「那些蒙受救贖的人是將救贖唯獨歸功於神主權的恩典，並將一切的頌讚都給祂，因祂使他們與其他人分別出來。」——約拿單·愛德華茲

我們之所以稱改革宗救恩論爲「恩典的教義」，是因爲救恩論中給出的五個神學命題通常被認定是以聖經爲本的加爾文主義五要點，並且是救恩論最純正的表達。這五個命題中的每一個——徹底的敗壞、主權的揀選、有限的救贖、不可抗拒的呼召和蒙保守的恩典——都極致地表現出神的主權恩典。把這五個命題放在一起的時候，就成爲神拯救恩典的全面陳述。因爲這個理由，恩典的教義實際上只有一點，換句話說，也就是神藉由祂的恩典並爲祂的榮耀拯救罪人，這兩個事實——神的恩典和榮耀——不可分割地綁在一起。任何最放大神恩典的就是最能放大祂榮耀的，最能彰顯神恩典的就是在恩典的教義中表達的真理。

另一方面，妥協五要點中的任何一點就是稀釋和貶低了神的恩典。例如，說人只有部分敗壞，一個失喪的罪人在他的罪裡只是靈性生病，就是嚴重減損神恩典的誤診。同樣的，採納依靠預先看見人的信心這樣有條件的揀選就是敗壞了神的恩典。教導基督獻上普世的贖罪就是使救恩對所有人來說是可能的（雖然這實際上沒有拯救任何人）會讓神的恩典變成廉價。相信一個允許人的自由意志抗拒的呼召就是妥協了神的恩典。而思考那允許人脫離信仰的可逆恩典就污衊了神純粹的恩典。這些觀點破壞了神的恩典，並且因爲那樣，令人難過的是它們竊取了神的榮耀。然而，這樣的觀點在現今的教會當中廣泛地被支持。在任何形式的亞米念神學路線裡，拯救是被視爲部分是神的和部分是人的—無論是人加上他的好行爲或是將自身的自我生發的信心貢獻給基督已成就的工作，這些路線將榮耀區分了神和人的。無論是在多少程度上背離了五要點的任何一個，就是排斥了罪人的救恩唯獨歸於神的榮耀。

榮耀唯獨歸給神

博愛思（James Montgomery Boice）在去世前不久時寫道：

高舉神意味著比將榮耀歸給神還要更多……它意味著唯獨將榮耀歸給神。這就是加爾文主義和亞米念主義之間最大的差異，當前者宣稱唯獨神拯救罪人時候，後者就給人有種神讓罪人在拯救自己當中有份的印象。加爾文主義表達救恩是三一神的工作——父神的揀選、聖子的救贖、聖靈的呼召。此外，這些拯救行動中的每一個都是直接指向選民，從而可靠地保守他們的救恩。相較之下，亞米念主義把救恩看作是某種神讓它成爲可能，而人讓它實現的東西。這是因爲神的拯救行動被指向不同的位格：聖子的救贖大體上是爲了人類、聖靈的呼召只有針對那些聽聞福音的人；更爲狹窄的是父神的揀選只是爲了那些相信福音的人。然而這三件事(救贖、呼召或揀選)沒有一個能保證一個罪人的拯救！不可避免的結果是，並非完全依靠神的恩典，救恩部分是取決於人的回應。所以雖然亞米念主義願意把榮耀歸給神，但講到救恩時，卻不願意把一切的榮耀歸給神，它把榮耀分成天上的和地上的，因爲如果使人得救和失喪的終極原因是人選擇神的能力，那就是神被人竊取了他的榮耀。然而神自己說過，「我必不把我的榮耀歸給別人』」賽48:11)。

這就是爲什麼恩典的教義在我們教會中是如此迫切地需要，它們唯獨將榮耀歸給神，它們將拯救定義爲全都是屬於神的。當救恩正確地在這樣的方式下被認知時—唯有那樣—神因爲它得到一切榮耀。只有唯獨恩典產生唯獨榮耀歸於神。

譯：楊忠道；校：謝昉。

https://tc.tgcchinese.org/article/doctrines-grace-his-grace-and-his-glory

Those who have received salvation are to attribute it to sovereign grace alone, and to give all the praise to Him, who makes them to differ from others. —Jonathan Edwards

The doctrines of grace are so called because these five major headings of theology, often identified as the five points of biblical Calvinism, contain the purest expression of the saving grace of God. Each of these five doctrines—radical depravity, sovereign election, definite atonement, irresistible call, and preserving grace—supremely display the sovereign grace of God. These five headings stand together as one comprehensive statement of the saving purposes of God. For this reason, there is really only one point to the doctrines of grace, namely, that God saves sinners by His grace and for His glory. These two realities—God’s grace and glory—are inseparably bound together. Whatever most magnifies God’s grace most magnifies His glory. And that which most exalts God’s grace is the truth expressed in the doctrines of grace.

On the other hand, compromising any one of the five points dilutes and diminishes the grace of God. For instance, to speak of a mere partial corruption of man, one in which the lost sinner is only spiritually sick in his sin, makes a misdiagnosis that grossly diminishes the grace of God. Likewise, to espouse a conditional election that is dependent upon God’s foresight of man’s faith corrupts the grace of God. To teach that Christ made a universal atonement, making salvation possible for all (though actual for none), cheapens the grace of God. To believe in a resistible call that allows for the free will of man compromises the grace of God. And to think of reversible grace, which would allow man to fall away from the faith, contaminates the pure grace of God. These views undermine the grace of God, and because of that, sad to say, they rob God of His glory. And yet, such views are widely held in the church today. In any syncretistic Arminian scheme of theology, salvation is seen as being partly of God and partly of man—whether it be that man adds his good works or that he contributes his own self-generated faith to the finished work of Christ. These schemes divide the glory between God and man. To whatever extent one deviates from any of the five doctrines of grace, one marginalizes the glory that is due to God alone for the salvation of sinners.

Giving Glory to God Alone

Writing shortly before his death in 2000, James Montgomery Boice noted:

Having a high view of God means something more than giving glory to God . . . it means giving glory to God alone. This is the difference between Calvinism and Arminianism. While the former declares that God alone saves sinners, the latter gives the impression that God enables sinners to have some part in saving themselves. Calvinism presents salvation as the work of the triune God—election by the Father, redemption in the Son, calling by the Spirit. Furthermore, each of these saving acts is directed toward the elect, thereby infallibly securing their salvation. By contrast, Arminianism views salvation as something that God makes possible but that man makes actual. This is because the saving acts of God are directed toward different persons: the Son’s redemption is for humanity in general; the Spirit’s calling is only for those who hear the gospel; narrower still, the Father’s election is only for those who believe the gospel. Yet in none of these cases (redemption, calling, or election) does God actually secure the salvation of even one sinner! The inevitable result is that rather than depending exclusively on divine grace, salvation depends partly on a human response. So although Arminianism is willing to give God the glory, when it comes to salvation, it is unwilling to give Him all the glory. It divides the glory between heaven and earth, for if what ultimately makes the difference between being saved and being lost is man’s ability to choose God, then to just that extent God is robbed of His glory. Yet God Himself has said, “I will not yield My glory to another” (Isa. 48:11).

This is why the doctrines of grace are so desperately needed in our churches. They give glory to God alone. They define salvation as being all of God. When salvation is correctly perceived in this way, then—and only then—God receives all the glory for it. Only sola gratia produces soli Deo gloria.

https://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/doctrines-grace-his-grace-and-his-glory