ADULTERY (p. 6-7). Adultery is illicit sex outside marriage and, as well, in the Old Testament by the betrothed with a third party prior to the consummation of marriage. In the Bible sex belongs to marriage. Adultery is consistently prohibited and condemned in both Old and New Testaments.

In the Old Testament, the cornerstone of sexual morality is the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exod. 20:14; Deut. 5:18). Adultery was prohibited by law and was punishable by death (Lev. 18:20; 20:10; Deut. 22:22-24). This proscription endured late in Old Testament history (Ezek. 18:11-13; 22:11; Mal. 3:5). Fidelity is foremost a moral issue based on the foundations of family life following creation (Gen. 2:24). The Old Testament teaches that God intended a single male and a single female to contract a permanent spiritual union, that is to say, monogamous marriage. Adultery is a violation of this union. This prime moral issue takes precedence over social considerations such as the husband's or wife's individual sexual rights, the assurance that children are a husband's own, or the practice on grounds of the mores of polygamy or polyandry.

The seriousness with which adultery is viewed in the Old Testament is clear from the adultery of David with Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11-12; note David's confession in Ps. 51). By analogy, adultery is used as a symbol of spiritual unfaithfulness and religious backsliding (Jer. 3; 7:9-10; Ezek. 16:26; Hos. 4:11-19).

   In the New Testament, Jesus reinforces prohibition of adultery (Matt. 19:18). By not only the actual deed, but by the thought in the heart one is equally culpable (Matt. 5:28); and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery with her (Matt. 5:32; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18). The latter proscription condemns the easy dissolution of marriages and easy remarriage as being in fact adultery. Jesus forgave the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53-8:11) and thus brought even this serious moral lapse under divine grace and forgiveness. Jesus adds, however, "go and sin no more." Similarly, the conversion of the woman at the well of Samaria entailed her commitment to a new, moral lifestyle (John 4:16-26, 39). Paul states that remarriage after the death of a spouse is not adultery (Rom. 7:3; 1 Cor. 7:39).

Adultery is, however, a ground for divorce (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). It is likely that divorce in this case simply ratifies what has in fact already taken place, namely, sinful violation and dissolution of the marriage which is in the first instance a deeply spiritual covenant between contracting persons, rather than a church or civil formation. Forgiveness, reconciliation, and reaffirmation of fidelity may restore the marriage, without divorce occurring.

It is important to set the specific prohibition of adultery in its wider biblical context of prohibition of fornication, including the related vices of lust, indecency, and filthy talk. Exodus .20:10 is understood to include all fornication, which 'is also true of Paul's many references to sexual sinning. Of Paul's seven major lists of vices, five list fornication as the first vice, and this would include

adultery (1 Cor. 5:11; 6:9; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 5:3; Col. 3:5; the other two lists are Rom. 1:19-31 and 2 Cor. 12:10). Someone who fornicates is not really, but is only "called;' a brother (I Cor. 5:11). The seriousness of this sin is clear from 1 Cor. 6:9-20: no fornicator or adulterer can inherit the kingdom of God. Paul goes on to say that because the Christian belongs to Christ and is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, his or her very body cannot be joined to a harlot as well.

It should be noted that the terms for fornication, adultery, and harlotry in the New Testament coincide (Luke 15:30; Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25; 1 Cor. 5:1; 6:13, 18; 7:2; 2 Cor. 12:21; 1 Tim. 1:10; 1 Thess. 4:3). Such prohibitions completely undercut modern attempts to relativize sexual morality as accommodation to varying situations or to glamorize deviant sexual behavior through euphemisms such as "making love" or to excuse it on pseudo-Freudian grounds that sex relieves tension and prevents neurotic guilt. Guilt is due not to abstaining from illicit acts, but from their practice. Forgiveness comes when sin is acknowledged and confessed; spiritual well-being ensues when a new, moral lifestyle is pursued.

Christians are urged to recognize and shun internal and external enticements to sexual sinning. Graphic examples are cited, as in the case of David and Bathsheba, and Samson and Delilah (Judg. 16). The tactics of adultery and fornication include womanly sinful wiles (Prov. 2:16-17; 7:6-23) and male lust (Job 24:15; 31:9; Matt. 5:28). The main vehicles of concupiscence are the eye and the heart, which must be set to see other persons differently from being lustful objects or persons craved sexually. The Scriptures warn against beautifying and justifying sinful desires or behavior.

Throughout the Scriptures such acts as murder and adultery are uniformly and equally condemned as morally wrong. Because sexual abuse was widespread in the Roman world, Christians' emphasis on sexual purity, among other virtues, won them deep respect. Such Christian virtue is as relevant today, and as practical, as it has always been.

When Athenagoras wrote his famous *Plea* to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius about *A.D.* 175, he declared what had been the Christian ideal and practical morality from New Testament days. Athenagoras pointed out that Christians seek to do more than restrain themselves from evil. They seek to have right relations among themselves and with their neighbors. Thus Christians regard each other as sons and daughters, as brothers and sisters, as fathers and mothers: "We feel it a matter of great importance that those, whom we thus think of as brothers and sisters and so on, should keep their bodies undefiled and uncorrupted." This is the expression of true love.

Bibliography: Athenagoras, *Plea* (c.175); Dewar, *L., New Testament Ethics* (1949); Henry, C*., Christian Personal Ethics (1957); Yankelovich, D., New Rules* (1981).

S. J. M.

AGAPE (p. 10-11). The two most widely used words for love in the New Testament along with their cognates are *agape* and *philos*. The term *eros*, which was historically the common word for love in Greek along with *philos*, does not occur in the New Testament. The question about the lexical origin and meaning of agape and the significance of the absence of *eros* from the New Testament have produced vigorous discussion and conflicting scholarly opinion. Some have argued that *agape* is a providentially initiated and preserved term uniquely suitable to express divine love. Others have argued that *eros* was excluded from the New Testament because of its traditional sexual overtones. Still others maintain that the uses or non-uses of these terms are simply either historical accidents or the natural consequences of the evolution of language and that no term lexically is more spiritual or theological than any other.

The translators of the Septuagint, which is the pre-Christian era translation of the Old Testament into Greek, did not make such fine distinctions. They commonly used *agape* and its cognates for sexual love (Song of Sol. 2:4-5, 7; 5:8; 8:6), *eros*, and *philos* synonymously (Prov. 7:18). In Psalm 109:5 and Hosea 11:4 *agape* identifies human affection and loyalty and in Habakkuk 3:4 admiration for might. Plato used a form of *agape* to describe the love of a wolf for a lamb (*Phaedrus* 241d), which does not fit the exclusively spiritual connotations attached by some to *agape*.

Whether or not the absence of *eros* from the New Testament is a conscious omission is a matter of dispute. Its sexual overtones are clearly not the meaning for love which most New Testament references require. Some believe as well that its classical use for aspiration to the divine is not consistent with Christian spiritual aspiration or the meaning of grace. *Philos* is employed commonly for human affection, including the kiss of greeting. While earlier uses of *agape* embrace the normal range of human affection in the Septuagint, the total absence of *agape* from non-biblical texts is puzzling. Only one occurrence has been cited and the broken state of the text has drawn vigorous denial that the occurrence is in fact *agape*. It would appear that *agape* was picked up in Christian vocabulary, perhaps from the *Septuagint*, as the ordinary word for love and that it and its older synonymn *philos* were used interchangeably (John 21:15, 17). *Agape*, meaning love with the added dimension of being other-regarding, dominated use for redemptive love and Christian interpersonal love.

In the New Testament, *agape* is used for the highest form of love, including God's love to mankind (John 3:16; Rom. 5:8), God's love to Christ (John 15:9; 17:23, 26), Christ's love to mankind (John 15:9; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 2:4), man's love to God and Christ (John 14:23-24; 1 John 2:5), and men's love to one another (John 13:35; 1 John 3:14; 4:20). Notably, John and Paul use this word extensively in a natural and unforced way to express the truth about God's relationship to mankind, man's to God, and the best interpersonal relationships among men.

The single and most important characteristic of the love which *agape* identifies

has to do with persons and personal relationships and the ethics of those relationships. This is crucial with respect to the biblical teaching about God, the world, and redemption.

Firstly, in the Bible, love is not God's way to the world ontologically. Regarding the nature of God, various forms of ancient and modern demythologizing reconstruct the interpersonal nature of love. To say that God is love or that God loves is thought to jeopardize the impassibility or simplicity of God's nature, which seemed unappealing to Plato. Ancient Gnostics theorized that the world is the product of the overflow of the divine essence or that the world derives from descending emanations from the primordial impassible divine principle. According to the Gnostics and contrary to traditional Christian teaching, desire enters only well down the scale in relation to the material, evil-infected world.

Secondly, neither is love the world's way to God. This was the role of *eros* in various Greek philosophical traditions. Man aspires to the beatific vision, to mystical union with the divine, hence the traditions which advocate the pursuit of absolute beauty or absolute truth through ecstatic flight of the soul. Paul Tillich, for example, denies that God personally loves. Tillich says that love is aspiration or drive to unity. Love is that attracting and impelling power which moves us toward reunion with God, which he defines as full actualization of individual life in a social context. While the concept of aspiration lends credence to the attracting power of transcendental ideals, it misses the active, gracious, other-regarding character of God's love.

Thirdly, love is not man's way to himself, though healing and reintegrating sin-broken persons is certainly a function of love. Love is not to be redefined to signify purely human personality dynamics and relationships. The final stage of contemporary demythologizing does precisely this. Some argue that to say that God is love is too anthropomorphic; rather, that God is love means that I believe in pure personal relationships or that I feel good about myself. In other words, the being of God and the love of God become functions of human nature and human relationships, not attributes of the God who loves, and redeems.

Love is the essence of God's nature and this truth controls our understanding of all love. When John says "God is love" (1 John 4:8), this means more than that God loves men or that they love one another. It means that, as the living God, His inmost nature is love. In the Bible, far from protecting God from attribution of love in order to shield His impassibility, both testaments of Scripture freely declare that God is love and that He loves. There is no higher metaphysical reality than personhood. God is personal and He loves personally. On this text C. H. Dodd helpfully comments, "If the characteristic divine activity is that of loving, then God must be personal, for we cannot be loved by an abstraction or by anything else less than a person."

This truth fits the full range of Christian teaching. God is triune, Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit, and love is the essence of the divine interpersonal relations (John 17:23). God deals with mankind redemptively through his love (1 John 4:10). Consequently this love becomes the sphere of the Christian life (John 15:9), and this mode of God's dealing with us becomes the pattern of our own relationships with one another (1 John 4:16-21).

Love is essentially other-regarding. Anders Nygren and many others overdraw the distinction between *eros* as self-acquisitive and *agape* as value-conferring. J. M. Rist has shown that *eros* means more than sensual, self seeking desire. Nevertheless, the other-regarding character of love as *agape* in biblical teaching is clear. Love is not so much value-creating as value affirming. Because men are sinners does not mean that they are of no value. Rather, the immense value which God placed upon mankind through creation is reaffirmed through redemptive love.

Redemptive love operates morally. While redemption originates in love, it is not achieved by display or attraction but by action, which is the cross. Hence the biblical epitome of love: if love then persons; and if persons, then morality. Love in the Bible is holy love.

Paul has much to say about the ethics of the sphere of love into which Christians are deemed (Eph. 6:23). Christian are the beloved of God (Rom. 1:7; 8:37-39), which means they are lovingly chosen through grace. God loves sinners (Rom. 5:8), and believing sinners themselves become repositories of God's love (Rom. 5:5; 15:30). Christian life operates within a range of new categories, including faith, hope, and love. These are not merely beliefs. They identify a new lifestyle, a new set of moral relationships among Christians and new ways of dealing with others (Gal. 5:22-23; 1 Thess. 3:6).

The way of life which is infused by the love of God is Paul's great theme in 1 Corinthians 13. It should be borne in mind that Paul in this letter wrote to a factious church where some members were boasting super-spirituality. The most excellent way of life, he declared (1 Cor. 12:31), is not self-seeking. It is the way of love. This chapter not only defines love, it sets forth ethics that operate within the sphere of love. Here is true love for one's brother or sister or neighbor. Here is a true prescription for inner healing. Having concluded, Paul repeats, "Make love your aim" (1 Cor. 14:1).

What is the ethical prescription of 1 Corinthians 13? It begins with the infinite value of persons: if a man has no love (love regards persons as ends, not means), he is hollow despite all pretensions to abilities and gifts (vv. 1-3). Love is therefore the necessary inner essence of valid human existence. Paul identifies love in God and love in man; he draws no distinction between them. We may take it that 1 Corinthians 13 defines what Paul found in Christ.

Fourteen paired statements follow (vv. 4-7), which are ethical prescriptions as

well as descriptions of love and how it works. Love is long-tempered and gentle; it seethes neither with jealousy nor envy; it makes no bragging display; it is not arrogantly puffed up nor is it unmannerly and tactless; love does not look out only for its own interests; it does not get angry easily or remain bitter long after a wrong; love does not store up resentment; love takes no pleasure in the wrong-doing of others; rather, it takes pleasure in the truth and in what is right; love forbears; it absorbs much; love believes the best rather than the worst when there is no proof. Love believes that good will finally prevail, which is the heart of hope. Love endures, despite the odds. Paul concludes (v. 8) that love never ends. Beyond all the things that men might prize, true personhood and full maturity embrace and are defined by the life of love. Love is the greatest virtue among the trilogy of faith, hope, and love (v. 13).

(See LOVE in this series.)

Bibliography: Morris, L., *Testaments of Love* (1981); Newlands, G. M., *Theology of the Love of God* (1980); Nygren, *A., Agape and Eros* (1953); Rist, J. M., *Eros and Psyche* (1964).

S.J.M

AGGRESSION (p. 12-13). Great ambiguity may attend the use of the term *aggression*, from describing a military action to the use of the term by a pacifist to advocate aggressive pacifism.

The negative connotations of the term go back to its root (*aggress*) as "attach" or "assault,' in the sense that the aggressor initiates the attack. He makes it first, unprovoked, whether it is a military action, a fight, a quarrel, or the style of a relationship in which one of the parties is the aggressor and abuser.

Distinctions need to be made between the meaning of aggression and terms such as *opposition, conflict, tension, rivalry, resolution, initiative*, and *competition*, Harmony without tension is not mandated by the Christian ethos. At the same time, Christians reject the ancient dictum of Empedocles that conflict is metaphysically the father of all things, which concept is a key feature of Marxist ideology: thesis, antithesis, synthesis. Instead, Christians advocate reconciliation as the key to resolving a conflict-using tension creatively and morally to achieve progress. For Christians, the term *aggression* is used in a benign way, more as *initiative,* employed to cut through bureaucratic stalling or blundering; to encourage efficient, profitable enterprise in business; to provide assistance to the needy quickly, efficiently, and at the lowest cost; to reinforce the commitment of faith and pledge of loyalty to Christ (Matt. 10:14, 34-39; 11:12; Acts 5:29; Rom. 8:13; 1 Cor. 9:24-27; Eph. 6:12).

The roots and causes of human aggression are a matter of uncertainty and great disagreement among theologians, psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, and other students of human behavior. Christians believe that aggression, especially when rooted in anger, is a characteristic of sinful humanity not merely in the sense of having been produced or learned behaviorally but as rooted in a fallen nature. Man sins because he is alienated from God the Creator and Norm-giver. The result is aggression in the form of war, interpersonal quarreling and violence, crime, and various forms of psychological violence. Christians believe the problem is best and most effectively dealt with at its root, in the heart of man (Matt. 15:19; Rom. 1:28-32; 3:9-20; Gal. 5:19-21) through redemption (Rom. 3:21-26; Gal. 5:2226) and a life subsequently patterned after the teachings of Christ.

The image of the aggressive, swashbuckling North American capitalist, though true in a limited number of cases, does a disservice to the vast numbers of businessmen and businesswomen who create opportunity for others through efficient, competitive enterprise. There are theories of enterprise which advocate aggression as the most effective way to achieve efficiency and success. These are now largely discredited in favor of administration theory, which rejects multilayered levels of communication in which detached executives simply give orders aggressively for leadership. The new approach strives to create a corporate culture in which everyone feels a sense of ownership and responsibility to innovate, produce efficiently, and achieve excellence.

The cure for wrongful aggression is respect for persons and love. This is, particularly important in family relations where children are first nurtured in the subtleties of human relationships. Modern pressures on the family raise new questions as to their effects upon the emotional tone of growing children. Do modern problems in family life inhibit the capacity to love and instead generate increased anger, depression, and, consequently, aggressive behavior? Some recent studies claim that day-care for small children, especially during the first three years of life, tends to produce a more aggressive personality. Others challenge this finding. Claims have been made that impersonal rearing, as was said to have occurred in early kibbutz experiments, produces flat emotions. In North American society, increased incidence of divorce, single-parent families, working mothers, and impermanent spousal relations are creating new conditions. Special attention will have to be given to propagating and nurturing love in children through precept and example while preserving creative tension, competition, and creativity.

Bibliography: Drucker, P. F., *Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (1985); Forbes, C., *The Religion of Power* (1983); Ouchi, W. G., *Theory Z* (1981); Pfeffer, J., *Power in Organizations* (1981).
(Note CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION, MILITARISM, PACIFISM, and VIOLENCE in this series.)

S.J.M.

ALTRUISM (p. 15). Altruism is to act with regard for others as a prime and consistent principle of action, in contrast to egoism which is to act systematically with regard to one's own interests.

The term originated in the period of the French Enlightenment in relation to social theory. Altruism, defined as selfless love and devotion to society, was advanced by Comte as a major cohesive social force. That man is by nature altruistic became a fundamental premise of nineteenth-century optimism. Altruism became part of the quest to perfect man socially by eradicating self-centered desire. Most socialist theory assumes the right of society to discipline self-centered desire, though some have advocated the right not only to discipline but to eradicate self-centered desire by chemical means, conditioning, or close regulation. For Marxist (communist) theorists it remains a dilemma as to how to combine a moral ought of devotion to society with historical, economic, and psychological inevitability (note the work of Ernst Bloch).

Some (e.g., A. L. Hilliard) reject altruism as intellectually and emotionally suicidal. They applaud the ancient hedonism of the Epicureans, though in a modern form. They argue that behaviorally all organisms, including man, in fact, seek their own satisfaction or gratification. Others concede that while psychological hedonism is the root of action, intelligence should lead men to conclude that self-gratification ought to be the motive for action. It remains a puzzle in the naturalistic ethics of R. B. Perry and John Dewey as to why anyone should care about anyone else.

Attempts to frame a behavioral explanation of altruism have led some to claim that concern, even self-sacrificing concern, for another (such as animal care for offspring) suggests that altruism may be biologically programmed into creatures, including man. It is therefore not a spiritual quality in the sense of answering to a divinely given ethical norm.

Still others, notably within the Catholic and other Christian monastic traditions, have advocated the view that altruistic concern for humanity can come only when one achieves total self-abnegation. On this view, love for God and for others is inconsistent with love for self.

In principle, Christian love is directed in a threefold manner: to God, to neighbor, to self (Matt. 22:37-39). Man is not seen in purely behavioral terms, though there is no denigration in the Bible of the creation nor of the human body and emotions. Fundamentally, God is love and God created man for love. This is reflected in God's care of man and His redemptive love for man. It is also to be reflected in human relationships. God loves us and through that love enables us to love others (I John 4:16-21).

In practice, altruism should be the principle of action for the Christian. To act altruistically is to be systematically other-regarding. In its best sense this is not the

product of neurotic self-flagellation, but is based on reflection, deep devotion to God, and love to others. Self-sacrifice, sharing what one has with others, and regarding others as better than oneself are not psychological aberrations. They are person-conserving and person-affirming attitudes that the Christian learns from God's prior love (Phil. 2:3-5).

Bibliography: a Kempis, T., *The Imitation of Christ*; Lewis, C. S., *The Four Loves* (1960); Merton, T., *Seeds of Contemplation* (1949); Neil, S., *The Christian Character* (1956).

S.J.M.

ANTINOMIANISM (p. 18-19). Antinomianism is the denial of obligation to the moral law. In practical terms, it is the easy excusing of lawless or immoral behavior. Antinomianism is implicit in some modern behavioral views of human nature and conduct which deny objective moral standards by means of rationalizations such as that good is any object of any interest.

Antinomianism is peculiarly a religious phenomenon in which what morally would be called wrong acts are justified religiously or theologically. Professing Christians have done this on a number of grounds.

Firstly, by denying creation. The created order, including the body, is held to be indifferent to the spirit and therefore bodily acts including licentiousness are matters of no consequence. In modern times super-Christians or Christians claiming superior spirituality are not infrequently guilty of such aberration because their illusion of spirituality tempts them to become a law to themselves.

Secondly, by abasement and corruption of moral values (Isa. 5:20). In this, attempts are made to justify evil acts such as fornication or adultery in the name of love and beauty; to venerate fertility and sexual intercourse; or to justify repression, cruelty, and genocide in the name of national or religious ideals.

Thirdly, by biological or psychological special pleading. This includes pleas such as that release of tension, human frailty, biological makeup, or overwhelming impulse in even normal people explains and presumably therefore justifies wrong acts.

Fourthly, by dispensational rationalism. Because some kingdom ideals are scarcely realizable until Christ's return, the inference is drawn that all ideals of the kingdom are neither presently realizable nor are they a present moral obligation.

Fifthly, the traditional form of antinomianism, which is to misinterpret Paul 's emphasis on grace in contrast to law. This is the antinomianism which presumes on grace. Paul reacted swiftly and vigorously to the distortion of his teaching which said, "Why not do evil that good may come?" (Rom. 3:8). Such teaching is anathema (Rom. 6:1, 14). Paul, like James, makes clear that true faith without works is impossible (Rom. 6-8). We are justified by faith alone, but the faith which justifies is not alone.

Identification and rejection of antinomianism by Christians requires a clear sense of the gospel as to what are grace, faith, justification, and morality. Paul insists that salvation is received by faith alone and that good works must spring from faith. James insists that the faith which justifies must be authenticated by good works. In other words, *believe and behave.*

The moral law is not nullified by faith. The moral validity of the commandments is clear from Christ's words in Mark 7:21. Jesus lists at least five of the evils which

are condemned by the Ten Commandments in this passage. As well, he joins obedience to the moral law with love for God and love for neighbor (Matt. 5:43; 19:19; 22:37). Paul deals extensively with the moral principles which are renewed and reinforced in each Christian's life and which are conveyed to each Christian by the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23). His lists of vices are as frequent, detailed, and prominent as his references to virtues.

Thus everywhere in Scripture the principle of freedom is balanced by the principle of obedient love based on the broad, undergirding premise that creation and morality derive from the same Creator and that it is therefore always better to do right than to do wrong.

Most Christians have succumbed to antinomianism to varying degrees at various times, and most churches have been tested by such views. Modern Christians are particularly vulnerable in view of the prevalent behavioral view of man that morals are merely functions of mores-that human beings are no more than behavorially responding organisms whose bodily functions are no more and no less moral than the more" 'of the community.

Christians believe that morality is grounded in the righteousness of God, not in Situational Ethics in which every person does what appears to be right in his own eyes. Christian morality is more than an expression of feeling. Thus Christians teach each other to avoid evil and to do good as an expression of the life of grace.

Bibliography: Fairlie, H., *The Seven Deadly Sins Today* (1978); Lewis, C. S., *Christian Moralitv* (1943); Mikolaski, S., *The Grace of God* (1966); Robinson, N. H. *G., Faith and Duty* (1950).

S.J.M.

COLLECTIVISM (p. 76-77). Collectivism is a social and economic theory and is sometimes called socialism. Sometimes advocated on religious grounds, collectivism theorizes that the people as a whole own and control the means of production and distribution. This contrasts sharply with capitalism, which advocates private ownership for profit of most means of production and distribution and resists central planning and state control.

Historically, collectivist theories and ideals abound, from Plato's *Republic* to various versions of modern socialism and Marxism and to Christian communes in their various forms.

The most common modern political form of collectivism is Marxism, usually in its Leninist form. Marxist collectivism (Communism) is based solidly upon a materialist metaphysic, including historical and economic determinism, except for its expectation of a utopian social end. The traditional concept of absolute ethics and rights is regarded as a reflection of ruling class interests. Religion is viewed as an opiate that consoles the oppressed in their misery. Power alone is regarded as the key to social reform and is usually grasped by a small minority allegedly held in the name of the people. All citizens theoretically share in decision making in collectives, though in reality they become employees of the state. Modern collectivist states produce their own entrenched ruling class, as observed by Milovan Djilas, the former vice-president of Marxist Yugoslavia, in his biting 1957 expose, *The New Class* (for which he was imprisoned).

In modern times, collectivism advocated on grounds of Christian teaching ranges from democratic socialism in Western Europe, Britain, and Canada, to political liberalism and Christian communes. Many other versions have been added to the traditional Mennonite and Hutterite communes. Arguments against ownership and free enterprise by means of appeals to the monastic movement and to early church fathers have tended to be one-sided. For example, the money raising tactics of Jerome when he built his monastery at Bethlehem rivaled modern religious television fund raising methods. The religious sanction of greed in the name of a utopian collective model is particularly odious.

Contemporary liberation theology is usually allied with a collectivist social and political model. Liberation theologians favor Marxist economics in relation to their thesis that truth from God can be discovered only within solutions to present-day political and social problems. The claim that personal freedom and freedom from economic repression flourish under collectivist regimes flies in the face of the facts. It is striking that liberation theory runs hand in hand with decrease in personal liberty and vast increase in enslavement and torture.

Peter Bauer, a British economist, argues that modern socialist and liberation theories that are advocated in religious guise amount to the legitimation of envy. He has demonstrated that psychological and cultural factors in many cases precondition whole societies against economic growth. The studies of the

American sociologist Thomas Sowell arrive at similar conclusions.

There is a superficial resemblance between secular and Christian collectivist theories in that both are utopian. Each in its own way depends upon the unwarranted assumption that human beings are universally altruistic and the assumption of the prior validity of the will of the whole group as against the individual will. On one side this ignores original sin, and on the other side it ignores human propensity to selfishness and abuse of power (note the novels of the Mennonite, Ruth Wiebe). Collectivist societies boast about their elections, which are usually a formality; but few have safeguards to eject leaders, as happens in democracies. Collectivist societies discourage pluralism, and the right to say no is rare.

The inevitable formation of massive, entrenched, and self-serving bureaucracies that blunt initiative is a serious problem in modern collectivist societies. An unsolved problem of socialist countries is how to incorporate incentive into a system which plans from the top. The smothering effects of a closed system tend to starve the system itself. In eastern European bloc countries, moonlighting in addition to working at state jobs is a modern expression of how incentives draw people to productive work which jeopardizes central planning. It is instructive that such utopian societies require walls and strict regulations to prevent people from emigrating.

Christians, like others, adapt to many different political and social models. Christians are morally committed to freedom, justice, equitable treatment in an economy, and to the principle of love of neighbor to help those less fortunate than themselves. At the same time, Christians recognize that humans are imperfect, sinful, and at times exploitative and repressive. Thus from long experience, Christians realize that utopian schemes are not only inadequate but are not mandated by biblical teaching.

The dark side of human nature must be kept in check. Thus human society, short of Christ's promised kingdom, must always ensure that a system of checks and balances is jealously guarded as well as maintain the hope that principles of freedom, justice, enterprise, and love of neighbor prevail. In human society altruism and self-interest will always be present together and will be in frequent tension. A great value of democratic capitalism is the advantage of the impersonal nature of the market economy that the economist Paul Heyne describes as "a social system in which people do not care about most of those for whom they care." When motivated by self-interest to do their best work and to produce the best product competitively in a free economy, people tend to serve the needs of others best.

Bibliography: Popper, K. R., *The Open Society and Its Enemies, 2 vols.* (1945); Novack, M., *Capitalism and Socialism* (1979); Gutierrez, G., *A Theology of Liberation* (1981); Bauer, *P., Reality and Rhetoric (1984).*

S.J.M.

CONFESSION (p. 83-84). The meaning of confession is rooted in the spiritual life of God's people in both testaments. There are three foci: worshiping. praising, and blessing God (Ps. 89:1-3); declaring faith in God and Christ (Matt. 16:16; John 1:34; Rom. 10:9; Phil. 2:11; 1 John 4:15); and acknowledging sin and guilt as the mark of repentance toward God and man (Lev. 26:40-42; Neh. 9:1-3; Pss. 32; 51; Acts 2:37-38). It is in this latter sense that John the Baptist called people to repentance (Matt. 3:1-6), that men and women everywhere are invited to turn to God in Christ, and that Christians confess their sins to God and to one another.

Auricular confession, which means "to the ear" (of the priest), as practiced in the Roman Catholic Church since the late Middle Ages, evolved from various forms of priestly and lay confessional traditions. Its danger lies in the communicant's forming the perception that he is confessing to the priest rather than directly to God, which perception may be reinforced by the priest's words "I absolve thee." (The earlier form of absolution was "May the Lord absolve thee.")

Some Reformation churches did not totally abandon the practice of auricular confession to a priest; but their emphasis changed dramatically to general congregational confession and absolution, along with encouragement to be reconciled to one another and to make restitution wherever possible. The danger in this is that confession may be practiced in a general, formal manner, without becoming deeply personal.

Smaller or larger group confession runs the risk of inciting recurrent hysteria, of encouraging the ceaseless raking over of feelings of guilt and inadequacy, and of catering to the prurient interests of hearers.

Each of the many forms of confessions may be helpful if practiced in an uncorrupted way and with careful attention to the biblical truths relating to Christ's atonement and the nature of forgiveness and reconciliation.

The validity of confession rests on the premise that men and women are morally answerable to God and to one another, that they are responsible to one another as neighbors, and that reconciliation between man and God and man and man is God's redemptive purpose. At bottom, confession rests on the truth that forgiveness is possible and that confession and forgiveness permanently remove the stain of sin.

Confession and forgiveness are essential to the moral integrity of the soul, to the emotional health of the whole person, and to the well-being of the church as the household of faith. This is especially true for those who believe that they have committed the unpardonable sin (though often this is not understood in its biblical sense). Recognition of one's guilt is the first step to healing; confession and reconciliation to God and to others is the second. Sin isolates and creates mistrust. Repentance, confession, and forgiveness create the environment of love where persons can be whole (I John 1:9-10).

Bibliography: Baillie, *J., A Diary of Private Prayer;* Mowrer, O. H., *The Crisis in Psychology and Religion* (1961); Stott, J., *Confess Your Sins* (1964).

S.J.M.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION (p. 85-86). A conscientious objector is a person, Christian or non-Christian, who refuses to go to war because he or she believes that killing is wrong. Christians who object to military service as a matter of conscience usually do so on grounds of a no-exception interpretation of the sixth commandment ("Thou shalt not kill") and an interpretation of the teachings of Jesus which applies principles of peace and nonresistance to every human situation without exception (Matt. 5:9).

It is important to note that where conscientious objection is legally accepted it is done solely on moral or religious grounds or both, but not on political grounds. The conscientious objector refuses military service because he or she believes war and killing to be wrong on moral and religious grounds, not because he or she objects to the political policies of the government. Governments have been reluctant to grant conscientious-objector status on political grounds. Conscientious objection is a public policy issue primarily when universal conscription for military service is in force.

Historically, conscientious objectors have been severely punished and abused. This included beatings, torture, imprisonment, confiscation of property and even execution in Western countries up to the twentieth century. Such treatment was most severe under totalitarian regimes. Sometimes conscientious objection (or refusing to swear an oath in a court of law) was used as an excuse to practice religious persecution. The widespread persecution of minority evangelical groups such as Nazarenes in some European countries earlier in this century is a case in point.

Western democratic societies have gradually relaxed laws and provided legal exemption from combat duty for conscientious objectors. In many cases alternative or noncombat service is required in lieu of combat duty. In most cases concession against military service is granted on religious grounds. Recently, especially during the Vietnam War, conscientious objection on purely moral grounds has increased. Granting conscientious-objector status and exemption on other than grounds of conscience has proved to be a thorny issue. In England, very often a corroborating statement made to a clergyman has been required. Until suspension of the draft in the United States, a legal declaration by the individual usually made before a tribunal was accepted.

Interpretation of conscientious objection varies. Some pacifists regard conscientious objection as a narrow category of a broader and more desirable conviction, namely, nonresistance as a lifestyle. Some are selective conscientious objectors: they will fight in some wars but not in others. Some will engage in noncombat military service; others will not. Some countries, such as Britain, have allowed for substitute nonmilitary social service at home or abroad during the pre-scribed period of conscripted service. The cyclical nature of attitudes is instructive. During peacetime conscription the percentage of conscientious objectors tends to rise; during wartime the percentage falls. For example, in the

United States during World War II, less than half of conscripted Mennonites chose alternative service, while in the 1950s this figure rose to over 80 percent.

While the majority of the population, including Christians, reject conscientious objection in a democratic society which is committed to justice, allowance for it is still made in democratic societies. Vigorous criticism has been leveled against conscientious-objection practices in the past. These practices include payment of commutation fees by conscientious objectors, which were sometimes bribes to escape military service. On occasions the money was used by the state to finance war. Another practice found by critics to be objectionable was the recruiting and paying of a substitute to serve in place of the conscientious objector. This practice is regarded by critics as solicitation or hiring of a mercenary.

Other criticisms are directed at the theological, moral, and social arguments of conscientious objectors. The state is divinely sanctioned, as Christian conscientious objectors usually agree, in Scriptures such as Romans 13:1-7 and I Peter 2:13-17, and it has the right and obligation to punish evildoers. It is argued therefore that Christians have the moral obligation to honor justice by participating in the punishment of wrongdoers. Others insist that a distinction must be drawn between the ideals of personal ethics among Christians and the realities of life in an evil-infected world. It is wrong to interpret John 17:16 in such a way as to excuse Christians from citizenship and societal duties, which are seen to be moral obligations just as the quality of Christian interpersonal relations is a moral responsibility. While just punishment is an evil to the evildoer who is being punished, because it is just it is not an absolute evil. The forcible restraint of evil is necessary, and is morally incumbent upon Christians as well as upon the state. Hence the Christian cannot be excused from any and all acts of justice. Morally, the Christian cannot enjoy the benefits of a just society and at the same time disown responsibility for maintaining justice. Advocates of pacifism are accused of one-sidedly emphasizing social and economic justice and of failing to uphold retributive justice. They are also charged with overplaying the importance of physical violence while missing the psychological violence which characterizes human relations generally, even in utopian groups.
In the United States and Canada the current establishment of the military as volunteer forces has greatly lessened the tensions created by conscription and conscientious objection.

Bibliography: Eidsmoe, J., *God and Caesar* (1984); Hormus, *J. M., It Is Not lawful for Me to Fight* (1980); Kaufman, D. D., *The Tax Dilemma: Praying for Peace, Paying for War* (1978); Niebanck, R. J., *Conscience, l{br and the Selective Objector* (1968).

S.J.M.

DEMONOLOGY (p. 105-106). Belief in personal or other intelligent forms of evil forces which are beyond our knowledge is common in most religions of the world.

The majority of Christians believe in the existence of angels, who are divine agents for good, and the devil and demons, who are agents of evil. Christians reject idealism, monism, and dualism in part because these philosophies deal inadequately with the origin and nature of evil. Given the Christian premise of the creation of the world by God, the Fall must have been an event in time. The idea of creaturely rebellion permitted by God, that is, the premundane fall of an angelic being (Satan) or the fall of Adam or both, therefore, is seen to be as reasonable an explanation of the origin of evil as any other. For Christians, the working of evil in the world takes place through the bad wills of fallen creatures and through the damaging impersonal forces of the evil-infected creation.

The healing ministry of Jesus included cure of disease, restoration of disability, and release from demonic power. There appear to be distinctions drawn in the Gospel accounts between demonic possession and insanity (Matt. 4:24; 17:15) and between possession and other forms of illness. Some scholars argue that this awareness is evident from the fact that Jesus customarily commands the demon whereas he customarily touches the sick (Matt. 8:14-17; Mark 1:40-41; 7:24-37; Luke 11:14-26). Debate continues as to how much of Jesus' healing dealt with physical causes, psychological factors, demonic powers, or combinations of these.

Medieval thought and practice continues to influence powerfully modern thought, language, and practice regarding the demonic. However, modern understanding of medieval thought tends to be distorted due to oversimplification and lack of knowledge.

The variety of abnormal phenomena compelled medieval people, and compels us, to distinguish differing abnormal conditions by asking whether the causes are hereditary, physical (including chemical, such as the body tumors of the Middle Ages), dietary, psychological, moral, or demonic. All these elements were factored into medieval theory to a greater or lesser degree. Unlike some modern faith healers, most medieval theologians and clergy were too sophisticated to attribute most or all illness and insanity to demonic power. They distinguished between permanent mental incapacity, rage which quickly abates, insanity (those out of touch with reality), compulsive behavior, and menta capti, that is, when one is under the power of the devil or some other power. It is from this latter language alongside the terminology of the New Testament that our language of possession and obsession derives.

T. K. Oesterreich says that traditionally there are three key signs of demon possession: changed facial form, usually made grotesque; change of voice (sometimes a mimicking of another person); and, crucially, displacement of the usual personal identity of the person by a new and alien self. This last point forces

the observer to make the difficult judgment of distinguishing among epilepsy, ecstasy, furor, the fool, hysteria, insanity, and possession. As well, the possession may be spontaneous (invaded by the evil agent) or voluntary (yielded to or induced by the subject); it may be unconscious (not remembered later) or lucid; it may be possession by demons, other human spirits, or animal spirits (zoanthropy or lycanthropy), imagined or real (note Dan. 4:28-37).

When correlated with modern concepts these received ideas create great complexity and ambiguity. The secular inclination is to dismiss them, although a wide range of authorities, Christian and non-Christian alike, are reluctant to dismiss demon possession altogether as mythology or as hysteria.

The modern secular mood is to regard demons as the reification of evil powers or, as in Freudian theory, subterranean forces which defy or suspend the superego. However, modern humanists are dismayed, as are many Christians, at the rise of widespread interest in demonology, spiritism, astrology, and other paranormal and deterministic theories.

Some claim that this is due to the direction of thought taken by post-Freudian man about himself. The ancients believed that some disturbed people were possessed by the devil and could be delivered through penitence, prayer, and divine power. Modern man sees the devil to be part of his soul; to comprise the dark recesses from which emanate all the guilt, anxieties, fears, violence, and insecurity which plague mankind. The split between the ego and the superego is native to the soul; it is a fact of nature. This, critics of the modern mood say, is too great a burden, too intolerable for mankind to bear. Hence there has occurred a turning away from the mood of cultivated rational guilt to the irrational, a move which also took place in Greek and Roman times.

Most Christians believe that alien powers which may assault the soul exist. Indeed, some Christian theologians believe that most if not all suicide is demonically instigated. It was the purpose of Christ to triumph over the kingdom of evil and this he has accomplished through his death and resurrection. The Christian is therefore part of an army whose moral victory is not only assured; it is already won through the cross. Christ has repulsed the demonic kingdom and broken its power (Col. 2:14-15). C. S. Lewis has expressed this theme in highly literate form in *The Screwtape Letters*. Many Christians believe that demon activity is regionalized and that where the kingdom of Christ is planted -- in individual lives, homes, communities, society -- the forces of evil are held in check.

Christian, non-Christian, psychiatric, and religious authorities uniformly caution against dalliance with forces of evil or amateur attempts at exorcism. M. Scott Peck emphasizes that as was the case traditionally in the Christian church where informed insight and spiritual credibility in rare cases called for exorcism, this may be done. But in all cases it must be attempted only by professionally competent psychotherapists and devout persons of great piety, spiritual strength,

and moral courage.

Bibliography: Alexander, W. M., *Demonic Possession in the New Testament* (1980); Martin, M., *Hostage to the Devil* (1976); Neaman, J. S., *Suggestion of the Devil* (1975); Peck, M. S., *People of the Lie* (1983).

S.J.M.

DIVORCE (p. 114-116). Divorce is legal dissolution of the marriage bond with right of remarriage. No Old Testament law institutes divorce. The clearest biblical statement about divorce is Malachi 2:16, "I hate divorce, says the LORD the God of Israel."

Two broad perspectives determine the understanding of marriage and divorce, namely, utilitarian and creationist points of view.

The utilitarian perspective accepts the common-sense notion that monogamous marriage fits best our notions of love, provides emotional stability, and suits family rearing. Nevertheless where, as an empirical fact, marriage no longer exists, divorce is simply a recognition of that fact.

The creationist perspective holds that marriage is a gift of God in creation to the human race and that monogamous marriage, as a bond between two covenanting persons, is intended to be permanent (Gen. 2:24). However, biblical teaching focuses not upon the married state as an abstraction but as a unique kind of personal relationship involving deep, loving commitment to each other. Divorce is a concession to human failure where love has been annihilated. Divorce is thus a necessary evil.

Deuteronomy 24:1-4 does not institute divorce but only controls it, apparently to protect the woman. The bill of divorcement may have been intended as a procedure to discourage hasty acts as well as to regulate actions. "Defilement" which precludes remarriage to the same man (Deut. 24:4) may mean that the first marriage was not really annulled and that her second marriage was really a defaulting on the first. This statute on divorce is one of a series of statutes as-sembled in the latter part of the book, but without interpretation. It may well reflect compromise to regulate common marriage failure. Subsequent Jewish argument divided among those of strict interpretation that divorce is granted only for cause of adultery (School of Shanunai) and those of broader interpretation that divorce may be granted for every cause (School of Hillel).

These are issues which stand behind the challenge to Christ on the question of divorce by the Pharisees (Matt. 19:3-12; Mark 10:1-12) and our Lord's other pronouncements (Matt. 5:31-32; Luke 16:18). The Pharisees posed a dilemma in which He could be criticized for being too strict or too loose. Crucial implications and statements of His words are as follows: the divine aim of marriage as expressed in Genesis 2:24 is reaffirmed by Jesus to be a lifelong union between one man and one woman. -The Creator made them male and female from the beginning:' The first man and the first woman were intended solely for each other. Equality between man and woman as to obligation and responsibility is implied. Divorce is allowed on grounds of adultery. Other divorce is merely a concession to hardness of hearts. Remarriage following divorce except for cause of fornication is itself adultery.

Thus, while Jesus concedes the empirical facts of the casuistry embodied in the deuteronomic code, he does not concede that easy divorce was Moses' wish nor that it is the divine purpose. Divorce had to be conceded because of human frailty and was therefore regulated in the Mosaic code. In dealing with the dilemma posed, Jesus says that there is a cause which justifies divorce, but not just any whim ("for every cause").

There follows in Matthew a difficult passage (19:10-12). The disciples expostulate that marriage difficulties combined with such a strict rule concerning divorce might tempt men not to marry. (Instead, they would presumably live common-law in order to avoid such a strict code.) Jesus' reply has been construed to refer to celibacy, though Paul says he had no command respecting celibacy (I Cor. 7:25). The passage probably belongs to the context of a pronouncement on self-denial for the sake of the kingdom. In it, however, is an important observation on human frailty. Jesus states that not all can take this (Matt. 1912, but let him do so who can. Not everyone can have a fulfilled marriage. There may be burdens of marriage for some that are too great to bear.

In 1 Corinthians 7, an enigmatic chapter, Paul refers to celibacy, marriage, separation, and divorce. We do not know the specific questions the Corinthians posed. Remaining single is an honorable lifestyle but marriage is normal, he says. Marriage entails obligations, and each partner has his or her rights. Paul's charge to those who are married (vv. 10-11) is direct: no separation or divorce (perhaps this is to some who thought celibacy a higher spiritual state). Every attempt should be made to preserve a mixed marriage if the unbelieving spouse wishes to preserve the marriage (vv. 12-16). If not, it may be fairly inferred that Paul accepts separation or divorce as a necessary evil. In that case the forsaken partner is no longer bound by the marriage. These appear to be matters of what is humanly possible and of what is common sense (v. 25).

What is to be said about the indissolubility of marriage and Christian faith and practice? The facts of human frailty rule out unconditional self-committal for life. Nevertheless, utilitarian marriage falls below the Christian ideal because it falls below the Christian understanding of true love. To make of the married state a metaphysical abstraction, or a binding contract, or a necessary convention for society's good, does not address the issue that primarily marriage is a gift of the Creator, and that He blesses it as we choose it and experience the mysterious unity He intended (Gen. 2:24).

Every marriage is the same. To call marriage "sacramental" does not add anything to it. "One flesh" applies to marriage in general. This, it appears, is the force of Christ's teaching in Matthew 19:3-12 and Mark 10:1-12. Our Lord cast a bright light on the fact of creation. God intended that one man and one woman should enjoy a unique, deeply personal, unified life in their mutual self-giving. When that fails, men and women must seek reconciliation. If reconciliation is not possible, human frailty may dictate dissolution of the marriage with whatever safeguards

rightthinking society can devise.

The Christian position involves more than a single paradox. The "one flesh" teaching is a matter of biblical revelation; yet Christians believe in only one kind of marriage for all mankind. The indissoluble nature of the "one flesh" union is the professed Christian ideal; yet sadly
not a few modern Christians themselves have been unable to honor it.

The struggles of the various Christian traditions with these issues is legendary. Some, such as the Eastern Orthodox and most Protestants, allow divorce for the cause of adultery. Others, such as the Roman Catholic Church, deny divorce altogether but have devised a complicated and often generous system of annulment. In no case has any Christian tradition satisfactorily resolved the issue of the status of the vows taken in marriage. The result is that most Christians yield the matter to the courts, thus assigning to the courts a higher spiritual authority than claimed by any church.

Christians ought to understand "except it be for fornication" not as a policy legitimizing divorce but as a concession to human frailty. Likewise, Christians must not too quickly take cognizance of the remnants of sin in human life to speed movement to divorce. Marriage makes demands, often calls for heroic qualities, stands for more than the achievement of happiness, and teaches that love and fidelity are the most precious realities of life. Without them human beings are spiritually and emotionally maimed.

Rules that facilitate severing the bond of marriage, though sometimes necessary, must not become the norm of the church or of society. Rather, the pressure of family, church, and society must be exerted, and easy emotional escape routes cut off, to keep married couples together for their own good as well as for the good of the family and the community.

While Christians are bound to seek help for themselves and for threatened marriages, some problems may be humanly intractable. These include annihilating evils such as philandering, alcoholism, violence, cruelty, psychotic or serious neurotic conditions, homosexuality, impotence, sociopathic behavior, abandonment, extended imprisonment, incest, and abortion without consent of the husband. There is no warrant in Scripture to submit to such evils. In some cases spiritual heroism on the part of a suffering spouse may be redemptive. Where redemptive steps prove fruitless, most Christians understand the Scriptures to allow merciful escape from such evils.

Where divorce occurs, the burden for just dealing is very great. Maintaining communication by divorcing and divorced parents is a moral obligation so that the well-being of the children can be put first, including decisions about property, maintenance, and access. Parents can never divorce their children. No matter how amicable the parting between parents, the children suffer severely.

Communication is also important to fair division of money and property especially where a homemaker, after midlife, is expected to enter the work force, having devoted herself for years to her husband's career or business and to a family.

Bibliography: Church of England report, *Marriage, Divorce and the Ch*urch (1971); Green, W., *The Christian and Divorce* (1981); Rambo, L. R., *The Divorcing Christian* (1983); Swihart, J. J. and Brigham, S. L., *Helping Children of Divorce* (1982).

SJM.

EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS (p. 121-122). Christianity came into a world of ideas and sophisticated ethical systems. Ancient schools that were based on Democritus, Plato, and Aristotle, such as the Stoics and Epicureans, produced distinct and popular ethical theories that continue to influence modern thinkers.

How did it come about that as a result of the life and teachings of Jesus and the activities of his undistinguished followers, the ancient cults and schools were displaced? The republican nature of the Roman Empire and its legendary rule of law helped to transcend regional religious-ethnic sentiments. Early Christian writers such as Justin Martyr and Athenagoras make a strong point of the principle of universal justice in their plea for toleration. Ease of travel, the social withdrawal of the aristocratic class, and the emergence of a new entrepreneurial social group stimulated the cross-fertilization of ideas including the spread of Christianity.

More importantly, key features of philosophical traditions fostered the denigration of human personality and elementary morality. The philosophical schools tended to reinforce the impression that the universe is indifferent to individuals. Idealism advocated the view that existence is a form of nonbeing, while materialism through its determinism encouraged a fatalistic view of life and a belief in such practices as astrology.

The religious cults of the empire (Diana, Mithra, Adonis, Isis, Eleusis, and many others) were impersonal and ritualistic. Transcendental absorption, ritual ecstacy, and ritual asceticism tended to diminish the worth of the individual and to be a cover for orgiastic practices. The Christian conventicles became a powerful magnet to non-Christians because of their fellowship and personal purity. The Christian doctrine of creation with its corollaries that God is personal, that He personally cares for and judges man, that He loves mankind redemptively in Christ, and that as a forgiven sinner man can live in harmony with God and his fellows, furnished ancient people with a distinct intellectual, emotional, and moral alternative.

Criticism has been directed against early Christian writers by alleging that they diminish salvation by grace alone and instead articulate Christianity in legalistic and moralistic terms. For the most part, this view is mistaken. For example, the teaching about the Two Ways, the way of love to God and neighbor and the way of death, of the Didache runs parallel to the teaching of the book of James in the New Testament. If there is a frequent appeal for perfection in early writers, this should be judged in relation to the thenwidespread immoral practices and the pastoral need to urge vigilance, morality, and integrity of Christian commitment. They expressed their faith in relation to issues that shaped perception and thinking. Thus at the end of the second century A.D., Clement of Alexandria presented Christ as The Instructor. Clement did not intend to exclude the cross but, in the fertile intellectual climate of a great educational center, he interpreted Christ to the non-Christian mind.

Three examples of ethical exhortation and discussion may be cited:

Firstly, concerning Christian actions and interpersonal relations. The so-called

First Epistle of Clement is the earliest extant item of Christian literature outside the New Testament. It is not an episcopal document; rather, it is a congregational letter from the Christians of the church at Rome to the Christians in the church at Corinth. The situation at Corinth reflects Paul's earlier concerns in his two letters to Corinth, though now certain elders had been ejected from office and a younger group had assumed leadership in the church.

The letter is filled with Old Testament and secular allusions and appeals based on obedience to Christ. Pride, envy, and sedition are wrong. The Lord commands repentance, following the example of obedient biblical heroes of faith such as Abraham. The Holy Spirit honors the gentle and longsuffering. Consider the example of Christ's own humility and submission. There is order and harmony in nature and subordination and gradations of rank in the army as well as in other human relationships. The evicted elders should be restored to their places. These ethical injunctions are not episcopal pronouncements but appeals to faith, loyalty to Christ, a Christ-like pattern of humility, and common sense.

In the letter, the Corinthians are repeatedly addressed as "brethren," the exhortation "let us" occurs over sixty times, and the term beloved recurs many times as well. The theme of the letter is renewal of brotherly love, not direction from Rome. Allied with the fraternal appeal are pleas to re-establish mission as their priority, and to reshape attitudes and relationships. Ethical behavior is seen to be an ingredient essential to effectively "preaching the good news that the kingdom of God is coming."

Hallmarks of early influential Christian congregations were kerygmatic integrity, egalitarian loving concern, and high moral standards that reached out with welcoming and renewing hands of love.

Secondly, concerning interpretation of the Christian faith to non-Christians. An unknown Christian of the early second century addressed a letter to Diognetus. Christians, he says, despise gods fashioned in the image of their makers' passions. Propitiatory sacrifices to such gods insult the intelligence. It is immoral to try to buy off the gods or to gaze at the stars in order to cater astrologically to one's own whims. Devotees employ superstition simply to gratify human passions and justify moral weaknesses.

There follows a remarkable statement in *Diognetus 5-6* about the place of Christians in the world. Christians are not eccentrics, but are like their fellow-citizens in any society. To be sure, their mores differ from those of the world, but more important are the spiritual qualities which their faith produces in them. Christians believe that God personally creates, cares for, redeems, and will finally judge all men for their deeds. God saves men by neither coercion nor deception, but by love and persuasion. Such love evokes answering devotion to truth and goodness, so that Christians would rather die in the arena than renounce their faith.

Life is viewed from the standpoint of a divine purpose, not of fatalism; as under divine providence, not as victims of capricious nature or gods. God is nurse, father, teacher, counselor, physician, mind, light, honor, glory, strength, and life.

To those who yearn for faith, their response is moved by love: love for Him who wrought the sweet exchange in sending the Son to die for them, which makes men debtors to limitless grace. The true Christian understands that while his lot is cast on earth, God rules in heaven. Therefore, he admires the heavenly virtues and is unafraid to rebuke evil and wrong, whether in himself or around him.

Thirdly, concerning the defense of Christian faith and values, about *175-177* A.D. *a Plea* on behalf of Christianity was submitted to the emperor Marcus Aurelius at Athens by Athenagoras, who was trained in philosophy and had become a Christian. It should be borne in mind that Marcus Aurelius was the last of the great Stoic ethicists.

At the outset, Athenagoras pleads for justice on the grounds of traditional Stoic and empirical commitment to equity. By law even ridiculous beliefs were tolerated. It is not beliefs but wrongdoing that merits penalty and punishment, says Athenagoras. Christians, on the other hand, "suffer unjustly and contrary to all law and reason:' Despite such mistreatment, Christians are taught not to return blow for blow but to be kind to those who oppress them and who pour out unfounded accusations upon them. Christians espouse principles of justice, rather than arbitrary acts of malice.

Athenagoras argues that the atheism charged against Christians is false. Christians distinguish God from matter, and he cites well-known pagan sources that satirize the irrationalities and immoralities attributed to the gods. Such behavior is merely an attempt to explain away or to justify human immorality, which Christians do not practice. They regard adultery, homosexuality, and pederasty as outrageous. The strong chase the weaker, he says, and "outrage those with the more graceful and handsome bodies." These practices Roman laws also condemned but were unable to control.

Christians strive not to violate personhood. and they set a value upon human life. Athenagoras states a beautiful and vital Christian principle: through genuine love, Christians regard one another as sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, fathers and mothers. Therefore, "it is a matter of great importance that those, whom we thus think of as brothers and sisters and so on, should keep their bodies undefiled and uncorrupted.' Christians will neither exploit nor kill. They "regard the fetus in the womb as a living thing and therefore the object of God's care:' How then can they slay it? Children are God's gift. How then can unwanted infants be left on hillsides exposed to die or be eaten by animals, as was commonly done by the Greeks and Romans?

Athenagoras goes on to argue that the Christian virtues of love and goodness are neither merely abstract principles, nor ascetic ideals, nor hair-splitting verbal distinctions. Christians value the creation and the beauty of the human body as God's work. The "order, harmony, greatness, color, form, and arrangement of the world" give ample reason to adore God. He adds, "beautiful, indeed, is the world, in all its embracing grandeur." Yet, it is not the world but its Maker who should be worshiped. Men by avarice and immorality destroy beauty by unreasoning passion.

Some remarkable parallels between the modern and early Christian worlds are closer than at any intervening time. Ease of conversion from cult to cult was a feature of life in the second and third centuries A.D. Especially noteworthy was the quest for personal identity. The cultic religions and ethical systems were lonely and impersonal. Aspiring to displace the individual's ordinary social identity through ecstacy or transcendental participation in the divine was a common theme among devotees. This quest for a new identity tended to diminish the ultimate worth of the individual and his daily ethical responsibility.

Christian attitudes and practices contrasted sharply with the mood of the times. Christians were radically egalitarian; they displayed a powerful sense of community and affirmation of one another; their devotion to God was complete; and their ethical principles were life-transforming.

Bibliography: Chadwick, H., *The Early Church* (1967); Judge, E. A., *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (1960); Oates, W. J., (ed.), *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers* (1940); Richardson, C. C., (ed.), *Early Christian Fathers* (1950).

S.J.M.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP (p. 133-134). The role of the entrepreneur is integral to the free enterprise economy. While all modern economies are mixed, that is, they are neither wholly socialist nor wholly capitalist, entrepreneurs are in principle excluded from socialist economies. Free enterprise allows free choice to entrepreneurs, consumers, and workers to buy and sell goods and services for their own advantage. In practice, greed and exploitation are muted by societal forces that tend to reward those who furnish that which is socially beneficial, though democratic societies try to ensure the maintenance of a free market and to censure abuse through laws.

The entrepreneur is a risk taker. He is prepared to undertake, to venture, and to try something untried. The entrepreneur is the vital link and catalyst between capital and labor. Incentive creates opportunity; that is, the entrepreneur's pursuit of his own self-interest tends to benefit others as well.

The role of the entrepreneur is criticized by somebecause the primary incentive is seen to be venture for profit that is then further defined as greed. However, profit serves a function beyond income. Profit is also a signal of efficiency and of having met public need or demand satisfactorily. To interpret the risk taking of the entrepreneur as being solely for profit is unfair. Some entrepreneurs are greedy; but most venture for reasons beyond profit including a sense of achievement, to create opportunity for others, to create or invent something new, and to contribute to the economy and to the well-being of their own country.

For the Christian, important ethical considerations follow from the role of the entrepreneur. The first is diligence and self-reliance that are part of the biblical work ethic. No Christian should be an idler (2 Thess. 3:6). This means that he should produce more than he consumes so as to be able to help others who are not so fortunate (I Cor. 16:2; Eph. 4:28). Self-reliance does not exclude accepting help when one is in need; but it does reject exploiting the system when productive work of some kind is available. Paul does not say that those who are unable to work should not eat; only that those who refuse to work do not deserve to eat (2 Thess. 3:10).

Productivity is more than a profit-oriented concept; it is a term reinforced by powerful ethics. The Christian is expected to be productive in the important sense of creating opportunity for others. This means more than merely avoiding re-pressive tactics (Mic. 2:2; Amos 2:7; 5:12). It means targeting prosperity as a goal for others as well as for oneself as the natural by-product of personal initiative. "The plans of the diligent lead surely to abundance" (Prov. 21:5). The evangelical revival of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries evoked from Christians new diligence, productivity, stewardship of capital, and social concern. Paul's denunciation of avarice (1 Tim. 6:6-10) is balanced by his insistence that Christians be diligent.

Competition sharpens one's wits and stimulates efficient use of resources. Because it forces effective planning, competition and incentive oriented planning by individuals and local enterprise are vastly more efficient than the planning of centralized bureaucracies. Enterprise thus accommodates a better use of human

resources that fosters human development, creativity, and fulfillment. The greatest waste is the waste of human resources and potential.

For the Christian entrepreneur as for others, life is filled with moral choices. These include commitment to justice, fairness, honesty, and kindness. A crucial issue is that of priorities. Does the drive to succeed solely concern acquisition of property, making a great deal of money, or controlling a business empire? Or does the Christian entrepreneur see business as his or her contribution to the well-being of society alongside his or her loving commitment to marriage, family, friends, and the ongoing work of the kingdom of God?

Bibliography: Kirzner. I. M., *Competition and Entrepreneurship* (1973); Novak, M., (ed.), *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism* (1982); Ouchi, W., *Theory Z* (1981); Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H., *In Search of Excellence* (1982).

S.J.M.

ESCHATOLOGY AND ETHICS (p. 135-136). There are three points of the kingdom and related ethics in the Bible: Old Testament theocracy and kingdom expectation, fulfillment in the life and ministry of Jesus, and the eschatological event of Christ's second coming to inaugurate the final kingdom. The several meanings of the biblical term "kingdom" and related kingdom ethics have been reduced in modern times to platitudes and sometimes to theological confusion, even contradiction.

In the Old Testament God is king, which signifies both the prerogative of His divine right to rule and the sphere of His rule which is all creation, including men and nations. Notable passages such as Psalms 2 and 24 state this unambiguously. Extensive biblical documentation is possible (I Sam. 12:12; Pss. 10:16; 44:4; 103:19; 149:2; Isa. 43:15; Jer. 10:7; Mal. 1:14).

Major themes of the Old Testament kingdom vision are righteousness and truth, judgment and redemption, and hope and renewal. The travail of nature in an evil-infected world; national social injustice; religious perversions such as idolatry and superficial ritual; international upheaval and war; and personal sins such as avarice, heartlessness, and impurity receive and are promised ultimate divine judgment. Judgment, however, is tempered by grace and promise of healing. God calls men to repentance, faith, and obedience. Often the appeal combines the themes of renewal and justice with hope for a new day when God will truly be king and men will willingly obey His laws (Isa. 2; 43). The principles of the final kingdom ought to affect present attitudes and behavior.

While in the Old Testament the coming kingdom is God's in the broadest sense and some Old Testament writers do not include messianic references, most interpreters of the Old Testament agree that the concepts of kingdom and Messiah belong together (Isa. 9:6-7; 32:1; Jer. 23:5130:9; Dan. 7:13-14; Zech. 14:9). The kingdom vision includes restoration of balance in the forces of nature. The greatest emphasis is placed upon reconciliation of man to God and renewal of human personality to do good. Great stress is placed upon righteousness, social justice, personal morality, and spiritual fidelity. Kingdom ethics in the Old Testament are never merely legal; they are always renewal ethics. God wants the hearts of his people; their obedience will follow.

This strand of Old Testament teaching is at the heart of kingdom expectation and realization in the life and teaching of Jesus (Zech. 9:9; Matt. 21:5). Jesus radically transformed conceptions of the kingdom from a political and economic ideal to personal renewal, a sustained spiritual relationship with God, and obedience to him. While Jesus confirms certain signs of the kingdom (Matt. 10:5-15; 11:2-6; Luke 4:16-30), He declares that the first priority of the kingdom is spiritual and moral renewal (Matt. 6:33; Mark 1:15; Luke 17:21). Nevertheless a powerful eschatological motif pervades Christ's teaching. There is indeed to be a coming kingdom and He is its true king, now revealed, who finally will be enthroned. This truth also serves as a sanctifying expectation, a presently morally purifying hope (1 John 3:1-3).

An important link between the Old Testament and the New Testament regarding

the kingdom ideal is the place of the Holy Spirit. The new age is the age of the Spirit, which most Christians understand was inaugurated at Pentecost (Ezek. 36:27; 37:14; Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:17-21). The Spirit energizes redeemed and restored mankind. The advent of Christ indeed marks inauguration of the kingdom, and Pentecost indeed marks the birth of the church. However, Pentecost is not the primary sign but the consequent sign of the Spirit. The primary sign of the Spirit is Christ Himself. His advent not only marks inauguration of the kingdom, but it also discloses historically the new man for the new age: the spirit-bearing humanity of Christ, the file-leader of the new humanity. Kingdom ethics are the ethics of the new spirit-endowed humanity.

Thus in Scripture there is a conscious analogy drawn between the life of Christ and the life of each Christian. Christ was begotten of the Spirit, baptized in the Spirit, taught and did mighty works by the Spirit, and quickened from the dead by the Spirit. The same is true of each Christian. The analogy of Romans 6:1-4, which speaks of entering upon new life, has its climactic interpretation in Romans 8:11. The Spirit in each Christian is the Spirit of Christ. The Spirit is author of the law of Christ. The aim of the Spirit is to duplicate in each life the spirit-bearing humanity of the incarnate Lord. Thus the greatest sign of the Spirit's presence is not unusual phenomena but the permanent moral transformation of life.

The kingdom ethic combines expectation and fulfillment. It gathers rather than scatters, conserves rather than discards. Christ came not to destroy but to fulfill the law. Similarly, Paul does not jettison but honors the moral values of the law. The principle of justification by faith does not sidestep morality. It embraces it and makes possible the morally transformed life by the power of the Spirit. It is therefore inadequate when dealing with the Sermon on the Mount to evade its moral principles as at present altogether impossible to realize and to project them wholly to a future kingdom age. The kingdom ethics that Jesus espouses parallel the ethics of the life in the Spirit which the epistles envisage.

While it is possible to draw instructive parallels between lists of proscribed vices in the teaching of Jesus and in the Epistles, especially Paul's, the power of kingdom ethics resides in their positive quality. First and foremost is their inward base: "the good man out of his good treasure brings forth evil" (Matt. 12:35). The primary virtue of this treasure of the heart is love, not as pure emotion, but as a personal relationship based on the integrity of moral commitment. It is love to God and love to neighbor (Matt. 22:37; Mark 12:3031; Luke 10:27-28).

Corollaries of this inward spiritual and moral dedication include deep hunger to know and fulfill the righteousness of God, transcultural kindness and mercy, a peaceable and unrancorous disposition, integrity of moral purpose rather than moral duplicity, humility, and a forgiving spirit. These virtues, spoken by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount and the Beautitudes, coincide with the graces listed by Paul (Gal. 5:21-26), Peter (2 Pet. 1:5-11), and other writers in the New Testament. Early church literature, such as Clement of Rome's First Epistle and the Epistle to Diognetus, convey powerfully the same sentiments. To be a part of God's kingdom entails earnest aspiration to reflect its principles in life through God's help.

The ancient world was furnished richly with ideals, including attractive ethical ideals, in Judaism and the various schools of Greco-Roman culture. Christianity did not offer merely abstract ideals, but the power by means of which its ideals could actually be realized. This is the meaning of the life in Christ as the life in the Spirit. The fact that the world is still an evil-infected world and that Christians are still sin-prone reinforces to the Christian the importance of his dedication and rededication to kingdom ideals. Diognetus the enquirer is told in the epistle addressed to him that "Christians dwell in the world, but do not belong to the world." This is the eschatological nature and impact of kingdom ethics. Christians and their values really belong to another world. Nevertheless, they are solidly a part of this world and strive to realize Christ's ideals, which are epitomized in the phrase "the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2), in their own lives, in their relationship with one another, and in their dealings with other people.

Bibliography: Hunter, A. M., *A Pattern for Life* (1953); Ladd, G. E., A *Theology of the New Testament* (1974); Schnackenburg, R., *Present and Future Aspects of New Testament Theology* (1966); Wilder, A. N., *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (1950).

S.J.M.

ETHICS ESSAYS

SAMUEL J. MIKOLASKI
published in
Encyclopedia of Biblical and Christie
(ed. R. K. Harrison)
Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987

Adultery
Agape
Aggression
Altruism
Antinomianism
Collectivism
Confession
Conscientious Objection
Demonology
Divorce
Early Christian Ethics
Entrepreneur ship
Eschatology and Ethics
Fall of Man
Force, Ethical Use of
Forgiveness
Free Will
Holiness
Liberty
Love
Militarism
Original Sin
Pacifism
Preaching
Property
Remarriage
Self-Deception
Temptation
Utilitarianism
Violence
Vocation

FALL OF MAN (p. 145-146). In the Bible the Fall is a historical event in which Adam rebelled against God (Gen. 3). Through this act Adam and all of mankind consequently lost their original divinely given innocence and have experienced the doleful conditions which follow from sin: guilt, condemnation, painful conditions of life and environment, and finally death.

The original temptation is attributed in the Bible to the devil, disguised as a serpent. That God created the first couple and that the Fall was historical is assumed (Luke 3:38; Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 1 Tim. 2:13). In principle, the logic of the Fall of man and the logic of a premundane angelic fall (John 8:44; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6; Rev. 20:1-2) are the same. To take it out of history is to end up with either dualism (that good and evil co-exist eternally) or monism (that good and evil are jointly encompassed in one undifferentiated whole). Given the Christian premises of the creation of the world by God, personhood, freedom and moral responsibility, the Fall, whether premundane or the Fall of man, must have been an event in time.

In modern times even those who have taken the Fall account to be mythological have expressed growing admiration for its theological implications, psychological insights, moral perceptions, and its cosmological and philosophical uniqueness.

This uniqueness centers upon the moral nature of man and his moral relation to God. The central issue is perversion of man's nature, which was created originally in the image of God. Whatever else this may mean, personhood is essential to the biblical model. Man is created to be an intelligent, moral, and purposing self. Corruption of this image by sin does not mean that something has happened to man; rather, that something has happened in man (Mark 7:21). The evil comes willfully from within. Evil is not merely a metaphysical state, but is a moral condition due to disobedience. This condition has been universal since the Fall. Hence the present contradiction in human nature. Man is capable of great good; nevertheless, man is dogged by his proneness to evil.

The possibility of sin is in itself a tribute to the greatness that man was given by God, who made man akin to Himself (Ps. 8:5). God made a free spirit in contrast to the rest of the animal creation. Man's uniqueness is apparent in his intelligence (including science and the practical applications of his knowledge), his creativity (including art and culture), and his ability to discriminate between right and wrong.

The dark side since the Fall is that man has become loveless, frustrated, and perverse. There have ensued repeated acts that reflect the Fall (1 Cor. 10:12; 1 Tim. 3:6; Heb. 4:11).

Why man fell remains a mystery. Answers include pride, independence from God, unbelief, concupiscence, and disobedience. Despite man's continuing perversity, God graciously purposes human redemption and renewal through Christ's sacrificial death. Renewal comes not by educational and social reform, nor by psychological or psychiatric reprogramming, as helpful as these may be, nor by adjusting any universal chemical imbalance in the brain as some have thought to do. Rather, the new man for the new age comes by redemption. Paul dramatically

contrasts all that has come to the race through Adam's disobedience and the Fall with what has come to the race through Christ and His obedience (Rom. 5:12-21). Paul does not envision a behaviorally induced change, but a permanent moral transformation of human life through the power of Jesus Christ.

Bibliography: Babbage S. B., Man in Nature and Grace (1957): Cave. S., The Christian Estimate of Man (1944); MacKay, D. M., Human Science and Human Dignity (1979); Mikolaski, S. J., The Grace of God (1965).

S.J.M.

FORCE, ETHICAL USE OF (p. 154-155). Force is the power to attack, conquer, compel, or punish. This may be done by means of sheer personal physical strength, force of arms, maneuver or entrapment, psychological coercion, or lawful authority. The legitimate use of force is based upon morally and legally valid authority backed by physical power or force of arms. Immoral and illegal use of force includes violation of persons, various criminal acts, unjust war, anarchy, terrorism, and psychological violence. This can occur between nations or within communities. churches, families, and in the work place.

Pacifists, Christian and non-Christian, claim that there can be no justification for the use of force. Christians of the peace groups differ significantly among themselves as to how much force, if any, an individual may use; whether self--defense is ever legitimate; whether one may physically discipline children; whether the state may punish criminals (including the question of capital punishment); and whether Christians ought to be involved in enforcing the binding power of law.

Critics of pacifist, nonresistance, and nonviolence perspectives allege that absorption with the question of physical force allows such groups to ignore the practice of psychological violence within their own ranks. A damaging criticism is the observation that the claim that force and punishment are inconsistent with the New Testament law of love creates a disjunction between Christians and the legitimate responsibilities and obligations of the state. Pacifism is alleged to be utopian and unrealistic. A nation made up of sinful men and women cannot be run solely on the basis of the law of love. As well, this view creates an unbridgeable gulf between Old Testament and New Testament teaching, furnishing no basis for faith in the continuity of ethical and moral principles from Old Testament to New Testament literature, nor any justification for the historical judgments of God upon evildoers through disaster and war.

For Christians, the crucial question is the meaning of the law of love (Gal. 5:6) as the crystallization of Jesus' ethical teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. All Christians believe that love and peace are God's will for men. No Christian defends naked violence. What stance must the Christian take when he has his feet planted in two worlds, the evil-infected world of fallen humanity and the kingdom of God?

Those who reject the pacifist claim do not thereby reject peace. They believe that it is a moral obligation to fashion laws which justly withstand and punish evil; and that Christians have the freedom, indeed the obligation, in a just state to participate in the proper coercive functions of the state as soldiers, judges, police officers, sheriffs, and guards.

On this view the importance of love and peace as obligations placed upon Christians is not diminished. They are put into the broader perspective of biblical teaching which embraces obligations wider than those which define ideal character and ideal relations. The Sermon on the Mount is thus understood to deal with personal, one-on-one relations, not with state relations or general non-Christian relationships. The Sermon on the Mount does enjoin peace. It is

significant, however, that such matters as war, capital punishment, and punishment of evildoers are not specifically proscribed. It is clear that God judged Israel for idolatry, injustice, immorality, and other vices, but not for self-defense or just war. To separate God's commands to judge, punish, or go to war from fundamental morality creates a theological impasse in biblical interpretation.

The state is divinely sanctioned to maintain and promote justice and to punish evildoers (Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-17). How far does this extend? To which matters does this authority apply? What role may or ought Christians to have in the work of the state? Ought the Christian acting as an individual ever use force? Most Christians maintain that their faith and instinct to reject the use of force in personal relations runs parallel with their obligation to uphold justice and to participate in the restraint of evil even if force is necessary. Thus nonviolence as a norm in personal ethics, submission to violence when persecuted, and refusal to participate in unjust acts or causes, cohere with the right to self-defense and obligation to restrain evil.The power of the state to compel is not in itself evil. Each situation must be judged in light of the moral principles of justice and equity, and in relation to political and religious freedom.

Most Christians believe themselves justified to go to war in defense of their country and to prevent the conquest of others by totalitarian regimes. The march to political freedom has been long and bloody. Few who now enjoy democracy and freedom are prepared to yield them.

The right to self-defense and the defense of life is fundamental to existence in an evil-infected world. As contradictory as it may seem, the right to restrain, including the power to kill, is moral and killing may itself, paradoxically, be a just act. This does not justify personal vengeance or war crimes. The faith that life is God's gift does not of itself entail the obligation to yield life to any and every act of violence. Rather, it entails the obligation to shelter life, nourish it, and under law to avenge its abuse or violent extinction. To take life in some cases may be the only way to avoid betraying the moral trust of which humanity is heir. The idea that it is never right to use lethal force squares neither with biblical precept and practice nor with the considered moral conviction of humanity. Nevertheless, the burden of proof to justify the taking of life rests with him who takes life. Thus in a hostage-taking in democratic countries every effort is made to talk the hostage-taker skillfully into surrender, and lethal force is reserved as a desperate measure to protect the lives of hostages and others.

A difficulty alleged of no-defense and no-punishment theory is that it tends to institutionalize coercion and violence and to encourage anarchy. The compromise solution advocated by some Christians, that the state has the God-given right and duty to punish evildoers but that Christians ought to excuse themselves from these duties, is singularly unconvincing to most people and absurd to some.

Law and penalty express the right of society to protect itself and to punish evil deeds. Punishment must be seen for what it is, namely, punishment for wrongdoing. Punishment can indeed serve more than one function. It can aid reformation and deter evildoing. However, the ultimate moral justification of punishment must be, first, that it vindicates the law and, second, that it brings just

(graded and appropriate) retribution upon the wrongdoer.

Bibliography: Bainton, R. H., *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace* (1960); Cleary, E. L., Crisis and Change: The Church in Latin America Today (1985); Clouse, R. G., (ed.), *War: Four Christian Views* (1981); Yoder, J. H., *The Politics of Jesus* (1972).

(Note AGGRESSION, CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION; MILITARISM; PACIFISM; and VIOLENCE in this series.)

S.J.M.

FORGIVENESS (p. 156). There is no verbal solution to sin in the Bible. Forgiveness is not merely spoken; something happens so that forgiveness becomes possible. The crucial factor is that sin is forgiven as it is borne (John 1:29). This is based upon a previous objective decision to forgive sin lovingly. This is as true of human forgiveness as it is of divine forgiveness, because true human forgiveness is a copy of God's forgiveness and is made possible by it.

In the Bible sacrifice and atonement are the ground of forgiveness and reconciliation. All of these have their possibility in the unbounded grace of God (Exod. 34:6-7; Num. 14:17-19; Neh. 9:17; Ps. 86:15). In the Old Testament, grace, atonement, and forgiveness belong together (Lev. 17:11; cf. Heb. 9:22). The unity of the Scriptures and fulfillment of their promises devolve upon Christ the Lamb of God whose death on the cross is the final sacrifice for the sins of the world (Matt. 26:28; Acts 2:36-38; Eph. 17; 1 John 4:10). That the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 is the Son of man who comes to give His life a ransom for many (Mark 10:45) is the vital link in the biblical message of redemption, forgiveness, and reconciliation.

God's forgiveness and human forgiveness interlock (Matt. 6:12, 14-15; Luke 17:3-4; Eph. 4:32). Man's being forgiven entails his having a forgiving spirit toward his fellows. The righteousness of God is more than legal rectitude, for it embraces mercy and grace. For this reason Jesus, in Matthew 5:38-48, urges His followers to practice love and forgiveness rather than stark justice (an eye for an eye) or vindictiveness. This meaning of forgiveness is integral to the ethical life of the Christian and is built upon the spiritual foundation of reconciliation with God. Forgiveness and reconciliation through Christ bridge the gap between God and man and between man and man to overcome the distance and alienation due to race, culture, and religion (Eph. 2:11-22).

Previously "sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2), Christians enter the blessings of loving obedience as the children of God (Rom. 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:2). This obedience is not acquiescence to arbitrary rules. Rather it is joyful participation in doing good as the expression of true freedom. Forgiveness releases from guilt, condemnation, and fear of death. The forgiven sinner can be at peace with himself because he is at peace with God and is able to forgive himself as well (Pss. 32; 51). This is the theme of Paul's powerful argument in Romans 5:1-11. While there may be contrived, self-imposed kinds of guilt which can be exposed and dispelled verbally, the real guilt of which Paul speaks can be dealt with only by grace, atonement, and faith.

Deliverance and freedom are goals of forgiveness (Col. 1:13). The "washing" (forgiveness) of I Corinthians 6:11 relates to the "all things are lawful ... but I will not be enslaved by anything" of verse 12 (RSV). Freedom from *sin* means *freedom* for righteousness (Rom. 6:18; 8:11-15).

Forgiveness liberates for hope (Rom. 5:3-5). Sin creates more than the conditions of individual guilt and death. The dispersed consequences of evil acts spread out in widening rings, having unforeseen and uncontrollable consequences. Forgiveness includes for the sinner the faith that God through His redeeming activity

can assuage these effects and turn their power to good. Therefore each forgiven person can enter his Christian vocation as a co-worker with God, confident that what he puts his hand to *will* not fail (Rom. 8:28).

Forgiveness is in itself a triumph over evil. A new power is released into the world and the moral affairs of men through the cross, namely, the power of vicarious love and burden bearing. To act vicariously epitomizes the genius of forgiveness. The heart of forgiveness is that sin is forgiven as it is borne, hence its costliness. When one person is forgiven by another, the injured party absorbs the evil done to him and converts its energy for good. This is a major element of the ethical substructure of the New Testament. If someone strikes you on the cheek, turn the other; render to no man evil for evil, but good for evil (Rom. 12:17; Gal. 6:10; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9-12). To absorb evil redemptively is to triumph over evil and convert the powers of human life from evil by grace for good.

Bibliography: Brunner, E., *Our Faith* (1936); Hodgson, L., *Christian Faith and Practice* (1950); Marshall, I. H., *The Work of Christ* (1969); Stott, *J., Men Made New* (1966).

S.J.M.

FREE WILL (p. 159-161). In the West, three major philosophical traditions dominate discussion of freedom of the will: materialist, idealist, and creationist. Each brings to the discussion certain prior assumptions as to antecedent psychological and physiological conditions which determine the outcome of the argument.

Materialism, whether in its ancient atomistic or in its modern naturalistic form, sees the world as the product of a series of inexorable cause-effec t events which do not allow for contingency related to the exercise of free will. Psychological components of existence are made out to be comPIe:ely functions of physiological necessity whether mechanical, chemical, or neurological. Contingency may be allowed for in the sense of limited chance events, such as postulating that a primordial atom unaccountably swerved to produce atomic interaction and the present universe. Nevertheless, nature is ruled by laws of necessity and is a closed system.

Modern versions of materialism include Marxist theories of historical and economic necessity (E. H. Carr), psychological determinism (B. F. Skinner), instrumentalists (John Dewey), and various philosophical versions of biological determinism in which the mind is seen to be solely a function of physical processes in the brain (Russell Brain, Gilbert Ryle). These views leave little room for duty and "ought." Morality is defined in terms of mores and behavioral responses, usually hedonistically, rather than as answering to transcendental or divinely sanctioned ethical norms.

Traditional forms of idealism tend to denigrate the physical world and to elevate mind or cosmic reason as the divine element of the universe as well as being transpersonal. In the mind of God there scarcely can be any contingencies, and therefore freedom in the sense that events may occur at the choice of a finite being which are against the will of God is an illusion (Spinoza). As the expression of the mind of God, the best of all possible worlds is already here (Leibniz).

Modern forms of idealism have sought to incorporate a scientific view of the world in their attempts to embrace transcendental forms within the evolutionary process, as in recent finite god theories (A. N. Whitehead, Charles Hartshorne). In these views the possibility of free *will* is expressed as part of a series of antinomies relating to the emerging absolute *will* of God.

Systems of idealism tend to absorb finite acts into divine ones and thereby emptying free will of significance. Critics of modern attempts to express Christianity metaphysically in categories of philosophical idealism include Leonard Hodgson, Gustave Weigel, and Kenneth Hamilton.

Modern rejection of free will and reduction of mind to physical functions of the brain have evoked a strong reaction and a significant literature, including studies by Austin Farrer, Arthur Koestler, John Beloff, H. D. Lewis, J. R. Smythies, Ian Ramsey, Donald MacKay, John Eccles, and Karl Popper.

Christian creationism rejects materialist and idealist attempts to cancel or to rephrase radically the meaning of free will. In the Christian revelation, persons and personal relations are the highest level of reality, hence the strategic role of grace. In this view grace is the primary mode of relationship between God and the world, in virtue of which He remains free and the world remains real. Grace is also the primary mode of human

interpersonal relations, in virtue of which men allow freedom to one another. Thus grace, freedom, and responsibility are correlative concepts.

Augustine reiterates this theme in his *Confessions (7.2).* Only when based upon the categories of freedom, sin, responsibility, and redemption could his soul find peace and his mind rest, because these allowed him to make sense of his experience in contrast to the reductionist idealist philosophy of the Manicheans, which had attracted him earlier.

For Christians, freedom is a function or capacity of spiritual beings. Persons are spiritual beings. To be a person is to be a self-conscious spiritual reality with the power of rational thought and capable of purposeful activity which is morally qualified. Freedom involves the reality of contingency in the world order and the recognition that things may go this way or that depending upon the choice of a spiritual being. Persons as spiritual beings are free in contrast to matter. This is the fundamental distinction between spirit and matter: the difference between that which is active and that which is passive; between that which is self-moved and that which is moved upon (such as being programmed or conditioned).

Spiritual beings are more or less free, that is, they are more or less spiritual. Christians are called upon to spiritualize their bodily life, which means to act in terms of moral and other ideals. Thus there is a further meaning of freedom, namely, the difference between spiritual bondage and spiritual liberty. As spiritual beings, persons in the image of God are intended to utilize the elements of a dependable world to increase freedom.

A scientifically dependable world and the reality of persons and their freedom are the truth of the way things are to the Christian. Increase of control can lead to increase of freedom, whether it is control of one's own life or of the environment. Actions and goals are to be morally qualified by the will of God. God's purposes have at their center the creation of free good persons who share His life and work. The Christian sees it as a moral ideal to relate to and to treat others as persons altruistically, through love, for their full development in freedom.

For the Christian there are three practical issues which impinge upon understanding free will and the morality of choice. Firstly, modern psychological explanations of wrong behavior and purely sociological explanations of social ills have failed. Anna Russell aptly satirizes such explanations in her "Psychiatric Folksong":

But now I'm happy; I have learned the lesson this has taught; that everything I do that's wrong is someone else's fault.

A proper sense of responsibility and guilt is now seen by many to be the first step to healing and to freedom. On this view the term "free" is virtually superfluous. The self knows itself in the immediacy of its own intuition. It reflects on its own immediate acts in relation to motive and ends. The self knows not only that the body is acting, but also that the action has been willed.

Two sustained themes in the Bible are moral responsibility for wayward behavior and clarity as to the question of moral choice. Many biblical examples focus on these two issues: David's dramatic confession of adultery and murder in Psalm 51 clearly pinpoints his freedom of choice and his guilt: "I know my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me" (v. 3 RSV). The prodigal son accepts that his alienation was his own choice (Luke 15:18). Judas acknowledges that his betrayal of Jesus was his own action (Matt. 27:4).

Wrongdoing entails freely taken wrong moral choice. Augustine concludes that 'nothing can make the mind the consumption of lust but its own will and free choice" *(On Free Will* 1.11). He was a shrewd diagnostician to conclude that imperfect commitment to do good results in imperfect command to will good *(Confessions 8.9).*

Secondly, A. N. Whitehead has argued that the emergence of the modern scientific world view is tied closely to the medieval conception of a providentially governed and therefore dependable world order, based on the Christian doctrine of creation. Modern man accepts the Christian premise that the world order does not function capriciously and that what happens here under given conditions will happen there under the same conditions. Therefore, far from evading the truth of the conditioned response, Christians embrace it. However, Christians embrace the behavorial principle not to empty freedom of its meaning but with a view to heightening freedom. Conditioning can be used to increase freedom and maximize good. Habits of devotion, well-balanced meals, buckling a seat belt, and exercising the body, all work for good. Such behavioral responses help to maximize freedom. Bad habits limit freedom. Nevertheless, a major thesis of biblical teaching is that we are responsible for the evil conditioning to which we become slaves. We know that we are freely conditioning ourselves and that we may reach the point or series of points at which there is loss of freedom and control. For this, too, we are responsible. Paul's statement concerning morally wrong conditioning is "all things are lawful for me but I will not be enslaved by anything ... all things are lawful, but not all things are helpful" (1 Cor. 6:12; 10:23-25).

Thirdly, freedom combined with the truth of providentially dependable world order provides opportunity to maximize good socially, scientifically, and politically. Christians can accept the contingencies of life as opportunities to be coworkers with God in shaping the future. Fatalism and historical and economic inevitability are not Christian points of view. The Christian ought to consider the whole of life as dedicated to God. So viewed, life becomes a providentially overshadowed pathway through thousands of options. By freely choosing among them in relation to moral and spiritual ends, the Christian as a co-worker with God can make a valuable contribution to the present and future well-being of others.

Bibliography: Farrer, A., *The Freedom of the Will* (1957); Hodgson, *L., For Faith and Freedom,* Vol. I (1956); Popper, K. R. and Eccles, J. *C., The Self and Its Brain* (1977); Schelling, T. *C., Choice and Consequence* (1984).

<div align="right">S.J.M.</div>

HOLINESS (p. 181-182). The common though derived meaning of holiness is purity, integrity, moral perfection, and sanctity. The terms sanctification and holiness are, for the most part, synonymous. Tension continues as to whether holiness is best defined in negative terms such as "freedom from defect" or in positive terms. While most Christians tend in principle to emphasize the latter, the ways in which the holy life is defined in the practice of specific virtues remains a matter of dispute.

Modern perceptions as to what constitutes the holy life encompass the range of historical misconceptions. Some make special signs or unusual phenomena necessary conditions of higher holiness, though Paul insists that gifts are apportioned by the Holy Spirit and are not obtainable by wheedling God (1 Cor. 12:11). Indeed, he insists not only that no Christian can have all spiritual gifts, but that no gift such as miracles, healings, or tongues is the prerogative of either every or any Christian. It is clear that "no" is the only possible answer to Paul's rhetorical questions in 1 Corinthians 12:29-30. Thus unusual phenomena may be part of the holy life, but they are not routinely a condition of the holy life.

Another claim which recurs generation after generation is the conviction that holiness and some form of abstinence are inextricably tied together. Individuals and groups have been thought, or they have thought themselves, to be more holy if they practice fasting, infliction of pain or discomfort on themselves, a strict regimen, and abstinence, including celibacy or even abstinence from sex within marriage. Paul probably had such "super-Christians" in mind when he cautioned against unnatural and ego-satisfying practices in I Corinthians 7. Monastic and other devotional literature is replete with testimonials that no ascetic ideal of itself produces or sustains holiness. Nevertheless, many who aspire to holiness attest to the legitimate place that self-examination, self-denial, commitment, and sacrifice can have. It is cultic forms of ascetic practices without moral change that prove to be self-defeating (Isa. 1:10-20).

A final misconception is to envision holiness as static perfection, the mirror image of an abstract ideal. Holiness certainly concerns character formation; however, in the Bible holiness is not presented as static perfection. Holiness is not merely a flight into a trans-world state of being. Rather, it is solidly embedded in this world and includes a process of becoming, of development and growth. More than this, holiness is active in the sense of service or ministry. Holy men and women are servants of God, not mirror images of abstract sanctity. There is a distinct contrast between some medieval and modern conceptions of holiness. A pale, drawn, eyes-downcast, madonna-like visage conflicts with the robust character of holiness one finds in prophets such as Amos and apostles such as Paul.

The Old Testament and the New Testament parallel each other as to the meaning of the holy. The holiness of God is His separateness, transcendence, and unapproachableness. He is God, which means that He is not dependent upon the creation for His life. It means also that God is awesome. From this there follows the conception of holiness as moral perfection. These two ideas, otherness and moral perfection, combine in the meaning of the standard Old Testament declarations that God is holy or the Holy One of Israel (Lev. 10:1-3; Ps. 111:9; Isa. 6:3;

41:14; 43:1415; Ezek. 36:20-23). The New Testament parallels include Jesus' prayers "Holy Father" (John 17:11) and "hallowed be thy name" (Matt. 6:9).

There follows the moral imperative that God who is holy requires holiness in His people: "You shall be holy, for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44, NKJV; cf. Deut. 14:2; Jer. 2:3; Hab. 1:12-13). Peter repeats the demand: "As he who called you is holy, be holy yourselves in all your conduct; since it is written, 'you shall be holy, for I am holy'" (1 Pet. 1:15-16, RSV, note Heb. 12:10, 1824). In the presence of the holy God, men and women become aware of their absolute profaneness and their need for cleansing and renewal. Holiness is the meaning that is assigned to the term saints (Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2; Eph. 5:3) whose sanctified lives in the church comprise a holy temple in the Lord (Eph. 2:21).

Christian holiness is uniquely mediator and redemption centered, in contrast to other purely contemplative or ascetic sanctification ideals. Christian holiness is Christ-centered in two crucial senses: Christ is the pattern of holiness and Christ by His cross makes holiness possible for sinners. In both of these senses the Holy Spirit plays the crucial role, in the life of Christ as well as in the lives of Christians.

Firstly, as the bearer of the Spirit or the man of the Spirit, Christ in His humanity marks the onset of the new age and the new humanity. This is the primary and essential meaning of sanctification. Whatever follows in the Christian will be a duplication by the Holy Spirit of the qualities of Christ's incarnate life (Luke 4:18-21; Rom. 8:911). Secondly, Christ not only died for all; the death He died amounts to our own judgment of death and death to sin. Paul declares that the all for whom Christ died themselves died in that death (2 Cor. 5:14). This is the root of sanctification: death to sin (Rom. 6:1-11; Titus 2:14), death to the world in its alienation from God (Gal. 1:4: 6:14), and death to the carnal self (Gal. 2:19-20). In the Bible, sanctification is impossible apart from redemption. In practical ethical terms this death means responsiveness to new values in a new realm, which is to say the values of the kingdom of God.

Christ, the bearer of the Spirit, is as well the giver of the Spirit (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7-14). Holiness defines that quality of life that ensues from the graces of the Spirit. For the Christian, the graces are always Christ-centered, not induced merely by contemplation, ascetic practices, nor simply by response to the numinous. This new reality and new relationship with God are the meaning of the metaphors that describe the presence of the sanctifying Spirit in each Christian's life: each Christian is baptized in the Spirit (Acts 2:38; 1 Cor. 12:13), sealed by the Spirit (Eph. 1:13-14; 4:30; 2 Cor. 5:5) and indwelt by the Spirit (Rom. 5:5; 1 Cor. 3:16). Essentially these terms all mean the same thing: each Christian is now indwelt by Christ through the Spirit, which reality is the power of the new holy life.

Thus salvation and development, justification and sanctification, Christ's work for us and Christ's work in us, and the once-for-all and progression are linked in the New Testament. There is a striking example of these truths in Hebrews 10. The Christian is sanctified once-for-all through Christ's cross (verse 10). Being related

to Christ in this way, the Christian is also in the process of being sanctified (verse 14). The sixteenth century Anglican theologian Richard Hooker expressed this truth succinctly: "the righteousness wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come is both perfect and inherent; that whereby here we are justified is perfect but not inherent; that whereby we are sanctified, inherent, but not perfect."

Permanent moral change is the indispensable outward mark of holiness and answers to the inner renewal of the heart and will by God. Justification is free but can never be an excuse for license (Rom. 5:1; 6:1). Grace is costly, and the price of redemption ought to be reflected in commitment to a holy life (I Cor. 6:19-20). In practical terms the fruit of the Spirit and the Christ-like moral virtues coincide as the true description of a holy life (Gal. 5:16-25; 2 Pet. 1:3-11). Entailed are moral purity (1 Cor. 6:9-20), the obedience of faith (2 Cor. 10:5; 1 Pet. 1:2), and the great trilogy of faith, hope, and love (1 Cor. 12:31; 13; Gal. 5:14).

Bibliography: Baillie, J., *A Diary of Private Devotion* (1949); Barclay, W., *Epilogues and Prayers* (1963); Hallesbv, 0., *Religious or Christian* (1954); Tozer, A. W., *The Knowledge of the Holy* (1961).

S.J.M.

LIBERTY (p. 231-232). While the terms *freedom* and *liberty* are often used interchangeably, *freedom is* philosophically the broader term, encompassing the meanings of *liberty*. Freedom is a function or capacity of spiritual beings. Persons are spiritual beings. To be a person is to be a rational, selfconscious spiritual reality capable of purposeful activity which is morally qualified. Freedom involves the reality of contingency in the world order-that things may go this way or that depending upon the choice of a spiritual beingin contrast to the freedom-denying determinism of idealism and materialism.

Liberty is freedom from fate, necessity, or arbitrary control. It is the right to choose, which choice makes a difference to the course of events. This broad definition embraces a wide range of issues. They may be vital issues such as religious liberty, freedom of the press, civil liberties, political freedom, liberty to move from one place to another, liberty to choose a vocation, or issues which may be important or trivial such as social drinking, use of tobacco, or addiction to soap operas.

A moral person, including the Christian, acknowledges that there are limits within which freedom may be exercised. Thus definitions of liberty such as "the right to do anything;" "exemption from compulsion," "the power to do as one likes," and "subject only to the laws of nature" are inadequate. Human actions ought to be qualified morally. The Christian prizes his or her liberty as God's gift and aims to enhance freedom through the moral utilization of the elements of the scientifically dependable world. Therefore increase of the control of one's actions in relation to moral and spiritual ideals and ends leads to increase of freedom. These ideals reflect the will of God for the maximizing of good in the world. In this respect Christians see themselves as coworkers with God, redeemed to be free, good persons who share God's life and work. God's providential oversight of a scientifically dependable world and the reality of persons who are responsible to utilize their freedom in moral ways are the truth of the way things are to the Christian.

In the New Testament, liberty in Christ is a crucial issue. Salvation is by grace alone and is salvation to liberty. This is a major Pauline theme (Rom. 3:21-26; Gal. 5:1), in contrast to the treadmill of legalistically imposed religious observances which cannot justify a person before God (Acts 15:10-11).

Nevertheless, freedom in Christ does not signify that Christians are free to do anything at all. The freedom of grace is not license to sin, but a call to spiritual liberty which is bounded by the grace of Christ. Paul says, "you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another" (Gal. 5:13; note 5:13-25 and Rom. 6).

Three major points follow from these New Testament truths:

First, true liberty excludes the practice of those things which are distinctly sinful. In chapters 56 of his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul rebukes the church for tolerating certain abuses of liberty. This highlights the apparently paradoxical truth that using freedom to sin is really bondage and that the life of freedom is the

moral life. Paul's seven lists of vices make sobering reading: Romans 1:29-32; 1 Corinthians 5:11-13; 6:9-11; 2 Corinthians 12:20-21; Galatians 5:19-21; Ephesians 4:31 and 5:3; Colossians 3:5-9.

Second, true liberty avoids the practice of those things which tend to enslave. Here Christians give full credence to the modern principle of the conditioned response. However, Christians believe that they are responsible for the ways in which they condition themselves into irresponsible, immoral, or illegal behavior. For example, small amounts of mood modifiers, or a little social drinking, or the occasional cigarette may lead to addiction. The Christian principle is, "All things are lawful to me but I will not be enslaved by anything" (1 Cor. 6:12). This is a sober injunction to moderation or total abstinence.

Third, true liberty takes into account the effects of actions upon others. This is the significance of Paul's question of whether an act or habit is edifying or unedifying. He counters the aphorism "all things are lawful for me" with the rejoinder "but not all things are helpful" (I Cor. 6:12; 10:23). The example he employs is instructive (I Cor. 10:23-11:1): Pagan meat vendors first offered their goods to the gods before selling them at the public market. The question arises, Ought a Christian to eat meat previously dedicated to a pagan god? The answer is: Of course we know that an idol is a nonentity and that the offering of the meat makes it neither better nor worse. Nevertheless, the Christian who understands the best use of his or her liberty *will* refrain from eating such meat if eating it offends a Christian who has scruples about that sort of thing.

This appears to proscribe personal liberty by the mores and sometimes foibles of others. It may well do so, though no Christian is bound completely or permanently by the erratic or irrational behavior of others. Nevertheless, the issue is one of love and edification, not merely of personal rights. The Christian can say, "I am free;' but can also choose to say, "I am ready to limit my freedom and to shape my habits and interests so as to be helpful to myself and to others."

For Christians, liberty is a primary value (2 Cor. 3:17). It may be said that a key purpose of the Creator is to create free, good persons who manifest life as temples of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 3:16-17).

Bibliography: Fromm, E., *The Fear of Freedom* (1963); Gibbs, M., *Christians With Secular Power* (1981); Mill, J. S., *On Liberty* (1859); Miller, A. 0., (ed.), *The Christian Declaration on Human Rights* (1977).

S.J.M.

LOVE (p. 238-240). Poets, essayists, and novelists of all ages celebrate love as the greatest human emotion. Paul says that love is the highest virtue (1 Cor. 13:13). Differing and sometimes conflicting value systems as to the nature, place, and practice of love make for ambiguity in modern times.

Commonly understood, love is a feeling that is aroused by perceived attractive qualities in someone or something. Nevertheless, love is often powerfully evoked by the unbeauteous and wounded, even the grotesque. Love is a liking or affection for, an emotional attachment to, or sexual passion for a person of the opposite sex. Love is a wife or sweetheart. Love is friendship and personal appreciation.

Theologically, love is God's benevolence to men and His gracious action to redeem mankind. Man's chief end is to love God. Love is the affection Christians have for each other in the brotherhood as well as others outside.

Fundamentally, love is a function of persons and personal relations. This is the generic difference between Christianity on one side and systems of idealism and materialism on the other: Christians declare that personhood is the highest reality in the universe. God is love, and love is the ultimate state and activity of man (1 John 4:721). For Christians, love and ethics are jointly necessary parts of the sphere of persons and personal relations. They require each other. In materialist and behaviorist systems, love technically is a purely behavioral, value-free response. In idealist systems love is a needless complication of impersonal transcendental ideals. In Christian faith love is allowed its full emotional quotient on a sound moral footing and is not placed on a lower metaphysical level.

In the Old Testament God's love (*aheb*) embraces a wide range of meanings: affection, provision, mercy, care, redemption. These aspects show that God's love is personal, benevolent, saving, and moral. He loves individuals such as Abraham and David (1 Sam. 13:14; Isa. 41:8), those who trust Him (Ps. 60:5), and His beloved Israel (Isa. 63:9; Jer. 31:3). God's love places upon men the burden of loving obedience as their proper response to God's love (Deut. 4:37,40*, 7:12-13). Hosea's message is particularly poignant: God loves Israel still, even though she has played the harlot spiritually, and His enduring love will finally bring her back to Himself. God loves not only Israel; His love is universal (Deut. 33:3; Isa. 42:4-7).

The Old Testament is replete with terms that are synonymous with love and convey the truth about God's benevolence: loving-kindness (Deut. 5:10); mercy (Ps. 25:6); faithfulness (Lam. 3:23); and graciousness (Ps. 9:13). Many metaphors and images reinforce the truth about God's love. He cares for His children as a vinedresser cares for a vineyard, a shepherd for his sheep, or a physician for the sick. Above all, God cares for men as a father cares lovingly for his own child (Ps. 103:13).

In the New Testament *philos* and *agape* are the main terms used for love. The term *philos* and its cognates mean friendship, a beautiful relationship, to cherish. For example, the love of Jesus for Lazarus (John 11:3, 36), the father's love for the son (John 5:20), God's love to men (John 16:27), and Christian love for Christ (1 Cor. 16:22).

Agape dominates New Testament theological and ethical use. Love originates within the Godhead (John 14:31; 17:26). Love is the nature of God (I John 4:8). God loves men savingly in Christ (Rom. 8:37; Eph. 2:4; 1 John 3:1, 16). It is man's duty to love God (Matt. 22:37; 1 John 4:19). Love to Christ is the heart of Christian faith (Eph. 6:24; 1 Pet. 1:8). Love is fundamental to Christian personal relationships (John 13:34; 1 Pet. 1:22; 1 John 3:11, 21).

The biblical characteristics of God's love set its ethical parameters. Love is given freely (Rom. 5:8), universal (John 3:16), sacrificial (Gal. 2:20), saving (Eph. 2:4), unfailing (Rom. 8:39), and purifying (2 Thess. 2:13). In short, God's love is person-centered and person-conserving on the moral footing of spiritual restoration. Appropriate human response is love that includes devoted loyalty to God (Mart. 6:24), affectionate obedience to God (John 14:15), and genuine care, matching His, for one's fellowman (1 John 4:12. 21). Love is the identifying mark of Christian communities (Eph. 4:16).

The most complete listing of the characteristics of love is in 1 Corinthians 13. Other parallel characteristics are: importuning on behalf of another (Philem. 9), restricting one's own liberty for the sake of another's welfare (Rom. 14:15), obligation to forgive (2 Cor. 2:7-8), sincerity (Rom. 12:9), unity (Phil. 2:2), and help (Heb. 6:10).

Love in the Bible is not defined or described in abstract terms. Its nature and characteristics are stated concretely. These convey not only the nature of love but the ethics of love as well. We should consider the following:

Love to God. "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind ... you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Matt. 22:37-39). Christian ethics rests upon these two major premises, the second following from and enabled by the first. To love God is to give oneself up wholly to Him through faith and obedience. Love becomes the air one breathes for life, hence the capacity to love others. Love for God constitutes not only the saving response of faith to His redeeming grace in Christ it comprises as well the new mood of Personality. From within this new mood one can react appropriately to specific situations and recognize and react appropriately to specific need. The Old Testament term for this attitude is "loving-kindness," which matches the meaning Paul gives to love as preferring always to think the best rather than the worst (1 Cor. 13:4-7).

Self-love. Modern definitions of love often begin with self-love. This ego-centered, narcissistic trend has gone so far as to say that the key to effective living is a proper self-image. While only a distortion of biblical teaching denigrates human Personality, including the emotions, contemporary narcissism misses the crucial place that self sacrifice must have in a proper ethical life (Matt. 10:39; Mark 8:34; John 15:13). True understanding of self through love leads to self-sacrifice, without which nothing effective in life can be built, whether it is marriage, family, relationships, or a career. In Scripture, prideful egocentricity is contrasted with the fully realized life. For example, Paul puts down classical male chauvinist pride by elevating the virtues of humilityand self-giving (Phil. 2:3),

which were thought tobe appropriate only for women and slaves.

Romantic love. There has been a distinct ascetic strain in Western Christendom. Eastern and evangelical Christian thought have generally accepted the ethical legitimacy of romantic love more readily than have large segments of the Catholic and evangelical perfectionist traditions, though in recent years Catholic writers have sought to relate *eros* to human love. There are still those, including some evangelicals, who accept the Song of Solomon only as an allegory rather than as a literal celebration of romantic love, which it is.

Samuel Butler, the nineteenth-century essayist, remarked that "God is Love, I dare say. But what a mischievous devil love is." The writer in Proverbs ponders the mystery of awakening romantic love (30:18-19). Scripture combines wholesome appreciation for budding romantic love with chastity and reservation of sex to marriage (I Con 7:9). The seeking of a bride for Isaac (Gen. 24, note vv. 62-67) results in a tender, romantic meeting and marriage. Jacob fell in love with Rachel and persisted until he had won her (Gen. 29:9-12, 28). Ruth loved Boaz and won his heart (Ruth 3). At the same time, the dangers of wrongly directed romantic love are pointed out as in the case of Samson's infatuation with Delilah (Judg. 16) and David's adulterous liaison with Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11-12).

Young people need encouragement to develop the arts of romantic love chastely and need emotional support in seasons of despair when romantic love fails. There is no reason to discourage romantic love but every reason to guide it helpfully and to nurture it in marriage. Modern debasement of the term "making love," which now often means fornication, should encourage Christians to recapture the sweetness, innocence, and high moral virtues of romantic love.

Married love. Christian marriage entails love in which the connubial partners share their lives fully and in which conjugal relations are the ongoing expression of their true love. Christian understanding of the created order places high priority on love in marriage and the achievement of delicate mutual understanding and fulfillment of emotional needs. This is the main point of Paul's discussion about marriage in I Corinthians 7. Married love should be self-giving and selfsacrificing (Eph. 5:25). It includes mutual bearing of burdens and responsibilities as well as mutual sharing of joys. It can fairly be said that love in marriage creates a new psychic entity that husband and wife share mutually, so that when bereaved the remaining partner feels as though part of him or her has died (Mark 10:6-9). Paul has in mind such unique love, intimacy, and trust when he employs the analogy of love in marriage to illustrate the love of Christ for the church (Eph. 5:21-33).

Family love. Husbands and wives, parents and children are urged to love one another (Ps. 103:13; Eph. 5:28; 6:4). Christian family love was unique in the ancient world. Jesus taught that the claims of husband and wife transcend even the ties to mother and father. This is not well understood by some modern parents, though it is a clear statement by Christ with regard to the social and ethical order of the kingdom of God.

Children are God's gift (Isa. 8:18). One of the most beautiful statements in Scripture is that of Cornelius, who gathered his household to hear Peter, "Now

therefore we are all here present in the sight of God, to hear all that you have been commanded by the Lord" (Acts 10:33). Modern self-seeking finds children to be a burden. Christian love gives self to the interests of others, notably through family love.

Fraternal love. Love for one another within the Christian community is the badge of Christian society. Love creates the condition in which fellowship is nurtured (Col. 1:4; 2 Thess. 1:3). It is the witness of the earliest Christians, as in the *Plea* addressed to the emperor Marcus Aurelius by Athenagoras, that to regard one another as father, mother, brother, or sister is a sure way to protect the moral integrity of each person. A Christian would not wish to do to his own that which is morally demeaning. The concept of brotherhood and sisterhood among Christians is a powerful incentive to moral behavior.

Neighbor love. As noted earlier, the second part of the great love commandment is to love your neighbor as yourself (Matt. 19:19; 22:39). Paul repeats the commandment (Rom. 13:9), as does James (2:8). To love your neighbor as yourself means to desire for him nothing less than you desire for yourself. This is as much a missionary exhortation as it is an exhortation to loving care. The Christian ought to desire for others the same spiritual blessings he himself enjoys, and he ought to regard other persons as objects of love in the additional sense of caring and equitable treatment.

Love to enemies. This is the most dramatic of Jesus' teachings (Matt. 5:43-48; Luke 6:27-36). To love an enemy is to exercise the same love whereby God has first loved us as rebellious and often hurtful sinners. Such love absorbs the evil, which is the moral center of sacrifice and atonement. Forgiveness occurs first in the heart of the injured party and only then is it offered to the offender. Such love aims at spiritual renewal and reconciliation. Enmity is rendered ultimately powerless, even if the enemy remains an enemy despite such love. A fundamental principle of Christian ethics is the power of love to absorb evil

and to convert its power for good through forgiveness (Matt. 5:38-42; Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15).

Love of truth. For Christians perception of and commitment to truth is as much a moral issue as it is an intellectual one. P. T. Forsyth remarked that the truth we see depends upon the men we are. It is one thing to see that something is true, but it is another to act upon it. True love is committed to truth and to that which is right (1 Cor. 13:6; Eph. 4:15; 1 John 5:3). A Christian must love truth and hate falsehood. Paul joins together the concepts of showing love and having a good conscience (1 Tim. 1:5).

Love of truth embraces mercy, not merely rectitude or unfeeling justice. Jesus taught that the righteousness of His followers must exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, which amounted to legal rectitude. Christian love of truth includes the plus factor of grace and love.

Finally, Christian love is person-centered and redemptive. Only within the bonds of affection combined with morality can persons grow to full spiritual and

emotional maturity. Love forgives, heals, restores, reconciles, and builds. Love commits to the highest, best, and holiest: "whoever keeps his word, in him truly love for God is perfected" (1 John 2:5).

Bibliography: Lasch, C., *The Culture of Nar*cissism (1978); Lewis, C. S., *The Four Loves* (1960); Morris, L., *Testaments of Love* (1981); Yankelovich, *D., New Rules* (1981).

(Note AGAPE in this series.)

S.J.M.

MILITARISM (p. 255-256). From the earliest days of the church, Christians have been divided in their attitudes toward war and armed forces. Generally speaking, major Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant groups have supported the legitimacy of armed forces as an arm of the divinely sanctioned state, provided that the state is committed to the principles of truth and justice. Christians of the older Anabaptist and some European Pietist traditions and modern peace groups have held mixed attitudes. Most Christians now reject the legitimacy of any nation's building up armed might for purposes of conquest. Some pacifists reject the concept of armed forces altogether. Most Christians affirm the necessity in a evil-infected world of a nation's maintaining adequate armed forces to protect itself and its democratic allies.

Since 1974 the United States armed forces have operated effectively on a completely voluntary basis. It is assumed that the draft will be reactivated by the Congress only in the event of a national emergency. In Canada the armed forces also operate on the basis of voluntary enlistment. However, conscripts were not sent overseas from Canada during World War II, due to the peculiarities of the French-Canadian question in Canadian politics.

Christians usually disapprove of service as mercenaries and the private sale of arms to mercenaries. While they are divided on the question, most Christians accept that sometimes it may be necessary for a Christian to participate reluctantly in revolutionary activity against oppression.

Attractive features of military service are disciplined training, the inculcation of honor, and the values of nationhood. In the Western democratic countries, bloodthirsty training and propaganda are not matters of policy. The forces themselves are run by competent officers who appreciate full well the horrors of war. It is important to maintain a powerful ethical sense and a sense of honor within the military. This is a noteworthy feature of Western military traditions. It is equally important to make the military subservient to elected government. Thus a sense of national decency and honor, a national mindset committed to peace, and democratically elected political control of armed forces are the best protection against dominance by militarists.

Historically, attitudes to armed forces, including attitudes among Christians, run in cycles. Whenever enemies or potential enemies appear to threaten, most Christians encourage and participate in the expansion of armed forces. During peacetime, as in the period 1918-1939, powerful peace movements emerge which insist on disarmament. A similar cycle has been occurring since the end of World War II in 1945.

The development, use, and continuing threat of nuclear arms have added new dimensions to the militarist threat. Totalitarian regimes now pose the danger of global disaster as the possession of nuclear arms widens. The policy of the major world powers since World War II has been deterrence, that is, mutual assured destruction of the aggressor (MAD). Totalitarian nations are accused of unnecessarily building up huge armies, subverting the democratic process, and militarily dominating their neighbors. For this reason security since World War II

has been found in force, rather than in trust, mutual aid, and unarmed competition. Satellite TV makes more difficult the waging of war in the future by democratic societies because the offending horrors of war are brought home to people directly and almost instantly. Conversely, such communications capabilities when completely controlled by government increase the capability of totalitarian regimes to foster hatred and to incite to brutality and war.

Longing for peace, aversion to violence, and fear of holocaust are the shared sentiments of most people everywhere. Nevertheless, it is an error to think that despite the terrors of mutual assured destruction all nations will logically choose peace, and most Christians are not satisfied that the pacifist option is justified morally or biblically.

Since the Vietnam War, powerful forces in the West have advocated disarmament, even unilaterally. Others point out that totalitarian governments have armed themselves heavily. Thus the debate over the legitimacy of military preparedness will go on into the twenty-first century.

One of the most poignant of post-World War II statements is that of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on April 16, 1953, as he contemplated the opportunity for peaceful coexistence in the world after the death of Joseph Stalin. President Eisenhower had been the supreme Allied Commander during World War II. More than thirty years later his comments are again widely quoted: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, and hopes of its children.... This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

Nevertheless, his comments are set in the context of an address reminding his hearers and potential totalitarian adversaries that self-defense is a moral constraint placed upon free people which they cannot avoid despite their preference for a new era of mutual trust and disarmament. This sentiment reflects the reality of world and human conditions which most Christians perceive to be the case.

Bibliography: Chomsky, N., *For Reasons of State* (1973); Curry, D. C., *Evangelicals and the Bishops' Pastoral Letter* (1984); Dyson, F., *Weapons and Hope* (1984); Novak, M., *Moral Clarity in the Nuclear Age* (1983).

(Note AGGRESSION; CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION; FORCE, ETHICAL USE OF; PACIFISM; and VIOLENCE in this series.)

S.J.M.

ORIGINAL SIN (p. 298-299). The doctrine of original sin attempts to frame a rationale for the universal tendency of mankind to sin, which comes from the depths of his being. Mankind is predisposed or biased to sin. This has been expressed in many theological, philosophical, and psychological forms, all of which come down to the concept of man's inevitable yet willful radical tendency to evil.

An important distinction is often drawn between actual sin and original sin, between sinning and the sinful nature that produces sinful behavior. Augustine epitomizes this in a famous confession: "those sins which I have committed, both against thee, and myself, yea, many and grievous offenses against others, over and above that bond of original sin, whereby we all die in Adam."

Historically, as Paul states in Romans 5:12-21, original sin is related to the Fall. Adam sinned and consequently mankind became universally sin-prone. Paul does not say how the transmission occurs, nor what is transmitted, only that through the one sin of the one man, Adam, all people have been affected. Their sinning by violating the moral law entails something more than personal imitation of Adam's sinning.

Spiritually this is expressed by Paul in Romans 7. By means of a deeply moving self-analysis, Paul laments that he knows how he ought to behave but fails to do so. No good dwells within himself, he says (18) and then adds, "for I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do" (19). Why? It is the "sin which dwells in me" (20).

This apparent contradiction is the root of the theological problem of how to state this doctrine so as to reconcile inevitability and responsibility. We perceive that sinful acts to which we succumb are beneath moral behavior. Guilt sets in for the wrong done. Nevertheless, in the process of the sinning, we sense a moral obligation and the freedom at hand to avoid it. Experientially this paradox is regarded as a strong attestation to the reality of original sin and for the continuing need of divine grace to break its habit through the use of freedom for its proper ends.

Few recognize the practical social and political values of this doctrine in the history of Western Christendom. This doctrine is a pillar of democracy, because belief in the universal sinfulness of man has forced a recognition of the need to balance the use of power with means to eject those who abuse it.

Human behavior is pervasively sinful. It is impossible to assign responsibility individually for many of the conditions that prevail in the world. No single person has escaped having a sinful nature, and therefore every single person is in need of God's grace and salvation. As well, racial solidarity signifies that no individual escapes sin and that all men and women share in the trauma of humanity that is due to sin. We have a responsibility to change for good our inheritance, which

works for evil both societally and racially.

Bibliography: Becker, E., *The Structure of Evil* (1968); Dubarle, A. M., *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin* (1967); Newbigin, L., *Sin and Salvation* (1956); Neibuhr, R., *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1946).
S.J.M.

PACIFISM (p. 301-302). *Pacifism* and *pacifist* are early twentieth-century terms that originate from the traditional terms *to pacify* and *pacification.* Pacifism is the doctrine or belief that all wars and armed hostility are wrong and that all national and international disputes should be settled by peaceful means rather than by force. Some extend this doctrine to reject the use of any force or violence including self-defense and law enforcement.

Pacifism has been defined as enthusiasm for love, though critics hold that this ideal is left uncontextualized and is sometimes done to death by a thousand qualifications. Marxists identify love with economics. Liberation theology similarly identifies love with economics and politics. At times liberation theology writers advocate the use of force to achieve their ends, and thus are alienated from other Christian pacifists who also are absorbed with social issues. Critics of nontheological pacifism maintain that advocates of the doctrine frequently defer to social pressures and modify their views to suit current fancy.

Christian pacifism has many roots, the most prominent being the stance of the defenseless Christians in late medieval and Reformation times in Europe and Britain. Most Christian pacifists identify Christian pacifism with Christian nonresistance and take as their golden texts Matthew 5:9, 39 ("Blessed are the peacemakers .... Do not resist one who is evil"), along with I Peter 2:21-23. Significant differences exist among pacifists as to the precise interpretation and application of these ideals.

The least rigorous pacifism is a generalized feeling that war is wrong without formulating specific injunctions as to what to do in particular cases. Moderate pacifists maintain that all war is wrong but often ignore or say nothing about violence in society, or about homicide such as abortion, euthanasia, family or paramour killing, or manslaughter of various kinds. Moderate pacifists express conflicting opinions about self-defense. Some vigorously defend the right to self-defense; others deny the right.

Strict pacifists reject any use of force and deny that killing is ever right but face the charge of advocating utopian withdrawal. On the one hand they acknowledge that the state is ordained by God to maintain justice and order in non-Christian society. On the other hand as Christians they decline to participate in the state's coercive activities on the ground that "the sword is outside the perfection of Christ." Critics allege that strict pacifists wrongly apply the person-to-person ethics of the Sermon on the Mount to the non-Christian civil sphere and that, failing to make it work, they then abdicate all secular social and civil relationships and responsibilities. This hiatus in the ethical responsibilities of the individual reflects a theological perspective in which an unbridgeable gulf is created between Old and New Testaments. Critics insist that Jesus did not reject Moses, only the distortion of the Mosaic law into loveless retribution (Matt. 5:38). Otherwise, what God commanded in the Old Testament is made morally contradictory to that which he gives in Christ. The Sermon on the Mount does not negate the validity of just civil government, nor national loyalty, nor the civil responsibility of the Christian (Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-17).

Many Christians feel apprehensive about the ambiguities of the solutions that pacifists have advocated and practiced. Is patience and resignation in the face of war or violence justified, especially when it may actually facilitate murder and genocide, further anarchy, and increase violence? Does absorption with nonresistance by pacifists result in failure to glorify the positive ideals and values of justice and a just and democratic state?

A damaging criticism of traditional pacifist groups and communes is their tendency to practice psychological coercion and psychological violence, which is a common characteristic of all closed and optionless societies. The Canadian Mennonite-Brethren novelist Rudy Wiebe has dramatically highlighted this issue in his several novels, especially *Peace Shall Destroy Main.*

If the state is divinely ordered, ought not the Christian to take his rightful place and accept his civil responsibilities to repress evil, to redress wrong and to maintain justice, even by force? Nevertheless, the burden of proof to justify the use of force is always on the one who uses force. In view of this the pacifist is often right. As much as pacifism conflicts with powerfully held moral convictions (for example, self-defense), nonresistance can be redemptive and may be the best solution in more instances than the critics of pacifism allow.

Nonviolent resistance is sometimes an acceptable way of bringing about change where structural injustice is present and some form of civilized protest is called for. However, this is a form of aggression which is not consistent in principle with the passivity of strict pacifism.

Most Christians believe that it is impossible to find an absolute fixed point between strict pacifism and anarchy. They hold that the use of force or lethal force is rarely right and that if it is used an adequate moral statement must legitimize its use.

Bibliography: Buzzard, L. and Campbell, P, *Holy Disobedience* (1984); Cizik, R., *The High Cost of Indifference* (1984); Jesudasan, I., *A Gandhian Theology of Liberation* (1984); Lutz, C. P and Folk, J. *L., Peace Ways* (1983).

(Note AGGRESSION; CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION; FORCE, ETHICAL USE OF; MILITARISM; and VIOLENCE in this series.)

S.J.M.

PREACHING (p. 321-322). The role of the preacher is by its very nature a contradictory one. He is inevitably buffeted by competing external and internal forces. The generic biblical sense of "to preach" is evangelistic. Preaching is proclamation of the Christian faith to those who are not Christians.

The expansion of this term by Christians to include ministry within the church has broadened the meaning of preaching to embrace didactic and nurturing functions of public Christian ministry. The preacher is required prophetically to rebuke evil and sin in the world and in the church, to insite non-Christians lovingly to become Christians and at the same time pastorally to shelter and nurture Christians in the church. The requirement to be firm and uncompromising about many matters, while at the same time needing to be humble and tenderhearted creates its own special ethical difficulties.

The divine call to preach places the preacher in a unique position. He is driven by an inner compulsion that provides a sense of urgency. The call is God's. This direct call is one of the mysteries of the Christian faith. It places a terrible responsibility upon preachers and impels them with awesome urgency (Amos 7:15). Jesus took this role to Himself (Isa. 61:1; Mark 1:38; Luke 4:18). The early Christians felt this same urgency (Acts 4:20; 5:20). Paul declared "necessity is laid on me" (1 Cor. 9:16). He expands upon the tensions as well as the joy of his preaching efforts in 2 Corinthians 1-6. Failure to answer the divine call and failure to fulfill the divine mandate because of personal moral bankruptcy have always appeared to Christians to be a particularly odious lapses. It is difficult to see how it could be otherwise, given the greatness of the calling.

The preacher's single most important priority must be to guard his personal integrity (1 Tim. 6:11-16). Otherwise, the reputation of the Christian faith and any effectiveness of preaching are undermined (1 Tim. 3:7). Personal purity is crucial.

The preacher must also give attention to competence in sermon preparation, gathering of data, factual honesty, valid observation, and confidentiality of information divulged to him during personal conversations. It is not only indiscreet but immoral to cite attributable information about others in sermon illustrations.

Salary, money management, and spending require careful scrutiny. The preacher is ill-advised to build up consumer debt. He and his family ought to live within a reasonable median range of the economy where they minister. Preachers who leave town without paying or securing all debts are an offense to the faith.

Personal integrity for the preacher includes a good marriage relationship and family life. Most professionals, including preachers, must work long and irregular hours. Their children ("preacher's kids") are sometimes overwhelmed by the role that others expect them to fill. The care with which the preacher attends to these problems reflects on his character. Parents of devout, sterling character are usually held in high regard by their own children, even when responsibilities keep parents away a great deal. Integrity cements love and creates trust.

Integrity is crucial in multiple staff relationships, in dealing with fellow pastors,

and in denominational matters. Few Christian denominations have written or detailed codes of behavior for pr achers. There is a received consensus among Christians based on New Testament teaching that betrayal of trust, an overbearing manner, manipulation, character assassination, divisiveness, and schism are morally wrong. Cooperation is the hallmark of spiritual maturity. Where theological issues or the integrity of denominational life are clearly at stake, then here too resistance can be mounted and leadership exercised with integrity, even if firmly.

Clarity and authenticity of message are linked by Paul to integrity in 1 Timothy 6:11-16. In Scripture there is the continual warning against false or misleading prophets (Deut. 13:1-3; Jer. 23:25; Matt. 7:15; 2 John 10). The call of God and moral responsibility to communicate accurately the revelation combine in the Bible. The central Christian message concerns Christ incarnate, crucified, risen, and coming again. Therefore a certain sense of greatness is a moral obligation laid on the preacher. He should not trivialize the faith by concentrating on peripheral and divisive issues.

Authenticity and credibility are important criteria when judging the emotional freight of preaching. Persuasion rather than manipulation, moral transformation by God's Spirit instead of mere behavior modification are goals of preaching. Legitimate passion that is fired by Christ's compassion for broken humanity will reach out to more and more people and may not be called mere multiplying of numbers. On the other hand, to major on developing a cult of personality through mass suasion is morally wrong.

The preacher ought also to be a person of grace. The virtues Paul urges for Christians in contrast to vices (Gal. 5:16-26) apply equally to preachers. The preacher must expose evil, pretension, and injustice, but he must not be a trampler. The gospel and beauty are not disjunctives. Thus the preacher is obligated to prepare sermons that are literate, informing, and educating as much as they are persuading and exhorting.

Finally, the preacher must be the man of God that the Scriptures and the Christian church have aspired for him to be. Preaching competence. ethical integrity, and spiritual sensitivity belong together. Great preachers are men who walk with God. Credibility depends upon perceived spirituality (Isa. 57:15). The preacher who spends time \k ith God quietly internalizes those principles and values that do more than shield the mind and heart from moral turpitude. More importantly, they serve as a positive guide in behavior patterns, which include the sanctified use of trust and intimacy for the glory of God.

Bibliography: Blackwood, W., *The Preparation of Sermons* (1948); Morgan, G. C., *Preaching* (1937); Mounce, R. H., *The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching* (1960); Spurgeon, C. H., *Lectures to Students* (n.d.).

S.J.M.

PROPERTY (p. 333-334). Property is that which one owns. It means the right to own, possess, or have exclusive use or control of something, often land. Such right commonly includes right of disposition by means of sale, gift, or bequest. There is no capital-free society. All property within societies is owned or controlled either privately (private capitalism) or publicly (state capitalism) to varying degrees. It is useless to postulate absolute ownership of property. Historically all jurisdictions have hedged ownership with myriads of qualifications. These include state power to expropriate; taxation; limiting rights of sale, gift, and bequest; regulations governing use (chattel, land, buildings); and humanitarian considerations (treatment of animals).

Ownership is relative and transient. Christians believe that all property ultimately belongs to God the Creator (1 Chron. 29:11, 14), that men bring nothing into the world, and that they certainly can take nothing out when they die (1 Tim. 6:7). The purpose behind Israel's tradition of the jubilee year (Lev. 25) may have included an implicit reminder of the common humanity of rich and poor, of mankind's common dependence upon God the Creator and Sustainer of life, and of the importance of ethical stewardship in managing property and resources.

Socialist theory inveighs against the private ownership of property, though all modern socialist states have had to concede property ownership to varying degrees. Many have had to allow private enterprise as well. State capitalism is biblically indefensible. Private ownership of property is not only explicitly approved in both the Old Testament and New Testament, it is the social and economic backdrop to life on earth. God gave man dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:28; 9:1-7; Ps. 8). The proscriptions against theft and covetousness in the Decalogue assume right of ownership (Exod. 20:15, 17). This is confirmed in the New Testament (Matt. 19:18; Rom. 7:7: 13:9). Abraham negotiated and paid for land as a family burial plot, which became his "possession" (Gen. 23). Owed wages are earned property and must be paid (Lev. 19:13). Ahab at first respected Naboth's property rights (1 Kings 21), but Jezebel plotted to have Naboth killed in order to wrest away from him and his heirs that which was rightfully theirs. Samuel challenged Israel as to whether he had ever wrongly taken or absconded with anyone's property (1 Sam. 12:3-5).

The common ownership referred to in Acts 2:44-45 and 4:32 does not constitute a universal prescription. More likely this event signifies accommodation to the exigencies of the moment, namely, social assistance in a time of need during the formation of the church. This practice did not become the pattern of early Christian life, or else it proved to be inadequate to their circumstances, judging from Paul's campaign to secure welfare for them (Acts 24:17; Rom. 15:25). Dispersal from Jerusalem forced Christians to adapt to life in the world at large within varying cultures. The second-century Epistle to Diognetus states that such adaptation enabled them to expedite their missionary mandate and that this was preferable to life in closed communities. Communal life may be a useful expedient, but it cannot be advocated on biblical grounds that purport to deny right of private ownership of property.

A serious danger of modern times is dominant ownership in perpetuity, which in

principle excludes or limits others from opportunity to own property and to create wealth. Examples of this are exclusive state capitalism (communism) and religious bodies such as churches, corporations, and communes, where such bodies are closed entities, unlike public stock companies. In modern times these may lock up land for generations, even more completely than the traditional superwealthy. Impersonal entities are immune to death and laws governing bequest, which in the past have facilitated transfer of property through wealth creation and acquisition. A crucial Christian principle is to avoid repression and to encourage opportunity.

Christian stewardship of property and resources entails far more than prudent use of wealth, tithing, and altruistic help to the needy. It also entails wealth creation as a moral obligation. This is inherent in man's gifts and abilities and in the divine mandate given to man to have dominion over creation. Wealth creation ought to result in creation of opportunity for others. The message of Amos should not be seen merely as an appeal to help rather than to oppress the poor. It is an appeal to create opportunity. Jesus taught that uninvested resources are bad stewardship. It is striking that Matthew places the parable on effective wealth creation (25:14-30) in series with the injunction to help the needy (25:31-46). Paul does indeed caution against avarice (1 Tim. 6:6-10; also note Pss. 73; 82); however, he also urges avoidance of idlers. He alludes to a received tradition regarding diligence (2 Thess. 3:6), which complements wealth creation and proportionate, altruistic giving (1 Cor. 16:2; Eph. 4:28).

The rich farmer in Luke 12:16-21 is not censured for his good and successful farm management, but for his selfishness. Repressive ownership, whether private or public, is wrong. Wealth creation and economic development are parallel concepts. For the Christian steward, the ability to maximize wealth and opportunity is a divine gift and an ethical responsibility.

Bibliography: Chilton, D., *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators* (1981); Novak, M., *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism* (1982); Sider, R., *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (1977); Wogaman, J. P, *The Great Economic Debate: An Ethical Analysis* (1977).

S.J.M.

REMARRIAGE (p. 349-350). References to the dissolution of marriage in Scripture carry the implication of the right to remarry (Deut. 24:1-4; Matt. 5:31-32; 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18). Christ's words on the subject, variously reported in the Gospels, must be understood in light of the dilemma the Pharisees posed and of the unacceptable practices implied in the words "from the beginning it was not so."

The Pharisees hoped to criticize Christ, whether He advocated either position too loose or too tight. Jesus' reply is, first, that easy divorce by easy procurement and flaunting of legal papers is, in fact, adultery. There must be no trifling with marriage. Second, while divorce may occur due to adultery, God's purpose in creation is a real, lifelong union of one man and one woman. Remarriage must thus constitute commitment to that goal. While this allows for the concessionary nature of divorce in Deuteronomy 24:1-4, it proscribes the ancient and modern practice of the easy shuttling of men and women back and forth and reinforces the ideal of creation, which is enduring, monogamous marriage. Jesus' words ought not to be seen as legislative enactment, but as moral indignation at gross abuse and as strong reinforcement of the creation ideal.

Paul's limited discussion of marriage and divorce in 1 Corinthians 7 includes the so-called "Pauline privilege" (vv. 10-11, 17, 25, 40). Some scholars believe that what Paul says is offered not as blank apostolic authority, but as informed apostolic opinion on what makes sense and is emotionally possible while maintaining moral standards in a sinful world and in difficult situations. Marriage is normal (vv. 8-9). Marriages ought not to be broken up (vv. 10-11). Mixed marriages should be conserved (vv. 1216). If the unconverted partner wishes divorce, the spouse should accept it. Presumably severing such a tie allows ("not bound" v. **15)** for remarriage of the forsaken partner, although this is not stated in the text. Widows (and presumably widowers) are free to marry, only in the Lord (v. 39).

Marriage is clearly the preferred state. The proscriptions in Scripture are aimed to prevent wife-swapping or easy passage of women from one man to another, or of men from one woman to another. The creation ideal is affirmed, concessions to human frailty are noted, and balanced judgment is encouraged. Some remarriage is equivalent to adultery, Scripture says, but apparently not all remarriage.

The union of one man and one woman in marriage is central to God's purposes for mankind. Through marriage God ordained the continuance of the human race and human emotional well-being. As such marriage and remarriage ought to be viewed as more than issues of civil and ecclesiastical law. Those who reject remarriage in the church give to the state the right to frame its own laws respecting divorce and remarriage. Christians should regard marriage as a creation gift for the good of all men and women and seek to enhance its permanence and values.

Marriage as the normal state of mankind is accepted more realistically in Eastern Christian traditions than in some in the West where there persists a strong ascetic tendency. In the Eastern rite of remarriage, reconsecration includes the words

"being unable to bear the heat and burden of the day and the hot desires of the flesh, are now entering into the bond of second marriage." This poignantly highlights Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 7:1-8. However, full recognition of the legitimacy and importance of conjugal union to human beings means more than that marriage is an emotional escape-valve. Thus the Eastern rite, along with most other Christian traditions. emphasizes that true love is the necessary condition in which full personhood can blossom.

In certain circumstances divorce and remarriage may disqualify one from ministry. Paul insists that marital stability is crucial to effective ministry (1 Tim. 3:2-5). Those who divorce and remarry must allow to others, especially in cases of previous flagrant behavior, the right to discount potential effectiveness in ministry. Thus, a distinction needs to be preserved between forgiveness, which God freely gives to the penitent, and qualifications to minister in view of the reputation of the gospel (I Tim. 3:7).

Bibliography: Besson, C. C., *Picking Up The Pieces* (1983); Hosier, H. K., *The Other Side of Divorce* (1975); Krebs, R., *Alone Again* (1978): McRoberts, D., *Second Marriage* (1978).

(See also DIVORCE in this series.)

S.J.M.

SELF-DECEPTION (p. 370-371). The classical early modern statement about self-deception and falsity is given by Roger Bacon (1561-1626) in a series of parables at the dawning of the modern scientific method. He calls them idols or false notions and identifies them thus: Idols of the Tribe (given in human nature itself as men make themselves to be the measure of all things), Idols of the Cave (prejudices of individual men due chiefly to the predispositions generated and sustained by their egocentric predicament), Idols of the Marketplace (errors due to the associations of men which reinforce the ambiguous and erroneous use of words), and Idols of the Theater (error deriving from received dogma, categories, and method which, because wrong at bottom, can yield only wrong conclusions).

Modern psychological research has endeavored to discover the mechanisms of the brain which facilitate self-deception and the relation between the disposition of the person toward his own wellbeing and the function of those mechanisms. A sociological correlation is then made. For some, such as the Jewish writer Elie Wiesel who has in his writings probed the meaning of the holocaust, memory serves the vital function of retaining painful awareness of past evils in order to warn against repeating them in the future. The new research claims that human beings commonly practice the "vital lie" as individuals, groups, and societies. This entails denial, buried secrets, and fantasy in situations such as perpetuating the myth of a happy family which is anything but happy, masking the problem of drug addiction or. alcoholism, "group-think" situations in which no dissenting voice dare be raised, unquestioned assumed consensus, white lies as the lubricant of social well-being, frames of reference which become a Procustean bed for the truth, and the tendency of societies to rewrite painful history. While some suggest that self-deception may serve a useful function, such as the claim that some patients who purposely avoid seeking out information about impending surgery tend to recover more quickly than those who do, most authorities see self-deception as a destructive force.

On the basis of biblical teaching, Christianity has always advocated commitment to truth. This is so closely woven into Christian faith that it is as much a subtle, pervasive pattern as an explicit statement. Anything less than commitment to truth is a betrayal of what is fundamental to Christian faith. Truth, appreciation for and authentic knowledge of the created order, and revelation by God of himself to man are seen to be a coherent whole. Christian faith does not undercut respect for nature or the scientific enterprise. Rather, it reinforces the importance of fact, verification, and truth.

Paul in 1 Corinthians 1-2 does not depreciate reason, only the abuse and errors of reason. His play of words on "things that are not" (1 Cor. 1:28) is a reference to a Greek philosophical phrase which means nonbeing. Paul, like Bacon, is saying that things men imagine to be ultimate reality may well be nonbeing, while the truth about God which some men by their categories exclude is reality.

Similarly, in 2 Timothy 2:23-26 Paul refers to those of untrained mind who, while purporting to teach others, are themselves a contradiction and lead others into error. Paul urges Timothy to be patient with contradiction and to try to lead such persons back to their sober senses (note also 2 Tim. 3:7). Important in this context

is Paul's relating of ethics to intellectual pursuits: character and the pursuit of truth are inextricably linked, hence his call to repentance. P. T. Forsyth comments that the truth we see depends upon the men we are. Athenagoras, the second-century Christian apologist, wrote to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius that Christians center their attention not upon specious logic nor upon the skill of making speeches, but on the proof and lessons of actions.

For Christians, truth is accurate statement of that which is actually the case. This entails rigorous logic, careful attention to data, screening of historical record, and recurring scrutiny of hypotheses. This is laid upon Christians because of the Christian claim to historical revelation, to objective truth which is more than merely existential ("truth to me"), and to events which are reportable, not merely events to faith. The claim to truth and the demand for truth are powerful and demanding emphases in Scripture.

Bibliography: Goleman, D., *Vital Lies, Simple Truths: The Psychology of Self-Deception* (1985); Holmes, A. F., *All Truth Is God's Truth* (1977); Laing, R. D., *The Divided Self. An Eristential Study in Sanity and Madness* (1965).

S.J.M.

TEMPTATION (p. 406). It is important to distinguish two primary meanings of this term in biblical and Christian usage: testing or proving someone or something without inducement to sin, and enticing someone or being enticed to sin.

In the Old Testament God tested individuals, such as Abraham (Gen. 22:1), and nations, such as Israel (Deut. 8:2; 13:3). These tests were not intended to undermine faith, but to rebuke unbelief and confirm faith. In the New Testament Christians may be allowed by God to undergo testing, most notably persecution. James 1:12-15 and 1 Corinthians 10:1-13, often wrongly thought to center upon sinful appetite or sinful enticement, refer primarily to the allurement of apostasy as a result of persecution or extreme hardship. Christians should be ready for the test of persecution (Mart. 6:13; James 1:2-4). The prayer "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil" (Matt. 6:23) may refer to such testing. It is always wrong, however, for man to test God (Matt. 4:7; Exod. 17:7).

Enticement to sin is the more common understanding of temptation. Being tempted without succumbing to the temptation is not sin. God does not tempt to evil (James 1:13). However, succumbing to temptation in the heart is sin (Mart. 5:28). Thus, mind-set, inclination, and intention are important. Fondling temptation entails consent to sinning.

The incarnate Lord is presented strikingly in the Bible as the second Adam, which metaphor includes His triumph over the tempter and temptation. He has set a new path for a new humanity (Col. 2:12) and is the file leader of the new race (Heb. 4:14-15). He has fully experienced, our condition and can now help us sympathetically in times of testing (Heb. 2:18).

Since early Christian times expositors have recognized in Scripture a link between Adam's temptation, Christ's temptation in the wilderness, and temptations the Christian undergoes. Indeed, among the early church fathers, Christ was seen to be the second Adam, defeating Satan on the same ground on which man's first parents fell morally. A parallel may thus be drawn between "good for food," "pleasant to the eye,' and "to make one wise" (Gen. 3:6); the three temptations of Jesus (Matt. 4:1-11); and the evil trilogy of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life (I John 2:16-17).

Christ's victory over the kingdom of evil has taken place through the perfection of His humanity, His incorruptible death on the cross, and His resurrection. The Christian, therefore, should enter the fray of life confident that victory over the powers of evil is already behind his back. Hence the strong urging to "resist the devil and he will flee from you" (James 4:7).

Modern understanding of human nature rarely includes advice to resist temptation, especially with regard to appetite. With human nature being viewed purely behaviorally, gratification of appetites is said to be no more and no less moral than any body function. Christians, however, refuse to reduce all human acts to such a nonmoral footing. Lust is a morally qualified feeling that is sinful (Matt. 26:41; James 1:14).

Others discourage resistance to temptation on psychological grounds, claiming

that resistance causes repression and that repression causes neurosis, unhealthy fantasy, and isolation, which may lead to violence. Here the Christian replies that guilt and neurosis are not caused by restraint, but are the consequence of dalliance with and succumbing to temptation. The best antidote to immoral allurement of any kind is to fasten the mind upon that which is good (Gal. 5:16-26).

Bibliography: Fairlie, H., *The Seven Deadly Sins Today* (1978); Neill, S., *The Christian Character* (1955); Olsson, K. A., *Seven Sins and Seven Virtues* (1959); Pieper, J., *The Four Cardinal Virtues* (1966).

S.J.M.

UTILITARIANISM (p. 421-422). Utilitarianism is an early nineteenth-century formulation by Jeremy Bentham and James Mill of ancient Cyrenaic and Epicurean hedonism into a modern ethical theory which is opposed to intuitionism. The son of the latter, John Stuart Mill, gave the theory its traditional definition in his 1851 essay Utilitarianism: "The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals utility, or the greatest happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By 'happiness' is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by 'unhappiness,' pain, and the privation of pleasure." Ever since, the popular short definition of Utilitarianism has been the doctrine that the greatest happiness of the greatest number should be the guiding principle of action.

In England, the traditional rigorous doctrine that pleasure is the only good (at least that the actual or probable maximizing of pleasure is the preferred action to be taken by an agent) was later balanced by ideal forms of Utilitarianism, which granted that other things besides pleasure are good and might command priority. In America, following the work of William James, R. B. Perry, and John Dewey, Utilitarian ethics took a more pragmatic and instrumentalist bent and were used to reinforce the interest theory of value.

The root of Utilitarian doctrine is the idea that intrinsic value lies in pleasure or pleasant consequences and that actions are therefore to be judged in relation to the net value of these. The early form of Utilitarianism was philosophical and ethical in character: the pursuit of happiness ought to be the chief end of action. Later, American versions of Utilitarianism especially became much more psychological and descriptive, claiming that pleasure is in fact the chief end of the actions of all organisms, including man. Recent formulations make this a biological-behavioral response, in the sense that actions are understood to be behavioral not intentional, that is, organisms are programmed or conditioned to seek fulfillment of needs and to maximize pleasure for themselves.

Nineteenth-century criticism of Utilitarianism was severe, especially by Christians, some of whom used the charge of defection to Utilitarianism as a slur. It was seen to be selfish, with no provision for overriding ideals which direct behavior. Mill was forced to defend the doctrine by conceding that as a system of ethics it could achieve its end only by the general cultivation of nobleness of character. With the development of evolutionary theory late in the century, questions were put as to whether, in the absence of sentiment, ideals, and altruism, Utilitarianism becomes the justification of savage evolutionism (nature red in tooth and claw). In modern times, Utilitarianism is, paradoxically, strongly criticized as a theory of behavior while continuing to be powerfully influential in practical day-to-day ethics and politics.

The theoretical question as to how to measure pleasure and happiness quantitatively remains, as does the traditional hedonistic paradox that the direct pursuit of pleasure or happiness entails missing them. True happiness invariably accompanies, or is a function or correlative of, some other constructive activity.

The idea that everything is to be judged by its utility is offensive to many. It is one thing to say this about concepts and abstractions, but it is another to say it about persons. Utilitarian theories with an economic bias are charged, as are aspects of Marxism, with valuing humans merely as production units: if they contribute to the general economy, they are of value; if they do not, they are of little or no value or are even of negative worth. Christians strongly deny that human beings, or any individual human being, are simply a means to a universe of happiness or a means to maximize happiness per capita. Rather, human beings are ends in themselves and are of infinite worth in themselves. For Christians this is a critical foundation stone of ethics.

Parallel to the foregoing is the charge that Utilitarianism is only superficially altruistic; that its genius is fundamentally egoistic and selfish. If the fundamental principle of action is egoistic satisfaction of need, as modern hedonists claim, why should anyone care for anyone else? It remains a question whether altruism does not logically mark the death of any consistent hedonism.

Nevertheless, Utilitarianism is widely regarded in modern societies as a useful, practical social and political tool, especially in the age of polls and poll-taking. The principle of the greatest happiness for the greatest number furnishes a rough-and-ready method of balancing the demands of interest groups. Theoretically, it leaves unanswered the question of what to do with the dissident, the outcast, and the minority. Utilitarianism is the ethical palliative of an affluent society. Only as other values and ideals are superimposed upon it can utilitarian principles be made to function in a civilized manner.

Bibliography: Blackham, H. J., *Objections to Humanism* (1963); Downie, R. S. and Telfer, E., *Respect for Persons* (1970); Graham, B., *The Secret of Happiness* (1955); Mill, J. S., *Utilitarianism* (1851).

S.J.M.

VIOLENCE (p. 428-429). Ethically, violence must not be defined in terms of natural disasters such as tornadoes, floods, landslides, lightning strikes, or animal savagery, but in personal terms. Violent acts are functions of persons and are to be judged morally in relation to the motives of persons as moral agents (whether God, man, or other rational creatures) and the nature and quality of their acts.

Violence is the use of physical or psychological force so as to injure or coerce someone either physically or psychologically or both or to damage something. The physical and psychological consequences may well interlock, for example, physical maladies du;.:o psychological abuse, as in the case of the abuse of a spouse or a child.

Modern forms of violence differ little from traditional forms, except that the inventions of modern technology and psychological techniques make violence easier to mask. Common modern forms are:

1. Terrorism (including assassination, kidnapping, hostage-taking), random or indiscriminate violence, and sadism.

2. Torture, maiming, and judicial amputation.

3. Homicide, including murder and other forms of killing such as abortion, infanticide, assistance to commit suicide, and euthanasia (whether voluntary, nonvoluntary as in the case of an unconscious person, or involuntary).

4. Fighting, and striking or threatening to do so, which at times may include some sports such as boxing, ice hockey, and football.

5. Robbery and mugging.

6. Vengeance, vigilante activity, and mercenaries who are not ethically motivated.

7. Abuse of a spouse, child abuse, abuse of the elderly, and abuse of employees.

8. Anarchy, unjust war, some civil disobedience including aggressive pacifism.

9. Certain controversial medical, clinical or quasi-medical procedures including lobotomy, leucotomy, and elect roconvulsive therapy, forced treatment of various kinds, claims for beneficent confinement, surgical alteration of the sex of an individual, and clinical or surgical alteration of personality. Many regard some or all of these as violent acts.

10. Psychological roughness or aggression including lie detector or other similar tests, malicious psychological injury, the use of truth serums, some forms of conditioning including brainwashing, the use of mood or mind-altering substances, threats, summoning a prisoner for execution only to halt it at the last instant, and various forms of aggression theory and practice in business administration.

In the past, apart from one's actually witnessing a violent act, violence could be depicted only in still-life drawings or paintings, simulated (acted out in a staged drama), or imagined through literature. Modern communications techniques such as television and video graphically portray violence in action. Television has the capacity to sensitize the public against the horrors of violence. As well, many claim that television violence blunts moral sensitivity and increases the potential for violence. Modern communications techniques are powerful tools for good or ill. Some believe that television readily brutalizes people, for example the showing of an actual killing such as the shooting of a felon in a police action.

In the hands of the unscrupulous, television or video may readily be used for evil purposes such as exploiting prurient interests. Repressive regimes use nationally controlled television to suppress truth and to foster violent attitudes for political purposes. Thus television depiction of violence can as much contribute to violence as it can deter violence, depending upon the moral intention of the presenter and the capacity of the viewer to deal with it morally.

Despite the fact that violence can be progagated via television it can be a powerful tool against violence. As in the case of shortwave radio, satellite television makes repressive control of the media more difficult in closed societies so long as some free countries exist. Balanced programming from countries which are democratic and free tends to foster longings for liberation, especially among women and minorities in cultures where they are abused and repressed.

Jesus rebuked naked violence and urged peace. His gospel brings peace among men. Christians abhor violence and the anger which accompanies it. In the seven New Testament lists of vices, four mention anger: 2 Corinthians 12:20; Galatians 5:20; Ephesians 4:31; Colossians 3:8. Violence is uniformly condemned: Psalms 7:16; 18:48; Ecclesiastes 5:8; Matthew 5:39; 26:52; Luke 3:14; 2 Corinthians 11:20; 1 Timothy 3:3; Titus 1:7; 1 Peter 2:23. As much as is humanly possible, Christians should be peaceable: Matthew 5:9; Romans 12:18; 2 Corinthians 13:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:13; 1 Timothy 2:2.

A distinction must be drawn between the customary meaning of violence and the lawful use of force, coercion, and infliction of pain. Scripture is replete with references to the just anger and wrath of God and to his smiting evil people. The state is God's instrument to withstand and judge evil (John 19:11; Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-17). While to some the forcible restraint of evil (Rom. 4:15; 13:4-5) in relation to the law of love (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:6) is a puzzle, both are consistent with the nature and rule of God. They attest to the realities of the present evil-infected world as well as to the presence of God's kingdom in the evilinfected world.

Legal use of force is legitimate, but it must be exercised within the terms of a legal code based on principles of justice, equity, and compassion. Thus, just war, policing and imprisoning, capital punishment, and legitimate self-defense against criminal activity (which is distinct from persecution) are not specifically prohibited to Christians. Jesus did not denounce participation in war, even though

he urged his followers to peace. However, a purely vengeful view of justice (an eye for an eve) is alien to the righteousness of God as taught in the Bible.

Physical force has little place in family relations. This includes the discipline of children. Spanking should be rare; it must be carefully controlled and must flow from and be practiced in love.

The root causes of human violence are a puzzle to modern, sophisticated man. Violence occurs in all social, economic, and educational levels of society. Nineteenth-century German society was one of the most educated and culturally advanced of the era, yet a Hitler could subsequently arise and with him the indescribably cruel and violent Nazi regime. Violence characterizes sinful man. Christians may well have to suffer violence in this life for the sake of their faith. Scripture has long pointed to the close relation between anger and violence on one hand and the importance of forgiveness and faith on the other in the ultimate justice of God.

The imprecatory psalms are an important paradigm (Pss. 35, 55, 58, 59, 69, 109). How can a Christian heap abuse upon and pray for violence to come upon his enemies? It should be noted that the psalmists recall the goodness and severity of God upon both the just and the unjust. Evil is not excused. It is seen to be real, reprehensible, and worthy of judgment. The sentiments of the imprecatory psalms are offered in prayer and are a dialogue between the troubled soul and God who is just. The psalmists' anger is vented. Destructive anger is not stored up to cultivate guilt and depression, eventually to break out in uncontrolled violence. These are prayers to purge the soul, not formulas for action. The final judgment is left to God, and the faith is expressed that God judges men severely in this life as well as in the future in many ways, through disaster, armed might, and the judicial process.

Bibliography: Devine, P. E., *The Ethics of Homicide* (1978); Fromm, E., *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (1973); Sider, R. J., *Christ and Violence* (1979); Ungerleider, C. S., *Television and Society* (1984).

(Note AGGRESSION; CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION; FORCE, ETHICAL USE OF; MILITARISM; and PACIFISM in this series.)

S.J.M.

VOCATION (p. 432-433). The concept of vocation is a peculiarly continental Reformation derivative from the theology first of Luther, then Calvin. It was not used commonly by Christians of the Reformed traditions in Britain. The concept continues to appear in the literature of the Lutheran and Reformed traditions in the United States, though common use is declining.

The term *calling is* almost wholly a Pauline concept, with a parallel use in First Peter. Paul's primary meaning is as a calling to salvation (Rom. 8:30) through the gospel (2 Thess. 2:14), and, as a necessary corollary of this, to "lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called" (Eph. 4:1; 1 Peter 2:9). This is the primary sense in which the Christian life is a vocation., namely a calling to follow Christ and to fulfill the pattern of His life in our lives (Phil. 3:14; 1 Peter 2:21; 3:9). Such vocation embraces love, forgiveness, reconciliation, peace, and goodness as its frame of reference.

A derived sense of calling to special ministry sometimes occurs (Acts 16:10; Rom. 12:6-8; 1 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 4:11). However, it is doubtful that the biblical term *calling* can be understood to mean vocation. Luther was wrong to translate 1 Corinthians 7:20 as "vocation" *(Beruf). This* passage probably refers to the environment or circumstances in which one finds oneself (1 Cor. 1:26).

More important than vocation is the crucial Reformation doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. Those who are called, justified, and sanctified by grace and by faith alone are called to serve as well. Christian vocation is not the prerogative of a priestly class only, nor is ministry legitimated only by ordination. Every believer is called to minister, from which comes the concept of Christian vocation.

In Neo-orthodox theology of modern times, Karl Barth has given a powerful impetus to the concept of vocation through his teaching regarding the election of Jesus Christ to servanthood. The vocation of the eternal word was to go into the far country, becoming obedient by offering and humbling Himself to be the brother of man; to take His place with the transgressor; and to judge him by judging Himself and dying in his place *(Church Dogmatics* 4.1.157). It follows that Christ's commitment to His vocation ought to elicit humble obedience from us, His followers.

The Christian's vocation, therefore, is to be the Lord's servant in the world, whatever one's occupation. In practical, day-to-day terms, the ethics of such a life implied in general biblical principles, specific biblical prohibitions, and the pattern of Christ's life.

Christian vocation ties in closely with the theology and ethics of work. Not work, however, merely as drudgery nor to maintain subsistence existence, but the more positive sense of contributing to the well-being of others through careful utilization of the earth's resources. Scripture abounds with references to the values of useful work. Jesus learned carpentry. Several of His disciples were fishermen. Paul was a tentmaker. Lydia traded in fine cloth. Philemon was probably a businessman.

Three important principles follow from biblical teaching. First, as much as lies within their power, each Christian and each Christian family should strive to be self-reliant. This is not merely to avoid becoming a drain on others, but to produce more than their own needs so that others can share in the abundance. Second, Christians should strive for excellence. When men and women do good work and produce dependable products, they bless and enrich the lives of others. Third, Christians ought to strive to improve the world, making it a better place than it was when they came into it.

To accomplish these things, biblical writers urge Christians to give daily attention not only to their general deportment and interpersonal relations, but also to specific actions in the marketplace. While the Christian is free, not all things are helpful, nor do they build up. Some things actually enslave (1 Cor. 6:12; 10:23). These should, therefore, be avoided. Seek the good of one's neighbor (1 Cor. 10:24). Don't pilfer from the job. Guard the reputation of the Christian faith by doing good work (Titus 2:8-10). As a general rule, therefore, the Christian ought to work hard in a useful vocation, striving to contribute to the good of humanity.

Bibliography: Hatfield, C., *The Scientist and Ethical Decision* (1973); Reich, R., *The Next American Frontier* (1983); Richardson, A., *The Biblical Doctrine of Work* (1952); Trueblood, E., *The New Man For Our Time* (1970).

S.J.M.