基督教教义发展史

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE
READER

目录
TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (1)
《新约圣经》的正典：历史发展与正统的信仰立场 (一)

Part One. HISTORY OF THE CANON
第一部分：正典的历史

170-220 A.D.
主后 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：催使教会正式地反省/决定教会的《圣经》究竟包括哪些书卷。

   a. Marcionism. Marcion went to Rome in 140 AD.
      马吉安。140 年到罗马。
      Marcion taught that the Old Testament God is not the same as the New Testament God.
      马吉安的教导：《旧约》的神与《新约》的神，是不同的神。
      The Old Testament God is fickle, cruel, a despot.
      《旧约》的神是残酷的独裁者，脾气古怪。
      The New Testament God is a God of mercy and love.
      《新约》的神是一个慈爱，怜悯的神。
      Marcion rejected the Old Testament entirely.
      马吉安完全拒绝《旧约》的神。
      The Evangelists (authors of the gospels) and the apostles were blinded by Jewish influence.
      他认为四福音的作者们与使徒们，都被他们的犹太教背景所影响，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.
      马吉安的 "正典" 包括：保罗的十封信 (不包括《提摩太前后书》，《提多书》)，与一本删除很多部份的《路加福音》。

   b. Gnosticism.
      诺斯底主义。
      Gnosis – secret knowledge of God.
      诺斯底 = 这个希腊名字，是秘密知识的意思。
      The Gnostics produced a body of literature with equal authority and revelatory importance as the orthodox New Testament canon.
      诺斯底派的领袖们，编了一套文献，与《新约圣经》有同样的权威，和同样地有启示性。

c. Montanism.
孟他努主义。

Montanus and his followers taught that a new and copious outpouring of the Holy Spirit began with Montanus himself.
蒙他努和他的跟随者教导说，圣灵在当今(当时) 有一次新的浇灌，由孟他努开始。

Similar to a "second blessing."
像二十世纪灵恩派的"第二次祝福" 。

A widespread movement in the late 2nd century, and early 3rd century.
孟他努派在第二世纪末与第三世纪初增长得很快。

Montanists received new revelation, and wrote them down.
孟他努派者宣称他们收到新的启示，然后笔之于书。

2. Response by the Church.
教会如何回应这些异端。

a. The view of Adolf Von Harnack (a liberal view). *Marcion and the New Testament*, John Knox Press 1942.
十九世纪新派神学家哈纳克 (Harnack) 的看法。他写的书，《马吉安与新约》，于 1942 年出版。

Primitive Christianity is a religion of the spirit, not of the letter.
原始的基督教是灵的宗教，不是字句的宗教(听起来很属灵！)。

Primitive Christianity thrived on oral tradition.
原始的基督教有很多的口头传统(口传) ，因这些口传而增长。

Heretics took up the idea of a collection of authoritative writings.
异端者就想出要收集一套有权威性的文献这个观念来。

Marcion created the New Testament canon!
意思是说，是马吉安想出/搞出新约的正典来的！

The church then borrowed from Marcion the idea of a canon, but with different results.
后来，教会模仿了马吉安的做法，也想收集一套正典 -- 当然，教会正典所包括的书卷是不同的。

Oral tradition became confused.
当时的情况是，口头传统非常混乱。

Written tradition increased in number, and the quality is different.
而书写的传统越来越多，可是素质参差不齐。

Therefore the church must distinguish between true and false.
因此，教会必须辨别真假。

It is lamentable that Christianity became bound by a book – it became a religion of the book. (Harnack's view)
所以，结果教会 (基督教) 成为一个被一本书"绑着" 的宗教 -- 而不是活的，属灵的宗教。(这是哈纳克的说法，是福音派不能接受的观点。)

b. The orthodox view.
正统 (福音派) 的看法。
(e.g. Ned Stonehouse, Herman Ridderbos)
(二十世纪中期，费城威敏斯特神学院教授 Ned Stonehouse, 与荷兰神学家 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.
《新约圣经》的起源，《新约圣经》的存在是一回事；而教会承认《新约圣经》，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!
从起初开始，就是，从使徒时期，教会就拥有一本《圣经》。教会从来就有神的话！

3. Sources for 170-220 AD.
170-220 年这个阶段，我们目前有的文献。

a. The Muratorian canon.
《穆拉多利正典残篇》。
Muratori, an 18th century Italian, discovered this canon.
穆拉多利是一位拾捌世纪的意大利人。他发现这分文献。
180 AD, written in Latin.
约 180 年写的，拉丁文。
It is the earliest list of canonical documents by someone on behalf of the church.
这是教会人士代表教会承认《新约圣经》书卷的最早文献。
It listed: all of the New Testament except: Hebrews, James, 2 Peter.
这分正典残篇列出了所有新约的书卷，除了：《希伯来书》，《雅各书》，《彼得后书》。
Not sure whether I Peter is mentioned or not.
《彼得前书》有没有被列出，我们不清楚。

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).
爱任纽，130-200。
他是东方教会，与西方教会的代言人。(东方教会用希腊文，包括：亚细亚，希腊，埃及等。西方教会用拉丁文，包括：意大利，北非洲，法国等。)
Wrote *Against the Heresies*, against Gnosticism and Montanism.
爱任纽写书反驳异端 -- 反驳诺斯底主义，蒙他努主义。

c. Tertullian, 160-220 AD. Represented the Western church. Lived in North Africa.
特土良，160-220。西方教会的代表。住在北非洲。

d. Clement of Alexandria, 150-215 AD.
亚历山大的革利免，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。革利免的学生与继承人。他们两位都是第三世纪重要的神学家。对于东方教会的影响非常大。

4. The Attestation to the New Testament, 170-220 AD.
这些文献对《新约圣经》的见证，170-220 年。

a. The Gospels
文献对福音书的见证。

i. Irenaeus – contrasted with Marcion (single gospel). With Gnostics (5th Gospel of Truth). With those who rejected the Gospel of John.
爱任纽 - 反驳马吉安 (马氏只有一本福音书) 。也反驳诺斯底派 (后者有一本《真理福音》，是他们的第五本福音书。)
The Logos, who created the world, has given the church the perfect gospel in its 4-fold form.
爱任纽：道，就是创造世界的道，赐给了教会福音 -- 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).
在这段时期，一般的作者都称福音书为"福音"(单数) ， 然后说明是谁写的 (按照谁 - according to, 希腊文 kata) 。

iii. Tertullian, Muratorian canon mentioned forgeries (attributed to Paul). No mention of other gospels competing for a place in the canon.
特土良与《穆拉多利正典残篇》提到一些伪经，冒充保罗写的。没有提到有哪本福音书与四福音 "竞争"， 在正典里争地位。

iv. Clement of Alexandria – broad minded. But distinguished the 4 gospels "entrusted to the church."
亚历山大的革利免 - 立场比较没有那么严谨。虽然如此，可是他也分辨出四本"交托给教会" 的福音书。
Others who wrote or used apocryphal Gospel transformed the gospel.
其他的人写了旁经，或用旁经，就把福音改头换面了。

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.
爱任纽说当时在崇拜时用的 (诵读的)，只有四福音，没有其他福音书。而四福音书任何一卷，从来没有人怀疑是否应在敬拜时诵读。

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.
爱任纽用灵意解经法，解释启示录 4：6-9 四活物，还有四个约，四个方向 (东，南，西北)，四风等等来解释，为什么福音是四卷的。

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。叙利亚教会领袖。"四位所写的" - 是第二世纪末的文件，想要以这本取代四福音。可是这本"福音" 所用上的材料，都出自四福音，没有用其他文献的材料。

viii.   Origen. "The church of God recognizes only 4 gospels."
俄利根说："神的教会只承认四本福音。"

b. Paul's Epistles
文献对保罗书信的见证。

All 13 were universally received. As a unit.
拾三卷都被所有教会领袖承认。被视为一套整全的书卷。
Pseudo-Pauline literature existed, but never posed threat to the church.
当然，当时也有冒充保罗写的书信；但是没有一本威胁到教会 (意思：教会没有相信这些是保罗写的，或以神的话来对待这些。)

c. Acts was universally acknowledged as the work of Luke. On the list after the Gospels, before Paul.
《使徒行传》被所有教会领袖承认是路加所写的。列在四福音之后，保罗书信之前。

d. Indisputable books:
没有疑问(被所有教会领袖接纳，承认)的书信：
4 Gospels   四福音
13 Pauline letters   拾三卷保罗书信
Acts   《使徒行传》
Revelation   《启示录》

1 Peter	《彼得前书》
1 John (2 & 3 John	《约翰壹书》(通常《约翰二书》，
were associated with	《约翰三书》与《约翰一书》并列，或
1 John)	联在一起被提到)
Jude	《犹大书》

Challenged:
有疑问/被挑战的书卷：

Hebrews	《希伯来书》
James	《雅各书》
2 Peter	《彼得后书》
Shepherd	《牧人书》
Didache	《使徒遗训》
1 Clement	《革利免一书》
2 Clement	《革利免二书》

e. Summary: There was central agreement, with some disagreement.
总的来说，基本上大家同意大部份的书信，有少部份有异议。
The boundaries were fluid – this disproves the theory of the church responding to Marcion.
教会所承认的新约正典，其"边界" (定义) 不是硬性的，有弹性。这个弹性刚好反驳哈纳克(Harnack)的理论。
Free, organic development; idea was not coerced by ecclesiastical decision or authority.
正典的被承认，是一个活的，有机的发展过程。正典这个观念，不是教会开会决定，从上压下来的。
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)
《新约圣经》的正典：历史发展与正统 的信仰立场 (二)

140-170 AD. 主后 140-170 年

The young church was struggling for its existence.
教会还年轻，挣扎求存。
There were two directions in the writings of this period:
这时候的写作，针对两方面：
Inward – against heresies.
教会内部，要面对异端。
Outward – apologetic writings, aimed at heathen authorities and the masses.
而向外又要护教，面对异教与大众对基督教的疑问。
No extant evidence of canon.
这时，没有"正典" 这方面的文献。
With apologetic concern, there was naturally little reason or opportunity to reflect upon the canon.
教会要面对不信的，攻击基督教的人士来从事护教，当然没有精力，或机会，来反省正典这个问题了。
The most helpful writings for our study of this period, are those from the heretics.
所以，这个时期的文献，对我们研究正典这个题目最有帮助的，乃是异端的作品。

1. The Gospel of Truth.《真理的福音》。
   Gnostic writing. Author was Valentinus (Rome). In Latin.
   是一本诺斯底派的作品。作者是华伦提奴 (罗马)，用拉丁文写的。
   Used the 4 gospels, Paul, Hebrews, Revelation.
   这本书引用了四福音，保罗书信，《希伯来书》，《启示录》。
   Acts? I John? I Peter?
   (不确定有没有引用：) 《使徒行传》，《约翰壹书》，《彼得前书》。
   No use of extra-canonical writings.
   重要的是：这本异端的书，没有引用正典以外的书卷！
   Documents convey "Good News" which Valentinus sought to reproduce.
   这些书卷述说"福音-好消息，"华伦提奴尝试从新解说。
   Even Hebrews and Revelation were included.
   连《希伯来书》和《启示录>。都用上了！
   Therefore: 140-150 Canon was used in Rome.
   因此我们可以推论说：在 140-150 时期，新约正典的书卷，在罗马被使用。
   Written well before Marcion was condemned.
   这本书是在马吉安被定为异端之前好长时间。

2. Marcion's Canon.马吉安的正典。
   Marcion worked on the Canon – trimmed it down for his own interests.
   马吉安处理正典这问题，他为了自己的原因，把《新约圣经》削减了。

He used the same structure as New Testament Canon.

不过，他的正典的结构 (次序) 还是与《新约圣经》的一样。

Gospel (Luke) – he incorporated elements from the other 3 gospels.
Pauline corpus.

福音书 (路加) - 他引用了其他三福音书的材料。保罗的所有书信。

No evidence of incorporation of apocryphal materials.

没有引用旁经的迹象。

He rejected the General Epistles – also rejected all of the Old Testament.

马吉安不承认普遍书信 - 同时拒绝了全部《旧约圣经》。

Therefore: Existence and structure of canon can be seen from Marcion。

因此：我们可以从马吉安的正典中，看出当时新约圣经的轮廓。

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

殉道者游斯丁。100-165。是一位护教者。

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

游斯丁描述了当时敬拜的情况。他说，"使徒们的回忆，和先知们的著作都被诵读。"

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

游斯丁引用了《马太福音》，《马可福音》，《路加福音》，也承认是使徒们所写的。

Also quoted extra-canonical writings.

游斯丁也引用了正典以外的书卷。

Prophets = Old Testament.

所谓先知 - 是指《旧约圣经》。

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

因此，使徒们的作品，与先知们 (旧约) 平排并列。

Gospels = included.

这包括福音书。

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

所用上了的，或间接提到的，包括：

Romans	《罗马书》
I Corinthians	《哥林多前书》
Galatians	《加拉太书》
Ephesians	《以弗所书》
Colossians	《歌罗西书》
2 Thessalonians	《帖撒罗尼迦后书》
Hebrews	《希伯来书》
1 Peter	《彼得前书》
Acts	《使徒行传》
Didache	《使徒遗训》

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (3)
《新约圣经》的正典：历史发展与正统 的信仰的立场 (三)

Before 140 AD.
主后 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 年时，四福音和保罗的 13 书信，已经被视为与旧约圣经同样的有权威。

1. Sources before 140 AD.
   140 年前的文献
       a. 1ˢᵗ Clement. Bishop of Rome, 95-100 AD .
          革利免 - 罗马的主教，主后 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，约 115 年写的七封信；写给亚细亚的教会。
       c. Letters of Polycarp (Smyrna) to Philippi. Ca. 110 AD.
          波理甲 - 士每那教会 - 写给腓立比教会的信。约主后 110。
       d. Papias, 60-130 AD. More confident about oral tradition.
          Papias，主后 60-130。对于口传传统比较有信心。
       e. The New Testament itself.
          新约圣经本身。

2. Attestation.
   这些文献对正典的见证。
       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.
          对保罗书信的见证。
          革利免，Ignatius，和波理甲：都承认，保罗的 13 卷书信是带有权威的：时为主后 90-100 年。
          新约圣经：彼得后书 3：14-16。 15 节 - 保罗的一封信。16 节：保罗所有的信。彼得把这些信，与旧约圣经视为等同。
       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.

对四福音的见证。

革利免：耶稣的话，与旧约先知们的话，同样的带有权威，或更加有权威。

"福音" – 英文：the Gospel – 希腊文：to euaggelion – 单数。这个观念 (只有一个福音) 在 140 前已使用，用来指四福音的权威。

当作者引用福音书时，往往说："主说" – The Lord says – legei ho kurios；或"经上记着说" – it is written – he graphe. 或："记着说" – it is written – gegraptai. 默默的承认了，福音乃以四福音书组成。

3. Conclusion. There were two collections recognized in this period.
   结论：在这时期，教会已承认两套书卷(旧约，新约)。

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (4)
《新约圣经》的正典：历史发展与正统 的信仰的立场 (四)

3ʳᵈ and 4ᵗʰ Centuries 第三，第四世纪

The basic contour of the New Testament canon was clearly seen by the church, 180-220.
《新约圣经》的基本素描，在 180-220 时期已经蛮清楚。

After this, there were two processes:
220 年之后，有两方面的发展：
Fixing of limiting lines of the canon, with increasing exclusiveness;
and (based on this),widespread recognition toward universal recognition.
第一，正典的内容 (哪些书卷) 越来越清楚，明确；
第二，越来多(差不多所有) 教会领袖接受《新约圣经》的正典。

1. Origen. 185-254 AD. He is an overlap figure.
   俄利根，185-254。他是一位过渡时期人物。
   He traveled widely, and was well respected.
   他周游列国，非常被敬重。
   a. He made a distinction between the "homologoumena" – those confessed, agreed upon, and the "antilegomena" – those disputed, spoke against.
      他分辨出那些被承认，同意的书，与那些被怀疑，反对的书卷。
   b. The homolegoumena were: 4 gospels, 13 letters of Paul, 1 Peter, 1 John, Acts, Revelation.
      前者包括：四福音书，保罗 13 卷书信，《彼得前书》，《约翰壹书》，《使徒行传》，《启示录》。
      The antilegoumena 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.
      后者包括：《希伯来书》，《彼得后书》，《约翰二书》，《约翰三书》，《雅各书》，《犹大书》；还有：《巴拿巴书》，《黑马牧人书》，《使徒遗训》，《希伯来人的福音》。

2. Eusebius. 260-340 AD.
   优西比乌，260-340。
   Bishop of Caesarea. Made the same distinction as Origen.
   该撒利亚的主教。与俄利根一样区分两种书信。
   Homolegoumena – 4 gospels, Acts, 14 letters of Paul (including Hebrews), 1 Peter, 1 John (perhaps Revelation).
   前者：四福音书，《使徒行传》，保罗 114 卷书信 (包括《希伯来书》)，《彼得前书》，《约翰壹书》 (也可能《启示录》)。
   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).

后者包括 (一) 应被接纳的：《雅各书》，《犹大书》，《彼得后书》，《约翰二书》，《约翰三书》。(二) 应被拒绝的：《牧人书》，《巴拿巴书》，《使徒遗训》，《彼得的启示录》(=《启示录》)。

Homolegoumena and antilegomena (to be accepted) together = 27 of our New Testament canon.
前者，与后者中应被接纳的书信，加起来 = 27 本我们的新约书信。

3. Athanasius. 296-373 AD. Bishop of Alexandria.
    阿他那修，296-373，亚历山大主教。
    Athanasian Creed – stated clearly the doctrine of the Trinity endorsed by the council of Nicea.
    阿他那修的信经 - 清楚地说出尼西亚大公会议所订下地三位一体教义。
    Easter Letter of 367. Pastoral-official open communication to the church.
    367 年复活节教牧书信。是主教写给教区的公开信。
    There is a section on the problem of the continued use of the apocrypha in his district.
    信里有一段处理在教区里有人还用旁经的问题。
    What makes up Scripture? Canonical – the 27 books of the New Testament.
    那么，《新约圣经》包括哪些书卷呢？就是 27 卷。
    This is the first instance of maintaining only the 27 as the New Testament canon. First formal ecclesiastical decree.
    这是教会历史上，第一次教会正式的宣布，《新约圣经》就是指这 27 卷。
    There is a sharp line here, then:
    27 卷之后有清楚的界限，然后：
    Books worthy of reading: Old Testament apocrypha, Shepherd, Didache.
    有些值得读的书：旧约旁经，牧人书，使徒遗训。
    Then, a line not as sharp here, then:
    之后又有一个界限(不过没有前面的界限那么清楚，严重)：
    Books to be fully rejected.
    应被拒绝的书卷。

    Athanasius' letter took the status of a decree in the Eastern church.
    在东方教会中，阿他拿修的这封信，有教会官方决定的权威。

4. Council Decisions.
    教会会议的决定。

    Church councils in the western church: Synod of Rome, 382. 27 NT books.
    西方教会的会议：罗马会议，382。27 卷书。

    Church councils in the eastern church: Synod of Hippo, 393; Synod of Carthage, 397.
    东方教会的会议：希坡会议，393。迦太基会议，397。

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON (5)
《新约圣经》的正典： 历史发展与正统的信仰立场 (五)

Part Two. WHAT WE BELIEVE CONCERNING THE CANON
第二部份： 我们对正典的信仰

The Bible's inspiration is necessary for canonicity and its authority.
《圣经》是神所默示的；神的默示是《圣经》正典和《圣经》权威的大前提 (基
础) ，是必须条件。

But: 不过：
- A. The church has not been able to establish criteria of canonicity.
   教会不曾(从未) 建立过能决定《圣经》正典的准则。
- B. The church cannot establish criteria for canonicity.
   教会不可能建立能决定《圣经》正典的准则！
- C. God is canon.
   神乃正典。
- D. The Structure of the Office of the Apostle.
   使徒这个职位的结构。
- E. Redemptive history and the history of revelation.
   救赎历史与启示的历史。

- A. The church has not been able to establish criteria of canonicity.
   教会不曾(从未) 建立过能决定《圣经》正典的准则。

    1. Apostolicity – as a criterion for canonicity.
       可以用"使徒性" 来决定正典吗？(意思是说：一本书只要是使徒写
       的，就应在正典里。)
       Difficulties – Mark, Luke, Acts; Hebrews?, Jude, James?
       这个准则有它的问题：
       马可，路加，使徒行传；(可能) 希伯来书，犹大书，(可能) 雅各书 --
       These books were not (may not have been) written by apostles.
       这些都不是(或可能不是) 使徒亲笔写的。
       The idea of "apostolic men" weakens the criterion of apostolicity for
       canonicity.
       假如我们说，是使徒 "布道团" 团队里的人写就可以了 -- 那么， "使
       徒性" 这准则就削弱了。
       I Corinthians 5:9 – Paul's letter to Corinthians;
       林前 5：9 – 保罗还有 (一封？) 信写了给哥林多教会的；
       Colossians 4:16 – Paul's letter to Laodicea –
       西 4： 16 – 保罗写信给老底嘉教会。
       These were apostolic, but not in the canon.
       这些都是使徒写的，但是没有列在正典 (新约) 里。

2. Antiquity.　This criterion cannot stand.
　　最古旧的书卷就应该列在正典里。这准则不成立。

3. Public lection (Zahn).
　　一本书有没有被公开诵读 -这是 Zahn 提出的准则。
　　Difficulty – Didache, Shepherd … were used in the church; read publicly.
　　这个准则也有困难。比方说，《使徒遗训》，《牧人书》在教会里被使用，被公开的诵读！
　　2 Peter, 3 John, Jude were used before they were recognized.
　　而《彼得后书》，《约翰三书》在没有被承认之前，就被使用了。

4. Inspiration.
　　默示的准则。
　　Inspiration is necessary to canonicity, but the two ideas do not coincide.
　　是的，默示对于正典是必须的。可是默示与正典是两个不同的观念。
　　Inspiration is necessary.　But just inspiration is not sufficient.
　　默示是必须的。可是光是默示还不够。
　　I Corinthians 5:9 – apostolic communications were inspired; but some are not extant in the canon.
　　林前 5：9 -使徒们有一些被圣灵灵感而写的，没有在正典里。

B. The church *cannot* establish criteria for canonicity.
　教会不可能建立能决定《圣经》正典的准则。
　Attempts to establish criteria must fail.
　若尝试订下这种准则，必然失败。
　They threaten to undermine the authority of Scripture.
　因为这样作，就威胁，削弱《圣经》的权威。
　They destroy the New Testament as canon.
　这样作，就破坏了《新约圣经》的正典。
　They subject canon to the relativity of historical study.
　因为这样作时，我们将《圣经》放在/服在人的，相对的历史学的研究下。
　They attempt to control the canon by fallible human insight.
　这样一来，正典 (《圣经》)就被有限的，可犯错的人为思维控制了。
　It is rationalization: we generalize upon a unique historical entity.
　是理性的绝对化：我们把一个历史上空前绝后的现象 (《圣经》这本书)，用一个更高低观念含盖它。
　We try to get at the canon from above it.
　我们尝试从正典 (《圣经》)的上面看下来。必然失败！

　The canon is self-establishing.
　《圣经》的正典是自我建立的。
　The canon is self-attesting.
　《圣经》的正典是自我见证的。

The canon is self-validating.
<<圣经》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.
《新约圣经》源自神；神是《新约圣经》的作者！
The canon is not some impersonal process.
正典不是一个无情的历史过程。
God is personally involved in the process.
神直接地参与，介入这过程。
[We must guard against some abstract view of history, as if God is not involved.]
我们必须提防，不能效法世俗的历史观：世俗的历史观的假设是：神没有参
与历史。
Abstract view of history:
不承认《圣经》权威的历史观，必然是抽象的历史观，列表如下：

A priori idea of canon 一个抽象的 (没有神介入) 的"正典" 观念

---

^   ^   ^   ^   ^
| | | | |
Apostolic church history 使徒时期历史

X X X X X X X X
(historical phenomenon) (个别历史事件，现象)

Canon is not just some brute fact, hanging on the horizon of our past, i.e., on just pure contingency.
正典不是某个赤裸的历史事实，在我们过去的水平线上；意思是说，正点不
是偶然的。
Biblical view of history:
合乎《圣经》的历史观是：
History is the realization and expression of God's eternal, predetermined plan.
人类/宇宙历史，乃是神永恒的，预定的计划的实现与表达。
The Bible is not a human anthology (collection).
《圣经》并不是一套人为的作品。
Therefore the Bible does not need to be verified.
因此，《圣经》并不须要由人 (教会) 来断定/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.
正典已经关闭(意思是：《圣经》已经写成了)，从使徒时代知道主再来。
Canon is not some abstract, timeless idea/process.
正典(教会承认《圣经》)不是抽象的概念，不是抽离时间的概念/过程。

Therefore: GOD IS CANON.
因此我们说：神就是正典。(正典这个字，是指标准。原文是指一支棍。)
But – we must do justice to the fact that the New Testament is a historical phenomenon, with a historical origin.
可是，我们当然应该正视一个事实，就是：《新约圣经》的写成，是一个历史的事实。《圣经》有它在历史中的起源。
(See above diagram: abstract view of history.)

Apostolicity is not a (sufficient) criterion for canonicity.
使徒性这个准则，对正典来说是不足够的。
But canonicity cannot be asserted without apostolicity.
可是，没有使徒性，我们也不能宣认正典。

D. **The Structure of the Office of the Apostle.**
    使徒的职位的结构。

Apostolos – Hebrew shaliach.
使徒 (希腊文) - 相对与希伯来文的 shaliach 这个字。
A technical term in intertestamental Judaism.
是在新旧约圣经之间的时期，犹太人用的一个专用名词。
It is a legal term. A representative, with legally empowered authority.
是一个法律上帝用词，知一个作法律上承认的， 有权力的"代表人" 。
In carrying out his commission, a shaliach is identified with his commission.
一个 shaliach 执行他的任务时，他与他的任务同为一。

Talmud (5th – 4th century, BC) – a man's shaliach = man himself.
他勒目 (犹太遗传法典，主前 4，5 世纪) -一个人的 shaliach 等于他自己。

John 13:12ff, esp. v. 16 – Authority is derived. Identification with the sender.
约翰福音 13：12 等，尤其 16 节：权威是被授予的。被授权的那位，与授权的那位认同了。
Apostolic authority is unique and full authority.
使徒弟权威，是独特的权威。使徒弟权威，是完全 (充份) 的权威。
The apostles were the foundation of the church.
使徒们是教会的基础。
Apostolic gifts did not operate in isolation.
使徒的属灵恩赐并不能在孤立自己时使用。

The church is the result of God's house-building activity in the exalted Christ.
教会的被建立，是因神自己在建造圣殿 - 都因主耶稣复活，被荣耀。
The church is realized between Christ's resurrection and Christ's return.
教会的实现，是在主耶稣复活之后，再来之前。
Apostles were the foundation of the church.
使徒们是教会的根基。
Ephesians 2:19, 20.
以弗所书 2：19-20。

The ultimate foundation is Christ, but the foundation involves others (apostles and prophets).
教会至终的根基是耶稣基督。不过根基包括其他人：使徒们，和先知们。

Prophets were mentioned with the apostles, as the foundation of the church.
先知们与使徒们并提，为教会的根基。
There were New Testament prophets.
新约时期也有显知的。
There was variety of offices and functions –
新约时期有不同的职位，不同的职位用不同的功能，
But the apostles were primary.
可是使徒是最重要的职位。

Apostles had a specific function within the context of redemptive history.
在神的救赎计划，救赎历史中，使徒的功能是独特的。见证基督的复活；作基督的代表，有权威；口传，笔传，行神迹。
The office of the apostle was not perpetuated.
而使徒的职位没有传下去。
Apostolic witness = witness to the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
使徒的见证就是：耶稣已复活了！

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 使徒所宣讲的，与神的话等同。教会就这样接受使徒所讲的。

1 Cor. 11:23 Christ himself is the bearer of apostolic tradition.
林前 11：23 基督就是使徒传统的主人与内容。

John 15:26, 27 The Spirit's coming is for the purpose of apostolic witness.
约翰 15：26， 27 圣灵要来，目的就是使使徒们能作见证。

Therefore from the apostolic matrix, new revelation is given.

因此，透过使徒的职位(和他们周围的同工们) ，神赐下了新的 (新约时期)
启示。
Apostolic witness = the foundation of the church.
使徒们所作的见证 = 教会的根基。
Apostolic witness = preserved in the church, by the church.
使徒们所作的见证 ＝ 在教会里被保存，被教会保存。
Apostolic concern for preservation:
使徒们本身关切保存传统这件事：
Apostolic witness = viewed as tradition, paradosis.
使徒们视他们的见证为传统，希腊文：paradosis。

2 Thess. 2:15
帖后 2：15 - 教训， 原文是传统。

2 Thess. 3:6
帖后 3：6

1 Cor. 11:2
林前 11：2

Apostolic tradition = both oral and written
使徒弟传统乃是口传递，也是笔传递。

2 Thess.2 :15
帖后 2：15

2 Thess. 2:2
帖后 2：2

Paul to Timothy: Guard the paratheke – the thing entrusted.
保罗嘱咐提摩太：要护卫 "所交托给他的" – 希腊文：paratheke.

1 Tim. 6:20
提前 6：20

2 Tim. 1:14
提后 1：14

2 Tim. 2:2
提后 2：2
A more technical, stereotyped term – a specific entity.
这个是一个专用名词。所交托的事，有一定的内容。

There was clear anticipation that:

我们可以说：使徒时期的教会关切到，预先看到，
As the apostles die off, as oral witnesses cease,
当使徒们去世后，当口传停止时，
As apostolic control of oral tradition is no longer available,
当使徒们再不能控制口传这个过程时，
The written apostolic witness will come into prominence,
使徒弟笔传传统就会显为重要。
It will function as the foundation of the continuing church.
这个笔之于书的传统就成为教会的根基/权威。

Complementary fact: Foundational significance of written apostolic witness = recognized.
与此同时的，相辅相成的事实是：教会承认，看见，使徒的写作，在教会里占有"根基性" 的重要性/权威。

E. **Redemptive History and the History of Revelation.**
救赎历史与启示历史。

Redemptive revelation = verbal revelation.
神救赎的启示，是话语的启示。

Correlation between redemptive deed and revelatory word.
神救赎的作为，与塌启示的话语 (晓谕) 之间有密切的关系。

Focus of verbal on the act.
神的话语的重点，放在他的救赎作为上。

Verbal revelation = parallel of, part of redemptive history.
神话语的启示 = 与救赎历史平衡，是救赎历史的一部份。

Highpoints of redemptive history = associated with full outpouring of verbal revelation.
因此，当救赎历史达到高潮的时候，神话语的启示也会达到高潮。
(Exodus; rebuilding of Temple – Haggai, Zephaniah, Malachi)
(例如：出埃及；重建圣殿 - 哈该，西番雅，马拉基)

The history of revelation is closed for us, until the Second Coming of Christ.
神启示的历史在目前是结束了；知道主再来。

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY
三位一体教义发展简史

第一部份
诺斯底主义(神哲派)
GNOSTICISM

诺斯底派的主要教义
The Main Teachings of Gnosticism
(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 47-49 ；伯克富，《基督教教义史》，页 30-32。林慈信修。)

　　我们在此不讨论诺斯底主义的各种派系，如 Valentinus 与 Basilides 等；我们只简单地讨论诺斯底主义的教义。他们的教义有 "二元论"(dualism) 的特征。宇宙有两个原始原则，或两个神，他们彼此敌对，一个高于另一个，甚至一善一恶。至高的神，即善神，是无可测度的深渊。祂在自己与有限的被造物中间，造了一连串的中级存有者(middle beings, 或 aeons: 灵体)，都是从神性放射的 (emanations of the divine) , 这些神圣的存有也被称为分神。善神与这些分神总合在一起，称为 "圆满" (pleroma)，就是神性本质的丰满 (fullness of the divine essence) 。至高的神只能藉这些 "分神" 与被造物发生关系。世界并不是善神所造，乃是因为神性丰满中发生了堕落；所以世界是一位低级的，可能由敌意的神所造。这位低级的神被称为 "造物主" (Demiurge)，即是旧约的耶和华，是一位较低的，有限的，有激情的，有时也会报复的存有者。这位造物主与至高真神之间，有着强烈的对照；至高真神是至善，至德，至真之源；祂在基督里显示出来。

　　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.

　　物质世界既是这一位低等的，可能是 "恶神" 所造，因此物质本身是邪恶的。然而物质里有灵界的余种，就是人的灵魂，是从高级圣洁世界来的一道光。这余种怎样与物质缠在一起，无人能解释。灵魂得解脱，只有藉善神的介入。有一个救法，就是一位使者从众光的国度差遣到黑暗的世界来。基督教的诺斯底主义通常认为基督就是这使者。关于基督，他们有多种描述：有时祂被视为一位属天存

有， 以一种幻影的灵体出现。有时祂又被视为一位属世的人，暂时与一种更高的力量或灵体相连。物质既然本是恶的，这位高超的灵不可能有一般的人体。

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.

若要在救赎上有份，或胜过世界，必需参加诺斯底派，领受入教的秘密仪式。救赎之途径包括以下各步骤：进入与基督结婚的奥秘，特殊的洗礼，神奥的名字，以及特别的膏抹。这样才能获永存的秘密知识 (secret knowledge of Being)。从这方面看，诺斯底主义近乎一种秘密宗教。人类分为三种：属灵的人，是教会中高级委员；属魂的人，是教会中一般的会友；属物质的人，即所有的外邦人。只有第一类才能获得更高的知识，因之有更高的福份。第二类藉信心与行为也能得救，他们只能获得次等的福份。第三类是毫无盼望，失丧之人。

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.

诺斯底主义的伦理哲学有两种相反的结果：他们的伦理道德与他们的救赎观有关。有时主张苦修主义，但也有人认为属灵的人既有了属天的祝福，肉体方面的行为并不能影响他们的救恩，所以不禁止肉体的情欲，过着放荡的生活。诺斯底主义的教义完全忽视末世论，他们否认死人复活的教义。他们认为当人的灵魂离开物质的身体时，就进到"完满"的境界，这就是人生的结局。

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.

附录：诺斯底派的敬拜

-- 从高到低 -- 从不变的本质 — 灵 — 到魂，到变与死，物质，到无有
-- 每一种存有没有更好的事物：本质的不同
-- 低的存有被更高的 (属灵人) 毁灭

「当约翰见了福徒拿都的不变心灵时，说道：啊，那不变位较好的本性呀！啊，那停驻于愚顽的魂之泉呀！啊，那充满黑暗的腐败之本质呀！啊，那欢跃于属死亡的他们之死亡呀！啊，充满火烧的无果之树呀！啊，那结着石炭之果的树木呀！啊，那与物质的疯狂及不信者邻舍同住之物质呀！你证明了你是谁和总是跟你的儿女同被判决。你不知道怎样赞颂较好的事物；因为你没有它们。因而你的道路（成果）怎样，你的根底和你的本性也是怎样。愿你从那些信靠主的他们遭受毁灭，从他们的思想，从他们的心念，从他们的灵魂，从他们的身体，从他们的行为，他们的生活，他们的谈话，从他们的工作，他们的职业，他们的谋略，从复活到安息于上帝，从他们的那你将不可分享的甘甜的滋味，从他们的信仰，他们的祈祷，从圣洗，从圣餐，从肉的饼，从酒，从衣，从爱，从看顾，从节制，从公义；从这一切，你那最不洁的撒但，上帝的敌人啊，我们的上帝耶稣基督必要即作为你和你性格一样的人的审判官，必将使你们从以上所说的一切斩绝而至灭亡。」(<约翰行传>，第 84 章。《基督教早期文献选集》，页 465。)

诺斯底派对基督的赞歌

- 基督不是真有物质身体的
- 基督的人性，身体 = 幻影？举身离地?
- 基督的事 = 神秘，无从言说

(约翰说) 众弟兄，我又要告诉你们另一荣耀之事。当我把捉住他，我忽捉到一具物质的僵硬的身体，而另一时当我感触了他，这实体却又是非物质的，而像毫无存在的样子。每当他被某个法利赛人请吃饭而允许去的时候，我们跟了他去，而主人在我们每一个人面前放了一块面包，他也跟我们一样受了一块；他祝福了他那一块，而把它分给了我们；每一个人无不从那个小面包吃饱了，而我们所有的一块全都不吃了因而主人惊奇呆木了。我曾屡次跟他同走，想察看他的脚印是否留在地面上；因为我看他好似举身离地，我从不曾见他脚踪。众弟兄，我告诉了你们这些事，为的是鼓励你们对祂的信心；因为我们今日必不说到祂的大能和奇妙作为，由于它们实皆无可言说的，可能是，完全无从讲起或听到的。(<约翰行传>，第 93 章。《基督教早期文献选集》，页 467。)

第二部份
反诺斯底主义的教父们
The Anti-Gnostic Fathers

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

护教学的教父时期，很自然地转入另一个时期，就是继承他们的 「反诺斯底主义的教父」(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.

爱任纽 **(Irenaeus)**

第一位反诺斯底主义的教父是爱任纽。他出生于东方，后来称为坡旅甲的门徒，但他的一生大部份时间住在西方。他本是一位长老(presbyter, 即牧师)，后来成为里昂(Lyon)的监督。他的著作显示一种实践的基督徒精神，他的思想近于约翰的教义，但有时他的观念中也会重视感情。他最主要的作品是《反异端》(*Against Heresies*) 一书，其中特别批判诺斯底主义。从本书中可以看出他的才干，他所论述的基督教的福音也非常纯粹，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.

希坡利达 **(Hippolytus)**

第二位是希坡利达，据说是爱任纽的门徒，他的思维取向很像他的老师。他也是一位非常单纯，中肯，实践的人。他虽不像爱任纽那样有天才，但他很喜好哲学思想。他主要在罗马附近事奉，据说在那里殉道。他最重要的著作是 《驳斥异端》(*The Refutation of All Heresies*)。他发现所有教义上的谬误，是出于在哲学上的揣测。

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 deoctrine in the speculations of the philosophers.

特土良 (Tertullian)

三位教父中最伟大的一位是特土良；他不但有深奥的智慧和丰富的情感，又有活泼的想象力。他的学问很高，又有敏锐的观察力。他在迦太基作长老(牧师)，因此是北非神学派系的代表。又因为他的性格非常激烈，所以他为基督教辩护时会用严励的言辞。他本是律师，对罗马法律非常熟悉，他的神学著作中也使用法律名词与观念。他与希坡利达一样，认为所有的异端乃受希腊哲学的影响，因之他竭力反对哲学。他真诚热切的本性，使他对时代的放荡精神非常厌憎，后来甚至接纳了厌世的孟他努主义 (Montanism)。他认为与异端辩论不会发生功效，因此认为处置异端最简单的方法就是向他们提出异议。他是对西方神学思想影响最深的教父。

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.

神论，人论，及救赎历史
Their Doctrines of God, Man, and the History of Redemption

神的教义
Doctrine of God

他们认为诺斯底主义最大的错误，乃是将真神与创造主分为两位。他们认为诺斯底主义是出于撒但的亵渎；他们特别重视只有一位真神，祂不但是创造之主，也是救赎的主。律法由祂所赐，福音也是祂所启示。这位神是三一真神；有三个位格 (three persons)，但只有一个本质 (a single essence)。特土良是教会历史上第一个指出神有三个位格，也是首先使用 "三位一体" (Trinitas) 专名的人。为了要驳斥神格唯一派 (Monarchianism)，他特别重视神是一位，但有三个位格；只有一个本质 (one substance)。虽在数字上是三位，但神的本体绝无分裂。虽是如此，特土良的三一观仍是不太正确，因为他认为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.

人的教义
Doctrine of Man

他们在人论上也反对诺斯底主义；他们特别指出，在人里面的善恶，并不是天赋的本性的 (natural endowments)。假使物质是恶的，那么人的本性是恶的，人就不能被视为有道德选择的存有者 (a free moral being)。然而人是按着神的形像而造，并非不朽 (意即：并非完全)；但是人若顺服，则可能获得不朽。罪乃是叛逆，结果是死亡；正如顺服神的结果是不朽。全人类都在亚当里服在死亡之下。当时的教父们并没有详细指出我们的罪怎样与亚当的罪有关，唯有特土良曾略为提到这一点。他说自从一个人出生，恶就在人的本性里，这种光景借着繁殖传递给人类。这是论到原罪的教义最早的记录。

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.

救赎历史
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.

基督的位格与工作
Their Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ

对于基督位格的教义，爱任纽与特土良大相径庭；所以我们必需分别讨论。

Irenaeus and Tertullian differ considerably in their doctrine of the Person of Christ, and therefore it may be well to consider them separately.

1. 爱任纽
Irenaeus' Christology

爱任纽的基督论比特土良和希波利达更正确，他的基督论也影响了希波利达。他非常讨厌对 「道」的揣测，因为这样只会带来更多的揣测。他只指出「道」是永存的，也是借着道而将父神显示出来。他以历史上显示的神的儿子为真正的出发点。借着 「道成肉身」， 道成为历史上的耶稣；从那时起祂是真神，也是真人。他反对诺斯底主义的异端，就是说那位不能受苦的基督在十字架钉死之前与那位能受苦的耶稣分开了。他却指出神与人性联合是至为重要的。人类在第二亚当基督里再 次 与 神 联 合 。 人 类 ， 无 论 是 以 往 的 或 将 来 的 人 ， 在 祂 里 面 得 到 恢 复(recapitulation)，这恢复使人类从亚当堕落后踏上之途挽回过来。这是爱任纽基督论的中心思想。他提到耶稣基督替死赎罪，但没有太强调。基督工作的最重要因素是祂的顺服，祂的顺服抵消了亚当的不顺服。

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 fro 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

特土良的基督论以 「道」 为出发点，发展出在历史上很重要的教义。他说：基督教的 「道」 有实际的本质(a real subsistence)， 是一位独立的位格 (Person)，是神所生，从神而出；不是从神流出，乃是自动生长 (self-projection)，正像树木从根生长出来一样。祂的存在是有起点的 (There was a time when he was not)。特土良强调 「道」 与父同质(substance)，但生存的形态 (mode of existence) 却与父不同。祂有自己的位格。祂的存在不是由于和父神分隔开来 (partitioning)，乃是藉自我彰显 (self-unfolding)。父是全部的本质，而子只是本质的一部份，因为子是演展出来的 (derived)。特土良并没有完全脱出子是低于父的观念。特土良的长远重要性，乃是因为他是第一位提出本质 (substance) 与位格 (person) 这个观念者；后来制订尼西亚信经 (Nicene Creed) 时，就用到这些观念。我们可以说他扩大了 「道」 的教义，发展为三位一体的教义。为了驳斥神格唯一派，特土良强调神性中的三个位格只有一个本质。位格乃众数，却没本体之别。可惜他并没有完全讲明三位一体的教义。他只看到 *「道」 是在神里面的 「无位格理性」* (impersonal reason)， 在创造时才有位格。一个位格低于另一个位格这观念，又以粗略的方式表达：第一位格参与神性的本质 (substance) 比较多， 而第二位格的参与较少。

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 Hi, 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.

关于基督的神人二性，特土良与小亚细亚派的说法非常相似。关于基督完全的人性，除了麦利都 (Melito) 之外，他比其他教父们都讲得更清晰。他清楚地分辨基督的两性不混淆，神性人性都有各自的属性。他认为两性并没有融合起来 (fusion)，神人二性在基督里聚在一起 (conjunction)。他很重视耶稣基督的死，但没有详细解明，因为他并没有强调耶稣受刑替死赎罪的必需性。他只注重罪人必需诚心悔罪。他虽认为神的公义有刑罚的因素，但特别高举神的怜悯。同时，他的教导中有律法主义的趋向。他认为人受洗之后若犯罪，必须悔改或认罪，才能满足神的要求。他又认为藉禁食及禁欲来治死罪 (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. 爱任纽论救赎的工作
Irenaeus on the Work of Redemption

在反诺斯底派的教父中，爱任纽对于基督救赎大功的描写最详细，但他的讨论不完全一致。爱任纽是教父之中最正统的一位，但在他的著作中有两种思想不合乎《圣经》：一是道德取向的，二是神秘主义取向的。前者乃是说：人若自动地拣选善 – 这是靠己力能做到的 -他就能重获得到永生的命运。基督圣工的真正重要性，是叫我们确实的认识神，因此强化了人的自由。后者，基督叫人类在祂里面复原 (recapitulation)，在神人之间建立了新的关系，成为叫人类获新生命的面酵。"道"借着受苦受死与人类认同，也借着使人类成圣与赐人不朽，使人类升到更高的境界。祂使人类在祂里面复原，挽转了人类在亚当里启动的命运。祂赐给人类新生与不朽的的面酵。这种说法可被解释为：救赎是透过神秘的过程 (mystical process)，从道成了肉身直到人类神化 (deification)。爱任纽在这方面的强调，可能因为他受到约翰的影响，比保罗的影响更深。显然地，爱任纽的用意并不是要教导救赎是完全神秘的，超肉体的。他虽特别重视基督与祂救赎的子民必须有生命的联合 (living union) – 圣安瑟伦并没有论到这一点 – 但他也提到这方面与救赎其他方面的关系：如基督为我们顺服神，满足了神的要求；祂为我们受苦，为我们付上罪债，向父神献上挽回祭，挽回父神的忿怒 (propitiation) 。祂也救赎我们脱离撒但的权势。

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 Johaninne 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，教会，末世论教义
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 throng a new head in Antichrist. Then Christ will appear, and the six thousands yeas 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
亚历山大的教父
THE ALEXANDRIAN FATHERS
(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 70-76；伯克富，《基督教教义史》，页 51-57。林慈信修。)

正如在第一世纪，犹太教宗教思想与希腊哲学混合，产生一派由斐罗 (Philo) 代表的思想；同样在第二，第三世纪，希腊哲学与福音真理混合起来，形成了亚历山大派的神学。当时有些杰出的神学家，将诺斯底主义中最深奥的揣测，用来建立教会的信仰。在这过程中，他们用了隐喻法解释；《圣经》 (allegorical interpretation)。基督教真理成为一种用文学方式表达的学问。这派基督教学术中最重要人物，乃是亚历山大的革利免 (Clement of Alexandria) 与奥利金 (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.

亚历山大的教父
The Alexandrian Fathers

亚历山大的革利免
Clement of Alexandria

革利免与奥利金代表东方的神学，这派比西方的神学更抽象。两位都是亚历山大教义学院 (School of the Catechetes) 的老师，影响力至深。若与爱任纽和特土良比较，我们可以说革利免不是正统基督徒。他没有像爱任纽与特土良遵守信仰的准则 (The Rule of Faith)。他乃根据护教士的方法，尝试以自己对当日哲学的理解，来配合基督教的传统，有时几乎以哲学取代传统教义。革利免与特土良不同，他对哲学友善，坚持基督教神学家必须在外邦学术思想与福音之间建立桥梁。他觉得《圣经》与理性 (他尤其高举理性) 都是认识神之泉源；又因采用隐喻 (灵意) 解经法，引进许多人为的猜测。不过，他对希腊哲学的估价并不一贯；有时认为希腊哲学有启示的成份，但有时又谴责是从希伯来先知们剽窃而来。

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.

奥利金
Origen

奥利金的父母亲是基督徒，小时受基督教教育。他非常早熟，年轻就开始严谨的苦修操练。他继承了他的老师 – 亚历山大的革利免，出任教义学院院长。为了装备自己，他彻底研究了当时流行的新柏拉图派哲学 (Neo-Platonism)，和当时最重要的异端，尤其是诺斯底主义。不久他就名扬四海，越来越多人参加他的讲座。他是早期教会中最有学问，思想最深奥的思想家。他的教义非常抽象，后期被判为异端。他竭力反对诺斯底主义，也使神格唯一论受到极大的打击。然而这些都是次要的；他主要的工作乃是建立一套基督教教义系统。他最重要的著作《原道》 (*De Principiis*)，是基督教最早的一部完整的系统神学。其中有一部份后来被定为异端，然而他对后来的教义发展有极大的影响。他似乎愿意在信仰上作正统的基督徒；他坚持遵照神的圣道与信仰的准则，作为他诠释的标准；认为若不出于《圣经》的教训或是根据《圣经》的教义的推论，就当拒绝。虽是如此，他的神学深受新柏拉图主义的影响，而他的隐喻法解经引致各样的猜测与随意解释。

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.

神论与人论
Their Doctrine of God and of Man

神论
Doctrine of God

如同护教士们，奥利金认为神是绝对的，是不可认知的，不可测度的，不可被动的；是自足的，超乎任何需要和缺乏的；他也像反诺斯底派的教父们那样，反对诺斯底主义者将善神与 「造物主」 (Demiurge) 分为两位神。神是一位，旧约与新约的神是同一位神。神是绝对的第一因 (absolute causality) 。因他认为神的属性，如 「无所不能」 以及 「公义」 等，永远是动性的 (eternally in action)， 因此他提倡神永远创造的教义 (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 Anti-gnostic 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」 的教义
Doctrine of the Logos

亚历山大的革利免对 「道」 的解释甚不清楚。他认为 「道」 是有位格地存在的 (personal subsistence)，与父同一 (oneness with the Father)，祂是父神在永恒中生的 (eternal generation) ；但又称 「道」 为神的理性 (divine reason)，次于圣父。他将 「道」 分为两位，一位是 「真的神的道」 (real Logos of God)，另一位是在肉身出现的 「神子道」 (Son- Logos)。从起初开始，「道」 是神启示的媒介 (mediates revelation)，因为 「道」 在创造大工上加上神智慧的印记。 「道」 将理性之光赐予人类；为真理作了特别的启示；并在基督里道成肉身。「道」 的光帮助外邦人，在他们来就福音完备之光上作踏脚石。

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.

奥利金说独一神主要是圣父，但祂借着 「道」 自我启示，也借着 「道」 来行事。「道」 是有位格的，与父同永 (co-eternal)，是由父神一个永恒的作为 (one eternal act) 而生。奥利金论子从父而生时，完全拒绝子是从父射出来 (emanation) 或分出

来 (division) 的看法。但他虽承认子有完全的神性，但有时又好像说子是次于父 (subordination)。他虽说子是在永恒里由父而生，但当他解释这句话时，不单认为子在救赎计划上次于圣父 (economic subordination)，而在本质上也次于圣父 (essential subordination)。他有时称子为第二位神 (*Theos Deuteros*)。在道成肉身中，道与一个人的灵魂联合，这灵魂在先存时 (pre-existence) 乃是纯洁的。基督的神性与人性是有别的 (kept distinct)；但奥利金又说道复活与升天之后，将祂的人性「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.

圣灵论
Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

革利免没有尝试解释圣灵与圣父和圣子的关系。可是奥利金对三位一体第三位的教义，比他对基督的观点更偏离大公教会的教义。他说圣灵是父藉子所造的第一位受造物。圣灵与圣父的关系没有圣子与圣父的关系那么亲密。他更说：圣灵没有在整个宇宙中运行；祂只在圣徒的生命中运行而已。圣灵的本质是善的，他使罪人更新与成圣，也是敬拜神者敬拜的对象 (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.

奥利金的人论
Origen's Doctrine of Man

奥利金论人的教义也非常独特。因他持「永远创造论」(eternal creation)，所以他认为人是先存的 (pre-existence of man)，因为原本的创造只创造了有理性的灵 (rational spirits), (与神)平等(co-equal)，(与神)同永 (co-eternal)。今天人类的光景预设了一个先存的堕落，从圣洁堕落到有罪。物质世界就是在这先存的堕落时候被造

的。堕落了的灵，因之成为灵魂，穿上了肉体。物质之被造，是要为这些堕落的灵预备居所，使他们受管教，得以炼净 (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.

基督的位格与工作的教义
Their Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ

道成肉身的教义
Doctrine of the Incarnation

这两位教父都认为道成肉身，就是道成了完全的人，有完整的人性，包括人的身体与灵魂，因此成了一个真实的人，即 「神 –人」 。可是革利免脱不出 「幻影说」。他说：耶稣基督吃东西，并不是因为他需要食物，乃是要藉此使人不能否认他的人性；他又说基督不可能有人的悲伤与喜乐等感情。奥利金坚持，基督的灵魂是 「先存的」，如其他一切的灵魂一样，他甚至说基督的灵魂在 「先存的」 状态中，是与 「道」 联合的。其实在道成肉身之前，基督的灵魂与 「道」 早已完全彼此融合 (complete interpenetration)。「道」 所充满的灵魂取了一个身体，甚至这个身体也被 「道」 穿入(penetrated) 而 「神化」 (divinized) 。因为在基督里神性与人性是如此混合 (mingling)，所以当祂被荣耀时，祂等于成为无所不在 (ubiquitous)。奥利金并没有成功地维持基督里神性与人性的完整性 (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.

论基督工作的教义
Doctrine of the Work of Christ

他们对基督的工作有不同的看法。革利免认为基督献上自己作为赎价 (ransom)，但他并没有看到基督为人类的罪成了赎罪的挽回祭 (propitiation)。他特别重视基督为赐律的主，教师，能教导引致永生不朽的道路。对于他，救赎的工作并不是要使过去的罪得以赦免，而是叫人能从堕落的光景中升高，过一种更完善的生活。奥利金论到基督救赎之工时，认为基督是大医师，牧师，赐律者，并作我们最好的榜样。祂对罪人说是医师，对那些已经被洁净的人是教师，对祂的百姓是赐律者，对那些跟从祂的人是道德生活的好榜样。基督是大医师，教师，赐律者，好榜样，所以能使人因祂获得神的性情。奥利金同时看到信徒的救恩完全靠着基督为我们受苦替死。基督因为能够蒙蔽撒但的眼，而将信徒从魔鬼的权势之下拯救出来。祂将自己交给撒但作为赎价，撒但接受了这个赎价，却不知道因为基督是完全无罪的。撒但就无法将祂留住。基督之死是替罪死，是赎罪之祭，如此方能叫死人的罪得了代赎。"道" 所作成的救赎功效，不但在今世，而且在来世也照样有效。不但是古往今来的世人，就是那些堕落的灵，甚至撒但与祂的恶魔们也会受到基督救赎的影响。末日时，万事都要复兴。

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.

论教会的教义，论未来的事的教义
Their Doctrine of Salvation, Of the Church, and Of the Last Things

救恩的教义
Doctrine of Salvation

亚历山大的教父们承认人有自由意志，所以当耶稣基督的救恩传给他的时候，他就会接受救恩，弃恶从善。神将救恩赐下，人有权自由接纳。但奥利金虽然一方面说信心是出于人意志的行动，但他也认为人有信心是由于神的恩惠。信心是得救过程中最初的步骤，因此，救恩的获得是出于信心。然而信心不过是接受神启示的第一步，此外还必须要提高到知识与悟性，也必须进到好行为的表现。信心使人得救，但信心的目标乃是行为。这些都很重要。奥利金常提到救恩的两个步骤，一是信心 (对外的) ，一是知识 (对内的) 。这两位教父并没有看到保罗所教导的信心与称义的观念。此外，奥利金特别提到信心并不是得救的唯一条件。在他看来，悔改比信心更重要，因为悔改是在神面前承认我们的罪。他所论的救恩是内在的，不是像西方的教父，尤其是特土良等，所着重的法律上的救恩。

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.

教会论
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.

末世论
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.

<div align="center">

第四部份
神格唯一说
MONARCHIANISM

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

</div>

神格唯一说的兴起
Rise of Monarchianism

　　第二世纪最大的异端是诺斯底主义，而第三世纪最大的异端则是 「神格唯一说」 (Monarchianism) 。护教士，反诺斯底主义的教父，及亚历山大教父的 「道的教义」 ，都不完全令人满意。一般人认为 「道的教义」 有许多不当的地方。有人觉得伤害了神论；有些人又认为他们伤害了基督论。重视神论的人觉得 「道的教义」 认为「道」 乃是另一位格，可能威胁了神的合一性，甚至一神论；而重视基督论者则认为 「道」 若次于父，就似乎妥协了基督的神性。因此有学识之士尝试解决这两个问题，一方面保持神的合一性，另一方面不能抹煞基督的神性。因此两派思想兴起，都被称为 「神格唯一说」 (这个名称是特土良所起) 。虽然严格来说，这名称只适合于那些要维护神的合一性的思想；然而到今天这名称是两派思想的总称。

　　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.

动力的神格唯一说
Dynamic Monarchianism

这派 「神格唯一说」 的目标乃是维护神的唯一性；可以说，完全与以前的 「爱宾派」(Ebionites) 及近代的 「独神论派」 (Unitarianism) 如出一辙。有人认为这派思想最初出现于阿罗该 (Alogi) 一个不著名的派别。斯伯克 (Seeburg) 不同意这个解释。此派比较可能的创始人，是被罗马大主教维克德 (Victor) 革出教会的一位拜占庭人，名 「提阿多达」 (Theodotus of Byzantium) 。此后一位 「亚提蒙」

(Artemon，在叙利亚出生) 试用《圣经》与传统来证明这一类「神格唯一说」。然而亚提蒙的论证被一位佚名氏所著《小迷宫》(*Little Labyrinth*) 一书所驳斥。这一派的神格唯一说不久就烟消云散。

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*.

撒摩撒他之保罗
Paul of Samosata

动力的神格唯一论，后来又由安提阿的主教「撒摩撒他之保罗」(Paul of Samosata) 将之死灰复燃。这位主教非常属世，也甚傲慢。他认为「道」是与父神同质 (*homoousios*, co-substantial)，但在神性 (Godhead) 中没有独立的位格。道可以与神同为一 (identified with God)，因为祂存在于神里面，正如人的理性存在于人里面。道是无位格的能力，存在于所有的人里面，但特别在耶稣这个人里面运作。因为道渐进地，独特地完全渗透了耶稣的人性，这个神的能力逐渐地神化了耶稣。因为这位人耶稣是如此被神化，所以祂配有神的尊贵；然而严格说来祂并不应被认为是神。撒摩撒他保罗如此建构道的教义，保持了神的合一性；神的本性 (nature) 和位格 (person) 都是一，道与圣灵不过是神性 (Godhead) 中无位格的属性 (impersonal attributes)。这种看法后来也被索西奴派 (Socinians) 及近代的独神论派所采用。这些神格唯一的派别都尝试维护神的合一性及耶稣真正的人性。马基弗 (McGiffert) 认为这些异端 [译注：撒摩撒他之保罗] 的目的，乃只是坚持耶稣的人性。

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.

形态的神格唯一说
Modalistic Monarchianism: Sabellianism

　　另一种神格唯一说，影响比较广泛。这派一方面要保持神性的合一，但主要在基督论方面保持基督完全的神性。这派被称为 「形态上的三种形态」(modes)。西方教会称此派为「圣父受苦说」(Patripassianism)，因为此说认为父神自己道成肉身成为基督，因此圣父在基督里受苦，与基督一同受苦。东方教会称此派为 「撒伯流派」 (Sabellianism)。撒伯流派与 「动力神格唯一说」 不同之处，乃在坚持基督真正的神性。

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.

普拉克西亚与奴爱达
Praxeas abd Noetus

　　特土良认为创始 「神格唯一说」 的是一位不太有名的 「普拉克西亚」(Praxeas) ，而希坡利达 (Hippolytus) 认为创始者是示每拿的奴爱达 (Noetus of Smyrna) 。可能两人都对倡导此派学说有功。普拉克西亚完全反对神性 (God) 中可以有位格上的不同。特土良批判他，说：「他将保惠师赶走，又将圣父钉死在十架。」普拉克西亚似乎并没有说圣父受苦；不过奴爱达就清楚的说出这点。希坡利达说：「他(奴爱达)说：基督自己就是圣父，乃是圣父自己降生，并受苦而死。」("He said that Christ is Himself the Father, and that the Father Himself was born and suffered and died.") 按照希坡利达，奴爱达大胆地说，圣父改变了自己的形态(mode of being)，变成(became)祂的儿子。奴爱达自己是这样说：「当圣父尚未降生时，祂当被称为父；但祂按自己的美意，服在降世为人之下时，祂就出生，成为圣子；是祂自己 (He of Himself)，并不是另一位 (of another，成为圣子)。」

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

　　「形态神格唯一说」最著名的代表是撒伯流。他的著作只有很少的片断存留至今，我们因此不能详细断定他的教导。然而我们清楚晓得他特别重视神的本质是合一的 (unity of the divine essence)，祂的显示则有多种 (plurality of its manifestations)。神的显示如同戏剧中的各部份。撒伯流虽说到三个位格，但对于他，「位格」乃是指一个演员所装扮的角色，或显示的形态。按他的看法，父，子，灵这三个名称，只不过是指唯一的神显示自己的独一神圣本质 (one divine essence)的三个阶段而已。神在创造，赐律法时以父显示自己；在道成肉身中以子显示自己；在叫人重生与成圣时，以圣灵显示自己。

　　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 n regeneration and sanctification.

<div align="center">

第五部份
关于三位一体的争论
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY: THE TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSY

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

</div>

一. 争论的背景
The Background

三位一体争论的兴起
Rise of the Trinitarian Controversy

　　三位一体的争论，到了亚利乌与阿他拿修间之争达到了高潮。这是它的根源的。上面说过，早期教父并没有清晰的三位一体观念，有的认为「道」是非位格的理性 (impersonal reason)，在创造是才有位格。另一些教父们则认为「道」是有位格的，与父神同永，享有神的本质，但却认为「道」从属与父。在他们的讨论中，圣灵并不重要；他们提到圣灵，主要是关于在信徒的生命中运行救赎。有人认为圣灵不仅从属于圣父，也从属于圣子。特土良是首先清楚说神是三个位格的教父，并坚持三位格在本体上同一。但连他也不能将三位一体的教义说清楚。

　　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.

　　神格唯一论(Monarchianism)此时兴起，强调神的合一性与基督真正的神性，实际上否认了真正的三位一体教义。西方教会里有特土良与希坡利达 (Hippolytus) 驳斥神格唯一论；在东方，奥利金给予此异端致命的打击。他们都维护《使徒信经》所表达的三位一体教义。但奥利金对三位一体的解释并不妥当。他坚称圣父与圣子都是神圣的位格 (divine hypostases)，都有位格的存在 (personal subsistences)。但他未能合乎《圣经》地讲出神性中三位个与一本质之间的关系。奥氏虽然是第一位用「永远生出」的观念 (eternal generation) 来解释父子关系，但是他的定义包含了第二位在本质上从属第一位的意思。而圣父传达给圣子(communicated) 的神性是次等的，可以称为神 (Theos), 但不能称为唯一的神 (Ho Theos)。奥氏有时甚至称圣子为第二位神 (Theos Deuteros)。这是奥利金三位一体教义中最基本的缺点，为后来的亚利乌铺路。另外比较次要的缺点，是他说子之生出宾公费父神的必要作为 (necessary act)，而是出自父神主权的旨意 (sovereign will)。不过他小心地避开了父子在时间上有先后 (temporal succession) 的观念。奥氏的圣灵论就离《圣经》的

教训更远了。他不仅将圣灵从属于圣子，而且将圣灵当为子所创造的。在奥氏的言论中，似乎有一处说到圣灵只是受造之物。

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 Deuteros*. 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. 争论的性质
The Nature of the Controversy

1. 亚利乌与亚利乌派
Arius and Arianism

三位一体的大争论，通常被称为亚利乌派之争论 (the Arian controversy)，因为是亚利乌反三位一体所引起的。亚氏为亚历山大里亚的长老 (即牧师)，是辩论高手，但生命缺乏深度。他主要的思想观念是神格唯一派的一神论原则，即只有一位神，祂不是被生的，是没有源始的存有者，也没有存在之始。亚氏将临在神里面 (immanent in God)，仅为神的一种力量 (a divine energy) 的 「道」，与最终成为肉身的子或 「道」 加以区分。后者是有起头的：祂是父神所生，用亚利乌的说法，就等于说基督是被造的。祂在创造世界以前从无被造出来，因此基督不是永远的，也没有神的本质。祂是一切受造物中最伟大，最初的；祂被造的目的，是藉者祂创造世界。因此祂是可变的，但因为祂预见的功德被神所拣选，也想到祂未来的荣耀，被称为神的儿子，也由于祂被神认为义子，所以祂能受人的崇敬。亚利乌从《圣经》中到似乎说圣子次于圣父的经节，来支持他的见解，即如箴八 22 (在七十士译本中)， 太二十八 18，可十三 32，路十八 19，约五 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. 对亚利乌派的反抗
[b] The opposition to Arianism.

(一) 阿他那修 (Athanasius) 的势力
Strength of Athanasius

亚利乌首先受到他自己的主教亚历山得 (Alexander) 的反对，亚历山得为圣子的真神性据理力争，同时主张由父生出永远之子的教义。然而亚利乌真正最大的敌对者，是他教区中的大主教阿他那修。历史证明阿氏是坚强不屈不挠的真理斗士。西波尔说，阿他那修的伟大能力，在于三方面: (a) 他伟大坚定不移的性格；(b)他有稳固的根基，就是他坚持神合一的观念，保守他不至于与当日最流行的从属观念 (subordinationism) 同流合污；与 (c) 他用正确的方法教导人承认基督位格的性质与意义; 他觉得若以基督为受造者，就是否认相信祂而得救和与神联合。

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) 阿他那修论圣父与圣子之关系
Athanasius on the Relation of the Son and the Father

阿氏特别强调神的合一性，并坚持在三位一体教义的解说上，不得影响此合一性。虽然圣父与圣子是属于同一的，是神的本质，但在基本的神性上是没有区分的；若说有次等的神是非常严重的错误。虽然阿氏非常着重神的合一性，但他也承认在神性中有三个不同的位格。他拒绝相信亚利乌派所说，圣子是在创立世界以前造的，并且主张圣子独立，永远位格上的存在。同时，他牢记神性中的三位格并非是分立的；若是分立则导致多神主义。根据阿氏，神的合一性以及在在祂本性中的区分，最好是用「本质上的一体」一词来表明，这就清楚说明圣父与圣子是同质的，但也暗示二者也许在其他方面不同，例如在圣父与圣子的生存方面。阿氏如奥利金一样，教导圣子是由父所生的，但与奥利金有别；阿氏描述此生出乃如神的内在行为，因此是必要的，永远的，并非要依赖圣父主权旨意的作为。

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.

影响阿他那修，并决定他神学见解的，非仅逻辑一致性的要求；他对真理解说的主要因素，乃在于宗教的主要信念。他的神学教义是自然而然地从他的拯救论信仰上产生的，他的根本立场是主张，要与神联合就必须得救，除了祂本身是神的那一位之外，没有一个受造之物能叫我们与神联合。因此西波尔说：「如果基督是神，祂来到人间，就是神来到人间。那么借着祂我们才能与神有交通，罪得赦免。祂把真理以及永生，确定地带给世人。」(《教义史》，卷一，211 页)

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 foregiveness of sins, the truth of God, and immortality been certainly brought to man." *Hist. of Doct*. I, p. 211.

三. 尼西亚会议 (Council of Nicea)

为了解决此争端，尼西亚会议在主后 325 年召开。会议中讨论的问题非常清楚明了，可用一句话表明，即亚利乌派拒绝永远生出的概念，而阿他那修却坚称此点。亚利乌派说，圣子是从无中被创造出来的，而阿他那修主张，祂是从圣父的本质中而生出的。亚利乌派主张，圣子与圣父并非同质，而阿他那修坚称，祂是与父同质 (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.

在争论的双方之外，还有一个较大的中间派，即优西比乌 (Eusebius) 所领导的，构成了中间派中的较大多数。优西比乌是教会中最有名的历史家，此派又称为奥利金派，因为他的思想是来自奥利金的原理。

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

尼西亚会议及其决定

奥利金倾向于亚利乌派，反对圣子与圣父同质的教义。该派事先由优西比乌起草了一项声明，在此声明中除了上述之外，一切都与亚历山得与阿他那修相同，并建议用 「似质」 (homoi-ousios) 一词代替 「同质」 (homo-ousios)， 以此教导说，圣子与圣父有相似的本质。经过相当的辩论之后，皇帝最终运用他的权威，倾向阿他那修派，因而获胜。会议就所争论之点，采纳了下列的声明： 「我们相信一位神，就是全能的父，有形与无形之物的创造者。又信一位主，就是耶稣基督，是生出而非被造 (begotten, not created)，与圣父同质 (homoousios)」 等。这是非常清晰的声明。「同质」 一词，除了圣子的本质与圣父相同以外，不能谬解作其他的意义，这样就把圣子放在与圣父同等的地位，并非被造者，乃承认祂本身就是神。

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 *homoiousios* 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. 尼西亚会议争论的后果
The Aftermath

1. 不圆满的会议决定
[a] Unsatisfactory nature of the decision.

会议的决定并没有止息争端，只是成为争端的开始。会议的决定是由于皇帝高压手段的结果，未能达成圆满，而且平息的期间也不太确定，使得基督教信仰的决定，似乎在于皇帝的善变与宫廷中的谋算。阿他那修本人虽然得胜，但对于此种解决教会争论的方法，也深表不满，他宁可借着辩论的威力来说服对方。结果清楚证明，皇帝态度的改变，影响着结论的改变，占优势的一派可能立刻受到挫败，这在以后的历史中是屡次发生的事。

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. 半亚利乌派在东方教会中暂时的兴盛
Temporary Ascendancy of Semi-Arianism in the Eastern Church

尼西亚会议后期的三位一体争论中的伟大人物，就是阿他那修，他是当代位伟人，杰出的学者，拥有坚强性格的一位，也是一位为他的信念有勇敢抱负的人，随时准备为真理受难。此时的教会，逐渐归属于亚利乌派，皇帝也随风倾倒过去，所以当时有一句通俗流行的话：「一个阿他那修抵抗全世界。」这位神的忠实仆人，五次被放逐，其职位由一些不配的阿谀者所取代，他们为教会带来奇耻大辱。

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 Athansius 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) 对尼西亚会议决定的反抗
Opposition to the decision of Nicaea

对于《尼西亚信经》的反抗，分为不同的几方面。甘宁汉说：「比较更凶悍，更诚实的亚利物派说，圣子是非本质的 (heteroousios) ，是属于与神完全不同的本质；又有的人说，祂不像父神；又有些人说 (一般认为是半亚利乌派者) ，祂是有与父相似的本质 (homoiousios) ；但是他们却都异口同声的拒绝《尼西亚信经》中所说的，因为他们反对《尼西亚信经》中圣子真正神性的教义。」(《历史神学》，卷一，290 页) 半亚利乌主义在东方教会非常盛行，然而西方教会在此问题上才不同的见解，并且忠于尼西亚会议的决定。这在以下的事实上得到了说明，那就是东方教会受到奥利金从属主义 (subordinationism)的影响，意即圣子是在圣父之下的主义；而西方教会多受特土良的影响，并发展出一种神学，与阿他那修的主张趋于一致。然而除此之外，西方教会与东方教会之间的抗衡，也需予以检讨。当阿他那修从东方教会被放逐的时候，他受到西方教会的欢迎，其中罗马会议 (主后 341 年) 与撒底迦 (Sardica) 会议 (主后 343 年) ，都无条件地赞助他的见解。

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 it 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) 安吉拉之马赛路 (Marcellus of Ancyra)

由于马赛路在西方教会晋升为尼西亚神学的健将，因而导致阿他那修思想活动的逐渐没落。马氏又重回到神性中永远的与非位格的道之间的古老区分上，次非位格的道，意即在创造之工上显明为神的能力，而此道在道成肉身

时成为位格。马氏否认 「生出」 (generation) 一词可以用在先存的道上，因此把「神的儿子」 这名词，仅限于成肉身的道上；并且主张在祂道成肉身生活的末了，这个道 (Logos) 要回到祂在创造世界以前与父的关系。马氏的学说，明显是属于奥利金派或优西比乌派的见解，如此成为加深东西教会分裂的工具。

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) 协调的努力
Reconciling Efforts

为了挽救分裂，曾有多方面的努力。在安提阿所召开的会议中，接纳了尼西亚的定义，虽然有两项重要的例外。他们坚称，「似质」 并子之生出，是由于父之旨意的作为。当然这不能满足西方的教会。以后，又有其他的总会及会议，在这些会议中，优西比乌派要求西方教会不承认阿他那修的见解，并另起草一折衷的信经，均遭失败。后来，康士坦丢斯登基，用一种狡猾的手段及势力，强迫西方教会主教在亚勒尔与米兰的会议上，与优西比乌派站同一阵线。

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. 潮流的转变
The Turning of the Tide.

反抗的受阻
Disruption of the Opposition

不正当运动的得胜，再次证明此为一件危险的事，这事实上市反尼西亚派的疾候。这一派的中间分子，就是主张三位一体中之第二位不是生出来的，他们一旦

杰出了外部的压力，就显露出内部的不合，这时非常明显的事。亚利乌派与半亚利乌派并不相投合，后者并没有组织上的合一，在 357 年底舍米安会议 (Council of Sirmium)上，他们就想将各派联合起来，将本质，同质与似质等名词一边不加理会，认为这三名词并非是人的知识所能及。为求解决这件事，深感棘手，至此亚利乌派原形毕露，就逼迫保守的半亚利乌派进入尼西亚阵营。

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 maters 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

此时新兴的尼西亚派，为奥利金学派的弟子所组成，但对真理更完全的解释，则有负于阿他那修与《尼西亚信经》。其中主要的人物就是加帕多加的三位教父，巴西流，尼撒贵格利，以及拿先斯贵格利。他们看出，使用本质 (ousia) 与位格 (prosopon) 等名词，是导致误解的根源，因此禁止用它们来指明圣父与圣子位格上的本质 (personal subsistence)。他们又想出一个方法不走阿他那修的路线，即不走在神里面有一个本质 (本体) 的路线，这三位教父思想的出发点则集中在神性中的三个位格上，并企图将此三位格置于神本质的观念中。二贵格利将神性中的三位格与神性的关系比作三个人与一般人类间之关系。正因为他们强调神性中的三位格，所以他们才使尼西亚有关三位一体的教义，脱离了在优西比乌派眼中所看见的撒伯流主义的色彩，这样一来，道 (Logos) 的位格就得到了充份的保障。同时，他们三人极力主张三位格在神性中的合一性，并多方予以说明。

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. 关于圣灵的争辩
[d] The Dispute about the Holy Spirit.

关于圣灵的早期见解
Early Opinions about the Holy Spirit

　　虽然关于这题目有许多不同的意见表露出来，但到目前为止，圣灵还没有受到广泛的注视。亚利乌主张，圣灵是由圣子所产生的头一个受造者，此观点与奥利金的非常符合，而阿他那修则坚称，圣灵与圣父是同质的，但是《尼西亚信经》则仅包括一不确定的说明：「我信圣灵。」至于加帕多加教父则跟随阿他那修，强烈主张圣灵与圣父的同质。在西方教会有圣希拉流 (Hilary of Poitiers)， 主张圣灵是为帮助人寻求神深奥之事，所以不可能没有属神的本质。康士坦丁堡的主教马西顿纽斯 (Macedonius) 则发表了一完全不同的见解，他声明圣灵是被造的，从属于圣子 ；但 他 的 见 解 被 认 为 是 异 端， 而 其 从 者 被 人 称 作 「 反 圣 灵 派 」(Pneumatomachians)。主后 381 年，在康世坦丁堡大会席上，宣布承认《尼西亚信经》，并在拿先斯贵格利指导下，接受有关圣灵的下列信条：「我们信主圣灵，是生命的赐予者，是从父而出，与圣父，圣子同得荣耀，并藉先知发言。」

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. 圣三位一体教义的完成
[3] Completion of the Doctrine of the Trinity

圣灵由圣子而出
Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son

康世坦丁堡会议的声明中，有两点并不完善，令人不满意：(1) 「同质」一词未能使用，所以圣灵与圣父是属于同一本质的关系没有说出；与 (2) 圣灵与其他二位格之关系未能确定。声明中写着说，圣灵由圣父而出，但这里没有确定也没有否认圣灵也是由圣子而出，在这一点上没有完全的一致性；若说圣灵之从圣父而出，这似乎是否认圣子与圣父在本质上帝相同 (Essential Oneness)；若说圣灵也是从圣子而出，那么似乎又将圣灵置于依存圣子的地位上，并对圣灵的神性加以侵犯。阿他那修，巴西流与尼撒贵格利坚称，圣灵由圣父而出，但并不反圣灵也由圣子而出的教义；而伊比法纽与马赛拉斯也赞同此教义。

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 form the Son. But Epiphanius and Marcellus of Ancyra positively asserted this doctrine.

一般西方教会都主张圣灵是由圣父与圣子而出；在主后 589 年的托理多会议 (Synod of Toledo) 上，又加上了 「和子」 (fileoque) 这个字。东方教会则有大马色约翰提出圣灵教义最终的信条，根据他所说，只有一个属神的本质与三位格，而这三位格被认为是神性中的实体，并不像三个人彼此间的关系。除了他们存在的方式外，神一体中的三位，不论从那方面说都是合一的，而圣父的特性是 「非生的」 (non-generation) ，圣子是 「生出的」 (generation) ，圣灵则是 「发出的」 (procession)。三位格彼此间的关系，被描述为一互通的关系，并没有混杂不清。大马色约翰虽然极其反对从属主义，但他仍然说到圣父为神性之源，并说圣灵是借着道由父而出，这依旧是希腊从属主义的遗物。东方教会从未采取托理多会议所附加的 「和子」 一字，这也是东西教会分离的主因。

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.

奥古斯丁论三位一体
Augustine on the Trinity

西方教会有关三位一体的观念，在奥古斯丁的巨著 《论三位一体》 (*De Trinitate*) 中，达于最终的阶段。奥氏也强调本质上的合一与位格上的三分，说三位中的每一位都拥有全本质，并与本质是同一的，且与位格中的其他二位也是同一的。 圣父、圣子、圣灵并不像我们世间的三个人，只拥有出生人性的一部份；此外，三者不能缺一而独立，即父不能没有子，子不能没有父，圣灵不能没有子和父，祂们中间有相依存的关系。每一位都有属神的本质，但具有不同的观点，如使之出生、出生的，或者说由感化而存有的，这三位格之间，有一种互通、互住的关系。以「位格」一词来指明三位之间彼此的关系，不能令奥氏满意，但他仍然继续使用，正如他所说：「我用这词句，并不是为了表明三者之间之关系，乃是为了不甘寂寞。」论到三位一体这一方面的观念，圣灵自然是由圣父而出，但也是由圣子而出。

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.

拉丁神学中的三位一体教义
The Doctrine of the Trinity in Latin Theology

罗瑟林论三位一体
Roscellinus on the Trinity

后期神学对三位一体的教义，并未作具体资料上的加入，只不过在形式上有所分歧，并在真理上予以重述而已。罗瑟林引用唯名派 (nominalism) 的理论，说普遍的概念仅仅是从属于三位一体的观念，如此而想要避免将数目的合一于一位神里位格的区分的困难。他认为神性中的三位格好像本质上不同的个人，也可以说在属性上是一个，而且只是在名义上；祂们的合一仅仅是意志与能力的合一。安瑟伦正确地指出，此立场不可避免的导致了三神论，并强调普遍的观念可以提供真理与现实的事实。

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.

吉尔伯特论三位一体
Gilbert of Poitiers on the Trinity

假如罗瑟林是以唯名论来解说三位一体的教义，那么吉尔伯特 (Gilbert of Poitiers) 就是以亚理斯多德式的温和现实主义来解说三位一体的教义，而此温和性的现实主义主张，普遍的观念是存在于特殊观念之中。吉氏在属神的本质与神之间加以区分，而且又将此种关系与人和具体的人类之关系作一对比。属神的本质并非是神，只不过是神的形式，或者说是使祂成为神。这个本质或形式，一般就是指着三位格，在哪方面说祂们是一个。这种区分的结果，是他被攻击位四神主义者 (Tetratheism 此说教导神性中有三位格，另外又有一属神的本质，而此属神的本质，是神性中三位格的来源，这样这教义就被解说为相信四个神)。

If Roscellinus gave a Nominalisitc 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.

亚比拉论三位一体
Abelard on the Trinity

亚比拉论三位一体教义的方法，被人攻击为撒伯流派。他似乎是把神性中的三个位格当作神的三个属性，那就是能力、智慧与善良，其中以能力代表圣父的名字，以智慧代表圣子的名字，以善良代表圣灵的名字。虽然他也用暗示神性中真正位格上的区分的表词，但是他也用一比方，使人明显察觉他是走向形态主义。

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，我们发现有关三位一体教义的代表说法，并且是当时教会界最盛行的观点。

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.

基督论的发展史(1)：基督论的争辩
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST (1):
The Christological Controversies
(Louis Berkhof, A History of Christian Doctrines, pp. 101ff.)

基督论与三位一体之问题的关联
Connection of Christological and Trinitarian Problems

基督论的难题可以从一般神学（译注：神论）方面，与拯救论方面来加以研究。早期教父对基督论拯救方面的关系，虽未曾加以轻忽，但他们在重要的讨论上却没有重视。在三位一体争论的气氛中，他们从一般神学（译注：神论）方面来研究基督，乃天经地义的事，而三位一体争论所导致的决定则是，基督为神的儿子，事与父同质的，因此祂是神。从此而发生的问题，就是基督神性与人性间之关系。

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.

早期基督论的争辩，并未带给人多大的造就，其中情感上的激动过于表面化，不正当的阴谋往往扮演着重要的角色，有时甚至出现暴　的场面。从外表上看来，在这种气氛之下只会产生错误，没想到这些争辩却导致基督位格教义的信条，就是到今天也还被认为是教会教义的标准。圣灵往往借着羞耻与混乱引导教会进入更清楚真理的环境（译注：境界）中。有些人声称，教会在定义根本难以解说的奥秘上实在是大费周章，可是我们应当注意，早期教会并没有声称将这些伟大的真理予以全然了解，也并没有在迦克敦会议上冒然的解说道成肉身的问题；该次会议仅希求保卫真理，抵抗各项异端，并提出了信仰上的条文，企图避免各种显然不合圣经对真理的解释。

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.

　　教会所希求的是有关基督的见解，以致不损及以下的各点：（一）祂的真实与本有的神性；（二）祂的真实与妥切、适当的人性；（三）神人二性联合于一位格；与（四）神人二性在一位格内适当的区分。若是以上所提的要求未能达成，或仅仅达到一部份，那么有关督的见解就是不完全的。早期教会中所兴起的基督论的一切异端，都起因于未能将所有这些真理，在教义方面的声明予以联合。有些人完全或部份否认基督的神性，又有些人则完全或一部份的驳斥祂的真人性；有些人着重基督位格上的合一，但却忽视神人二性上的区分，有些人则将二性分清，却忽视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.　　争辩的第一阶段
First Stage of the Controversy

[a] 背景 The Background.
基督论难题的兴起

　　此争辩是尤其根源的。爱宾派 (Ebionites)、非「道」派 (Alogi)、与动力的神格唯一派别 (Monarchians) 否认基督的神性；幻影派 (Docetae)、神哲派 (Gnostics)、与形态派别 (Modalists) 则拒绝基督的人性。他们只是把基督论难题重的名词之一给取消了，而有些人则不那么极端地将基督的神性或人性给否定掉。亚利乌派反对在基督里成为肉身的道 (the Son-Logos)，说祂没有绝对的神性。老底嘉主教阿波林 (Apollinaris)， 否认耶稣基督的真实人性，与亚利乌对照下，他是拥护基督的真神性，企图以道来代替人里头的令，来确保祂的无罪，因阿氏认为，人的灵是罪的根据地，而一个完全的人性，自然就包括罪性在内；此外他企图使着道成肉身容易为人的理性所接受，他推测在道的里面又原初人的永远倾向。但是阿波林的解释不能令人满意，正如赛德 (Shedd) 说：「如果从人减除理智的成份，那么那人不是变成白痴，就是变成禽兽。」然而阿波林的目的是值得赞扬的，他是想确保基督位格合一与无罪。

　　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 ether 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.

对阿波林的反抗
Opposition to Apollinaris

由于阿波林对问题提出了解决的论点，因而引起了相当的抗议。有加帕多三教父于西拉流主张，如果道没有取得完整的人性，那么祂就不能作我们的救赎主，既然全罪人需要重生，那么基督就须具备完整的人性，而非仅是（不）重要的一点点。他们也在阿波林的教训中，指出其中有幻影说的成份在内。如果基督里没有真正属人的意志，那么祂就不能够在祂为人的生活中有真实的试验与进步。然而，就是阿波林的论敌，虽然着重基督的完全人性，但也认为基督受到祂神性的影响。尼撒的贵格利也说，基督的肉体被改变了，借着与神性的联合，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.

在主后三六二年，亚历山大亚的会议中，所讨论的初步结果声称，在基督里有属人的「灵魂」 (soul)。「灵魂」一词为会议所使用，认为包括有理性的范围在内，就是阿波林所称的「灵」 (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] 争辩的各党派

The Parties to the Controversy
　（一）涅斯多留派。

　　有些早期教父所用的表词，似乎是否认在基督里有两性的存在，并且假定只有一个性，就是「成肉身并可尊敬的道」。从此观点，马利亚往往被称为神之母。而亚历山大学派特别表显出此派的倾向。另一方面，安提阿学派走相反的路线，着在摩普绥提亚之狄奥多的教训中可看出。

[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.

摩普绥提亚之狄奥多。

　　他的出发点乃在基督完全的人性，以及祂属人经验的完全现实性，他说基督的确与人的情绪相搏斗，经历了试探而得胜；祂拥有胜过罪恶的能力：(a) 祂的生是无罪的； (b) 有属神的道 (Logos) 与祂的人性联合。狄奥多否认在基督里道有实质上的存在，道住在里面仅仅是名义上道德性的方式存在，在他看来，神在基督里与在人里面没有什么基要的区分，只是在基督里的成份比较多一些而已。此一观念实际上是以道德的成份住在为人的耶稣里面，来取代道成肉身。

　　虽然如此，狄奥多仍企图避免由此见解所达到的必然结论，那就是在基督里有双重的位格，他说在两位格间还有道德性的联合存在，且此联合是如此的密切，因此可以说成只有一位，正如丈夫与妻子可以成为一体一样。

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。

　　此安提阿学派见解的必然发展，可在涅斯多留派中发现。涅氏步狄奥多的后尘，否认「神之母」一词能适当地应用在马利亚身上，只因马利亚不过是带来了一个有道同在的人而已。涅氏虽然没有从此立场推出一必然的结论，但反对他的人区利罗 (Cyril)却一定要他为此结论负责任，区利罗指出： (a) 假如马利亚不是神之

母，那么她就是人之母亲，而那个人也就是属神的人，且此被认为与道发生交通的人，取代了神的道成肉身； (b) 如果马利亚不是神之母，那么基督与人的关系就要改变了，祂就不再是人类有效的救赎主。涅氏的从者毫不迟延的下了这些结论，显得非常草率。

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 accoampnied 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.

对涅斯多留派的评估。

涅斯多留派在思想上是不健全的，并不是在基督两性的教义上，乃是`在一个位格的教义上。真神性与真人性他都接受，但并没有把这两项认为是一真的合一，并且成为单一的位格。此派认为，这两个性，也是两个位格，但却对共有的属性与各自独立生存的位格之区分，完全予以忽视，且没有把神人二性混淆成为单一的自我意识，而使这两性并行成为一道德上的合一。基督这人并不是神，乃是神性的持有者 (theophoros)， 而基督被崇拜，不是因为祂是神，乃是因为神在祂里面。涅斯多留的重点，就是在于强调基督的人性，并且认为是正当的，同时，他们这种作法完全与圣经的证据相违背。叫教会高举耶稣基督的人格、敬虔与道德，但却将祂位神又为人的救主，就是一切属灵能力、恩典与救赎的根源，给抹杀了。

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.

（二）区利罗派。

　　涅斯多留最大的劲敌就是亚历山大的主教区利罗。据他来说，为了要救赎人，道 (Logos) 取了完全的人性，同时又成为神而人的独一位格，但他用此名词，却未加以澄清。一方面他似乎只教导说，道 (Logos) 取了人性，所以在基督里有两个性，者两个性在道 (Logos) 的一个位格内找到了他们不可分解的合一，而两性本身却没有任何的改变。但区氏也使用一词句，借着属性的互通来强调在基督里二性的合一，并且说到基督的位格就好像是由一结果而产生出合一性。区氏与涅斯多留相比较下，他着重之点乃在于强调基督位格的合一性，他强调的三点完全与当时大公教会的信仰相符合，即 (a) 二性不可分的联合； (b) 人性 (manhood) 的客观性与依存性，也就是道 (Logos) 用以为祂的工具 （或手段、媒介）；与 (c) 在基督里位格的合一性与继续性。可是偶而地，区利罗用的一些词句，似乎是认为后期地犹提干派是正确的。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) 与位格 (hypostasis)，好像是异字同义的名词。有时区氏要负担起字基督里只有一个神而人的性的教义（这是指着道成肉身以后说的），并可能叫人认为区利罗对基督一性说者 (Monophysites) 发生兴趣，此派叫人相信基督只有一个位格，所以在中保内也有一个性。虽然区氏极力反对这两性的混同，但他还是继续不断地对他们发生兴趣。（译注：应翻译为：但是基督一性说者还是会诉诸区利罗来支持他们的说法。）以弗所会议提出了一个妥协的方案，一方面支持神之母 (theotokos) 一词可能用在马利亚身上，另一方面则又坚称基督二性分清的教义。

[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.

（三）犹提干派。

许多区利罗的信者，都不同意犹提干派的主张，因他们不接受两性分清的教义。犹提干为一很老的修士，其信念很不平衡，非常反对涅斯多留派，对于康士坦丁的亚历山大神学、运动或主张，都拳拳服膺。根据狄奥多热脱 (Theodoret) 所记载，犹氏事实上主张，基督里的人性与基督里的神性是相同的，所以祂的身体和我们的身体不是同质料的，实在说来祂并非是人。犹氏在主后四四八年的君士坦丁堡会议中被定为异端，但他不服，就上诉罗马主教利欧，在利欧接到夫拉维安有关此案的全部报告后，发表了他对夫拉维安所讲述的「大卷」 (Tome)。因为「大卷」深深影响到迦克墩信条，所以其中的重点应当注意，兹述之如下： (a) 在基督里有二性，是永远分清的。 (b) 二性联合于一个位格，而一个性在道成肉身的生活中，都行使其本身适当的功能。 (c) 由位格的合一而产生的交通 (communication idiomatum)。 (d) 救赎的工作需要一位既是人又是神、能朽坏又不能朽坏、受感的又不受感的中保。道成肉身是神那方面的屈尊行动，但是道 (Logos) 在道成肉身中，并未中止祂就是神。 (e) 在基督里的人性是永久的，并且否认此点，就暗示着一种否认基督的真实性，着实是西方教会基督论的清华之点。

[3] The Eutychian Party: Eutichus 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.

[c] 迦克墩会议的决议

在开过几次地方性的会议之后，对犹提干是毁誉参半，联合大公会议于四五一年在迦克墩召开，并发表有关基督位格教义的重要声明如下：

[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:

> 「我们追随圣教父，一致教导人承认一位圣子，我们的主耶稣基督，有完全的神性也有完全的人性，祂是真神也是真人，有理性的灵魂与身体；按神性来说是与父同质，按人性来说是与我们同质，在凡事上与我们一样，但没有罪；按神性说，祂在诸世代以前为父所生，按人性说，在末世是由童贞女马利亚（神之母），为我们及我们的得救而生，也就是这位基督、圣子、主、独生的儿子，被认为由两性，不混淆、不改变、不可分的，而二性的分清不能由于联合而消失，反而每一性的本质应被保存，同时发生在一个位格、一个生活方式中（译注：一个生存形式中），并不是两个位格，乃是一个，就是这同一的圣子，那独生的子，为道的神，就是主耶稣基督；以上所说的正像先知从起初关于基督向我们宣布的，与主耶稣所教导的，并圣父的信经所一脉相传下来给我们的。」

> ***"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 nad 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 tings 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 (adiairetos), 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."***

此声明最重要的涵意如下： (1) 神人二性的本质可以归属于一个本质，例如无所不知于有限的知识。 (2) 神而人 (God-man) 的受苦可以被认为是真实的无限，然而是无感于神性的。 (3) 基督位格的根基，是在于祂的神性，而非祂的人性。 (4) 道 (Logos) 并非与一般人类中的个人联合，乃与人性联合。三位一体神之第二位，并不是首先和一个体的人联合，这个联合早在童女马利亚怀孕耶稣基督的时候就联合了。

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.

基督论的发展史 HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST(2)
争辩的第二阶段
The Second Stage of the Controversy

1.迦克墩会议决定后的混乱
[a] Confusion after the Decision of the Council of Chalcedon

迦克墩会议关于基督论的争辩，正如奈西亚会议关于三位一体的争辩一样，并没有得到圆满的效果。虽然罗马已经成为正统信仰的中心，但是在埃及、叙利亚与帕勒斯丁等地，还包含着许多犹提干派狂热信仰的修道士。事实上，教义发展的程序，已迅速地从东方教会传至西方。[译注：其实教义的发展，很快地从东方教会转移，落在西方教会的手中。]

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.

基督一性说派。

迦克墩会议后，区利罗与犹提干的跟从者，都被称为基督一性说派，因为他们承认在联合之后，基督有一个混合的性，并否认祂有两个分清的神人二性。正如他们所了解的，这分清的二性包含有双重性格的可能性（译注：这分清的二性必然导致两个分清的位格的结论），在不同的派别之间有　长又不适当（不漂亮）的争辩。就是在基督一性派之间，意见也不一致，他们又分为好几个支流，欧尔博士(Dr. Orr) 说，光是他们这几个派的名称，就叫人不寒而栗了。这些名称就是父神受苦派 (Theopaschitists)；另一派则是基督人性合我们相似派 (Phthartolatrists)，　此派主张与迦克墩信条很相近，强调基督人性与我们一样的事实，因此祂能受苦，也因而说应崇拜那会朽坏的；和正与此相反的基督人性与我们相反派 (Aphthartolatrists)，此派主张基督的人性与我们不同质，乃赋有神的属性，因此是无罪的，不可毁灭与不可衰残的。

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 hsiver." 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。

迦克墩神学最能干、显著迪护卫者就是拜占庭迪李安迪，他在基督教义神学迪构造（译注：基督论的建构）上有所加添后，又为大马色约翰予以充分的发挥，所论之点乃是：涅斯多留派的反对，可能导致基督人性独立客观的存在，此一观念是受到客观的 (anupostasis) 与在位格内的 (anupostasia) 两名词所助成。因此李安迪强调，基督人性的事实是在位格内的，而非客观性的，自从道成肉身的那一刹那开始，在神儿子的位格中，就有其个人的生存 (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.

五五三年罗马皇犹斯提念 (Justinian) 在君士坦丁堡召开第五此大公会议，定狄奥多所写的为异端，使得情势对基督一性说派有利。但是单单就基督一性说派咒诅那些声称迦克墩会议暂助其所定罪之错谬这方面来说，对他们就不利。这件事并没有另基督一性说派满意，反而使他们与罗马国帝国教会分离。

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．基督一志说的争辩。
[b] The Monothelitic Controversy.

不久就见出企图在会议中解决基督一性说的事未能圆满达成。几项重要的问题尚未解决，在基督的二性不单指基督内的二性（翻译注：基督内的二性如何是二性）时，另外又产生了一个问题，即在位格中包括多少，在属性中又包括多少？且与此有关更重要的问题是，意志是属于前者或是后者？这就等于问，基督里是不是只有一个意志，还是两个？若说只有一个，那似乎剥夺了基督有真正属人的意志，因此就从祂人性的完整上有所减损；另一方面，若说有两个意志，那又回到涅斯多留的阵营中了。

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.

基督一志说派。

结果从基督一性说派中又兴起了一新的基督一志说派 (Monothelites)。顾名思义，该派的主张是由位格的合一开始，并宣称基督只有一个意志。此教义具有两种说法：一说是基督属人的意志被属神的意志合并了，所以只有属神的意志在活动；另一说法则是，意志被认为是混合体，是由神的意志于人的意志注入的结果。反对基督一志说的人被称为基督二志说派 (Dyothelites)，此派的立场是主张基督有二性，并宣称在基督里有两个意志。而基督一志说派反对他们破坏了基督个人生活（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.

有一个时期，能力 (energeia)一词在此次争辩中先于意志 (thelema) 而被使用（译注：比较更被接纳），但不久「意志」一词较「能力」一词表达更为清楚，所以就取代了「能力」而被使用。但有一件事必须注意，就是「意志」一词的意义非常广泛。严格说来，当我们用「意志」的时候，意思是意愿、自决、与选择的功能；但此字也用在广义方面，包括直觉、嗜好、愿望、与爱情（译注：情操），及其与之相反的意义。这些在从前的争辩中，都包括在「意志」一词中，所以就带出了一个问题，即基督是否惧怕，并逃避苦难与死亡？若否认基督属人的意志，那么基督的人性就多少带有幻影派的色彩。

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会议（主后六八零年），具有罗马主教的合作，采纳了二意志、二能力教义为正统的信仰立场，但也决定了基督内属人的意志必须被了解为从属于属神的意志。被公认的意见乃是说，在基督里属人的意志，并没有因与属神的意志联合而削减了人的成份，反而因着联合而被提升，并达于完全，此二者总是有一种完全协和的姿态一起活动。

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．大马色约翰的基督论
[c] The Construction of the Doctrine by John of Damascus.

希腊教会神学在大马色约翰时的发占达于最高点，因此注意他对基督的位格教义的了解是非常重要的。根据他的说法，道 (Logos) 取了人性，并不是也稣这个人取了道。这意思就是说，Logos 是一个具有约束性的代理，目的在求得二性的联合（译注：Logos 是形成基督，控制基督位格的个体，二性因此合而为一），而并没有取属人的个人性（并没有取一个个体的人），也没有采取一般的人性（也没有取人性的共相），乃是具有潜力的人（而是一个有潜力成为个体的人），亦即尚未发展成一位格的人性。藉 Logos 与具有潜力的人（人性），在马利亚的腹中联合，而后者需要（译注：取得了）一个体的存在。虽然说基督的人性没有祂自己独立的位格，但是借着 Logos 而有其个体的（位格的）存在，祂并非是位格的（译注：祂并非是非位格的），但却（而是）在位格之内。

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.

祂将基督二性的联合比作人身体与灵魂的联合，认为在基督里有一种神和人彼此互相存在的关系 (circumincession)，即神的属性与人的属性互相交通，所以属人第性情被神化，也可以说是神在肉身受苦，而人性也只有在这种情形中有效，因此人性纯粹是接受的，并且是被动的。神的儿子（包括祂的完全人性在内）乃是教会崇拜的对象，虽然有一减损基督人性到一仅为 Logos 之器官的倾向，但是却承认两性合

作，并且一个位格在每一个性中都有所行动和意愿。意志被认为是属与本性的，但却声称在基督里属人的意志，已成为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．西方教会的基督论
[d] The Christology of the Western Church.

西方教会并未受到东方教会激烈争辩的影响。整体的说来，似乎西方教会的思想，对于哲学的区分还没有充分地了解，以致未能在问题的讨论上采取主动参与，认为这些问题是如此地深奥于诡 （微妙），以致使东方教会分裂。

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.

嗣子说 (Adoptionism)。
在七、八世纪中，西班牙关于基督论又出现瞭一个新的运动，称之为嗣子说的争论。「嗣子」一词在西班牙使为人所熟知的，因为在主后六七五年托理多会议中宣称基督是神的儿子，是由于本性 (nature)，而非由于领养 (adoption 嗣子)。嗣子说教义的真正健将，就是俄基拉之主教非利士 (Felix of Urgella)，他认为基督在祂神性着方面（就是 Logos）当然是神的独生子，但在人这方面说，乃是领养的神之子。他同时想要借着强调耶稣在马利亚腹中之时，人子与神的儿子就联合的事实，来保守位格上的合一。

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，此说是在自然为神的儿子（译注：在本性上是神的儿子）与领养成为神的儿子间作了一区分，而前者是指着基督神性说的，后者是指着基督人性说的。非利士及其信从者将以下几点作为他们信仰（立场）的根基：(1)根据基督里两性的区分，暗示着在子权里两种方式的区分（译注：暗示着：基督作为「子」的位份有两种形式）。(2) 根据圣经中的经文，指出基督是个人，在圣父之下从属于父神（译注：指出作为人的基督低于父神，从属父神）。(3) 根据信者被神领养，得儿子的名份，成为神的儿子，并且也成为基督的「弟兄」，这似乎暗示（译加：在同一样的意义上，）基督在人性上也是神的儿子。为了在进一步地了解此意义他们就在基督在伯利恒自然的生与属灵的生之间作一区分，而此属灵的生是从耶稣受洗时开始，并在复活后中止（完结）；此属灵的生使基督成为神的嗣子。

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.

反对此见解的人虽然未能攻击嗣子说派，说他们教导有关基督双重位格的明显错误，但他们却坚称此见解的必然结果就是有两个神之子 (dual sonship)（必然结果就是基督的儿子位份有两个）。查理曼时代的著名学者亚勒昆 (Alcuin)，就基督分有两个儿子的问题与非利士大起争辩，他主张没有一个父亲能够有本性上是儿子，而同时又是领养的儿子，毫无疑问地，嗣子派将一种从外来的生疏的立场加诸于基督的人性上，只等到基督借着一特殊领养的作为，才能成为神的儿子，这实是一种错误的想法。这个错谬在主后七九四年的法兰克福大会 (Synod of Frankfurt) 上被定为异端。

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.

后期基督论的检讨：中古世纪
THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

在中古世纪时期，基督位格的教义并未居于显著的地位，而其他的问题如有关最于恩的教义、救赎工作的教义，都为当时人们注意的中心。简单提示阿奎那对于基督解释最显著之点，将足以说明此问题在宗教改革时的情形。

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.

阿奎那的基督论
Christology of Thomas Aquinas

至于在基督里二性的联合，阿奎那赞成过去教会所领受的神学立场。 Logos 的位格在道成肉身联合的时候成为混合体，此联合「阻碍」 (hindered) 了基督的人性，使之未能达于独立的位格。由于与 Logos 的联合，基督的人性领受了双重的恩惠，即 (1) 联合的 (gratia unionis)， 或谓从人性与神性联合的结果而产生出的尊严，所以基督的人性也成为崇拜的对象；与 (2) 成圣的恩惠 (gratia habitualis)，此成圣之恩是给予为人的基督，使之在与神的关系中做为对人性的支持（译注：支持着基督人性与上帝的关系）。在基督属人这方面的知识可分为两种，即注入的知识 (scientia infusa)与取得的知识 (scientia acquisita)。由于前者使得基督能知道人所能知道的一切事，并由于启示而得知的一切事，酒知识上来说是完全的，但是因为人是受造的，所以受到限制。由于后者，借着理智的才能（译注：功能），基督因而知道一切所能知的事。在抽象的两性之间没有属性的互通，但在位格上却能有人与神的属性（译注：抽象的来说，两性之间没有属性的互通，但可以说，位格里有人性与神性）。基督的人性并非无所不能，而是受到人情感上的控制，即如忧愁、悲哀、恐惧、稀奇、与愤怒。在基督里有两个意志，但最终的因果关系乃属与神的意志（译注、译加：但神的意志才是至终的成因，人的意志总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.

赎罪论的发展史：基督的工作 (1)
THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT:
THE WORK OF CHRIST (1)
(Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christina Doctrines*, pp. 165-170.)

I. 希腊教父的神学
The Atonement in Greek Patristic Theology

使徒时代教父论赎罪
　　使徒时代的教父往往以一般性的圣经观点，来论及基督的工作，最具意义的陈述，是发现在戴格尼塔斯的书信 (Epistle to Diognetos) 中。在此书信中，概括了人有罪应当受刑，神差遣祂的儿子为赎罪祭，以及又基督的义遮盖罪等概念在内。护教士论到赎罪的题目，并没有深入的讨论，所论及的也只是基督是救赎主，救人脱离魔鬼的权势。神哲派说基督救人脱离了黑暗的国度，也就是脱离物质的世界。在马仙的议论中，说基督的死是神的爱，将人从世界的创造主手中赎回来。

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.

爱任纽论赎罪。
　　爱任纽是一位在东西方中间的神学家，他同意护教士的看法，说任是受到黑暗权势的奴役，并且视救赎的一部份为从撒但的权势下得拯救。他虽然不看赎罪为补偿撒但的要求，但却认为是从撒但权势下得拯救。他的意思乃是基督的死满足了神公义的要求，叫人得自由；同时他高抬恢复说 (Recapitulation Theory)，这意思就是说「基督在祂自己里面，经过了人生的各阶段，以及重述了各阶段中的经验，包括我们为罪人的情况。」（欧尔语）基督借着祂的道成肉身，并且成为人，一反亚当由于罪所走的道路，使得人类重新开始，并在人类生命中产生新的原动力。基督对那些借着信心与祂联合的人，赐给他们不朽坏的生命，并在他生活中产生了道德上的变化，且由于祂的顺服，补偿了亚当的悖逆。

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.

亚历山大的革利免与奥利金论赎罪。

在亚历山大学派中，我们可发现几个论点。在亚历山大革利免一些不太著名的书中，说到基督的死乃是为罪人付上赎价，但在其重要的著作中却论到基督为一教师，藉宣扬真知识来拯救人，并感化他们过有爱心且真实公义的生活。奥利金则提出几个不同的见解，但并未并入综合的整体教义中。基督借着道成肉身，使人性神化；借着自我牺牲的至高榜样，如此可以启发人作此同样的牺牲；借着舍命为赎罪祭；并借着买赎人脱离撒但的权势来拯救人。关于救人脱离魔鬼的权势这个观念，奥氏介绍了一个新的观念，那就是在交易上魔鬼受了骗。基督把祂自己提出作为给撒但的赎价，撒但接受了这赎罪，未想到祂不能抓住基督，因为基督属神的能力与圣洁。撒但吞了基督人性的饵，反被基督神性的钩给钩住了。这样，全人类的灵魂 – 甚至那些在阴间的的 – 就都脱离了撒但的权势。

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 though 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.

阿他那修论赎罪。

有关赎罪首先系统性的论述，当推阿他那修的道成肉身论，本书包括了几项不同的概念：道成了肉身，叫人复活由于犯罪而失去有关神的真知识；成肉身的道，也代表替身，借着担当罪的刑罚，替人附上了罪债，此项满足的需要，必须根据神的诚实，而非根据神的公义，且这赎价也不能说是付给撒但的。然而爱任纽的意思是说，道取了肉身，为的是使道成为神，并成为不朽，他这种观点是非常突出的。同时，阿他那修的论述在另外两项上与爱任纽不同： (1) 在得救的程序上，道

成肉身与基督的死与复活有直接的关联； (2) 在得救的程序上，着重点是在于道德方面，而非物质方面。基督借着祂的道与榜样在人心中作工。

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 base don 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．尼撒贵革利与拿先斯贵革利论赎罪

阿他那修真正的继承者乃是三位加帕多家的教父。巴西流对于赎罪论的贡献无几，他的小弟尼撒贵格利却写了一本书，名叫《大要理问答》 (Great Catechism)，是论到基督赎罪第二部非常重要有系统的工作，他又重复了撒但受骗的概念，并且根据以下的两个理由来述说此概念的正当性： (1) 当撒但受欺骗的时候，欺骗者就已经得到了所当得的；(2) 撒但本身在末了时也得到了好处，因为综结时牠也得救了（得到解脱）。《大要理问答》的基本思想，就是从阿他那修借来的，那就是说神借着道成肉身，与人的性情连合起来，为的是释放人脱离死亡。早期这本大要理问答中也指出，基督的死不但毁灭了死亡，同时也毁灭了罪。拿先斯贵格利对于付赎价给撒但的观念予以痛斥并表示愤慨，所以他特别重复阿他那修的教训。奎首吞与区利罗特别强调基督之死的无限价值，区利罗的主要贡献乃在于基督之死，为一神格之死的无限价值。包珥则发现了我们实际上在基督得到完全满足的概念，但与神以及属神的义无关。

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 o the work of Chris, the *Great Catechism*. He repeats the idea of the deceit practiced on Stan, 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．大马色约翰论赎罪

希腊教父的神学，在大马色约翰时达于最高点，他将以往论基督赎罪的思想归纳起来，但本人却并无显著的贡献。为了归纳当前赎罪论思想的发展，我们可以说，在西方教会（希腊）神学有两个主要的方面：(1) 一方面说，人得救被认为是道成肉身的直接结果，是神给人的一个新的启示，或者是神给人的一个新生命。(2) 另一方面，救恩被看做达成某项客观条件的结果，即如向神献祭、满足神的公义，或付赎价给撒但。假如我们提出什么理论，来表明希腊教父时期的神学思想，我们就要指出向马肯他须所说的：「西方教会的赎罪论，是对未识者的一大开放。」这是说到对撒但付代价的教义；他又称之为「恢复的秘传说 (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．拉丁教父的神学
The Atonement in Latin Patristic Theology

特土良论赎罪

论到基督赎罪的教义，虽然在拉丁神学与早期的希腊神学中有相同的地方，可是近来却有重要的不同之点开始复苏（译注：可是，就算在这么早的时期已经有不同之点显明）。显著的拉丁式神学起于特土良，他多少采用了爱任纽的重复说，但他对道成肉身的了解，主要还是限于基督藉教训与榜样来影响人类这方面，然而这整个观念的势力已渐消失。他比爱任纽还强调基督死在十字架上的中心意义，认为这是基督降世达成使命的最高点。关于基督之死教义上的制定，不能说特土良超越了爱任纽，他真正的贡献，乃在于他把几个正确的名词，即如「罪孽」、「满足」与「功劳」等介绍到神学里面去，而这些名词对基督赎罪的神学发展十分重要，但有一点值得注意，他并没有把这些名词用在基督赎罪的工作上，而用在人受洗之后又犯罪，应当悔改行善的情形上。他为天主教补赎教义的发展奠下根据。

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．希拉流与安波罗修论赎罪
　　二者将希腊教父的思想介绍到西方教会。前者代表了希腊教父认为赎罪是借着道成肉身，来恢复人类的这种观念，但是这种观念还是说到基督之死的重大意义，他甚至看基督之死为向神提出满足，这点与特土良不同。基督的死是甘愿的，为的是要满足刑罚上的要求，希氏向阿他那修一样，此满足是从神的诚实而非公义引来的。安波罗修也有爱任纽的这种观念，此外他又重复了奥利金认为基督是向撒但付上赎价，并且欺骗了撒但的这种观念，同时他又强调基督的死乃是向神献上祭物的事实，并且认为这个祭物是为满足神在有罪的人身上所宣布的死刑，可是他并没有解释为什么需要献这个祭。

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 o the divine sentence of death pronounced on sinful humanity. However, he does not explain why this sacrifice was necessary.

奥古斯丁论赎罪
　　一提起赎罪论，我们自然而然地会想到西方教会最伟大的教父奥古斯丁，对基督赎罪工作教义的伟大贡献，其实不然，他主要的成就乃是在其他方面。归纳他以往的思想，可发现他有许多有关赎罪论不同的见解，（重译：看奥氏如何归纳在

他以前的赎罪论思想，可发现这段时期对赎罪论有不同的见解，）有些甚至自相矛盾。

　　有一个观念是说，虽然只是一伦理上的方法，但借着基督的道成肉身，使得人性得以神化；另一个观念是说，撒但在人身上有一个要求，但这种观念被另一个思想所补足，即撒但的要求被基督之死所消除。奥古斯丁的主要思想可以说是离了希腊教父的神学思想，他的前题与他的结论并不相合，而其中心思想则是有关原罪、因恩称义，以及藉基督赎罪（重译：基督的牺牲）与神和好。这个新的西方教会思想是在自圆其说、固执己见，而我们所遵循的则是使徒保罗的赎罪观，（重译：奥古斯丁代表了新的西方教会思想开始兴起，这种思想是遵循使徒保罗的思想架构的，）即人被看作是承受神忿怒的，但基督的死（重译：基督的牺牲）担当了这一切的忿怒，教人与神和好。奥氏并没有将以上的思想作成一完全的体系，他的说法还远不如安瑟伦清楚的救赎论。奥氏在赎罪法律与更新的上面，没有作彻底的区分（奥氏没有彻底地区分救赎工作里法律层面与更新人心的层面），他认为称义的根基有的时候不在于借着耶稣基督移除罪孽，乃在于圣灵成圣之恩的感化。再有，有时候他教导说，借着基督而有的赎罪，是最适宜的救法，但神也可以用别的方法救罪人。如此一来把赎罪当作不是那么地重要其实他的意思就是说，神的能力可能与祂的智慧有冲突。（重译：如此一来，救赎的必须性就显得是相对的；神的能力就有可能与祂的智慧有冲突了。）

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.

大贵格利论赎罪

　　在神学家中受奥古斯丁影响最大的人中，只有一人值得我们一提的，那就是大贵格利。在他的著述中有一段被称为「古代拉丁神学论赎罪的大成」，其主要思想

如下：「人在罪恶与死亡的辖制下，自甘堕落，唯有代替的牺牲才能除掉这样的罪。但是到那里去找这祭牲呢？牛羊是派不上用场的，那就只有人才行，可是找不到没有罪的人啊，因此神的儿子道成了肉身，取了人性，但却没有人的罪。那无罪者为我们成为祭牲，由于祂的人性才能视为牺牲者，并借着祂的义才能够使我们得洁净。祂为我们偿付了不是祂所应当得的死债，所以我们应当受的死就不致于伤害我们。」大贵格利的这一段话，可说是赎罪论思想中最清楚的一大进展。

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.

救赎论的发展史（二）：
安瑟伦至宗教改革前的赎罪论
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT:
THE WORK OF CHRIST (part 2)

从大贵格利到安瑟伦的五百年中间，神学上对于赎罪论的贡献无几。赎罪论有系统的研究，乃是在安瑟伦时期，祂开创了赎罪论教义历史的新纪元。

The theological discussion in the five centuries between Gregory the Great and Ansem 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.　安瑟伦的赎罪论
THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN ANSELM

1．安瑟伦论赎罪。

坎特布理主教安瑟伦，在赎罪论上是头一个向以和谐、一贯的方法来讲述的人。「*神为何成为人*」(Cur Deus Homo) 是安氏划时代的一本神学名著，他在本书中将形上学的深度与陈述的清晰，合一炉而冶之。该书的首段证明在写出的当时，有很多人不明白为何要有赎罪论，也不明白赎罪论是什么。此书也指出当时赎罪论多是从基督论这一方面来讨论，当作道成肉身之必要性的问题来讨论，当时提供几个如下的问题：（1）神能不能用祂无所不能的大能力，就像创造天地时那样容易的力量来拯救人呢？（2）慈悲的神能否干脆赦免人的罪，不要求什么来满足祂自己呢？（3）如果需要一个中保，祂为何选择祂的独生子来作中保的工作，而不拣选别的人呢？一旦允许耶稣道成肉身，就觉得这是一件伟大惊人的紧急事态，才能说明道成肉身的重要。关于道成肉身的这个问题，就解说了安瑟伦用「神为何成为人」的题目的目的。

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.

安瑟伦的整个神学思想的立场就是，赎罪的绝对必须，乃是为了要拯救人。安氏特别反对恢复说、付赎价给撒但说，以及基督之死仅仅彰显神对人的爱，认为此三说是不能令人满意的，因为这些学说不能适当地解释赎罪的必要性。根据他的意见，耶稣流血赎罪的必要性，必须根据宇宙遍在的必要属性而存在。安氏在神的尊荣里找到了耶稣替人赎罪的根据。

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.

安瑟伦的正确立场，只能以他对罪与满足的观念了了解。人是神的受造者，应当将自己的意思完全服从神的意旨，当他以背叛的心拒绝这样做的时候，他就是羞辱了神，并且亏欠了神的荣耀。神的荣耀受了亏损，不拘用什么方法，这个荣耀都必须收回来，不能因神的慈爱而疏忽了罪，因为这样一来变得不正规 [重译：变得失常]，而且也是不公义的。只有两个方法能叫神的尊荣得到卫护，就是借着刑罚与满足。神并没有采用刑罚的方法，因为这样做就毁灭了全人类，而且也令祂自己的目的 – 爱全人类，无法达成。于是祂选择了满足的方法，这方法包括了两件事：（1）人向神提出有亏于神的甘愿顺服（重译：人应当还给神祂所应得的顺服）；（2）人应当补满亏欠神荣耀的地方，如何补满呢？就是要付上远超于实际上所亏欠于神荣耀的债。（重译：人应当付上比他的罪债更大的事物，来补偿对上帝荣耀的亏欠。）但是纵使最小的罪 – 得罪了一位无限的神（重译：因为是得罪了一位无限的神）– 其重量也超过全世界而无法加以补偿。恩赐 – 安瑟伦视满足为一个礼物而不是一个刑罚 – 超越了一切非属于神的，只能从神而来，只有神才能做这个真正的赔偿，而祂的爱，借着赐祂的儿子，来做此赔偿。神提供了这个满足还不够，祂还必须成为人，就是成为欠下罪债之人中的一员，但祂本身没有罪，祂担当罪债并不是为祂自己，只有神而人的这一位，才能够满足这些要求，并且显出神的公义。

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.

神而人的这一位，必须向神提出人所没有提出的顺服，但这个还不足以维持神的尊荣，因为这只是人当尽的本份。在祂这方面说算不上什么功德，可是以一个无罪者的身份来说，祂不应当受苦受死。在祂这方面说，绝对是出于自愿的，而且为了忠实地厉行祂对天父的本份，甘愿受痛苦与羞辱的死，祂才将无限的荣耀交给神。这就是余德的工作 (works of supererogation) [注：此名词是根据路加 10：35 的拉丁文翻译 (quodcumque supererogaveris)。此名词在中世纪时候=才被使用，为宗教改革加所摒斥的教义。]，此余德叫人得益处。公义要求一白白得来的礼物当受偿赐，但是天父将其儿子赐给我们，并无任何希求，因为祂不需要什么，因此所得到的赏赐就是叫人白白得益处，并且采取了罪得赦免，以及将来幸福得方式，使得那些按照福音命令生活的人得到益处。

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．安瑟伦贡献的评估

安瑟伦的学说，对于赎罪论的发展有非常重要的贡献，其真实价值乃在于赎罪论客观性的事实，并将其重要性奠定于神不变的根基上，这不变的属性使得神不能够容许干犯神荣耀的人不受刑罚。若将之与后来发展的刑罚代替说相比较，就可发现后者之不健全，有下列几点：（1）刑罚与满足，从神那方面来说是有选择性的，这种说法是错误的。（2）说基督在受苦上担当了罪的刑罚，这观念是靠不住的，因为基督的受苦被认为是向上帝的荣耀所表示甘愿的尊敬，是超余的功德，能补偿缺少德行的人。这正天主教将赎补的观念应用在基督赎罪的工作上。（3）刑罚代替说一开始就是以私法或习俗原则说到赎罪，是矛盾的。根据这个原则，受害的一方可以要求他看为适当的满足，若是这样的话，为了建立赎罪的绝对必要性，就非公法的观点所能及。（4）将赎罪仅限于基督的死，而否认其生活的意义，乃

是偏执一方的。（5）该说将基督的功劳应用在罪人身上，仅属外部的交易，并没有暗示基督与其信徒之间神秘性的联合。

Evaluation of Anselm's Contribution.

The theory of Anselm makrs 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．亚比拉的赎罪论
ABELARD'S THEORYT OF THE ATONEMENT

1．　　亚比拉论赎罪

亚比拉的理论除了在反对付赎价给撒但上与安瑟伦相同外，其他没有一样与安氏同。他认为基督的死不能算做是一种赎价，甚至也不能算做是给神的赎价。亚比拉也反对安瑟伦所说，神借着祂儿子的死与世人和好的论点，他认为神并不喜悦祂独生儿子的死，作为罪得赦免的根基，而且也不需要这种根基，因为神是爱，不论有没有什么补偿，祂都准备赦免人，祂唯一想从罪人身上得到的就是悔悟，而且祂也渴望饶恕那些愿意悔改的人；同时我们也可以说，我们是靠基督的血得称为义，与神和好。基督借着取得人性，并为我们的教师与榜样以致于死，来显明神的爱，神的大爱唤起了罪人心中对神的爱，并且这是罪得赦免的根基（参路 7：47）。这新被唤起的爱救赎了我们，使我们脱离罪的权势，并且领我们进入神儿子的自由中，所以我们顺服神是出于爱的动机。如此说来，罪得赦免是在我们心中的爱被挑起的直接结果，而基督的死只不过是间接的果实而已（重译：而只不过是基督之死的间接后果）。

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 ． 亚比拉论点的评述 。

亚比拉的理论与安瑟伦的赎罪论是大相径庭的，他的论点非常主观，且在他的论点中也缺少了道德的深度与内在的清晰性，而此二者正是安瑟伦赎罪论中的特性。在亚比拉的理论中我们可以发现今日赎罪论所谓道德感化说的典型代表，这种道德感化说是出自错误的原理，说爱在神里面是统管一切的中心属性，而忽视了神公义与圣洁的要求，况且此说也没有提出基督受苦的适当理由。假如神不要求补赎就赦免了罪，那么为什么神还牺牲祂的儿子受痛苦与羞辱的死呢？神既然能用其他很多的方法，来唤起罪人对神的爱，那么祂这样做岂不是令人怀疑祂启示爱的实际吗？这种理论剥夺了基督受苦救赎的意义，而将祂降低仅仅为一个道德教师，借着祂的教训与榜样来感化人。

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 ．伯纳德论赎罪
REACTION TO ABELARD IN BERNANRD OF CLAIRVAUX

伯纳德对亚比拉的理论加以批评，但自己却没有提出什么有关赎罪论的观点，同时他也不接受安瑟伦的见解。他特别攻击亚比拉对于基督教理性化的解释，并且也反对亚氏所支持基督的榜样使我们成为圣徒，救想亚当的榜样使我们成为罪人的论点。（重译：他特别攻击亚比拉，认为后者对基督教信仰的解释是理性主义

的；伯纳德认为，基督的榜样使我们成为圣徒，就像亚当的榜样使我们成为罪人一样的不可能。）他十分愿意承认基督之爱的榜样与伟大，但只是在祂救赎的工作上采可以找到。（重译：他十分愿意承认，基督之爱的榜样使伟大的是重要的，但这伟大与重要性只建立在祂救赎大工的基础上。）事实上他这样的见解与亚比拉相同，（重译：事实上，在这一点上他的见解与亚比拉的是相同的），是在基督的人类生活与受苦上强调基督的爱，（重译：就是他强调，基督的爱在祂人性的生活与受苦中被彰显；）但他在此不仅看见神爱的启示，也看见基督自己神性具有拯救能力的彰显（重译：也看见基督自己的神性在祂拯救大工上显明出来）。

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.

伯纳德的见解可以说是爱任纽与阿他那修赎罪教义在西方教会的翻版。他说道成肉身就是神进入人间，然而我们必须注意，他并没有强调道成肉身的外在结果，即如带来生命与不朽；他所强调的乃是在人心中的心理影响，即如在人心中启发出像基督一样的忍耐与爱心。同时，他并不以纯主观的观念为满足，而坚信一项作为主观根基的客观救赎，即天父并没有要求祂儿子死，但接受祂自愿的死作为祭物，而此祭物救赎我们脱离罪恶、死亡与羞辱（重译；与撒但的权势），并叫我们与神和好。

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．赎罪论的综合见解
SYNCRETISTIC VIEWS OF THE ATONEMENT

在经院神学家中如兰巴德、波拿文土拉与阿奎纳，都受到安瑟伦与亚比拉的影响，他们都从此二人的理论中有所引证，但却未能将此二人的思想组合，成为一致的理论。

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· 兰巴德论赎罪

兰巴德的彼得是以基督的功劳为理论的出发点。基督借着祂敬虔的生活，为自己赚取了功劳，不致受苦，反而得荣耀，当祂受苦又受死的时候，祂是甘心乐意的，并非为祂自己，乃是为着罪人。因此，祂为罪人赚得了脱离罪恶、魔鬼与刑罚的救赎，并得进天堂。到目前为止，这些思想都是从安瑟伦而来的，但是问到基督的死如何影响到救赎的时候，他回答说这是显明神对人的爱，借着神对我们这样的大爱，我们就受感动要爱神，如此使我们脱离了罪，更使我们成为义，当我们脱离罪的时候，我们也就脱离了魔鬼。

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) 论赎罪

根据波拿文土拉，对于道成肉身的必要性，乃是为了要补偿而存有的。仅仅一个受造者是不能为全人类的罪作补偿的，而且从另一个族类，也不适宜担当此任，因此必须有神而人的一位来作补偿。基督借着祂的功劳，就是祂借着受苦而赚得的，作成了此补偿。作补偿就是向神付上神所当得的荣耀，借着基督的受苦来完成此补偿，作为安抚神最适宜的方法，这样，神的慈爱与公义都得彰显。可是他这样说法是安瑟伦与亚比拉二人的合论，说基督受苦是最合适的方法，因为着最适于在人里面唤起对神的爱。论到基督于教会的关系，波氏远比安瑟伦解说的更好，他说明基督是教会的头，祂才能将祝福传递给祂的肢体。

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．　　　阿奎纳多马论赎罪

经院学派最伟大的神学家就是阿奎那多马，他比其他任何中古时期的神学家对前辈的神学思想更吸收的完全，因此我们在他的思想中看见安瑟伦与亚比拉的观念是不足为奇的，而且论到基督赎罪的意见陈述上，他也没有一致的论点。

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.

在其意见陈述上使我们想起了爱任纽与亚比拉，他认为在基督人性中可发现一切恩典的丰满性（重译：一切恩典的丰盛住在基督的人性里），因为祂是人类的元首，所说祂的完全与德行就传给了那些愿意顺从头的肢体。为一新人的基督，是新人类的原理，（重译：基督是新人，是新人类的原理与「酵」，）我们可从其为教师，并藉其教训、行动与受苦为人类榜样的观点来看救赎的工作。基督的受苦更显明了神的爱，我们就受感动要爱神，如此使我们脱离了罪，更使我们成为义，当我们脱离罪的时候，我们也就脱离了魔鬼。

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.

然而祂也有一项更属安瑟伦的思想路线，也就是天主教会所遵循的。阿奎那主张救赎并非绝对必须，因为神可以让人类在他们的罪中灭亡；（但）从神的属性看来，他也认为这样的做法是最合宜的。此外（如上文说的），他还有的意见就是，神不要求任何适当的补偿也能救赎人类。他认为在人世间一般的审判官不可能忽视人对律法的干犯，但是在人犯罪的情形下神能这样做（但在面对犯罪的人类的情形下神能这样做），因为祂本身就是公义的来源，以目前的情形，祂是受害的一方（也同时是这个案中受害的一方）；且神本着祂自己的意志来决定何者为是，何者为非，并且祂无需补赎而赦罪，因为这（注：不补偿而赦罪）并没有得罪什么人，然而神却要求一定要祂的儿子道成肉身来做补偿，因为一个人不能救赎所犯抵挡一位无限之神的罪。

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个动作、言语上，所以祂生活的所有行动，对救赎人的罪都有贡献，这就是向神提出适当的补偿。严格地说，基督的受苦与死是不必要的，可是却有个适当地理由可以说明，神为何需要基督受苦与死所作成的救赎，理由是要保全祂的慈爱与公义，同时确保二者得到最大地彰显。基督的死彰显了神的大爱，给人立下了顺服、谦卑、坚定不移的榜样；基督的死不但救人脱离罪，也为人赚取了称义的恩典与永远的福气，并提供给人抵挡罪有利的动机。

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.

基督受苦对罪人得救有下列四点的影响：（1）借着赚得救恩将福气传递给罪人；（2）使神得到非常的满足，也由于神秘的联合，使信者蒙受恩益；（3）为一甘愿的牺牲，使神喜悦；与（4）救赎罪人脱离奴役及刑罚。虽然人被魔鬼弄成为一属灵的奴隶，但是魔鬼也没有权柄要求赎价，所以祂也没有得到这赎价。可是若没有洗礼和补赎礼，那么就靠基督超余的恩典有多大，也不能救人，理由乃在于信者与元首耶稣基督神秘性联合的必要性。

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.

阿奎那多马论点的评述。

阿奎那的观点与安瑟伦的极为相似，可是在某些方面的观点低于安瑟伦的观点，主要是未能显出逻辑上的清晰度，也未能说出赎罪的必须性是根据神的属性，

他只说出赎罪仅在乎神的旨意。这种武断的内容就成为敦司苏格徒满意接受说的前身。而阿奎那的观点优于安瑟伦的地方，乃在于论到刑罚性补赎的观念，意思就是借着刑罚来满足神的要求；阿氏特别强调基督的功劳，在基督自动的顺服于被动的顺服间，加以清楚区分，并在神秘联合的观点上说明基督的功德传给了信徒。

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．敦司苏格徒论赎罪
DONS SCOTUS ON THE ATONEMENT

敦司苏格徒论赎罪。

阿奎那代表了多明尼加的神学，亦即天主教会公认的神学；而敦司苏格徒则是方济神学的创始者。敦氏的神学著作主要是批评性的与消极性的，他没有像阿奎那一样写下了神学总论，但在他所写兰巴德嘉言录的注释中，提到了有关基督赎罪的见解。我们可以推测他接受了兰巴德的赎罪观，因为他并没有更正兰巴德错误的地方，而他这样做为的是让兰氏的赎罪观，有更积极建设性的成就。在一些重要的观点上，他与以前的神学家像悖。

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.

　　敦氏使得赎罪观完全依赖神武断的圣旨意。（重译：完全依赖神随意的旨意。）他声称，向神提出补偿单单是因为神的要求，是神要的；但是并不是说神一定要这补偿，这完全是神的意外行动（重译：a contingent act of God）。此外他还主张，纵使容许补偿的必要性存在，那也不一定是说非要采取目前已经实际发生的外部方式（指基督被钉十字架），故提出补偿的并不一定是祂，或比受造之物更大的一位。这样说来，如果亚当能表现的敬虔一点，那他也可以救赎他自己初犯的罪

了；再者，敦氏没有考虑到补偿的证明，一定要由人提出，不然神也可能接受一位天使的工作，当做一充足够用的救赎，因为这全在乎神决定性的旨意。

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.

然而神从永远就预定了基督受苦，作为预定之人得救的方法。基督在十字架上所受的苦难，之所以有特别的价值与果效，只因为事先已预定为救人的方法，且神甘愿视此方法为有效。敦氏否认基督功劳的无限价值，因为他说那是带有人性的功劳，终究是有限的；然而，由于神旨意的决定，就接受了这些功德为有用的，即一项与所欠债务相称的功劳，神也会接受，这就是通常所谓赎罪论的满意接受说(Acceptilation Theory)。但根据马金他须，实在应称为赎罪论的接受说(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.

<div style="text-align: center">

拯救论的发展史（一）：
救赎施行的教义
THE HISTORY OF SOTERIOLOGY (part 1):
THE DOCTRINE OF THE APPLICATION OF GRACE

</div>

从讨论赎罪的教义（或者说是藉基督完成客观的救赎工作），进而讨论信徒得到救恩的方法（或说是借着圣灵的工作，基督功劳的主观应用），这实是必经的时期（重译：这是必经的思路）。

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. 前三世纪的拯救论
THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

若想在早期教父终寻找救赎工作应用的一个普遍、确定、完整与彻底发挥的观念，实是不可能的。那些教父们的陈述确实是（译加：不确定、）不完全，有时又错误百出且自相矛盾。迦尼斯 (Kahnis) 说：「事实显明，所有奥古斯丁以前的教父教导说，得到救恩的方法，是藉者人的自由与神恩典的合作。」

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· 早期教父论信心

为了与新约所说相符合，人得到救恩的祝福，是「借着向神悔改与相信主耶稣基督」，这是早期教父所强调的条件。（重译：早期教父强调：人得到救恩的祝福，是「借着向神悔改与相信主耶稣基督」；这些条件是符合新约《圣经》的。）然而，这并不是说他们已经具有信心与悔改的完满与适切的观念。一般认为，信心是接受基督功劳的显著工具，而且往往被称为人得救的唯一方法。这种观念的了解，乃包括在认识神的真知识上，并将自己交托给神，是耶稣基督及其赎罪宝血的特殊对象。（他们的理解是，认识神，信靠祂，把自己交托给祂，信心的特殊对象就是耶稣基督合祂赎罪的宝血。）这个信心被认为是称义的方法，而不是靠律法的行为。信心包括真使徒时代的教父，一再地表显出这种观念，又为护教者再度提出。后期教父，如爱任纽与奥利金，也分享人靠信心得救的概念。而拉丁教父，如居普良与安波罗斯，在强调人完全堕落与因信称义的必要上，远超过他们以前的教父。然而，这不能说有关信心的清晰观念，在前三世纪中浮出。在他们着重信心

上，教父们重复着他们在《圣经》上所发现的，但当他们说到信心是神什么的时候，则完全不清楚。一种流行的观念似乎是说，仅仅在头脑里同意真理，但在某些情况中，信心似乎包括自我降服的观念。然而着与在也稣基督里有圆满得救信靠的观念还相差太远。亚历山大学派，有时候在信心与知识上相冲突，他们说前者为一初步的阶段，一般说来知识对真理的接受；而后者则是较完全的阶段，在此阶段中才能了解二者的关系。

此外，早期教父虽然强调神的恩典与信心，作为领受救恩的媒体，可是也显示出道德主义的色彩，这明显与保罗的教训不符。福音往往被描述为一新律法，而信心与悔改仅仅被说明为，要倚靠人的意志。这样，救恩是靠神的恩典，同时又靠人自愿地合作。

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．早期教父论悔改

与信心一样，悔改也被认为是得救的初步条件。至于悔改一词之真义为何，则颇令人置疑，这在初代教父的思想中透露了出来。到底悔改仅仅只是一种行动，或内心的一种状态，或被认为是人生中的一种改善呢？这些都是不确定的，同时也清楚显示，当他们说到悔改是一种行动的时候，他们就特别强调悔改者悔罪行为的外部表现。这些行为甚至被认为有洗礼之后所犯的罪的价值，有一强调善行必要的倾向，特别是舍己的善行，即如施舍、守独身等等，都具有特殊的功能，与信心并驾其驱，作为得神恩宠的方法。这种善行的见解，是法理上的，并非福音上的。此种新约基督教道德上的曲解，在人心自以为义上，并在犹太法理主义进入教会开了门户上，得以窥见。

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．早期教父终的礼仪主义与行为之义

尚有一点值得注意，即前三世纪的教父，已经显示一种向礼仪主义移动的倾向。洗礼带着一种赦免以前所犯的罪，而洗礼以后所犯的罪，也能借着补赎得到赦免的观念，在他们中间广为流行。此外，某人的善行，特别是殉道所受的苦难，可以赎别人的罪的思想，也逐渐的占优势。到这时期的末了，虽然有一些教父不太赞同，但大多数的教父，却把一种超余的价值，加诸在殉道者与其代求上。所麦 (Sohm) 认为，以上的观念违背了《圣经》的教训，且时间会显示出这两种根本不同的思想，将彼此发生冲突，这是不可避免的。

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. 教父后期的拯救论
THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE REMAINING CENTURIES OF THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

1· 伯拉纠论神的恩典

伯拉纠较早期的任何教父，在论到救赎上更远离《圣经》的教训，甚至可以说是弃绝了《圣经》的根基，而这根基对早期教父来说，是神圣不可侵犯的。（重译：伯拉纠比早期的任何教父，在论到救赎的施行上更偏离《圣经》的教训，甚至可以说他弃绝了早期教父尊重的《圣经》根基。）伯氏又重申异邦哲学自足的原则，而他对罪的观念，导致他否认靠神的恩典在基督里得救的绝对必须性，他说人可以靠守律得救。他并没有完全藐视「恩典的帮助」 (assistance of grace)，甚至认为这时应当有的，使厉行神的吩咐更为容易。但是他所说的恩典，并不是神使人重生，藉此人心得光照，人意志得到更新，以至向善追求圣洁得恩典，而只是包括在：（1）性善或自然界之美善 (good of nature)， 即人生下来就有自由意志，所以他能行善或作恶；与（2）传福音与基督的榜样，二者都与人心并教导得救之法有关。神在自然界中所表现的恩惠使普遍的，且是绝对需要的，虽然能叫人容易得到救恩，但神在福音中的恩惠，既不普遍又不必须。自然恩典对善用自然能力的人而言，是随处可得到的，因为这恩典并不直接行使在人的意志上，乃仅是行使在人的悟性上给予光照。此外，人也可能抗拒这恩典的行使。基督教被人认为是一个新的律法，与旧约相比，乃是一扩大的律法。真正基督徒是认识神的人，相信自己已被神悦纳，并顺服福音的训诲，且效法基督的圣洁，而不是效法亚当的罪。

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 percepts of the Gospel, and imitates the holiness of Christ rather than the sin of Adam.

2· 奥古斯丁论神的恩典

奥古斯丁的出发点，与人本来自然的情况完全不同。他认为，人是完全败坏的，根本不能行属灵的善事。他也用客观的意义来说到恩典，包括在福音、洗礼、赦罪中的恩典，但他知道这是不够的，他并且也了解到罪人需要内在属灵的恩典，一种神的灵超自然的感化，藉此人心得光照，意志被更新转向圣洁。这恩典是神预定的果实，是按照神主权的美意，而非按着人的什么功德，白白赐给人的，它是在人的功德之先，神所给的礼物。这恩典赐给人一颗新心，并光照你，叫你的意志转变，离恶而就善，且生发信心，使人行属灵的善事。到人重生以后为止，恩典的活动，绝对是神独作的，亦即人的得救，丝毫没有人的功劳成份在内。奥氏有一时间，以为人有相信的能力，但后来看到保罗在林前四 7 所写的，就不再那样想了。

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.

奥氏在行动之恩 (gratia operans) 与协同之恩 (gratia co-operans)间予以区分。前者是在人不愿意之前就使其愿意之恩；而协同之恩使在人愿意之后使其意图不致徒然的恩典，且此恩典使不可抗拒的。这意思并没有强迫的意思，乃是说不可避免地要更新人的心意，以致意志才能甘愿选择正当的途径。人借着洗礼接受了恩典头一部份的祝福，就是重生，或者说是内心初步的更新与罪的赦免，而这些祝福也有可能失掉，事实上，除非也得到保守之恩，不然二者都无法保守住。

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 consrains 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．　　　奥古斯丁论信心

论到基督徒生活的开始，以及所有善行的根源，信心都当居首要的地位。奥氏对信心的了解，乃在于对真理的理智上的认可，在他所写对信心的看法中，比较氏属于高尚理解的观念。他把一般的信心于基督徒的信心，信基督与在基督里有信心之间加以区分，认为只有当一个人爱基督，并在祂身上有所有的指望的时候，才算是信基督，且基督徒的信心所成就的，但是奥氏的信心观念还没有达到赤子之心那样完全信靠的程度，而此赤子之心的信心才是真正的得救信心。奥氏认为，信心在罪人称义上是有所作为的，因为他说人是因信称义的，那就是因信心得称为义。但奥氏并非是以纯辩论的性质来了解因信称义，虽然包括有罪得赦免的意思在内，但是并非是因信称义的本质。在称义中，神不仅宣布，也是借着改变罪人内在的本性，使着罪人成为义。奥氏在称义与成圣之间未能作一清楚的分别，实际上他是把后者包括在前者之中。奥氏神学思想的主要特性，就是把所有的事都归于神的恩典。

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．　　　半伯拉纠派论神的恩典

半伯拉纠派采取中间立场，否认人的完全败坏，但承认不用神恩典的帮助，人也可以作成得救的工夫；虽然神的恩典能够光照人的心，并能扶佐人的意志，但人的自由意志则总是不能妥协。事实上二者在救赎的工作上，是彼此合作的。神的恩典虽然是普遍的，能为所有的人得到，但是必须在适当运用自由意志的人的生活中，神的恩典才发生功效。严格地说，决定其后果的乃系乎人的自由意志；相信或继续相信，乃在乎人，只有为增强信心的时候才需要恩典，根本没有不可抗拒之恩惠这回事。伯拉纠主义被迦太基会议、以弗所会议、奥兰治会议定为异端，这些虎疫也反对伯拉纠主义，使奥古斯丁主义在教会中大获全胜。

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· 奥古斯丁见解之修正

然而这并不是说，奥古斯丁的见解没有受到修正，他本人的教训包含着与人绝对倚靠神恩典的观念相冲突的成份在内，并走向礼仪主义与行为之义，兹提数点如下：（1）有时靠教会及其圣礼来得神的恩典。（2）认为在赦罪与重生上，可能会再失去神的恩典。（3）对救法真正如此基要的因信称义的教义，被说明为很难与白白恩典教义相协调。神白白赐给的恩典，主要并非在于罪得赦免上－事实上这乃是奥氏思想中的一个细节－乃在于重生，而将神的恩典注入人心中，使人能够行善事，并赚得永生。信心所以被称为义，并不是它支取到基督耶稣的义，乃是因为信心是由爱所促成的。人在恩典的工作与信心的恩赐以前，无功德可言，但是当重生恩典与信心在人心中作成的时候，他的行为才真正是功德的行为。因此根本上说，恩典只不过再一次使人能赚得救恩。

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 no 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.

以上所说的这些内容，实在不是奥古斯丁思想的主流，乃是教会中之一些人急于把握的思想，更属于支持半伯拉纠主义的教训。在奥古斯丁于半伯拉纠主义间的抗争，为时已久，表明了对预定论、人的完全败坏，以及不可抗恩惠的强烈抵抗。最后为教会所认可的信仰立场，乃是温和的奥古斯丁主义。西波格 (Seeberg)Z 在其所著「教义史」一书中说：「唯独靠恩典的教义占了优势，而预定论却遭到遗

弃。预定的不可抗拒的恩惠，被洗礼的恩惠所驱逐。恩典的教义于流行的天主教发生了关系，由于高举善行，就成为得神恩典的目的。」（卷一，382页）

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． 教会中发生的不良影响

在教会中有些影响正活动着，就是以恩典所有属灵祝福的恩典教义，与产生善行原理的信心教义相冲突的影响正活动着；另一些影响则引诱人高举外部的行为，并坚持此行为的功德性，且忽略救恩的主观条件，而强调行为。以下数点值得特别注意：（1）有一种把信心与信仰纯正混为一谈的趋势，一位相信仅仅是主张一信仰纯正的信条而已，而将注意力集中于一系列的教义上，只需要理智上的同意，但是却远离了作为一个人对神态度，并能结仁义果子的信心。（2）善行于自律深受推崇，且往往被描述为能补偿信徒之罪的适当方法。（3）许多教父在神的吩咐与福音的辅导（重译：劝导）间作一区分，因为前者绝对约束所有的基督徒，至于后者厉行与否则无关重要，但对于那些遵守的人，则必得大赏赐。此乃为了修道院主义的好处，才作此区分，意欲将人特殊的阶级成为圣洁，这就是他们勤于外部行为的原因。（4）崇拜圣徒、依靠圣徒的代求，特别是依靠童贞女马利亚代求的习俗有增无减，证明了对救恩属灵的涵意有害无益。这就导致外部的行为主义，并靠人的行为。基本的观念就是说，圣徒有了过剩的善行，可以转让给他人。（5）有一种靠洗礼而得救的观念不断增强，这种观念就是说进入除此以外别无救恩的教会。东方教会对于不受洗礼而能得救的可能性，大表怀疑，而在西方教会则是绝对否认不受洗而能得救的观念，甚至奥古斯丁也教导说，没有受洗而死亡的孩童是灭亡的。

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.

拯救论的发展史（二）：经院主义时期的拯救论
THE HISTORY OF SOTERIOLOGY (part 2):
THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE SCHOLASTIC PERIOD

当我们来到经院时期的时候，关于得救程序的主要内容，即如恩典、信心、因信称义、功德、与善行，我们看到许多各种不同的见解。一般说来，虽然在经院学派中显示出半伯拉纠主义的倾向，但是教会的立场还是温和的奥古斯丁主义。我们要简略地看看这些主要的思想。

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.　　经院学派的恩典观
THE SCOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF GRACE

1·经院学派的恩典观

有一点我们看出，在经院学派中盛行的见解，就是同意奥古斯丁派，而不同意伯拉纠与半伯拉纠派的见解。虽然后者说开始有信心与继续有信心，乃在于属血气之人的能力，可是一般说来，经院学派都主张人若没有神**充足**恩典 (Sufficient Grace) 的帮助，是无法有信心的。这就与奥古斯丁的思想同出一辙，可是不那么完全，因为奥古斯丁说还必须有**有效**的恩典 (Efficient Grace)。在经院学派当中，关于恩典的题目，没有普遍一致的见解。兰巴德彼得德见解与奥古斯丁的见解，有着密切的关联，同时广被接受。兰氏认为解释恩典的性质，是一件非常困难的事，但是他宁愿倾向于恩典乃为在人里面行使的超自然能力，并在*行动之恩*（使人以信心转向神）与*协同之恩*（与人意志合作，发生预期有效的结果）之间加以区分。唯有前者使最先赐给人的（只有前者是没有人的行动而在人心中作成的），并且纯粹是白白赐给人的恩赐。再进一步所赐给人的恩典，乃在乎人意志的同意与合作，不然无法得到。人的自由意志是唯独靠神恩典的协助，才能有所活动，并且获得预期的效果。

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 o 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.

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*.

哈勒之亚历山大的说法，与兰巴德彼得是相一致的，但是他又提出另一个区分，就是经院神学的特性，他说到白白赐下的恩典 (gratia gratis dans)，施赠的恩典 (gratia gratis data)， 与使人蒙悦纳的恩典 (gratia gratum faciens)。阿奎纳多马以不同的意义来使用这些名词，因此就决定了这些名词后来的用法。他虽然使用「使人蒙悦纳的恩典」这个名词，是指着一切超自然的辅助，目的是叫领受者本身 dedao 补赎，但他却把「施增的恩典」这名词，仅限于白白的恩赐，目的再为别人的好处，而非求领受的好处。论到「使人蒙悦纳的恩典」，他在「运行的恩典」于「协同的恩典」之间作一区分。前者更新人的意志，而后者在合作上予以辅助；前者可称之为***充足的恩典***，而后者可称之为***有效的恩典***。

II．经院学派的信心观
THE SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF FAITH

在经院时期，有一普遍的倾向，就是以知识为方式的信心（仅对真理的同意），与属灵情感的信心（能够产生善行）间有所区分。兰巴德彼得在此作了三项区分，即信神、神的信实与基督徒的信。前两项实际上的意思是说到一件事，那就是接受神所说的为真实；但后者是指深一层的信心，藉此信心我们才能与神有交通。兰巴德说，信神是一回事，也就是信祂所说的是真的，与在神里面有信心（重译：信靠神自己，faith in God）是另外一件事，那就是说，相信祂就是爱祂，到祂那里去就

近祂，并加入基督身体中成为肢体。他也在相信信经、教义的信，与因信称义的信之间作了一个区分。

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.

在兰氏以后，通常理智的信与为爱所形成的信之间又有所区分；此外，又特别宣称理智上的信是为称义作准备，只有为爱所形成的信才是使人称义的信。同时，作神父的认为，叫信徒无条件的服从教会的权威，乃是信心主要的特性，所以有些神学家就鼓励这种观念。

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． 经院学派的称义与功德观
THE SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTION OF JUSTIFICATION AND MERIT

奥古斯丁对称义与成圣的混淆，不但未加以澄清，反而为经院学派更为加强。他们的一般教训就是说，神将成圣之恩注入人的心中，使着人得称为义。在神那方面包括成圣之恩的注入与赦罪，在人这方面包括借着信心与懊悔，将人自己的自由意志转向神，当然，那最后的一部份并不包括婴儿，因为在婴儿里面完全是神的工作，如此一来，因信称义仅仅包括恩典的注入与原罪的赦免。

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. 经院学派论称义。
The Scholastics on Justification.

经院学派一般都同意在称义中所包括的，但却从未想过基督之义是仅仅归给罪人的，然而，在称义中各不同本质的次序决定上，则意见各殊。根据阿奎那多马，最初是有恩典的注入，然后才有自由意志的转向神，其次是将自由意志转向抵挡罪，最后是罪得赦免。而哈勒的亚历山大与波拿文土确主张另外一个次序，即转离罪，恩典的注入，罪得赦免，与自由意志转向神。但恩典注入的那一刹那，人就生发懊悔之心，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.

敦司苏格徒则有完全不同的见解，他所了解的称义包括两项神的工作，那就是罪得赦免与藉成圣之恩内心的更新。实际来说，二者虽然是同时的，乃在次序上来说，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.

经院学派说称义是立即的作为，但是天特总会却说称义是逐渐增进的。关于称义之恩的确保，阿奎那主张这并不是一般信徒所共有的，必须根据恩典的外部表记，才能够得到合理揣测的满足，也只有那些为宗教缘故有所作为或多受苦难，又借着特殊启示的人，才能得到称义的确信。

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．经院学派论功德
The Scholastics on Merit.

与自由恩典教义（重译：白白恩典的教义）并行，并关系到称义的，就是其次的功德教义。德性的功德素质，特别是在善行所表显的，在中古世纪非常盛行，几乎没有任何著名的经院学派神学家反对。阿奎那多马将功德分为两类，就是「赚取的功德」(Merit of Condignity)，严格的公正上来说，得报偿是应该的，并且这功德唯独属于基督；与「施赠的功德（而非赚取的）」(Merit of Congruity)，意思就是人能给予赏赐并且人也能得到这功德。然而他的门人多马派却更为极端，主张一个人在称义之后，由于神恩典的帮助，才能赚取的功德，那就是使他在神面前有所作为、在神身上有所要求（重译：使神必须给他的功德）。敦司苏格徒的弟子否认此点，但主张在称义前的善功，可以得到一致的功德，且根据这个而能得到恩典的增进。他们主张神性的完全，使得神不得不将人所赚得的恩典传给人。

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．天主教拯救论最终得型态
Final Form of Roman Catholic Soteriology.

天主教论神恩之应用与支取上，采取了下列的形式。在教会之内所生的孩童，就已接受了重生的恩典，包括在洗礼时恩典的注入与罪得赦免。然而，在后来受福音感化的人，也领受到充足的恩典，那就是圣灵的光照悟性，并加强意志；他们能抵抗，但也要顺服神的工作，并随从圣灵的引导。借着顺服并与神合作，他们为称义之恩预备自己，此种预备包括了下列七种成份：（1）同意教会所教导的真理；（2）看见自己有罪的景况；（3）盼望神的怜悯；（4）开始爱神；（5）憎恶罪；（6）决志遵守神的诫命；与（7）愿意受洗。

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，信心在此并没有占重要的地位，但却与其他的预备程序相协调；信心只不过是对教会教义作理智上的同意 (fides informis)，并且是仅借着爱所分赐的恩典 (gratia infusa 即浇灌的恩典，藉此称为又爱所形成的信心)，而得到称义的能力。这称义的恩典才是称义的根基，为七种预备程序中的首要项目。

　　It is quite evident that faith does not occupy a central place here, but is co-ordinated 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.

　　在此七项预备程序之后，因信称义就随着洗礼而来。称义在乎于恩典的浇灌（超自然的功德），然后才有罪得赦免，而此赦免得多寡程度又与实际上胜过罪的程度相称。称义是白白赐予的，而非靠那事先预备项目而赚得的，并且是借着守诫命、行善事来保守称义。在浇灌的恩典中，人领受了超自然的能力作善事，如此本着基督所赚得的功劳，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赚得救恩，但却无法确定这称义的宝贵恩赐，将持续到多久，可能因不信或犯什么大罪而失掉；然而，因为补赎之礼，包括忏悔、认罪、赦罪与补赎的工作，则又重新复得。罪孽与永远的刑罚，借着告解（罪得赦免）得以免除，但罪的暂时的刑罚，只能借着补赎的工作得以消除。

　　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.

<div align="center">

教会论发展史
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

</div>

I. 教父时期的教会论
IN THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

1．早期教父的教会观
The Church in the Early Church Fathers.

有关教会的教义，在基督教早期的文献中就有其根基了。在使徒时代的教父与护教者的文献中，论到教会通常被称为神产业的代表者（重译：通常被称为圣徒的交通 *communio sanctorum*，神的子民，神所拣选的属民）。虽然说到神的子民为真以色列人，但是在历史上的预备时期，却往往不被人所了解。甚至在第二世纪，关于教会的观念，也都有些可以觉察出来的变迁，那乃是由于异端的兴起，使得真正大公教会外部的特性显露出来。因为这样的结果，大家都特别强调外部的特性，以兹区别何为真正的大公教会，结果教会被认为是一个外部的组织体，为使徒继承者之主教所治理，并且拥有真正的遗传（重译：并且拥有真正信仰的传统）。这种观念颇为流行，认为世界所有普遍的教会，都是地方教会，也都有地方教会的历史行，（重译：认为普世教会就是所有地方教会在历史上的本质 (prius)。）但是这个地方教会，不能被视为一分离的团体，应当被视为普遍教会的一部份（重译；但是地方教会不能被视为不同分离的单位，而是有主教的普世教会的部份），只有这些分离单位的教会对大公教会尽忠、服从时，她们才被认为是真教会。

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．其他派别的教会观
The Church in the Sects.

可是在其他派别里（重译：可是在一些异端的旁门里），他们特别强调教友的圣洁，以此圣洁程度来定夺教会的真伪。主张此学说的人，即使第二世纪中叶的孟他努、第三世纪中叶的诺洼天，与四世纪初的多纳徒派为代表，主因是由于他们

反对教会逐渐的世俗化于贪爱世界而产生的。孟他努派的领袖，猛烈地攻击教会的松弛与世界化 （世俗化），并且坚持苦修的生活习惯，他们说受洗以后所犯的大罪是不可赦免的，但是他们却也说，借着殉道能够补赎大罪。诺洼天派并不同享孟他努派的说法，但却赞同、遵循追求教会的圣洁，他们主张教会没有权柄接纳那些受逼迫而否认神信仰的人再加入教会，但却发现有些主教接纳这些人入教，并重新给予施洗。多纳徒派在罗马皇戴克里先迫害的时候，也有这样的趋势，他们有力地坚持教会惩诫，与纯洁的教友制度，反对灵性上有缺乏的人作他们的牧师，拒绝政府干扰教会；但同时他们却又力求皇帝的恩宠。

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 beingun pardonable; 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．居普良的教会观
Cyprianic Conception of the Church.

教父们对于这些派别非常反对，并且强调教会的主教制度。居普良是特土良的学生，是头一个倡导教会主教制的人。他认为，主教是由主自己所选召的，是使徒真正的继承人，并主张根据马太十六章 18 节，教会使建立在主教上，而主教是教会绝对的主宰，至于谁属于教会的权力完全在乎主教，某人犯罪后想重新加入教会也是由主教决定；他是以神祭司的身份来领导教会崇拜，并以那个资格来献祭。居普良是头一个教导牧者有真正祭司职份的人，按他来说，主教可以成立一个教团，召开主教会议，（重译：主教们可以成为一个教团，就是主教会议 episcopate，）如此可以代表教会整体的合一，他乃是以主教的合一作为教会合一的根基；他同时也主张各主教间地位的平等，并不将优先权让给罗马的主教；并称背叛主教就等于背叛神，任何人不服从主教，就没有资格和教会来往，结果那人的得救也遭到怀疑（重译：结果那人就失去他的救恩），而真正的会友总是在教会内，教会以外没有真正的救恩（重译：总之，真正的会友总是在教会内，服从教会，因为在教会以外没有救恩的可能。）。

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*.

这种的教会观使得居普良否认异端所施洗礼的有效性，很明显地，对他来说，一个在教会以外的人，不可能吸引别人到教会来，而且他相信只有教会领袖才可领受圣灵－因他只有在教会内才分赐给人－才能将赦罪之恩分赐给人。这样，居普良是首先发表大公教会观念的人，清楚地包含所有基督教会地各分支，并且借着有形的与外部的合一联系在一起。一位神学家说：「这是居普良导致教会错谬与腐败更深一层的贡献。」

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．奥古斯丁论教会
Augustine on the Church.

奥古斯丁的教会观也是在以上所说的思想范围内，他与多纳徒派之思想间有一番挣扎，迫使他对教会的本质有更深一层的反应。说来可悲，他的教会观与他所倡罪与恩典的教义不相一致，事实上在他的教会观念上存在着二元论，一方面奥氏主张预定论，认为教会是蒙拣选者的集团，拥有神的灵并有真正的爱心，其中最重要的是在于实质，而非仅是外部的参加圣礼而已，且由于此团体的代求，罪就得到赦免，得到神的恩典（重译：神赐予救恩的恩赐），因此圣徒（教会）真正的联合

是无形的，但是（重译：而且）此联合只能在大公教会内，因为圣灵只有在教会内才工作，并且只有在教会内才有真正的爱。

  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，奥氏也是一个主张主教制的人（重译：奥氏也是一位认同有形教会的人），一般说来他持守居普良的教会观，认为真正的教会就是大公教会，而在这个教会中，使徒的权威透过主教的继承而延续下去，且教会将不断扩展下去；（重译：真正的教会就是大公教会，在此教会中，使徒的权威透过主教的继承延续下去。教会不断在世界各地扩展；）而在教会之外就无救恩，因为人只有在教会内才能被爱充满得着圣灵；而教会的圣礼不仅仅是一种象征，乃神能力实际的应用（重译：神的能力实际施展，），在洗礼中神真的藉此赦免人的罪，在主餐中真实地给人属灵的复苏；在这个教会中虽有各形各色的人，（加：有好的也有邪恶的会友；）但是论到完全的纯洁则在将来才会实现。

  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.

  多纳徒派人士批评奥古斯丁将教会分成两个：现今混杂的教会与将来在天上的纯洁教会。奥氏为了回答他们，他主张现今的大公教会也有纯洁性，但是在客观的组织上，即在教会的职份，如大主教、主教、神父等，圣礼与管理上当力求纯洁（重译：他在客观的组织上，即在教会的职份，如大主教、主教、神父等，圣礼与各种的事工上，寻找大工教会的纯洁性；）；除此以外，奥氏也护卫一个主观上的圣洁，虽然他承认教会中有好的有坏的信徒混杂一起，但是他却主张这两类人同时存在，并不具有相等的意义，虽然那恶的人不能从教会外部的组织上除去，但是就内部来说，他与真正敬虔的人氏分离的，他们虽属于教会却不在教会里，他们氏基督身体里的毒瘤，一定要被铲除掉。如此在思想上奥古斯丁影响了多那徒派思想在生活中实践的纯洁性（重译：如此，奥古斯丁实现了多那徒派试图在生活上实践的教会纯洁性）。

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．奥古斯丁论神国
Augustine on the Kingdom of God.

在这里还有一点值得考虑的，就是奥氏论神国的教义。早期教父用「神国」一名词来描述教会发展的结果与目标，也就是所说末世论的国度（重译：即是末世的国度）。但奥古斯丁说：「教会在现今就是天国。」虽然他也把这意思用在教会的领袖身上，可是他说这话的主要意思是，圣徒组成了神的国。虽然神的国在本质上来说，是那些敬虔的生徒，但是也是有组织的教会，在上帝之城与世界之城间的对比，被认为是基督教与异邦主义、善与恶、教会内的圣徒与恶人、属灵的与属肉体的、蒙拣选与未蒙拣选之间的对照。

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.

奥古斯丁的观念缺乏综合性。
Want of Synthesis in Augustine's View.

在奥古斯丁有关教会分歧的观念中缺乏综合性，但值得怀疑的是，到底实际情况中是不是真能有综合性呢？兹提出一些问题之三重回答来回答这些问题。可以说：谁在教会中？a. 一切预定得救的人，包括未悔改之人。 b. 一切信者，包括那

退后之人。 c. 所有参与圣礼之人。可是问题又来了，那一个是真教会呢？是受洗礼者的外部交通，还是选民与圣徒的属灵交通呢？抑或二者都是，因为在外部交通和属灵交通之外没有救恩？此外为选民组成的教会，与信者所组成的教会，怎么能发生关系而有联系呢？我们可以清楚发现，因为信者当中有些人不是在被选之列，所以后来也是灭亡了，二者可说毫无关系。当奥古斯丁说，没有一个人有了神为父而不在教会中的时候，他说的就是那有形的大公教会。自然问题又发生了，关于那些未曾加入教会的选民又将如何呢？再者，假如有形的大公教会，如奥古斯丁所主张的，就是基督的真身体，这岂不证明多纳徒派所争论，恶人与异端者不能容留于教会的论点是真实的吗？再有，假如这个教会是以神预定的恩典为根基，那么曾经接受重生之恩与在洗礼中罪的赦免的人，怎么能再失去恩典而得救呢？最后，如果神是诸多恩典的唯一来源，而且此恩典优势随祂己意来分配的，那么要把这个能力归给有形教会的洗礼，又靠教会组织成为会员来得救，这样做可以被认为是适当的吗？关于这一点，可以说奥氏对预定的见解，使得他与他同一时代的人，远离了圣礼主义的方向。

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, Whoa re 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.　中古时期
IN THE MIDDLE AGES

（补译：很突出的事实是，虽然中古世纪时期的神学家对于教会的言论很少，因此对教会论的发展并没有太多的贡献，可是教会本身发展成为一个有高度组织和绝对权威的架构。这事实的根源乃是居普良的著作，和奥古斯丁关于外部教会的教导。奥氏另外一个基本的观念：教会乃是圣徒的交通 *communio sanctorum*，则完全被忽略。）

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.

在中古世纪时期有两项较显著的观念，那就是天主教的权势占了优势，与以教会为神国的观念。（重译：那就是：（一）罗马教会的权势在所有教会以上，和（二）教会就是神国的观念。）

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．教皇观念的发展。
Development of the Papal Idea.

在主后四、五世纪的时候，教会的遗传非常盛行，说基督将那首要的权柄赐给了彼得，使他超过其他使徒以上，并且说彼得是罗马天主教的第一任教皇；此外，据说这个首要的地位传递给了他的继承者，就是帝国基层的主教（重译：就是帝国首都罗马的主教）。主后五三三年，拜占庭皇帝遮斯丁承认罗马主教的权位，在所有其他区域的主教以上；贵勾利一世时拒绝「普遍主教」（重译：「普世性主教」）的称呼，但是在六零七年，这名称又加给他的继承者波尼法修第三，而波氏也接受了。此后，罗马的基层主教属灵的权势在西方世界中广被接纳，这就是天主教教皇制度的开始。这样一来，教会就接纳了外部有形的元首，不久就演变成为一个无上的主权者。

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 Wes, 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．教会被认同为神的国。
Identification of the Hierarchical Church with the Kingdom of God.

随之而来的发展就是大公教会即为神的国，因此天主教的管区就是属世的国，这种观念受到两种伪造的鼓舞：君士坦丁的贡献与伪造的教宗喻令。这二者在当时都是欺骗百姓，藉此来证明教皇的权威，是早在第三世纪时的教皇就颁布授与的了。

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.

把有形的与有组织的教会当成是神的国这件事，有很深远的结果。如果只有教会是神的国，那么所有基督徒的本份与活动就都必须投给教会，因为基督教说到这个国度，是所有基督徒所该努力的最高目标，而自然生活与社会生活对教会来说，不过是次要的生活而已；一切不受教会管辖的，都被认为是世俗的，若要抛弃或拒绝它，将被认为是虔敬的事；隐士与修道士的生活则被视为罪伟大的理想生活。

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.

还有一个结果，就是将不当的意义加在教会外部的组织上，怎么说呢？因为神的国在新约中，不但被解说为基督徒生活的目的，而且也是基督徒蒙福的总结，因此按照这种说法，救恩一切的祝福，借着教会的条例、法令、仪式才临到人，若没有这些礼节上的用途（重译：若不使用这些礼节），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.

将神的教会当成神的国的结果，导致了教会真正的世俗化，教会既然被认为是外部的国度，就自觉有责任解说、维护她与世界国度的关系，那么久而久之就只关心政治，而忽略了人得救之事，世俗化代替了永世的追慕。教皇有鉴于神国至高的特质，以及神国包罗万象的护理，所以认为应该透过要求皇帝服从教会的统治，来实现国度的理想。这就是诸如贵勾利第七、英诺森三世与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. 罗马天主教的教会观。
Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Church.

在宗教改革之前，罗马天主教的教会观，就已经明确的规定了，后来在天特会议中，不敢讨论教会的定义，乃因当权者还是愿意教皇制度存在的缘故。他们还没预备好要承认教会的权柄根本是属于教皇的，也不承认主教是从教皇得权柄，但却主张主教是由基督直接而得权者。这样冲突的见解，使得他们要用明文来制定教会的意义到底是什么。（重译：罗马天主教的教会观，要到宗教改革之后才正式规定下来。可是，要了解天主教的教会观，最好是正视这时期定规的最后形式，因为在宗教改革已经这个观念已经存在在天主教内；再者，若要了解基督教的教会观，最好先有天主教的教会观作为背景。天特会议没有为教会作出一个定义；这是因为，虽然教会最高的领袖愿意承认教皇制度，可是不少主教们的坚持主教的权力。后者不愿意承认教会所有的权柄主要都在教皇手中，主教的权柄来自教皇；反之，这些主教认为主教的权柄乃直接来自基督。这两种观点的冲突，使为教会作出定义不很适当。）

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.

可是天特要理问答，却把教会界说为「所有信者得团体，有一个无形的元首基督，及一个有形的元首，就是彼得的继承者，占有罗马天主教的教区。」而天主教最有名的大主教伯喇尔明，也对天主教的教会观提出了清楚的说明，根据他的说法，教会乃是「本着承认同一的基督信仰而结合，引用同一的圣礼，在合法牧师的指导之下，并基督在世上的代理人，即天主教教皇治理之下的团体。」这个定义的头一句（承认同一的信仰），将不信的人排除在外；第二句（同一圣礼的使用），将使用规定不合者排除在外；第三句（服从天主教教宗），则将天主教以外的一切教派，（加译：天主教认为这些是分裂教会分子，）如希腊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.

论到天主教的教会观，应注意下列几点：

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

a. 教会的有形性质
1. Visible Nature of the Church.

天主教教会特别着重教会的有形性，而认为教会有形性可见之原因，乃在于神圣圣道的具体化 (incarnation)。因为神的道不能降入人心，只能够像人一样在人中出现，并借着人为有形的媒体来执行祂的工作；而教会甚至被认为是道成肉身的继续，那么基督自己借着委派使徒，并且委任他们中之一人（彼得）为他们之首，就组织了教会。教皇就是彼得的继承人，主教就是其他使徒的继承人，前者持有直接于绝对的权威，而后者仅有从教皇而来一点点的权威。

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．教会的教导与信仰（重译：教导的教会，相信的教会）

2. Teaching and Hearing Church.

在教导的教会与相信的教会之间，有一个很重大的区别，前者包括从其教会之首而来全部的教训，后者包括尊敬牧师权威的所有信者。天主教认为教会最重要的属性就是教导，因她认为自己是大公的、独一的、属使徒的、无谬的与永远的教会，除此以外她都不承认别的教派为教会，因此她采取了毫不容忍的态度来反对其他的教会。而教会里的听众，是以教导的教会为依存。

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．教会的身体与灵魂

3. Body and Soul of the Church

教会像人一样，是由身体与灵魂合成的，教会的灵魂就包括那些信基督，并借着超自然的恩典、恩赐、与基督联合的社团。并非所有的选民都在教会的灵体里，也不是所有在教会灵体里的人都是选民，因为至终有人堕落了；有些不在教会组织体里的人，不一定不在教会的灵体里，即如一些慕道友在没有加入教会前已经得到了主的恩典。而教会组织体，就是那些承认真信仰的人们，不拘他们是罪人或义人，只有受洗的人是属于教会的，但有些受洗的人却还没有属于教会，亦即他还未受主恩典，还未成成为真教会之一员。

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 whoa re 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．教会分配救恩

4. The Church Dispenser of Grace

　　基督把罪人所赚的恩典与祝福分配给教会，祂乃是完全藉神父的代理来执行，结果教会这机构，在逻辑上来说是先于机体，换句话说有形教会是在无形教会之先。

　　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．教会是救恩的机构
5. The Church Institute of Salvation.

　　教会就是一个得救的机构（重译：教会就是一个分配救恩的机构），即救人的方舟，这样说来她有三项的功能：（1）借着传道来宣扬真信仰；（2）藉圣礼使人成圣；（3）遵照教会法规来治理信徒。只有教导的教会才能做这些事，因此严格说来，教会就是教导的教会，她在基督之下是人得救的唯一中保，她并将救恩分赐给众人，是全人类得救唯一的方舟。得救的次序并不是神借着祂的道印人道教会，正相反，是教会灵人明白道，而进入基督里。

　　The Church is exclusively an institute of salvation, a saving ark. A s 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.

圣礼论的发展史
HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS
(from Louis Berkhof, *A History of Christian Doctrines*, pp. 242-256.)

I．　圣礼总论
THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

1．宗教改革前圣礼教义的发展
[a] Development of the Doctrine before the Reformation

「圣礼」 (Sacraments) 一词，是从拉丁文 sacramentum 而来的，意思是指着基督教一切奇妙与难以了解的事，而这字原来是指着兵丁入伍时的宣誓。

（重译：「圣礼」 (Sacraments) 一词，是从拉丁文 sacramentum 而来的，武加大圣经用此字来翻译希腊文的 musterion；后者是新约圣经用来指旧约中没有显明的事。此字后来有另外的涵意，指基督教和其他宗教中所有奥秘与难以了解的事，包括奥秘的行动与事物。拉丁文的 sacramentum 一字后来也有了这重意义，而这个拉丁字本来是指兵丁入伍时所必须作的宣誓，或在律法控诉时作为保证金的款项；官司若打输了，钱归政府或归诸神。）

The term "sacraments" is derived from the Latin *sacramentum*, by which the Vulgate rendered the Greek *musterion*, 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．早期教会的圣礼观
Sacraments in the Early Church.

在早期基督教世代中，「圣礼」一词有广泛的应用，凡具有神圣意义的任何事，都可以用 sacramentum 一词。特土良把创造之工、道成肉身之子的工作（特别是指着祂的死），都当做圣礼；至于十字架的记号、神父的封立。婚礼、赶鬼、守安息日，也都称做圣礼。同时，这名词主要是用在洗礼与圣餐上。

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．经院时期的圣礼（观）
The Saraments in the Scholastic Period.

大体来说，经院时期的学者是遵循奥古斯丁的圣礼观，他们认为圣礼是一个可见的记号，是无形恩典的媒体。至于圣礼数目的多寡，则随各主张而不同，有些甚至主张三十种之多，萧俄 (Hugo of St. Victor) 就是其中之一；而兰巴德是首先提出天主教七项圣礼的人，后来于一四三九年佛劳伦斯会议中，正式采纳兰氏的提案。这七项圣礼是：洗礼、坚振礼、圣餐礼、补赎礼、神父奉献礼、婚礼与抹油礼。

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 firs to name the well-known seven of he 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.

圣礼数目的范围，当然是逐渐地减少，但圣礼属灵成份却未能清楚地加以解说，至于用什么方法来执行圣礼，也没有清楚的说明。奥古斯丁有的时候执行圣礼是根据领受者的信心，因此使得外部的圣礼，只不过成为神在人心中工作的印象而已，这种观念在经院时期所盛行的见解中可清楚看出。而事实上这种观念有的时候是很占优势，那也就是说，圣礼本身并不真包括神的恩典，只不过是象征而已。此见解在波拿文土拉于丢兰达斯的著述中可找到，又因为敦司苏格徒 (John Duns Scotus) 的赞同，使得此种见解在中古世纪盛行起来。

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.

可是除了这种见解之外，还有另外一种见解，主张神的恩典真在有形的圣礼之中。这并不是说神恩典的永久能力存在可见的酒、饼、水中，乃是说「执行圣礼时，分别为圣的话语，在外部表记上发生属灵的功效；属灵的功效若没有达到，在圣礼中就谈不上有什么神的恩典。」萧俄与阿奎那多马赞同此见解，最后也为教会所接纳。

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.

关于圣礼的执行是否在乎受礼者有否资格，或执行圣礼者有否资格的问题，经院学派趋向因功生效(*ex opera operato*) 的观点，那就是说，乃在呼客观上的执行。当然意思就是说，得到圣礼之恩补在乎领受者的属灵状况如何，也不在乎执行圣礼神父的品格如何，只要为了接受圣礼而准备好，就能得到报偿。因功生效的圣礼行为，使得新约的圣礼被认为较旧约更优越。

In connection with the question, whether the operation of he 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. 天特总会论圣礼
The Council of Trent on the Sacraments.

天特总会关于圣礼，通过了几项决议，以下是其中最重要的几点：（1）圣礼对救恩来说是必要的，那就是说，人必须要接受圣礼，最低限度是那些想要得救的人，可是这不能说每个人都需要圣礼。（2）圣礼中包含了其所表明的恩典，并且借着执行圣礼，把因功生效的恩典赐给愿意接受圣礼的人，也就是说不犯大罪或其他恶行的人，就能得到恩典。（3）执行圣礼的神父，只要以诚实的心来执行圣礼，也就是行教会所要行的，那就能达到圣礼的有效性了，但若由不具神父职份的人来执行圣礼，那就犯大罪了。（4）洗礼、坚振礼或封立礼，在领受者的心灵这一方面已经留下不可抹灭的印象，所以不可以重复施行。（5）只有神父才是圣礼合法的执行人，可是坚振礼和封立礼则只能由主教来执行，在特殊情况下，才可由平信徒来执行洗礼。

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.

在洗礼与圣餐之外，天特总会还承认以下的圣礼：坚振礼、补赎礼、抹油礼、封立礼与婚礼。现在简单的分述如下：（1）坚振也是一个圣礼，由主教按手、抹油祷告，使得那些已经受洗的人，领受圣灵七样的恩典，因此他们能够有能力承认他们的信仰，并且能很忠实地将他们信仰活出来。（2）补赎礼也是圣礼，藉此能使受洗后所犯的大罪得到赦免。（3）抹油礼，就是为那些将近死期的信徒，借着膏抹圣油、借着神父的祈祷来领受特别的恩典，并靠赖神的怜恤，以抵挡魔鬼最后的攻击与试探。（4）封立礼就是把神父职份的全权传递给受礼者，同时使受礼者也领受执行职务的特殊恩典。（5）婚礼，即男女双方在婚约中的结合，并且领受必须的恩典，信实地来实行婚约中的义务，一直到死为止。

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 whoa re 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, an receive the necessary grace to discharge the duties of their state faithfully until death.

以下数点值得注意：（1）天主教认为在圣礼中所传达的恩典，使是一种灌入式的成圣恩典，提升人至一超自然的境域，使领受者有分于神的性情，这些圣礼被视为一超自然的恩赐，是从外面临到人的。一般说来在圣经中与洗礼有关的罪得赦免，在天主教的教义中占着不太重要的地位。（2）圣礼与圣道的关系，实际上来说是受到天主教的忽视。道已经来了，但却只是预备性的意义，在人心中只能生发纯历史的信心，除非用爱心来传道，亦即有恩典的浇灌，不然实际上是不能救人的。（3）信心并不是接受圣礼所传恩典的绝对条件，此外尚须成圣之恩，而成圣之恩在圣礼中是以物质的姿态出现，借着物质的东西以因功生效的方式传达出来，并且是以领受着不在圣礼的路上放下障碍（犯大罪）为前题，才能领受圣礼中所传达的恩典。

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· 洗礼 BAPTISM

1. 宗教改革前洗礼教义的发展
Development of the Doctrine before the Reformation.

a. 早期教会论洗礼。
Baptism in the Early Church.

洗礼是信徒加入教会，最重要的一个圣礼。在使徒时代的教父中，我们得知洗礼是罪得赦免与传达重生的工具，因此有些早期的教父们教导洗礼的重生 (Baptismal Regeneration)，然而这种说法的范围还是受到限制：（1）他们主张洗礼只能实行在成人身上，亦即只有在这些成人内里有这样期望的时候才能领受、生效。可是特士良认为，只要一接受洗礼，罪就得到赦免，不论领洗之人的内心如何。（2）他们不认为洗礼是得重生的必要条件，但却视洗礼为达到更新的最后步骤。

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.

虽然特士良反对婴儿洗礼，他的理由是认为年轻孩子没有能力厉行所立的约，认为这是不当的，可是婴儿洗礼在奥利金、特士良的时代却非常盛行。一般的见解认为，洗礼只需一次，不必重复再做，但对那些被信仰不纯者施洗的是否有效，则莫衷一是。罗马天主教认为有效，但居普良反对此点，结果前者占了上风，致所主张的成为一固定原则，凡奉三位一体之神名施洗的，都不必再重复一次，都

可算为有效。再洗礼的方式尚并无争议，虽然浸礼再当时被人采用，但却不是唯一的方式，当然也并不认为是洗礼的唯一本质。

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．奥古斯丁论洗礼。
Augustine on Baptism.

自第二世纪以降，洗礼观逐渐地有所变革，在有增无减地辩论中，洗礼带着神秘作为的观念逐渐得势。虽然奥古斯丁主张成年人接受洗礼的必要条件是信心与悔改，但是祂对圣礼带有神秘性的观念也加以赞助。可是论到婴儿洗礼，他却是采因功生效的立场，他主张婴儿没有受洗礼就死了，是灭亡的；而那些本着教会信仰受洗的婴孩，则因着带领他的大人的信仰而得救了。虽然一般认为洗礼能将人的原罪移除，但他解说洗礼的功效却无法将人的旧性情挪除。虽然殉道被认为完全等于洗礼，但是洗礼却被认为是绝对必须的。由于以上的这些事实，就可以证明婴儿洗在当时是普遍地被实施了。

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．经院学派论洗礼。
The Scholastic Conception of Baptism.

经院学派最早是同意奥氏对洗礼的主张，即洗礼只施在成人身上，是以信心为前题，但后来却逐渐地认为圣礼是因功生效，并且忽视了主观条件的重要性，如

此便为罗马教的洗礼观铺下道路，根据天主教的见解，洗礼就是重生的礼，就是加入教会的礼。

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 form 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 · 圣餐 THE LORD'S SUPPER

1. 宗教改革前圣餐教义的发展
Development of the Doctrine Before the Reformation.

a. 早期教会论圣餐
The Lord's Supper in the Early Church.

新约时代最初的圣餐是伴随着普通的饭食，这些食物是由信徒各自带去，当作礼物献上，由主教祷告后食用。随着时日的过去，由于这种习惯，圣餐得到了以下的名称：献祭、供物、感谢祭，都用在圣餐上。这些事的本身并没有害处，但却导致一种危险的发展，就是当牧职的观念加强之后，主教成为神父，神父也就相当于旧约时期的祭司的时候，危机就来了。以后感谢祭就被认为是圣餐中饼与酒的奉献礼，而圣餐本身拥有从祭司（主教）那儿所带来祭牲献祭的性格，这样一来就影响到圣礼联合性的表明。奥利金、犹西比乌、巴西流、拿多模、大马色的约翰等人所主张的基督血、肉与圣餐中的酒、饼联合的教义所取代，而后此观念又传入了圣餐化质说中。

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 *prosphorai* (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．奥古斯丁论圣餐
Augustine on the Lord's Supper.

圣餐的教义在西方教会的发展比较缓慢，但结果还是一样。奥古斯丁认为圣餐可以说就是基督的身体，因为圣经上常常说饼与酒为基督的身体与血；

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．经院学派论圣餐
Scholastic Development of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

在中古世纪奥古斯丁所教导的圣餐教义，逐渐被天主教所教导的圣餐教义取代的时候，于主后八一八年，正式解说圣餐中的饼和酒，节着神的能力，已经真的变成基督的身体和血，而物质外部的外貌，经过奉献礼之后，只不过成为掩人耳目的遮盖物。这教义为当时最有名的神学家所反对，特别是毛拉斯与拉特兰努，他们指出，这新的教训混淆了标记与所表明之物，并且用物质代替了信心。但此新的教义为葛伯特 (Gerbert)与一零零三年所拥护，不久以后又成为雄辩的主题。一零五零年有伯仁杰起而坚称，圣餐中的确有基督的身体同在，不是在本质 (Essence) 上，乃是在能力 (Power) 上；圣餐的元素改变了，但是物质没有改变；为了求得这个改变与能力，不仅要有奉献之礼，还必须有领受圣餐的信心。他的见解为蓝福克（一零八九年）、韩伯特（一零五九年）所反对，韩氏勉勉强强的作了以下的生命：「基督的身体真的被祭司的手所握住、擘开，被信徒的牙所咀嚼。」这个观点最终为海德勃（一一三四年）所解说，饼被指称为圣餐化质说 (Transubstantation)。当主后一二一五年，第四次拉特兰会议的时候，正式采纳圣餐化质说为信条。此项教义为经院派的学者提供了许多难题，如：关于变质期间所受的影响、饼与杯与接受者之关系如何、基督以何方式在饼与杯中出现，对圣餐的敬重等等。

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, by 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. 天特总会论圣餐
The Council of Trent on the Lord's Supper.

　　天特总会论到圣餐，是记载在天特喻令第十三次会议记录中之第八章第十一条条款，要旨如下：耶稣基督在圣礼中，真实具体地临在。根据基督复活后坐在天父右边地实施，祂自然能在任何地方同时出现，虽然我们无法解说这件事，但是我们却能知道祂具体地临在圣礼中，是有可能的。神父将饼与杯祝谢之后，这整个的饼与杯的本质就变成了基督的身体和血，所以凡领受饼与杯的仁，就是领受了整个基督。基督不只是神父说话时才同在，就是在未领饼与杯前，基督就与领受的人同在了，因为主在最后晚餐上，还未分饼与杯给门徒前，就称那饼未祂的身体了。由于基督在圣餐中的临在，所以对圣餐的敬重与纪念基督圣礼节，乃为当然之事。圣餐礼主要的结果乃是：「成圣之恩的增添；实际特别的恩典 – 小罪之赦免，免犯大罪；以及永远救恩的盼望。」

　　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."

「道」的教义（早期护教士：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，是世界的创造者、美饰者、和保存着。不能见的上帝是不受生的，无名的，永恒的，不可知的（不能测度的）、不变的存有；没有需要，没有激情。祂从无有创造了世界，使物质成形（给了物质「形式」）。（物质从某种方法被生，由上帝创造，上帝用物质造了世界，使世界成形（使之得到「形式」））。虽然如此，永活上帝的真实本性是没有表达出来的。（护教士们）仅有抽象的观念，就是：上帝的存有就是绝对没有属性的存在。

　　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.

　　在这两项作为中（即：创造物质，和创造世界），上帝用了子作中保。可是不可从神话式的意义来理解子。子是上帝的「道」 (Logos)。这是知识分子阶层非常喜欢用的词汇。只要提到「道」，就能引起大家的兴趣。可是教会选用个名词的事实说明，他们的思想集中在被荣耀的基督身上。他们若主要想到耶稣这个人，则可能把他说成「第二位苏格拉底」。可是他们的观念是，「道」是神、在神里面、与神同在，因此选了「道」这个名词，以便对异教徒清楚解释。

　　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，可是因祂拥有的理性功能，在祂里面有「道」。借着上帝简单的意志行动，道就生出。祂是父头生的作为。「头生者 … 不是得到存有，因为从起初以来，上帝既是永恒的聪明，在祂里面就有道，祂是永远有道性的。」

　　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".

关于「道」的起源是这样说的：「这能力是从父的权能和计划而生的；不是由分隔而生。父的本性并没有被分。」就像火，点了另外一把火时，并没有变小，「而被点燃的第二把火，也同样地没有比第一把火小」。道不是天使，乃有神性；是神圣的 (theos)，可是不是神自己 (ho theos)。对父来说，道是他者，他物，是另外一位，却不是另一个心意 (mind)：「受生的是另外一位，与生他的有别，我们都承认这点。」因此道与父一起是上帝，我们理当唯独敬拜他，像唯独敬拜父一样。

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 thought 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 τισ), 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.

上帝透过道来启示祂自己。道就是在旧约向人显现的那位。他是上帝的使者，「我们的教师与使徒」，被显明的上帝。上帝决定要创造世界的时候，他就生出了他在自己里面有的「道」，成为说话的道。

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 προφορικοσ).***

奥利金（俄利根）：「道」从来就是住在上帝的心中。因为万物被造之前，上帝就有这位策士，就是祂自己的理性和旨意。但当上帝决定要造祂所愿意造的被造物的时候，祂就生出这道，就是所有被造物的头生者，上帝自己没有倾倒出祂的道，乃是生出了道，而无时不与道有关系。」因此，基督就是上帝里头的理性，上帝赐给这「道」分开的存在。身为上帝的理性，祂不仅仅在创造之时，和在旧约先知中工作，而且也在世界的智慧者（哲学家）中运行。

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 (φρονησισ). But when God determined to make whatever he desired, he begat this Logos as the word (προφορικοσ), 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」这个哲学观念决定了基督教的思想，虽然我们不应该忽略两者之间的分别：基督教作者的「道」是一个独立的位格。他们无条件地承认基督属神的位格。当约翰「道」的观念被认为是与斯多亚哲学的「道」平衡时，我们必须这样理解：它只是思想的外形（虽然它的影响力是惊人的），用来介绍「道」给世界认识。

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 grab as to commend it to the heathen world.

除了「道」以外，还提到了「上帝的智慧」，或「圣洁先知的灵」；不过相比之下，后者并不突出。不过，三一神论的确是共同信仰的一点。… 护教士虽然不常说到这个奥秘，可是这却为他们带来最深奥的难题，因此在他们心中造成最高的愿望：「我们只被这愿望催使：要看见上帝，和与上帝同在的道。子与父合一，是怎样的合一？父与子的相通是怎样的相通？圣灵又怎么样？灵，子，父之间的联合与分别又在哪里？」

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, Τριασ, 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圣洁的灵；他成为人，由同贞女马利亚所生。护教士坚持他有肉体的人性：「他成为一个人，完全能受苦难，道成肉身，」可是他不因为这样而成为一个普通的人，而是既是神也是人；他的神性隐藏在他的肉身里，他借着他的生命与工作作见证。「因为，他既然像上帝，又是完全的人，他将他的两性置于我们之上。」关于他，是这样说的：「上帝受苦了。」根据这一点，不是一个人在十字架上受死刑，而是上帝的儿子，就是基督与父，与先知的灵一同尊重的。他们引用先知来支持这观点。

THE WORK OF CHRIST. The Logos of God, who, before the incarnation, was only a holy spirit (πνευμα αγιον), 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 αυτου κεκρυμμενην εν σαρκι 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" (ο πεπονθωσ θεοσ). Accordingly, he is now not a man executed upon the cross, but the Son of God, whom Christians honor next to the Father (εν δευτερα χωρα εχοντεσ), and together with the prophetic Spirit. This view is supported by quotations from the prophets.

对基督的工作的定义，首先强调他成为全人类的教师，正如他道成肉身之前已经显现自己。他教导的内容就是：一神的观念；新的律法，要求人过一个满有美德的生活；和不朽，严格来说就是复活，带来奖赏与惩罚。Aristides 这样向皇帝报导基督徒的圣经的教导：「为要你从他们的经书学习，皇上，认识它们的话语与诫名，和他们事奉是多么的荣耀，他们期待根据他们每人所作的奖赏，就是期待在来世得到的。」

In defining the work of Christ, it is first of all emphasized that he became the teacher of the race (καινοσ νομοθετησ), 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."

人有能力遵守这些诫命，因为上帝造人是自由的。虽然人，借着违背上帝的诫命而堕落，要承受死亡，他还是有自由决定，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….

早期教会信仰真伪辨 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH

上帝，圣父，圣子：我们的信仰
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。宇宙并没有两位神（创造主＋至高至善神：诺斯底主义）。
There is only one God. There aren't two gods (creator-demiurge, plus the highest God: Gnosticism).
上帝是位格。上帝不只是祂的属性的总和。
God is a person. God is not just a bunch of attributes.
上帝是有位格的。祂在永恒里计划要创造人，与人建立（约的）关系。
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，也是无限的。
God is both personal and infinite.
上帝是不可测度的，可是可以知道，可以认识的 – 借着启示。
God is incomprehensible, but knowable, through revelation.
上帝是三个位格。
God is 3 persons.
上帝同时是一个位格（一本质，一神格），也是三个位格。
God is both one person (one substance, one godhead), and three persons.

2．圣子：上帝的儿子，上帝的「道」
GOD THE SON (LOGOS)

我们称圣父为「上帝」。我们也称三位一体的上帝为「上帝」。
By "God" we mean the Father; by "God" we also mean the 3 persons.
圣子是神，不仅仅是一个神。圣子与圣父同质。
The Son is God, not a god. The Son is of the same substance as the Father.
不错，圣子启示圣父。可是圣子是圣子。祂是祂自己，不仅仅是父的形象，不仅仅是父的启示。圣子自己是位格，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.
圣子不仅仅是神的理性。圣子是有自己的位格的。
The Son is not just "divine Reason." The Son is personal.
圣子是神，不仅仅是多神论中间的一个神。更不是另外一个神，不是低等的神。
The Son is God (ho theos), not just a god (theos): definitely not "a second god."
圣子与圣父同有全部的神性。圣子从来不是一个次等的神。
The Son is equal with the Father in divinity. The Son is not a lower god.

圣子是子（不是女儿，母亲，父亲…）。圣子有祂自己的存在模式。祂是以「子」的身份在永恒里存在的。
The Son is the Son (not daughter, mother, father…): He has his own "mode of subsistence".

3．父生子：「独生」是必须（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

圣父在永恒里从来就是圣子的父。
The Father is always, in eternity, the Father of the Son.
圣子在永恒里从来就是圣父的子。
The Son is always, in eternity, the Son of the Father.
从来没有一时刻，圣子不存在。
There never was a moment when the Son did not exist.
圣父在永恒里生子，不是父的自由、主权行动；不是上帝计划的一部份。
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.
圣父在永恒里生子，是三位一体上帝存在的方式。父与子是同永的。
The eternal generation of the Son is the very way in which god the Trinity exists.
圣父在永恒里生子，是必须（必然）的，不是自由的、主权的。
The eternal generation of the Son is necessary, not free/contingent.
圣父在永恒里生子，不是神性的放射。
Eternal generation is not emanation.
圣父在永恒里生子，不是父上帝本质（神性）的分割。
Eternal generation is not division of a part of the Father.
父生子，不等于说，子比父有更少的上帝的本质；子比父有更少的上帝的属性。
Eternal generation does not make the Son have less divine substance, or less attributes, than the Father.

4．圣子：位格
SON: A PERSON

圣子是一个位格：有上帝的所有的属性。
The Son is a person – with (God's) attributes.
父的一切属性，子都有，圣灵都有。
Every attribute which the Father has, the Son has, the Spirit has also.
圣子是一个位格：有祂的思想、感情、意志、计划、关系。
The Son is a person – with his mind, will, emotions, plan, relationship.
圣子是一个位格： 道成肉身并没有使圣子成为第二个，另一个「道」（子）。
The Son is one person; incarnation doesn't make him a 2nd logos.

5．道成肉身
THE INCARNATION

圣子道成肉身；圣父并没有道成肉身。

The Son became incarnate; the Father didn't become incarnate.

道成肉身的圣子是：100% 神，100%人。

The incarnate Son is 100% divine, and 100% human.

圣子道成肉身的时候，不是不再是神，不是不再是三位一体的第二位。

The Son does not stop being 100% God, the 2nd person of the Trinity, after the Incarnation.

道成肉身的圣子是 100% 人：身体与灵魂。圣子所穿上的，是一个人性，不是一个人，不是一个位格。

The incarnate Son's human nature is 100% human: body and soul.

道成肉身，

道成肉身的圣子的人性是 100% 人：可是完全没有罪性。

The incarnate Son's human nature is 100% human, but not sinful whatsoever.

三位一体的第二位取了 100%人性：祂并不是只取了人的身体。

The 2nd person of the Trinity took on this 100% human nature; he didn't just take on the body alone.

三位一体的第二位取了 100%人性，包括人的灵魂：这不是发生在永恒里，乃是发生在道成肉身的时候。

The 2nd person of the Trinity took on this 100% human nature, including the soul; this happened at the Incarnation, not in eternity.

道成肉身的结果是：一个位格，神人二性一位格，一位耶稣基督。

The result of the incarnation is one person, one divine-human person, Jesus Christ.

耶稣基督的神性与人性并不是混合，而是完全的融合、结合、联合 (united)。

In Jesus Christ the divine and human nature are not just co-mingled, but united in a perfect union.

这位 100% 上帝、 100%人的耶稣基督从死里复活，升天，今天在天上。这位道成肉身的耶稣基督有一天要在历史结束的时候以神人二性一位格回来。

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.

早期教会教义真伪辨：
尼西亚会议 (325 AD) 前的上帝论，基督论
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 误　T = True 正

诺斯底主义：上帝，人，与宇宙的真相
GNOSTICISM: GOD, MAN, AND THE UNIVERSE

1. 误：（诺斯底主义的世界观）：宇宙不只一个神。最高的神是「纯神性」（纯存有）。祂的神性放射（像太阳光放射）给不同的灵体；神与灵体造成「丰满」。

   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（爱任纽，特土良）：宇宙只有一位神。祂的神性不与任何其他活物分享：不与天使或人分享。不过，上帝造人是按照自己的形象造的：有些上帝的属性是可以传递的。人是有限的；在有限的范围里，起初人是圣洁的，公义的，智慧的等。这些可传递的属性都因为亚当犯罪堕落的缘故，受了污染。总的来说，上帝的属性是不放射的。

   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. 误：人里有神性，因此人性与神性只是量的不同，不是质的不同。

   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：创造主与被创造者之间有着绝对无限的区别。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. 误（诺斯底派的教会仪式）：若要得救必须领受秘密仪式。

   F (Gnosticism church rites): Salvation requires secret ceremonies.

   正：要得救必须信靠基督，认罪悔改。洗礼是公开的仪式，教会作见证人。

   T: Salvation requires faith and repentance. Baptism is not secret, but a public testimony in the company of the whole church.

4. 误（诺斯底主义，一些宗教，部份基督徒）：物质是邪恶的。

   F (Gnosticism, some religions, some Christians): Matter is evil.

   正：物质被造的时候是好的。物质是好的；上帝要我们享受祂所赐给我们的恩赐（如：食物），以祂规定的方法来享用（要节制）。我们若认为物质是

邪恶的话，要就是禁欲主义，不然就是无律法主义（放纵）。唯有正确的了解、使用、顺服上帝的律法，才能避免律法主义与非律法主义。

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. 误（诺斯底主义）：有两个上帝；至善的神（无底的深渊），和创造主（旧约的神），后者是有激情，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，祂是创造主，也是至善的救赎主。

T: There is only one God – He is the Creator and the all-holy Redeemer.

基督（基督教）与哲学
CHRIST (CHRISTIANITY) AND PHILOSOPHY

6. 误：为了向知识分子传福音，就以哲学配合真理，甚至以哲学解释真理，取代真理。（革利免，奥利金。）

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：哲学需要被真理批判，然后真理来改造哲学，救赎哲学。

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. 误：《圣经》与理性都是认识真理的泉源，途径。（革利免，奥利金。）

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。认识真理，必须靠上帝的启示，包括普遍启示与特殊（圣经）启示。人的理性已经堕落，需要启示来改造，光照，才能正确地理解真理。

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. 误：一些神学家坚守「信仰的准则」（《圣经》的权威），却受世俗哲学深深影响（奥利金，20 世纪众多中、西「福音派」神学家）。

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：坚持《圣经》的权威，就要从《圣经》的立场来批判哲学。

T: When a Christian confesses that he/she submits to the authority of the Bible, then secular philosophy must be critiqued.

9. 误：「道」将理性之光赐予人类，「道」的光帮助外邦人认识真理，为他们来到福音面前作踏脚石。（奥利金。）

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」将理性赐人类，可是人类误用了理性，理性堕落了。现在的哲学并不是人原有理性的正确使用的结果，乃是误用的结果。因此人的理性需要上帝光照，理性需要悔改，来到上帝面前服在真理之下。理性须被上帝被改造（罗 12：2：心意更新而变化）。

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. 误：神学家研究了哲学，如：新柏拉图主义（奥利金）；然后写系统神学，把世俗的哲学思想写进基督教的系统神学。（如：今天中西众多神学家。）

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：研究哲学是为了护教，为了批判哲学。写系统神学时要黑白分明，批判世上的小学。

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. 误：基督（上帝的儿子）=「罗格斯」（道）= 希腊哲学的「道」。
（这个「道的教义」从殉道者游斯丁的时代开始。）

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 = 自我见证的主，祂就是真理本身。祂不是一个人想出来的观念，如：「绝对真理」，希腊哲学的「道」，或中国《道德经》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. 误：基督／上帝的儿子 = 神圣的「道」=「神圣的理性」= 非位格的属性、能力。正如人有理性和灵，上帝也有理性（道，子）和灵（圣灵）。

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，上帝的儿子 = 上帝，拥有所有圣父的属性，所有圣灵的属性。上帝的属性包括：祂是主，永恒，无限，不变；智慧，权能，圣洁，公义，良善（爱，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.

我们的上帝，就是《圣经》所宣讲的上帝，是无限的，又是有位格的。异教、非基督教的上帝，要就是无限但非位格的（如：希腊哲学的「形式／理念」，「道」），不然就是有限但有位格的（如希腊神话中的神祇，中国民间宗教的神：关公，观音，黄大仙等）。

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. 误：基督（上帝的「道」）= 一切人间真理、智慧的来源，因此：所有真理都是上帝的真理。哲学，心理学，文学的成果都是上帝的启示。

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」）= 所有真理的来源。上帝创造人的时候赐人智慧，真理，圣洁与公义（创 1：26-28，弗 4：24）。可是人犯罪，从他原有的智慧，公义，圣洁堕落了。因此，现在人所追求的，若没有上帝的帮助，必然是愚拙（林前 1：18-31），是世上的小学（西 2：8）。人所能达到的 – 哲学，心理学，艺术，文学 – 都不是上帝的启示，不可能是上帝的启示，而是堕落的罪人对上帝普遍群启示的回应。基督并不为罪人的哲学与文化中对真理的扭曲和错误观念负责！

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!

上帝的不可知性与可知性
THE INCOMPREHENSIBILITY OF GOD AND THE KNOWABILITY OF GOD

14. 误：上帝 = 完全不可知，无底的深渊。上帝是「全然的他者」。只有基督（「道）启示上帝。」（古今中外各样的非理性主义。）

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，若祂不亲自启示自己给我们认识的话。可是，上帝是可知的，因为祂计划了自我启示，也具体地透过（一）受造之物（大自然），（二）人地良心，（三）《圣经》自我启示了。因此上帝是可知的。人需要圣灵的光照才能认识《圣经》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.

上帝的不变与动性
GOD IS UNCHANGEABLE, GOD IS DYNAMIC

15. 误：上帝完全是动性的。（奥利金，当代的进程神学。）

    F: God is always (eternally) in action. (Origen, today's process theology.)

    正：上帝是不变的。可是他计划了创造，掌管宇宙历史，救赎，审判，因此他不断执行他的计划，从这角度来说，「我父作工至今。」可是上帝的动力，作为并没有使祂的本性，计划，与应许改变。

    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.

人的问题
MAN'S PREDICAMENT

16. 误：人性里的善恶，不是天赋的本性。是永恒里灵体的堕落因此有物质，有人的肉体。

    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：人被造的时候是善的（包括身体，灵魂）。邪恶是因为人犯罪才存在在人间（罗 5：12）。

    Man was created good (body and soul). Evil exists in man's world because of man's sin. (Romans 5:12)

17. 误：人的问题，人为什么需要救恩 ＝因为人是有限的，生命短暂。

    F: Man's problem, man's need for salvation = because man is finite, life is short.

    正：人的问题，人为什么需要救恩 ＝ 人背叛了上帝。人的问题是宗教性的，属灵的（与上帝的关系，背叛了上帝）； 和道德性的（心的污秽，行为的不义）。「不虔，不义」（罗 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. 误：原罪借着繁殖传到全人类。（传统天主教教义）

    F: Original sin was transmitted to all mankind through procreation (traditional Roman Catholic teaching).

正：因为上帝对待亚当为人类的头，人类的代表，因此上帝把亚当的罪归算给全人类。结果，繁殖的后果是每一个生出来的婴孩都有上帝所归算的罪。

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. 误：有两个「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. 误：有两个「道」：上帝里面的能力，和道成肉身的道（亚利乌）。

    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：三位一体里的第二位（圣子）是一个位格；道成肉身并不改变这事实。

    T: The 2nd person of the Trinity is one person; the incarnation doesn't alter this fact.

21. 误：基督（上帝的「道」，上帝的儿子）= 从属父上帝，本质上低于父（奥利金）。

    F: Christ/the Logos/the Son of God = subordinate to the Father in being. (Origen)

    正：基督（上帝的儿子）= 与父上帝同等，同是上帝，同有尊荣，同是永恒，拥有所有上帝的属性。但是，在永恒救赎计划中，子甘愿顺服父.，因此，在救赎计划中，子从属父。

    本质上的 (ontological) 三位一体：父，子，灵同等；父是上帝，子是上帝，灵是上帝。

    救赎计划上 (Economy) 的三位一体：子，灵顺服父。

    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. 误：父生子不是必须的行动(necessary act)，而是自由的行动 (free act)（奥利金）。

    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：父生子是三位一体在永恒里必须的存在模式；是必须的，不是自由（主权）的决定、计划、行动。

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. 错误：圣子是能变的（亚利乌）。

    F: The Son is mutable (changeable) (Arius).

    正：圣子与圣父，圣灵一样，是不变的神。

    T: The Son, like the Father and the Spirit, is God. He is unchangeable.

24. 误：「道」与耶稣（人）的灵魂在永恒里结合（奥利金）。

    F: The Logos and the human soul of Jesus = united in eternity (Origen).

    正：「道」（耶稣基督的神性，三位一体的第二位）与耶稣基督的整个人性（身体，灵魂）在道成肉身的时联合：圣灵感孕马利亚的时候。

    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. 误：基督的神性与人性混合，祂是混合品，两性并没有融合。

    F: The divine nature and human nature of Christ was composite. There is no union, no fusion between the two natures.

    正：基督的神性与人性是完全地联合 (union)。

    T: The divine and human nature of Christ united in perfect union.

基督是位格；子是父在永恒里生的
CHRIST IS PERSON; THE SON IS ETERNALLY BEGOTTEN OF FATHER

26. 误：基督与父同质，可是祂不是位格。只有一个位格，就是父。祂只是神圣的理性、能力（特土良，动力神格唯一说：撒摩撒他之保罗）。

    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：基督与父上帝同质。祂是位格，正如父是位格。（不要把「位格」当作属性来看待！）子的生存形态与父不同（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. 误：「道」是神里的理性，到创造等时候才有位格。

    F: Logos is impersonal divine reason; only becomes personal at creation.

    正：「道」（子）在永恒里就是位格。

    T: Logos (Son) is person in eternity, from eternity.

28. 误：子与父同质，可是只有父有全部的本质（特土良）。

    F: The Son and the Father have the same substance, but only God the Father has all the substance (Tertullian).

    正：子与父同质，子与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. 误：父创造子（亚利乌）。子是父从无有创造出来的（亚利乌派，在尼西亚会议）。

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：子与父同创造宇宙。父生子，不是创造子。

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. 误：父生子，是永恒里的作为（奥利金）。子有开始存在的时刻；有一段时间子并不存在（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：父在永恒里生子；子没有开始存在的时刻。所有上帝所「计划」，所作的「作为」，都是三位一体一起作的「计划」与「作为」。

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.

从来没有一刻，子不是（不存在）的。

There was never a moment when the Son was not.

人的被创造；基督的人性
CREATION OF MAN; CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE

31. 错误：人是在永恒里被创造的。

F: Man was created in eternity (eternal creation).

正：人是在七日的第六日被创造的；人是在时间的开始时被造的。

F: Man was created on the 6th day of 7 days; man was created at the beginning of time.

32. 错误：基督不真正是人。基督吃东西，并不是祂真正需要食物，而是要藉此使人不能否认祂的人性（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：人不能否认基督的人性，因为祂真正的是人。

T: We cannot deny the humanity of Christ, because Jesus Christ was/is fully human.

33. 误：「道」所充满的灵魂取了一个身体，这个身体被「道」穿入而神化(divinized)（奥利金，动力神格唯一说的：撒摩撒他之保罗，后来基督新教中反对三位一体的教派）。

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」（三位一体的第二位）取了人性（灵魂与身体）。结果不是人性被神化，乃是：道成肉身的耶稣基督是一个位格，一位耶稣基督：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. 误：耶稣被父认（收养）为儿子，因此被人尊敬为上帝的儿子（亚利乌）。

F: Jesus is recognized/adopted by the Father as Son, therefore men esteem him as God's Son (Arius).

正：子在永恒里就是父的独生子。因道成肉身的基督成就了救赎大工，父上帝荣耀祂，高举祂，承认/宣称祂为爱子。可是这宣称并不是基督成为上帝儿子的原因，而是圣子完成救赎大工的奖赏。

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. 误：耶稣（人）取了「功德」，如：圣洁，对上帝的意识 （士来马赫）等。因此他成为上帝的儿子，被称为上帝的儿子。

F: The man Jesus took on "meritoriousness" such as: holiness, consciousness of God (Friedrich Schleiermacher), etc. Therefore he became the Son of God.

正：上帝的儿子从来在永恒里就是上帝的儿子，与父同等。祂在道成肉身（圣灵感孕马利亚）的时候穿上了人性。

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赎主
CHRIST, THE INCARNATE GOD-MAN, IS THE REDEEMER

36. 正：基督若是上帝，那么他来到世间，就是上帝来到世间。

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. 误：基督只是教师，榜样，赐律法者。

F: Christ is only a teacher, an example, the lawgiver.

正：基督来更为罪舍命。祂是救主。

T: Christ came mainly to die for sins as a substitute. He is the Redeemer.

38. 错误：基督借着付赎价 (ransom) 给魔鬼来拯救我们：基督欺骗了魔鬼。

F: Christ rescued us by paying the ransom to the Devil. Christ deceived the devil.

正：基督的舍命，满足了父上帝的公义和公义的要求，因此平息了父的忿怒（＝挽回祭的意义）。

T: Christ's death satisfied the justice and just requirements of God the Father, thus removed his wrath. (= propitiation)

39. 误：基督的神性，在耶稣被挂在十字架的时候，已经离开耶稣（人）。

F: Christ's divine nature left the human Jesus when the man Jesus hung on the cross.

正：神人二性的耶稣基督在十字架上舍命。这是莫大的奥秘。

T: Jesus Christ, the God-man, died on the cross (this is a profound mystery).

40. 误：救赎就是神人合一：人能神化（爱任纽）。

F: Salvation involves the union of man and God. Man is deified (Irenaeus).

正：救赎是上帝与人和好。人不成为上帝！

而只有神自己：只有一位自己就是上帝的救主，才能使我们与上帝联合（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. 误：基督的神性与人性混合，因此基督升天的时候，就等于成为无所不在 (unibiquitous)。（奥利金，马丁路德。）

F: The Divine and the Human in Christ was so co-mingled, that by his glorification, he became virtually ubiquitous. (Origen, Martin Luther.)

正：基督的神性与人性完全的联合。基督的神性从来就是无所不在的。祂升天的时候，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. 误：耶稣基督的人性，在升天的时候消失了。

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稣基督。

T: Today Jesus Christ, in both his divine nature and human nature, is in heaven.

三位一体
THE TRINITY

43. 误：三位一体的三位，好像戏剧里的演员，角色，甚至像面具。（形体上的神格唯一说，即：撒伯流主义；参：周联华，《信徒神学》。）

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：三位一体的三位，每一位都是位格，有别与其他两位；每位都是上帝。

T: There are three distinct persons in the Trinity, but there is only one God.

44. 误：圣父道成肉身，被钉在十字架上。（圣父受苦说。）

F: The Father became Incarnate, hung on the cross. (Patripassianism.)

正：圣子道成肉身。

T: The Son became Incarnate.

45. 误：上帝是三位一体，「一体」或「同质」就像泥土，金，银，木头一样。

F: God is three persons in one substance: substance is like clay, gold, silver, wood.

正：三个位格的「位格」，和一体的「体／质」，这两个观念都是广泛的。我们可以说：上帝是三个位格，同时是一个位格。不过很少人这样说，只有范泰尔 (Cornelius Van Til, 20 世纪最伟大的护教家) 这样说。

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　　　论上帝与三位一体
Westminster Confession of Faith　　Chapter 3　　On God and the Trinity

三、上帝是独一的上帝，但祂里面有三个位格，同属一个本质，权能相同，同样永恒，这三个位格就是：父、子、圣灵(三位一体的)上帝 (o)。父不属于、不受生于、也不出于任何其他来源；子在永恒里为父所生 (p)；圣灵在永恒里由父和子而出 (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　　　论中保基督　　　　　Chapter 8　　On Christ the Mediator

二、上帝的儿子，三位一体中的第二位，正是永恒的上帝， 与父同质、同等；当日期满足的时候，就取了人性 (k)，并人性一切基本的性质、共通的软弱，只是无罪 (l)；借着圣灵的大能，在童贞女马利亚的腹中成孕，有她的本质(m)。所以在耶稣里面是两个完整的、无缺的，且相异的性质（就是神性与人性），不可分地结合于一位格里，没有转化、合成、混合 (n)。这个位格是真正的上帝，也是真正的人，却是一位基督，神人之间的惟一的中保 (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.

早期教会信仰真伪辨 THE FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH
人论，罪论，恩典论
DOCTRINE OF MAN, SIN AND GRACE

奥利金与希腊教父

1· 误：「永恒创造论」：人是先存的（奥利金）。
　　正：「历史的创造」：人是在时间的起初（第六天）被创造的。
2· 误：最初的创造所造的，只是又思想的灵体（没有肉体），是与上帝平等的，与上帝同样永存的（奥利金）。
　　正：起初上帝创造的，是灵魂与身体结合的人（创1：26-28，2：7），绝对不与上帝平等；绝对不与上帝一样永存。人有起源（被创造的时刻）。
3· 误：今天人类堕落的光景，是因有先存的堕落（灵体的堕落）- 奥利金。
　　正：今天人类堕落的光景，是因在历史（时间开始了之后）亚当的犯罪。
4· 误：希腊教父：亚当按照上帝的形象被造，没有道德的完全。
5· 正：亚当被造有圣洁，公义，真理（创1：28，弗4：24，西3：10）。
6· 误：希腊教父：亚当只有道德上完全的可能性。
7· 误：亚当本来就是完全的，若经得起上帝的考验（顺服的考验），就可以永远活在道德的完全（圣洁，公义，知识）中。
8· 误：希腊教父：亚当将肉体的败坏传给后代，但它本身不是最，没有把人类陷在罪孽里。
　　正：罪（罪孽）因一人进入到世界；因此死也进入到世界，因为世人都犯了（亚当一人的）罪（罗5：12，15-21）。
9· 误：希腊教父：人类与亚当只有肉体上的关系。
　　正：人类与亚当除了有肉体上的关系，还有「约」中的关系；亚当在约里，是人类的头，人类的代表。
10· 误：希腊的教父：人类与亚当的关联，只与肉体与感官的本性有关；在人性比较高尚的方面，和理性方面没有关联。
　　正：罪、审判、与死，由一人传给人类；堕落是全人的，我们整个人：灵魂，身体，都死在罪恶过犯中（弗2：1）。
11· 误：希腊的教父：人类与亚当的关系，与意志没有关系。
　　正：人类在亚当里的堕落，牵涉整个人：理性，意志，情感，身体等。
12· 误：希腊的教父：罪，总是由于人的自由意志选择而来。
　　正：罪，固然是人的真正选择，但是罪的根源是罪性：人的心（灵魂）败坏。因此，罪不仅是意志的选择。
13· 误：希腊教父：婴孩不能算是有罪的。
　　正：我们在母腹里就是罪人（诗139篇）。
14· 误：奥利金：人领受恩典，起点是人的自由意志，不是上帝的恩典。
　　正：我们得救乃是本乎恩，借着信（弗2：8-9）；起点是上帝的恩典。
15· 误：奥利金：自由意志开始了重生的工作；然后上帝帮助人，上帝的能力与人的意志合作，使着意志转离恶，行上帝眼中看为喜悦的事。

正：上帝的大能改变人的意志（这就是圣灵重生的工作），使人的意志甘心情愿地降服在上帝面前，认罪悔改，信靠基督。

16·误：特土良：上帝创造了普遍的人性。然后上帝藉生殖个别化这普遍的人性 (God individualizes generic human nature by procreation)。

正：《圣经》说：上帝创造了人，《圣经》没有提到「普遍的人性」。

17·误：上帝与人在重生合作 (synergism)。

正：重生，是唯独上帝的工作 (monergism)。

伯拉纠与奥古斯丁

人的被造

18·误：伯拉纠：亚当被上帝所造，并未赋予正面的圣洁。他起初的状态是中立的，既非圣善，也非有罪。

正：亚当被上帝所造，有圣洁，公义，知识；是无罪的。

19·误：亚当有行善或作恶的可能性（比较误导的说法）。

正：亚当在约中面对上帝的吩咐；他起初的圣洁，公义，知识是能变的。

20·误：伯拉纠：亚当有一个自由，完全不被决定的意志 (free, un-determined will)。

正：人的意志是由上帝的旨意掌管（决定）的；而上帝向人启示了祂的旨意，要人选择遵守祂的话。因此人的意志不是完全不被决定，不是随意的。

21·误：伯拉纠：人有能力按自己的判断，犯罪或不犯罪。

正：人不犯罪的能力是上帝所赐予的。

22·误：伯拉纠：人被造是必死的，他已经被死的律所主宰。

正：人被造，是活在上帝的面光之中，在上帝的约里，充满着生命，福乐。

23·误：伯拉纠：人的本性中没有先存的恶来决定他一生的路程；人犯罪是自己的选择。

正：不错，人犯罪是自己的选择，但是「先存的恶」有或没有，是否由它来决定人一生的路程，是抽象的猜测，容易误导人的思想。

人的堕落

24·误：伯拉纠：人堕落在罪中，损伤的不是他人，仅是自己。人性并没有受到永久性的负面影响。

正：亚当一人犯罪，以致罪、审判、死临到全人类。

25·误：伯拉纠：人类没有罪性或罪孽的遗传性传递。

正：人类在上帝的约（审判）之下，都被定罪。

26·误：伯拉纠：人的本性中没有任何恶的倾向或欲望，使他无可避免犯罪。

正：我们犯罪，是因为罪性导致（或住在我们里面的罪发动）。我们里面有犯罪的欲望（罗 7 章）。

人的罪，罪孽，罪性

27．误：伯拉纠：人类仍然出生在亚当堕落以前的情况中，不仅没有罪孽，也没有罪的污染。

正：人完全污染了；也承受了亚当的罪孽（罪名）。今天的人类，与亚当堕落前的情况，是完全不同的。

28．误：伯拉纠：罪，不在于错误的情操或欲望，只在于意志的个别行动。

正：人犯罪，是因为「心」（情操，欲望）坏透了。

29．误：伯拉纠：每一次的犯罪都在于人自愿的选择。

正：每一次的犯罪在于人自愿的选择，可是不仅在于自愿的选择。

30．误：伯拉纠：人并不须要犯罪。

正：堕落后，人不可能不犯罪；人受了罪的辖制。

人的自由，行善的能力

31．误：伯拉纠：人与亚当一样，被赋予完全的自由意志，有选择的自由 (liberty of choice)，可称为「中性的自由」 (liberty of indifference)。所以在任何情况中，人可以选择善，或选择恶。

正：堕落后的人，还是活在上帝的面光之中；人的自由堕落了，被污染了。人并不能完全按着自己的意愿行事，特别没有行善的自由 / 能力。

32．误：伯拉纠：在上帝吩咐人行善这事实上，足以证明：人有行善的能力。

正：上帝吩咐人行善，只证明上帝的吩咐，并不证明人有行善的能力。堕落之后的人有否能力行善，完全要看《圣经》怎么说。

33．误：伯拉纠：人的责任就是他的道德能力的尺度。

正：人的责任和人的能力的尺度，都在乎上帝在《圣经》怎么说。

34．误：伯拉纠：罪的普遍性，仅仅是由于错误的教育，不良的榜样，不可破的犯罪习惯。

正：罪的普遍性，是因为人的「心」坏了。

恩典

35．误：伯拉纠：人弃恶向善，并非因为恩典。恩典仅是外在的恩赐和自然的赋予，如：人的理性，《圣经》中上帝的启示，耶稣基督的榜样等等。

正：人离弃罪，是因为耶稣基督救赎的大能，和圣灵的呼召，重生。

奥古斯丁：罪的本质

36・误：奥古斯丁：罪不是积极之物，乃是消极的，是一种缺乏(privation)。罪不是有实质的恶，乃是善之缺乏 (*privatio boni*, privation of good)。

正：罪不是「物」，不过是「真」的。要按《圣经》，按上帝的判断来判断罪；罪的真实/实质来自上帝的判断。罪包括（一）亚当不遵行／违反上帝的吩咐；（二）因上帝的审判，而有的罪孽；（三）人性的污染：犯罪的倾向；（四）我们的罪行。把罪说成太「具体」，反而成为更抽象。

37・误：奥古斯丁：罪的根源在于自爱 (self-love) 取代了对上帝的爱。

正：罪当然包含人的心偏离上帝，爱自己，爱世界。可是罪也是干犯上帝的律法。罪是不荣耀上帝，不敬拜上帝。要维持三个角度来看罪：（一）准则：上帝的律法；（二）心态：爱；（三）目标：荣耀上帝，敬拜上帝。

奥古斯丁：欲念；「能／不能」行善或犯罪（这就是「自由意志」问题的症结）

38・正：奥古斯丁：人背叛的结果包括灵魂中强烈欲念 (concupiscence)：感官欲望不正之辖制；理性之律不再管制灵魂。

修正：不错，人的欲望辖制灵魂，人的灵魂不能正确运作。不过：情感（欲念），理性，意志，都堕落了。每一功能和它们之间的关系都扭曲、败坏。

39・正：奥古斯丁：人被造是不朽的；他不是不会受死的影响，乃是他有身体不朽的可能。他若证明自己的顺服，就会在圣洁里得以坚定 (confirmed in holiness)；就会从「能不犯罪」与「能不死」的境况中，过渡到「不可能犯罪」与「不可能死」的境况中。但是他犯罪了，结果他进入了「不可能不犯罪」与「不可能不死」的境况中。

修正：「能」与「不能」犯罪，都在上帝的面光之中，都须从上帝的「约」的角度来看。

40・正：奥古斯丁：人因为罪完全堕落，不能意旨／行出任何善事。不错，意志仍有本性的自由 (natural freedom)，人仍然能行社会公认的善；不过人与上帝分离，担负罪孽，在恶的权势下，因此不能意旨神眼中正直的事。

奥古斯丁：亚当与人类的关系

41・误：奥古斯丁：亚当与人类有着有机的关联 (organic connection)。人类的合一性不是盟约性的 (federally)，是现实主义的 (realistically)。全人类的种子都在亚当里；人类不是个别地组成，乃是有机地组成：亚当里有人类普遍的本性 (generic human nature)，而每一个个体 (individualizations) 都是在亚当里已有的普遍本性的有机部份 (organic parts)。

正：「普遍人性」太抽象；「盟约」(federal) 关系比较合《圣经》。

42・误：奥古斯丁：全人类都在他里面实际上犯了罪。

正：全人类都因为「约」在亚当里，亚当代表人类犯罪；从这意义上，全人类都犯了亚当的罪。不是「现实主义」，乃是「约」的观念。

奥古斯丁：恩典

43 · 正：奥古斯丁：人的意志需要被更新：从始至终唯独是上帝恩惠的工作。
44 · 正：奥古斯丁：人的更新唯独归功于上帝的恩惠；这是上帝「不可抗拒的恩惠」。可是神的恩惠并不违背人是自由行动者 (free agent) 的本性。上帝不勉强人的意志。上帝乃改变人的意志，使之甘愿选择善。人的意志被更新了，恢复了他的真自由。上帝的确在人的意志上运行，以致人的意志自由地选择美德，圣洁。
45 · 正：奥古斯丁：重生是完全靠上帝的恩典的 (monergistic)。在重生上，圣灵的运行是必需的，不仅供应人里之不足，而且完全更新人内心的性情，以致人的灵完全的效法上帝的律法。
46 · 正：上帝在人身上恩典的工作分三阶段：（一）预先的恩典 (prevenient grace)：圣灵用律法产生罪与罪孽的意识。（二）运行的恩典 (operative grace)：圣灵用福音产生信心，使人相信基督和他赎罪大工，结果人被称义，与上帝和好。（三）合作的恩典 (co-operative grace)。人被更新了的意志与圣灵合作，终生作成成圣的功夫。上帝恩典的工作，使神的形象完全在人里更新，上帝的灵完全改变罪人，成为圣徒。

奥古斯丁：教会，圣礼

47 · 正：奥古斯丁：教会是支配神恩典的机构 (independent dispenser of grace)。注：「支配恩典」这观念，从宗教改革宗后的角度来理解。
48 · 误：奥古斯丁：洗礼使人重生 (baptismal regeneration)。但是重生之恩会再次丧失。只有那些重生而坚守，或重生后失丧又蒙恢复，才能至终得救。

奥古斯丁：上帝的预定

49 · 正：上帝在时间里更新罪人的恩典之工，乃是他在永恒计划里所意旨的。
50 · 误：早期的奥古斯丁：上帝预定是在乎 (contingent upon) 祂的预知。
评：这其实是把上帝对人自由的行动的的预知，当作祂预定的条件。
51 · 正：后期的奥古斯丁：人选择行善，相信基督，都是上帝恩典的效果。
52 · 正：奥古斯丁：预定就是从上帝永恒的观点看救恩 (salvation viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*, from the point of view of eternity)。
53 · 注：奥古斯丁：至于未被拣选者，他认为神在他的预旨中 (decree of God) 忽略了他们 (pertermission)。遗弃与拣选是不同的，神的遗弃没有任何神的直接功效伴随着，来达成预期的效果。（改革宗有两种看法。）