Sacramental Union 圣礼联合

**Zacharias Ursinus - Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism**

**乌尔西努牧师 - 海德堡教理问答注释**

**TWENTY-FIFTH LORD'S DAY - VII. WHAT IS THE UNION BETWEEN THE SIGNS AND THE THINGS SIGNIFIED, WHICH WE CALL SACRAMENTAL?**

**主日25 - 第5点：标记与被标记的实体是如何联合的？（我们称之为圣礼联合）**

一般来说，联合这个词指的是两个或以上的事物之间的结合，藉着这样或那样的方式成为一个整体。（基督）位格性的联合指的就是他的神人二性联合于同一位格中。圣礼中的标记与被标记的实体的联合就被成为圣礼联合，这是我们现在所必须论述的。罗马教皇党幻想那用于庆祝圣餐的标记变成了被标记的实体，但变化并不是联合，同时，圣礼联合必须适用于所有的圣礼，否则这个联合就不能称为圣礼联合，如此它只是关乎洗礼或圣餐，如此这个联合（对所有的圣礼而言）就不具有共性了。还有人臆测标记与被标记的实体间存在一个物质意义上的结合、或联合，仿佛标记与被标记的实体是同一事物，仿佛它们可以在同一时间、同一地方共存一般，但像这样的共存说，或者一方被隐藏在另一方里的说法并不是圣礼联合，因为这些说法不适用于所有的圣礼。因此，圣礼联合并不是实质性的，它不存在于标记与被标记的实体在同一空间临在的说法中，更不存在于化质说、或同质说中；圣礼联合是具有关联性的，并且存在于这两个层面中：

1. 标记和被标记的实体间的相似性或相关性。如奥古斯丁所说：“如果圣礼与被标记的实体间不具备确实的相似性与关联性，那它们就不能被称之为圣礼了。”
2. 当正确地施行圣礼之时（标记与被标记的实体的共同呈现或领受之时），真信心也是不可或缺的。我们接下来会讲到这一点。凡有真信心之人，他们从牧师那里所领受的，无非纯粹是标记本身而已，但他们却从基督那里领受被标记的实体；而当这些真信之人在圣礼的正确施行中一并领受了标记与实体，他们就拥有了圣礼联合。

为我们证实上述论点的，首先是圣礼的本质。圣礼这个词是具有关联性的。神所设立的仪式及礼仪为我们奠定其根基，同时圣礼也将基督、以及在基督的一切恩惠中与他联合一并包含其中。这种关联性，就是在标记与被标记的实体间存在的次序或联系，其关联的双方是标记与被标记的实体。因此，我们可以知道，圣礼联合不是别的、而是标记与被标记的实体间的关系。我们可以从这里得到一条无误的定律，即：当其间的关联性仍旧存在的时候，标记与被标记的实体就仍旧联合；但只要其间的关联性一旦停止，标记与被标记之的实体就不再联合了。因此，我们可以明白到：只要神在标记与被标记的实体间设立的次序仍旧存在，其中的实体就藉着标记临在、也被该标记所印记；当神的命定停止之时，标记就不再印记任何实体、也不再将任何实体呈现给我们了。用于支持上述论点的第二个证据是圣礼中的类比性与关联性，这在所有的圣礼中必须是一致的。因此，我们当求问，基督与旧约的圣礼是如何联合的，如此我们就可以知道基督与新约的圣礼是如何联合的了。因为其间必定存在关联性，否则旧约的圣礼怎能称之为圣礼呢？（如果其间不具有关联性），那它们的联合就不是圣礼联合了，或者说，就不是与所有圣礼一致的联合了。就现在而论，那曾一度属于旧约圣礼的圣礼联合如今不过是一个相对的关联性而已。可见，这种相对的关联性本身也是圣礼联合的本质。

Union, in general, is the joining together of two or more things, so that in some way or other they become one. The hypostatical union consists in joining together the divine and human natures of Christ, so as to constitute but one person. The union which holds between the sign and the thing signified in the sacraments is called a sacramental union; and it is of this that we must now speak. The Papists imagine that the signs which are used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, are changed into the things signified. But a change is no union. It is necessary, also, that a sacramental union should correspond with all sacraments, or else it will not be sacramental, but will have reference merely to baptism, and the eucharist, and so be no longer general in its nature. Others suppose that there is a corporal conjunction, or union between the sign and the thing signified, as if they were one mass, and as if both existed at the same time in the same place. But such a co-existence as this, and concealment of the one in the other is no sacramental union, for the reason that it does not agree with sacraments generally. A sacramental union, therefore, is not corporal, nor does it consist in the presence of the sign and the thing signified in the same place; much less in tran, or con-substantiation; but it is relative, and consists in these two things: 1. In a likeness or correspondence between the signs and the things signified thereby, concerning which Augustin says: "If the sacraments had not a certain resemblance or relation to the things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments." 2. In the joint-exhibition and reception of the signs and things signified in their proper use, which cannot be done without faith, as we shall hereafter show. None but those who have faith receive from the minister the signs, and from Christ the things signified; and when they thus receive both in their proper use, we have what is called the sacramental union.

This is proven, first, from the nature of a sacrament. The word sacrament is relative. The rites and ceremonies which God has instituted constitute the foundation or ground-work. The term includes Christ, and communion with him in all his benefits. The relation, is the order or connection which exists between the rites and the things which they signify. The correlatives are the signs and the things signified. From this, it is evident that the sacramental union is nothing else, than the relation which the sign has to that which is signified, from which we obtain this infallible rule: While this relation continues the sign and the thing signified remain united; but when it once ceases, they are no longer united; by which we are to understand, that as long as the order established by God between the sign and the thing signified remains, so long are the things exhibited and sealed with the signs; but when this divine appointment ceases, the signs do not exhibit or seal anything unto us. The second proof which we advance in support of the sacramental union as just explained, is that which arises out of the analogy and correspondence of sacraments. It must be a union in harmony with all sacraments. Let us, therefore, inquire, what was the union between Christ and the sacraments of old, and we shall then see what is the nature of the union which holds in the sacraments of the New Testament; for there must be a correspondence in this respect, or else the sacraments of old were no sacraments, or the union was not sacramental, not being such as corresponds with all sacraments. The union now which belonged to the sacraments of old could only be a respective or relative union. Hence, such must now also be the nature of that union which is sacramental.