

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1949

The Social Ethics of St Paul with Implications for Marriage and the Family

Walter Fisher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fisher, Walter, "The Social Ethics of St Paul with Implications for Marriage and the Family" (1949). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 211.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/211>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL WITH IMPLICATIONS
FOR MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of Systematic Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Walter F. Fisher

May, 1949

41,296

Approved by:

A. M. Reinisch
John Theodore Mueller

52319

THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL WITH IMPLICATIONS

FOR MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

Outline

Summarizing Purpose: This paper seeks to present the principles of St. Paul's social ethics with their implications for marriage and the family, as found in his New Testament writings.

I. It is important to understand the general principles of St. Paul's social ethics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Outline iii

I. The Social Ethics of St. Paul 3

II. The Implications of Paul's Social Ethics for Marriage and the Family 24

Bibliography 65

THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL WITH IMPLICATIONS

FOR MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

(Outline)

Controlling Purpose: This paper is to present the principles of St. Paul's social ethics with their implications for marriage and the family, as found in his New Testament writings.

- I. It is important to understand the general principles of St. Paul's social ethics.
 - A. What is meant by Christian social ethics?
 1. Christian social ethics deal with the organized world of Christian morality.
 2. Christian social ethics must be built up on Christian individual ethics.
 - B. Did St. Paul treat social ethics?
 1. That St. Paul did treat social ethics is immediately apparent from his writings.
 2. However, Paul did not develop a scientific system of social ethics, but applied certain principles as specific problems arose.
 3. These principles are relevant today.
 - C. What are the basic principles from which the social ethics of St. Paul are derived?
 1. They are derived from the ruling principle of justification by faith and the resultant life of sanctification.
 2. They recognize sin as the basic problem in social relationships.
 - D. The doctrine of the Christian's union with Christ is a fundamental principle of Paul's social ethics.
 1. Union with Christ is the motive and the source of power for ethical conduct.
 2. The union controls the relationships of the Christian with fellow Christians.
 3. The union does not imply antisocial behavior toward the non-Christian.
 4. The union eliminates the possibility that Paul's emphasis on God's free grace would result in anti-nomianism.
 - E. The Christian concept of love is another basic principle in the social ethics of Paul.
 1. It is the Christian's love that controls his attitude toward his neighbor.
 2. The love of which Paul speaks is utterly spontaneous and uncaused.
 3. The Christian is capable of such love by virtue of his union with Christ.
 4. This love unfolds in a great variety of social virtues.

- F. Paul's eschatology effects his social ethics.
 1. He is not devoid of an effective social message because of his eschatology.
 2. It is a misrepresentation to say that his eschatology causes him to ignore the practical affairs of this life.
 3. Paul's eschatology makes it possible for people to live in proper relationship to things of this world.
- G. Paul was not a social revolutionist.
 1. He did not assume a revolutionary attitude toward the social institutions of his day.
 2. This does not mean that he was indifferent to social evils.

II. The implications of Paul's social ethics for marriage and the family are helpful in view of the problems of our day.

- A. What is Paul's attitude toward marriage?
 1. It has frequently been charged that he was hostile to marriage.
 2. Such an alleged hostile attitude cannot be based on the premise that he was fundamentally an ascetic in his thinking.
 3. Paul does not regard celibacy as a state of higher moral perfection.
 4. Paul does recommend celibacy under certain conditions.
 5. The influence of eschatology on his attitude toward marriage has been exaggerated.
 6. Paul did not discountenance marriage because of any Jewish prejudice.
 7. Paul regards marriage as God's will for man under normal conditions.
- B. The function of sex in marriage is taken into consideration by Paul.
 1. This was one of the major social problems with which Paul had to deal.
 2. The hostile attitude that the church has at times shown toward sex stems from ascetic tendencies.
 3. Paul recognizes the proper function of sex in marriage.
 4. He sets forth the correct purposes of sex.
 5. The abuse of the sexual relationship in marriage is to be eliminated by Christian love.
 6. Paul speaks strongly against the misuse of sex.
 7. The function of sex involves the entire personality.
 8. Paul's arguments against impurity are as vital today as in his day.
 9. The church in its efforts to serve the family should neither war against sex nor encourage its usurping the supremacy in the man and woman relationship.
- C. Marriage is regarded as permanent for this life.
 1. The finality of marriage is affirmed by the illustration of the union of Christ with His church, and by the doctrine of the oneness of husband and wife.

2. Underlying and maintaining the union of husband and wife there must be mutual love.
 3. Death dissolves marriage and therefore a widow or widower may be remarried.
 4. Paul does not sanction separation even if a new marriage is not contracted.
 5. In the case of malicious desertion a divorce may be obtained by the innocent party.
 6. Jesus speaks of fornication as a reason for breaking the marriage bond, and Paul speaks of malicious desertion as an act which breaks the bond.
 7. We must not relax our attitude toward divorce, but at the same time we must seek to preserve the family by a positive program.
- D. Paul's view as to the relationship of husband and wife in the home is perfectly reliable for our day.
1. Some have argued that Paul places woman into a position of intolerable subjection.
 2. Paul does not teach that woman is inferior to man, but subordinate.
 3. Paul's ethics have contributed much to the elevation of the status of woman.
 4. Paul sets forth mutual obligations for husband and wife.
 5. Paul's ethics aim at the highest happiness for both man and woman.
- E. Paul shows a remarkable understanding of the relationship of parents and children.
1. He has a high regard for children.
 2. He places a great deal of importance upon the Fourth Commandment.
 3. He speaks of duties of parents toward children.
- F. Paul's ethics are concerned with the family as a social unit.
1. The family as such is implicit in his thinking.
 2. The primary area in which the family functions as a unit is the home.
 3. While Christian character is developed in the individual, that development is largely guided by society, and particularly by the family.
 4. The implications of Paul's social ethics need to be understood and applied to conditions in our day.

THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL WITH IMPLICATIONS

FOR MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

Today, as never before, there is a need for emphasizing the relationship of Christianity to social ethics. We need to clarify our thinking as to what the principles of Christianity mean for the associated life of men. Due largely to our technical development our social life today grows constantly more and more institutional, more impersonal, more the life of large masses. In the family, the community, the Church, the state, the economic order in its many and varied expressions, the international order, we are presented with problems of Christian living. At every point our life is conditioned by these social groupings for good or ill. How can Christianity help us here?¹ More specifically, what help does St. Paul give us here?

In this paper it is our intention to confine ourselves to a treatment of St. Paul's social ethics. He has a great deal to say on this subject. We shall first of all develop the principles of his social message in general, and then confine ourselves to the implications of these principles for the basic social institution as we see what he has to say about marriage and the family.

1. Rall, Harris Franklin, According to Paul, pp. 210-211.

Until recent years the social message of Paul has not received a great deal of attention. Those who have gone to the Bible for its social message have centered their attention on the prophets of the Old Testament and on the teachings of Jesus.² In view of the significance of Paul's message on social ethics this is rather surprising.³ By this we do not mean to minimize the importance of the social message of the Old Testament prophets and Jesus. Paul, however, writes against the background of the teachings of the prophets and Jesus. This, and the fact that he writes to a Christian church trying to establish itself in the midst of a pagan society gives his message particular significance. We who live in the midst of the terrifying world of the twentieth century will find that Paul's message is relevant to the problems of our day.

Paul's social message is found in his letters and in the book of Acts. For the purpose of this study we have accepted all of those letters which have been traditionally held to be of Pauline authorship without entering in upon a discussion of pertinent introductory questions which have been raised by some New Testament scholars from time to time. We have done this because we personally believe that to accept all of these books as genuine is the correct view.

-
2. Rolston, Holms, The Social Message of the Apostle Paul, Preface.
 3. Enslin, Morton Scott, The Ethics of Paul, p. xi.

I. The Social Ethics of St. Paul

WHAT IS MEANT BY CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ETHICS?

Social ethics deals with the organized world. It refers to the collective life of men. "From the systematic viewpoint, Christian Social Ethics is a subdivision of Christian Ethics dealing with the organized world of Christian morality, the moral communities to which the realization of the Christian moral ideal gives rise, i.e., with the Christian life in the relations of the family, church, state, and economic and cultural orders."⁴

Christian social ethics must, however, be built up on Christian individual ethics. As society is made up of individuals, so the life of society is largely determined by the individuals composing it. Nevertheless, Christianity is a religion not only of individuals as such, but of individuals joined together in community life. In fact, it is largely within the sphere of the various social relationships that the individual Christian develops his own personal Christian life and character.⁵ The sanctified life can not be lived apart from relationships to others.

DID ST. PAUL TREAT SOCIAL ETHICS?

In reading the epistles of Paul it is immediately evident that he concerns himself with social ethics. In general, the first sections of the epistles concern themselves with doctrinal discussions, but invariably he turns to make ethical applications.⁶ That Paul deals with

4. Nash, N. B., "Christian Social Ethics," Anglican Theological Review, Vol. 12, (1929-1930), p. 317.

5. Reu, Johann H. and Buehring, P. H., Christian Ethics, p. 256.

6. Rolston, op. cit., p. 44.

the social aspect of ethics is quite apparent merely from considering the sins against which he warns his churches: selfishness, pride, division, contention, anger, bitterness, malice, and sexual immorality.⁷ A Roman Catholic writer has put it well when she writes:

Never did the Apostle sanction the isolation of the individual's actions from his social setting. Never did he conceive mankind as the 'accidental juxtaposition' of individuals, each pursuing his own course independently of others. He saw the human race as an organic whole. 'God hath made of one all mankind' . . . Because of this solidarity of the human race and the consequent mutual influence of evil environment and bad company, he saw its effect on morals and conduct. Moreover, because of this same doctrine the Christians of those days were taught that conduct must be regulated by a consideration of its influence on those not of the Faith . . . Furthermore, it should be noted that Saint Paul's instructions that the individual's conduct be regulated by his influence on others was not optional. It was expressed in terms of obligation and moral responsibility. He reflected again and again--'that if one member suffereth anything, all the members suffer with it, and if one member glory all the members rejoice with it.' This doctrine of Saint Paul on the solidarity of the human race, and the consequent social responsibility of the individual was but one of the sociological truths which Saint Paul expounded . . .⁸

It has also been pointed out that, "Almost every moral precept is based on its effect on the brethren. The social virtues--love, harmony, service--are never forgotten."⁹ From this it is apparent that Paul consistently stresses the social implications of his ethical principles.

Paul did not, however, develop a scientific system of ethics. He did not write a text book for Christian conduct.¹⁰ However, for Paul ethics and theology could never be dissociated. The Christian ethic was

7. Rall, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

8. Agatha, Mother M., "Pauline Sociology Offers Solution to Current Evils," *America*, Vol. 60, 22, (March 4, 1939), pp. 510-511.

9. Enslin, Morton Scott, *ibid.*, p. 129.

10. Such passages as Colossians 3:18 - 4:1 and Ephesians 5:22 - 6:9 would almost seem to be a step in that direction.

the living in a manner worthy of the high calling of a Christian. This embraced the whole of life and all the relationships of life.¹¹ As specific problems arose he met them with "deep-seated principles."¹² The matter has been correctly stated by James S. Stewart when he says: "Ethical precept in abundance his epistles contain; his Gospel is ethical to the core; he will have nothing of a religion that does not issue in a morally strenuous and elevated life: Yet he makes no scientific classification of virtues such as the Stoic and pagan moralists of his day loved . . ."¹³

This immediately raises the question as to whether the ethical pronouncements of Paul are relevant for society today. Harris F. Rall has pointed out that the social setting from which Paul's statements on social problems were born was quite different than ours here in America today. He says:

Paul belonged to a small and scattered religious group living under a great imperialism. He could not speak to a monarch or a people as the Hebrew prophets did in pointing out social evils and calling for repentance. His situation differed even more radically from ours today. The Christian community, it is true, is still a minority group and we can hardly call our western governments Christian nations in any real sense. Yet we do have a real measure of democracy . . . Under this Christian men and women can influence thought and actions, and the Church in the name of God can bring a Christian judgment upon evil and voice the Christian demand. But the complex questions of public order, thus raised for Christian ethics, obviously would have no relevancy for the groups whom Paul addressed in his letters.¹⁴

This difference in social setting must be taken into account in any discussion of Paul's social ethics. Yet, as we shall bring out as we go

11. Enslin, op. cit., p. 76.

12. Enslin, ibid., p. 309.

13. Stewart, James S., A Man In Christ, p. 28.

14. Rall, op. cit., p. 212.

along, the ethical problems which Paul discusses are in large measure such as appear in every human group. And the ethical principles that he applied then are equally relevant today.

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES FROM WHICH THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL ARE DERIVED

Justification by faith has been heralded as Paul's great contribution. Ethical conduct, however, is identical with sanctification.¹⁵ Paul does not separate sanctification from justification, but he sets both in proper order. Justification is the source of sanctification.

Justification and sanctification are indeed indissolubly (nexu indivulso) joined together; yet the two must not be mingled with each other. Justification is the source of sanctification. To teach the reverse means to teach the anti-christian doctrine of work-righteousness and thus to thwart both justification and sanctification.¹⁶

We must keep this order in mind from the outset. Justifying faith is accomplished by the work of the Holy Ghost in the act of regeneration or conversion. The Holy Ghost also energizes such faith to produce sanctified living.¹⁷ To Paul faith was not merely a creed or an intellectual acceptance of certain statements, but it was productive of ethical behavior. This is evident from such statements as the following: "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."¹⁸ "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love."¹⁹

15. Rehwinkel, Alfred M., "The Ethics of Jesus," Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. XIX, (March, 1948), p. 174.

16. Mueller, J. T., Christian Dogmatics, p. 385.

17. Graebner, A. L., Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, p. 195.

18. Eph. 2:10.

19. Gal. 5:6. cf. also I Thess. 4:3-5.

Paul also knew the actual source of social problems. He realized that all of humanity's difficulties were the consequences of sin. This is brought out clearly in his indictment of contemporary society as we find it in Romans 1. "Paul saw not only the superficialities of life and the outward manifestations of evil, but he saw in sin the root and cause of it all."²⁰ Paul's diagnosis of social problems enable him to get to the source of the difficulty. Man must be right with God before he can be right with his fellow-man. Hope for real social improvement must recognize the reality of sin if it would avoid a superficiality that deals only with symptoms.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN'S UNION WITH CHRIST FOR THE SOCIAL ETHICS OF ST. PAUL

In St. Paul's teaching of the Christian's union with Christ we come to a fundamental principle of his ethics. James Stewart speaks of it as "the mainstay of Paul's religion," and "the sheet-anchor of his ethics."²¹ Albert Schweitzer says:

. . . in the mystical being-in-Christ he possesses a concept of redemption from which ethics directly results as a natural function of the redeemed state. In this concept there is a logical foundation for the paradox, that the man before redemption was incapable of good works, but afterwards not only can but must bring them forth; since it is Christ who brings them forth in him.²²

Spiritual union with Christ is, according to St. Paul's teaching the fundamental secret of the Christian life. Hunkin informs us that the expression "in Christ" is found in St. Paul's epistles (not counting

20. Geisemann, O. A., "The Social Philosophy of Paul", Associated Lutheran Charities 37th Annual Convention, (1938), p. 35.

21. Stewart, op. cit., p. 194.

22. Schweitzer, Albert, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 295.

the Pastorals) one hundred and fifty-five times and only forty-one times in all the rest of the New Testament.²³

What is meant by "union with Christ" and how is this related to St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith? Our dogmatics speak of the "mystical union" (unio mystica), "by which the Holy Trinity, in particular the Holy Spirit, dwells in the believer."²⁴ "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"²⁵ This indwelling is distinct from God's general presence with all creatures since "God dwells essentially in the believer. Yet it is not a pantheistic transformation of the essence of the believer into the essence of God."²⁶ This union with God is also the result of justification. Through faith the justified believer receives Christ who dwells in the heart.²⁷ "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith."²⁸ It is particularly characteristic of St. Paul to speak of this union as being "in Christ."

For St. Paul the union with Christ is the motive and the source of power for ethical conduct. The character of the ethical as it arises out of this union is formulated by Paul in many and various ways, as sanctification, giving up the service of sin, living for God, bringing forth fruit for God, serving the Spirit.²⁹ For example we note the following:

23. Hunkin, J. W., The Earliest Christian Church, p. 52.

24. Mueller, op. cit., p. 320.

25. I Cor. 3:16.

26. Mueller, op. cit., p. 320.

27. Mueller, ibid., pp. 320, 381.

28. Eph. 3:17.

29. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 302-303.

"This is the will of God, even your sanctification." I Thess. 4:3. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Rom. 4:6. "Therefore reckon yourselves also to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 4:11. "Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Rom. 6:13. "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." Rom. 8:5. "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Rom. 8:12-14. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. 12:1. "Glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." I Cor. 6:20.

James Stewart speaks beautifully of the manner in which this union with Christ furnishes the motive for ethical living. He says:

'Christ in me' means Christ bearing me along from within, Christ the motive-power that carries me on, Christ giving my whole life a wonderful poise and lift, and turning every burden into wings.³⁰

This inner motivation is essential to ethics. Paul does not present some high ideals and then leave us cold for lack of motivation and power.

Here we see that Paul's ethics differ radically with a modernism that would content itself with presenting Jesus to us merely as an example or pattern for ethical behavior.³¹ Now it is true that we are given a noble ethic in the example and statements of Jesus. The New Testament recognizes that this is in accordance with divine plan.

"Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps."³² However, the mere example would leave us cold and lead

30. Stewart, op. cit., p. 170.

31. For an example of this we might use Harnack's What is Christianity? It is quite typical of this school of thought.

32. Stewart, op. cit., p. 168.

us to despair. "The evangel of an ethical example is a devastating thing. It makes religion the most grievous of burdens."³³ Paul's teaching of the "life in Christ" supplies the necessary power. "To be 'in Christ' means that Christ is the redeemed man's new environment . . . thus the soul draws for its strength upon the supplies of power which in Christ are quite inexhaustible."³⁴ Enslin says: "Christlikeness was the ideal, but was not attained by imitation but by entering on a new life."³⁵ Similarly, the motivation of an "undying gratitude"³⁶ would not compare to that of the "life in Christ." For Paul it is the union with Christ that constitutes the dynamic source of ethical behavior.

The concept of union with Christ also has extensive social implications. The vertical bond of union with Christ results in just as real a horizontal union among fellow believers. The man who was actually "in Christ" must of necessity recognize the intimate tie that bound him to his fellow.³⁷ This thought is most fully developed in Paul's teaching of the Church. Here he speaks of the closely knit and highly developed union of people in the body of Christ. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."³⁸ And again the unity of people bound together in Christ is brought out in the picture of the spiritual house and temple of God of which Christ is the sole foundation. "In whom all the building fitly

33. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 168.

34. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 196.

35. Enslin, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

36. Geiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

37. Enslin, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

38. Rom. 12:4,5. cf. Eph. 1:23,24; 4:13-16.

framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye are also builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."³⁹

In such a closely knit union there would be no place for arrogance and pride. They were members not because of their own merits, but solely because of God's grace. In this union the social virtues and duties could abound.

This does not imply that the Christian group or the Christian individual was to display an attitude of superiority toward the unchristian. Nor was the Christian group to be antisocial. Fundamental to Paul's general attitude toward men in their social relationships was his recognition of the equalizing effect of the Gospel. Paul believed that Jesus had come to save all men and that in Him social distinctions were dissolved. When Paul saw men, they were to him redeemed and blood-bought souls, regardless of the station to which they might otherwise belong in society.⁴⁰ The Christian society was not to become an elite and exclusive social group. The social virtues were not only to flourish in relationship to the members of the body of Christ, but recognizing that they were members of the Christian organism not by virtue of their own goodness, and realizing that Christ had "died for the ungodly,"⁴¹ they were to seek the salvation of the nonmember. Paul's own attitude was that he would be willing to sacrifice his own salvation if by that means he could bring his fellow but unbelieving Jews to the fellowship of Christ.⁴² It is true that the Christians were never to join in the

39. Eph. 2:21,22. cf. II Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:20; I Cor. 3:11.

40. Geiseman, op. cit., p. 37.

41. Rom. 5:6.

42. Rom. 9:1-3.

sinful practices of an ungodly society, nor were the Christians to permit ungodly men to act as a leaven for evil among them. But the Christian society was to be a leaven for good in an evil society.⁴³

Paul's teaching of union with Christ also eliminates completely the possibility that his emphasis on God's free grace might cut the nerve of ethics and result in complete antinomianism. The problem of antinomianism did arise as the result of Paul's gospel of free grace and unmerited forgiveness. If every sin of man provides God with a new opportunity of showing His grace, may not the sinner console himself with the reflection that his evil ways are actually promoting God's glory? May he not say, "Let us do evil, that good may come?"⁴⁴ or "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?"⁴⁵ Paul bluntly brands those who would accuse him of such a conclusion as slanderers.⁴⁶

In this connection James Stewart has a fine paragraph. He says:

Those who originally challenged him on the point had practical evidence to support their case: for certainly there were antinomian Christians in the early Church, people to whom the new religion was mainly an emotional excitement, a little private luxury with no real reaction on life and conduct. Very probably it was against such a group that the striking words were written, 'I tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ;' (Phil. 3:18) and there were members of the Christian community at Corinth who regarded participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as securing for them all the blessings of salvation both here and hereafter, and thus exempting them from a too scrupulous attention to moral duty and self-discipline. (I Cor. 10:16 ff.) Right through Christian history the workings of this spirit can be traced; men have found it easy to shelter their sins beneath 'the imputed righteousness of Christ,' have used a phrase like 'not under law, but under grace' (Rom. 6:15) to

43. I Cor. 5:7-11.

44. Rom. 3:8.

45. Rom. 6:1.

46. Rom. 3:8.

blur the otherwise disturbing fact that God is holy and that there is such a thing as moral stringency of Jesus, and have persuaded themselves that to an orthodoxy of creed, coupled with the cry 'Lord, Lord,' the gates of the Kingdom are bound to open. So the Christian faith has been wounded in the house of its friends, and the terribly damaging divorce between religion and ethics has cast a slur on the Church's name.⁴⁷

Such a charge of antinomianism is serious. The Roman Catholics have accused Luther of this because of his view of justification. But there is one factor that absolutely rebuts the charge. That factor is union with Christ. For to be united to Christ means to be identified with Christ's attitude to sin. "It means seeing sin with Jesus' eyes, and opposing it with something of the same passion with which Jesus at Calvary opposed it It means, as Paul put it tersely, death."⁴⁸ It also follows from everything that the apostle says about redemption and the Redeemer that the man in union with Christ is possessed of an ethical motive of the first order. Compromises and moral second-bests can no longer satisfy him. It was therefore to the strongest of inward motives that Paul was appealing when he wrote, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."⁴⁹

LOVE IS THE BASIC REQUIREMENT FOR TRUE SOCIAL ETHICS

The concept of love is of utmost importance for Paul's social ethics. The love of which Paul speaks forms and controls one's attitude toward his neighbor. The thought that love to man is the fulfilment of the law occurs several times in Paul's writings. The classical passage is Romans 13:8-10: "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For

47. Stewart, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

48. Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 198.

49. Col. 3:1.

this, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." A similar statement is made in Galatians 5:14: "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

Andres Nygren has pointed out the fact that Paul is unique in that his ethical statements have definite social implications. He says:

The ethics of antiquity were individualistic ethics through and through; the problem of the Good was the problem of the 'highest good'--that is, of the final satisfaction of the needs of the individual. The dominant idea was that of eudaimonia, happiness; and though various answers might be given--the answer of Hedonism, that happiness is momentary pleasure; that of Aristotle, that it consists in energeia and the attainment of perfection; or that of Stoicism, that it is ataraxia, the independence of the individual in face of the external changes of life--the statement of the question is always the same: how is the individual to attain happiness?⁵⁰

At this point Paul makes a revolutionary change. The question of Good is no longer envisaged from the point of view of the isolated individual, but is widened out to cover the relations of man with God and with his fellow-men.

When Paul equates love to man with the whole demand of the Law, as seen above, neglecting the inclusion of love to God, this does not at all imply that he is making love towards man into a purely ethical precept divorced from its religious basis. But on the contrary, he

50. Nygren, Andres, Eros and Agape, Vol. I, pp. 29-30.

continually refers love towards man back to its basis in God's love to men. Human relations are to be based on love. Therefore he says, "Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself for us."⁵¹ This same principle has been applied in the preceding verse to Christian forgiveness: "forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."⁵² It appears often elsewhere, as in "Receive ye one another, even as Christ also received you, to the glory of God."⁵³

The term that Paul consistently uses for "love" is agape. The question now arises as to whether we can actually speak of a Christian having agape for his neighbour. Nygren has shown that the term agape is used for a love that is utterly spontaneous and uncaused.⁵⁴ The question is whether a human being is capable of that kind of love. The answer is that by himself man is not capable of such love. But Paul treats the ethical life of the Christian as the direct expression of God's or Christ's agape: "the love of Christ constraineth us."⁵⁵ This is the reason why Paul can use the name agape for the love of the Christian for his neighbor. It is not really man, but God who is the subject of this love. Nygren says:

Between Christ and the Christian there is a spiritual fellowship such as Paul describes in Gal. 2:20: 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me'; and the basis of this fellowship is, that He 'loved me and gave Himself for me.' Thus the Agape of the Christian is Christ's Agape in him. God's Agape can be described, almost real-

51. Eph. 5:1,2.

52. Eph. 4:32.

53. Rom. 15:7.

54. Nygren, op. cit., p. 92.

55. II Cor. 5:14.

istically, as 'shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which is given unto us' (Rom. 5:5); it forms the true substance of the life of the Christian, and in his social life it is freely given to others. He has nothing of his own to give; the love which he shows to his neighbour is God's Agape in him.⁵⁶

Hence the use of the term agape to describe the love of the Christian for men means that in this case also agape denotes God's own love. It is not that God's love for man and man's love for his neighbour are two different things; they are one thing. Here the principle of union with Christ, of which we have already spoken, and the principle of love come together.

Paul traces this Agape back to its original source in God's own Agape. It is not that I have in my religious life the true basis for my ethical life; were it so, it would appear that I should still remain in myself, and develop my ethical potentialities. Paul's religion and Paul's ethics are theocentric altogether: All is of God, who has reconciled us with Himself through Christ; and whoever is in Christ is a new creature, living not unto himself or for himself, (II Cor. 5:15 ff.) but unto Christ.⁵⁷

The love of which Paul speaks will unfold itself in a great variety of social virtues, such as kindness, gentleness, meekness, forbearance, mercy, forgiveness, charity. For Paul love is the all-embracing virtue. "Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness."⁵⁸ Of the fruits of the spirit love was the first and most inclusive.⁵⁹ Love was to restrain anyone from using his Christian freedom for selfish or sinful purposes. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another."⁶⁰ "Here is the kernel of his social ethics with its intimate

56. Nygren, op. cit., p. 95-96.

57. Nygren, ibid., p. 96.

58. Col. 3:14.

59. Gal. 5:22-23.

60. Gal. 5:13.

connection of love and service, forbearance and freedom."⁶¹ Paul exhorted his readers: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another."⁶² He admonished the Ephesians to conduct themselves "with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love."⁶³ Not only was love to express itself in relationship to fellow believers, but it was to control behavior even towards the enemy. In writing to the Romans in the twelfth chapter he speaks of many types of behavior that should come from love,⁶⁴ and here he also says: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."⁶⁵ The importance that Paul places upon the concept of love for social behavior is seen most clearly in I Corinthians 13. Paul here shows that love always seeks the welfare of the other person and is ready to make even the greatest sacrifices for him. "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."⁶⁶ All writers on Christian social ethics recognize the fundamental importance of Paul's concept of love. "Love is the unifying and prime virtue of Christianity."⁶⁷ "His whole social philosophy was determined by this. The one supreme law."⁶⁸

61. Enslin, op. cit., p. 243.

62. Rom. 13:8.

63. Eph. 4:2.

64. Rom. 12:9.

65. Rom. 12:19-21.

66. I Cor. 13:13.

67. Mattson, A. D., Christian Ethics, p. 206.

68. Geiseman, op. cit., p. 37.

And we must recognize, as one writer says, that: "Indeed, it is the only real solution of the many vexing social, economic, and racial problems of our day."⁶⁹

THE EFFECT OF PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGY ON HIS SOCIAL ETHICS

There are many thinkers who have felt that because of his eschatology Paul was devoid of an effective social message. It is evident that Paul expected the Lord to return in the near future. The thought is that such a viewpoint could not be combined with a social program. In reading Paul's letters we soon see that Paul was expectantly waiting for our Lord's return. He taught his converts to be prepared at any moment for the return of Christ, as in I Corinthians 1:7, where he speaks of them as people "waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." And in his letter to Titus, after making exhortations concerning proper Christian conduct, he says: "Looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."⁷⁰

But does Paul's belief in the imminent return of the Lord cut the nerve of social endeavor? In discussing Paul's attitude toward marriage we shall see that eschatology did have an influence on what he has to say. It is also apparent that the teaching of the Lord's imminent return could cause people to ignore the practical affairs of life. This would, of course, be an abuse. But there is evidence that there were such abuses in Paul's day. Paul's second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written to curb the extravagances that had appeared there.

69. Reu and Bushring, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

70. Titus 2:13 *cf.* also I Thess. 4:15-17; Phil. 3:20; II Thess. 2; I Cor. 10:11.

Christopher F. Drewes has the following quotation in his "Introduction to the Books of the Bible":

'Mistaken and enthusiastic men had also nourished this deception by appealing to visions and to the traditional sayings of the apostle; and it would even appear that an epistle had been forged in the name of the apostle. The church was thrown into a state of wild excitement; an impatient and fanatical longing for the instant when Christ would come seized upon one portion The consequence was that many of the Thessalonians were neglecting their secular business and living idle and useless lives, conceiving that there was no use of working in a world which was so soon to be destroyed.'⁷¹

Here Paul shows that he has utterly no patience with lazy individuals who used this teaching as an excuse for quitting work.⁷² He insisted that they were to continue a normal life.⁷³

In this matter of the imminent return of the Lord Paul should not be pointed out as teaching anything different than other writers of the New Testament. A note of expectant waiting for the second coming is to be found in the Epistles of Peter, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the book of Revelation, and in the teachings of Jesus.⁷⁴ When we see what Paul has to say about man's life on earth in conjunction with others it is obvious that his eschatology does not cut the nerve of social endeavor. It was against this very abuse that he wrote, "be ye not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of the Christ is at hand."⁷⁵ There was always sufficient uncertainty as to the time of the return of the Lord to prevent men from

71. Drewes, Christopher F., Introduction to the Books of the Bible, pp. 182-183.

72. II Thess. 3:6-15.

73. II Thess. 2:1-3.

74. Rolston, Holms, op. cit., p. 36.

75. II Thess. 2:2.

using this as an excuse for laziness or indifference to or planning for the life on earth and certain signs, such as the rising of the Antichrist, would first have to appear. The expectation of Christ's coming was, in fact, to incite the Christian to greater efforts in sanctified living. In writing to the Romans Paul says: "Knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."⁷⁶

One of the important contributions of Paul's eschatology is that it gave people who were helpless victims of social conditions the hope of a coming age when the scale would be reversed. Therefore the slave could be confident that he would receive his reward later.⁷⁷ Paul wanted to assure people that the present struggle of life was not the end. If it were, then the Christian might well despair. But the future age when all would be changed was coming soon. This was not to make people oblivious to their present situation, nor was it to create in them an inertia for betterment, but it was to set into the foreground of their thinking spiritual and eternal values.⁷⁸ The need for such a view of life today is only too apparent. We just cannot understand the pain and the suffering, both individually and socially, without an adequate eschatology; without the assurance of the coming of a new age when all that seems so wrong will be made right.⁷⁹

76. Rom. 13:11-12.

77. Eph. 6:5-8; Col. 3:22-24.

78. Rall, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

79. Holms Rolston in his chapter on eschatology uses the term "eschatology" in such a wide sense that the issue becomes confused. Instead of confining the meaning of eschatology to the "last things", he would include anything that refers to God or the eternal. The importance of Paul's eschatology as such for his social message is therefore exaggerated. Rolston, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-45.

It is only as we view the approaching life in heaven that we can live in proper relationship to things of this world.

PAUL WAS NOT A SOCIAL REVOLUTIONIST

Paul does not assume a revolutionary attitude toward the social institutions of his day. He did make the seemingly radical statement: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ."⁸⁰ But in saying this he does not mean that in our present earthly existence the distinctions of race, class, and sex are to be ignored. His point is that these differences do not effect God and His plan of salvation for men. Before God all men are sinners, and by faith in Christ men become the children of God and heirs of heaven regardless of race, class, or sex. "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."⁸¹ That Paul did not intend to overthrow the existing social framework is made clear by statements like the following: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."⁸² "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."⁸³ "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh."⁸⁴ Holms Rolston says:

. . . Paul does not assume a revolutionary attitude toward the orders of creation and history within which the life of the Christian in society must be lived. He does not deify these orders. But he does urge the Christian to accept them and to acknowledge that they represent the will of God in that

80. Gal. 3:28.

81. Gal. 3:22.

82. Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:22.

83. Rom. 13:1.

84. Eph. 6:5.

they constitute the God-given social situation within which the Christian must live out his earthly life. In this sense, Paul's social message is a conservative force in the midst of society.⁸⁵

When we say that Paul does not assume a revolutionary attitude toward the social institutions of his day, we do not mean to say that he was indifferent to social evils. He is in constant opposition with all that is evil. In his exhortation to Christian living in Colossians 3:5-11 he says:

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them. But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeking that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.

The Christian was to be opposed and separated from all kinds of sin.⁸⁶ And Christ's attitude of love toward all men irrespective of their social situation should become that of the Christian in his attitude toward his fellowman. Such an attitude would rise above all social barriers, but it would not disregard them completely. It would seek to eliminate those elements that are contrary to the law of love, but it would not in every case seek to abolish the social setting. Because of our earthly existence, and because of sin, certain distinctions were seen by Paul as necessary. Therefore he would not abolish government, but would encourage Christians to work and pray for a just govern-

85. Rolston, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

86. Eph. 5:11.

ment.⁸⁷ He would not ignore the distinction of sex, but have husband and wife be guided by love.⁸⁸ He would not ignore the distinctions of position in the family, but he would encourage parents to train their children in the spirit of love, and would have children obey their parents in the same spirit.⁸⁹ The relationship between servant and master was to be one of fair treatment and fair service.⁹⁰ Although all such distinctions will be abolished in heaven, they are necessary for our earthly life, but for the Christian all social interaction must be ruled and guided by love. As we go on to present the implications of Paul's ethics for marriage and the family this matter will be illustrated more fully, but we speak of it here because the principle applies to the other social institutions as well.⁹¹

87. Rom. 13:1-7; I Tim. 2:1-3.

88. Eph. 5:21-35.

89. Eph. 6:1-4.

90. Eph. 6:5-6; I Cor. 7:21-24.

91. Holms Rolston speaks of St. Paul's radical and conservative principle. As far as possible Christians are to approximate the radical ideal illustrated by Gal. 3:28 and Col. 3:10,11. While he speaks of certain social institutions that are to be considered as orders of creation, he goes beyond the limits of Scripture in the application of his thought. For example he states: "It would be tragic if Paul's authority were to be used to make permanent within the church the present status of woman and to prevent the church in obedience to her inner life (which also comes from Paul) from building on earth a fellowship in which the emancipation of woman from male dominance has become complete." Paul seems to establish the place of woman in the church not only on the basis of social custom, but as a result of the order of creation. I Tim. 2:11-15. His words are therefore binding until the end of man's earthly life. Rolston, op. cit., pp. 56-714.

II. The Implications of Paul's Social Ethics for Marriage and the Family

Against the background of the general principles of St. Paul's social ethics as developed in the preceding pages we shall now single out the institution of the family for specific consideration. This is done because of the current increased interest in the welfare of the home. "This is evidenced by the number of syndicated columns appearing in our newspapers which treat some phase of courtship, marriage, and family living. The number of marriage clinics, organizations for the advancement of the family, and church committees on marriage and the home has likewise increased. All of these are a response to a felt need for help."⁹² Furthermore, we have selected this phase of Paul's social ethics since the family is the smallest social unit and is the very cornerstone of our whole social structure. Emil Brunner says:

Indeed, without being guilty of exaggeration, we may well maintain that the crisis in marriage presents the Christian ethic with the most serious and the most difficult problem with which a Christian ethic has to deal; indeed, in comparison with this problem even the questions of economic and political justice are of secondary importance. For not only are we here dealing with the very foundations of human existence, but here too all ethical problems are condensed into a complex at the one point, so that we are compelled to say: what an ethic has to say on this question shows whether it is any use or not.⁹³

Finally we have selected this phase of Paul's social ethics since the institution of the family affected the lives of Paul's converts more deeply than any other social institution.⁹⁴ For this reason Paul has

92. Feucht, Oscar E., in The Christian Family in the Modern World, 5th Yearbook of the Lutheran Education Association, p. IX.

93. Brunner, Emil, The Divine Imperative, p. 341.

94. Rolston, op. cit., p. 107.

much to say about marriage and family relationships. This is written with the feeling that Paul's contribution to this phase of social ethics should be better understood, and that such an understanding would be tremendously helpful in view of the problems of our day.

ST. PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MARRIAGE

We must first give consideration to Paul's attitude toward marriage in general. * It has frequently been charged that Christianity has advocated the celibate life as a higher type of life than the married state. This charge is tied up with the ascetic trend that has existed in some sections of the church from time to time, especially in the Roman Catholic Church. In speaking of some of the influences that led to the ascetic trend E. R. Groves mentions, among other things, "the example and teachings of St. Paul."⁹⁵ There are many who express opinions similar to that of E. R. Groves. For example we find that Theo. von Haering says that Paul undeniably regards marriage "essentially as a concession to weakness."⁹⁶ Allen G. Widgery writes:

For Paul marriage was a means to avoid the greater evil of fornication. He did not see in it either a realm of moral companionship or of experience of sexual good. He taught that it should be avoided as far as possible . . . The Epistle to the Ephesians suggests a high view of marriage in its symbolic description of the Church as the bride of Christ: but it is now maintained by scholars that this is not a Pauline writing. For Paul marriage was 'essentially

95. Groves, E. R., Christianity and the Family, p. 43. In this connection it should be noted that in a later section E. R. Groves shows that he does not understand the true nature of asceticism. He says that "It cannot rightly be said that asceticism is the ideal of the Catholic Church. It is not regarded as a universal obligation." However, asceticism stems from the belief that the material body is in some manner inherently evil while the soul is good. The question of universal obligation is not pertinent to this matter.

96. Haering, Theo. von, The Ethics of the Christian Life, p. 233.

a concession to weakness' and thus definitely not a constituent of the highest moral life.⁹⁷

George Matheson attributes Paul's "lack of sympathy for the marriage state" to insufficient spiritual development. The high estimate placed upon marriage in Ephesians is said to represent a later development in comparison with what is said in I Corinthians.⁹⁸ Albert Schweitzer thinks that Paul was essentially an ascetic in his thinking, but feels that he "is not rigorous in his application of the ascetic principle, whether in the question of marriage, or that of property, or any other."⁹⁹

But is it entirely correct to attribute the foregoing attitude to St. Paul with regard to marriage? In the first place it is clear that Paul is not influenced to take a negative attitude toward marriage because of the idea, common in the thought and practice in his day as well as at later periods in the history of the church, that there was something evil in the flesh as such in contrast with the spirit.¹⁰⁰ Paul is not guilty of this metaphysical dualism that lies behind the spirit of asceticism. To explain what is meant by this dualism of matter and spirit we quote a section from Nygren's Eros and Agape:

The soul is essentially good, but it is held in the body as in a prison-house; its enforced association with the body is the root of its evil, and therefore the aim of ethics is the liberation of the soul from bondage to sense. Hence the ethics of Eros show a regular tendency towards asceticism. Evil lies in the downward direction, looking towards the sensible; good lies in the upward direction, towards the

97. Widgey, Allen G., Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life, pp. 214-215.

98. Matheson, George, The Spiritual Development of St. Paul, pp. 271-274.

99. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 311.

100. Rall, op. cit., p. 214.

spiritual; and 'conversion' in Eros-religion always means a change in the direction of desire. The soul which had previously cared only for lower things and sensual satisfaction now begins to care for higher things and to have spiritual ideals.

The ethics of Agape are quite differently conceived. Here, the difference between Good and Evil consists in an attitude of the will. Sin has nothing to do with the presence of the soul in the body. It is the perversion of the will in disobedience to God and rejection of God; it is man's self-centered attitude in relation to God. There is nothing evil in the body; and conversion means, not the turning of the soul to seek higher and nobler objects of desire, but a complete change of mind, whereby the self-centered will is changed to a theocentric will, subject to the Will of God.¹⁰¹

St. Paul's ethics are dominated by agape rather than by eros as we have brought out in the preceding chapter.

Paul was not an ascetic. He exhibits none of the characteristic tendencies of the ascetic. For example, he did not consider it necessary to make distinctions in meats.¹⁰² He did not think it wrong to make use of wine.¹⁰³ Nor was he averse to participation in social pleasures.¹⁰⁴ The spirit of asceticism is directly attacked when he writes to the Colossian Christians:

So if, through your faith in Christ, you are dead to the principles of this world's life, why, as if you were still part and parcel of this world-wide system, do you take the slightest notice of these purely human prohibitions--'Don't touch this,' 'Don't taste that' and 'Don't handle the other'? 'This', 'that' and 'the other' will all pass away after use! I know that these regulations look wise with their self-inspired efforts at worship, their policy of self-humbling, and their studied neglect of the body. But in actual practice they do honour, not to God, but to man's own pride.¹⁰⁵

101. Nygren, op. cit., pp. 174-175.

102. Rom. 14:2,14; I Cor. 8:4; I Tim. 4:3-5.

103. I Tim. 5:23.

104. I Cor. 10:27.

105. Col. 2:20-23. Phillips, J. B., Letters to Young Churches, pp. 123-124.

Mattson is correct when he says, "Asceticism is mistaken in regarding the natural as evil in itself. The ascetic may be a very selfish individual, merely seeking the salvation of his own soul."¹⁰⁶ The long list of abnormal psychic states that result from asceticism confirms the fact that it is essentially evil. "Asceticism in its extreme forms could never become a universal practice without destroying the human race."¹⁰⁷ It is not asceticism that influences Paul's view of marriage.

* Nevertheless, did not Paul in an unqualified manner commend celibacy above marriage? Before we consider some of St. Paul's statements we should consider the fact, as W. A. Maier says, that "celibacy is condemned by that sweeping, all-comprehensive verdict which the divine Creator immortalized in the opening records of human history: 'It is not good that the man should be alone.'¹⁰⁸ Paul is in agreement with the general principle that marriage is the normal state for man and woman. Celibacy is not to be considered as affording higher moral perfection. He says that "A bishop . . . must be blameless, the husband of one wife."¹⁰⁹ And he brands those who will come in the latter times forbidding marriage as "seducing spirits", and their teachings as "doctrines of devils".¹¹⁰ Despite his great zeal for the cause of Christ and his eagerness to win consecrated men and women as workers in the church, he did not want young widows to be tied to church duties when it would be morally and spiritually more wholesome for them to be

106. Mattson, op. cit., p. 260.

107. Mattson, ibid.

108. Maier, W. A., For Better and Not For Worse, p. 28.

109. I Tim. 3:2.

110. I Tim. 4:1-3.

married. He says, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully."¹¹¹ The fact is, and Paul recognizes this, that since marriage is a divinely established institution and both sexes have been created for it by God, it follows that celibacy cannot be considered as affording a higher moral perfection.¹¹²

It can be safely said that Christianity alone places the proper estimate upon marriage. C. S. Lewis has said:

I know some muddle-headed Christians have talked as if Christianity thought that sex, or the body, or pleasure were bad in themselves. But they were wrong. Christianity is almost the only one of the great religions which thoroughly approves of the body--which believes that matter is good, that God Himself once took on a human body, that some kind of body is going to be an essential part of our happiness, our beauty, and our energy. Christianity has glorified marriage more than any other religion; and nearly all the greatest love poetry in the world has been produced by Christians.¹¹³

St. Paul has certainly contributed to placing marriage on a high level. Such passages as Colossians 3:18 ff., Ephesians 5:22-33, and II Corinthians 11:2, with their injunctions for husbands and wives to live in the tenderest love, and above all the choice figure from wedded life to illustrate the union of Christ and the Church, show the loftiness of Paul's conception of marriage.¹¹⁴

Paul does, however, recommend celibacy under certain conditions. Because of conditions in the congregation at Corinth he advises against marriage for certain people. Among the things that he told them with

111. I Tim. 5:9-16.

112. Reu and Buehring, op. cit., p. 263.

113. Lewis, C. S., Christian Behavior, p. 27.

114. Enslin, op. cit., p. 192.

regard to marriage was that, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman . . . I would that all men were even as I myself . . . I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I."¹¹⁵ In this same chapter he then gives reasons for such a recommendation. For one thing he says, "I suppose therefore that this is good for the present distress."¹¹⁶ And then another reason is mentioned when he says, "I would have you without carefulness, He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife."¹¹⁷ Of the two reasons given for which the state of celibacy might be preferable, there is, first of all, the peculiar conditions of the time for the Corinthians. The "present distress" of which Paul speaks is usually thought to be a reference to impending violent persecutions. The other reason was that the individual Christian might serve the Lord more capably if he were not distracted by family obligations.

It is on the basis of these statements of Paul in I Corinthians 7 that the many charges have arisen as to Paul's aversion for marriage and his exaltation of celibacy. However, to find in these words a general endorsement of the unmarried state as a superior holiness is entirely unfounded. Paul's general rule is stated in this same chapter where he says: "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."¹¹⁸ It should also be noted that he says, "I

115. I Cor. 7:1,7,8.

116. I Cor. 7:26.

117. I Cor. 7:32,33.

118. I Cor. 7:2.

speak this by permission, and not of commandment."¹¹⁹ In another verse he speaks of this advise^C as being "after my judgment." He emphasizes that he has received no divine revelation on this question of marrying or not marrying but that he is expressing his private conviction which the Holy Spirit has perpetuated.¹²⁰ Under the circumstances it was undoubtedly good advice.

Paul does not give this advise^C to remain unmarried under the circumstances existing for those Christians without making the proper qualifications. He expects, as he explicitly states, only those to follow this advice who have the special gift of continence. "But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn."¹²¹ It is on the basis of this statement that many have taken the idea that Paul views marriage merely as a concession to weakness. It is an arbitrary and false interpretation to find such an idea in these words. Paul is merely stating the fact that although the situation of Christians was so precarious that it might justify abstinence from marriage for reasons of prudence, even at such a time it might be wiser for many to marry than to carry on fierce struggles against the sexual urges. E. R. Groves puts it concisely when he says, "He did not intend to have later Christians read into his words, 'Marriage is for Christians always undesirable and only to be entered upon because it is better than being consumed by passion.'"¹²² There is also merit to what Otto Piper says on this matter, namely:

119. I Cor. 7:6.

120. Maier, op. cit., p. 550.

121. I Cor. 7:9.

122. Groves, op. cit., p. 46.

When . . . he says it is better to marry than to keep on burning, his point is not to put marriage on a lower plane as a 'medicine for immorality.' Rather he is attacking a refined doctrine of 'righteousness by works', whereby a purely outward restraint from sexual intercourse is regarded as meritorious. Against this view, he insists, in harmony with Jesus, that lustful glances and passion in the heart are themselves adultery. Paul's objective, therefore, is only to prevent celibacy being imposed from without. Rather God Himself will make it plain to a man whether he is fitted for celibacy. If a person has control of his will in regard to sex, then, but only then, is it divinely ordained that he remain unmarried.¹²³

Piper also has this comment: "Paul never utters a solitary word against marriage, although he regards as a special gift of grace that it has been granted to him to be able to live unmarried."¹²⁴

Paul's view that marriage would lead to divided loyalties¹²⁵ is also written in view of the "present distress", but again the qualification applies that only those who are capable of celibacy are to remain unmarried. In view of the present distress he feels that it is better not to marry¹²⁶ if one has the gift for it, but where this is not the case he would certainly not call marriage wrong.¹²⁷ We can understand the problem which Paul faces here. It is easy to see that Paul himself in the midst of his roving life as the apostle to the Gentiles would have found it very difficult to combine loyalty to Christ with the obligations of family life. Similarly, those who marry do assume responsibilities. In this respect, they do not have the freedom of those who have family responsibilities. However, as Rolston

123. Piper, Otto A., The Christian Interpretation of Sex, pp. 16-17.

124. Piper, ibid.

125. I Cor. 7:32-35.

126. I Cor. 7:38.

127. I Cor. 7:36-38.

points out:

. . . it does not always follow that the Christian life is best realized in the absence of responsibilities. And the testimony of most Christians is that loyalty to the responsibilities of the home does not involve any lack of loyalty to Christ and His church. Christ demands the first loyalty of our life. There is no place in the Christian's life for an idolatry that places love of children ahead of love of Christ. But we do not need to love our children less because we must love Christ more. In fact, when God is placed first, there is a fiber and moral quality about our human loves which they never attain unless they are related to a consuming love for Christ. And through the homes which they have created, Christian men and women have often rendered their largest service to Christ and His kingdom. The decision here must be left to every individual as he faces the demands of his Lord on him. Some may find that they can best serve Christ by not marrying. Others will find that it is within the married life that they can best serve their God.¹²⁸

While for some marriage may lead to a divided loyalty, for others who have not the gift of continency the marriage relation brings freedom from distractions and promotes a life of full service to God. That Paul did not intend to have his words construed to be a sweeping endorsement of the celibate life is evident in that he also says: "I will therefore that the younger women" (the reference is to young widows) "marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully."¹²⁹

Some writers make a good deal of the eschatological note in Paul's attitude toward marriage. In the same section in which he speaks of the "present distress" he also speaks of the impending end of the present world. He speaks in this manner:

^{128.} Rolston, op. cit., pp. 114-115.

^{129.} I Tim. 5:14.

Brethren, the time is short; it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; And they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; And they that use this world, as not abusing it: for the fashion of this world passeth away.¹³⁰

In reference to these words Reinhold Niebuhr says that St. Paul is dominated by the interims motif and particularly in his family ethic.

He then says:

Confidence in the imminent destruction of the present world order prompts him to counsel indifference toward relationships the significance of which depends upon its continuance. Jesus' attitude toward the family is entirely different. It is, on the whole, sacramental ('what God hath joined let no man put asunder'). Where it approaches the ascetic, as for instance, in the identification of lust with adultery, the rigorous note has no relation to the apocalyptic element. It is merely a consistent part of the entire emphasis upon absolute purity of motive in the total system of thought.¹³¹

Here is an example of drawing a conclusion without taking into consideration the full import of the context. As pointed out earlier,¹³² Paul did regard the coming of the end of the present world to be imminent. And the "present distress" spoken of by Paul is found to be in immediate conjunction with this eschatological note. The counsel he gives here is not only conditioned by his eschatology, but by this chaotic condition which was also to be thought of as a sign of the beginning of the end. Even here the words of Paul are not to be pressed to the extent that we assert that he advises a sinful "indifference toward relationships"¹³³ ordained by God and exalted by Paul in other

130. I Cor. 7:29-31.

131. Niebuhr, Reinhold, Moral Man and Immoral Society, p. 56.

132. Cf. pp. 18-21.

133. Niebuhr, ibid.

passages. When he advises those who have wives "to be as though they had none"¹³⁴ he merely wishes to emphasize the need for maintaining a sane estimate of relationships which are to last only for the present life. The thought is not that married men should now simply disregard and neglect their wives. Paul also says: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."¹³⁵ As we have brought out before, Paul's eschatology does not cut the nerve of social action, but it rather serves the necessary function of setting eternity into the foreground of man's thinking so that a proper evaluation of the things of this life might be made.

The question has been raised from time to time as to whether St. Paul had ever been married. Among the Jews marriage was generally accounted as a sacred obligation. Its neglect was deemed a calamity and a crime. Marriage was a religious ordinance. "Marriage is, in fact, the first of the 613 precepts."¹³⁶ Because of this David Smith says:

It seems likely that Saul, a devout Jew and a strict Pharisee, would marry in due course; and the inference is confirmed by the fact that he was subsequently enrolled in the high court of the Sanhedrin and on at least one memorable occasion participated in its judicial procedure. For it was required, among the qualifications of a Sanhedrist, that he should be not only a married man but a father, inasmuch as one who was softened by domestic affection would be disposed to mercy in his judgments.¹³⁷

The fact that Paul was not married when he wrote to the Corinthians¹³⁸

134. I Cor. 7:29.

135. I Tim. 5:8.

136. Farrar, F. W., The Life and Work of St. Paul, p. 46.

137. Smith, David, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, p. 30.

138. I Cor. 7:8.

does not prove that he had never been married. The word translated "unmarried" in the passage just referred to could also be translated "widowers." David Smith¹³⁹ and F. W. Farrar¹⁴⁰ think that he was a widower.

However, it is also admitted that there were exceptions made to the almost universal rule that every Jew should marry. There were some who at least theoretically placed on a higher level than marriage a complete devotion to the study of the law free from the incumbrance of marriage.¹⁴¹ In view of this Ramsay regards the statements of Paul in I Corinthians 7 as a case in which "Paul is defending himself by stating the reasons which impelled him when young to violate the almost universal custom and remain unmarried."¹⁴² The matter cannot be proven absolutely. But it can be said that his alleged discountenancing of marriage cannot be charged to a Jewish prejudice toward marriage.¹⁴³

In concluding this discussion of Paul's attitude toward marriage it can be said that Paul regards marriage as God's will for man under normal conditions. Paul exalts marriage placing it on an extremely high level. He does prefer celibacy for himself because of the qualifications he possessed for that state, and because of his circumstances in life. While at the same time he declares his right and privilege to marry if he should so choose.¹⁴⁴ Under certain conditions, physical, social, or even professional, it may be best for an individual to

139. Smith, op. cit., p. 31.

140. Farrar, op. cit., p. 46.

141. Farrar, ibid.

142. Ramsay, Sir W. M., Pauline and Other Studies, pp. 68-69.

143. Farrar, op. cit., p. 46.

144. I Cor. 9:5.

remain single. Weidner summarizes the principles with reference to the matter of choosing the celibate life when he writes:

All arbitrarily chosen celibacy is objectionable, and it is, moreover, an act contrary to duty to decline marriage for the sake of ease, or of maintaining a so-called independence. A celibacy determined on from duty and conviction must either have for its reason individual peculiarities, or special circumstances. In some circumstances also it may be a duty to choose celibacy for the kingdom of God's sake, because special activity to which an individual may be called for the cause of Christ, e.g. that of a missionary, would encounter in married or domestic life to great hindrances to its full development.¹⁴⁵

Under any circumstances, a person must not determine to choose celibacy when it is clear that he does not have the gift for it. Furthermore, this characteristic cannot be produced by artificial training. However, when celibacy is chosen because of valid circumstances and the guidance of God, then there will also be compensations in other ways for the loss of those blessings attainable only in matrimony.¹⁴⁶

THE FUNCTION OF SEX

Although sex communion is not the chief purpose of marriage, it is the chief distinguishing characteristic of marriage.¹⁴⁷ In any discussion of marriage and the family this subject must come in for consideration. This is especially the case in the treatment of Paul's social ethics. Of all the writers of the New Testament, Paul is the one who deals with sex matters at greatest length and in most varied ways. Paul was frequently confronted with problems of sex in his mission activities and therefore deals with these problems in his

145. Weidner, op. cit., p. 318.

146. Reu and Buhring, op. cit., p. 264.

147. Reu and Buhring, ibid., p. 265.

letters. There has been much confused thinking done on Paul's theory of sex morality. Ascetic tendencies have been charged against him here, as in his attitude toward marriage in general. From the outset we should understand that in going to Paul for light on matters of sex, we cannot expect to find a systematic treatment of normal or abnormal sexual behavior, no more than we can expect to find a systematic treatment of the general field of social ethics. Paul gives answers to problems that confronted him. However, the implications of his answers are not specifically confined to the immediate situation, for he speaks on the basis of principles that express the will of God. How his words apply to our situation today is not difficult to see. Certainly, we will admit that in our day, there is a need for sound principles in dealing with the many and varied sexual disturbances that arise within and without the institution of marriage.

In the history of the church there has been the feeling at times, in both Catholic and Protestant groups, that sex constituted a foreign element hostile to spiritual achievement.¹⁴⁸ This feeling has grown out of the ascetic principle which regards the physical as essentially evil. We have already seen that Paul was not in sympathy with such a teaching. Paul's attitude is that sex, like our entire physical frame, is a gift of God that is not in itself evil, but rather good. However, as with other things, sex must be used in the right way.¹⁴⁹ In the letters of Paul the human body with its various organs is spoken of as a wonderful creation. This body is given a high recog-

148. Groves, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.

149. Cf. I Cor. 8:8; I Tim. 4:3 ff.

dition when Paul uses it to illustrate the Christian Church with its many members who possess "diversities of gifts."¹⁵⁰ The tragedy of life is that sin has perverted the functions of the body.

Paul definitely recognizes and commends the proper function of sex. In the first place, sexual communion is to take place in marriage exclusively. Paul reiterates the plan of the Creator who ordained marriage. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."¹⁵¹ In the relationship of husband and wife sex communion is a necessary thing, but outside of marriage it is always forbidden. "But fornication, and all uncleanness . . . let it not be once named among you as becometh saints."¹⁵²

What is the purpose of sex communion in marriage? Certainly Paul would say that, for one thing, it is for reproduction. His emphasis upon proper family relationships would imply this. In speaking of young widows he says: "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children etc."¹⁵³ Childbearing is an essential function of the female sex. In motherhood she finds her greatest glory.¹⁵⁴ The natural and necessary result of marriage and sex communion is the issuance of children. However, reproduction is not the only purpose of sex communion in marriage. Otto Piper says that Paul "regards sex intercourse not from the standpoint of reproduction,

150. I Cor. 12.

151. Gen. 2:24, Eph. 5:31.

152. Eph. 5:3.

153. I Tim. 5:14.

154. I Tim. 2:15.

but from that of a mutual obligation."¹⁵⁵ This is stated by Paul in the words: "The husband should give to his wife her conjugal right, and likewise the wife to her husband."¹⁵⁶ Becoming "one flesh" is literally accomplished in sex intercourse. This is the will of God for husband and wife.¹⁵⁷ This "oneness" of husband and wife is therefore another purpose of sex communion. Furthermore, Paul speaks of the necessity of sex communion for the purpose of avoiding fornication. "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."¹⁵⁸ This does not mean that sex communion in marriage is the less of two evils. Here Paul merely states the principle that holds true among all married people. When proper sex communion is established and maintained, there the sex urge finds proper satisfaction. Sex communion therefore serves as a prophylactic against immorality. These various purposes of sex communion are recognized by Paul and should be recognized by the Christian who endeavors to apply the principles of God to the social institution of marriage.

Paul also sees that there are abuses of the sex principle even in the marriage relationship. A spouse may be unreasonable in sexual demands. Here is where the vertical relationship of the Christian husband and wife with Christ is seen to be of vital importance. How is the powerful drive of sex to be properly controlled in marriage for the protection of both husband and wife? Love is the answer to

155. Piper, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

156. I Cor. 7:3. Cf. also v. 4-7.

157. Eph. 5:31.

158. I Cor. 7:2.

the problem. Christ's love in the husband and wife is the only completely satisfactory control. Paul writes: "Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it . . . So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."¹⁵⁹ A genuine Christian love places its own limits on the activity of sex in marriage. Neither of the pair will one-sidedly make sexual claims on the other. It is not reconcilable with love to compel another to sexual intercourse. Not only one's own desire, but also the willingness and the bodily condition of the other will effect one's attitude in sex life. Both parties are responsible for each other, to protect each other from physical and mental hurt, through excessive or defective activity of the instinct.¹⁶⁰ Love of the partner is also incompatible with a permanent refusal to have intercourse. These are implications of Paul's words:

The husband should give his wife what is due to her as his wife, and the wife should be as fair to her husband. The wife has no longer full rights over her own person, but shares them with her husband. In the same way the husband shares his personal rights with his wife. Do not cheat each other of normal sexual intercourse, unless of course you both decide to abstain temporarily to make special opportunity for fasting and prayer. But afterwards you should resume relations as before, or you will expose

159. Eph. 5:24-30.

160. Piper, op. cit., pp. 129-130.

yourselves to the obvious temptation of the devil.¹⁶¹

It is only the power of Christ's agape in husband and wife that can bring husband and wife to the ideal relationship in the matter of sex communion. Paul states the ideal when he says: "This is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: That every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour."¹⁶²

Just as St. Paul recognizes the proper function of sex, he also comes out strongly against any misuse of sex. The fight against sexual impurity was one of the most bitter the apostle was called to make. In many of the cults of the oriental world sexual life and religion were closely associated. Even in the more respectable of the cults the wildest of orgies with drunkenness and the utmost abandon often accompanied the ceremonies. To all this the Gentile Christian was accustomed, and was disposed to regard such excesses very leniently if indeed he was not indisposed to indulge in them himself. To cite one example of the type of morality that was common, "unchastity in an unmarried daughter was a grievous wrong against her family since it had the tendency to make her marital chances poorer, but aside from that it carried no particular disgrace."¹⁶³

In the catalogue of vices Paul lists those connected with the sexual relation among the first.¹⁶⁴ In enumerating sins which will exclude us from the Kingdom of God Paul never omits the sexual sins.

161. I Cor. 7:3-6. Phillips, op. cit., p. 46.

162. I Thess. 4:3,4.

163. Enslin, op. cit., pp. 144-145.

164. Rom. 1:26 ff.; I Cor. 6:9 ff.; Gal. 5:19 ff.; Eph 5:3 ff.; Col. 3:5 ff.

Piper says:

This fact does not show that he was 'specially hostile to the body.' Rather it shows the insight of a man nineteen hundred years before the discovery of psychoanalysis, an insight which probed more deeply than the latter into ramifications and abysses of human nature. Paul saw how any confusion in sex matters exercised a devastating influence upon the whole life of an individual and on his relations with his fellows. He saw how it enslaved the will more than do other acts.¹⁶⁵

Overagainst the pagan society from which his converts were drawn, Paul sets his high standards of sexual purity.

In the first chapter of Romans he speaks of those vicious abnormal sex practices in which many of that heathen and idolatrous society engaged. He says:

For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.¹⁶⁶

These unnatural practices are common in the society of our day, more common than most of us realize. Of those who engage in such things Paul says: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God."¹⁶⁷

In the fifth and sixth chapters of I Corinthians, Paul deals with the sin of fornication. He starts with a specific instance in which a man who had been guilty of the sin of incest was permitted to remain

165. Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

166. Rom. 1:26-27.

167. I Cor. 6:9-10.

in the fellowship of the church. But here Paul also sets forth the principles that stand in opposition to impurity of any kind. In verses 12-19 of the sixth chapter of I Corinthians Paul gives us his reasons for holding that sexual sins are totally inconsistent with genuine Christian living. The point in verse 12 is that although we enjoy freedom as Christians, we are to exercise that freedom so as not to allow ourselves to be mastered by the body. In verse 13 he says: "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them. Now the body is not for fornication, but the Lord; and the Lord for the body." Evidently there were some who argued that it is just as natural to have sexual intercourse as it is to eat, therefore promiscuous sex relations should not be considered as evil. Paul points out that the analogy is a false one. His point is that while the belly is for food alone and serves no higher purpose than that, sex affects the body as a whole.¹⁶⁸ And the real purpose of the body is the service of God.¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, "the Lord is for the body."¹⁷⁰ Christ actually dwells in the Christian. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?"¹⁷¹ What follows presents the reason for Paul's horror of illicit sexual relations:

Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. What? know ye

168. Rolston, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-109.

169. Phil. 1:20.

170. I Cor. 6:13.

171. I Cor. 6:15.

not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.¹⁷²

Paul emphasizes that in fornication there is more than a meeting of the bodies of men and women on a purely animal plane. In intercourse there is a mutual surrender of their whole personalities. Sexual intercourse can never be merely an isolated union. It implies the complete union of a man and woman unto "one flesh."¹⁷³ Here we quote a significant paragraph by C. S. Lewis:

The Christian idea of marriage is based on Christ's words that a man and wife are to be regarded as a single organism--for that is what the words 'one flesh' would be in modern English. And the Christians believe that when He said this He was not expressing a sentiment but stating a fact--just as one is stating a fact when one says that a lock and its key are one mechanism, or that a violin and a bow are one musical instrument. The inventor of the human machine was telling us that its two halves, the male and the female, were made to be combined together in pairs, not simply on the sexual level, but totally combined. The monstrosity of sexual intercourse outside marriage is that those who indulge in it are trying to isolate one kind of union (the sexual) from all the other kinds of union which were intended to go along with it and make up the total union. The Christian attitude doesn't mean that there is anything wrong about sexual pleasure, any more than about the pleasure of eating. It means that you mustn't isolate that pleasure and try to get it by itself, any more than you ought to try to get the pleasures of taste without swallowing and digesting, by chewing things and spitting them out again.¹⁷⁴

Or as Brunner has said: "The evil in the life of sex is the isolated function, which manifests its hostility to the Divine order by reducing the awful process of procreation and sexual union to a mere trifle."¹⁷⁵

172. I Cor. 6:15-20.

173. I Cor. 6:16.

174. Lewis, C. S., op. cit., pp. 30-31.

175. Brunner, op. cit., p. 349.

Paul also shows keen insight into the nature of sex when he says that, "he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body."¹⁷⁶ The entire body with its personality is involved. It is not just the sex organs or genitals which have sexual desires, but the self. For that reason sexual desire is directed not to the sexual organs only of another, but to the whole person as the one who possesses the sexual quality. Similarly the impulses of sex are so strong and are felt so urgently because they are not the desires and impulses of the sex organs and their functions, but rather the needs of the self.¹⁷⁷

These basic principles which stand in direct opposition to impurity are just as true and vital today as they were in Paul's day. There are many arguments for purity that Paul does not mention. The non-Christian urges the fear of disease or the sense of wrong to unborn life as arguments against illicit sex communion. With the advance of medical science, these arguments have lost much of their effect. Paul's argument that impurity is contrary to the very purpose of sex and that it is destructive of human personality is always valid.¹⁷⁸ For the Christian, who is in union with Christ, the overwhelming argument against impurity as presented by Paul is given in the rhetorical questions: "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid."¹⁷⁹ No further argument should ever be necessary.

176. I Cor. 6:18.

177. Piper, op. cit., pp. 35-36.

178. Rolston, op. cit., pp. 111-112.

179. I Cor. 6:15.

In view of the foregoing we may conclude that it is the task of the Christian church, in its efforts to serve the family, neither to war against sex nor to encourage its usurping the supremacy in the man and woman relationship. It is only a part, fundamental though it is, of the total oneness of husband and wife. The minister as he seeks to conserve marriage and the family as a teacher and a counselor should be concerned with sexual maladjustment as an obstacle to wholesome and complete husband and wife fellowship. He must seek to avoid giving the impression that sex communion and sex adjustment is an end in itself. Its function in marriage must cultivate the larger relationship. Nor does sex, when it functions properly, as God would have it function, detract from one's relationship to God.¹⁸⁰

THE PERMANENCY OF MARRIAGE

Paul regards marriage as a permanent relationship in this life. That is, the marriage relationship should not be broken during the life time of the husband and wife. Separation by death of one or the other should be the only dissolution of the marriage relation. Paul says: "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband."¹⁸¹

The finality of marriage is also affirmed by the fact that Paul uses the union of man and woman in marriage to illustrate the union of Christ with His church. Rolston says: "The surrender of the soul to Christ has about it the note of finality. And if it lacks this note it

180. Groves, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

181. Rom. 7:2. Cf. also I Cor. 7:39.

is not genuine. No man can say that he will experiment with being a Christian for a year and that if he does not like it he will at the end of the year return to sin."¹⁸² Likewise, Paul would never sanction a trial marriage. Once marriage is consummated it must be accepted as final by both parties.

The finality of marriage is also asserted in the doctrine of the oneness of husband and wife. The sexual union climaxes the relationship of husband and wife and ties them irrevocably together. This oneness is brought to its final stage in the issuance of children.

Man and woman and child form a trinity that cannot be broken.

And not only throughout our earthly life but throughout all eternity, it will be true that one immortal soul knows that through the creative union of two persons that soul has come into being. This is the basic human fact that underlies marriage and it is this fact that should make the marriage union irrevocable.¹⁸³

In approaching the subject of the permanency of marriage as that teaching affects the husband and wife, it should be kept in mind from the outset that underlying this union and maintaining it there must be mutual love. The obligation of keeping marriage inviolate is carried out on the strength of love. Paul says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church."¹⁸⁴ While the sense of duty and fidelity need to be stressed, yet it must not give the impression that the first duty of familial experience is fidelity. Fidelity is a product rather than a cause. It must be the natural outcome of an underlying love. The marriage vows are to be kept whether a genuine mutual

182. Rolston, op. cit., p. 116.

183. Rolston, ibid., p. 119.

184. Eph. 5:26.

love exists or not, but where they are kept merely because of duty the marriage has lost its chief value. Where mutual love reigns the problem of maintaining the husband and wife relationship ceases to be a problem.

Paul is aware of the fact that marriage is only for this earthly existence. Because of this a marriage is automatically dissolved by the death of either partner. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband But if her husband be dead, she is free from the law."¹⁸⁵ In such a case a second marriage is allowable. "But if the husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord."¹⁸⁶ In many cases remarriage is not only allowable but also advisable. That is why Paul advises the younger widows to marry again, and for the reasons which are stated.¹⁸⁷ Nor is there any disapprobation of remarriage in these passages where Paul required of a bishop and a deacon "to be the husband of one wife."¹⁸⁸ While bigamy and polygamy are regarded as being contrary to the divine plan of marriage,¹⁸⁹ remarriage after the death of a partner is never forbidden.¹⁹⁰

Does not Paul permit a spouse who for some reason or other no longer wishes to live in the state of marriage to separate as long as

185. Rom. 7:2,3.

186. I Cor. 7:39.

187. I Cor. 7:8,9; I Tim. 5:11-15.

188. I Tim. 3:2,12; Tit. 1:6.

189. Paul consistently uses the singular in speaking of husband and wife. Any other form than monogamy is condemned by implication and by the very nature of marriage. Rom. 7:2; I Cor. 7:2; II Cor. 11:2.

190. Weidner, op. cit., p. 332.

a new marriage is not contracted? That view has been held by many.¹⁹¹ The basis for the position is said to be found in the words of Paul: "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife."¹⁹² But that he here permits separation with the condition that no new marriage be contracted can hardly be the meaning of these words. In the first place, he says, "Let not the wife depart," and "let not the husband put away his wife."¹⁹³ To permit separation in the same breath would be nothing less than a contradiction. In verse 5 his rule is that conjugal cohabitation should cease at most only "for a time." On this passage Theo. Laetch says:

The evident meaning of these words is that the wife must do one of two things, either remain unmarried or--rather--be reconciled, since the Lord permits no separation. For this use of η compare Acts 24, 18-20: 'Certain Jews of Asia ought to have been here before thee and object if they had ought against me, η , or else let these same here say, if they have found any evil doing in me.' Ask the Jews from Asia, η , or rather, since that cannot be done because of their absence, let these men speak. In a similar manner η is used in our passage. Let her remain unmarried, or rather, since that cannot be done because of the divine prohibition of separation, let her become reconciled.¹⁹⁴

As a consequence of this we may conclude that Paul's position is that marriage is never to be dissolved. But at the same time Paul came up against the situation in which marriage had actually been dis-

191. Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-263. He says: "Where, however, contentment was lacking, it was legitimate to sever the union in the interest of peace."

192. I Cor. 7:10, 11.

193. I Cor. 7:10, 11.

194. Laetch, Theo., "Divorce and Malicious Desertion," Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 3, 1932, November and December.

solved by the act of desertion. It is easy to see how such a situation would arise. While one of a married pair became a Christian, the other remained a pagan. Therefore the first question to arise was with regard to such a mixed marriage. What was the Christian spouse to do? Paul gives his answer in verses 12-16 of I Corinthians 7.

In the case of mixed marriages two possibilities were open. First of all, if the unbelieving spouse was "pleased to dwell" with the Christian, then, "let him not put her away."¹⁹⁵ The marriage itself was a genuine marriage and was not to be dissolved. Besides, there would be the possibility of winning the unbeliever for Christ. This should be the earnest desire of the believer. To that end the believing spouse would be obligated to do everything possible to save the soul of the unbeliever as well as to continue the marriage relationship. Paul's point is that unbelief on the part of one spouse is no reason for divorce.

But then there was another possibility, and one which undoubtedly occurred quite frequently in those days. What was to be done when an unbelieving spouse deserted? That is the problem with which Paul deals in the words: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases."¹⁹⁶ In such a case Paul says that the deserted party is free, although this did not imply that the deserted spouse must relinquish his claims on the deserter. The deserted spouse need not, however, try to force his presence on the deserting unbeliever. The believer is not under

195. I Cor. 7:12.

196. I Cor. 7:15.

obligation to the unbeliever. Theo. Laetch puts the matter in these words:

There may be no . . . agreeing to continue with the marriage on the part of one spouse. In fact, he may have shown his aversion by departing, by deserting the spouse, or by expelling her from the home, making cohabitation no longer possible, severing the marital relations . . . What, then is the believing husband or wife to do in this case? Must he still regard himself bound to his spouse who has left him? . . . Though the marriage has been broken in a manner utterly displeasing to God, though the departing unbeliever will be called to account by the Lord, yet the Supreme Legislator in these matters declares the deserted spouse to be no longer under bondage.¹⁹⁷

In such a case the deserted party may obtain a divorce. It is of course to be understood that this permission is not to be stretched to include mere quarrels and misunderstandings in consequence of which the husband or wife leaves the home temporarily. The fact of wilful and absolute desertion with sinful intent must be established.¹⁹⁸ In this connection Theo. Laetch says:

Continued threats and attacks in spite of all admonition, making cohabitation impossible, will eventually constitute malicious desertion; for Quenstedt correctly notes that, while certainly a person departing from his spouse is guilty of malicious desertion, yet one who causes his spouse to leave him by his brutality and tyranny is just as much guilty of desertion.¹⁹⁹

Anyone who has dealt with such cases will recognize that the problem of establishing the fact of desertion is not any easy one. The cases are seldom clear-cut, and therefore require patient and detailed consideration. Each case must be dealt with on the basis of the facts that are involved.

197. Laetch, op. cit., pp. 197-199.

198. Maier, op. cit., p. 436.

199. Laetch, op. cit., p. 204.

The problem is frequently presented to us in our day in a different manner than in Paul's day. A question that we must frequently be concerned about is whether and how the words of Paul apply to those cases of desertion in which both deserting and deserted spouses are members of a Christian congregation. Such cases will necessitate another procedure. Before the case can be placed into the framework of Paul's words, the congregation must first exercise church discipline according to Matthew 18. In its efforts to solve the difficulty the congregation must exercise due patience. At the same time it is evident that the deserted spouse must make every effort to win back the deserter and must accept him if he returns.²⁰⁰

When desertion has been established, may the deserted contract another marriage? After a legal divorce has been obtained remarriage is permissible. That is the natural conclusion that is drawn from Paul's words: "A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases."²⁰¹

We may wonder why Paul does not also mention the permission for divorce given by Jesus.²⁰² Paul evidently takes the situation referred to by Jesus for granted. His problem was a different one. Neither does Paul go beyond and contradict the words of Jesus. The difference between the words of Jesus in Matthew 5:32 and the words of Paul in I Corinthians 7:15 might be summarized as follows:

In the former passage the Lord answers the question, When has a man (or woman) the right to ask for a dissolution

200. Laetch, *ibid.*, pp. 200-201.

201. I Cor. 7:14.

202. Matt. 5:32.

of the marriage bond? In the latter the apostle answers the question, What is to be done when the marriage bond has actually been dissolved? In the former case the guilty party makes the discontinuance possible, in the latter the continuation impossible.²⁰³

W. A. Maier correctly says, "When malicious forsaking is proved, it is interpreted by the Church as a breaking of the marriage relation and not merely a cause for which divorce may be secured before legal authority."²⁰⁴

While we certainly do not believe that we should go beyond the Scriptures in relaxing our attitude toward the question of divorce, as many church groups have done, we at the same time agree with E. R. Groves in that we should seek to preserve the family by a positive program rather than by the threat of excommunication. The following paragraph by E. R. Groves is extremely pertinent in our day and for our church:

It is not good strategy for Christianity to consider any domestic problem for example, divorce, as an evil that can be isolated from the general social situation and dealt with as an independent menace. This policy proves ineffectual because it tends to mix up symptom with cause, blocking an expression of domestic failure rather than getting at its sources. Our divorce rate provides a spectacular and impressive measurement of family instability but, even so, Christianity cannot conserve the home unless it assumes a more positive program than merely seeking to prevent or lessen divorce or spiritually to ostracize those who have sought the courts to dissolve their unhappy marriage.²⁰⁵

THE RELATIONSHIP OF HUSBAND AND WIFE IN THE FAMILY

We must now discuss Paul's view as to the relationship of husband

203. Reu and Buehring, op. cit., p. 270.

204. Maier, op. cit., p. 436.

205. Groves, op. cit., p. 97.

and wife in the family. It has often been asserted that Paul was a woman-hater and that he placed wives into a position of intolerable subjection. Such sentiments are based on such words of Paul as the following: "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man."²⁰⁶ "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man."²⁰⁷ "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church."²⁰⁸ What Paul says about the position of women in the church²⁰⁹ adds fuel to the bitterness and venom that has been poured out upon him by many. It is said that such an ethic has no place in our day. Rall unhesitatingly says:

Here are teachings which the Church of today cannot well make its own though they have strongly influenced the Church of the past. Paul reflects here the common conception of antiquity, reaching down indeed to our own time, of the inferior nature and status of woman. He is, in fact, untrue here to the Christian principle which he himself enunciates, that in Christ there is neither male nor female. (Gal. 3:28.)²¹⁰

Is this actually the case?

In direct opposition to such a view it can be asserted that a correct understanding of Paul's teachings on this point will show that his ethics are perfectly reliable even here. Paul does not place obligations only on the woman. The fact is that he asked husbands to love their wives in the same unselfish and self-sacrificing way in

206. I Cor. 12:3.

207. I Cor. 12:9.

208. Eph. 5:22,23.

209. I Cor. 14:33-36; I Tim. 2:11,12.

210. Rall, op. cit., p. 214.

which Jesus loved the Church and gave Himself for it. He asked wives to be subject to their husbands "as the Church is subject unto Christ."²¹¹ Christians are subject to Christ, but certainly not in the sense in which a slave is subject to a taskmaster. Osborn says:

The analogy would indicate that Paul places the wife in definite subjection to her husband. His rabbinic training, as well as the custom of the time in both the Jewish and the Greek world, would make this perfectly natural. Nevertheless the subjection of the body to the head is of another order than that of a slave to his master. The difference is one of function, not of standing or essence. The head and the body are complements of each other.²¹²

Paul's teaching does not imply that woman is inferior because of her subordination to man, but only that she occupies a different position and fulfills a different purpose than man in the world order. Just as the Son has equal honor with the Father, so woman has equal honor with man.²¹³ Man and woman, husband and wife, are to complement each other. Where this relationship is properly understood, there is no danger of the husband becoming a tyrant, nor of the wife being reduced to the status of a mere housekeeper or slave. On the contrary, such a relationship will be conducive to the highest happiness of all concerned.²¹⁴

When Paul is properly understood it is seen that few men in history have done so much to raise the status of women. His words effect a real emancipation of woman. The status of woman in non-Christian lands and in pre-Christian times has been an unenviable one. As a rule girls have not been welcome at birth, or at least not as

211. Eph. 5:24. Cf. also Col. 3:18.

212. Osborn, op. cit., p. 182.

213. Gal. 3:28.

214. Reu and Buehring, op. cit., p. 280.

welcome as boys. Education has been denied them generally. Betrothal and marriage have often depended upon the arrangements and will of the parents irregardless of the will of the daughter. Child marriage has been prevalent in large sections of the world. Woman has been looked upon as the property of her husband, and the right to divorce has often been granted to the husband alone. The burning of widows has been practiced. The prostitution of slave girls and temple girls is a lurid story. Even the hope of a better life in another world has been denied womankind. Heavenly paradise for men linked with the eternal degradation of woman is the picture of heaven presented by Mohammedanism. In Hinduism the hope of woman is to be reborn a man.²¹⁵ Paul sets the stage for the emancipation of women, not by making man and wife equal, not by disregarding the natural differences between man and women, but by placing each in proper relation to the other. "In place of antithetical differences, we have the unity of mutually conditioned conduct."²¹⁶

Paul places a tremendous obligation upon the husband when he says: "Husbands, love your wives even as Christ also loved the church."²¹⁷ The Christian husband who recognizes how much Christ has done for him, will also recognize what a high standard is set for him here.

Glorifying Christ, the husband will be impelled to cherish his wife with an intense affection, to acknowledge her virtues and accomplishments, to minimize her frailties, to perform the many services of love by working for her, providing for her, living for her, and, if necessary, even dying for her, as Christ gave Himself for the Church.

215. Mattson, op. cit., pp. 285-286.

216. Piper, op. cit., p. 79.

217. Eph. 5:25.

This includes of course the less heroic exhibitions of devotion--the daily evidence of love and comradeship expressed in words of endearment and in confidential exchanges of opinion.²¹⁸

Paul also says: "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself."²¹⁹ This is a striking deduction from the teaching that husband and wife are one. The love and consideration extended to the wife must be as intense as the thought and care which the husband bestows upon himself. This presents a tremendous challenge to the husband in his treatment of his wife.

In like manner wives should appreciate the love of their husbands, recognize them as the head of the house, and in their turn do all they can to live and labor for the husband's happiness. In writing to Titus Paul advises wives "to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discrete, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."²²⁰ Paul was anxious to see that Christian women preserve their new liberty. Their actions were not to cause pagans to confuse them with prostitutes. That is why he also exhorts them to behave, dress, and adorn themselves in a sober and modest manner.²²¹

The facts of nature are such that women achieve their highest station in life when they live in accordance with the principles set forth by St. Paul. His statement: "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman,

218. Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 464-465.

219. Eph. 5:28.

220. Titus 2:4,5.

221. I Tim. 2:9-15.

but the woman for the man,"²²² merely expresses this undeniable fact of nature. A woman is not completely happy if she cannot look to her husband as the head of the house. The woman's movement of modern times and all the finer cultural and educational opportunities afforded women have not altered this fact. The spirit of materialism which has gained so much ground in our civilization, the whole philosophy which views human life from a purely physical, biological point of view has done much to destroy the sanctity of marriage and the family, and in so doing it has also robbed woman of her chief glory. Geiseman correctly says:

Many a woman who had been looked upon with eyes of envy by her own sex because of her triumphs of glory on the stage, screen, or in public life, has, by her multiple marriages, her contempt for the responsibilities of wifehood, or her refusal to accept the honor and duties of motherhood, in reality been womankind's most insidious foe.²²³

From this we see that Paul was far from being an enemy of woman. In the high standards of behavior that he sets for both husband and wife he promotes the true happiness of both. The wonderful harmonious relationship that he would have exist between husband and wife is most beautifully expressed in his analogy of the relationship of Christ to the Church.²²⁴

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN

Paul not only shows a profound insight into the proper relationship of husbands and wives, but he also shows a remarkable understanding of the relationship of parents and children. He shows a great deal of

222. I Cor. 11:8,9.

223. Geiseman, op. cit., p. 46.

224. Eph. 5:22-33.

concern for children. As pointed out before, Paul regards it to be the natural duty of husband and wife to have children. Procreation is one of the essential purposes of marriage and of sex. His attitude toward children reflects his Jewish background as well as the spirit of Jesus. This was a sharp contrast to the way in which the heathen world of his day regarded children. Pagans believed thoroughly in the father's power to be rid of any child that he did not want. Even as twins are still strangled by superstitious parents in dark Africa, so unwanted children were exposed or strangled in the days of pagan Greece and Rome.²²⁵

Paul places a great deal of importance upon the Fourth Commandment. He tells children: "Honour ~~thy~~ father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise."²²⁶ And again: "Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord."²²⁷ Children are to recognize that their parents are their God given superiors to whom obedience and submission is due. It should be noticed that Paul's injunction does not stay on the horizontal level only. Children were to obey their parents "in the Lord",²²⁸ and because such behavior "is well pleasing unto the Lord."²²⁹ This is an attitude that needs to receive greater emphasis among Christian parents and children. The relationship to God must always predominate and motivate the behavior of the children. Where obedience is looked upon as a purely earthly need, the proper respect for superiors is not developed.

225. Geiseman, op. cit., p. 46.

226. Eph. 6:2.

227. Col. 3:20.

228. Eph. 6:1.

229. Col. 3:20.

This, of course, presupposes that the parents exercise their duties toward their children. It is not only the duty of parents to provide for the physical well-being of their children, although this, too, is a God given obligation²³⁰ but they must be brought to Christ and trained in godly living. "And, ye fathers," says Paul, "provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."²³¹ This includes the duty of parents to bring their children to the Lord in Holy Baptism, to tell them of the Lord Jesus, to guide them by word and example in Christian living. These duties are especially incumbent upon the father as the head of the household.

Paul also gave consideration to the problems of children who are frequently abused by an unreasonable severity on the part of the parents. He says, "Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath," and, "Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged."²³² Parents are to discipline their children, "to have them in subjection with all gravity,"²³³ but such discipline must be that of a spirit of love. All temper, caprice and injustice must be avoided, lest the children become exasperated. All discipline and punishment should serve the purpose of increasing genuine dutifulness and love.²³⁴

We in our day observe strangely contradictory attitudes toward children. We see on the one hand how children are coddled, subjected to much sentimental gush, afforded the most meticulous kind of

230. I Tim. 5:8.

231. Eph. 6:4.

232. Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21.

233. I Tim. 3:4.

234. Weidner, op. cit., p. 340.

physical care, and are sent to expensive schools. On the other hand we see how many who profess a sentimental interest in children are childless by choice; how husbands and wives frankly shun the sacrifices and responsibilities which parenthood would demand of them; and how many, who do have children of their own, abuse and neglect them in the most shameful and tragic way.²³⁵ There seems to be an ever increasing need for parents and children to put the principles of St. Paul into practice.

THE FAMILY AS SUCH

We have already said that the family is the basic unit in society. And until now we have been discussing essential elements and functions of the family. But now in concluding we must discuss the family as such. Paul uses the word "family" in only one place and that in reference to the world of people and the heavenly creatures as being the family of the Father. He says: "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."²³⁶ Although this concept of the family as an organized social unit is not specifically developed by Paul we can see from his references to the fatherhood of God, from his attitude toward and interest in marriage, from his concern with the relationships of husband and wife, and from what he has to say with regard to parent and child relationships, that it is implicit in his thinking.

The primary area in which the family functions as a unit is the home. In our modern life and culture the home has lost much of its

235. Geiseman, *op. cit.*, 45.

236. Eph. 3:15.

significance. As Mattson says: "Man is often born in a hospital, lives in an apartment house or a hotel, eats at a restaurant; if he becomes ill, he goes to a hospital, and is finally buried from a funeral home."²³⁷ And there is no doubt that the twentieth century has brought a tidal wave of problems for the home and the family. To mention but a few we note, two world wars, the rapid spread of industrialism and technocracy, great periods of inflation and depression, the increasing urbanization making for larger and larger cities, the rise of organized labor, the expansion of education, the increase of leisure time without an increase of instruction for it, the emphasis on mass recreation, and the complete upheaval of traditions and habits of life that has resulted from all of these happenings.²³⁸

All of these interrelated problems have left their mark on the family. Broken homes, childless homes, deserted children, juvenile delinquency, and sex delinquency among children and adults give sociologists of our day grave concern. We of the church must also be gravely concerned. The church must make its influence felt in the home. While Christian character is developed in the individual, that development is largely guided by society, and particularly by the family. The church is made up of individuals who are in fellowship with Christ, but the home is the major area for the development of the "life in Christ." The Christian life in relation to others expresses itself in love--that which makes a man want to be for the next man.

237. Mattson, op. cit., p. 285.

238. Jahsmann, Allan Hart, "Our Society Makes Its Impact on the Christian Family," The Christian Family in the Modern World, pp. 3,4.

In the development of love in the individual the family is of first importance. As Caemmerer says:

For it is in the family that the person gets his first practice in love. There he first sees love in action; there he first picks up his own responsibilities and possibilities in loving others. Not only is the family the first training ground for love, but it is an especially splendid one. The family differs from the other units of society in that its members are together daily and through many years. Hence it breeds those drives which are basic for character . . . It seeks to develop in its members those qualities which are essential for all living with people--love, forbearance, congeniality, interest in others, responsibility for people, readiness to sacrifice. Family life provides the opportunity for the most essential type of love, namely, self-sacrificing labor without hope of return, the pouring out without stint or hindrance of energy and responsibility . . . The Christian family becomes a garden in which each individual raises a crop of Christian character for the next person.²³⁹

There are few who will question the opinion that we are living in the midst of a decaying society. St. Paul also moved in the midst of a decaying pagan society. Within that society he built a new society in which marriage was permanent, the life of the home was purified, and children were given a place in which they could grow into Christian men and women.²⁴⁰ The principles of Paul's social ethics, and specifically the implications of his social ethics for marriage and the family, need to be understood and applied to the conditions in our day. It is evident that Paul's message is vital today and for us.

239. Caemmerer, Richard R., "The Christian Family--a Living Force in the Modern World," The Christian Family in the Modern World, pp. 57, 58.

240. Rolston, op. cit., p. 132.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AGATHA, MOTHER M., "Pauline Sociology Offers Solution to Current Evils," America, LX (March 4, 1939), 510-511.
- ANDREWS, MARY E., "The Problem of Motive In the Ethics of Paul," Journal of Religion, XIII, 200-216.
- ANSPACH, PAUL P., "The Race Problem in Paul's Epistles," Lutheran Church Quarterly, IX (January, 1936), 39-49.
- ARNDT, W., "Paul As Citizen," Concordia Theological Monthly, II (October, 1931), 736-747.
- BARBOUR, G. F., Christianity and Present Moral Unrest, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1926.
- BRUNNER, EMIL, The Divine Imperative, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, c. 1947.
- The Christian Family in the Modern World, Fifth Yearbook of the Lutheran Education Association, St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House, 1948.
- CONYBEARE, W. J. AND HOWSON, J. S., St. Paul, the Life and Letters of, Hartford, S. S. Scranton & Company, 1900.
- DREWS, CHRISTOPHER F., Introduction to the Books of the Bible, St. Louis, Missouri, Concordia Publishing House, 1929.
- ENSLIN, MORTON SCOTT, The Ethics of Paul, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- FARRAR, F. W., The Life and Work of St. Paul, New York, P. P. Dutton and Company, 1889.
- FAULSTICH, A. H., The Ethics of St. Paul Concerning Sexual Morality, S.T.M. Thesis, IV.
- FRANK, R. WORTH, "The Christian Ethic Today," Religious Digest, XII (February, 1941), 63-66.
- GEISEMAN, O. A., "The Social Philosophy of Paul," Associated Lutheran Charities 37th Annual Convention, 1938, 36-48.
- GOODENOUGH, E. R., "St. Paul and Onesimus," Harvard Theological Review, XXII (January, 1938), 13-21.
- GRAEBNER, A. L., Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, St. Louis, Missouri, Concordia Publishing House, 1910.

GROVES, ERNEST R., Christianity and the Family, New York, Macmillan Company, 1942.

GROVES, GLADYS HOAGLAND, Marriage and Family Life, New York, Published for Reynal and Hitchcock by Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942.

HAERING, THEO. VON, The Ethics of the Christian Life, New York, G. P. Putman's Sons, 1909.

HUNKIN, J. W., The Earliest Christian Church, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1929.

JAMES, E. O., The Social Function of Religion, Nashville, Cokesbury Press, 1940.

KEYSER, LEANDER S., A System of General Ethics, Burlington, Iowa, Lutheran Literary Board, c. 1934.

LAETSCH, THEO., "Divorce and Malicious Desertion," Concordia Theological Monthly, IV (March, 1933).

LENSKI, G. E., "The Lutheran Church's Responsibility in Marriage," Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (July, 1938), 251-264.

LEWIS, C. S., Christian Behavior, New York, Macmillan Company, 1944.

MACHEN, J. GERSHAM, The Origin of Paul's Religion, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923.

MACMILLAN, ARTHUR TARLETON, What is Christian Marriage? London, Macmillan and Company Ltd., 1944.

MAIER, W. A., For Better and Not For Worse, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1935.

MARIANE, JOHN H., Shall I Get a Divorce--And How? Published by Council on Marriage Relations, Inc., 110 East 42nd Street, New York 17, New York, 1946.

MARTENSEN, H., Christian Ethics, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1879.

MATHESON, GEORGE, The Spiritual Development of St. Paul, London, Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1890.

MATTSON, A. D., Christian Ethics, Rock Island, Augustana Book Concern, 1935.

MUELLER, J. T., Christian Dogmatics, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1934.

- MUELLER, J. T., "St. Paul and Woman's Status," Concordia Theological Monthly, IX (January, 1938), 13-21.
- NASH, A. S., Education For Christian Marriage, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1939.
- NASH, N. B., "Christian Social Ethics," Anglican Theological Review, XII (April, 1929-1930), 317-321.
- NIEBUHR, REINHOLD, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics, New York and London, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1935.
- NIEBUHR, REINHOLD, Moral Man and Immoral Society, New York, Charles Scribner's, 1932.
- NYGREN, ANDRES, Eros and Agape, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- OSBERN, ANDREW R., Christian Ethics, London, Oxford University Press, 1940.
- PHILLIPS, J. B., Letters to Young Churches--A Translation of the New Testament Epistles, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1948.
- PIPER, OTTO A., The Christian Interpretation of Sex, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- RALL, HARRIS FRANKLIN, According to Paul, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945.
- RAMSAY, SIR W. M., Pauline and Other Studies, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1906.
- REW, JOHANN H. AND BUEHRING, P. H., Christian Ethics, Columbus, Ohio, Lutheran Book Concern, 1935.
- ROLSTON, HOLMES, The Social Message of the Apostle Paul, Richmond, Virginia, John Knox Press, 1942.
- SCHMID, CHR. FR., General Principle of Christian Ethics, Philadelphia, Lutheran Book Store, 1872.
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, New York, Henry Holt & Company, 1931.
- SHAW, CHARLES GRAY, Christianity and Modern Culture, Cincinnati, Jennings and Graham, 1908.
- SMITH, DAVID, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, New York and London, Harper and Brothers Publishers, n. d.

SMYTH, NEWMAN, Christian Ethics, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons,
1892.

✓ STEWART, JAMES, S., A Man In Christ, New York, Harper and Brothers,
1943.

TITUS, HAROLD, H., "Christian Ethics and Contemporary Social Issues,"
Journal of Bible and Religion, XV (October, 1947), 215-219.

WEBER, MAX, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, London,
George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1930.

WEIDNER, REVERE F., Christian Ethics, Chicago, Wartburg Publishing House,
1897.

WIDGERY, ALLEN G., Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life, New York,
Round Table Press, Inc., 1940.

WUTTKE, ADOLF, Christian Ethics, New York, Nelson and Phillips, II, 1873.