

有别于“变革论者（transformationalist）”或某些版本的新凯波尔主义，对于试图将较早的改革宗”两国论”（或如加尔文所说的”双重国度”）方法用于后君士坦丁时代的改革宗伦理学，有一种比较常见的批评意见是，它为改革宗神学引入了一种”中立性（neutrality）”。最近发表的评论表明，对某些人来说这仍然是一个问题。

任何熟悉亚伯拉罕·凯波尔（Abraham Kuyper），或赫尔曼·巴文克（Herman Bavinck），或哥尼流·范泰尔（Cornelius Van Til）著作的人都知道，“中立”的概念一直被现代荷兰改革宗神学的大部分制定者彻底拒绝，因此，如果是一个两国论者（人们喜欢称为2K）犯了将其引入改革宗神学的错误，这将是一个巨大的，甚至是致命的缺憾。

在这个讨论中，“中立”的意思是“一个未经上帝的话语解释过的生活领域”或“一个没有规范的生活领域”或“一个未经解释的生活领域”，基督徒甚至不信者都可以说：“这是我的。”这是一个真正合理的关注点。改革宗神学反对人类自治（自治）。亚伯拉罕·凯波尔说得绝对正确：“整个宇宙没有一寸土地不是耶稣指着宣告，‘这是我的！这属于我！’”

对于所谓的两国论伦理的支持者来说，问题不在于耶稣是否有主权，而在于如何有主权。据我所知，新加尔文主义（neo-Calvinist）运动（普林斯特勒van Prinsterer、凯波尔Kuyper、巴文克Bavinck、范泰尔Van Til、伯克富Berkhof等）都教导了两个互补的原则：对立和普遍恩典（Gemeene Gratie）。正如我所理解的所谓的两国论模型，它试图描述普遍恩典相对于对立面的运作方式。

普遍恩典是是指那些不属于教会（ecclesiastical ）的生活领域，在某种意义上，这些领域是信徒和非信徒共同的，在这些领域中，上帝通过祂的护理来抑制邪恶，在这些领域中，非信徒据说能够行公民（不是救赎意义的）善行。它还涉及福音的白白真诚邀请的问题。在北美，当代对它们的讨论往往从基督教改革宗教会（Christian Reformed Church）的卡拉马祖会议（Synod Kalamazoo，1924）提出的三要点教义开始：

教会在审议了第三点标题下的委员会总体建议的那部分内容后，对三要点的处理，得出了以下结论。

第一要点

关于第一要点，涉及上帝对人类的总体恩惠态度，而不仅仅是对选民的恩惠态度，会议宣布，根据圣经和信仰告白，可以肯定的是，除了上帝的拯救恩典只显明给那些被拣选有永生的人，上帝对祂的所有受造物也有某种恩惠或恩典。这从所引用的圣经段落和《多特信条》第二章第5条，第三章，以及第四章第8条和第9条中可以明显看出，其中讨论了福音的普遍邀请；从改革宗神学兴起时期的改革宗作者所引用的声明中可以明显看出，我们的改革宗父辈们自古以来都拥护这种观点。

第二要点

关于第二要点，涉及个人生活和社会中罪的约束，会议宣布，根据圣经和信仰告白，罪是有约束的。这从所引用的圣经经文和《比利时信条》的第13和36条中可以明显看出，其中教导说，上帝通过祂的灵的一般运行，而不更新人心，抑制了罪恶肆意爆发，因此，人类社会仍有可能继续发展；从改革宗神学兴起时期的改革宗作者所引用的声明中可以明显看出，我们的改革宗父辈们自古以来都拥护这种观点。

第三要点

关于第三要点，涉及未重生的人履行所谓的公民正义，会议宣布，根据圣经和信仰告白，未重生的人虽然没有能力做任何蒙拯救的善事（《多特信经》3.4.3），但可以履行这种公民善行。从引用的圣经经文和《多特信经》3.4.4和《比利时信条》中可以明显看出这一点，其中教导说，上帝在没有更新人心的情况下对人施加了如此大的影响，以至于他能够履行公民善行；从改革宗神学兴起时期的改革宗作者所引用的声明中可以明显看出，我们的改革宗父辈们自古以来都拥护这种观点。

为了节省篇幅，省略了会议为捍卫这三要点而提供的支持材料。会议在这些观点上主要引用了加尔文和佩特鲁斯·范·马斯特里赫特（Petrus van Mastricht）。我在《雅努斯，福音的真诚邀请和威斯敏斯特神学》（Janus, the Well-Meant Offer of the Gospel and Westminster Theology）一书中已经讨论了第一要点，载于大卫·范楚南（David VanDrunen）编辑的The Pattern of Sound Words: A Festschrift for Robert B. Strimple（Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2004），页149–80。

新加尔文主义运动的问题之一是，人们倾向于站在普遍恩典/对立区分的一侧或另一侧。有些人，例如谢尔德（K. Schilder）和霍克西玛（H. Hoeksema），完全拒绝了普遍恩典。其他人似乎完全忽略了对立。然而，凯波尔、巴文克和范泰尔试图将这两个原则结合在一起。

除非普遍恩典意味着中立，而范泰尔不这么认为，那么两国论伦理就不意味着中立。范泰尔长篇大论地为普遍恩典辩护。他专门写了关于普遍恩典的三本书：

普遍恩典(1947)

特殊主义和普遍恩典（1951）

普遍恩典与福音(1977)

这份标题列表仅表明他对普遍恩典的兴趣。普遍恩典的教义充斥着他的著作，以至于加里·诺斯（Gary North）写了一卷书拒绝普遍恩典（以及范泰尔的无千禧年末世论），同时试图坚持他的范泰尔主义者身份。

当范泰尔教导普遍恩典时，他没有教导“中立”。他没有教导说：有一寸土地，基督没有宣告：”这是我的！”他教导说，上帝以一种方式在日常生活中运作，而祂以另一种方式进行拯救。对邪恶的约束并不是圣灵的拯救行动。通过传讲福音，圣灵的工作是一种拯救行动。这两种运作可以被认为发生在不同的领域，或者使用更古老的语言来说——“国度”。可以肯定的是，这些领域是重叠的，因为我们同时生活在两个领域或国度中。

坐在教堂里听福音的是罪人。这些罪人是普遍（或世俗）领域的公民。如果一个罪人在教堂期间把车停在红色区域，他很可能会像异教徒一样得到一张罚单。他在地方法官的权柄下，即使在教堂里也是如此。当我们聚集在教堂里领受圣言和圣餐时，我们依靠地方法官来保护我们的安全。那个地方法官同时在保护那些没有加入教会的人。异教徒和基督徒在相同的道路上驾驶相同的汽车。我们在同一家餐厅吃饭。我们做同样的数学题。基督徒不断向异教徒学习。怎么学？普遍恩典。所谓两国论伦理的支持者将这种普遍生活置于“公民国度”之下。

对立存在于多个层面，其中最基础的是解释层面。基督徒和非基督徒对共同生活、护理和现实的意义给出了截然不同的解释。非基督徒主张他的独立性，他对上帝的自主权。他主张自己对区域、范围和英寸的主权。与范泰尔一样，正确理解圣经和信仰的基督徒拒绝了异教徒对自主权的要求。我们说：“你就像一个拍打父亲脸的孩子。他之所以能做到，是因为他坐在父亲的腿上。”

事实上，没有什么是中立的。我们生活在一个被上帝主权描述过的世界。祂已经启示了自己，并对所有生命提出了要求。祂赋予一切事物以意义，基督徒服从于这种对现实的权威性描述。改革宗神学教导说，上帝在两本书中启示了自己：自然和圣经。在自然界中，上帝已经启示了祂的存在、祂的一些属性和祂的道德律。在圣经中，上帝启示了祂的道德律和福音，因此一般或自然启示与特殊启示之间存在一些重叠。在这两个地方都可以看到上帝的道德律。然而，福音只在圣经中可见。

自十六世纪以来，改革宗神学不仅清楚地教导了上帝道德律自然启示的教义，而且它也载入了改革宗的信仰告白。然而，在现代时期，这一思想已经陷入困境，那些在十九或二十世纪开始的改革宗神学来说，很可能不熟悉它。卡尔·巴特是二十世纪最有影响力的改革宗神学家，他拒绝接受自然法的概念。正如许多改革宗人士显然受到他拒绝律法/福音的区分和他对圣约神学彻底改造的影响一样，许多人也受到他对待自然法和自然启示的方法的影响。我的意思并不是说人们已经坐下来阅读巴特并同意他的观点，但是人们还是受到了他的影响或他的思想的影响。

其他人在对文化崩溃作出反应时，如此强调基督徒和非基督徒之间的对立，几乎抹杀了任何普遍恩典的概念。对于基督教和基督教对世界的解释（所谓的“世界和人生观”），对立是真实的和必不可少的。拒绝普遍恩典，或共同的生活领域，或公民国度，在自然、良知和圣经中已知的上帝的道德律下运作，就真是在冒摩尼教（Manicheanism）的风险。

事实上，任何自重的凯波尔主义（Kuyperian）或范泰尔主义者（Van Tillian）都不应该谈论“重新夺取”任何普遍的文化事业，因为基督已经是主。我们不必像某些人所说的那样“让祂成为主”。祂就是主。当然，在后基督教王国和后基督徒世界中，愿意承认这一事实的人越来越少，但他们拒绝承认基督的主权并没有改变祂的升天和祂统治万物的事实。

异教徒拒绝承认君王耶稣也不会改变祂在两个不同领域治理衪的国度的主权法令。在这里，似乎有些人对“两个国度”的名称绊住了。由于不熟悉宗教改革和以及讨论这个问题的旧方式，让一些人感到困惑。我们不妨说一个国度有两个领域。君王耶稣用律法和福音统治教会或救赎的领域。后者只见于特殊启示中，前者则见于特殊启示和自然启示中。祂用祂的律法统治民事，或公共，或创造领域，这些律法在创造（自然）和良知以及他的约束护理中得到启示。祂同样是两者的主。祂的启示规范了这两个领域，但他们确实有不同的功用，祂对他们也有不同的治理方式。我们不期望行政官宣讲福音，但我们确实期望他惩罚罪犯。我们不期望牧师写停车罚单，但我们确实期望他传扬福音。传道人和行政官都是上帝的仆人，但他们在两个不同的领域或国度中有不同的职能。

这两个领域的区别就是律法和福音的区别。这是传统改革宗的另一个区别，在现代时期已经丢失。您可以在《圣约、称义和教牧事工（Covenant, Justification, and Pastoral Ministry）》一书中读到更多相关内容。民事行政官关心的是法律，而不是福音。就圣约而言，地方行政官的工作是行为之约的一部分。我们在民事领域彼此之间的关系是基于行为，而不是恩典。我们在教会，或灵性，或救赎领域/国度中彼此的关系是基于恩典，而不是行为。当美国海军保卫那艘船时，他们不是在进行福音事工，而是在进行法律工作。海盗行为违反了航海者之间隐含或明确的法律关系。盗窃违反了上帝的律法。

不存在认知中立或道德中立这样的东西。上帝的话语以主权的方式描述了万物。在公民或共同生活中，我们承认祂的王权，按照祂在创造和良知中启示的律法来行事。在教会、灵性或救赎领域，我们也承认祂的王权，作为我们天父的养子，通过宣讲律法和福音，并出于感恩、在圣灵中按照祂的道德律生活，与基督联合。

译注：雅努斯是罗马神话中的神，通常被描述成有前后两张面孔，展望着过去和未来；克拉克博士用雅努斯来呼吁改革宗神学对原型知识和复本知识进行区分 ，福音的真诚邀请和上帝主权的特定救赎。

https://www.reformedbeginner.net/common-is-not-neutral/

Heidelberg 87: The Impenitent Cannot Be Saved

by R. SCOTT CLARK on July 2, 2015



Since the advent of the so-called Second Great Awakening, which shaped American evangelical theology, piety, and practice so profoundly in the 19th century, many American Christians have simply assumed that revivalist paradigm as correct. Many evangelicals have never seen any other approach to salvation and to the Christian life. An important part of that picture, that approach is the “altar call,” which was given at the conclusion of a “revival” service that consisted of two or three parts. The first part of a revival was dominated by the singing of carefully selected, emotionally powerful songs. The second part of the service was the sermon, which was intended to persuade sinners to come forward at its conclusion to pray the so-called “sinner’s prayer” at the “anxious bench.” Versions of this pattern carried on through the 20th century and the basic structure of the revival service still influence the structure of evangelical and even Presbyterian and Reformed worship services to this day.

Underlying this system for gaining converts is the conviction that once a person has “come forward” and prayed the sinner’s prayer that he must be saved no matter what he may later say and do. It is to this doctrine and practice that some refer when they speak of “once saved, always saved.” This approach to conversion and to the Christian life has been roundly criticized as a form of “easy believism” and “cheap grace.”

The Reformed take a quite different approach to the question of salvation, conversion, and the Christian life:

87. Can they then not be saved who do not turn to God from their unthankful, impenitent life?

By no means, for, as the Scripture says, no unchaste person, idolater, adulterer, thief, covetous man, drunkard, slanderer, robber, or the like shall inherit the Kingdom of God (Heidelberg Catechism).

There is a great distinction here that must not be missed. That distinction is between is and because (ground) or through (instrument). What the Reformed Churches here confess is that it is the case that believers will be penitent, i.e., they will recognize sin for what it is. They will recognize their own sin what it is. They recognize and confess the greatness of their sin and misery (Heidelberg Catechism 2–9) and they turn away from it. Believers, those to whom God has graciously, sovereignly granted new life and with it true faith, have repented, do repent and shall repent.

In contrast, however, there are those who profess faith in Christ, who wish to be regarded as believers, whose profession of faith may have been received as genuine in the church. These are called “hypocrites.” They do not actually believe and they are not actually repentant or penitent.

More particularly, those who have been placed under discipline (as discussed under the keys of the kingdom), who have demonstrated their unbelief by refusing to repent, are in grave danger and great jeopardy. That someone has, during a moving (affecting) service, felt a wave of emotion, come forward, felt guilty, or even regret for the consequences of his sins, does not make him a believer. What makes one a believer is true faith, a certain knowledge of Christ and the basics of the Christian faith, assent to their truth, and a personal, heartfelt trust in Christ and in his gospel.

It is not that sinners cannot be saved. Were that so there would be no saved persons. We know from Scripture that there are saved persons. It’s not that the imperfect cannot be saved. Heidelberg 87 is thinking about those who sin impenitently. Christians may indeed commit the gross sins which the catechism quotes from 1 Corinthians 6:9, 10. What distinguishes the believer from the unbeliever is repentance and penitence, which is the fruit of true faith.

This is why it is so important to distinguish between is, because, and through. We are not saved because we are penitent. it is not the ground of salvation. Christ’s righteousness is the ground of salvation. Rather, believers are penitent. If you tell me that you are a believer and you sin impenitently, i.e., you keep on sinning and refused to acknowledge it as sin and turn away from it, then the church should judge you and unbeliever. We are not saved through penitence. Repentance is the fruit of new life and true faith. It is believers who repent. We are not speaking chronologically but logically. Unbelievers cannot repent because they do not have new life and true faith. We are saved by grace alone (sola gratia) through faith alone (sola fide). Only faith apprehends Christ and his righteousness. That is why we confess it to be the only instrument of salvation. We should be particularly on guard against the error that would seek to add obedience to faith (e.g., “faithfulness”) as the instrument of salvation. This error denies the finished work of Christ, who alone has satisfied the righteous law of God, who alone has substituted for us on the cross, and who alone was raised for our justification.

It is the case that believers repent and are penitent, i.e., daily acknowledging the greatness of their sin generally and turning away from particular sins. Thus, when believer comes to another believer to speak to him about a sin, a believer acknowledges his sin. In church discipline cases, at least in confessional Reformed and Presbyterian congregations, it is not the sin itself that is typically the ground of discipline. It is the member’s refusal to acknowledge his sin and to turn from it. When such a person tells the church that the church has no place to speak to him about his sin, then we are dealing with what we call contumacy or a high-handed response to God’s law and to Christ’s Church.

“Easy believism” is a widespread pattern in American evangelical religion. The biblical and Reformed approach to repentance and faith may be a shock to the system. That someone has walked the aisle or prayed the prayer means little if it is not accompanied by evidence of true faith. Chief among those evidences is not perfection but penitence. It is to this sort of faith that James referred when he complained that some Christians professed faith but there was no evidence of their faith (James 2:14-15). Such a faith, that is a mere profession of faith that is, in fact, not true faith at all, cannot indeed save anyone since it is not faith. It is not, as Rome says, that our good works makes faith what it is (fides formata caritate) or that we must augment our faith with good works (moralism) but that it is the case that living trees produce fruit.

https://heidelblog.net/2015/07/heidelberg-87-the-impenitent-cannot-be-saved/