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Most of the scriptural quotations in the thesis are from the American Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible. Some long quotations are made so as to acquaint my advisers on the psychiatric aspect of the thesis with the full biblical stories. There are few quotations from the New English Bible, New Testament, and they are indicated wherever they appear.
A. Purpose of Thesis.

When the writer was in his last year at Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, he read D.M. Baillie's book, God Was In Christ. When he came to the section, "Objective and Subjective Atonement", he became very interested in and was looking forward to the kind of answer that Baillie would give to the question, 'How does forgiveness become a constitutive reality of the sinner's being?' In other words, the writer was interested in knowing how Baillie would answer the question, 'How does Christ's work of redemption become a reality in the sinner's concrete life?' When Baillie comes to this point he says:

"His love is inexorable towards our sins, just because it is infinite love and sin is its opposite... and for the same reason it persists indefatigably through all our sinning. That is how He bears our sins. And that is how He overcomes them. That is the costly 'expiation' out of which forgiveness comes. And the story of that, as it was incarnate in Jesus, is what gives us the liberation which leads to a new life. For that story, with the Christian interpretation of it, makes us willing to bring our sins to God, to see them in His light, and to accept from Him the forgiveness which we could never earn."

The writer is not satisfied with this answer because Baillie does not say exactly how the story of Christ's

sin-bearing changes the sinner’s life. The writer realizes that Baillie, however, touches upon a very important point when he says "For that story, with the Christian interpretation of it...." It means that the story per se, or a Muslim or Buddhist interpretation of it, is not likely to change the sinner's life. The writer realizes that there is a certain subjective or psychological factor in Baillie's statement. The psychological factor is the subjective element in the interpretation and reception of the story. The writer feels that there is a need for an investigation into this subjective element to determine the way Christ's work of salvation becomes a factor that changes the sinner's life and what the nature of this change is.

To determine the reality of forgiveness becomes a problem not only for theology but also for psychology.

Before the writer arrived at this conclusion he read more about forgiveness from Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, vol. 6 pp. 73-82. He found out that the New Testament conception of forgiveness is theologicopsychological.

The New Testament conceives of forgiveness as the way the individual when becoming a Christian gets rid of the incubus of his sins, and after he becomes a
Christian he can annul the sins which still easily beset him. In other words, forgiveness in the New Testament is the annulment of the old life, which is sometimes described as the old man, the old Adam or the old creation, and putting on the new life. St. Paul writing about the process of transition from one mode of existence to the other says, "Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have put off the old nature with its practices and have put on the new nature, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator". (Col. 3:9,10)

Forgiveness in this sense is a change from one state of the soul to the other. This process is described in the New Testament as passing from death to life. Thus Jesus says, "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life, he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life". (John 5:24). Other New Testament passages that describe forgiveness as a transition from one state of the soul to the other are: Acts 26:18; Rom. 8:21; 6:18; Col. 3:1; I John 3:14.

The moment that marks the transition is described as 'being born again', John 3:3; 'regeneration', Tit. 3:5; 'conversion', Matt. 18:3; Acts 3:19; 'opening of understanding', Luke 24:45 and as the 'Opening of

With this New Testament understanding of forgiveness the writer becomes more convinced that forgiveness is really a theologico-psychological problem and it is concerned with the sinful acts of the individual and with his change over to a new way of life.

Systematic Theology has concerned itself with the way Man's (man is used in generic sense) Sin is removed and thus deals with general theories of redemption e.g. reconciliation, atonement, justification and not with the way the individual as a concrete being may find grace with God. The writer is of the opinion that there is no sin with capital 'S', i.e. racial sin, and that there is no such thing as the sin of the world but rather sinful acts of individual human beings of time and space are real and should be the issues that forgiveness should be concerned with. He therefore feels that all that has been said about forgiveness theologically is a one-sided account of forgiveness and that this account should be combined with all that has been discovered in psychology about the change of an individual from one way of life to another to give a well-rounded and
complete account of forgiveness.

This theologicoc-psychological approach to the study of the problem of forgiveness may look strange and unusual to some psychologists and theologians. But one verse from St. Paul's letter to the Romans will bring out the necessity of this approach. In Chapter twelve, verse two of this epistle he says, "Adapt yourselves no longer to the pattern of this present world, but let your minds be remade and your whole minds thus transformed. Then you will be able to discern the Will of God, and to know what is good, acceptable, and perfect". (The New English Bible, New Testament). What is implied in the first half of this verse is that the reformation of a person's mental life is a necessary condition for the transformation of his life. The truth of this verse of St. Paul has recently been pointed out by Dr. Robert J. Lifton in his study of brainwashing, or thought reform, in China.¹

A statement of Dr. Brunner on salvation points to this theologicoc-psychological approach to the problem of forgiveness. In his book, The Mediator, p. 528, he says,

---

1. Dr. Lifton is a Research Associate in Psychiatry and an Associate in East Asian Studies at Harvard University. The result of his study of thought reform in Communist China appeared in his book, Thought Reform (Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1961).
"Salvation is the Word of God in Christ as it speaks to us in the heart. There are two very important factors in Brunner's statement: a) the Word of God which may be called an external factor, b) the desire of the heart which may be called man's impulses towards a change. These two factors work together to bring about the new life and they are theological and psychological. Man is not changed either by the external force, the Word of God, alone or by his impulses towards change alone. He is changed by the combination of these two factors. Another way to express this truth is to say that people are changed according to a specific ideological conviction which may be a religious faith or a political belief and this conviction is directed towards their desire for change.

The purpose of the writer, therefore, is to determine the way forgiveness becomes a constitutive reality of the sinner's life by using both theological materials that are available in modern theology on forgiveness and the psychological materials that are available on human

---


2. In verse 21 of the first chapter of St. James' letter the two factors are clearly indicated: "Away then with all that is sordid, and the malice that hurries to excess, and quietly accept the message planted in your hearts, which can bring you salvation". (The New English Bible, New Testament).
The appropriate sub-title of the thesis will be, "The Reality of Forgiveness in Human Experience".

B. Definition and Limitation.

Since the personal relations of a person constitute the reality of his personal existence forgiveness as a realization of a new life presupposes a renewal of personal relationship which has been disturbed by the individual's sins. Man is basically related to God or to any object of supreme devotion but this relationship is materialized in his relationship to the world and neighbour. In other words, man's relationship to God and to his fellow men are one and indivisible. It is in the individual's personal relation on the human level that he encounters God and his demands as the other which are over and against him. The individual Christian does not encounter God outside the world of his personal relations but rather within it. For this reason Jesus Christ regards what is done to others in one's world of relations as done to God. In the parable of the Last Judgment he emphasizes this point by saying, "And the King will answer them, 'Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you
did it to me'... Then he will answer them, 'Truly, I say to you, as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me'." (Matt. 25:40, 45) One of the best poetic expressions of the indivisibility and oneness of divine and human relations is found in Leigh Hunt's poem, "Abou Ben Adhem". At first Abou Ben Adhem does not consider the love of his neighbour as the same as the love of God but when the angel writes his name down as the one who loves his neighbour he discovers that he becomes one of those who loves God as well.¹ The individual's sins disturb this personal relationship with God and men and so forgiveness in a broader sense is a positivization² of a disrupted personal relationship.

A right understanding of forgiveness, therefore, needs a good understanding of human relations. Erich Fromm, the American psycho-analyst and cultural analyst, has made a good contribution to the study of human relationship in Western Society and so the writer has chosen him for a special study on the nature of personal relationship.

The objective of forgiveness is not only the positivization of personal relation but a reformation of the

---


2. 'Positivization' is used to describe the making of a sin-disrupted relationship creative of life again.

In theology the writer has studied Dr. Emil Brunner's and H.R. Mackintosh's theological works on the theological conception of forgiveness. These two theologians are chosen for a special study because they fairly represent the theological position on forgiveness. Mackintosh's book, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*; and Brunner's, *The Mediator*, and *Man In Revolt*, are very useful in the study and the thesis is based mainly on the works of Brunner and Mackintosh and on the works of C.G. Jung and Erich Fromm.

1. Emil Brunner, (1889-)

Dr. Emil Brunner is one of the leading reformed theologians of our time. He was born on December 25th
1889 in Zurich, Switzerland. He is a son of a school teacher and was educated at the Gymnasium in Zurich and matriculated at the University of Zurich. In 1912 he received his doctorate degree in theology from this University.

Dr. Brunner was theologically brought up in the reformed tradition of Ulrich Zwingli and his mother, a daughter of a reformed minister, taught him the Bible through a naive picture Bible. Johann Christoph Blumhardt and Christoph Blumhardt, reformed ministers, played a very important role in his early formative years. They introduced him to dialectical theology. Both Dr. Brunner and Karl Barth were greatly influenced by Hermann Kutter, (1863-1931). Kutter was an uncle of Mrs. Brunner and Brunner was greatly impressed by his prophetic and challenging sermons. Kutter's influence appeared in Karl Barth's first commentary on St. Paul's letter to the Romans, Der Römerbrief. Dr. Brunner came under the influence of Leonhard Ragaz (1868-1945) in his University years. Ragaz was the head and the founder of the religious socialist movement and he introduced Brunner to the works of Kierkegaard. Ragaz influenced also Walter Rauschenbush, Paul Tillich and Martin Buber with his socialist ideas. Through Ragaz's help Brunner was able to travel in England and while he was learning
English in England he taught French.

He returned from England during the first world war and became a soldier in the Swiss militia. After his military service he became a pastor in a mountain church at Obstalden. Here he was married to Margrit Lauterburgh in 1917 and they have four sons.

While Brunner was serving as a pastor at Obstalden he intensified his study of Kierkegaard because he believed that Kierkegaard would help him interpret the Gospel in terms that modern man will understand and preach it in a way that will be relevant to the modern situation.

In 1924 he was called to the Chair of Systematic and Practical Theology at the University of Zurich and he held this post until 1959. While at the University Dr. Brunner wrote many books on theology and through his theological works he continues to speak to those outside the Church and interpret the Gospel to the secular mind. Because of his concern for the modern man both inside and outside the Church he has been interested in the "anknupfungspunkt", i.e. a point of contact between man's mind and the Word of God, while Karl Barth writes his theology with his eyes on believers and for them. Dr. Brunner is a very strong opponent of totalitarian communism and he thinks that it is as evil as Hitlerism,
because of his attitude to communism he could not understand why Karl Barth should oppose Hitlerism but be soft on communism.

Dr. Brunner was very much interested in the Oxford Movement through which he saw clearly the connection between spiritual reality and fellowship. Through the Movement he received a training in teamwork which he valued as one of the greatest gifts of God in his life. In his autobiography, speaking about this fellowship experience, he says, "Fellowship was no more a mere ethical attitude but a new reality --- the reality of God's Holy Spirit among and in men". Dr. Brunner was very active in the ecumenical movement and he took part in innumerable study groups in many countries. Among the many honours which came to him are honorary degrees from Edinburgh University, 1931, from Oxford University, 1937, and from Princeton University, 1946, as well as from many continental universities.

The writer found the Brunners very kind and friendly Christians when he visited them in April of 1960. Dr. Brunner walked with him during this visit even though he was not in very good health. The writer asked him

whether he thought that there was a need today for a conversation between theology and psychology. He replied emphatically by saying, "Yes, there is really a great need for psychology and a good theology to converse." Then he added, "Of course, when I say 'good theology' I mean my theology which looks at both aspects of the problem and not Karl Barth's theology which looks only at one side of the problem".

2. Hugh Ross Mackintosh, (1870-1936)

H.R. Mackintosh was born on October 31st, 1870 at Paisley, Scotland. He was a son of Rev. Alexander M. and Jessie Ross Mackintosh. Both of his parents died while he was a child and he was brought up by an uncle and aunt in Ross-shire.

Mackintosh was educated at Paisley Neilson Institution, at Tain Royal Academy, Edinburgh George Watson's College and at the University of Edinburgh where he received his M.A. degree in 1892 and Ph.D. degree in 1897. He studied theology at New College and learned much from the New Testament scholarship of Marcus Dodds and A.B. Davidson gave him a profound insight into the theology of the Old Testament. He studied for a semester in Freiburg, Halle and Marburg under Reischle and
developed a profound respect for his theology. His theological mind was also shaped by P.T. Forsyth, James Denney and H.A.A. Kennedy from whom he gained an understanding of Pauline theology.

Mackintosh's pastoral ministry in the Church was very short. In 1904 he was called to the Chair of Systematic Theology at New College and he held this post until his death in 1936.

While he was lecturing at New College he was still interested in the pastoral ministry and preached on Sundays because he believed that doctrine and life must answer to each other, and the less they in fact do so the more likely they are to err. He believed that the Kingdom of God (salvation) is realized in and through the events of the world of every day experience discernible simply through the act (moral) of entering it. Mackintosh was very much influenced by Ritschl but towards the end of his life he swung from Ritschl to Karl Barth from whom he received fresh insight into his old theological problems. He published about nine volumes.

3. Erich Fromm, (1900-)

Dr. Fromm is one of the outstanding psycho-analysts and cultural analysts of our time. He was born in 1900 in Frankfurt, Germany. He was educated at the University of Heidelberg and received the Ph.D. degree from this University in 1922. He studied at the University of Munich from 1923-24, and at the Psycho-analytic Institute in Berlin. Until 1932 he worked in Frankfurt as a lecturer at the Psycho-analytic Institute and at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Frankfurt.

Dr. Fromm was affiliated with the International Institute for Social Research in New York from 1934 to 1939. In 1941 he joined the faculty of Bennington College and was a guest lecturer at Yale University and Columbia University. He also taught at the New School of Social Research and at the same time was the Chairman of the Faculty of the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psycho-analysis and Psychology. He is now a guest lecturer at the National University of Mexico.

Dr. Fromm has written about eight books. Among them are, *Escape from Freedom*, *The Sane Society*, *Psycho-analysis and Religion* and *The Forgotten Language*. In many of these books he deals with the problem of modern
man's relationship in our industrial society. He shows a good grasp of the effects of capitalistic society on the structure of man's relationship. His books have been widely read and quoted. He is now an American citizen.


Carl Gustav Jung, one of the pioneers of modern psychiatry, was born on July 26th, 1875, at Kesswill in Swiss Canton of Thurgau and he died on June 6th, 1961, at the age of 85. His father was a pastor whose spare hours were devoted to the study of symbols and the meaning of language. He came from a long line of theologians, physicians and men of learning.

He graduated in medicine in 1900 at Basle. He originally entered the university to study archaeology and philosophy but, following a period of doubt, he transferred to medicine. While studying for his final examinations, he read his first book of psychiatry, that of Kraepelin, and at once realized where his real interest lay. As a result, he surprised his contemporaries by not applying for the university post which was clearly his due and by going to work at the Canton Mental Hospital where his father was the visiting pastor. He later
moved to the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Zurich where he worked under the direction of Eugen Bleuler, head of the famous Burgholzli.

In 1902, he went to Paris and studied for a semester at the clinic of Pierre Janet at the Salpetriere, at that time the centre of new thought and method in psychological treatment. Like his colleagues of the early days of the psycho-analytic movement, Freud and Adler, he had a thorough training in the methods of objective science and in general medicine before turning his attention to human motive as seen in disease. Unlike Freud and Adler, he was also intrigued by the apparently supernatural, by mysticism and the history of religious thought, and his first publication was a psychiatric appraisal of occult phenomena.

On his return to Zurich, Jung published a series of descriptive papers on psychiatric disorders, including hysteria and malingering, which reflected the beginning of his search for a unifying hypothesis to explain psychoneurosis. It was Jung who gave the name "complex" to the hidden constellations of ideas which may determine attitudes and behaviour of individuals without full awareness on their part. He was already well known, if only for his use of the word-association test as a guide
to hidden motives, when he became aware of the work of Sigmund Freud. Jung realized that the Freudian theory of the unconscious provided an attractive explanation of his word-association experiments and his observations on dream symbolism.

Jung's encounter with Freud led to an intense interest in the theory and method of psycho-analysis. This method fitted in so well with his own developing ideas of the "depth psychology" of neurotic illness that, by 1911, he was fully associated with the psycho-analytic movement, and was elected as the first president of the International Psycho-analytical Society. He was regarded by Freud as the most promising of his co-workers and as his own natural successor in the position of leader. By 1913, however, considerable differences of opinion had appeared in the group and Jung established his own separate school of Analytical Psychology.

His differences with Freud and Adler came under his self-analytic eye, for he saw them not so much as differences of doctrine but as due to the differing temperamental qualities of three strong personalities. His preoccupation with the constitutional aspects of temperament led in 1921 to the publication of his theory of psychological types and the introduction of the
contrasting "introverts" and "extroverts" whose different outlook on life has clashed repeatedly in the course of history.

Jung's view of unconscious mental life was always less restricted than that of orthodox psycho-analysis and his introduction of the concept of the "collective or objective unconscious" was founded on the study of different temperaments, customs and folklore of different races and cultures.

While developing these ideas, Jung travelled extensively, living with the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico and with peoples of North Africa and Kenya. His interest in the individual mind extended itself to that of the group, with its mythologies, mysticism and religions. He was profoundly influenced by Fraser and later by his personal contact with Richard Wilhelm who introduced him to Chinese religion and philosophy. He was a man of enormous energy, physical and mental, he treated patients, founded and encouraged the school of thought organized by his pupils, wrote constantly on a wide variety of subjects and, above all, set an example to psychologists by unashamedly enjoying the simple things of life. His home base was at 228 Seestrasse, Kusnacht-Zurich where the writer visited him last year. He married, in 1903,
Emma Ruasenbach, herself an analyst and his most valued collaborator. He had one son and four daughters and over 20 grandchildren.

Jung was a prolific writer and his books have been translated into many languages. His publications run into well over 30 volumes, and more than 100 papers in various journals.

C. Method and Procedure.

The thesis is a result of a study in which the method of fact finding and critical analysis and interpretation of the collected facts is used. Apart from the facts collected from various sources the writer went down to Zurich in April of 1960 and interviewed C.G. Jung and Brunner on forgiveness. His interview of Jung, with the writer's critical comments on it, is added as 'Appendix A' to the thesis. Dr. Brunner was not able to give the writer an interview because he had just returned from the hospital, but he drew the attention of the writer to some of his important books on forgiveness.

The writer interviewed some patients suffering from morbid guilt at Jordanburn Nerve Hospital, Morningside, Edinburgh. He attended some of the University Psychiatric Clinic classes to gain an understanding of some mental illnesses. In the interpretation and analysis
of the collected facts the writer used concrete human experience with its scientific interpretation as the criterion of judgment.

The thesis is divided into six chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter deals with human nature and its relation to wrong-doing; the second chapter with sinful acts which are the result of man's creative-destructive nature. The subject of the third chapter is guilt and its role in the experience of forgiveness. The fourth chapter deals with forgiveness as a transformation of personal relation and the fifth chapter is on an examination of the relationship between forgiveness and punishment. The last chapter is about forgiveness as a reformation of life and the marks of the forgiven life.
Chapter One.

THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN NATURE AND ITS RELEVANCE TO FORGIVENESS.

MAN: The Enigma of Human Nature

"What is man that thou art mindful of him? (Ps. 8:4a) is one of those perennial questions that every generation of men has to ask itself. This question may be asked within the framework of man's relation either to God or to the rest of the universe. The content of the question may differ but it has to be asked by each succeeding generation.

This question is addressed to and it is about human nature and existence as a whole. It is a question of meaning and of human destiny. It is inherent in the nature of human nature and existence. In a profound sense man himself is the question and at the same time the answer to it. ¹ The whole expression of his life, what he says and does, what he is, is an answer to the question, What is man?

Man, as an answer to this question, is not always an answer in the affirmative, sometimes he is a negative answer. Thus at every point of deep human experience he finds his nature and existence in conflict. He experiences a contradiction between the contrasted element of

his nature and in the conditions of his existence. St. Paul gives a classic expression to this inner conflict in these words, "I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate". (Rom. 7:15)

This experience of doing the evil that one does not want and not doing the good that one wants to do, or the experience of not doing the good all the time in spite of one's desire to do it all the time, is one source of constant crisis in human experience. Man's nature and existence thus become an enigma, a puzzle and a contradiction. He finds himself as a question, a riddle to be solved.

Who is this man whose experience of life is in contradiction? He is not an abstraction but the "actual human being whom we have known here and now....", and in history. Therefore the human being whose experience of life is in contradiction is the empirical man as he is known in the past and in the present.

It is this empirical man whose existence and nature are a question and an answer at the same time. Man's whole nature and existence is the problem. The contradiction is a part of himself and his life. (1) What

then is the nature of man's inner contradiction?

(2) What are the need-problems resulting from the contradictory conditions of human nature and existence?

(3) What is the meaning of the contradictory nature of man and his existence in terms of human destiny?

(4) What is the nature of sin and its relationship to human nature?

A. Man's Knowledge of Human Nature

The first three of these questions will be taken up in the present chapter, and the fourth question will form the subject of the next chapter. (This will be the chapter on "Sin")

Before any of these first three questions about the nature of man and his existence is discussed, it is necessary to discuss the nature of our knowledge of man as an external object and as the knowing self. This discussion will show the area within which any knowledge of man's nature can be validly asserted.

1. The nature of human perception

It has been pointed out above (p.23) that the subject of this discussion is the actual human being as he has been known by experience in the past and in the present.
This actual human being is an external object from the standpoint of the perceiver and as a subjective self of the perceiver. And so the actual human being is the self, reflecting upon himself with some amount of detachment and upon others as objects.

What is the actual content of this reflection? Is it the actual concrete human being or sense data from him? The actual concrete human being in himself does not come into sensation. It is only his sense data that are present in perception and form the materials of our knowledge of the actual human being. Therefore all that can be positively said about the actual concrete human being is that he exists in space, because the sense data that are present in sensation when two human beings come into contact with each other, represent something in space. The knowing mind receives these sense data by means of the organs of hearing, seeing and touch.

How do these sense data from the actual human being

1. Sense data. Sense datum is used here as a part of what is given in sense at one time and attention is focussed on it, e.g. particular properties of colour, noise and smell.

come to form a piece of knowledge? This work of transforming the sense data into knowledge is done by the nervous system. The nervous system translates the sense data received by the body from outside into a uniform system of electrical coding. The electrical impulses in the nerves are then decoded into knowledge. Man as an object of knowledge is therefore known as the nervous system interprets and co-ordinates the sense data from outside.

This medium of perception necessarily colours our knowledge of the actual human being. The nervous system, especially the brain contributes some sensory qualities to the object. It has been known that drugs like mescaline and lysergic acid can interfere with those parts of the brain concerned in perception and produce perceptual illusions. As a result of a drug interference the brain can fabricate information such as would have been aroused by external objects. The validity of our knowledge of man therefore depends upon the integrity of the nervous system.

However, because the sense organs and the nervous system can receive and do receive information from the external world and of the self, perception is never purely subjective. Perception gives indirect knowledge of
an external object and of the perceiving self. But it is not known what the actual human being really is.

2. Knowledge of Human Nature and the Unconscious Element

It is not only during the physiological process of receiving information about the actual human being that something is added. Sometimes what has been finally settled upon as a piece of knowledge of man has been unconsciously conditioned. Thus what an individual says about himself, or about his friend, or what a certain religion or school of thought says about the nature of man, cannot be taken to be unconditionally true. Sometimes what 'A' says about 'B' is a piece of information about 'A' rather than about 'B'. What 'A' says about 'B' can be a piece of information leading to reliable knowledge of 'A'. 'A' then presents rationalised information. This rationalisation is not limited to individuals only, but it extends to religious, political and philosophical groups as well.

This handicap on the acquisition of reliable knowledge of human nature is not, however, insurmountable. The rationalised information can be penetrated by a careful analysis. But the danger of presenting rationalised knowledge of man's nature to be true is very great
especially in religion and politics.

There is some feeling of insecurity involved in this type of rationalisation. The individual, his nation, or his religious institution may be a victim of this feeling of insecurity. Whenever this happens there is an attempt to present a sectarian view of man's nature as the sole truth. What the group wants to be true becomes the truth. This may result in divergent and contradictory views of human nature. All this is due to unconscious defense of group interests. Each group turns to defend its sectarian view of man while attacking and condemning views presented by other groups.¹

In the present study of the nature of man the Christian view of man is cross-checked over against the empirical view of man and vice versa. This approach of the problem of human nature leads to the adoption of the empirical method and the method of revelation in the study of human nature. These two methods need some brief discussion.


There has been some rivalry between religion and science as to which holds the more correct view of man. This rivalry is fundamentally concerned with the two methods mentioned above for arriving at knowledge of man's nature. For example E. Brunner maintains that true knowledge of man's nature comes from what is revealed by God in Jesus Christ. This means that only the method of revelation gives true knowledge of man. Though he admits that any theological statement about the nature of man should not contradict what is known of man through experience and that all that can be learned about man from experience ought to be included in theological doctrine of man, yet he contends that the revelatory knowledge of man is the true one.¹

Both Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr argue that as man knows God revealed in Jesus Christ, he comes to have true knowledge of himself. If this is the case it means that the actual observable facts of man are not to be interpreted empirically but from an a priori standpoint. And so though Brunner admits the place of the empirical method in acquiring knowledge of man he rejects it again.

¹. Brunner, op. cit. Man In Revolt, pp. 60-64.
Due to this attitude towards the empirical method Michael B. Foster goes as far as to say that the empirical method is only good for dealing with physical reality but not with man since man truly knows himself by knowing God as revealed in Jesus Christ. According to Foster the empirical method is used to compel "nature to answer questions framed by man";¹ but God is hidden and he is only known by his self-revelation. Therefore, argues Foster, "... Revelation is not an answer to our questions".²

It must be pointed out that the empirical method, and for that matter the experimental method, is not used to force nature to answer man's questions. If it were used to force or to extract an answer from nature, it would not be experimental or scientific at all. If it is true that the method is used to force nature to answer humanly desirable questions then only those questions that man wants answers for would be addressed to nature. But this is not the case. The method is experimental in this sense that various connections are experimented upon in establishing suitable relations between observable

---

2. Ibid. p. 27
facts. Only the right question can connect the facts satisfactorily.

Moreover, the nature of physical reality determines the kind of questions that can be asked about it. The empirical method tries to discover the inherent laws in the nature of things so that man can co-operate more successfully with nature. This is more than true in the physiological and psychical study of man. The medicine man is less successful in dealing with man's physical and psychical problems because he wants to force human nature to answer his questions.

Conclusion

The empirical method thus deals with observable facts. It interprets and establishes satisfactory connections between the observable facts. Its validity is well established in dealing with empirical facts, and so far as the facts of human behaviour are concerned this method can give some knowledge of man.

The empirical method, however, does not say anything about what is behind the phenomenal. It ceases to be empirical and becomes metaphysical as soon as it starts to make statements about Dinger an Sich. Its competence is in the realm of the observable. And so the empirical method is not capable of dealing with God, not because it tries
to force God to answer human questions, but because its validity is limited to the phenomenal.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that though revelation is not a forced answer to a question asked by man, yet it is an answer to a question. In other words, revelation is purposive. God has a purpose to become man in Jesus of Nazareth. God becoming man is an answer to the question posed by the contradictory conditions of human existence. God's mighty acts in the history of Israel came at certain crucial points. Thus when love of justice and righteousness temporarily disappeared from Israel, and the oppression of the poor and sham piety and senseless luxury took their place, God became known once more in the prophecy of Amos. In it the people of Israel knew God as God of justice and of mercy, and as God who demands true devotion of the spirit.

And so a divine revelation is an answer to a question posed by the mystery of human existence and the contradictions involved in human nature. If the answer is relevant, it can reveal the nature of the problem. That is to say something can be known about human existence and human nature in relevant revelation. Revelation is relevant when it does not contradict experience.¹

¹ Brunner, op. cit., Man In Revolt, p.60.
Thus revelation and the empirical methods can work together to yield balanced knowledge of man.

4. Revelation and Human Nature

The revelation of God does not fall down from heaven nor does God as a rule speak through the telephone to men. The revelation of God comes to man through the soul as one of its media.\(^1\) When the revelation is received it is communicated to the community. Since revelation does not have a conceptual language of its own it has to be communicated through a language that is culturalized. Culturalized images have to be used as a prong for grasping the new experience. Thus the prophet Amos reported one of his visions in these words loaded with rural images of which he was familiar. He said, "Thus the Lord showed me: behold he was forming locusts in the beginning of the shooting up of the latter growth, and lo it was the latter growth, after the King's mowing". (Amos 7:1. Italics are mine.)

This cultural handicap on revelation becomes more obvious when revelation is handed down from one culture to another.

---

1. The communication of revelation here referred to is especially the form that came to people like Moses before the burning bush, to Isaiah in the Temple and to St. Paul on his way to Damascus. In this form of revelation the whole psychic personality is possessed and used as a medium.
or from one generation to another which is far removed from the one which directly encountered the divine reality.¹

Furthermore, since the soul is finite and susceptible to both physical and psychic disorders, the validity of the revelation that the soul transmits depends upon the integrity of the soul. The soul also has its bright and dark sides and some horrible materials could come out of the soul.²

Conclusion

The cultural limitation on revelation can be overcome by a careful study and re-interpretation of the cultural conceptual forms. This will bring out the

---

1. This discussion of the cultural factor in the understanding of a new religious experience is based on an interview which the writer had with C.G. Jung on man's understanding of God and on his introduction to his book, Answer to Job, where he says, "It is, in fact, impossible to demonstrate God's reality to oneself except by using images which have arisen spontaneously or are sanctified by tradition..." (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1958), p.XVII.

message of revelation afresh for each succeeding generation.

Since the activities of the soul could be observed and studied empirically, whatever is communicated through the soul could be evaluated over against actual experiences of life. It is in experience that the truth or untruth of the Christian view of man's nature could be asserted. In arriving at either the Christian view or the empirical view of man certain principles are used to interpret the observable facts of human nature and human existence. It will be necessary at this point to discuss these principles.

The Principles of Interpretation of Human Nature

In the interpretation of the observable facts of man Brunner and H.R. Mackintosh use the 'hierarchical principle' while Jung uses both the hierarchical and 'causalitic principle'.

The hierarchical principle while looking at man in terms of what he could be, has overlooked what he has been in the past. Thus this principle alone is inadequate to comprehend man's nature. It is true that man's life is shaped and directed by whatever is his supreme object of devotion, yet what man's goal of development could be can be fairly ascertained from what man has been in the

---

1. Brunner, op. cit., *Man In Revolt*, pp. 63-66. Brunner contends that man is whatever is the most controlling idea in his life. It is the ideal goal or the idea from above (hierarchical) that guides, directs and shapes man's destiny. According to Brunner the all-controlling idea should be the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The essence of this revelation is love which is the only factor that resolves the problem of human existence and man's inner conflict. Furthermore, it is love that unites man to God and man to man. For these reasons the observable facts of human nature and existence should be interpreted in the light of divine love. Divine love then becomes the principle from above—the hierarchical principle—which is used to comprehend human nature and life. According to this viewpoint man's nature and life are comprehended in terms of where it is going and not where it has been.
past. It is necessary therefore to complement the hierarchical principle with the principle of causality.

Jung describes the principle of causality as a way of interpreting the present in terms of the past. This principle does not necessarily mean that present events are the consequences or effects of antecedent conditions. The facts of man's historical existence can be studied to arrive at reliable knowledge of human nature. This will undoubtedly lead to an understanding of man's present life, but it will also lead to knowledge of what can be reasonably expected of him in the future. Thus the two principles working together could yield a more balanced interpretation of human nature.

It is unfair to human nature to interpret it by one principle of corruption as Mackintosh does. At page 52 of his book, The Christian Experience of Forgiveness, he said, "... the fatal distinction between what we are and what we ought to be comes home to us. We are forced to look with open eyes on the one hand at our moral obligations, on the other at our moral incapacity. Both experiences are our own—— the sense of what we should be imposed on us by God, and the sense of what we are thrust on us by a corrupt nature".

It is true that man has a corrupt or evil nature,
and that some evil always accompanies his actions, but this is not a total representation of man's nature, his being and actions. Because it is equally true to say that man has some good in him. If this were not so man would not know that he is corrupt. It is, therefore, true to say that man in general is a mixture of good and evil, and so a principle of corrupt nature alone cannot be used to interpret what man is now. What he is now is a result of his good-and-evil nature. Any true view of human nature should assert the contrasted and conflicting possibilities of human nature.

Mackintosh further argues that what man ought to be is imposed on him by God. This view of what man should be is unacceptable because what man should be is not an external pattern of life forced upon him. What man ought to be is inherent in his very nature. In other words, what man ought to be is limited by his own nature. It is true to say that there is a state of being which affords the maximum of integration and union of man's inner conflicts. It is rather this wholesome state of being that man should seek to achieve. The oughtness implied in this search is in the fact that it is on this plane of being that man truly fulfils himself in spite of the conflicting elements of his nature. This state of being
is a renewal of the old which has been distorted, corrupted, and almost destroyed. Salvation of the old nature or creation is not an imposition or destruction of the old state of being but a transformation of the old state of being into a new one. In other words there must exist an intrinsic relation between the divine plan of life and what man is capable of being. In this sense the divine plan of life is not an imposition upon man but it becomes the innermost law of man's true growth.

C. Conditions of Human Existence and Human Nature

It has been pointed out above that man in general is a mixture of good and evil. In man is found love as well as hate. His whole existence has been characterized by contrasted possibilities. He is a rational being but he is also driven by irrational nature. He has achieved a considerable consciousness but he is still rooted in unconsciousness. In one chapter of the book of Genesis man is described as created in the image of God, then in the next chapter he is said to be formed of the dust of the ground (Gen.1:27; 2:7)

Alexander Pope accurately describes this grandeur and misery condition of man and man as,

A Being darkly wise, and rudely great:
With too much knowledge for the Sceptic side,
With too much weakness for the Stoic's pride,
He hangs between; in doubt to act, or rest; In doubt to deem himself a God, or Beast; In doubt his Mind or Body to prefer; Born but to die and reasoning but to err; Alike in ignorance, his reason such, Whether he thinks too little, or too much; Chaos of Thought and Passion, all confus'd; Still by himself abus'd, or disabus'd; Created half to rise, and half to fall; Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all; Sole judge of truth, in endless error hurl'd: The glory, jest, and riddle of the world!

What then is the nature of man's inner contradiction, the contradiction inherent in his existence and the conflict they cause? This question will be discussed under The Bipolarity of human nature, (a) Reason and Animal Nature, (b) The Bipolarity of psychic life, (c) The Image of God and the Creaturely Image.

1. The Bipolarity of human Nature

Both Brunner and Mackintosh argue that man's present existence is one of conflict and separation. Man, deep within him, experiences a conflict and feels that he is separated from God and from what he really wants to be, and from this neighbour. They go on to say that before the present existence in contradiction, there was a

"human existence as created by God" This God-created existence, however, was lost, and what man has now is a human existence of sinful man. 

Brunner maintains that man has lost his existence in the love of God during the Fall. Then he goes on to say that the Fall should not be taken as a historical fact and that Adam's deed does not make men sinful and guilty. This is so, contends Brunner, because Adam is not the physical father of the race and thus sin or existence in contradiction is not inherited.

If there was no great, great historical grandfather who brought forth existence in contradiction, and that so far as human memory is concerned, there is no time when man's life is not in contradiction, then there is no perfect human existence once lost and now man is trying vainly to regain it. That means that all that man knows is this life of inner as well as external contradiction.

3. Brunner, op. cit., Man In Revolt, p. 119
So far as racial memory and individual and personal memory are concerned man is always aware of an existence in contradiction.

Brunner has seen this aspect of human existence but at another place he gives the impression that once upon a time there was a life free of conflicts. In support of the view that man has lost no ideal existence Brunner says, "We are not aware of any moment in our existence when we are not sinners. So far as our consciousness is concerned, the state of "being a sinner" began with our first sin.... So far as recollection as persons is concerned we are aware of ourselves as sinners. The same is true of humanity as a whole, so far as it can be perceived in history, it is seen to be sinful".¹

Therefore anyone who assumes an existence, which once was free of sin, free of all conflict and suffering, is denying that God is the creator of this present sinful existence and is escaping from the baffling contradictions and puzzles of the present life into a life which existed nowhere. Again Brunner has something very cogent to say

on this conclusion. He says, "For believers in the Biblical revelation, the fact that this creaturely existence is not only transient but also contains suffering, is no reason to deny that it has been created by God". ¹

Conclusion

The present human existence with its inner contradiction is the existence that man has known. Man is not aware of any once-perfect existence which is lost in the misty past of human history. Man's restless seeking of an existence in which he will find meaning for his present life of contradiction does not mean that he is restless after a lost existence. The restless search for a life of meaning is forward looking; it is not a nostalgic anamnesis. The existence of meaning after which man aspires grows out from the present existence of contradiction. The restlessness is inherent in the existence. The Christian therefore lives this life of conflicts with hope and not as one who is trying to escape either into a once-perfect life of the past which never existed, or to escape into a future life which is yet to be. It is this existence in contradiction that is man's concern and God's

¹. Ibid. p. 129.
purpose to save.

a. Reason and Animal Nature

One of the characteristics of this existence in contradiction is the fact that though man has developed his power of reason and by means of it he transcends his animal nature and historical contingencies and himself, though with his rational faculty he is able to interpret and order his experiences and though by the power of reason he can envisage possibilities of order, unity and harmony above and beyond the contingent and arbitrary realities of his physical existence, yet at the same time man finds that he is still rooted in nature, subjected to its laws and unable to change them. Man realizes that he is still driven by his animal instincts of sex, hunger and thirst. The upshot of this is that though man has emerged from his instinctual level of existence yet he is still in it. This causes a conflict in his life.\(^1\) In thought and imagination man realizes that he is free and he transcends his animal nature but he does not always act on rational ground. His actions are greatly motivated

---

and determined by his emotions of fear, hate, anger and love.

Furthermore, man realizes that he is capable of conceiving higher values and better order of society, but he is incapable of incarnating all his higher values and transforming his society as it is rationally conceived. This leads man to discern a certain disharmony between his thought and action. This realization drives him to seek for a unity in the disharmony in his nature.

The more clearly he perceives this disharmony the more man realizes that he is free but limited, that in him finiteness and infinity meet, and that with his power of reason he creates and destroys, he produces evil thoughts and gives birth to evil actions.

The existence of these opposites of freedom and finiteness, of creativity and destructiveness, creates conflict and tension in man's nature. Man finds this disharmony unbearable and he is driven to find a state of equilibrium.

How is the conflict between man's rational and animal natures to be overcome? Erich Fromm suggests that man can overcome this inner conflict by developing his reason until he becomes a master of nature and of himself.¹

¹ Fromm, op. cit., The Sane Society, p. 24.
What Fromm is saying in effect is that more use of and development of reason will bring about inner peace and unity of life. But experience does not support this kind of solution. It is not true that man's animal nature will become more amenable to reason if reason alone is developed to the peak of perfection. What man needs is not one-sided development of the personality but full development of mind and heart and instincts. C.J. Jung gave an example of a professor whose life does not bear out Fromm's contention. Jung said this professor talked about his absolute reliability and honesty. Some time later the professor was caught lying. This professor developed his reasoning power but he neglected his dark side which took him by surprise.

And so man cannot be saved by the development of his power of reason, however important this may be. It is the whole man who is to be saved because it is the whole man who is involved in an existence of contradiction. The conflict between reason and man's animal nature can be overcome when both are accepted, developed and utilized in a new existence of love which is of God. In this unity reason and man's animal nature will complement each other.

b. The Bipolarity of the psychic life
It may seem that the inner contradiction of human existence is only limited to man's conscious life. But it is amazing to find out that this inner conflict has permeated man's whole being and has reached down into his unconscious life. Jung points out that from the same unconscious mind comes the power of psychic healing as well as evil forces that destroy the personality. ¹ And so the same unconscious life becomes the source of good as well as evil. The same contradiction that exists in conscious life finds its corresponding part in the life of the unconscious. ²

The conflict inherent in the human psyche sometimes manifests itself clearly in psycho-pathological cases like schizophrenia and other forms of mental disorders. In these cases the conflict has actually resulted in


2. The unconscious is that aspect of man's psychic life that is not accessible to conscious life. The unconscious contains materials that are not acceptable to conscious life. These materials because they cause pain or because they are not acceptable either to the individual or to his group, have been pushed down into the unconscious.
splitting the personality. Thus there seems to be two contradictory selves in the same personality.

Jung points out that even in the normal person there are two selves or personalities. He calls the one the persona, which is the acceptable self and the socially unacceptable self he calls the shadow. There is always a tension between these two selves and this affects the personality of the individual and his life as a whole.

Jung goes on to say that sometimes the individual or his group may project the unacceptable self on to persons or upon the environment. The individual or his group turns now to deal with this unacceptable self externally. This method of dealing with the unacceptable elements of the psyche turns in the end to dull the sharpness of the inner conflict, because the individual regards the conflict as between him and an external object which is interfering with his peace of mind and so he has every right to fight it. The conflict, however, is still present. The individual feels the inner conflict in a more acute form as soon as the external symbols for dealing with the objectionable materials of the psyche have been removed. And so the conflict of man's psychic nature is there whether he becomes unconscious of it through
projection or he is forced to face it directly.\textsuperscript{1}

This contradiction is not confined to the personal unconscious which is the top layer of the unconscious, but it has gone down into the collective unconscious which is the deeper layer of the unconscious and contains racial memories. Jung points out that the collective unconscious contains archetypes\textsuperscript{2} which act as a compensation for one-sided development of a conscious function. Thus it may happen that a man may develop his intellect and neglect his feeling function. Then the archetype in dreams will warn him against the danger of unbalanced development of the personality. If he heeds this warning then he will correct what is going wrong in his personality development.

However, whenever a function of an archetype, say of the god-image, which stands for man's desire to have order and meaning in his experience of physical realities and of


2. "Archetypes are recurrent impressions made by subjective reactions" (Jung, Ibid, pp. 68-69) of the soul to everrepeated experiences of life. The archetypes, because they become highly charged autonomous centres of power, have the power to cause certain regular physical and psychological phenomena to be experienced in a universal way. The archetypes (or universalized images of psychic experience) contain all the good and fine things thought and felt and also the worst infamies of which men have been capable. Some archetypes are the shadow, the God-image, the anima, the animus, the wise old man, the mother, and the child.
human affairs, has been introjected, that is when the psychic energy embodied in the archetype has ceased to be experienced as an outside phenomenon, as was the case during the period of Enlightenment, the psychic energy runs into its opposite function. It then becomes a destructive force as was experienced in the horrors of the French Revolution. Thus the same archetype of order and meaning could reverse into one of destruction.

Man's unconscious life as a whole, therefore, is not free from the contradiction of human nature and so man's desire for a unity of his nature and of his experience of life stems from deep within him.

c. The Image of God and the Human Image.

The contradiction of man's nature does not stop on the rational and the psychic levels of man's nature, but it has reached down into his spiritual existence as well. Man experiences within him the image of God as well as the human image.

In discussing the image of God in man Brunner argues that once upon a time there was a perfect state of existence which is now lost because of man's sin. In the pre-fall perfect state of existence man had the image of God in all its fullness but now only a relic of it is left.
He goes on to say that man's limited freedom which he has now to respond to God is derived from the relic of the image of God left in him and that this freedom was not there at the beginning. In other words, man's limited freedom is the result of his fall from the perfect state of existence.¹

But Brunner at another place says that the self always has a certain amount of self-determination,² and that this self determination or limited freedom is necessary for responsibility. He goes on to say that this limited freedom is the heart of man's being and that it is the very purpose for which man has been created. He concludes his argument by saying that man possesses this limited freedom that he may respond to God.

There are two main objections to Brunner's conception of human freedom. Firstly, if this limited freedom is not there from the beginning then there is no use calling it a relic as he does. Secondly, if this freedom is the

---


2. Ibid, p.56.
essence of man being man at all then it is not alien to man. Man, therefore, possesses this limited freedom from the very beginning and so the freedom does not become visible after the wrong response has been made. Moreover, it is the essence of this freedom that it should contain the possibility of making a wrong response otherwise it will be no freedom at all.\(^1\) It means that only human beings can be sinners, to be a sinner it is therefore necessary to possess that quality, freedom, that distinguishes man from the animal.\(^2\)

Man's limited freedom, therefore, is not a relic of a lost freedom or a result of his fall; it is an essential part of human nature. Man has this freedom to be a human being at all. This limited freedom involves either yes-or-no possibilities. In other words, within this limited freedom there is what may be called the human image which can say 'no' to the Word of God and the image of God. The existence of these two images makes

---

1. On this point Brunner himself says, "... it is the essence of this responsible freedom that its purpose may or may not be fulfilled.... Thus it is part of the divinely created nature of man that it should have both a formal and material aspect". Ibid, p.56.

2. "Only human beings can be sinners; to be a sinner it is necessary to possess that quality which distinguishes man from the animals". Ibid, p.60.
man responsive to an existence in the love of God and also responsible for his decisions. Man cannot avoid the task of decision which forms an essential part of his nature. The existence of the image of God and the human image creates a conflict in man's experience of life and he seeks for a resolution of this conflict.

Conclusion

Whether man is considered as a rational, as a psychic being or as a spiritual being, he experiences a constant contradiction in his nature and existence. He is torn between contrasted and conflicting possibilities of his nature; between reason and animal nature, between the personality-building and personality-destroying forces of the psyche, and between the image of God and the human image. It is in the conflicts of these contrasted possibilities that man has to decide either for or against God. This is his unique human quality as well as his unique responsibility; it is the condition of his greatness as well as of his fall.

D. Human Needs in relation to Human Nature

This polarity of human nature drives man to seek for a restoration, not for a resolution that will eliminate
one opposing element, e.g. the one that is not acceptable to him, but man is driven to look for a way of harmonizing the contradictory elements of his nature. It is then upon the basis of the harmonized elements that he will build a wholesome personality and a true human existence.

As man's possibility for the growth of a wholesome personality and his experience of a meaningful existence can be and is being destroyed by the evil effect of his contradictory nature, he therefore needs to be saved from being destroyed by the inner contradictions of his nature and existence. This will mean a salvation from destruction as well as for a meaningful human existence and genuine personality. In the process of this salvation there is a (1) need for self-identity; (2) need for communion: relatedness and rootedness; (3) need for transcendence; (4) need for a frame of orientation. All these needs can be summed up under one general heading, the need for an all-embracing meaning of life and a need for a unity of personality. A genuine salvation will include the resolution of these needs.

1. The need for self-identity

One of the chief characteristics of man is his
ability to respond. Man is a being who has to answer to and to decide for or against God, that is for or against a dynamic form of existence. (Brunner calls this form of existence, an existence in the love of God or in the Word of God) and a dynamic form of personality. As man decides for this dynamic form of existence he acquires his human-

To be human then man has to respond, he has to answer to a certain form of existence. It is in the process of this life of decision that man discovers who he is. Since man has lost his original unity with nature, he can no longer live in a perpetual unconsciousness of who he is. The loss of this original unity drives him to make decisions and to sense himself as the subject of his own thoughts, decisions and actions. It is only in a life of decision that the individual discovers his identity.

This individual identity, however, is very difficult to realize in the process of living. Many people do not experience themselves as the subjects of their own thoughts, emotions and actions. They continue to live in participation mystique.¹ This state of existence is

---

¹ Jung uses this expression, participation mystique, to mean a projection of everything that is unconscious in ourselves on to nature, and on to neighbours. Modern Man In Search of a Soul, p. 197.
especially true of people who are at a very low level of religious development. Animals, and trees, rivers and lakes, mountains and caves are peopled with human thoughts and emotions. And so these people never discover themselves as the authors of their own thoughts, decisions and actions. They live and die without achieving a sense of self-identity.

The existence of the sense of self-identity is also threatened by the individual's desire to belong. In the individual's desire to belong he follows the crowd unquestioningly. The crowd may be one's nation or religious group, it may be one's social class or labour group. The individual comes to identify himself with the group, and thus substitutes the identity of the group for his own which he is completely unaware of. The individual experiences the group values and attitudes as that of his own, and by this means he falsely satisfies his need for self-identity. He identifies himself so closely with the group values and attitudes that he is ready to sacrifice his life, give up his love, surrender his freedom and critical thinking to defend the group values and attitudes. In the end he comes to think, feel and act as he thinks his group wants him to do. ¹

There are two dangers involved in the loss of true self-identity. There is the danger of having 'a group faith' in God instead of a personal faith which springs from the individual's own encounter with God. An individual who is too much formed in the image of the group lacks this personal or genuine faith which is an event in which the individual himself is encountered by the Word of God.¹ True self-identity and genuine faith therefore go together and they form an essential basis of one's response to the Word of God.

The second danger is that since the group gives a synthetic self-identity to the individual, there is always a danger that the individual may turn to defend whatever the group believes to be true. Such people are more easily led to fight aggressive wars and they unreasonably defend unjustified group claims. How can the individual then achieve a true sense of self-identity and at the same time maintain a healthy communion with his group?

2. The need for Communion.

¹. Brunner, op. cit., Man In Revolt, p. 205.
It has been pointed out above that one of the things that endangers the achievement of a true sense of self-identity is the need for communion or belonging. Man is driven to discover himself as an individual but he finds it terribly frightening to achieve his individual identity in isolation. He feels insecure and lonely when he is alone, and he is torn between his need for self-identity and his need to belong.

Moreover, as man is created for communion, it is only in the community that he realizes his unique personality. The individual thus has his roots in the community and grows up in his relationship to the community. The value of communion is so vital that some groups use its denial as a form of punishment for those who will not conform to group demands. This creates a tension between the group image and the individual's sense of self-identity.

Man needs social communion as well as spiritual communion. Individuals can bear to be hermits and withdraw from any social communion, but they cannot live without communion with God. A lack of communion with God means an inward emptiness and spiritual death.

What then should be the basis of this communion both with God and man? The basis of this communion varies.
It may be on the basis of fear or domination, on the basis of submission or love, or on the basis of hate.

The individual may submit passively to his group in order that he may belong. In his submission he loses his individual integrity, self-identity and freedom. Then instead of the community helping him to fulfil himself, the individual becomes an instrument of group policy. The totalitarian states afford good examples of this type of relation between the individual and his group. The group as such is capable of either contributing to the development of the individual's personality or destroying the integrity of the individual.

In personal relations the communion may be one of submission or domination. One individual may sacrifice his own integrity and freedom simply because he wants to belong to a particular individual or he may adopt a domineering attitude in the relationship so as to cover up for his own feeling of insecurity. In either of these cases the individual is carrying on a communion of a sort but these relations are not creative. Even in the God-man relationship God may be rather feared than loved. The relationship can also be dominated by mutual hate. In all these forms of communion the individual is losing his true life rather than finding it.
What then is the true basis of communion? The true basis of a creative communion is love. Because love that is without fear, love that is a spontaneous response of the heart, is the love that unites one free personality in freedom with other persons, and therefore this is the love that forms the true basis of both divine and human fellowship. True love then becomes the power that makes every form of communion creative of a wholesome personality.

3. The Need for Transcendence

One of the characteristics which distinguishes man from the rest of nature is his power of reason and imagination. By these two powers man is driven to create culture in form of art and religion. Thus man by his power of reason and imagination transcends nature, historical accidents and himself. He is thus raised above time, space and nature into the realm of freedom and purposefulness. This is the realm of creativity. Man then becomes a creature by virtue of his power of reason and imagination.

But the nature of man's reason is such that it can be employed creatively as well as destructively. And so what is an asset to man on one hand becomes a liability
on the other. These two possibilities are inherent in man's rational nature. Fromm remarking on these two possibilities says, "The enormous power of will for destruction which we see in history of man, and which we have witnessed so frightfully in our own time, is rooted in the nature of man (Italics are mine) just as the drive to create is rooted in it".¹

Man may project his destructive power upon external objects, e.g. the devil, but in the final analysis man has to accept the fact that he is the source of both his creative and destructive powers. He is the problem. The problem in this connection is how to be creative on the basis of the double possibilities of his rational nature. Man therefore needs a meaning and a purpose for his powers of imagination and reason. He needs a unifying factor that will take care of the creative use of his powers of reason and imagination and at the same time control their destructive use. This unifying factor will form man's frame of orientation.

4. The need for a frame of Orientation

¹ Fromm, op. cit., The Sane Society, p. 37.
The contradictions of man's nature drive him to seek a transcendental reference that will give a unity to his experience of life. Only this will resolve the general contradiction of man's nature and existence. This need for a transcendental reference manifests itself in the restless search of man for a meaningful existence. St. Augustine gives a classic expression to this spiritual need of man in these words, Cor meum inquietum donec requiscat in Te, Domine. As man devotes himself in faith to this transcendental frame of reference he will have a unity of thought, of feeling and of action.

This consciousness of a need that only God himself can supply is manifested in man's religion. Man, however, has turned to all kinds of objects for a satisfaction of this need. Thus man is known to be devoted to a totem, to an idea, to an institution or even to himself for the satisfaction of this need. In all these devotions he worships anything but the living and true God through whose worship and help he can find meaning and unity for his life.

The problem that faces man in this connection is how to know the true transcendental frame of reference, the true and living God that alone creates the new existence and the new being. As man is related to God on the basis
of love he achieves his new being, his true sense of identity, and enters into a creative relationship with his neighbours and experiences a meaningful existence.

E. Religion

What is the nature of religion as a phenomenon manifesting the consciousness of a need that only God can supply, and its relation to human nature? In what sense is God, the creator of that new existence and new being and their fulfilment?

1. Authoritarian Religion and Forgiveness

There is a form of religion that has been identified with forgiveness in the popular mind. This is what John G. Mackenzie calls "religion of the law". As many people associate forgiveness with this type of religion it is necessary to indicate the difference between a religion of the law or 'heteronomous religion' and the religion which is the phenomenon of man's consciousness of his need for a divine help and power which is only found in a creative communion.

In authoritarian religion the law of righteousness is assumed as external to God and man. This law is usually identified with what the religious authority has said. God then is to see to it that the law is obeyed and he punishes every violation of it. To this type of religious attitude the alternative to punishment is forgiveness or expiation. Forgiveness then ceases to be a restoration of a broken fellowship or re-establishment of the sinner in the love of God and of his fellow men.

God is pictured in this type of religion as a law-giver, who must be obeyed because he demands obedience. Religion of the law feeds on a personality structure which is built on parental and social prohibitions and on threats of punishment. There is always a fear of not meeting the demands of God in the adherents of authoritarian religion. This creates a state of unconscious instability which is symbolized by fear of heights. This state may manifest itself as a fear of not being able to meet the trials of life, illness or bereavement. Faith in God then is replaced by fear of God and of life as a whole.

The individual who has this type of religion usually projects the prohibitions of his infantile conscience upon God, and so God appears to him as a policeman and a bully.
But deep within the individual he is morally at war with his natural drives. He experiences a conflict between his internalized parental and social prohibitions and a legitimate expression of his natural drives. As a result of this internal conflict the individual may develop a severe sense of guilt and a neurotic striving to be above temptation. Victims of this type of religion become fanatical crusaders for the keeping of 'God's law'.

A further psychological effect of this type of religion on the individual is that it prevents him from attaining to a mature and unified manhood and from experiencing the values of a mature religion. Thus the individual cannot stand alone in freedom and make decisions upon the basis of that freedom. He reckons submission to authority as equivalent to faith. His relationship with God and his fellow men is based on the law instead of on love which is the fulfillment of the law.

Submission is not only to God but it is transferred over to dogmas, to political creeds and to political leaders. The individual may become a 'Yes' man with an insipid personality. This type of submissive personality considers servility instead of insight as a virtue.

Forgiveness is also distorted in the mind of this type of religious individual. He rejoices in forgiveness
not because the whole person has been re-established in the love of God, but because the infantile conscience has been temporarily relieved. The individual feels that he has been spared the punishment due to his infringement of the law. Forgiveness in this sense is not creative of a new life of God, but it leaves the individual yet in chains of his prohibitive conscience.

True religion on the other hand is an incarnation of man's encounter with God. In this encounter man's need for salvation from the conflict that is due to the contradictions of his nature and existence is met. The individual who experiences the power of God in this type of religion finds an all-embracing meaning of life and experiences a genuine development of personality. The law of God is not imposed on the individual in this form of religion, but the law of love that is rooted in God becomes at the same time the innermost law of man himself. The law of love becomes the essence of man's relation to God and to himself and to his fellow men.

The task of a true religion is therefore one of finding an all-embracing meaning of life that will resolve the contradictions that man finds in himself and in his existence both as a part of nature and as a spiritual personality, and as a being made in the image of God and
as a sinner.

Reinhold Niebuhr maintains that the sole problem of religion is to seek redemption from sin of which the contradiction of man's nature is the occasion. Sin as the destructive manifestation of the human contradiction destroys life, personality and society, therefore it should be a proper concern of any true religion. But any realistic approach to the problem of human existence should not only stop at sin but should go right on to what is the occasion for sin, that is, to the contradiction of human nature and existence. This contradiction cannot be reduced to one static and absolute solution because human nature is dynamic and so the contradiction of human nature is dynamic and so the contradiction of human nature should be tackled afresh again and again. The dynamism of human nature drives man to transcend any momentary solution of the contradiction of his nature. And since the contradiction of human nature is the ground upon which man's moral and spiritual character is built, it is necessary that religion should be concerned with the contradiction as well as sin. In other words, the contradiction is the

1. This concern is tragically lacking in Fromm's humanistic religion which is a religion concerned only with the development of man's power of reason and love.
occasion for man's moral and spiritual growth as well as for sin, and so a true religion should have a scope for both man's sin and moral and spiritual growth on the basis of the contradiction.

Sin in this sense becomes a barrier in the way of creative communion with God and one's fellow men. It is in this creative communion that man realizes his moral and spiritual stature. It is therefore necessary that the barrier should be removed, that is sin should be forgiven. Forgiveness is therefore necessary for the realization of the new state of being in which the new humanity is made possible. Forgiveness, however, is not an end in itself, it clears the way for the realization of the new being which is created in man's encounter with the creative Word of God. As a chaotic mass and contradiction man encounters God's Word and through this encounter, God's Word acts as a power that forms the new man from the chaotic mass.

F. God, the Meaning of Human Nature

In speaking of God as the creator of the new life and the new being the Bible uses the Hebrew word יִצְוָ֣א (yits'wa) which means 'to form by cutting' or 'to fashion', and thus to introduce an order into a chaotic mass. (Gen. 1:27)
The word \( \chi \) is used exclusively of divine creation, and the instrument of God's creation is the Word or the Will of God. God's Will is revealed in Jesus Christ as divine love. It is this divine love that is creative of both a meaningful human existence and a substantial personality.\(^1\) In contradistinction to human existence and wholesome personality formed by God is an existence that is devoid of meaning and destructive of personality. It is through God's Word that man's genuine personality is brought into being.

God therefore is not "a symbol of man's powers" (powers of reason and of love) which he tries to realize in his life as Fromm contends.\(^2\) God is the creator of a genuine human existence and of a true selfhood, and he transcends this new being by the fact that he is the creator of it. Moreover, man is more than reason and love. A true self development includes man's emotions as well as his other powers of love and reason and feeling. The creation of God takes man as a whole and not just a

---


part of him. In other words it is the whole man who is to be saved.

How does God's creation come about? The creation of genuine human existence and wholesome personality takes place in the actual everyday business of living. It takes place in the actual business of social relations and in the historical process as a whole. Above all it takes place in a direct personal encounter with God in the soul.

In the everyday living of the family, of friends and of social relations the creating power of God is encountered, and from this encounter and with man's response, the new being is formed. This new being, however, is not a static creation but a growing entity and the extent of its growth, its direction and fulfillment is in the Word of God.

God is not limited to the above means of creation alone. He communicates himself directly to the individual e.g. to the prophet Isaiah and St. Paul. The Bible speaks of this kind of personal meeting with God as 'knowing' ($\gamma\nu\tau\iota$) that is to know by direct experience. (Job. 5:25; Ex. 6:7; Is. 5:19)

In such an experience of the creating Word of God, the individual is overwhelmed, gripped and possessed by God. A good example of this kind of knowing is the one
afforded by St. Paul's conversion experience. St. Paul was possessed gripped and driven around by the new power in his life. He told of the overwhelming power of this experience to King Agrippa in these words, "Wherefore, O, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision". (Acts 26:19)

From a careful study of the results of this kind of experience Jung points out that the experience of the transcendental power transforms the personality. This experience consolidates the ego of the individual subject and the individual finds a new and positive direction for his psychic processes. This new psychic direction affects the whole personal attitude of the individual. His life assumes a new meaning and a new direction. In case of St. Paul his psychic energy was turned from persecuting the Church and directed to preaching the word of God. (I Cor. 9:16)

Jung goes on to say that this experience of God may lead to confession, reparation of wrong done or open acknowledgement of guilt.¹ Thus Isaiah in the Temple was overwhelmed by the numinous experience of God and he

¹ Hans Schaer, Religion and the Cure of Souls in Jung's Psychology, op. cit., pp. 105-112, 56-56
declared, "Woe is me! For I am lost; for I am a man of unclean lips; and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips". Is. 6:5.

As the whole personality of the individual is altered by the transforming power of this experience, the individual is said to know \( \mathcal{Y} \) God. The numinous experience of the subject is given a conceptual formulation. Others who have not gone through this numinous experience can only comprehend these conceptual formulations but the actual transcendental experience is out of their experience.

Jung says that in the transformation of personality that is the consequence of this divine experience the old attitude or the old nature disappears from consciousness but it is not completely dissolved. The old nature remains latent in the unconscious and goes on exerting certain influence from there. It is because of the existence of the old nature that St. Paul in spite of all the wonderful results of his conversion he could still say afterwards, "I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate". Rom. 5:17. The double possibilities of good and evil are still parts of the individual's nature even after the numinous experience. But the individual does not make
the destructive powers of his nature as the dominant motivating principle of his life. In other words the individual is saved but his struggle for a continual growth of wholesome personality continues.

Conclusion

In summing up it could be said that man has known only one nature and only one human existence. This is his present nature and existence which are not imitations of a lost ideal and once-perfect nature and existence.

This nature and existence, however, contain contrasted possibilities. Thus man is capable of doing good as well as evil, of loving as well as hating. From his nature arises good as well as evil. This possibility of good and evil existing in the same nature is carried over into human existence and into human society.

These contrasted possibilities cause a conflict and tension in human life. The consciousness of this conflict and tension drives man to seek a meaning for his existence and a unity of his experience of himself as a part of nature and as a spiritual personality.

The new being and existence that man restlessly seeks is not anything that emerges as a result of the annihilation of the destructive possibilities of his nature
and existence, but the new being and the new existence grow out of the actual conditions of human nature and existence. For God himself is in the midst of these conditions of human existence. That is, there is the power of God working for good in the historical process. In peace as well as in war there is the creative presence of God. In man's response to the creative presence of God he experiences a new dimension of existence and a substantial and wholesome personality. The achievement of this new being and new dimension of existence means a removal of anything that may act as a barrier to it. In other words before the new state of being is realized sin which works to destroy a meaningful existence must be dealt with through forgiveness.
Chapter Two.

S I N

Introduction.

Human nature has been considered mainly as a general phenomenon with some basic elements in the last chapter. The contradictory and contrasted nature of these elements has been emphasized. The basic instinctive elements, (the sex, hunger and thirst drives) and the human emotions of love and hate are contrasted with man's power to respond to something above him and in so doing demonstrates his freedom of choice. This ability to respond to a transcendent Being on the basis of his freedom of choice forms man's unique character. This unique characteristic has set man apart from and above the rest of created nature.¹

A truly human life, however, does not emerge simply by the virtue of the presence of these basic elements and of man's power to respond and to decide on the basis of his freedom. As the individual goes through the actual

1. Brunner speaking on the importance of the responsiveness of man says, "The Christian, however, holds that man has his essence and freedom in God's Word of creation and grace. In this act of God which is unthinkable without a responsive act of man, that is, in this responsibility, man has his being. He is a man through his relation to God. Outside that relation man is a caricature of man...." The Word and the World, (SCM Press, 58 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1., 1931), p. 75.
affairs of life he has to make certain decisions. Upon the basis of these decisions a certain pattern of life emerges. The form of life may be rooted in love and thus yields the truly human life. Man's life of decision may lack love as its motivating principle. This form of life then will be against an existence in the love of God and of one's fellow man.

Thus in actual life there exists a state of deciding either for or against a truly human life (or an existence in the love of God and of one's fellow man). Whenever the individual decides against this existence in the love of God and of his neighbour he has strayed from the true life and thus has sinned.

It should be pointed out that man's experience of life is not characterized by one stream of adverse decision against a truly human life. Man sometimes responds positively to this existence in the love of God and of his neighbour. That is to say man does not exist perpetually in a sin-committing state. If this were so man would not know it, because he would have no experience of any other state of existence to use as a basis of comparison. Man's sin is therefore an act as his response to the Word of God is an act. The individual therefore lives on the boundary line between the possibility of
responding to a truly human life on the one hand and the possibility of deciding against that way of life on the other.

A life of this nature is not one which is characterized by one continuous harmony or discord. It is marked rather by tension because both possibilities to sin or not to sin are always there. The individual therefore undergoes tension and conflicts in his experience of life and of his nature. It is upon the basis of this life of tension that the saint and the villain are made. In this life of tension there is the possibility for saintliness and also for villainy. Therefore the discord between passion and reason, between impulse and conscience, and by and large, the discord between the divine and the human is inherent in the very fabrics of human nature and it is not the consequence of the wreck and ruin of a once-fair-and-perfect harmony as Brunner maintains. It is the reality of this organic discord of human nature that has made sinning an actual experience of life. What aspect of human experience comes then under the category of sin?

A. Sin in the Bible


Sin as a category of human experience has been misunderstood today in some quarters, and has been regarded, with the advance of psychological science, as a primitive concept. Thus Professor Knight Dunlap of Pittsburgh University says that sin is a human creation and is not a basic part of the universe. He goes on to say that the concept of sin is evil and should be destroyed.¹ Since sin is strictly a religious and moral terminology it is necessary to start the study of sin by examining the term 'sin' as it is used in the Bible.²

There is no systematic account of sin in the Bible. Different aspects of the individual's experience of life have been subsumed under the category of sin; but there is something common about all these varying forms of experience, and this is a sense of failure which is common to them all.

a. Sin as missing the mark

The Hebrew word מַעַל is used in the Bible to


². This part of the study is based on Gerhard Kittle's Bible Key Words, Sin, (Adam and Charles Black, Soho Square, London, 1951).
mean 'to miss the mark and not hit the goal' or 'to stumble in the path of rectitude'. The word could be used to mean a deviation from a religious objective, e.g. I Sam. 7:6, the people of Israel said, "We have sinned (לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה) against the Lord". The word could also mean a deviation from an objective of social relationship, e.g. Gen. 20:9, "Then Abimelech called Abraham, and said to him, "What have you done to us? And I have sinned (לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה) against you".

The Hebrew verb לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה can also mean 'to become liable to a penalty or forfeiture of something by sinning, and in this sense it has no reference to motive or to inner quality of sinful behaviour, but it is mainly an objective reality.

The verb can also be used to mean 'to miss one's way' e.g. Prov. 19:2, "It is not good for a man to be without knowledge, and he who makes haste with his feet misses (לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה) his way". לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה meaning 'to make mistake' becomes the commonest expression for sin in Hebrew.

In the Old Testament legal term the word לַעֲבֹדָה תְנַפְּעָה is used to denote a faulty action, and comes to be applied to all kinds of wrong doing. It may be used to denote a failure to comply with the normal laws of human
intercourse e.g. Judges 11:27, "I therefore have not sinned (יהזון) against you, and you have done me wrong by making war on me..."

יהזון could also mean a deviation from an ethical norm e.g. I Sam. 19:5b, "Why then will you sin (יהזון) against innocent blood by killing David without cause?". In Gen. 20:9, cited above ייהזון is used to mean "things that are not done". (tabus).

As the Hebrews regard social life as subject to legal norms or to generally recognized rules, religious life is also regarded as being under rules and regulations and intercourse with God is possible under these prescribed conditions. Sin, therefore, in the sense of ייהזון is a failure to arrive at the right objective in social as well as in religious intercourse. Sin in this sense is mainly concerned with an objective reality, e.g. social norm or religious norm. This norm is the condition of a creative communion either with God or with one's fellow man. A failure to conduct a social or religious intercourse under these prescribed conditions is sin.

b. Sin as rebellion ינהזון

The Hebrew verb ינהזון meaning 'to fall away from
anyone' or 'to break a covenant entered into with a person' e.g. I Kings, 12:19, "So Israel has been in rebellion, ( יָשָׁרָהוֹת ) against the house of David to this day". Amos used the word יָשָׁרָהוֹת to mean 'to transgress against the Lord' or 'to assert one's independence of God.' (Amos 4:4) In any political state the breaking away of any political unit could be described as 'rebellion' in the original understanding of the word יָשָׁרָהוֹת. In religious usage יָשָׁרָהוֹת comes to mean 'breaking away from God as the leader and unifier of one's life'. Sin in this sense is therefore a separation or breaking away from God who is the meaning of one's life.

c. Sin as 

The Hebrew verb יָשָׁרָהוֹת which means 'to wander' or 'to go astray' is also used for sin in the Old Testament. While יָשָׁרָהוֹת and יָשָׁרָהוֹת refer only to an objective reality e.g. social norm or covenant agreement, יָשָׁרָהוֹת, however, implies a right intention on the part of the one who has gone astray. His going astray is then attributed to God. Thus Job is able to say that God is responsible for "the deceived and the deceiver" (Job 12:16). According to this view of sin man in his finite strength is not allowed to reach God, that is man experiences failure,
because God denies him the power to do so. The source of man's fatal incapacity to do good always is attributed to God. This is the irrational factor in sin. The Hebrews realize a sense of necessity in sinning. But this irrational factor in sinning is only the occasion for sinning and it does not make sinning unavoidable. Under the views of sin expressed by the \( \gamma \) and \( \pi \) the factor of man's responsibility to decide either for or against an existence in the love of God and of his neighbour is always implied.

Conclusion.

Sin in the Old Testament is (a) a failure to reach the objectives of social and religious relationship. Sin becomes an abnormal behaviour, a deviation from the norm that only makes social and religious intercourse possible. (b) Sin also means a breaking away, separation from either a ruler or a ruling house e.g. the house of David, or from God who is regarded as the guardian of one's life. (c) The Old Testament also recognizes the inevitability of sin. It recognizes the fact that man is finite and his finite situation involves a possibility of sinning. Thus "to be human is to be a sinner".

1. Kittle, op. cit., p. 32.
According to this view of sin, its consequences consist of all kinds of suffering. (Rom. 1:27) The Jews regard suffering as punishment for sin, sickness especially is considered as a punishment for sin. Thus when the disciples of Jesus saw a blind man they asked Jesus, "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" Jn. 9:1, 2.

The Jewish formula then for sickness as a punishment for sin is that no one can recover from one's sickness until God has forgiven all his sins. (Ba. Ned. 41a). Forgiveness in the context of this kind of understanding of sin is sparing one of punishment due to one's sin. It is only in the revelation of God's nature by Jesus Christ that forgiveness of sin becomes atonement, that is a restoration into the right fellowship with God and with one's fellow man and restoration to one's true self.


In the New Testament Jesus deals with sin as he meets it in the lives of people. He does not give a systematic account of the nature and consequences of sin. He shares some Jewish ideas of sin, e.g. a belief in sin as the cause of some illnesses, thus in curing the paralytic man he said to him, "My son, your sins are
forgiven". (Mark 2:5)

Jesus, however, does not confine sinning to an external non-conformity to a norm. According to him the individual sins not only in his overt behaviour, but also by his motives and intentions as well. Evil motives and intentions to Jesus Christ are as sinful as the acts they give birth to and so he says to the Pharisees, "For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander". (Matt. 15:19). These evil motives and intentions form the psychological elements in sinning. They make a man a sinner even if they are not actualized in overt behaviour. A sinful act is therefore to be judged not only by its objective quality but also by the individual's motives and intentions. Sin is a subjective as well as objective reality.

Sin as a subjective reality is well portrayed by Jesus Christ in the parable of the Prodigal Son and his stay-at-home brother. To all appearances the Prodigal Son has sinned because he has broken away from his father and has declared his own independence of his father. His sin is a sin of rebellion and it is objectively real.

The stay-at-home brother maintains a filial intercourse with his father and there is no break in his
relationship with him. But this very fact has made him become self-righteous and jealous. So though his external relationship with his father is maintained yet his spiritual relationship with his father and his brother is sinful. He thinks that his obedience to his father has won for him indisputable privilege to his father's love and therefore his father is bound to recognize his righteousness. Furthermore, he thinks that because he has not broken any filial bonds he is better off than his prodigal brother who is publicly known to be disobedient and rebellious. The stay-at-home brother thus becomes proud in his righteousness and sins in his wrong attitude towards his prodigal brother. Therefore an outward conformity to a norm of social and religious intercourse alone is not a guarantee of sinlessness. The individual can sin in his attitude as well as in his overt behaviour.

b. St. Paul's Conception of Sin.

St. Paul to start with was a self-righteous man as the stay-at-home brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son. He believes that a rigid observance of the Law will make a man righteous and this self-acquired righteousness will not escape recognition from a righteous
Thus in his letter to the Christians in Philippi he says, "Though I myself have reason for confidence in the flesh (Law) also. If any other man thinks he has reason for confidence in the flesh, I have more: circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee, as to zeal a persecutor of the church, as to righteousness under the law blameless". (Phil. 3:4-6)

It is with this understanding of the Law and righteousness that St. Paul judges the rightness of his persecution of the early church. But after his conversion he perceives that his rigid observance of the Law is not necessarily the doing of the will of God, which has been made known afresh in Jesus Christ. He therefore comes to conceive sin as man's determination to live for himself and manage by himself. To him sin, therefore, is hatred and opposition to the will of God and a reliance on one's power to procure one's own salvation. The reliance upon one's power to obtain one's salvation according to him expresses itself in the rigid observance of the Law which holds a promise of death for those who believe in it.

St. Paul, however, develops his conception of sin
further and extends it to embrace the origin of it. As a Jew he believes that sin entered the world through one man, Adam, who freely chose to act against God. (Rom. 5:12). But he does not stop with this Jewish traditional answer to the origin of sin. He goes on to say "sin indeed was in the world before the law (Will of God) was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law". (Rom. 5:13).

When St. Paul says "sin indeed was in the world before the law was given" he is not referring to sin as an act but as a propensity. According to him the human propensity to sin is innate and it is actualized after the Law has been made known. It is this sin-disposed nature that makes it possible for man to go against the will of God as made known in the commandment of the Law. Sin is therefore a rebellion against the will of God and it is thus an act and guilt before God. St. Paul argues that the place of this sinful propensity is in the flesh. The Law is given because of the weakness of the flesh and through the flesh it makes sinning actual, and thus he says, "Apart from the law sin lies dead". (Rom. 7:8b). Since sin brings death the function of the Law then is death not life. As man by nature is sold as slave to sin he is consequently under the dominion of
death.¹

How is man saved then from sin and the Law and death? According to St. Paul the end of the coming and work of Jesus Christ is to condemn and to destroy sin and thus bring an end to the power of the Law and death. Through the death of Christ, on the Cross, he argues, sin is defeated once and for all. (Rom. 6:10; I Cor. 15:3). The sinner who dies with Christ, that is, believes Him and in His saving work will receive a newness of life. Salvation then does not depend upon the life and works of the sinner but only on faith in Christ and his saving work. In concrete terms, what does this mean to the sinner here and now? A close examination of the Pauline answer to this question, that is of St. Paul's solution of the problem of man's sinful propensities and of sin as an act and of its consequences will be taken up in chapter four, but it is enough to say

¹. The Pauline conception of the function of the Law as death is the very opposite of the Rabbinic understanding of it. Rabbinic Judaism admits the fact that man has sinful propensities which are given him by God. But God, on the other hand, gives man the Law to curb his sinful propensities and if man lives according to the Law he will be saved from the evil powers of these propensities.
here that "for one who has died and risen again with Christ, i.e. for his ego, Christ has become the pattern (\( \tau \alpha \pi \sigma \) ) shaping his conduct".¹

To summarize, sin in the Bible is both an objective and subjective reality. As an objective reality it is a failure to live one's life according to the conditions that make fellowship with God and with one's fellow men possible. This failure leads to a separation from God who is the ground and meaning of life, and a separation from one's neighbour.

Sin as a subjective reality implies the evil quality of the motives and intentions of the individual's actions. This understanding of sin makes evil thought, whether actualized or not, sinful. The Bible also recognizes inherent evil human propensity as a factor in sinning and it is this factor that makes sinning possible at all. But sinning is not a necessary consequence of this propensity. The individual does not sin until he has chosen to do so. Actual sinning is a responsible act and the individual's acts become sinful in terms of the revealed will of God. In other words, his acts become sinful in terms of what will promote and make more meaningful his life and the life of his neighbour and the

¹ Kittel's Bible Key Words, Sin, op. cit., p. 83.
common interests of his group. Sin considered in these terms is an opposition to God's will as made known in connection with the purpose and meaning of man's life and the life of his group. Sin is the failure to use the will of God as the foundation of one's life and thus to be independent of God's will.

B. Sin in Modern Theology and Psychology.

1. Sin as Apostasy.

According to Brunner the kind of human nature that God had given and established in the beginning was "a creation in the Word of God". In other words to start with man lived in perfect obedience to the will of God and he knew no sin. This period of perfect obedience to the will of God may be called 'the pre-Promethean era'. Brunner goes on to contend that man, once upon a time, decided to go against the will of God and this was the beginning of his sinful life. The pre-Promethean era thus ended with man's disobedience. Sin therefore is the reversal of this era of harmony and obedience; it is an apostasy, a turning away from living in the Word of God.

It has been demonstrated in the introductory chapter that there is no time in the history of the human race or of the individual when man is not a sinner. Therefore sin cannot be considered as a secondary element or the reversal of the primary element which is an existence in the Word of God. The co-existence of being in the Word of God and in sin is rather inherent in human life and is the source of tension in man's experience of life. Because of the co-existence of these two elements the individual has a decision to make here and now whether to live in the Word of love or not. Any fresh decision against the existence in the Word of God is a turning away --- apostasy --- from God. Sin is apostasy not because once upon a time man by his first sin had reversed the primary element, but because here and now man decides to turn away from God.

Sin as an apostasy cannot be said to be disobedience to God either.¹ For disobedience presupposes a command, and before a command is disobeyed there must be a disruption in the objective relationship. That is to say man first breaks away from a communion with God before he disobeys his command. If love, which is the condition of creative communion, is lacking then disobedience is made

---

¹ Brunner, ibid., p. 92.
possible. Thus Jesus said, "If you love me, you will keep my commandments". John 14:15. The communion of love therefore comes before obedience, and breaking away from the communion of love is sin and disobedience follows as a necessary consequence.¹

2. Sin as egoism and idolatry.

Usually egoism — selfishness — and self-love are considered as identical and since selfishness is evil therefore self-love is evil too.² But is self-love the same as selfishness? Does it follow that if love for others is virtuous then self-love is a vice? There is an evil in making self as one's sole object of love, but if it is a virtue to love others who are human beings, since the loving subject is also a human being, it follows

1. Fromm in his book, Psychoanalysis and Religion, fails to see disobedience as a consequence of sin, and so he represents sin in Christianity as "lack of reverence and obedience". p. 35.

that the self should be loved as well as other selves. For this reason Jesus said, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself". (Mark 12:31.)

Psychologically, others as well as oneself are the object of one's feelings and attitudes. One's attitude towards oneself determines one's attitude towards others. If one has an attitude of love towards oneself one will see something lovable in others too. If one has a respect and concern for one's own integrity and uniqueness, and love for and understanding of one's own self, these attitudes will be shown for other individuals too.

Therefore a reasonable and an accurate image of oneself is necessary for seeing others as they are. For the unhealthy self experiences everything in a distorted way. Therefore the acquiring of a true self is a value in personal and social relations. The failure of some individuals to act according to the normal conditions of social intercourse is due to a faulty view that they have of themselves.

Thus it cannot be said that 'self' as such is sin, or a natural self-assertion is sin. Rather the failure to acquire a true self is sin. For there will be no unique individual without an individual organization and assertion of his vital energies. The person who can
rightly affirm his unique individuality will not be a mere reflection of the group image and will be able to love others in his unique way.

How is 'selfishness' different from 'self-love', and the static and phony self different from a dynamic and true self? Psychologically, selfishness is directing all one's psychic energy on to a self that is sick and static. The selfish individual "is interested only in himself, wants everything for himself, feels no pleasure in giving but only in taking. The world outside is looked at only from the standpoint of what he can get out of it; he lacks interest in the needs of others, and respect for their dignity and integrity. He can see nothing but himself...."¹

This type of individual is basically unable to love himself as well as others. He feels that he has no substantial self that will give him stability and so he becomes morbidly concerned with his empty self. He does this because he has no real self that he can genuinely love. Therefore basically the lack of a true self and a reasonable self-love lead rather to selfishness and unhealthy self-assertion.²

---

Theologically, selfishness is a sign that the individual's centre is removed from existence in the Word of God. The self then becomes the centre of itself and of its world. This is the sin of idolatry. Man makes the wrong object (self) an object of its supreme devotion and worship.

Selfishness becomes a pride if the individual's being is centred in himself. The self-centred man elevates himself beyond his peculiarity and makes himself divine on the basis of his finiteness.

Egoism can also manifest itself in the form of power. In such cases the individual may draw the whole reality into himself in terms of power. He sees everything in terms of how much power it can confer upon him and he uses the power to further his own interests. He comes to worship power in terms of his own individual ends. This is a worship of the self through power.

The sin of selfishness may show itself also in the form of a moral pride. This form of selfishness is revealed in all forms of self-righteous judgments. In this self-righteous judgment the other person is condemned because he fails to conform to the highly arbitrary standards of another self. Since the self judges itself by its own standards it finds itself good. It finds
others evil because they do not measure up to its arbitrary standards. In all this the self is made the centre of the world and of worship.

The self-centred individual may go as far as to attribute divine sanction to its partial standards and relative attainments. This is a spiritual pride. In another sense this can be a sin of arrogance or pretension and a desire to be equal to God while that very self is far removed from God.

Conclusion.

Selfishness is not the same as self-love. Selfishness is rather the worship of a sick and inauthentic self. It is the removal of man's centre from existence in the Word of God and centring it in the self. Spiritually speaking, this is idolatry. True self-love on the other hand is a virtue in itself and a necessity for an experience of a genuine social and personal relations.

C. The origin and nature of Sin.

What then is the origin and nature of sin? Sin is only predicable of a human existence. This means that sin is predicable of a being who has a finite nature and existence, and of a being who possesses freedom and power
to be independent and superior over the world. A problem arises when the individual has to live this finite existence; especially when he has to live his life of decision. At this point he has to decide whether to make a god of his human nature and existence or to live them in the love of God and of his fellow man. Sin thus comes at the meeting point of nature and freedom. And so the fact that man has transcended his created nature by his gift of freedom, becomes the presupposition of his sinning. But this gift of freedom is the image of God in man. Therefore "sin itself is the manifestation of the image of God in man, only he who is created in the image of God can sin... No animal is able to sin, for it is unable to rebel against its destiny, against the form in which it has been created; it has no power of decision".  

Therefore the fact that man has the freedom of decision and a nature which is capable of good and evil makes sin possible. In sinning then there is both a personal responsibility and necessity. The human situation itself is susceptible to sin and the temptation to sin lies in it because man's freedom and finiteness are capable of being used either for good or

for evil.

1. The Devil as the Source of Sin.

How does sin, evil,¹ actualize itself in the human situation? Both Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr argue that whenever man sins he is tempted by the devil which they identify as the serpent of the Adam's story and sometimes as a fallen angel.² They contend that the devil is a force of evil antecedent to any evil and human action. Brunner, in particular, argues that man did not invent evil because he is too small, too weak and too closely connected with his senses to be an inventor of evil and so the devil invents evil. Human sin, therefore, presupposes a force of temptation or "powers" as the New Testament calls them. (Rom. 8:38; Mark 6:14). Brunner and Niebuhr go on to say that evil first befell the devil in his attempt to transcend his proper state

---

1. 'Evil' is here used to mean that which hinders, corrupts and destroys life. It is life-defeating and dis-integrating. Sin then is an evil because it is destructive of life. Good, on the other hand, is life furthering and integrating. It is purposeful and meaningful.

and become like God. The human situation being made susceptible to sin became sinful after the devil had introduced sin into it.

Firstly, this account of the origin of sin is unsatisfactory, because the question could be asked, how did sin come to the devil? To this question two answers could be given. (a) The devil might be tempted like man by a force external to him. If this is true then the origin of sin is pushed a step further back without explaining it. The investigation of the origin of sin then could lead on to an infinite regression of external temptors. This means that the origin of sin has to be posited arbitrarily, and this could as well be man himself as the devil. (b) Or the devil might have such an unconditioned power so as to introduce sin all by himself into the human situation. But such a position will lead to a metaphysical dualism. God then becomes just one of the cosmic powers. Therefore to say that the devil as a fallen angel is the origin of sin is an untenable proposition.

Since the introduction of evil into the human situation cannot be attributed to God, otherwise he will be defeating his own purpose, the actualization of sin in the human situation is to be attributed to man himself.
The actual manifestation of sin then is the result of man's decision. Sin, therefore, becomes real in human life as a result of the individual's decisions. The devil therefore cannot be used as a principle to explain the origin of sin. Sin comes from the junction of human

1. Psychologically Jung points out that the devil is a projected human shadow which comprises all that the individual has repressed into the personal unconscious without reflection of any kind. The contents of the shadow are usually materials that are not approved of either by one's family or group, or are objectionable to the individual. The individual has refused to countenance or recognize these rejected materials as a part of himself. These rejected materials form a kind of psychic personality and this personality is projected and characterized as the 'devil'. The individual in projecting this psychic personality on to the external world is able to deal with it better and so he thinks that the devil is outside him and it is his duty to fight it.

The shadow is also projected into the lives of one's enemies, and into the 'enemies' of one's nation. Thus the individual may come to believe that the Communist, the Jew, the Capitalist and the Negro are the source of all evil. He then sees others constantly in a completely distorted way and in accordance with his own shadow qualities that he projects on to them.

Jung, however, in talking about evil confuses two types of evil. He confuses 'physical evil' with 'human (moral) evil'. Thus he says, "At all events we don't do justice either to nature in general, or to our human nature, when we deny the immensity of Evil, and suffering and when we turn our eyes away from the cruel aspect of creation. Evil should be recognized and one should not attribute the existence of Evil to Man's sinfulness". (this
quotation is from a letter that Jung wrote to H.L. Philip, the author of Jung and the Problem of Evil, pp. 241-242).

It should be pointed out that human evil e.g. poison gas, the evils of Nazi concentration camps and gas chambers, and of racial segregation are not the same as physical evils which Jung calls "the cruel aspect of creation". Flood, tidal waves, earthquakes and storms are different from any of these evils mentioned above. These physical evils are neutral so far as human interests are concerned. They become evils when they are considered on the basis of human interests. These physical evils are there in nature as any natural phenomena and are not due to man's sinfulness or goodness.

Human evil, however, comes under a different category. Human evil is the result of man's action and thus is caused by man and its cause cannot be attributed to any external agent, e.g. the devil.

Jung further argues that since evil has been projected on to the external world while its real source is in man, therefore God cannot only be the author of the good in man, but he must be the author of the evil as well. He concludes that God rightly speaking is the embodiment of good and evil. (Philip, op. cit., Jung on the problem of Evil, p. 242, Jung, Answer to Job).

Speaking of human good and evil it should be pointed out that man has a responsibility in actualizing the good in this life, because man is a creator of value as well as of evil. But the ultimate source of this human value is on the basis of man's communion with God, or on the basis of his existence in the Word of God. From this communion flows the power to do the good. But man is responsible for the decision that he makes either to stay in this communion and be creative or to stay out of it and create evil. God, therefore, is the ultimate source of the good in man's life and man is also responsible for its realization in actual life.

evil' and 'moral evil', but he argues that physical evil is the result of the moral evil of man. At page 41 he says, "Man, then, as a free agent is capable of sin, and this in turn causes suffering, so an important answer to the question, Why should there be physical evil, is that it is the result of the moral evil of man. It is the boomerang effect of sin."

It is very difficult to see any causal relationship between an earthquake whose cause is scientifically known and any moral evil, unless Vicar James wants to read a causal relationship which is not there into it. If it is accepted that man's moral evil is the cause of earthquake, does it mean then that people who die of earthquake are the sole cause of the moral evils that produce the earthquake. Or could it be said that because the Japanese are the worse sinners that is why they experience more earthquakes than other countries. Physical evil cannot be so arbitrarily connected with moral evil. Physical evils occur without regard to human evil or human interests.
freedom and nature. It does not either come from the human nature, bodily instincts and then enters into the human situation, because the natural instincts are neutral. But the nature of the individual's attitude towards these natural instincts can make evil or good of them.

To conclude, the devil is not privy to man in sinning. Man's nature as such cannot be said to be the cause of sin, because the human nature is such that it can be used as a basis for sinning or for realizing the Will of God in one's life. Sin becomes real within the context of the kind of decision that man makes when he is confronted by the Word of God. Without human nature and human freedom and the Will of God there will be no sin.

2. The Will as the originator of sin.

According to F.R. Tennant, the author of The Concept of Sin, "the will is the sole ultimate source or seat of sin...."¹ He argues that the human will is free and so moral evil originates from the free will of man. In other words, since man's will is free he can equally

¹ The Concept of Sin, (Cambridge Press, 1912), p. 182. At page 139 of the same book Tennant says, "The will constructs sin".
decide for evil as well as for good and his sinning depends upon the way he uses his free will.

There are two main objections to this view of the origin of sin. Firstly, it does not explain why man sometimes decides for the good and sometimes for the evil. The insistence upon man's free will will assign responsibility to man in sinning but it will not say what is the ultimate cause of man's decision to sin.

Secondly, the will is not an all-powerful and separate faculty of man. As Tennant himself says, the will is one aspect of the spontaneous or inherent activity of the conscious subject. It is the individual as a whole who wills and expresses his will in action. The self is above its will and determines the motives that express themselves through the will. The will is only a canalized energy of the individual subject and his motives and intentions determine the way the psychic energy is to be canalized. In other words, it is man as a whole who sins and not any faculty, e.g. his will, as such. The will is always prompted into action by conscious ends that the subject has selected to be the springs of his action. The will, therefore, cannot be said to be the sole source of sin. Sin is committed by

1. Ibid, p. 175.
man as an undivided whole and is not a result of any action of his will alone.

D. Sin and Moral Disease.

Anton T. Boisen, of the University of Chicago, regards sin as maladjustment of the whole personality to the internalized social and moral image.¹ Jung on the other hand regards sin as "unconsciousness".² According to Boisen, in particular, sin then is a kind of moral disease or social disease. It is therefore necessary to differentiate between sin and moral disease.

In talking about sin, there are certain presuppositions which make sin real and different from moral disease. Firstly, there must be a definite way of life which is true to the actual experiences of life and which affords the maximum growth of personality and integration of society. This presupposition may be called the Way of God or existence in the Word of God. Secondly, the individual subject must have capacities and opportunities to respond to this way of life. Thirdly, the individual

subject must be able to grasp the content of this way of life and be aware that it is good for the development of his life in particular and of his community in general. Fourthly, the individual must have a certain amount of personality integration to enable him to respond to a definite way of life.

In case of the patient of a moral disease, e.g. the alcoholic, the kleptomaniac, and the exhibitionist, there exists a definite break-down of the personality structure. This break-down has led to the weakening of his moral strength. The individual then has lost any capacity to respond to certain moral demands of his society. He experiences a sense of disharmony as he fails to integrate his immoral practices into the organized group experience. Such kind of individual is psychically and morally sick. This type of patient cannot be described as a sinner, he is maladjusted to healthy social demands and he needs a therapeutic treatment that will help him integrate his personality. This integration will make him capable to respond again to these social demands and to any definite way of life. At this point his actions could be described again as sinful or not sinful. For sin is primarily concerned with one's conscious relation to that which is ultimate in meaning in one's experience.
of life.

Furthermore, the sense of failure which the patient of a moral disease experiences cannot be described as a sense of sin as Anton T. Boisen does. The failure of the individual to live up to the social expectations of him can produce a sense of failure, or a sense of guilt, but this is not a sense of sin. It becomes a sense of sin when the individual has failed to relate himself creatively to God and to his fellow man. And also for a genuine sense of sin to develop it is necessary that the individual believes in a divine basis for his way of life, because only what the individual has accepted consciously or unconsciously gives content to his conscience and thus exercises a subjective authority over him.

There is yet another element in sinning and moral failure. Besides a sense of failure to live up to a certain way of life and a failure to live up to the demands of God, the individual experiences a sense of alienation. He feels that he is separated from the standards and values of his society and thus separated from his group. He may feel alienated from that existence which is rooted in the Word of God and thus from God and his neighbour. He feels that his past bad
life becomes a barrier in his way of communion with his group, with God and he longs to be one again with his group and with God. This estrangement is prominent in the mind of the sinner or the maladjusted. He feels that if he could be forgiven, that is restored to the love and favour of God and his community, his isolation will be at an end.

To conclude, moral disease is the result of a character breakdown which is due to disintegration of the personality. As a phenomenon, it is a criminal act which is the result of neurotic drives, e.g. homosexuality and sexual attacks on the young. Because of the breakdown of the integrity of personality the patient of moral disease becomes incapable of responding to a required way of behaviour. He persists in his unsocial practices because he has become a slave to them. Such kind of individual needs a restoration of the integrity of his personality before he could respond normally to the demands of life. Sin, on the other hand, is a failure of normal people to live up to the demands of God. It is the negative identity factors in the life of people.

E. Consequences of Sin.

Brunner is of the opinion that "through sin man has
lost his original freedom". \(^1\) He argues that due to the loss of his freedom man is not free to realize his divine destiny.

It has been already pointed out in Chapter One that man has not lost this original freedom, image of God, and that it is this original freedom that has still set man apart and above the beasts. Moreover, it is the presence of this original freedom that has made man's sinning a responsible and guilty act and not an accident or a logical follow-up of his sin-disposed nature. Therefore so long as man remains a responsible being, that is so long as he can be said to be guilty before God for his sins, he is still in possession of his original freedom. No original freedom, therefore, is lost and so it cannot be said to be a consequence of sin.

1. Alienation.

However, three main consequences of sin can be traced and these are firstly, 'Alienation' which is a spiritual consequence, secondly, 'Pangs of Conscience' which is a psychic consequence, and thirdly, 'Physical Suffering'.

---

Spiritually speaking, sin separates the sinner from God as crime separates the criminal from his neighbour and society. Sin disrupts the sinner's relationship with God and alienates him from God and from his fellow man. Through sin as an act the unseen tie between God and man is broken and this expresses itself in the individual's personal and social relationships. Moral and spiritual deterioration may set into his life as a result of disruption of his relationship with God and this may lead to spiritual death which is the worst consequence of sin that may befall any sinner.¹

2. Pangs of Conscience. (Guilt).

The second consequence of sin is the two states of guilt that it leads to. Because man sins as a free being he becomes personally responsible for all the collective evil deeds of his past. He lives in a state of objective guilt, in other words he lives in a state of personal blameworthiness. The objective state of guilt acts as a barrier that separates the sinner from God and from his neighbour.

Because man sins as a free being his sin may produce a state of morbid feeling or attitude towards his failures

¹ H.R. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 168.
in the past. This is the subjective guilt and it is directed towards the negative elements of the individual's self-identity. It is this subjective guilt feeling that prompts some people to say, "I shall never forgive myself". The nature of objective guilt and the mechanism of subjective guilt will form the subject of the next chapter. It is enough to say here that sin may cause a troubled conscience, that is guilt feeling.

3. Physical Suffering.

The third consequence of sin is the physical suffering that follows as a direct result of a sinful action. This physical suffering may even end in death or it may take the form of a legal punishment. The life and suffering and death of Al Capone in prison is a good illustration of the physical suffering as a consequence of sin. The nature of suffering as a consequence of sin and the question of punishment and its relation to sin will be closely examined in Chapter Five.
Chapter Three

GUILT.

A. Normal Guilt.

1. Guilt and Sin.

Guilt has been briefly referred to in the previous chapter as a state of personal blameworthiness that emerges as a result of an individual's sin or wrong-doing. This state of guilt is a consequence of a conscious and free action of a normal being and it follows wrong-doing and it is therefore referred to as normal guilt. It produces a sense of guilt and this sense of guilt and the state of personal blameworthiness are related to an objective reality which may be the Law of God, or the laws of the society, or the tabus of the tribe.

There are three essential elements in normal guilt: (a) the negative identity. This is the sum total of one's past and present evil thoughts and deeds. This element stands as a barrier to a creative communication either with God or with people or with any other object that the individual may consider as worthy of supreme devotion in his life.

Normal guilt as a sum total of one's past and present evil thoughts and deeds cannot be described as sin as Dr. Karl Heim does in his book, Jesus The World's
Perfecter, because sin is an act that disrupts man's ultimate relationship with God and with his fellow man.¹

There is a state of guilt involved in sinning but a normal state of guilt may also develop whenever an individual goes against the laws of his society or against the tabus of his tribe. In all cases the individual goes against an objective standard, but this 'going against' in case of the Law of God, is sin and in case of the society, is crime and in case of the tribe, is impropriety. The state of going against in all cases is the guilt state and the feeling of wrongness of the


Karl Heim argues in this book that guilt is an evil will of our own and a rebellion against God. According to Heim the assertion, Christ has come to take away the sin of the world, means that Christ has come to take away the guilt of the world.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that sin once committed remains a completed act of the past, but its effect on the present life continues. It is this continuous effect of past evil act that has the present under its evil shadow. And so it is this evil effect, guilt, that is to be taken away. That is why Brunner says, "...The problem of guilt—the problem of how guilt can be removed—is the central problem of the Christian Faith". (Man In Revolt, p. 135). It is to this evil past existence that man has been chained and his salvation means his freeing from the chain of this evil past. Freedom from the power of guilt is one of the crucial problems of the Christian Faith.
conduct is the subjective guilt.

(b) Normal guilt is not only confined to the past. It conditions the present and its evil effect becomes the power of committed sin. Thus though the actual evil act e.g. adultery belongs to the past yet its power influences the character of the present self. The individual is thus still bound to his bad past and is forced to identify himself with it. Normal guilt in this sense is the present evil power born of the evil past and it becomes a burden that the individual carries with him. This evil power is the consequence of sin and is not sin.

(c) The third element in normal guilt is the personal responsibility or culpability. In sinning the individual is aware that his conscious motives and intentions have entered into the sinful act. He therefore feels that he is responsible for that particular evil deed, and that he has failed to live up to the objective standards of social or divine intercourse. For this reason this form of guilt is described as objective guilt. The wrong-doer's culpability is objectively real because of the existence of the objective standards, be they the commands of God or the laws of the society. His going against these objective standards is an objective reality and so his guilt is objectively real too.
But so far as the objective standards are concerned the individual may realize that he has gone against them and his guiltiness may be real to his society, yet he may not feel the wrongness of his action. On the other hand if he accepts that particular way of life he will feel guilty for going against it. In this instance the accepted standards of life become for him measures of what is right and wrong. He is judged and he judges himself guilty or innocent by the conformity of his actions to these objective standards. He is said to be guilty when he fails to conduct his life according to them.

1. This aspect of normal guilt, i.e. guilt as non-conformity to an external standard, has been very much over-stressed by some theologians, e.g. J.S. Whale. In his book, Christian Doctrine, p. 46, he argues that without objective guilt as blameworthiness there is no forgiveness. According to him the fact of the breaking of the divine law must be upheld at all cost so as to establish the ground for punishment and if the divine law-breaker is not punished then he is forgiven. Forgiveness in this sense means a remission of penalty. However traditional this view of forgiveness may be yet it is very hard to consider God as a judge who inflicts punishment for every violation of his law, and sometimes from his act of mercy he refrains from punishing His erring children, in other words he forgives them. This is a legalistic and feudalistic view of forgiveness. The essence of forgiveness is the removal of all barrier to personal communion and thus a transformation of disrupted personal relation into a creative fellowship and the cancellation of the evil power of guilt.
be said to be guilty so far as outward non-conformity is concerned but he himself may not feel guilty about his supposed guilty action. Upon what ground then can a man be said to be really guilty? What is in man that makes guilt-predication of his action reasonable?

2. Guilt and The Will.

Normal guilt as blameworthiness assumes the ability of man to respond to the Will of God or to the moral requirements of his society. This power to respond to the Will of God or to the demands of society is considered as man's ability to choose between right and wrong and to act accordingly. In other words, the ability is regarded as man's will power and freedom of the will. By and large blameworthiness is, therefore, grounded on the freedom of the will and in this way responsibility and freedom of the will are held together in objective guilt. In other words, the sinner is blameworthy, i.e. deserves punishment because he has the ability to choose to do the right thing but he has not used it and so it is his own fault. The question may be asked, Is the will really free to such an extent that its freedom can be used as the ground for allocating blame?
a. Guilt and Freedom of the Will.

In traditional psychology and in moral theology conscious will is regarded as a force that governs human conduct.\(^1\) It is considered as the only driving power behind all human behaviour. According to F.R. Tennant the will is a power that the self uses and the self uses it as it wants. For this reason Tennant says, "...the will is the cause of sin".\(^2\) According to this view the will has a power of causation and control, all united in a normal person. Because the will is free whenever matters of right and wrong are at stake man can make his own \textit{free} choice and his choice will not be determined by any external factor.

This type of argument for the freedom of the will purports to show that man is not a robot but a responsible agent. This means that his moral choices are not conditioned by any unconscious or environmental factors.

---


2. Tennant, op. cit., p. 234. Mackintosh speaking about the relation between sin and the will says, "Here we must start from the voluntary character of sins that come home to us most poignantly; underlying them all is a certain attitude of our will towards the will of God...." op cit., p.66.
In other words, man cannot be said to be pushed literally from behind either by the force of heredity, upbringing or of environment. Furthermore, it is held that because man's will is free his desires, his moral choices and conduct cannot be said to have been conditioned by an inner compulsion. His will is powerful enough to curb his unruly desires. Man acts, therefore, not because he cannot help it, but because he chooses to act so and so he is guilty whenever he acts wrongly.

This view, however, assumes wrongly the unlimited freedom of the will. The freedom of the will could only be assumed if the will is taken as an entity in itself. But the will cannot be regarded as a faculty like the powers of hearing and seeing. It is a function of the self and its strength of direction depends upon the strength of the individual's personality. The will is not a self-contained and self-sustaining entity and above all it cannot be taken as an all-powerful faculty. And so the question, Is the will free or not, becomes Is man free or not? A free man will have a will that is also free, and a man who is in bondage to his impulses and to this world of sin will have his will likewise in bondage. And so guilt, meaning accountability, cannot be grounded on the freedom of the will.¹

The will as a product and function of an organized self is the capacity of the self to canalize its energy along a line consciously chosen. This work of canalizing the energy of the self is not blindly done but it is directed by the power of reason. The power of reason determines which of the individual's desires should be given rightful expression and then discovers the right and proper means to achieve the desired end through the power of the will. The will may be described as an executive power of an organized personality. It is the ability of the self to express itself rightly and effectively in life's various activities. The exercise of the power of the will involves a self employing itself effectively and resolutely to effect a certain chosen end and it is the whole self, that is, conscious and reasoned-out personal choice, interest and energy, that is employed in the performance of an action. The will expresses itself in action as a self-willing and self-desiring, as a self-acting to bring about a desired result and as a self-enjoying the acting. The self cannot be separated from its will which is its executive energy.

The will, therefore, cannot be considered as a factor outside an action and causing it, or as an antecedent factor in an action. When the self is powerful it expresses its intentions in action and the intentions
are effected by the organized energy of the self, i.e. the will. The will is a power to effect and not a power to choose. The choice is done by the self as a whole and so it is the self that is to be held responsible, guilty, in wrong-doing. How free is the self?


It is a common belief that the chief functions of the life of consciousness are knowing, willing and feeling and the individual is supposed to exercise his reasoning and willing and feeling powers in his experience of life. His conduct is therefore considered, at least, as a result of carefully reasoned and willed action. If this common belief about the individual's conduct is granted it means that human conduct is free from unconscious influences. This view further implies that the self is free in its choices and actions, and so it is free to pursue the *summum bonum* or the will of God and is guilty when it fails to do so. But it is a fact that instinctive tendencies, both those repressed and unrepressed, do to a great extent govern human conduct.¹

---


This discovery was at first found out to be true in pathological life, but it has been found out that the workings of instinctive tendencies in both normal and pathological life is a difference of degree. Both reveal the same fundamental mechanisms and conflicts. The influences of unconscious forces therefore should be admitted in the life of a normal person as well. Studies and analyses of dreams and slips of tongue of normal persons reveal the unconscious nature of their experiences of life. In the unconscious mind one finds certain

1. The Nature of the Unconscious. C.G. Jung conceives of the unconscious as made up of the "personal unconscious" and the "collective unconscious". The unconscious is regarded by Jung as the repository of everything objectionable, and everything infantile in ourselves. All that we want to forget because they cause us psychic pain are pushed into the unconscious.

Jung goes on to explain that the life of consciousness is the 'I' knowing and willing and feeling, but what is known about the self and the world, what the self can direct and control is not fully conscious all the time. The self sometimes has sense perceptions which do not have enough strength to reach consciousness. Thus the self experiences much that has not become fully conscious. These marginal perceptions and the repressed memories are termed "personal unconscious". The "collective unconscious" is then that aspect of the psyche which is totally unconscious to the self. Jung points out that the personal unconscious belongs to the present life of the individual. The personal unconscious contains the materials of repressed infantile impulses and wishes, marginal perceptions and many forgotten experiences.

The collective unconscious on the other hand is the other layer of the unconscious considered as a unit. It is deeper than the personal unconscious. According to Jung the individual's consciousness originates in the materials of the collective unconscious. (C.G. Jung, op. cit., Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, pp. 63-155.)
broad lines by which people generally act and experience life. The impulses to act in certain inherited ways of action are without conscious motivation. These broad lines of acting are due to how the brain itself has been shaped and influenced by the past experience of mankind.

The influence of unconscious forces on human behaviour is not only limited to the study of the unconscious behaviour of people. Through hypnotism it has been proved that an individual given an order while he is hypnotized will carry out this order when he regains consciousness. The subject usually experiences a conscious inclination to perform the action suggested to him though the source of the order is utterly unknown. Thus actions could be consciously performed with their unconscious origins unknown to their actors.

In case of hypnotic orders the individual may or may not give way to his inclination. This depends upon how the subject evaluates the order. Joseph Nuttin, professor at the University of Louvain, quotes a case of a girl who would not carry out a hypnotic kissing order because she considered that behaviour to be improper.¹ From this and other cases of the performance

¹ Nuttin, op. cit., p. 125.
of post-hypnotic suggestions Nuttin concludes that "the effect of post-hypnotic suggestion is not absolutely a matter of fate, some people fight against it."¹

Nuttin goes on to say that before motives are expressed in action, they are experienced by the individual who gives values to them. The motives can be considered as forces influencing freedom of action as they are or come into experience. It is in experience that they are assigned values "according to the concrete system of values which make up his (individual's) own personality".²

It could be concluded from the preceding discussion that human beings are to some extent determined in their behaviour first, by man's general interests in action and then by unconscious forces. The self, however, in its conscious experience of life is free to choose and assign expressional values to whatever unconscious motives that come into consciousness. The self is motivated but it makes up whatever develops from its unconscious motives. The individual therefore can be said to be guilty of a certain form of conduct not because he has no unconscious forces that influence his actions but because in conscious experience of these

¹. Loc. cit.,
². Ibid. p. 127.
unconscious motives he is free to assign values to them.

b. Guilt and Personality.

What kind of personality then is able to value-judge and express effectively and creatively its unconscious motives? This task is done by a self that is well organized and thus has a will to effect its own desired end. A weak and an unintegrated self cannot perform the task of expressing unconscious motives creatively because its psychic powers do not appear organized at the spiritual level and so the dynamism aroused by unconscious order is released automatically or impulsively in behaviour. When the individual is normally balanced and has his normal psychic powers integrated he will be able to control and direct his psychic life creatively. The freedom of the self, that is the capacity of the self to build up its own actions without any internal or external determinants, cannot be separated from the integrated personality, because it is only the integrated personality that has some amount of freedom. Furthermore, freedom of the self varies according to the level reached by any man in his personal development. Guilt meaning responsibility, and wholesome personality, therefore, cannot be treated in isolation. They are
intrinsically related. Sense of responsibility diminishes with the disintegrating of personality.

To conclude, true freedom of the self is not only a control or absence of external determining factors but also a control over all internal psychic forces that may be in the way of a dynamic and creative personality development. Freedom of the self, therefore, is interrelated to a wholesome integration of the personality and it is a well developed self that is able to express its desires as a will in action. The freedom of the will is, therefore, rooted in the freedom of self which in turn grows out of an integrated personality. It is the wholesome self that becomes an effective power to direct life and the will as a directive power depends upon the integration and organization of the whole personality.

The self, however, cannot be said to be absolutely free. Paul Tillich sums up the question of the true freedom of the self in these words: "The doctrine of the universality of estrangement does not make man's consciousness of guilt unreal; but it does liberate him from the unrealistic assumption that in every moment he has the undetermined freedom to decide in whatever way he chooses --- for good or for bad, for God or against
him. The limitations of man's nature and existence have limited his freedom too.

Though the self is not absolutely free yet it has the ability to handle creatively the different motives and external factors that come into conscious experience of life. The self becomes relatively free as it gains power to use productively all the raw materials of human nature and environment. The individual is, therefore, responsible for the kind of values he assigns to any motive, for the quality of an action will not so much depend upon its unconscious source, but rather upon the kind of spiritual value assigned to its motive and expression.

The soundness of an individual's value judgment, however, will depend upon the soundness and the integration of all the values that go into the building of his unique personality. The integrated self becomes a very vital and basic value and should be sought in and for itself. The development of a sense of accountability, in other words, man's general and correct response to life as a whole, is therefore interrelated to the development of a wholesome personality.

4. Objective Guilt and Divine Freedom.

Emil Brunner sees freedom and responsibility as existing in a very close relation. According to him freedom without responsibility is no freedom and only freedom in responsibility is real freedom. Brunner argues that the scope of man's uncontrolled use of his life is limited by man's relationship to God. In this relationship of responsibility the self is disciplined because man knows that he has to answer for all his actions to God. This awareness of man makes him put restraints upon his actions and is the source of discipline on man's freedom.

Brunner goes on to say that this discipline, however, means obedience to God. "Genuine freedom is (in) willing obedience to God who calls us to communion with Himself". It is from this obedience to God that divine freedom springs. This relationship of obedience involves a certain amount of divine control. He points out that this control may look like a limitation on man but it is a necessary and good limitation for "the spiritual value of our life is always reached through limitation". He concludes his argument by saying that the highest

1. Ibid, pp. 265-266.
discipline is that of belonging to God and in this relationship all self-will is taken away from man, and through it man becomes truly spiritual and a genuine personality.

Divine freedom, therefore, springs from the acceptance of divine limitations over one's wild nature and these limitations or discipline is accepted because man knows that he has to answer to God for his actions. In this relationship of obedience man is able to master and creatively use all the opportunities of life and to find his genuine manhood.

What then is the relationship between divine freedom and the freedom of the self? Divine freedom is realized as one accepts the way of God for his life. This acceptance involves some limitations on unpurposive and selfish expressions of life. The individual's response to the divine way of life, in other words, the shaping of his life according to the requirements of the Word of God, gives him a direction and meaning and thus frees him from purposeless wandering and meaningless existence. Divine freedom is a freedom born from one's obedience or response to the Word of God.

A genuine response to the divine way of life, however, depends upon a true freedom of the self which
is psychic in nature. Since the Word of God is communicated to the individual through his soul, the soul must be sound and free before it can realize the full impact of the Word of God. In other words, true psychic freedom or wholeness is a presupposition of spiritual freedom or wholeness. Since psychic freedom does not necessarily confer any meaningful experience of life upon the individual, psychic freedom or wholeness becomes meaningful only in terms of spiritual freedom or wholeness. The two forms of freedom are therefore meaningful in terms of each other.

To conclude, normal guilt is a state that follows a disruption of communion between God and man or between an individual and any supreme object or standards in terms of which he judges the quality of his life. The action that disrupts the relationship is described as 'wrongdoing', 'failure' or as 'sin'. So far as its effect is concerned it forms a barrier to a creative communion.

The guilt state produces a normal feeling of failure in the wrong-doer and the guilt feeling has an adverse effect on his character. Guilt in this sense becomes a power born of the past evil deed but it has its adverse effect on the present life of the guilty person. It is
therefore from the evil power of guilt that man seeks salvation. The goal of salvation, that is forgiveness of sin, in this sense is therefore the cancellation of the evil power of guilt and the renewal and resumption of a creative communion.

Normal guilt also becomes personal blameworthiness for a wrong response to a definite way of life. The individual is blamed for his wrong response because he acts as a free agent. This blameworthiness is predicated of him, however, not simply because he has a free will, but because he as a whole is capable of responding to a reasonable way of life. His ability to respond rests on the fact that he has a certain amount of personal freedom to determine the course of his life and the nature of his action. The effectiveness of this freedom depends, to a great extent, upon a genuine development of the self as a whole, because a well integrated person is free both from internal and external determinants of life and so is free to respond to the Will of God. Psychic freedom and spiritual freedom are therefore interrelated and both of them make man truly responsive to life.
B. Subjective Guilt.

Normal guilt always has its corresponding subjective state which is described as 'subjective guilt'. A normal person experiences a certain unpleasant feeling in connection with his wrong-doings, and he adopts an attitude of failure towards them. This feeling of failure or of having done wrong within the context of a certain way of life or relation is the subjective guilt. It is an unpleasant feeling concerning one's wrong-doings and about one's failure to live up to the objective demands of God, of society and of life as a whole. Victor White describes subjective guilt as "an emotion-toned sense of having done wrong, any sense of inadequacy in a particular situation of life, or sense of failure in meeting the demands of life, or for an inability to live up to certain ideals, however, unrealistic and impractical".¹

Subjective guilt is different from objective guilt in the sense that objective guilt is the wrong-doer's personal answerability to his wrong-doings and his consciousness of himself as the actual and responsible cause of the wrong-doings, while subjective guilt is the

wrong-doer's unpleasant feeling that is produced by the wrongness of his action, or by the consciousness of his failures.

1. The Origin of Guilt Sense.

What makes the existence of this guilt-feeling possible in the individual? Freud conceived of the origin of guilt in a three-body or triangular situation. According to him the child's sense of guilt originates when the child as a young boy starts to rival with his father for the possession of his mother, or when the child as a young girl starts to rival with her mother for the possession of her father. It is in this three-body relation that the child experiences love and hate for the same person. Thus he wants to destroy the same object that he also loves and this causes a conflict in him. This conflict then produces a sense of guilt in the child.

Melanie Klein, however, has developed the idea of conflict in a simple two-body relation of the infant to the mother. Klein maintains that one of the basic needs of the child is the need for some person or persons to whom he can relate himself significantly so that life can be securely and meaningfully enjoyed. This kind of
relationship becomes love objects.

The first two-body relation that the infant experiences is that of the infant and his mother. The mother is she who satisfies the "self-preservative needs and sensual desires" of the infant. The child feels satisfied and secured when he is being fed by the mother. A feeling of love and gratitude arise in the child as a response to the love and care of the mother. The mother becomes a good or love-object and a relation to her a good-object relationship.

It is not always that the baby is fed promptly when he is hungry. The baby experiences hunger-pain when his feeding is delayed. He feels frustrated when he is poorly and inadequately fed. This bodily discomfort and frustration give rise to the feeling of hate. The mother then becomes a bad object, a source of a bodily pain and frustration.

The power of love as well as of hate then is developed in this two-body relation. Klein points out that the power for love "is there in the baby as well as the destructive impulses (the power for hate) and finds its fundamental expression in the baby's attachment to his mother's breast...."  

2. Ibid., p. 65.
Love and hate as emotions, therefore, first appear in the early relation of the infant to his mother's breasts. The mother is the first object of love and hate of the baby. As the child's feeling of security and sensual pleasure depend upon the mother's love and care, he wants to keep the mother and maintain the good-object relation. When, however, the relation becomes a source of bodily discomfort, pain and frustration, the infant wants to destroy the bad object whom he also loves. These aggressive feelings give rise to a painful state such as choking, breathlessness, which are felt to be destructive to the child's body.

The aggressive feelings create tension and anxiety in the child. The child becomes afraid that he will not be able to manage his destructive impulses. To the child this will mean that he is going to lose his love-object and its good relation. It further means that the child is going to be a victim of a painful state that will result from the loss of the good-object relation.

Klein describes this fear of the child as "depressive anxiety". The child fears the destruction of his love-object because menacing force of hate threatens it.

1. Ibid. p. 282.
This depressive anxiety is related to harm done to internal and external loved objects by the subject's destructive impulses.

Klein points out that this fear of losing the love-object is the result of a conflict between love and hate in the mind of the baby. This conflict of love and hate and the destruction of the love-object either in reality or in fantasy leads to a feeling of guilt. The child then wishes to make good what has been destroyed. Sense of guilt therefore emerges in the child as he detects in himself impulses of hate which are directed to destroy the object that he loves.

a. Guilt and Reparation.

Klein has discovered that the feeling of guilt is also a feeling of concern. The child feels a concern for maintaining the good-object relation and for preserving a love object from destruction. The child also feels a concern about a real or imagined destructive use of his impulses. He develops a profound urge to make a sacrifice in order to help and put right loved people whom in fantasy have been harmed. Guilt thus resides even in the unconscious intention and so the intention to kill makes the individual feel guilty, and the guilt
feeling does not only arise as a result of an overt action. Klein points out that "in the depth of the mind, the urge to make people happy is linked up with a strong feeling of responsibility and concern for them..."

Sense of guilt then is not just a bad feeling about past wrongs but a feeling of concern and responsibility for a love-object and a good-object relation. It is a feeling to make good what has been destroyed by the individual's own action. The development of the sense of guilt, therefore, indicates a significant step in the emotional and moral development of the child. Normal guilt feeling therefore is creative and is good for the health of the soul. It is nature's way of expressing concern for the health of personal relationships. Without it forgiveness will be impossible.

Conclusion.

It could be concluded from the preceding discussions that man has a capacity to feel guilty. This sense of guilt develops from a conflict between the emotions of love and hate, first in a two-body relation of mother and infant, then in the family relation as the child reacts to his parents and siblings. The sense of guilt becomes an essential element in the emotional and moral

1. Ibid. p. 66.
growth of the child. In this infant emotional and moral growth the adult emotional and moral growth is built. Guilt also involves an expression of concern and responsibility for a love-object and for a good-object relation. Along with this the individual develops a concern to make good what has been damaged either in fantasy or in reality. Above all guilt sense is an expression of concern for the use of the individual's destructive impulses. The capacity to feel guilty and experience guilt feeling becomes a necessary positive attribute of a healthy personality. Therefore a sense of guilt cannot be fully understood in terms of sorrow over past wrong deeds. The elements of concern and responsibility and reparation are very vital in the sense of guilt. The emergence of these elements in a child is an indication of a moral and emotional development. Therefore it is right to say that "the sense of guilt is of itself a token of hope; it proves that we are not hopelessly lost to goodness, because our eyes are not fast close to the reality of God".  

2. Guilt and Punishment.

Some psychologists like Norman Cameron and Leslie D.  

1. H.R. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 66.
Weatherhead maintain that the fear of consequences of the individual's evil actions is one of the factors in the development of the guilt sense. According to Cameron the anticipation of punishment, as unfailing consequence of wrong-doing, by children produces a sense of guilt in them. He contends that this is the origin of guilt feeling.¹

If this observation is correct then a child will not feel guilty or develop a sense of guilt without the use of punishment in any forms in his training. In other words, the child will not develop any sense of guilt until he reaches the age when moral valuations of his actions in terms of physical and psychological punishments can be meaningful to him. The sense of guilt, however, is known to develop very early in the child and as soon as the emotions of love and hate have emerged. In this respect the development of guilt sense may take place in the child before the mother could even think of referring to his actions in terms of punishment.

An anticipation of punishment could produce a certain unpleasant feeling, guilt feeling, in a person who has done wrong and he knows that punishment will

unfailingly follow. This guilt feeling, however, will be limited to the physical and psychological pains that the wrong-doer will suffer. But the guilt sense may develop in a child in a situation where punishment is not present. Therefore an anticipation of punishment could not be considered as the only basic cause of the development of guilt feeling.

Furthermore, guilt reactions mean more than an emotional reaction to the effects of physical and psychological punishments that a wrong action brings to oneself. It involves a concern for oneself as well as for others and for the maintenance of a good personal relationship. Even in adult life people who know perfectly well that their wrong-doings will never be found out and punished, nevertheless feel guilty about these wrong actions. Some people may succeed in repressing their guilt feelings but others confess their crimes and sins because they feel guilty about them. On the other hand some criminals are punished again and again but they do not feel guilty about their wrong-doings.

L.D. Weatherhead in his discussion of the origin of guilt digs deep down into the collective unconscious to explain the origin of the guilt sense. He argues that primitive man personified natural phenomena into one god.
He then endowed this God with moral qualities which were derived from his own experiences of life. Primitive man, however, grounded his moral standards on these moral qualities, and since God became the embodiment of these moral qualities, God became also the supporter of the moral standards that the primitive man evolved.

Weatherhead goes on to say that moral evil then becomes an affront against God. It earns man's displeasure as well as God's anger. Moral evil is always followed by punishment and punishment has come to be inextricably woven into the structure of social and personal relations. He goes on to say that the consequence of punishment is distasteful to people and so they fear it and the fear of evil consequences of evil actions produces a sense of guilt in wrong-doers. This experience of the fear of evil consequences forms a part of the legacy of the collective unconscious and becomes an archetype. A guilt pathway is formed in the mind as a result of a constant experience of the fear of punishment and it is the presence of this guilt pathway which makes man capable of guilt feeling at all.¹

There is one main objection to Weatherhead's explanation of the origin of the guilt sense. In explaining its origin he postulates primitive man and his moral qualities, standards and moral values. These moral qualities and standards, however, would not mean anything to primitive man if he had not already developed a sense of guilt, because moral values and standards are meaningless to a person whose sense of guilt fails to develop, or who has lost it. Fear of punishment, therefore, cannot be said to be the sole origin of guilt feeling. The child develops sense of guilt before he even acquires a moral consciousness.


What then is the relationship between the child's sense of guilt and his moral personality? With the coming on of self-consciousness the child begins to feel certain rightness about certain actions, thoughts and feelings of which his parents approve. In other words the child does not feel guilty when he acts according to these accepted moral attitudes and values of his parents. During the course of time these actions, thoughts and feelings are enlarged to include those of the Church, State and school and the community as a whole. So far the child has been
accepting these social and religious norms and values as coming from outside authorities of the family, the Church and the State and even from the authority of public opinion.

A time comes when the child stands in the place of these outside authorities and adopts their reaction-attitudes towards his own actions. He begins to see his actions and wishes in the light of these outside authorities. He disapproves of things that his outside authorities disapprove of and vice versa.

At this point the child is said to have internalized these moral authorities and their moral attitudes and values. The behaviour, thinking and feeling patterns form the contents of the child's conscience or moral personality. The conscience then becomes the active principle and standard of behaviour within the individual child. His actions are morally judged now by the conscience. He develops a sense of guilt when he has failed to live up to these principles and standards adopted from outside.

From this point onward the conscience, however, is not completely divorced from the external authorities which provide its formal contents. The conscience continues to be bound to the external authorities as well as
to their internalized images. In this continuous relation the conscience is continually nourished. If the external authorities ceased to exist or lost their power, or if people had no reason to be afraid of them the conscience weakens and loses its moral directive power. Thus for a conscience to be an effective directive power, and thus to make the feeling of guilt possible, its external authorities must be living and command respect at all time.¹

The death of some tribal gods in Africa provides a very good example of what happens to the conscience, and for that matter to guilt feeling about certain ways of behaviour, when its external authorities cease to exist. Before Christianity and Western civilization came into many parts of Africa tribal moral solidarity was underpinned by the tribal gods. These tribal gods formed the social and religious external authorities for the conscience of the people.

The authorities of these tribal gods had been undermined by Christian and Western ideas. This leads to the weakening of the directive power of the conscience and breaking down of tribal moral solidarity and consequently—

the loss of sense of guilt about certain forbidden behav-
: iours.

What then is the purpose of the interiorised contents of
the conscience? All the external norms and tabus are
designed to help the proper functioning and development
of the individual's personality. The contents of the
conscience are designed to provide healthy social and
personal relationships within which this proper function-
ing and development of the personality takes place.

A positive conscience organizes the behaviour pattern
of the child by using the moral principles and standards
provided by his family, society and Church. The moral
principles and standards could be rational or irrational.
The conscience, in most cases, accepts them and acts
according to them. In some cases the contents of the
conscience are modified or even rejected when they are
not the essence of moral experiences of life and thus
could not be used to further the fullest development of
the personality. The conscience is not a passive recept-
:acle of both life-giving and life-destroying moral
standards and principles. It works to keep a balance be-
tween the loving and destructive forces in the life of
the individual and to keep out any harmful influences
from outside. Usually it warns the individual of any
psychic conflict and does this by producing an abnormal sense of guilt. This abnormal guilt feeling is a sign that there is something wrong in the development of the personality. As a warning mechanism the conscience produces both a normal and abnormal sense of guilt. The abnormal sense of guilt is produced by the super ego which is a hyper-sensitive conscience.

C. Morbid Sense of Guilt

Sometimes the sense of guilt may develop out of all proportion to the inner conflict which causes it. The conscience in such a case becomes extremely inhibiting and accusing. The individual develops an exaggerated self-reaction towards his own conduct.

The presence of such morbid sense of guilt is a sign that the individual is fighting a losing battle with some offending behaviour tendencies. To protect the integrity of the self the conscience helps repress the offending behaviour tendencies and keep them down from erupting into overt behaviour. This phenomenon of morbid sense of guilt is seen e.g. in 'agitated depression' and in 'obsessional neurosis'.

1. Agitated Depression
Agitated depression is characterized by restless over-activity and sustained tension, by despair and self-condemnatory delusions. It begins in a setting of unrelied personal stress and strain. The patient suffers from tension and depressive anxiety.

To this anxiety reaction are added delusion of self-reproach and of personal guilt, of worthlessness and of hopelessness. The patient considers himself to blame for all these imagined negative qualities in him. He feels guilty for them and feels that he should be punished for them. The desire for punishment in this case is a desire to make reparation for the imagined damage done by the patient. The patient also feels insecure and this feeling originates from the fact that he sees an impending disaster for his loved one and a catastrophic destruction of the world and all on it.

In cases of agitated depression the patient has been fighting against the destructive use of his impulses but they seem to be gaining a control over him and thus threatening his love objects. This makes him feel guilty.

Norman Cameron cites the case of a 48 year-old private secretary, a lady, who had been helping her brother recover from alcoholism. Her brother showed a sign of recovery then relapsed into alcoholism; during
this time her family was making more financial demands on her. She became disappointed in her brother's recovery and resented the increasing financial demands of her family. This created an anxiety situation in her life and she became extremely agitated and self-condemning. Deep within her unconscious she realized that she was not able to control her destructive impulses in regard to her family whom she also loved. Her conscience blamed her for not controlling her destructive impulses, and she broke down with a very strong sense of guilt.

The patient was cured when she was removed from the eastern state hospital to a mental hospital in one of the mid-western states of America. Cameron said that she considered this hospital drab, humiliating and deliberately punitive, and in this kind of setting the patient unconsciously thought that she had made a reparation for what she had destroyed in thought and feeling.

Agitated depression with its consequent confessing of guilt manifests itself in normal conduct as well. It takes place in a setting of an emotional upheaval. This could be brought about by a failure of crops, grave illness in one's family or by the death of a near relation or a revered public figure. Any such incident may cause a state of acute tension and anxiety in one's life.
The reaction to this emotional upheaval is the feeling and confessing of human inadequacy and unworthiness. Long since-forgotten personal sins and conflicts are revived. The personal conflicts now generate a strong sense of guilt. This may lead to "a rush of sinners to church, the public lamentations and the declaration of personal unimportance...."

2. Obsessional Neurosis

The excess of guilt feeling is very pronounced in people suffering from obsessional neurosis. In obsessional neurosis the patient tries hard to put something right but without any success. This futile attempt may take the form of obsessive thinking. The patient tries hard to annul one idea which keeps intruding into his mind by another but he never succeeds.

In such a situation the patient is trying to hide the fact that in a specific setting of his life he finds that his hate is more powerful than his love. He is quite unaware of this situation. Dr. Donald W. Winnicott gives a very good example of a case of obsessional neurosis:

1. Cameron, op. cit., p. 527.
There was a girl who could not go to the seaside because she saw in the waves someone crying out for help. Intolerable guilt made her go to absurd lengths in arranging for vigilance and rescue. The absurdity of the symptom could be shown by the fact that she could not tolerate even a picture postcard of the sea coast. If she saw one by chance in a shopwindow she would have to find out who took the photograph, because she would see someone drowning, and she would have to organize relief in spite of the fact that she knew perfectly well that the photograph was taken months and even years previously. This very ill girl was able eventually to come through to a fairly normal life, much less hampered by irrational guilt feeling; but the treatment was necessarily of long duration.

In case of this girl it could be seen that she was occupied with guilt feelings which acted as a defence for repeating certain of her own prohibited behaviours. Her conscience heightened her fear for the prohibited behaviours but could not help her do the right thing.

Thus morbid guilt feeling apart from serving as a warning, is a negative asset. It keeps the individual in a state of moral and spiritual insecurity. It makes him adopt negative attitudes towards his offending impulses. The individual is worried about the offending impulses but he is not concerned about their creative use.

in his emotional and moral growth.

Generally speaking morbid sense of guilt is a sign of a faulty personality development. A person who has this abnormal sense of guilt is sick and he needs to be saved from the power of this kind of guilt sense. Psychiatry could be of a great help in releasing the symptoms of this kind of guilt feeling by analysing all the emotional factors that are involved. Religion on the other hand could integrate the sick personality as it directs and guides the normal growth of a person who has been saved from the bondage of morbid sense of guilt. This will mean that the individual will grow with a healthy sense of guilt.

D. The loss of Sense of Guilt

While some people have developed a normal sense of guilt and others a morbid sense of guilt, some people may lose any guilt feeling of either form. Some people may lose it due to the lack of the necessary emotional and physical settings which would have enabled the capacity for feeling guilty to develop. Other people may lose it because of some physical injury done to the central nervous system.

A study of the physical basis for human conduct and
its sense of guilt and their loss had been done by Professor Alexander Kennedy of the Department of Psychological Medicine of the University of Edinburgh. The result of this study appeared in The Advance of Science, vol. VII. No. 25, 1950, pp. 53-56, under the title "Brain Structure and Moral Values". In this article Professor Kennedy pointed out that responsible human behaviour is regarded as action which can be meaningfully interpreted in terms of consciousness. Consciousness is taken as a function of the central nervous system. The integrity of the central nervous system is then vital to the intensity of consciousness. For the nervous system to keep up its own integrity it must be fed with both internal and external sensory stimuli.

When a new sensory stimulus enters the brain it is related to the result of the previous sensory experience. This process of checking and relating of fresh sensory stimuli to the results of previous sensory experience is essentially carried on by the granular cortex of the brain. The checking process, however, depends upon the integrity of a system of conducting pathways of which the granular cortex forms a part.

During the process of human behaviour the individual is aware of what he does, and of what he intends to do.
He checks the suitability of his behaviour by reference to patterns of behaviour already resident in the nervous system. Professor Kennedy went on to say that if the checking is carried out at the stage when the act is merely contemplated, the individual is then exercising foresight.

What then will be the effect of a disturbance of the integrity of the nervous system on character and moral awareness? The epidemic encephalitis which occurred after World War I and the neuro-surgical removal of frontal lobes in the case of people suffering from tumours showed some effects of the disturbance of some parts of the nervous system on character and moral awareness and thus on the capacity for feeling guilty.

Patients whose nerve tracts had been interrupted within the frontal lobes, or who had undergone some lesions in the neighbourhood of the hypothalamus and subthalamus showed a gross disturbance of their sense of morality and social responsibility.

As a result of lesions in the brains of some patients of the epidemic encephalitis, the patients developed anti-social trends, e.g. sexual perversions, stealing and swindling. This was especially true in case of adolescents. In case of post-adolescents loss of initiative
and of social responsibility, egocentricity and infantile attitudes to life were the results.

Professor Kennedy said that epidemic encephalitis in early life can cause arrested mental development and a lack of conative awareness. If this happens later in life it can produce morally feeble people. The effects of partial or section excision of the frontal lobes can cause the impairment of the sense of responsibility to others and lack of foresight and appreciation of the individual's place in the community.

An example of the destruction of the moral sense of an encephalitic patient will make the degree of the impairment of moral sensibility clear. Professor Kennedy gave an example of one encephalitic patient who dragged his sister about by the hair before raping her, and the patient described what he had done without reticence. When asked why he pulled her hair he said, 'To make her scream, I like that'. When an attempt was made to get him to consider how she had suffered in the process, there was no comprehension at all. 'That's her business', was the only answer. This young man was highly sentimental about animals. His intelligent quotient was 116.1

To summarize, every individual has a conative aware-

---

mess which is maintained by the integrity of certain nervous units and pathways. In the course of his early life and training he is confronted with the standards of the good life; this may be embodied in the Law of God, or in the family code, or in the tabus of the tribe. The standard of the good life sets up a guilt milieu and through it his sense of guilt is developed. His behaviour patterns are developed according to the standard of the good life and stored up in the nervous system. He feels guilty whenever he acts against the standard of the good life, i.e. when his actions are not in conformity with the stored up behaviour patterns. Through his sense of guilt, as his inner sensitivities to his own faults, he is made vulnerable to his own limitations and unfulfilled potentials and at the same time he is made responsive to the good life. Sense of guilt is, therefore, a vital means through which man's life is changed and it is through the development of sense of guilt about one's sins that one is led to seek forgiveness. Sense of guilt is, therefore, important and basic to the experience of forgiveness.
FORGIVENESS: TRANSFORMATION OF RELATIONSHIP

A. The Nature of Personal Relationship

One of the cardinal Christian teachings about God is that he is a personal God and has created human beings as persons into a world of personal relations. The personal nature of God implies that his relationship with men is personal too. The personalness of God and of his relationship with men is very essential for a real and true understanding of God's forgiveness. It is, therefore, necessary to discuss what it means to say that: 1. God is personal; 2. human beings are created persons; 3. the relationship between God and man is personal.

The first question could be answered by examining the idea of Father-God both in the Old and New Testaments. In both Testaments the fatherhood of God is an essential attribute of God. Through a series of historical acts the Father-God created Israel and shaped it into a nation. (Hos. 11.1; Deut. 32.6). The Israelites are thus considered the 'children' of their Father-God. (Deut. 14.1)

In the New Testament Jesus made God known as "Our Father who art in heaven." (Matt. 6.9) His disciples became God's children through him. In other words, God was the Father of the disciples because he was the Father of Jesus Christ. Jesus therefore told them that they

1. It should be pointed out that it is not an Israelite as an individual that is considered as God's child, but it is the corporate group that is the children of God and the individual participates in this group belongingness.
should be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect (Matt. 5.48), and that through their good works others might glorify their Father in heaven (Matt. 5.16).

Throughout the New Testament 'Father' is the distinctively Christian name for God. In St. Paul's letters God is addressed as "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1.2) and he speaks of "the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named." (Eph. 3.15) The fatherhood designation is used for God to bring out poignantly that he is a person and created men as persons and thus has a personal relationship with them. It further means that God could be addressed through prayers, i.e. he is communicable.

There are certain important truths that are implied in the personal idea of God. Firstly, the fatherhood of God implies that a personal relationship between God and man is possible. In other words, because of the personal nature of God He confronts men with his Personal Will. He is a Person means then that he is a Personal Will. In the personal relationship between him and men he makes known his Personal Will as something that is different from man's will. Through his Personal Will God confronts man with a claim which is the foundation of a real life and order of existence. Since God is Personal Will he wills that

---

the claim of his Will be expressed in man's life. Thus Brunner says, "God wills that His Name shall be glorified, that He shall be seen to be the Holy in His Otherness. Thus He wills that "the whole earth be filled with His glory." The personalness of God is essentially in his willing and confrontation. He is Personal Will and he confronts man with his Will as a personal claim. In other words, he communicates with men through his Will and where God's Will is confessed and expressed in life there is a true communion between God and man, "there the creature has become "full" of God". Where there is a true communion between God and man a new relationship comes into being and a new man is created full of the glory of God. The personalness of God then, further, means that he is a living and creative God. He acts and creates new relationships and men as persons who could carry on a personal relationship with him.

God as Personal Will created men as persons, i.e. as created will, and put them in a world of personal relations. As persons men are capable of a personal communion both with God and with one another. What is the nature of the personal communion among men and its relation to the personal relationship between God and man?

In every personal relationship on the human level there is an interaction of created and intelligent, self-

2. Ibid.
directing and self-conscious wills. In a genuine personal relationship one person checks and limits the other's relation to him through the special claims that he makes on him and *vice versa*. In other words, there is a limitation and freedom, dependence and independence in any real encounter of wills on the human level of existence. One created will confronts the other as a source of human worth and activity and so the other person is not humanly worthless and passive and thus to be manipulated as an instrument of the purpose of the other will. Persons in a real personal relationship are dependent on one another and yet independent of one another. They limit and condition one another, yet free of each other.\(^1\) How is unity and harmony achieved then in the personal relationship?

The nature of the personal relationship is such that every individual person is rooted in it through his finiteness and yet is out and above it through his freedom. Every person is an individual as well as a social being. He needs the group to realize his unique individuality and other members of the society need him to be their unique individuals. Thus any real personal relationship involves reciprocal claims. Each person is then united to the other on the basis of a claim and they are all claimed by the Personal Will of God. It is the personal claim of

---

God that gives meaning to reciprocal claims in any personal relationship. The Personal Will of God and man's confession and acceptance of it forms the true harmony and unity of the world of personal relations.

The divine and human claims, however, are not two separate entities. "The divine claim always draws its practical content from the claim of finite persons upon us: two claims, the divine claim and the human claim are not to be separated from one another."¹ Farmer goes on to say, "The claim of my neighbour is always part of God's claim on me: God's claim on me meets me always in and through the claim of my neighbour".² The personal relation between God and man and between man and his neighbour is a close-knit relationship. It is one and indivisible relationship. (Matt. 25.37-46) It is one relationship with two poles: the God-ward pole consists of the divine claim which derives its content from and is realized in the man-ward pole with its individual claims. The divine claim as the righteous Personal Will of God is at the very centre of personal relationships and man as a relational being is always confronted with it. Man is a person standing all the time in a personal relationship to God. It is that relationship that constitutes him—MAN.³

John Macmurray states this same truth philosophically in

---

1. Farmer, op. cit., p. 69.
2. op. cit., p. 53.
3. op. cit., p. 57.
these words, "The idea of an isolated agent is self-contradictory. Any agent is necessarily in relation to the Other. Apart from his essential relation he does not exist. But, further, the Other in this constitutive relation must be personal. Persons, therefore, are constituted by their relation to one another."1

Every individual person moves and realizes his true being in his personal relations. The 'new man' is then created in man's communion with God and neighbour. Thus H.R. Mackintosh says, "Because God is what they (the Hebrew prophets) knew Him to be, He can create a man's soul by taking him decisively into communion with Himself."2 The individual is not created a new man and then afterwards enters into a communion with God. Man is distinctively humanus because he stands right down to the innermost core and essence of his being in the profoundest relationship to God all the time in an order of persons.3 God as the self-communicating Will creates the basis of the redemptive relationship within which the new man is created. The essential and final meaning of man's life, then, is found in his personal relationship with God.

Man, as a created will, however, is not and cannot be forced into the personal relationship with God. He is free to reject the claim which is at the centre of the

3. Farmer, op. cit., p. 68.
relationship but which he cannot escape. He can no more escape it, than he can escape being a human being. Through man's sin he rejects the divine claim on his life and thus has lost the creative communion with God the Father. Sin then is the perversion or disruption of the personal relation between God and man. It is the estrangement that makes men aliens and strangers from God. (Eph. 2.11-22) The sinner is a prodigal son. He has lost his sense of being at home with his Father. Since man's personal relationship with God constitutes his essential being sin disrupts not only this personal relationship but also his life as well. Man's deepest need in his sinful predicament is, therefore, reconciliation. (Rom. 5.10; II Cor. 5.18-20; Col. 1.20; Eph. 2.16) Forgiveness of sins, therefore, means: 1. a transformation of the sinner's perverted personal relationship with God and his fellow men; 2. and consequently, a reformation of a sinful life. Thus Brunner says, "Forgiveness of sins is indeed, not alone and not, above all, the setting aside of guilt but the new relationship with God, the joyful relationship of God's children, the certainty that nothing can separate me from the love of God."¹ At another place he says, "...forgiveness is...but fellowship with God---a represented, restored relationship between us the creatures and him the Creator."²

2. op. cit., p. 148.
According to this relational understanding of forgiveness, sin, firstly, is a personal and relational act and it is the sinner who is the object of forgiveness. It is man's perverted will that is in opposition to the Personal Will of God and it is man's rebellious self will that is fought against and conquered in the course of divine forgiveness. Secondly, the frustration and guilt which sin brings in its train is seen to be the consequence of the loss of the supreme experience of which man is capable, communion with God. It is because of this understanding of forgiveness, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the fruits of Christ's redemption are described as, "to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way..." (Hebr. 10.19,20) St. Paul expresses the same idea as "access" (Rom. 5.2; Eph. 2.18; 3.12), or "boldness" (Eph. 3.12). Forgiveness may be described in a less theological term as the opening up of a new road of personal communication between God and man and as the sinner walks on this new road his life is renewed. George S. Hendry of Princeton Theological Seminary is right when he says, "Surely it is here in the relation between God and man that the decisive aspect of the atonement must be seen, and surely it is in terms of personal relationship that its ultimate mystery must be explained."  

How then is the sin-perverted personal relationship transformed and how is the sinner's life renewed in the transformed relationship?

B. The Redemptive Concept of Forgiveness

The relational and personal concept of forgiveness implies that forgiveness is redemptive. It is redemptive both of a sin-perverted personal relationship and of a sin-infested life. Forgiveness, in other words, is God's offer of salvation to the world in general and to the individual sinner in particular. Thus Nels F.S. Ferre says, "Forgiveness is neither vindictive nor evasive, but redemptive.... God's work in atonement is the making available of the love that is the power to salvation, whereby the past is remade, the present redirected and the future filled with longing for an ever more righteous order within the love of God."¹ The divine salvation is offered to man through God's self-revelation in which he makes his Personal Will known and on the basis of which he establishes the divine communion with men. What is the nature and content of the divine salvation?

The answer to this question will be found in and

determined by the two main problems of forgiveness: 1. the transformation of a broken personal relationship; 2. the reformation of the sinner's life. The sinner's salvation in terms of these problems means the healing of the broken personal relationship and of the sin-sick soul.¹ Salvation, in other words, "means reuniting that which is estranged, giving a center to that which is split, overcoming the split between God and man, man and his world, man and himself."² The power that heals and saves is God's power of love and holiness. How is the healing and saving power of God present in the history of revelation? Paul Tillich points out that God's healing and saving power is present in the "concrete revelatory events in all periods in which man exists as man."³ The revelatory events are especially present in the history of Israel and exceptionally present in Jesus Christ. These revelatory events are subsumed under the term, the "Word of God". God's healing and saving power is, then, in his Word. What actually is meant by the "Word of God"?

Paul Tillich in his *Systematic Theology*, vol. I, pp. 157–159, points out at least six meanings of the term, the "Word of God". Firstly, the term "Word of God" is the principle or the means of divine communication. Within the context of the personal and relational understanding

2. Tillich, op. cit., p. 166.
3. Ibid.
of forgiveness, the Word of God, according to its first meaning, is the means whereby God reveals his Personal Will to man and without the Word of God personal communication is impossible.

The second meaning of the term, the "Word of God", Tillich says, is that "the Word is the medium of creation, the dynamic spiritual word which mediates between the silent mystery of the abyss of being and the fullness of concrete, individualized, self-related beings."¹ The creative quality of the Word of God enables it to heal and renew the broken God-man relationship and sin-sick soul.

The third meaning of the Word of God, says Tillich, is that it is the manifestation of the divine life in the history of revelation. Within the context of the redemptive concept of forgiveness the Word becomes the revelation of a new life based on the Personal Will of God, i.e. based on the love and holiness of God. This divine life has been made known in the whole history of revelation, but it has been made fully and conclusively known in Jesus Christ. He is the Personal Will of God on the plane of human existence. In him the Word as the principle of all divine manifestation and as the medium of creation and also as the divine life became flesh. In him the first three meanings of the term, the Word of God, coalesce. It is he as the Word of God that the Bible contains and the Church

proclaims in her preaching. Underlying all these differ-
ent but related meanings of the Word of God, Tillich says, is God manifesting himself in creation, in history of revelation and in Jesus Christ.¹ It is God himself, then, who is present in his Word, in all the revelatory events, as the healing power of love and holiness and thus as the saving and reforming power of all broken personal relationship and sin-sick souls. Salvation, as the bes-
towal of life which comes from man's fellowship with God, is realized in the history of revelation. God then has been a forgiving God before Jesus appeared, though there is a unique history of revelation, the centre of which is the revelatory event of Jesus Christ.²

The Personal Will of God, therefore, confronts man in his Word as love and holiness. God, made known as a loving Father, wills to forgive his wayward children, i.e. accept them back into a personal communion with himself. At the same time he made himself known as the one who is utterly opposed to sin, i.e. as the Holy Father. (John 17.11) God is a loving Father, gracious in mercy as well as the Holy Father who hates sin. (Exod. 34.6,7; Ps. 7.11) It is upon this basis of his nature that he communes with man. His salvation is thus based and rooted in his love and holiness. In practical terms, it means that any personal relationship that is founded and rooted in the

². op. cit., p. 156.
love and holiness of God has a transforming and creative power. God's love and holiness are, therefore, the contents of his healing and saving power.

God's forgiveness is offered on the basis of his love which manifests itself in the gracious treatment of the sinner. In this gracious treatment the sinner is accepted in spite of his guilt in breaking the personal relationship with God and in spite of his sinful nature. He is accepted again by the love and life that he has rejected. In the moment of St. Paul's conversion he found himself accepted by God in spite of his guilt. Because of this gracious acceptance, he was able to accept himself, and to be reconciled to others and was united with him to whom he belonged. This gracious acceptance may be described as "the in-spite-of-guilt acceptance". As St. Paul accepted the divine in-spite-of-guilt acceptance he found his life transformed.

The in-spite-of-guilt acceptance is characterized by a different treatment of the sinner. He is regarded and treated as if he were without guilt. He is offered a new communion with God, i.e. a new life, in spite of his rejection of it, because God still regards him as his child. God does not accord the sinner the treatment of a prodigal that he deserves. He is still treated as a beloved son. In other words, God's attitude towards the sinner does not

change, thus P. T. Forsyth says, in atonement "God's feeling toward us never needed to be changed. But God's treatment of us, God's practical relation to us—that had to change."

The sinner comes to know God's gracious treatment of him in his acceptance by people who are involved in his world of personal relations.

The gracious acceptance of the sinner, however, has to be accepted by the sinner before the broken personal relationship is healed and becomes regenerative of a new life. Wherever this human response is present and is coupled with God's gracious treatment, the sinner feels that the barrier of his wrong-doings has been removed. He realizes that his sin-perverted personal relationship with God and fellow men has been transformed. He now feels that he has been forgiven and has entered into a new personal relationship with God and men. Finally, he feels that the pangs of his guilt-ridden conscience are over. It should be pointed out that even though complete and real forgiveness is possible only as the sinner accepts the divine offer of forgiveness, yet it is God who takes the initiative in the process and experience of forgiveness. He establishes and offers a new personal relationship with man, and as man responds and cooperates with the divine initiative his life is transformed and renewed.

God's offer of forgiveness is based not only on his fatherly love, but also on his holiness. His holiness is his wholly otherness in being, it is his absolute difference of nature. God's otherness in nature and being expresses itself in his wrath: his reaction to sin.

It should be pointed out that God's love and holiness should not be considered as either two separate divine emotions or attributes. Love is the essential structure of God's being, and his holiness as his wrath follows the rejection of his love and its healing and creative power.\(^1\)

Thus Mackintosh says, "It is because God loves that anger in him is conceivable and credible.... It is love alone that makes wrath pure, sublime, redemptive."\(^2\) The wrath of God cannot be separated from his love or from his grace to forgive. It is because God is holy that is why his wrath, as the self-destructive consequences of sin, goes its way. These self-destructive consequences of sin are an expression of God's demand that his children should be as holy as he is holy. Thus Brunner says, "As the Holy One, God wills to be separate from all creatures; as the Holy One He also wills that all creation should be filled with His glory, and thus should have a share in that quality which is His alone. Thus the Holiness of God is the basis of the self-communication which is fulfilled in

---


love. "¹ There is then the oneness of the holiness and the love of God. (Is. 41.14; 43.3; 47.4) God's holiness as well as his love then underlies his personal relationship with men. The way to God is the way of love and holiness. God's household has love and holiness as its foundation and those who dwell in it must then have love and holiness as the central core of their being. In practical terms it means that in any true and creative personal relation on the human level holiness must go with love as a resistance and breaking what is against love. In the saving-event of Jesus Christ God's love and holiness had been revealed as the true and real basis of God-man relationship, i.e. as the true and real basis of forgiveness. It is true to say that, "forgiveness...is the receiving of the holy love of God."² How is God active in Jesus offering his holy love to man? What is the nature of the sinner's response to the divine offer of forgiveness? The first question will be discussed in the next section and the second question will be examined in the section after that.

² Brunner, I Believe in the Living God, op. cit., p. 150.
C. Forgiveness in and through Jesus Christ

The main question that will be taken up in this section is, How is God active through the saving-event of Jesus Christ to save the sinner? To put it another way, How does God offer salvation, his healing and creative power of the new man, in and through Jesus Christ? How does God establish the redemptive personal relationship in and through Jesus Christ?

It has been pointed out above that wherever God reveals himself there exists his healing and reforming power that recreates new men. The atoning power is therefore present in Jesus' revelation of God. The power to heal and create a new relation and a new man is present in Jesus Christ as the true revelation of God. What is the peculiar character of the healing and reforming power present in Jesus Christ?

The peculiar character of the healing and creative power which was in Jesus is in his unique revelation of God. In him the Personal Will of God which was formerly revealed through the prophets became flesh and lived among men. (Hebr. 1.1,2; John 1.14) In him the holy and loving God confronted men directly not in words but in a person. In other words, in him the personal relationship between God and man was personally established in the world. The complete and final and conclusive revelation
of God's Personal Will, therefore, came in Jesus Christ. In him God's holiness and his love which seeks to save those that are lost confront sinners on the level of human existence.

In Jesus' revelation of God two powers of God are manifested in the world. Firstly, in Jesus God's power is manifested in the world as his power of love for salvation. Secondly, God's power is shown in the world in his wrath, i.e. since God is a holy Personal Will, he wills to be known as the God who opposes evil and through his wrath he permits men to inflict on themselves the evil consequences of their own sins. It is God's arrangement that the universe is a moral order and sin has its self-destructive consequences. Through the healing and reforming love and through sin's self-destructive consequences the power of God is revealed through Jesus Christ in the world. In the saving-event of Christ divine love and wrath have been established absolutely as the only basis of divine communion and thus of salvation. How is the basis of the new way of communion between God and man made known in the life and death of Jesus Christ? How did Jesus establish the foundation of the new redemptive relationship between God and man through his life and death?

Firstly, Jesus established the redemptive relationship

through his acceptance of and through his close self-identification with sinners. Jesus identified himself with sinners in his baptism, and he had fellowship with some in their homes, and some he called to be his disciples. In him the Pharisees saw quite a new order of personal relationship with sinners and so they remarked, "This man receives sinners and eats with them." (Luke 15.2)

Jesus' close self-identification with sinners manifested itself in his suffering and death. He suffered and died sharing the same criminal and shameful death with sinners. In his Cross he identified himself with sinners in the self-destructive consequences of their sins.

In this act of self-identification sinners saw in Jesus Christ God's acceptance of them as over against the Pharisees' rejection of them. They also saw God's love as concern for them in Jesus' close self-identification with them, because it was only divine love that would cause him to sit where they sat. Jesus' life and death, therefore, revealed and offered the divine in-spite-of-guilt acceptance to sinners. In him God confronted men with his creative and healing power.

It is not only the divine in-spite-of-guilt acceptance that was revealed in Jesus Christ. This is one aspect of his total revelation. The whole life and death of Jesus Christ revealed clearly God's utter reaction to

---

Right from the beginning of his ministry he declared war on evil. At the synagogue at Nazareth he said that he came to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty those who are oppressed. (Luke 4.18; also see John 9.39) He strongly opposed and condemned evil in those who were blind to it, e.g. the Pharisees. In some of his parables he revealed God not only as a loving Father but as a just and holy Father. In the parable of the Messianic Banquet (Matt. 22.1-14), he revealed God as an angry king who sent his troops to destroy those who murdered his son. In his fellowship with sinners they realized him at once as the person in whom the holy Father was present. Thus Simon Peter realizing the Holy God in him said to him, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." (Luke 5.8) In him sinners saw the loving Father who accepted them and who was at the same time opposed to sin. This realization brought confession from some of them, e.g. Zacchaeus, (Luke 19.8).

Jesus also showed God's utter opposition to sin by putting his life in sin's path. He opposed evil on the Cross with his life. The Cross is the supreme manifestation of God's mind regarding sin and his active opposition to it. In the Cross the connection between sin and suffering—the wrath of God—became abundantly manifested.

1. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 199.
The Cross is the final and supreme drama revealing the truth that transgression entails self-destructive consequences. It shows that the world of personal relation is established on the Personal Will of God.

Jesus had thus truly revealed the real nature of God the Father. He revealed him not only as loving but also as holy and thus had to suffer. He had to suffer to reveal the true basis of the personal communion between God and man. Thus St. Paul says, "For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 3.11) The revelation of God's offer of forgiveness will not be complete without the revelation of the part of his Personal Will that expresses itself in his holiness. This is the part that is made known supremely through Jesus' suffering and death. Jesus' suffering, however, is not only limited to his Cross, but it characterizes his whole life. Thus P.T. Forsyth says, "The Cross was not simply a fate awaiting Christ in the future; it pervaded subliminally His holy Person. He was born for the Cross." It is true then to say that the Cross of Jesus Christ manifested both the love and the wrath of God.

The Cross of Jesus revealed yet another truth. It revealed the fact that sin and evil are not the ultimate meaning of life. The very presence of Jesus in the world was a manifestation of this truth. The new order of

relationship was now within the reach of the sinner and thus his chance of experiencing God's forgiveness and having a new life was brought nearer. This is the good message that Jesus and his Cross convey to the world of faith. Through faith the message of the Cross is apprehended and issues in a new life. The new life, however, is not present in its entirety. It is present and is still to come in all its fullness.

The chief role of Jesus Christ in man's redemption is, therefore, to lay the only true foundation of the personal relationship between God and man and to invite men to enter into it. He showed that a true communion between God and man is founded on God's love and holiness. It is worth quoting G. S. Hendry again at this point. He says, "The grace of God is his will to have fellowship with sinful men, and its primary work is to be seen, not in the removal of obstacle to that fellowship, but in the establishment of the fellowship that removes the obstacle."¹ The principal role of Jesus in the offer of divine forgiveness is the establishment of the true basis of God-man personal relationship which is pregnant

with the saving and healing and reforming power of God. ¹

1. At this point it will be necessary to discuss briefly the penal theory of the Atonement which Brunner represents.

The main contention of this theory is that the world is based on a moral order which is the Will of God. Since the moral order is the basis of order in the world, its violation is necessarily followed by God’s punishment. Thus Brunner says, "Guilt (objective guilt) is an inescapable necessity of punishment". (The Mediator, p. 469) Through sin man violates the divine law and has come under divine wrath. Into this sphere of human sin and its consequences Jesus came to reveal God’s forgiveness and thus had to bear the punishment of man’s sins. (The Mediator, pp. 455-474).

The penal view of the atonement possesses two merits; it emphasizes the Atonement as an objective fact and assigns a very significant place to the Cross. But there is one main objection to this view of Christ’s Cross, i.e. his suffering and death. The consequences of men’s sins are not commodities that can be transferred from the sinner to Christ. Moreover, men suffered, and still suffer the evil consequences of their sins. Their suffering is due to the fact that they reject the love of God made known in the life and death of Jesus. In other words, because men have sinned, they have to experience God’s love as wrath. Jesus’ suffering and death, though they are necessary, are not a penal substitutionary suffering and death and they are not a vindication of the sanctity and integrity of the moral order either. God’s wrath was active and made known before Jesus came and is the vindication of the sanctity and integrity of the moral order. Jesus’ suffering is rather redemptive and not penal.
To sum up, Christ revealed God's love and holiness and their healing and saving power as the only true foundation of the personal relationship within which the sinner experiences God's forgiveness. This revelation was made known in his life and death as a whole. In other words, there is an organic connection between the life, suffering and death of Jesus Christ. The foundation of the new life was laid in and through Jesus’ total revelation. Thus Brunner says, "'God becomes man for your sake, man'. This act of becoming man begins at Christmas and ends on Good Friday."

With this organic understanding of Christ's saving-event, the Cross becomes a part of his whole work of reconciliation, and is as necessary as his life for reopening the new and living way to God. His life and death are the necessary birth pangs of the New Covenant. Thus at the Last Supper he said, "Take; this is my body." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." (Mark 14. 22, 23)

Through his life and death Jesus placed the righteous Personal Will of God at the very centre of personal relations. Man can now commune with God only on the basis of God's love and holiness. Sinners then really

communicate with God as God's love and holiness are mirrored in their lives and thus have come to form the foundation of all their personal relations.

Since, in the final analysis, it is the healing and reforming power of God that is offered as the ground of man's salvation, it is God himself who is at work in Christ's saving-event to heal and regenerate the sin-sick soul. It is God himself in Christ offering his gracious acceptance to and self-identifying himself with sinners.

Though Christ's work of salvation has a cosmic significance yet what he did has to be incorporated into the life and heart of the sinner before it becomes an effective and real salvation. In other words, forgiveness is both a divine act and involving a human response and cooperation. Thus Luther commenting on the atoning work of Christ in connection with Col. 2.15 said, "When therefore thou lookest upon this person thou seest sin, death, God's wrath, hell, the devil, and all evil, overcome and dead. In so far therefore as Christ by His grace rules in the hearts of the faithful, there is found no more sin, death, and curse; but where Christ is not known they still remain." On the same point H.R. Mackintosh says, "In a perfectly moral and spiritual religion, reconciliation can consist in nothing but the actual effectuation of

1. This is a quotation from Gustaf Aulen's book, Christus Victor, (translated by A.G. Hebert, S.P.C.K. London), p. 122. The italics are the writer's.
fellowship between men and God, through seeking, costly Divine love on the one hand and its penitent reception by man on the other.\textsuperscript{1} With the proper response to and cooperation with the saving work of Christ the sinner finds himself in a new personal relationship with God.\textsuperscript{2} It is necessary now to examine the nature of human acceptance of divine forgiveness.

D. The place of Repentance and Confession in Forgiveness.

The meaning of man's personal relationship to a great extent is determined by his attitude towards it and it is therefore his attitude that determines the value of the relationship for his life. Brunner is right when he says, "Man is...what his attitude towards God is...he is that as which he determines his attitude to God."\textsuperscript{3} The sinner, therefore, experiences a transformation in his relationship to his spiritual and human environment partly through a change of his attitude towards it. The change of his attitude expresses itself in his repentance and confession of wrong-doings, and failure and incompleteness in his personal relations. What is the nature of the

\textsuperscript{1} Op. cit., p. 226.
\textsuperscript{3} Man in Revolt, p. 151. Also see The Mediator, p. 443.
sinner's repentance and confession and what makes him repent and confess his faults and wrongness in his personal relationship?

Any individual who honestly examines his life will admit that his life in spite of all his best attainments, is not what it could be. He may perceive something incomplete about it. He may be fully or dimly aware of this incompleteness, but usually when he is confronted with a new and better way of life he becomes more aware of his incompleteness and faults. The picture of this new and better way of life is painted for the Christian in the Word of God, and for him Jesus of Nazareth is the incarnation of this life. The presentation of the new and better way of life, born of a new form of personal relationship, may lead to an increased restlessness and the individual's desire to find a complete and more satisfying life.

Psychologically speaking, the presentation of the new and better way of life undermines the old loyalties, beliefs and self-identity of the sinner. His sense of 'I am this or that', in other words, his ontological identity, is undermined as he responds to what has been revealed to him. This penetration of the sinner's sense of self-identity by his environmental influences is theologically called, confrontation by the Word of God. This confrontation is based on the sinner's innate desire to change to
be something better and is carried on through his sense of guilt. Through the proclamation of the Word of God the old life of the sinner, i.e. the old man and his loyalties and identities, is undermined and he is offered a new form of life based on a new form of personal relationship. This proclamation is the offer of God's forgiveness.

The sinner's acceptance of divine forgiveness involves his change from one state of existence to the other, or from one state of the soul to the other, i.e. conversion. The Chinese Communists have been using the method of conversion to change some Westerners captured during the Korean War or arrested in China during the Communist take-over. Dr. R.J. Lifton, in his book, Thought Reform, (A Study of "Brainwashing" in China), gave a careful account of how a Western missionary medical doctor, Dr. Vincent, was brainwashed by the Chinese Communists into becoming a Chinese Communist sympathizer. A short account of the process of his conversion or 're-education' as the Chinese termed it, is given here and will be used to illustrate the psychological processes involved in the change of the sinner to a new man. The psychological processes in Communist conversion and Christian conversion are the same but the methods are different. The Chinese Communists use coercion, a real physical and mental torture to produce conversion while the Christian method is exhortation and persuasion. (I Thes. 5.14)
The Christian convert is not forced to become a Christian. He is encouraged to seek and he is promised that he will find the forgiveness of God. Some revivalist evangelist may use the method of group pressure to produce conversion but even here God may overrule it.

Another significant difference in the two forms of conversion is the object of the conversion. In Christianity man primarily sins against God as the ultimate structure of reality and then against his neighbour and so it is to God that the sinner is converted, i.e. it is from God that he receives forgiveness. While in Communism sin is against the Party, against the people's government, and finally against the Communist society. So it is from the officials of the Party and the government that the 'imperialist criminal' seeks pardon.

Finally, in the Christian conversion the converted sinner is asked to love God and his neighbour. His neighbour is any person that may happen to be within the orbit of his personal relation and so could be a communist. The Communist convert is supposed to love all men too but so long as the Communist world is opposed to the capitalist world his love is restricted to those who espouse the communist way of life. The account of the conversion of Dr. Vincent which follows will bring out some of these differences.
Dr. Vincent is a Frenchman in his early fifties. He lived in Shanghai working as a medical doctor for twenty years. He was one of the Westerners left behind after the Communist take-over. One afternoon he was arrested on the street and taken to a re-education centre, prison, where he spent the next three years. He was released and came down to Hong Kong where Dr. Lifton met him. Afterwards Dr. Vincent went back to work in an Asian country.

The psychological processes of his conversion.

The assignment of the Criminal Role: The Assault on Personality.

When Dr. Vincent entered the prison he was given a number and addressed by this prison number. He was welcomed as an "imperialist spy" and other prisoners treated him as such and shouted invectives at him. They pressured him to confess his crimes against the Chinese people and the people's government. When Dr. Vincent denied the charges brought against him more group pressure was brought on him and he was put in chains and treated inhumanely.

All the prison treatments were aimed at destroying his sense of being a benevolent missionary medical doctor and forcing him to accept the criminal role. He was being forced to look at himself from the "people's standpoint" and to accept the prevailing Communist definition of a criminal behaviour. Through this treatment they established for him his sense of guilt and shame. Gradually this guilt atmosphere merged with his subjective feelings of wrongness. (Psychologically, Brunner is right when he says, "To repent is really nothing else than to become honest before God and to see oneself as one is in the mirror of God".) (op. cit. p. 117). The equivalent of "the mirror of God" in Chinese Communist conversion is "the people's standpoint". Dr. Vincent made the first wild confession of non-existent espionage activities when he pretended to look at his activities in China from the "people's standpoint".

The use of Existential Guilt.

The more they forced Dr. Vincent to look at himself and his activities from the people's standpoint the more he confessed his "crimes" and the more he felt guilty. He himself said, "You feel guilty, because all of the time you have to look at yourself from the people's standpoint, and the more deeply you go into the people's standpoint, the more you recognize your crimes." (Lifton, Thought Reform, p. 30). As his subjective feelings of wrongness
invaded him more, he confessed more, and more reality was realized in his confessions. He denounced himself, the Western imperialist, denounced what he was in the past and through his self-denunciation and confession he subverted the structure of his individual identity and his previous mode of existence. At this point the old man is killed, the mind is cleared of all "imperialist reactionary ideas."

The Emergency of the New Man.

Finally, Dr. Vincent, after he had made a very good progress in seeing his life from the people's standpoint, was allowed to teach French to the other prisoners and to conduct medical classes for Chinese students brought to the prison for this purpose. Dr. Vincent who entered the prison as an imperialist spy came out as a new man sympathetic to Chinese Communism. The reactionary spy who entered the prison perished and in its place arose a new man who could now look at life more sympathetically from the people's standpoint. (pp. 19-86)

The offer of forgiveness, whether it is considered as the confrontation of the sinner with the Word of God, or penetration of his sense of I-am by his environmental influences, has to be responded to in order to have any effect on the sinner's life. The response or acceptance of the Word of forgiveness is expressed through the sinner’s repentance and confession. It is repentance and confession that prepare the sinner to experience God’s forgiveness as a change of his personal relations and in his life. Repentance and confession, therefore, form the bridge between the old and the new life, between the old and new personal relationships of the sinner. For this reason the New Testament presents repentance as a necessary condition for the forgiveness of sins and entry into the Kingdom of God. (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; Acts 2:38; 8:22)
What is the nature of repentance? Repentance is turning over to look at one's life in the mirror of God and this turning over is accompanied with the desire for a change. Repentance, therefore, involves a change of mind and heart and in itself it does not necessarily mean turning away from sin to God, e.g. Dr. Vincent's repentance in the Communist prison was about his Western outlook. Physiologically, repentance may be a change of the attitude of the human organism towards his behaviour pattern. Whenever the human organism finds himself in a new situation where his old pattern of behaviour does not offer him a satisfactory adjustment to life, it changes its former mode of behaviour. He does this so that his life's energy can continue to flow smoothly and thus helps him release an internal tension and adjust better to the changed conditions of its existence. When Dr. Vincent entered the prison he found out that his past mode of life and activities were a burden to him and because of them he was made to suffer shame and physical pains. The emotional pressure and the physical hardship brought upon him forced him to change his attitude towards his former life and activities.

The change of mind and heart may not necessarily involve a definite pattern of behaviour. It may take place quite on an abstract level. Thus the change of attitude may be from one philosophy of life to another, or from one
political belief to another. It may be a change from one way of life that does not have God at its centre to a God-centred life, or vice versa. A change of attitude that is directed to God and a way of life represented by the Will of God is a repentance unto forgiveness. (Mark 1.4)

The story of the Prodigal Son, theologically, illustrates very well the importance and the place of repentance and confession in God's forgiveness, and so it is quoted here at length and used as a theological illustration of the place of repentance in forgiveness.

And he said, "There was a man who had two sons; and the younger of them said to his father, 'Father, give me the share of property that falls to me'. And he divided his living between them. Not many days later, the younger son gathered all he had and took his journey into a far country, and there he squandered his property in loose living. And when he had spent everything, a great famine arose in that country, and he began to be in want. So he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country, who sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would gladly have fed on the pods that the swine ate; and no one gave him anything. But when he came to himself he said, 'How many of my father's hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and I will say to him, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son; treat me as one of your hired servants".' And he arose and came to his father. But while he was yet at a distance, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and embraced him and kissed him. And the son said to him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son! But the father said to his servants, 'Bring quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet; and bring the fatted calf and kill it, and
let us eat and make merry; for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found;' And they began to make merry.


The change of mind and heart of the sinner involves, firstly, a change in the emotional disposition. Every person attaches certain affective values\(^1\) to a certain way of life or to a certain system of values and meaning. Whenever he finds himself under new conditions of life, he reappraises his affective values in the light of his present need and in the light of the need of the on-going process of his life. When these affective values are found inadequate to meet the new demands of life and thus to make his life flow more satisfactorily they lose their drive value for him. What actually happens is that as the former way of life has been undermined by his environmental influences it loses its significance and consequently its emotional worth has been re-oriented towards either a new behaviour pattern, or towards a new way of life. Also the individual's attitude towards the practical significance of his old way of life changes. This is the emotional change that is involved in repentance. Another way to describe it is to say that the emotional change implied in repentance is a transference of the

individual's affective values from one way of life to another that has acquired a new meaning for him. The emotional change may be dramatic and ends up as an emotional upheaval due to the severity of the environmental pressure that is brought to bear on the person. Dr. Vincent experienced this emotional upheaval as his treatment in the prison became more harsh and less humane. Many converts at revivalist meetings go through this emotional upheaval prior to their conversion.

Another factor that is involved in repentance is the cognitive element. The whole cause of the emotional change is due to the fact that the sinner has landed upon a new and better insight into life. As he is confronted with this new life he judges his old life in the light of it. This judgment may lead to a repentance of all that he has done wrong in his old way of life. The perception of the dark spots in the old way of life is, however, not mere knowledge nor a carefully manufactured self-depreciation as happens in Communist prisons. It is sincerity with oneself in the light of the new reality. True repentance comes as the sinner sincerely and honestly examines and analyses his life in terms of the new understanding of life. For the Christian, this new understanding of life comes through the revelation of the Personal Will of God in Jesus Christ. This revelation is the New Reality, the new mode of fellowship with God the
Father, and one's fellow men.

In the parable of the Prodigal Son this moment of insight came to him at the point where the evangelist said, "But when he came to himself...." In coming to himself the Prodigal Son grasped the painful truth about his life. He realized the wretchedness of his life in the far country and at the same time had a vision of a new life in his father's house. When the vision of the new life dawned upon him he said, "How many of my father's hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger." (Luke 15.17) He perceived a new state of existence in which his needs would be met. To him this new state of existence was more than possible for him because it was real for his father's hired servants. The perception of this new life and of his own wretched condition, i.e. his objective guilt, prepared him for his repentance and confession. In the case of Dr. Vincent the moment of insight, even though forced, came to him when his captors unexpectedly showed him some kindness. In this way they gave him a slight vision of life in the Communist Promised Land.

Today the Christian perceives the wretched condition of his life and a picture of the new life through the Gospel. Through the preaching of the Gospel a new way of life is enfolded before him. This is the way of life in the Word of God. It is in the light of this that he
examines and analyses his whole life. In the process of this examination and analysis the wretched condition of his life becomes exposed and undermined. As in the case of Dr. Vincent, the Christian himself has helped in subverting the old structure of his life. He has accepted his gracious acceptance. When the wretchedness and incompleteness of the old way of life fully invade his consciousness he repents and confesses his faults and inadequacies. He gives up the old way of life and takes in the new life of the Gospel. True repentance and confession, therefore, follow an honest and critical analysis and examination of the old way of life in the light of the new: God's revelation, the people's standpoint. This critical and honest examination is basic to the destruction of the foundation of the old way of life. Upon the demolished foundation of the old way of life the new is built. Thus St. Paul says, "We were buried therefore with him by baptism unto death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life." (Rom. 6.4) Through Dr. Vincent's self-denunciation, self-criticism and self-analysis which he was forced to do, (the Chinese call it 'solving your problem) he pulled down his own old self-identity.

There is yet one more factor in repentance. This is the sense of despair. Before the sinner repents of his sinful way of life he comes to a point where he finds his
life a frustrated experience. He makes some desperate attempts to remove the frustration in his life without any success. Finally, he becomes disappointed with his effort to remove the frustration from his life and disappointed with his life as a whole. The Prodigal Son expressed his disappointment with his life in these words, "How many of my father's hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger". There is a note of despair in these words. He despaired of his own effort to bring about a new way of life. Before he came to this point he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of the country, but this move did not solve his problem. Finally, he decided to give up his effort and go back to his father and ask for forgiveness. His despair led him to give up his old way of life and to seek for a new life in his father's house. His life was saved at the moment when he gave up his effort in despair. Paul Tillich is right when he says, "Grace strikes us when we are in great pain and restlessness. It strikes us when we walk through the dark valley of a meaningless and empty life. It strikes us when we feel that our separation is deeper than usual, because we have violated another life, a life which we love, or from which we are estranged... Sometimes at that moment a wave of light breaks into our darkness, and it is as though a voice were saying
"You are accepted. You are accepted, accepted by that which is greater than you, and the name of which you do not know."  

The experience of despair of one's effort to save one's self and the subsequent surrender of one's attempt is a necessary condition for the acceptance of the new life. Psychologically speaking, before any new way of life takes hold in the life of a man he must be willing to let go any other idea or system of meaning and values that occupies the centre of the field of his consciousness and thus has been directing his life's energy. The Chinese Communist psychologists call this psychological surrender, hai nao, i.e. wash brain. By means of this psychological surrender the sinner does not let the old system of values and meaning be the dynamic centre of his life. The old thought habit and emotions are given up, they are dead and buried in the unconscious. Thought and action are now directed by the mental image of the new life around which thought and action are united. From the new centre life now flows and expresses itself in action. This shift in the consciousness of the sinner will be thoroughly discussed in chapter six.  

Usually at this stage in the process of forgiveness there is a confession of sins. Confession is a

1. The Shaking of the Foundations, pp. 161, 162.
culmination of a long inner experience and it is making repentance public. Through confession the sinner symbolically pours out and exposes the impurities that he has repented of in his life. This public exposure of the sinner's faults and wrongness is a symbol of his surrender to the new way of life and his merger with his spiritual and human environment. Dr. Vincent pointed out that the more confession he made the more he became deeply merged with the people's standpoint. Through confession the sinner is also released of his suppressed guilt feelings. True confession is, therefore, a very important mark in the change of attitude of the sinner and thus in the transformation of the sinner's disrupted personal relationship. It is very essential for his embodiment of the new life.

When the Prodigal Son came to this point in the process of his change he said to himself, "I will arise and go to my father, and I will say to him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you'." His repentance ended in his confession of his sin against heaven and before his father. He was now ready to accept his father's forgiveness, i.e. to identify himself with the new life of his father's house. He was ready to accept his new self-identity and to enter into a new personal relationship with his father.

To conclude, true repentance and confession are the results of an honest and sincere critical examination and
analysis of the whole human sphere of existence in the light of the Word of God and they signify a turning of one's back upon the old way of life and a seeking for a new and better one. Thus repentance and confession is man's genuine change of heart and turning to God. They form essential parts in the process of the transformation of sin-disrupted relationship. To be able to repent and confess one's sins means that one has accepted one's objective guilt and is willing to assume the new self-identity given in forgiveness. Repentance and confession form the bridge that leads from the old life of sin, the old man, to the new life, and thus to be true they must come from the sinner. Moreover, repentance and confession are an experience that lies wholly within the life of the sinner. For his repentance and confession to be true he must be able to say, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you."

Can repentance and confession then be undertaken by one person, e.g. Jesus Christ, for another person? Moberly in his book, Atonement and Personality, thinks that this can be done.¹ According to him Jesus Christ made a vicarious penitence and it is on the basis of this vicarious penitence that the sinner is saved. He goes on to say that in this vicarious penitence Jesus perfectly

condemned sin and thus perfectly identified his personality, i.e. his will and character, with the righteousness of God. Moberly argues further that if the sinner is able to identify himself with this perfect penitence of Jesus and condemn sin truly as Christ did and know truly God's mind about righteousness, then he is saved. Thus for Moberly the atonement is this perfect penitence that Jesus Christ offered on the sinner's behalf.

There is one main objection to Moberly's explanation of repentance and thus of atonement. Repentance is an experience and one either has repented of his wrongdoings and has gone through all the necessary psychological experiences or he has not. It is the sinner's own repentance and confession that lead him to accept forgiveness, i.e. to identify himself with the new image of himself that is offered him in the Word of God. Moreover, the cleansing of the sinner's guilty conscience follows his confession of his faults and incompleteness.

For the sinner Jesus Christ is the incarnation of the new life which confronts him in his sinful state. But before this new life becomes his own he has to respond to it by means of repentance and confession. The experience of forgiveness, i.e. salvation, comes at the meeting point of the Word of God, the grace of God, and human response that is expressed through repentance and confession. This
is the point of effective concurrence and at this point grace and human response meet to effect man's salvation.

There is a danger in stressing the offer of forgiveness, i.e. divine grace, as the sole account of and the cause of salvation and also in stressing human response alone as the sole cause of it. Neither grace nor human response alone accounts for the whole experience of forgiveness. Both of them are to be taken together to explain the whole facts of the experience of divine forgiveness.

James Denney in his book, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, page 260, realizes the important place of human response in the form of repentance in true forgiveness. But he is wrong when he says that human response is no more than a reproduction of the one perfect repentance that Jesus Christ made to God on man's behalf. Denney argues that it is this perfect repentance that God accepts when he forgives sinners. The sinner, therefore, knows no perfect penitence of his own making and the worthy penitence that he makes is a reproduction of Jesus' once-and-for-all perfect repentance.

Historically speaking, it cannot be said that there was no true repentance before Jesus Christ came and thus no true forgiveness. The Old Testament is full of instances of true repentance and experiences of forgiveness, e.g. Ps. 51.4, "For I know my transgressions, and my sin is ever
before me. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight." This repentance and confession are as true as they are personal and genuine.

Moreover, it cannot be said that sinners today offer a perfect repentance of Jesus' type to God. The sinners who are willing to repent of their sins at all offer only the kind of repentance that they are capable of. Christ's offer of perfect penitence, if anything like that was ever done at all, does not automatically save the sinner from performing the human response of repentance and confession. As the sinner responds with the proper penitence and confession to God's gracious acceptance revealed in Jesus Christ, he experiences God's forgiveness as the release of a new creative power into his life. Thus C.H. Dodd says, "Forgiveness... is the actual creative power of God coming in His Kingdom, released for action when men accept His judgment and repent."¹

To summarize, man's positive personal relationship is constitutive of his essential being. The positive personal relationship comprises man's relationship to God and fellow men. At the centre of it is God's Personal Will which wills to be expressed in man's life as love and holiness, i.e. God seeks communion with man on the basis of love and holiness. In this communion with God man finds his salvation.

Though man derives his salvation from his communion with the Personal Will of God, yet man as a created will is free to reject it but he cannot escape it. Through his sins man rejects God's Personal Will and thus disrupts his positive personal relationship with God, and his essential being. Forgiveness of sins is therefore a transformation of sin-disrupted personal relationship and consequently a renewal of the sinner's life. In other words, forgiveness is God's offer of salvation to man, i.e. salvation of his positive personal relationship with God and of his sin-sick soul. This salvation is embodied in the Word of God which has a healing and creative power.

The Word of God was made known in all revelatory history, but uniquely in the revelatory history the centre of which is Jesus Christ. In his life and death God revealed himself as a loving, forgiving and holy Father. In and through Jesus' unique revelation he established the foundation of communion between God and man on the divine love and holiness. In him God offered his gracious acceptance to sinners.

For the divine forgiveness to become real and effective the sinner has to respond to it with the proper repentance and confession. Through his repentance and confession he helps to subvert the structure of the old man and merges himself with the identity of the new man created
from the Word of God. Through this response and cooperation the sinner finds the barrier of his guilt removed and his guilty conscience cleansed. He now finds himself in a new relationship with God and experiences a release of a new creative power of God into his life. The new man has now been carved from the demolished walls of the old sinful self-identity.
FORGIVENESS AND PUNISHMENT

In the previous chapter forgiveness of sins has been discussed as a transformation of the personal relationship between God and man, and between man and his neighbour; and consequently, as a reformation of the sinner's life. Nothing, however, has been said about the place of sin's consequences within the context of the redemptive concept of forgiveness. It is therefore necessary now to examine the place of sin's consequences in the experience of forgiveness. The main question that will be discussed is, What is the place of sin's consequences that the sinner or his neighbours may suffer before and after the sinner has been graciously forgiven? The main proposition to be defended is: God wills that the doing of evil should issue in pain for the doer. God's forgiveness is not necessarily, therefore, freeing the sinner from the consequences of his sins. The sinner in some cases still has to bear the evil consequences of his sin even though his personal relation to God has been changed from alienation to the consciousness of being graciously accepted again. In other words, by and large God wills that the nexus between sin and suffering should be realized in fact for the sinner and the real experience of forgiveness means that the sinner is able to accept the consequences of his sin and be at peace with them.¹

The treatment of sin's consequences will necessitate a fresh and detailed examination of the wrath of God considered as his reaction to sin. This will be followed by an examination of the different forms of punishment as the manifestation of the wrath of God. The chapter will end with a discussion of the deliverance of the sinner from the wrath of God through faith in the saving work of Jesus Christ.

A. Sin and the Wrath of God

What is the relationship between sin and the wrath of God? According to the redemptive understanding of forgiveness, sin is a perversion or disruption of the positive personal relation between God and man. Sin is the abrogation and rejection of a creative personal relationship and it is thus within the context of the personal relationship that the wrath of God is conceived in the Old Testament.

In the history of Israel the wrath of God is first made manifest in the abrogation of the covenant relationship between God and Israel as a nation. To start with, there was an ideal personal relationship, based on faith and obedience, between God and Israel. (Exod. 19.5,6.)
As the people of Israel lived according to God's Will as it was embodied in the commandments and ordinances they remained as God's children and did not come under the wrath of God.

The second covenant relationship with Israel was established as the first ideal covenant was broken through the sin of the people of Israel. (Exod. 34.10ff.)

Within the terms of the new covenant there was a provision for punishment and destruction of those within his bounds who would not make the response of faith, in other words, there was a provision for the exercise of the wrath of God in his relationship with the people of Israel. (Josh. 7.1ff.) Moses, therefore, warned them that they would incur the wrath of God if they broke up their covenant relationship with God by serving other gods. (Deut. 29.18-20).

Israel then conceived of the wrath of God as an integral part of his personal relationship with man and it manifests itself when man through sin perverts his personal relationship with God. Since God's dealing with man is rooted in his love his wrath arises when the course of his love is impeded, when the right relationship with him is broken. What is the meaning of the term, 'the wrath of God'?

The concept of the wrath of God in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament has undergone some

---


historical developments and changes. The wrath appeared first as the direct action of God against all those who offended him, and it was not necessarily moral and rational (2 Sam. 6.7; 24.1) Later on the wrath of God became his personal reaction to sin but it was still not yet his reaction to all sins under all circumstances. It was only to specifically flagrant sins, idolatry in particular. (Deut. 29.20) A definite conception of God's wrath as a working principle in history emerged in the Deuteronomistic school. There, for the first time, the divine wrath was manifested through the defeat of Israel in war. (Josh. 7.1-11) From the time of the exile onwards the Deuteronomistic conception of the wrath of God became standardized. The wrath became an inevitable process in history, something remote, automatic, and very impersonal. At this point the wrath became the inevitable process of sin working itself out in history.¹ The prophetic conception of the wrath of God was carried on by the exilic and post-exilic prophets. In the apocalyptic writers an eschatological content was added to the prophetic concept of the wrath of God. (Is. 13.9-11) According to the apocalyptic writers the wrath was to come in the day of the Lord, i.e. in the last day.

The New Testament writers made use of both the apocalyptic and the personal conceptions of the divine wrath.²

The idea of God's wrath was explicitly stated in St. Paul's epistles more than in any other books of the New Testament with the exception of the book of Revelation. The same conception of the wrath as St. Paul entertains lies behind the other books in the New Testament and so the discussion of the wrath in the New Testament will be confined to St. Paul's writings.

In Rom. 1.18-32 Paul talks about the revelation of the wrath of God and its consequences. According to him 'the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth.' (18) The wrath is 'in action now' (revealed) against all impiety and unrighteousness of men. The fundamental sin that calls forth God's wrath is religious apostasy. (25) Secondly, the wrath of God discloses itself against other sins resulting from the religious apostasy, e.g. lust which was notorious in the Graeco-Roman world and much of it was associated with idolatry. (24-27); the second sin associated with the sin of religious apostasy is the malignity and inhumanity in manifold forms pervading society. (28-31)

In connection with the consequences of man's sin Paul uses three times the expression, 'God gave them up...to impurity' (24) etc. According to him God's personal will is operative (God gave them up) in the moral order in which sin breeds its punishment. (Jas. 1.15) Paul then does
not dissociate the wrath of God from God's Personal Will and the wrath thus expresses a quality of God's nature.

According to St. Paul then the term 'the wrath of God' means the personal reaction of God against sin and sinners who pervert their personal relationship with him through the sin of apostasy. As in the Old Testament, Paul conceives of God's wrath as disclosing itself when man perverts his personal relationship with God. The wrath is contemporary and works in the present, though at some places he speaks of the wrath to come. (I Thess. 1.10) Finally, Paul speaks of the wrath of God manifesting itself as certain effects of sin, e.g. unnatural intercourse.

To sum up, the wrath is primarily a relational and personal concept. It forms an integral element in God's dealing with men. It is his reaction to man's perversion of the personal relation between him and man. As a reaction of God it originates in his holiness and expresses itself through the moral law of the universe. According to the moral order of the universe sin is followed by self-destructive consequences. The wrath of God thus works itself out in the self-destructive consequences of sin in history either of the individual's life or in the history of a nation. In its effects on the sinner it is a condition of self-destruction and death due to sin. The wrath of God is then both God's personal reaction made manifest in the sinner's life and effects of sin. (Jer. 4.4; 6.11) Though the wrath is the personal reaction of
God it should not be thought after the image of purely man's natural impulses of anger or as the petulance of God. In God's dealing with men, there is a principle of repudiation of wrong-doing and it works itself out in a moral and historical process. This principle of repudiation of sin is the negative part of God's love. Its operation follows the perversion of man's relationship with God and neighbour. This divine principle of repudiation of wrong-doing is the wrath of God. How does this divine principle of repudiation manifest itself in the life of the sinner?

B. The Wrath of God as the Divine Punishment

In both the Old and New Testaments the wrath of God and punishment are closely associated. (Josh. 7.1f.; Rom. 12.19; 13.1-7) The wrath is a divine punishment even though it is not a penalty inflicted from outside. It is a self-operating system of punishment. (Rom. 1.26-28; I Cor. 11.19) How does the divine punishment manifest itself in the sinner's life? The divine punishment for sin manifests itself in: 1. physical suffering and death, e.g. in pain and sickness; 2. the pangs of a troubled conscience; 3. alienation; 4. and finally
through the system of human law and its forms of punishment. The sinner may not experience all these forms of sin's consequences but he may experience the divine punishment in one form or another.

1. Physical Suffering and Death

One of the inevitable consequences of sin is physical suffering which may lead to death in some cases. Thus St. Paul talking about the sin of unnatural intercourse of the Roman Christians says that they received in their own persons due penalty for their sins. This penalty seems to be the physical effects of unnatural intercourse.

The story of David's adultery with Uriah's wife is another instance where sin is followed by its consequence. After David had organized the death of Uriah the prophet Nathan faced him with his sin. David acknowledged his sin frankly and Nathan assured him of God's readiness to forgive him. But he went on to say, though forgiven, justice or God's holiness demanded that the public should see clearly that there was no favouritism in kings' palaces and sin does not pay. The child of the adulterous union must die, and, in spite of the earnest prayer of David, the child died. (II Sam. 12.7-18)
The story of David illustrates very well the relationship between sin, punishment and divine forgiveness. Though David was forgiven yet because of the inevitable working of the wrath of God he still suffered for his sin. This shows that the sinner may still suffer for his sins even though those sins have been forgiven by God. Thus Mackintosh says, "...in forgiving God must condemn what He forgives."\(^1\) It may be asked whether every physical pain and death are agents through which the divine punishment expresses itself.

It is true to say that God allows the divine punishment to take the form of pain and sickness and death, yet no indissoluble connection of sin and divine penalty can be claimed in every instance of physical suffering and death. There are instances where the sinner is directly punished for his sins, e.g. the story of David's adultery with Uriah's wife. But there is an instance of physical suffering reported by St. John, which shows that it is not every physical suffering that is a divine punishment for sin. St. John said that when Jesus' disciples saw a blind man in the Temple they asked him, "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (John 9:2) The disciples' question shows that they believed that physical illness was a divine penalty for sin and that

---

God even punished children for the sins of their parents. The question further shows that that particular blind man might be suffering because of his own sin. Jesus' answer to the disciples' question undermined their belief. Jesus said to them, "It is not that this man sinned, or his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him." (John 9.3) Jesus, however, at another place made it quite clear that sin could be followed by suffering. (John 5.14)

Divine punishment for sin expresses itself in physical suffering yet it is not every physical ill that is a divine penalty. Physical suffering as such is man's share of life. It is a fact of human existence and because of that Christ's suffering could be considered as a part of his close self-identification with men. He saved man by entering into man's world of suffering. Thus Brunner says, "He suffered that He might feel the whole misery of man."1

To sum up, physical suffering in some cases is one of the categories through which God judges man's sin. But the divine penalty in the form of physical suffering does not invariably follow every misdoing. Sometimes the sinner escapes physical suffering. At other times other innocent people are punished for the misdeeds of one man. Thus the punishment for the wrong-doings of Hitler and his

1. The Mediator, p. 497.
Nazi collaborators was visited on a lot of innocent people in and outside Germany. It means that it is not every physical suffering that is a divine penalty of man's own sin. Whatever be the incidence of physical suffering it is one agent through which the divine punishment for sin manifests itself.

2. The Pangs of Conscience

The second category through which the divine reaction to sin expresses itself is the pangs of a troubled conscience, the feeling of guilt. A sinner who has a normal sense of guilt experiences the pangs of conscience after he has committed a sin or a crime. In the Old Testament some of the penitential psalms are the out-pourings of people experiencing the divine punishment as the pangs of conscience. The first six verses of Psalm 6 is a very good example. The psalmist said:

O LORD, rebuke me not in thy anger,
nor chasten me in thy wrath.
Be gracious to me, O LORD, for I am languishing;
O LORD, heal me, for my bones are troubled.
My soul is sorely troubled.
But thou, O LORD, how long?
Turn, O LORD, save my life;
deliver me for the sake of thy steadfast love.
For in death there is no remembrance of thee;
In Sheol who can give thee praise?
I am weary with moaning;
every night I flood my bed with tears;
I drench my couch with my weeping.
In this penitential psalm the psalmist poured out the pains on his heart. He pointed out clearly the relationship between the wrath of God, divine penalty and forgiveness. He was suffering psychically because of the wrath of God. In verse four he asked for God's forgiveness in spite of his suffering. 'Turn, O LORD, save my life; deliver me for the sake of thy steadfast love.' His prayer for forgiveness was not unheeded. Later on he said, 'The LORD has heard my supplication: the LORD accepts my prayer.' (v. 9) From the experience of the psalmist of God's wrath and forgiveness, it could be said that sin may be punished and forgiven at the same time. Divine punishment and forgiveness are therefore not incompatible.

It should be pointed out that the presence of the guilt feeling is not always a sign of the divine penalty for sin. Sometimes people with a hypersensitive conscience or what J. G. Mackenzie calls, "the prohibitive conscience" feel a sense of shame and an intolerable burden following some peccadillo or incident. A good illustration of this point is seen in the exaggerated sense of guilt that follows the practice of masturbation. The writer studied one such case at the Jordanburn Hospital, Edinburgh. A man, 35 years old, developed a severe sense of guilt and had to be admitted to the hospital. He had

a family and children. He said that he was feeling guilty because when he was young he masturbated and now felt that his self-esteem was lowered because of his adolescent masturbation. This man was really suffering both physically and psychically because of his feeling of guilt. The existence of the pangs of conscience in this case, however, is due to a prohibitive conscience and so could not serve as a manifestation of the divine punishment.

Sometimes the normal sense of guilt in some people, even though it has not developed into an exaggerated form yet cannot be completely relied on to serve as an agent through which the divine punishment expresses itself. Some people who have a normal sense of guilt, may commit certain sins and crimes, e.g. killing in war, murdering one's political enemy, for which they do not feel the pangs of hell. Instead of feeling guilty they rationalize their killing by saying that they are acting for their country and party or even according to the Will of God, e.g. the Crusades and the Spanish Inquisition.

In some cases a wrong object may be substituted for God and towards which the individual feels guilty. Today, in the totalitarian States, it is towards the State and the people's government that the so-called political criminals direct their guilt feelings. It is to the representative
of the State that they confess and from him that they receive forgiveness.¹ At the recent 22nd Congress of the Communist Party, last October in Moscow, it was towards the Communist Party and Krushchev that Marshal Voroshilov confessed his sin of 'anti-partyism'. The guilt feeling in this case is real, because so long as the individual believes in the moral authority of the Party and accepts its moral sanctions, his moral personality will consequently be oriented towards the Party. Thus he will feel guilty if he feels and believes that he violates the moral law of the Party or State. At the same time he could commit any crime, e.g. murdering any so-called enemy of the Party and he will not feel the pangs of conscience.

To summarize, the divine punishment is experienced in the pangs of a troubled conscience and it may precede the experience of God's gracious acceptance. In some cases the guilt feeling may prepare the sinner to seek for the divine forgiveness. In such a case it could be said that even in his wrath God is present and seeking the salvation of the sinner. Thus the psalmist said, "It is good for me that I was afflicted that I might learn thy statutes."

(Ps. 119.71)

But a caution should be exercised in interpreting any feeling of guilt and shame. In cases of people with a

¹ Paul Tillich describes very well the new orientation of the guilt feeling, in the contemporary western society, towards the State, or "the collective" as he calls it, in his book, The Courage To Be, (Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 22 Berners St. London, 1955), p. 96.
prohibitive conscience any minor infraction may cause an exaggerated sense of guilt. In such a case the troubled conscience is not the divine punishment for sin. The conscience may cease to respond to the moral demands of God and be oriented to man-made objects. Such a conscience hears the voice of man and does not know the cleansing of the soul that a sinner forgiven by God experiences.

3. Alienation

The third category through which the sinner experiences the divine punishment for sin is alienation. The spiritual punishment for sin is manifested in its effect on the sinner's personal relationship with God and neighbour. Sin alienates the sinner from God and his neighbour. The positive and creative communion which is constitutive of the sinner's essential being is cut and the experience of life is confined to the perimeter of his own ego. In this state the sinner experiences the backward flow of his life's energy. The state of estrangement may lead to a spiritual and psychic death. This is the worst consequence of sin that a sinner may suffer. Thus Mackintosh says, "All consequences of sin are minor
in comparison with this; those affecting the body scarcely count when put beside the penalty of alienation from God and neighbour.\(^1\)

Alienation as a divine punishment for sin, however, is overcome as the sinner accepts the divine forgiveness present in and offered through Jesus Christ. While the sinner is still in a state of alienation he is likely to experience the deterioration of his power to resist evil but when, as the Prodigal Son, he returns to the father's house he experiences a new release of power that will enable him to overcome the power of evil in his life. Alienation as a consequence of sin ends with the sinner's experience of God's forgiveness.

4. The Wrath of God and the Human System of Punishment

The fourth category through which the divine punishment for sin is experienced is a direct human agency, e.g. human government, law and penalty. What is the relationship between human government and law and punishment and divine penalty?

The right and original relationship between God and man is personal and based on love and faith and obedience.

---

In such a personal relationship nothing comes between God’s Personal Will and man’s trust. The relationship remains personal so long as man lives in a loving and trustful communion with God and his fellow man. But through sin man disrupts the original personal relationship with God and the divine law comes into his relationship with God the Father. Thus St. Paul says, "Law came in, to increase the trespass;" (Rom. 5.20) With the breaking up of his relationship man is now confronted by the Personal Will of God through the Law. The Law, however, is the fatherly Personal Will which touches man indirectly. It is one remove from God and is impersonal, concrete and legal. Thus Brunner says, "The more legalistic it is, the more it takes the statutory form, the less it is identical with the real will of God." The law in its statutory form also indirectly embodies the Will of God. The human system of law is in a sense an answer of God to man’s sinful nature and sin.

The Law in its statutory form is therefore a human necessity. Since men are what they are they need the statutory law and its system of legal punishment to regulate their evil activities, brute forces of hate and vindictiveness. In short, the human system of law is needed to regulate man’s aggressive, destructive and selfish impulses. Man needs the law and its system of punishment for his own good and for the good of his
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neighbour and society. The human system of law is removed from God's Personal Will yet it is an indirect expression of His Holy Will and it is given for the good of man.

The Law, however, may be considered as a tyrant because it imposes upon man obedience to its commandments and ordinances. In this form it stands as a judge over sinful man's failure to keep it and this leads to his punishment. The sinful man then experiences the wrath of God indirectly as a legal punishment for his failure to conduct his life according to God's law. The law and the human agencies that execute it are then the instruments for the expression of God's Will and wrath. It is with this understanding of the law that St. Paul in Rom. 13 enjoins obedience to the Roman government and governing authorities. The State in contemporary society could be said to be the realm of the divine law and thus of the wrath of God and through it the divine punishment is made manifest. The sinner may then experience the divine penalty for sin through the State.

A case of an Indian Christian convert illustrates this aspect of the divine punishment very well. Bishop L. Newbigin of India in one of his talks in "Lift Up Your Hearts" told a story of an Indian convert. He said that the man was sent to prison for murder and he served thirteen years of imprisonment. While he was in prison he
was converted to Christianity and afterwards was released on the ground of good conduct. On the following Sunday after he had been released he came to church and was asked to tell the congregation what God did for him while he was in prison. He stood up and came forward and instead of standing up to talk about his conversion experience he fell down on his knees and spoke humbly about his experience of God's forgiveness. Bishop Newbigin ended the story by saying that the man was really forgiven. Here is a case of a man who was really forgiven and punished by the State at the same time. The reality of his forgiveness made him accept peaceably his legal punishment. The sinner therefore may experience God's gracious acceptance and still suffer punishment under the system of human law.

The law and its system of punishment, however, are only instruments of the wrath of God when they are applied on principle, i.e. used for eradication of evil and thus for the increase of good in the world. But the law has not been always used to that end. At times it is used to protect, promote and increase evil deeds of men. In many cases it is under the cloak of the law that the Negroes are oppressed and exploited in some American States and in the Union of South Africa. Any punishment for the infringement of the law under a condition where it is deliberately used to perpetrate evil cannot be said to be a divine punishment for sin. The law is given to help man
in his sinfulness but man may also use it to cover up and increase his sinful activities.

The law has another weakness. It sets man in legal relationship with God and his neighbour. This legal relationship is not rooted in a spontaneous obedience of love. The law then serves as an external regulator of man's conduct and thus judges man's overt behaviour and so does not reach down to the springs of human conduct. It cannot command man to love. Moreover, no specific human law and its system of punishment can be said to hold good and express the mind of God at all times.

Finally, in the totalitarian States the legal institution and its executive body may be used to protect and promote the interests of the Party and of those who are in authority alone. The interest of the Party in such a situation is set above the interest of the people. For this reason those who even genuinely criticize the activities of the Party are punished. Under such conditions a caution should be exercised in interpreting the legal punishment meted to any critic of the Party as an agent of the wrath of God.

To sum up, the wrath of God is his punishment, and his punishment is what he permits sinners to inflict upon themselves.¹ The wrath of God is the condition under which sinners experience the self-destructive consequences

¹ A. Hanson, op. cit., p. 198.
of their sins. God permits this condition to exist because the moral order of existence is constituted in such a way that misdeeds are followed by suffering in its various forms. But this does not rule out the reality of divine forgiveness. Because God is both a loving and holy Father he forgives sinners and reacts to their sins at the same time. His reaction manifests itself in divine punishment. God's personal relationship with man is rooted in his love, which seeks to forgive and at the same time turns out as his wrath when man through sin has disrupted the personal communion with him. The divine forgiveness and punishment are, therefore, not incompatible. They are true to the nature of God. To be forgiven, therefore, does not necessarily mean the remission of punishment nor does divine punishment mean the absence of divine forgiveness. It is worthwhile quoting John Oman on this point. He says, "To be justified, then, is not to have the consequences of sin condoned or even obliterated, but so to be reconciled to God in spite of sin, that we can face all evil with confident assurance of final victory over it, and by God's succour transform all its consequences, whether the evil be natural or moral, the outcome of our sin, or from our necessarily fellowship with others in His family." \(^1\)

What then is the purpose of the divine punishment as

it is experienced in its different forms? The purpose of the divine punishment is both retributive and redemptive. How is the divine penalty retributive? The term 'retributive' is used of the divine punishment to express the fact that wrong-doing with its debt of guilt, by and large, tends to bring its own punishment. Because sin is evil and culpable it implies a form of reaction which expresses itself as punishment. The divine punishment is then inherent in the nature of evil and so in a sense it is an end in itself. The sinner's punishment is his sin coming home to him.

The term 'retributive' is used of the divine punishment further to mean that because of man's sinful and moral nature his personal relationship with God is so constituted that punishment for wrong-doing forms a part of it. Punishment is a necessary moral repudiation of the evil element in life. It derives its specific nature from the assumption that the sinner is a moral being, a responsible being, otherwise he could not have incurred guilt which makes him liable to punishment.

Two examples, one from the Old Testament and the other from the New Testament, illustrate the retributive nature of the divine penalty very well. When Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, committed idolatry and rebelled against the ordinances of God, the wrath of God fell upon him. His house was swept away. (I Kings 14.1-11; 15.29ff)
The nation of Israel, corrupted with Jeroboam's sin, was punished as well.

In the New Testament St. Luke reported that two robbers were hanged with Jesus Christ. (Luke 23.32-43) Primarily these robbers were punished because they were guilty. It was their guilt that brought the punishment upon them. In other words, the evilness of their crime and their moral responsibility made them liable to punishment. Their punishment, therefore, was not in any future advantage to be gained by its infliction whether for themselves or for the society. Their punishment was rather retrospective and not prospective. They were punished retributively.

The retributive character of the divine punishment, however, does not mean that it works automatically as the law of karma. The retributive feature of the divine punishment points out the fact that punishment itself has been built into the very nature of the moral order of the universe, and thus it indirectly expresses the will of God. In some cases the working of the divine penalty is remedial.

The word 'remedial' is used to refer to the redemptive aspect of the divine punishment. It refers to the effect of the divine punishment in turning sinners towards divine righteousness. (Ps. 119.71) Both physical and psychic sufferings have turned some people to God. There is an instance in the Old Testament when Israelites forsook God
and worshipped foreign gods. Because of their idolatry they were oppressed by the Philistines. They repented and confessed their sins and were saved from their enemies through the leadership of Jephthah. (Judges 10.10,16f; 11)

Another instance is the psalmist of Psalm six. He turned to God for forgiveness through the pangs of his troubled conscience.

The redemptive factor in the divine punishment, however, is only conceivable because human nature is constituted in such a way that it could respond to it. In other words, the divine punishment is remedial because man's moral character is capable of being moulded through punishment. Thus P.H. Nowell-Smith says, "pleasure and pain, reward and punishment are the rudders by which human conduct is steered, the means by which moral character is moulded; and 'moral' character is just a set of disposition that can be moulded by these means."¹ It is because of the amendability of human nature that it is true to say that divine punishment is a necessary factor in the formation of man's moral personality. In other words, the divine punishment is a part of man's personal relationship with God because man's moral character is amendable to it. Though it cannot be said that all manifestations of the divine punishment are redemptive yet some manifestations are remedial.

Can the divine punishment be vindicative of the divine law? Brunner is of the opinion that the divine punishment is meted out to safeguard the inviolability of the moral order. He says, "For punishment is the expression of the divine law and order, the inviolability of the divine order of the world."  

At another place he says, "The divine law—the world order requires that sin should receive its corresponding penalty from God." According to Brunner because of the inviolability of the divine law sin is punished. The end of punishment then is neither in the person punished nor in his personal relation with his society. He goes on to say that because the end of punishment is in the divine law, "It is not educative, paternal punishment, but the punishment of a sovereign inflicted on a rebellious subject."

There are two main objections to Brunner’s understanding of the divine punishment. No punishment can be solely justified purely on the ground of protecting the inviolability of an abstract moral law. It becomes an immoral punishment if it does so, because the divine punishment is only rational and justifiable on the ground that sin is evil, i.e. God’s nature is opposed to it and that man is a responsible being and has a moral character that can be moulded through punishment. Mackintosh is right
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when he says, "If penalty were merely the repulsion of an assault upon a useful moral system a counter-attack upon an attempted violation of beneficent convention, but one which left the evil will untouched, no result will follow but a heightening of the moral loss."¹

Secondly, it cannot be said that all sins and crimes are punished and if this is true it means that the moral order is violated after all. The divine punishment, by and large, can only be said to be an expression of the divine repudiation of wrong-doings in man's personal relationship with God. Moreover, since in some cases the divine punishment serves as a means for the moulding of the moral personality it is true to say that the divine punishment is educative.

Finally, it cannot be said that the divine punishment is "the punishment of a sovereign inflicted on a rebellious subject". The punishment is not inflicted by God, if this is so it will mean that in some cases God punishes sinners and in some cases he does not. God has created the moral order of the universe in such a way that punishment is one of its structural parts. The personal relationship is formed in such a way that sin draws its consequent penalty. The divine punishment is therefore not inflicted by God.

C. Jesus Christ and the Wrath of God.

How did Jesus Christ deliver the sinner from the wrath of God? Before this question is discussed it may be pointed out that it does not mean the same question as, How did Jesus Christ obliterate the self-destructive consequences of sin? The main argument of this chapter: God forgives the sinner and repudiates his sins as well, makes the latter question absurd. The question to be examined in this section can be expressed differently as, How did the saving work of Jesus transform the sinner's legal and work-merit relationship with God into a personal one? The discussion will be based mainly on St. Paul's classic text, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us--- for it is written, "Curse be every one who hangs on a tree". (Gal. 3.13)

This verse will be discussed under two sections:
1. 'The curse of the law'. What is the curse of the law from which Christ redeemed sinners? 2. 'Having become a curse for us--- for it is written, "Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree."

'The curse of the law' (καταρασ του νομου) It has been pointed out above that the law is indirectly related to the holy Will of God. This understanding of the law has some bearing on Paul's conception of the wrath of God. According to him the law came in because of sin. It then set up a legal and work-merit relationship with God. This
legal relation admits of no faith and spontaneous obedience of love. Through the commandments and ordinances man's failures and guilt in his attempt to live according to the law become exposed. The law then makes man incur guilt and liable to the divine punishment. The sphere of the law then becomes the sphere of the wrath of God and vice versa. Through the law man is subject to the wrath of God. The legal relationship that the law established leads the sinner to experience the wrath of God. 'The curse of the law' is then the wrath of God. The law is a curse, the wrath of God, to all who try to live by its demands and fail. The law is a curse to all sinners and so all sinners have come under the wrath of God for Jesus Christ to deliver them.¹ "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" then means that Christ saved sinners from the wrath of God.

In Paul's world a curse was believed to be a living entity and among the horrible curses was that which rested upon a criminal whose body, after execution by some mode of penal punishment, was hanged on a tree for special retribution. The Jews identified the divine retributive punishment with a curse and so it was from the retributive divine punishment that Jesus Christ delivered sinners. In what sense can it be said that Christ became a curse?

The New English Bible's translation of the part of

¹ Hanson, op. cit., p. 75.
Gal. 3.13 which says that Christ became a curse for us is better. It reads, "...by becoming for our sake an accursed thing." Christ became an accursed thing because of what he suffered. In this verse Paul does not imply that Christ turned himself into a curse, or that God treated him as a reprobate. Christ found man estranged from God; the object of God's love; yet, placed where he was, of necessity the object of God's wrath. To set man free Christ had to identify himself with all who had incurred the law's curse by disobedience. Into the darkness of man's rebellion and estrangement from God Christ had to enter. He entered the darkness of God's wrath by closely identifying himself with the sinners whom he came to save.

When he came he did not live according to the law. He lived by faith in and loving and spontaneous obedience to God. Even though he did not live according to the law yet because he came into the sphere of the law through his self-identification with sinners he also came under the curse. Suffering and death on the Cross were the prices which Christ had to pay to set men free from the law and the wrath of God. Christ became a cursed thing, i.e. he suffered and died on the Cross, not because he was a sinner and thus rightly deserved the divine punishment, but because he came to save man from a world in which suffering and death are made possible by man's sin. Through his innocent suffering and death he brought God's salvation to
sinners. How did he save the sinner then from the wrath of God?

Because Christ lived by faith in God he transcended the legal curse of the law and broke its power. By his victory he opened a new way to God, this is the way of faith and spontaneous obedience to the Will of God. It is the way of a personal communion with God. As the sinner through faith appropriates this new and living way he ceases to live according to the law. He transcends the law and now lives on the plane of a direct personal relationship with God and his fellow man. Since he ceases to live by the law through faith in the saving work of Jesus Christ he is also saved from the wrath of God.

To conclude, since God is holy and man is a moral being and has a moral character that is amendable to punishment God has so created the moral order of the universe that wrong-doing tends to bring its own punishment. Divine punishment forms an integral part of the moral order and becomes an inevitable consequence of sin and guilt. It is the inevitable self-destructive consequences that God allows sinners to inflict upon themselves. In the process of forgiveness these self-destructive consequences of sin are not obliterated. They form an organic structure of reality. In the experience of forgiveness the sinner may still have to bear the evil consequences of his sin in one form or another even though his personal
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relationship to God has been changed from estrangement to the consciousness of being graciously accepted again. This gracious acceptance is made possible through the saving work of Jesus Christ.
Chapter Six.

FORGIVENESS AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Forgiveness as a release of creative power of God in the sinner basically means a reformation of the sinner's life. His nature and life are reformed through the reformation of his thought and the realignment between his personally-held ideas about God and life. St. Paul is right on this point when he says, "Adapt yourselves no longer to the pattern of this world, but let your minds be remade and your whole nature thus transformed. Then you will be able to discern the will of God, and to know what is good, acceptable, and perfect". (Rom. 12:2. The New English Bible, New Testament.) As St. Paul indicates here, the sinner's mental life is reformed as he adapts himself to the divine pattern or reality and this divine pattern is revealed in Jesus Christ. Through this mental reformation the sinner is able to live according to the Will of God and to perform the demands and duties of his personal relations. The new reality of God revealed in Jesus Christ is then the ground of the life of forgiveness. How is the mental reformation carried out?

A. The New Being

Through the sinner's response to the new reality
creative powers for meaningful living are released. In the revelation of Jesus Christ the sinner perceives a new dimension of existence and a new self-identity. This revelation is a dimension of meaning as over against an existence which is devoid of any substantial meaning. In this revelation he sees the possibility of the realization of his unique powers and this gives him a new hope in life. Not only the forgiven sinner who derives his creative powers and meaning from his response to the new reality but the Church also as a community of forgiven individuals derives her purpose and meaning from her existence in the new reality. The transformation of both the community of believers and the individual takes place in the terms of the new reality.

The individual sinner through repentance and confession accepts his new self-identity and the new reality in the Word of God as a mental representation. He forms a mental image of the new way of life and integrates it into his mental furnishings. The image of the new reality may occupy the centre of his mental life or it may be like a small piece of brick that is added to the building of a particular aspect of the sinner's life. Whether the mental integration involves the whole or a part of the sinner's life it always necessitates a definite re-organization of the thought and feeling and conduct. This
new organization forms a unit of the sinner's mental life and is centred around the new reality.\(^1\) In the experience of the Christian the unit of mental life prepares him for a certain adaptive behaviour. Thus it is true when Brunner says, "Salvation is ... the Word of God in Christ as it speaks to us in the heart."\(^2\) As the mental representation of the new reality acquires some emotional value the individual experiences it as the directive and the integrating power of his life. He feels that he has a new centre of being.

St. Paul describes the organization of the mental unit of life in Christian experience as the formation of Christ Jesus in the sinner, or the union of the sinner with Christ. He longs very much for the Christians in Ephesus to have Christ formed in them, that is, to have units of mental life that are organized around Christ. In his letter to them he said, "My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you". (Gal. 4:19) This formation of Christ in the Christian can be very sudden and dramatic, as in St. Paul's case, but usually it is a gradual process and continues through-
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out the whole life of a Christian. Whatever nature the formation may take, when the new reality is accepted through repentance and faith a new relationship is established between God and the sinner and upon the basis of this new relationship the new being emerges. "Therefore, if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come". (11 Cor. 5:17)

1. The Marks of the New Being
   a. The Creative Power of the forgiven man

   What are some of the characteristics of the new being that is formed through the sinner's union with Christ? The forgiven sinner who is made new through forgiveness is new in the sense that psychically the old system of meaning and values has been excluded from the centre of his life's energy. A new system of meaning and values is now organizing and directing his life and conduct; and so the new being means a possession of a new source of creative power. The possession of this creative power means that the forgiven sinner will be able to carry on a creative communion with his fellow men and to create something positive and valuable in his personal relations.
b. Sense of new meaning in the reality of forgiveness

Another mark of the new being is a perception of new meaning in life. The really forgiven man discovers a new meaning in life as a whole. This new meaning may emerge from quite familiar things or a familiar aspect of life may put on a new meaning all of a sudden. Reality as a whole is seen as clothed with newness and meaning. Thus John Bunyan at the moment of his conversion discovered a well of meaning in the familiar verse of the apocrypha, "Look at the generations of old, and see, did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded". The new being means a perception of a new meaning, that is, a new orientation of life and its energies.

The perception of meaning in life changes the forgiven man's attitude towards his own life and towards his ordinary relations. The whole world, for the forgiven man, undergoes an objective change and looks fresh with meaning. This change, however, is perceived with an eye of faith and it is difficult to convince others of it. The really forgiven man sees life as a whole conceived in

meaning and thus St. Paul was able to say, "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him." (Rom. 8:28) His perception of good in everything does not mean that he was playing down the reality of evil of which he was fully aware. Because of his awareness of evil powers in the world, later on in the same chapter he said, "For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. 8:38) St. Paul's perception of goodness in everything was an act of faith. In this faith perception of life he acknowledged both the good and evil of life. Through this faith perception life is transformed into a purposeful existence. For St. Paul the new meaning of his life is the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ.

c. Joy.

The perception of meaning in what formerly looks meaningless gives the forgiven man a joyous conviction of the purposiveness of life. The joy springs from his union with a new reality, that is, from the experience of the formation of Christ in the life of the forgiven
man. Thus Paul Tillich said, "Joy is nothing else than the awareness of being fulfilled in our true being, in our personal centre".¹ The perception of meaning of life which unites the forgiven sinner at the centre of his being brings about a joy of life. Thus St. Paul in several of his letters said, "Rejoice in the Lord always, again I will say Rejoice". (Phil. 4:4). "and we rejoice in our hope of sharing the glory of God". (Rom. 5:2) "For you are our glory and joy". (1 Thes. 2:20)

The joy which the forgiven man experiences is not based on the fact that the negative element is taken out of his life. The saved man is still a mixture of good and evil. Brunner is right when, talking of the situation of the forgiven sinner, he said, "... his sin has been "covered" by God, but the roots of sin have never been eradicated"² At another place he said, "... that even in them (Christians), above all in them, there is unceasing battle going on between that which is from above and that which is from below, that even they, the saints of God, are sinners, although their sin is dead so long as they are living with Christ".³ The roots of sin are still

². op. cit., 570.
³. The Scandal of Christianity, p. 108.
in the forgiven sinner and this is rather the ground of his growth and fall in the Christian life. The joy in his life is, therefore, based on the fact that he has found a new meaning of life and he has been united at the centre of his being in spite of the continued presence of the roots of sin in him. The inner union with the new reality leads to an experience of a sense of peace and harmony even though the outside conditions of life remain the same. The inner unity does not mean that the dichotomy that characterizes life has been obliterated. The forgiven sinner still has the freedom to decide for or against God. But since his life energy is organized around a central meaning the forgiven sinner's life is better controlled and directed and his freedom in a sense has now been made captive. His freedom and organic drives are now directed by the new creative power towards responsible goals that are not determined by mere self-interests.

The organization and effective control of the contradictory elements of life can be described as the union of the opposites in man's experience of life. Though it does not mean the union of conscious and unconscious elements as Jung conceived it in the process of individuation, yet it is a union of the contradictory aspects
of mental life and of the contradictory elements in the experience of life. As the mental representation of the new reality is the centre of the new organization of life, the new reality has become the ground of this union of opposites. This union brings about an inner peace which is extended into the outward relations of the forgiven sinner. Thus at one place St. Paul said, "And let the peace of Christ rule in your heart", (Col. 3:15), and at another place he said, "If possible, so far as it depends upon you, live peaceably with all men", (Rom. 12:18)

Through the forgiven sinner's reconciliation with the new reality at the depth of his being he is now at peace with reality especially as it shows itself in personal and social relations. Peaceful relations among men are the blessings of the transformed relations that have been established between God and man through Jesus Christ. Thus St. Paul said, "For he (Jesus Christ) is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility". (Eph. 2:14).

d. Freedom

The forgiven life is also marked with a sense of freedom. This sense of freedom is both an inner and external experience. The organization of the forgiven man's life energy around a new centre of meaning and values has saved him from a purposeless employment of his life. He is no more a rudderless victim of his unintegrated psychic energies but is now freed from inner compulsion and disorganized behaviour. His inner freedom stems from the fact that he now has an all-embracing meaning that integrates his life.

The possession of an all-embracing meaning of life elevates the forgiven man above the accidentals of life. He is no longer tied up to the temporal and historical limitations of life but is now elevated into the realm of the meaningful and eternal. This is the realm of the freedom of the spirit. Thus St. Paul said, "Now the Lord is the spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom". (11 Cor. 3:17). At another place he said, "For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to the yoke of slavery". (Rom. 6:22). The possession of this freedom is due to the appropriation of the new reality into one's life and the subsequent organization of life around it. The new reality responded to through repentance and faith becomes the foundation of the forgiven man's freedom.
To summarize, the new being is the result of a new life that emerges when the sinner has entered into the transformed relationship created through Jesus Christ. This new life expresses itself as an experience of an all-embracing meaning which integrates and organizes the life of the forgiven man. The all-embracing meaning becomes the ground of inner unity and harmony of the individual's experience of peace and freedom of the spirit.

The new being, however, is realized in an earthly vessel. The individual whose sins have been forgiven still has the roots of sin in him. The human nature is potentially still human even after forgiveness. In one sense the forgiven man is still continuous with his old being and the existential contradictions of life are still in his world. But in another sense he has ceased to identify himself with his old self. His attitude to his old self and old world has changed and he now perceives his being and world in the light of the new reality and grows in an appropriation of it. Because the roots of sin are still even in the forgiven man, the possibility of relapse into the old way of life is a constant threat and sometimes he does relapse into it. For this reason the forgiven life is one of prayer, watchfulness and

1. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 245.
struggle. Thus St. Paul characterized it, "Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil... Pray at all time in the Spirit, with all prayer and supplication. To that end keep alert with all perseverance, making supplication for all the saints". (Eph. 6:10, 11, 13, 18) The new life therefore has the seed of its growth and destruction within itself.

B. The Fellowship of the Forgiven

The beginning and the nature of the new forgiven life has been examined with little reference to the community within which it expresses itself and takes shape. But no man lives and grows in isolation. The forgiven man before and after forgiveness is a member of a group and thus experiences his life within the world of his relations. Since he cannot conceive of any meaningful existence outside the web of his relations, both personal and impersonal relations, it is therefore, actually, in the personal relations with men and women who cross his path of life that the sinner experiences God's forgiveness. He experiences his forgiven life through the way

---

he responds to the demands and duties that are involved in his personal and social relations and through the kind of decisions that he makes in respect of them. For it is through these personal and social demands, and through his decisions regarding them that his transformed relationship with God expresses itself. Forgiveness, therefore, takes place within the community and the new being is born within it. The development of the new being, or the new man, that is, a substantial and genuine personality, is rooted in the community.¹ For this reason the community and the individual’s relations within it have assumed a special importance. What is the nature of this community and how does it affect the growth of the forgiven sinner?

The first community that comes to mind when forgiveness is considered as taking place in a community is the Church. Christian experience of forgiveness is usually considered as taking place within the Church as a fellowship of believers. It is true to say that the sinner meets God as a forgiving Father in the Church but in truth

¹. On this point R.G. Smith says, "Here (in the community) is the real place where man is made new. The new man is man in community with man in the strength of the given grace which meets him as tasks and responsibilities and opening freedoms in actual situations in their wholeness." (The New Man, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1936, p. 112)
it is in the personal relations with men and women who cross his path of life that he experiences God's forgiveness. God's forgiveness is proclaimed and offered by and in the Church but this forgiveness becomes real in the sinner's personal and social relations. The actualization of divine forgiveness is to be sought therefore, both within and outside the Church.

The relationships of a forgiven Christian at any time and at any one place involve groups or organizations of people both within and outside the Church. These different groupings may comprise the men's Brotherhood, Youth Fellowship and Women's Guild within the Church. Outside the Church they may comprise the local Trade Union, Labour Party, the Employers Union, or an international labour organization. Above all the forgiven Christian is related to his family and to his immediate neighbourhood. Members of these various groups may be made up of Christians and non-Christians and so he may be related to both Christians and non-Christians, to Christian and non-Christian organizations. It is out of the intricate relations of this nature that the world of relations of the forgiven man is formed. Especially in contemporary society this is the nature of his fellowship and it is within the web of these relations that he moves and experiences God's forgiveness. Though he is not saved in
virtue of them yet he is not saved outside these relations. Therefore, to be a Christian is to be fully involved in these relations as a saved and forgiven man.

Since the forgiven man is related to both Christian and non-Christian organizations his forgiven life is first and foremost a witnessing life. The new life is lived and it expresses itself as a life of witness to the saving relationship that exists between God and the forgiven sinner. The life that he lives in his personal relations witnesses to his relationship with God. In one respect, therefore, it is through witnessing that the new being evolves, and this witnessing is a witness of life as it expresses itself in all its relations. The forgiven life is a witnessing life.

1. Human Forgiveness

The individual sinner experiences God's forgiveness also through his ability to forgive others. It is in his ability to forgive others that God's forgiveness of him becomes real and effective. God's forgiveness becomes true and real as it expresses itself in his power to forgive others.

H.R. Mackintosh, however, is of the opinion that man's practice of forgiveness is an imitation of divine forgiveness and not the actualization of God's forgiveness
in the life of the sinner. He says that the forgiven sinner should deal with his neighbour as God has dealt with him. Thus the forgiveness of the sinner is one thing and then his practice of forgiveness in his relations is another. The only relationship between them is that one serves as a pattern for the other. In other words, the sinner's salvation takes place outside his personal relations. But this is not true to experience. Mackintosh himself said, "... in the Kingdom of God none can be saved in isolation." On this point Brunner said, "An isolated existence is not human, because we are created not to be isolated, self-sufficient individuals; we are created for fellowship. Therefore we can be truly human only in communion with our fellow men." The truly human being is the one who is forgiven and is thus able to carry on a creative and positive communion with God and his fellow men. The reality of God's forgiveness cannot be located outside personal and social relations. It becomes real as it expresses itself as the ability of the forgiven man to forgive others. One important characteristic of a creative and positive relationship is the

ability and the practice of forgiveness of the people involved in it. It is through this that God's forgiveness is seen and made real. Human forgiveness is not and cannot be a copy of divine forgiveness. Human forgiveness becomes the very vehicle through which divine forgiveness is experienced. The practice of forgiveness, however, means the ability to ask for forgiveness from others and to forgive others as well because there will be no real forgiveness if it is not offered and sought at the same time. Moreover, since the forgiven man can sin even after forgiveness he is always a person who asks for forgiveness and also forgives others.

The story of the unforgiving servant recorded by St. Matthew illustrates the importance of the practice of human forgiveness:

Then Peter came up and said to him, "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? As many as seven times?" Jesus said to him, "I do not say to you seven times, but seventy times seven.

"Therefore the kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who wished to settle accounts with his servants. When he began the reckoning one was brought to him who owed him ten thousand talents; and as he could not pay, his lord ordered him to be sold, with his wife and children and all that he had and payment to be made. So the servant fell on his knees, imploring him, 'Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay you everything. 'And out of pity for him the lord of that servant released him and forgave him the debt. But that same
servant, as he went out, came upon one of his fellow servants who owed him a hundred denarii; and seizing him by the throat he said, 'Pay what you owe.' So his fellow servant fell down and besought him, 'Have patience with me, and I will pay you.' He refused and went and put him in prison till he should pay the debt. When his fellow servants saw what had taken place, they were greatly distressed, and they went and reported to their lord all that had taken place. Then his lord summoned him and said to him, 'You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt because you besought me; and should not you have had mercy on your fellow servant, as I had mercy on you? And in anger his lord delivered him to the jailers, till he should pay all his debt. So also my heavenly Father will do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother from your heart!' (Matt. 18: 21-35)

This story, apart from the feudalistic pattern of relationship within which it is cast, brings out two main points. Firstly, the reality of divine forgiveness is expressed in the forgiven man's relationship to his neighbour. Secondly, divine forgiveness is not a mechanical operation which has nothing to do with a real change of life of the sinner. Divine forgiveness means a real change of heart and the ability to forgive and practice forgiveness. What does it mean to forgive others? Does it mean indifference to the wrongdoings of others and a refusal to judge them?

The unique way in which Jesus conveyed God's forgiveness to sinners is in his acceptance of them as they were. In Jesus' dealing with them they saw that they had
been accepted by God. Jesus did not demand of harlots, publicans and tax-collectors that they should first reform their characters then he would deal with them. He first established a relationship with them through love that accepts and welcomes sinners as they were. As they responded to his loving acceptance to them they entered into a new transformed relationship with God. Within this relationship they experienced the creative power of God that transformed their lives. In Jesus' practice of forgiveness then there is a respect for the personalities of sinners and thus an acceptance of them for what they were and for what they could be. This acceptance, however, is not cheap, because it is based on his knowledge and understanding of man. Thus is said about him, "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the Passover feast, many believed in his name when they saw the signs which he did; but Jesus did not trust himself to them, because he knew all men and needed no one to bear witness of man; for he knew what is man". (John 2:23-25) To be able to convey true and genuine forgiveness to others, therefore, there must be knowledge and understanding of and respect for people's personalities.

It is easier to judge and condemn wrongdoers than to know and understand them and thus accept them. Many
people are rather quick to criticize certain evils in others because they themselves are struggling with them. So through their criticism and condemnation of the same evils in others they indirectly fight the evils in themselves. This indirect and unconscious way of fighting one's own evil in others does not lend itself to the creation of a positive and creative personal relationship. Therefore to be able to establish a creative and personal relationship within which others will be accepted and thus they in turn will experience the acceptance of God through that, there must be some amount of self-knowledge.

This self-knowledge is not the same as the knowing that 'we are all sinners'. Neither does it imply sufficient head knowledge of one's powers and weakness. True self-knowledge is more than becoming aware of one's unconscious mental life. It includes this and something more. True self-knowledge comes as a result of a constant judgment of one's life in the light of the Word of God. As the Word of God revealed in Jesus Christ is the ground of the new life, the forgiven man can only grasp the
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nature of his life at any time by locating it within the context of the new reality. In other words as the forgiven life still has the seed of wrong-doing in itself, it should be constantly judged in the light of an increased and deeper understanding of the transformed relationship with God. This judgment is especially to be carried on in the way one's life expresses itself as love and hate, and as fear and aggression. It is only as the forgiven man is able to judge, with some degree of objectivity, the quality of his life within the context of a deeper understanding of God and man, that he is able to know and understand others. This kind of knowledge is a growing and deepening understanding of one's relationship to God as it expresses itself in one's personal and social relations. It is only on the basis of this knowledge that the forgiven man will be able to have a true respect for others and thus a true acceptance of them for what they are. It is this kind of acceptance that establishes the redemptive relation within which the other person feels and knows that it is God Himself who accepts him.

This acceptance of others for what they are and for what they could be, does not mean that no judgment is passed on their lives at any time or place. True acceptance can be a form of judgment that is based on true
self-knowledge and thus on true knowledge and understanding of the wrongdoer. In this kind of judgment the wrongdoer feels that it is God Himself who is judging him. True acceptance and judgment combined can lead to repentance and the experience of forgiveness.

2. Self-affirmation

In all these different acts of relatedness a unique self is presupposed for there can be no communion either with God or with one's neighbour without a self with a unique individuality. The unique individuality is in the exceptional way that a person relates himself to God and others. The possibility of any personal relation depends upon the fact that there is a difference and a unique expression of being.¹ This difference is the otherness of being of all the people who are involved in any relationship. It is because of this ontological otherness that one individual is able to relate himself to another without feeling that he is dealing with himself in the other person. So in the meeting of two people who relate themselves to each other on the basis of their true being

something quite different and new emerges. When the individual on the basis of his own unique self meets or responds to God he becomes a new person because in any positive and personal relationship something new is born in the person who truly relates himself.

In this positive relatedness the other person's sense of self-identity is not submerged in the other person. He is still aware of his own individual identity. It is this consciousness that sharpens his sense of responsibility. This awareness of one's personal and unique individuality and acting according to it, is the affirmation of one's self. Thus it is through this self-affirmation that the new being takes its shape and grows.

Usually a person's sense of responsibility becomes dull when he finds himself in the crowd where his sense of self-identity is submerged. Because of this it is the mob as un-identified individuals that destroys public property and does the lynching. It is not only in the mob that he is led to do wrong, but also he is more likely to do wrong when he finds himself in a situation where he cannot affirm his unique self-identity. So one of the ways in which the forgiven man experiences his forgiveness is in the affirmation of himself in his personal and social relations. He has really lost his soul if
he cannot identify himself as a unique son of God in his personal and social relations.

The structure of contemporary society, however, has made it very hard for the individual to affirm himself as a unique son of God. He has been alienated from his true self and since he is not aware of this he cannot affirm himself. This change in his experience of himself has been precipitated by the industrial revolution. This revolution has introduced a change in the traditional forms of economic and social relationships. The rise of giant corporations has threatened his economic security. As he cannot compete alone with the different forms of economic organizations of contemporary society he has to become a team-mate in a labour union, or he has to become a member of a political party in order to compete better. Consequently on the industrial as well as political front there has been amassing of people with no deep mutual interests except the desire to survive in the competitive existence.

The desire of the individual to survive in contemporary society has pressured him into a great deal of overconformity. In these pressure groups he is governed by public opinion and strives to adjust himself according to the opinions of others around him. In many cases he
has no convictions of his own and he shapes his personality according to the picture that his pressure groups put up for him. The overconformed individual, the robot man, in contemporary society, has been alienated from his true self. He does not know who he really is and is out of touch with his genuine self. Self-affirmation is not within the experience of the overconformed man.¹

Erich Fromm contends in all his books that a good deal of this overconformed personality is carried into all personal and social relations in contemporary society. Many human relations today are governed by superficial friendliness and behind this superficial friendliness there is indifference, distance and sometimes mutual distrust. He points out that in many cases friends are held together not by the bond of love but by selfishness and the desire to use one another.

T.S. Eliot in his book, The Cocktail Party, has very well characterized the selfish desire in contemporary society and the way it expresses itself in the desire of people to use one another instead of to be related to them in true love. He brings out this selfish desire to use others in the relationship between Celia and Peter who are

¹. Erich Fromm, The Sane Society, pp. 78-177.
two of the characters in the book.

For a long time Peter and Celia have been friends and they think that they are really in love with each other. After the break-up of their friendship Celia has gone to see a psychiatrist and it is there and then that she discovers that they have not really known each other and so they have not been really in love and they do not even know themselves. She confesses to the psychiatrist in these words:

And then I found we were only strangers
And that there had been neither giving nor taking
But that we had merely made use of each other
Each for his purpose. That's horrible. Can we only love something created by our own imagination?

Are we all in fact unloving and unlovable?
Then one is alone, and if one is alone
Then lover and beloved are equally unreal
And the dreamer is no more real than his dreams¹

In this kind of superficial and conventional relationship, the sense of sin disappears. Evil is done all
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right in it but it is not against God and is considered as a "bad form". An action becomes a bad form when the people one knows disapprove of it. If the action is approved of and yet one feels a sense of guilt about it then one must have some mental kinks. In a situation of this sort the individual's life is shaped by what his people approve and disapprove of. He does not know who he really is and with this loss of a true sense of the self goes the loss of a sense of sin, and of the experience of divine forgiveness. The forgiven life, therefore, expresses itself through the forgiven man's affirmation of his unique self in all his relations.

3. Forgiveness and Love

Finally what is the relationship between divine forgiveness and love as an expression of the Christian life? Can the reality of forgiveness be experienced through the power of love? It has been pointed out above that the individual experiences his forgiveness as an acceptance of God through his acceptance by others. It is this acceptance that leads the forgiven man to accept himself and others. His experience of rejection by God and others

has come to an end. It is the experience of rejection that causes him to hate life, his neighbours through whom he experiences the rejection of God, and also hate himself. Forgiveness is the acceptance of one by God and then through this divine acceptance one is able to accept others and himself. This experience of acceptance produces love in the forgiven man. Through forgiveness the forgiven man is now able to love again the object of his rejection and hate. Through love he has been reconciled to God, reconciled to others and to himself. Forgiveness creates love in the forgiven and this love is the ground of reconciliation. It is the love born of forgiveness that is the bond of union between two people who have been alienated from each other. Dietrich Bonhoeffer is right when he says, "Love is the reconciliation of men with God in Jesus Christ. The disunion of men with God, with other men, with the world and with themselves, is at an end".¹

St. Luke in his gospel recorded an incident in the house of Simon the Pharisee which illustrates very well the relation between forgiveness and love. The whole incident is worth reproducing here so as to bring out its

---

One of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat at table. And behold, a woman of the city, who was a sinner, when she learned that he was sitting at table in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster flask of ointment, and standing behind him at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet, with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what sort of woman this is who is touching him, for she is a sinner". And Jesus answering said to him, "Simon, I have something to say to you". And he answered, "What is it, Teacher?" "A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. When they could not pay, he forgave them both. Now which of them will love him more?" Simon answered, "The one, I suppose, to whom he forgave more." And he said to him, "You have judged rightly." Then turning toward the woman he said to Simon, "Do you see this woman? I entered your house, you gave me no water for my feet, but she has wet my feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair. You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not ceased to kiss my feet. You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much; but he who is forgiven little, loves little". And he said to her, "Your sins are forgiven." (Luk. 7:36-48)

It is clear from that story that it is not the love of the woman that brings her forgiveness. The new translation of verse 47 in "The New English Bible" brings out this point clearly. Verse 47 reads, "And so, I tell you, her great love proves that her many sins have been for-
given, where little has been forgiven, little love is shown". It is the experience of forgiveness that creates the great love of the woman. The forgiven man therefore experiences the reality of his forgiveness as a power of love released in his life. Forgiveness opens up the power of love and through the power of this love the forgiven man is united with life and expresses his own life through it.

4. Love as response and respect

How does this love express itself in the life of the forgiven man? To be able to examine the expression of this love a special aspect of God's love must be discussed first. This aspect of God's love is His love as response.

In discussing God's love Brunner points out that the main characteristic about God's love is that it is unmotivated or uncaused.¹ What Brunner means by this is that it is not the worth or any value in man that motivates God to love him. Therefore it is rather by loving that God confers value upon man. It is true to say that God's love is not caused by any worth in man and that it is a love that gives value to the beloved and that it does not get any value from loving. But if it is not man's worth that initiates God's love then it must be something else.

in man. This something Brunner himself calls the 'emptiness' of man. God's love is then initiated by the emptiness of man and it is a response to man's need situation. In this sense God's love can be said to be motivated by the emptiness of man but to say this does not in anyway mean that God is forced to love something that is good in man. Love does not exist in a vacuum and it needs an object of love to be meaningful and real. The object of God's love is man who has his emptiness to be filled. The love of God is therefore a response to man's emptiness.

God's love as response does not mean that it is a responsibility which to some people means duty, or something imposed upon one from outside. Another way of describing God's love is to say that it is an answer to man's emptiness. The content of this response is the new life that is offered in Jesus Christ to the forgiven man. Thus St. John said, "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his Son into the world, so that we might live through him." (I John 4:9) At another place he said, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whosoever believes in him should not
perish but have eternal life" (John 3:16) Jesus Christ through whom this love is conveyed said, "I have come that man may have life, and may have it in all its fullness" (John 10:10)

It has been indicated above that this new life which is the content of God's love as response becomes real through forgiveness. The love of God then becomes the initiating factor and the creator of the new life, which becomes real as God responds to man's emptiness. The love of God then cannot be separated from the new life of the forgiven man. The new life in a sense is an expression of the love of God in and through the individual. It cannot express itself effectively in any other way but in love. To live, for the forgiven man, is to love. Thus St. John said, "He who does not love remains in death". (I John 3:14) The love of a forgiven man is not a thing apart and outside him and then motivating him to do deeds of love. Love is the very expression of his life. To say this does not mean that love psychologically cannot be described as an attitude. Even if love is described as an attitude it is only through the attitude of love that the individual gives a full expression to his life. He cannot do this through the attitude of hate or by a display of aggression.
The expression of the individual's life, however, takes place in his personal and social relations. What makes then the expression of it an expression of love for others? One of the ways his life is expressed as love for others is when it is expressed as respect for them. To respect a person is to be able to see him as he is and to treat him on the basis of his unique individuality. To respect another person is to relate oneself to him on the basis of the recognition of his unique individuality. In this kind of relationship the other person is allowed to grow and develop as he is capable. The other person is loved not as an object for one's use but as an end in himself. To express life as respect for others therefore eliminates all selfish use of them and to love them for their own sake.¹

Another way by which the expressing of life becomes love is when life is lived as a response to the lives of others. As the love of God is expressed in a personal and positive and living relationship and becomes concrete in responding to the need situation of man so the love of the forgiven man becomes real as he expresses his life as

¹. Fromm, The Art of Loving, p. 28.
a response to the needs of others who cross the path of his life. His love for his brother therefore is the expression of his life as a response to the life and need of his brother. But to respond effectively to the life and need of another person needs knowledge and understanding of him.\(^1\) True love therefore is not easy and cheap and it demands all of man's life. It is a love of heart, mind and strength. It is only through this kind of response that the loved person feels that it is God Himself who is responding to his life and needs. To relate oneself responsively to another person is to love him in deed.

The story of the Good Samaritan recorded by St. Luke is a very good example of love as response. (Luke 10: 25-37). Among the three people who came upon the man who fell among robbers, it was only the Samaritan who responded to the need of the wounded man in that particular situation. So it was he who loved the wounded man. It was in his response to the need of the wounded man that his love became real and effective.

Conclusion

To conclude, forgiveness creates love in the life of the forgiven man and it is through his power of love that he experiences the reality of his forgiveness. His new life becomes an expression of love and as this new life is carried on in personal relations the love of the forgiven man becomes real within the context of personal relations. Within this context his love expresses itself firstly, as respect for the unique individualities of others and as a willingness to allow them to grow and unfold along their own lines, and secondly, as a response to the life and needs of others. Through love therefore he is united with others at the depth of their being. The forgiven man therefore experiences the reality of his forgiveness as the power of love working in his life and uniting him with others in their innermost being.
CONCLUSION

The right way to the understanding of forgiveness is not to conceive it in terms of an abstract Law of God and punishment for its violation, but rather to conceive it within the context of human existence and its relation to the Will of God. Since man's personal and social relations constitute his personal existence forgiveness is a relational concept and deals with man's divine relationship as it is incarnated in personal relations on the human level. The specific problem it deals with in the personal relationship is man's failure to relate himself to life and others according to the Will of God. This failure affects the sinner's relations and these sin-disrupted relations impede a full realization of the sinner's life. Forgiveness in this respect aims at saving the sinner's life. Man's failure in his personal relations, however, is occasioned by his nature and freedom as they encounter the Will of God within the sinner's world of relations.

The nature of man, which is the occasion for his failure, has creative-destructive possibilities. These possibilities are conflicting and contrasting and so there is no clear-cut plan laid out for their use. Man has to decide as to how to use them. He can create or destroy through them. This creates a tension in man's experience
of his nature and existence. This ambiguity is inherent in the reality of human nature and existence and has made man basically a decision-making being. He always has the double possibility of making either the right or the wrong decision, either for God or against God. Man's failure in his personal relations is therefore a necessity, i.e. it is made possible by his nature, and it is a responsibility, i.e. it is the result of his own decision.

Man's decision, however, is not made in a vacuum. It is always made with a reference to a certain frame and this frame may be what is ultimate in meaning for him, or it may be himself, or it may be his country, family or love of humanity. Whatever man's frame of reference may be, his ambiguous nature and existence have made him capable of relating himself and his actions to some frame. It is this capacity that has made it possible for man to respond to the Will of God or to the suggestions of the devil.

Man has then the right nature that he needs to be a son of God or a son of the devil, to be a spiritual personality or to be the incarnation of the devil on earth. Human nature and existence as they are known and
experienced are, therefore, not a result of a fall or are they left-overs from a lost and once-perfect nature and existence, and they are not a punishment for man's sin of a misty antiquity. God has given man the nature and existence that he needs to rise or fall. The conflicts and tensions and contradictions are all inherent in the reality of human life and nature and they should be accepted and taken more seriously. To think that man once upon a time had an existence devoid of creative conflicts and tension and contradictions and so now he should go back to them is to escape from the baffling nature of reality. The inherent contradiction of human nature, e.g. between love and hate, and the tension it causes rather offer man permanent and profound incentive towards a continual inward growth of personality and never-ending challenges for the improvement of human existence. The goal of man's life is not a rejection or annihilation of his destructive or animal nature, but to secure an existence in which he can live truly with himself and others both as a part of nature and as a spiritual personality at the same time. In other words, the goal of his life is wholeness even as God is whole.

This kind of existence needs an all-embracing meaning that will take up the conflicting and contrasting natures
of man and aspects of life into itself and thus gives man 
a sense of unity and harmony in his experience of life 
and himself. The Christian finds this transcendental 
frame of reference in God and in his Word. To him the 
Word of God is the very foundation of his life and the 
unity and harmony in his experience of his nature and 
existence.

The Christian's basic transcendental relation is 
with the Word of God. It is the Word of God that 
confronts him as demands and claims, as duties and stan-
dards in the issues of his personal and social relations. 
It is here that he has to act either in conformity with 
or against the Will of God. The Christian's failure 
is not to be understood only in terms of the Will of God 
but specially as a failure to conduct the issues of his 
personal and social relations according to the Will of 
God. The essence of his failure, sin, is to be under-
stood within the frame of his personal relations and 
consequently forgiveness of sin is to be understood in 
terms of these relations.

The objectives of forgiveness should be: 1. To 
transform the sinner's personal and social relations so 
that he will be able to respond rightly to the demands of 
God which confront him in the issues of his personal
relations. 2. To transform the sinner so that he will have the power to express himself truly as a part of nature without being beastly and as a spiritual personality without hating his animal nature and suppressing any legitimate expression of his organic drives.

Forgiveness is first and foremost a renewal or transformation of a personal relation between God and man, which, however, actualizes itself in the renewal of personal and social relations on human level. This transformation starts with the in-spite-of attitude of the Word of God to the sinner as it is mediated through the world of the sinner's relations, i.e. through the community, friends, relatives and through men and women who cross the sinner's path of life. Through this attitude the sinner is treated and thought of not in terms of his innate wrongness and actual wrong-doings, but only in terms of all the good and creative powers in him. A good example of this kind of treatment is found in the way Jesus treated the woman caught in adultery. The sinner is appealed to, through this kind of treatment, in terms of his higher self and this appeal is based on man's fundamental urge towards change. Through his acceptance by people involved in his world of relations the sinner feels that he is accepted by God himself.
The sinner is not only presented with a picture of the best that is in him, he is also confronted with a picture of his negative identity in the Word of God. These two pictures judge his old life and undermine his old pattern of relations, his old loyalties and beliefs and his old sense of inner identity. At this point the Word of God penetrates the sinner's inner emotions and causes the death of the old man. "For the Word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart". (Heb. 4:12). The Word of God pulls down the old life and offers a new one in its stead. The role of Jesus Christ as the Word made flesh is then a judge of the old life and the conveyor of the new life, in other words, he is the means whereby the transformed relationship is established.

The sinner's inner emotions and sense of inner identity are reached through his existential guilt. His existential guilt makes him vulnerable to his own limitations and unfulfilled potentials and the picture of his negative identity is presented to him through it. It is through his existential guilt that the sinner is brought to the point of repentance and confession. The
development of a normal sense of guilt is therefore a prerequisite for a genuine experience of forgiveness.

When the sinner is reached with the Word of God through his fundamental impulse towards change and existential guilt, he responds with repentance and confession. Through repentance and confession he inwardly and publicly gives up the old way of life and merges himself with his positive self-identity and new life revealed to him in the Word of God. At this point he feels a cleansing of his guilty conscience and feels that the barrier of his evil past between him and God has been removed and finds himself in a new relationship with God. The transformation of the sin-disrupted relationship is completed with the sinner's act of repentance and confession. The renewal of the relationship is therefore not effected either from God-ward alone or from man-ward alone, but from the working together of the grace of God and man's response. In other words, forgiveness has to be offered and accepted before it becomes real and effective. Jesus' work of redemption and its mediation through people becomes a constitutive reality of the sinner's life through his response of repentance and confession to the Word of God.

This response means the sinner opening himself to and welcoming his new self-identity and new pattern of
relations. This open acceptance of the Word of God means a reformation of the sinner's life which is achieved through the reformation of his thought and the realignment of his personal emotions and personally-held ideas about reality. The sinner's mental life becomes organized around the Word of God or Jesus Christ as the Word made flesh. The sinner is now united with Christ and this mental organization influences his life as a whole or only in its expression in a particular area of life. Forgiveness in this sense is a method of thought reform in particular and a reformation of the sinner's life in general. It is this reformation of the sinner's thought that changes and directs his outward expressions of life. St. Paul is wonderfully right when he says to the Romans "Adapt yourselves no longer to the pattern of this present world, but let your minds be remade and your whole nature thus transformed. Then you will be able to discern the Will of God, and to know what is good, acceptable, and perfect". (Rom. 12:2). The integrity of the central nervous system is therefore specially important for the realization of the sinner's thought reform.

The reorganization of the mental life opens up a new creative power in the life of the sinner. It lifts up his life to a new level of existence and brings him back
into the stream of creative living. It enables him to live according to the Will of God in his personal relations. This creative power is the source of the sinner's ability to conform his life to the Will of God. In other words, the sinner is justified now and in the future on the basis of the creative and sustaining power of God which is released in his life.

The sinner's creative power expresses itself in the way he relates himself to life, to his community and to men and women who cross his path of life. His whole life is changed on the basis of this creative power. It expresses itself as the sinner's ability to love and forgive others and to affirm himself as a unique son of God in his personal relations.

It is then through the sinner's experience of forgiveness that he knows that he is forgiven by God and through the creative way that the sinner orders his relational affairs that others know of the reality of his divine forgiveness. The sinner then is not saved first and then commanded to do good works, i.e. commanded to respond creatively to the demands and duties of his personal and social relations. His salvation becomes actualized through his positive response to these demands and duties, though he is not saved by virtue of them yet
he is not saved outside them. The Christian's life is then truly lived in his personal and social relations, in his community and in the world.

Finally forgiveness of sin does not mean the replacement of the sinner's creative-destructive nature. The roots of sin are still in him. His old pattern of life is only buried in the unconscious and will reappear whenever the power of the new life is weakened. There is always room for growth in the forgiven life and it grows in virtue of its constant struggle with the negative conditions of life and factors of human nature. The forgiven man needs a constant reinforcement of his life through worship and prayer and through a deepening insight into the Word of God and human nature. His consolation in this struggle is that he has the creative and sustaining power of God on his side.
Appendix A

C.G. Jung on Forgiveness

On April 23rd, 1960, the writer of this thesis interviewed C.G. Jung, the well known Swiss psychiatrist, at his home in Kusnach-Zurich. This interview is tape-recorded and it is reproduced here. The purpose of the interview is to determine the views of Jung on the reality of forgiveness in human experience which is the subject of this thesis. The works of C.G. Jung and Erich Fromm, the American psychoanalyst have formed the basis of the psychological aspect of this examination of the reality of forgiveness in life.

The Writer: "Would you say that the shadow is the cause of evil in man?

Jung: "Well, you see, my concept of the shadow is a consummative term. I took it from Nietzsche's book, The Wanderer and the Shadow. That is, of course, man and his dark side which he does not want to see. The shadow, the side which he does not want to see is a typical phenomenon in our civilization. It was formed when man began to develop consciousness.

"You see, consciousness is a choice of things, a selection. It is not everything of the whole self. For instance, you see certain things, then your
consciousness retains certain things that you have picked out from what you have seen. For instance, take a man, a tailor. He walks through the town, and when asked, 'What have you seen?' He would reply, 'Oh I have seen that women are very elegant and their frocks are chiefly made on models from Paris'. These things are interesting to him. They form his consciousness at that moment.

"Then, take another man. He is a professor of the history of fine arts. After he has gone through the town and you ask him, 'What have you seen?' He would reply, 'Oh, you have a famous Gothic Church and I notice that there is another romanesque type of church presumably of the 12th century'. He has seen nothing of the frocks, but the tailor has seen the frocks. The tailor on the other hand has seen no church buildings. He has seen only the things that he has picked up. A butcher would have seen all the butcher-shops, but he has seen nothing else.

"And so our consciousness is selective. It picks up things and leaves odd things in the shadow. These odd things remain unconscious. You see, the professor of the history of fine arts has walked along the same street as the tailor. Both have seen the same things, the same buildings. But when you
ask the tailor, 'Have you noticed this beautiful Gothic cathedral?' He would say, 'Well, I haven't seen it at all'. But he saw the lady in an elegant frock. Likewise, the professor of the history of fine arts is not aware of the hose of the ladies, and the tailor too is not aware of cathedrals and other interesting historical buildings. And so the two people are miles apart.

"As the tailor sees only the frocks, we see those things we have picked upon. For instance, a philosopher might have picked upon philosophy and he knows nothing about biology, he knows nothing of theology, he knows nothing of astronomy. He knows only his philosophy and that is all. And so all the rest are in the shadow.

"This is the way we know of ourselves. For instance, we have an idea what we are. Then when I ask you, 'Do you know yourself?' You reply, 'Yes, of course, I am next to myself and I know myself'.

'Well, I reply, 'Tremendous illusion! You don't know yourself. You know what you pick of yourself'. So as a rule we are not aware of certain disagreeable parts of ourselves, that is things that are painful to us, things we dislike, or that we do not particu-
larly appreciate. We prefer to forget them. Many people have certain mannerisms. They do not know them. When you ask them, "Why do you make such funny grimaces?" He would say, "I have no grimaces." Then I reply, "I see them, but you don't see them." You see, he does not pick upon these grimaces, he does not select them to form a part of his consciousness. They are in the shadow.

Certain people go about and think that they are fine people. They are honest and everything desirable. They do not know that they are also very disagreeable people, that they are dishonest, liars and cheats. They do not know these because they are in their shadows. For instance, I have a friend who is a professor. He talks of his absolute reliability and honesty. Later I heard that he was caught lying. So what? What do you make of this?

The Writer: "Well, theologically I would say that he has sinned. Lying is sin."

Jung: "When it is seen from a theological point of view perhaps you can say this, but when you speak from the point of view of a natural scientist, which is my point of view, you cannot say this. My point of view is based on facts. You must always stick to facts. This professor believes that he is an honest man, and
that he speaks the truth always and nothing but the truth. Then he is caught lying. He does not know that he can lie. He is unconscious of it.

"You see, all things in us which we are not conscious of make a personality of themselves, and that personality is called "the shadow". We call the dark and queer part of man the shadow. The shadow, however, is not always made up of bad things. There are some people for instance, who see all their faults, all their misgivings, all their inferiorities but they are not aware of the good qualities that they have. They are not aware of their good traits. So these people also have a shadow that consists of nothing but good things.

"Someone may say to you, 'You know, I committed sin'. Then I ask him, 'What have you done'? Then he tells me a story. And I ask him, 'Do you consider that as a sin?' He may reply, 'Well, I don't know, let me think first'. I ask him again, 'Do you consider that as a sin, and by what reason?' He finally comes to the conclusion that he does not consider that as sin at all. Now what? What do you make of this? And so his sin is not a sin. For instance, the law punishes a man for an outrage he has committed. If
he can prove that he did not know that it was an outrage, then he is not punished, because he cannot be punished for a law of which he is ignorant. But in the Church a man is forgiven for a sin of which he is ignorant, yet he has committed it. Sin then is a judgment *apres le coup*, that means after the fact. Sin is not sin if there is no consciousness of sinning.

"When we speak as biologists, we speak of sin in a figurative sense. We say that a man has committed a sin against his body. By this we mean that if a man does not know that he has a tendency towards diabetes, and then he eats sugar and bread and everything, and as a result he almost dies. This is sin against his body. It is a suicidal act for a diabetic to eat sugar. No law will punish him for his ignorance. Yet we say, biologically speaking, that this is sin. Our sin is unconsciousness. You see, when a man is not conscious that he is doing something against nature, then he is a sinner. We have to describe it figuratively and we do not mean it morally. Sin is a misfortune. And this understanding is different from the theological point of view."
"You see, nature does not forgive, and so we have no concept of forgiveness. That is an entirely human consideration. I can forgive myself for doing something against myself. I can forgive another person. But it is all a lack of judgment in man. If you believe, say, in a Grecian god, then along with this belief goes other beliefs that to do such and such is sinful, or wrong. But it is all a lack of judgment in man. But has God made a law for diabetic people that they should not eat sugar and bread and carbohydrates? Yet there is such a law, and it is a crime to go against it. For instance, an educated mother does not know that her drinking water is infested. Then she gives it to her children and they become sick of gastric fever. Now what is the sin of the mother? Theologically, there is no sin at all, and legally there is no sin. Unconsciousness in theology and in law is no sin. But I say you are very sinful, because you are unconscious of what you are doing, and it is your duty to know that drinking water can be infested. And so you would know that this water is not good for your children, but because of your
"unconsciousness" you have killed your children.
And so for us sin is unconsciousness.¹

The Writer: "How then would you describe an act of
murder, robbery or marital infidelity? Theologically
these are sinful acts.

Jung: "No, I would not say that. I would say how unfor-
tunate that such a thing happens. Take the case of
adultery, or murder, I would ask, 'How did it happen
that such and such a person committed a murder?
What are the circumstances?' If I learn that he has
been attacked and that his attacker was killed by
him, then I would not consider that as sin. We kill
a man who attacks us in self-defence.

The Writer: "What about the unfaithful husband?
Jung: "I will be very careful in inquiring into the cir-
cumstances which lead to the act of unfaithfulness.
You see, in this case if I would speak of adultery,
I would say to his wife who complains, if any-body

¹. Jung is using the word "unconsciousness" in two
senses. He first uses it in connection with the
shadow. In this sense "unconsciousness" is made
up of memory-materials that have been pushed aside
from the centre of the field of consciousness be-
cause they are disagreeable. Jung does not regard
"unconsciousness" in this sense as sin.
Jung next uses "unconsciousness" to mean ignor-
ance or lack of knowledge of how things behave in
nature. The lack of knowledge of the rules of
good physical health, according to Jung, will be
sin. This is a figurative use of the term sin.
Jung has not yet come to grips with the theological
understanding of the word, sin.
has committed adultery then it is you. You have investiga
ted your husband into doing it by your own be-
haviour. You have behaved in such a way that your husband could not do anything else.

"It all depends upon the circumstance. I have been a psychiatrist and because of this I would be very careful to weigh the circumstances. You know, one must be in the picture to know what the situation actually is. You must know the whole psychological situation. Then you can say that the husband is surely no good, he is irresponsible, or you may come to a contrary conclusion that the wife is no good.

The Writer: "In your book, The Undiscovered Self, you said that man is a 'potential criminal'. Would you say then that man is by nature sinful?

Jung: "You see, that is quite so. Man, considered as a conscious being is quite harmless, because he has a very harmless idea of himself. But if you consider him as a historical fact, a biological fact and that he has a long history behind him then it is entirely a different case. Man then is the most horrible beast you can imagine. He is a meat-eating monkey.

That is what he is. He is an anthropoid, and for ten million years we have been colicpocus.

The Writer: "Is this sinful nature one with man?"

Jung: "Oh, quite. And it will stay with him as his body stays with him. Man's criminal nature will stick with him.

The Writer: "But in Christianity we believe that Christ has taken away our sins."

Jung: "You see, I cannot see how he has taken away our sin. No sin has been taken away for me. I don't understand it. I have a thorough Christian training. But still I have never understood how Christ has taken away our sin because we still have it. We are full of it. I cannot see how Christ has taken away our sin. I just do not understand it and no theologian is able to explain it to me."

---

1. Jung is a son of a Reformed Church minister.

2. When Jung says that he cannot understand how Christ has taken away our sin, it is not so much a lack of intellectual understanding as a lack of sufficient evidence to justify the assertion. Here Jung is speaking as a scientist. According to him the statement of belief that Christ has taken away our sin has not been proved simply because of the fact that there is still sin in the world.

The assertion, Christ has taken away our sin, is true in one sense and in another sense is oversimplification of the whole problem of redemption. As this thesis has pointed out, some individuals have been freed from the sinful way of life through the power of God in Jesus Christ. But even these people remain sinners so long as the roots of sin are still in them. Then there are a good number of people who have not responded to the revelation of God in Christ and even some of those who have responded to it have given up again. And so it is true to say that there is sin still in the world and it is also
Even if I admit that Christ has taken away my sin, I do not see it all. Because I don't feel redeemed from my kind of sin. I still see them everyday, right before my eyes. I can understand it symbolically, but not concretely. I can see it symbolically but that is what the theologian cannot see.

The Writer: "What do you mean that you can see it symbolically?

Jung: "That is if I take Christ to be 'the way' (Christ says of himself that he is 'the way'), then he represents a picture of a human being that has found a way, an attitude by which one can overcome the bad consequences of a bad past. I know that I am blood-thirsty and half animal. But I can master this nature through a certain psychological development. This is the hope that Christ personifies for me. The hope is that we get away from our historical past, our guilt, and from the blood-thirsty beasts that we are."

true to say that there is salvation in the world through Jesus Christ for all who will sincerely accept him.

1. Jung does not say specifically how man gets free from his evil historical past (guilt) and from his criminal nature. If pressed on this point Jung would use his method of individuation as the means of this salvation. Jung pre-scribes the method of individuation as a means
But, you see, these thoughts that I have from the psychological side are not popular with the theologians, and they despise me and think that I am a devil, of an atheist. God knows what! I am most unpopular with them.¹

The Writer: "How then do you understand divine forgiveness?

Jung: "Forgiveness is an anthropomorphic idea and could be predicated of a revengeful God.² Forgiveness can be carried on between man and man but not between God and man. Man is man. God has made him a blood-thirsty beast and when man behaves as a blood-thirsty beast, should he ask for forgiveness from God who has made such a clay pot."³

of gaining a new dynamic centre which he calls the Self. This new centre is found as the patient is able to assimilate his unconscious materials into his personality structure. The new self is the union of the individual's conscious and unconscious materials. The method of individuation is only good and safe for some people and so cannot be accepted as a means of salvation of everyone.

1. This is the end of the part of the interview that is recorded on tape. What follows after this is based on notes taken by the writer.

2. This popular understanding of divine forgiveness has been discussed above p.p. 155-157.

3. Jung has been looking only at the bad side of man. To him man is a blood-thirsty beast, a clay pot, a potential criminal. This is rather a gloomy view of man. Jung has overlooked the spiritual nature of man. It is only by taking the good and evil together in man that a true picture can be drawn of man. Human nature is neither intrinsically good nor intrinsically evil, but the possibilities for doing good as well as evil are in man.
As God has made man as he is, there is no point in sacrificing his Son to mitigate his wrath. God is responsible for making the clay pot.

The Writer: "What then is God?

Jung: "The existence of God cannot be proved by man. God is a power that man becomes aware of in addition to his awareness of his unconscious. God as a power is both outside and inside man and influences man through the unconscious, that is through dreams. The power of God grips the individual and the individual describes the numinous power that grips him as God. The gripping moment is Kairos. This power is in nature. You see it in nature and it cannot be explained in terms of nature. It is beyond nature and yet in it. When you are gripped by this power you are led where you do not want to go, because this power is stronger than oneself. The gripping power makes people afraid of God.

Love and hate can be a power that grips you and in this sense love or hate becomes your God".

---

1. The type of theory of atonement that Jung is alluding to here is the Anselmic theory. In the Anselmic theory of atonement Christ is held to have done something to God: either he discharged a debt, paid a penalty, performed an act of obedience, made a confession or a sacrifice by means of which he procured forgiveness for man. One objection to this theory is that the New Testament represents the atonement as a movement from God to man and not from man through Jesus Christ to God. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son ..." John 3:16. The second objection to Jung's interpretation of the death of Jesus Christ is that Jesus did not die so that the wrath of God might be mitigated. Jesus' death was a consummation of his forgiving mission.
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