中 (**decree of God**) 忽略了他們 (**permissio**)。遺棄與揀選是不同的，神的遺棄沒有任何神的直接功效伴隨著，來達成預期的效果。（改革宗有兩種看法。）