TOWARD DEFINING CHRISTIAN ETHICS:

An Evaluation of Contrasting Views

Daniel R. Heimbach, Ph.D.
Professor of Christian Ethics
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

I know of no evangelical scholar today who questions accepting Christian ethics as a valid field of study. Neither do I know any evangelical scholar today who is not also sure he or she knows what Christian ethics means. But, while evangelicals all accept Christian ethics as a valid discipline, we are far from united on what we think it means. This is not good and as James says in the Bible, "My brethren, these things ought not so to be" (Jas 3:10, KJV). While evangelicals all embrace Christian ethics, we have no common understanding and hold many incompatible views, not just on the end result, but on what we are doing in the first place.

This is in a way understandable because evangelical failure to embrace a single view of Christian ethics accords, not only with the cultural milieu, but also with the fact that no consensus exists among scholars in the field at large, which comprise a body many of whom do not even claim to be Christian. Stanley Hauerwas observes there is among scholars in the field "no consensus about what ethics is or how it should be done."[1] But while non-Christian scholars and those who deny the supernatural can be excused for having trouble understanding what Christian ethics means, this cannot be said for evangelicals. For, as Hauerwas also observes, lack of consensus on what Christian ethics means connects with the way people have become "less and less clear (on) . . . what it 'means' to be Christian."[2] But surely evangelicals are not confused about that. Indeed agreeing on

what it means to be "Christian" is the very thing by which we define ourselves as "evangelical." And since we agree on that, we have no excuse for not having a common understanding of what Christian ethics means as well.

Of all people, evangelicals should know of what moral life consists. We of all people should know how God distinguishes right from wrong. We of all people should know the moral significance of living life in, through, and for our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. And even if we differ on some details, we should at least be able to agree on what *real* Christian ethics *really* means for *real* Christians. Do Christian ethics deal with something speculative or prescriptive? Does it deal with something transcendent or mundane? Is it about something supernatural or natural? Is it something old or new? Is it something religious or nonreligious? Is it for the world or only for Christians? Is it for the Here-and-Now-World or for a Not-Yet-World? Is it something changing or unchanging? Does it center on Christ, or on God, or on the Bible, or on the Christian community, or on human experience, or on human rationality, or does it have no center at all? Such questions divide scholars in the field, and even though evangelicals do not go to extremes we are divided nearly as badly as everyone else.

I will now survey the range of definitions current among scholars writing in the field of Christian ethics. The scholars mentioned are not all evangelical, but they all do, or did while living, consider themselves to be Christian. And most that I will mention are in fact evangelically Christian. After surveying positions, I will make some observations and then close with a definition for Christian ethics around which I think evangelicals should unite.

CONTRARY DEFINITIONS

On comparing the ways scholars relate Christian ethics to theology, philosophy, history, and revelation, it is possible to identify nine fundamentally different positions on what Christian ethics means. And while there is no obvious evangelical proponent for each of these positions, it is nevertheless the case that evangelicals are being pulled in all directions.

> Position 1: *Christian ethics as only philosophy for Christians completely distinct from theology and the Bible.*

Robin Lovin, in *Christian Ethics: An Essential Guide*, exemplifies this position. Lovin is no evangelical, and no evangelical openly favors this position.[3] But some evangelicals are moving rather close to it. Lovin holds that Christian ethics is no more than teaching philosophical ethics to Christians, and in his case that means reducing the whole enterprise to Aristotle. Lovin believes that, even for Christians, "ethics . . . is basically about the positive goals and directions we all set for ourselves." It is whatever people who think they are Christian "choose about the good life."[4] And, while Lovin notes that Christians often try relating ethics to God and the Bible, he does not think either God or the Bible provides any real "answers to be learned."[5] For answers Lovin thinks Christians should instead "follow a more Aristotelian understanding."[6]

> Position 2: *Christian ethics as philosophy supplemented by theological elements not opposed to, or going beyond, what philosophy allows*.

Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., in *A Survey of Christian Ethics*, and Jochem Douma, in *Responsible Conduct: Principles of Christian Ethics*, represent this second category.[7] Those taking this position see more value in theology and scripture than those in Lovin's category, but they still treat philosophical ethics as primary and incorporate theological elements only so

far as philosophy allows. Long thinks Christian ethics so depends on philosophy it "cannot be understood" without it,[8] and he openly denies that Christian ethics should be treated as "a branch of theological ethics which has its methodological problems solved for it by a parent discipline."[9] Douma relies on Kant, Aristotle, Bentham, and Mill to explain what ethics means for Christians.[10] He thinks "the Bible provides building blocks for our ethics, but the Bible itself provides no ethics that we can simply adopt as our own."[11] And Douma goes on to warn against thinking Christian ethics includes what he calls "antiquated elements" found in the Bible as it is.[12] No evangelical takes this position either, but again some are moving toward it.

> Position 3: *Christian ethics as only the history of how Christians have thought on moral matters structured philosophically not theologically*.

Philip Wogaman, in *Christian Ethics: A Historical Introduction,*[13] and in *Readings in Chris-tian Ethics: A Historical Sourcebook,*[14] exemplifies this third position. Wogaman thinks the Bible offers no "single ethical perspective," and he claims Christian ethics has been "from the very beginning, substantially influenced by ancient philosophical tradi-tions."[15] And, while Wogaman limits Christian ethics to the history of Christian moral understanding, that is not enough because he also thinks no one is competent even to accomplish this without training in the social sciences and philosophy. He thinks just reporting on what Christians have taught and done is not "Christian ethics" until it has all been interpreted within "the limitations imposed on them by their cultural contingencies."[16] Again, no evangelical takes this position, but some are being pulled in this direction.

Position 4: *Christian ethics as only philosophy limited to what a biblical worldview does not deny, but with only philosophical and no specific theological content*.

Kerby Anderson, who is clearly evangelical,[17] takes this fourth position in *Christian Ethics in Plain Language*.[18] Kerby Anderson wants clearly to promote moral witness in the culture, but does so in a way that treats Christian ethics as no more than philosophy restricted to biblical worldview boundaries. For Anderson, the worldview presented in the Bible sets limits on philosophical speculation. But so long as speculation does not cross these boundaries, he treats Christian ethics as amounting to nothing more than teaching Christians to employ concepts borrowed from human philosophers. Within these boundaries, Christian ethics is simply a matter of matching up philosophy with "Christian ethical foundations."[19] It is philosophical ethics with the Bible used as a "filter for the philosophical ideas and principles."[20] He says we should not think that Christian ethics arise entirely from the Bible or divine revelation, but rather claims it is something made better and better as Christians learn "new information" produced by interacting "with different philosophies and worldviews."[21]

Position 5: *Christian ethics as philosophy supplemented by divinely revealed theological elements restructured philosophically not theologically*.

Most evangelicals give moral theology and the Bible a larger role in Christian ethics than given by Lovin, Long, Douma, Wogaman, or even Kerby Anderson. And yet, while relying on the Bible for more than worldview boundaries, many evangelicals still consider philosophical ethics to be indispensable for Christian ethics. Those who do can be divided in two categories, with those in one category relying on philosophy more extensively than those in the other. The first category consists of those who draw content from the Bible and biblically based moral theology, but who then rely on philosophy to structure how they

believe Christians should understand what they are doing. Those in this category include Norman Geisler in *Christian Ethics: Options and Issues*, John Jefferson Davis in *Evangelical Ethics: Issues Facing the Church Today*, John and Paul Feinberg in *Ethics for a Brave New World*, Joe Trull in *Walking the Way: An Introduction to Christian Ethics*, and Scott Rae in *Moral Choices: An Introduction to Ethics*.[22]

While Geisler draws heavily from the Bible and moral theology, he does not structure Christian ethics in biblical terms. Instead Geisler orders content from the Bible in philosophical terms. He first says that philosophical "ethical systems can be broadly divided into two categories, deontological and teleological," and then claims that Christian ethics is a form of "deontological" ethics known as "the divine-command position."[23] Davis, the Feinbergs, Trull and Rae all do much the same thing. Davis and the Feinbergs follow Geisler in defining Christian ethics philosophically as "a form of the divine command theory,"[24] and Davis even says that while scripture functions as a "bottom line," it is not the only source of Christian ethics.[25] Trull thinks that "to understand the structure of ethics and the questions raised by Christian ethics, we must first consider philosophical backgrounds."[26] And Rae goes beyond Geisler, Davis, the Feinbergs, and Trull, first insisting that Christian ethics must "use terms in a manner consistent with their use in secular works on ethics,"[27] and then asserting that the Bible's moral message is not "fully developed" until its message has been restructured in philosophical terms.[28]

> Position 6: *Christian ethics as divinely revealed moral theology, supplemented by elements from philosophy judged to be theologically compatible*.

The second position evangelicals hold that mixes biblical content with philosophical ethics consists of those who not only employ biblical moral content but also rely on the Bible and moral theology to structure the way Christians understand ethics. But, while structuring

Christian ethics theologically not philosophically, these nevertheless hold that Christian ethics is not complete or as good as it could be until supplemented by elements borrowed from philosophy.

Evangelicals taking this approach include Henlee Barnette in *Introducing Christian Ethics*, Terence Anderson in *Walking the Way: Christian Ethics as a Guide*; and Dennis Hollinger in *Choosing the Good: Christian Ethics in a Complex World* and in *The Meaning of Sex: Christian Ethics and the Moral Life*.[29] While Barnette defines Christian ethics as "a systematic explanation of the moral example and teaching of Jesus applied to the total life of the individual in society,"[30] he also insists that Christians must "make use of philosophical insights which contribute to an understanding of these problems." But he warns that while doing this we should not forget that "Christian ethics begins with revelation while philosophical ethics starts with reason," and that Christian ethics "possesses the truth" while philosophical ethics only "pursues the truth."[31]

Terence Anderson also thinks the Bible is not entirely sufficient for Christian ethics, and so he claims that, while the Bible is our "most authoritative source," Christian ethics also requires relying on other sources to expand moral understanding beyond what the Bible says.[32] And, while Hollinger reminds readers that Christians "look to the Bible as divine revelation to guide their understanding,"[33] he also thinks that Christian ethics is a something that develops as scholars examine how theories of philosophical ethics "match up to biblical teachings and a Christian understanding of reality."[34]

> Position 7: *Christian ethics as only the history of established (old) moral theology regarding divine revelation structured theologically not philosophically*.

Waldo Beach and H. Richard Niebuhr in *Christian Ethics: Sources of the Living Tradition*, and George Forell in *History of Christian Ethics*,[35] represent a seventh position that treats

Christian ethics as a matter of biblical revelation, structured theologically not philosophically, but that is limited only to reporting what major movements or teachers within the church have taught on moral issues over time.

Because Beach and Niebuhr define Christian ethics in descriptive-historical terms, they do not think Christian ethics has any fixed structure or substance. They claim it is not an "accumulation of knowledge whereby one generation adds to the fund of wisdom built up by its forebears (sic)," but rather consists of many different often conflicting ways that people who claim to be "Christians" have interpreted life responding to God.[36] For Beach and Niebuhr, Christian ethics includes whatever moral ideas have arisen within the "Christian community"—however these moral ideas may or may not relate to the Bible and however they may or may not align with what other Christians have thought or believed.[37] Forell treats Christian ethics in the same way, regarding it simply as "the history of . . . a varied and complex response" of "human beings whom the Christian Gospel has reached in some way."[38]

> Position 8: *Christian ethics as only humanly generated and very recent theological speculation, not philosophy, which, though distinct from philosophy, nevertheless arrives at similar conclusions*.

Stanley Hauerwas in *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics*, and Wyndy Reuschling in *Reviving Evangelical Ethics: The Promises and Pitfalls of Classic Models of Morality*,[39] are proponents of this eighth position, which is one that treats Christian ethics as a strictly human enterprise while at the same time insisting it is all theology and not philosophy. Hauerwas is no evangelical, but Reuschling not only claims she is but is trying also to influence and change what evangelicals think.

Hauerwas insists that Christian ethics is theology not philosophy, but then also claims it is neither universal nor fixed. He says that Christian ethics is not a matter of choosing between "alternative ethical theories,"[40] but rather is something "at the heart of the theological enterprise."[41] And yet, while Hauerwas insists it is theology, he also denies Christian ethics has any methodological starting point.[42] In other words, he does not think it is either consistent or coherent. This is because what Hauerwas means by "theology" is just a way of describing the ever changing and often inconsistent convictions held by fallible people comprising "the Christian community."[43]

Hauerwas therefore claims that "Christian ethics is not any distinct discipline but varies from time to time and from one to another ecclesial tradition," and therefore also says that "how Christian ethics is understood has always been dependent on its context in a specific tradition."[44] With this, he also denies Christian ethics entails anything actually divine, transcendent, universal, or fixed. So, even though Hauerwas defines Christian ethics theologically, it is all just stories "the Christian community" makes up for itself.[45] He says "the stories of God in Scripture" can be comforting to read, but he does not think anyone should think they are true.[46] Reuschling also defines Christian ethics as theology not philosophy. But she too, like Hauerwas, reduces "theology" to something she makes up herself and that is therefore not objectively true and unchanging as a matter of divine revelation.[47]

Position 9: *Christian ethics as only divinely revealed moral theology, both established (old) and speculative (new), not philosophy, which being revealed can judge but never mix with philosophy*.

By far the greatest number of leading scholars in the field have defined Christian ethics in this ninth way, a way that is quite different from all the positions covered so far. These have held that Christian ethics is so purely theological it can be treated philosophically or joined to philosophical elements without serious harm, and they also deny it can be improved adding to it any ideas coming from any source other than the Word of God. Those taking this position not only insist that Christian ethics is theological, but also is transcendent, supernatural, theistic, theocentric, divinely revealed, and divinely ordered, and is therefore not mundane, naturalistic, anthropocentric, or humanly generated. We cannot here list every main scholar taking this position, but they include Karl Barth, in *Ethics* and in *The Christian Life* (volume 4 of his *Church Dogmatics*), Reinhold Niebuhr in *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, Paul Ramsey in *Basic Christian Ethics*, Georgia Harkness in *Christian Ethics*, Carl F. H. Henry in *Christian Personal Ethics*, Helmut Thielicke in *Foundations*, Jacques Ellul in *The Ethics of Freedom*, R. E. O. White in *Christian Ethics: The Historical Development* and in *Biblical Ethics*, Oliver O'Donovan in *Resurrection and Moral Order*, and most recently John Frame in *The Doctrine of the Christian Life*.[48]

Barth saw no difference between moral theology and Christian ethics because he did not think Christian ethics could be rightly understood any other way. He said Christian ethics is "a theological discipline . . . in which an answer is sought in the Word of God to the question of the goodness of human conduct."[49] Barth did not think theology can be

separated from ethics because "theology in general includes from the very first and at every point the problem of ethics," and he insisted "the goodness of human conduct can be sought only in the goodness of the Word addressed to man."[50] He worried that treating Christian ethics as a discrete discipline risks suggesting the false idea that it could be separated from theology. This raises, he thought, "a justifiable concern" that Christian ethics might sink to the level of "spectator-metaphysics."[51] So Barth insisted that Christian ethics "is itself dogmatics, not an independent discipline alongside it," and urged "there must be no change into another genre here."[52] In fact he believed that philosophical ethics is really no ethics at all because the only true ethics to be had by anyone is what God reveals in the Word of God. He thought that, being of God, Christian ethics makes an ownership claim *vis-a-vis* all philosophical speculation. And so, like the children of Israel claiming the Promised Land, Barth thought that in "the field of ethical deliberation" Christian ethics "advances the claim that it is the one that with its investigation has the last word which absorbs all others."[53]

Barth dismissed what he described as "the philosopher who really thinks he knows a higher principle by which to ask and answer the question of the whence and whither, and who thinks he can meet the theological as a judge in the question of truth."[54] And, because there is no real ethics anywhere "beyond the Word of God itself," he held that philosophical ethics has no standing to claim any sort of moral insight for improving on "the Word of God itself." It also has no basis for asserting any ultimate truth claim, and so, if it tries, the attempt is idolatrous precisely because it turns speculation into a sort of false theology.[55] Hauerwas summarizes Barth's position saying that,

> For Barth, . . . there can be no ethics that is not from beginning to end theological. Indeed, ethics (meaning all real ethics) is theological through and through because for Barth theology is more than simply one discipline among others. Theology rather is the exposition of how God's Word as found in Jesus Christ provides not only its own ground but the ground for all that we know and do.[56]

The leading scholars in the field of Christian ethics have always been in substantial agreement with Barth's position. Reinhold Niebuhr followed Barth, as did Dietrich Bonhoeffer, as did Paul Ramsey, as did Georgia Harkness, as did Van Til, as did Carl F. H. Henry, as did Helmut Thielicke, as did Francis Schaeffer (following Van Til), as did Jacques Ellul, as did R. E. O. White, as also have Oliver O'Donovan and John Frame. These are not minor figures but make up the most respected leaders in the field. Even so many evangelicals are now breaking with this leadership thinking to find in philosophical speculation something to supplement, restructure, or even replace theological ethics, and because of this some are thinking Christian ethics might be something new, changing, and speculative as opposed to something revealed, transcendent, old, and unchanging. I will now make some observations about what this entails.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Reviewing the conflicting ways Christian ethics is defined enables one to notice a connection between whether one treats it philosophically or theologically and how old one views the discipline to be. Treating it philosophically leads to thinking Christian ethics is something new with little or no history, while treating it theologically results in treating it as something old. Attempting to order Christian moral understanding in philosophical terms is indeed new, but Christian moral understanding that studies and applies God's

moral revelation is not new at all. Since Barth defined Christian ethics theologically, he thought it began at least by the 2nd century observing "one of the first from whom we have particular ethical tractates was the later Montanist Tertullian. And the author of the supposedly oldest Christian *ēthika* or collection of Christian rules of life was none other than the greatest theoretician and organizer of Eastern montanism, Basil of Caesarea."[57] O'Donovan, who also defines Christian ethics theologically, takes the start of Christ-centered moral understanding in the act of creation because "the resurrection of Christ directs our attention back to the creation which it vindicates."[58]

The one seeming exception to this rule connecting the new-old division with the philosophical-theological division in defining Christian ethics is Stanley Hauerwas, who while defining Christian ethics theologically nevertheless claims "the notion of Christian ethics is a modern invention."[59] But Hauerwas is no exception because on examining him more closely one discovers that what he means by "theology" is not what others mean. What Hauerwas calls "theology" is neither revelational nor divine but only consists of his own very human speculation about theology. Thus what Hauerwas calls "theology" is merely philosophy by another name.

Another thing to observe is how defining Christian ethics philosophically requires separating moral theology and biblical ethics from the discipline, whereas moral theology and biblical ethics are essential to Christian ethics defined as theology. The philosophical approach also leaves Christian ethics with little prescriptive force, while Christian ethics as theology is hortatory and prescriptive. Christian ethics as theology proclaims "Thus says the LORD!" But as philosophy it is never is more than speculating. As theology, Christian

ethics is complex. It deals with moral commands, moral wisdom, moral character, moral relationships, moral motives, moral desires, moral judgments, moral affects, moral priorities, moral rewards, moral punishments, moral thoughts as well as actions, and ultimate moral goals. But as philosophy, Christian ethics is made far less complex. Transcendence is reduced to mundane categories, and the supernatural is conceived in natural terms.

In short, defining Christian ethics philosophically turns the moral message of Christians into something nonreligious. It takes the "Christ" out of Christian ethics severing it from the rich record of biblical teaching passed on through twenty centuries of Christian teaching on what it means to live in ways that are righteous, holy, and blameless in the sight of God. Said one way, Christian ethics as philosophy is a message of worldly speculation delivered to Christians, while Christian ethics as theology is a message of God to the world. Said another way, Christian ethics as philosophy addresses what God says and does from man's perspective, while Christian ethics as theology addresses what man says and does from God's perspective.

But defining Christian ethics as theology, not philosophy, does not settle every vital question. That is because theology too can be viewed different ways. If it is not revelational, Christian ethics can be religious in ways that are as mundane as any philosophy. If it is not Christocentric, Christian ethics can be revelatory and religious without being distinctively Christian. If it is not eternal, Christian ethics can be revelatory, religious, and Christocentric, but not unchanging and perhaps not even relevant to the age in which we live. And if it is not universal, Christian ethics can be revelatory, religious, Christocentric and unchanging, and yet not be a Word-to-the-World.

Finally, we should observe that even though the history of Christian ethics must be treated in largely descriptive terms, some limit must be set on what gets to be included. However it may be defined, when it comes to the history of Christian ethics, what is included should be restricted to what at least some portion of the institutional church has recognized and enforced as being morally worthy. In other words, historical descriptions of Christian ethics should leave out what fringe groups, cults, or marginal individuals have said, claimed, or imagined without institutional backing.

PROPOSAL FOR CONSENSUS

All we have covered to this point has been preparatory for calling evangelicals to unite in suppor-ting a single coherent definition of what *real* Christian ethics *really* means for *real* Christians. I will now list ten features I think evangelicals will or at least should agree are essential to the nature of authentic Christian ethics, and then based on these I will suggest a definition I think should become the consensus position for evangelicals working in the field. Here then are the features I think we should agree are essential to the way evangelicals approach what Christian ethics means. We should all agree:

1. That Christian ethics is mainly hortatory and prescriptive and is only marginally speculative.
2. That Christian ethics is religiously prescriptive and is not secular either in the sense of being religiously neutral or in the sense of being nonreligious.
3. That Christian ethics is theistically and religiously prescriptive and is not pantheistic.
4. That Christian ethics is moral theology and is not moral philosophy.

5. That Christian ethics is transcendent, God-centered, divinely revealed moral theology and is not mundane, anthropocentric, humanly generated moral theology.

6 That Christian ethics is moral theology specifically revealed by, in, and through the Bible as the Word of God and is not merely transcendent, God-centered, divinely revealed moral theology not necessarily grounded upon or controlled by the Bible as the Word of God.

7. That Christian ethics is Christocentric, biblically revealed moral theology and is not merely transcendent, God-centered, divinely revealed biblical moral theology however anyone happens to interpret it.

8. That Christian ethics is therefore something old and is not something new.

9. That Christian ethics is therefore something universal (for the world) and is not something only for Christians or the Christian community.

10. That Christian ethics is therefore something unchanging and is not something changing, or that only applies to a future Not-Yet-World.

Based on these essential features, I suggest that we take the following to be the consensus definition for evangelicals working in the field.

> *Christian ethics is nothing either more or less than the study, understanding and practice of everything about right and wrong as ordered and revealed by God, in the Word of God, being understood from, through, and for the person, work, and purpose of Jesus Christ, combined with studying how it has been understood, practiced, challenged, and defended through the history of religious, philosophical, and cultural interaction with God's work in the world being interpreted in faithfulness to scripture and limited to what has been affirmed by at least some portion of the institutional church*.

If this definition is controversial, the degree to which it might be so only illustrates how badly we need to bridge differences between us. This definition falls squarely in line with how the greatest names in the field have understood what they were doing. It is right in line with how Barth, Reinhold Niebuhr, Bonhoeffer, Ramsey, Harkness, Van Til, Henry, Thielicke, Ellul, White, Schaeffer, O'Donovan, and Frame understood, or understand now,

the meaning of Christian ethics. If these field leaders could agree, then evangelicals can as well. We must reach consensus, and that consensus must be on viewing Christian ethics as something religious, something of God, something supernatural, something theological, something biblical, and ultimately something that is Christian because it is from, to, and about Jesus Christ.

END NOTES

1. Stanley Hauerwas, *The Hauerwas Reader*, eds., John Berkman and Michael Cartwright (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2001), 43.

2. Ibid.

3. Lewis Smedes, in *Choices: Making Right Decisions in a Complex World* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), comes very close to this position. In that book, Smedes never makes any mention of God or the Bible and reduces moral thinking to what "anyone at all can know" (p.13) based on feeling, intuition and personal experience. But Smedes also says, in *Sex for Christians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1976), that he tries "to let the biblical message control my reasoning" (p. xii).

4. Robin W. Lovin, *Christian Ethics: An Essential Guide* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2000), 7 and 16.

5. Ibid., 7.

6. Ibid., 17.

7. Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., *A Survey of Christian Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967); Jochem Douma, *Responsible Conduct: Principles of Christian Ethics*, trans. Nelson D. Kloosterman (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2003). Previously published in Dutch as *Verantwoord Handelen: Inleiding in de Christelijke Ethiek* by Kok Voorhoeve, Kampen, 1997.

8. Long, *Survey*, 3.

9. Ibid., 35.

10. Douma, *Responsible Conduct*, 19-25.

11. Ibid., 30.

12. Ibid.

13. J. Philip Wogaman, *Christian Ethics: A Historical Introduction* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1993).

14. J. Philip Wogaman and Douglas M. Strong, eds, *Readings in Christian Ethics: A Historical Sourcebook* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1996).

15. Wogaman, *Historical Introduction*, 1-2.

16. Wogaman, *Readings*, ix-x.

17. Kerby Anderson is the national director of Probe Ministries International.

18. Kerby Anderson, *Christian Ethics in Plain Language* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005).

19. Ibid., xiii.

20. Ibid., 20.

21. Ibid., 6.

22. Norman L. Geisler, *Christian Ethics: Options and Issues* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1989, originally Zondervan, 1971); John Jefferson Davis, *Evangelical Ethics: Issues Facing the Church Today*, third edition (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2004, originally in 1985); John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg, *Ethics for a Brave New World* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 1993); Joe E. Trull, *Walking in the Way: An Introduction to Christian Ethics* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman, 1997); Scott B. Rae, *Moral Choices: An Introduction to Ethics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2000).

23. Geisler, *Options and Issues*, 22 and 24.

24. Davis, *Evangelical Ethics*, 16. Feinberg and Feinberg, *Brave New World*, 30.

25. Ibid., 15.

26. Trull, *Walking in the Way*, 17.

27. Rae, *Choices*, 14.

28. Ibid., 19.

29. Henlee H. Barnette, *Introducing Christian Ethics* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman, 1961); Terence R. Anderson, *Walking the Way: Christian Ethics as a Guide* (Toronto, Ontario: The United Church Publishing House, 1993); Dennis P. Hollinger, *Choosing the Good: Christian Ethics in a Complex World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2002); Dennis P. Hollinger, *Choosing the Good: Christian Ethics in a Complex World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2002); Dennis P. Hollinger, *The Meaning of Sex: Christian Ethics and the Moral Life* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2009).

30. Barnette, *Introducing*, 3.

31. Ibid., 8-9.

32. Terence Anderson, *Walking the Way*, 229.

33. Hollinger, *Choosing the Good*, 16.

34. Hollinger, *Meaning of Sex*, 24.

35. Waldo Beach and H. Richard Niebuhr, eds., *Christian Ethics: Sources of the Living Tradition* (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1955); George Wolfgang Forell, *History of Christian Ethics*, vol. 1, *From the New Testament to Augustine* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg, 1979).

36. Beach and Niebuhr, *Sources*, 4-5.

37. Ibid., 10.

38. Forell, *New Testament to Augustine*, 12.

39. Stanley Hauerwas, *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983); Wyndy Corbin Reuschling, *Reviving Evangelical Ethics: The Promises and Pitfalls of Classic Models of Morality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos, 2008).

40. Hauerwas, *Peaceable Kingdom*, xv.

41. Ibid., xvii.

42. Ibid., 62.

43. Ibid., 1.

44. Ibid., 50.

45. Ibid., 33.

46. Ibid., 25.

47. Reuschling, *Reviving Evangelical Ethics*, 169.

48. Karl Barth, *Ethics*, ed. Dietrich Braun, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (New York: Seabury Press, 1981, originally as *Ethik* in Zürich by Theologischer Verlag, 1928); Karl Barth, *The Christian Life*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley [being titled "Lecture Fragments" in *Church Dogmatics*, volume 4, part 4] (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1981); Reinhold Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1963, originally 1935); Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox, 1950); Georgia Harkness, *Christian Ethics* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957); Carl F. H. Henry, *Christian Personal Ethics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1957); Helmut Thielicke, *Foundations*, vol. 1, *Theological Ethics*, trans. William H. Lazareth (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1979, earlier by Fortress in 1966, and by Mohr in 1958); Jacques Ellul, *The Ethics of Freedom*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1976, originally 1973), also as *Ethique de le Liberté* (Genève: Editions Labor et Fides, 1973-1974); R. E. O. White, *Christian Ethics: The Historical Development* (Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox, 1979); R. E. O. White, *Biblical Ethics* (Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox, 1981); Oliver O'Donovan, *Resurrection and Moral Order: An Outline for Evangelical Ethics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1986); John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 2008).

49. Barth, *Ethics*, 3.

50. Ibid., 13 and 15.

51. Ibid., 19.

52. Ibid., 18.

53. Ibid., 20.

54. Ibid., 22.

55. Ibid., 44.

56. Hauerwas, *The Hauerwas Reader*, 48.

57. Barth, *Ethics*, 6.

58. O'Donovan, *Resurrection and Moral Order*, 31.

59. Hauerwas, *The Hauerwas Reader*, 37 also 43.