KHARISMA: JURNAL ILMIAH TEOLOGI
Vol. 7, No. 2 (2026): 14–35 ISSN: 2722-6441 (online), 2722-6433 (print)
Diterbitkan: Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kharisma, Bandung http://jurnalsttkharisma.ac.id/index.php/Kharis/

Reinterpreting Nrimo Ing Pandum: Open Theism as a Pastoral Corrective to Divine Providence

Satya Mega Ywana
Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Kharisma Bandung
Satya.mega2025@gmail.com

Abstract
Divine providence offers hope amid suffering, yet deterministic readings may diminish prayer, human action, and moral responsibility, especially when nrimo ing pandum is understood as passive resignation. This article reinterprets nrimo ing pandum, distinguishes divine providence from theological fatalism, and evaluates open theism as a pastoral corrective. It uses qualitative literature research with a constructive-contextual theological approach, examined through conceptual analysis, internal reconstruction, critical-comparative analysis, and theological-pastoral construction. The findings show that nrimo ing pandum is not inherently fatalistic but encompasses acceptance, patience, gratitude, resilience, and concrete action, while language about divine decrees may be received fatalistically in pastoral practice. Open theism's insights on divine relationality, participatory prayer, and meaningful human action can be selectively appropriated. The article proposes an active-participatory acceptance model that connects surrender to God with discernment, prayer, concrete action, victim protection, and the church's social responsibility.

Keywords: nrimo ing pandum; open theism; divine providence; theological fatalism; moral agency; pastoral theology

Introduction

The doctrine of divine providence affirms that life and the world remain under God's preservation, governance, and involvement. In the Heidelberg Catechism, providence encompasses God's preservation, governance, and cooperation with his creation, so that it cannot be equated with a blind fate that nullifies human action.[1] Yet a pastoral problem arises when providence is communicated reductively as a closed decree over every event. Such a reading can lead congregations to accept suffering, poverty, illness, or injustice without any effort to remedy them, because human action is regarded as making no real difference. In this form, belief in God's sovereignty shifts into theological fatalism that weakens prayer, moral agency, and social responsibility.[2]

[1]Chandra Wahyuni Irawati, Johanes Lilik Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH: Eksposisi Dari Katekismus Heidelberg P/J 27," Didache Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani vol. 4, no. 2 (2023), https://doi.org/10.55076/didache.v4i2.59.

[2]Thio Christian Sulistio, and Esther Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19," *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021), https://doi.org/10.30648/dun.v6i1.489.

This pastoral risk may become more complex when a deterministic reading of providence interacts with a particular understanding of the Javanese philosophy of *nrimo ing pandum*.[3] [4] A number of studies show that this philosophy does not merely signify resignation to fate, but encompasses patience, gratitude, acceptance, psychological resilience, diligence in work, and the ability to manage life wisely.[5] [6] Rakhmawati (2022)[7] affirms that *nrimo* is placed after people have exerted their strength and effort, while Mahanani and Herdiyanto (2026)[8] show that *nrimo ing pandum* can support resilience and meaning-making, but also risks becoming maladaptive when understood as a resignation that closes off room for action. Thus, *nrimo ing pandum* does not in itself eliminate effort and responsibility. Passivity is better understood as an interpretive possibility that can arise when the elements of effort and *makaryo ing nyoto* are separated from acceptance, rather than as an inherent trait of the philosophy.[9] [10]

Therefore, neither *nrimo ing pandum* nor divine providence is properly positioned as an inherent cause of passivity. The problem lies rather in interpretive distortions that separate acceptance from concrete action and God's sovereignty from human responsibility. From within the Reformed tradition itself, providence is not understood as the abolition of human agency. Calvin places predestination primarily within the framework of grace and salvation, not as a theory that human action has no meaning.[11] The Reformed doctrine of providence also retains the role of secondary causes, so that God can exercise his governance through the actions of creatures without abolishing the character and moral accountability of those who act.[12] Within

[3]Safira Mahanani, and Yohanes Kartika Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?," *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat* (2026), https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu1326.

[4]Thio Christian Sulistio, and Esther Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19," *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021), https://doi.org/10.30648/dun.v6i1.489.

[5]Noor MA Hanafi Prasetyo Subandi, "NARIMO ING PANDUM" INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT.

[6]Primadita Yemimaistyasih et al., "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens," *Psychopreneur Journal* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021).

[7]Silvia Maudy Rakhmawati, "Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa," vol. 3, no. 1 (2022).

[8]Safira Mahanani, and Yohanes Kartika Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?," *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat* (2026), https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu1326.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Rakhmawati, "Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa."

[11]John Calvin, and Kalvin S Budiman, Memahami Ulang Konteks Berteologi John Calvin Dalam Doktrin Predestinasi.

[12]Chandra Wahyuni Irawati, Johanes Lilik Susanto, and Tarisih Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH," *Didache Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 4, no. 2 (2023), https://doi.org/10.55076/didache.v4i2.59.

Calvin's compatibilism, human beings are still regarded as acting according to their own will and motives and as responsible for their actions, even though all of life remains under God's governance.[13] Accordingly, the critique of this article is directed not at Calvinism or the classical doctrine of providence as a theological system, but at a reductive pastoral reading that emphasizes only divine decrees and neglects prayer, the use of means, and human responsibility.

One approach that can be used to correct this reading is *open theism*. This view emphasizes God's love and relationality, human freedom, the participatory meaning of prayer, and the real consequences of human decisions in history.[14] This emphasis has pastoral value because it helps the church avoid the assumption that every tragedy is God's specific will and that human action has no significance. However, *open theism* also faces problems concerning divine omniscience, the openness of the future, divine immutability, prophecy, and the certainty that divine purposes will be fulfilled.[15] Critiques of process theology also remind us that affirming God's relationality must not produce a concept of God too limited to guarantee the final victory over evil.[16]

On this basis, this article does not position *open theism* as the only alternative to determinism or as a comprehensive replacement for classical theism. Arminianism, C. S. Lewis's theodicy, and the *already and not yet* eschatological perspective also provide room for freedom, responsibility, perseverance, and human participation without having to accept all the metaphysical propositions of *open theism*.[17] [18] [19] Recent developments in classical theism even show that God's relationality and receptivity can be maintained without abandoning the central commitments of classical theism. Kintz (2024)[20] argues that God can be involved in

[13]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[14]Michael Teng, "Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 13, no. 1 (2012).

[15]Ibid.

[16]Jessica Novia Layantara, "Kritik Terhadap Teologi Proses Dan Pembelaan Terhadap Pandangan 'Greater Good' Dalam Menanggapi Masalah Kejahatan," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 16, no. 2 (2017).

[17]Esther Gunawan, "Meneropong Makna Penderitaan Manusia Menurut Konsep Teodise C. S. Lewis," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* vol. 16, no. 1 (2017), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v16i1.8.

[18]Marlon Lahope, "Arminius, Arminian, Dan Kaum Injili: Sebuah Klarifikasi," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 18, no. 1 (2019), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v18i1.319.

[19]Alexander Darmawan Limasaputra, "Memandang Penderitaan Melalui Perspektif The Already and The Not Yet dari Rasul Paulus," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* vol. 17, no. 1 (2018), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v17i1.305.

[20]James Kintz, "Classical Theism, Interpersonal Relations, and the Receptivity of God," *Religions* vol. 15, no. 10 (2024), https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101253.

interpersonal relationships with human beings and possesses a receptivity that need not be understood as deficiency or ontological dependence. Thus, the relational dimension is not monopolized by *open theism*. This article therefore uses the relational and participatory insights of *open theism* selectively as a pastoral corrective to the way providence is communicated and received.

This correction is important because the reading of providence has consequences for the church's presence amid suffering. Jesus' ministry in Luke 4:18–19 shows that the church's mission includes concern for the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized, so that ministry cannot be limited to spiritual comfort without social action.[21] Studies of the suffering of Christians in Aceh Singkil and of incarnational theology likewise affirm that God's presence needs to be embodied through solidarity, accompaniment, and involvement amid vulnerability, and not merely through doctrinal explanations of why suffering occurs.[22]

Previous research has discussed *nrimo ing pandum*, providence, fatalism, human freedom, *open theism*, suffering, and the church's social responsibility, but these themes have generally been developed along separate lines of inquiry. Studies in cultural psychology explain *nrimo ing pandum* as acceptance and resilience, but have not yet placed it specifically in dialogue with providence. Studies in systematic theology discuss divine sovereignty, human freedom, and *open theism*, but have not situated them in interaction with Javanese philosophy. Meanwhile, pastoral studies emphasize the church's solidarity and social responsibility, but have not specifically explained how the encounter between cultural meaning-making and doctrinal readings can shape congregational passivity.[23]

In the body of research reviewed, no study was found that integratively brings together the interpretation of *nrimo ing pandum*, deterministic readings of divine providence, and the critical use of *open theism* insights as a pastoral corrective. The novelty of this article lies in its construction of active-participatory acceptance, that is, a spirituality that acknowledges limitations and entrusts outcomes to God without negating prayer, discernment, concrete action, protection of victims, and social responsibility. This construction interprets *nrimo ing pandum* together with the principle of *makaryo ing nyoto*, distinguishes providence from fatalism, and

[21]Herry Susanto, "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 19, no. 1 (2020), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v19i1.356.

[22]Hanna Dewi Aritonang, "THE PRESENCE OF GOD IN THE MIDST OF ACEH SINGKIL SUFFERING," *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual Dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021), https://doi.org/10.21460/gema; Simon Rachmadi, "THE DIVINE REVELATION WITHIN THE VULNERABILITY OF THE WORLD A Theological Message about the Incarnation of God in the Johannine Tradition," vol. 7, no. 1 (2022), https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

[23]Noor Hanafi Prasetyo, and M.A. Subandi, "'NARIMO ING PANDUM' INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT," *Jurnal Intervensi Psikologi* vol. 6, no. 2 (2014); Susanto, "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja"; Teng, "Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed."

draws on the relational emphasis of *open theism* without uncritically accepting its entire system.[24]

Based on this gap, the article addresses three questions: how *nrimo ing pandum* can be distinguished between active acceptance and fatalistic resignation; how divine providence can be distinguished from deterministic readings that diminish the significance of human action; and to what extent the insights of *open theism* can be used as a pastoral corrective. The article argues that pastoral passivity does not originate inherently from Javanese culture or the doctrine of providence, but from interpretive distortions that reduce acceptance to resignation and providence to determinism. The relational and participatory insights of *open theism* can therefore be used critically to build an acceptance that continues to affirm prayer, moral agency, and the congregation's social engagement.[25]

Practically, this article aims to formulate a conceptual model of active-participatory acceptance that can help the church distinguish healthy acceptance from fatalistic resignation and communicate providence without weakening prayer and moral agency.[26] [27] This model is intended to serve as an initial framework for preaching, teaching, and pastoral care when the church confronts suffering, injustice, and the limitations of life, in line with the church's calling to embody social concern and solidarity with those who suffer.[28] [29]

To develop this argument, the study uses a qualitative library research method with a constructive-contextual theological approach. Literature on *nrimo ing pandum*, providence, human freedom, fatalism, *open theism*, suffering, and pastoral ministry is analyzed conceptually

[24]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH:Eksposisi Dari Katekismus Heidelberg P/J 27"; Teng, "Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed"; Yemimaistyasih and Prasetya, "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens."

[25]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19"; Teng, "Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed."

[26]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?"

[27]Clark H Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?'.

[28]Hanna Dewi Aritonang, "The Presence Of God In The Midst Of Aceh Singkil Suffering," *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021), https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

[29]Herry Susanto, "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja," *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 19, no. 1 (2020), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v19i1.356.

and comparatively to produce a theological construction that is critical of both culture and doctrinal tradition without alienating either.[30]

Method

This study uses a qualitative library research method with a constructive-contextual theological approach. This approach was chosen because the study does not merely describe or compare theological views, but also builds a pastoral formulation through critical dialogue between the Christian theological tradition and the Javanese philosophy of *nrimo ing pandum*. Local culture is treated as a source of meaning that must be understood in its own context, then evaluated and placed in dialogue with Christian theological sources (Panuntun, 2025).

The literature was gathered through searches on official journal websites, academic repositories, and bibliographic tracing of relevant sources. The keywords used included "*nrimo ing pandum*," "*narimo ing pandum*," "divine providence," "divine providence," "theological fatalism," "theological fatalism," "*open theism*," "human freedom," and "pastoral theology." The research corpus consists of 22 journal articles published between 1997 and 2026. This range was chosen to include early articles representing the *open theism* debate as well as recent research on *nrimo ing pandum*, providence, and classical theism.

Literature was included if it met four criteria: it directly addressed one of the study's main concepts; it was published in an academic journal; it had verifiable bibliographic identity; and it provided argumentation relevant to the theological, contextual, or pastoral problem under study. Sources were excluded if they were duplicates, non-academic publications, lacked traceable metadata, or addressed the study's themes only indirectly. Selection was purposive, based on argumentative relevance, and not intended to produce a systematic review or a quantitative mapping of all available publications.

The literature was then grouped into three clusters of inquiry. The first cluster covers research on *nrimo ing pandum*, acceptance, work ethic, resilience, and the risk of fatalistic resignation.[31] [32] [33] [34] The second cluster covers providence, predestination, free will, and

[30]Daniel Fajar Panuntun, "Teologi Kematian Berdasarkan Perspektif Antropologi-Metafisika Bagi Tradisi Ritual Kematian Toraja Dan Jawa," *Societas Dei: Jurnal Agama Dan Masyarakat* vol. 12, no. 2 (2025), https://doi.org/10.33550/sd.v12i2.532.

[31]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?"

[32]Hanafi Prasetyo Subandi, "NARIMO ING PANDUM" INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT.

[33]Rakhmawati, "Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa."

[34]Yemimaistyasih et al., "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens."

fatalism in the classical and Reformed theological traditions.[35] [36] [37] The third cluster covers sources that support and critique *open theism*. Pinnock (2003)[38] , Sanders (1997)[39] , and Mullins and Sani (2021)[40] are used to reconstruct the position of *open theism*, while Teng (2012)[41] and Kintz (2024)[42] are used to present critiques and alternatives from Reformed theology and classical theism.

The analysis was carried out in four stages. First, conceptual analysis was used to distinguish *nrimo ing pandum* from fatalism and providence from predestination and determinism. Second, internal reconstruction was conducted by identifying the definitions, premises, aims, and conclusions of each view according to its own argumentative structure before comparing it with other views. This stage was used to prevent the formation of unfair representations or *strawman* versions of both classical theology and *open theism*.

Third, critical-comparative analysis was conducted on the basis of three parameters: theological coherence, contextual adequacy, and pastoral implications. Theological coherence was assessed by the consistency of concept use, the logical relation between premises and conclusions, and a view's ability to explain the relationship among providence, human freedom, prayer, and evil without abolishing moral accountability. Contextual adequacy was assessed by its fit with research findings on the meaning and practice of *nrimo ing pandum*. Pastoral implications were assessed by a view's ability to sustain prayer, moral agency, victim protection, the use of means, and social responsibility. An argument was judged more adequate if it could satisfy all three parameters without producing internal contradiction or generalizations that go beyond the sources.

Fourth, theological-pastoral construction was carried out by bringing together the elements of acceptance, resilience, and concrete action in *nrimo ing pandum* with the doctrine of divine preservation and the relational and participatory insights of *open theism*. This dialogue was used to formulate a conceptual model of active-participatory acceptance. The model was

[35]Calvin and Budiman, Memahami Ulang Konteks Berteologi John Calvin Dalam Doktrin Predestinasi.

[36]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

[37]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[38]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?'.

[39]John Sanders, "Why Simple Foreknowledge Offers No More Providential Control than the Openness of God," *Faith and Philosophy* vol. 14, no. 1 (1997), https://doi.org/10.5840/faithphil199714120.

[40]R. T. Mullins, and Emanuela Sani, "OPEN THEISM AND RISK MANAGEMENT: A PHILOSOPHICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE," *Zygon* vol. 56, no. 3 (2021), https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12723.

[41]"Michael Teng-Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed," (n.d.).

[42]Kintz, "Classical Theism, Interpersonal Relations, and the Receptivity of God."

not formed through an eclectic combination of all views, but through critical selection of the elements that sustain providential hope as well as human responsibility.

The validity of the argumentation was safeguarded through theoretical triangulation and claim–source verification. Each position was read through both its supporting and its critical sources so that the analysis would not become one-sided advocacy. Each citation was also checked for its fit with the specific claim it supports. This study is limited to a conceptual inquiry and is not intended to represent all of Javanese society or all churches in Indonesia. Because it uses no interviews, surveys, or field observations, the pastoral implications formulated are conceptual possibilities that still require empirical testing.

Findings and Discussion

Nrimo Ing Pandum: Active Acceptance, Not Fatalism

The results of the analysis show that psychological, cultural, and theological studies converge on an important point: acceptance is not identical with the cessation of action. In psychological studies, *nrimo ing pandum* helps individuals reduce emotional denial of reality, maintain psychological well-being, and build resilience when facing circumstances that cannot be fully controlled.[43] [44] However, such acceptance remains accompanied by adaptive action, such as resource management, diligence in work, and effort to fulfill life's responsibilities.[45] Thus, the psychological function of *nrimo* is not to eliminate problems, but to free individuals from prolonged denial so that they can respond to circumstances more realistically.

This conclusion is consistent with cultural studies on the relationship between acceptance and work ethic. Rakhmawati (2022)[46] places *nrimo* after people have exerted their strength and effort, so that acceptance is directed at outcomes that are not entirely within human control, not at the abolition of the process of effort. This relationship is also evident in the expression *nrimo ing pandum, makaryo ing nyoto*, which pairs acceptance with concrete action. Conceptually, the two address two different domains: *makaryo* relates to human responsibility for action, whereas *nrimo* relates to human attitude toward the limits of outcomes.

These psychological and cultural findings find a parallel in the theology of providence. The acknowledgment that life is under God's preservation does not require the abolition of human action, because providence continues to involve secondary causes, the use of means,

[43]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?"

[44]Hanafi Prasetyo Subandi, "NARIMO ING PANDUM" INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT.

[45]Yemimaistyasih et al., "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens."

[46]Rakhmawati, "Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa."

choices, and human moral accountability.[47] [48] Thus, both psychological and theological studies reject the same two extremes. Psychology rejects acceptance that turns into helplessness, while theology rejects trust in providence that turns into fatalism. Both converge on the principle that human beings need to accept the limits of their control without surrendering their responsibility.

This synthesis explains why *nrimo ing pandum* is not inherently identical with fatalistic resignation. Acceptance becomes constructive when it helps a person distinguish circumstances that can be changed, circumstances that can be managed, and outcomes that must be accepted. Conversely, acceptance risks becoming maladaptive when all circumstances are regarded as beyond influence and human effort is regarded as meaningless.[49] Therefore, the difference between active acceptance and fatalism lies not primarily in the existence of limitations, but in whether those limitations still leave room for discernment, action, and accountability.

The theological interpretation of *nrimo ing pandum* therefore needs to be carried out dialogically and critically. Christian theology can affirm patience, gratitude, resilience, and awareness of limitations, while correcting understandings that separate acceptance from concrete action and moral responsibility. This approach neither rejects Javanese culture nor accepts it without evaluation, but transforms it toward an active acceptance that continues to leave room for action and solidarity.[50]

Divine Providence and the Risk of Deterministic Readings

Providence affirms that God continues to preserve, govern, and work in the life of creation. The Heidelberg Catechism explains this work through *preservation*, *government*, and *cooperation*, so that God's governance is not understood as the abolition of natural processes, human action, or secondary causes.[51] On this understanding, this article argues that providence does not in itself nullify human agency. The problem arises not merely from the doctrine itself, but from a pastoral simplification that emphasizes only divine decrees without explaining the way God works through the decisions and responsibility of creatures.

The distinction among providence, predestination, determinism, and fatalism is therefore decisive. Providence concerns God's preservation of creation, whereas predestination relates primarily to election in salvation. Determinism explains the relationship between causes and the occurrence of events, while fatalism concludes that human action makes no difference

[47]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

[48]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[49]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?"

[50]Daniel Fajar Panuntun, "Teologi Kematian Berdasarkan Perspektif Antropologi-Metafisika Bagi Tradisi Ritual Kematian Toraja Dan Jawa," *Societas Dei: Jurnal Agama Dan Masyarakat* vol. 12, no. 2 (2025), https://doi.org/10.33550/sd.v12i2.532.

[51]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

to the final outcome. From this distinction it can be concluded that determinism does not necessarily lead logically to fatalism, but can be received fatalistically when the roles of prayer, means, choices, and accountability are not adequately communicated.[52]

The classical theological tradition itself provides internal resources for rejecting this fatalistic conclusion. Augustine continued to uphold the human will as the basis of accountability, even though the will requires grace to be directed toward the good.[53] Luther rejected the human capacity to obtain salvation through one's own effort, but this rejection was not intended to abolish all of human moral and social capacity.[54] Calvin likewise places predestination within the framework of grace and the assurance of salvation, not as a theory that all human action is meaningless.[55] Thus, all three traditions affirm human dependence on grace without having to conclude that human beings become passive agents.

The crux of the problem lies in how the relationship between sovereignty and responsibility is explained. In the Reformed tradition, the concepts of secondary causes and compatibilism are used to maintain that human beings continue to act according to their own will and motives and are responsible for their actions, even though all of life is under God's governance.[56] [57] Arminian critiques question whether this framework succeeds sufficiently in explaining freedom and responsibility without indirectly making God the ultimate cause of evil.[58] This article does not attempt to resolve this entire metaphysical debate, but notes that both sides reject two conclusions alike: that God becomes the moral agent of evil and that human beings lose their accountability.

From this dialogue, deterministic readings need to be distinguished from a fuller theology of providence. A theologian can maintain compatibilism while still teaching prayer, the use of means, and human responsibility. However, a congregation may receive only one part of the teaching, that all events have been determined, without understanding the role of secondary causes and human action. The result is not a consistent compatibilism, but a practical

[52]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[53]Brogian Ribhato, and Siprianus Soleman Senda, "Telaah Kebebasan Perspektif Agustinus Dalam Lukas 15:11-32 Dan Kaitannya Dengan <I>Homo Digitalis</I>," *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual Dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 11, no. 1 (2026), https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.2026.111.1266.

[54]Minggus Minarto Pranoto, "Kehendak Bebas di Dalam Teologi Martin Luther," vol. 7, no. 2 (2006), https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v7i2.181.

[55]Calvin and Budiman, Memahami Ulang Konteks Berteologi John Calvin Dalam Doktrin Predestinasi.

[56]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

[57]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[58]Lahope, "Arminius, Arminian, Dan Kaum Injili: Sebuah Klarifikasi."

fatalism. Therefore, the pastoral risk arises primarily in the process of translating doctrine, and not only in its metaphysical formulation.

Such a reductive reading has the potential to lead congregations to regard illness, violence, poverty, or injustice as conditions that need no response because they have become God's specific will. However, because this study uses no field data, this consequence is understood as a conceptual risk, not as an empirical finding about all churches. Theologically, trust in providence should instead encourage the use of means, prayer, moral action, and accountability, since these means can be understood as part of the way God preserves creation.[59] [60]

The risk of fatalism increases when a deterministic reading interacts with a reductive understanding of *nrimo ing pandum*. If acceptance is understood only as accepting a portion that has been determined, while providence is understood as a specific decree over every circumstance, efforts at change may be viewed as rejection of the Lord's will. Yet cultural studies place *nrimo* together with effort and *makaryo ing nyoto*, while the theology of providence retains the action of secondary causes. Both concepts therefore need not be rejected, but restored from interpretations that separate acceptance from responsibility.

Accordingly, this article argues that pastoral correction must be directed at the language and reception of doctrine. Providence needs to be communicated as God's preservation that continues to give meaning to prayer, the use of means, decisions, and human action. Criticism of determinism need not end in the rejection of classical theism, but must ensure that God's sovereignty is not taught in a way that abolishes human agency. At this point *open theism* can be considered a critical dialogue partner, particularly through its emphasis on God's relationality and the meaningfulness of human response.

Open Theism as a Pastoral Corrective: Contributions and Theological Limits

Open theism offers a direct critique of readings of providence that portray history as a closed script and human beings as passive executors. This view affirms that God relates genuinely to creation, while prayer, repentance, obedience, and human action have consequences in the unfolding of history.[61] [62] The main contribution of open theism is therefore not merely to defend human freedom, but to restore the meaningfulness of human response in relationship with God.

---

[59]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

[60]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

[61]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?'.

[62]Sanders, "Why Simple Foreknowledge Offers No More Providential Control than the Openness of God."

Within the framework of open theism, human freedom is understood in a libertarian sense: human beings have a genuine possibility of choosing among more than one action. A future that depends on free decisions is therefore understood as a range of possibilities, not as a fact that is entirely closed. God knows all possibilities perfectly, responds to developments in history, and directs creation without unilaterally determining every human decision.[63] [64]

This article accepts three pastoral contributions from this view. First, the relationship between God and human beings must be understood as a truly meaningful relationship, not merely the appearance of a decree already completed. Second, prayer and human action have real consequences, so the congregation must not make providence an excuse for passivity. Third, suffering must not automatically be called God's specific will, since some suffering arises from human evil, negligence, the fragility of creation, or unjust social structures.[65]

These three contributions are important for pastoral ministry. The conviction that God can bring good out of suffering must be distinguished from the claim that God specifically designs every instance of suffering. This distinction protects the church from theological language that may sanctify violence, obscure the responsibility of perpetrators, or add to the burden of victims. Therefore, pastoral care needs to give priority to presence, listening, lament, protection, and solidarity before offering explanations of God's purposes behind suffering.[66] [67]

Contemporary developments of open theism also seek to answer questions about God's ability to direct history. Mullins and Sani (2021)[68] explain that God's perfect knowledge of all possibilities, wisdom, and responsive capacity enable him to manage risk in a world that involves the freedom of creatures. Thus, the openness of the future is understood not as God's powerlessness, but as a form of governance that makes room for the participation of creatures.

Nevertheless, the openness of the future is not the only theological basis for relationship, prayer, and human responsibility. Reformed critiques show that prayer can remain meaningful as a means of God's providence, while Arminianism maintains libertarian freedom without

[63]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?'.

[64]Sanders, "Why Simple Foreknowledge Offers No More Providential Control than the Openness of God."

[65]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?'.

[66]Aritonang, "The Presence Of God In The Midst Of Aceh Singkil Suffering."

[67]Simon Rachmadi, "Penyataan Diri Allah di Tengah Kerapuhan Dunia: Pesan Teologis tentang Inkarnasi Allah dalam Tradisi Teologis Yohanes," *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 7, no. 1 (2022), https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

[68] Mullins and Sani, "OPEN THEISM AND RISK MANAGEMENT: A PHILOSOPHICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE."

rejecting God's comprehensive knowledge of the future.[69] [70] Kintz (2024)[71] even shows that classical theism can sustain God's interpersonal relationship and receptivity without abandoning its basic commitment to divine perfection. Therefore, God's relationality is not monopolized by open theism.

This article takes a firm position: the relational and participatory insights of open theism are accepted as a pastoral corrective, but the openness of God's knowledge of the future is not made the foundation of the model constructed. Prayer, moral agency, responsibility, and solidarity can be maintained without first accepting the entire metaphysics of open theism. This position allows the article to draw on the pastoral strengths of open theism while retaining the hope that God's purposes will not fail.

Thus, the function of open theism in this article is both corrective and constructive. It corrects the language of providence that abolishes human response and helps build an understanding that trust in God's preservation must strengthen prayer, action, accountability, and care for victims. From this point, open theism contributes directly to the formation of the active-participatory acceptance model.

Biblical Foundations for Providence and Human Responsibility

The construction of active-participatory acceptance rests not only on dialogue between Javanese philosophy and theological systems, but also on a biblical pattern that brings together God's work, human response, lament, and acts of restoration. Genesis 50:15–21, Jeremiah 18:1–12, Psalm 13, and Luke 4:18–19 do not provide a single uniform metaphysical theory of providence. However, the four show that acknowledging God's work does not negate moral judgment, human response, honesty in suffering, and social responsibility.

In the context of Genesis 50:15–21, Joseph's words arise after Jacob's death, when his brothers fear that Joseph will repay them for their wrongdoing. Joseph does not deny their guilt, but names the deed as evil and refuses to place himself in the position of God. The statement "you meant evil against me, but God meant it for good" maintains two distinct moral intentions within a single sequence of events: the human intention remains evil, while God's work is directed toward the preservation of life. Therefore, providence in this text does not abolish the perpetrators' responsibility or turn evil into moral good (Wong, 2024)[72] .

[69]Lahope, "Arminius, Arminian, Dan Kaum Injili: Sebuah Klarifikasi."

[70]Michael Teng-Tinjauan Kritis terhadap Open Theism dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed.

[71]Kintz, "Classical Theism, Interpersonal Relations, and the Receptivity of God."

[72]Sonia Kwok Wong, "Acts of God and Restorative Justice in the Joseph Story," *Stellenbosch Theological Journal* vol. 10, no. 3 (2024), https://doi.org/10.17570/stj.2024.v10n3.a7.

Joseph's statement is also a retrospective interpretation of a life journey full of betrayal, slavery, injustice, and reconciliation. Wong (2024)[73] shows that Joseph's understanding of God's action develops through a process of confronting his trauma and his relationship with his brothers anew. The acknowledgment of God's work is thus not used to avoid wounds, but becomes part of a process of meaning-making and restorative justice. Pastorally, this text supports the conviction that God can bring restoration out of evil without having to claim that God is the moral agent of that evil.

Jeremiah 18:1–12 displays a different yet complementary relationship between divine sovereignty and human response. The image of the potter in verses 1–6 affirms God's freedom and power over Israel. However, verses 7–10 explain that proclamations of uprooting, tearing down, building, or planting are related to the response of the nation addressed. When a nation turns from its evil, God declares a change regarding the disaster that had been announced; conversely, a promise of good meets with new judgment when that nation does evil.

Wessels (2020)[74] shows that verses 7–10 give an active role to the nation called to "turn" and at the same time clarify the meaning of the reworking of the clay in the image of the potter. God's sovereignty in this text is not a power that renders human response irrelevant, but a governance that calls for repentance and treats that response seriously. This text can be read differently by *open theism* and classical theism, but both need to acknowledge that divine warning is not information about an unchangeable fate. The warning is a means to produce repentance and change.

This pastoral dimension is deepened by Psalm 13. This psalm does not begin its reflection on suffering with an explanation of God's plan, but with a repeated question, "How long?" The psalmist expresses the experience of abandonment, inner distress, and the threat of enemies directly to God. The structure of the psalm moves through lament, petition that God look and answer, a statement of trust, and praise. This transition does not mean that the problem has been explained or that all circumstances have changed, but shows that faith provides room for protest as well as hope.

Human (2021)[75] explains Psalm 13 as a pattern of the believer's interaction with God when God seems silent and inactive. Lament is not the opposite of faith, but a relational act that refuses to surrender to suffering. The psalmist does not merely accept the situation, but asks God to act and to bring salvation. Pastorally, this pattern corrects the use of *nrimo ing pandum* that silences the complaints of victims. Active-participatory acceptance must provide room to

[73]Ibid.

[74]Wilhelm J. Wessels, "At the Potter's Workshop. Jeremiah 18:1–12: A Narrative That Reveals More than Meets the Eye," *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies* vol. 76, no. 4 (2020), https://doi.org/10.4102/HTS.V76I4.6108.

[75]Dirk Human, "Human Suffering," *OTE* vol. 34 (2021), https://doi.org/10.17159/2312.

name the wound, question the circumstances, pray, and seek restoration before speaking about acceptance.

Luke 4:18–19 extends the relationship between God's work and human response into the social dimension. In the programmatic statement of his ministry, Jesus connects the anointing of the Spirit with the proclamation of good news to the poor, liberty for the captives and the oppressed, and the recovery of sight. The quotation brings Isaiah 61:1–2 together with Isaiah 58:6 to underscore the social character of Jesus' ministry. Salvation is not limited to inner comfort, but touches the concrete conditions of those who experience poverty, marginalization, and oppression.[76]

Therefore, trust in providence must not produce a church that merely asks those who suffer to accept their circumstances. The church is called to be a means of God's presence through proclamation, accompaniment, protection, and acts of restoration. Ministry to the poor and the oppressed is not a form of distrust in God's preservation, but participation in the mission of Christ.

These four texts yield a biblical synthesis that serves as the basis for the active-participatory acceptance model. Genesis 50:20 affirms that God's work of restoration does not erase human moral wrongdoing. Jeremiah 18:7–10 shows that God's warning and providence leave room for response and change. Psalm 13 shows that faith can lament, plead, and refuse to remain silent in the face of suffering. Luke 4:18–19 directs the response of faith toward concrete social engagement. Providence is thus not a reason for passivity, but a ground of hope that moves prayer, repentance, discernment, reconciliation, and acts of restoration.

A Conceptual Model of Active-Participatory Acceptance and Its Application in the Local Church

The dialogue among *nrimo ing pandum*, divine providence, and the relational insights of *open theism* yields a conceptual model of active-participatory acceptance. This model refers to a spirituality that accepts reality and human limitations, entrusts the final outcome to God, yet continues to uphold prayer, discernment, the use of means, moral accountability, and social solidarity. Acceptance is positioned not as the end of action, but as an attitude toward outcomes after people have carried out the responsibilities within their power.[77] [78] [79]

This model is built to avoid two extremes. The first extreme is fatalism, which uses acceptance and providence as an excuse to stop making effort. The second extreme is activism,

[76]Susanto, "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja."

[77]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, "Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?"

[78]Rakhmawati, "Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa."

[79]Yemimaistyasih et al., "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens."

which assumes that all circumstances and outcomes can be controlled by human beings. Active-participatory acceptance positions human beings as agents who are limited yet responsible: human beings do not master the final outcome, but this limitation does not abolish the obligation to pray, make decisions, use means, and strive for restoration.[80] [81]

Table 1. Conceptual Model of Active-Participatory Acceptance

Dimension	Distortion corrected	Active-participatory principle	Pastoral implication
Acceptance	Resignation without effort	Accepting limitations after taking responsible action	Helping the congregation distinguish circumstances that can be changed, managed, or accepted
Providence	All events regarded as God's specific will	God preserves creation without abolishing human action and responsibility	Encouraging the use of medical, social, legal, and community means
Prayer and lament	Prayer as merely an exercise in accepting decrees	Prayer as a space for relationship, lament, petition, and discernment	Connecting prayer with willingness to act
Moral agency	Human choices regarded as making no difference	Human action has consequences for oneself and others	Upholding the accountability of perpetrators and the protection of victims
Social solidarity	Spiritual comfort without concrete restoration	Pastoral presence embodied through accompaniment and social action	Developing diakonia, empowerment, protection, and advocacy
Hope	Fatalism or unbounded activism	Final outcomes entrusted to God, while the obligation to act is maintained	Forming perseverance that is realistic and not passive

[80]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, "PROVIDENSIA ALLAH."

[81]Sulistio and Gunawan, "Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19."

Note. This model is the author's construction based on the dialogue among studies of *nrimo ing pandum*, divine providence, *open theism*, biblical lament, and the church's social responsibility.[82] [83] [84] [85] [86] [87]

Application Flow in Pastoral Care

Application of the model begins with acknowledging the reality the congregation is experiencing. Pastoral workers need to listen to the experiences, emotions, losses, and limitations of the person being accompanied before offering theological explanations. This stage prevents advice about acceptance from being used to suppress the grief, anger, or questions of those who suffer. The pattern of lament in Psalm 13 shows that complaint and petition can be forms of faith relationship, not signs of rejection of God.[88]

The second stage is causal and moral discernment. The church needs to help the congregation distinguish circumstances arising from bodily limitation or the fragility of nature from suffering caused by negligence, violence, abuse of power, discrimination, or unjust social structures. Accepting the reality that a wound has occurred does not mean justifying the actions that caused it. Genesis 50:20 shows that God's work of restoration can be acknowledged without erasing the evil intent and accountability of the perpetrator.[89]

The third stage is participatory prayer and lament. Prayer is directed not only toward producing calm in accepting circumstances, but also toward asking for help, obtaining wisdom, and recognizing actions that can be taken. Participatory prayer maintains that human response has meaning in relationship with God. Therefore, prayer for healing can go together with medical care, prayer for victims of violence is accompanied by protection, and prayer for poor families is followed by material support and empowerment.[90] [91]

---

[82]Human, “Human Suffering.”

[83]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, “PROVIDENSIA ALLAH.”

[84]Mahanani and Herdiyanto, “Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?”

[85]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?’.

[86]Rakhmawati, “Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa.”

[87]Susanto, “Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja.”

[88]Human, “Human Suffering.”

[89]Wong, “Acts of God and Restorative Justice in the Joseph Story.”

[90]Human, “Human Suffering.”

[91]Pinnock, RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?’.

The fourth stage is the selection of actions and the use of means. The church, together with the person being accompanied, identifies available resources, such as family, community, medical personnel, counselors, legal institutions, economic assistance, or social services. The use of means does not indicate a lack of faith in providence. Within the framework of providence, means and human action can be understood as part of the way God preserves his creation.[92]

The fifth stage is surrendering outcomes and communal evaluation. After responsible action has been taken, the congregation accepts that the final outcome is not entirely within its control. Acceptance at this stage is not the cessation of effort, but a willingness to face the outcome without losing faith, dignity, and responsibility. The church continues to accompany, evaluate developments, and consider further action if circumstances change. It is here that *nrimo ing pandum* and *makaryo ing nyoto* are placed in sequence and complement one another.

Application in Preaching and Teaching

In preaching, this model calls for caution when using expressions such as “everything is God's will” or “everything is already the Lord's plan.” Preachers need to distinguish among God's preservation, human action, natural consequences, and moral evil. The conviction that God is able to work through suffering is not the same as the claim that God morally wills every act of violence, betrayal, or injustice.

Sermons on providence also need to include a call to pray, use means, make decisions, and take responsibility. The congregation is taught not only to accept circumstances, but also to ask: what action is still possible, who needs to be protected, what wrongs need to be held accountable, and what resources can be used? In this way, the teaching of providence shapes an active hope, not passive waiting.[93] [94]

Application in Cases of Violence and Conflict

In cases of domestic violence or abuse of power, active-participatory acceptance does not direct victims to remain in dangerous circumstances in the name of patience, forgiveness, or the integrity of the community. The first step is to ensure the victim's safety, listen to their testimony, and connect them with the professional or legal help needed. Acceptance is directed toward acknowledging that a wound has occurred, not toward accepting the continuation of violence.

Forgiveness is likewise not used to erase the accountability of perpetrators. Reconciliation requires acknowledgment of wrongdoing, cessation of destructive behavior,

[92]Irawati, Susanto, and Tarisih, “PROVIDENSIA ALLAH.”

[93]Ibid.

[94]Sulistio and Gunawan, “Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19.”

repentance, and efforts to repair harm. The pattern of Joseph's story shows that the restoration of relationships is not built through denial of evil, but through acknowledgment, transformation of relationships, and an orientation toward the restoration of life.[95]

Application in Illness and the Limits of Life

In facing illness, the church can help the congregation accept a diagnosis and real limitations without stopping treatment. Prayer for healing goes together with medical consultation, discipline in care, family support, and adjustments in life. When healing does not occur as hoped, acceptance helps the congregation face limitations without interpreting the outcome as a failure of faith.

This approach also prevents the church from directly linking every illness with personal sin or a specific divine decree. The focus of pastoral care is directed toward presence, the management of suffering, the use of available means, and the preservation of the dignity of the sick. Incarnational theology supports a ministry that is present in human fragility, not merely one that offers explanations of why suffering occurs.[96]

Application in Social Ministry

In social ministry, active-participatory acceptance prevents the church from using the language of gratitude and acceptance to sustain poverty or injustice. Ministry to poor families does not stop at charitable assistance, but can be developed toward education, economic accompaniment, access to health care, and empowerment. The aim is not to promise that the church can eliminate all poverty, but to ensure that limitations are not used as an excuse for neglecting actions that are possible.

Luke 4:18–19 shows that Jesus' mission has a concrete dimension for the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized. Therefore, the church's social action does not compete with God's work, but can be understood as participation in his work of restoration.[97] Active-participatory acceptance connects spiritual comfort with action that touches the living conditions of the congregation.

Limits of the Model's Implementation

The active-participatory acceptance model is a conceptual model, not a pastoral procedure whose effectiveness has been empirically proven. Its application needs to be adapted to the type of problem, level of risk, the church's resources, and the competence of ministers.

[95]Wong, "Acts of God and Restorative Justice in the Joseph Story."

[96]Rachmadi, "Penyataan Diri Allah di Tengah Kerapuhan Dunia: Pesan Teologis tentang Inkarnasi Allah dalam Tradisi Teologis Yohanes."

[97]Susanto, "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja."

Cases of violence, psychological disorders, serious illness, and legal problems still require the involvement of professionals.

Therefore, this model serves as an initial framework to help the church pose more responsible pastoral questions: what needs to be accepted, what can still be changed, who needs to be protected, what action must be taken, and what outcome ultimately needs to be entrusted to God. Field research through interviews, observation of pastoral care, and case studies is still needed to assess its application and limitations in local churches.

Conclusion

This article finds that passivity is not inherently attached to *nrimo ing pandum* or to the doctrine of divine providence. Passivity is more likely to arise through interpretive distortions that separate acceptance from effort and separate God's sovereignty from human agency. In a fuller understanding, *nrimo ing pandum* governs the human attitude toward outcomes that cannot be entirely controlled, while providence provides a ground of hope without abolishing prayer, the use of means, choice, and moral accountability.

The scholarly contribution of this article lies in formulating a conceptual model of active-participatory acceptance as a bridge among Javanese cultural wisdom, the doctrine of providence, and the relational insights of *open theism*. The model preserves acceptance of limitations while affirming discernment, lament, prayer, concrete action, victim protection, and social responsibility. The insights of *open theism* are used to correct language about providence that renders human response meaningless, but the openness of God's knowledge of the future is not made the metaphysical foundation of the model.

Practically, this model offers the church a framework for distinguishing what needs to be accepted, circumstances that can still be managed, and injustices that must be changed. In preaching, the church needs to avoid calling every tragedy God's specific will. In pastoral care, presence, lament, victim safety, and the use of professional help need to precede advice to accept one's circumstances. In social ministry, spiritual comfort needs to be connected with empowerment, protection, and acts of restoration.

Because this study is library-based, the active-participatory acceptance model cannot yet be declared effective in church practice. Further research needs to test it through analysis of sermons, interviews with ministers and congregants, and case studies of pastoral care. Such testing is needed to assess how the model can be applied contextually without turning into fatalism, unbounded activism, or an oversimplification of the experience of suffering.

References

Aritonang, Hanna Dewi. “The Presence Of God In The Midst Of Aceh Singkil Suffering.” *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021). https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

Aritonang, Hanna Dewi. “THE PRESENCE OF GOD IN THE MIDST OF ACEH SINGKIL SUFFERING.” *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual Dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021). https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

Calvin, John, and Kalvin S Budiman. Memahami Ulang Konteks Berteologi John Calvin Dalam Doktrin Predestinasi. .

Gunawan, Esther. “Meneropong Makna Penderitaan Manusia Menurut Konsep Teodise C. S. Lewis.” *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* vol. 16, no. 1 (2017). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v16i1.8.

Hanafi Prasetyo Subandi, Noor MA. “NARIMO ING PANDUM” INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT. .

Human, Dirk. “Human Suffering.” *OTE* vol. 34 (2021). https://doi.org/10.17159/2312.

Irawati, Chandra Wahyuni, Johanes Lilik Susanto, and Tarisih. “PROVIDENSIA ALLAH: Eksposisi Dari Katekismus Heidelberg P/J 27.” *Didache Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 4, no. 2 (2023). https://doi.org/10.55076/didache.v4i2.59.

Irawati, Chandra Wahyuni, Johanes Lilik Susanto, and Tarisih Tarisih. “PROVIDENSIA ALLAH.” *Didache Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 4, no. 2 (2023). https://doi.org/10.55076/didache.v4i2.59.

Kintz, James. “Classical Theism, Interpersonal Relations, and the Receptivity of God.” *Religions* vol. 15, no. 10 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101253.

Lahope, Marlon. “Arminius, Arminian, Dan Kaum Injili: Sebuah Klarifikasi.” *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 18, no. 1 (2019). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v18i1.319.

Layantara, Jessica Novia. “Kritik Terhadap Teologi Proses Dan Pembelaan Terhadap Pandangan ‘Greater Good’ Dalam Menanggapi Masalah Kejahatan.” *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 16, no. 2 (2017).

Limasaputra, Alexander Darmawan. “Memandang Penderitaan Melalui Perspektif The Already and The Not Yet dari Rasul Paulus.” *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* vol. 17, no. 1 (2018). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v17i1.305.

Mahanani, Safira, and Yohanes Kartika Herdiyanto. “Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?” *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat* (2026). https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu1326.

Mahanani, Safira, and Yohanes Kartika Herdiyanto. “Nrima Ing Pandum: Menerima Atau Pasrah Dengan Keadaan?” *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat* (2026). https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu1326.

“Michael Teng-Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed.” (n.d.).

Mullins, R. T., and Emanuela Sani. “OPEN THEISM AND RISK MANAGEMENT: A PHILOSOPHICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.” *Zygon* vol. 56, no. 3 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12723.

Panuntun, Daniel Fajar. “Teologi Kematian Berdasarkan Perspektif Antropologi-Metafisika Bagi Tradisi Ritual Kematian Toraja Dan Jawa.” *Societas Dei: Jurnal Agama Dan Masyarakat* vol. 12, no. 2 (2025). https://doi.org/10.33550/sd.v12i2.532.

Panuntun, Daniel Fajar. “Teologi Kematian Berdasarkan Perspektif Antropologi-Metafisika Bagi Tradisi Ritual Kematian Toraja Dan Jawa.” *Societas Dei: Jurnal Agama Dan Masyarakat* vol. 12, no. 2 (2025). https://doi.org/10.33550/sd.v12i2.532.

Pinnock, Clark H. RECONSTRUCTING EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY: IS T H E OPEN VIEW OF GOD A GOOD IDEA?’. .

Pranoto, Minggus Minarto. “Kehendak Bebas di Dalam Teologi Martin Luther.” vol. 7, no. 2 (2006). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v7i2.181.

Prasetyo, Noor Hanafi, and M.A. Subandi. “‘NARIMO ING PANDUM’ INTERVENTION PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF FAMILY CAREGIVER OF SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENT.” *Jurnal Intervensi Psikologi* vol. 6, no. 2 (2014).

Rachmadi, Simon. “Penyataan Diri Allah di Tengah Kerapuhan Dunia: Pesan Teologis tentang Inkarnasi Allah dalam Tradisi Teologis Yohanes.” *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 7, no. 1 (2022). https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

Rachmadi, Simon. “THE DIVINE REVELATION WITHIN THE VULNERABILITY OF THE WORLD A Theological Message about the Incarnation of God in the Johannine Tradition.” vol. 7, no. 1 (2022). https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.

Rakhmawati, Silvia Maudy. “Nrimo Ing Pandum Dan Etos Kerja Orang Jawa: Tinjauan Sila KeTuhanan Yang Maha Esa.” vol. 3, no. 1 (2022).

Ribhato, Brogian, and Siprianus Soleman Senda. “Telaah Kebebasan Perspektif Agustinus Dalam Lukas 15:11-32 Dan Kaitannya Dengan <I>Homo Digitalis</I>” *GEMA TEOLOGIKA: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual Dan Filsafat Keilahian* vol. 11, no. 1 (2026). https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.2026.111.1266.

Sanders, John. “Why Simple Foreknowledge Offers No More Providential Control than the Openness of God.” *Faith and Philosophy* vol. 14, no. 1 (1997). https://doi.org/10.5840/faithphil199714120.

Sulistio, Thio Christian, and Esther Gunawan. “Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam Menghadapi Covid-19.” *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021). https://doi.org/10.30648/dun.v6i1.489.

Sulistio, Thio Christian, and Esther Gunawan. “Perbandingan Konsep Teodise John Calvin Dan C. S. Lewis Serta Relevansinya Terhadap Sikap Fatalistik Dalam

Menghadapi Covid-19." *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021). https://doi.org/10.30648/dun.v6i1.489.

Susanto, Herry. "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja." *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 19, no. 1 (2020). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v19i1.356.

Susanto, Herry. "Panggilan Sosial Gereja Berdasarkan Pelayanan Yesus Dalam Lukas 4:18-19: Sebuah Upaya Merevitalisasi Pelayanan Gereja." *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 19, no. 1 (2020). https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v19i1.356.

Teng, Michael. "Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Open Theism Dari Perspektif Teologi Reformed." *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan* vol. 13, no. 1 (2012).

Wessels, Wilhelm J. "At the Potter's Workshop. Jeremiah 18:1–12: A Narrative That Reveals More than Meets the Eye." *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies* vol. 76, no. 4 (2020). https://doi.org/10.4102/HTS.V76I4.6108.

Wong, Sonia Kwok. "Acts of God and Restorative Justice in the Joseph Story." *Stellenbosch Theological Journal* vol. 10, no. 3 (2024). https://doi.org/10.17570/stj.2024.v10n3.a7.

Yemimaistyasih, Primadita, Psikologi Fakultas, Kristen Universitas, Wacana Jl Satya, Berta Esti, A Prasetya Fakultas, Psikologi Universitas, and Kristen Satya Wacana. "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens." *Psychopreneur Journal* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021).

Yemimaistyasih, Primadita, and Berta Esti A. Prasetya. "Konsep Narimo Ing Pandum Pada Para Kusir Dokar The Concept of Narimo Ing Pandum towards Dokar's Coachmens." *Psychopreneur Journal* vol. 6, no. 1 (2021).