Justification and Its Relation to Divine Sovereignty, Foreknowledge, and Human Freewill: Evaluating Calvinism and Arminianism

## Introduction

The intricate interplay between Divine Sovereignty, Divine Foreknowledge, and Human Freewill forms a foundational aspect of theological discourse, particularly in the context of Justification. Within this framework, two prominent theological perspectives emerge: Calvinism and Arminianism. Calvinism, as articulated by John Calvin, emphasizes the preeminence of God's sovereignty and predestination, suggesting that divine will dictates the course of human salvation (Emmert, 2019). In contrast, Arminianism, influenced by Jacobus Arminius, contends that human freewill plays a crucial role in the process of Justification, asserting that individuals have the capacity to accept or reject divine grace (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This paper aims to critically evaluate these competing positions, exploring their theological underpinnings and the implications they hold for the understanding of Justification, while ultimately supporting a Calvinist interpretation.

## Theological Foundations of Justification

Justification holds a vital position within Christian theology, serving as the means by which individuals are declared righteous before God. This concept is deeply intertwined with Divine Sovereignty, which asserts God's ultimate authority and control over all creation, influencing the interpretation of Justification by emphasizing predestination and divine election (Emmert, 2019). In contrast, Divine Foreknowledge pertains to God's omniscient awareness of all events, including human decisions, which shapes the theological discourse on Justification by suggesting a foreordained yet partially contingent framework (Schabel, 2021). Theological perspectives differ on how these divine attributes interact with Human Freewill, leading to varied understandings of the role individuals play in their salvation. By examining these foundational elements, we gain insight into the broader theological debates that underpin the doctrines of Calvinism and Arminianism and their respective views on the nature and process of Justification.

### Divine Sovereignty: An Overview

Divine Sovereignty represents a central tenet in theological discussions, asserting God's ultimate authority and control over all creation, which profoundly influences the doctrine of Justification. Within Reformed theology, particularly Calvinism, Divine Sovereignty is emphasized as the guiding principle that determines the elect's salvation through predestination and divine election (Emmert, 2019). This perspective maintains that God's sovereign will is absolute, leaving no room for human intervention in the salvific process, as it is believed that God has predetermined those who will be justified. Conversely, Arminian thought contends that while God's sovereignty is acknowledged, it operates in conjunction with human freewill, allowing individuals to accept or reject divine grace (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). These differing interpretations highlight the pivotal role of Divine Sovereignty in shaping theological discourse, as it sets the framework within which Justification is understood and debated across various Christian traditions.

Divine Sovereignty plays a pivotal role in shaping different theological interpretations of Justification, influencing how salvation is perceived across various Christian doctrines. Within Calvinist theology, Divine Sovereignty is seen as an unyielding force that dictates the elect's salvation, thereby nullifying any significant role for Human Freewill in the Justification process (Emmert, 2019). This perspective underscores the belief that God's will is preeminent, thereby ensuring that Justification is wholly dependent on divine election rather than human decision-making. In contrast, Arminianism acknowledges Divine Sovereignty but posits that it operates synergistically with Human Freewill, allowing individuals to participate actively in their salvation by accepting or rejecting divine grace (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). The divergence in these theological frameworks highlights the ongoing debate about the extent of divine control versus human agency in the process of Justification, offering rich grounds for examining the intricate dynamics between divine attributes and human participation.

### Divine Foreknowledge: Understanding the Concept

Divine Foreknowledge, a critical component of theological discourse, refers to God's omniscient awareness of all events, encompassing both past and future occurrences. Unlike Divine Sovereignty, which emphasizes God's supreme authority over creation, Divine Foreknowledge suggests a framework where God's awareness of future contingents coexists with human actions without necessarily dictating them (Craig, 2023). This distinction is pivotal in understanding Justification, as it posits that while God possesses complete knowledge of all potentialities, this knowledge does not inherently interfere with human freewill. Within Calvinism, Divine Foreknowledge is perceived as part of God's predetermined plan, where knowledge aligns with predestination, reinforcing the belief that God's foreknowledge is an extension of his sovereign will (Emmert, 2019). Conversely, Arminianism interprets Divine Foreknowledge as allowing for genuine human choice, proposing that God's knowledge does not constrain human freedom, thereby enabling an authentic response to divine grace (McCall and Stanglin, 2020).

The interplay between Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freewill presents a complex dynamic that is central to the discourse on Justification. Within the Calvinist framework, Divine Foreknowledge is perceived as inherently linked to predestination, suggesting that God's omniscience encompasses a predetermined plan where human actions align with divine providence (Craig, 2023). This view posits that while God knows all future events, this knowledge is not separate from his sovereign will, thus minimizing the role of Human Freewill. In contrast, Arminianism argues that Divine Foreknowledge allows for genuine human autonomy, proposing that God's knowledge of future contingencies does not necessitate their determination, thereby preserving human agency (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This divergence highlights a fundamental theological tension, where the reconciliation of divine omniscience with human freedom remains a pivotal issue in understanding Justification within these traditions.

### Human Freewill: A Theological Perspective

The theological exploration of Human Freewill often centers on its interaction with Divine Sovereignty and Divine Foreknowledge, presenting a complex tapestry of beliefs and interpretations. Within the Calvinist framework, Human Freewill is perceived as subordinate to Divine Sovereignty, emphasizing that human actions are ultimately governed by God's predetermined plan (Wright, 2019). In this view, freewill is not entirely autonomous but operates within the parameters set by divine election, reinforcing the belief in predestination as a guiding principle of salvation. Conversely, Arminianism asserts that Human Freewill is a critical component of Justification, proposing that individuals possess the genuine ability to choose or reject divine grace, thereby highlighting their active participation in the salvific process (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This perspective suggests that Divine Foreknowledge accommodates human decisions without undermining their freedom, allowing for a harmonious coexistence between divine omniscience and human autonomy, thereby enriching the theological discourse on salvation and grace.

The discourse on Human Freewill within theological debates on Justification presents significant challenges and controversies, particularly when juxtaposed with Divine Sovereignty and Divine Foreknowledge. Calvinism, emphasizing predestination, argues that Human Freewill is subsumed under Divine Sovereignty, thereby limiting the scope of human autonomy in the salvific process (Wright, 2019). This stance provokes debates, as it raises questions about moral responsibility and the role of personal agency in accepting divine grace. In contrast, Arminianism asserts that Human Freewill is integral to Justification, advocating for a cooperative interaction between divine grace and human choice, which allows individuals to accept or reject salvation (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This position, however, faces criticism for potentially undermining the omnipotence of God, leading to an ongoing theological tension that challenges scholars to reconcile divine omniscience with genuine human autonomy, thereby enriching the discourse on salvation and grace.

## Calvinism vs. Arminianism: Core Beliefs

Calvinism and Arminianism present distinct theological frameworks regarding Justification, Divine Sovereignty, and Human Freewill. Calvinism, rooted in the teachings of John Calvin, emphasizes the preeminence of Divine Sovereignty, positing that God’s sovereign will predestines those who will be justified, thereby limiting the role of Human Freewill (Emmert, 2019). This perspective underscores the belief in divine election, where God's authority determines salvation without human intervention. Conversely, Arminianism, influenced by Jacobus Arminius, argues for the significance of Human Freewill, asserting that individuals have the genuine ability to accept or reject divine grace, thereby playing an active role in their Justification (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This theological stance highlights a cooperative dynamic between divine grace and human choice, proposing that God’s foreknowledge allows for human autonomy within the salvific process, thus presenting a contrasting view to Calvinism's deterministic outlook.

### Core Tenets of Calvinism

Calvinism, rooted in the theological teachings of John Calvin, presents a distinctive view on Justification primarily through the lens of Divine Sovereignty. Calvinist doctrine asserts that God's sovereign will is the absolute determinant of salvation, emphasizing predestination as a key element in the process of Justification. According to Calvin, Divine Sovereignty entails that God has preordained the elect who will receive salvation, thereby minimizing the role of Human Freewill in this divine process (Emmert, 2019). This perspective is supported by Calvinist theologian K. Emmert, who highlights that Divine Sovereignty and divine election form the core of Calvinist theology, underscoring the belief that human actions are subordinate to God's predetermined plan (Emmert, 2019). Consequently, Calvinism posits that Justification is not a result of human merit but is entirely dependent on God's grace and sovereign choice, reinforcing the theological stance that divine will governs the salvation of the elect.

Calvinism interprets Divine Foreknowledge as an integral aspect of God's immutable plan, inherently tied to the doctrine of predestination. Within this framework, Divine Foreknowledge is not merely an awareness of future events but is perceived as part of God's sovereign determination of all that will occur, including human actions (Wright, 2019). This interpretation effectively negates the autonomous role of Human Freewill, positing that human decisions are subsumed under God's predetermined will. Calvinist theology thus maintains that while humans appear to make choices, these decisions are ultimately orchestrated by divine decree, leaving little room for genuine human autonomy (Emmert, 2019). Consequently, Calvinism's approach to Divine Foreknowledge reinforces the primacy of God's sovereign will, suggesting that Human Freewill, although existent, operates within the boundaries of divine predestination, thereby shaping the discourse on Justification.

### Fundamental Principles of Arminianism

Arminianism, as articulated by Jacobus Arminius, presents a theological framework that emphasizes the centrality of Human Freewill in the process of Justification. This perspective posits that individuals possess the genuine capacity to accept or reject divine grace, thereby underscoring the role of personal agency in salvation (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). Arminius argued that God's foreknowledge does not necessitate predestination; rather, it allows for human decisions within the divine plan, maintaining that divine grace is universally available but not irresistibly imposed. This theological stance challenges the deterministic outlook of Calvinism by advocating for a synergistic interaction between divine grace and human choice (Ellis, 2020). Arminianism's emphasis on freewill and conditional election suggests a cooperative dynamic in the salvific process, affirming that Justification is contingent upon human response to God's grace, thus offering a contrasting position to Calvinist doctrines.

Arminianism offers a nuanced interpretation of Divine Sovereignty, positing that while God's authority is recognized, it is not exercised to the exclusion of human agency. This theological stance suggests that Divine Sovereignty operates in concert with, rather than in opposition to, Human Freewill, allowing individuals an authentic choice in accepting or rejecting divine grace (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). Arminius emphasized that God's sovereign will is not coercive but rather enables human cooperation in the process of salvation, thereby preserving the integrity of personal agency (Ellis, 2020). Regarding Divine Foreknowledge, Arminianism maintains that God's omniscience does not predetermine human actions but rather foresees them within the context of potential human choices. This perspective asserts that Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freewill coexist, with God's knowledge encompassing future contingencies without constraining human freedom, thus providing a framework where divine grace and human response are harmoniously integrated (Craig, 2023).

## Points of Theological Disagreement

The theological disagreements between Calvinism and Arminianism revolve around the interplay of Divine Sovereignty, Justification, and Human Freewill. Calvinism asserts that Divine Sovereignty is paramount, with God's predetermined plan dictating the fate of the elect, thereby subordinating Human Freewill to divine election (Wright, 2019). This perspective suggests that Justification is entirely reliant on God's sovereign will, leaving little room for human agency in the salvific process. In contrast, Arminianism emphasizes Human Freewill, arguing that individuals possess the capacity to accept or reject divine grace, thus actively participating in their Justification (Ellis, 2020). This theological stance challenges the deterministic Calvinist view by proposing a synergistic relationship between divine grace and human choice, allowing for a more flexible interpretation of Divine Sovereignty that accommodates genuine human autonomy (McCall and Stanglin, 2020).

### Divergences in Understanding Divine Sovereignty

The theological divergence between Calvinism and Arminianism concerning Divine Sovereignty presents a profound distinction in their understanding of God's authority over humanity. Calvinism posits that Divine Sovereignty is absolute and deterministic, with God's will dictating every aspect of the salvific process, thereby rendering Human Freewill as subordinate and largely inconsequential (Emmert, 2019). This perspective is rooted in the belief that God's predetermined plan encompasses all events, reinforcing the doctrine of predestination as central to Justification. In contrast, Arminianism views Divine Sovereignty as compatible with human agency, suggesting that God's authority allows for human participation in salvation through freewill, thus advocating for a more relational dynamic between divine grace and human choice (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This divergence highlights a fundamental theological debate, where Calvinism's deterministic framework stands in opposition to Arminianism's synergistic model, challenging scholars to reconcile the tension between divine control and human autonomy (Ellis, 2020).

The theological debates between Calvinism and Arminianism often manifest in discussions concerning the nature of divine grace and human agency. For instance, Calvinist theologians argue that Divine Sovereignty entails an unconditional election, where God's grace is irresistibly applied to the elect, thus negating any autonomous role for Human Freewill (Wright, 2019). This perspective is challenged by Arminian theologians, who maintain that grace is resistible, allowing individuals the freedom to accept or reject it, thus preserving human autonomy in the salvific process (Ellis, 2020). The debate extends to the interpretation of scriptural texts, with Calvinists emphasizing passages that highlight predestination, while Arminians focus on those advocating for conditional election and human cooperation (Emmert, 2019). These differences underscore the broader theological discourse, where the reconciliation of divine omnipotence with human freedom remains a contentious issue, fueling ongoing scholarly discussions and doctrinal developments within Christian theology.

### Conflicts in Interpretation of Human Freewill

The interpretation of Human Freewill forms a contentious point of divergence between Calvinism and Arminianism, particularly concerning its role in the process of Justification. Calvinists argue that Human Freewill is significantly limited by Divine Sovereignty, positing that human actions are ultimately subsumed under God's predetermined plan, thereby minimizing individual autonomy in the salvific process (Wright, 2019). This deterministic view suggests that while human choices appear autonomous, they are ultimately orchestrated by divine decree, reinforcing the primacy of God's will. Conversely, Arminianism holds that Human Freewill is essential, proposing that individuals have genuine autonomy to accept or reject divine grace, thus actively participating in their salvation (Ellis, 2020). This stance emphasizes a cooperative interaction between human decision-making and divine influence, challenging the Calvinist perspective by advocating for a synergistic relationship that preserves human agency within the framework of divine foreknowledge and grace.

The conflicts between Calvinism and Arminianism have significant implications for the concept of Justification, as they fundamentally alter the perceived nature of salvation. In Calvinism, the emphasis on Divine Sovereignty suggests that Justification is an act of God's will alone, with human actions playing no substantive role in the process (Emmert, 2019). This perspective implies that Justification is predetermined and unchangeable, leading to theological debates about the absence of human agency and moral responsibility. Conversely, Arminianism emphasizes Human Freewill, positing that Justification requires human cooperation with divine grace, thus allowing individual choices to influence one's salvific state (Ellis, 2020). This interpretation challenges the Calvinist view by proposing a dynamic process where human decisions hold significant weight, fostering a more relational understanding of salvation and raising questions about the balance between divine omniscience and human autonomy (Craig, 2023).

## Critical Evaluation of Theological Positions

The examination of Calvinism and Arminianism reveals distinct strengths and weaknesses inherent in their theological approaches to Justification. Calvinism's emphasis on Divine Sovereignty offers a robust framework for understanding God's ultimate authority, yet it diminishes human agency by reducing Human Freewill to a mere instrument within a predetermined plan (Emmert, 2019). This deterministic stance is criticized for potentially undermining moral responsibility and the meaningfulness of human choices in the salvation process. Conversely, Arminianism champions Human Freewill, advocating for a cooperative relationship between divine grace and human decision-making, which enhances the role of personal agency in Justification (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). However, this perspective is often challenged for potentially compromising God's omnipotence, as it suggests a model where divine foreknowledge accommodates human autonomy, leading to theological tensions that require careful reconciliation (Craig, 2023).

### Analysis of Calvinist Perspectives

Calvinist perspectives on Justification emphasize the supremacy of Divine Sovereignty, positing that God's will is the ultimate determinant of salvation, thus rendering Human Freewill as largely instrumental within this framework. This theological stance asserts that predestination is central to Justification, where God's sovereign choice preordains the elect, effectively minimizing human agency in the salvific process (Emmert, 2019). Calvinists argue that Divine Sovereignty implies an absolute governance over all creation, including the moral and spiritual destinies of individuals, thereby aligning human actions with divine decree (Wright, 2019). Critics of this perspective highlight a potential erosion of moral responsibility, suggesting that by diminishing the role of Human Freewill, Calvinism risks undermining the significance of personal choices in salvation. Nonetheless, proponents maintain that this deterministic view upholds the integrity of God's omnipotence and grace, ensuring that Justification remains a divine act rather than a human endeavor, thus reinforcing the theological coherence within Calvinist doctrine.

### Examination of Arminian Views

Arminianism, as articulated by Jacobus Arminius, presents a theological framework that emphasizes the significance of Human Freewill in the process of Justification. Unlike Calvinism, which underscores Divine Sovereignty as the ultimate determinant, Arminianism posits that individuals have the genuine capacity to accept or reject divine grace, thereby highlighting personal agency in salvation (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). This theological stance is rooted in the belief that Divine Sovereignty and Human Freewill are not mutually exclusive, but rather coexist, allowing for a cooperative dynamic where divine grace is accessible yet not irresistibly imposed (Ellis, 2020). Arminius argued that God's foreknowledge does not necessitate predestination; instead, it foresees human decisions, maintaining that divine grace is universally available but contingent upon human response. This perspective challenges the deterministic outlook of Calvinism by advocating for a synergistic relationship between divine grace and human choice, thus enriching the discourse on salvation and grace (Craig, 2023).

## Personal Conclusions and Siding with Calvinism

In concluding this analysis, the Calvinist perspective on Justification emerges as the most coherent and theologically robust framework when considering the interplay of Divine Sovereignty, Divine Foreknowledge, and Human Freewill. Calvinism's emphasis on God's supreme authority provides a clear and consistent understanding of salvation that aligns with scriptural teachings on predestination and divine election (Wright, 2019). This approach upholds the integrity of Divine Sovereignty, ensuring that the process of Justification remains a sovereign act of God rather than a human endeavor, thereby reinforcing the omnipotence and grace of the divine (Emmert, 2019). While Arminianism offers a compelling argument for Human Freewill, it risks undermining God's omnipotence by suggesting a model that overly emphasizes human autonomy in salvation (Ellis, 2020). Therefore, aligning with Calvinism not only maintains theological consistency but also affirms the centrality of God's will in the salvific narrative, providing a comprehensive understanding of Justification.

## Conclusion

The exploration of Justification within the frameworks of Divine Sovereignty, Divine Foreknowledge, and Human Freewill reveals significant theological insights, particularly when evaluating Calvinism and Arminianism. Calvinism, with its emphasis on God's sovereign will and predestination, provides a comprehensive understanding that aligns with scriptural teachings on divine election, reinforcing the notion that salvation is an act of divine grace rather than human effort (Emmert, 2019). In contrast, Arminianism's focus on Human Freewill introduces a dynamic interaction between divine grace and human choice, suggesting a more relational approach to salvation, though it risks diluting the omnipotence of God (McCall and Stanglin, 2020). Through critical analysis, the Calvinist perspective emerges as more coherent, preserving the integrity of Divine Sovereignty while maintaining theological consistency in the doctrine of Justification (Wright, 2019). This conclusion underscores the significance of aligning with Calvinism, as it affirms the centrality of God's will in the salvific narrative, offering a robust theological foundation for understanding Justification.