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To my Lord, beloved brother, and most-longed-for fellow-minister Epictetus, Athanasius greeting in the Lord. I thought that all vain talk of all heretics, many as they may be, had been stopped by the Synod which was held at Nicæa. For the Faith there confessed by the Fathers according to the divine Scriptures is enough by itself at once to overthrow all impiety, and to establish the religious belief in Christ. For this reason at the present time, at the assembling of diverse synods, both in Gaul and Spain, and great Rome, all who came together, as though moved by one spirit, unanimously anathematised those who still were secretly holding with Arius, namely Auxentius of Milan, Ursacius, Valens, and Gaius of Pannonia.And they wrote everywhere, that, whereas the above-said were devising the names of synods to cite on their side, no synod should be cited in the Catholic Church save only that which was held at Nicæa, which was a monument of victory over all heresy, but especially the Arian, which was the main reason of the synod assembling when it did. How then, after all this, are some attempting to raise doubts or questions? If they belong to the Arians, this is not to be wondered at, that they find fault with what was drawn up against themselves, just as the Gentiles when they hear that ‘the idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men’s hands,’ think the doctrine of the divine Cross folly. But if those who desire to reopen everything by raising questions belong to those who think they believe aright, and love what the fathers have declared, they are simply doing what the prophet describes, giving their neighbour turbid confusion to drink, and fighting about words to no good purpose, save to the subversion of the simple.

致我的主，親愛的弟兄，最為我所思念並一同服侍的職事愛比克泰德，[[1]](#footnote-0)亞他那修在主裡問候您。我認為異端的空談雖然多如海沙，都已經被在尼西亞舉辦的大會所阻擋。因為父老們根據神聖的經文所做出的信仰宣告本身就足以推翻一切都不敬虔，並建立在基督裡敬虔的信仰。因著這個緣故，如今在高盧和西班牙，並偉大的羅馬[[2]](#footnote-1)所舉辦的各種教會會議，所有的主教聚集在一起，雖然他們被同一位（聖）靈所驅動，異口同聲地咒逐那些仍然偷偷的支持亞流的人，就是米蘭來的奧先求（Auxentius），烏薩丘（Ursacius），瓦朗（Valens）和潘諾尼亞（Pannonia）的蓋烏斯（Giaus）。他們寫信給各處，有鑑於前面提及的那些人用不同的城市的名稱作為他們的教會會議的名稱，但是，出了在尼西亞舉行的大會外，沒有其他的教會會議當被大公教會所引用。尼西亞大會是一件戰勝所有異端的歷史性事件，特別是針對亞流派，他們是那個大會舉辦的主要原因。在所有的這一切之上，有些人怎麼還能夠產生提出懷疑或問題？若他們屬於亞流派，他們對那些制定來針對他們的（信仰規範）吹毛求疵，就不會讓人覺得驚訝，就好像當外邦人聽見『異教徒的偶像是金的，銀的，是人手所造的，』[[3]](#footnote-2)的時候一樣，認為神聖十字架的教義是愚蠢的。若那些認為他們所相信的才是正確的並熱愛父老們所宣告的教義的人士們想要利用提出問題而重新興起波瀾，他們不過就是在做先知們所描述的，給鄰舍酒喝、又加上毒物，[[4]](#footnote-3)不是基於良善的理由咬文嚼字，不過就是覆滅那些單純的人罷了。

I write this after reading the memoranda submitted by your piety, which I could wish had not been written at all, so that not even any record of these things should go down to posterity. For who ever yet heard the like? Who ever taught or learned it? For ‘from Sion shall come forth the law of God, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem;’ but whence came forth this? What lower region has vomited the statement that the Body born of Mary is coessential with the Godhead of the Word? or that the Word has been changed into flesh, bones, hair, and the whole body, and altered from its own nature? Or who ever heard in a Church, or even from Christians, that the Lord wore a body putatively, not in nature; or who ever went so far in impiety as to say and hold, that this Godhead, which is coessential with the Father, was circumcised and became imperfect instead of perfect; and that what hung upon the tree was not the body, but the very creative Essence and Wisdom? Or who that hears that the Word transformed for Himself a passible body, not of Mary, but of His own Essence, could call him who said this a Christian? Or who devised this abominable impiety, for it to enter even his imagination, and for him to say that to pronounce the Lord’s Body to be of Mary is to hold a Tetrad instead of a Triad in the Godhead? Those who think thus, saying that the Body of the Saviour which He put on from Mary, is of the Essence of the Triad. Or whence again have certain vomited an impiety as great as those already mentioned; saying namely, that the body is not newer than the Godhead of the Word, but was coeternal with it always, since it was compounded of the Essence of Wisdom. Or how did men called Christians venture even to doubt whether the Lord, Who proceeded from Mary, while Son of God by Essence and Nature, is of the seed of David according to the flesh, and of the flesh of the Holy Mary? Or who have been so venturesome as to say that Christ Who suffered in the flesh and was crucified is not Lord, Saviour, God, and Son of the Father? Or how can they wish to be called Christians who say that the Word has descended upon a holy man as upon one of the prophets, and has not Himself become man, taking the body from Mary; but that Christ is one person, while the Word of God, Who before Mary and before the ages was Son of the Father, is another? Or how can they be Christians who say that the Son is one, and the Word of God another?

我在閱讀敬虔的您交給我的記錄後寫下了這封我本不希望寫下的信，面對關於那些事的任何記錄被流傳給後代。因為，誰曾經聽過類似的事？誰有曾經教導或學習過那樣的事？因為『因為訓誨必出於錫安；耶和華的言語必出於耶路撒冷；』[[5]](#footnote-4)但是這個東西是從那裡來的？是那個低賤的地區突出從瑪利亞所生的身體與道的神格同質（coessential）的說法？或道被改變成為肉身、骨頭、頭髮和整個身體，而與祂本身的性質不同？誰曾經在任何一個教會，或甚至從基督徒口中聽見，主以一種被推測的方式，而不是在性質中披上了一個身體；或誰曾經不敬虔而荒謬的說並堅稱，祂在祂與父同質的神格中受了割禮，從完全的變成不完全的；並那個被掛在木頭上的不是身體，而是那創造萬有的素質並智慧？若聽見道親自改變成為一個不是屬於瑪利亞的，能夠受苦的身體，而是一個屬於祂自己素質的身體的，還能夠稱這樣說的人是一個基督徒嗎？那進入自己的想像力中，宣稱主屬於瑪利亞的身體就是堅稱一種在神格中的一個四一體（Tetrad），而不是一個三一體（Triad），豈不是炮製出這種令人厭惡的不敬虔想法嗎？那些這樣想的人，說救主從瑪利亞披上的身體是屬於三一體的素質。或，他們的某些人又嘔吐出一種與前面提到同樣偉大的不敬虔；就是說，身體並不會比道的神格新，而是總是與道的神格同永恆（coeternal），因為它是由智慧的素質所組成的。怎麼有稱為基督徒的人檔案懷疑那位從瑪利亞而有的主，祂同時因其素質（essence）和性質（nature）是神的兒子，根據其肉身也是大衛的後裔，[[6]](#footnote-5)而那個肉身是神聖的瑪利亞的？或者，那些膽大妄為的人說在肉身中受苦並被釘在十字架上的不是主、救主、神和父的兒子？[[7]](#footnote-6)或者，那些想要被稱作基督徒的人，說道臨及一個神聖的人就好像臨及先知們一樣，祂自己並沒有成為人，也沒有從瑪利亞取得一個身體；基督是一個位格，同時在瑪利亞之前，並在萬世之前就已經存在的那位神的道，就是父的兒子，是另一個位格？那些是基督徒的人怎麼能夠說子是一位，而神的道是另一位呢？

3. Such were the contents of the memoranda; diverse statements, but one in their sense and in their meaning; tending to impiety. It was for these things that men who make their boast in the confession of the fathers drawn up at Nicæa were disputing and quarrelling with one another. But I marvel that your piety suffered it, and that you did not stop those who said such things, and

propound to them the right faith, so that upon hearing it they might hold their peace, or if they opposed it might be counted as heretics. For the statements are not fit for Christians to make or to hear, on the contrary they are in every way alien from the Apostolic teaching. For this reason, as I said above, I have caused what they say to be baldly inserted in my letter, so that one who merely hears may perceive the shame and impiety therein contained. And although it would be right to denounce and expose in full the folly of those who have had such ideas, yet it would be a good thing to close my letter here and write no more. For what is so manifestly shewn to be evil, it is not necessary to waste time in exposing further, lest contentious persons think the matter doubtful. It is enough merely to answer such things as follows: we are content with the fact that this is not the teaching of the Catholic Church, nor did the fathers hold this. But lest the ‘inventors of evil things’make entire silence on our part a pretext for shamelessness, it will be well to mention a few points from Holy Scripture, in case they may even thus be put to shame, and cease from these foul devices.

那些就是那個記錄裏面的內容；各種不同的選，但是都只有一個意義；傾向不敬虔。人們因著那些事，用父老們在尼西亞制定的信仰宣告自吹自擂，彼此辯論並拌嘴。但是，我驚奇於敬虔的您竟然能夠忍受這一切，不阻止說那樣的事物的人，告訴他們正確的信仰，以至於他們聽見它的時候仍然能夠堅持他們的平安，或者，若他們反對正確的信仰就可以被視為異端分子。因為那些不當被基督徒擬定或聽見的宣告，在各方面都背離了使徒的教訓。因著這個緣故，就像我前面說過的，我已經將他們的說法坦率的放在我的信中，好叫僅僅聽見那些說法的人能夠察覺到那些說法中所含有的羞辱和不敬虔。雖然全面性的公開指責並曝露那些有那樣的想法的人的愚蠢是當作的事，但是，將我的信停在這裡也是一件好事。因為，那些明顯看起來就是邪惡的事物，根本不需要浪費時間進一步的曝露，免得那些愛爭論的人認為那件事是可以被懷疑的。僅僅用下面的方式回答即可：我們堅信，事實上這不是大公教會的教導，父老們也不相信這個。但是，為了避免『捏造惡事的人』[[8]](#footnote-7)把完全對於我們部分靜默不語當作毫不知羞恥的藉口，我還剩要根據聖經提出幾個點，好叫羞辱他們，別再使用那些愚蠢的手段。

1. Whence did it occur to you, sirs, to say that the Body is of one Essence with the Godhead of the Word? For it is well to begin at this point, in order that by shewing this opinion to be unsound, all the others too may be proved to be the same. Now from the divine Scriptures we discover nothing of the kind. For they say that God came in a human body. But the fathers who also assembled at Nicæa say that, not the body, but the Son Himself is coessential with the Father, and that while He is of the Essence of the Father, the body, as they admitted according to the Scriptures, is of Mary. Either then deny the Synod of Nicæa, and as heretics bring in your doctrine from the side; or, if you wish to be children of the fathers, do not hold the contrary of what they wrote. For here again you may see how monstrous it is: If the Word is coessential with the body which is of earthly nature, while the Word is, by your own confession, coessential with the Father, it will follow that even the Father Himself is coessential with the body produced from the earth. And why any longer blame the Arians for calling the Son a creature, when you go off to another form of impiety, saying that the Word was changed into flesh and bones and hair and muscles and all the body, and was altered from its own nature? For it is time for you to say openly that He was born of earth; for from earth is the nature of the bones and of all the body. What then is this great folly of yours, that you fight even with one another? For in saying that the Word is coessential with the Body, you distinguish the one from the other, while in saying that He has been changed into flesh, you imagine a change of the Word Himself. And who will tolerate you any longer if you so much as utter these opinions? For you have gone further in impiety than any heresy. For if the Word is coessential with the Body, the commemoration and the work of Mary are superfluous, inasmuch as the body could have existed before Mary, just as the Word also is eternal: if, that is, it is as you say co-essential with the Body. Or what need was there even of the Word coming among us, to put on what was coessential ith Himself, or to change His own nature and become a body? For the Deity does not take hold[[9]](#footnote-8) of itself, so as to put on what is of its own Essence, any more than the Word sinned, in that it ransoms the sins of others, in order that changing into a body it should offer itself a sacrifice for itself, and ransom itself.

先生們，你們根據什麼說（基督的）身體與道的神格屬於同一個素質？因為，從這點開始是合適的，為要證明這點是站不住腳的，所有其它的論點也是一樣。我們現在無法從神聖的經文中發現類似的說法。因為他們說神進入一個人類的身體。但是，那些也在尼西亞聚集的父老們說，不是身體，而是子本身與父同質，當祂是父的素質的同時，那個身體，就像他們根據聖經所承認的，是瑪利亞的。那麼，他們就不要否定尼西亞大會，又如同異端分子一樣從外界引入你們的教義；或者，如果你們想要成為父老們的兒女，就不要相信與他們寫下的相反的事物。因為你們在此或許能夠再次看見它是多麼醜惡：如果道與那個屬於屬地性質的身體同質，在同時，根據你們自己所承認的，道又與父同質，這就會造成父自己也與那個從地產生的身體同質。那麼，為什麼還要責怪亞流派稱子為一個被造之物，在同時你們發展出另一種的不敬虔，說道變成肉身、骨頭、頭髮、肌肉和整個身體，並改變了自己的性質呢？現在應當是你公開講說祂乃是從地（from earth）而生的時刻了；因從地是所有的骨頭和肉的性質。那麼，你們是多麼愚蠢，甚至彼此相爭？因為說道與身體同質，你將一個與另一個區分出來，[[10]](#footnote-9)在同時，說祂改變成為肉身，你為道想像出一種改變。誰還能夠忍受你們，如果你們膽敢將此那些看法呢？因為，你們的不敬虔比任何異端更嚴重。若道與身體同質，紀念瑪利亞的儀式就是多餘的，[[11]](#footnote-10)正如身體能夠存在於瑪利亞之前，好像道也是永恆的意義：若是那樣，就是你們所謂的與（道的）身體同質（co-essential with the Body）。道為什麼還需要，披上一件與自己同質的事物，或改變自己的性質並成為一個身體？因為神格並不會奪取自己，好像還需要披上屬於自己素質的事物，過於犯罪的道一樣，讓神能在其中為他人犯的罪付出贖價，為的是改變成為一個身體，才能更為自己獻上一個祭物，為自己付上贖價。

5. But this is not so, far be the thought. For he ‘takes hold of the seed of Abraham,’ as the

apostle said; whence it behoved Him to be made like His brethren in all things, and to take a Body

like us. This is why Mary is truly presupposed, in order that He may take it from her, and offer it for us as His own. And this Isaiah pointed to in his prophecy, in the words: ‘Behold the Virgin,’while Gabriel is sent to her—not simply to a virgin, but ‘to a virgin betrothed to a man,’ in order that by means of the betrothed man he might shew that Mary was really a human being. And for this reason Scripture also mentions her bringing forth, and tells of her wrapping Him in swaddling clothes; and therefore, too, the paps which He sucked were called blessed. And He was offered as a sacrifice, in that He Who was born had opened the womb. Now all these things are proofs that the Virgin brought forth. And Gabriel preached the Gospel to her without uncertainty, saying not merely ‘what is born in thee,’ lest the body should be thought to be extraneously induced upon her, but ‘of thee,’that what was born might be believed to be naturally from her, inasmuch as Nature clearly shews that it is impossible for a virgin to produce milk unless she has brought forth, and impossible for a body to be nourished with milk and wrapped in swaddling clothes unless it has previously been naturally brought forth. This is the meaning of His being circumcised on the eighth day: of Symeon taking Him in his arms, of His becoming a young child, and growing when He was twelve years old, and of His coming to His thirtieth year. For it was not, as some suppose, the very Essence of the Word that was changed, and was circumcised, because it is incapable of alteration or change. For the Saviour Himself says, ‘Behold, behold, it is I, and I change not,’ while Paul writes: ‘Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.’But in the Body which was circumcised, and carried, and ate and drank, and was weary, and was nailed on the tree and suffered, there was the impassible and incorporeal Word of God. This Body it was that was laid in a grave, when the Word had left it, yet was not parted from it, to preach, as Peter says, also to the spirits in prison.

事實無惡不是這樣，並遠超你們的想像。因為祂就像使徒說的，『救拔亞伯拉罕的後裔』；[[12]](#footnote-11)因此祂理應在所有的方面被造，像祂的弟兄們一樣，並取得一個與我們相似的身體。這就是為什麼瑪利亞確實預先被選定，好讓祂能夠從她得到身體，並將那個身體當作自己的，為我們獻上。以賽亞在他的預言中指出這點，說：『看哪！童女，』[[13]](#footnote-12)加百列同時被差給她——不僅僅是一位童女，而是『一位已經與一個男人訂婚的童女，』[[14]](#footnote-13)為的是藉著與男人訂婚，以表明瑪利亞確實是一個人。聖經因著這個緣故也提到她生產，並論到她用襁褓包裹祂；故此，祂所吸允的乳房被稱作有福的。[[15]](#footnote-14)祂被獻上為祭物，以至於被生出來的祂是頭生的。[[16]](#footnote-15)那一切如今都是證明童女生產的證據。加百列以明確無誤的方式向她傳福音，不僅僅說『由妳而生，』面對那個身體被認為是從外部強加給她的，而是『妳的，』以至於那位被生的能夠被相信具有她的興致，就好像大自然明確的表明，除非童女生產，她就不可能分泌乳汁一樣，若一個身體不是先根據其性質被生出，就不可能以母乳餵養，或以襁褓包裹一樣。這也是祂在第八天受割禮的意義：西緬用他的手臂抱著祂，因為祂成為一位孩童，當祂長成到十二歲，將近十三歲那麼大的時候。因著這並不像有些人所認為的，道的素質被改變，受了割禮，因為它不能被改變。因為救主自己說，『因我─耶和華是不改變的，』[[17]](#footnote-16) 保羅在同時寫到：『耶穌基督昨日、今日、一直到永遠，是一樣的。』[[18]](#footnote-17)那都是因為不可受苦並非物質的神的道在身體中受了割禮，被攜帶，又吃又喝，感到疲倦，又被釘在木頭上受苦。這個就是被放在墳墓裡的身體，當道離開它的時候，然而道卻為與它分離，也就是說，就像彼得說的，他去找那些在監獄中的諸靈（spirits）。[[19]](#footnote-18)

1. And this above all shews the foolishness of those who say that the Word was changed into bones and flesh. For if this had been so, there were no need of a tomb. For the Body would have gone by itself to preach to the spirits in Hades. But as it was, He Himself went to preach, while the Body Joseph wrapped in a linen cloth, and laid it away at Golgotha. And so it is shewn to all that the Body was not the Word, but Body of the Word. And it was this that Thomas handled when it had risen from the dead, and saw in it the print of the nails, which the Word Himself had undergone, seeing them fixed in His own Body, and though able to prevent it, did not do so. On the contrary, the incorporeal Word made His own the properties of the Body, as being His own Body. Why, when the Body was struck by the attendant, as suffering Himself He asked, ‘Why smitest thou Me?’And being by nature intangible, the Word yet said, ‘I gave My back to the stripes, and My cheeks to blows, and hid not My face from shame and spitting.’For what the human Body of the Word suffered, this the Word, dwelling in the body, ascribed to Himself, in order that we might be enabled to be partakers of the Godhead of the Word. And verily it is strange that He it was Who suffered and yet suffered not. Suffered, because His own Body suffered, and He was in it, which thus suffered; suffered not, because the Word, being by Nature God, is impassible. And while He, the incorporeal, was in the passible Body, the Body had in it the impassible Word, which was destroying the infirmities inherent in the Body. But this He did, and so it was, in order that Himself taking what was ours and offering it as a sacrifice, He might do away with it, and conversely might invest us with what was His, and cause the Apostle to say: ‘This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality.’

以上這一切都表明那些說道改變成為血肉之人的愚蠢。因為若是如此，就不需要墳墓。因為身體就會自己去想在陰間中的諸靈傳福音了。然而事實上，祂親自去傳福音，約瑟在同時用裹屍布包裹了那個身體，並放在各個他。[[20]](#footnote-19)這就表明身體不是道，身體是道的。當身體從死復活後，這就是多馬抓住過的身體，並看見其上的釘痕，道親自被釘，看見釘子被釘入祂的身體中，雖然祂能夠避免這件事，但是祂沒有。相反的，非物質的道讓身體的屬性成為自己的屬性，就如同是祂自己的身體一樣。為什麼，當身體被行刑者擊打的時候，在受苦中的祂問，『你為什麼要鞭打我？』[[21]](#footnote-20)作為本質為不可理解的道卻說，『我讓我的背被鞭打，讓我的連被掌摑，不讓我的臉迴避羞辱和被吐痰。』（根據英文重譯）[[22]](#footnote-21)因道的人類肉身所受的苦的這個緣故，道住在身體中，將身體歸於自己，為的是我們能夠成為道的神格的有份者。[[23]](#footnote-22)祂若同時是受苦由沒有受苦的那位，真是一件奇怪的事。祂因著祂自己的身體受苦而受苦，祂在那個身體裡面，因此受苦；祂沒有受苦，因為道的本質是神的本質，是不能受苦的。當那位是非物質的祂在可受苦的身體裡面的時候，身體裡面就有了不可受苦的道，這就摧毀了身體所繼承的軟弱。但是，祂如此行乃是為了親自取得我們所擁有的，將其獻上為祭，祂就能夠出去那個軟弱，能夠用相反地方式將祂所有的授予我們，這使得使徒說：『這必朽壞的總要穿上不朽壞的，這必死的總要穿上不死的。』[[24]](#footnote-23)

1. Now this did not come to pass putatively, as some have supposed: far be the thought: but the Saviour having in very truth become Man, the salvation of the whole man was brought about. For if the Word were in the Body putatively, as they say, and by putative is meant imaginary, it follows that both the salvation and the resurrection of man is apparent only, as the most impious Manichæus held. But truly our salvation is not merely apparent, nor does it extend to the body only, but the whole man, body and soul alike, has truly obtained salvation in the Word Himself. That then which was born of Mary was according to the divine Scriptures human by nature, and the Body of the Lord was a true one; but it was this, because it was the same as our body, for Mary was our sister inasmuch as we all are from Adam. And no one can doubt of this when he remembers what Luke wrote. For after He had risen from the dead, when some thought that they did not see the Lord in the body derived from Mary, but were beholding a spirit instead, He said, ‘See My hands and My feet, and the prints of the nails, that it is I Myself: handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me to have. And when He had said thus, He shewed them His hands and His feet.’ Whence they can be refuted who have ventured to say that the Lord was transformed into flesh and bones. For He did not say, ‘As ye see Me to be flesh and bone,’ but ‘as ye see Me to have,’ in order that it might not be thought that the Word Himself was changed into these things, but that He might be believed to have them after His resurrection as well as before His death.

但這不是一種推論，就好像有些人所認為的一樣：遠離那樣的想法：救主確實真正的成為人，帶來全人的救贖。因為若道以推論的方式在身體裡面，就像他們所說的一樣，而推論的意思就是想像，這就會造成人的救贖和復活成為不過是表象而已，正如同最為不敬虔的摩尼所相信的。但是，我們的救贖確實不是一個表象，它也不僅僅擴展到身體而已，而是擴展到全人，身體和魂都一樣，在道本身中得到了真正的救贖。那麼，那位從瑪利亞所生的根據神聖的經文，其本性確實是神，主的身體也是真實的身體；因為那個身體與我們的身體一樣，因為瑪利亞就是我們的姐妹，就如同我們是亞當的兄弟一樣。當人們記得路加所寫下的，就不會懷疑。因為祂在從死人中復活後，當某人認為他們在從瑪利亞得到的身體中看不見主的時候，反而之際看見一個靈，祂說，『你們看我的手，我的腳，就知道實在是我了。摸我看看！魂無骨無肉，你們看，我是有的。』[[25]](#footnote-24)這就是那些膽敢說主已經被改變成為血肉之人能夠被駁斥的原因。因為祂並不是說，『就像你們看見我是血肉，』而是說，『就像你們看我有，』為的是別讓人認為道自己已經改變成為那些東西，而是祂也能被相信在復活後並在祂的死亡前都擁有那一切。

These things being thus demonstrated, it is superfluous to touch upon the other points, or to enter upon any discussion relating to them, since the body in which the Word was is not coessential with the Godhead, but was truly born of Mary, while the Word Himself was not changed into bones and flesh, but came in the flesh. For what John said, ‘The Word was made flesh,’ has this meaning, as we may see by a similar passage; for it is written in Paul: ‘Christ has become a curse for us.’And just as He has not Himself become a curse, but is said to have done so because He took upon Him the curse on our behalf, so also He has become flesh not by being changed into flesh, but because He assumed on our behalf living flesh, and has become Man. For to say ‘the Word became flesh,’ is equivalent to saying ‘the Word has become man;’ according to what is said in Joel:‘I will pour forth of My Spirit upon all flesh;’ for the promise did not extend to the irrational animals, but is for men, on whose account the Lord is become Man. As then this is the sense of the above text, they all will reasonably condemn themselves who have thought that the flesh derived from Mary existed before her, and that the Word, prior to her, had a human soul, and existed in it always even before His coming. And they too will cease who have said that the Flesh was not accessible to death, but belonged to the immortal Nature. For if it did not die, how could Paul deliver to the Corinthians ‘that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures,’ or how did He rise at all if He did not also die? Again, they will blush deeply who have even entertained the possibility of a Tetrad instead of a Triad resulting, if it were said that the Body was derived from Mary. For if (they argue) we say the Body is of one Essence with the Word, the Triad remains a Triad; for then the Word imports no foreign element into it; but if we admit that the Body derived from Mary is human, it follows, since the Body is foreign in Essence, and the Word is in it, that the addition of the Body causes a Tetrad instead of a Triad.

因此那些事物被證明，觸及那些點，或進入任何與其有關的討論都是多餘的，因為道在其中的身體並不是與神格同質，而是真從瑪利亞所生，在同時，道本並沒有被改變為血肉，而是進入肉身中。因為約翰說，『道成肉身，』[[26]](#footnote-25)就具有這樣的意義，正如同我們從一個類似的段落中看見的一樣；因為保羅寫到，『基督為我們成為咒詛。』[[27]](#footnote-26)就像祂並沒有親自成為咒詛一樣，而是被稱作如此，因為祂為自己取得了咒詛，以至於祂成為肉身並不是因著改變成為肉身，而是因為祂因著我們的緣故取得了活生生的肉身，並成為人。因為說『道成為肉身，』就是等於說『道已經成為人；』根據約珥所說的，『我要將我的靈澆灌凡有血氣的；』[[28]](#footnote-27)因為應許並不會被延伸到無理性的動物身上，而是為了人，主因著他們的緣故成為人。這就是前面的經文的意義，它們都會合理的定罪那些認為從瑪利亞取得的肉身存在於瑪利亞之前，並存在於她之前的道擁有一個人類的魂，而這個存在在道裡面的魂總是存在於祂臨及世界之前的那些人。他們也就不再會說肉身不會死，而屬於那個不死的性質。因為如果它不會死，保羅如何能夠告訴哥林多人說，『基督照聖經所說，為我們的罪死了，』[[29]](#footnote-28)或如果祂沒死過，又如何復活呢？再者，那些能夠四一體的可能性，而不接受三一體所產生的結果的人士深深的感到羞慚，如果聖經說身體是從瑪利亞而來的。因為如同（他們辯稱）我們說身體與道是同一個素質，三一體仍然是三一體；因為道並沒有把任何陌生的元素引入三一體；但是，如果我們承認從瑪利亞來的身體是人類的身體，這就造成，因為身體與神的元素不同，而道在其中，加入身體就產生了一個不是三一體的四一體。

When they argue thus, they fail to perceive the contradiction in which they involve themselves. For even though they say that the Body is not from Mary, but is coessential with the Word, yet none the less (the very point they dissemble, to avoid being credited with their real opinion) this on their own premises can be proved to involve a Tetrad. For as the Son, according to the Fathers, is coessential with the Father, but is not the Father Himself, but is called coessential, as Son with Father, so the Body, which they call coessential with the Word, is not the Word Himself, but a distinct entity. But if so, on their own shewing, their Triad will be a Tetrad. For the true, really perfect and indivisible Triad is not accessible to addition as is the Triad imagined by these persons. And how do these remain Christians who imagine another God in addition to the true one? For, once again, in their other fallacy one can see how great is their folly. For if they think because it is contained and stated in the Scriptures, that the Body of the Saviour is human and derived from Mary, that a Tetrad is substituted for a Triad, as though the Body created an addition, they go very far wrong, so much so as to make the creature equal to the Creator, and suppose that the Godhead can receive an addition. And they have failed to perceive that the Word is become Flesh, not by reason of an addition to the Godhead, but in order that the flesh may rise again. Nor did the Word proceed from Mary that He might be bettered, but that He might ransom the human race. How then can they think that the Body, ransomed and quickened by the Word, made an addition in respect of Godhead to the Word that had quickened it? For on the contrary, a great addition has accrued to the human Body itself from the fellowship and union of the Word with it. For instead of mortal it is become immortal; and, though an animal body, it is become spiritual, and though made from earth it entered the heavenly gates. The Triad, then, although the Word took a body from Mary, is a Triad, being inaccessible to addition or diminution; but it is always perfect, and in the Triad one Godhead is recognised, and so in the Church one God is preached, the Father of the Word.

當他們這樣辯稱的時候，他們就沒有察覺他們自己的矛盾。因為雖然他們說身體不是從瑪利亞來的，而是與道同質，然而（他們掩飾自己的論點，以避免因他們真實的觀點臭名遠揚）這個由他們提出的看法仍然能夠被證明會產生一個四一體。因為根據父老們，作為子就是與父同質，但是不是父自己，而被稱作同質，就好像子與父的關係一樣，身體也是如此，他們稱身體與道同質，卻又不是道自己，而是一個不同的個體。如果是這樣，他們自己表明他們的三一體是一個四一體。[[30]](#footnote-29)因為，真實的，真正完全和不可分割的三一體不可能想那些人所想像的，能夠被加入任何事物。那些在真神之外想像出另一位神的，怎麼可能還是基督徒呢？愛寵，因為人們可以在他們其它的謬誤中看見他們的愚蠢。因為他們如果因為聖經包括並宣稱救主的身體是人類的並從瑪利亞而來，以至於四一體是由一個三一體所構成，如同雖然身體被造成為一個而外的（元素），他們就大錯特錯了，這就好像將被造之物等同於造物主，認為神給可以領受而外的（事物）一樣。他們也不了解，道成肉身並不是在神格中加添任何事物，而是為的讓肉身能夠復活。道從瑪利亞而來，並不是為了祂能夠被提升，而是讓祂能夠成為人類的贖價。那麼，他們怎麼能夠認為那個被道贖回並點活的身體會成為點活它之道的神格新加入的事物呢？相反地，人類的身體透過道與它的交通和聯合而得到了一件偉大的事物。因為必死的成為不死的，雖然它是一個動物的[[31]](#footnote-30)身體，卻成為屬靈的身體，它雖然從地被造，卻進入了屬天的大門。雖然道從瑪利亞取得了一個身體，三一體仍然是三一體，不會增加或減少；但祂總是完整的，在三一體中只有一個神格，在教會中也只宣揚一位神，就是道的父。

10. For this reason they also will henceforth keep silence, who once said that He who proceeded

from Mary is not very Christ, or Lord, or God. For if He were not God in the Body, how came He,

upon proceeding from Mary, straightway to be called ‘Emmanuel, which is being interpreted God with us?’Why again, if the Word was not in the flesh, did Paul write to the Romans ‘of whom is Christ after the flesh, Who is above all God blessed for ever. Amen?’Let them therefore confess, even they who previously denied that the Crucified was God, that they have erred; for the divine Scriptures bid them, and especially Thomas, who, after seeing upon Him the print of thenails, cried out ‘My Lord and my God! For the Son, being God, and Lord of glory, was in the Body which was ingloriously nailed and dishonoured; but the Body, while it suffered, being pierced on the tree, and water and blood flowed from its side, yet because it was a temple of the Word was filled full of the Godhead. ’For this reason it was that the sun, seeing its creator suffering in His outraged body, withdrew its rays and darkened the earth. But the body itself being of mortal nature, beyond its own nature rose again by reason of the Word which was in it; and it has ceased from natural corruption, and, having put on the Word which is above man, has become incorruptible.

從今以後，他們因著這個原因而靜默不語，他們曾經說從瑪利亞所生的那位並不是基督，或主，或神。因為如果祂在身體裡不是神，祂怎麼可能從瑪利亞生出來後，當直接被稱作『以馬內利，當被詮釋為神與我們同在』呢？[[32]](#footnote-31)在此，若道不在肉身中，為什麼保羅在羅馬書中寫，『按肉體說，基督也是從他們出來的，他是在萬有之上，永遠可稱頌的神。阿們』呢？[[33]](#footnote-32)有鑑於此，讓他們公開承認，即便他們原先否認那位被釘十字架的是神，他們犯了錯；因為神聖的經文駁斥了他們，特別是多馬，在看見祂身上的釘痕後，大叫『我的主，我的神！』[[34]](#footnote-33)因為子，作為神，和榮耀的主，[[35]](#footnote-34)就在那個以不榮耀的方式被釘在那個身體裡面，並被羞辱；但是，那個受苦的身體，在樹上被刺，水和血從它的肋旁流出，但它仍是那位被神格所充滿之道的殿。因著這個理由，拿看見創造主在引起憤怒的身體中受苦的太陽，收起了它的光芒，使得地球變暗。那本具有必死性質的身體，因著在其中的道超越其自身的性質的緣故復活；不再具有天然的敗壞，披上了超越萬人的道，而成為不朽壞的。

11. But with regard to the imagination of some, who say that the Word came upon one particular

man, the Son of Mary, just as it came upon each of the Prophets, it is superfluous to discuss it, since their madness carries its own condemnation manifestly with it. For if He came thus, why was that man born of a virgin, and not like others of a man and woman? For in this way each of the saints also was begotten. Or why, if the Word came thus, is not the death of each one said to have taken place on our behalf, but only this man’s death? Or why, if the Word sojourned among us in the case of each one of the prophets, is it said only in the case of Him born of Mary that He sojourned here ‘once at the consummation of the ages?’ Or why, if He came as He had come in the saints of former times, did the Son of Mary alone, while all the rest had died without rising as yet, rise again on the third day? Or why, if the Word had come in like manner as He had done in the other cases, is the Son of Mary alone called Emmanuel, as though a Body filled full of the Godhead were born of her? For Emmanuel is interpreted ‘God with us.’ Or why, if He came thus, is it not said that when each of the saints ate, drank, laboured, and died, that He (the Word) ate, drank, laboured, and died, but only in the case of the Son of Mary. For what that Body suffered is said to have been suffered by the Word. And while we are merely told of the others that they were born, and begotten, it is said in the case of the Son of Mary alone that ‘The Word was made Flesh.’

但是，對於某些人的想像力而已，他們說道臨及某一個特定的人，瑪利亞的兒子，就好像臨及那些先知一樣，那根本不必加以討論，因為他們的瘋狂為自己帶來顯而易見的定罪。如果祂臨及我們，為什麼那個人還需要從童女而生，不像其他的男女一樣？因為所有的聖徒都是這樣被生的。或者，為什麼道臨及我們，並不是像我們每一個人一樣因著各自的行為而死，而是成為這個人而死呢？或者，為什麼若道透過每一位先知身上住在我們中間，而在祂透過瑪利亞出生這件事上，經上僅僅說到『在所有世代完成（根據英文重譯）的時候』[[36]](#footnote-35)呢？或者，為什麼祂在過去的世代中臨及聖徒，而所有其他的人死了就沒有再復活，而唯有瑪利亞的兒子在第三天復活呢？或者，為什麼道以祂曾經使用的方式臨及我們，而只有瑪利亞的兒子被稱作以馬內利，就好像那個被神給充滿的身體從她而生呢？因為以馬內利可以被解釋為『神與我們同在。』或者，為什麼，如果祂臨及我們，並不像其他的聖徒一樣吃、喝、工作和死亡，祂也（道）吃、和、工作和死亡，但是僅僅是作為瑪利亞的兒子而已。因為身體所忍受的也被稱作道所忍受的。當我們僅僅被其他的人告知，他們出生、並被生，聖經只稱瑪利亞的兒子為『道成肉身。』

1. This proves that while to all the others the Word came, in order that they might prophesy, from Mary the Word Himself took flesh, and proceeded forth as man; being by nature and essence the Word of God, but after the flesh man of the seed of David, and made of the flesh of Mary, as Paul said. Him the Father pointed out both in Jordan and on the Mount, saying, ‘This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.’ Him the Arians denied, but we recognising worship, not dividing the Son and the Word, but knowing that the Son is the Word Himself, by Whom all things are made, and by Whom we were redeemed. And for this reason we wonder how any contention at all has arisen among you about things so clear. But thanks to the Lord, much as we were grieved at reading your memoranda, we were equally glad at their conclusion. For they departed with concord, and peacefully agreed in the confession of the pious and orthodox faith. This fact has induced me, after much previous consideration, to write these few words; for I am anxious lest by my silence this matter should cause pain rather than joy to those whose concord occasions joy to ourselves. I therefore ask your piety in the first place, and secondly those who hear, to take my letter in good part, and if anything is lacking in it in respect of piety, to set that right, and inform me. But if it is written, as from one unpractised in speech, below the subject and imperfectly, let all allow for my feebleness in speaking. Greet all the brethren with you. All those with us greet you; may you live in good health in the Lord, beloved and truly longed for.

這就證明當道臨及其他的人的時候，只是為了他們能夠作先知說話，道親自從瑪利亞取得肉身，並作為一個人宣道；祂的性質和素質就是神的道，但根據肉身是大衛的後裔，一個人，並從瑪利亞被造為肉身，正如保羅所說的一樣。[[37]](#footnote-36)祂和父在約旦河和變化山上都指出，說，『這是我的愛子，是我所喜悅的。』[[38]](#footnote-37)亞流派的人否認祂，但我們卻認為敬拜祂不意味著分割子和道，反而是承認子就是道的本身，萬有藉祂被造，我們也藉著祂被贖回。我們因著這個理由納悶你們中間為什麼會產生關於那些那麼明白無誤之事物的爭論。但是，感謝主，就當我們因著閱讀你們的記錄而哀傷的時候，我們也因著那些記錄的結論感到高興。因為它們和諧一致的脫離紛爭，並以和平的方式認可了敬虔和正統的信仰。這個事實促使我，在前述的顧慮後，寫下那些字；因為我擔心，希望我對這件事靜默不語不會造成痛苦，反而會讓那些和遊戲一致的人把歡樂帶個我們。故此，我先請求敬虔的您，再請求那些聽見這些話的人能夠善待我們的心，若這封信缺少任何敬虔的方面，為了改進的緣故，請告訴我，。但是，若所寫下的若因為講的不清楚，文不對題並寫的不完美，請您們容忍我的言不及義。問候所有與您在一起的弟兄們。那些與我們同在的弟兄們也問候您；祝您在主裡身體健康，您是我們摯愛並期望碰面的。

1. Of Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, nothing else is known. This letter reflects the uncertainty, which attended the victory of the Nicene Creed, as to the relation of the Historical Christ to the Eternal Son. The questions raised at Corinth were those which troubled the Eastern Church generally, and which came to a head in the system of Apollinarius, whose distinctive tenet, however, is not mentioned in this letter. Persons anxious to place the Nicene doctrine in intelligible connection with the matter of the Gospel Narrative had debated the question before Epictetus, and with deference to his ruling. Their tentative solutions (§2 infr.) fall into two classes, both of which, in attempting to solve the problem, proceed upon the assumption incidentally combated by Athan., that the Manhood of Christ was a Hypostasis or Person, which if invested with Divine attributes, would introduce a fourth hypostatic entity into the Trinity. To avoid this, one class identified the Logos and the ῎Ανθρωπος, either by assuming that the Logos was changed into flesh, or that the flesh was itself non-natural and of the Divine Essence. The other class excluded the Man Jesus from the Trinity, explaining His relation to God on the lines of Photinus or the later Nestorians. Both alternatives are already glanced at (supr. p. 485) by the Council of 362. In the present case, both classes of suggestions seem to have been made tentatively and bona fide (§12). The letter must have been written before the two books against Apollinarianism, which (if genuine) fall about 372. Its more exact date depends on the identification of the Councils referred to in §1 (νῦν γενομένων), and is therefore very doubtful. At any rate Apollinarianism proper is not alluded to, and Apollinarius is said to have expressed to Serapion of Thmuis his high opinion of our Letter (see Letter 54, note 1).It was much quoted in the Christological controversies of the next 80 years, e.g. by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, by Theodoret, Cyril, and Leo the Great /愛比克泰德是哥林多的主教，此外我們對他一無所知。這封信反應出一種對尼西亞獲得勝利，就是關於歷史的耶穌和永遠的子之間的關係，的不確定性。在哥林多提出的問題是普遍困擾東方教會的問題，在亞波裏拿流的系統中佔有一席之地，然而這封信並沒有提及其獨特的教義。人們急切的將尼西亞的教義至於與福音書敘事的事實的理想關聯中，在愛比克泰德面前與他辯論，與他的裁定相反。他們的教義解決方案（第二段）有兩種，嘗試解決從與亞他那修辯論中的假設，意外產生的問題，就是基督的人性是一個Hypostasis或位格（Person），被賦予神聖的屬性，這就會把第四種位格的存有引入三位一體中。為了避免這點，一種解決方案將道（Logos）等同於Ανθρωπος，或者假設道改變成為肉身，或肉身沒有自己的性質，屬於神聖的素質。另一種解決方案將人耶穌排除在三位一體之外，用（Photinus）或後來聶斯托流的思路來解釋祂與神的關係。兩種方案在362年的會議中都被都已經被檢查過了。對於目前的問題，兩種建議看起來都是實驗性的，也是善意的（12段）。這封信必然是寫作兩本駁斥亞波裏拿流的作品之前，那兩本書（若存在的話）大約是372年左右。更準確的日期取決於第一段中所提到的（νῦν γενομένων），因此更是被懷疑的。不論在任何程度上，亞波裏拿流主義並沒有被正式提及，亞波裏拿流據稱向提姆斯的薩拉蓬（Serapion of Thmuis）表達了對我們這封信的高度關切（參考第54封信件）。這封信在接下來80年中的基督論爭議中被頻繁的引用，例如：被以弗所和迦克頓大會，被提多烈，區利羅和大裏奧(see Migne xxvi. 1050; Bright, Later Treatises, pp. 43 sq., and D.C.B. s.v. Epictetus and Apollinaris the younger)。 [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. Are these those referred to in the letter to Ruf., and held a.d. 362–3, or are they to be identified with one or other of those held under Damasus (see Introd. to ad Afros.)? [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. 詩篇一百一十五4。 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. 哈巴穀書二15，七十士譯本 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. 以賽亞書二3；彌迦書四2。 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. 羅馬書一3 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. This opinion seems to belong to that next to be mentioned, the two, however, are separately dealt with below, cc. 10 and 11./這個觀點看起來屬於接下來要提及的看法，然而，兩者將會在接下來的段落中被分開處理。參考10和11段。 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. 羅馬書一30。 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. 希伯來書二16。 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. ἕτερον πρὸς ἕτερον σημαίνετε [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
11. 書信第61，第三段。 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
12. 希伯來書二16。 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
13. 以賽亞書七14。 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
14. 路加福音一27。 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
15. 路加福音十一27。 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
16. 路加福音二23。 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
17. 瑪拉基書三6。 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
18. 希伯來書十三8。 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
19. 彼得前書三19。 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
20. 馬太福音十五46。 [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
21. 約翰福音二十八23。 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
22. 以賽亞書一6。 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
23. 彼得後書一4。 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
24. 哥林多前書十五53。 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
25. 路加福音二十四39。 [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
26. 約翰福音一14。 [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
27. 加拉太書三13。 [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
28. 約珥書二28。 [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
29. 哥林多前書十五3。 [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
30. 這個論點根據三位一體是一個不同位格，而不是由不同的素質所組成的三位一體的原則：反對者含蓄的批判尼西亞的教義，認為會造成基督若是真人，就會是一個與子不同的位格。 [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
31. ψυχικόν. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
32. 馬太福音一23。 [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
33. 羅馬書九5。 [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
34. 約翰福音二十28。 [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
35. 哥林多前書二8。 [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
36. 希伯來書九26。 [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
37. 參考羅馬書一3；加拉太書四4。 [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
38. 馬太福音三17，和十七5。 [↑](#footnote-ref-37)