What Is Divine Election?

Defining divine election is no simple task. Ask someone the meaning of it, and you are sure to hear something like, "It's the belief that God eternally predestines certain people to heaven or hell," or, "God chooses to save people who choose Jesus as Savior." Some people will define it with mentions of Calvinism and Arminianism, others with talk of reprobation, and perhaps others will raise concerns about the meaningfulness of evangelism. The difficulty is largely because divine election has been understood, defined, debated, and nuanced in many ways throughout church history.

While the historical development of the doctrine is fascinating in its own right, we should be ever mindful that divine election is first and foremost a biblical doctrine rooted deeply within the Old and New Testaments. Though various theological traditions hold to specific beliefs about this doctrine, election itself does not belong to them but to God. It is Scripture that teaches us that God elects and how he goes about it. As such, we will begin our study by exploring the Scriptures in an attempt to develop a biblical definition of election, then we will explore how this definition unifies Christians while leaving room for differences of opinion.

Surveying the Scriptures

The Hebrew term most commonly associated with election is *bāḥar*, a verb that simply means "to choose."[1] The primary Greek verb for election is *eklegomai*, and its basic meaning is "to choose (for oneself), to select someone/

---

1. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, n.d.), s.v. בחר. See also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, ed. M. E. J. Richardson (Leiden: Brill, 1995), s.v. בחר.

something for oneself."[2] The corresponding noun is *eklektos*, a term meaning "pertaining to being selected, chosen."[3]

Divine election, therefore, refers broadly to what God chooses or selects to do. The Scriptures are full of God making choices and selections to fulfill his perfect will. We see God electing people for various roles and positions, like Adam and Eve as the first parents in Genesis 1–2, Abraham as the father of nations from whom the Messiah would come (Gen. 12–13; 15; 17; 22), Moses as the leader of the exodus, and Jesus as the Savior of the world. We also see God sovereignly choosing tasks to be carried out by specific people, such as the duties of the Levites when they came before God's holy presence and offered sacrifices for atonement, or the disciples who were tasked with following and serving Jesus.

Furthermore, we see God sovereignly choosing the agency of salvation, meaning that God alone determines how he will save people. In the Old Testament, God entered into a covenant relationship with Abraham and his descendants, through whom all the nations would be blessed (Gen. 12:3). They were marked by the sign of circumcision (Gen. 17:11) and entered into this covenant by faith (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:16–17; Gal. 3:8–9). By God's sovereign choice, there were not many pathways toward a relationship with God, and humanity did not determine the processes by which they could become saved. Rather, in the Old Testament the Lord unilaterally determined the method, sign, and limits of salvation. The same is true in the New Testament. Jesus affirmed he is the way, truth, and life, and that no one comes to the Father except through him (John 14:6).[4] God has sovereignly chosen the gospel of Jesus to be the only means of salvation for the world, and disciples are to make it known through proclamation.

As we can see, God elects to do many things so that his will is accomplished, and most of the choices mentioned above are not problematic for Christians. What is problematic, however, is God's choice for those human beings to be saved. When we consider God's choice of saving sinners, we immediately have to consider things such as human freedom and responsibility, the fate of the unsaved, and the sovereignty of God. Reconciling these issues is no small task, for we are ultimately trying to reconcile divine sovereignty with human will. Therefore, it is no wonder why church history has been so

---

2. Walter Bauer, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature,* eds. William F. Arndt, F. Wilber Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. ἐκλέγομαι.

3. Bauer, ἐκλεκτός.

4. For more treatment on this, see Bruce Demarest, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*, Foundations of Evangelical Theology (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006), 118–35; and Daniel Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism: Is Salvation Cooperative or the Work of God Alone?* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018), 56–68.

divided on the issue. Despite such division, there are a few points of common agreement that build up to an agreeable definition for most people.

Election and Common Agreement

When referring to salvation, we define *divine election* as "God's gracious choice to save certain sinners through the person and work of Jesus Christ." This definition is almost universally accepted by evangelical Christians today because it is broad enough to include a variety of perspectives while conforming to the clear teaching of Scripture.

Jesus mentioned election both directly and indirectly. In Matthew 24:22–31 and parallels, we read how Christ will ransom the elect in the last days from false messiahs and terrible persecutions. He also spoke in John 10:14–28 of the elect as his sheep for whom he died, and that as God's elect they have eternal life and no one can snatch them out of his hand. Additionally, in John 13:18 Jesus referenced those disciples whom he had chosen while also knowing that Judas would betray him.

Paul spoke often about election to salvation. In Ephesians 1:4–5 he told the church in Ephesus that they were chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, to be holy and blameless before him. In Romans 9:11–13 the apostle talked about God's purpose of election continuing through Jacob. The church of Thessalonica was called the beloved and chosen of God in 1 Thessalonians 1:4–5.

Other New Testament writers referred to the "elect" and "election," and those terms can be used in various ways. The elect can be a synonymous term with the church or chosen people of God (Titus 1:1; 1 Peter 1:1; 2 John 1, 13). Jesus Christ himself, moreover, was called the elect (or chosen) in Luke 23:35 and 1 Peter 2:4, 6. As such, election can refer to many things. However, as it pertains to the doctrine of salvation, election primarily refers to God's choice to save certain sinners through his Son, which is the sense on which we will focus our study.

Unity Amongst Traditions

Again, most evangelicals agree that election is a biblical doctrine and refers (in the doctrine of salvation) to God choosing to save certain sinners through the person and work of Jesus Christ. The doctrine is believed and embraced by Reformed and non-Reformed traditions[5] as well as many more groups and denominations who seek to believe the whole counsel of God. It

---

5. Arminius and the Arminian tradition are Reformed in the broad sense, coming out of the Reformed (as opposed to Lutheran) movement. Additionally, see J. Matthew Pinson, *40 Questions About Arminianism* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2022), 55–61, and 63–68, where many commonalities between Arminians and Reformed are shown. Throughout this book, we will use the term "Reformed" in a way typical in modern nomenclature to refer to non-Arminian traditions that lean toward Calvinism even if they do not accept

is not a belief limited to any particular group, and we would do well to understand not only each tradition's distinctions but also how they agree.

Take, for example, the Calvinist and Arminian traditions. They are unified in their agreement that God elected people groups (namely Israel and Christians) to be his treasured possession. Together, they agree that God sovereignly elects people for tasks and positions (such as Old Testament prophets or modern-day pastors). These traditions are also agreed that God elects and determines the pathway and limitations of salvation. These agreements should be acknowledged while myths and mischaracterizations are dismissed. For example, Roger Olson rightly calls it a myth that Arminians do not believe in election and predestination.[6] Arminian scholar William Klein readily affirms that God chooses people individually and corporately to carry out God's will.[7] Recognizing that election is much broader than election to eternal glory, Arminian scholar Jack Cottrell also affirms that God, in his sovereignty, elects persons to fulfill appointed tasks, including the election of Jesus, the election of Israel, the election of the church, and the election of persons to salvation.[8]

Similarly, Reformed theologians and traditions readily embrace the aforementioned categories of election. Bruce Demarest affirms God's election to service, of people, and to salvation in Christ.[9] Louis Berkhof begins his discourse on election with notice that election has multiple senses (including election of people, election for service, and election to salvation).[10] James Oliver Buswell urged his readers to carefully note the usages of *election*, which include election to function, eternal life, and personal holiness.[11] Of these types of election, there is great consensus.

Another fascinating area of agreement between many Reformed and Wesleyan-Arminian parties is the treatment of election within the eternal decrees of God. Jacobus Arminius's treatment on divine election falls within his section on predestination, a belief he calls the "precise and absolute decree of God . . . by which God decreed to save and damn certain particular persons."[12]

---

all tenets of that perspective. We do not mean to suggest that Arminians (or at least some Arminians) are not Reformed in a broader sense. See the introduction of this book.

6. Roger Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), 179–99.

7. William W. Klein, *The New Chosen People: A Corporate View of Election* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001), 26–35.

8. Jack W. Cottrell, "Conditional Election," in *Grace Unlimited*, ed. Clark H. Pinnock (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1975), 70–73.

9. Demarest, *The Cross and Salvation*, 118–35.

10. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1941), 114.

11. James Oliver Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 2:148–52.

12. *The Works of James Arminius*, trans. James Nichols and W. R. Bagnall, 3 vols. (Spring Valley, CA: Lamp Post, 2009), 1:185. See also Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism*, 63–65.

John Wesley, following Arminius's thought, also held to divine election in salvation as an eternal decree of God.[13] This claim is not unlike the belief John Calvin, who also viewed divine election as an eternal divine decree.[14] Granted, these traditions understand and apply election in the divine decrees differently, but we can appreciate that both of these traditions find election to be a divine decree.

Election and Differing Perspectives

Despite much common agreement, this doctrine has led to lasting debate and division. Michael Bird aptly answers why:

> In general, all theologians agree that God "elects" people to salvation. . . . The point of contention is the *basis* for this election. Does it lie in God's foreknowledge of persons who would freely choose for themselves to believe in him, or does it pertain to God's free and inscrutable decision to save some but not others? That is the debate.[15]

Although Christians agree that persons are elect, they disagree on the basis for such election (as because of faith or because of the unilateral decision of God). To be elected to service is not in doubt, but rather the extent of election to service (whether Christ's service was for all or only some people). Most Christian traditions fully affirm divine election of saving agency (as in Christ by faith); however, they disagree whether divine electing activity of specific persons is foreordained from eternity past by immutable decree.

What is more, Christians throughout church history have considered where their positions on divine election logically lead. Are certain sinners enduring eternal torment in hell because of their sin and disbelief, or because God did not elect them? If God loves everyone, why would he limit his saving activity to just a few people of his choosing? Are some people elect and others not because of something God finds inside each person? These are just some of the questions people raise when exploring divine election, and this book intends to explore them from biblical, historical, and ethical perspectives.

Summary

Divine election in salvation is a difficult and contentious doctrine because there is so much difference of thought. Is election based upon what God

---

13. John Wesley, *Calvinism Calmly Considered: Sovereignty, Predestination and Free Grace* (Salem, OH: Schmul, 2001), 23.
14. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 3:21.
15. Michael F. Bird, *Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2020), 565 (italics original).

foresees (his knowledge) or what he desires (his will)? Are people elect because of what they do or simply because of what God does? Are people in hell because of their sin and disbelief or because God did not want them? These differences are significant and will occupy much of our attention in this book. However, these differences need not suggest a lack of common agreement. On the contrary, most Christians agree that God has elected some people for salvation and service as well as electing a pathway for people to be saved. Returning, then, to the initial query of "What is divine election?," we may broadly state that it is God's sovereign choice. When speaking to the specific matter of election unto salvation (the focus of this book), we mean God's gracious choice to save certain sinners in Jesus Christ, and of that definition Christians share much common agreement.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

1. What types of electing activity does God do?

2. What was the basis for God's choices (in its many forms) in the Old and New Testaments, in your view?

3. What areas of common agreement do you see among the vast Christian viewpoints?

4. How significant is it that Reformed and Arminian traditions understand divine election within the eternal decrees of God?

5. How is defining divine election in salvation, as done here, both helpful and limited?

How Did the Early Church Understand Election?

In the previous question, we provided this basic definition of divine election: God's gracious choice to save certain sinners through the person and work of Jesus Christ. However, who is God, who is Jesus Christ, and what is the nature of their personhood and saving work? These questions became of central importance to the period known as the *early church*, which ranges from the late second century (beginning with the letter of First Clement in ca. A.D. 96) to September 3, 590 (the day Gregory the Great was consecrated as St. Peter's successor of the Catholic Church). Encompassing numerous councils, theologians, and heresies, the early church period helped form essential foundations that framed the doctrinal development of divine election.

The God Who Elects

Early on, with no official creeds or councils in place, the church relied upon the apostles to guide them through emerging heresies. Upon the apostles' natural and unnatural deaths, however, the church had to find ways of addressing new heresies that challenged the apostolic faith. The early church gathered in councils to create creeds and confessions that would define their beliefs on God and salvation.

One of the earliest heresies was *Sabellianism*, named after a third-century Roman presbyter named Sabellius.[1] This belief claims that God is one in person, three in presentations. Known today as *modalism*, this view argues that God manifested himself sometimes as Father, sometimes as Son, and sometimes as Spirit (a divine monad in three separate expressions), with the Son and Spirit being inferior and subordinate to the Father.

---

1. Much of what we know of Sabellius comes from his critics. It is difficult to be certain that everything attributed to Sabellius is true of him.

Another heresy arose in the third century through an Alexandrian presbyter named Arius. Appealing to the Father's immutability and distinctness, Arius taught that the Son is a created being who was not ontologically equal to or sharing the same substance with the Father. The same argument was later applied to the Holy Spirit. Only the Father is divine in this view, and though the Son and Spirit have similar (*homoiousios*) natures as the Father, they do not have the same (*homoousios*) nature.[2]

Other heresies developed during and after this time. *Subordinationism* is the belief that the Son and Spirit are divine but not equal in divinity. *Tritheism* affirms the divinity of the three persons at the expense of their unity of essence, while *partialism* believes that each person makes up a third of the Godhead (and thus not each truly, fully divine). Furthermore, the relationship between the two natures (human and divine) of Christ became a matter of importance. Some heretics claimed Jesus had only one nature (*Eutychians*), others that he did not have a human mind or spirit (*Apollinarians*), and others that the two natures were separate (*Nestorians*).

During the fourth century, the Cappadocian Fathers (Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Basil of Caesarea) distinguished between *ousia* and *hypostasis*. Building upon the theology of the Cappadocians, the First Councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381) both affirmed that the Son is *homoousios* (of the same divine substance) as the Father yet distinct in *hypostasis* (person). Still, there is only one God. Their view was predicated upon Athanasius in the third century, who wrote strongly against the Arians; yet, as Nicaea was not universally accepted, Athanasius continued to write against heretics in the East who denied Christ's divinity until Arianism was dealt a fatal blow at Constantinople.

Ambrose of Milan (339–397) championed Nicene orthodoxy both in the West and East, leading to a catholic (i.e., "universal") understanding of the divinity of Christ. Moreover, the Council of Chalcedon (451) settled the controversies on the person of Christ. Its conclusion was that Christ was *truly* man (contra Apollinaris) who was indivisible and inseparable in one person (contra Nestorius), yet having two natures that are neither confused nor changed yet remain distinct (contra Eutyches).

By defining their beliefs about the Trinity and personhood of Christ, the church had a basis to frame divine election and salvation. Consider the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381. Built upon a robust Trinitarian theology, they included this phrase: "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven." The same phrase, "for us and for our salvation," is found in the 451 Creed of Chalcedon. The Athanasian Creed articulates a full Trinitarian theology that refutes the claims of the heresies above, but the early

---

2.   For an excellent overview, see Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 95–116.

church took such pains to define the nature of the Godhead because, "He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity."[3] A proper theology of the Godhead and Christ meant that they could then develop a theology of salvation and, specifically, election. That is to say, the church fathers before Augustine did not articulate a mature, clear doctrine of election.[4] Although the reasons for such an absence are debated, it is clear that the historic councils that upheld high Trinitarian and Christological theology, matched with Augustine's doctrine of original sin (discussed below), provided the necessary framework for the doctrine to be developed.

Human Nature

The early church needed to articulate not only their beliefs about the God of salvation but also of the people who needed salvation. Two of the earliest heresies the church faced were *Gnosticism* and *Stoicism*. Amongst other things, these schools of thought affirmed pagan notions of fatalism, where human destiny was controlled and determined by impersonal forces. Wishing to disassociate themselves from these heresies, early Christians like Justin Martyr (ca. 100–165) and Origen (ca. 185–254) adamantly rejected eternal predestination to salvation in favor of a human-divine synergism. Foreknowledge, in their view, precedes foreordination so that humanity can be free. Origen claimed that God foreknows (and subsequently elects) people whose inclinations are toward piety.[5] Justin, on the other hand, believed God elects people he foresees will freely respond to the gospel.[6] Both views hold to a type of synergism in which God conditionally elects based upon the actions of a person. Underlying these affirmations is the belief that humanity had to be free from external control or fate. However, was humanity free from internal control that determined their eternal trajectory?

During this time, the works of a British monk named Pelagius (354–420) came to prominence. Taking a step further than his contemporaries, Pelagius believed not only that election was based upon God's foreknowledge of the worthy, but that human beings were unaffected by original sin. This belief came to be known as *Pelagianism*, a view where humans do not inherit a depraved nature. Rather, they have the capacity to obey God's law without

---

3. Philip Schaff, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom*, 6th ed., 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 2:68.
4. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 3:852.
5. See *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, and Selected Works*, trans. Rowan A. Greer (New York: Paulist, 1979), 91–92.
6. See Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 43, and *Second Apology*, 7, in *Ancient Christian Writers*, trans. Leslie William Barnard (New York: Paulist, 1997), 52–53, 78–79. It is significant to note that Justin did not believe in original sin and corruption, thinking that someone had the power to choose good or evil.

preceding and intervening grace.[7] Human nature is thus uncorrupted, guilt-less, and capable of utmost piety. The Massilians adapted this view. Known eventually as *Semi-Pelagians*, they claimed that salvation begins with a person's free and unencumbered assertion of faith (unaffected by original sin), though final salvation and growth require divine grace. Election, then, was more of a person choosing God than God choosing a person.

The greatest theologian of the early church, the father of Western Christianity, Augustine of Hippo (354–430) argued against Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. While his premature views aligned with synergists like Justin who claimed God elects people who will freely believe in Christ for salvation, Augustine would later (ca. 397) conclude that corrupted human natures prevented people from freely believing in Christ unto salvation.[8] All people sinned in Adam, claimed Augustine, meaning all people are guilty and corrupt before God. In such a condition, humanity freely, willingly, and yet inevitably does nothing but sin. Free will remains intact (as does responsibility), but that free will can only do what it *can* do, not what it *should* do (which is to believe the gospel).

Thus, if humans are ever to be saved, it must be owed to operating (monergistic) grace from God rather than cooperating (synergistic) grace. This grace must precede any goodness from a person (thus making it undeserved, unconditioned favor). For some twenty years, Augustine fiercely fought the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians until the Council of Carthage (418) condemned Pelagianism as heresy. The Council of Orange later condemned Semi-Pelagianism in 529. Interestingly, though Augustine's view on original sin and human nature became the official position of the church, his views on election were not universally accepted.

Election During and After Augustine

Augustine's doctrine of election is well articulated in his *Anti-Pelagian Writings* as well as in his *Enchiridion*. Election to salvation was predestined from all eternity and determined according to God's good pleasure. Relatedly,

---

7. *The Letters of Pelagius*, ed. Robert Van de Weyer (Worcestershire, U.K.: Arthur James, 1995), 5.

8. This change may largely be attributed to the influence of Ambrose, who articulated inherited corruption in humanity through Adam's fall before Augustine did. Important in Augustine's thought is that eternal life comes by being born again through baptismal regeneration (see Question 32); Augustine, "On Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism," in *Anti-Pelagian Writings*, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. Philip Schaff 14 vols. (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 2012), 1.23, 23–24. This baptismal regeneration itself is grace. It does not mean, though, that God's operative grace renders the human will superfluous. Augustine rejected the notion that people are saved without use of their reason or will. Still, this expression of the will was not of someone's own doing, and why God enables one person over another to believe is beyond humankind's ability to know. See "On Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism," 2.6, 46.

the non-elect (who cannot change their status) are reprobate of God and punished according to their sins.[9] Having built the case of humanity's fallenness, Augustine argued that election is of grace, not merit, and if it is of God, then he will see the elect's salvation through into eternity.[10] The non-elect, however, were predestined to be punished for their sins. As for what Augustine viewed as the purposes of election, his view was twofold. On the one hand, the purpose of election is holiness. God chose the elect not because they were holy but in order to make them holy (Eph. 1:4).[11] On the other hand, the purpose of election is to replace the number of fallen angels. That is to say, Augustine believed the number of the elect was fixed and corresponded exactly to the number that God lost in the rebellion of the angels.[12]

Influenced by Augustine's work against Pelagianism, the Council of Orange made six propositions. First, humans inherit sin and death because of Adam's transgression. Second, human free will is distorted and weak, making us unable to believe in God or love him without preceding divine grace. Third, Old Testament saints owed their merits to grace and not to natural goodness. Fourth, baptism enables all Christians to do their duties for salvation provided they make the proper effort. Fifth, predestination to evil was emphatically rejected. Finally, any good action is predicated upon God's grace (including seeking baptism and all other spiritual duties).[13] While these decrees from this council do not directly correlate with election, they correlate indirectly and had significant implications on the development of the doctrine (even if both Carthage and Orange were seemingly forgotten by the time of the Scholastic period). If God is to elect people to salvation, it cannot be owed to innate goodness. Additionally, it cannot be owed to human effort. God must take all initiative in the salvation process, and any good outcome is owed entirely to grace. Without a high Trinitarian and christological theology, matched with a biblical theology of human sinfulness, divine election would be meaningless.

Summary

The early church period was consumed by heresies that primarily concerned the nature of God and human beings more so than election. Some heretics denied the oneness of God's nature while others denied the plurality of persons. Some heretics denied the human nature of Christ while others the divine. Great effort was made to reach conciliar agreement on the nature of God (and for good reason). Simply put, the early church knew that if God were not one in essence, three in persons, or if Christ were not truly human

9. Augustine, "On Rebuke of Grace," in *Anti-Pelagian Writings*, 39, 42, 487–89.
10. Augustine, "On Rebuke of Grace," 13–15, 476–77.
11. Augustine, "On the Predestination of the Saints," in *Anti-Pelagian Writings*, 35, 515.
12. Augustine, "Enchiridion," in *Confessions and Enchiridion*, ed. and trans. Albert C. Outler (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955), 9.28–30, 355–57.
13. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, rev. ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 1978), 371–72.

as well as truly divine, there would be no salvation. In each of the earliest decrees of major councils, the continually repeated phrase that accompanies such high theology and Christology is "for us and for our salvation." There would be no election if God were not three and one, nor Christ human and divine. For there to be elected people, there must be an electing God who is able to save.

The same thing can be said regarding human nature. Augustine emphatically emphasized the corruption of human nature for the purpose of showing God's election by grace. Rightly framing the human condition was particularly evidenced at the Council of Orange, which dispelled Pelagianism for a time. If we deny our inherited corruption, we deny God's mercy and assume we can save ourselves (which cannot be) per canons 7, 14, and 19. Thus, the early church (particularly during and after Augustine) formed and framed the election debate around the triune God, the person of Christ, and the fallenness of humanity. They showed that God is the only one able to save, and humans are the ones in need of saving. From this foundation, the church began to explore how divine election relates to the human will, a matter of great importance during medieval Christianity.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

1. What problems arise when someone denies the Trinity?

2. Why is it essential for Jesus to be truly human and divine?

3. What capacity does the human will have to obey God in its natural state?

4. How are the church's beliefs about salvation affected when the nature of the Trinity or humanity is wrongly defined?

5. How did Augustine help develop the doctrine of election?