

*The Relationship between Theology and Ethics: How Theology informs Ethics*

*The University of Transylvania, Brasov, Romania, October 13, 2013*

First, I want to thank the Dean of the literature department of the Transylvania University of Brasov for his graciousness in extending opportunity to lecture to the students of this great university. He is an example of what a scholar should be in an honest search for and openness to the truth.

Our topic is how theology informs ethics: What is the relationship between theology and ethics. What effect does one's morality or presuppositions have on which theology one gravitates towards? We are going to address three specific areas:

- 1) Ethics on an atheistic and naturalistic worldview
- 2) Ethics on relativistic worldview which denies the existence of objective truth
- 3) Ethics on a theistic worldview

I. Ethics on an atheistic and naturalistic worldview

1. It appears to human beings that objective morality exists.
2. The best explanation of objective morality is that it is grounded in God.
3. Therefore God exists.

However, if God does not exist then there is no ultimate basis for morality and ethics. While this talk is not about the existence of God per se, answering the question of the origins of the universe, namely the origins of humans, answering questions about ethics becomes much easier. Ultimately, questions of ethics come back to the issue of authority. Therefore, the existence of God is of primary importance in ethics.

Suppose that God does not exist. What are the implications for ethics? If God does not exist then the following statements are true. First, if theology is nothing more than extrapolations based upon myths from human societal evolution then theology has nothing authoritative to say on any ethical issue. Theology is simply a misunderstanding of the universe. Richard Dawkins, in his book, *River out of Eden*, accurately captures the ethical import if God does not exist:

In a universe of blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason in it, nor any justice. The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind pitiless indifference.<sup>1</sup>

If God does not exist then can free will exist? Is not free will required for moral responsibility? If there is no free will and we are all determined by our various biological make up, then ethics are synonymous with a physical or chemical formula. In the controversial documentary, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, Cornell University Professor Will Provine flatly states, "If you believe

in evolution you cannot possibly hope to believe in free will.”<sup>2</sup> For example, on atheistic ethics, one would have difficulty finding any ultimate basis for believing that torturing babies is objectively wrong. The point is simply that naturalism entails determinism, which effectively erases the link between one’s actions and one’s moral responsibility. Atheists will challenge this claim, “In what sense does naturalism sever the link between one’s actions and moral responsibility?” The answer is quite simply that culpability requires the freedom to have chosen otherwise. C.S. Lewis provides a pertinent word on this philosophical confrontation. He writes:

No thoroughgoing Naturalist believes in free will: for free will would mean that human beings have the power of independent action, the power of doing something more or other than what was involved by the total senses of events. And any such separate power of originating events is what the Naturalist denies. Spontaneity, originality, action ‘on its own’, is a privilege reserved for ‘the whole show’, which he calls *Nature*. The Supernaturalist agrees with the Naturalist that there must be something which exists in its own right . . . But he does not identify this Fact with ‘the whole show’.<sup>3</sup>

Lewis’ key word is “thoroughgoing” which requires a Nietzsche-esque bravery to confront the implications of a rejection of theism. The issue is often unnecessarily overcomplicated. Determinism allows for no non-material explanations since materialism is the best descriptor for the universe. If this is the case, then persons and their choices, whether choices that include the handling of nuclear arms to something so simple as the choice between a red or green toothbrush are all determined. Hence, the words “choice” or “freedom” are epistemologically vacant. Words relating to freedom are deceptive coverings of raw mechanistic forces from which no one can extradite themselves. But then again, the morally laden term “deception” is bereft of substantive moral meaning because the deceivers could not have done otherwise.

On naturalism, a deceiver is not ultimately culpable for his or her deception because not only their actions, but their thoughts as well, were determined by their biological makeup. “Deceiver” may still be used as a descriptor within naturalism so long as one understands that no moral praise or blame can be ascribed. It is difficult to imagine such a world where adjectives noting virtue and vice are stripped of their moral import. Communication itself, as we know it, would experience a nihilistic polar shift of sorts because the plethora of language dealing with morality would arrive at a dead end street. Philosophical attempts to avoid the deterministic implications of naturalism are as varied as they are wrong. Sam Harris states, in his groundbreaking work, *Free Will*, “The illusion of free will is itself an illusion” only later to admit, “Am I free to change my mind? Of course not.”<sup>4</sup> If Harris’ attempts to ward off what William Lane Craig calls, “The absurdity of life without God,”<sup>5</sup> were not so sad, they would be entertaining as a collection of philosophical bloopers.

Atheistic assumptions of ethics are ungrounded because if Naturalism is true, upon what basis can one argue for the ethics of survivalism? Sam Harris, one of the *Four Horsemen* of the New Atheists, has attempted to establish moral absolutes from the “moral landscape” of survival. William Lane Craig, responds:

But Dr. Harris has to defend an even more radical claim than that: Uh, he claims that the property of being good is identical with the property of creaturely flourishing. And he’s

not offered any defense of this radical identity claim. In fact, I think we have a knock-down argument against it. Now bear with me here; this is a little technical. On the next-to-last page of his book, Dr. Harris makes the telling admission that if people like rapists, liars, and thieves could be just as happy as good people, then his “moral landscape” would no longer be a moral landscape. Rather, it would just be a continuum of well-being whose peaks are occupied by good and bad people, or evil people, alike.<sup>6</sup>

Craig continues:

The philosopher of science Michael Ruse reports, “The position of the modern evolutionist...is that humans have an awareness of morality...because such an awareness is of biological worth. Morality is a biological adaptation no less than are hands and feet and teeth ... Considered as a rationally justifiable set of claims about an objective something, ethics is illusory. I appreciate that when somebody says ‘Love thy neighbor as thyself,’ they think they are referring above and beyond themselves...Nevertheless, ...such reference is truly without foundation. Morality is just an aid to survival and reproduction, ...and any deeper meaning is illusory...”<sup>7</sup>

If we were to rewind the film of human evolution and start anew, people with a very different set of moral values might well have evolved. As Darwin himself wrote in *The Descent of Man*, “If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unmarried females would, like the worker-bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering.” For us to think that human beings are special and our morality is objectively true is to succumb to the temptation to species-ism, that is to say an unjustified bias in favor of one’s own species.<sup>8</sup>

The atheist may respond that living moral lives is necessary to human flourishing and a safe society. While it is certainly true that a society where persons treat one another ethically is better than one where people steal from one another, attack, murder, and rape one another.

But why, on atheism, should there be any difference in human ethics? On atheism, what distinction is there between humans and lower animals? Just to be clear, I’m taking the position that the actions humans carry moral weight as opposed to the actions of non-human animals. Non-human animals act based upon instinct and behavior modification whereas humans have a moral dimension whether they act upon it or against it. Non-human animals are not held to the same moral standard as humans, except for those of overly invested pet owners. Marc Houser observes:

Animals share many of the building blocks that comprise human thought, but paradoxically, there is a great cognitive gap between humans and animals . . . By looking at key differences in cognitive abilities, we find the elements of human cognition that are uniquely human. The challenge is to identify which systems animals and human share, which are unique, and how these systems interact and interface with one another.<sup>9</sup>

If Houser is correct that the separation is in the realm of the cognitive then naturalism *still* has major problems scavenging materials with which to form a consistent case for moral culpability. Why? The reason is simply because determinism still reigns. A few implications are that the sanctity of human life would be a myth (a rigorously contested idea in its own right), as would the charge of “speciesism” since those perpetrating such acts would be predisposed to take no other course of action. From a sociological perspective, the shift in Western culture in regards to the devaluing of human life<sup>10</sup> coupled with the emphasis on speciation as a moral good, the West appears to be adopting ancient pagan ideas in a rejection of traditional Judeo-Christian values.<sup>11</sup> Michael Peterson, in his book, *Evil and the Christian God*, opines, “Conceptual systems, such as naturalism or pantheism, can explain neither our peculiar consciousness of value nor its senseless destruction.”<sup>12</sup> Peterson’s criticism of naturalism is as common as it is difficult to refute. Many of the talking points of the revolutionary Intelligent Design movement find their roots in the impotence of naturalism to provide an intellectually warranted account of consciousness. Maybe the naturalists should consider seriously the counsel of Sir Arthur Eddington, “In science we sometimes have convictions which we cherish but cannot justify.”<sup>13</sup> Such quandaries on naturalism cannot be flippantly shrugged off with a passive aggressive *non sequitur* about the rants of rabid, fundamentalist Christians.

William Lane Craig posits an obvious but troubling scenario that further illustrates the holes in the hull of naturalism:

For animals are not moral agents. As I have often pointed out, when a lion kills a zebra, it *kills* it, but it does not *murder* it. For lions have no moral obligations to fulfill or prohibitions to obey. Zebras have no more right to life than a lion has a right to eat. Nature is just morally neutral because animals are not rational agents endowed with moral duties. Now if the lion does no wrong in killing the zebra, why is a human being wrong in killing the zebra? It cannot be simply because the zebra would experience pain, for the pain is the same in either case. If the zebra had an inherent right not be harmed, why would that right evaporate when the perpetrator is a lion rather than a human being?<sup>14</sup>

One does not have to be the valedictorian of the analytic philosophy department to detect the breakdown of the basis for both animal and human rights. If the naturalist remains ruggedly assertive about moral demands then one only needs to reference Arthur Allen Leff’s “Sez who?”<sup>15</sup> On naturalism, one cannot be dogmatic concerning morality . . . unless one is willing to adopt the brutal Nietzschean ethics. Nietzsche argues for “a *reversal of values* for a certain strong kind of man of the highest spirituality and strength of will and to this end slowly and cautiously to unfetter a host of instincts now kept in check . . . I write for a species of man that does not yet exist: for the “masters of the earth.” Religions, as consolations and relaxations, dangerous: man believes he has a right to take his ease. In Plato’s *Theages* it is written: “Each one of us would like to be master over all men, if possible, and best of all God.” This attitude must exist again.”<sup>16</sup> Such a sentiment is expressed in Eric Hoffer’s striking statement, “The quality of ideas seems to play a minor role in mass movement leadership. What counts is the arrogant gesture, the complete disregard of the opinion of others, the single-handed defiance of the world.”<sup>17</sup> On naturalism, freedom and tyranny are merely variations of chemical formulas.

This critique is an addendum to the first argument raised in this paper. One wonders where Ayn Rand, for example, acquires the necessary grounding for her strong notion of human rights and moralistic sermonizing, “The purpose of morality is to teach you, not to suffer and die, but to enjoy yourself and live.”<sup>18</sup> Baggett and Walls are correct where they identify the uselessness of moral outrage as a “futile emotion.”<sup>19</sup>

Yet, on atheism, the moral responsibility to give hope and encouragement, even physical assistance, is bereft of explanatory power. One may rebut this criticism by citing the necessity of persons to banding together and treating one another with care for the purposes of survival. Morality, then, equals survival. Certainly any society seeking to prosper must disavow a Coliseum-like ethical hermeneutic that pits citizen against citizen. It almost seems intuitive to believe that, in a civilized society, it is in the interest of persons to treat other persons with dignity, respect, and tolerance. It is safe to assume that most persons would agree with the truth of such a statement and that a rejection of the virtues of dignity, respect, and tolerance, is evidence of a flawed moral compass. However, the problem for naturalism lies squarely in the moralistic undertones of the entire idea of a free, tolerant, and virtuous society. Simply put, the entire concept of virtue is vacuous on naturalism. One may argue that one has a duty to assist in the flourishing of others because otherwise society could not exist.

Not only does atheism lack explanatory power for moral responsibility; it eviscerates moral responsibility. Vice and virtue are merely products of a mechanistic and determined universe. Even moral terminology is vacuous since “the human predicament” is qualitatively absurd.<sup>20</sup> Gregory Thornbury observes, “There is nothing more gray and dispiriting than a closed system.”<sup>21</sup> Honest intellectuals should be able to come to grips with the hopeless drab of a naturalistic universe. Ultimate meaninglessness in a pointless universe is one thing; feigning the existence of one’s moral responsibility to one’s neighbor is quite another. Moralizing molecules is the height of absurdity in a universe that will one day be stripped of any chance of even primitive life as it expands into the horizon of a silent and permanent heat death. Bertrand Russell’s anguished words are a fitting epitaph for the “future” of a naturalistic universe:

I look out upon the night of nothingness. The revolutions of nebulae, the birth and death of stars, are no more than convenient fictions in the trivial work of linking together my own sensations, and perhaps those of other men not much better than myself. No dungeon was ever constructed so dark and narrow as that in which the shadow physics of our time imprisons us, for every prisoner has believed that outside his walls a free world existed; but now the prison has become the whole universe. There is darkness without, and when I die there will be darkness within. There is no splendour, no vastness, anywhere; only triviality for a moment, and then nothing. Why live in such a world? Why even die?<sup>22</sup>

Russell’s words should elicit a solemn, “Amen” from fellow naturalists without the all too common banality of trying to wed moral responsibility and naturalism. Atheistic formulations of moral responsibility are vacuous given that all occurrences are reducible to physical causation.

## II. Ethics on relativistic worldview which denies the existence of objective truth

Whereas numerous atheists attempt to posit objective morality and fail, Relativists outright deny objective morality. On relativism, the basic human intuitions clash with the ethics of a denial of absolute morality. What if the Nazis had won WWII and brainwashed the entire world? What if it the extermination of Jews and other “undesirables” became not only fashionable but also obligatory? What about the brutal and barbaric practice of female circumcision in certain African and Arab cultures? The *World Health Organization* believes there to be “About 140 million girls and women worldwide are currently living with the consequences of FGM.”<sup>23</sup> In those cultures, it is an expected moral virtue that parents permanently mutilate their daughters. What of the ancient Indian practice of *suttee* where widows were burned alive on the funeral pyre of their dead husbands? The cultural relativist would have to say that these horrible acts are not objectively wrong as Mihailo Markovic says, “I can find no ultimate basis for ‘ought.’” Max Hocutt concurs with, “Human beings may, and do, make up their own rules.” The book of Judges 21:25 in the Hebrew Bible reads, “In those days...everyone did what was right in his own eyes.”<sup>24</sup> David Noebel responds, “If there is no objective moral reality, then why concern ourselves with ethical issues?”<sup>25</sup> Relativists such as Richard Rorty who claim that ethics are not subject to logic and reason should be asked upon what basis others should accept his argument. If ethics and morality are little more than cultural fluctuations then how can there be moral responsibility? What about virtues such as honesty, fairness, equality, loyalty, courage, dedication, justice, and sincerity?

### III. Ethics on a theistic worldview

The objection at this point is that one does not need to believe in God to see that these practices are morally abhorrent. This is true. The argument is not that one must believe in God to recognize moral evil and act ethically. Rather, if God does not exist then there is no objective basis for ethics and morality. To be sure, we are not saying that atheists cannot live moral lives or be nice people. Only that, on atheism, there is no basis.

Christian Ethics: All 3 must be fulfilled for an action to be “right”:

- Motive (pure in heart)
- Standard (God’s Law/Word/Nature)
- Goal (glory of God)

Jesus on Ethics

- 1) *Love the Lord your God with all your heart, mind, soul and strength* = Duty-based ethics (deontology) [Kant] Non-consequential = GOD (If you only stay here you’re a Pharisee)
- 2) *and the second is like it, Love your neighbor* = Virtue ethics, Aretaic ethics (*arete*) [Aristotle] = OTHERS (If you only stay here you’re a secular humanist)
- 3) *as yourself* = Consequentialism, Teleological [Mill] = SELF (If you only stay here you’re a narcissist)<sup>26</sup>

In theism, theology is the study of the Creator. Specifically, in Christian theism, God is a maximally great being whose nature *is* good. Therefore, God’s essence or nature informs ethics. The Bible even goes so far as to say that humans have been made in the image of God.<sup>27</sup> If Christian theism is true then to understand ethics, one must understand God. The Bible tells us

we can know God from the creation and the conscience.<sup>28</sup> According to the Gospel, ethical violations are not just against other persons but against God as well.<sup>29</sup> It is the God-given conscience, the intuitive moral compass, through which we best understand ethics. If Christianity is true (if Jesus rose from the dead), then there is hope for one's past moral misdeeds to be rectified through faith in Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus, the one who taught to forgive and pray for one's enemies, was a true radical.<sup>30</sup> Jesus, the one who was morally impeccable, not only lived ethically towards others but also voluntarily absorbed the punishment of others who acted unethically. Even when Jesus was on the cross, he prayed for his torturers to be forgiven.<sup>31</sup> The resurrection of Jesus, in one step, gives evidence for the existence of God and provides hope for life beyond the grave. God's antidote for a world plagued with moral evil and untold numbers of horrific ethical violations is the offer of salvation by grace through faith in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Dawkins, *River out of Eden* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 133.

<sup>2</sup> *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, directed by Nathan Frankowski (2008; New York, NY: Premise Media, 2008), DVD.

<sup>3</sup> C.S. Lewis, "Miracles," *The Complete C.S. Lewis Signature Classics* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005), 307.

<sup>4</sup> Sam Harris, *Free Will* (New York: Free Press, 2012), 64, 65.

<sup>5</sup> William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2008), 65-88.

<sup>6</sup> Sam Harris, *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values* (New York: Free Press, 2010), 190. <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/is-the-foundation-of-morality-natural-or-supernatural-the-craig-harris#ixzz2WDNGm1fT>

<sup>7</sup> Michael Ruse, "Evolutionary Theory and Christian Ethics," in *The Darwinian Paradigm* (London: Routledge, 1989), pp. 262, 268-9. In, "Is the Foundation of Morality Natural or Supernatural?" Debate between William Lane Craig and Sam Harris, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, April 2011. <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/is-the-foundation-of-morality-natural-or-supernatural-the-craig-harris#ixzz2WDRC9fGo>

<sup>8</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, 2nd edition (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1909), p. 100. In, "Is the Foundation of Morality Natural or Supernatural?" Debate between William Lane Craig and Sam Harris, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, April 2011. <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/is-the-foundation-of-morality-natural-or-supernatural-the-craig-harris#ixzz2WDSXIUHW>

<sup>9</sup> "What Is The Cognitive Rift Between Humans And Other Animals?" *Harvard University: Science Daily*, February 22, 2008. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080217102137.htm>

<sup>10</sup> Luke 12:6-7 reads, "Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies? And not one of them is forgotten before God. <sup>7</sup> Why, even the hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not; you are of more value than many sparrows" (ESV). According to Jesus, humans have an innately higher value than animals.

---

<sup>11</sup> One illustration comes from Victor W. Von Hagen’s study of Mayan culture’s lack of distinction between human and non-human animal life, “Any form of death was defilement. The greater social uncleanness came from the shedding of blood. The Maya had even to atone for the killing of an animal. That is why he hung up something of the animal and usually pierced his own tongue and/or penis and spread a few drops of his own blood over the recently killed animal. Killing an animal was the same as homicide, and anyone who took life and shed blood brought about social defilement; he was subject to tribal discipline.” Certainly most Westerners do not take such drastic measures but one can see the emotional turmoil expressed by certain animal rights activists over animal mistreatment. Compared to the silence from many of the same groups over abortion, the “respect for all life” mantra becomes quite confusing. Victor W. Von Hagen, *World of the Maya* (New York: New American Library, 1960), 102.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Peterson, *Evil and the Christian God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 65.

<sup>13</sup> C.S. Lewis, *Miracles* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009), 166.

<sup>14</sup> William Lane Craig, “Animal Pain and the Ethical Treatment of Animals,” *Reasonable Faith*, Accessed October 8, 2013, <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/animal-pain-and-the-ethical-treatment-of-animals>

<sup>15</sup> Arthur Allen Leff, “Unspeakable Ethics, Unnatural Law,” *Duke Law Journal* 6 (1979): 1229. In, David Baggett & Jerry Walls, *Good God: The Theistic Foundations of Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3.

<sup>16</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, trans., Walter Kaufman, ed. (New York: Random House, 1967), 503.

<sup>17</sup> Eric Hoffer, *The Passionate State of Mind* (Titusville, NJ: Hopewell, 2006), 181.

<sup>18</sup> Ayn Rand, *For the New Intellectual* (New York: Signet, 1963), 123. Rand argues, “But neither life nor happiness can be achieved by the pursuit of irrational whims. Just as man is free to attempt to survive in any random manner, but will perish unless he lives as his nature requires, so he is free to seek his happiness in any mindless fraud, but the torture of frustration is all he will find, unless he seeks the happiness proper to man.” *Ibid*.

<sup>19</sup> Baggett and Walls, 224.

<sup>20</sup> William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith*, 65.

<sup>21</sup> Jerry Bowyer, “The Book of Revelation is Hayekian,” *Forbes*, October 10, 2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jerrybowyer/2013/10/10/the-book-of-revelation-is-hayekian/2/> Thornbury’s full point is as follows: Unless you have this notion of something from the outside to which the universe is accountable – and this is a very broad topic in general, that even a minimal theist like Immanuel Kant could sign off on – but unless there is judgment, unless there is a reckoning coming, you cannot truly be creative. This is one of the things, if you read Chesterton and *The Man Who Was Thursday* and *Orthodoxy*, one of the things he brilliantly points out is the reason why the imagination flourishes under a Christian social scene is because we know that ultimately we can experiment, because there’s one to whom we are accountable. In other words, only a Tolkien could imagine something as fantastic as Middle Earth. Chesterton talks about how only a Christian could truly enjoy mythology because we know that there’s actually meaning behind the universe. If the universe has no meaning, you can’t really be creative.

<sup>22</sup> Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 374.

<sup>23</sup> “Female Genital Mutilation,” *World Health Organization*, February, 2013, <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs241/en/>



---

<sup>24</sup> David Noebel, *Understanding the Times*, (Manitou Springs, CO: Summit Press, 2006), 138-139.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, 156.

<sup>26</sup> Edward Martin, "Thoughts on Christian Ethics," *God, Evil and Suffering*, APOL 930, Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA, June, 2012.

<sup>27</sup> Genesis 1:26-27 "Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." <sup>27</sup> So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them."

<sup>28</sup> Romans 1:18-20 "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. <sup>19</sup> For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. <sup>20</sup> For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse."

Romans 2:14-16 "For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. <sup>15</sup> They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them <sup>16</sup> on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus."

<sup>29</sup> Psalm 51:4a "Against you, you only, have I sinned and done what is evil in your sight,"

<sup>30</sup> Matthew 5:43-45 "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' <sup>44</sup> But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, <sup>45</sup> so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven. For he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust."

<sup>31</sup> Luke 23:34 "And Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And they cast lots to divide his garments."

<sup>32</sup> Ephesians 2:8-9 "For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God, <sup>9</sup> not a result of works, so that no one may boast."