

**SHAME: A PASTORAL STUDY**

Craig A. Brannan,  
Dip. Psy. (INTEC); Dip R.E. (C.M.I.); B.Th.(UNISA); M.Min. (Baptist Bible  
Seminary), M.A. (North West University)

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor  
in Pastoral Studies  
at the North-West University

Promoter: Prof. Dr. G.A. Lotter.

Potchefstroom  
2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	iv
Opsomming.....	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION ON SHAME.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. TITLE AND KEYWORDS.....	1
1.2. STATE OF RESEARCH.....	1
1.3. THE CONCEPT OF SHAME.....	2
1.3.1 'Shame' from a scriptural viewpoint.....	2
1.3.1.1. Recent research using the honor/shame paradigm.....	3
1.3.1.2. 'Shame' in the Old Testament and New Testament.....	4
1.4. PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	7
1.5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	7
1.6. CENTRAL THEORETICAL STATEMENT.....	8
1.7. METHOD.....	8
1.8. CHAPTER DIVISION.....	9
1.9. REPRESENTATION OF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN POINTS 7.2.1, 7.2.2 AND 7.2.3.....	10
CHAPTER TWO: BASIS-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SHAME. OLD TESTAMENT: GENESIS 3 AND THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.....	11
2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
2.2. THE BOOK OF GENESIS.....	12
2.2.1. Introduction.....	12
2.2.2. The Title of Genesis.....	13

2.2.3.	Date of Composition, Authorship and Historicity of Genesis.....	13
2.2.3.1.	Graf-Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis and the effect on the dating of composition, authorship and historicity of Genesis.....	14
2.2.3.2	Internal evidence for the historicity of Adam and Eve and the suggested significance to the study of shame.....	16
2.2.3.3.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	22
2.2.4.	The structure of Genesis.....	23
2.2.4.1.	The structure of Genesis and <i>toledot</i> .....	23
2.2.4.2.	The “ <i>Toledots</i> of shame”.....	23
2.2.4.3.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	31
2.2.5.	A study of Genesis 3 as the blueprint for interpreting shame.....	31
2.2.5.1.	Introduction.....	31
2.2.5.2.	Adam created by God to relate to Him and for Him (Genesis 1:26; 2:7).....	33
2.2.5.3.	Adam as God’s representative (Genesis 2:8; 2:15).....	35
2.2.5.4.	God’s restriction for Adam (Genesis 2:16-17).....	36
2.2.5.4.1.	Four suggested aspects of the restriction of Genesis 2:16.....	37
2.2.5.4.2.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	38
2.2.5.4.3.	The design of the woman for Adam (Genesis 2:18-24).....	39
2.2.5.5.	The entrance of forensic shame into relationships  (Genesis 2:25-3:7).....	40
2.2.5.6.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	59
2.3.	THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.....	60
2.3.1.	Introduction.....	60
2.3.2.	Title.....	60
2.3.3.	Background.....	61
2.3.4.	The Structure of Jeremiah.....	63
2.3.5.	A suggested approach to the study to the Book of Jeremiah.....	64
2.3.5.1.	Various approaches to the Book of Jeremiah.....	64
2.3.5.2.1.	A suggested approach: The book of Jeremiah studied within the	

---

	context of shame .....	65
2.3.5.3.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	68
2.3.6.	The strategies of shame viewed through the grid of repentance in the Book of Jeremiah.....	68
2.3.6.1.	Repentance as an important supportive theme in Jeremiah.....	69
2.3.6.2.	Suggested strategies of shame identified and defined through the grid of a repentant attitude.....	70
2.3.6.3.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	78
2.3.7.	Preliminary Conclusions.....	78
2.3.7.1.	The Book of Jeremiah is significant in assisting in a biblical critique of shame.....	78
2.4.	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS FOR CHAPTER TWO.....	78

**CHAPTER THREE: BASIS-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON  
SHAME NEW TESTAMENT: THE BOOK OF EPHESIANS.....80**

3.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	80
3.2.	TITLE AND AUTHORSHIP.....	81
3.3.	THEOLOGICAL STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE.....	82
3.4.	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS.....	89
3.5.	AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF EPHESIANS 4:20-24.....	89
3.5.1.	What was the condition of the believer before “putting off” and “putting on”?.....	90
3.5.1.1.	An exegetical study of Ephesians 2:1-3 as a necessary theological antecedent to Ephesians 4:17-19.....	91
3.5.1.2.	An exegetical study of Ephesians 4:17-19.....	98
3.5.1.3.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	104
3.5.2.	How does a believer “put off” and “put on”? Ephesians 4:20-24.....	105
3.5.3.	Preliminary conclusion of Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19; 4:20-24.....	110
3.6.	CONCLUSION.....	112

CHAPTER FOUR: META-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SHAME... 113

4.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	113
4.2.	VARIOUS APPROACHES TO SHAME.....	114
4.2.1.	The psychoanalytical approaches to shame.....	115
4.2.2.	The "self-psychology" approach to shame.....	123
4.2.3.	Bio-innate-psychological approaches to shame.....	126
4.2.4.	Michael Lewis - the affect-cognitive approach of shame.....	128
4.2.5.	The sociological approach to shame.....	129
4.2.6.	The cultural anthropological-shame-honor approach.....	137
4.2.7.	Shame and Addictive Behavior.....	140
4.2.8.	Shame and Forgiveness.....	145
4.3.	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION – A SUGGESTED CRITIQUE.....	149
4.3.1.	The psychoanalytical approach.....	149
4.3.2.	The ‘self-psychology’ approach.....	152
4.3.3.	The bio-innate-psychological approach.....	155
4.3.4.	The affect-cognitive approach.....	157
4.3.5.	The sociological approach.....	158
4.3.6.	The cultural anthropological honor-shame.....	159
4.3.7.	Shame and Addictive Behavior.....	160
4.3.8.	Shame and Forgiveness.....	161
4.4.	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION.....	162

CHAPTER FIVE: EMPIRICAL QUALITATIVE STUDY..... 164

5.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	164
5.2.	THE PARAMETERS OF THE INTERVIEWS.....	164
5.2.1	The design of the questionnaire.....	164
5.2.2.	The questionnaire.....	167

---

5.3.	AN EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH CLIENTS SUFFERING FROM SHAME.....	179
5.4	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS.....	196

CHAPTER SIX: PRACTICE-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE:  
SHAME INTERVENTION – PROBLEM AND OPPORTUNITY..... 199

6.1.	REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS.....	199
6.2.	INTRODUCTION.....	200
6.3.	SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION AS THE PLATFORM ON WHICH TO ADDRESS SHAME.....	202
6.3.1.	A foundational belief in God as revealed in the Bible.....	202
6.3.2.	A foundational belief in Scriptures in providing a paradigm for understanding shame.....	204
6.3.3.	Some guiding questions regarding the spiritual foundation of God and His Word.....	209
6.3.4.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	212
6.4.	HINDRANCES TO ADDRESSING SHAME: THE 7 STRATEGIES IN AVOIDING SHAME AND UNDERSTANDING THE 5 TYPES OF SHAME.....	212
6.4.1.	The 7 strategies in avoiding shame – Shame diagnostic tool.....	212
6.4.2.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	221
6.4.3.	The 5 types of shame.....	221
6.4.4.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	228
6.5.	ATTEMPTS AT COVERING SHAME – WHERE ARE YOU?: QUESTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES TOWARD GODLY SHAME.....	228
6.5.1.	Procedure.....	229
6.5.2.	Preliminary Conclusions.....	241
6.6.	MENDING THROUGH COMMUNITY – A CALL TO ADDRESS SHAME.....	241

6.6.1.	Truths from Jeremiah-Confronting the community.....	242
6.6.2.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	246
6.7.	EXPERIENCING CHRIST’S COVERING.....	246
6.7.1.	Lesson Title.....	247
6.7.2.	Lesson outline.....	247
6.7.3.	Lessons.....	248
6.7.4.	Preliminary Conclusion.....	252
6.8.	CONCLUSION.....	252
6.9.	FINAL CONCLUSIONS.....	253
6.10.	TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	253
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	254

### **Acknowledgements**

Several individuals offered invaluable assistance to me during the writing of this thesis. I will always be indebted to Him who paid the price He did not owe because I owed a price I could not pay! He has covered my shame with His Blood!

I am, as always, indebted to my wife, Rene and children, Steven and Alexandria, to whom I dedicate this thesis. I thank them for their support, during the time set aside for this study. No one has sacrificed more to see this thesis completed. Rene has been enthusiastic, encouraging and endearing during the many hours given to this project. Steven and Alexandria, whom I love and cherish as treasures from the Lord, have often prayed for their dad during this time of study. I love you both! It is finished!

I am grateful to my parents, Ralph and Pamela Brannan for their example and work ethic during my formative years. It is their tireless pursuit of completing tasks that were started that encouraged me to persevere in this study. I am also grateful to my in-laws Gert and Ingrid Oosthuizen for their continual prayers and practical encouragement during my years of study.

I am continually grateful to my friend and supervisor, Prof. Dr. G.A. Lotter. This thesis would not have been a reality without his professional and gracious guidance.

A special thanks to participants of the empirical research for their transparency and their addition to the human element of this thesis.

A special gratitude must go to the staff of 'Tim Hortons' for their support as I took up a table for several hours, over several months.

As an under-shepherd of the Chief Shepherd, I am thankful to Faith Baptist Church, the Pastoral Staff, Youth Leadership Team and all the Youth and Parents for their continual support during the time spent on this thesis.

*Soli Deo Gloria!*

Craig Brannan  
Oshawa, Ontario  
April, 2005

---

**Dedication**

They are a shining example of what it means to be covered and clothed in Christ. They continually surround those who meet them with joy, warmth and vitality.

They are a team, a bond and my best friends of whom I can truly say it would be a good day to die, because my life was lived with them.

This is for you three:  
Rene, Steven and Alexandria

2 Timothy 4:7

## Abstract

Shame may be considered one of the most painful emotions that an individual must endure. Recent research within the scientific discipline of theology has identified the fact that there has been little theological study on shame from a basis-theoretical perspective. This has resulted in a deficiency of theological-practical interventions to assist pastoral counselors and believers in addressing shame from a Biblical-integrative perspective. Although many of the scientific disciplines within the social sciences, i.e. psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, et al, acknowledge the effect of shame on humankind, they cannot seem to agree on a definition. This appears to have resulted, from a meta-theoretical perspective, in an inability to provide significant and lasting solutions to addressing shame. The Old Testament and the New Testament seem to adequately address the origins, strategies and solution to shame. In the Old Testament, Genesis 3 is the starting point for a blueprint and framework for understanding and evaluating the origins of shame. The Book of Jeremiah, as prophetic literature, identifies and defines the strategies of shame that may only be interpreted through the grid and in the context of a repentant attitude. The New Testament book of Ephesians seems to identify strategies for covering shame, and provides a permanent solution – a permanent spiritual position of “putting off” and “putting on” for a repentant individual based on the completed work of Jesus Christ evidenced through a renewed mind.

The “real-life” effect of shame may clearly be demonstrated through empirical, qualitative interviews, that are evaluated, and with the data gleaned from basis-, meta- and empirical-theoretical perspectives, a practical theoretical perspective is suggested as a theological-practical intervention in an attempt to address this “master emotion”, shame.

---

## Opsomming

Skande kan beskou word as een van die mees pynlike ervarings wat 'n persoon kan ondergaan. Resente navorsing in die vakgebied van die teologiese wetenskappe het getoon dat min spesifiek teologiese studie gedoen is m.b.t. skande vanuit 'n basis-teoretiese perspektief.

Hierdie stand van sake het gelei tot 'n gebrek aan prakties-teologiese hanteringswyses vir pastorale beraders en gelowiges om mense te ondersteun in die hantering van skande vanuit 'n Bybels-gefundeerde oogpunt. Alhoewel daar heelwat navorsing en besinning is in ander wetenskaplike dissiplines soos byvoorbeeld psigologie, sosiologie en sosiale antropologie oor die gevolge van skande, blyk dit hulle nie eenstemmigheid kan bereik oor 'n definisie nie.

Die gevolge van onsekerheid oor die volle omvang van skande, het op meta-teoretiese vlak gelei tot die onvermoë om betekenisvolle en durende oplossings te voorsien vir die hantering van die probleem. Die Ou Testament en Nuwe Testament hanteer egter voldoende die oorsprong, strategieë en oplossings m.b.t. skande. In die Ou Testament is Genesis 3 die vertrekpunt van 'n bloudruk en raamwerk vir die verstaan en begrip van die oorspronge van skande.

Die boek van Jeremia, as profetiese literatuur, identifiseer en definieer die omvang van skande wat alleenlik geïnterpreteer kan word in die konteks van 'n "bekeerde" gesindheid. Die Nuwe Testamentiese boek van Efesiërs wys op die metodes om skande te verberg en beskryf 'n permanente oplossing – 'n permanente geestelike benadering van "aflê" en "opneem" vir die berouvolle persoon op die grondslag van die voltooide werk van Jesus Christus wat duidelik na vore kom in onder andere herstelde denke.

Die volle realisme van skande word aangetoon in die empiriese deel (kwalitatiewe benadering d.m.v. onderhoude) wat geïnterpreteer is en met die inligting van die basis- en meta-teorie waarna die interaksie met mekaar, 'n praktyk-teoretiese metode voorgestel word as prakties-teologiese model om die saak van skande te hanteer.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION ON SHAME**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Chapter one attempts to present the need for a pastoral study on shame. This will be done by means of title and key words, describing the state of research on shame; defining the concept of shame from a scriptural point of view and proposing a definition of shame; presenting the problem statement; delineating the research objectives; stating the central theological argument; describing the method of study; outlining the chapter divisions and presenting a schematic representation for this thesis.

##### **1.1. TITLE AND KEYWORDS**

- Title: “SHAME: A PASTORAL STUDY”
- Key words: shame, pastoral
- Sleutelwoorde: skaamte, pastoral

##### **1.2. STATE OF RESEARCH**

The experience and effects of shame have been the focus of several recent books within Christian research (McNish, 2004; Steibert, 2002; Pattison, 2000; Capps, 1993) and Christian self-help or popular literature, either directly (Wilson, 2002; Wilson, 2001; Altrock, 1998; Smedes, 1993) or dedicating a chapter to this topic (Swindoll, 2004: 47-60; Crabb and Allender, 1996:105-119). McNish, (2004:137) observes that contemporary scholarship has only recently begun to plumb

the rich depths of shame, and see the centrality of shame in Christian theology and practice. It would appear that shame has not been a prominent topic in theological discourse (McNish 2004:131, cf. Thomas and Parker, 2004:176). Even a recent comprehensive “Christ Centered” counseling book (Anderson, Zuehlke and Zuehlke, 2000) that advocates being a practical integration of theology and psychology, makes a passing reference to this vital topic on a few lines in two separate places (cf. page 158; 253). Shame and guilt have been understood as interchangeable or synonymous terms (Thomas and Parker, 2004:176; Tangney and Dearing 2002, 12-25). It would appear that there is a void within the scientific discipline of practical theology in that very little research has been conducted into both a theological understanding of shame and a practical intervention for addressing shame. There is a need to develop a practical theological intervention that addresses shame as distinct from and prior to addressing guilt (Thomas and Parker, 2004:182).

### **1.3. THE CONCEPT OF SHAME**

What is “shame”? It would appear that there exists no agreement on the definition of shame (Pattison, 2000:40) and in the latest research in the scientific discipline of psychology a “working definition” is described as “a most difficult task” (Lewis, 2004:624-625). Pattison, (2000:45-59) describes eight approaches to shame within the various scientific disciplines of psychology, sociology, philosophy and anthropology.

Shame is the master emotion central to an individual understanding his or her identity (Augsburger, 1996:82-84). It appears that the recent preoccupation and debate on defining shame validates the need for researching shame as the *sine qua non* for the pastoral counselor interpreting the human condition and assisting in a biblical and practical intervention.

### **1.3.1 'Shame' from a scriptural viewpoint**

#### **1.3.1.1. Recent research using the honor/shame paradigm.**

Recent research in the scientific discipline of pastoral theology (McNish, 2004); Missiology (Muller 2000); Old Testament Theology (Steibert, 2002); and New Testament Studies (Neyrey, 2000; Neyrey, 1998; Neyrey 1996; DeSilva, 1999; Pilch and Malina, 1998:106-115; Rabichev, 1996; Neyrey, 1995; Malina, 1993) has interpreted and reduced shame almost exclusively in and to the honor/shame paradigm within the Mediterranean region. In the honor/shame paradigm in the Mediterranean and Near Eastern culture, honor is fundamentally a dynamic and

relational concept. (Neyrey, 2000: 25). The public recognition of an individual's social standing, either/both ascribed honor inherited from the family of birth or acquired honor inferred by the community based on virtuous deeds upheld by significant others within that community (Moxnes, 1993:1-2). 'Shame', in this paradigm, is essentially the loss of ascribed or acquired honor as determined by significant others in the community.

Although this paradigm presents a rich interpretative context for understanding the New Testament, Nel (2001:Zondervan CD) warns that reducing an understanding of shame to a cultural anthropological classification of societies according to their perception of sin or unacceptable forms of conduct, is an unfeasible point of departure for describing 'shame' in the Old Testament. Nel also cautions about reducing an understanding of shame in Scripture to a passive-subjective emotion, as something that happens to an individual, which ignores an objective reality of 'shame'.

Albeit that it is inferred that a definition of 'shame' is difficult to put forward in concrete terms and there exists stereotypical classifications of shame, it is suggested that the scripture seems to provide a rich context for researching this important construct.

---

### 1.3.1.2. 'Shame' in the Old Testament and New Testament

It is suggested that an understanding of the concept of 'shame' as described in the Old Testament is a foundational starting point for interpreting this construct throughout the rest of the Bible. Schneider (1990:1161; cf. Crabb and Allender, 1996:108) observes that in the Revised Standard Version of the Bible shame and its derivatives appear 195 times in the Old Testament and 95 times in the New Testament. To illustrate the rich meaning of 'shame' in the Old and New Testament, the following comparisons are presented:

#### Shame in the Old Testament

- Vangemeren (2001; cf. Nel; Seveers) gives the following comparison of Hebrew words for 'Shame' in the Old Testament.

Nel (2001:'Shame')

- *bosh* בּוֹשׁ occurs most frequently, meaning "to be ashamed", "put to shame", "behave shamefully"; "to cause shame or disgrace"; to expose. The verb *bosh* בּוֹשׁ<sup>o</sup> frequently occurs in Psalms, Proverbs, and the Prophets (in particular Isaiah and Jeremiah), and very seldom in the historical books. It is suggested that Nel (2001) interprets the semantic domain *bosh* (בוֹשׁ) as multifaceted and complex. He divides the concept of shame into five categories or 'senses': an objective sense, a subjective sense, a religious sense, a metaphorical sense, and a societal sense. While these divisions are not exhaustive they present how the verb may be understood from a number of 'senses'.
- Derivatives of 'shame' בּוֹשׁ.

1. 'disgrace' בָּשַׁת (boset) The nominative בָּשַׁת, disgrace or shame, is the most common derivative of בּוֹשׁ and occurs with the same distribution of meanings and often within the same verse (e.g., Psalm 35:26; 109:28-29; Isaiah 30:3-5; 42:17; 54:4;

Jeremiah 3:25, 23:40). **בַּשֵּׁת** is also substituted as a name for Baal (Jer 3:24; 11:13), which provides a rich description of the futility, shameful and disgraceful strategy and substitution of idolatry (cf. Brueggemann, 1998:48; Huey, 1993:78)

2. 'humiliate' **כָּלַם** (kalam) to be shamed, humiliated, hurt; to cause disgrace.

**Seevers** (2001:'Naked')

- **עָרוֹם** (*arom*) in Genesis 2:25 demonstrated that Adam and Eve's nakedness without sin, was not evil. Seevers, (2001:Zondervan CD) states that 'Naked' after this verse takes on a new meaning. There exists a wordplay of the nearly identical **עָרוֹם** (*erom*) "crafty" or "shrewd" in Genesis 3:1. Seevers further points out that in the rest of the Bible, nakedness, is often associated with shame, with nakedness and shame even used interchangeably.

### Shame in the New Testament

**Louw and Nida (1993:319b)** give explanations for the concept of 'shame' in the following domains: 25:189-202; 53:60; 66:12; 88:127, 149-151. They seem to categorize the word 'shame' into three specific, yet interrelated, 'senses': an objective sense; a subjective sense; and a global/public sense. Louw and Nida (1993:310-311a) state that 'shame' has the following meanings:

- **αἰσχύνη** – a painful feeling due to the consciousness of having done or experienced something disgraceful- 'shame, disgrace' (Luke 14:9)
- **αἰσχύνη ματαιότητος** (derivative of **αἰσχύνη**) to feel shame or disgrace because of having done something wrong or something beneath one's dignity or social status. (Luke 16:9)

- *ἐπαισχύνομαι* – to experience or feel shame or disgrace because of some particular event or activity – ‘to be ashamed of’. (Romans 6:21; 2 Timothy 1:8)
- *ἀσπασίζω* – to cause someone to be much ashamed – ‘to humiliate, to disgrace, to put to shame.’ (1 Corinthians 1:27)
- *ἐπαισχύνω* – to cause someone to be embarrassed or ashamed – ‘to shame, to embarrass.’ (1 Corinthians 4:14)

### **Proposed definition**

From the above comparisons it would appear that ‘shame’ is an internal evaluation, a self-conscious emotion that focuses primarily on the way a transgression or failure to meet an understood internalized moral standard, whether privately or publicly, makes a person understand themselves globally. The focus seems to be on the person’s identity and the negative effect that the transgression will have on relationships. Intricately linked to this sense of this shame-based identity are self blame and internal attribution and evaluation of negative events. This appears to lead to strategies to “cover” or “hide” from consequences of the transgression, but primarily, to “cover” or “hide” from relationships before which the transgressor perceives they are accountable. These strategies may comprise *inter alia* addictive behavior, depression, dissociation, narcissism, revenge, hiding, escaping, bitterness, unforgiveness and even suicide. (cf. Brannan 2002; Allender and Longman, 1995:191-204; Crabb and Allender, 1996:105-119)

It will be advocated in this thesis that there indeed exists a biblical and practical intervention for ‘shame’. However, developing an invention for ‘shame’ cannot be viewed in simplistic or mechanical terms as individuals experiencing shame battle to verbalize this phenomenon (Schneider, 1990:1160-1163). It is suggested that the pastoral counselor can have a remedy for all ‘shame’, which seems to include a process of defining the ‘shame’, developing an understanding of the “corrosive power” of ‘shame’ (cf. Allender and Longman, 1995:191-204); understanding and working through genuine godly sorrow and repentance for areas of shame (cf.

Roberts, 2002) and appreciating the redemptive agency of ‘shame’ (cf. Allender and Longman, 1995: 205-220). This redemptive agency is found in the person of Jesus Christ who “for the joy set before him endured the cross, scorning its shame, and sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.” (Hebrews 12:2. New International Version).

#### **1.4. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

In light of the foregoing, the following question presents itself:

#### **WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE PASTOR IN EQUIPPING BELIEVERS WITHIN THE CHURCH IN DIAGNOSING AND PROCESSING SHAME?**

The specific issues that will be investigated with regard to the above-mentioned question are:

- What are the Scriptural perspectives on ‘shame’?
- What are the perspectives on ‘shame’ within other scientific disciplines?
- What would an empirical study on ‘shame’ reveal?
- What Biblically and practically-based model-intervention can be proposed regarding ‘shame’ for pastoral counselors?

#### **1.5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this study is to research the concept of ‘shame’ as seen within the religious and secular academic, therapeutic and counseling professions with the aim arriving at a valid Biblical understanding of ‘shame’ in people’s lives, and to propose a model-intervention for the counseling of individuals who experience ‘shame’.

---

In order to reach this goal, the researcher will endeavor to reach the following objectives:

- To determine what the Scriptural perspectives on ‘shame’ are.
- To determine what other disciplines say with regard to ‘shame’.
- To conduct an empirical study on ‘shame’.
- To propose a model for pastoral counselors in which ‘shame’ can be used to counsel individuals.

## **1.6. CENTRAL THEORETICAL STATEMENT**

The central theoretical argument of this study is that one of the important roles of a pastor is to equip believers to deal with shame on biblical and practical levels.

## **1.7. METHOD**

1.7.1. This pastoral-theological study will be conducted accepting that the Word of God is inerrant, authoritative and sufficient for the correction and instruction of humankind (Geisler, 2002:494-513; Adams, 1973:15)

1.7.2. 1.7.2. The research model that will be used in this research corresponds to the model developed by Zerfass for practical theology, which is constituted in a basis-theory, a meta-theory, and a practical theory (cf. Heitink 1999:113; Heyns and Pieterse, 1998:34-35).

1.7.2.1. With reference to the basis-theory, research will be conducted into literature, articles, Internet searches and a grammatical-historical exegesis of various Scriptures from both the Old and New Testaments (cf. De Klerk & van Rensburg, 1999:1-64; Greidanus, 1988:252). In the Old Testament studies will be done from Genesis 3 and the book of Jeremiah. In the New Testament a study will be done from Ephesians 4:20-24.

- 1.7.2.2. With reference to the meta-theory research will be conducted into literature, articles and Internet searches into the scientific disciplines of the social sciences with an emphasis on psychology, with references to sociology. A qualitative-empirical study will be conducted with 9 case studies who have experienced shame and have matured through it, are processing, or are seeking to process this experience.
- 1.7.2.3. With reference to the practice-theory, a synthesis of the data gleaned from the basis-theory will be compared with the data gleaned from the meta-theory and empirical study, in a hermeneutical interaction to formulate a model-intervention for practice theory.
- 1.7.2.4. Client/Counselee and Pastor/Pastoral counselor will be used interchangeably.
- 1.7.2.5. Unless indicated otherwise, all Bible references will be made from the New International Version, 1984.

## **1.8. CHAPTER DIVISION**

- Chapter One: Introduction
  - Chapter Two: Basis-theoretical perspective on shame. Old Testament: Genesis 3 and The Book of Jeremiah
  - Chapter Three: Basis-theoretical perspective on shame. New Testament: the Book of Ephesians
  - Chapter Four: Meta-theoretical perspective on shame
  - Chapter Five: Empirical Qualitative Study
  - Chapter Six: Practical theoretical perspectives on shame
  - Bibliography
-

**1.9. REPRESENTATION OF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN POINTS 7.2.1, 7.2.2 AND 7.2.3**

<b>PROBLEM STATEMENT</b>	<b>RESEARCH OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>
What are the Scriptural perspectives on 'shame'?	To determine what the Scriptural perspectives on 'shame' are.	Research will be conducted into literature, articles, Internet searches and a historical-grammatical exegesis of relevant Scripture from both the Old and New Testaments.
What are the perspectives on 'shame' within the scientific discipline of psychology, with references to sociology?	To determine how recent research within the scientific discipline of psychology and sociology understand 'shame'.	Research will be conducted into literature, articles and Internet searches in corresponding fields of study regarding 'shame'.
What would an empirical study regarding 'shame' reveal?	To conduct an empirical study with consenting individuals.	A qualitative-empirical study will be conducted with 6 case studies.
What Biblical and practical guidelines can be put forward for the intervention of 'shame' for pastoral counseling?	To propose a Biblical model in which 'shame' can be used by pastors to counsel individuals.	Data gleaned from the basis-, meta- and practice theories will be synthesized to form a 'shame' model-intervention for pastoral counseling.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **BASIS-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SHAME**

#### **OLD TESTAMENT: GENESIS 3 AND THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH**

##### **2.1. INTRODUCTION**

The theoretical argument in Chapter one poses that one of the important roles of a pastor is to equip believers to deal with shame on biblical and practical levels. Heitink (1999:111) states that the hermeneutical point of departure is of great importance for any attempt at practical theology. The basis-theoretical perspective is this “point of departure” in that the basis theory attempts to, through a grammatical-historical hermeneutic methodology, a study of a scriptural perspective on shame. This chapter attempts to conduct research into literature, articles, Internet searches and a historical grammatical exegesis of relevant Scripture to address shame from the Old Testament.

This chapter divides into two main sections. The first section limits its consideration to Genesis 3. This Old Testament passage appears to offer substantial assistance in understanding and advancing a biblical critique of shame. Genesis 3 seems to provide the blueprint and framework for the phenomenon of this critical, spiritual and emotional condition. Yet it seems a bi-polar challenge exists in attempting to address shame through the presupposition of a biblical-theological grid. The first is a skepticism as to the validity and integrity of the historicity of the book of Genesis, hence Genesis 1-3. The second challenge, recently emphasized by Thomas and Parker (2004:176-182), that although there are some theological researchers who accept the validity and integrity of Genesis 1-3 as a starting point for addressing shame, they have not gone far enough in establishing theological and practical interventions for addressing shame. Therefore, it is critical to address these challenges by establishing a basis for the historicity of Genesis, specifically Genesis 1-3, and laying the foundation for a theological intervention for addressing shame as rooted in Genesis 3.

The second section considers the Book of Jeremiah. The main argument is that as prophetic literature the book of Jeremiah identifies and defines the strategies of shame that seem to be realistically interpreted through the grid and in the context of a repentant attitude. Repentance is a leading theological thought in Jeremiah which seems to emphasize that an individual or a nation are not victims but perpetrators who, because they attempt to cover their shame through destructive attitudes and behavior, need to identify these strategies through the magnification of repentance. Jeremiah is also a book of hope in that it outlines the only remedy for shame as a personal relationship with God who changes the inner attitude as He changes the heart and provides a new motive to propel an individual and nation through life.

Admittedly, a number of Old Testament (cf. Isaiah 44-45; Ezekiel 32) passages could serve as a critique and model to guide our response to shame. However, the investigation into all these passages lay outside the scope of this thesis. These two passages seem the most appropriate to assist in understanding and guiding our response to shame.

## **2.2. THE BOOK OF GENESIS**

### **2.2.1. Introduction**

Genesis is a foundational book (Sailhamer 1998: Electronic CD) as it is the first book of the Pentateuch, the Old Testament and the Bible. It appears that without this book of “beginnings” the reader would be left clueless as to how the world came into being. Genesis proves the basis of defining the creation and purpose of humankind and the entrance of destructive attitudes and behavior into the world. Significant to this thesis, it further introduces the imputation, consequences and affects of shame resulting from these destructive attitudes and the strategies of the human heart, on relationships in the inner person, marriage, environment, siblings and most important, God. Positively, Genesis introduces the reader to the purpose of God; the intimate involvement of God; the forgiveness and covering of God; the mercy of God and the call of God on often-dysfunctional individuals and families. Hence, Genesis 3 seems to provide the necessary framework for understanding the harbinger of shame.

### 2.2.2. The Title of Genesis

Each book of the Pentateuch originally received its title from the first word or two in the book (cf. Constable 2004:1; Matthews 2002:41; Gangel and Bramer, 2002:3). In Genesis the first Hebrew word is a prepositional phrase **בְּרֵאשִׁית** (rē'šit) “In the beginning” (cf. Arnold, 2001:Electronic CD). Arnold (2001:Electronic CD) states that the first word in Genesis 1:1 is grammatically peculiar and syntactically unique because the author is describing a unique event. Sailhamer (1998: Electronic CD) states that in opening the account of Creation with the phrase “in the beginning”, the author has marked creation as the starting point of a period of time. It seems that “in the beginning” has important ramifications for why things are the way they are. Etiology in ancient Israel was an important historical explanation for the current order of life. Genesis, as a book of beginnings, seems to present several etiological events: the beginning or origins of the world (Genesis 1-2); humankind (Genesis 1-2); marriage (Genesis 2); of sibling rivalry; (Genesis 4); murder (Genesis 4); the flood (Genesis 6), capital punishment (Genesis 9), languages (Genesis 11); and the Jewish Nation (Genesis 12-50) (cf. Wenham, 2000:54). Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to detail all the etiological events in the Book of Genesis, one event is of significance to this thesis, Genesis 3, theologically understood as the Fall. Genesis 3 seems to disclose the etiology of shame, which seems to, as the other events, affect all humankind.

### 2.2.3. Date of Composition, Authorship and Historicity of Genesis

It seems that fewer subjects have generated more discussion and more disagreement than the question of the authorship and history of Genesis (and the Pentateuch) (cf. Wolf 1991:51). It is suggested that the documentary hypothesis of Wellhausen (known as the Graf-Wellhausen the “JEDP theory”) should not be overlooked as it seems to be the main “ingredient” to the discussion and disagreements, and, as it will be demonstrated, diametrically affects an understanding of shame as having its roots in the purported historical events of Genesis 3. Although a detailed study is beyond the scope of this thesis, it seems that before one presents the hypothesis that Genesis 3 is the blueprint for Adamic, forensic and global shame, two brief presentations require attention. First, there needs to be a refuting of the Graf-Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis that rejects the historicity of the Pentateuch and therefore, also

Genesis. Second, there needs to be a presentation of the internal evidence of Genesis 1-11, which seems to support the historicity of its contents.

### **2.2.3.1. Graf-Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis and the effect on the dating of composition, authorship and historicity of Genesis**

Sewell (2000:3) states that G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831), a German philosopher who taught that religion, like the rest of civilization, developed gradually, said that primitive "cave-men" began a polytheistic worship of the things around them. Later, he said, higher concepts such as a supreme God evolved in people's minds. Hegel's student, the theologian K.H. Graf (1815-1868), and his student Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), from an idea first proposed by Jean Astruc (1684-1766), developed the "JEDP Documentary Hypothesis" of higher criticism, which said that the early parts of the Old Testament could not have been written during the times they described. They based this on the belief that writing had not evolved until about 1000 BC. Wellhausen, a German Scholar, is known as the father of modern biblical criticism. He sought to establish religion on a firmer "scientific basis" so as to recapture the "real heart" of the Old Testament that would appeal to "modern" man appreciating the biblical message (cf. Matthews, 2002:68-85). Wellhausen attempted to undermine the literary and historical integrity of the Old Testament, hence the authorship, of specifically the Pentateuch. He attempted to reduce Genesis and the other four books of the Pentateuch to an evolutionary process of redactors who joined, over time (850 B.C.-200 B.C.), portions of major documents into a final form, which is now called the Pentateuch. The basis of this theory states that the first five books of the Bible, called the Pentateuch consisting of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, were not written completely by Moses, who died in 1451 B.C. according to Bishop Ussher's Chronology, but by different post-mosaic authors. It is alleged that these authors are detectable through the variations of usage of different words within those books. These authors are known as the Jehovist, the Elohist, the Priestly, and the Deuteronomist (cf. Slick, 2004:1-7; Harrison, 1988:19-32). The letter P became associated with this view. McDowell (1999:391-395) states that Wellhausen arranged the Pentateuch authorship in the following manner:

1. The earliest part of the Pentateuch came from two originally independent documents, the Jehovist (850 B.C.) and Elohist (750 B.C.).

2. From these the Jehovist compiled a narrative work (650 B.C.).
3. Deuteronomy came in Josiah's time and its author incorporated this into the Jehovist's work.
4. The priestly legislation in the Elohist document was largely the work of Ezra and is referred to as the Priestly Document. A later editor(s) revised and edited the conglomeration of documents by about 200 B.C. to form the extant Pentateuch we have today.

This view seems to have strong support by modern advocates (cf. Armstrong, 1996:13) However, set against the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, Geisler, (2002:586-588; 769-771) and McDowell, (1999:391-477) provided scholarly arguments why this is to be rejected, which are beyond the scope of this thesis. Matthew (2002:85) is correct in observing that any literary method whose philosophical assumptions drive a wedge between historicity and the referential value of the text for knowing reality undercuts the assumptions of the Bible itself. He adds that biblical revelation is grounded in historical events that have been interpreted by the sole authoritative voice of the text. Elwell and Comfort (2001:521) concur with Matthews when they state that the science of archaeology has discredited many of the postulations of Wellhausen to “restore confidence in the historicity of Genesis”.

Gangel and Bramer (2002:2-3) are correct in stating that internal evidence in each book of the Pentateuch supports the view of a single author. Although Genesis never directly asserts Mosaic authorship (Kidner, 1967:15-16), there is much evidence from the rest of Scripture including Christ's words in the New Testament that indicate that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and thus Genesis. Mosaic authorship for Genesis and the date of its final composition around 1406 B.C. is substantiated, by a number of leading scholars (cf. Constable, 2004:2; Gangel and Bramer 2002:2-3; Dyer and Merrill, 2001:1-3). Genesis, however, was not written in a cultural vacuum. Moses wrote within the framework of the cultural and geographical setting, which strengthens the argument for Mosaic authorship. Waltke (2001:21-22) contends that a “good case” can be made that Moses authored the essential shape of Genesis and the Pentateuch, “he clearly did not author the extant text in our hands”. However, Waltke (2001:28) supports the fact that Moses was “a historian” who would have “used sources”, and “a foundational Mosaic authorship is probable” yet this does not take away from Genesis as an authoritative literary text that communicate the purposes of God, who is the “real hero of Genesis” (cf. Wenham, 2000:55).

A preliminary conclusion is inferred that reducing Genesis to an evolutionary process, not events that took place in time-space history, reduces the construct of shame to evolutionary-sociological causes and processes, devoid of a starting point in history between a personal Creator and His image bearers, Adam and Eve.

### **2.2.3.2. Internal evidence for the historicity of Adam and Eve and the suggested significance to the study of shame**

Woven together in the fabric of the discussion of the historicity of Genesis is a clarification of the historicity of Adam and Eve and the implications for a study on shame. There seems to have been among scholars (Coppes, 1970:148-178) and continues to be (cf. Eslinger, 2004; 1-5; Sapone, 2004:1-8; Hansen, 2003, 2-6), much skepticism over the integrity and validity of Adam and Eve as historical figures. As discussed above, they (Anon (a), 2004) seem to understand the Bible as consisting of compressed extracts of a large library of traditions that have been continuously re-edited in the course of time. These assaults are not simply coming from non-theological fields of study. One recent researcher (cf. Williams, 2001:48-81) within the scientific discipline of theology has unequivocally stated that “we can do without Adam and Eve” in order to explain destructive behavior in the world. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present an in-depth study on the historicity of Adam and Eve; however, it suggested that before discussing the phenomenon of shame in the book of Genesis it is vital to propose significant data for accepting the historicity of Adam and Eve. It is purported that shame has its root within the historical characters of Adam and Eve. The very credibility for explaining the etiology of shame with its strategies and consequences lay within the “genesis” of this historical couple.

The first chapters of Genesis have been understood by critical scholars to be myth. Tsumura (1996:29) observes that ever since Hermann Gunkel's famous book “Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit” (1895), scholars have taken it for granted that the Genesis 1-3 has its background in the ancient Babylonian mythology, “Enuma elish”, and the poetic genre of the text and the parallel between the early chapters of Genesis and ancient myths. Psychological (cf. Poulson, 2000:250) and Sociological (cf. Scheff, 1997:206-207) researchers while acknowledging the importance of the characters of Adam and Eve in understanding the origins of shame, and stating, “in the Genesis story of creation shame is

the only emotion that is discussed at any length". Lewis (2003:6) does not accept this account as historical. Some Biblical scholars (cf. Bandstra, 1999) believe Genesis 2-3 to be historical myth. It is critical that researchers decide whether Genesis 1-11 is myth or history (cf. Engelsma, 2000:1), which is, as it will be demonstrated, essential for understanding the etiology of shame.

There seems to be evidence for the historicity of Adam and Eve. Etiology, from the Greek for "cause, origin", is a term used to describe the reason for something being (or being called) what it is. (cf. Banstra, 1999). Arnold (1998:38) explains that etiology in ancient Israel was an important historical explanation for the current order of life. Several etiological events exist in the book of Genesis, one of which is the historical account of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. There have been scholarly research and studies (Thompson, 2001:1-22; Phillips and Fouts, 1997:1-5; Scaer, 1977:21-25) on the historicity of Genesis 1-11, which are beyond the scope of this study.

The following table will suggest internal evidences in Genesis 1-11 that seem to demonstrate the historicity of Adam and Eve as it concerns this study of shame. This table will also serve as a background to understanding Genesis 3.

**Internal evidence for the historicity of Adam and Eve**

There seems to be a great deal of geographical and genealogical detail. Phillips and Fouts (1996:1) observe that there exist in Genesis 2-11 64 geographical terms, 88 personal names; and at least 21 identifiable cultural items such as iron, gold, mortar, brick, bronze, *et al*. Hence, Genesis 1-11 focuses on the physical world more characteristic of historical rather than non-historical literature.

**Suggested significance for a study of shame**

The phenomenon of shame has its roots within the reality of time and geographical location.

In Genesis 1-3 there does not seem to be a narrator, interpretation or interpreter. Non-historical narratives do have such literary characteristics. Every account of the narrative seems to be non-symbolic. There is mention of literal plants, animals, stars, etc. These passages are not then to be taken as an analogy of a single event.

Adam is described grammatically as a historical individual man, not a population of people. There is a number of supports for this fact. a) אָדָם (*adam*) is followed by the singular object suffix (“him”) in Genesis 1:27 and 2:15, rather than by a verb with a plural object suffix (“them”). As would be expected if אָדָם (*adam*) was a population and not an individual person. b) In Greek a definite article is used to emphasize proper names. In 1 Corinthians 15:22 a definite article is used for both Christ and Adam. c) According to Genesis 2:20-23 and 1 Timothy 2:13-14 there was a time when there was only one man, Adam, and no woman. d) Wenham (2000:55) is correct when

If Genesis 1-3 is not to be understood analogically or symbolically, it is suggested that Genesis 3’s account of shame is to be understood literally.

If Adam was understood by the Old and New Testament authors as a historical individual man, and not a population of people, then the consequence of Adam’s actions i.e. shame, was the result of a historical act by this historical man.

he states that “the writer of Genesis” seems to assume the historicity of Adam, Eve and their descendants, for he links them together in long family trees that end with Abraham. This demonstrates that Adam was a real individual like Abraham or Isaac.

The Bible seems to present Adam and Eve as literal people who had real children from whom the rest of the human race came (cf. Genesis 5:1). There seems to be an uninterrupted account of one event in Genesis with the following account. The uninterrupted accounts are based on the internal literary structure or framing device “*toledot*” which is translated (the accounts of/ the “history of”/ the “generations of” (cf. Gangel and Bramer, 2002:4-5) Matthews (2002:27) observes that this framing device is used to introduce and explain a list of historical generations. The *toledot* “serves as linking device that ties together the former and the following units by echoing from the preceding material a person’s name or literary unit motif and at the same time anticipating the

The Garden of Eden *toledot* (Genesis 2:4-4:26) is linked by its *toledot* introduction (‘this is the account of the heavens and the earth’, 2:4a) to those of Adam’s line (5:1-6:8), Noah’s (6:9-9:29), *et al* (cf. Arnold, 1998:33). It is suggested that the *toledot* section of Adam (5:1-6:8) is vital as it advances the historical and theological thoughts of the antecedent chapters (cf. Matthews, 2002:295-296). Some preliminary conclusion may be inferred.

First, It presents an interconnectedness of all humankind from Adam to Noah. Second, it seems to demonstrate that all are connected to Adam in life and death. Third, recent research in human genetics (cf. Hansen and Rankin, 2003:2; Wenner, 2000:1) strongly suggests that human DNA may be traced back to an original man and woman from whom all humanity has come. It is further suggested in light of scientific research that the Adam and Eve and the Garden of Eden should not simply be dismissed as a myth (Day, 1998:115-143; Munday, 1996:123-154). Fourth, ALL of humankind dies, i.e. they experience

focal subject of the next. Arnold (1998:33) is correct in stating that if all *toledot* define and connect historical events and people how can Adam be understood as mythical or metaphorical.

the results and consequences of Adam's sin and shame. Each person died ('and then he died' cf. 5:5, 8,11, 14, 17, 20, 26,31), hence it is implied that each person had shame. (cf. Romans 5:12-17). Fifth, Genesis seems to demonstrate the blueprint of the universality of human strategy to shape their lives without reference to God from childhood. (cf. 6:5, 8:21). Sixth, Adam and Eve gave birth to literal children who did the same (Genesis 4:1, 25; 5:1ff). Hence, it is suggested that these children continued to manifest shame in their lives (cf. 4:1-7, Genesis 8:21). Seventh, it is important to note that the concept of sin, shame and the need for deliverance from an imperfect human condition is present in all the world religions and cultures, i.e. Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, *et al* (cf. Coward, 2003).

Waltke and Fredicks (2001:65-66, cf. Matthews, 2002:95-97; Walton, 1990:19-44) note that in Ancient Near East literature it was widely accepted that the image and spirit of the gods resided in the king alone. However, this is different in the Hebrew understanding of humankind. The distinct difference is that humankind is appointed king over all of God's creation, as an image bearer. There exists a distinct and unique relationship between God and

It seems that this distinct privilege anticipates a distinct responsibility to live life within the boundaries defined by God. (cf. Genesis 2:15-17) Adam and Eve in partnership seem dependant on God to define their existence. There seems to exist a tension between freedom and obedience, interdependency and independency, command and autonomy. Adam and Eve seem to understand and interact with the data they received from God. They also seemed to understand the positive and negative ramifications of this command. Obedience to the command seems to promote harmony with the boundary of Garden to serve and worship God, as

humankind not found in any of the Ancient Near Eastern texts. Wenham (1991:xlix) concurs when he states that Genesis gives man a very different place to the Ancient Near Eastern texts. According to Ancient texts man was created as an after thought to supply the gods with food. In Genesis Adam is the climax of God's creation and God provided the plants as food for man. There furthermore exists a plurality of unity between male and female, which is also distinct from Ancient Near Eastern literature.

The book of Romans declares that literal death was brought into the world by a literal man "Adam". (cf. Romans 5:12-14)

naked beings who felt no shame. Disobedience seems to result in negative awareness nakedness, shame, hiding, separation, attempts to cover, blame and relational and physical death.

The book of Romans is widely accepted (Cranfield (1990:30, cf. Bruce, 1989:56-58) as the cornerstone of the Pauline corps and New Testament Literature. Romans 5:12-14 describes Adam's "sin: as being transmitted and imputed to all humankind. Genesis 2-3 describes a supra-historical dimension in that Adam and Eve "represent every man and women". It seems Adam and Eve represent humankind's rebellion, fallenness, shame and need for God's graceful redemption (cf. Waltke and Fredricks, 2001:80). Adam and Eve are not just the first, but also the paradigmatic man and woman. (cf. Kaas, 2003:10)

Christ viewed Adam as a historical individual in Matthew 19:4-5 and Mark 10:6-8. It seems that the historical reality of Adam and Eve served as the point of departure for Jesus Christ's discussion on marriage and divorce in Matthew 19:4-5 and Mark 10:6-8.

In the scope of God's redemptive plan, it is implied that Christ, and other New Testament writers, understood Adam as the first man, and Himself as the Second Adam. (cf. Matthew 1:21; Luke 19:10; 1 Corinthians 15:22, Romans 5:12-15). Christ as the second Adam is depicted in the New Testament, in a historical act, "scorning the shame" of the most shameful object of punishment, the cross, for all humankind (cf. Hebrews 12:2)

#### **2.2.3.3. Preliminary conclusion.**

It is significant that Kaas (2004:9), after twenty years of research of the Book of Genesis, not as a theologian but as a scientist and a philosopher states, "The best place to start is at the beginning, with the first book of the bible." Kaas (2004:10-11), although not advocating a belief in the historicity of Adam and Eve, does observe that Genesis seems to provide a history of a sequence of what happened at the start and conveys timeless anthropological beginnings or roots of human life, and in all their moral ambiguity. Genesis seems to present a powerful pedagogical beginning for the moral and spiritual education of the reader. He states that Genesis shows us not just what happened, but also what always happens. It is further suggested that Genesis 3 is not to be studied in a vacuum. Even though it seems to be the pivotal narrative that suggests a blueprint for shame, this narrative is connected to the larger framework and scope of the Book of Genesis, the Pentateuch and the rest of the Old Testament. An understanding of the structure of Genesis seems to be a necessary foundation for the setting of Genesis 3.

#### 2.2.4. The Structure of Genesis

A casual reading of the Book of Genesis seems to suggest, not a loose arrangement of Sunday School stories, but an interwoven, selective thought-out presentation of historical narrative that provides a guide and flow for the reader. This “guide” is done by means of the *toledot*. It is imperative to appreciate the literary structure of Genesis and this structure’s influence on developing a richer interpretation of shame

##### 2.2.4.1. The structure of Genesis and tôlêdôt

It was introduced in the table above, as to the literary structure of the book of Genesis, that there exists a redactional device  $\text{וַיִּלְדֹּת$  (*toledot*). *Toledot* is a very specific genealogical schema/rubric that acts as a very clear outline for the whole book of Genesis (cf. Constable 2004:4). *Toledot* comes from the verb  $\text{יָלַד}$ , (*valid*) give birth to, bear. As such, it refers to that which is born or produced. The expression “these are the generations of” points to the progenitor and the progeny. Matthews (2002:33-34; Arnold, 1998: 17-18) explains that *toledot* also serves as a linking device or hinge that ties together the former and the following units by echoing from the preceding material a person’s name or literary motif and at the same time anticipating the focal subject of the next. This forms a framework for the book of Genesis and Genesis’s organic unity. The *toledot* sections seem to assist in defining the purpose of the book. Hamilton (2001) concurs that *toledot* serves a theological function. They affirm that each new child in the genealogy, everybody from Adam to Jacob, represents a link in a chain by which God desires to bring blessing to his world. The *toledots* seem to assist the reader in presenting Genesis as an “optimistic book” (Wenham 2000:58) which does not end with human failure.

“The.... *toledot* sections function as cycles in Genesis marking the book’s major divisions in tracing God’s program of bringing the seed of the Serpent under dominion of the elect seed of the woman. ...the God of the covenant community is the same as the Creator of the cosmos. God is the implicit king of the cosmos, making provision, establishing order, commissioning regents.” (Waltke, 2001:32, 55)

#### 2.2.4.2. The “*Toledots of shame*”

It is purported that the sections that make up the structure of the book of Genesis have important implications for understanding shame. The following table will present a suggested outline of “the study of shame” within the Book of Genesis. Two observations are proposed. First, these 11 *toledots* are critical as interlinking, unfolding effects of the phenomenon of shame. Second, they seem to demand the need for Genesis 3, for without this chapter there is no blueprint for interpreting shame in the rest of the Old or New Testament.

##### *Toledot*

##### **Suggested implications for the study of shame**

##### **1:1-2:3**

Prologue.

This is the beginning, history, origin of God’s, as opposed to gods, activity in the relationship with the heavens and the earth.

Now the earth...” The focus is God’s chronological activity and attention is the earth where He prepares a “good” תוב (*tob*) environment and home for the pinnacle of His creation to enjoy. This was a foreign concept to the Ancient Near Eastern religions. Adam and Eve are designed יושר (*yoser*) in the image of God. Hooks (2001) reference to the man signified that this act of creation was by design, "an idea demonstrated by the use of the a related noun later in the book: "Every intent יושר of the thoughts of his heart was evil." (Genesis 6:5)" (cf. Hooks, 2001; Ross 1988:122). The use of the word “intent” appears to describe humankind’s capability to form their own thoughts and shape their own world system their way, independently from God. Consequently this also seems to emphasize their culpability before God (cf. Lidmus, 2004:109). Neither Adam, nor humankind is god or in any way eternal as God is. God designed humankind to be faithful to and enjoy Him by representing Him in obedience and trusting Him as their Personal and Infinite Reference Point.

**2:4-4:26**

This is the beginning, history, origin of the heaven and the earth as it specifically relates to the pinnacle of His creation Adam, then Eve, what originally was, and what went wrong and why.

Chapter 2 places special emphasis on man and his original condition, purpose, interdependent responsibility, need for partnership, and that they felt “no shame”. Without Chapter 3, Chapter 4 would make no sense. It would read from perfect original condition and environment to jealousy and murder, with no explanation. Therefore, Chapter 3 is a vital component to understanding why there are destructive attitudes and Adamic and forensic shame in the world. This part of the *toledot* is the “account” or “history” of the paradigm of the nature of temptation, sin, shame and its consequence (cf. Arnold, 1998:33). Chapter 3 also seems to introduce temporal and permanent “covering” of forensic shame. Permanently, 3:15 seems to introduce the Seed that will permanently crush Satan and shame (eschatological hope). Temporally, 3:21 in a physical sense seems to introduce God’s effectual mercy by Him covering the nakedness of the man and woman. Temporally, 3:21 in a spiritual sense and emotional sense seems to introduce God’s effectual mercy and grace in that an animal had to be sacrificed in order to cover the man and woman’s forensic shame. This seems to be a harbinger to the One Seed who will (permanently) “for the joy set before him endured the cross, scorning its shame” (Hebrews 12:2). (This *toledot* will be discussed in detail in the next point.)

**5:1-6:8**

This is the beginning, history, origin, of Adam’s line, and the effects and consequences of shame.

As previously stated, each generation dies. They experience the results, consequences and contagious nature of Adam’s sin and forensic shame. Each person died (‘and then he died’ cf. 5:5, 8,11, 14, 17, 20, 26,31), hence it is implied that each person had Adamic shame imputed to them, yet committed forensic shame. (cf. Romans 5:12-17). Genesis seems to demonstrate the blueprint of the universality of human strategy to shape their lives without reference to God from childhood (cf. 6:5, 8:21). It can be suggested that there exists an important play on words, introduced in Chapter 6, and a connection between the Hebrew verb “formed” (׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ ) Genesis 2:7 and the noun “inclination” (׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ ) in Genesis 6:5. (Konkel,

2001: Reference CD; Hartley, 2001: Reference CD). Humankind seems to want to form or shape their world their way because every inclination, strategy, purpose of their heart is wicked all the time (cf. Genesis 6:5). The root word for “all the time” יוֹם (yôm)(a 24 hour day) seems to emphasize the duration of the affect shame had on humankind as a result of Adam and Eve’s historical Fall (Verhoef, 2001). Fuller (1992:67) observes that the tremendous potency of sin was unmistakably recognized and people see the destructive force of sin, the need for God’s intervention as required. The imputation of Adamic shame, which led to deliberately thought-out acts motivated by destructive attitudes of the heart led to forensic shame, shame which was the result of culpability.

#### 6:9-9:29

This is the beginning, history, origin of Noah’s line.

Although there are up to two hundred and thirty different flood stories in Ancient Near Eastern texts, in the literary structure of the biblical flood narrative has indicators that this account is intended to be factual history and as historically veracious as the rest of Genesis (cf. Davidson, 1998:261-262). Waltke (2001:121) states that in the flood God wipes out the seed of the Serpent, which has become utterly corrupt (Genesis 6:5). Tragically, however, Noah and his family again give birth to the seed of the Serpent (cf. Genesis 8:21). Shame seems to be contagious. The affects of destructive attitudes and shame begin “from childhood” (נֶעֱוֵרִים (n<sup>e</sup>‘ûrîm)) (cf. Walton, 2001) Not even a cataclysmic flood could eradicate it affects. Yet, there was also the perpetuation of the seed of the woman (cf. Genesis 3:15).

**10:1-11:9**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Noah's sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth.

The affects of destructive attitudes and shame that begin “from childhood” (cf. Genesis 8:21, Genesis 6:5) have “now burst all limits as man tried to trespass on God’s realm by building a skyscraping temple” (Wenham, 2000:69). There seems to be inference to the shame strategies and purposes of the heart in the repetition of “Come, let us make bricks...Come let us build ourselves a city (Genesis 11:3-4). This emphasizes the deluded attempts of the human family to control God and not submit to Him (cf. Matthews, 2002:480). God identifies the depth of the intent as He sees that “nothing they plan to do will be impossible for them” (Genesis 11:6). Instead of strategizing for good, as image bearers, they can only attempt to build images of destruction, in attempts to hide their shame. Humankind are “scattered” throughout the world as they are forced to obey God’s original design (cf. Genesis 1:28; 8:17). However, destructive attitudes and shame were also now scattered over the face of the whole earth.

**11:10-26**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Shem.

There is hope of redemption and the covering of shame as the line of descent for the promised seed and Redeemer who will crush Satan is traced through Shem to Abraham, and ultimately through Judah and David to Jesus Christ (cf. Genesis 11:10-27; Luke 3:36) “God’s program to save humanity cannot be stopped.” (Waltke, 2001:185)

**11:27-25:11**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Terah.

God’s division of the World into nations is the backdrop for God initiative to elect one nation through whom one particular nation from Shem’s lineage is to bring universal salvation and covering of shame (cf. Waltke, 2001:193). A new beginning is anticipated as the initiative for this new nation is commanded by God (cf. Genesis 12:3). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to go into the Abrahamic Covenant in detail, however, it seems valid to note that the Covenant is permanent and will impact all peoples of

the earth (Genesis 12:3). Ironically the affects of shame are experienced right after the Covenant is made with Abraham (Genesis 12:10-20). Even in Abraham's dysfunction and lack of faith (Genesis 16; 20), the dysfunction and shameful strategies of his nephew (Genesis 13); he remained faithful (Genesis 22), because God proved faithful (Genesis 15; 17-18, 21). It is implied in Galatians 3:8-9 that God's faithfulness through Abraham was going to impact all the people of the earth despite their shame. "The Scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, and announced the gospel in advance to Abraham: "All nations will be blessed through you." So those who have faith are blessed along with Abraham, the man of faith." This emphasizes that there is another history at work: God's salvation history to cover those who by faith will believe in Him.

#### **25:12-18**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Ishmael.

Although Ishmael is mentioned briefly, it is nevertheless significant that he is mentioned. This *toledot* seems to be a reminder of the consequence of Abraham attempting to pacify his shamed wife (Genesis 16:1-3). Ironically, the ancient culture may have frowned (global-social shame) upon a woman without a child, yet the issue was that of an heir and God had promised that one would come through Sarai. God's grace is evident throughout this disobedience, and promises to make Ishmael into a great nation (cf. Genesis 16:10; 21:18). "Even in the peripheral characters of this great salvation history, God is faithful to His Word." (Arnold, 1998:113) However, the affects of destructive attitudes, behavior and shame are felt throughout history, as he will live in hostility toward all his brothers (cf. Genesis 16:12). God will use the twelve tribe confederacies to discipline and, it is suggested, shame his elect people. There will exist an ongoing political and spiritual hostility between Ishmael's line and Abraham's line.

**25:19-35:29**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Isaac

This *toledot* is a powerful illustration of interrelational destructive attitudes and forensic shame in a dysfunctional family. Isaac has twin sons, Jacob and Esau. A central theme of the remainder of the book--the struggle between brothers--is introduced in the brief account of the wrestling of the twins in the womb (cf. Sailhamer, 1998). God had determined that the Covenant Blessing would be passed through Jacob. This emphasizes the sovereign purpose and pleasure of God (cf. Waltke 2001:349; Romans 9:10-12). Isaac, like his father Abraham, attempts to affect God's blessing using human strategy. He favors his eldest son, Esau (Genesis 25:28; 27:1-3). The effects of shame are further seen by Jacob's deception (twice, cf. 27:36), and ongoing conflict between Jacob and Esau. The influence of Adamic shame seems to unfold in greater degrees in each *toledot*. Forensic shame, in which family members are culpable of their destructive attitudes and strategies, is evident. It is not a coincidence that destructive attitudes result in shame, which are passed on from father to son: Both Abraham and Isaac lie about their wives (Genesis 12, 20; 26) and attempted to affect God's blessing through cultural and human methods (cf. Genesis 16; 27). Forensic shame is also demonstrated in Esau despising his birth right (cf. Genesis 25:34); Jacob's deception and lying to both his brother and father (cf. Genesis 27:36) and his future father-in-law (cf. Genesis 31:20,26); and favoritism by parents for one of their children, could have intensified the problem of global shame. The affects of forensic shame are also demonstrated in the fact that Jacob had to flee from his brother (cf. Genesis 27:41) who held a grudge against him. The consequence of forensic shame is demonstrated in Jacob himself being deceived by his future father-in-law (cf. Genesis 29:25).

Yet, again, in spite of human failure and shame, God remains faithful to accomplish His purpose "even through the deceitful actions of Laban and Jacob, and the Jealous hatred of Jacob's wives." (Arnold, 1998:126). Jacobs' descendants that will make up the 12 tribes of Israel are born through him.

**36:1-37:1**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Esau

The effects of bitter conflict and inter-family shame are strongly suggested by this *toledot*. A long history of enmity, revenge and forensic shame existed between Judah (Jacob) and Edom (Esau). Several prophets spoke out against Edom (cf. Isaiah 11:14; 34:5-17; Ezekiel 32:29; Joel 3:19; Amos 1:11-12; Malachi 1:2-4). Obadiah reprimanded Edom for not assisting Judah at the time of the Babylonian invasion. Edom instead took advantage of the situation by raiding Judah and handing them over to the enemy. However, in view of the immediate context within this *toledot*, God's providence and purpose hold true. Esau's migration left Canaan to Jacob (Genesis 37:1). Rebekah had been told that two nations were in her womb and that the older will serve the younger (Genesis 25:23). The fact that only a brief *toledot* is reserved for Esau suggests that God's agenda is never thwarted by humankind's shame. The fact that God commands His People "Do not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother" (Deuteronomy 23:7) suggests God's grace is always available for humankind's shame (Waltke, 2001:489)

**37:2-50:26**

This is the beginning, history, origin of Joseph

Although the beginning chapter of Joseph's life reveals the bitter conflict and inter-family shame between him and his brothers Sailhamers' (1998) point is worth noting. He is correct when he states that the writer of the book patiently waits until the end to thematically express the lesson behind these struggles, using the words of Joseph to his brothers: "You intended it to harm me, but God intended it for good" (50:20). Out of each of the struggles, God's will was accomplished. The point is not so much that the struggles were necessary for the accomplishment of the will of God, but rather that God's will was accomplished in spite of the conflict. In spite of humankind's shame, God provides covering.

### 2.2.4.3. Preliminary conclusion

It may be stated from the above table that the *toledot* serves to unify the narratives into an introduction, effect and contagious spiritual impact of Adamic and forensic shame throughout this foundational book of the Pentateuch and the Old Testament.

Supported by the proposed argument for the historicity of Adam and Eve and the structure of the book of Genesis the following argument is presented: Genesis 3 as a historical event and within the framework of the Genesis 2:4-4:26 *toledot* is essential for interpreting shame, its strategies and consequences. The question may then be asked: is shame a predisposition imputed from Adam and Eve, innate in all humankind from birth?

## 2.2.5. A study of Genesis 3 as the blueprint for interpreting shame

### 2.2.5.1. Introduction

The following reasons are suggested why Genesis 3 is an important starting point for the interpretation of shame.

First, Martin Luther (1483-1546) the father of the Reformation and a significant historical figure in understanding theology as a practical science, referred to Genesis 1-3 as “doubtless the foundation of the whole Scripture” (cf. Blocher, 2000:372; Heitink, 1999:107-108). Genesis 1-11 is the introduction to the Book of Genesis, the Pentateuch and the rest of the Bible (cf. Sailhamer 1998).

Second, Genesis is important as a historical narrative genre and foundational for any discussion on problems faced by humankind (Constable, 2004:4). Genesis not only seems to provide the basis for Israel’s theological and historical basis (12-50) but in a few verses (Genesis 3:1-7) describes the destructive decisions of humankind’s first parents that left an indelible impression within God’s image bearers (cf. Constable, 2002:1-8; Thompson, 2001:14; Dillard & Longman III, 1994:45-52; Childs, 1993:566-577). Arnold (1998:64) states that the sin problem in Genesis 1-11 is demonstrated to be universal problems that all humankind may have a historical reference point to interpret the origin of

their personal problems today.

Third, recent research in the scientific discipline of psychology includes the story of Adam and Eve as bearing at least some relevance in discussing the construct of shame. Whether confused as to the point of Adam and Eve's sin (Nichols, 1995: 126) or labeled as a myth (Schneider, 1992:131), shame has been recognized "...since antiquity. A strong theme of shame exists in the early stories of Adam and Eve" (Gilbert and Andrews 1998:v). Lewis (2003:6), a scientific researcher on shame, states that "the biblical version of the origin of shame has considerable significance for the western mind" and as a part of the Genesis story of creation is the only emotion that is discussed at any length and is "particularly cogent with my view on the developmental process" of shame. Therefore, theologically, historically and practically a context is required for the establishment of this covenant. Genesis 3 seems to provide that context.

Fourth, the grammatical structure of Genesis 1-11 is made up of pericopes that formulate a direction for the reader, which is accomplished through a structural element that ties the passages together (cf. Constable, 2002:5; Hamilton, 2001.). When the author wants to begin a specific topic much narrower than the preceding subject matter, he uses the technique of disjunctive. This structure gives the passages integration, meaning and direction. In the New International Version this disjunctive is the repetitive use of the connective "now" ("and" in the King James Version), which is used eight times throughout Genesis 1-11 (1:2, 2:8, 2:19, 3:1, 4:3, 4:8, 6:11, 11:1). The significance of this connective lies within the fact that it weaves the pre-fall and Fall pericopes together. The reader is left with no doubt that humankind has failed to obey God's טוֹב (good) for them, and has sought to define their existence as a part from His good. As a pericope Genesis 2:4-3:24 lays a foundation as to the "inconceivable and unalterably inexcusable" (cf. Bonhoeffer, 1962:77) act of disobedience of Adam and Eve that follows; and, for the concern of this paper, lays the foundation for shame. Spykman (1992:303) observes, that it does not take long for someone to recognize that there is something persistently and pervasively wrong with his or her world. There is a universal awareness of man's "sickness unto death"

Fifth, Genesis 3, as a vital starting point on the discussion of humankind's problem, seems to suggest that humankind's problems are more than just bad behavior; rather they are rooted in a depraved inner being. This starting point is formulated in the context of a question and answer format in the

Heidelberg Confession, first published as a polemic document in 1536 (cf. Williamson 1993:5). Question and answer three to eleven deal with man's sin and misery. Question seven asks and answers,

“Q. Whence, then, comes this depraved nature of man?

A. From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise, whereby our nature became so corrupt that we all are conceived and born in sin.” (Heidelberg Confession, cf. Williamson, 1986:23)

It can be summarized that a person's presuppositions regarding the plight of an individual's inner condition will diametrically influence the approach to dealing with shame. The question may be asked, Genesis 3 supports which the Heidelberg Confession anticipated, and it seems, “Did God, then, create man so wicked and perverse?” The answer was suggested,

“By no means; but God created man good, and after His own image; that is; in true righteousness and holiness, that he might rightly know his god his Creator, heartily love Him, and live with Him in eternal blessedness to praise and glorify Him.” (Heidelberg Confession, cf. Williamson, 1986:23)

There seems to have been an intended relationship between God and humankind that was to be enjoyed and defined humankind's perception of God, themselves and others.

#### **2.2.5.2. Adam created by God to relate to Him and for Him (Genesis 1:26; 2:7)**

It is suggested that Genesis 3 presents shame as, at its root, a relational phenomenon in that it is impossible to sense shame without the inner conviction and innate perception of the reality of an interpersonal and interdependent relationship with God and community (others). This interpersonal and independent relationship is grounded in the fabric of the *Imago Dei*, man created in the image of God.

Genesis 1:26-27 states,

Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground." So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.

The image of God is foundational to the biblical concept of humanness (cf. Johnston, 2000:564). Yet, there are various interpretations as to the exact meaning of man as created in the image of God which lies beyond the scope of this thesis (cf. Lidums, 2004:1-155; Brunner and Barth, 1946:17-128; Short, 2002:1-16; Childs, 1993:568-571; Aquinas, 1982:492-501; Niebuhr, 1949:150-167; Brunner 1947, 82-112). "Genesis does not make fully clear wherein the image lies"(Childs 1993:569). Adam and humankind must be understood as an integrative whole, a unity having both physical and spiritual properties, but "combined as one entity, one person" (Day, 1998:12). This premise is supported in the Hebraic world-view of humankind. God breathed into Adam the breath of life and he became a living being (שָׁדָד וְחַיָּים). Van Leeuwen (2001; cf. Erickson, 1994:510-517; Grenz, 1994:218-233) observes, Hebraic thinking does not de-compartmentalize the human body into "parts", "rather the word describes the whole person" (cf. Ross, 1988:123). Adam was designed to function as a holistic spiritual being and person, who would function, distinct from all animals. In Genesis 1:26 the word **צִלְמוֹת** "image" is used with the word **דְמוּת** (*d'mût*) "likeness". There should be no major distinction made between "image" and "likeness". "Image" (*selem*) describes that Adam and humankind were fashioned and designed by God as a representative figure, while "likeness" has the idea of comparison or similarity, i.e. that the nature of man can be described by being compared to what God is like (Konkel, 2001). To summarize, Adam was created, distinct from animals. The image of God is not in Adam and Eve, but they are the image of God. Adam and Eve created in the image of God, reflect, and represent the personality and purposes of God within the sphere of defined freedom and boundaries. This makes up who they are as spiritual beings interdependent on God as his representatives, who have dominion over His creation. The question may be asked: what does this representation and dominion entail?

### 2.2.5.3. Adam as God's representative (Genesis 2:8; 2:15)

It is vital not to overlook the richness of the word “put” שָׁם ( *sim*) in verse 8 and “put” (נָח) ( *nuah*) in verse 15. The meaning in Genesis 2:8 God “puts” שָׁם Adam in the garden of Eden describes a spatial displacement, which is “characteristically associated with prepositions that specify the kind of location. When one positions objects or persons, their new location is specified with respect to other objects” (Meier, 2001). It is important to quote Meier (2001) further to capture the depth of 2:8:

One is exercising power and authority over whatever one relocates to another position. The object or person placed in a new position need not be moved easily, or even willingly, but the fact that it is accomplished implies that the one who effects the movement has either the requisite authority or the competence to achieve the task. This dimension of authority attributed to the subject of the verb is easily observed on those occasions where one individual places another in a position of power and status. One can predict that in most cases, the one who appoints is socially superior to both the position and the individual appointed

God is the one exercising His rightful power and authority over Adam; places, fixes and appoints him in a position of status as His representative, the details which are defined in verse 15. God of course is not only “socially” superior but also the Sovereign Lord. However, He is also the LORD God, which describes the intimate and close relationship with Adam. He is the God who personally and carefully “sculpted”, and “formed” the man and breathed into his nostrils life. Oswalt (2001) explains that “put” (נָח) ( *nuah*) in Genesis 2:15 is connected with the idea of a place to land are the ideas of safety and security. The only place where human beings can land in absolute confidence and safety is in the promises of God, but that requires an abandoning of self-reliance, which is perennially distasteful to fallen humans. An example of the words usage is Isaiah 32:18: “My people will live in peaceful dwelling places, in secure homes, in undisturbed places of rest.” Oswalt further explains that it is significant to note that in about half of these latter references the point is made that a sinful people will not find a place to land. To summarize, it is a personal, covenant God who places Adam in the Garden of Eden for a purpose and in security. There is no need for Adam to hide from God, or feel ashamed or intimidated by Him.

Sailhamer (1998) draws the readers' attention to the fact that in Genesis 2:15 the term used for Adam, as God's image bearer, is a term reserved for two special uses: God's rest or safety which he gives to man in the land (e.g., Genesis 19:16, Deuteronomy 3:20; 12:10; 25:19) (cf. Ross 1988:123-125). God's purpose for Adam was found within two complementary prerequisites. Firstly, to worship and serve him אָבָד ( *'abad* ), and secondly to work for and obey עָבַד Him (cf. Carpenter, 2001:Reference CD) by reproducing what God had given. Adam was to experience this responsibility within the safety and rest of the delightful עֵדֵן (eden - "delight") boundary of God's "idyllic delight and rest." (cf. Sailhamer, 1998) These idyllic conditions imply that man has no loathsome or burdensome demands placed on his daily schedule. Work was not a curse; it was the very essence of what it meant to be the image of God. Adam's worship before God was equated to his working and service for God within the boundaries God had placed Him. Idleness and shirking responsibility was unheard of at this point. Inseparable from this thought, the garden was not something to be possessed, but preserved and protected as this represented Adam's faith and obedience in God's Word (cf. Ferguson, 1996:10).

This by and large defines what God has done for Adam. How was Adam to demonstrate to God obedience, love and his spiritual dependence upon his Personal Creator? This implies the boundary in which God placed Adam was to be delineated in terms of a restriction and test.

#### **2.2.5.4. God's restriction for Adam (Genesis 2:16-17)**

A polemic question may be asked: "Did God restrict Adam and Eve so He could enjoy shaming them because He knew they would disobey?" This is not a simple question. This question comes from fallen people. First, humankind is aware that they live beyond God's good for them, hence there is something wrong within their inner beings. Second, in spite all of humankind's attempts to "explain" sin a part from Scripture, they can only arrive at simplistic solutions for complex problems (cf. McMinn, 1996:127-162; Erickson, 1994:581-588; Spykman, 1992:303-311). Four significant aspects are suggested from this restriction.

#### 2.2.5.4.1. Four suggested aspects of the restriction of Genesis 2:16

The first significant aspect of this restriction was, as the case with Adams' existence, that his dominion was to be defined by God, through his spoken Word. This presupposition is based on the fact that God alone knew what was good (טוב) for Adam, and God alone knows what is not good (רע) for him (cf. Sailhamer 1998). Genesis appears to portray humankind, as the crown of God's creative activity who ought to recognize their total dependence on God's special revelation for defining their existence. God is the Lawgiver who (positively) commands the man as to his boundaries with his dominion (cf. Enns, 2001). Adam's knowledge of his world was derived from God. Adam's "freedom" was part of his spiritual service to God. Waltke (2001:87) states that these first words of God to man assume man's freedom to choose demonstrated his formed moral capacity. On the one hand, it comprised of trusting that God's provision for him was what he needed, "you may eat from any tree in the garden." On the other hand, Adam's "freedom" also resided in obeying what God commanded what he could not do, that is, to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This restriction further emphasized the unique relationship and opportunities he had, to enjoy God and His provision. "Freedom has no meaning without prohibition; the boundary for Adam is but one tree. This prohibition is stated in the strongest terms" (Matthews, 2002:211). The knowledge of good and evil was a responsibility Adam could not handle. God knew it, and Adam was to accept it. Erickson (1994:425-432) argues that the meaning of "knowledge of good and evil" indicates moral autonomy. He observes that man is forbidden of what is in his best interests. This is a decision God has not delegated to the humankind. It appears that humankind becomes a god unto themselves whenever they make their own self the center and the only frame of reference for moral guidelines. When humankind attempts to act autonomously it is inferred from Genesis (cf. 6:5; 8:21) they are indeed attempting to be godlike.

The second significant aspect of this restriction was the purpose of the test was to enhance Adam's spiritual development as he obeyed God's command and became a transparent mirror of the glory of the Creator (cf. Keil and Delitzsch, 1991:86). The purpose of the test also resided in a choice and not some intrinsic evil or good within the tree. God is saying "Believe Me and stand in your place as a creature, not as one who is autonomous. Believe Me and love Me as a creature to His Creator, and all will be well. This is the place I have made for you." (cf. Schaeffer, 1991:49)

This leads to the third significant aspect of this restriction: the consequence of disobedience to God. Genesis 2:17 stated that death would be the consequence of disobedience. The consequence or disobedience was not a cruel trick of God as was the case in ancient Mesopotamian literature (cf. Ferguson, 1996:155). Merrill (2001) observes that as a theological concept in the Old Testament, death on the whole is viewed as a negative termination or at least interruption of life. It is mysterious, foreboding, filled with uncertainty, and of an inevitable and universal nature. Since God's purpose for our first parents was never ending life, the introduction of death was an undesirable but necessary result of disobedience. Death becomes the consequence and punishment of sin. It originated with conscience, thought out, sin; and sin is any rebellion or conformity to his holy will. Death then, in the Old Testament, means ultimate separation from God due to sin. Death is not simply alienation physically, but a spiritual alienation from God. It is being separate from the protection, nurture and relationship that were once enjoyed. It can be suggested that a person entangled in addictive behavior does not have a sense of intimate relationship with God (vertically) and others (horizontally). This new relationship to whatever compulsive behavior is a pseudo relationship that brings no lasting depth or peace. Any behavior that steps outside God's provision of good will result in alienation from Him and only God knows what humankind needs.

A fourth aspect of this restriction is that God had provided every other tree, an abundance, which Adam was "free to eat", or "you may eat freely from" (cf. Matthews, 2002:211).

#### **2.2.5.4.2. Preliminary conclusion**

A preliminary conclusion is that this one restriction has at least pedagogical values that define Adam's relationship to God. God's determines what Adam needs and what Adam must avoid. Spiritual and personal growth and depth is developed through obedience to God. The restriction delineates the parameters for this obedience. Physical and spiritual separation ought to be a powerful deterrent to disobedience. The restriction is not harsh. When God commands, He also seems to provide abundantly so Adam has the ability "to keep on eating from every other tree". Adam is in relationship with his Personal Creator. It seems to be implied that if this boundary is crossed, if this command is broken, Adam will know and God will know. It seems that for Adam there will be exposure from the gaze of his God. The breaking of this law implies guilt in light of breaking a known law. However, more

important is the implication of shame. Shame does not exist in a vacuum (cf. Green and Lawrenz, 1994:81) Shame is a relational phenomenon and affect. Adam would be exposed, as he would be forensically culpable before God when he crosses this restriction.

Yet, there seems to be something missing. So far the only relationship that exists is a vertical one. God stated in Genesis 1:26-27 that there was to be male and female. This will both complete Adam and complicate his ability to keep the command of God.

#### **2.2.5.4.3. The design of the woman for Adam (Genesis 2:18-24)**

It is not difficult to be caught up in emphasizing the federal representation of Adam in hamartiological terms, failing to discuss the importance of man and the woman in anthropological/communal terms. God dwells with His people through His people (men and women) as they represent Him through community (cf. Grenz, 1994:147-148). God stated that out of all the good he had created that it was not good for Adam to be alone. The significance of this is that God creates a divine tension for Adam (cf. Ross, 1988:126): Adam was to realize for himself that he was designed for relationship. It appears in Genesis that significant individual growth can only take place in a relationship, to God in community (cf. Genesis 4:3-7; 50:19-20; Wilson, 1993:55). The author draws the reader's attention to this specific loneliness with the technique of disjunctive, using the connective "now" (Genesis 2:20a). Adam named all the animals, "But for Adam no suitable helper could be found." (Genesis 2:30b) This disjunctive gives the passage integration, meaning and direction to emphasize the prominence of God working His divine will and blessing through Adam and His relational provision for him, Eve (cf. Sailhamer, 1998).

Genesis 2:18-25 seems to suggest that Adam and Eve's relationship is the archetypal for all relationships. The thought of verse 25 must not be overlooked. Matthews (2002:225) quoting Davidson draws out the meaning "were not ashamed" as "they were not, at any time, ashamed". Waltke (2001:90; cf. Gangel and Bramer, 2002:30) adds to this by stating that their nakedness is an image of openness and trust and when they feel shame they need to protect their exposure by the barrier of clothing. This seem to imply that a profound vertical connection with God, Adam and Eve existed, and also a profound and meaningful horizontal connection between Adam and Eve.

An application seems significant to shame is that it seems to take place when community is broken down because of autonomous decisions and individual sin, which result in exposure, which in turn leads to the tearing a part of community and self-preservation. Doriani (1996:736) makes a legitimate statement when he says "sin offends people; it is violence and lovelessness toward other people, and ultimately, rebellion against God."

#### **2.2.5.5. The entrance of forensic shame into relationships (Genesis 2:25-3:7)**

Peters (1994:9) is correct in stating that sin is a mystery. A caution must be added that this does not mean sin is undefinable; but rather a complex topic (Cf. Doriani, 1996:736). Opponents that deny the historicity of Genesis cannot ignore the reality of the results of sin, that is shame (cf. Lewis, 2003:6; Gilbert and Andrews 1998:v). It has already been demonstrated that accepting or rejecting the historicity of the Fall of Adam and Eve has a great bearing on the interpretation on the root causes of human (spiritual) pathology, and this it is suggested, shame. This is not a new problem. Bush (1979:70-71) elaborates:

This has been a point of great controversy in all ages to reduce this part of the sacred history to allegory or fable, even the presence of a real serpent has been denied, and the whole treated as a mere figurative or symbolical representation designed to convey under expressive emblems certain great moral truths, which are important for man to know.

He goes on to conclude after much discussion that if one part of the Genesis narrative is allegory, then it and every other narrative must be reduced to thus. However, for example the Serpent is not portrayed as an irrational creature or a brute reptile. Admitting to the historicity of this text and others in the book of Genesis places a grave responsibility on humankind to use the narrative as windows to their own soul. "A more-studied attempt to treat the problem of evil and temptation to sin cannot be found in all the Scriptures." (Cf. Sailhamer, 1998). Textually the word "naked" עָרֹם (*arummim*) (2:25) and "crafty" (עָרָם) (*arum*) to describe the serpent (3:1) not only connect the two passages but to emphasize how Adam and Eve would move from transparency and integrity to shameful nakedness (3:7)(cf. Seevers, 2001).

The emphasis on Genesis 3 seems not to be on Satan, but on Eve's choice to act upon the temptation and therefore, incorrectly believe, that she needed to supplement what she believed to be deficiencies in God's goodness (cf. Crabb, 1993:80). It is suggested that Eve was not a victim of circumstance. Carpenter and Grisanti (2001) commenting on the nuance of the word "to deceive" or "to cause a deception" (עָרַב, לָרַב from נָסָא (*nasa*) state that the integrity of Eve was the target of the serpent's attack, yet she was not uninformed. Any understanding of reality that differed from a reality presented and defined by God's words (here with respect to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil) could only be deceitful and false. It seems that listening to Satan's words over against God's Word she questioned the truth instead of stating it. Second she focused on the restriction, not the freedom to be enjoyed. Third, she seemed to dismiss the understood consequences of her attitude and actions and fourth she seemed to focus on the restriction to her autonomy and hunger for knowledge to control life as a god.

It is worth noting that Christian Counselor Jay Adams (1979:6) seems to support the fact that Eve was thinking as an agent who could make thought-out moral choices describes this temptation as fourfold, 1) doubting and 2) distorting God's Word, "Did God really say?" (Genesis 3:1); 3) denying God's Word, "You will not surely die," the serpent said to the woman."(Genesis 3:4); and 4) distrust in God, "For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."(Genesis 3:5) He then adds:

Eve's response seems to indicate that she was not totally taken in by this approach, but possibly also reveal that she was sufficiently influenced to the point where she altered the commandment by adding the words, "neither shall you touch it. (Adams 1979:6)

Helmut Thielicke (1961:137) captures the atmosphere of the Serpent's lie

But now the serpent says to her: 'Surely it is sheer nonsense to think that God would let you die and perish utterly just because you don't take him so terribly in earnest, but rather just partly seriously. You will not die. The question of God is not that serious, my dear lady! All honor to your respect for him. I take my hat off to your display of piety, but really now, he's not *that* serious about it!'

It appears this leads the woman to define a paradigmatic anatomy of sin (Genesis 3:6).

**Genesis 3:6 as a suggested anatomy of sin leading to forensic shame in relationships**

Waltke (2001:90-92) has divided Genesis 3:1-7 into four helpful sections that seem to describe the process how Adam and Eve experienced the paradigmatic or archetypal shame: The shape of the tempter (3:1a); the shape of temptation (3:1b-5); the shape of sin (3:6) and the shape of sin's consequences (3:7). In their perfect state they focused on what they did not have instead of what they did have. This passage seems to present the pathetic shape or "anatomy" of sin. As "its centerpiece the account moves with rapid pace" (Matthews, 2002:237), which seems to be the reality of all destructive attitudes that translate into behavior, followed by shame. The following table suggests the anatomy of sin and a suggested interpretation leading to a case for forensic shame as presented in Genesis 3:6

**A suggested  
anatomy" of sin  
Genesis 3:6**

**A suggested interpretation leading to forensic shame into relationships**

"The woman saw"

This seems to define that she had the ability to evaluate all the data presented by the Serpent. It is interesting to note that God evaluated His Creation and Creature and "saw " that it was "good" and "very good". It seems the same cannot be said of the evaluation of Eve. The tree was pleasing to them for God had made it which an aesthetic quality (Genesis 2:9), but she should not have been evaluating that particular tree. Her evaluation should and could have been of all the other trees that were "pleasing to the eye". Williams states that the phrase  $\text{רָאָה וַיִּשְׂפָּט} \text{ וַיִּשְׂפָּט}$ , it was pleasing ( $\text{רָאָה} \text{ ( ta'wâ)}$  to the eye), connotes a physical beauty that evokes a desire that is less superficial. It is possible for the word to express a fulfilled longing, or a deluded sense that this will fulfill a covetous longing. The same is true of the fact that the tree was good for food. So were all the other trees. However, she believed a lie interpreting that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil could give her something she believed was a deficiency as an image bearer.

It appears that the command of God for them not to eat the forbidden fruit was not based on the fruit containing intrinsic evil. Their vulnerability lay in the test itself as to first, whether they would obey God and His Word because He had said it; second, whether they believed that what God had created for them was indeed good; third, whether or not creation lacked something; fourth, whether God was deficient in anyway; and fifth, whether God has held something back from them.

Eve's choice to take does not seem to imply to her that God was deficient and that He had not provided all she needed, nor was He all she needed. This seems to be emphasized by the fact that she evaluated the tree as "desirable" for something she was not permitted to have. Tally states that הָמַד (*hamad*) "desire", depending on the context, can stress a different meaning, either the desirability of an object or the desire to obtain. In 2:9, the emphasis is on the desirability of the object, i.e., one would be disposed to enjoy such an item. However, in 3:6, the emphasis is less on the desirability of the object and more on the emotion of the desire itself (i.e., the desire to attain). A destructive attitude began to take fruit within her inner being. An element of all destructive attitudes seems to be a desire to obtain something humankind believes and feels we cannot possess. Eve substitutes God's good for a deceptive imitation.

"she took.."

It seems that Satan did not give her the fruit. She took it. This was a thought-out choice propelled by a spirit of covetousness. She took because it seems that as a part of the anatomy of sin is the seduction of a relationship with something else on the woman's own terms. She was designed for relationship. A relationship without God would produce loneliness, therefore, she attempts a relationship with something other than God (Thielicke, 1961:158-160). The woman is totally culpable. This was thought out, and she acted upon her attitude.

“...ate.” She consumed for herself the things she believed and felt would fill a perceived deficiency of God’s. It seems another element of destructive attitudes lead to behavior that is totally self-focused.

“...gave some to her husband...” The affects of a destructive attitude is that it often destroys community as it draws in participants.

“...and he ate.” However, Adam is culpable as well. He is not described as a victim or an innocent bystander, but an active participant. (cf. 1 Timothy 2:14)

A preliminary conclusion suggests that the influence of Satan is not the same as being forced by Satan. The anatomy of sin seems to be a nurturing of doubt, desire, covetousness, believing a lie, and an inner accusation that God is lacking in his provision. Their sin seemed to be self-determined. Adam and Eve were not victims but active participants. Sin does not seem to be neutral with no consequences. Genesis 3:7-13 appears to be helpful in presenting a theological paradigm of forensic shame as it impacts relationships.

### **Genesis 3:7-13 as a suggested theological paradigm of forensic shame in relationships**

What took place over a very short time will have consequences for them and all of humankind throughout history. Genesis 3:7-13 records the consequences of their destructive attitudes and actions. It seems the very thing that they (falsely) believed, desired and coveted would bring fulfillment and replace a perceived deficiency, brought just the opposite. This seems to be the paradigmatic anatomy of shame, the etiology of shame. It appears that what happened in Genesis 3:7-13 is a theological paradigm of forensic shame. This passage seems to present a spiritual and emotional diagnosis as to

what always happens when people find themselves shamed. Although this will not be an exhaustive study, the following table will suggest Genesis 3:7-13 as the theological paradigm of forensic shame.

**Genesis 3:7-13**

**Suggested theological paradigm of forensic shame**

Then the eyes of both of them were opened, (v7a)

Hamilton (2001), insightful in his interpretation of the word פִּקְּעָה (*piqqeah*) “opened”, stated that Adam and Eve hardly got what they were falsely promised. Their eyes became opened but at what consequence. He reminds the reader “How different is this couple who had their eyes opened from another couple who also had their eyes opened as they walked from Jerusalem to Emmaus (“then their eyes were opened and they recognized him,” (cf. Luke 24:31). Both Adam and Eve experienced exactly the same consequence because they are both individually and collectively culpable.

and they realized they were naked (v7b)

The above thought is expanded in the second part of the verse. They, together and individually, “realized” יָדָעוּ (*yada*), developed an experiential knowledge of that which they had sought. They had come to know that which was the consequence of disobeying God. This knowledge of good and evil though produced a forensic guilt as they had transgressed a known law and boundary that was established (commanded) by God. The forensic guilt of which they were culpable created a sense of being naked. This seemed to result in forensic/moral shame. Waltke (2001:92) states that this was produced by a sense of someone “stripped of protective clothing” and “naked” in the sense of being defenseless, weak and humiliated. It is suggested that from this point there was an innate, imputed and inherited conscience and sense of both guilt and shame in every individual which seems to begin at birth (cf. Genesis 6:5; Genesis 8:21; Psalm 51:5; Romans 2:15; Romans 5:12). Seevers (2001) observes that in the rest of the Bible, nakedness is often associated with shame, with nakedness and shame even used interchangeably. “The *fig leaves* were pathetic enough, as human expedients tend to be, but the instinct (to hide in shame) was sound and God confirmed it (v. 21), for sin’s proper fruit is shame” (Kidner, 1967:69). There seems to be another affect to

realizing they were naked, Adam and Eve's relationship to one another. This shame should not be reduced to an emotional affect, nor to sexual shame (cf. Kaas, 2004:106-108). It is purported that there existed a very real inner objective sense of moral defilement before God and one another (cf. Anon 1998:780)

so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.(7c)

First, This realization does not bring a change of attitude in their relationship with God but a determination find a shallow solution to shame.

Second, there seems to be an urgency, a desperation and a clumsiness to covering their shame.

Third, they seem to be committed and engaged in a strategy to cover their shame. They "made" with their own hands a futile attempt to cover their shame. It seems this strategy to make with ones own hands becomes a powerful theme to describe covering forensic shame throughout the old Testament.

Fourth, they seem to be working virtuously in partnership, expending energy and time in a cause that will not provide the relief they so desperately need.

Fifth, the materials they use will not even bring temporary relief, although they seemed deceived into thinking they will.

Sixth, the deceitful attitude and strategy that was assumed to bring pleasure and a fulfilled longing brought the consequence of a sense of weakness, defenselessness, exposure, insecurity and humiliation. This thought is captured by Matthews (cf. 2002:239) who points out there is a linkage between the act and consequence with a play on words "pleasing" in verse 6 and the word for "fig".

Then the man and his wife heard the sound of the LORD God as he was walking in the garden in the cool of the day, (3:8a)

There would be no deluding God. Calvin (2001: 45) makes a valuable statement in this regard, “All bury the disgrace of their vices under flimsy leaves till God, by his voice, strikes inwardly their consciences. Hence, after God had shaken them out of their torpor, their alarmed consciences compelled them to hear his voice.” Ironically it seems the boundary (Garden) of delight (Eden) brings a sense of a need to hide, and not stand authentic before the LORD. Adam and Eve hear the sound (שָׁמְעוּ (qôl) of the Lord in the garden, in the cool of the evening (lit., at the breeze of the day and that sound awakens both their guilt and shame) (cf. Domeris, 2001; Sailhamer, 1998).

This far-reaching event in the world’s history of the entrance of sin brought with it the resultant objective because of the reality of guilt and exposure before God (cf. Constable, 2004:43). Although the wicked falsely believe they will not have to give an account before God (Psalm 10:13; Psalm 73:10-11), a reoccurring thought throughout Scripture is that all humankind must give an account for our choices before God (cf. Job 31:14; 31:37; Ecclesiastes 3:15; 12:14; 1 Corinthians 4:5; Hebrews 4:12-13). It is suggested that this is the reality of humankind in general as image bearers, and each are required standing before Him in recesses of their heart and confronting their forensic guilt and shame. This seems to be supported by following the murder of Abel, God searches out Cain and says, “Listen (שָׁמְעוּ!)” His brother’s blood is calling out, presumably for revenge (Domeris, 2001).

and they hid from the LORD God among the trees of the garden.

Hill (2001) states that the root חָבַא (*haba*) may refer to hiding in dread of divine presence, whether out of shame and guilt. The strategy in hiding is to vanish and be undetectable, almost invisible. Now, they had a choice either to face the culpability of their forensic guilt and shame, or to attempt a futile

(3:8b)

strategy to hide. The first does not alleviate the consequences of guilt, but it would enable them to address both their guilt and shame. By hiding they are implicitly admitting their guilt and shame, yet retaining a strategy of autonomy to save face. The strategy to hide from God only emphasized their spiritual and relational alienation from God and one another. They were disconnected relationally and their shame was the main indicator of this fact. They hid behind the very provision that should have brought contentment and enjoyment.

But the LORD God called to the man, "Where are you?" (v9)

Consistent through out Genesis God's intervention is in spite of human failure. God seems come as a father seeking His children (cf. Matthews 2002:240). This should not be equated with a permissive father who ignores the destructive attitudes and actions of his children. On the contrary He comes to uncover the deeds of which is intended to effect a pedagogical discipline which "permits the guilty to witness against themselves by their own admissions" (Matthews 2002:240). It seems that it is more than just admitting guilt. Adam and Eve not only get to face their guilt, but by their "father" finding them they get to face their individual shame which motivated them to attempt to hide or be undetectable from Him. This is supported by the fact that God questions Adam as an individual (second-person singular). This seems to be a question that should not be restricted to focusing on individual responsibility. God is also connecting with Adam. The judgment in which God has come is both punitive and restorative. "God does not pass judgment without careful investigation (Waltke, 2001:92; Genesis 4:9-10; 18:21). It seems imperative that Adam faces his shame before God Himself (cf. Psalm 51:4). "The modern world tends to question, "Where is God"? Genesis 3:9 seems to ask a different and more important question: Where is man?" (cf. Green and Lawrenz, 1994:81). It seems that there can be no reconciliation until Adam faces who he is before God addressing what he has done.

He answered, "I heard you in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; so I hid." (3:10)

It is significant that fear is attached to both hearing God in the garden, having to come face to face with God. Before his disobedience he enjoyed a "Coram Deo" with no sense of insecurity or fragmentation in his relationship. There should not be a haste to interpret his fear because of his circumstances as though he was a victim. His fear seems more to be attached to the fact that he understands his place in God's world, in terms of his relationship to Him. Pelt and Kaiser (2001) state that יָרֵא ( *yare* ) "afraid" in this text refers to the terror before Deity. "Naked" carries the same idea as in verse 7: a sense of powerlessness, humiliation, insecurity, which explains why Adam could not enjoy the "face to face" relationship that he once did. The only futile strategy he assumed he could take was one of self-preservation, to hide. Shame seems to cause the shamed to react when confronted with not just what they have done, but more significantly with who they are. It seems that Adam would rather hide his shame, than face it, and apparently, in his mind be further shamed, which of course was not true. God is seeking to have Adam face the consequences of his attitude and actions but also "cover" his nakedness and shame.

And he said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?" (3:11)

It is suggested that this second question would provide an opportunity for Adam to focus his attention on a self-evaluation before His Creator. This is an opportunity for Adam:

to accept his contribution and culpability before God

to confess his lack of leadership in challenging both Eve and the Serpent

to understand the ramification of coveting something he was never designed to have

to acknowledge the futility of attempting to find contentment outside of God's good for him.

to confess his guilt before God at defying an understood boundary and his attempt to cover his attitude and actions

to seek forgiveness from God

to confess his guilt before his wife in view of the fact that he functions in the role of final accountability before God.

The man said, "The woman you put here with me--she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it." (3:12)

There is a powerful lesson to be gleaned from Adam's response which, it appears, should not be passed over glibly. Instead of admitting and assuming responsibility it seems he takes the position of the victim of circumstance and pressure, not a culpable agent. Matthews (2002:241) captures the mood of the verse by stating that in the original language Adam's contention is given force by the emphasis on "she", yielding the sense, "I only took what *she* gave me!" Adam goes on to ultimately blame God for his disobedience, by stating that the woman that God gave to him, gave him the fruit. There seems to be a genuine case to state that blame shifting is one of the most prominent strategies when a person has a sense of shame, to avoid accountability. "Self-justification almost always involves the transfer of blame to others." (Swindoll and Zuck, 2003:733). It is suggested that they sink deeper into their shame as this seems to be another futile strategy to cover and hide their shame.

The man said, "The woman you put here with me--she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it." (3:13a)

It is significant that God addresses the woman with basically the same question. It may seem that God was taking His cue from Adam and was blaming the woman. This should be looked at as an opportunity for the woman to face her own culpability before the Lord.

Then the LORD God said to the woman, "What is this you have done?"

The woman said, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate." (3:13b)

The woman by shifting the blame to another party, the Serpent, actually condemns herself, as it is abundantly clear to God that she is culpable. Satan may have influenced her thinking but he did not determine her thinking (Boyd, 2001:166-167). Matthews (2001:242) believes that Eve was a "victim of deception". This does not seem to be accurate, as she was well aware of God's Word and had the ability to reply to the Serpent using God's Word (cf. Genesis 3:1-5).

In a preliminary conclusion Genesis 3:7-13 appears to be the theological paradigm of forensic shame. Genesis 3:14-24 seems to present and introduce the imputation, consequences and affects of shame resulting from these destructive attitudes and the strategies of the human heart, on relationships in the inner person, Satan, Jesus Christ, marriage, environment relationships a spiritual and emotional diagnostic as to what always happens when people find themselves shamed.

### **Genesis 3:14-17 as suggested theological-practical implications of forensic shame in relationships**

The following table will suggest some theological-practical implications of forensic shame found in Genesis 3:14-17. Sin always has a price. Shame seems to be the ultimate price that manifests itself in various ways.

#### **Genesis 3:14-24      Suggested theological-practical implications of forensic shame in relationships**

So the LORD God said to the serpent, "Because you have done this, "Cursed are

It is significant that God does not question the Serpent, but curses אָרַר (*arar*) him out right. The meaning of "a curse", as it related to interpersonal relationships translates into shaming an individual or treating them with indignity, and this by one in authority (Gordon, 2001). The one in authority is

you above all the livestock and all the wild animals! You will crawl on your belly and you will eat dust all the days of your life. (3:14)

God. It seems there is a play on words in that The Serpent attempted to be עָרַם ( *arum*) behind God's back, he is now אָרַר ( *arar*) cursed before God (cf. Sailhamer, 1998.). It is interesting to note, that God does not curse Adam and Eve, although there are consequences for their sin. Three aspects to the Serpent's curse include crawling on his belly; eating dust all the days of his life, which is associated with personal humiliation, and its ultimate destruction by the wounded seed of the woman (cf. Matthews 2002:244; Keil and Delitzsch, 1991:99-100). The Serpent is culpable and does not seem to argue or blame. It seems the reader, though, is left with the impression that as the Serpent slithers away, he is not done with humankind. He is shamed, and knows it, yet he will attempt to deal with his eternal shame by attacking that which matters most to God, humankind. He seems to be that "ancient serpent called the devil or Satan, who leads the whole world astray" (Revelation 12:9). Yet, it also appears that the real spiritual battle is not the one between humankind and humankind, or God and humankind, as valid and real this battle is. The real spiritual battle is between God and the Serpent (Satan) (cf. Boyd, 2003:319; Revelation 12:9; 17:17). This is a very real and conflicting relationship. God will be the victor one day (cf. Revelation 17:17; 20; Genesis 3:15)

And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel." (Genesis 3:15)

Why will God be the victor? Sailhamer seems to answer this question when he states, "The woman's "seed" is certainly intended to be understood as a group (or individual) that lies the same temporal distance from the woman as the "seed" of the snake does from the snake itself. Yet in this verse it is the "seed" of the woman who crushes the head of the snake. Though the "enmity" may lie between the two "seeds," the goal of the final crushing blow is not the "seed" of the snake but rather the snake itself; *his* head will be crushed. In other words, it appears that the author seems intent on treating the snake and his "seed" together, as one." Although this was a judgment on the Serpent, it was also a promise to humankind (cf. Wenham, 2000:63). A Divine program is set forth that supercedes human shame. Genesis 3:15 seems to speak of a so-called Protevangelium, the first utterance of the gospel after the Fall into

sin and shame. It appears that this passage advocates the need for a Divine Redeemer who must come through the woman's seed to overcome, once and for all the epidemic of spiritual forensic shame in humankind, and "crush"  $\text{סָרַף}$  (*sup*) the Serpent, influence on humankind not just sin, but to live with the affect of shame (Van Dam, 2001). The full victory implied in these "crush" words was initially fulfilled in Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection. The final fulfillment comes e.g., Roman 16:20; Colossians 2:15; Hebrews 2:14; Revelation 12; 20:9-10. The Divine will become human. Shame will one day not only be "covered" but also eradicated.

To the woman he said,  
 "I will greatly increase  
 your pains in  
 childbearing; with pain  
 you will give birth to  
 children. Your desire  
 will be for your  
 husband, and he will  
 rule over you."  
 (Genesis 3:16)

However, the affect of shame will be experienced for a long time at a profound level that will impact the man and the woman all the days of their lives. "The new things that the knowledge brought upon Adam and Eve were shame and passion." (Bonhoeffer, 1962:86). The passion that Bonhoeffer refers to was sexual. It is suggested, however, that a destructive sexual passion was a secondary consequence. A primary (negative) passion produced by shame was a desire to control and dominate her husband. Tally (2001) observes that the nominative  $\text{סָרַף}$  (*tsuqa*) is found only three times (Genesis 3:16; 4:7 and Song of Songs 7:10) in the Old Testament, therefore its usage is significant and purposeful. In Song of Songs 7:10 [11] the term has a romantic and positive nuance, describing the feeling of a mutual attraction between two lovers. Tally states, although there is disagreement over the meaning of the use of "desire" in Genesis 3:16, there is not much disagreement of the usage of the word in Genesis 4:17. In Genesis 4:7 the term has a decidedly negative nuance, describing the desire of sin that lies poised, ready to leap at and dominate Cain. It is a reference to conquering, the desire to defeat a foe. There seems to be a very real affect of shame, and strategy to deal with shame is introduced in Genesis 3:16, and that the woman will profoundly struggle with the leadership of her husband and will seek to dominate or control him. It is further suggested that the pain that will be incurred from child bearing will produce the fear of being a mother, which will shame her in light of a sense of inadequacy and/or entrapment, not just at

the point of child bearing but in the early stages of pregnancy and the formative years of the child's life. The view of the woman seeking to control seems to be supported by Waltke (2001:95) who states that the chiasmic structure of the phrase pairs the term "desire" and "rule over", "suggesting that her desire will be to dominate. In view of the struggle of the man (see below) the woman will lose confidence in her husband, hence blame him and seek to control the relationship using passive aggressive strategies. In a positive vein, it seems that the pain in childbearing not only be viewed as a reminder of the shame of the Fall but also a reminder of a future once-for-all "covering" for those who will believe in the coming Redeemer.

To Adam he said, "Because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree about which I commanded you, 'You must not eat of it,' Cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life. It will produce thorns and thistles for you, and you will eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your brow you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since

What seems to be implied in this narrative of Genesis 3 is that Adam was silent. He was silent with the serpent, and with his wife. Crabb (1995:97) is correct that Adam did not have to speak for her, to her, or even at her. However, he could have spoken with her. Yet, he said nothing. Nowhere in the passage does it indicate he communicated with her. He remained silent and absent during this process. Crabb (1995:97) suggests that Adam's disobedience did not begin with eating the fruit, but with his silence. This silence appears to be a consequence that God allows Adam, and imputed to all men, to have to face and overcome. The implication is that if they refuse to they will use this silence as a strategy to nurture their shame. Perhaps this further adds to the woman's desire to control her husband and resist his leadership because in fact, he does not lead, but remains silent. What other affects of shame on the man? Does this add to his need to be silent with his wife? Matthews (2002:252) identifies Adam's penalty as suffering a life-long toilsome labor and finally death. The ground will be the man's enemy. Adam lived in an agrarian society, however, the implication is that the sense of man striving to "conquer" the ground and lose themselves in their "toilsome" labor, even though futile, would be the pursuit that is imputed to all men in all ages. A sense of futility and frustration will seem to characterize men. The irony is that the man will return to dust he is grappling with, in the condition of shame (cf. Matthews, 2002:249). It does not seem that the emphasis is on

from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return. Adam named his wife Eve, because she would become the mother of all the living. (Genesis 3:17-20)

life as it is with the woman (cf. Genesis 3:20). However, God has not left man in the state of utter despair. It must be noted that man will find no meaning to life with out a permanent reference to God (cf. Ecclesiastes 3:9-12; 5:18-20).

The LORD God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them. And the LORD God said, "The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever." So the LORD God banished him from the Garden of Eden to work the ground from which he had been taken. After he drove the man out, he placed on the east

It is significant that garments of skin must cover the skin. Originally man's skin was to be his glory, identification that encased his perfect spiritual, cognitive, emotional and volitional condition. But now the man and the woman are exposed, vulnerable. Their relationship between God and one another is forever, fragmented. They had attempted to cover their nakedness and shame through futile strategies of making with their own hands and covering themselves with fig leaves, which only provided discomfort (cf. Wenham, 1991:75). They hid and blamed, and through all this remained shameful. "Man's nakedness had caused him shame and had forced him to seek a covering of his own creativity" (Gangel and Bramer, 2002:46). It seems, as will be demonstrated, that in the Book of Jeremiah for example attempting to create for oneself a covering is equated with idolatry, hence finding a substitute, instead of face God. However, God demonstrates His grace, compassion and unceasing love and commitment for His creatures by providing coverings for them. Yet, what was free cost someone something. An animal would have had to be substituted in their place in order to have had the garments provided for them. It is implied that unless His way, at a price of a sacrifice, covered them they would not be covered.

side of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life.

(Genesis 3:21-24)

God seems to banish them from the Garden for their own protection. It seems that this covering would not be a permanent solution to their shame. They had to be banished from the Garden so that they could not eat from the tree of life, and live forever, in the condition of shame. In the context of Genesis 3:15 this banishment also served as a deep longing to get back to a “Garden state” (cf. Genesis 13:9-10) in which they would no longer sense shame. However, only God alone will provide a once-for-all covering for humankind’s condition.

What theological-implications does Genesis 3:1-24 suggest in terms of the imputation of forensic shame on relationships?

**Genesis 3:1-24 as suggested theological-practical implications of the imputation of forensic shame to relationships**

Although the word “imputation” is not found in this narrative its affect in furthering shame and judgment is strongly implied. “Imputation”, one of the principle doctrines of the Christian faith, may be defined as charging to an account in terms of a forensic or legal reference to sin, its affects and salvation and its affects. It is to “set down in a record or ledger” a fact of an attitude and action taking place (cf. Elwell and Confort, 2001:630). In terms of Adam and Eve, when they sinned, humankind did not get blamed for the first parents’ sin, but the propensity and attitude to sin and attempt to cover up the shame of sin entered into humankind. Human beings are created as free beings under the direction of God through His moral law. In terms of Adam and Eve the test was necessary for these moral creatures to exercise their moral responsibility and freedom. Environment could not be blamed, as it was perfect. Their natures were perfect. They chose against God that which was not good, therefore it was choosing evil. Hence, they become inherently evil. Satan did not tempt them to lie, cheat, steal, murder, as he knew that inherently this was morally impossible for them. The only area of potential evil, i.e. choosing that which is not good, lay in the test to obey God. He knew they would be culpable. He knew that the perfect couple who neither knew nor stood under forensic or inherent shame, would be exposed and experience the reality of shame.

This "original sin" that was imputed to humankind does not mean that humankind is as sinful as they could be. Original sin does not mean that humankind is incapable of discerning truth or inferences to happiness. Pascal (1980:198) was correct in observing the original condition of humankind when he stated,

They have a secret instinct which impels them to seek amusement and occupation abroad, and which arises from the sense of their constant unhappiness. They have another secret instinct, a remnant of greatness of our original nature, which teaches them that happiness in reality consists only in rest and not in stir.....Wretched as we are and more so if there were no greatness in our condition, we have an idea of happiness, and cannot reach it. We perceive an image of truth, and possess only a lie.

Original sin does not mean that humankind is beyond redemption. Shuster (2004:161) is correct when she states that original sin refers to the belief that humankind is radically depraved in light of the historical Fall: the entire or whole of the person is in faculty and power is depraved and affected. "The intellect is darkened, the will is enslaved, the affects are corrupt." (Shuster, 2004:161)

Humankind's conceptions are marked by sin and cannot be simply corrected by neutral empirical observation and remedy. Original sin is universal in that it does not simply affect every aspect of certain individuals but to every aspect of all individuals. Therefore, it is suggested that just as original sin is both radical and universal, so too is shame both radical, it affects every part of an individual and shame affects all of humankind. Why is Adamic and Forensic shame an imputed reality?

Although the fallen conscience is fallible, humankind seems to sense an objective, innate moral law. It is suggested, building on Geisler's (2004:77) evidences for objective moral law, that there is evidence of the reality of Adamic and Forensic shame that exposes humankind's inherent struggle to face their shame.

First, there seems to exist a universality of basic moral beliefs that guide the consciousness of all humankind (Romans 2:14-15). When people go beyond the boundaries of these moral beliefs they attempt to either "defend" or "hide" their immoral actions that seem to emphasize the reality of Adamic and Forensic Shame. Alternatively, when a person has a sense of inner peace or relief in light of the

"covering" of obedience to these universal moral judgments demonstrates a need to live a "covered" life.

Second, there seems to exist an unavoidability of making moral judgments. Inherent within every human being is the capacity and often knowledge of making good or evil decisions based on good or evil attitudes. It appears impossible not to cultivate either a moral or an immoral attitude and hence make either a moral or an immoral decision. The fact that one has immoral attitudes that often result in committing immoral acts, and then develop strategies that attempt to "cover up" or "hide" immoral behavior is evidence of the presence of both Adamic and Forensic Shame.

Third, there exists an inescapable reality of there existing a perfect standard by which humankind measures shameful attitudes and behavior society. The moral fabrics of all standards seem to be relational in their motive. As will be demonstrated later, it seems that the reality of Global Shame varies from society to society and culture to culture based upon inherent cultural and societal norms. Hence, the very fact that cultures and societies develop certain standards of "acceptable" and "unacceptable" inter-relational codes of conduct demonstrates the existence of Absolute Standards developed by a Personal Creator. Furthermore, humankind could not have a comprehension of injustice if there did not exist standards of what was just.

Fourth, it seems impossible that humankind can make judgments regarding the progress or regress of the human race a part of external objective moral standards by which to measure the human race. Consequently, the ability for a person to make judgments to accept or reject the reality of Adamic or Forensic shame seems to be in turn rooted in the reality of such a spiritual and emotional condition. A person cannot debate something that has a more than average chance of existing on a universal scale.

Fifth, the strategies that all human beings seem to have, such as making excuses for; blaming others; covering up; hiding to avoid facing failure to keep moral law; and other similar strategies of self preservation at the expense of authentic relationships (cf. Book of Jeremiah) seem to suggest the reality of Adamic and Forensic shame.

Sixth, the inevitability of breaking moral law results in feeling Forensic Shame and Forensic Guilt. Forensic guilt refers to the sense that a relationship of a person with others has been broken or violated.

Seventh, there exists a reality that, from infancy, humankind discovers moral law and does not invent it. There seems to be an innate sense of failing moral law that manifests itself in Forensic Shame.

Eighth, the reality that people tend to act out of duty or adjust their behavior for the better in public seems to be evidence for the reality of Adamic and Global shame.

Ninth, the fact that most all cultures detest evils such as rape or genocide strongly and a desire for liberty, not bondage, is held in high esteem by humankind suggests the reality of forensic shame.

Tenth, the fact that people do not want immoral actions done against them i.e. as killing, cheating, stealing or disloyalty, seems to suggest the acceptance of forensic shame as a healthy deterrent.

#### **2.2.5.6. Preliminary conclusion**

Genesis 3 appears to offer substantial assistance in understanding and advancing a biblical critique of shame. This Old Testament passage, as historically valid, seems to provide the blueprint and framework for the phenomenon of this critical spiritual and emotional condition. Genesis 3 also introduces and establishes theological and practical implications for addressing shame. Swindoll and Zuck (2003:735) summarizes Genesis 3 well when they state:

Genesis 3 explains the major struggles of life in the ancient Near East. The words of the woman reflect the tensions within the home and the realities of child-bearing. The words to the man give lasting perspective to work, sweat, weeds, and death in an agrarian society. The gender-relatedness of these pronouncements should not cause us to stumble. Regardless of sex, we see ourselves and our struggles more vividly here than we would like to admit. These are human universals and that fact raises important questions.

The question raised in context of this thesis is: as prophetic literature, how does the book of Jeremiah assist in the study of shame?

## 2.3. THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

### 2.3.1. Introduction

It was purported that Genesis 3 provided the blueprint and framework for assisting in an understanding of shame. This section will be limited to a thematic representation of the strategies of shame in the book of Jeremiah. It is suggested that the book of Jeremiah, as prophetic literature, as the second longest book of the Bible, seems to identify and define the strategies of shame. Furthermore, it appears that these strategies may be accurately interpreted through the grid of the supportive theme of repentant attitude. Repentance appears to be a supportive theological thought in Jeremiah which seems to emphasize that an individual or a nation are not victims but perpetrators who, because they attempt to cover their shame through destructive attitudes and behavior, need to identify these strategies through the attitude of repentance. Jeremiah is also a book of hope in that it outlines the only remedy for shame. This remedy seems to be a personal relationship with God who changes the inner attitude because He changes the heart and provides a new motive to propel an individual and nation through life.

### 2.3.2. Title

The Title of the Book of Jeremiah, ירמיהו (yirm<sup>e</sup>ya) or ירמיהו (yirmy<sup>e</sup>ahu) may be translated as "the LORD hurls" (cf. Exodus 15:1), "the LORD founds," "the LORD establishes," or "the LORD exalts".

This title seems to be significantly woven into the fabric of the life of Jeremiah the Prophet. To lose the dynamics of Jeremiah's life and the spiritual life of the people to which he confronted, is to lose the essence of the Book. Prophetic Books seem to be reduced to books disclosing the wrath and judgment of God (cf. Bracke, 2000:1-2). This does a book, like Jeremiah, injustice. Jeremiah was the most autobiographical of all the prophets. Perhaps this was because he experienced the shame of the people first hand for all of his life. One of the strategies to cover their own shame was to personally attack Jeremiah.

Fienberg (1998) points out that Jeremiah's life, both private and public, is openly displayed in his book. Every aspect of his life is laid bare, and he in no way attempts to hide a difficult part of his life. Feinberg (1998) explains that Jeremiah's brave actions, his tenderheartedness toward his coreligionists, his deep emotional and spiritual struggles before God--all these and more are clearly presented. His disappointments and sufferings were undeniably as poignant as those of any other Jewish prophet. (Fienberg, 1998)

It would be unwise to presume that Jeremiah was authentic in and of his own strength and self-preservation. On the contrary, God "formed" (cf. Jeremiah 1:4) Jeremiah for a specific purpose, and Jeremiah obeyed this purpose. Konkel (2001) reminds the readers that the function of *יָסָר* (*yasar*) is to describe that which is a specific object of God's design and care. It is particularly significant in the creation of humans, both in terms of their unique relation to God and God's purposes for them. Jeremiah, a human with frailties and doubts, was a man called and covered by God. Jeremiah seemed to interpret his world and the political, cultural, social, religious, world in which he was to represent God, through the spiritual grid of God's purpose alone. Harrison (1988:808) observes Jeremiah was

empowered by God in his struggle to overcome the lower self and resist the determined demands of his personality to forsake his divine vocation; yet in all this he was well aware from the start of his complete inability to evade his prophetic function (cf. Jeremiah 5:14, 15:16; 20:9; 23:29)

Even though God's People, as His Bride (cf. Jeremiah 2:1-2) should have been preoccupied with their Husband, the LORD (cf. Chisholm, 2002:157), it seems they were preoccupied with themselves, attempting to cover their shame. It seems only an exposed, authentic and vulnerable servant could have written such a personal book to a people and leaders preoccupied with futile self-preservation.

### **2.3.3. Background**

It appears that the Book of Jeremiah has not been a simple book to interpret. Fienberg (1998) states that because Jeremiah seems to reveal no clear arrangement and demands so much extra-biblical, contemporary history for its understanding therefore, while many commentaries have been written on

the Book of Isaiah, Jeremiah has suffered from neglect. This should not distract from the relevance of the Book.

The intention of the Book of Jeremiah was written in time-space history, yet it appears the purpose of the book was not to portray a historical account of Judah or Jeremiah's life. This is not to dismiss the importance of the historical setting to interpreting this prophetic literature. McConville (2001) observes that the book of Jeremiah spans the long ministry of the prophet from his call in 626 BC to the exile of the people of Judah to Babylon in 587 BC, and beyond, to the release of the exiled King Jehoiachin from his prison there in 562 BC (Jeremiah 52). Jeremiah continued his work until after the fall of Judah and is last seen in Egypt, having accompanied a group of Jewish refugees there (Jeremiah 40-44). Although a detailed historical account is beyond the scope of this thesis scholars have given significant detail to this subject (cf. Constable 2004:4-7; Bracke, 2000:12-15; Huey, 1993:22-24; Kidner, 1987:13-21; Harrison, 1973:13-24). Furthermore, it seems that Jeremiah was not primarily a political book, although a substantial section gives the detail of the destruction of the various nations (cf. Jeremiah 46-51). Nor does the intention of the book seem to provide a chronological account (Dearman, 2002:20), which does not mean that Jeremiah's composition is illogical (cf. Kroeger and Evans, 2002:369) or a text that is "confusing" and "the most unpredictable, and quite simply, chaotic of nay book in the Hebrew Bible" (Stiebert, 2002:113).

It is hypothesized that there appears to be a clear theme and main intent of the book, which is primarily theological. It is proposed that Jeremiah is preoccupied with identifying and defining the strategies of shame. It appears that these strategies could only be accurately interpreted through the grid of the supportive theme of a repentant attitude. Repentance appears to be a supportive theological thought interwoven throughout Jeremiah and is the only attitude through which to evaluate the destructive attitude of shame of God's People. Connected with this thought is the proposal that this book does not appear to have been written primarily for its immediate audience. The Book of Jeremiah appears to have been intended for the exilic people and the next generation to look back and have answered why they were in exile. What destructive attitudes in them and their families promoted God to discipline them? The book of Jeremiah seemed to serve as both a pedagogical, punitive and restorative value.

The message of Jeremiah as a pre-exilic prophet seems to rest on two fundamental convictions. One is the certainty of an impending historical crisis with the disastrous issues for the nation of Judah and Israel. The second conviction seems to be that God was at work in spite of the chaos and destructive

attitudes of His people (cf. Bracke, 2000:1-2; Brueggemann, 1998:16-17). Jeremiah does not appear to be intended to be reduced to a descriptive account of what is, nor a prediction of what will be. The focus seems to be on the fact that “God is at work to create a new alternative community (to plant and to build”); Jeremiah 31:27-30) (cf. Brueggemann, 1998:17).

#### **2.3.4. The Structure of Jeremiah**

A thorough reading and study of Jeremiah seems to produce a chiasmic structure to the theology of Jeremiah that seems to act as the broader outline for the book (cf. Martens 1996:389-392).

- A. God’s personal message to Jeremiah (1)
- B. God’s warning against disaster (2-10)
- C. Signs to the People in the city to awaken repentance (11-20)
- D. Condemnation of the leadership (21-29)
- E. The Book of Comfort (30-33)
- D1. Condemnation of Jeremiah by the leadership (34-38)
- C1. The reality of a fallen city and the aftermath (39-45)
- B1. Speeches warning against disaster of the nations (46-51)
- A1. Appendix: Historical Documentation (52)

The above chiasmic structure will be modified to depict a suggested theology of shame that seems to permeate the Book of Jeremiah. The chiasmic structure will be presented and explained in the next point (2.3.4.).

### **2.3.5. A suggested approach to the study to the Book of Jeremiah**

In suggesting a theology or phenomenon of shame in the Book of Jeremiah it seems critical to, in light of the difficulties in interpreting this prophetic literature, to draw attention to various approaches to studying this vital book.

#### **2.3.5.1. Various approaches to the Book of Jeremiah**

Bracke (2000:5-7; Bruggemann, 1998:7-11) suggests that there are at least three approaches to studying the book of Jeremiah. The first approach is one that has dominated the study of the book of Jeremiah for 150 years, and that is one that has focused primarily on the prophet Jeremiah. This approach views the prophet's words as authentic and attempts to interpret them within the historical context in which they were spoken (cf. Holladay, 1986:1-10; Bright, 1976:140-170). This approach's weakness seems to be laden down with the ambiguity in determining the exact historical situation addressed in certain sections of the book (cf. Bracke, 2000:5). This may have led to interpreting the book of Jeremiah in terms of purely a psycho-biographical approach (cf. Skinner 1951). The second approach has focused on the work of the editors of the book of Jeremiah which assumes that within the book are the authentic words of the prophet, yet it was the work of later redactors influenced by Deuteronomistic theology that produced the book in its final form (Steibert, 2002:111-115). Interestingly, these "redactors" could not seem to develop a historical or chronological outline for the book. A third approach focuses on the book of Jeremiah as it is given in its final form. This approach takes into account the validity of what the book meant in the context of the ancient world but the primary focus is to interpret the book in light of the church and call of the church to faithfulness before God (cf. Bracke, 200:7; Brueggemann, 1998:19).

While this author appreciates these approaches another approach is suggested as it concerns the phenomenon of shame.

### 2.3.5.2. A suggested approach: The book of Jeremiah studied within the context of shame

Recent research in Old Testament Studies, specifically prophetic literature (cf. Steibert, 2002), has focused on the phenomenon of shame as a reality in the book of Jeremiah. Although Steibert (2002:111-112) is correct in observing the dangers and limitations of attempting to interpret shame in the Jeremiah from the pre-understanding of sociology or anthropology, she postulates a post-structuralist ideological approach in order to understand Jeremiah. Steibert (2002:111) explains that a post-structuralist approach breaks up a text's pretension to unity; it does not, however, unlike source criticism, pursue the reconstruction of coherence.

Post-structuralism is not a theory but a set of theoretical positions. At their core is a self-reflexive discourse that is aware of the tentativeness, the ambiguity and the complex interrelations of texts and meanings (cf. Lye, 2004:2). In essence the post-structuralist approach is an attempt to interpret the text through a post-modern presupposition of deconstructionism. Deconstructionism's basic presupposition is that there may be a multiplicity of interpretations of any given text. Steibert (2002:111) verifies this by stating,

The texts comprising the Hebrew Bible are, I believe, enigmatic and in offering my interpretation of a selection of them, I acknowledge that my own biases will inevitably encroach, exacerbating rather than resolving the situation of the unknowability. Such an admission in the context of biblical criticism is, of course, far from novel (what is?).

Steibert (2002:117), although admitting to the comparative preponderance of shame vocabulary in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, rejects the notion that these books are preoccupied with the subject of shame. She identifies that the dominant purpose of shame discourses in Jeremiah seems to draw the attention to the people's misconduct that has transpired in a fractured relationship between them and God, and to inculcate a sense of shame with a view to readdress this relationship. She reduces shame to a sexual metaphor. Furthermore, consistent to her post-structuralist grid, and influenced by the teaching of Derrida, a hierarchically opposition of shame is proposed: proper and improper shame. Steibert (2002:118) distinguishes between these two interrelated types of shame in Jeremiah, a proper and improper shame. Improper shame is defined as The-shame-by-which-one-must-be-bound in order to avoid (proper shame) the shame-that-destroys.

While acknowledging the contribution of Steibert to the subject of shame, her post-structuralist interpretation of Jeremiah is rejected for three reasons. One, she rejects the historicity of the Book of Jeremiah. Two, she is preoccupied with a post-modern hermeneutic at the expense of a historical-grammatical hermeneutic. Three, she seems to reduce the study of shame to a sexual metaphor. Positively, Steibert (2002:123) accurately assesses shame as being inculcated to produce a negative self-evaluation that is portrayed in Jeremiah as a prerequisite for restoration. It seems that if she had used a historical-grammatical hermeneutic she would provide a richer study of shame in Jeremiah, because shame seems to be a leading subject in this prophetic literature. An alternative approach is suggested that accepts the historicity of the book and its theological-pragmatic value for believers today in understanding and addressing the strategies of shame.

However, before presenting and evaluating this approach it seems prudent in suggesting a caution that shame should not be addressed in a stereotypical manner. Nel (2001) observes that in the semantic field of **בוש** (**bosh**) there have been stereotypical distinctions that require readdressing. One of the stereotypical distinctions that relates to this thesis is reducing shame to a cultural-anthropological classification of the shame-honor paradigm. This view interprets shame through the grid of a society's perception of sin or unacceptable forms of conduct. Those societies in which guilt arises from the publicity of a wrong deed are described as "shame cultures." In societies where the experience of guilt relates to inherent moral convictions is classified as a "guilt culture". It is acknowledged that "shame-honor" cultures existed in the Ancient Near Eastern world, in and up to the First Century AD (cf. Neyrey, 1998; Plevnik, 1998:106-115; Rabichev, 1996:1-10; Malina, 1993), and possibly still exists (cf. Muller, 2000). However, it seems that this is a biased ethnological assumption underlying this distinction, with its simplification of matters; making it unfeasible as a point of departure for describing shame in the Old Testament (cf. Nel, 2001).

The approach that this author suggests accepts the historicity of the book and its theological-pragmatic values for believers today in understanding and addressing the strategies of shame. This is supported by a suggested chiasmic structure for the book of Jeremiah guided by the subject of shame.

**A.** God's calls to an authentic Prophet to an exposed people (1)

**B.** God's People's shame is exposed and outlined through a call to repentance (2-10)

- C. Objects lessons to awaken repentance within the hearts of a shamed people (11-20)
- D. Condemnation of unashamed leadership (21-29)
- E. God alone addresses the shame of His People: a repentant new heart and new covenant (30-33; 31:15-34)
- D1. Condemnation of Jeremiah by the shamed leadership (34-38)
- C1. The reality of an unrepentant people as objects of shame taken into a 70-year captivity (39-45)
- B1. The Foreign Nation's shame is exposed and outlined and its unrepentant people condemned (46-51)

Appendix: Historical Documentation of an exposed people (52) **בוֹשׁ** (*bosh*) “to be put to shame”, is found 7x in chapters 2-10; 7x in chapters 11-20; 1x in chapters 21-29; and 11x in chapters 46-51. **בִּשְׁתָּה** (*boset*) “shame; shameful, disgrace” is found 4x in chapters 2-10; 2x in chapters 11-20. The fact that **בוֹשׁ** (*bosh*) is found 14x and **בִּשְׁתָּה** (*boset*) is found 6x in the second and third theological division of Jeremiah is significant. Chapters 2-10 and 11-20 speak specifically to God's People as Jeremiah attempts to articulate their shame, and its consequences. Also significant is the fact that **בוֹשׁ** (*bosh*) permeates chapters 46-51, which focus on the judgment of the Foreign Nations, specifically Babylon who attacked God's People. These exposed Nations are objects of shame, and reap the consequences. Clustered in the same semantic field are words that describe the shame of God's People: God will put Judah to shame (**בוֹשׁ**) and humiliation (**כְּלָם**) (*kalam*) because of her destructive attitudes (Jeremiah 6:15; 8:12; 14:3) (Nel, 2001); God will reject (**נִאָּס**) (*naas*) those who have destructive attitudes and behavior (Jeremiah 14:23; 23:17).

The book of Jeremiah appears to provide a realistic view of shame and its affects upon the heart and attitudes of a person. Even though the focus is on a nation, the description of Judah is very much personified as an individual wife (Jeremiah 3:1), as a Father-Son relationship (3:4,22:21,32:30), Shepherd and sheep (cf. Jeremiah 50:6) (Heschel, 1962:107-108).

### **2.3.5.3. Preliminary conclusion**

It has been suggested above that it does not appear to have been primarily written for its immediate audience. It seemed to have been written, within the historical events of 609BC-570BC. The final form of the Book of Jeremiah seemed to be intended for the exilic people and for the next generation to be able look back and interpret why they were in exile: What were the destructive attitudes in them and their families that prompted God to discipline them? The Book of Jeremiah was of significant value for Daniel as it was the springboard for his own prophecies (cf. Daniel 9:1-2). The book of Jeremiah seemed to serve as both a pedagogical, punitive and restorative value. As prophetic literature Jeremiah seems to identify and define the strategies of shame that seem to only be accurately interpreted through the grid of the supportive theme of a repentant attitude. Repentance, as a supportive theological thought in Jeremiah, seems to emphasize that an individual or a nation are not victims but perpetrators who, because they attempt to cover their shame through destructive attitudes and behavior. These strategies can only be identified, exposed and healed with a repentant attitude. Jeremiah is also a book of hope in that it presents the only remedy for shame as a personal relationship with God who will change the inner attitude and the heart, and provide a new motive to propel an individual and nation through life.

### **2.3.6. The strategies of shame viewed through the grid of repentance in the Book of Jeremiah**

Skinner (1951:76-90) does not believe that the call to repentance was meant by Jeremiah. At first the reader is taken aback by this statement, however, if this conviction is read in light of the condition of the heart, attitude and strategies of the people to cover their shame, it is not far fetched. If these people in exile were to look back during or after the seventy years of captivity and ask why did God discipline them, what would be the pedagogical, punitive and restorative value of the Book of Jeremiah to them? It is suggested that they would have been able to identify some primary strategies of shame. However, this would be limited to those with a repentant attitude. In the Book of Jeremiah, repentance seems crucial in identifying and defining the strategies of shame.

### 2.3.6.1. Repentance as an important supportive theme in Jeremiah.

Thompson and Martens (2001) observe that out of the 1050x the root שׁוּב (*sub*) (“repent, turn, return, change ones mind, *et al*”) occurs in its various verbal forms in the Old Testament, there is a concentration in the Book of Jeremiah (111x). This supports the view that repentance is a vital supportive theme and spiritual diagnostic in the self-evaluation process in regard to shame. Thompson and Martens (2001) explain,

שׁוּב is basically a verb of motion, with the meanings return, turn back, go back, come back, often in reference to physical motion of returning to a point of departure. שׁוּב occurs in the context of moral and spiritual lapses, departure (turning away) from Yahweh or turning to God. Turning from God is apostasy (שׁוּבֵי־אֱלֹהִים). Jeremiah charges that God's people have turned away from God (Jeremiah 34:16; 8:5). People turn (שׁוּב) to evildoing (11:10). Israel refuses to turn from its evil ways (15:7); “they refuse to return [to God]” (8:5).

Wakely (2001) points out that the nominative שׁוּבָה (*mesuba*) describes the condition of being turned away from God in faithlessness and rebellion (Jeremiah 2:19; 3:22; 5:6; 8:5; 14:7). In all cases except Proverbs 1:32, the nominative occurs in the prophetic literature, mainly in Jeremiah (9x). Certainly in the prophetic texts, the principal meaning of the word is an act of faithlessness.

Repentance is not simply a change in an individual or nation’s plans, intentions or beliefs. It is a change in one’s attitude about God (cf. Elwell and Comfort, 2001:1119). The Book of Jeremiah is a powerful lesson on the reality of a nation, comprised of individuals, who are so spiritually consumed with deceit and self sufficiency, that they are unable to identify their shame and change their attitude towards their destructive lifestyle and God (Bruggemann, 1998:41-50; Thompson, 1987:217). It is suggested that repentance functions as a supportive theme and grid through which to expose, specifically forensic shame. Repentance seems to be the only way that an individual or nation may acknowledge their destructive state of forensic shame. Repentance is an open and inner acknowledgement that one has unrepentant attitudes that are damaging or will damage relationships, often to cover forensic shame.

Repentance, although a necessary process, is a complex process because it is a work of God in participation with humankind. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present an exhaustive commentary on the supportive theme of repentance as it exposes the destructive strategies of shame. This study of the Book of Jeremiah will limit itself to seven primary strategies, which seem to serve as implications for a study of shame. It is suggested that it is precisely because the nation of Judah failed to identify and define these strategies through the grid of a repentant attitude, that they bore the consequences of their Forensic Shame.

### **2.3.6.2. Suggested strategies of shame identified and defined through the grid of a repentant attitude**

#### **A repentant attitude acknowledges the need to move from deceit as a cover to an authentic exposure of destructive attitudes.**

Judah seemed consumed with attempts to cover their shame with denial, excuses, rationalization or justification. They would not assume responsibility for their destructive attitudes and actions. (2:23, 5:12-13, 7:3-8, 8:5-6, 9:6). Jeremiah 2:23 and 5:12 are significant examples of this:

How can you say, 'I am not defiled; I have not run after the Baals'? See how you behaved in the valley; consider what you have done. You are a swift she-camel running here and there. They have lied about the LORD; they said, "He will do nothing! No harm will come to us; we will never see sword or famine.

Huey (1993:66) is correct in exclaiming that Judah's denial of wrong doing is incredible, and in 5:12 Huey (1993:90) adds that the indifference and deceit of the people in stating that God will do nothing is in fact emphasizing "not he", as if to say, "he will and could never do it". Deceit seems to be a powerful "ally" to cover forensic shame. They should have done away with attempts to spiritually anesthetize (self-preservation) forensic shame (7:4,10). The temple could have been used as a place to seek reconciliation with God through a repentant heart and sacrifice. Heschel (1962:196-197) is correct in stating that the sacrifice of expiation allowed the repentant individual a way of entering into communion with Him. In offering an animal, a person was offering himself vicariously. The sacrifice

had the power of atonement, of covering the forensic shame of the individual or group sacrificing. Sacrifice was prescribed by God, to restore fellowship with Him, His way. God therefore asks the question in Jeremiah 8:5-6,

Why then have these people turned away? Why does Jerusalem always turn away? They cling to deceit; they refuse to return. I have listened attentively, but they do not say what is right. No one repents of his wickedness, saying, "What have I done?" Each pursues his own course like a horse charging into battle.

Carpenter and Grisanti (2001) note that the description of the people as clinging to deceit רָמְיָא (r<sup>c</sup>mîyâ) depicts the deceit as an accomplished fact. The sobering reality of this is that there may come a point where a person or nation who has hid behind religion or destructive attitudes, to cover shame, may come to a point of no return, i.e. they live within the sphere of a deluded lifestyle of shame.

### **A repentant attitude identifies that covering forensic shame has been a life-long strategy**

The Book of Jeremiah suggests that the pattern of destructive attitudes and behavior began "from their youth" (cf. 2:4; 3:4; compared with 3:24-25; 22:21; 31:19; 32:30, cf. Genesis 8:21; Psalm 51:5). God diagnosed in Jeremiah 32:30 that His People have done nothing but evil in his sight "from their youth". Only a repentant attitude can acknowledge the forensic shame attached to destructive attitudes. Hence, in a repentant confession Judah acknowledges,

After I strayed, I repented; after I came to understand, I beat my breast. I was ashamed and humiliated because I bore the disgrace of my youth.'

The significance of this lies in the Book of Jeremiah identifying and defining the affect of learning strategies to cover shame at a young age. There is a suggested inter-textuality from Genesis 8:21 that states that every inclination of his heart is evil from childhood. In the study of Genesis 6:5 and 8:21 it was suggested that this was a reference to the רָמְיָא "intent" or "inclinations" of the thoughts of his heart was evil, and the use of the word "intent" appears to describe humankind's capability to form their own thoughts and shape their own world system their way independently from God, from

childhood. Consequently, this also seems to emphasize their culpability of humankind before God, also from childhood. As youths God's People were not innocent victims but active perpetrators who strategize to do evil and then cover their actions through further destructive attitudes. However, this left the people "ashamed", "humiliated" and "disgraced". Furthermore, they have not listened from their youth in that they seem unteachable with a desire to go their own way (Jeremiah 22:21). This thought is built on in the next strategy.

### **A repentant attitude admits they attempted to shape their life their way**

God's people attempted to selfishly shape their lives. This strategy is manifested in the phrase at the beginning of Jeremiah (1:16) "worshiping what their hands have made"(cf. 16:19-20, 25:6-7). God's people would worship what their hands יָדָם (*yad*) have made. Again, there seems to be a suggestion of inter-textuality from Genesis 2:15. Adam was placed in the Garden to worship and serve God. He was designed for worship. His sense of purpose would be in fulfilling God's purposes for him. Judah had learned, "from her youth", to shape their world, their way seems to have produced a false security which will ultimately end up to their shame (cf. Jeremiah 22:21-23). It is suggested in Jeremiah that shame is no accident. "Each pursues his own course like a horse charging into battle (Jeremiah 8:6). "You did not listen...you provoked me with what your hands had made.....you have brought this harm on yourselves..." (Jeremiah 25:6-7). It is in the giving up of an attitude of self-sufficiency, that a person has some ability to strategize their way out of the result of this destructive attitude and action. "Everyone is senseless without knowledge. Every goldsmith is shamed by his own idols" in God's eyes. The shamed goldsmith and the people who worship the works of their own hands worship that which is a "fraud" and "worthless" (cf. Jeremiah 10:14-15; 8:19; 10:8; 14:22; 16:19; 51:18).

This thought seems to be juxtaposed with God shaping Judah with His Hands, as a Potter, and they the clay. Jeremiah 18 presents a graphic image of God as the potter who retains the right to shape His people, in great patience, His way. Just as clay can be marred or ruined, so God will mold the clay (Judah) so it can be changed so they are useful. "Like clay in the hands of a potter so are you in my hand." (Jeremiah 18:6). There seems to be no question that God describes Himself as the One who determines and shapes the life of His People. "...But they will reply, 'it is no use. We will continue with our own plans; each of us will follow the stubbornness of our own heart.'" This passage is clear:

First, although Judah is exhorted to choose its attitude because its future depends on it. Second, the clay does not dictate to the potter its existence or autonomy, even though it is "preoccupied" with stating, "I will build myself a great palace." (cf. Jeremiah 22:14). Third, God has made very clear what will result if they do not change (18:7-10, cf. 1:10), the clay (Judah) will reap the consequence of its "I-don't-care" attitude and action. "In this place I will ruin the plans of Judah and Jerusalem..." (Jeremiah 19:7) (cf. Brueggemann, 1998:167-169; Huey, 1993: 180-183).

The consequences of this strategy are devastating. Judah would not relinquish its pseudo-spiritual (habitual addictive consumption) of shameful strategies (idols) that attempt to cover forensic shame. (cf. 2:8, 23, 18:12). It is significant that the very object of their worship identifies the culpability of their attitudes and actions. Molech (cf. Jeremiah 32:33-35), the object of Judah's worship in order to cover their shame was literally "king shame". "Molech" מֹלֶךְ ( *molek*) is the word for king vocalized with vowels of מֶלֶךְ, shame (Hadley, 2001). This strongly suggests that their choice of worship was an outward manifestation and condition of the attitudes of their hearts. Jeremiah 3:22-25 "shameful gods" is literally "the shame", a word that is sometimes substituted for Baal by scribes who did not want to mention his name. At the same time they were making a significant theological statement of the inner attitudes of the individuals worshipping the object of their shame. (Dyer and Merrill, 2001:598, Huey, 1993:78)

It further seems that this destructive shameful shaping of their lives were at the expense of the next generation, their children. There was a devastating price that was paid as a result of the destructive strategies of parents in covering Forensic shame: the sacrifice of children, to Molech (Jeremiah 32:35):

They built high places for Baal in the Valley of Ben Hinnom to sacrifice their sons and daughters to Molech, though I never commanded, nor did it enter my mind, that they should do such a detestable thing and so make Judah sin.

A parallel passage (Jeremiah 7:31) stresses the significance of Jeremiah 32:35. It states

They have built the high places of Topheth in the Valley of Ben Hinnom to burn their sons and daughters in the fire--something I did not command, nor did it enter my mind

Human sacrifice was viewed by God with abhorrence in ancient Israel (cf. 2 Kings 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; Psalm 106:37; Micah 6:6-7) as it demeaned the very form that ought to represent God, the image of God in humankind. Topheth, is an Aramaic word, “fireplace” and “pointed with the vowels of **בִּשֶׁת** (*boset*)” was an idol of contempt and shame (cf. Huey 1993:110). The Forensic shame in this act was not just understood in the sacrifice to a “shameful god” but also that it was taking life. Children were meant to be symbols of life and a gift of God (Psalm 127:3-4; 128:3; Isaiah 18:8) and there was grief expressed when one could not have a child (Genesis 30:1; 1 Samuel 1:3-17). Hence, the futility in sacrificing children. Destructive attitudes that cannot be viewed under the conviction of a repentant attitude continue to destroy relationships, specifically those closest to the individual, i.e. children. It seemed all this was because of a strategy to cover shame by shaping life one’s own way.

#### **A repentant attitude acknowledges the autonomous attitudes in the strategy to cover shame**

God has a purposeful agenda and strategy for the life of His people because He is aware of their tendencies to strategize an autonomous existence (1:16, 19:7, 18:12, 21:10, 23:20; 29:10-14). Jeremiah seems to stress that an autonomous direction is a destructive direction propelled by a destructive attitude at the expense of God and others ("Stiff necked", "stray" "turn away") (cf. 8:4, 31:19) (cf. Brueggemann, 1998:306-307). This suggestion is further supported by the fact that God attempted to teach them of their destructive ways, and guide them "again and again", literally "rising early and teaching", yet they chose to remain defiant. The essence of their idolatry and straying is that they do not believe that they can trust God with that which matters most to them. God’s People were also described as “stubborn” (**סָרָר**) (*sarar*), which stresses the attitude more than the rebellious deed (cf. Carpenter and Grisanti, 2001). Jeremiah 5:23 describes God’s People as people who have stubborn and rebellious hearts; they have turned aside and gone away, and in Jeremiah 6:28 they are described as hardened rebels. Both carry the view of stubbornness and autonomy in their pursuits. Therefore, the consequence will be that they will not discern their autonomy at their own peril (Jeremiah 5:21):

Hear this, you foolish and senseless people, who have eyes but do not see, who have ears but do not hear.

### **A repentant attitude acknowledges the futility of shallow attempts to heal Forensic Shame**

Those who are consumed in worshipping what their hands have made (cf. Jeremiah 1:16), have a sense of an almost narcissistic sense of entitlement. Even though God's People were in fact perpetrators there was a sense that they did not need to go through the channels of repentance, by articulating the offense confessing their destructive attitudes, seeking forgiveness, contrition or potential reparation that is required for other perpetrators. Instead these people sought "false physician" to "cover" their shame (cf. 6:13-15; 8:11, 22; 23:13, 17). They also attempt, in the midst of chaos, to "cover" or "dress" their shame in alluring others to their aid. These false physicians were the "spiritual" leaders, Priests and False prophets of the day. These leaders were described (Jeremiah 8:11; 6:13) as those who "dress the wound of my people as though it were not serious." They give false hope by exclaiming, "Peace, peace, they say, when there is no peace". Their human diagnostic does not take into account God's spiritual diagnostic. In Jeremiah 8:12 God asks, "Are they ashamed of their loathsome conduct?". God answers, "No, they have no shame at all; they do not even know how to blush."

The leaders though, who think they have knowledge are addressed by God as "the wise" who will be put to shame, will be dismayed and trapped. Since they have rejected the word of the LORD,

what kind of wisdom do they have? It seems that the circulation of false theological hope can be in itself a strategy for covering shame. God diagnoses the unavailability or skill of anyone to cover the shame of His People. He states (Jeremiah 8:22), "Is there no physician there? Why then is there no healing for the wound of my people? Jeremiah (Jeremiah 14:17) sees and feels the "grievous" spiritual "wound of" his people.

God alone will bring healing and restoration (cf. 30:12-17; 33:6-9). Jeremiah had asked with hope and knowledge that there existed medical assistance in the form of "balm in Gilead". This is metaphorical language to suggest there must exist spiritual healing for the spiritual wound of His people. However, as it has been suggested, Judah chose to "dress" and "cover" their own wounds (shame) attempting to form an allegiance with the enemy (cf. Jeremiah 4:30) and allowing their ears to be "tickled" (cf. 2 Timothy 4:3) by false teachers and leaders who give false hope (cf. Jeremiah 8:11, 22).

It seems that authentic repentance therefore begins with a relinquishing of false attempts to cover the wound caused by Forensic shame (cf. 6:13-15), which is followed by a sense of remorse (cf. 3:3, 8:12)

for the Forensic shame. Therefore, there seems to be a responsibility in taking personal ownership for destructive attitudes that lead to Forensic shame before God alone (cf. Jeremiah 31:29-30). "Each person counts and will be held accountable." (Kidner, 1987:110; cf. Dearman, 2002:286; Huey, 1993:279).

**A repentant attitude rejects the temptation and strategy to blame others for their destructive attitudes**

A repentant person seems to allow an exposure to destructive attitudes. They seem to be under conviction to move from blaming others to accepting the process of one attitude and action. (cf. Jeremiah 7:8, 24, 9:6, 19, cf. Jeremiah 31:29-30). This was not the case with the people of Judah. Those who paid the consequence of their sin (the exiles in Babylon cf. Jeremiah 25) complained that they had been unfairly suffering "for their father's sins." (cf. Lamentations 5:7; Ezekiel 18:2). It is a movement from blaming upbringing and/or parents. However, God searches the mind and the heart (cf. Jeremiah 17:10; 20:12), and sees what is hidden. A repentant individual acknowledges from their heart and mind that one is a perpetrator, not a victim. This person is willing to diagnose the strategies and agenda of his heart (cf. Jeremiah 5:23, 7:24, 18:12) and relinquish false strategies to clear or cover oneself of Forensic shame. God states in Jeremiah 2:22 that, "although you wash yourself with soda and use an abundance of soap, the stain of your guilt is still before me." This is a reminder of the fact that a person who attempts to cleanse himself seems to prove his culpability. The solution seems for Judah to accept what they have done and repent.

**A repentant attitude is ultimately submitting to the strategy of God to work in the heart of a spiritually "naked" individual or nation**

Forensic Shame seems to be a spiritual issue. Repentance, in uncovering and exposing shame involves a work of God and His Spirit in the lives of His People (Jeremiah 29:11-13; 31:33). They were those caught in forensic shame. Forensic shame desensitized God's people to their desperate spiritual condition. (cf. 3:1-5, 25; 8:12). Any attempt to repent and change without the work of God in the

hearts of His people is futile as it is devoid of truth (Chisholm, 2002:158). Repenting includes ultimately accepting that ALL Forensic shame is hiding from, facing and developing an authentic relationship with God. It seems important to accept the inevitable consequences of Forensic shame as both punitive and spiritual discipline. There seems to be an implied inter-textuality from Genesis 1, 3 in describing the consequence of forensic shame of Judah (cf. Dyer and Merrill, 2001:596). It seems these people have moved from God's provision, who formed order out of chaos, and brought them into a good land (cf. Genesis 1:1-3 with Jeremiah 2:6-7). The result is a loss of crops and harvest (cf. Jeremiah 12:13, 14:3-4) with the resultant "fruit" of their labor being thorns and chaos (Jeremiah 4:23-26; 12:13 with Genesis 1:1-2). However, God will not allow His People to suffer under the grip of Forensic shame forever. Huey (1993:187) states that the expression "the days are coming" occurs thirteen times in Jeremiah (cf. 7:32; 9:25; 16:14; 19:6; 23:5,7; 30:3;31:27,38, et al). These verses seem to indicate that God will perform a radical and final "uprooting" and "breaking down". In its place is God "planting" and "building" (Jeremiah 1). Shame will not always have its grip on people. There is an eschatological and restorative hope, an assurance for the future. Dearman (2002:286) states that this change will be in its totality because both Israel and Judah are mentioned. The truth remains that shame is diagnosed and may be worked on "today", in the present.

It seems prudent to mention that it is futile to hide from God's gaze, as He identifies all destructive attitudes and penetrates all false attempts to cover Shame (cf. Jeremiah 1:12, 7:11, 16:17; 24:6; 31:27-28). God watching also is an assurance that what is happening to Judah in her shame is happening under the "watch"ful superintending eye of God who is aware of His people's need for healing, and He will bring it about (cf. Brueggemann, 1998:290). God's diagnosis is an authentic diagnosis of the heart (cf 17:9-10), who radically works in the heart, to change it after genuine there has been repentance (cf. Jeremiah 4; 29:10-13). Brueggemann (1998:288) comments in regards to Jeremiah 31:31 that one of the dimensions of genuine and profound transformation is a "new heart" (cf. Ezekiel 11:19, 18:31,36:26), a "new covenant" (Jeremiah 31:31) and a "new name" (Isaiah 62:2). Repentance is a gift from God and not a work of humankind. God who creates "bara" a "new thing" on earth will give His people "a heart to know" him (cf. Jeremiah 24:7) and a "singleness of heart" (cf. Jeremiah 32:39). God's method of working through forensic shame is being exposed to the condition of spiritual "nakedness" (cf. Jeremiah 31:19).

### **2.3.6.3. Preliminary Conclusion**

In summary, God's discipline is both punitive and purposeful to radically change the inner attitudes and shame of His people (Jeremiah 31:27-28). God's method of working through, not ignoring, Forensic shame begins with His people admitting their shame and accepting the consequences of their shame - to learn from their failure and shame. God's purpose of working His people through their forensic shame is spiritually therapeutic in nature. It is to bring them to the point of identifying and understanding their nakedness so he alone is acknowledged as the One who permanently clothes and covers them, from the inside out (cf. 9:24, 31:33-34). God's purpose for working through His people through their shame is not simply punitive, but also the result of His deep covenantal commitment, yearning for them and their need to process and learn from their shame in order to spiritually strengthen them (31:20-22).

### **2.3.7. Preliminary Conclusions**

#### **2.3.7.1. The Book of Jeremiah is significant in assisting in a biblical critique of shame**

It appears that the Book of Jeremiah offers substantial assistance in advancing a biblical critique and practical implications of shame. It serves to heighten the reader's appreciation to the tension of humankind's various strategies to cover their Forensic Shame and God's grace and work in the process of repentance as a spiritual diagnostic of shame within the human heart.

## **2.4. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS FOR CHAPTER TWO**

The theoretical argument in Chapter one posed that one of the important roles of a pastor is to equip believers to deal with shame on biblical and practical levels. This chapter, Chapter two, of this thesis presented a basis-theoretical perspective of studying shame from the Old Testament (Genesis 1-3 and the Book of Jeremiah). It was purported that Genesis and the Book of Jeremiah were important Old Testament Books in understanding shame. First, the Old Testament passage of Genesis 3 serves as a useful starting point in order to critique shame. This passage seemed to offer substantial assistance for the reader to understand the origin of shame. In a study of Genesis 3 an attempt was made to lay the blueprint and framework of the entrance of shame into the world through the historical act and

“anatomy” of Adam and Eve’s disobedience and resultant strategies to cover their shame. This Old Testament passage also seemed to introduce and establish theological and practical implications for addressing shame. The Book of Jeremiah, as prophetic literature, seemed to identify and define at least seven strategies of shame that may only be authentically interpreted through the supportive yet imperative theme of a repentant attitude.

In addition to the Old Testament, The New Testament seems to offer an important contribution to not only understanding shame, but also providing an effective theological and practical intervention for shame, namely a relationship with Jesus Christ. Whereas the Old Testament could only identify a blueprint for shame (Genesis 3) and suggest some strategies that people use to cover their shame (the Book of Jeremiah) the New Testament, specifically the Book of Ephesians seems to identify these and further strategies for covering shame, yet provides a permanent solution – a permanent spiritual position of “putting off” and “putting on” for a repentant individual based on the completed work of Jesus Christ evidenced through a renewed mind. Chapter three will attempt to study this permanent spiritual position.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **BASIS-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SHAME**

#### **NEW TESTAMENT: THE BOOK OF EPHESIANS**

##### **3.1. INTRODUCTION**

The second chapter of this thesis presented an Old Testament perspective on shame through the selection of two important Old Testament Books: Genesis 3 and the Book of Jeremiah. Genesis 3 attempted to lay the blueprint and framework of the entrance of shame into the world through the historical act and “anatomy” of Adam and Eve’s disobedience and resultant strategies to cover their shame. This Old Testament passage also introduced and appeared to establish theological and practical implications for addressing shame. The second section of Chapter two attempted to present a study of the Book of Jeremiah. As prophetic literature, this Old Testament book seemed to identify and define at least seven strategies of shame that may only be authentically interpreted through the supportive, yet imperative theme of a repentant attitude. Chapter three considers the New Testament Book of Ephesians as offering substantial assistance in addressing not only the strategies used to cover shame but also a permanent spiritual solution for shame. It is within this theological framework that Chapter three considers Ephesians 4:20-24. The main argument is that God in Christ not only redeems (Ephesians 1:7; 2:4-10; cf. Hebrews 12:2-3) a person from their shame (Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19) but also demands and enables His children to live out their new identity by being clothed both in and with Christ (Ephesians 4:20-24). This identity in and with Christ seems to be understood by the metaphor of “putting off” and “putting on”. How are these metaphors to be understood within the context of the Book of Ephesians, whilst supporting theological and practical implications for this study of shame? Ephesians is known as the “quintessence of Paulism” as it sums up the leading themes of the Pauline letters (cf. Elwell and Comfort, 2001: 380; Bruce, 1996:424). It is significant, however, that even though the Book of Ephesians has been and continues to be a source of profound influence on those

who seek to understand their new identity in being clothed in Christ, there has been considerable debate and doubt about title, authorship and theological purpose of this letter.

### 3.2. TITLE AND AUTHORSHIP

It is accepted (cf. Turner, 2000:1222) that the title, “ἐν Ἐφέσῳ” (“in Ephesus”) is not found in the earliest manuscripts, yet this should not detract from the integrity and authenticity of the letter (cf. Ellicott, 1978:15). There has been no small amount of debate over the title and authorship of the Book of Ephesians, and in recent years, even as to Paul’s credibility as the author of all thirteen Epistles (cf. Wright, 1997:1-23). Ephesians has the worst credentials for authenticity, in critical circles, among all of Paul’s epistles. The usual obstacles to Paul’s authorship are divided into several categories of linguistic and stylistic arguments; historical arguments; literary considerations and theological differences with other Pauline letters. McDonald (1995:1903) states that these arguments can be answered satisfactorily (cf. Snodgrass, 1996:24). Hoehner (2002:6-7) and Snodgrass (1996:23) remind the reader that the first doubt of Pauline authorship was only introduced in 1792, which gained momentum into the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Ephesians was extraordinarily well attested in the early Church. Those church fathers who attested to Pauline authorship of Ephesians are Clement of Rome (96AD); Polycarp (69-135); Clement of Alexandria (150-215); Marcion (d.160); Tertullian of Carthage (160-220); Origen (fl.210-250) (cf. Hoehner, 2002:2-4; Elwell and Comfort, 2001:432). Critics have further attempted to argue against the authorship of Paul in light of the fact that the language of Ephesians seems to be based upon the book of Colossians. Hendriksen (2002:51; cf. Liefeld, 1997:14-20) rebuts this argument in observing that the striking similarity between Colossians and Ephesians is due chiefly to identity of authorship, time and place of writing, and the general situation of those addressed. Ephesians has some unique language and style that does not compromise Pauline structure and theology. Significantly, Wallace (2004:1) quotes Mitton, “a great champion” against the authenticity of Pauline authorship, starting his argument with the remarkable concession, “Pauline authorship can rightly be assumed until it is disproved”. A study of Geisler’s (2002:538) chart on the New Testament canon during the first four centuries reveals that out of seventeen church fathers, thirteen either quoted Ephesians directly or alluded to its contents; out of 5 Canons (from Marcion (c170) to Athanasius (367 AD) all five authenticated the Book of Ephesians; and all four major Church Councils (from Hippo (393 AD) to Carthage (419 AD) authenticated the Book of Ephesians.

Hoehner (2002:2-96) and Hendriksen (2002:2-56) offer scholarly and exhaustive arguments for Pauline authorship and address all the issues against Pauline authorship of Ephesians, which is beyond the scope of this thesis. It is pertinent to quote Hoehner (2002:60) after his extensive treatise developing the authenticity of Pauline authorship.

“The Pauline authorship of Ephesians not only has the earliest attestation of any book of the New Testament but this attestation continued until the last two centuries. The early attestation is highly significant. The early church was not only closer to the situation but also they were very astute in their judgment of genuine and fraudulent compositions. This overwhelming support for the Pauline authorship of Ephesians should not be easily dismissed.”

It is proposed that accepting Pauline authorship of Ephesians is directly tied to accepting the theology of Paul, which in turn is critical to assisting in interpreting this vital Epistle. The structure of the Book of Ephesians is connected to an understanding of the theological purpose of Paul’s letter, which significantly influences the interpretation of Ephesians 4:20-24 within the context of this thesis.

### **3.3. THEOLOGICAL STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE**

Ephesians 4:20-24 cannot be interpreted within a vacuum, but within the context of the theological structure and purpose of the Book of Ephesians. Ephesians 4:20-24 is preceded and followed by Scripture that God intended to be communicated and understood within a historical-grammatical context. Therefore, defining and explaining the theological structure and purpose of the Book of Ephesians will attempt to this foundation and context for Ephesians 4:20-24.

It is suggested that the structure of the book of Ephesians is directly tied to the question of authorship and flow of the book. A casual reading of this book identifies that, similar to other Pauline letters (cf. Romans), Ephesians is divided into two main sections: doctrine or theology (chapters 1-3) and practice, ethics or duty (chapters 4-6) (cf. Wiersbe, 1992:535-536). Paul probably wrote this as an encyclical letter, from prison (cf. Ephesians 3:1; 4:1; 6:20), intending to crystallize some key theological (chapters 1-3) and practical (4-6) essentials for the believers walk that needed to be viewed through, not just the Person of Jesus Christ, but how this ought to translate into the believers every day life.

Elwell and Yarbrough (1999:308) are correct in stating that for centuries the scholars have debated the most likely central theological purpose for this letter. The theological purpose, like the structure, of the letter seems to be directly tied to the question of authorship (cf. Snodgrass, 1996:21-22). It seems that the arguments against Pauline authorship unfortunately detract from the uniqueness, special nature and circumstances for this short book. A conviction on the authenticity of Pauline authorship, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is critical in developing a credible theological and practical purpose of the Christian being clothed in Christ. The greatest obstacle for critics in determining the authenticity and theological purpose of Ephesians seems to be the fact that Colossians is so intimately related to Ephesians, even though parallels are not exact. Colossians deals with a specific issue and is polemic. Ephesians is unique in terms of Pauline letters, as it does not address any particular problem or polemic. Yet, the inter-textuality (two thirds of Colossians is paralleled in Ephesians) strongly suggests that even if specific problems exist in particular churches, there are one or two universal spiritual conditions that propel individuals throughout life. These two spiritual conditions seem to always impact relationships and community. There are individuals who both promote love in unity (community) because of a changed spiritual condition and conduct in Christ, or there are individuals who fragment this community because of a condition and conduct of self-gratification and destructive attitudes. While emphasizing the former, Ephesians seems to address both spiritual conditions and conducts as basic spiritual foundations for life. What is the basis of these spiritual conditions and conducts? These spiritual conditions and conducts seemed to be developed in the theological purpose of Ephesians.

### Proposed theological purpose

The theological purpose of Ephesians seems to be an outline for young churches, possibly because they may lose their first love (cf. Revelations 2:4) in light of the strategies to live autonomous destructive lives (Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19) **to develop an unconditional commitment (love) to the well-being of one another through the unity of Christ-centered relationships.** In view of this thesis it seems critical that the believer appreciates their identity as defined by God in the *putting off* (the old clothes – person) and *putting on* (the new clothes – person) who is continually renewed in the sphere and attitude of their minds (Ephesians 4:20-24). This theological purpose requires an explanation.

### **The supportive theme of “love”**

Hoehner (2002:104) emphasizes that the frequent use of the verb form ( $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ ) (10x out of 27x in Pauline Letters) and the noun form ( $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\eta$ ) (also 10x out of 27x in the other Pauline Letters) is phenomenal because one third of all its occurrences is in the Book of Ephesians, which is only six chapters long. The usage of the term is divided into four parts. First out of the twenty times that the word appears, five times it refers to God’s love for Christ (1:6); God’s love for humans (2:4), to believers being rooted and grounded in God’s love (3:17); and to the love and faith that comes from God (6:23). Second, there are three references to Christ’s love. Paul prays for the believers that they may know and experience Christ’s love (3:19); believers are asked to be enjoined in love just as Christ loved us and gave Himself for us (5:2); and Paul asks husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the Church and gave himself for her (5:25). Third, eleven times it refers to believers’ love for another. God chose us to be holy and blameless (1:4). Paul had heard that they had love for each other and other believers of like faith (1:15). In Chapters 4-6 love is used nine times as Paul exhorts the believers to forebear one another in love (4:2); to be truthful with love (4:15); to contribute of themselves in order to build the Body up in love (4:16); to walk in love just as Christ loved them (5:2); Husbands are to love wives (5:25,28,33); and grace is given to all who love Jesus Christ (6:24a) with an undying love (6:24b). Louw and Nida (1993:292) define  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$  and  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\eta$  as a “love for something or someone, based on sincere, deep appreciation and high regard”. “Love” seems to carry with it a decision to commit, to sacrifice, to giving to, to giving up, a lifting up of one another. A dynamic translation of the verb,  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$  and noun,  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\pi\eta$  is suggested as “an unconditional commitment to the well being of others, no matter what”. This hypothesis seems consistent with the structure of Ephesians. Paul is a realist about human frailty and failures, yet he is undeterred in emphasizing, yet not idealizing, the need for an individual to spiritually connect, develop and participate alongside one another within the sphere of a loving community of likeminded believers in Christ (cf. Banks, 1998:47-57; 191-192).

The theme of love seems to be complemented by the supportive theme of unity

### **The supportive theme of “unity”**

The theme of unity is readily accepted by commentators (Constable, 2004:1-3; Hoehner, 2002:102-1-4; Turner, 2000:1222; Snodgrass, 1996:24). This theme of unity is established within the context and grammar of this Epistle. Hoehner (2002:102-103) presents Patzia’s contribution and study on the theme of unity in Ephesians, which supports a main theme for this Epistle. While Patzia suggests seven reasons why “unity” is a theme, these are worth mentioning as it relates to this thesis.

First, that the word “unity” (ἑνωσις) is used nowhere else in the New Testament except Ephesians 4:3; 4:13 (cf. Lincoln, 1990:237).

Second, that the preposition σύν, (“with”, “together with”), is combined with fourteen words. Here these words denote the union between Christ and believers such as God “made us alive together with (σύν τῷ Χριστῷ) Christ” in 2:5, he “raised us up with (σύν τῷ Χριστῷ) Christ,” and he “seated us with him (σύν αὐτῷ) in heavenly places (2:6). The remaining eleven of these combinations describe the nature of the union of Jewish and Gentile believers (examples 2:19; 2:21; 2:22; 3:6; 4:3; 4:16; 4:16; ). Interestingly, unity is also described negatively as believers are not to become unified in partnership with (σύν τοῖς ἀπίστοις) unbelievers (5:7) and are not to participate (σύν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῦ σκότους) in the unproductive, destructive works of darkness (5:11).

Third, that unity is found in the church (ἐκκλησία), a term found nine times in Ephesians (1:22; 3:10; 21; 5:23; 5:24; 5:25; 5:27; 5:29; 5:32).

Fourth, and it is suggested that the basis for all unity is ἐν Χριστῷ (“in Christ”). Hoehner (2002:103; 173-174) states that ἐν Χριστῷ (“in Christ”); ἐν ᾧ (“in whom”); ἐν κυρίῳ (“in the Lord”), or similar expression occur thirty eight times in Ephesians. This seems to indicate that God has purposed that Christ alone is the means by whom or in the sphere of whom all unity is achieved.

It is suggested that taking the two supportive themes today to be integrated into one thought: love in unity. It seems that humankind may have unity without love, but there can be no love apart from unity. This bears significance for the Book of Ephesians. What significance do the supportive themes of love in unity have on the structure of the book of Ephesians?

### **The theme of love in unity in relationship to the structure of the Book**

Ephesians 1-3 seems to lay the theological foundation and understanding of the theme of love in unity. This appears to impact the spiritual calling and condition of the believers in Christ (1:3-21); before they knew Christ (2:1-3); and because of Christ (2:4-3:23). This unconditional commitment is not something that is fabricated through the philanthropic purpose of man (cf. 1:11; 2:15; Genesis 2:15 contrasted to Ephesians 2:1-3; Genesis 6:5; 8:21); the plan of humankind (cf. 1:11; Jeremiah 29:11 contrasted to Genesis 6:5) or the works of humankind (cf. 2:8-10 contrasted to Ephesians 4:17-19). An unconditional commitment (cf. 1:4; 2:5) finds its source with God who, in His mercy and grace, intervened for individuals who were not helpless victims, but defiant perpetrators (cf. 2:1-3) (Ephesians 1:3-2:10). A love in unity of purpose finds its source within the appreciated function of the Godhead (cf. 1:3-14) in redeeming individuals. Interwoven into this is a thorough understanding of what God has done for individuals corporately by placing them into the Christ-like Community, the Church (2:11-3:21). An individual who has trusted in Christ as his/her personal Savior is not an autonomous being but an interconnected agent in the Body of Christ. Such an individual should live within a different sphere, particularly within the sphere of Christ that seeks to develop Christ-centered love in unity.

Ephesians 4-6, as the “practical” or “hands-on” section” of Paul’s letter, seems to identify and define five integrative spheres and strategies all Christ-centered believers seeking love in unity must cultivate in their lives. This hypothesis is supported by five imperatives  $\pi\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\epsilon\iota$  “Walk” (King James Version) or “Live” (New International Version). Louw and Nida (1993:505; 509) define  $\pi\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\epsilon\iota$  “to behave in a customary manner, with possible focus upon continuity of action” and “to imitate or walk in the same tracks as or in the same manner as someone else”. These believers are already positioned in Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:4-11; 2:7). This spiritual cultivation is not only to secure their salvation but rather an ongoing reality and lifestyle of those who ought to practically demonstrate and grow within the sphere of this spiritual security. Hoehner (2002:504) mentions that the eight times that  $\pi\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\epsilon\iota$  is found in Ephesians it is used metaphorically to refer to ethical conduct and lifestyle whether negatively (2:2; 4:17) or positively (2:10; 4:1; 4:17; 5:2; 5:8; 5:15). These imperatives form an important outline for the second half of Ephesians as they articulate exactly what sphere of lifestyle and strategies ought to guide a person who has been redeemed (cf. 1:7a) ( $\alpha\pi\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\tau\omega\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ ), set free, on the basis of a ransom paid to God through Christ’s death (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:488). It is proposed, with significance for this thesis that Ephesians 4-6 identifies and defines five integrative spheres and strategies all Christ-centered believers seeking love in unity must cultivate in their lives.

- Firstly, believers must live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of unity woven together in love (4:1-16).
- Second, believers must live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of renewed attitudes (4:17-32).
- Third, believers must live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of unconditional commitment to others (5:1-6)
- Fourth, believers must live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of spiritual light (5:7-14)
- Fifth, believers must live with the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of skill (5:15-6:9)

Understood in context with Ephesians 1-3, there appears to be eight common denominators that integrate and influence these five imperatives. These imperatives cannot function in a vacuum of human will power. They are spiritually propelled and motivated. These five integrative spheres and strategies identified and defined in Ephesians 4:1-6:9 are based upon the position that all believers have individually and corporately in Christ (1:3-3:21). These imperatives ought to be a reality and motivating factor for an individual believer's private and corporate life because of:

- God's choosing (1:4); love (1:4); predetermination (1:5); adoption (1:5); pleasure; (1:5); will (1:5); grace (1:6-7); revelation (1:9-10); purpose (1:11-12); possession (1:14).
- the hope and prayer to which all individual believers are called (1:15-23).
- the destructive spiritual disposition all individual believers were bought out of by Christ's substitutionary work. (Ephesians 2:1-9).
- the foundational position and relationship that all individual believers have in and through Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:7; 2:6-9).

- the new individual position all individual believers have in that they are God's workmanship created in Christ Jesus to do good works.(Ephesians 2:10).
- the new position all individual believers have corporately in love in unity with one another in the  $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$ . (2:11-22).
- all believers are responsible to understand the unfolding of God's purpose in developing a corporate unified  $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$ . of Gentile and Jew under Jesus Christ (3:1-13).
- all believers are to have a spiritual, practical knowledge of Christ's strengthening love which cannot be fabricated through human means (3:14-21).

Therefore, it appears that these practical, integrative five spheres and strategies identified and defined in Ephesians 4:1-6:9 are based upon the position that all believers have individually and corporately in Christ (1:3-3:21). These imperatives, however, must be cultivated with the right type of clothing, specifically armor. Paul made reference to the Prince of the ruler of the air who influenced and controlled all unbelievers, in that all unbelievers chose to live, as active perpetrators within the sphere and strategies of his influence (2:1-3; 4:17-19 and 6:12; 16). Paul begins the Book of Ephesians by drawing the attention of the readers to God's power and pleasure, which was unseen but had a spiritual blessing on the lives of those who believed. Paul seems to end his letter (Ephesians 6:10-20) by drawing the attention of the readers to Satan's power and pleasure, which is unseen, but he attempts to have a destructive influence on the lives of those who believe. Paul wants all individual believers to understand that God is aware of Satan's power, therefore He has provided sustaining armor so that all believers may stand, hold their ground (6:11, 13), not if, but when "the day of evil comes". The reason this appears to fit well as a conclusion is first, this seems to be an inclusion with describing God's unseen actions and affects (1:3-14) with Satan's unseen actions and affects (6:10-20) and second, and more significant to the preservation of love in unity, all the armor that is to be put on is in the middle voice which indicates all individual believers are responsible to put on and clothe themselves in the armor God had made available.

### 3.4. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

The question that was asked in the introduction was: How are the metaphors of “putting off” and “putting on” to be understood within the context of the Book of Ephesians, whilst supporting theological and practical implications for this study of shame? It was suggested that Ephesians 4:20-24 is to be interpreted within the context of the Book of Ephesians, Chapters 1-6. The above theological structure and purpose attempted to lay the foundation and context for Ephesians 4:20-24 by defining and explaining the theological structure and purpose of the book of Ephesians: **to develop an unconditional commitment (love) to the well being of one another through the unity of Christ-centered relationships.** In view of this thesis it seems critical that the believer appreciates their identity in Christ as defined by God who has “put off” (the old clothes – person) and “put on” (the new clothes – person) who responds by renewing the attitude of their minds (Ephesians 4:20-24).

### 3.5. AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF EPHESIANS 4:20-24

The main argument is that God in Christ not only redeems (Ephesians 1:7; 2:4-10) a person from their forensic shame, (Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19) but also demands and enables His children to live out their new identity by being clothed both in and with Christ (Ephesians 4:20-24). (For a definition of Forensic Shame, Adamic Shame, *et al*, refer to Table 7 practice theory). This identity in and with Christ seems to be understood by the metaphor of “putting off” the corrupt, Forensic shame of the old person, and “putting on” the new clothes covering the new person, which seems to be a divine action of God on behalf of the repentant unbeliever. The believer responds in turn by continually renewing the attitudes of their minds.

It was suggested that Ephesians 4:20-24 is located in the second of the five imperatives (περίπατε) in Ephesians 4:17-32. After the believers are exhorted to live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of unity woven together in love (4:1-16); connected with that they are commanded to live within the sphere of and develop strategies toward cultivating a life of renewed attitudes (4:17-32). A study of Ephesians 4:20-24 within the context of Ephesians 4:17-32 will be attempted through asking and answering two questions.

- What was the condition of the believer before “putting off” and “putting on”? (Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19).
- How does a believer “put off” and “put on”? (Ephesians 4:20-24).

### **3.5.1. What was the condition of the believer before “putting off” and “putting on”? (Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19).**

It is suggested that Paul seeks to describe the spiritual condition of believers before they trusted in Christ (Ephesians 2:1-3), and remind believers of their self-gratified, destructive lifestyles (Ephesians 4:17-19) in order to emphasize God’s mercy and grace (Ephesians 2:4-10) and the alternative in God’s “putting off” and “putting on”, and the believers’ response in renewing the attitudes of their minds (Ephesians 4:20-24). It appears that this is not an uncommon pattern of Paul in his writing to emphasize the spiritual condition of believers before and after their relationship with Christ. Johnson (2000:39; cf. Stott, 1994:67-68) makes the point well in his commentary on the Book of Romans,

“Paul cannot adequately declare the significance of the manifestation of the righteousness of God (Romans 3:21-22) until he has first painted the canvas with the actual human situation in God’s sight (Romans 1:18-32)”.

What was the spiritual condition of all believers before they had any ability to “put off” and “put on”? Ephesians 2:1-3 and 4:17-19 not only seem to reveal similarities with Adamic and Forensic Shame but further describe the spiritual attitudes and condition of all individuals in Adamic Shame and those who live out their destructive attitudes and strategies within the sphere of Forensic Shame. The attention of these verses, from a pastoral counseling perspective is not designed to focus primarily on the depraved condition of those gripped in Adamic and Forensic Shame alone, but to contrast it to, and introduce an appreciation “for what we have in Christ” that will influence the way believers live within the sphere of being clothed in Christ. Therefore, a brief exegetical study of Ephesians 2:1-3 is a necessary theological antecedent to a study of Ephesians 4:17-19.

### 3.5.1.1. An exegetical study of Ephesians 2:1-3 as a necessary theological antecedent to Ephesians 4:17-19

**As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins, in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient. All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath. (Ephesians 2:1-3)**

Ephesians 2:1-3 seems grammatically connected to Ephesians 2:1-10 and to its antecedent, 1:15-23. While not detracting from the importance of Ephesians 2:1-3, it seems the rubric, 1:18-21, seems to be on the “clothed”, exalted position and condition of the believer, contrasted to what they once were. Snodgrass (1996:94) observes that there is a significant parallel between Ephesians 1:18-21 and Ephesians 2:1-7:

- “raised” –“(which he [God] exerted in Christ when he **raised** him from the dead (1:20) and “God **raised us** up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus (2:6 ).
- “seated in the heavenly realm” – “and **seated him** at his right hand in the **heavenly realms,**” (1:20) and “and **seated us with** him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus” (2:6).
- riches – “in order that you may know the hope to which he has called you, the **riches** of his glorious inheritance in the saints” (1:18) and “in order that in the coming ages he might show the incomparable **riches** of his grace, expressed in his kindness to us in Christ Jesus” (2:7).
- “rule(r)” – “**far above all rule** and authority, power and dominion”(1:21) and “in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of **the ruler** of the kingdom of the air”.
- “this age and the coming age(s)” - and every title that can be given, not only in the **present age but also in the one to come**” (1:21) and “in order that in **the coming ages** he might show the incomparable riches of his grace” (2:7).

It is inferred that in a study of Ephesians 1:18-21 and Ephesians 2:1-7, a parallel is identified in which Paul is stating, “What is said of Jesus Christ’s position is now applied to believers”. Ephesians 2:1-3 then stands in stark contrast to what believers were before they, by grace through faith, received the gift of eternal life found only in the completed work of Christ. Hoehner (2002:307) states, “that power of God historically and presently operating in Christ is also working in you.” These verses (2:1-3) do not seem to be an interruption (cf. Ellicott, 1978:42; Wuest, 1973:59) or a digression (cf. Hoehner, 2002:307), but a purposeful postponement to define what they were before they were in Christ (cf. Hendriksen, 2002:111).

### *Vs. 1*

This contrast and connection seems to be emphasized by the conjunction  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$  (And you). Paul is very personal in his dialogue with these believers as to what they have in Christ and also what they were before they were in Christ. Snodgrass (1996:93) observes that this is the first of five (cf. 2:11-13; 2:19-22; 4:17-24; 5:8) explicit “formerly-now” contrasts, which distinguish a life of sin and alienation before Christ from a life of faith in Christ. Their spiritual state or condition was that they were “being dead” ( $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ ). The participle  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$  from  $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$ , modifying  $\sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ , expresses the condition they were in before God worked in them (cf. Salmond, 1983:283). Hence,  $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$ , emphasizes the possession of “certain characteristics whether inherent or transitory” (Louw and Nida, 1993:149). Paul seems to stress the fact that this was not a passing phase they were going through but a permanent condition in which they were under bondage. This thought seems supported by the next phrase  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ . They were in a permanent condition of being “dead in their transgressions and their sins”. This permanent spiritual condition is one of death ( $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ ). The adjective  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ , from  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ , is used metaphorically in defining “a persons inability to respond to God because of moral badness, spiritual alienation and powerless” (Friberg, Friberg and Miller, 2000:270). There seems to be an inter-textuality with Genesis 3, in Adam and Eve and the Book of Jeremiah mentioning that God’s people are wounded beyond cure (cf. Jeremiah 6:14; 8:11; 8:22). Geisler (2004:123) is correct in connecting spiritual death as the effect of Adam and Eve’s sin imputed to all humankind. This spiritual death is a spiritual separation from God (cf. Isaiah 59:2). He states that spiritual death is a spiritual isolation from God. Adam evidences this spiritual isolation by his shame and his hiding from His Creator. Every descendant of Adam, every person born of natural parents since the Fall, is spiritually dead as well.

The exact reason for and the state of this “deadness” is described by the nouns *παῦλαπὸμαρτίων* (transgressions) and *ἀμαρτίων* (sins). The noun *παῦλαπὸμαρτίων* from *παῦλαπὸμαρτία*, defines what a person has done in taking a false step or failure to meet the will or law of God. (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:775; Bauer, 1979:621). The noun *ἀμαρτίων*, from *ἀμαρτία*, defines every spiritual and resultant physical departure that humankind takes from the way of that which is right. Furthermore, it is an attitude, with a resultant act, viewed as the rejection of God, and His will by “self assertive human beings” (cf. Friberg, Friberg and Miller, 2000:45). It seems to be a moral principle or force personified as evil in character, resident in all humankind. Hoehner (2002:208, 308; cf. Bruce, 1991:280-281) explains that *παῦλαπὸμαρτίων* (transgressions) and *ἀμαρτίων* (sins) are synonyms that denote a failure to reach a goal by taking an alternative, false and destructive step. This is not simply an inadvertent mistake. It strongly implies a thought out strategy that seeks to shape life in an autonomous direction, without reference to and often ignoring God's moral direction and boundaries, absorbed in a “variety and dominance of sins” (Snodgrass, 1996:96).

These nouns graphically depict the state of “deadness”. Morris (1993:878) is correct in stating that Paul leaves no doubt that sin is death-dealing, cutting people off from that life that is life indeed. However, this spiritual condition of “being dead” that was characterized by continual, conscious, deliberate and intentional false steps, was not cultivated in a vacuum. In what sphere are these *παῦλαπὸμαρτίων* (transgressions) and *ἀμαρτίων* (sins) to be understood?

## *Vs. 2*

The first prepositional phrase *ἐν αἷμα πρὶν ἐπεὶ ἐπαρτίων* both locates and describes the sphere in which *παῦλαπὸμαρτίων* (transgressions) and *ἀμαρτίων* (sins) were once or formerly lived out. The particle *πρὶν* a particle of time, defines a point in time subsequent to another point in time (Louw and Nida, 1993:635). The verb *ἐπεὶ ἐπαρτίων*, from *ἐπιπαρτίων*, is found eight times in Ephesians, and it is used metaphorically to refer to ethical conduct and lifestyle whether negatively (2:2; 4:17) or positively (2:10; 4:1; 4:17; 5:2; 5:8; 5:15). It articulates exactly what sphere of lifestyle and strategies ought to guide a person who has been redeemed (cf. 1:7a) (cf. Hoehner 2002:504). The aorist views the total past life in summary (Reinecker and Rogers, 1980:524). There seems to be implied an oxymoron in that before believers were in Christ they lived as dead, spiritually alienated and isolated living beings. Taken together *ἐν αἷμα πρὶν ἐπεὶ ἐπαρτίων* powerfully describes the reality and

actuality of a state in which they formally lived. It is implied that on a "day-to-day" basis, there existed a destructive, strategic condition that characterized every waking moment. The second prepositional phrase,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega$  ("when you followed the ways of this world" or "according to the age of this world"), explains the standard that guided the lifestyle of believers. The noun  $\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , from  $\alpha\iota\omega\sigma$ , seems to be defined as a standpoint of time in describing a specific spiritual environment, a spiritual system that does not consider God (cf. Hendriksen, 2002:101; Snodgrass, 1996:96). Hendriksen (2002:112) adds that believers walked in line with the course of this world (in contrast with God's purposes) and this was an environment they enjoyed and moved about freely, "feeling perfectly at home". The third prepositional phrase,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , emphasizes whose influence and control. Reid (1993:863-867) explains that Ephesians offers a particularly rich selection of descriptive titles for Satan: "prince (or ruler) of the power of the air (2:2); the spirit now at work among those who are disobedient (2:2); the "evil" one (6:16) and "the devil" (4:27; 6:11). While it is possible to question his interpretation of "spirit" as descriptive of Satan, there seems to be significant contextual evidence for the reality and influence that Satan once had over the believers' lives. The ironic significance is that before the believers lived within the sphere and control of Christ, they were deluded in thinking they were free (cf. Genesis 5:1; Jeremiah 8:11). On the contrary, as their lives were controlled by the sphere and collective authority, which has been permitted to him, and dominion of Satan (cf. Ephesians 6:12; 1 John 5:19; 2 Corinthians 4:4). Satan seems to further produce an inward influence and motivation in the spirits of humankind, in contrast with the influence and control of the Holy Spirit, which is demonstrated in the lives of those who are disobedient ( $\tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ ) (cf. Hoehner, 2002:313-315; Salmond, 1983:284, cf. contra Hendriksen, 2002:114-115). The noun  $\tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , from  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\alpha\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma$ , seems to define the individual freedom and responsibility of personal choice (cf. Hoehner, 2002:322). This implies that those who were disobedient were so out of personal choice.

In summary, Ephesians 1-2 graphically defines the pathetic spiritual bondage that gripped the lives of those believers before they were clothed in Christ. They seem to live within the sphere of deliberate strategies of Adamic and Forensic Shame, that was motivated by the system and environment of the world, that is controlled by Satan who rules this spiritual atmosphere motivating these non-believer to a continual life of Forensic Shame before God.

Were these believers, pre-conversion, victims of this control, passively propelled (forced) to cultivate destructive attitudes and actions, since they were under the pressure of the world system, and its Ruler? In other words, they may be under Adamic Shame, but could these non-believers be held accountable for their Forensic Shame?

### Vs. 3

Paul seems to answer this question with  $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\ \ \iota\upsilon\omega\ \ \alpha\iota\omega\ \ \mu\epsilon\iota\omega\ \ \pi\alpha\omega\omega\omega\epsilon\ \ \alpha\omega\omega\epsilon\omega\omega\omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\mu\epsilon\omega\omega\ \ \pi\omega\omega\epsilon$  and goes on to explain. It is implied by  $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\ \ \iota\upsilon\omega\ \ \alpha\iota\omega\ \ \mu\epsilon\iota\omega\ \ \pi\alpha\omega\omega\omega\epsilon$ . Paul uses the first person plural ( $\mu\epsilon\iota\omega$ ) to affirm that he, as the author, and all the recipients of his letter, including all humankind past, present and future, without exception, are not exempt from the imputed destructive attitudes of Adam (cf. Genesis 8:21; Romans 5:12-21). The exact description to what “we all” did is defined by the verb  $\alpha\omega\omega\epsilon\omega\omega\omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\mu\epsilon\omega\omega$ , from  $\alpha\omega\omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\epsilon\omega\omega\omega$ , used seven times in the New Testament to indicate moral conduct or lifestyle that orders an individual’s attitudes and behavior (cf. Friberg, Friberg and Miller, 2000:52; Hoehner, 2002:318; Wuest, 1973:63) (Significant to this study is that the noun form  $\alpha\omega\omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega$ , is used in Ephesians 4:22 to depict the believer’s lifestyle before becoming a Christian.). This is an important theological statement as to the universality of what Paul has written in verses 1-2 and will state in verse 3. Universally, the unregenerates, which included Paul and all believers at one time, do more than occasionally lapse in their spiritual walk (cf. Erickson, 1994:623). They deliberately thought out premeditated destructive activities to shape or order their world their way. In addition to this thought of universality,  $\mu\epsilon\iota\omega\ \ \pi\alpha\omega\omega\omega\epsilon$  implies that they did it together in community. However, this was a pseudo-community because it seemed to have a definite interpersonal identification with and connection to a destructive lifestyle (cf. Crabb, 1999:37-56; Grenz 1994:234-275; Collins, 1993:134-135). This destructive shameful lifestyle seems to be supported by the prepositional phrase  $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\ \ \alpha\iota\omega\omega\ \ \epsilon\omega\pi\iota\omega\upsilon\mu\iota\omega\alpha\iota\omega\ \ \omega\omega\omega\omega\ \ \omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega\ \ \omega\omega\mu\omega\omega\omega\omega$  (“gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature”). It seems important in the context of this study to understand the theological context of  $\omega\alpha\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega$ , from  $\omega\alpha\omega\omega$ , (flesh, translated sinful nature). This noun may be understood as referring to the physical flesh (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:39; 2 Corinthians 12:7); the human body (Galatians 4:13-14); humanity as a whole (Romans 3:20; Galatians 2:16); human descent (Romans 1:3; 9:3); human relationships Romans 4:1; 9:3-5) (Deasley, 1996:259-260). None of these descriptions of  $\omega\alpha\omega\omega$  fit the context of this passage. Bauer (1979:744; cf. Machen, 1965:179-183) points out that in this context, it seems to be defined in an ethical sense as living life within the sphere and influence of destructive



is suggested that this noun  $\text{ἡ ἀνομία}$  is made up of a prefixed preposition  $\text{ἀνο}$ , which seems to be in the instrumental, defining that an individual's mind ( $\text{νοῦς}$ ) is the device through which destructive attitudes are nurtured and cultivated. Woods (1998: Electronic CD) observes that  $\text{ἡ ἀνομία}$  refers not to the mind itself but to the projects it entertains with uncontrolled abandon. The result of the Fall (cf. Genesis 3:1-24; Jeremiah 2:13) resulted in each person living within the sphere of the powerful influence of his/her immediate self-gratification of destructive attitudes actualized through destructive behavior. In the Book of Jeremiah this destructive behavior found its form, amongst other activities, in idolatry (cf. Jeremiah 2:5-11). Adam and Eve's destructive behavior consisted of attempting to invest their futile efforts to cover their physical and spiritual nakedness.

The individual without Christ seems altogether at the mercy of the tyrant self and its rash impulses, yet culpable. It is implied that Adamic Shame without God's covering in Christ produces Forensic Shame, attitudes and actions that grip the erring individually as culpable, but with no release or sense of forgiveness or change. It seems that the destructive behavior  $\text{ἡ ἀνομία}$  "we all" engaged in were not the result of passive enforcement of Satan but rather the result of their destructive longs and cravings ( $\text{ἐπιθυμία}$ ) of the will  $\text{ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς}$  and  $\text{ἡ ἀνομία}$ . Hoehner's (2002:321) comment serves as a fitting summary of Ephesians 2:3 thus far,

The unregenerate does the wishes of the flesh and the reasoning processes, showing that it is more than an occasional lapse but rather a deliberate or premeditated activity of the flesh and the mind.

The unregenerate become enemies in their minds against God. The consequence of humankind's destructive attitudes and behavior (practice) and in light of being in Adam (spiritual position) resulted in  $\text{ὡς ἡ ἡμετέρα φύσις ἡμῶν ὡς ἡμετέροις ὡς ἡμετέροις ὡς ἡμετέροις}$  (Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath.) Their spiritual fabric of who they were as human beings in their nature and condition ( $\text{ἡ φύσις}$ ) (Louw and Nida, 1993:586) had an innate, inherent, implanted spiritual predisposition from birth ( $\text{ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως}$ ) (Wuest, 1973:64). This predisposition was given life through the destructive longs and cravings ( $\text{ἐπιθυμία}$ ) of the will  $\text{ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς}$  and  $\text{ἡ ἀνομία}$  of their flesh do not merely stumble into sin as a genetic disposition or are passive victims of wrongful acts. There exists a strategy that to live life apart from God was therefore established on a foundation of the deliberate thought-out godless and unrighteous actions which begin within humankind, manifested in destructive attitudes and actions.

Hence, from birth (cf. Genesis 8:21; Jeremiah 3:24) and because of their destructive behavior they became children of wrath (ὄντας υἱοὺς ὀργῆς). God is an impersonal force but a real Heavenly Father who expresses His emotions in pure motives. The wrath of God (ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ) refers not to some irrational passion within the Godhead, but should be interpreted within the context of understanding God's Personal holy and righteous character (Van Groningen, 1996:845). Brunner (1947:163-164) observes that humankind can never escape from God, not even in hell. The idea that God is angry is no more anthropo-pathetic than the thought that God is love. Brunner believes that there should be no misunderstanding amongst humankind for their disapproval of the idea of divine anger, because even amongst humankind there is talk of "righteous anger". All (οἱ πάντες ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι), agreeing with Paul's previous statement (οἱ πάντες ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι) humankind, without exception, were objects of God's wrath, because all "of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts" (cf. Ephesians 2:3). God's Wrath is the consequence of both Adamic and Forensic Shame where no repentant heart seeks to make amends with Him.

Ephesians 2:1-3 is a necessary antecedent to Ephesians 4:17-19 as it lays the theological foundation for this important passage, in that it describes the strategic sphere of destructive attitudes and behavior that consumed the lifestyle of these believers before they trusted Christ as their personal Savior. There was nothing they could do to change their pathetic spiritual predisposition, yet to cultivate destructive attitudes and behavior that further plunged them into bondage within a pseudo-community. They were spiritually naked both in Adamic and Forensic Shame. Ephesians 2:1-3 is found in the "theological" section of the book of Ephesians. Ephesians 4:17-19 is found in the "practical" section of this Pauline Epistle. The significance of this is that Paul seems to want to re-emphasize to the believers what they were before God "put off" their destructive attitudes accompanied by its destructive behavior and "put on", clothed them in His Son, Jesus Christ.

### 3.5.1.2. An exegetical study of Ephesians 4:17-19

In Ephesians 4-6, the "practical" section of the Book of Ephesians, the imperative (cf. 4:1) to live a different life is used 40 times. The significance of this is that whereas in Ephesians 1-3 Paul was defining the intrapersonal relationship the reader had to God both individually (1:3-23) and as a spiritual community (Ephesians 2:11-22); in Ephesians 4-6 he described the ability that a believer has

to live ( $\pi\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\epsilon\iota$ ) a distinctive ethic within a different sphere of influence, i.e.  $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$  (cf. Ephesians 1:1; 1:3; 2:6; 2:7; 2:10; 2:13; 3:6; 3:21; 4:32). In Ephesians 4:2-16 Paul has described the unity that living in Christ ought to produce, each individual has a significant and distinctive role to equip, serve, love and truth tell within the Community of Christ. In Ephesians 4:17-19 believers are exhorted not to live within the sphere of the former lifestyle but rather to develop strategies toward cultivating a life of renewed attitudes (4:20-24). Paul appeals to them to understand the reality of the pull of the destructive old lifestyle (4:17-19), and then contrasts this to what they have been positionally clothed and transformed in Christ (4:20-24). The question that was asked, “What was the condition of the believer before “putting off” and “putting on”?” may be concluded here.

**So I tell you this, and insist on it in the Lord, that you must no longer live as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their thinking. They are darkened in their understanding and separated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to the hardening of their hearts. Having lost all sensitivity, they have given themselves over to sensuality so as to indulge in every kind of impurity, with a continual lust for more. (Ephesians 4:17-19)**

#### *v17a*

In Ephesians 4:17a with an imperative starting with  $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\mu\alpha\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\mu\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\pi\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$  (So I tell you this, and insist on it in the Lord, that you must no longer live as the Gentiles do). It is an appeal for a new morality, which actually extends to Ephesians 5:21 (cf. MacDonald, 1995:1937). There is a need for “a clean break with the past” (Wood, 1998: Electronic CD). There is a need for a “detachment from the world which they had formerly served, and an attachment to Christ their newly confessed Lord and Savior” (Hendriksen, 2002:208). Adamic Shame manifests itself through Forensic Shame, which seems to result in an inescapable spiritual bondage. Therefore, Paul seems to revert back to the imperative he made in Ephesians 4:1 that the believers walk in a way that distinctively reflects who and whose they are in Christ. He does this by stating  $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$  (“This therefore” or “Therefore, this”). The conjunction  $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$  connects a logical thought that is a result of a preceding thought. In this context he resumes the main thought of Ephesians 4:1 after background has been given (4:2-16) as to explain what it means to live in unity, they are not to live as they once did. The statement  $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\mu\alpha\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota$  emphasizes Paul’s insistence. In stating that they should no longer walk as the Gentiles did is

not so much referring to a population of people as it is a metaphor of a spiritual sphere and condition that once gripped them (cf. Ephesians 2:1-3). Paul's appeal is not one that originates from his personal opinion, but rather from himself living within the sphere of Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ).

The adverb μὴ ἔτι - "no longer" theologically connects this verse to Paul's previous thought in Ephesians 2:1-3 where they all formerly used to live within the sphere of destructive attitudes and behavior. This is the fourth of five (cf. 2:1-10; 2:11-13; 2:19-22; 4:17-24; 5:8) explicit "formerly-now" contrasts, which distinguish a life of sin and alienation before Christ, to a life of faith in Christ. There seems to be a lifestyle of Adamic and Forensic Shame that is not fitting for a believer clothed in Christ. It seems Ephesians 4:17b-19 describes five characteristics as to the spiritual disposition, nature and character of how they formerly lived:

"futility of their thinking" (v17)

"darkened in their understanding" (v18)

"ignorance that is in them" (v18)

"due to the hardening of their hearts." (v18)

"continual lust." (v19)

It seems that their Adamic Shame (Ephesians 2:1-3) does not seem to have produced victims incapable of thought process, locked into a spiritual catatonic state. On the contrary, their *imago Dei* was not suppressed. They retained their ability to think, develop attitudes, strategize and act upon that which were strategies. The problem lay in the fact that they developed attitudes that were destructive and without reference to God's purposes and will. Paul does not focus on specific actions though, but upon inner attitudes and "malfunction of the mind". (Snodgrass, 1996:229-234)

It is implied that the problem facing these believers "formerly" or before they came to Christ lay not in destructive external actions, which granted where a problems, but destructive inner attitudes that were thought out to result in and fueled this corrupt behavior.

**v17b**

The thought ἐπὶ ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦ αὐτοῦ (“futility of their thinking”) seems to focus on the basis of the inner attitudes of those who do not have a relationship with Christ. The noun ματαιότητι, from ματαιός is defined as “pertaining to being useless on the basis of being futile and lacking in content” ((Louw and Nida, 1993:625). Beck (2002:208) comments that in describing Pauline themes that focus on human vices ματαιότητι (among five other synonyms) the Apostle is emphasizing the spiritual energy that is lost and the unproductivity of an individual life consumed with “useless” and “purposeless” strategies. The preposition ἐπὶ modifies the noun ματαιότητι that is in the dative case, together functioning adverbially to modify τοῦ νοῦ. Hence this preposition with the noun describes the sphere in which the spiritual mind functions, or rather malfunctions in that it lacks reliable, authentic spiritual content and therefore is in a state of purposelessness. As a prepositional phrase ἐπὶ ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦ αὐτοῦ is the first phrase that explains the urgency of Paul’s appeal that they μὴ ἐπιβιώσῃτε... πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς (no longer live or have a lifestyle) that characterize those without Christ. It is implied that this useless thinking is not the result of passive victimization but active perpetration on the behalf of a spiritually-corrupt thinker.

**v18a**

This statement that this useless thinking is not the result of passive victimization but active perpetration on the behalf of the thinker is supported by the fact that those without Christ are furthermore ἐσκότισθη τὸ νοῦ αὐτοῦ (“darkened in their understanding”). The noun σκοτία, from σκοπέω, discussed in Ephesians 2:3, focuses on the function of the intellect and processing of thoughts and refers not so much to the mind itself, as does νοῦς, but to the projects it entertains with uncontrolled abandon. Furthermore, an individual without Christ seems altogether at the mercy of the tyrant self and its rash impulses, yet culpable. This individual gropes around “strategically” in darkness (cf. John 3:19-21) (ἐπιβιώσῃτε). The verb ἐσκότισθη, from σκοπέω, is in the passive voice. The use of the passive voice is “thematizing the subject” (cf. Young, 1994:135) in that the focus is on describing types of projects of the mind. These projects are characterized as “darkened”, which explains why the mind is spiritually unproductive, meaningless and useless. The tense of the verb is perfect which may be translated, with the intertextuality of Genesis 3:7-12; 6:5; 8:21; Jeremiah 4:14;

9:8; 9:26; 16:12 that these darkened strategies seem to have continued, plunging them into descending spiraling affects upon the attitudes of humankind.

### *v18b-d*

This thought is supported by the next phrase ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι ἑαυτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν (“separated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to the hardening of their hearts”). Connected with the perfect participle ἐκ τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν is the perfect participle ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν from ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν defined as “to alienate, estrange oneself, to shut oneself out from fellowship, intimacy and relationship with someone else” (cf. Friberg, Friberg and Miller, 2000:61; Wuest, 1973:107). These individuals who are morally darkened in their inner being have further cut themselves off from living the authentic life and community within the sphere of God’s influence. Rienecker and Rogers (1980:533) remind the reader that the perfect tense emphasizes the continual state and existence that such an individual lived alienated from God. Furthermore, this separation or alienate from the life of God does not mean that they had at one time enjoyed that life: it means simply “being aliens” from it. Once again intertextuality from Genesis 3:22-24 reminds the reader that as the result of Adam and Eve strategies to live life apart from God they were cast, alienated from God’s presence. It seems that a destructive affect of the Fall was the dismantling of community. This dismantling of community can become a form of a “fig leaf” to “cover” or hide behind the need to elevate responsibility for sin against God and one another. In Jeremiah 2:21 the prophet states that God’s people alienated themselves from Him by turning against him (cf. 3:19; 8:5). Isaiah 59:1-2 emphasizes that those who develop destructive strategies are separated from God. Why are these individuals darkened in their understanding and separated from a life of God? Perhaps they are victims of environment or circumstance? The reason (ἐκ τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν) is given in two empathic statements in v18c-d: ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν and ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῆς ἀνομιᾶς αὐτῶν. The noun ἀπὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποσταθῆναι αὐτῶν carries with it the idea of not simply being ignorant or mistaken because an individual did not know; rather it means an inexcusable moral ignorance because an individual refused to pay attention; to know what one knew (cf. Friberg, Friberg and Miller, 2000:32). Hendriksen (2002:210) observes that this darkening and alienation can be traced to their culpable ignorance, a condition they had brought upon themselves by hardening their hearts against the will of God. This thought is supported on three accounts from

scripture. First, the immediate context by  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ . The noun  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  in the accusative, modifying  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ , from  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  comes from a medical technical term to thicken or harden. In this context it must be understood in the passive, in light of the antecedent passive participles, to mean a self-hardening due to a stubborn unwillingness to learn. Second, throughout the book of Jeremiah this spiritual condition of the heart was thoroughly documented as a culpable strategy to live life without God (cf. Jeremiah 5:23, 7:24; 9:14; 11:8; 13:10; 23:17). Third, in terms of the history of exegesis the authenticated Pauline Epistle of Romans is amongst the few documents that have had more study concentrated on them (Cranfield, 1990:30). The significance of this is the parallel account of the description of the inner life of a culpable individual before God. In Romans 1:21-32 Paul states that although humankind knew God they refused to know Him, in practice, by their lifestyle what they knew in their minds. The results of these destructive culpable attitudes were Forensic Shame.

For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their **thinking became futile** and their **foolish hearts were darkened....They exchanged the truth of God for a lie... they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God... They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity** (Romans 1:21, 25, 28, 29).

It is implied in light of this study on shame that Ephesians 4:19a best captures the profound consequence of a willful futility, darkness, distorted reasoning leading to alienation from God, resulting in passions and desires that lead to further destructive attitudes and lifestyle.

### *v19*

The participial phrase  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  defines the consequence of willful directionless, darkened, distorted thinking that humankind chose: a loss of a sense of shame. The perfect particle  $\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  from  $\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ , is often translated “lost sensitivity” (cf. N.I.V.), “feeling no pain (cf. Peterson, 2002:2131); “being past feeling” (cf. King James Version); “to become calloused” (Hoehner, 2002:589). Louw and Nida (1993:310) go further and translate this verb within the semantic domain of shame as “to lose the capacity to feel shame or embarrassment” in that an individual loses the feeling of forensic shame, the shame attached to living life in destructive attitudes and behavior, thereby becoming calloused toward Him. The importance of this translation lies in the fact that

Ephesians 4:19 is the only place that this verb is used in the New Testament (cf. Hoehner, 2002:589; Lincoln 1990:279). The Apostle Paul chose to use this rare specific word to inculcate the result of a darkened mind and alienation from God. It is inferred that in the place of the spiritual conviction of a repentant attitude, there existed a spiritual callousness to repeat destructive behavior. The perfect participle continues the thought of ἐπέπλησαν μὲν τὰς φαντασίας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, resulted in a continual condition that was losing a sense of relational, global shame before God. They seem so spiritually consumed with deceit and self-sufficiency, that they are unable to identify their shame and change their attitude towards their destructive lifestyle and God. However, even though there did not exist a subjective shame, they remained an objective, culpability in Forensic Shame (cf. Ephesians 2:3). This thought is supported by Lincoln's (1990:279) observation that whereas Romans 1:24-32 emphasizes God's continued involvement in humanity's turning away from him with its threefold "God gave them over", in accord with the needs of paraenesis, Ephesians 4:19 stresses the moral responsibility of humanity. Humankind was responsible because they themselves gave themselves up (ἐπέπλησαν αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοὺς) (cf. Hendriksen, 2002:211) to a destructive lifestyle that plunged them into a judicial forensic shame before God. This destructive lifestyle without God's boundaries for their lives consisted of ἀπέχεσθαι ἀνακράσειν "unrestrained living" (cf. Rienecker and Rogers, 1980:5:33). This declining spiral resulted in engaging, investing spiritually and working at, (ἐπέπλησαν αὐτοὺς) (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:5-6) all types of destructive behavior with a perpetual desire and unabated consumption for more. As Paul stated in Romans 1:30, 32 they invented doing evil, continuing to do such things and approving of others who do. Both Ephesians 4:17-19 and Romans 1:21-32 seem to focus on a willful futility, darkness, distorted reasoning leading to alienation from God, resulting in passions and desires that lead to further destructive attitudes and lifestyle, with Ephesians 4:17-19 placing the forensic shame solely on humankind.

### 3.5.1.3. Preliminary conclusion

This section attempted to answer the question as to the condition of the believer before "putting off" and "putting on" discussed in Ephesians 4:20-24. This was attempted by a study of Ephesians 2:1-3 and Ephesians 4:17-19 as to the theological and practical implications for a study of shame are significant. It seems that shame is a relational phenomenon impacting the inner being of the individual and with

diverse affect on community. Ephesians 2:1-3 implied that humankind were not victims of circumstance or environment who occasional do bad things. They are culpable individuals who profoundly cultivate destructive attitudes from within themselves that affect community. The universality of Adamic Shame is strongly implied in Paul's statements "we all lived amongst them at one time" (ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ὡς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἠμαρτάνομεν ἐν τῷ σαρκί) (2:3), and "like the rest" (ὡς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες). Ephesians 2:1-3 is a necessary antecedent to Ephesians 4:17-19 as it lays the theological foundation of this important passage, in that it describes the strategic sphere of destructive attitudes and behavior that consumed the lifestyle of these believers before they trusted Christ as their personal Savior. Ephesians 2:1-3 is found in the "theological" section of the book of Ephesians. Ephesians 4:17-19 is found in the "practical" section of this Pauline Epistle. Therefore, Ephesians 4:17-19 focused on the practical consequence of a shameless willful futility, darkness, distorted reasoning leading to alienation from God, resulting in passions and desires that lead to further destructive attitudes and lifestyle.

If an unbeliever is in such a pathetic, hopeless and shameless condition how does he/she go about "putting off" the old self and "putting on" the clothing of Christ?

### **3.5.2. How does a believer "put off" and "put on"? Ephesians 4:20-24**

In Genesis 3:7 once Adam and Eve realized they were naked they attempted to cover themselves with fig leaves. This, however, did not cover their spiritual-forensic shame before God. God had to cover them by means of substituting an animal in their place. This implied that unless God covered them, they were spiritually naked. In the Book of Jeremiah it was studied that an attempt was made to endure the wound of their shame (cf. Jeremiah 10:19) or cover the forensic shame by means of the people's strategies of self-preservation (cf. 6:12; 8:11; 8:22; 15:18). It was only when the people allowed God to diagnose the severity of their "wound" (shame) (cf. 30:12, 15; 31:18-21) that God could pronounce: "I will restore you to health and heal your wounds, declares the LORD" (Jeremiah 30:17). God alone dresses their wound and gives them a heart to know Him (cf. Jeremiah 24:6-7).

Likewise, in Ephesians Paul diagnosed the spiritual condition of humankind (2:1-3; 4:17-19) as they attempted to live within the sphere of their destructive attitudes and lifestyle within false community, apart from God. These believers, before they came to know Christ were spiritually dead, and had no

sense of shame. Although a study of this passage is beyond the scope of this thesis, Ephesians 2:4-10 provides a significant contrast to humankind's pathetic shameful state:

But because of his great love for us, God, who is rich in mercy, made us alive with Christ even when we were dead in transgressions--it is by grace you have been saved. And God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus, in order that in the coming ages he might show the incomparable riches of his grace, expressed in his kindness to us in Christ Jesus. For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith--and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God-- not by works, so that no one can boast. For we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do.

Consistent with the theology of grace and salvation in Genesis and Jeremiah,  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\ \delta\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\ \mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ , "but God" alone must intervene to cover the shame of humankind. It is implied that Ephesians 4:20-24 seems to emphasize that the believer is not the agent of "putting off" and "putting on", but rather this is the result of God divinely placing the believer positionally in an identity in Christ. The believer's responsibility seems to be "to be made new in the attitude of your minds" (4:23). Just as God clothed Adam and Eve (Genesis), and God dressed the shame of His People (Jeremiah), so it is proposed that God is the only one who can "take off" the destructive attitudes (garments) of the destructive spiritual condition of humankind, and God alone can dress or "put on" the new position of the believer in their new identity in Christ. The believer's responsibility is to live within the sphere of Christ by day in and day out changing of the mind. This was true of Adam and Eve who, it is implied, were to live as image bearers, under God and God's People in the Book of Jeremiah (cf. 32:39) under the New Covenant would be given a singleness of heart to follow God. "Putting off" and "putting on" seems to be the result of God placing the believer positionally in a new identity in Christ. This is proposed with grammatical and contextual support under the following points.

#### *v 20-21*

First, this "putting off" and "putting on" does not seem to be the result of a daily battle that the believers in their own strength must accomplish (cf. Snodgrass, 1996:240-241), rather it is implied this has been done for them because of what they had learned ( $\epsilon\lambda\theta\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\lambda\theta\iota\varsigma$ , from  $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ , to learn) about their new position and identity in the sphere of the Person of Christ. Hoehner (2002:598) observes that the verb  $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$  is unique in this context and emphasizes that the believer does not learn facts about

Christ but must personally engage Christ. They heard (ἀκούσαντες, from ἀκούω to hear) about and were taught (ἐδίδαξαν, from διδάσκω to teach) that truth is embodied in Jesus. Snodgrass states that believers know better than to live in the shameful state described in Ephesians 4:17-19 because of the life, death and resurrection of the earthly Jesus, who is none other than the resurrection Christ who is the sphere of learning for their lives. Truth, ἀλήθεια, is “the content of that which actually happened”, therefore is trustworthy, dependable and reliable (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:673). Jesus is, was and will always be the only means of truth and means of salvation (cf. John 14:6). His earthly life, death, burial and resurrection were vindicated in the Him being the risen Christ (cf. Romans 1:4). Therefore, a believer’s salvation and identity is an *accomplished* work apart from anything they can do to affect their own salvation (cf. John 19:31; Ephesians 1:7; 2:8-9). The believer is God’s workmanship created in **Christ** Jesus to do good works which He determined in advance for the believer to do, for His glory (cf. Ephesians 2:10).

#### v22, 24

Second, it seems that both ἀποποιήσασθε (put off) and ἐνδύσασθε (put on) are aorist middle infinitives. The infinitive connects grammatically with the main verb ἐμύησθε (4:20) and denotes the substance of what they had been taught. An interpretation of what is meant by “put off” and “put on” is to be understood as the substance of what they had been taught, which is defined by the infinitives ἀποποιήσασθε (put off) and ἐνδύσασθε (put on), including their tense and voice. The middle voice carries with it the idea of “a direct participation, specific involvement, or even some form of benefit of the subject doing the action.” (Porter, 1999:67). This interpretation seems to be a theological one. It is suggested that these infinitives are not to be understood as imperative, as if this were the action of the believer. In the context this passage (4:20-24) and weight of Ephesians 1:3-15; 2:4-10; 4:1-3, God is the subject, who has placed the believer into Christ. It is God in Christ who has bought the believer’s redemption according to His good purpose and pleasure. If all salvation is of God it does not seem theologically accurate to suggest that the believer is then responsible for “taking off” and “putting on” their own salvation, in a positional sense. Furthermore, the aorist tense denotes a once for all, definite, concluding action: the “putting off” or the “taking off” is to be done at a once and for all moment (cf. Rienecker and Rogers, 1980:533). Hoehner (2002:603) states that the aorist middle infinitive has the idea of an inceptive act that may have a reference to conversion. Furthermore, lexical verbs of the “putting off” and “putting on” of clothing emphasize accomplished events rather than a process in activities. The middle voice emphasizes that the believer receives the benefit of the action. It

is not a reflexive idea for the believer who could not do it by his or her own strength. Hoehner's view seems further supported by the context of Ephesians 2:1-3 and Ephesians 4:17-19 that described the pathetic, shameless condition of the unbeliever. The infinitive ἀποποιεσθαι, from ἀποποιεσθαι to put off, "seems to focus on not the movement involved in removal of something as it does the removal of an object from a particular location or sphere, in that the object is removed from that location on a permanent basis" (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:728). God must remove something from us before He "puts on". In the context of the passage it seems that God alone can "take off" or "strip off" the strategic "fig leaves" that the unbeliever used in an attempt to cover and hide their spiritual condition. Similarly, the contrasting infinitive ἐπιθεσθαι, from ἐπιθεσθαι, to put on clothes (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:525), is the work of God alone in placing, and clothing, the new believer in a new position and identity (ὡς ἵνα παλαιὰ ἀποποιήσῃ) in Christ.

Third, Hoehner (2002:602) points out that Colossians 3:9-10, the parallel passage, where the aorist passive participle indicates that the putting off and putting on has already been accomplished.

Do not lie to each other, since you have taken off your old self with its practices and have put on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its Creator.

These participles are used in conjunction with imperatives (Colossians 3:8, 12) in that they commanded to put off sins like anger and wrath as a result of what had already taken place in that God "put off" the old person and "put on" the new person. Furthermore, in Colossians 3:10 Paul uses the word καινότης instead of καινότης to describe "new". The noun, καινότης refers to "newness" in a point in time (cf. Rienecker and Rogers, 1980:579). This newness seems to be a new spiritual position, condition and identity that the believer was placed into at a time of conversion: clothed in the sphere of an identity in Jesus Christ.

Fourth, the old person is "corrupted by its deceitful desires" (Ephesians 4:22). In the context of Ephesians 2:3 it was studied that desires ἐπιθυμία, was within the semantic domain of attitudes and emotions. Louw and Nida (1993:291) defined ἐπιθυμία as "to greatly desire to do or have something – to long for, desire very much". The theological application of ἐπιθυμία, was described in a negative connotation as "to engage in an activity that is morally wrong" almost in a sense of self-gratification regardless of the consequences. It seems that the spherical use of the preposition ἐπι implied that they all lived within the sphere of the powerful influence of immediate self-gratification of

destructive attitudes actualized through destructive behavior (cf. Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:19). In the present context ἀπὸ παλαιότητων from ἀπὸ παλαιότητων deceit, is in the genitive, which suggests genitive of source. The context of “corrupted by its deceitful desires, seems to refer to, with the weight of Ephesians 2:3, be describing the spiritual condition of the παλαιὸν ἑαυτοῦ (old self) pre-conversion, and not the believer after conversion. This seems to be strengthened by the phrase ἡ ἀπὸ ἀπὸ παλαιότητων ἀπὸ ἀπὸ παλαιότητων (according to or with regards to your former way of life). This prepositional phrase seems to be defining the spiritual position and condition of the believer before being clothed in Christ. The noun ἀπὸ ἀπὸ παλαιότητων was also found in Ephesians 2:3 to describe the spiritual condition of the believer before salvation.

Fifth, the aorist middle infinitives ἐπέστησαν αὐτοὺς and ἀπὸ πρὸς ἐπέστησαν, seem to be in contrast with the present middle infinitive ἀπὸ ἀπὸ ἐπέστησαν αὐτοὺς in verse 23. The present passive participle ἀπὸ ἀπὸ ἐπέστησαν αὐτοὺς, from ἀπὸ ἀπὸ ἐπέστησαν, is defined as causing something to become new and completely different with the implication of begin superior (cf. Louw and Nida, 1993:594). This seems to refer to the second point of the teaching they received about Christ (cf. Ephesians 4:20-21): The truth that they learned about in Jesus was that they were to continually propel and initiate a newness within the attitude of the mind of whose the believer is in their new identity in Jesus Christ. The phrase πρὸς ἐπέστησαν αὐτοὺς (“the attitude of your mind”) is important as it points to the sphere in which the believer’s continual renewal is to take place. All destructive attitudes took place within the inner being of the individual: “futility of their thinking” (v17); “darkened in their understanding” (v18); “ignorance that is in them” (v18); “due to the hardening of their hearts.” (v18); “continual lust.” (v19); and “deceitful desires” (v22). In their new identity, clothed in Christ positionally, does not remove a spiritual ache that believers are not “clothed in their heavenly dwelling” (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:1-4). However, this does not detract from their responsibility to continually renew the attitudes of their mind within the sphere of the truth of whose they are and who they are within their identity in Jesus Christ. The object of this continued renewal of the attitudes is the truth that is in Jesus Christ. Truth in and about Jesus Christ is to motivate and propel the believer in their “clothed” state. In Genesis 3, although Jesus Christ was foreseen (3:15), Adam and Eve were temporarily covered (3:21). In Jeremiah a permanent covering was only seen from a distance (Jeremiah 30-33). In Ephesians this spiritual covering and clothing is a reality. Spiritual nakedness is covered by the blood of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:7), and is secured for eternity.

A preliminary conclusion is that “putting off” the old person cannot be understood as an imperative that the believer is either obligated to do nor has the spiritual ability to do. “Putting off” the old spiritual condition may be likened to Adam and Eve attempting to cover their shame, and God’s people in Jeremiah attempting to dress their wound (shame). It could not be done. Likewise, as only God could clothe Adam and Eve, so God alone can place, “put on” the believer into the position and sphere of Jesus Christ. It is implied that if the believer is not clothed positionally in Christ, they are not clothed. However, the believer in the sphere of their new position is to live each day continuing renewing his/her mind with the truth of their identity that is in Jesus Christ. It seems that an individual believer may renew his/her mind because he/she is positionally created to be like God in true righteousness and holiness (cf. 4:24).

### 3.5.3. Preliminary conclusion of Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19; 4:20-24

The book of Ephesians seems to emphasize a number of practical and theological implications for the study of shame.

First, Ephesians 2:1-3 implied that humankind were not victims of circumstance or environment who occasional do bad things. They are culpable individuals who profoundly cultivate destructive attitudes from within themselves that affect community. The universality of Adamic Shame is strongly implied in Paul’s statements “we all lived amongst them at one time” (ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐγεννηθῆμεν ὡς ἡμεῖς πάντες) (2:3), and “like the rest” (ὡς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι). Relationships in community existed of individuals who would strategically and willfully cultivate a lifestyle of bondage. It is suggested that there was no lifestyle of authenticity but both Adamic and Forensic shame, which covered and layered itself through destructive attitudes. They were perpetrators who strategically used their faculties to reject God and attempt to establish pseudo-community, only to destroy themselves and attempts at community through the futility of their thinking and darkened understanding (cf. Rom 1:21-22; Ephesians 4:17-19). It is important to note that Ephesians 2:1-3 is not taken in isolation from other theological passages dealing with sin and destructive attitudes. Paul seemed to carefully define the universality of destructive attitudes residing within all individuals in humankind. These attitudes are not the result of occasional lapses of bad behavior rather that every inclination and strategy of the inner person is destructive and corrupt. This seems to refer to an Adamic Shame within each individual in

humankind. Before trusting Christ as Savior all “formerly” lived within the sphere of destructive attitudes. Sin was thought-out, projected, and lived out.

Second, it seems that these destructive attitudes made each person culpable. Forensic Shame seemed to be the result of knowingly choosing to ignore God and pursue one’s own self-preservation and self-gratification. Humankind is culpable and Forensic Shame is a reality and a lifestyle, a sphere in which every person lives. A selfish preoccupation seems indicative of a shamed-based individual.

Third, it seems that destructive attitudes and behavior does not exist in isolation, but rather community. Pseudo-community is developed as each individual either sins against another or partners with another individual. Each individual sins against God and incurs his righteous wrath.

Fourth, culpable humankind seems to live under the gaze of God, Global shame, as they sense an inner alienation from Him. However, this spiritual dissociation, separation and alienation from God do not produce in them a conviction to change. On the contrary, they are in fact shameless. They are spiritually numb, hardened, callous to any need to change.

Fifth, this desensitizing to shame produces in them an unbridled and un-abandoned desire to invest further in all kinds of destructive behavior. There is no changing of the mind, repentance, nor is their an ability to do so.

Sixth, a believer is covered, clothed by God, in light of Christ’s redemptive act, alone. The believer has their old self positionally stripped off (put off). This includes God permanently removing attempts to avoid the reality of Adamic Shame. The result and relief of a believer, upon receiving the gift of eternal life may be summarized as

- 1) Placed and clothed in Christ, once and for all,
- 2) The spiritual capacity to continually renew the attitudes of their mind.
- 3) This renewing of the mind seems to be a process of an intellectual and spiritual reformation that involves a submissive spirit and a mind that is open to the mind of Christ (cf. Ephesians 5:18-21; 1 Corinthians 2:10-14).

4) Furthermore this renewal seems to be part and parcel of the “workmanship of God” who created us in Christ Jesus to do good work which He determined in advance for the believer (Ephesians 2:10).

### **3.6. CONCLUSION**

First, the Old Testament passage of Genesis 3 serves as a useful starting point in order to critique shame. This passage offers substantial assistance for the reader to understand the origin of shame. In a study of Genesis 3, an attempt was made to lay the blueprint and framework of the entrance of shame into the world through the historical act and “anatomy” of Adam and Eve’s disobedience and result and strategies to cover their shame. This Old Testament passage also seemed to introduce and establish theological and practical implications for addressing shame.

Second, the Book of Jeremiah, as prophetic literature, seemed to identify and define at least seven strategies of shame that may only be authentically interpreted through the supportive, yet imperative theme of a repentant attitude.

Third, the New Testament passage of Ephesians 4:20-24 records the need for the believer to appreciate their position in Christ as “putting off” and “putting on”. It is imperative that they understand the spiritual condition, Adamic Shame and Forensic Shame that was universal (Ephesians 2:1-3, 4:17-19), before they came to Christ, and that they do not cover themselves but that God, in Christ, has already taken off their old garments, and placed on them new “clothes”. They, however, are to live within the sphere of their identity, Christ, in the continual renewal of the mind.

The attempt to develop a biblical and practical intervention of shame requires a study of this vital subject from both a basis-theoretical and a meta-theoretical perspective. Zerfass (cf. Heitink, 1999:113) stressed that if improvement was to be significantly and effectively made to an existing unsatisfactory praxis, a practical theological study cannot ignore the scientific contribution of the social sciences. Chapter Four will attempt to present a meta-theoretical perspective of shame from a selection of scientific disciplines within the social sciences.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### META-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SHAME

#### 4.1. INTRODUCTION

Shame is a universal emotion that is amongst the most painful of all human experiences in any culture around the world and stands at the center of an individual's emotional life (cf. Ho, Fu and Ng, 2004:64; Lewis, 2004:634). Gilbert (1998:3; cf. Heller, 2003:1-6; Pattison, 2000:45-60) observes that there are a wide variety of shame theories that are rooted in different schools of thought which include psychoanalytic theories; self-psychological theories; affect cognitive theories; cognitive-behavioral theories; developmental-psychological theories; sociological theories; and cultural-anthropological theories. Gilbert (1998:3-4) further observes that shame is not only studied within the scope of these different theories or approaches, but it has also been conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms. Shame has been examined in terms of emotion (e.g. as a primary affect in its own right, as an auxiliary emotion, or as a composite such as fear, anger or disgust); cognitions and beliefs about the self (that an individual is seen as by others as inferior, flawed, inadequate); behaviors and actions (e.g. running away, hiding and concealing, attacking others to cover one's shame; evolved mechanisms (e.g. the expression of shame understood as using similar bio-behavioral systems to those of animals expressing submissive behavior); and interpersonal dynamic interrelationships (shamed and shamer). Shame may also be used to describe phenomena at many different levels including internal self experiences; relational episodes and cultural practices for maintaining honor and prestige within a specific community.

Johannesen (2002:3) observed that

shame as a human emotion is a contested and controversial concept in such fields as anthropology, psychology, psychiatry, and moral philosophy. Some of the major disagreements focus on definitional characteristics...

In light of the plethora of approaches, and differences, it appears that a single definite definition of shame is not agreed upon from researchers across these scientific disciplines (cf. Webb, 2003:xiii). This is not to say that each researcher would not be convinced that their way is perhaps the definitive approach (Pattison, 2005). Pattison (2000:45) concurs that a major obstacle to a clear vision of the nature of shame is the diversity of approaches to the phenomenon in different disciplines and discourses. However, he seems to look for an eclectic value of these approaches to shame when he suggests (Pattison, 2000:59) that within this diversity of approaches to shame each approach contributes something of value for understanding this construct. It seems that it is a study of the parts that may assist in appreciating the whole (cf. Lynd, 1958:128-129). What does seem to be agreed upon by all researchers is that shame is the most visually conveyed of all emotions (cf. Hollander, 2003:1) and the most difficult emotion in everyday life (Webb, 2003:xiii).

This chapter will attempt a brief overview of only some of the main approaches to shame within the various social sciences. It seems imperative to study the various theories and approaches to shame to arrive at an integrative understanding of shame (cf. Lewis, 2004:626). In view of its complexities and its multifaceted approaches, it appears that an eclectic understanding of shame should be attempted. Some main approaches to shame will be proposed and a brief summary of these various approaches will be presented at the end of the chapter.

## **4.2. VARIOUS APPROACHES TO SHAME**

This chapter will attempt to address six approaches and two components of shame research. The approaches within the various scientific academic disciplines that will be summarized are the psychoanalytic approach; the “self-psychology” approach; the bio-innate-psychological approach; the affect-cognitive approach of shame; the sociological approach; the cultural-anthropological honor-shame approach. Shame has also been conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms. Two major components that center around interpersonal relationships will be addressed: Shame and Addictive Behavior, and Shame and Forgiveness

#### 4.2.1. The psychoanalytic approaches to shame

The basic premise of the psychoanalytic approach as a theory may be defined as an attempt to interpret human development in terms of intrinsic drives and motives many of which are unconscious, hidden from our awareness. These basic, underlying forces are viewed as influencing every aspect of an individual's thinking and behavior. This theory seems to provide the foundation for understanding human development and for specific developmental tasks within these stages, which impact an interpretation of shame. An exhaustive study of the psychoanalytic approach is beyond the scope of this thesis. An attempt will be made to discuss this approach and relevant stages as they refer to an understanding shame.

##### The influence of Freud to the study of shame

Although some researchers (Kihlstrom, 2000) do not believe that Freud's theories are relevant to the modern science of psychiatry and psychology, others (Lansky and Morrison, 1997:13-39) believe that Freud's affect on psychology and psychoanalyst cannot be overlooked. This does not negate the fact that some researchers seem to agree (cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002: 114-115; Seidler, 2000:119; Lansky and Morrison, 1997:3) in terms of his early writings on shame was followed by an abrupt and almost complete eclipse of attention to this important subject. Morrison (1989:22-29, cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002:115) suggests that if Freud had pursued the concepts of ego-ideal, narcissism and self regard that are central to shame he might have elaborated on the nature and implications of shame.

Pfeiffer (2004:1-5); Kardas (2004:1-3); Pattison (2000:45-46); Nye (1975:1-16) and Freud (1980:697-717) detail Freud's attempted, but limited approach to shame. For Freud all behavior is deterministic - it is caused and it can be explained. All behavior is the result of hidden parts or aspects of the human personality. Each individual has a personality that consists of the *id*, the *ego* and the *super-ego*.

The *id* is biological forces within individuals that focuses primarily on having its pleasures and needs met, on demand. Freud identified that there exists a primary process to achieve gratification that reduces internal tension, by forming an image of the object that will bring gratification. Contact must

be achieved with this object. This contact is achieved through a second important system, Freud labeled the *ego*. The *ego* acted as a filter of reality for the *id's*, often impulsive, desires for gratification by evaluating objectively between what is desired and what is, in reality, available. This filtering process, a secondary process, attempts to reduce the tensions of the *id*, as it functions as a type of "control center" of the personality. The *ego* releases or holds back the expression of impulses and drives of the *id*, which has no restraint and therefore invests energy in attempting to gratify desires.

The *ego's* functioning is profoundly affected by the demands of external impositions placed on the individual by parents, influential people and society. For Freud when an individual child has harsh unyielding parents or teachers there seems to be very little outlets for instinctual energy. Without an effective mechanism for releasing energy, there will be a build up of tension and anxiety. It is further suggested this would be directly as a result of global shame in light of forced, restrictive values placed upon the child, then possibly ridiculed or shamed for not reaching adult expectations. The aspect of Freud's understanding of the personality consisted of the *superego* which comprised of what he defined as the conscience and the *ego* ideal. The conscience represents the inner awareness of a moral judge within each individual which decides the course of action that each one should take, including moral implications of either course of action. For Freud the criteria for the shaping of the conscience are the value system of parents and society. The *ego*-ideal is an individual's idealized view of themselves. The *ego* ideal "dictates" and represents what a person would like to be and have in regard to objects and others. The *superego* strives for perfection. The aspect of the *superego* that strives for perfection and self-fulfillment is the *ego*-ideal. Freud explicitly believed that the focus of the *ego*-ideal was to self-regard and a dependence on the gratification of a narcissistic libido (satisfying sexual pleasure, but also the need to invest an object of love and in turn sense subjective love). The intensity for self-fulfillment is often so intense that if the individual is bombarded with an intense number of restrictions, hence there is nowhere or no means of gratification, there is often intense shame as a result of feelings of inferiority at not having these needs met. This in turn leads to preoccupation at attempting to fulfill a need for love from the "lost" object or person that often leads to psychopathic narcissism. For Freud this often began in a tension, particularly in young boys in childhood, in that they envied, and were shamed because of their father's relationship to their mothers, and sought to "challenge" this male figure in their lives. Freud called this the Oedipal Complex that seemed to preoccupy his understanding more of guilt indication, rather than shame. In regards to a young man's temptation of sexual feeling as towards his mother, Miller (1996:25) suggests that Freud understood shame also as an expression of internal distress over a wounded or belittled image of the 'self' but as possessing a function of restraint

from incest which would harm community. Scheff (2000:3) summarizes Freud's reductionist position of shame to elevating the status of guilt in his writings that seemed to have a profound impact on the entire psychological community from there on in:

However, in 1905, with the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud permanently renounced his earlier formulation in favor of drive theory, especially the sexual drive. In Freud's thinking, shame was replaced by anxiety and guilt, the appropriate emotions for responsible adults, especially male adults. By this time, Freud had become biased about shame. He thought that it was a regressive emotion, seen only in children, women, and savages. His rejection of his earlier work on shame can be seen as a lapse into the ethnocentric and sexist attitudes that prevailed at the time, as well as being psychologistic.

Therefore, it appears the challenge that seems to be facing the psychoanalytic approach is the great deal of polarization and dissension in psychoanalytic theory and clinical observation and practice, which began with Freud himself (cf. Lansky, 2004:443; Seidler, 2000:xvii). Nonetheless, Lansky and Morrison (1997:34-37; cf. Morrison, 1996:134-152) propose several central aspects that made up the phenomenology of shame in Freud's writing that seems to be relevant for present psychoanalysis: shame and transference; shame and counter-transference; shame and resistance; and shame and interpretation.

### Shame and Transference

An individual places a conscious (which could include subconscious) attachment, dependence and value to an object or person. In a complex internalized integration of beliefs, ideals, expectations, assumptions and feelings they interpret that object or person as the source for love, safety, security, bonding, and personal esteem. In other words the object or person shapes the internal identity and sense of selfhood as an individual. The individual becomes dependant, even codependent, upon the object or person because even in a perceived loss, a deep sense of shame may be aroused. A perceived or actual loss of the object or person may be caused by change in environment, a change in relationship due to conflict, death, et al; a change due to theft, damage, disaster, et al. This perceived or actual loss may create anxiety that arises from a perceived perception or actual calculation of that loss upon an individual. This may then be interpreted personally as something that is unworthy dirty, inadequate, needy, uncontrolled, disappointing in the individual. This perceived sense of unworthiness produces a

sense of shame, because the individual is exposed to an inner human need to feel secure, loved, safe and attached to an object or person.

#### Shame and Counter-transference

Freud understood the power of shame not only to be affecting a patient but also a therapist-doctor-counselor. The shame experienced in the patient may reverberate in the doctor, counselor or therapist.

#### Shame and Resistance

Resistance was understood by Freud to be the unwillingness of the patient to express a self-awareness of a sense of unworthiness because this unworthiness produces further pain and shame. There is a fear of exposure, disgrace, disintegration of relationships, re-traumatization, and consequent shame.

#### Shame and Interpretation

Interpretation implies that something on the surface means something else on the inner integration of feelings, thoughts and attitudes within an individual. When a therapist, doctor or counselor interprets the shame of the patient they point out an underlying inner struggle, which in turns may shame the patient further.

### **Erik Erikson's developmental stages and shame**

Erikson is known as the "father of psychosocial development" and "the architect of identity". Erikson (1985:247-274) postulated that each individual passes through eight contrasting (positive and negative emotional outcomes) developmental "psychosocial" stages:

Stage 1	Basic trust versus basic mistrust
Stage 2	Autonomy versus shame and doubt
Stage 3	Initiative versus guilt

Stage 4	Industry versus inferiority
Stage 5	Identity versus role diffusion
Stage 6	Intimacy versus isolation
Stage 7	Generativity versus self absorption
Stage 8	Ego integrity versus despair

Each stage is characterized by a different psychological "crisis", which must be resolved by the individual before the individual can move on to the next stage. Harder (2002:2) observes that although Erikson was influenced by Freud, he differed from him in that he believed that the ego exists from birth and that behavior is not totally defensive. Erikson (cf. Sheff, 2000) challenged Freud's assumption that guilt was the primary moral emotion for adults. He argues instead that shame was more elemental in that it concerns the whole self not just an individual's actions. Erikson became aware of the massive influence of culture on behavior, perhaps based in part on his study of Sioux Indians "warriors without weapons" on a reservation, and the Yurok, a tribe of fishermen on the Pacific coast (cf. Erikson, 1985:144-184). He seemed to place more emphasis on the external world, such as depression and wars. He felt the course of development is determined by the interaction of the body (genetic biological programming), mind (psychological), and cultural (ethos) influences (cf. Harder, 2002:2-4). It seemed for Erikson that if the person copes with a particular crisis in a maladaptive manner, the outcome will be more struggles with that issue later in life. He believed that babies are born with some basic capabilities and distinct temperaments, but they go through dramatic changes on the way to adulthood, and while growing old. In stage 2 the child is a Toddler (Age 1 to 2). The crisis is Autonomy (Independence) vs. Doubt (or Shame). The Toddlers learn to walk, talk, use toilets, and do things for themselves. Their self-control and self-confidence begin to develop at this stage. Positively if parents encourage their child's use of initiative and reassure her when she makes mistakes, the child will develop the confidence needed to cope with future situations that require choice, control, and independence. Negatively Erikson believed that if parents are overprotective, or disapproving of the child's acts of independence, she may begin to feel ashamed of her behavior, or have too much doubt of her abilities. It is also during this stage, however, that we can be very vulnerable. If we're shamed in the

process of toilet training or in learning other important skills, we may feel great shame and doubt of our capabilities and suffer low self-esteem as a result.

Erikson (1985:252) observed that shame, an emotion insufficiently studied because in “our civilization it is so early and easily absorbed by guilt”. He (1985:252) understood shame in

that one is completely exposed and conscious of being looked at in one word, self conscious. One is visible and not ready to be visible; which why we dream of shame as a situation in which we are stared at in a condition of incomplete dress, in night attire, “with one’s pants down.” Shame is early expressed in an impulse to bury one’s face, or to sink, right then and there, into the ground.

It did not seem that Erikson restricted the shamed individual to a victim. He (Erikson, 1968:110-111) observed that a child sensing shame seemed to internalize rage that one senses shame, and attempts to, in a secret guised determination to get away from that which shames them. There is a time when the shamed child perceives those around them have a control over their lives; an almost infallibility. The shamed child interprets his/her own actions and identity as “evil” or “dirty”. This secret determination may be turned around in an internalized anger that even though a shamed individual perceives they hanged on the gallows before the eyes of the community, defiance within may produce a destructive endurance to “consider as evil” those who are perceived to shame them.

It appears that at each negative pole of each of Erikson’s stages of development may be understood as a description of shame. Kauffman (1989:10) commenting on these eight stages states that the affect most critical to the development of mistrust, guilt, inferiority, isolation, and so on is actually shame. Lynd (1958:164-165, 205-210) believed that Erikson’s contribution to psychoanalysis was imperative to understanding shame and identity. However, recent researchers (Lewis, 2004:625) have argued that Erikson’s understanding of shame is limited specifically as he did not distinguish between shame and guilt, and limited an understanding of shame to an individual being ‘completely exposed and conscious of being looked at’. Lewis (2005) suggests that an individual may have an inner sense of shame without anyone “looking” at them.

### **Gerhart Peirs and Milton Singer – a psychoanalyst’s and an anthropologist’s view on shame**

Peirs and Singers book in 1953 “saw the publication of the first monograph devoted to the subject of shame” (Seidler, 2000:115). This book seemed to attempt to research and present shame and guilt within two approaches. Their book is divided into two parts. Part one focuses on shame and guilt in a psychoanalytic study by Piers, a psychoanalyst. Part two is a study of shame cultures and guilt cultures by Singer, anthropologist. Piers and Singer (1953:7,16-17) understood shame in both Freudian and Eriksonian terms as occurring when goals and images presented by the Ego-Ideal are not reached. They argued that behind the feeling of shame was a fear of contempt which would translate not into a fear of hatred but into a fear of abandonment and emotional starvation by the person that was desired. Pattison (2000:46) observes that their shame arose from a fear of a loss of love in response to failure of some kind of libidinal desire (Freud) or from turning anger inwards (Erikson). They sought to rigorously dissociate between shame affect and the drive sphere. They did not want to lose the differentiation between shame and guilt. Recent research (cf. Tangney 2002:13) seems to contradict Piers and Singers findings in that shame typically results from a negative ideal (e.g. the recognition that ‘we are who we do not want to be’), rather than from a recognition that an individual has failed to live up to some positive ego-ideal.

### **Helen Block Lewis – a ground breaking approach to shame**

It is agreed by scientific researchers (Lewis, 2005, Scheff, 2005, Tangney, 2002:18-25) that Helen Block Lewis (1971) wrote a landmark book on the subject of shame. She seemed to build a bridge between the intra- and interpersonal world of individuals suffering with shame and guilt (cf. Scheff and Retzinger, 1997:140). She (1971:23) appears to be the first psychoanalyst (cf. Lynd, 1958:208-210) to differentiate between shame and guilt. It is worth quoting her (1971:23) seminal definition of the difference between shame and guilt:

When guilt is evoked, the internalized threatening figure functions silently through their influence on the person’s value system. In guilt, the value system, however, is likely to be the focal point of the person’s awareness, rather than an awareness of himself in relation to the internalized “other”. In shame, the internalized admired imago functions more visibly as the referent ‘in whose eyes’ shame

is experienced; a 'shadow' of the imago falls on the self. This internal theater of shame may be played in the feeling of shame or humiliation before the 'other' or it may be played out in ideation. In the latter case, the person does not experience the full affect of shame, but rather has thoughts about what the 'other' is thinking about the self.

Tangney (2002:18-19) observes that this differentiation was an important contribution of Lewis to the study of shame and guilt. Lewis (1971:85-89), expanding on this definition, goes on to explain that in shame the self was demeaned ('I did that horrible thing') versus in guilt the focus is on the behavior ('I did that horrible **thing**'). Where the focus is on the self there is a tendency to hide, escape or cover up. When the focus is on the guilt or culpability of the action there tends to be a concern at reparation, i.e. to repair the wrong done.

Scheff and Retzinger (1997:141-146) identify Lewis' main contributions as the prevalence of shame that dominated most psychotherapeutic work; feeling traps that emotionally entangled the patient and the therapist as they intended to work on specific issues; shame and the social bond in that shame is a relational phenomenon that profoundly affected all relationships. The most important contribution to the study of shame was her discovery of unacknowledged shame (cf. Scheff, 1997:221-222). Through empirical research Lewis discovered that many times clients never acknowledged the shame they were experiencing. She postulated that there was an intrinsic connection between shame and the mechanism of denial work was vital to the study of shame (Lewis, 1971:196-197; cf. MacDonald, 1998:142). She believed after hundreds of therapy session that unacknowledged or by-passed shame was overlooked by therapists, counselors and interestingly, patients alike (cf. Lewis 1971:275-347).

Her studies launched modern studies of shame in the United States of America in a range of disciplines. Amongst the four critiques of Lewis' work Scheff and Retzinger (1997:150-151) identify that a new approach that focuses on the role of pride and shame in the patient's life and the therapeutic relationship requires modification.

### **Leon Wurmser – the two drives motivated by shame**

According to Seidler, (2000:106-207, Pattison, 2000:46-47; Broucek, 1991:14-16), Wurmser, extending the basic Freudian understanding of shame, reduced shame to two drives within individuals, i.e. exhibitionistic and voyeuristic partial drives. Miller (1996:21-24) interprets these drives as stemming from the “basic and archaic fears in shame” when an individual (child) senses they have lost love therefore interpret that they are unloveable. This leads to an emotional void that must be filled because the other (object of love) has turned away in contempt which results in a shame anxiety within the individual which in turn results in a reaction formation to the libidinal drives that find expression in exhibitionism and voyeurism.

Scheff (2000:4) observes that although there has been a re-awakening of interest in shame by current psychoanalysts, still only a small minority of analysts are involved.

Even in this group, converting from drive theory to shame language is a struggle. The work of Lansky (1992; 1995) on shame preserves drive theory. Morrison (1989) has translated drive theoretic formulations into shame dynamics, trying to bridge the two worlds. Broucek (1991) has rebelled against drive theory, but doesn't attempt a social formulation of shame.

It appears that even earlier in the history of psychology this psychoanalyst minority community split itself further into the “self-psychology” movement. How does the ‘self-psychology’ movement view shame?

#### **4.2.2. The "self-psychology" approach to shame**

Although it is closely related to the psychoanalytic approach the self-psychologist focuses attention on the concept of “self” which is a distinctive structure in the mind similar to an object representation that contains differing and contradictory qualities (Calkins, 1915:1; cf. Pattison, 2000:47).

### **Heinz Kohut –developing the narcissistic self**

Self-psychology was developed by Austrian psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut after World War Two. Kohut's concepts were born out of psychoanalytic treatment, and he was clear that the central focus of self psychology was its attention to the development and analysis of the transferences:

"Self psychology does not advocate a change in the essence of analytic technique. The transferences are allowed to unfold and their analysis - the understanding of the transference reactions, their explanation in dynamic and genetic terms - occupies, now as before, the center of the analyst's attention"

Self-psychology is an extension of psychoanalysis that embodies his fundamental contributions of self-object and self-object transferences (cf. Rowe, 2002:15).

Kohut (2001:181-185) builds on Freud's notion that shame is in general a reaction of an ego that has failed to fulfill the unrealistic demands and expectations of the *ego-ideal*, both as a theoretical presupposition and a clinical observation. Kohut (1986:61-73) argued that there is a distinct narcissistic sector to the personality. For Kohut (Suesske, 2004:2; cf. Morrison, 1986:69) the essential feature of the self is actually a bi-polar self

The equilibrium of the complete security of the child is disturbed by the inevitable limits of maternal care, but the child replaces the previous perfection (a) by constructing a grandiose and exhibitionistic image of the self, the grandiose self, and (b) by assigning the previous perfection to a venerated, omnipotent (transitional) self-object, the idealized parent imago

The state of shame is the result of, after being unable to accomplish and satisfy the certain ambitions (archaic narcissism) there are attempts of a suffering *ego* to do away with the self in order to wipe out the offending disappointing reality of failure. These attempts are often self-destructive narcissistic impulsives through exhibitionism and grandiosity.

Shame arises when the ego is unable to provide a proper discharge for the exhibitionistic demands of the narcissistic self. Indeed in all clinically significant instances of shame propensity, the personality is characterized by a defective idealization of the superego and by a concentration of the

narcissistic libido upon the narcissistic self; and therefore it is the ambitious, success driven person with a poorly integrated grandiose self concept and intense exhibitionistic-narcissistic tensions who is most prone to experience shame (Kohut, 1986:71)

Kohut believes that narcissism is a normal developmental milestone, and the healthy person learns to transform his or her infantile narcissism into adult narcissism. Shame is therefore not an emotion in which the ashamed person makes a judgment that their behavior is deficient or maladaptive. Shame is in essence judgment free as it focuses on the disturbance of the narcissistic pursuit for self expression. Therefore, the emphasis on empathy is an important aspect for Kohut in terms of assisting a patient with shame. (cf. Kohut, 2001:37-38). Kohut (cf. Morrison, 1986:368-369) argues that the essence of psychoanalysis lies in the therapist's protracted empathic immersion in the patient to discover what the inner narcissistic life of the patient is. Kohut reduced shame to 'guiltless despair' of not being able to attain the narcissistic cohesive self.

### **Andrew Morrison –a broader view of shame and narcissism**

Morrison (1989:62-63) argues that shame is at the center of the narcissistic experience. Morrison (1997:81) criticizes Kohut's narrow view of shame, which was restricted to Freudian drive theory. Kohut moved from a view that judged self-concerns as 'bad' or 'primitive' as something to attain. It seems for Morrison that Kohut is setting himself and his patients up for destructive consequences as the very thing that produces shame (narcissistic pursuits) seems to be the very goal that Kohut advocates ought to be pursued. Morrison seems to translate Freudian drive theoretic formulations into shame dynamics (Scheff, 2002:11). Morrison (1997:82) argues that shame affects the very core of an individual's experience and constitutes essential pain, because of a sense or awareness of failing, flawed or inferior to someone else, unworthy of praise or failing some cherished ideal. Narcissism is that aspect of psychology which relates to the subjective experience of selfhood. There is an archaic yearning from childhood for absolute uniqueness in the eyes of an idealized other (i.e. parent). Morrison (Broucek, 1991:55; cf. Morrison, 1996:16-20) postulates that there exists a 'dialectic of narcissism' in that the ultimate goal of the self is merged with the idealized object and portrays a sense of autonomy, competence and uniqueness. Shame is produced both when a sense of failure is perceived

at connecting with the idealized object and because people are human, there is a sense of shame at attempting to demonstrate uniqueness, competence and autonomy.

Morrison (1996:10, 22-57) emphasizes that shame is an unhealthy burden on the self and underscores that the relation of shame to such feelings as failure, inferiority, defectiveness, unworthiness, incompetence, passivity, despair, unloveability, and low self-esteem. In recent research Morrison (Morrison and Lansky 1997:xv) observes that shame is often a hidden dimension and has been called

the 'veiled accompaniment' of such clinical phenomena as wide spread and divergent as narcissism, social phobia, envy, domestic violence, addiction, identity diffusion, post traumatic stress disorder, dissociation, masochism, and depression. Shame also provides important clues to the instigation of dreams, nightmares, and impulsive action of all sorts.

Shame, veiled under narcissism seems to be a destructive combination that may lead to shamelessness (cf. Hotchkiss, 2002:3-6).

As a component of shame, shame has been identified to be a powerful emotion (Nathanson, 1997:355). So much so that Nathanson (1997:356) observed that a system of therapy of affect theory "offers a different template". This constitutes the bio-innate-psychological approach to shame.

#### **4.2.3. Bio-innate-psychological approaches to shame**

##### **Silvan Tomkins and Donald Nathanson – shame as an 'affect auxiliary'**

The emotions system constitutes the primary motivational system for human behavior (Izard and Ackerman, 2004:253). Tomkins' approach to shame is not based on drive theory but on a developed theory of affects. Gilbert (1998:4-5) observes that Tomkins was one of the first researchers to suggest that shame was an innate affect with its own facial display pattern. Nathanson (1987:12) states that He believed that there must be an innate pre-existent mechanism triggered by some stimulus acceptable to that mechanism (Nathanson, 1987:12). These mechanisms were defined by Tomkins as inherited sub-cortical 'programs' that in turn control facial muscle responses, autonomic blood flow, respiratory and vocal responses. Tomkins proposes nine mechanisms, or innate sub-cortical 'programs' (cf. Russell and

Lemay, 2004:499-500; Martinsen, 2003:xiv). These innate affects include two positive affects: interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy; and six negative affects: fear, anger, distress, shame, dissmell (affective reaction to noxious odors), and disgust (cf. Nathanson, 1997:116-120). Except for dissmell and disgust (drive auxiliaries in that they regulate the oral drive by guarding against ingestion of noxious substances), and shame which Tomkins labels an 'affect auxiliary' the other affects are activated by various profiles of 'neural firing'. Shame as an affect auxiliary ensures that the self restores or remains committed to relationships. Shame, then for Tomkins is a teacher because of the intensity individuals will work in order to avoid it (cf. Nathanson, 1997:126). Gilbert (1998:5) quotes Tomkins,

I posit shame as an innate affect auxiliary response and a specific inhibitor of continuing interest and enjoyment. As disgust operates only after something has been taken in, shame operates only after interest or enjoyment has been activated; it inhibits one, or the other, or both.

It seems therefore that Tomkins postulates that the trigger to shame affect is any experience that requires rapid decrease in the affects of interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy in situations where an individual wishes to maintain these states.

Donald Nathanson has attempted to champion the affect theory of Tomkins both as author (cf. Nathanson, 1997:107-138; Nathanson, 1997:339-353; Nathanson, 1992) and as Executive Director of the Silvan Tomkins Institute (cf. <http://www.tomkins.org>). Nathanson has developed Tomkins' theory of shame in that he defines shame as an auxiliary to the positive affects rather than a true innate affect. Nathanson (1992:125) defines shame in a couplet: shame-humiliation, an analogue of its stimulus. He argues that shame-humiliation is

an inborn script, an attenuator system that can be called into operation whenever there is an impediment to the expression of either positive affect. It depends on the remarkable ability of highly organized advanced life forms to assemble the data of perception into patterns and to compare those patterns to whatever has been stored as memory."

He (Nathanson, 1992:141) explains in more detail, building on his mentor's theory when he states

My hypothesis is that shame affect involves a neurochemical, a substance secreted in the ancient sub cortical portion of the brain, a compound that causes sudden widening or dilation of the blood

vessels in the brain...Earlier in evolution before the development of the 'higher centers' of cognition, all that shame affect did was turn off positive affects. But the more complex the brain became the more functions came to be influenced by shame.

Nathanson (1997:107-154; 1992:305-377) goes further in that he identifies four clusters of shame-related affective experiences which he interprets and presents through a "compass of shame" to provide a framework for better understanding of the dynamics of shame and supporting more effective approaches to shame-based responses in treatment situations. In this compass, each of the four cardinal directions is represented by a reaction to an experience during which a 'shame trigger' has occurred, a physiological affect has been experienced and a cognitive response has taken place. Nathanson (1997:237) concludes that there is not a single entity that can be called 'shame', but rather four separate entities, four patterns of response in reaction the life events.

#### **4.2.4. Michael Lewis - the affect-cognitive approach of shame**

Lewis (1992:86-96) does not believe that shame develops at birth. Through scientific empirical research (Lewis 2005) which he postulates both Tomkins and Nathanson's lack, he has observed that the emergence of shame in an individual begins from the age of two years old. He has observed that a child is born with primary emotions such as joy, anger, fear, sadness, disgust and surprise. However, none of these emotions appear at the same time. The earliest classes of emotion, positive emotion (joy/happiness) and a negative emotion (distress) seem to be different from other emotions. Disgust emerges from distress and is followed by anger appearing somewhere from month age of 2-4 months. Fear emerges from 8 months. Surprise emerges early, from the joy/interest axis. Socialization of the child with their caregiver and the interpersonal life of the child, which includes maturation, contributes to the next phase of development which is identified as the cognitive capacity of objective self-awareness. Lewis believes that at the stage that the child becomes objectively self aware there seem to be motives that are not evaluative in nature that the child experiences, i.e. embarrassment, empathy and envy. There is a need for children to develop an internalized core sense of morality for their lives - to do the "right thing". Although the "basic" emotions emerge very early in life (e.g. anger, fear, joy) shame and guilt seem to be considered more developmentally advanced (Tangney and Dearing, 2002:140). For shame to develop Lewis (2005; cf. 2004:624) believes this requires two cognitive

milestones that are reached: first, a clear objective recognition of self as separate from others; and two the development of standards against which the self and/or others are evaluated. Lewis (1992:96) suggests that after, not before, the age of 2 children show both shame and guilt in reaction to a transgression that they hold themselves responsible for.

It seems that Lewis understands shame as a self-conscious emotion (cf. Tracy and Robins, 2003:11-14). However, he (2004:626) states that there is little agreement among researchers as to the specific elicitors of shame and guilt. No particular stimulus event has been identified as a trigger for shame and guilt. Lewis (2004:629) states that it is not produced by any specific event but an individual's interpretation of that event. Even more important is that shame is not related to public failure. In fact many people sense shame privately.

#### **4.2.5. The Sociological approach to shame**

Pattison (2000:54) correctly observes that it seems clear that shame as a phenomenon has substantial social roots, functions, implications and effects. It appears that shame is a relational phenomenon with implications for community. There seems to be three leading researchers in the area of a sociological approach to shame: Helen Lynd, Thomas J. Scheff and June Tangney and Rhonda Dearing.

##### **Helen Lynd – Shame and the search for identity**

Although Scheff (2005) observes that very few, if any, sociologists refer to the impact of Lynd, she seemed to have made an important contribution to shame literature. Lynd (1958:204) emphasized that Erikson's deliberate use of the word identity instead of "self" or "ego" was vital as it spoke of the individual existing in a "double direction": there is "some sort of correspondence between the inner and outer world " that is indispensable for a sense of identity. The self therefore is subject and object, observer and observed, which psychoanalyst separate "in an effort to make exclusive distinctions between the concepts of self and ego". Lynd seems to have contributed several important 'discoveries' regarding shame.

First, Lynd (1958:69) seems to encourage disclosing shame and not by passing or un-acknowledging it. The very fact that shame is an isolating experience also means that that if one can find ways of sharing and communicating it, this communication can bring about particular closeness with other persons and with other groups

Second, Lynd (1958:49) emphasizes that shame is an experience that affects and is affected by the whole self. This "whole-self involvement" is unique to shame and "makes it a clue to identity". Lynd seems to be presenting a one and many philosophical concept in that separate discrete acts (the one) that may seem trivial but is in fact a part of the self-consciousness as they reveal something of an individual's identity (the whole). Experiences of shame reveal 'what and who' an individual is and provides important indicators as to their world. For Lynd (1958:5-71) shame is both something that an individual brings on themselves and at the same time something that comes on the individual from without. She understands guilt is something 'tangible' that can be processed, as it is a result of a moral action. Shame on the other hand seems to overtake the individual by surprise 'because one's whole life has been a preparation for putting one in this situation'. An individual may feel a sense of anxiety because of feelings of inadequacy. She believes that guilt can be processed based on confession, repentance, restoration and reparation. However, shame affects the entire inner being that reflects ones identity, and because the self did the shameful action, the emphasis is not an individual act but the whole self. Shame is not an experience of an anguish or fear over isolation or alienation as a penalty for the shameful act, but rather it seems the experience of shame itself isolates, alienates and is incommunicable.

Third, Lynd proposes not only a description and explanation of shame but moves to a suggested solution for processing shame. Lynd (1958:183) suggests that if it is possible that an individual experiencing shame faces and does not seek protection from what is revealed by unrecognized aspects of one's personality, unrecognized aspects of one's society and world, this may shed light on the inner and outer identity. The importance and significance of attempting this is that an individual may shed some light on who they are and "hence point the way toward who and what one may become".

Fourth, Lynd (1958:194) strongly proposes that an individual can only find authentic identity as an individual that interprets themselves within the context of a greater community. She (1958:194-201) seems to caution against psychoanalyst therapy in that the patient experiencing shame does not involve themselves in a reciprocal relationship. There is not mutual sharing and communication. This is the

result of the analyst, who, out of fear of transference from the patient usurps his own will on their patient. Instead of discovering their personality, attempts to reduce the shame experience with their own interpretation (from their psychoanalytic presuppositions) of what the personality of the patient ought to be. This for Lynd (1958:201) is destructive because

'what is actually involved is the break down of one identity and replacing it by one that the analyst considers more desirable'.

Finally, Lynd's (1958:208-210) proposal on processing the experience of shame in an individual clearly filtering their shame through differentiating between the 'guilt axis' and 'shame axis'. It is interesting to note that even before Lewis' (1971:82-91) research which was highly effective and significant to the study of shame, Lynd first suggested a differentiation between the reality of the "guilt axis" and "shame axis". Lynd summarized from her suggested 'axes' that only when an individual understands, not just the guilt of an act but processes the inner and social context of shame, may an individual move to a more holistic interpretation of their identity.

Lynd, although a "forgotten" sociologist, did in fact influence Scheff (2000:11) in that

Lynd's approach to shame is much more analytical and self conscious than the other sociologists. They treated shame as a vernacular word, rather than a concept. For them, shame sprung out of their data, unavoidable. But Lynd encounters shame deliberately, as part of her exploration for identity.

### **Thomas J Scheff – Shame: a part-whole influence on the social bond**

Scheff (2005) is under the conviction that the subject of shame has "been a secret" in sociology because it carries a stigma that threatens to challenge the isolated individualism of the Western worldview.

However, Scheff's (2005) interest in shame did not emerge in a vacuum. He (2000:4; cf. 1994:71-91) was influenced by various "sociological pioneers in the study of shame" (Simmel, Elias, Cooley, and Goffman) who in reality had "shame forced upon them by their data", therefore hinted at the presence of shame while not specifically mentioning the word. It was the sociologist Helen Lynd (1958) and

Helen Block Lewis (1971) that seemed to most significantly impact Scheff with their emphasis on acknowledged and unacknowledged shame, and their relationship of the social bond. Helen Block Lewis (1971), who built on Lynd, seemed to probe Scheff's thinking that shame signals threat to the bond and connectedness in intra- and interpersonal relationships. Just as instinctual emotion of fear signals danger to life and limb, shame also signals a potential threat to survival. Lewis (Lewis 2005) identified shame as an inherently social emotion in that, unlike any other emotion, shame depends only specific aspects of social relationships.

Scheff, (1997:12; cf. 2001:1-5) building on both Lynd and Lewis' research, in his seminal work on emotion and social bond states that shame is, not a, but, the master emotion because it has many more social and psychological functions than other emotions. Scheff (cf. 1997:5-45) emphasizes the need to focus on a micro-macro context; a text and context; on the part in relationship to the whole, in regards to the study of shame. Shame does not exist in a vacuum but is systemic in both origin and affect. Shame is crucial to all human interaction because it ties together the individual and social aspects of human activity as part and whole. He (cf. 2000:2) observes that the weakness of the psychoanalytic approach to shame is that it leaves out the social context, rather than focusing on the individual as though people experience shame in isolation from others. Shame is a class name for a large family of emotions and feelings that arise through seeing the self negatively, if even only slightly negatively, through the eyes of others, or even for only anticipating such a reaction.

Scheff (cf. 1997:76-77, 151-152) observed that shame arises in an elemental situation in which there is a real or imagined threat to our bonds; it signals trouble in a relationship. The degree to which there exists mutual understanding; joint attention to thoughts, feelings, intentions, and motives between individuals but also between groups, they are then attuned. Society exists to the degree and structure of attunement, as against being in a state of anarchy. Where the relationship is too loose, isolation takes place. Where an individual is forced to adopt the ideals of another individual, at the expense of their own value system this leads to engulfment. Shame seems to be a key component of conscience, the moral sense, since it signals moral transgression even without thoughts or words. Shame is an individual's moral gyroscope. Since an infant's life is completely dependent on the bond with the caregivers, this emotion is as primitive and intense as fear. Scheff purports that the point that shame is a response to bond threat cannot be emphasized too strongly, since in psychology and psychoanalysis there is a tendency to individualize shame, taking it out of its social matrix. Typically in these disciplines, shame is defined as a product of the individual's failure to live up to her own ideals. Scheff

(2000:11) observed that when an individual hides or disguises shame from community, which results in 'feeling traps': continuing control of one's thought and behaviors by the hidden emotion of shame. This in turn may lead to the ashamed person being ashamed at being ashamed. Feeling traps have further resulted in a sense of narcissist rage, anger, resentment and hatred. Scheff (2000:13) advocates that an individual needs to understand shame and identify cues to shame in relationship to the family of emotions such as embarrassment, shyness, modesty and humiliation and "their cousins" guilt, resentment, envy and jealousy. Blaming particularly needs to be identified as a strategy for bypassing shame, which is often done through verbal self-defense (cf. Scheff, 2003:10). Scheff (2005) observes that individuals with great backlogs of unacknowledged shame live behind a false front, however, as the shame backlog is reduced, they come to be authentic, in Yiddish, "menschen".

Scheff's systemic approach to understanding shame has contributed much to the understanding of shame in terms of indelibly affecting interpersonal relationships within the home, in marriage, and within the greater social construct.

### **June Tangney and Rhonda Dearing –differentiating between shame and guilt**

Tangney and Dearing (2002:18-25; 113-119), as social behavioralists, seem to be strongly influenced by Helen Block Lewis, as a starting point, for their understanding of shame, which they differentiate from guilt. Tangney and Dearing (2002:24) are correct in asserting, after many years of research, that shame must be distinguished from guilt. Shame and guilt do not differ in terms of the context, which engender them, but in the manner in which people interpret negative events, which they perceive themselves to either have caused or be involved. In shame and guilt, public exposure does not necessarily cause shame and guilt. In fact, just the opposite may be true. It is asserted that shame and guilt seem to be intrapersonal constructs that focus on a person's self-evaluation of himself or herself in context to a negative event or situation, perceived or real. Shame and guilt are "self-conscious" emotions. They are intimately intertwined in a person's relationship with themselves. When a person fails or transgresses they are naturally drawn to search for explanations and causes (cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002:53). Tangney and Dearing (2002:25) distinguish the fundamental difference between

shame and guilt as centering on the intrapersonal definition a person gives himself or herself. They (2002:25; Lynd, 1958:82-91; Lewis, 1971:85-89) distinguish that,

**“Shame involves fairly global negative evaluations of the self (i.e., “Who *I* am”). Guilt involves a more articulate condemnation of a specific behavior (i.e., “What I *did*”).”**

They believe that an understanding of this self (shame) vs. behavior (guilt) has far reaching implications for the immediate phenomenological experience of these emotions for subsequent motivation and ultimately for behavior. It would be advantageous to summarize their understanding of the key similarities and differences between shame and guilt (cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002:25), as this seems to conceptualize, confirm and build upon both Lynd and Lewis’ past research.

### **Key similarities and differences between shame and guilt**

#### **Features shared by shame and guilt**

- Both fall into the class of ‘moral emotions’
  - Both are ‘self-conscious’, self-referential emotions
  - Both are negatively-balanced emotions
  - Both involve internal attributions of one sort or another
- 
- Both are typically experienced in interpersonal contexts

The negative events that give rise to shame and guilt are highly similar (frequently involving moral failures or transgressions)

**Key dimensions on which shame and guilt differ**

	<b>Shame</b>	<b>Guilt</b>
<b>Focus of evaluation</b>	Global self: “I did that horrible thing”	Specific behavior: “I <i>did</i> that horrible <i>thing</i> ”
<b>Degree of distress</b>	Generally more painful than guilt	Generally less painful than shame
<b>Phenomenological experience</b>	Shrinking, feeling small, feeling worthless, powerless	Tension, remorse, regret
<b>Operation of the ‘self’</b>	Self ‘split’ into observing and observed ‘selves’	Unified self intact
<b>Impact on ‘self’</b>	Self impaired by global devaluation	Self unimpaired by global devaluation
<b>Concern <i>vis-à-vis</i> the other</b>	Concern with others; evaluation of self	Concern with one’s effect on others
<b>Counterfactual processes</b>	Mentally undoing some aspect of the self	Mentally undoing some aspect of behavior
<b>Motivational features</b>	Desire to hide, escape, or strike back	Desire to confess, apologize, or repair

Tangney and Dearing (2002:142-149) observe that shame is not developed in isolation from others but seems to be the result of series of emotional interactions and connection that begin early in childhood, between child and parents. A child’s self-evaluation of their “global self” is indelibly shaped and

developed from 15 months to 8 years old. “Global self” is the evaluation a person has of themselves through the “lenses” by which they sense the world, i.e. significant others like family, peers, etc, approve or disapprove of them. It is suggested that the term “imposed standards” be carefully understood. It is significant to further interject that standards not be construed to be or reduced to unfair or harsh socially biased demands on unsuspecting amoral people, who once “sin” or “fail to meet” such a standard are shamed. It is purported that humankind is not designed as morally neutral beings, with an inability “to experience shame and guilt” (cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002:140). All evidence seems to point to the contrary. Humankind has a propensity for great evil and destruction. There is a need to understand and appreciate certain boundaries and standards that assist in defining their world and particularly shape moral behavior under Divine guidance and intervention.

Tangney and Dearing (2002) do not suggest that all shame is bad. Nor are they advocating that guilt is bad. Their premise is that people who may legitimately “fail” or “sin”, or “hurt” others, have developed a shame-proneness that tends to focus on them alone, even to the point of blame shifting back on to the people they have hurt. When they fail, they understand they have done wrong, and are “exposed”, “caught”, therefore, they invest their efforts into hiding or striking back. On the other hand, a person with guilt-proneness, who has failed, focuses on the actual behavior and tends to be more concerned to have remorse over the behavior and make amends. Guilt-prone people demonstrate empathy and a competence to face and deal with a transgression. It therefore seems a person’s internalized perception that manifests whether a shame-proneness or guilt-proneness exists.

They (2002:194) suggest that more than a decade of research underscores that shame and guilt are distinct emotions with very different implications for an individual’s well-being, relationships and society at large. Guilt appears to lead people in a constructive, other-orientated direction while shame, in contrast, is a moral emotion that can lead a person astray. They conclude that identifying these distinctions “is an important first step in making ours a more moral society”.

---

The sociological approach seems to lead into the next approach that seems to understand shame within a cultural-shame-honor paradigm.

#### 4.2.6. The cultural anthropological-shame-honor approach

An eclectic study will be conducted in regards to the cultural anthropological-shame-honor approach, as it appears that the approaches to understanding the biblical paradigm of shame cultures and the cultural anthropological approach are quite similar. Francis Hsu (quoted by Malina (1993:xi) states

Cultures borrow much of each other in role matters such as food, artifacts, etiquette, theories of nature, and tools for control of human beings and things. But there is little evidence that people change in any fundamental way, and as a whole, their patterns of feeling about themselves, about each other, and about the rest of the world.

Pattison (2000:54) identifies shame cultures as those that are structured around shame, honor and esteem. These cultures seem to be primarily found in the Near-Middle and Far East. What follows is a broad summary of these Eastern Cultures in terms of their understanding of shame, as compared to Western understanding.

Plevnik (1998:106-108) states that there are both civic laws and community laws/traditions that make up the core values of communities within the Middle Eastern cultures. Plevnik (1998:107-108) defines honor and shame:

Honor is a claim to worth that is publicly acknowledged. To 'have honor' is to have publicly acknowledged worth. To 'be honored' is to be ascribed worth. Shame, as the opposite of honor, is a claim that is publicly denied and repudiated. To 'be shamed' is always negative; it means to be denied or to be diminished in honor.

Honor is therefore a group value in which individuals within a group share common values, which plays a dominant role in public life. Shame is to be branded as morally and/or socially inept by the community. Neyrey (1998:3) agrees that honor and shame were pivotal values in antiquity that structured the daily lives of people around the Mediterranean world. He (2005, cf. 2000:47-55) specifically defines shame culture, which exists to this day, as one where praise in regards to an individual has been removed by a significant group because of the individuals' failure to live up to societal standards or norms. The perception of developing an internal or personal identity is foreign to the Middle Eastern Cultures (cf. Muller, 2000:48). In the Middle Eastern Cultures an individual is "the

son of...". The individual is indelibly connected to kin, community and society in general. This is a Western interpretation based on the pursuit of individualism. Capps (1993:119) identifies the Western Worldview inside and outside the church as an "ontological individualism" where individuals assume that they, as individuals, are more real than society. Neyrey (2005) goes so far as to state that shame is not a cultural issue in the Western worldview. The individualism of the Western worldview seems to have produced one generation after the next that almost seem morally shameless (cf. Moxnes, 1993:19). Neyrey (2005) observes that this is so different in the Middle Eastern cultures in that there are times when an individual may never recover from shame but it is indelibly imprinted within one's family within a community. For example, when a soldier is dishonorably discharged from the military or branded a coward. If an individual is caught stealing the right hand is cut off. To do business with the left hand is a public disgrace, because the left hand is used in Middle Eastern Cultures only in the bathroom.

Pattison (2000:55) observes that cultural approaches reveal that shame as concept and experience is variably understood in different cultures. Recent research in culture and psychological studies (Ho, et al, 2004:64-65) have identified that shame is intimately rooted in religion and ethics, and there is a perception that Christianity has shaped the understanding of shame and guilt in psychology and anthropology and there is a need to investigate shame and guilt from other traditions and cultures.

It appears that the significance of this honor-shame culture should not be overlooked by the Western worldview. Schweder (2003:2) warns that the Anglo-American understanding of shame ought to be carefully filtered through a number of determinants, especially in light of what he perceives as Western psychoanalysts', biologists', psychologists', sociologists' and anthropologists' temptation to transfer a Western presupposition of shame on different cultures. He (2003:2-4) states that shame must be viewed from a 'symbolic', 'meaning-centered' view in terms of the culture that a scientist is researching. This requires the ability to be able to decompose a complex emotional mental state such as "shame" (itself a mix of feelings, wants, values, and beliefs) into various components. In order to make judgments about similarities and differences (or equivalence) between emotion-like mental states across cultures Schweder suggests seven determinants, which will be quoted at length, in order to understand a complete emotional episode, specifically concerning a concept of shame:

1. Situational determinants: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in the antecedent conditions of the world (for example, a public display of success, exposure of the sexual parts of the body) that elicit a particular emotional response.
2. Self-appraisal features: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in the perceived implications of the emotional response for their personal identity, agency, social standing, and self-regard (for example, status loss, goal-blockage).
3. Somatic phenomenology: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in their particular bodily feelings (for example, muscle tension, shortness of breath) when experiencing the particular emotional state. These are physically-localized feelings of the body.
4. Affective phenomenology: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in their affective feelings (for example, feelings of emptiness, agitation, contractedness) when experiencing the emotional state. These are existential feelings of the self or the "soul."
5. Social appraisal: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in the extent to which displaying one's emotional state has been socially baptized a vice or virtue, a sign of sickness or health, a signal of deviance or normalcy.
6. Self-management: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in the plans for self-management (for example, to withdraw, to hide, to apologize, to confess) that are activated as part of an action routine to cope with somatic and affective feelings and with the self-appraisals that are associated with the emotional state.
7. Communication: Here one asks whether members of different cultural groups are alike or different in their iconic or symbolic vehicles (for example, facial expressions, voice quality, posture, self-descriptions) for expressing the whole package of interconnected episodic components (1-6 above).

A preliminary conclusion is that the 'culture of a community' may have a profound affect on the social monitoring of individuals (cf. Greenwald and Harder, 1998:232). There seems to be different types of functions, nuances, definitions and uses of shame other than the Western individualistic psychological shame that seems to be predominant in contemporary Western Worldviews.

Shame has not only been researched and studied in terms of approaches. Shame has also been conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms. Two major components that center around interpersonal relationships will be addressed: Shame and Addictive Behavior and Shame and Forgiveness.

#### **4.2.7. Shame and Addictive Behavior**

It seems important to discuss shame and its relationship to addictive behavior, as it seems that recent research has identified shame as a significant stumbling block that seems to hinder the addictive behavioral intervention process. Scheff (1997:205) observes that shame is recognized as a real entity in only one institutional sphere, the self-help recovery movement, which is now quite large, that grew out of Alcoholics Anonymous. Addiction seems to be understood as a substitute for interpersonal relationships. Potter-Efron and Potter-Efron, (1999:8-9), leading researchers in the scientific discipline of addictive behavior, define shame as the sign of a break in the “interpersonal bridge” the bond of friendship and trust that develops between people when they treat one another with respect. However, as Potter-Efron (2002:113) observes, human beings are unreliable, and unpredictable, sources of comfort, however, chemical substances and addictive behavior are predictable and immediate sources of comfort. Substances and addictive behavior can replace human relationships and become enmeshed into the fabric of a person suffering with shame’s identity. They (Potter-Efron and Potter-Efron, 1999:10-12; Potter-Efron and Potter-Efron, 1989:63-71) seem to identify six sources of shame, which are all connected with intra- and interpersonal relationships: biological predisposition; family of origin (cf. Bradshaw, 1988:46-60; Nakken, 1996:115-117); adult-shaming relationships; social (group) shame; depression (cf. Scheff, 2000:1-13; Meehan W, O'Connor LE, et al, 1996:125-134) and self-shaming.

They (Potter-Efron and Potter-Efron, 2002:27-38) postulate that there are four levels in which an individual lives within the shame experience:

- The presentation self (cf. 2002:28-32). There are three powerful emotional activators for the development of the presentation self which are fear, guilt, and shame. The individual seeks to

present a public image that is 'acceptable' to others (social monitoring). The individual seeks to hide shame by presenting an image of themselves that would be 'acceptable'.

- The defensive self (cf. 2002:32-33). This describes how individuals protect their most vulnerable aspects of the individual from intrusion, rejection and humiliation. The individual who experiences shame in this sphere attempts to keep others from observing them so not as to shame them further; and to live in denial of areas that may need to be faced. In terms of addictive behavior
- The comparative (evaluative) self (cf. 2002:33-44). The individual identifies a defect in their life because of comparison to someone else or a perception of how or what someone may evaluate them as. The main evaluatory-comparison question is a shame-based inquiry: "Am I good enough" Shame and pride find themselves on bi-polar spheres. People sense pride when they measure up, which can be unhealthy if this translates into narcissistic idealization. However, continuing in shame can cause a shame-addiction spiral. Potter-Efron (2002:42-46) identifies the shame-addiction spiral through the analogy of a whirlpool. Just as a whirlpool tires the person caught in it, tries to escape but eventually gives up, this seems to be true of the person caught in the shame-addiction spiral. They sense a defect in their life; feelings of shame, at the core of their self, motivate a desire to escape. Addictive Behavior is used as a mechanism or strategy to escape these feelings of shame. Initial consequences of this self-protective strategy are identified by embarrassing incidents that lead to discomfort of a perceived and actual loss of control in an area or areas of their life. This further magnifies areas of defects, which perpetuate increased shame and a greater need to escape. This develops a tolerance for and increased use of addictive substances or addictive behavior. This leads to more serious consequences actualized in humiliating incidents, which possibly result in a complete loss of control. This in turn emphasizes deeper defects. Hence the spiral continues. Shame seems to plunge a person suffering with shame into more intense addictive behavior and addictive behavior increases their shame in a constantly descending spiral (cf. 2002:114).

When individuals preoccupy themselves with their addiction and addictive behavior it seems to distract the individual from his or her shame. This is the means through which they direct their shame away from the core of their being. Potter-Efron (2002:114) suggests that people suffering from addictive behaviors have their attention drawn to understanding their core shame issues.

Potter-Efron (2002:11) identifies that if a person is suffering from shame, then addictive behavior will degrade them further by being self-consumed with their faults, or consumption with the addictive behavior itself as a form of pseudo-companionship. Perceived unconcerned consequences of abandonment of authentic human relationships they become consumed with their experience, no matter what the price that must be paid.

Some people caught in addictions use the addictive as relief and escape from shame. Others seem to embrace these addictions and addictive behavior as a validation of their worthiness, as a coping mechanism to emphasize their perceived intrinsic shamefulness. They sense they are damaged, useless, worthless and flawed, hence they use the addictive behavior as a symbol of their shame or specifically as a casual agent to indicate or portray how they feel about themselves, as emotionally wounded individuals.

The 12 Step Program of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) seemed to present, even if by default, an effective, even though imperfect, method of addressing and processing shame. AA may be described as a moral, and “explicitly based on spiritual principles”, intervention consisting of twelve inseparable steps (cf. Koenig, McCullough, and Larson, 2000:177). The Twelve steps are:

Step One: We have admitted we are powerless over alcohol, that our lives have become unmanageable.

Step Two: Came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity.

Step Three: Made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God, as we have understood Him.

Step Four: Made a searching and fearless inventory of ourselves.

Step Five: Admitted to God, to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs.

Step Six: We are entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character.

Step Seven: Humbly asked Him to remove our shortcomings.

Step Eight: Made a list of all persons we have harmed, and became willing to make amends to them all.

Step Nine: Made direct amends to such people wherever possible, except when to do so would injure them or others.

Step 10: Continued to take personal inventory and when we were wrong promptly admit it.

Step Eleven: Sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God, as we understood Him, praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out.

Step Twelve: Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these Steps, we tried to carry this message to others, and to practice these principles in all our affairs.

Recent research (cf. Hart, 1999:25-39) in psychology has provided another perspective. Recovering alcoholics who met at AA meetings in the 1940s and 1950s spent most of their time supporting each other in mutual attempts to understand and practice the planned program of spiritual growth and rediscovery embodied by the Twelve Steps.

“Unfortunately, nearly 60 years later, there is quite a large schism between what happens in the humane fellowship commonest of AA on the one side (i.e. meetings) and the spiritual component (i.e., Twelve Steps) on the other side. Thus in effect there are currently two diverging branches of AA. The first branch “authentic” AA, which concerns itself primarily with using the planned program of recovery (Twelve Steps) as a vehicle for developing a relationship with a God of one’s understanding. In contrast the “pseudo” AA because it concerns itself primarily with fostering interpersonal relationships and human power (cf. Hart, 1999:26).

It appears that AA and other recovery programs have been interpreted as a limited one-size-fits-all approach; insular in nature; ignoring medical and scientific research on addiction, its cause and effects on addressing psychological issues which may include shame, and a failure to have professional therapists as support staff (Dodes, 2002:225-227). On the other hand, there appears to be scientific and therapeutic methods that have been developed by recent researchers. Potter-Efron (2002:70-109) appears to offer practical treatment guidelines for the ‘root’ of addiction: shame. It is beyond the scope

of this paper to provide a detailed discussion on these guidelines. These eight guidelines will be mentioned in the table below.

### **Guidelines for the treatment of the 'root' of addiction: shame**

1. Never shame a person feeling shame: shame only begins to heal when it is exposed within a safe environment.
2. Regularly attend to the client/helper relationship
3. Listen and observe carefully for shame that has been hidden, bypassed, or defended.
4. Help clients accept their basic humanity through recognizing, accepting and investigating their shame
5. Link client shame with specific deficiency messages
6. Differentiate and treat the sources of shame
7. Utilize the four spheres model of shame to develop specific therapeutic tasks and goals
8. Be patient: shame heals slowly

---

A preliminary conclusion is that the connection between addictive behavior and shame is well documented in recent research. The need for an individual to process who they are in an authentic manner is critical for the recovery process (cf. Wilson and Wilson, 1992:173-175). There are some significant stumbling blocks to processing shame and that seems to hinder the addictive behavioral intervention process, which was attempted to be addressed above. Often connected with addictive

behavior and shame, is forgiveness and shame (cf. Hart, 2002). It appears that this component of shame should be researched and addressed.

#### **4.2.8. Shame and Forgiveness**

It seems recent research in forgiveness has suffered the same ‘fate’ that research in shame has, in that there does not seem to be an agreed upon definition of forgiveness. Three of these recent researchers, McCullough, Pargament and Thoresen, (2000:8) emphasize this dilemma over definition,

“No consensual definition of forgiveness exists. Indeed some interpret the lack of consensus in definition to be one of the most pernicious problems in the field today. It appears that most theorists and researchers now agree that forgiveness should be differentiated from “pardoning”...; “condoning”...; “excusing”...; “forgetting”...[and] “reconciliation”... The fact that no scholars have offered serious disputations of these distinctions in recent years suggest that real conceptual progress has been made in understanding forgiveness. Agreeing on what forgiveness is not does not necessarily mean researchers agree on what forgiveness is.”

Robert Enright (2000:29), acknowledged as the pioneer of the study of forgiveness, provides an extensive definition of forgiveness as

“People, upon rationally determining that they have been unfairly treated, forgive when they willfully abandon resentment and related responses (to which they have a right), and endeavor to respond to the wrong doer based on the moral principle of beneficence, which may include compassion, unconditional worth, generosity, and moral love (to which thy wrongdoer, by nature of the hurtful act or acts, has no right)”.

---

It seems that the affect of shame on forgiveness is significant. It seems to be clear that forgiveness research has paved the way for a number of preciously ignored constructs that needed to be researched (cf. McCullough, Pargament and Thoresen, 2000:4-11). Forgiveness is not an isolated construct but must be addressed in collaboration, and as a total entity, with the emotional-personality constructs of empathy, shame, guilt, narcissism, and anger, to mention a few. It seems, as an intrapersonal-interpersonal construct, forgiveness cannot be divorced from empathy and narcissism in particular, as

these diametrically affect a person's ability to forgive or seek forgiveness (cf. Exline and Baumeister, 2000:133-151).

Enright (2005) identifies a connection between shame, pain and forgiveness. He explains that each individual has an innate moral conscious that develops moral norms. Shame, a complex phenomena, is processed in a therapeutic manner to the degree of maturity of an individual's moral conscious and moral norms interaction when interpreting a painful event that has the potential of the experience of shame. Shame, like forgiveness, is a relational/social construct. Shame occurs when an individual wrongs or offends another's moral conscious and/or norms external to their own. Shame implies the need for another individual. Guilt on the other hand is a violation of an individual's personal, moral conscious and norms. It is an internalized phenomenon. Forgiveness, like shame, is interpersonal, in that an offense takes place between at least two people. An offense affects people in their relationships. Forgiveness is therefore social in nature (cf. McCullough, Pargament and Thoresen 2000:9). This suggests that human beings were designed to relate, and interact. People do not live in harmony with one another but knowingly or unknowingly transgress against one another. Enright states that when an offense is committed, perceived or actual, pain occurs at three levels:

Level one: the individual has the pain of being treated unjustly or betrayed

Level two: they are angry because they sense this betrayal on an emotional level

Level three: they sense shame that someone would violate their moral conscious and moral norms.

Enright (2005) observes that not all shame is forensic shame, shame based on actual wrong doing. When an individual's conscience is telling them that a person has broken a standard, it may be a perceived violation. Both parties, the perceived perpetrator and the perceived victim are interacting, filtering the event or wrong doing through the lens of their moral norms. The individual (victim) who perceives they have been wronged may demand or expect an apology. Even though some offenses may not be actual but perceived, nonetheless, an offense, perceived or otherwise, has occurred to which is personal. A perceived offense is the result of a victim perceiving the actions of an offender as being noxious, harmful, immoral or unjust. (cf. McCullough and Worthington, 1999). A perceived offense is the result of a victim perceiving the actions of an offender as being noxious, harmful, immoral or

unjust. (cf. McCullough and Worthington, 1999) An offense affects a person in their inner being. These perceptions elicit emotional responses (feelings i.e. anger, fear, resentment, bitterness, guilt, shame or compassion, empathy, understanding), motivational responses (e.g. a desire to avoid the offender or seek revenge on the offender; cognitive responses, (e.g. not to distort reality (cf. Enright, 2000:29) or choose to become hostile towards the offender, and behavioral responses (e.g. avoidance, aggression or dialogue with the offender.

Empathy, forgiveness and shame seem to be related. Tangney et al, (1999:4) are correct in observing that in current forgiveness literature empathy has received the most attention (cf. McCullough, Sandage and Worthington, 1997). This emphasis, though, should not be ignored, as it is significant for understanding the construct of shame. Empathy may be defined as an injured or offended person identifying with the offending individual, realizing that they are also humans capable of making mistakes (cf. Newberg, et al, 2000:104). The ability for an offended person to see the offender in a more complex way, as possessing both strengths and weakness, enables intrapersonal growth, both cognitively and emotionally to take place (cf. Malcolm and Greenberg, 2000:180-181). It seems reasonable to suggest that an empathetic person focuses more on the transgressor, than the transgression (Worthington and Wade, 1999:7). However, if a shame-prone person offends or transgresses against another person, he/she focuses on himself or herself and not on the specific transgression, nor on the resultant hurt or injury caused to another human being. They seek to preserve, however falsely, their own sense of identity by nurturing their own "loss" of face, by transgressing. It is as if they become the victim. It can be speculated that as the transgressor will not seem likely to connect with the person they have hurt, but rather justify, excuse, hide, withdraw or strike back, which are all defensive shaming techniques (cf. McCullough, Sandage and Worthington, 1997:173-174). On the other hand if the shame-prone person has been transgressed against, it can be speculated that the above strategies will come into play, but with even more potency. The shame-prone person could now justifiably "lick their wounds" and attempt to make the transgressor pay explicitly, i.e. repeat the transgression to others, or implicitly rehearse the transgression inwardly and make them pay by destructive behavior that continually reminds the transgressor of what they have done. It seems that a shame-prone person who lacks empathy is much less inclined to forgive and seek forgiveness. Exline and Baumeister (2000:142-143) observe four specific characteristics or strategies of the shame-prone perpetrator that may prevent an attitude of repentance and/or confession. One, shame-prone people are not likely to be repentant of wrong doing because their perception of their entire self is viewed as 'bad', and because they are exposed by their wrong deed they attempt to hide or blame others. Two, they may

be reluctant to openly take responsibility for the misdeed. Three, shame-prone individuals may also view themselves as, narcissistically, morally good, therefore seeking to avoid admitting to an immoral act or having caused pain to another. Four, the wrong doing may require a public apology or confession, which may be interpreted or perceived as too humiliating. Repentance and expressing shame, (cf. Enright, 2005) requires humility, therefore the shame prone person will not repent but attack both the 'victim' and those they may perceive as threatening them.

Forgiveness, like the processing of shame, is complex and takes time. It is a process, not an event. It cannot be forced or rushed. There seems to be no guarantee that forgiveness may always take place. Enright (2005) warns that although the Biblical paradigm is one of the most effective paradigms for understanding and processing forgiveness and shame it must be used in a temperate way. Just because the biblical paradigm is an effective paradigm, forgiveness cannot be legislated. It takes time for the message of forgiveness to settle in. In light of forgiveness and shame taking place within a social context, to be truly effective it must be modeled by the community in love. Authentic love 'covers' the shamed individual with interpersonal relationships that connects and promotes a sense of identity and value.

It is significant that the medical field (Mediconf, 2004) recently has seen the need to address the relevance between shame and forgiveness with the scope of professional health and caregivers. However, it appears that connecting and addressing shame and forgiveness from a medical point has its limitations. Recent research has suggested that shame (Ho, 2004:64) and forgiveness (Rye, Pargament, Ali, et al, 2000:17-40) have their roots in religion. Yanke (1998:1) argues from various scientific researches in psychological literature that researchers are sensing the limitations of secular models of psychology in addressing people's deepest problems and encouraged counselors to attend to clients' theistic beliefs in the helping process. He (1998:1) quotes Berenson who stated that "the most underutilized resource in family therapy today is God".

A preliminary conclusion seems to be that forgiveness is a significant component for addressing the experience of shame which appears to include, among others, understanding perceived and actual shame in light of forgiveness and barriers that shame may create to forgiveness.

### 4.3. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION – A SUGGESTED CRITIQUE

This chapter has attempted to broadly address six approaches and two components of shame research. The approaches within the various scientific academic disciplines that were summarized: the psychoanalytic approach; the “self-psychology” approach; the bio-innate-psychological approach; the affect-cognitive approach; the sociological approach; the cultural-anthropological honor-shame approach. In view of shame being conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms, two major components that center around interpersonal relationships were addressed: Shame and Addictive Behavior, and Shame and Forgiveness.

It appears that each of these approaches provide some understanding to the experience of shame, and also carry limitations. A basic critique of these meta-theoretical approaches will be attempted as to the contributions and limitations of each approach to an understanding of shame

#### 4.3.1. The psychoanalytic approach

The psychoanalytic approach appeared to define shame as a drive inhibitor, and a failure to live up to the ideal self (Freud) or libidinal drives that find expression in exhibitionism and voyeurism (Wurmser); that the beginnings of shame may enter from infancy or at least in the second year (Erikson); that there seemed to be an acute fear of abandonment and emotional starvation from an ideal object or individual that is desired (Peirs and Singer); that the prevalence of shame that dominated most psychotherapeutic work in that feeling traps that emotionally entangled the patient and the therapist; that unacknowledged shame may result in various defense mechanisms (Lewis).

#### Contributions

Christian counselor Gary Collins (1986:3-4) observed almost twenty years ago that psychologists (and psychoanalysts) are influential in mental hospitals, industries, schools and military establishments. They are used by politicians to sell themselves, and by prisons to access and rehabilitate inmates. All the social issues of the day, ecology, aging, violence, and other human pathology are studied by this scientific discipline.

This is remarkable progress when one realizes that scientific psychology is one hundred years old

The scientific discipline of psychoanalysts has made several contributions to an understanding of shame.

- The identification that unconsciously drives impulses and fear may motivate conscious thought and behavior. Shame is an internal tension that is often suppressed. Freud's proposal of dreams is significant for understanding the suppression of shame that may find expression in dreams (or nightmares (cf. Lansky, 2004)) and pathological behavior.
- Freud's theory of defense mechanism that unconscious responses protect individuals from unpleasant emotions is significant to the study of shame. It is suggested that defense mechanisms appear to involve mental manipulation and self-deception, the deceiving of others to avoid the reality of shame. This agenda at distorting reality may be done through repression, denial, protection, rationalization, justifying, et al. This defense mechanism seems to be identified in Lewis' findings of unacknowledged or by-passed shame that may result in various (destructive) mechanisms that further intensifies shame and harm relationships
- An understanding of the developmental stages of children into adults seems imperative to an understanding shame. Erikson, building on Freud's work, focused on the elements that made up both a healthy and unhealthy view of an individual's identity. Erikson identified shame as an inhibitor to identity development taking place in the early years of a child's life. Erikson's 'eight states of man' introduced the need for human beings to identify and resolve the psychosocial 'crisis' or choices that, if left unresolved, may cause the individual to pursue a negative direction throughout life. One of these 'crises' was shame that could not be left unattended.
- The emphasis of the affect of a child's family of origin appears to have a profound effect on the emotional, cognitive and behavioral well being of the child is an important contribution of the psychoanalytical approach. A child seems to form his/her identity and sense of self worth, or lack thereof, within the environment of his/her home. Recent research has attested that shame-prone internal identities seem to be formed in shame-prone family systems (cf. Lansky, 1992:3-80; Harper and Hoopes, 1990:1-114; Middleton-Moz, 1990:3-66; Fossum and Mason, 1986:3-58).

- The emphasis on the client-therapist interface is a vital contribution of the psychoanalytical approach. It seem to focus on the reality of the individual who had value and a historical compass, a personal history that explains and contributes to the interpretation of the individual's present dilemma. It appears that an individual's shame has a historical compass that ought to be navigated with skill.
- The reality of transference and counter-transference of shame between a patient and therapist. The significance of this may further empathize that if this may take place within the context of counseling or therapy how much more could the transference and counter-transference of shame take place within every day relationships within micro- and macro-relational contexts. This contribution is vital as it alerts both the professional and the layperson to reality and powerful influence of their shame and that of others within the interface of relationships.

### **Limitations**

- A discussion of Freud's rejection of religion and its profound affect upon the entire scientific disciplines with human sciences cannot be overlooked. Koenig, McCullough and Larson (2001:61) quote primary sources from Freud's works, i.e. *Obsessive Acts and Religious practices* (1907) in which he reduced religious observances by which the religious people give expression of their piety as rituals of the obsessive acts of the neurotic. *Totem and Taboo* (1913) and *Psychoanalysis and Religious Origins* (1919) Freud developed his Psychoanalytical theory of religion. His best-known work, *The Future of an Illusion* (cf. Freud, 1927\1962), written by him at age 70, synthesized all his writings on religion. Freud believed religion would eventually cease to exist because, nothing could withstand treason and experience and religion contradicts these. He rejected religion as an illusion, a response to the experience of utter helplessness or dependency, a compulsive neurosis; something people can outgrow (cf. Braungardt, 2002:4; Freud, 1927\1962:42-43). It appears that Freud was a product of his age. His attempt to debase religion seemed to be an assault on institutionalized religion, and specifically Christianity.
- It is without question that religion particularly within Christianity may have intensified, and not adequately addressed, shame within the lives of individuals and families within local churches (cf. Arterburn and Felton, 2001:9-18; Wright, 2001:17-60). In contrast it has been authenticated by scientific research that human thought, personality and drives cannot be reduced to biological

determinism. Recent research acknowledged the connection between depression and shame (cf. Scheff, 2000). Recent research (Baetz, Griffin, Bowen, et al, 2004:818-822) has also demonstrated the positive significance of religion and spirituality on depression. It is suggested that religion and spirituality may have an important therapeutic contribution to make in addressing shame. McMinn (1996:45-60 cf. Koenig, McCullough and Larson, 2001; Matthews, 1998:1-12) advocates for an intra-disciplinary approach in order to assist the patient towards psychological and spiritual health. The Christian identifies the drive-instinctual model as limiting because it in no way reflects the *imago Dei*, but emphasizes a mechanistic view of humankind. It is purported that addressing shame in the scope and domain of the self must include the inner spiritual life as an integrative part of the whole (cf. Partridge and Elliot, 2001:117-173, Elliott, 2001:222-251).

- This seems imperative particularly for the holistic development of children and adolescents. Recent research (Elkins and Cavendish, 2004:179-184) in the medical community attests to this point that there exists a correlation between the meaning of spirituality that is evident during times of crisis and the role that it may play on a daily basis affecting overall health,

At different stages in a child's life, spirituality has different meanings. Spirituality and religious traditions are intertwined. Beliefs provide for the child's moral development, socialization, personality development, and behavior. The child's beliefs are greatly influenced by caregivers. Spirituality provides positive coping when the child is ill or dying, and the child and parents do not feel alone (Elkins and Cavendish, 2004:180).

It is suggested that in terms of addressing shame in the life of a child and adolescent that spirituality plays a significant role that the psychoanalytical approach seems to ignore.

#### **4.3.2. The 'self psychology' approach**

##### **Contributions**

- The research and emphasis on narcissism as a shame-based disorder is an important contribution in self-psychology (Kohut and Morrison). When the definition and the multifaceted

dynamics of narcissism are understood they have profound implications for the study of shame. Narcissism may be defined as

“Self-admiration that is characterized by tendencies towards grandiose ideas, exhibitionism, and defensiveness in response to criticism; interpersonal relationships that are characterized by feelings of entitlement, exploitativeness, and a lack of empathy.” (Emmons, 2000:159)

Tangney and Dearing (2002:72) are correct in observing that shame and narcissism share a common focus on self-related issues. A narcissistic person has an intrapersonal sense of entitlement and lacks empathy. These translate into the following characteristics (Emmons, 2000:163)

- 1) They believe they are entitled to special rights and privileges, whether earned or not.
- 2) They are demanding and selfish
- 3) They expect special favors without assuming reciprocal responsibilities and express surprise and anger when others do not do what they want.
- 4) They fail to recognize the desires, needs and feelings of others. When recognized, the subjective experiences of others are viewed as weakness they can exploit.
- 5) They seek opportunities to exploit others as a means to self-fulfilling ends.
- 6) They have fragmented and vulnerable self-esteem.
- 7) There is a deep need and demand for personal admiration.
- 8) They are hypersensitive to “injury” from criticism, failure, humiliation or offending others.

It has been sufficiently established and proven by research that narcissism is a shame-based disorder and has a profound affect on intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships (cf. Tangney and Dearing, 2002:72-76).

- The recognition of Kohut of understanding the self as more than simply a self concept or self image, but an agent and center of activity. For Kohut, within the human being lay a primitive core of spontaneity that exists within them a "life beyond the pleasure principle," which strives for self-expression (cf. Susseke, 2004:2).
- It is suggested that Kohut's understanding of the dynamic interface of the success and failure of parent-child relationships is a significant contribution. Kohut assumes that children vacillate equally between two poles in development: The first is referred to as the "grandiose self", in which childhood illusions place children in the center. The other pole is the "idealized parent imago", which is regarded as omnipotent and all-controlling, and the perfection of which the child would like to share by means of merging. In the development process, the child thus always goes back and forth between the desire for acknowledgement and love for his or her own achievements (or his/her personality) and the idealization of the parents by wishing to become exactly as they are. It is suggested that Kohut's understanding of these relationship would assist in understanding a child's emotional and relational development to those in authority or leadership at school or work is indispensable.

### **Limitations**

- This approach, because it is closely associated with the psychoanalytical approach seems to reduce human motives to instinctual drives (see The Psychoanalytical approach, Limitations.). Although Kohut did understand the need for a human being's need for self-expression, he accepted Freud's model of instinctual drives.
- A very real problem in counseling or therapy is, as a strategy to by-pass shame, when the patient continues to dwell and live in the past, blaming a parent for failing as nurturer, provider and role model.
- Self-psychology seems to reduce and limit the therapeutic technique to a patient-therapist model. There seems to be no or limited emphasis on the importance of community in addressing shame. Furthermore transference and counter-transference between patient and therapist is a very real danger. The idolizing or blaming of the therapist by the patient seems to be a strong probability

because of this closed environment of therapy. This may even produce further narcissism that may severely impact the patient's family or those close to them

### **4.3.3. The bio-innate-psychological approach**

#### **Contributions**

- Tomkins and Nathansons' concepts challenged the Freudian drive theories of psychoanalysis and the principles of behaviorism and cognition. His development of the theory of a series of innate primary (positive and negative) affects, the features that identified them, and their development and their significant role in the life of an individual, focused on the uniqueness of an individual and his/her particular response to the environment around him/her.
- Tomkins and Nathanson seem to emphasize the universality of an innate basic shame reaction and account for how it is shaped into a complex emotion (cf. Pattison, 2000:59). Tomkins' shame-humiliation as an affect auxiliary because it requires the presence of, and exists only in the terms of other affects, emphasized the reality of shame within each individual as affected by response to relationships.
- The bio-innate-psychological approach emphasizes the relational nature of shame and its practical-adaptive function in guiding the individual through social life (Pattison, 2000:59).
- Tomkins' extensive study on facial expressions is helpful in describing various non-verbal signals as to suggesting an individual's emotional state. Tomkins identified the dropping of the eyes or eyes down, the head down and averted, and blushing as facial expressions of shame.
- Nathan's 'shame compass' seems to be an effective diagnostic tool in identifying various strategies to facing shame. The uniqueness of an individual's personality may determine their reaction when experiencing shame, i.e. Withdrawal, Attack others, Attack themselves, or Avoidance.

## Limitations

- The idea that shame is an innate affect system has been criticized as unscientific (Lewis, 2005). In a brief but pointed critique of affect theory, Davidson (2003:129-130) identifies “seven sins in the study of emotion” as corrected by affective neuroscience. It is beyond the scope of the thesis to study these, however, it is significant to mention them for further study. These “sins” are

Sin 1: Affect and cognition are sub-served by separate and independent neural circuits.

Sin 2: Affect is sub-cortical.

Sin 3: Emotions are in the head.

Sin 4: Emotions can be studied from a purely psychological perspective.

Sin 5: Emotions are similar in structure across both age and species.

Sin 6: Specific emotions are instantiated in discrete locations of the brain.

Sin 7: Emotions are conscious feeling states.

- Gilbert (1998:5) observes that interruptions to goals, plans and positive affects can cause many other emotions, and even exclude the emotion of shame. Shame on the other hand is more likely to result from a loss of positive affect that has implications for the individual’s evaluation of him or herself.
- Nathanson does not go far enough in terms of discussing emotions in terms of social situation, when he reduces it to a neuro-chemical, a substance secreted in the ancient sub-cortical portion of the brain, and that earlier in evolution before the development of the ‘higher centers’ of cognition, all that shame affect did was turn off positive affects, but the more complex the brain became the more functions came to be influenced by shame. It seems that emotions are reduced to have evolved from a low state to more complex states. Human beings are more than just emotional

beings. Human beings' inner lives are made up of complex integrative components, which include emotions, thoughts, soul, volition, spirit and spiritual aspects.

#### **4.3.4. The affect-cognitive approach**

##### **Contribution**

- Shame is understood as a self-conscious emotion. An individual requires a cognitive capacity for self-awareness to process his/her values and norms. This is an important contribution to an understanding of a development of shame as it focuses on the unique individuality of a person and his/her ability to develop personal convictions, which may be used as a restraint (positive shame) which guards them against destructive behavior.
- An awareness in relationships of this individual development of norms and values may enhance relationships as they become sensitive to another person's (or shared) norms and values. The cognitive approach motivates that individuals think through their contribution when accused. For example, if a husband is blamed by his wife for violating a specific norm that both hold, but he is innocent, he would not sense shame because as he processes the accusation there is no internal self blame, therefore there is no need for shame. However, if he has violated this norm, there is a failure of the self to comply and a need to repair (which is a process of facing guilt).
- The affect-cognitive approach seems to understand that object self-awareness is one aspect of the individual's inner system and that this system of integrative thoughts and emotions can operate without paying objective to other states (i.e. emotive states). Therefore, shame can, and does, exist even when an individual is not "thinking" about it.

##### **Limitation**

- As with the other approaches the affect-cognitive paradigm fails to recognize the significance of the spiritual "state" in understanding the complex nature of shame.

#### 4.3.5. The sociological approach

##### Contributions

- An important contribution of the sociological approach is that it suggests that shame must not be reduced to an individual significance. An individual's social environment and their relationships to significant others have a bearing on their shame.
- Shame seems to be an emotional pivot of social life since it underlies social order and the development of a child's identity in relationship to themselves and others.
- The systemic understanding of the 'part/whole' aspect of shame in that shame does not exist in a vacuum but within a social construct or context.
- The experience of shame acting almost as a diagnostic tool for revealing 'who and what' an individual is, which provides important indicators to those around them, is important. Shame can provide a positive barometer especially as when an individual determinates between shame and guilt in their relationship with others.
- The identification of cues and defense mechanisms of by-passed shame is crucial to an understanding of shame in relationships.

##### Limitations

- It appears that the sociological approach reduces individual shame to interpersonal and social criteria. If shame is viewed from a global perspective alone, an individual may live life within the boundaries of social monitoring wondering what others think of them as the foundation for their existence. For Scheff shame operates to support the social bond, where attunement or mutual understanding exists. It would have been helpful if the sociological approach included the development of individual spirituality for the sake of community because individual shame does not seem to be restricted to interpersonal relationships on a human level but also an individual's relationships to God on a spiritual level.

- Interestingly for Scheff, even though shame is the master emotion, by-passed or unacknowledged shame does not involve much feeling, but rather a brief powerful feeling that is flowed by a lengthy episode of obsessive thought. Lewis believes that the feeling of shame becomes repressed. Shame does not seem to be a feeling that lasts for a minimum time to be replaced by other feelings, but seems to actually intensify other feelings and even thoughts.

#### **4.3.6. The cultural anthropological honor-shame**

##### **Contributions**

- This approach appears to imply a universality of shame. Wherever humankind exists, there will be a sense of internalized and social monitoring because shame is both a personal and interpersonal phenomenon.
- This approach appears to suggest that shame may begin from one's family origin as parents introduce social norms from birth.
- This approach seems to assist Western workers, missionaries, caregivers, et al, in foreign countries to be sensitive to different cultural standards, norms, and etiquette that signal shame. There appears to be several determinants that may assist in developing an understanding and sensitivity towards different cultures.
- It appears that shame may assist in restraining pathological behavior; especially of those who may develop narcissistic tendencies that could possibly bring harm to a community. Community is held in high regard in Middle Eastern and Eastern cultures, which are 'foreign' and almost lost in Western cultures where individualism has produced a lack of positive shame.

##### **Limitations**

- There is a tendency to define Western cultures as 'guilt' cultures and Middle Eastern and Far eastern cultures as 'shame' cultures. Recent research (Zimmerling, 2003:1-14) appears to

dispute this as there seems to be no evidence to challenge the view that shame everywhere is produced by self-blame following an important failure of the individual. It was suggested above (introduction) that shame is a universal emotion that is among the most painful of all human experiences in any culture around the world and stands at the center of an individual's emotional life (cf. Ho, Fu and Ng, 2004:64; Lewis, 2004:634).

- What does not appear to be universal is the nature of the internalized standards, rules and goals whose violation precipitates shame. This approach seems to sacrifice individual understanding of shame at the expense of emphasizing social shame.
- There does not seem to be much discussion, in light of globalization, the potential for negative legalistic control in homes of children conditioned by shame and its affect of their ability to adapt to a Western worldview and socialization.

#### **4.3.7. Shame and Addictive Behavior**

##### **Contribution**

- The 12-Step Program of Alcoholics Anonymous appears to be a method of addressing and processing shame.
- Research seems to have taken the reality of shame seriously in addressing addictive behavior as a key, perhaps the main reason for addictive behavior.

##### **Limitations**

- The contribution of the 12-Step recovery programs may be their limitation in that they even though they appear to be a spiritual organization, the depth and effectiveness of this spirituality may be limited. Research has demonstrated that patients attending religious programs were “almost ten times as likely as those attending non-religious programs to remain abstinent” from addictive behavior” (Matthews 1998:26). Eighty nine percent of alcoholics interviewed had lost interest in religion as an adolescent. While these statistics cannot be verified they do seem to

point to the significance of religious based recovery intervention programs. Matthews (1998:108) is correct in stating that the need for the Western person suffering from addiction and addictive behavior to remain in control, and seek to retain their autonomy and individualism, does provide a stumbling block to accepting their powerlessness over their addiction. It was suggested (3.2.7.) that addictive behavior is an attempt to by pass or 'hide' or 'disguise' shame. The ability to confront shame requires humility, not individualism. When recovery does take place effectively, Matthew postulates (cf. 1998:108-109), it seems frequently promoted by profound spiritual change, such as religious conversion and spiritual growth as people attempt to deal with their addictions, and it implies shame.

- Any recovery program must be aware of the 'feeling trap' it could cultivate in that the person suffering from addictive behavior is trapped in 'compulsive confession'. They never move beyond their difficulties from the past, as they relive them each meeting.
- They never process or work through personal shame because they never confess to the people they may have hurt. Their shame remains because they have injured someone in community, and may not sense they can face community.

#### **4.3.8. Shame and Forgiveness**

##### **Contributions**

- Recent research in the construct of forgiveness has seen an important connection between unforgiveness and shame. Unforgiveness may be attributed to strategies to unacknowledged shame: bitterness, resentment, blame, et al.
- Recent researchers have identified four specific characteristics or strategies of shame-prone perpetrators that may prevent an attitude of repentance and/or confession. One, shame-prone people are not likely to be repentant of wrong doing because of self-protection. Two, they may be reluctant to openly take responsibility for the misdeed. Three, shame-prone individuals may also view themselves as, narcissistically, morally good. Four, the wrong

doing may require a public apology or confession, which may be interpreted or perceived as too humiliating

- Researchers have also studied the significant therapeutic connection between repentance and expressing shame.
- It seems that shame is an intra- and interpersonal phenomenon, like forgiveness. It appears that researchers have identified that a person suffering with shame may need to seek forgiveness from someone close to them.
- There seems to be an emphasis on the process and the fact that processing shame takes time.

#### **Limitation**

- There does not seem to appear to be any limitations in the process itself. The limitations seem to rest in the individual suffering from shame who may not wish to seek forgiveness.

#### **4.4. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION**

This chapter attempted to study the recent and past research that have provided a rich contribution and has identified the integrated theories, components and mechanisms in researching shame. There appears to be a wide variety of shame theories that are rooted in different schools of thought, which include psychoanalytic theories; self-psychological theories; affect-cognitive theories; cognitive-behavioral theories; developmental-psychological theories; sociological theories; and cultural-anthropological theories. This chapter was limited to broadly addressing six approaches and two components of shame research. The approaches within the various scientific academic disciplines that were summarized: the psychoanalytic approach; the “self-psychology” approach; the bio-innate-psychological approach; the affect-cognitive approach; the sociological approach; and the cultural-anthropological honor-shame approach. Shame research does not seem to be limited to these different theories or approaches, but it has also been conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms of which shame and addictive behavior and shame and forgiveness were considered.

Each of these theories, components and mechanisms appear to have made significant contributions and limitations to understanding shame.

Zerfass (Heitink, 1999:113-114) states that practical theology starts from a concrete and unsatisfactory praxis, which is first examined from the basis of the social sciences, as has been attempted in this chapter. “Tensions become visible, leading to the impulses to act, with a view to renewal and improvement of the existing praxis. Practical Theology has the task to lead in this process of change in a way that is responsible from the perspective of both theology (Chapter two) and the social sciences (Chapter three).” Before presenting a practical-theoretical proposal, the theoretical contribution of the basis-theoretical and meta-theoretical contributions of these components of shame would be static without the “real-life” qualitative contribution of empirical research. The next chapter will attempt to present the empirical research of a qualitative study.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **EMPIRICAL QUALITATIVE STUDY**

#### **5.1. INTRODUCTION**

Chapter five will attempt to assess the qualitative empirical research studies. This chapter is concerned with data accumulated through a typed personal interview of nine individuals who have suffered from shame. This chapter is divided into two sections. Section one describes the parameters of the qualitative study in the form of the questionnaire. Section two will attempt to summarize and evaluate each part of the questionnaire in order to accent relevant findings within each individual's life narrative and experience in relationship to shame.

#### **5.2. THE PARAMETERS OF THE INTERVIEWS**

This section provides an outline as to the design and parameters of the questionnaire as developed by this researcher.

##### **5.2.1 The design of the questionnaire**

The parameters of the interview are defined by means of a questionnaire, which was given to each individual approximately a week before the interview. The parameters of the interviews were laid out as follows:

### **A questionnaire**

A questionnaire was developed which was comprised of four parts:

- A cover letter outlining the motivation and process of the interview;
- A page of “an acknowledgement of participation and permission to publish” which was to be signed by both the client and the author of this thesis, who conducted the interviews;
- A “section one” which dealt with one introductory question to state the client’s gender and a list of questions pertaining their family history and spiritual history; and
- A “section two” which was divided into three sections:
  - the client’s interpersonal relationships,
  - the client’s significant relationships, and
  - the client’s spiritual life and particular shame. This section was divided into five parts using the acronym S.H.A.M.E.. Each part was given a title and an explanation.

### **A caution**

The design of the interviewing process was not to further shame the clients, therefore they were informed that they could answer only the questions they felt comfortable in answering. The dynamic of this would assist in understanding the shame of the client.

### **The interview**

A mutually-agreeable time was arranged in which the researcher and the client addressed the questionnaire. The following criteria governed each interview:

- A place for the interview was determined that was comfortable for the client

- A signed copy of the “acknowledgement of participation and permission to publish” was given to the researcher.
- The researcher provided reassurance of the confidential nature of the interview and identity of the client. Clients will be referred to as Client A, Client B, etc.
- A cordial atmosphere of questioning, guided by the questionnaire, then took place over a one-hour period.
- A question was asked of each client at the end of the session: “If you were to say that this was a profitable use of your time, please give a reason?”
- The interviews took place on the following days outlined in the table below

<b>Client</b>	<b>Date of interview</b>
Client A	23 March, 2005
Client B	1 April, 2005
Client C	29 March, 2005
Client D	1 April, 2005
Client E	2 April, 2005
Client F	28 March, 2005
Client G	28 March, 2005
Client H	1 April, 2005
Client I	3 April, 2005

### 5.2.2 The questionnaire

This section provides the outline of the questionnaire that was given to the nine clients. It is suggested that its inclusion of the questionnaire in this chapter, rather than in an appendix maintains the flow of the chapter and provides an immediate pre-understanding of the assessment of the accumulative data.

Dear .....

#### *Participation in an empirical research study*

Thank you for taking the time to read this cover letter. I am presently working on a Doctorate Degree in Practical Theology at **North-West University** in South Africa. My thesis is: "Shame: A Pastoral Study". I am required to do empirical research for the degree. What this means is that I am required to do a practical study with people who have gone through the experience and challenge of shame.

After some discussion with you I thought it opportune to ask you to participate in such an enriching study. I assure you that this will not just be a sterile academic exercise. As your Pastor, it is my objective for this to be personally relevant and enriching to you.

There will be some strict guidelines so as to protect your identity. Please be ensured that this study will be totally **confidential and private**. You do not need to reveal your name, age or occupation.

#### *The procedure in the empirical research*

You will be given a list of guiding questions divided into two major sections. Section one will deal with one introductory question to state your gender and a list of questions pertaining to your family history and spiritual history. Section two is divided into three sections: your interpersonal relationships, significant relationships and your spiritual life and particular shame. Each section will be self-explanatory.

Important: Although complete openness will assist in the development of this study, please do not feel obligated to answer every question.

#### *The benefit of this empirical research study*

Your participation will play a significant role in helping others through this often lonely and painful reality of shame in their lives. It is my prayer that people battling with shame enter into a redemptive community where people do not only heal but are equipped and encouraged to come in along side others with biblical and relevant resources so they may take God's next step for their lives.

My deepest appreciation for taking the time to consider this important study. If you choose to participate please fill in the attached indemnity form which will give me permission to use your particular answers in publish my findings.

In His service with you,

Pastor Craig Brannan

**Acknowledgement of participation  
and permission to publish**

I \_\_\_\_\_ (please print), being ensured by **Craig Brannan** that this study will be totally confidential and private and that my name, age and occupation will be never be disclosed without my expressed consent, willfully participate in this questionnaire and research study. I further give **Craig Brannan** permission to use the data in his Ph.D.-thesis within the boundaries herein specified.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Craig Brannan (Researcher) \_\_\_\_\_

## **Section 1**

**Please feel free to answer on the reverse side of this questionnaire or on a separate piece of paper.**

### **1. Please state your gender**

### **2. Family History**

- 1) What was your parents' marital status?
- 2) Did other family members live permanently in your home whilst you were growing up?
- 3) Who controlled the home environment and could you be more explicit?
- 4) How did your family deal with conflicts?
- 5) Who were you attached to emotionally more and why?
- 6) Were you held physically growing up?
- 7) Were you affirmed emotionally growing up?
- 8) Would you consider yourself growing up in a hostile or nurturing home?
- 9) What were some common or often repeated negative phrases in your home growing up?
- 10) Do you believe that your home had double standards growing up?
- 11) What would you consider your parents to be addicted to either chemically or behaviorally?
- 12) Did you hear your parents criticize others openly? If so, what were some of the common criticisms you heard?

- 13) Outside of your family, who had the profoundest influence on your life and in what way?
- 14) If you could change three things about your home, what would they be?
- 15) Other comments:

### **3. Spiritual History**

Growing up:

- 1) What religious background do you come from?
- 2) Has this religious background changed? Please explain
- 3) Describe your understanding of God?
- 4) Who helped to shape your understanding of God?
- 5) Describe how you understood what Christ has done for you?
- 6) How did you understand personal suffering and suffering in the world?
- 7) What don't you like about religion?
- 8) Have you ever blamed God for anything?
- 9) If you could ask God to change three things in your life, what would they be?
- 10) Other comments:

## Section 2

### 1. Personal relationships

- 1) What is your marital status?
  - 2) What would you consider your greatest fear in terms of relationships?
  - 3) If you sensed you were losing control of a situation what was your immediate temptation or response?
  - 4) Presently, when you sense you are losing control of a situation what is your immediate temptation or response?
  - 5) Do you isolate yourself from certain individuals or groups of people? Explain.
  - 6) Have you ever had someone in your life that lovingly confronts you biblically and tells you the truth about yourself?
  - 7) Define how you understand the word intimacy (“into-me-see”)?
  - 8) Do you now have a sense of fulfillment about life?
  - 9) Other comments:
-

## **2. Significant relationships**

- 1) What regrets do you have in your relationships?
- 2) Do you need approval from others and if so what do you do to gain approval?
- 3) Are projects or relationships more important to you? Why?
- 4) Do you idealize certain people? Explain.
- 5) Would you consider yourself a demanding person?
- 6) Do you think you have a tendency to manipulate people at times?
- 7) To “get away from everything” what certain habits or “escapes” do you have?
- 8) Do you expect people to be there for you?
- 9) Do you believe people should “pay” if they hurt you?
- 10) Other comments:

## **3. Spiritual relationships and Shame**

There seem to be 5 stages that involve shame in the life of an individual. Shame seems to affect many other feelings, such as worry, insecurity, fears, anger, bitterness, etc. These stages will be described by using practical acronym **S.H.A.M.E.** Not all these stages or elements in these stages may relate to your past or present situation. Please only address the questions that are relevant to you.

**Stage one - Spiritual foundation**

**Explanation: It is proposed that our ultimate struggle in life is to connect spiritually with God. However, there are attitudes inside us that can often form a barrier between ourselves and God. It is vital to understand where we are at this point of time in our relationship with Him.**

- 1) At what age were you made aware of “God”?
- 2) How was “sin” described to you?
- 3) What understanding did you develop regarding “sin”?
- 4) What do you understand as “destructive attitudes”?
- 5) Have you ever doubted God’s goodness and if so, how did this affect your relationship to Him?
- 6) Have you ever thought that God was holding back something from you that were preventing your happiness? What was it?
- 7) Have you ever attempted to find satisfaction in your life without God’s guidance? Please explain briefly.
- 8) What would you regard as an ultimate struggle/s in your life? Please explain briefly.
- 9) Can you identify or articulate a “process” or “procedure” you seem to follow when you think anddo things wrong?
- 10) Please provide a definition of shame? - - - - -
- 11) Has anything happened to you that caused you to experience personal shame? (you do not have to give details)

**Stage two – Hindrances to facing inner attitudes and external behavior**

**Explanation: There are some personal hindrances or barriers we will erect in order not to face who we really are on the inside.**

- 1) Do you use any strategies not to face shame, embarrassment or insecurities in your life?
- 2) If so what are these strategies?
- 3) Do you ever sense that other people are judging you? Please explain.
- 4) What defenses have you developed in your life so that no one gets to you or keep others at a distance?
- 5) If God was to look at your past and now your present with you and asked: “Where are you?”
- 6) “Do you know that you are spiritually naked?” “Why are you like this?” how would you answer these questions. Past and Present.
- 7) What patterns of behavior have you carried over from your childhood?
- 8) Is there a specific destructive attitude (unforgiveness, bitterness, anger, et al) that you seem to nurture that you know must be dealt with?

**Stage three - Attempts to cover shame**

**Explanation: Stage three focuses on interpersonal strategies to further cover forensic and global shame.**

- 1) What do you understand by the word, “blame-shifting”?
- 2) Do you ever find yourself blaming others? If so, in what circumstances?
- 3) Have you ever battled with anything about the way you look?
- 4) What do you understand by the word, “self-deception”?
- 5) In what ways, if any, have you deceived yourself?
- 6) In what ways have you deceived others?
- 7) Are there any addictive behaviors that you have or are currently battling with?
- 8) Do you find that you lack empathy towards others? Please explain
- 9) Do you battle with bitterness towards others? Please explain
- 10) Do you ever feel insecure around certain people? Please explain.

**Stage four - Motivated to cultivate a false community**

**Explanation: This focuses on the development of a false community. We all have a need to belong. Humankind is designed for community. However, if we have not worked through our inner problems this community can often be developed on the basis of selfish engagement that either anesthetizes our pain or we hide behind.**

- 1) Are you or have you ever been attracted to what you knew was a “wrong crowd”?
- 2) How did you know this community was destructive?
- 3) Did you ever gossip about others in this group?
- 4) Did you find that this group rehashed the same issues?
- 5) What destructive attitudes characterized this group?
- 6) Was this group honoring God and promoting service to others that pointed them to God? Please explain.
- 7) Why was it difficult to leave this group?
- 8) Was this group alienated from others? Could anyone join this group and be made to feel welcome?
- 9) Did you find that there was “compulsive confession”?
- 10) Was anyone slandered in the group?
- 11) Who lead the group?

### **Stage 5 - Experience God's empathy and covering**

**Explanation: Authentic change comes from authentic covering that is found in Jesus Christ. God wants to change your life. Even if He has, it is worth checking to ensure that you are following the "A-E of Covering"**

- 1) Do you admit that you are powerless to change these attitudes in and of oneself?
- 2) Do you have the courage to articulate precisely your destructive attitudes and potential reasons for them? Please explain.
- 3) Do you understand that you were once positionally, spiritually naked before God, before you actually did anything wrong?
- 4) Do you believe that Christ died, and shed His blood for you because you are worth so much to Him?
- 5) Do you believe that you are forever loved by God, just the way you are?
- 6) Have you confessed (told God exactly who you are and what you have done) regarding your shame and attitudes?
- 7) Have you called on God with a desire to change in your heart?
- 8) Have you called on God to receive the gift of eternal life found only in Jesus Christ?
- 9) Are there consequences that you are willing to accept in regard to past destructive decisions?
- 10) Have you developed practical convictions to seek God and Christ at the throne of grace?
- 11) Do you enter each day with the confidence that you are clothed in Christ practically as a new creature, to worship God through all you do.
- 12) Do you embrace the continual covering of God that is available for His children who cultivate a repentant attitude?

### **5.3. AN EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH CLIENTS SUFFERING FROM SHAME**

This section will summarize and evaluate the findings of the interview. The questionnaire will serve as the outline for this summary and evaluation. This evaluation is the researcher's interpretation of the data that was accumulated for the basis of this research thesis.

#### **Section 1**

##### **1. Gender**

Three males and six females were interviewed between the ages of nineteen to forty years old. It seemed that males who did not have a previously established relationship with the researcher were reluctant to do interviews. The three males that were interviewed had developed a relationship of trust with the researcher, therefore seemed more open to discuss their lives. It appeared that that potential male clients appeared to be apprehensive about being interviewed because their male identity for significance may / would be affected by any 'exposure' to weaknesses. Potential female clients, even those who had gone through significant shameful experiences were more open to participating in this researcher's study. This seemed to be attributed to their trust of the researcher and their natural desire to connect and share their life narrative.

##### **2. Family History**

The home environment seemed to have a significant effect on the perception of each client's identity growing up. The clients battled to understand their parents' role definitions in the home. Eight out of the nine clients did not have a clear understanding of their parents' roles. Eight out of the nine clients' mother ran the home emotionally. Seven out of the nine clients' parents were either physically or emotionally divorced.

Eight out of the nine clients' homes lacked conflict resolution skills, which resulted in their homes experiencing yelling, passive aggressive 'silent treatment', shutting down the children from communicating their emotions, bullying, intimidation, hiding significant information from children,

ignoring conflict, blaming family problems on the children. Six out of the nine clients referred to their homes as hostile. Seven of the nine clients were not affirmed growing up. It appears that all nine clients have an inability to clearly define conflict resolution skills within their own homes at present.

### **Preliminary conclusions**

Although there were periods of holding, dialogue, and as Client E stated that she had a traditional Christian home where Bible reading took place, all nine clients seem to come from homes where intentional strategies for developing intra- and interpersonal skills in identity, conflict resolution and communication were lacking.

### **3. Spiritual History**

The design of the 'spiritual history' section is to determine the clients' relationship to God growing up in terms of their view of Him and their perception of Him working in and through their lives during their formative years. All nine clients had a very open and receptive desire to know God and learn about Him. All nine clients are Christians with three of them recently trusting Christ as their Savior. Four out of the nine clients had a religious upbringing but were not regular church attendees. Five out of the nine clients were either raised Baptist or as part of the Baptist church from a young age. The Baptist church 'prides' itself on effectively communicating a historical-grammatical hermeneutic, sound biblical exegesis and 'preaching the gospel with regular alter calls'. However, all five clients stated that they were never taught practical life tools about how to process the affect of shame in their lives. Six out of the nine clients have either questioned or blamed God for something, i.e. a cousin's death, the result of their abusive home life, losing employment, Client D stated that it was situational, as "stuff" happened. It appears that although all nine clients did not reject God they were ill equipped, hence lacking a 'working' knowledge of God's Word in that they did not have an ability to practically assimilate truth into their lives. They further lacked any theological and practical understanding of shame and its effects on their lives.

### **Preliminary conclusions**

Preliminary conclusions seem to be that with an inability to develop intra- and interpersonal relationships with God, His Word, their identity, conflict resolution and communication skills these clients were, in their pasts, left spiritually and personally deficient in being able to work through the reality and affect of shame in a fallen world.

## **Section 2**

### **1. Personal relationships**

This part of the questionnaire focused on the clients intra - personal relationships in how they perceived and related to others emotionally, spiritually, cognitively and behaviorally, from within themselves.

Client A is married but has struggled to lead and develop a significant relationship with the spouse. When losing control of situation it appears as though this person tends to sulk and pout. Their greatest fear is losing their home. It appears this person senses the conflict in this reasoning and wishes to be authentic with his/her spouse and children.

Client B is married. It seems this person lives within a constant realm of distrust of others, and inner rage in facing who they are in social settings. When they sense they are losing control, they develop inner anger that is not always acknowledged on the surface, but by their silence, through passive aggressive behavior of withdrawal and blaming others. It appears this person still battles with a sense of personal identity and value. They are aware of their need to work through this, and desire to move from being so judgmental, and reinvest this negative attitudes into a meaningful authentic lifestyle and career.

Client C was rejected and devalued emotionally growing up, however, there is a supportive, affirming spouse. This earlier rejection and lack of identity though has translated itself into a desire to develop an independent body and self-image. It appears as though this person understood that this could develop into narcissistic compulsion to perform. When they sense they are losing control they develop a

strategy of isolation, then unacknowledged rage, followed by anxiety. The result of being devalued has created continuous anxiety, which they have identified and are addressing at the present time. This person has a definite goal to serve a younger generation in developing a healthy body and self-image.

Client D is a single adult who appears to seek to balanced relationships with accomplishment. It appears as though this person has a need for performance and personal fulfillment. Failure is a fear that they attempt to avoid. They seem to attach performance accomplishment to tasks with praise, their personal identity, and a need to be valued. They appear to be quite regimented in their leadership style and appear to take on too much. This may develop into a narcissistic attempt to be valued and approved by others. When they sense they are not in control or they do not understand they attack and dominate, raise their voice; speak in a threatening tone, and often not addressing those they know with eye contact.

Client E is remarried. It appears this person comes from an extremely abusive background in their previous marriage. When they have a sense they are losing control they either lash out or dominate to assume control. They grapple with and are unsettled with their sense of identity and direction. They long for intimacy, openness and authentic relationships, channeled in meaningful direction for their life that will impact younger generations.

Client F is married and grapples with a sense of intimacy and personal relationships. It appears this person has siblings that were favored above them. They battle to trust and fear betrayal. Although they have been affirmed, they struggle with close relationships, even at times with their spouse. When they sense they are losing control they either isolate themselves or perform through business. They have not many who have valued them or believed in them as an individual. They seem to derive their identity and acceptance through what they do but not who they are. They are developing tact and sensitivity in being a justice seeker.

Client G is married with a supportive spouse, however, their sense of identity and personal value is a continual struggle. It appears this person was betrayed as a teenager and developed a strategy of rebellion that they regret today. They understand their past behavior as a downward spiral that led to comfort food, promiscuous relationships and manipulating others. Only until the last year have they understood the need to be authentic and develop open and meaningful relationships. This has been effectively translated in them assisting others of a younger generation.

Client H is single and is cautiously pursuing relationships with the opposite sex. It appears as though this person is presently grappling to live in which they are forgiven by God for things that they did in their past, which seems to affect their sense of identity to a degree. It appears that their greatest fear is that others would 'label' them or categorize them in order to control their life. When they sense they are losing control they close up and withdraw. They desire to work on this and share more of who they are, but require time. They have a love for the younger generation, and exhibit great patience and effective communication skills with them.

Client I is single. It seems this person has had two significant relationships in which they were deeply hurt. Their greatest fear seems to be getting close to the opposite sex. When they lose control they isolate themselves and develop a narcissistic anger, which they mask, that can only be identified by those who have attempted to get to know them. They have a deep need for relationships and possess an uncanny ability to analyse other people's relationships. However, they can use this 'gift' to over analyse, especially in relationships with the opposite sex, so as to protect themselves from perceived hurt. They have a deep love for the younger generation so that they may avoid certain 'pitfalls' that Client I almost or did fall into, especially in the area of peer influence.

### **Preliminary conclusions**

As a preliminary conclusion seems to be that the present strategies and interpretations, demands, assumption and expectations in their personal relationships were indelibly affected by their past and present self-identity. Positively, all nine wish to assist the younger generation in not repeating what they have gone through in their pasts.

### **2. Significant Relationships**

It was purported that people have core or significant relationships that influenced and influence them on a day-to-day basis. All shame seems to find its 'breeding ground' in relationships. The clients were asked questions that dealt with these relationships especially in the areas of regrets, approval and escapes. Six out of the nine clients had as a primary regret that they never had a significant and meaningful relationship with their parents. Two out of the nine that did not have at least a good

relationship regretted not being equipped to discern the difficulties of relationships. Seven out of the nine had a need of approval from others and often did not sense personal value in the eyes of others. One client denied needing approval from others yet in the past often regulated their lives by criticizing others. Eight out of the nine clients battled with some type of distrust of others or fear of betrayal by others. Interestingly all nine considered themselves loyal individuals in relationships and seven out of the nine clients demanded or expected loyalty in significant relationships. Five out of the nine clients were project or task orientated, and valued relationships, especially when this translated into impacting the lives of others by accomplishing mutually agreeable assignments that would enhance the relationship, especially for others.

### **Preliminary conclusion**

A preliminary conclusion may be drawn that all nine clients longed for relationships they were cautious in trusting, and at times in taking the initiative to develop meaningful relationships. It seems the opinion and evaluation of others is an important criterion for trusting and pursuing deeper relationships with others. The clients that seem tasks orientated relationships had a need to be in control, perhaps so as to regulate or prevent personal emotional injury occurring. Seven out of the nine clients expressed a sense of deep disappointment of not developing more significant relationships. None of the nine clients understood the “get away from anything” or habits as negative but answered them in the positive such as “I read a book” or “I take long walks” or “I go for a drives”. Only one of the nine clients admitted to manipulating others.

### **3. Spiritual relationships and Shame**

#### **Stage one - Spiritual Foundation**

It is proposed that an individual's ultimate struggle in life is to connect spiritually with God. There seems to be attitudes inside people that can often form a barrier between them and God. It is imperative that an individual understands their relationship with God, and the affects of this on their interpretation of shame. None of the nine clients had a clear understanding of sin, which seemed to indicate they may only interpret shame globally, in terms of what others think about them, and not forensically, in terms of destructive attitudes that offend a personal God to whom they have a relationship. As an observation all three male clients interpreted God holding something back from them in terms of finding significance in their jobs. Three of the six female clients defined their struggle with several regrets, even though they have processed much of it; these regrets are very fresh in their mind. One of the significant regrets is a wish that their parents and the Christian leadership had taught and the Christian community had cultivated a vision for making individuals aware of the destructive nature of relationships. All nine clients' ultimate struggles revolved around relationships, which influenced their definition of shame.

#### **Some of the clients' ultimate struggles and definitions of shame:**

Client A defined shame as doing

“something that you know would make others would question you. They would look at you in a negative way. But you that but you do it anyway. It is a premeditated wrong and you do it anyway”.

Client A understands that they have had an on going problem with conflict, shouting and sulking. They appear to avoid conflict by withdrawing from others.

Client B's understanding of shame is a “feeling of humiliation and embarrassment you feel when the sin you are doing in private is found out”. Client B's struggle with shame seemed to be profoundly attached to their search for identity. He has developed a critical spirit of others. Growing up they

battled with pornographic material of women. It is significant that they were bullied by their father, who in turn was bullied as a young man. Client B seems to use pornography as an outlet to control women through a fantasy life, because of a lack of intimacy with his father and others close to them. This led to an affair with a coworker in the early stages of their marriage.

Client C understood shame in a simple definition of “embarrassment and not happy with what you have with yourself”.

Client D understood shame as ‘a personal feeling that I have done something wrong and that I am not good enough’. Client D has interpreted their ultimate struggle to performance, coupled with a dislike for ‘regular’ people. However, she longs to be identified as competent by ‘regular’ people that she would not receive from those she works with. Client D portrays an independent ‘high performance’ exterior whereas there appears to be inner conflict with their inability to relate well in terms of team work and the assigning of tasks.

Client E’s struggle has been to move past the regrets of the betrayal in past relationships. Due to abuse in significant relationships and a personal accident they lost about ten to fifteen years of their life and identity. In light of these abusive relationships they have battled to demonstrate empathy for those who hurt. They developed in their own words ‘an air of superiority, I guess’. This narcissistic strategy was based on a quiet inner rage of loss, even though they had somewhat grieved these losses. It may have been a struggle to express this loss in words, especially in a Christian community where being vulnerable was not encouraged. Client E’s definition of shame reflects this:

“Something that you are embarrassed about that would be revealed or exposed about your life”.

Client F’s ultimate struggle appears to be unprocessed hurt from their past, as a result of not knowing how to work through these hurts, nor identify any particular shame.

Client G defined shame as ‘being embarrassed and not fitting in’. Client G defined shame indirectly as a need to preserve the relationships close to them to “do everything I can to keep my marriage and my home”.

Client H passed on describing their ultimate struggle. It appeared that they did not wish to divulge their past as they felt that it would stigmatize them. This seemed to demonstrate a shame response.

Although Client H would not describe their ultimate struggle they seemed to provide the result of this struggle in their definition of shame:

“The thing that stops you from being real. To cover up your shame. Devalued. A big hiding game. I have hid and it has affected my relationships with others. I will be personable to a point but when I feel threatened I cut people off. It scares me. It is a problem because relationships fall apart. Although relationships are important, and sometimes people get in, I move away.”

Client I did not provide a definition of shame but sought to define in terms of their struggle:

“Ticks me off that nothing I do counts for nothing. It is happening. I feel powerless. When I put forward an effort nothing happens. I struggle with loneliness, the previous programming done by the church. If I died tomorrow, no one would care. I AM AT WAR!!”

### **Preliminary conclusions**

Some preliminary conclusions may be evaluated that these clients used to evaluate God in terms of what He did or did not give them. It seems that they used to require tangible ‘proofs’ of His goodness in light of a lack of relationships growing up. Only two of the nine clients automatically equated developing a relationship with God as an imperative step to processing their shame, even though all nine clients admitted to the need for God in some stage of addressing their shame. It was significant to identify the various unconscious categorizing of the shame experience by the different clients. Some examples:

Client A defined shame globally - ‘something that you know would make others question you’ and forensically: It is a premeditated wrong and you do it anyway. Client A understood that they deliberately and premeditatedly attempted to shame their spouse and themselves through sulking and withdrawal.

Client B seems to view shame forensically in terms of their affair with another woman; globally in terms of the perception of his view that others have of him, specifically his father; and there seems to be an identity of shame in terms of his inner anger, pessimism and blaming of others.

Client C did not elaborate on shame nor gave much detail as to what they have done to themselves to experience shame. However, it appeared from the interview that the client was severely devalued growing up by one of their parents. This has translated into a large investment in personal body image. It is uncertain what the underlying motives are at this stage.

Client D perceived shame from a Global perspective in that they are 'not good enough' in the eyes of others. Shame was a reflection on their personal identity as they referred to shame as 'I'.

Client E admitted to growing through their struggles and shame. They were encouraged and 'excited' about delving into their struggles, engaging the researcher to probe further into their life. They seemed humble in that they wanted to continually work through their issues which this empirical study seem to surface for them.

Client F appeared to be very sad and teary eyed at some points in the interview. The researcher thought it best not to probe any further in terms of their shame as they had just started to get to know the researcher and trust is still being established. This did emphasize the need to have developed significant authentic relationships in order to assist individual's work through their shame.

Client G seemed to interpret shame globally as not fitting in with those who may have an opinion of them. There seemed to be some forensic shame in the need to deal with their manipulating of their spouse and parents from time to time; and a demanding spirit that causes others to have to prove their loyalty to this client, which is a narcissistic self-protection strategy.

Client I described his life eight times as being at war, both on the inside but in light of close and personal relationships failing. He sensed he was all alone on his birthday with no one around, even though his siblings and mother was present. Shame was understood globally because "no one cares", in their identity "I am at war", even self-imposed in that they shared that they should have done more to tell their parents about Christ.

It appears that these clients were paralyzed in their shame in their pasts, and for some their shameful pasts paralyzed them in the present which affected meaningful growth as it seemed they lacked the resources, skill, authentic partnerships and spiritual depth to address their Adamic, Forensic, Shame identity and Global shame.

### **Stage two - Hindrances to facing inner attitudes and external behavior**

There appears to be some personal hindrances or barriers that people erect in order to avoid facing who they are on the inside, in particular confronting their shame. All nine clients were very open in discussing strategies they use to cover shame.

Client A was very clear that he “Sulks. Uses silence, anger, cutting words as a weapon. In-your-face attitude. Non-verbals like rolling my eyes or breathing deeply. And I know I’m going to jump on this band wagon. And I’ll ride it all the way!”

Client B stated that he will “keep quiet, listen and observe that person and determine if they are someone I wish to get to know. If they are someone I don’t take a liking to, then I will not engage them in anything other than polite idle chit chat.”

Client C admitted to using rage, anger, alienating themselves from others, and in the beginning exercise in order not to confront shame or insecurities in their life.

Client D confessed to attacking others, a critical voice, working harder and over compensate on any given task to deal with shame, insecurities and embarrassment.

Client E has developed a strategy of control over the lives of others and to narcissistically look down upon or demonstrate a lack of empathy towards those who hurt. It appears they have been shown little or no understanding to their own plight. Although Client E demonstrates a tremendous amount of empathy for the younger generations, particularly their children, she finds it difficult to transfer this onto adult relationships. She senses this may be due to almost ‘living through this younger generation’ as she seemed to have had almost fifteen years ‘taken from’ her (approximately from eighteen years old to thirty one years old).

Client F ‘pretends’ there is no problem or ‘ignores there is a problem’ in light of her need for acceptance. There seems to be a powerful need for acceptance and this is found through performance or setting expectations too high for others to attain. She senses a deep sense of bitterness towards certain individuals in her life, and a sense that she will never measure up with what propels her to perform.

Client G used to believe that manipulating others, especially those that had caused her pain was a successful strategy to cover her insecurities. In light of being lied to her by her mother in the past she used this as justification for using her mother to get what she wanted. Humor, even sarcastic humor, became another strategy to avoid facing shame. Most significantly she identified a cyclic strategy not to face shame in her life. She stated,

I tended to, and at times still, push people away by saying mean things. I close people out. By pushing people away it gives you a sense of control over them. I then demanded loyalty. I did this by making them feel guilty that they had not done enough for me. I was known as the ‘Queen of the guilt trip’. Manipulating people was not enough. I became addicted to comfort food, alcohol to numb pain, sex to numb intimacy and cigarettes to control my weight. But I still had these insecurities.”

Client G’s preoccupation with her strategies provided false fig leaves to cover her deep shame of rejection by her mother so many years before.

Client H did not want to discuss her particular shame yet admitted to cutting others off who get too close to her. She also attempts not to get too attached to people in case they probe or discover about her past of which she is ashamed. She explained,

It seems easier not to have to deal with tough issues. To put up a barrier. There is one area....I just don’t want to be a statistic where a stigma is attached to you because people know. You don’t feel safe. If there would be things in the open I would be judged. I am more than that. I know that I am forgiven, but the reminders are there.

Client H is struggling in what to reveal or expose about her past; what will the people she reveal this to, do with her past. This is a real tension for her because she seeks to be authentic, especially for the next generation.

Client I came to realization that he did not want to face the 'mess' that he made in the past therefore wallowed in pessimism, which was cultivated in his brother who grappled with a sense of identity. He believes that everybody is judging him, but he 'just wants to be loved'. He uses 'subtle control' to navigate a relationship that allows him prime opportunity to analyze others in a condescending tone of voice. He identifies this as a strategy to cover shame, and wants to face it 'head on'.

### **Preliminary conclusions**

All nine clients had developed personalized and thought-out strategies that defended themselves from the pain of their shame, embarrassment and insecurities. It seemed that some even moved from victims to perpetrators, which suggests that hurt people can hurt people.

### **Stage three - Attempts to cover shame**

There was no great input at this stage. Four out of the nine clients believed that this was adequately covered in stage two. Five out of the nine clients noted the connection to stage two and added some comments to their attempts to cover shame.

Client A admitted that he attempts to cover his shame by "pointing a finger at my wife, blaming her and others without looking into it." He confessed that blaming others is "always easier" because others have to carry the "problem that I should take as my responsibility". Client B used to blame his upbringing and father for the problems he faced in his life. He now understands that any inappropriate reaction to difficult or unfortunate circumstances is the choice of the individual. Client C was tempted, even in the midst of a strict body consciousness and training, to gravitate to comfort food to anesthetize her pain or anxiety. Client D has a high regard for those who hurt but can demonstrate an indifference to those who 'should know better'. Client F seems to blame themselves for problems. They have a continuous struggle with her weight and compares themselves to other woman.

Client G was the most detailed and commented that she blamed and identified in doing so.

"I like to hold grudges against those who do not do things the way I want. I get hurt and threatened."

There seems to be a perception of a loss of control which motivates blaming others for the way she feels. Another strategy is to spend money on 'material things' or gravitate to 'comfort food'. She has a fear to get too close in case she pushes others away but at the same time longs for closeness in a significant relationship. It is significant that Client G cannot get past feeling bitterness towards her mother.

### **Preliminary conclusion**

It seemed that, when the clients felt safe with the researcher, some of the clients dialogued at a deeper level regarding who they were and what is causing shame. Only Client G seemed ready and equipped to interpret in detail their strategies for covering shame. Nonetheless, it appeared that addictive behavior becomes a very real but destructive coping mechanism to avoid facing and covering shame. Client G is an example of an individual who would delve deeper into forensic shame in order to avoid the shame of rejection by her mother. She described this as a downward spiral. Once again the need for developed and functional relationships seems to be vital to addressing shame.

### **Stage four - motivated to cultivate a false community**

God appears to have designed humankind for relationships and specifically community. Individuals who have failed to address their shame biblically and practically seem to develop a false community.

The following examples describe the tensions that some of the Clients experienced in and/or towards community.

Client B is a strong independent individual who has an ability to critique and analyses groups. He had no desire to be a part of any group at school or after. He did and does have a desire to be respected, valued and sought out by significant others he can trust, and interact with.

Client E has felt, at times, shamed by a community of women who work, and as a stay-at-home mother senses, compared to these working women, that she is missing out on opportunities. She seems to be dealing with this by reaching out to a younger generation and her family

Client F has attached herself to different communities which seem to propel her need to perform. She is highly efficient and may come close to compulsive performance. She seems to have the outward appearance of a social individual, yet the opposite is true. She is an organizer and works well with an individual who is competent and completes tasks, yet is in the public eye. She makes real attempts to develop an authentic connection to healthy communities. She requires some time in developing her identity so she can relate to community in secure ways.

Interestingly Client G has a strong passive aggressive personality, and consistent with their manipulative strategy would

“find individuals to use so that I could escape the pain of my past. I sought dispensable relationships. You taught yourself how NOT to connect. Therefore you developed pseudo-connections that you could control. You developed community to what you could control, hide behind or get rid of once it had served its purpose.”

Client G was very clear that because she did not want to be hurt by anyone else again 'you were the group. You were the leader of your own gang - YOU.' It was difficult to remove herself from these individuals because they made her forget her problems.

Client H attempted to belong to a specific group that caused her to feel even more insecure about herself presently. The researcher is unclear whether this group actually caused her the shame she grapples to talk about. There seemed to be a sense of identity with this group, but she believes that this group is often stigmatized, labeled and judged. It is hypothesized that perhaps belonging to the group was a metaphor to interpret her life and shame and identity.

Client I has an outwardly expressive personality. He was severely bullied by particular groups at school and by his father emotionally. He has learnt to use humor and 'shock value' to get the attention of various groups. However, at the same time he can be intimidated and threatened by certain 'funnier' individuals in a group. He made it clear that there exists a tension within him that although he has a

need to be accepted, he rarely connects with anyone in a particular community. If he does connect he reverts back to a strategy of over analyzing them, instead of discovering who they are as persons. It seems he does this because he transfers his own need for someone to analyze yet accept him for who he is and especially after what they discover to be negative about him.

### **Preliminary conclusion**

It appears that certain clients struggled to maintain authentic meaningful community. It seems that these clients developed a community comprised of individuals who seemed to live within a paradoxical tension of a desire for connecting and control-manipulating community by means of several narcissistic strategies. Personality seems to play a significant role in whether an individual dominates attacks, withdraws from or avoids community. Community is an unsafe, but necessary context to address shame.

### **Stage five - Experience God's empathy and covering**

This stage presents the hypothesis that authentic change comes from the authentic covering that is based on the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ. It appears to be God's eternal plan to "clothe" an individual who identifies with their Adamic and forensic shame and seeks covering in the completed work of Jesus Christ on their behalf. It seemed that all nine clients have accepted the gift of eternal life, yet are in various stages of their Christian growth. The following are examples of some of the changes that have taken place in the clients that were interviewed

Client A believes that accepting the free gift of salvation through Jesus Christ has given him a completely different perspective regarding his life and shame. The researcher had the privilege, in companionship with a number of other Christians, of sharing the gospel with Client A two weeks before the interview. He trusted in Jesus Christ as His personal Savior a week before the interview. He believes that the opening of his spiritual eyes has enabled him to confront destructive strategies to avoid facing his shame. "I no longer mouth off to my wife or others. I talk to God first. I fail at times

but I attempt to deal with what I need to before God. I am doing this more and more." Client A has developed both forensic sense of shame partnered with a godly shame that convicts him to face what he has done, and assume responsibility for it.

Client B believes that God can use his past shame to enable him to identify with and serve the next generation. He is praying about the possibility of full time service in the ministry. He has grown closer to his wife and children. He is committed to facing the pain of his past with his father by accepting who he is in Christ. Client B understands that the healing from a shame identity is a process:

"I know that God will bring healing through this. There are those that I need to seek out and apologize to and ask forgiveness. I know that God has forgiven me in the past and will continue to forgive me in the future and I ask for the grace and strength to not make the same mistakes over again."

Client C has been an individual that the researcher has known for about a year. The enriching aspect of this interview is that she came to both the Good Friday service and the Sunday morning service, and for the first time gained a clear understanding of the gospel, first through a clear gospel presentation by the researcher's colleague, next by watching the "Passion of the Christ", and third trusted in the gift of salvation on the Sunday Morning after the service. She said, "I know that Jesus died on the cross but only this weekend did I understand that he died for me". Her husband who was in the interview stated, 'There has been a remarkable improvement in her anxiety, she is more calm, more focused.' The researcher read John 10:27-31 once in the interview. He then asked Client C to read it but with her name in the place of Sheep. I then told her that no one can take you from the Hands of Jesus or God. You are Jesus Christ's and He knows your name. She commented that she has never viewed the Bible and her relationship to Jesus Christ and God as so personal, and as the "Passion of the Christ" emphasizes, that He has died for her shame.

Client E has enjoyed a number of years of freedom in Christ. She realized her need to grow in areas that she has developed potential narcissistic strategies of control. She has demonstrated a teachable heart to pursue these areas so she lives a life that reflects the clothing of Christ through changed attitudes to her spouse and other significant relationships to her.

Client H discovered for the first time toward the end of the interview that she was truly forgiven and clothed in Jesus Christ. She had battled with a number of years of temptation to pursue the past of which she was ashamed. The researcher explained this was a natural inner tension to what she once knew, controlled yet by what she ultimately found no satisfaction. This temptation seemed to shame her further yet after the researcher assisted Client H in identifying the differences between the various types of shame: Adamic shame, forensic shame, shame identity, global shame and godly shame. She identified with a shamed identity, but understood that Jesus Christ died for ALL her shame, and she was forgiven.

During the interview process Client I addressed their sense of shame before the Lord. He wept and made a commitment to live within the covering of Jesus Christ, and the acceptance of God. An agreement was reached between Client I and the researcher to develop a strategy to work through their shame and develop their relationship in Jesus Christ.

### **Preliminary conclusions**

This last section was both enriching and sobering. It was enriching because of the clients' desire and conviction to grow in their spiritual relationship in Jesus Christ. It was also sobering because of the affect of shame that still requires addressing and processing at certain times in the lives of seven of the nine clients. It appears that shame has consequences that carry on into the Christian life.

## **5.4. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS**

The following preliminary conclusions appear to have surfaced from this empirical study

- Females seem to be more open expressing and detailing their shame than males. Preliminary interviews for the empirical study revealed that males were a lot more apprehensive to share their past and any aspects of their shame.
- The home environment seemed to have a significant effect on the perception of each client's identity growing up. All nine clients seem to come from homes where intentional strategies for

developing intra- and interpersonal skills in identity, conflict resolution and communication were lacking. All nine clients seem to possess some form of shame identity.

- An inability to develop intra- and interpersonal relationship with God, His Word, and a person's identity, conflict resolution and communication skills particularly in one's past, may leave an individual spiritually and personally deficient in being able to work through the reality and affect of shame in a fallen world.
- Present strategies and interpretations, demands, assumptions and expectations in personal relationships may indelibly be affected by an individual's past and present self-identity.
- There may be some positive lessons learned by addressing shame issues as all nine clients wish to assist the younger generation in not repeating what they have gone through in their pasts.
- Even though all nine clients had experienced shame and its consequences, all of the clients longed for relationships. However, they were cautious in trusting, at times in taking the initiative to develop meaningful relationships.
- Only two of the nine clients automatically equated developing a relationship with God as an imperative step to processing their shame, even though all nine clients admitted to the need for God in some stage of addressing their shame. It seemed that the clients interpreted shame filtered through their own eyes and battled to get beyond themselves, to understanding shame as an opportunity for change.
- It appears that these clients were paralyzed in their shame in their pasts, and for some their shameful pasts paralyzed them in the present which affected meaningful growth as it seemed that they lacked the resources, skill, authentic partnerships and spiritual depth to address their Adamic, forensic, shame identity and global shame
- All nine clients have developed 'elaborate' thought-out strategies and barriers that seem to hinder the opportunity for personal change in addressing shame. These strategies defended themselves from the pain of their shame, embarrassment and insecurities. It seemed that some even moved from victims to perpetrators.

- Shame can be a downward spiral that motivates others to delve deeper into hiding from facing their contribution to their own shame experience. It seemed, as the clients felt safe with the researcher, that some of the clients knew how to dialogue at a deeper level regarding who they were and what is causing shame.
- It appears the people faced with shame need to be confident and equipped in order to address their shame at a number of levels.
- It appears that certain clients struggled to maintain authentic meaningful community. It seems that these clients developed a community comprised of individuals who seemed to live within a paradoxical tension of a desire for connecting and control-manipulating community by means of several narcissist strategies.
- Personality seems to play a significant role in whether an individual dominates attacks, withdraws from or avoids community. Community is an unsafe, but necessary context to address shame.
- A relationship with and in Jesus Christ seems to be the foundational component in order to address shame. However, this relationship is only the beginning as it provides spiritual eyes through which to evaluate and critique the human condition. It takes skill, time and spiritual-cognitive-emotional resources in order to address shame.
- The reality of the transference of shame and counter transference was at times a factor during the interviews. The researcher had to work through their own 'reminders' or shame and not probe the clients. The researcher had to prayerfully prepare himself for the interviews so not as to import his own feelings. There was a strict discipline to listen and not lead the clients in their discussion.

This chapter has attempted to assess nine qualitative empirical research studies. The accumulative data from the basis-theoretical, meta-theoretical perspectives and empirical, qualitative study will provide the material for a suggested theological-practical intervention for addressing shame. The next chapter will present this practical-theoretical proposal.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **PRACTICE-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE: SHAME INTERVENTION – PROBLEM AND OPPORTUNITY**

#### **6.1. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS**

The theoretical argument in Chapter one poses that one of the important roles of a pastor is to equip believers to deal with shame on biblical and practical levels. It is important that a pastoral counselor gain an understanding of shame from various disciplines which include a basis-theoretical perspective, a meta-theoretical perspective, an empirical-qualitative research study and then synthesize these findings into a practice-theoretical model that provides the pastor with a relevant model to equip believers to deal with shame on a biblical and practical level. Chapter two of this thesis presented a basis-theoretical perspective of studying shame from the Old Testament (Genesis 1-3 and the Book of Jeremiah). Chapter three presented a basis-theoretical perspective on shame from the New Testament (Ephesians). Chapter four presented a meta-theoretical perspective regarding shame by studying various approaches within the scientific discipline of social sciences. Chapter five evaluated the “real-life” qualitative contribution of empirical research of nine individuals.

It was purported in Chapter two that Genesis and the Book of Jeremiah were important Old Testament Books in understanding shame. First, the Old Testament passage of Genesis 3 serves as a useful starting point in order to critique shame. This passage offers substantial assistance for the reader to understand the origin of shame. In a study of Genesis 3 an attempt was made to lay the blueprint and framework of the entrance of shame into the world through the historical act and “anatomy” of Adam and Eve’s disobedience and resultant strategies to cover their shame. This Old Testament passage also seemed to introduce and establish theological and practical implications for addressing shame. Second, the Book of Jeremiah, as prophetic literature, seemed to identify and define at least seven strategies of shame that may only be authentically interpreted through the supportive, yet imperative, theme of a repentant attitude. In Chapter three, it was suggested that the New Testament passage of Ephesians

4:20-24, emphasizes the need for the believer to appreciate his or her position in Christ as “putting off” and “putting on”. It is imperative that they understand the spiritual condition, Adamic Shame and Forensic Shame that was universal (Ephesians 2:1-3, 4:17-19), before they came to Christ, and that they do not cover themselves but that God, in Christ, has already taken off their old garments, and placed on them new “clothes”. They, however, are to live within the sphere of their identity in Christ, in the continual renewal of the mind.

Chapter four attempted to study the recent and past research that have provided a rich contribution and has identified the integrated theories, components and mechanisms in researching shame. There appears to be a wide variety of shame theories that are rooted in different schools of thought which include psychoanalytic theories; self-psychological theories; affect-cognitive theories; cognitive-behavioral theories; developmental-psychological theories; sociological theories; and cultural-anthropological theories. This chapter was limited to broadly addressing six approaches and two components of shame research. The approaches within the various scientific academic disciplines that were summarized: the psychoanalytic approach; the “self-psychology” approach; the bio-innate-psychological approach; the affect-cognitive approach; the sociological approach; and the cultural-anthropological honor-shame approach. It was suggested that shame research does not seem to be limited to these different theories or approaches, but it has also been conceptualized in terms of its components and mechanisms of which shame and addictive behavior and shame and forgiveness were considered. Each of these theories, components and mechanisms appear to have made significant contributions and limitations to understanding shame.

Chapter five attempted to assess nine qualitative empirical research studies. This chapter concerned itself with data accumulated through a typed personal interview of the nine individuals who have suffered from shame.

## **6.2. INTRODUCTION**

Heyns and Pieterse (1998:29) have observed that Jesus did not deal in abstract theories but continually applied his message to the specific people and social conditions. To him truth was not mere theoretical abstraction but something to be done (cf. John 3:21). Practice theory should be formulated “for the

renewal the improvement of the existing praxis” (Heitink, 1999:113). It would appear that there is a void within the scientific discipline of practical theology in that very little research has been conducted into both a theological understanding of shame and practical intervention for addressing shame. There is a need for practical theological intervention being developed that addresses shame as distinct from and prior to addressing guilt (Thomas and Parker, 2004:182). This chapter does not presume that the response to shame is comprehensive. Its aim is to propose a practical, integrative model, using the acronym S.H.A.M.E. as a counseling guide for equipping pastors and pastoral counselors in addressing shame on a biblical and practical level. Shame seems to be both a problem that all humankind must face, yet it also seems to be an opportunity to address areas of attitude and character that may need spiritual adjustment. The accumulative findings of the basis-theoretical perspective, meta-theoretical perspective and the empirical study will be integrated into this chapter in order to enrich this practical-theoretical perspective.

The material divides into five sections:

Spiritual foundation as the platform on which to address shame

Hindrances to addressing shame: The 7 strategies in avoiding shame and Understanding the 5 types of shame

Attempts at covering shame – Where are you?: Questions and consequences toward Godly Shame

Mending through community – A call to address shame

Experiencing Christ’s Covering

### **6.3. SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION AS THE PLATFORM ON WHICH TO ADDRESS SHAME**

There appears to be two spiritual foundations that ought to be discussed if one is to address shame from a practical and theological perspective: a foundational belief in God as revealed in the Bible and a foundational belief in the reliability of Scriptures.

### **6.3.1. A foundational belief in God as revealed in the Bible**

The empirical study reveals that only two of the nine clients automatically equated developing a relationship with God as an imperative step to processing their shame, even though all nine clients admitted to the need for God in some stage of addressing their shame. It seemed that the clients interpreted shame filtered through their own eyes and battled to get beyond themselves, to understanding shame as an opportunity for change.

It appeared that each client had to come full circle and realized that in the midst of the tragedy and suffering experienced in shame, no matter the religious beliefs, no one can really deny the existence of God. Most of the clients had blamed God at some point in their lives. It is not uncommon to discover than many Christians, and those who are searching for a spiritual relationship with God, fail to develop a practical relationship with God. This seems to be linked to an incorrect understanding of God, as revealed in the Bible. A theological and practical relationship with God is imperative, authentic and sustaining change is to take place. It is one thing to reduce the Bible to the “proverbial contradictions”; it is quite another to test its claims. It has been suggested that the problem with Christianity is not that it has been tried and found wanting, but that it has been found difficult, and left untried. A person suffering with shame cannot come to God with a list of demands, because it seems that this demanding spirit is what contributed to their shame condition and experiences. God must be approached in an attitude of discovery. It is suggested this is in reality the ultimate quest of every individual, their ultimate search is one for a personal relationship with God.

It seems that a quest for the spiritual indicates that humankind cannot exist without addressing ultimate questions regarding their existence. There is a God-shaped vacuum that only a personal relationship with God on His terms, can fill. Recent research attests to the fact that humankind has a need for a sense of the Divine. The reality in, avoidance of, and an inward search of God is one that is the basic premise of Scriptures and was attempted to be alluded to throughout this paper (cf. Genesis 1:26; 2:7; 3:8-10; Jeremiah 9:24, 30:12-17; 33:6-9 Ephesians 2:1-10; 4:17-24). Spirituality, which appears to be based on human effort often “worshipping what their hands have made” (cf. Jeremiah 16:19-20, 25:6-7) does not seem adequate to answer the problem of shame. Recently, there seems to have been an increase in literature on spirituality which points to the expedience of experience, originating with human beings themselves, as the source of discovering the divine. This provides little assistance or

assurance for a person suffering with shame. In Genesis 3 and the book of Jeremiah, in the light of the reality of Adamic and Forensic shame, strategies were developed to avoid the consequence of this exposure. This was done by “sewing fig leaves together” or idolatry. Adam was placed in the Garden to worship, and Judah was established, to serve God. Humankind was designed for worship. His sense of purpose would be in fulfilling God’s purposes for him. Judah had learned, “from her youth”, to shape their world, their way seems to have produced a false security which will ultimately end up in their shame (cf. Jeremiah 22:21-23). It appears that only an accurate understanding of who God is provides an opportunity for authentic inner transformation.

What are some foundational truths an individual must assimilate in his or her life if shame is to become an opportunity for sustaining change?

- God is the one exercising His rightful power and authority over humankind and places, fixes and appoints him in a position of status as His representative (cf. Genesis 1:26-27; 2:15-17), even when humankind has failed (cf. Jeremiah 24:7; 29:11-12).
- He is also the LORD God, which describes an intimate and close relationship with humankind. He is the God who personally and carefully “sculpted”, and “formed” the man and breathed into his nostrils life (Genesis 1:26, 2:7).
- God not only defines what is good, but He alone is qualified to define what is “good” and “evil” or “bad” (Genesis 2:15-17). The human nature is one that can be led astray to interpret these boundaries as hindering personal “potentially” (cf. Genesis 3:1-5), however, the desire to step over God’s boundaries results in alienation, shame and interpersonal conflicts (cf. Genesis 3:7-20).
- God has a purposeful agenda and strategy for the life of His people because He is aware of their tendencies to strategize an autonomous existence (Jeremiah 1:16, 19:7, 18:12, 21:10, 23:20; 29:10-14).
- All attempts to cover shame before God with denial, excuses, rationalization or justification must be rejected. It is important to assume responsibility for their destructive attitudes and actions. (2:23, 5:12-13, 7:3-8, 8:5-6, 9:6)

Albeit, even in the mundane areas of life, God and His Word can and must be relied upon to define a person's existence as foundational for all of life.

### **6.3.2. A foundational belief in Scriptures in providing a paradigm for understanding shame**

It appeared in the meta-theoretical perspective on shame that there was no agreement as to the definition and solution for shame. Many of the approaches rejected religion as an adequate assistance in addressing shame. It seemed that from Freud on, the adherent of these social sciences identified the inner struggles of humankind but could not address consistent solutions. It is suggested that Scriptures do adequately diagnose and provide solutions to shame. This diagnosis and solution will be discussed below, which is found in knowing through His Son, Jesus Christ. However, God cannot be known apart from Scriptures, and Scriptures cannot be known apart from a relationship to God. A clear historical-grammatical method is required if an accurate theology is to be developed by the counselor assisting individuals in addressing shame. Importing psychological pre-understanding into the Scriptures will reduce the text to superficial self-help that will veneer greater spiritual issues ingrained within the hearts of people suffering with shame. Superficial solutions are in reality "fig leaves". It was suggested from Genesis 3, the book of Jeremiah and Ephesians 2:1-3, 4:17-19 that the basic problem with humankind is depravity, not bad behavior. Scripture is clear and non-apologetic that the origin of humankind's problem has gone in search of his and her own schemes (cf. Genesis 6:5; Genesis 8:21; Ephesians 2:1-3, 4:17-19). It appears that because every person has an ability to cover their shame their way, every person has an ability to interpret their shame, their own way. This seems to point to the fact that people are interpreters. As interpreters, who interpret daily, weekly, monthly and yearly events that affect him or her emotionally, cognitively, and specifically spiritually, it is likely that a person may misinterpret their shame and their lives.

It suggested that the Scriptures provide accurate definitions and descriptions of ultimate problems facing humankind. These problems are not psychological, nor are they behavioral; they are spiritual in their motivation and root. What spiritual parameters, tools and attitudes should an individual struggling with shame, yet needing to accurate use Scriptures, come to the Scriptures?

### **“Eyes of faith” - Observation**

The hurting person, whether searching for eternal life, or a Christian caught in the grip of shame, are encouraged to move their focus from themselves to Scriptures. In searching the Scriptures with “eyes of faith” they will be encouraged to search their shame, which is below the surface of their life as such. This requires “eyes of faith” that look at what the text is actually saying about themselves. It engages them in an eternal book with eternal implications as to what they do with what they read. Therefore, it seems imperative that they ask the right questions and approach God’s Word with the right attitude, when observing the Scriptures. This level forces the individual to observe, not necessarily answer. It is gleaning data not solutions. It is suggested that approaching the Scriptures with the right hermeneutical questions may be paralleled with coming to their lives with the same diagnostic questions. Important questions that must be considered are (Table 1):

**TABLE 1**

<b>Approaching the Scriptures with “eyes of faith”</b>	<b>Approaching the inner life of shame with “eyes of faith”</b>
<p>Who wrote the Scriptures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To whom was He writing?</li> <li>• To whom was the author writing?</li> <li>• What did the author actually say?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is suffering with shame</li> <li>• Who needs assistance in facing their shame?</li> <li>• Who is affected by this shame?</li> <li>• What is actually going on in the inner person?</li> </ul>

- What key words or phrases seem to be repeated?
- What comparisons, connectives or contrasts exist in the passage?
- What words seem puzzling?
- What Bible Study tools are required to look up the answers?
- Where does this take place geographically?
- What historical events were taking place when this Scriptures was written?
- Why does a particular person say or do something?
- Why is a particular teaching presented?
- What key words or phrases are repeated in your life?
- Who do you compare, connect or contrast your life of shame with?
- What aspects of your shame seem puzzling?
- What tools do you think you may require in order to address through your shame?
- What environment or geographical location did your shame originate in or surface the most?
- What historical events seem to have taken place that caused your shame to develop?
- Why do you think certain significant people in your life said what they said about you that caused you shame?
- What certain beliefs about what was said about you seem to shape a shame identity from the inside?

**Table 1**

### **A mind that studies the facts - interpretation**

The temptation in Christian “recovery” work is attempting to find “God’s answer” avoiding the important work of interpretation of the text, reducing the Scriptures to: “This is what it means to me” or “This is what it is saying to me”. While the task of observation is to gather relevant data, interpretation seeks to filter and further provide clarity of the text under consideration. Interpretation requires an “insight of heart” that goes beyond a person’s pre-understanding and biases to understanding the historical-cultural; geographical; context of the passage; the relationship of the passage to other passages, and the meaning of words as they relate to the passage and book as a whole. The necessity of a contextual understanding of a passage of Scripture avoids emotional transference and importing that often “cloud” the penetrating truth of God’s Word that judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart (Hebrews 4:12). The same may be said regarding attempting to face shame. The ability to successfully address shame seems to take time and a correct use of the Scriptures that interprets the human condition and contribution to the shame that is being experienced.

### **A teachable heart-attitude - Application**

The process of application is an integral part of searching the Scriptures. As it has been suggested, the Bible accurately describes the ultimate problems facing humankind. It is imperative to a person who has studied the Scriptures to apply the truth they have observed and interpreted to their present condition and situation. The danger in attempting to study Scriptures in order to spiritually diagnose shame, is reducing the observation and interpretation of the Scriptural inquiry to cold orthodoxy or list of beliefs. The pastor must move the client from data to decision. Convictions may only be developed when truth is applied to concrete issues in an individual specific shame experience that they are struggling with. An individual struggling with shame must be able to relevantly address their shame by asking the question as to how God’s Word should be applied in order for them to change, understanding that this is not an event but a process.

Although this will be addressed later below, suffice is it to comment that the starting point to the application of God’s Word is to ensure that a person has a living relationship to God through His Son, Jesus Christ (cf. Romans 10:17). It is purported that all significant change is spiritually based (cf.

Genesis 3:21; Jeremiah 24:7; Romans 12:1-3; 1 Corinthians 2:10-14; Ephesians 2:4-10; 4:17-6:17). A person who is shamed that is not covered by the blood of Christ (who died for all shame), is not covered and will remain 'exposed' (cf. Hebrews 12:2-3). The beginning of all change is dependant on a person being saved by grace through faith (cf. Ephesians 2:8-9) in the name of Christ (cf. Acts 4:12) whom the person confesses without their mouth and believes upon in their heart (cf. Romans 10:9-10; Ephesians 1:13-15). Furthermore, sustaining change in a believer's life is a process of application of God's Word that leads to godly sorrow (2 Corinthians 7:8-13); a demonstration of authentic discipleship (John 8:31-32); probe the inner attitudes of the heart (Hebrews 4:12-13); a desire to discern between good and evil (Hebrews 5:11-14); and reflect a believer's deepest needs (James 1:22-25).

### **A community to live life clothed - Correlation**

It was proposed in the basis-theoretical perspective that all humankind was designed by God to connect, belong and represent Him within community. Humankind in was not designed for alienation, isolation or independency. It is imperative that the pastoral counselor guide the person clothed in Christ that there must be an integrative reciprocal connection with community on various levels of their lives. It is only within community that a person recovering from shame may effectively

- respond to insults and trials (1 Peter 2:21-25)
- develop compassion for the hurting (Matthew 9:36-38)
- renew their minds (Romans 12:1-3; 2 Corinthians 10:5)
- commit to their family (Ephesians 4:21-6:4)
- develop godly attitudes in the work place (Ephesians 6:5-9)
- share Christ with others, especially through trials (1 Peter 3:15; Colossians 4:5-6)
- obey the ruling government (Matthew 22:18-22; Romans 13:1-8)

- serve others within the Body of Christ (Philippians 2:1-20)
- live like a “clothed”, covered free person (Ephesians 6:10-17)

### **6.3.3. Some guiding questions regarding the spiritual foundation of God and His Word**

Some guiding questions that may assist a pastor or pastoral counselor in addressing a person suffering with shame as to their basic beliefs about God and Scriptures (Table 2a and Table 2b)

**TABLE 2a**

**Some guiding questions that may assist a pastor or pastoral counselor in addressing a person suffering with shame as to their basic beliefs about God and Scriptures.**

**Basic belief about God**

1. Can you think back to who was responsible for shaping your initial beliefs about God (i.e. your father, mother, friend, etc)?
2. Can you recall your family's perceptions of God growing up?
3. What religious background do you come from?
4. Has this religious background changed? Please explain.
5. Describe your understanding of God?
6. Who helped to shape your understanding of God?
7. Describe how you understood what Christ has done for you?
8. How did you understand personal suffering and suffering in the world?
9. What don't you like about religion?
10. Have you ever blamed God for anything?
11. If you could ask God to change three things in your life what would they be?
12. How would your perception of God be shaped by the following "titles":
  - Cosmic Kill-Joy;
  - Father;
  - Tyrant;
  - Dictator;
  - Shepherd;
  - Provider;
  - Disciplinarian;
  - Protector;
  - Creator;
  - Judge;
  - Forgiver;
  - Friend;
  - Teacher;
  - Guide;
  - Helper;
  - Authority.
13. What feelings do each of these "titles" create inside of you? Which ones stand out as particularly liberating or offensive?
14. The word "Theology" basically means "words about God". Everybody has a "theology" because everyone has basic beliefs about God. Briefly record what you believe about God. Write down what is on your heart.
15. Have you ever blamed or been angry at God? Please explain.

**Table 2b****Basic beliefs about Scriptures**

1. Can you think back to who was responsible for shaping your initial beliefs about Scriptures (i.e. your father, mother, friend, etc)?
2. What were your perceptions of Scriptures growing up?
3. How would your perception of Scriptures be shaped by the following “titles”:
  - Rule Book
  - Bread
  - Authority
  - Traditions
  - Law
  - Guide
  - Meat
  - Heart-felt Stories
  - Sword
  - Hammer
  - Judge
  - Milk;
  - Mirror
  - Myths
4. What feelings do these titles create inside of you? Which ones stand out as particularly liberating or offensive?
5. What is the biggest obstacle you have in studying the Bible?
6. Just like each person is a “theologian”, each person is an interpreter. How do you interpret the Bible? I.e., do you see it as primarily story; myth; example; historical fact, etc?
7. Do you find it difficult applying God’s Word to your life? Why? Why not?
8. Explain the significance of Bible referring to itself as a
  - “light” (Psalm 119:105)
  - a “mirror” (James 1:22-25)
  - “milk” (1 Peter 2:2)
  - “meat” (Hebrews 5:11-14)
  - a “sword” (Hebrews 4:12).
9. Please read the following passages of Scriptures using the method of “Observation”; “Interpretation”, “Application” and “Correlation. Please explain them in your own words as to the relationship that exists between God and His Word, and our responsibility to Him: Genesis 3:1-5; 6—7, 8-21; Ephesians 2:1-10; 2 Timothy 3:13-17).

### **6.3.4. Preliminary conclusion**

Understanding a responsibility to and need for God and His Word is only the beginning of the journey of addressing shame. There seem to be some hindrances in attempting to address shame that must be evaluated and worked through.

## **6.4. HINDRANCES TO ADDRESSING SHAME: THE 7 STRATEGIES IN AVOIDING SHAME AND UNDERSTANDING THE 5 TYPES OF SHAME**

Shame is a complex integration of cognitive, emotional, spiritual and volitional factors. These issues seem to contribute to some personal hindrances or barriers that are erected in order not to face who a person really is on the inside. The basis-theoretical perspective and the empirical studies seem to identify several strategies or hindrances that seem to be used to avoid addressing shame. The basis-theoretical perspective, the meta-theoretical perspective and the empirical studies seem to practically identify five types of shame that, if not understood, may severely impede upon an individual effectively addressing shame.

### **6.4.1. The 7 strategies in avoiding shame – Shame diagnostic tool**

Shame is a painful experience and process. The pastor must be able to understand and identify the seven strategies that individuals suffering with shame attempt to use to avoid addressing their shame. However, because people are different not every person will use all seven strategies at once. They may only use a few of them. They may use all seven over a period of time dependant upon the severity of their shame. The researcher has identified seven main strategies to avoid shame that seem to surface. A shame diagnostic tool has been developed in order to address these seven strategies. The pastor may use this shame diagnostic tool in the following way:

**First, the pastoral counselor is to familiarize him/herself with the seven strategies that are proposed which include:**

- Doubting God’s goodness;
- Hiding or covering shame;
- Addictive behavior;
- Unforgiveness, anger and bitterness;
- Blaming others;
- Cutting oneself off from authentic community, and
- Selfishness, pride and narcissism.

A brief definition and the danger of each strategy will be proposed in order to effectively address these strategies (Table 3):

**TABLE 3**

Strategy	Definition	Danger
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doubting God’s goodness</li> </ul>	<p>A belief or convincing oneself that God cannot be trusted with that which matters most; God cannot be trusted; God is not good; God does not seek my best; if it were not for God I would not be in this mess or feeling the way I do.</p>	<p>The danger of this strategy is that a healthy and scriptural perspective of God is imperative for effective and sustaining change in addressing shame. An individual who does not develop a biblical view of God is likely to become a god unto themselves in order not only to control their lives but the lives of those close to them.</p>

- Hiding or covering shame

Various techniques, strategies, moods, beliefs, emotions, actions, or decisions that are used to avoid having to process shame experiences. Very close to addictive behavior techniques.

The danger of this strategy lies in the fact that the individual is hiding from facing themselves because they may not understand who or whose they are. The more they refuse to change their attitudes about what they have done, what may have been done to them and what they could be doing to others to anesthetize their shame, the deeper the shame experience will become.
- Addictive Behavior

One or two specific compulsive behaviors, attitudes and emotions that an individual is consumed with so as to “numb” the responsibility from facing their shame experience. They are attempting to “numb” themselves to the pain of shame.

The danger of this strategy is that the person suffering from addictive behavior may go from victim to perpetrator in order to further numb their pain. They may create pseudo-perpetrators if they have lost focus on who they believe caused their shame.
- Unforgiveness, anger and bitterness;

Feelings of deep resentment, anger, rage, bitterness to significant others who actually or it is perceived have offended and/or hurt the person battling with shame. This person is “gripped” with feelings of revenge, resentment, deep rage towards another and cannot seem to forgive them, and/or nor do they wish to.

The danger of this strategy is that the individual may go from victim to perpetrator in that they “infect” or “transfer” their family or those close to them with bitterness or hatred.

- **Blaming others**    The person suffering with shame cannot or will not assume any responsibility or contribution for destructive attitudes or behavior that may have led to their shame experience.

The danger of this strategy is that the individual deludes themselves into believing they are primarily a victim. Eventhough there is some shame, like sexual abuse or battering, that is not caused by the individual, if the person does not process this shame, and learn to forgive they may prevent themselves from enjoying significant relationships in the future because of over-protecting themselves through blaming others for insignificant mistakes. In doing so they may excuse themselves from destructive attitudes or behavior they may have contributed to future relationships.
  
- **Cutting oneself of from authentic community**    A person suffering with shame inadvertently attempts to cut, avoid or hide themselves off from those that may have hurt them, those they are threatened by, those that they may perceived to have threatened them, those they are accountable to, so as not to face their shame or be reminded of their shame.

The danger in this strategy is that we are designed for community. Therefore, a person suffering with shame often gravitates to or forms a pseudo-community that they may control either actively or passive-aggressively. It may develop into a community of compulsive confession where each member “licks their wounds” without effectively addressing the roots of their shame experience. A further concern is that a person suffering from shame uses individuals to numb their fear of community and shame.

- Selfishness, pride and narcissism

A person suffering with shame may believe that they are entitled to special rights and privileges, whether earned or not.

The danger of this strategy of suffering with shame is that they express anger when others do not do what they want.

They become demanding of others without assuming reciprocal responsibilities. They fail to recognize the desires, needs and feelings of others. When recognized, the subjective experiences of others are viewed as weaknesses they can exploit. They seek opportunities to exploit others as a means to self-fulfilling ends. They have fragmented and vulnerable self-esteem.

There is a deep need and demand for personal admiration. They are hypersensitive to “injury” from criticism, failure, humiliation or offending

**Second**, the pastoral counselor gives the client a **Client Exercise Sheet 1, Shame diagnostic tool (Table 4)** and the **Client Questionnaire, The 7 Strategies of shame (Table 5)**. (The pastoral counselor keeps a **Counselor Exercise Sheet, Shame Diagnostic Tool, Table 4a** for their files with the seven strategies identities on the end box on the far right hand side.)

The exercise sheet comprises of 56 blocks in which the client fills in the relevant numbered blocks with numbers 1,2,3,4,or 5 (1 – Almost never. 2.- Seldom 3. Occasionally, 4.-Faily often, 5.-Almost always) that corresponds to numbered statements on the questionnaire.

**Example**

Block one will correspond to statement one “1. I have a tendency to think that God does not have my best in mind. The client answers **1** – Almost never, **2** - Seldom, **3** - Occasionally, **4** -Fairly often, **5** - Almost always. When the client has finished filling in the number blocks with the number that corresponds to the appropriate statement they are to add up their score and place it in the small, empty dark, outlined box on the right hand side.

**Client Exercise Sheet 1, Shame diagnostic tool (Table 4)**

- Statements 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36, 43, 50 deal with strategies of doubting God’s goodness
- Statements 2, 9, 16, 23, 30, 37, 44, 51 deal with strategies of hiding or covering shame
- Statements 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 38, 45, 52 deal with strategies of addictive behavior
- Statements 4, 11, 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 53 deal with strategies of unforgiveness, anger and bitterness
- Statements 5, 12, 19, 26, 33, 40, 47, 54 deal with strategies at blaming others
- Statements 6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 44, deal with strategies of cutting oneself off from authentic community
- Statements 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49, 56 deal with strategies of selfishness, pride and narcissism

**Client Questionnaire, The 7 Strategies of shame (Table 5).****TABLE 5****The 7 Strategies of shame**

Life is a system. One thing affects another. The parts affect the whole. It is important that you gain a clear evaluation of where you are in terms of your shame. You will discover that your shame is the foundation to many of the issues that you face. This is a diagnostic tool. It is not perfect, but it is effective. Please be assured that these statements are NOT designed to shame you further. These 7 areas have already affected your attitude towards yourself, others and your future. There are 56 statements that you are asked to address. In each of the boxes please place a number (1,2,3,4, or 5) 1 – Almost never, 2 – Seldom, 3 - Occasionally, 4 -Fairly often, 5 - Almost always. When you have finished please add up your score and place it in the small empty dark, outlined box on the right hand side

1. I have a tendency to think that God does not have my best in mind.
2. I believe you have to perform to be accepted.
3. I am involved in a habit that I can't seem to stop.
4. I have been deeply hurt by someone and it seems difficult to forgive them.
5. I wish my Dad or Mom were more loving towards me.
6. People seem to form clichés.
7. I have a tendency to see myself as very different from others, in the sense that no one understands me.
8. I believe that you have to look out for number 1, myself, because no one else will.
9. I do not want people to see my weaknesses.
10. I seem gripped by pornography on the Internet
11. When I see \_\_\_\_\_ (think of name of someone) I want to avoid them.
12. I often feel picked on by others.
13. You really can't trust people.
14. I am quite content not to have people in my life.
15. I believe that there are so many hypocrites and judgmental people at church.
16. I have strongly contemplated suicide.
17. I sexually fantasize.
18. I wish people understood how much I have been hurt.
19. My Boss or Teacher seems to be against me.
20. I isolate myself from events that involve people I know.
21. No one understands me.
22. I'm not ready to hand my life into God's Hand's just yet.
23. I think that my life is so rushed.
24. When I battle to express myself or become afraid I engage in a particular habit.
25. I talk about certain people behind their backs.
26. I am the last to be acknowledged or loved.
27. I believe no one cares, not really.

28. I believe it is my right to be heard when I have something to say.
29. I wonder where God is when other people suffer.
30. I sense that there is nothing wrong with me.
31. I numb the pain with a particular activity.
32. \_\_\_\_\_(person's name) has no idea how much trouble they have caused.
33. I am the last to be acknowledged or loved.
34. I live by the D.T.A. Principle (Don't Trust Anyone).
35. No one seems to care how much I suffer.
36. I believe you have to do it yourself if you want to get ahead.
37. I battle with things no different from anyone else.
38. I could stop my habit any time I choose.
39. I seem to keep playing in my mind what damage they could have done.
40. Some people really irritate me.
41. I feel that you cannot rely on people for very much.
42. I believe if I feel that you cannot rely on people for very much.
42. I believe if you want a job done right, do it yourself.
43. I believe it is difficult to trust in a Being that you cannot see.
44. I need a good income, home and car to believe I am a success.
45. I think what I do in private is my business, as long as it does not hurt anyone else.
46. I believe that people who wrong me ought to take the first step in asking forgiveness.
47. Its not my fault that I battle with what I do.
48. I don't want to be tied down by any group.
49. I feel that people need to cooperate when I am placed in leadership.
50. I personally think the Bible is outdated as a self help book compared to the spiritual material available.
51. I need to be seen with the latest fashion and styles.
52. I feel I need my habit to get by.
53. I believe I can forgive but don't ask me to forget.
54. I think if others know my background they would understand my attitude.
55. I think that people like to stereo-type others so they can control them.
56. I believe I require specialized help from a trained professional.

### **Third, the pastoral counselor scores the clients exercise sheet 1**

The highest score that can be recorded is 280

There are two suggested ways of diagnosing the exercise sheet

#### **First: To view the Shame Diagnostic tool 1 collectively.**

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 1-112   | No significant shame issues in regards to this strategy  |
| 113-168 | There are some consistent strategies to shame that are surfacing and may intensify if not addressed. (Use the questionnaire as a guide to addressing these areas of shame) |
| 169-280 | There are strategies to avoid shame that must be immediately addressed. (Use the questionnaire as a guide to addressing these areas of shame)                              |

#### **Second: To evaluate the Shame Diagnostic Tool 1 per individual strategy.**

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| 1-16  | No significant shame issues in regards to this strategy  |
| 17-24 | There are some consistent strategies to shame that are surfacing and may intensify if not addressed. (Use the questionnaire as a guide to addressing these areas of shame) |
| 25-40 | There are strategies to avoid shame that must be immediately addressed. (Use the questionnaire as a guide to addressing these areas of shame)                              |

### **Fourth, the pastoral counselor identifies the Shame Strategies**

The pastoral counselor assists the client in identifying each of the shame strategies by having them write the strategy in each box on the far right hand side of their exercise sheet 1.

The pastoral counselor hands out Table 4 and uses it as a template to discuss the various strategies and dangers of these strategies with the client.

#### 6.4.2. Preliminary conclusion

There appears to be strategies within individuals experiencing shame that act as hindrances or barriers in addressing shame. These strategies are very real and require understanding. This Shame Diagnostic Tool is a guide, and is not comprehensive. Another hindrance in addressing shame seems to stem from an inaccurate understanding of the types of shame.

#### 6.4.3. The 5 types of shame

Shame cannot be evaluated under one umbrella. A pastoral counselor must understand that shame has different dynamics that make up this condition. There seem to be different types of shame. Some shame is negative, and in fact we carry these types of shame around with us both when we sleep and throughout our day. These negative types of shame may be the result of upbringing, unresolved painful relationships and experiences in our past, and/or the accumulation of both that are added to strategies we have used not to be hurt any longer. These negative types of shame may influence our emotions, decisions and relationships. Some are positive, in that they act as a restraint and assist in tempering our temptations and decisions throughout the day. They assist in preventing us from acting on impulses that may result in destructive attitudes, consequences that harm ourselves and those around us.

The researcher is suggesting five types of shame that individuals experience. A shame diagnostic tool has been developed in order to address these different types of shame. The pastor may use this shame diagnostic tool in the following way:

**First, the pastoral counselor is to familiarize themselves with the different types of shame which are proposed, which include:**

- Adamic Shame
- Forensic Shame
- Shame Identity
- Global Shame
- Godly Shame

A brief definition of each type of shame will be proposed in order to effectively address these types of shame (Table 6)

**TABLE 6**

**Different Types of Shame**

- **Adamic Shame**

In light of the historical Fall of Adam and Eve there exists an imputed spiritual predisposition within the nature of each individual in humankind. It is the propensity to develop and harbor destructive attitudes (cf. Genesis 3:1-12; Romans 5:12). These destructive attitudes and the resultant strategies seem to begin from childhood (cf. Genesis 6:5 with Genesis 8:21). Adamic Shame is a day by day reality that may serve as a positive reminder that as Christians we are not “home with the Lord” (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:1-9; John 14:1-3).
  
- **Forensic Shame**

A person dealing with Forensic Shame may develop strategies to cover up in order to prevent assuming responsibility or contribution to destructive attitudes and behavior. They may use many or all of the seven strategies so they do not have to have wrong doing, Forensic Shame profoundly impacts community which results in destructive and broken relationships intra-personally and interpersonally with God, -oneself and others. God's gaze spiritually diagnoses Forensic Shame (Jeremiah 1:12 "...for I am watching cf. 7:9-11). Forensic shame may serve as a preventative inner conscience and conviction to temptation to actualize Adamic Shame. It is also an inner conviction to face

both destructive attitudes and behavior in a humble, contrite, reparative authentic attitude. Forensic Shame could be positive if it brings an individual to a repentant attitude and change.

- **Shame Identity**

A person with a Shame Identity lives with perpetual inner insecurities, in spite of forgiveness or reconciliation. They may have a continual sense of being worthless, and internalize fears, failures and frustrations. They may adopt a number of the strategies of shame to cope with day-to-day activity.
  - **Global Shame**

An inner awareness that an individual lives within societal boundaries that seem to influence and even regulate, and for some condition the external responses or reactions of people within a particular culture. This may include dress, beliefs, conduct, *et al.*
  - **Godly Shame**

This is a healthy form of shame as it may act as a restraint from ungodly and destructive attitudes and behavior. A believer who allows their consciences to be calibrated by God's Word, prayer, authentic service and worship to God through their community, family, work environment, church and friendships will develop a godly shame.
-

**Second**, the pastoral counselor gives the client a **Client Exercise Sheet 2, Shame diagnostic tool 2 (Table 7)** and the **Client Questionnaire - The different types of shame (Table 8)**.

The exercise sheet comprises of 40 blocks in which the client fills in the relevant numbered blocks with numbers 1,2,3,4, or 5 (1 – Almost never, 2 – Seldom, 3 - Occasionally, 4 - Fairly often, 5 - Almost always) that corresponds to statements on the questionnaire.

### **Example**

Block one will correspond to statement one “1. I feel disconnected from God. “The client answers **1** – Almost never, **2** – Seldom, **3** - Occasionally, **4** - Fairly often, **5** - Almost always). When the client has finished filling in the number blocks with the number that corresponds to the appropriate statement they are to add up their score and place it in the small empty dark-outlined box on the right hand side.

### **Client Exercise Sheet 2, Shame diagnostic tool (Table 7)**

- Statements 1,6 , 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36 deal with Adamic Shame
  - Statements 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37 deal with Forensic Shame
  - Statements 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38 deal with Shame Identity
  - Statements 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39 deal with Global Shame
  - Statements 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 deal with Godly Shame
-

**Client Questionnaire (Table 8)****TABLE 8****The different types of shame**

When we feel a sense of shame it is easy to interpret this and place it under the one name – shame. However, there seem to be different types of shame. Some shame is negative, and in fact we carry these types of shame around with us both when we sleep and throughout our day. These negative types of shame may be the result of upbringing, unresolved painful relationships and experiences in our past, and/or the accumulation of both that are added to strategies we have used not to be hurt any longer. These negative types of shame may influence our emotions, decisions and relationships. Some are positive, in that they act as a restraint and assist in tempering our temptations and decisions throughout the day. They assist in preventing us from acting on impulses that may result in destructive attitudes, consequences that harm ourselves and those around. There are 40 statements that you are asked to address. In each of the boxes please place a number (1,2,3,4, or 5) 1 – Almost never, 2 - Seldom 3, Occasionally 4 - Fairly often, 5 - Almost always. When you have finished please add up your score and place it in the small, empty dark-outlined box on the right hand side

1. I feel disconnected from God.
2. I naturally try to cover up or hide my faults from others.
3. I battle with feelings of self-worth.
4. I am suspicious of others; that people are talking behind my back.
5. I do not challenge my thought life before I engage in destructive behavior.
6. I have a tendency to blame my father for what he did to me.
7. I tend to lie to about my faults when accused.
8. I often don't feel like I am forgiven.
9. I often feel like I have to look over my shoulder at what other think about me.
10. I can't seem to pray to God about my insecurities.
11. I seem to have a tension between doing what is wrong and being aware of God's gaze on my life.
12. I am often defensive when failures surface in my life.
13. I am critical of others.
14. I am concerned about what others think about me.
15. I battle to read the Bible because it might expose something that I am doing.
16. I think that God does not treat me fairly.
17. When I am confronted with a fault I deny that there is an issue.
18. I struggle with anger or rage.
19. I want to look good in front of others so they acknowledge me.
20. I often feel like a hypocrite at church.
21. I question whether God wants to help me face my problems.
22. I seem to have become numb to problems in my past.
23. I seem to be bitter towards certain people.

24. I expect to be praised or thanked for what I do.
25. I battle to be real in front of others.
26. I have a tendency to blame God.
27. I avoid speaking to certain individuals who may hold me accountable.
28. I can't seem to move beyond my past.
29. I need to be the center of attention at times.
30. I do not want to be accountable to spiritual leadership, i.e. Pastors, Deacons, etc.
31. I have battled with certain areas of my life since I was young.
32. I can't seem to stop certain destructive behavior that I do in secret.
33. I have a sense of ongoing insecurity.
34. I don't want others to know about my weaknesses.
35. I don't seem to have many Christian friends I can openly share my life with.
36. I am not too concerned that I was born with destructive attitudes before God.
37. I am struggling with a particular addictive behavior.
38. I am intimidated by certain people.
39. I am a part of a group that I hide behind.
40. I don't feel I need to address destructive attitudes when they arise.

### **Third, the pastoral counselor scores the client's exercise sheet 2**

The highest score that can be recorded is 200

There are two suggested ways of diagnosing the exercise sheet

#### **First: To view the Shame Diagnostic tool collectively.**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 1-80    | The client does not seem to be struggling with a significant amount of shame. (Proceed to the second way of evaluating shame to ensure that there are no high numbers under any of the first four types of shame) |
| 81-120  | There are some types of shame that must be addressed in their appropriate context. (Use the client questionnaire 1 as a guide to address certain strategies of shame)   |
| 121-200 | There are types of shame that must be immediately addressed. (Use the client questionnaire 1 as a guide to address certain strategies of shame)   |

#### **Second: To evaluate the Shame Diagnostic Tool per type of shame.**

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| 1-16  | There seems to be a balanced understanding of shame. However, Godly Shame should have scored Lower. There seems to be an understanding of restraint and mature walk in the Lord. Low scores for Adamic Shame reveal that the client does not wallow in a sense of shame                 |
| 17-24 | There seems to be a need to address the different types of shame. If Godly shame is scored around 20-24 work still needs to be done on understanding the importance of developing restraint   |
| 25-40 | These are high scores and different types of shame require explaining. (Use Table 7 and Tables 4 and 6 that describe the various strategies to avoid facing shame). If Godly Shame is this high there is a need to address the issue of restraint and maturation in their walk with God |
-

#### **Fourth, the pastoral counselor clarifies with the client**

The pastoral counselor clarifies with the client so that he can articulate the different types of shame.

The pastoral counselor is to assist the client in understanding the scriptural context for these types of shame, particularly, Adamic Shame, Forensic Shame and Global Shame. Godly Shame appears to be an integrative understanding of identifying with the covering of Christ that will be explained below.

#### **6.4.4. Preliminary conclusion**

It was proposed that because shame is a complex integration of cognitive, emotional, spiritual and volitional factors, there seem to be some hindrances or barriers that influence individuals from addressing shame. The two hindrances that were presented by means of diagnostic tools were seven strategies to avoid addressing shame, and five different types of shame that may need clarifying for an individual suffering with shame. The next stage or step in addressing shame is to answer and synthesis the journey up to this point as to evaluate what the individual has learned from attempting to cover up shame.

#### **6.5. ATTEMPTS AT COVERING SHAME – WHERE ARE YOU?: QUESTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES TOWARDS GODLY SHAME**

It is proposed that before the individual suffering from shame engages community they biblically and practically address where they are from the above stage. This exercise involves using Genesis 3:6-13 to summarize where they are at, at this point and begin the process of addressing and developing Godly Shame. Genesis 3 serves as a useful starting point in order to critique shame. This passage offers substantial assistance for the reader to understand the origin of shame. Adam was confronted by God to evaluate where he was at in relationship with God, Himself, Eve and his environment. It seems to be important to evaluate where an individual is in their walk with God, et al.

### 6.5.1. Procedure

The client is to read the Scriptures, and then the commentary. They are then to pray and ask God to give them insight into where they are in their relationship with God, their shame experience. The starting point for these questions is taken directly out of the basis-theoretical perspective on Genesis 3:6-13

<b>Genesis 3:6</b>	<b>A suggested interpretation leading to forensic shame into relationships</b>	<b>Where are you? (Answer on a separate piece of paper if required)</b>
“The woman saw”	This seems to define that she had the ability to evaluate all the data presented by the Serpent. It is interesting to note that God evaluated His Creation and Creature and saw that it was “good” and “very good”. It seems the same cannot be said of the evaluation of Eve. The tree was pleasing to her for God had made it with an aesthetic quality (Genesis 2:9), but she should not have been evaluating that particular tree. Her evaluation should and could have been of all the other trees that were “pleasing to the eye”. Williams states that the phrase <span style="font-family: monospace;">𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕</span> <span style="font-family: monospace;">𐤕𐤓</span> , it was pleasing ( <span style="font-family: monospace;">𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕</span> ( ta <sup>a</sup> wâ) to the eye), connotes a physical beauty that evokes a desire that is less superficial. It is possible for the word to express a fulfilled longing, or a deluded sense that this will fulfill a covetous longing. The same is true of the fact that the tree was good for food. So were all the other trees. However, she believed a lie	How do you evaluate what is “good” and what is “bad”? Be specific  What lies have you believed that has caused you to bring shame upon yourself?  What lies have you believed that has caused you to question God’s goodness?

interpreting that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil could give her something she believed was a deficiency as an image bearer.

It appears that the command of God for them not to eat the forbidden fruit was not based the fruit containing intrinsic evil. Their vulnerability lay in the test itself as to first, whether they would obey God and His Word because He had said it; second, whether they believed that what God had created for them was indeed good; third, whether or not creation lacked something; fourth, whether God was deficient in any way; and fifth, whether God has held something back from them.

Eve's choice to take seem to imply to her that God was deficient and that He had not provided all she needed, nor was He all she needed. This seems to be emphasized by the fact that she evaluated the tree as "desirable" for something she was not permitted to have. Tally states that

— — — — — can stress a different meaning, either the desirability of an object or the desire to obtain. In 2:9, the emphasis is on the desirability of the object, i.e., one would be disposed to enjoy such an item. However, in 3:6, the emphasis is less on the desirability of the object and more on the emotion of the desire itself (i.e., the desire

List four things that God has provided you with what you have needed?

Are you a thankful or demanding individual?

What don't you have that you long for? Why?

Will this contribute to your life and the life of others, or take away? Explain.

to attain). A destructive attitude began to take fruit within her inner being. An element of all destructive attitudes seems to be a desire to obtain something humankind believes and feels we cannot possess. Eve substitutes God's good for a deceptive imitation.

- “she took..” It seems that Satan did not give her the fruit. She took it. This was a thought out choice propelled by a spirit of covetousness. She took because it seems that as a part of the anatomy of sin is the seduction of a relationship with something else on the woman's own terms. She was designed for relationship. A relationship without God would produce loneliness, therefore, she attempts a relationship with something other than God (Thielicke, 1961:158-160). The woman is totally culpable. This was though out, and she acted upon her attitude.
- “...ate..” She consumed for herself the things she believed and felt would fill a perceived deficiency of God. It seems another element of destructive attitudes lead to behavior that is totally self-focused.
- “...gave some to her husband...” The affects of a destructive attitude is that it often destroys community as it draws in participants.
- Do you assume responsibility for your actions?
- Do you make wise choices? Why? or Why not?
- Would you consider yourself an autonomous person?
- What has changed in your life in terms of your need to consume things? Explain.
- In what ways have destructive attitudes or choices influenced those closest to you?

Do you assume responsibility for

these attitudes?

Have you confessed these attitudes to those closest to you? Why? or Why not?

“...and he ate.” However, Adam is culpable as well. He is not described as a victim or an innocent bystander, but an active participant (cf. 1 Timothy 2:14). Have those closest to you, if they have sinned, confessed their contribution to you and God?

**Genesis 3:7-13 Suggested theological paradigm of forensic shame**

**Where are you?  
(Answer on a separate piece of paper if required)**

Then the eyes of both of them were opened, (v7a) Hamilton (2001) insightful in his interpretation of the word פתחו (pithu) “opened” in stating that Adam and Eve hardly got what they had falsely promised. Their eyes became opened but at what consequence. He reminds the reader “How different is this couple who had their eyes opened from another couple who also had their eyes opened as they walked from Jerusalem to Emmaus (“then their eyes were opened and they recognized him,” (cf. Luke 24:31). Both Adam and Eve experienced exactly the same consequence because they are both individually and collectively culpable. Now that you have addressed your shame, what exposure did you or do you still fear the most?

and they realized  
they were naked  
(v7b)

The above thought is expanded in the second part of the verse. They, together and individually, “realized” יָדְעוּ (yad'u) developed an experiential knowledge of that which they had sought. They had come to know that which was the consequence of disobeying God. This knowledge of good and evil though produced a forensic guilt as they had transgressed a known law and boundary that was established (commanded) by God. The forensic guilt of which they were culpable created a sense of being naked. This seemed to result in forensic/moral shame. Waltke 2001:92) states that this was produced by a sense of someone “stripped of protective clothing” and “naked” in the sense of being defenseless, weak and humiliated. It is suggested that from this point there is an innate, imputed and inherited conscience and sense of both guilt and shame in every individual which seems to begin at birth (cf. Genesis 6:5; Genesis 8:21; Psalm 51:5; Romans 2:15; Romans 5:12). Seevers (2001) observes that in the rest of the Bible, nakedness is often associated with shame, with nakedness and shame even used interchangeably. “The *fig leaves* were pathetic enough, as human expedients tend to be, but the instinct (to hide in shame) was sound and God confirmed it (v. 21), for “sins proper fruit is shame” (Kidner,

Do you believe there is such a thing as a private sin?

Do you believe that all destructive attitudes will have “public” consequence?

When you have done something wrong, do you face it or do you attempt to deny it?

In what way have past destructive attitudes and behavior affected your relationships?

1967:69). There seems to be another affect to realizing they were naked, Adam and Eve's relationship to one another. This shame should not be reduced to an emotional affect, or to sexual shame (cf. Kaas, 2004:106-108). It is purported that there existed a very real inner objective sense of moral defilement before God and one another (cf. ANON, 1998:780).

<p>so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves (7c).</p>	<p>First, this realization does not bring a change of attitude in their relationship with God but a determination to find a shallow solution to shame.</p> <p>Second, there seems to be both an urgency, desperation and a clumsiness to covering their shame.</p> <p>Third, they seem to be committed and engaged in a strategy to cover their shame. They "made" with their own hands a futile attempt to cover their shame. It seems this strategy to make with one's own hands becomes a powerful theme to describe covering forensic shame throughout the Old Testament.</p> <p>Fourth, they seem to be working virtuously in partnership, expending energy and time in a cause that will not provide the relief they so desperately need.</p> <p>Fifth, the materials they use will not even bring temporary relief, although they seemed deceived into thinking they will.</p> <p>Sixth, the deceitful attitude and strategy that</p>	<p>Do you use any quick-fix solutions to ignore destructive attitudes or behavior in your life?</p> <p>Do you panic when you do something wrong?</p> <p>Can you remember the procedure you take in order to cover things you may have done wrong?</p> <p>How much energy and time did it take to keep the destructive attitude and behavior covered?</p> <p>Who have you involved in attempting to cover up your shame?</p> <p>What has attempting to cover up cost you and others?</p>
--	--	---

was assumed to bring pleasure and a fulfilled longing brought the consequence of a sense of weakness, defenselessness, exposure, insecurity and humiliation. This thought is captured by Matthews (cf. 2002:239) who points out that there is a linkage between the act and consequence with a play on words “pleasing” in verse 6 and the word for “fig”.

<p>Then the man and his wife heard the sound of the LORD as he was walking in the garden in the cool of the day, (3:8a).</p>	<p>There would be no deluding God. Calvin (2001: 45) makes a valuable statement in this regard, “All bury the disgrace of their vices under flimsy leaves till God, by his voice, strikes inwardly their consciences. Hence, after God had shaken them out of their torpor, their alarmed consciences compelled them to hear his voice.” Ironically it seems in the boundary (Garden) of delight (Eden) brings a sense of a need to hide, and not stand authentic before the LORD. Adam and Eve heard the sound (l/q (qôl) of the Lord in the garden, in the cool of the evening (lit., at the breeze of the day and that sound awakens both their guilt and shame. (cf. Domeris, 2001; Sailhamer, 1998))</p>	<p>What is or was your reaction when you were confronted with wrong doing?</p> <p>Explain where you sensed shame?</p> <p>Were you affected physically in any way?</p>
<p>This far-reaching event in the world’s history of the entrance of sin brought with it the resultant objective because of the reality of guilt and exposure before God (cf.</p>	<p>Do you ever think of God’s gaze and/or judgment as beneficial for you? Explain.</p>	

Constable, 2004:43). Although the wicked falsely believe they will not have to give an account before God (Psalm 10:13; Psalm 73:10-11), a reoccurring thought throughout Scriptures is that all humankind must give an account for our choices before God (cf. Job 31:14; 31:37; Ecclesiastes 3:15; 12:14; 1 Corinthians 4:5; Hebrews 4:12-13). It is suggested that this is the reality of humankind in general as image bearers, and each are required standing before Him in recesses of their heart and confronting their forensic guilt and shame. This seems to be supported by following the murder of Abel, God searches out Cain and says, “Listen (l/q)!” His brother's blood is calling out, presumably for revenge (Domeris, 2001).

and they hid from the LORD God among the trees of the garden. (3:8b)

Hill (2001) states that the root  $\text{אָחַז}$  ( $\text{אָחַז}$ ?) may refer to hiding in dread of divine presence, whether out of shame and guilt.. The strategy in hiding is to vanish and be undetectable, almost invisible. Now, they had a choice either to face the culpability of their forensic guilt and shame, or to attempt a futile strategy to hide. The first does not alleviate the consequences of guilt, but it would enable them to address both their guilt and shame. By hiding they are implicitly admitting their guilt and shame, yet retaining a strategy of autonomy to save face. The strategy to hide from God only

Where and behind whom do you go to hide from your wrong doing?

emphasized their spiritual and relational alienation from God and one another. They were disconnected relationally and their shame was the main indicator of this fact. They hid behind the very provision that should have brought contentment and enjoyment.

<p>But the LORD God called to the man, "Where are you?" (v9)</p>	<p>Consistent through out Genesis God's intervention is in spite of human failure. God seems to come as a father seeking His children (cf. Matthews 2002:240). This should not be equated with a permissive father who ignores the destructive attitudes and actions of his children. On the contrary He comes to uncover the deeds of which is intended to effect a pedagogical discipline which "permits the guilty to witness against themselves by their own admissions" (Matthews, 2002:240). It seems that it is more than just admitting guilt. Adam and Eve not only get to face their guilt, but by their "father" finding them they get to face their individual shame which motivated them to attempt to hide or be undetectable from Him. This is supported by the fact that God questions Adam as an individual (second-person singular). This seems to be a question that should not be restricted to focusing on individual responsibility. God is also connecting with Adam. The judgment in which God has come is both punitive and</p>	<p>What have you learned about yourself in attempting to hide? List 5 truths about your character.</p> <p>Do you sense that God wishes to train you as a child when he confronts you in your heart?</p>
--	--	---

restorative. “God does not pass judgment without careful investigation (Waltke, 2001:92; Genesis 4:9-10; 18:21). It seems imperative that Adam faces his shame before God Himself (cf. Psalm 51:4). “The modern world tends to question, “Where is God”?. Genesis 3:9 seems to ask a different and more important question: Where is man?” (cf. Green and Lawrenz, 1994:81) It seems that there can be no reconciliation until Adam faces who he is before God addressing what he has done.

He answered, "I heard you in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; so I hid." (3:10)

It is significant that fear is attached to both hearing God in the garden, having to come face to face with God. Before his disobedience he enjoy a “Coram Deo” with no sense of insecurity or fragmentation in his relationship. There should not be a haste to interpret his fear because of his circumstances as though he was a victim. His fear seems more to be attached to the fact that he understands his place in God’s world, in terms of his relationship to Him. Pelt and Kaiser (2001) state that פָּרֹחַ (פָּרֹחַ) (“afraid” in this text refers to the terror before Deity. “Naked” carries the same idea as in verse 7: a sense of powerlessness, humiliation, insecure, which explain why Adam could not enjoy a “face to face” relationship that he once did. The only futile strategy he assumed he could

Please list 4 of your top fears?

Do you think that any of these fears are related to your shame? Explain.

Are any of these fears related to you not wanting to face the consequences of your shame?

take was one of self preservation, to hide. Explain.

Shame seems to cause the shamed to react when confronted with not just what they have done, but more significantly with who they are. It seems that Adam would rather hide his shame, than face it, and apparently, in his mind be further shamed, which of course was not true. God is seeking to have Adam face the consequences of his attitude and actions but also “cover” his nakedness and shame.

And he said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?" (3:11)

It is suggested that this second question would provide an opportunity for Adam to focus his attention on a self-evaluation before His Creator. This is an opportunity for Adam:

to accept his contribution and culpability before God.

to confess his lack of leadership in challenging both Eve and the Serpent.

to understand the ramification of coveting something he was never designed to have.

to acknowledge the futility of attempting to find contentment outside of God's good for him.

to confess his guilt before God at defying an understood boundary and his attempt to cover his attitude and actions.

to seek forgiveness from God.

to confess his guilt before his wife in view of the fact that he functions in the role of final accountability before God.

Do you find study Scriptures in order to identify areas of your life that need changing?

Do you identify with any of the opportunities to change in this commentary?

The man said, "The woman you put here with me -she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it." (3:12)

There is a powerful lesson to be gleaned from Adam's response which, it appears, should not be passed over glibly. Instead of admitting and assuming responsibility it seems he takes the position of the victim of circumstance and pressure, not a culpable agent. Matthews (2002:241) captures the mood of the verse by stating that in the original language Adam's contention is given force by the emphasis on "she", yielding the sense, "I only took what *she* gave me!" Adam goes on to ultimately blame God for his disobedience, by stating that the woman that God gave to him, gave him the fruit. There seems to be a genuine case to state that blame shifting is one of the most prominent strategies when a person has a sense of shame, to avoid accountability. "Self-justification almost always involves the transfer of blame to others." (Swindoll and Zuck, 2003:733). It is suggested they sink deeper into their shame as this seems to be another futile strategy to cover and hide their shame.

Do you still have a tendency to blame others for wrong doing? Who?

The man said, "The woman you put here with me -she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it." (3:13a)

It is significant that God addresses the woman with basically the same question. It may seem that God was taking His cue from Adam and was blaming the woman. This should be looked at an opportunity for the woman to face her own culpability before the Lord.

Then the LORD said to the woman, "What is this you have done?"

The woman said, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate." (3:13b)

The woman thinking. (Boyd, 2001:166-167) Matthews (2001:242) believes that Eve was a "victim of deception". This does not seem to be accurate, as she was well aware of God's Word and had the ability to reply to the Serpent using God's Word (cf. Genesis 3:1-5).

Do you have a tendency to blame the devil for your own sin?

### **6.5.2. Preliminary Conclusions**

It seems that Genesis 3:6-13 provides an adequate and practical opportunity to face the consequences of shame in addressing and understanding Godly Shame. The first three stages or steps of addressing shame deal with the individual. However, as it has been suggested in the basis-theoretical perspective, the empirical research and the first stage in addressing shame ('correlation') that people are designed for community and find authentic change and restraint in an integrative community

## **6.6. MENDING THROUGH COMMUNITY – A CALL TO ADDRESS SHAME**

Communities often seem to be fragmented on the outside because there seems to be no repentance and addressing destructive attitudes within each heart, on the inside. Authentic healing seems to be directly related to authentic repentance. Jeremiah seems to offer substantial assistance in advancing a biblical critique and practical implications of shame in light of the means to healing a broken community. It serves to heighten the readers appreciation to the tension of humankind's various strategies to cover their Forensic Shame and God's grace and work in the process of repentance as a spiritual diagnostic of shame within the human heart.

### 6.6.1. Truths from Jeremiah-Confronting the community

This stage seeks to ask questions to the spiritual community at large in addressing its shame, and by implication addresses each individual heart. A selection of statements from the basis-theoretical perspective is imported into a spiritual diagnostic tool designed to confront a community as they address their shame or potential shame by means of a series of complementary questions. These questions should not be reduced to a spiritual community but to a family, business, school, etc

#### Truths from Jeremiah

The Book of Jeremiah is a powerful lesson on the reality of a nation, comprised of individuals, who are so spiritually consumed with deceit and self-sufficiency, that they are unable to identify their shame and change their attitude towards their destructive lifestyle and God. (2.3.5.1)

Jeremiah 8:5-6,

Why then have these people turned away?

Why does Jerusalem always turn away?

They cling to deceit; they refuse to return. I have listened attentively, but they do not say

what is right. No one repents of his wickedness, saying, "What have I done?"

Each pursues his own course like a horse charging into battle.

Carpenter and Grisanti (2001) note that the description of the people as clinging to deceit 𐤓𐤌𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 (r<sup>o</sup>mîyâ) depicts the deceit as an accomplished fact. The sobering reality of this

#### Confronting the Community

Are you a part of a spiritual community that is so focused on performance in the name of God that it has lost its passion for God? Explain.

Can you identify the deceit you as a community are "clinging to"? If not why can't you?

What will be some destructive consequences to you as a community if you do not face this deceit?

is that there may come a point where a person or nation who has hidden behind religion or destructive attitudes, to cover shame, may come to a point of no return, i.e. they live within the sphere of a deluded lifestyle of shame. (2.3.5.2.)

The Book of Jeremiah suggests that the pattern of destructive attitudes and behavior began "from their youth" (cf. 2:4; 3:4; compared with 3:24-25; 22:21; 31:19; 32:30, cf. Genesis 8:21; Psalm 51:5). God diagnosed in Jeremiah 32:30 that His People have done nothing but evil in his sight "from their youth". Only a repentant attitude can acknowledge the forensic shame attached to destructive attitudes. Hence, in a repentant confession Judah acknowledges,

After I strayed, I repented; after I came to understand, I beat my breast. I was ashamed and humiliated because I bore the disgrace of my youth.' (2.3.5.2)

Does there seem to be a systemic pattern of destructive attitudes and behavior in your community?

Has it been left unaddressed for years?

If so, why do you think it has been left "uncovered"?

What strategies are used to cover up the past?

It is suggested in Jeremiah that shame is no accident. "Each pursues his own course like a horse charging into battle. (Jeremiah 8:6) "You did not listen...you provoked me with what your hands had made.....you have brought this harm on yourselves..." (Jeremiah 25:6-7). It is the giving up of an attitude of self-sufficiency,

In what ways do you as a community allow each other to cultivate selfish autonomous behavior?

Has this promoted harmony or disunity?

that a person has some ability to strategize their way out of the result of this destructive attitude and action. "Everyone is senseless without knowledge. Every goldsmith is shamed by his own idols" in God's eyes. The shamed goldsmith and the people who worship the works of their own hands worship that which is a "fraud" and "worthless" (cf. Jeremiah 10:14-15; 8:19; 10:8; 14:22; 16:19; 51:18).

Would you state that leadership does as it sees fit in their own eyes?

Even though God's People were in fact perpetrators there was a sense that they did not need to go through the channels of repentance, by articulating the offense confessing their destructive attitudes, seeking forgiveness, contrition or potential reparation that is required for other perpetrators. Instead these people sought "false physician" to "cover" their shame. (cf. 6:13-15; 8:11, 22; 23:13, 17; ) They also attempt, in the midst of chaos, to "cover" or "dress" their shame in alluring others to their aid. These false physicians were the "spiritual" leaders, Priests and False prophets of the day. These leaders were described (Jeremiah 8:11; 6:13) as those who "dress the wound of my people as though it were not serious." (2.3.5.2)

Do you, as a community, see the severity of your condition or do you choose leaders who will turn a blind eye to you destructive condition?

Do you choose leaders on the basis of popularity in the eyes of people or passion for God and His Word?

Do you have a true pastor of God or a puppet of the people?

God searches the mind and the heart (cf. Jeremiah 17:10; 20:12), and sees what is hidden. A repentant individual acknowledges from his or her heart and mind that one is a

In what ways are you desensitized as a community to the gaze of God? Are you willing for Him to work in each of you individually and as a community?

perpetrator, not a victim. This person is willing to diagnose the strategies and agenda of his or her heart (cf. Jeremiah 5:23, 7:24, 18:12) and relinquish false strategies to clear or cover oneself of Forensic shame. God states in Jeremiah 2:22 that, "although you wash yourself with soda and use an abundance of soap, the stain of your guilt is still before me." This is a reminder of the fact that a person who attempts to cleanse themselves seems to prove their culpability. (2.3.5.2.)

Repentance, in uncovering and exposing shame involves a work of God and His Spirit in the lives of His People (Jeremiah 29:11-13; 31:33). They were those caught in forensic shame. Forensic shame desensitized God's people to their desperate spiritual condition. (cf. 3:1-5, 25; 8:12). Any attempt to repent and change without the work of God in the hearts of His people is futile as it is devoid of truth (Chisholm, 2002:158). Repenting includes ultimately accepting that ALL Forensic shame is hiding from, facing and developing an authentic relationship to God. It seems important to accept the inevitable consequences of Forensic shame as both a punitive and a spiritual discipline. (2.3.5.2)

Huey (1993:187) states that the expression "the days are coming" occurs thirteen times in Jeremiah (cf. 7:32;9:25; 16:14; 19:6; 23:5,7; 30:3;31:27,38, et al). These verses seem to indicate that God will perform a radical and

In what ways are your traditions a hindrance to God's working in and through you in order to cover your shame?

In what ways are you aware that if you are not covered by God you remain spiritually naked?

The only healing for community is repentance, a changing of the attitude and heart before God. How prepared are you as a community to face your individual shame and corporate shame?

What strategies for avoiding shame are hindering you from repenting?

If you do repent, what steps are you going to take to reconcile with God, one another and those you may have injured?

How are you demonstrating an urgency to face your shame as a community?

final "uprooting" and "breaking down". In its place is God "planting" and "building" (Jeremiah 1). Shame will not always have its grip on people. There is an eschatological and restorative hope, an assurance for the future. Dearman (2002:286) states that this change will be in its totality because both Israel and Judah are mentioned. The truth remains that shame is diagnosed and may be worked on "today", in the present.

#### **6.6.2. Preliminary conclusion**

Authentic healing seems to be directly related to authentic repentance. The Book of Jeremiah seems to offer substantial assistance in advancing a biblical critique and practical implications of shame in light of the means to healing a broken community. Selections of statements from the basis theoretical perspective were imported into a spiritual diagnostic tool designed to confront a community in addressing their shame. The individual and the community have been addressed. The final stage provides the basis and the means for authentic covering which is found in Jesus Christ as described by the book of Ephesians.

### **6.7. EXPERIENCING CHRIST'S COVERING**

Ephesians 2:1-10 and 4:17-19 seem to graphically explain four truths to experiencing Christ's covering. The following may be used as a Bible Study to assist the client in addressing shame in light of their life in Christ. This Bible Study is taken from the basis theoretical perspective on the Book of Ephesians.

### 6.7.1. Lesson Title

“Tailor-Made Covering - Intentionally living like we are spiritually clothed”

### 6.7.2. Lesson outline

#### Tailor-Made Living - Intentionally living like we are spiritually clothed

<b>Lesson</b>	<b>Your relationship to Christ</b>	<b>Spiritual position</b>	<b>Implication for Shame (Objectives)</b>	<b>Ephesians</b>
Lesson 1	Looking back before you knew Christ	What you were before Christ: Spiritually Naked	To understand our hopeless condition without a relationship with Christ	2:1-3, 4:17-19
Lesson 2	Looking to Christ alone	What you are because of Christ: Spiritually Clothed	To appreciate the work of Christ in order to cover out shame	1:7, 2:4-9
Lesson 3	Living in Christ alone	What we are once we trust in Christ: Spiritually Changed	To motivate us to live in the sphere of what we already have positionally	2:10; 4:20-24

### 6.7.3. Lessons

#### Lesson 1

#### **Tailor-Made Living - Intentionally living like we are spiritually clothed**

#### **Lesson 1**

#### **Looking back before you knew Christ**

#### **Purpose: To understand our hopeless condition without a relationship with Christ**

- Read Ephesians 2:1-3 carefully. This passage focuses on who you were positionally before Christ
- What was the sphere in which you once lived?
- How does this sound like an oxymoron?
- Was this a state of genetic predisposition or where you culpable? Explain
- Were you in control of your life? Explain.
- Who ruled your life?
- Was anyone exempt from this condition?
- What seemed to fuel your lost condition?
- How was your relationship to God affected?
- Read Ephesians 4:17-19. This passage focuses on who you were practically before you knew Christ.
- Describe the five characteristics as to the spiritual disposition, nature and character of how you formerly lived.
- What implications did this have as to your condition of shame?
- How did it affect your relationship to your family, children, friends?

Would you describe your lifestyle as productive or destructive? Explain

**Lesson 2****Tailor-Made Living - Intentionally living like we are spiritually clothed****Lesson 2****Looking to Christ alone****Purpose: To appreciate the work of Christ in order to cover out shame**

- Read Ephesians 1:7 carefully. This passage focuses on who you are positionally in Christ, once we have trusted Christ as our Savior
- Is salvation based upon a religion or a person? Support this from Ephesians 1
- How do we know that our salvation is secure based on the prepositional phrase “in Him”?
- What does it mean that “we have redemption”?
- How important is it that Christ’s blood was shed for our sin?
- What implications does the shed blood of Christ have for
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- What implications does God’s Grace have for our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- Read Ephesians 2:4-9. This passage focuses on who you / we can become in Christ and why.
- What is the significant of the conjunction “but” at the beginning of verse 4?

- What are the implications of God's love for our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- What is the difference between God's mercy and God's Grace?
- What are the implications of God's Mercy for our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- When did God make us alive with Christ?
- Where has God placed us in Christ?
- How secure is our salvation because of God's sovereign act?
- Does God only focus on our pasts? Explain.
- What implications does God's "seating arrangements" have on our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- What is our role in receiving the gift of eternal life?
- What must we avoid in attempting to receive the gift of eternal life?
- What implications does receiving the gift of eternal life have on our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?

**Lesson 3****Tailor-Made Living - Intentionally living like we are spiritually clothed****Lesson 3****Living in Christ alone**

Purpose: To motivate us to live in the sphere of what we already have positionally

- Read Ephesians 2:10 carefully. This passage focuses on who you are positionally in Christ, once we have trusted Christ as our Savior
- Whose design are we, and how does this take you back to Genesis 1:26, 2:7?
- In what sphere were we crafted?
- For what purpose were we crafted or shaped?
- When was this in the mind of God?
- Do you think that God has a purpose for our lives? Answer this according to Ephesians 4:1-16.
- What implications does the fact we are God's "workmanship" have on our
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?
  - Godly Shame?
- Read Ephesians 4:20-24. This passage focuses on how we ought to live practically in light of our position in Christ.
- Where does truth reside? Be specific.
- Review and summarize your "former life" in light of Ephesians 2:1-3; 4:17-19.
- Is there a potential that you could revert to old ways of living in shame?
- How is it possible that you live within the sphere of your
  - Adamic Shame?
  - Forensic Shame?
  - Shame Identity?
  - Global Shame?

- In light of the previous Scriptures (Ephesians 1:7; 2:1-3, 4:17-19) is your “former self” and your “new self” something you fabricate or must pursue, or it is something that God has already accomplished for you in Christ?
- What does it mean to be made new in the attitude of your minds?

#### **6.7.4. Preliminary Conclusion**

This final stage focused on experiencing Christ’s covering in addressing shame. This was attempted by proposing a three-part lesson Bible study based on the Book of Ephesians 2:1-10 and 4:17-24. This Bible study is a guide for the pastoral counselor to assist a client in the final stages of addressing shame by understanding and appreciating whose they are and who they are in Jesus Christ, as their Covering for their Shame.

### **6.8. CONCLUSION**

This chapter proposed an integrative model through the method of a practice theory that was formulated for the renewal and improvement of the existing praxis of shame. This chapter did not presume that the response to shame was comprehensive. Its aim was to propose a practical integrative model, using the acronym S.H.A.M.E. as a counseling guide for equipping pastors and pastoral counselors in addressing shame on a biblical and practical level. This covered the **S**piritual foundation as the platform on which to address shame; **H**indrances to addressing shame which included 7 strategies in avoiding shame and understanding the 5 types of shame; **A**tempts at covering shame which addressed questions and consequences toward Godly Shame; **M**ending through community which addressed the need for a community to address shame corporately as studied in the book of Jeremiah and; **E**xperiencing Christ’s Covering which suggested a Bible Study of selected passages in the Book of Ephesians that addressed a believer’s position before Christ, in Christ and lifestyle through Christ.

## **6.9. FINAL CONCLUSIONS**

This research has demonstrated that one of the most important roles of the pastor is to understand and equip believers to deal with shame on a biblical and a practical level.

## **6.10. TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

This paper raises the need for further research in a number of areas. The following points provide the need for areas of further research.

1. Shame and family violence: A pastoral-theological study
2. Shame and guilt: A pastoral study
3. Shame and Teenage identity: A pastoral study
4. Local church traditions as shaming strategies: A pastoral study
5. Parental strategies and Shame
6. Marital conflicts and Shame
7. Shame and unforgiveness within the home
8. Shame and the workplace: the affect on volunteerism in the church – a pastoral study
9. Failure and Shame: a pastoral-theological study
10. Suicide and Shame: a pastoral study
11. Adultery, Narcissism and Shame: A pastoral-theological study
12. Anger and Shame
13. Bitterness and Shame: A Pastoral study
14. Shame and Addictive Behavior: A pastoral-theological study
15. Anxiety and Shame: A Pastoral Study

**Shame Diagnostic Tool - I**

Name:

Date:

1.	8.	15.	22.	29.	36.	43.	50.		
2.	9.	16.	23.	30.	37.	44.	51.		
3.	10.	17.	24.	31.	38.	45.	52.		
4.	11.	18.	25.	32.	39.	46.	53.		
5.	12.	19.	26.	33.	40.	47.	54.		
6.	13.	20.	27.	34.	41.	48.	55.		
7.	14.	21.	28.	35.	42.	49.	56.		

**Client Comments/Observations:**

**Shame Diagnostic Tool - 1**

Name:

Date:

1.	8.	15.	22.	29.	36.	43.	50.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Doubt God's Goodness
2.	9.	16.	23.	30.	37.	44.	51.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strategies at Hiding or Covering Shame
3.	10.	17.	24.	31.	38.	45.	52.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Addictive Behavior
4.	11.	18.	25.	32.	39.	46.	53.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unforgiveness, Anger and Bitterness
5.	12.	19.	26.	33.	40.	47.	54.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Blaming others
6.	13.	20.	27.	34.	41.	48.	55.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cutting oneself off from Authentic Community
7.	14.	21.	28.	35.	42.	49.	56.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Selfishness, Pride, Narcissism

**Shame Diagnostic Tool – 2**

**Name:**

**Date:**

1.	6.	11.	16.	21.	26.	31.	36.		
2.	7.	12.	17.	22.	27.	32.	37.		
3.	8.	13.	18.	23.	28.	33.	38.		
4.	9.	14.	19.	24.	29.	34.	39.		
5.	10.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	40.		

**Client Comments/Observations:**

**Shame Diagnostic Tool – 2**

**Name:**

**Date:**

1.	6.	11.	16.	21.	26.	31.	36.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adamic Shame
2.	7.	12.	17.	22.	27.	32.	37.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Forensic Shame
3.	8.	13.	18.	23.	28.	33.	38.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shame Identity
4.	9.	14.	19.	24.	29.	34.	39.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Global Shame
5.	10.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	40.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Godly Shame

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**ACHTEMEIER, P.J.; GREEN, J.B. AND THOMPSON. M.M.** 2001. *Introducing the New Testament. Its Literature and Theology.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

**ADAMS, J.E.** 1973. *The Christian Counselor's Manual. The practice of nouthetic counselling.* Grand Rapids:Zondervan.

**ALLENDER, D.B.** 1995. *The cry of the soul.* Christchurch:Navpress

**ALTROCK, C.** 1998. *The Cross. Saved by the shame of it all.* Joplin:College Press Publishing House

**ANDERSON, N.T., ZUEHLKE, T.E. AND ZUEHLKE, J.S.** 2000. *Christ-Centered Therapy. The practical integration of theology and psychology.* Grand Rapids:Zondervan Publishing House.

**ANON** 1998. *Shame.* (*In* Ryken, L. Wilhoit, J.C. and Longman III, T. *eds.* *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery.* Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.)

**ANON** 2004. *Catastrophism.com. Man, myth and mayhem in Ancient History and Science.* [*In* <http://www.catastrophism.com/online/pubs/journals/workshop/vol0203/07lettr.htm> .] [Accessed: 21/3/2003]

**AQUINAS, T.** 1982. *The Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Question 93. The end or term of the production of man. Nine Articles.* (*In* Hutchins, R.M. *ed.* *Encyclopedia Britannica. Great Books of the Western World. Volume 19.* Chicago:University of Chicago.)

**ARMSTRONG, K.** 1996. *In the Beginning: A New Interpretation of Genesis.* New York:Ballantine

**ARNOLD, B.T.** 1998. *Encountering the book of Genesis.* Grand Rapids:Baker Book House.

**ARNOLD, B.T.** 2001. **תְּשׁוּבָה** (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**ARTERBURN, S. AND FELTON, J.** 2001. Toxic Faith. Experiencing Healing from painful spiritual abuse. Colorado Springs:Shaw Books.

**BAETZ, M., GRIFFIN, R., BOWEN, R., KOENIG, H., AND MARCOUX, E.** 2004. The Association Between Spiritual and Religious Involvement and Depressive Symptoms in a Canadian Population. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease*. 192(12):818-822, December

**BANDSTRA, B.L.** 1999. Reading the Old Testament. An Introduction to the Hebrew Bible. Wadsworth Publishing Company. [*In* <http://www.hope.edu/academic/religion/bandstra/rtot/rtot/.htm>.] [Accessed:2/1/2005]

**BANKS, R.** 1998. Paul's idea of community. Peabody:Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

**BARBER, W.** 2005. A Brand new way of life, Part 1-3. [*In* <http://www.ankerberg.com/Articles/verse-by-verse/VV0800W4.htm>. P. 1-20.] [Accessed: 3/04/2005]

**BAUER, W.** 1979. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Second Edition. Revised and augmented by F.W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker. Chicago:The University of Chicago Press.

**BECK, J.** 2005. The Psychology of Paul. Grand Rapids:Kregal Publications.

**BLOCHER, H.A.G.** 2000. Adam and Eve. (*In* Alexander, D. T.; Rosner, B.S.; Carson, D.A. and Goldsworthy, G. *eds.* New Dictionary of biblical theology. Exploring the unity and diversity of Scripture. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press. P. 372-376

**BONHOEFFER, D.** 1962. Creation and Fall. A theological interpretation of Genesis 1-3. London:SCM Press LTD.

**BOYD, G.A.** 2001. Satan and the problem of evil. Constructing a Trinitarian warfare theodicy. Doners Grove: InterVaristy Press.

**BRADSHAW, J.** 1989. Healing the shame that binds you. Deerfield Beach:Health Communications Inc.

**BRANNAN, C.** 2002. Equipping believers with addictive behaviour towards reconciliation pastoral study. M.A.degree dissertation. Potchefstroom:Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education

**BRAUNGARDT, J.** 2002. Freud on religion. (*In* Freud's view of religion. <http://www.braungardt.com/Papers/Freud/Freud's/Religion.htm>. P.1-40] [ Accessed:22/3/2005.]

**BRIGHT, J.** 1976. Covenant and Promise: The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel. Westminster Press.

**BROUCEK, F. J.** 1991 . Shame and the Self. New York:The Guilford Press

**BRUCE, F.F.** 1991. The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians. The New

**BRUCE, F.F.** 1996. Paul. Apostle of the heart set free. Grand Rapids:William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

**BRUCE, F.F.,** 1989. Romans revised edition. Tyndale New Testament commentary. Eerdmans.

**BRUEGGEMANN, W.** 1998. A commentary on Jeremiah. Exile and homecoming. Grand Rapids:William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

**BRUNNER, E.** 1947. Man in revolt. A Christian Anthropology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

**BRUNNER, E. AND BARTH, K.** 1946. Natural Theology. Comprising "Nature and Grace" by Professor Dr. Emil Brunner and the reply "No!" by Dr. Karl Barth. Eugene:Wipf and Stock Publishers

**BUSH, G.** 1979. Notes on Genesis. Volume 1 and 2. Minneapolis:James Family Christian Publishers

- CALKINS, M.W.** 1915. The self in scientific psychology. [*In* <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Calkins/self.htm>.] Accessed:21/3/2005
- CALVIN, J.** 2001. Genesis. Wheaton:Crossway Books.
- CAPPS, D.** 1993. The Depleted Self. Sin in a narcissistic age.Minneapolis:Fortress Press.
- CARPENTER, E.** 2001. עֲשֵׂה (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- CARPENTER, E.** 2001. עָשָׂה (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- CARPENTER, E. AND GRISANTI, M.A.** 2001. עָשָׂה (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- CARPENTER, E. AND GRISANTI, M.A.** 2001. עָשָׂה (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- CARPENTER, E. AND GRISANTI, M.A.** 2001 עָשָׂה (In VanGemeran, W. A ed. Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- CHILDS, B.** 1993. Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments. Minneapolis:Fortress Press.
- CHISHOLM, R.B.** 2002. Handbook on the prophets. Grand Rapids:Baker Acedemics
- COLLINS, G.** 1986. The rebuilding of psychology. An integration of Psychology and Christianity. Wheaton:Tyndale House Publishers.
- COLLINS, G.** 1993. The Biblical Basis of Christian Counselling for People Helpers. Colorado Springs:Navpress
- CONSTABLE, T.I.** 2004. Notes on Genesis. [*In* Sonic.Light. [www.soniclight.com](http://www.soniclight.com). P. 1-311]

[Accessed:2/2/2004]

**CONSTABLE, T.L.** 2004. Notes on Jeremiah. [*In* <http://www.soniclight.com/constable/notes/pdf/jeremiah.pdf>.] [Accessed: 4/2/2004.]

**COPPES, L.J.** 1970. An introduction to the hermeneutic of Hermman Gunkel. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 32(2):148-178, May.

**COWARD, H.** 2003. Sin and salvation in the world religions. A short introduction. Oxford:Oneworld Publications.

**CRABB, L.** 1993. Who we are and how we relate. Colorado Springs:Navpress

**CRABB, L.** 1995. The silence of Adam. Grand Rapids:Zondervan Publishing House.

**CRABB, L.** 1999. The Safest Place on Earth. Nashville:Word Publishing

**CRABB, L. AND ALLENDER, D.B.** 1996. Hope when you are hurting. Grand Rapids:Zondervan Publishing House.

**CRANFIELD, C.E.B.** 1990. Romans Volume 1. Introduction and Commentary on Romans I-VIII. Edinburgh. T and T. Clark Limited.

**DARWIN, C.** 1872. Self-attention, shame, shyness, modesty, blushing. (*In* Darwin, C. The expression of the emotion of the emotions in man and animals. [*In* <http://human-nature.com/darwin/emotion/chap13.htm>.] [Accessed 4/5/2003]

**DAVIDSON, R.J.** 2003. Seven sins in the study of emotions. *Brain and Cognition*, 52, 129-132.

**DAVIDSON, R.M.** 1996. The Flood. (*In* Elwell, W. ed. Evangelical Dictionary of theology. Baker Book House.)

**DAY, A.J.** 1998. Adam, anthropology and the Genesis Record. Taking Genesis seriously in light of contemporary science. *Science and Christian Belief*, 10:115-143.

**DE KLERK, B.J. & VAN RENSBURG, F.J.** 1999. The making of a sermon: a practical guide to reformed exegesis and preaching. Potchefstroom : PU for CHE.

**DEARMAN, J.A.** 2002. Jeremiah-Lamentations. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids:Zondervan.

**DEASLEY, A.R.G.** Flesh. *In* Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids : Baker.)

**DESILVA, D.A.** 1999. The Hope of glory. Honor discourse and New Testament interpretation. Collegeville:The Liturgical Press.

**DILLARD, R.B. AND LONGMAN III, T.** 1994. An introduction to the Old Testament. Zondervan.

**DODES, L.** 2002. The heart of addiction. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

**DOMERIS, W.A.** 2001. לָוִי (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**DORIANI, D.** 1996. Sin (*In* Evangelical dictionary of biblical theology. Baker Book House.)

**DYER, C. AND MERRILL, E.** 2001. Nelson's Old Testament Survey. Nashville:Thomas Nelson Publishers

**ELKINS, M. AND CAVENDISH, R.** 2004. Developing a Plan for Pediatric Spiritual Care. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 18 (4), P 179-184. July/August.

**ELLCOTT, C.J.** 1978. Ellicott's Commentaries. Critical and Grammatical on the Epistles of Saint Paul with Revised Translations. Galatians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians. Minneapolis:James Family Publishing Company.

**ELLIOTT, M.** 2001. Conclusion: Some considerations of a theological nature (*In* Elliott, M ed. The Dynamics of human life. Waynesboro:Paternoster Press

**ELWELL, W.A. AND COMFORT, P.W.** 2001. Tyndale Bible Dictionary. Wheaton:Tyndale House Publishers

**EMMONS, R.A.** 2000. Personality and forgiveness. (*In* McCullough, M.E., Paragament, K.I., Thoresen, C.E. *Eds.* 2000. Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice. New York:The Guilford Press. p. 156-175.)

**ENGELSMA, D.J.** 2000. Genesis 1-11. Myth or history? [*In* <http://members.aol.com/twarren19/genesis111.html>.] [Accessed: 11/11/2004.]

**ENNS, P.** 2001. אָרָם (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**ENRIGHT, R.D.** 2001. Forgiveness is a choice. A step-by-step process for resolving anger and restoring hope. Washington: American Psychological Association.

**ENRIGHT, R.D.** 2005. Telephone interview. Professor of Human Development. University of Wisconsin-Madison. March 28, 2005. Questions and Transcript available.

**ENRIGHT, R.D. AND FITZGIBBONS, R.P.** 2000. Helping clients forgive. An empirical guide for resolving anger and restoring hope. Washington: American Psychological Association.

**ERICKSON, M.** 1994. Christian Theology. Grand Rapids, Il. : Baker.

**ERIKSON, E.H.** 1968. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

**ERIKSON, E.H.** 1985. Childhood and society. 35<sup>th</sup> Anniversary edition. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

**ESLINGER, L.** 2004. The ecology of myth. [*In* <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~eslinger/myth/BibMyth.html>.] [Accessed:6/10/2004]

- EXLINE, J.J. AND BAUMEISTER, R.F.** 2000. Expressing forgiveness and repentance. (*In* McCullough, M.E., Paragament, K.I., Thoresen, C.E. *Eds.* 2000. *Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice.* New York:The Guilford Press. p. 133-155.)
- FEINBERG, C.L.** 1998. Jeremiah. (*In* Expositors Bible Commentary. Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- FERGUSON, P.** 1996a. Adam (*In* Evangelical dictionary of biblical theology. Baker Book House.)
- FERGUSON, P.** 1996b. Death, Mortality (*In* Evangelical dictionary of biblical theology. Baker Book House.)
- FOSSUM, M.A. AND MASON, M.J.** 1990. Facing shame. Families in recovery. New York:W.W.Norton and Company.
- FREUD, S.** 1962. The Future of an illusion. Newly translated from the German and edited by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- FREUD, S.** 1980. The Ego and Id. (*In* Hutchins, R.M. Ed. *In* Chief, Encyclopedia Britannica, The Major works of Sigmund Freud. Great Books of the Western World. Volume 54. Chicago:The University of Chicago.)
- FRIBERG, T.; FRIBERG, B. AND MILLER, N.F.** 2000. Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids:Baker Books.
- FULLER, D.P.** 1992. The importance of the unity of the Bible. (*In* Hubbard, R.L; Johnston, R.K.; Meye, R. *eds.* *Studies in Old Testament Theology.* Dallas:Word Publishing.
- GANGEL, K.O. AND BRAMER, S.J.** 2002. Genesis. Holman Old Testament Commentary. Nashville:Holman Reference.
- GEISLER, N.** 1998. Primitive Monotheism. *Christian Apologetics Journal*, 1(1):1-5. Spring.

**GEISLER, N.** 2002. Systematic Theology. Volume 1. Introduction. Bible. Minneapolis: Bethany House.

**GEISLER, N.** 2002. Pentateuch, Mosaic authorship of. (*In Geisler, N. Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books).

**GEISLER, N.** 2002. Problem of Evil. (*In Geisler, N. Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books).

**GEISLER, N.** 2002. Wellhausen, Julius. (*In Geisler, N. Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books).

**GEISLER, N.** 2004. Systematic Theology. Sin. Salvation. Volume Three. Minneapolis: Bethany House.

**GILBERT, P.** 1998. What is shame? Some core issues and controversies. (*In Gilbert, P. and Andrews, B. eds. Shame. Interpersonal Behavior, psychopathology, and culture.* New York: Oxford University Press. Pages 3-38)

**GORDON, R.P.** 2001. אִשְׁמוֹתָי. (*In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD.* Zondervan Publishing House.)

**GREEN, D. AND LAWRENZ, M.** 1994. Encountering shame and guilt. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

**GREENWALD, D.F. AND HARDER, D.W.** 1998. Domains of shame. Evolutionary, cultural, and psychotherapeutic aspects. (*In Gilbert, P. and Andrews, B. eds. Shame. Interpersonal Behavior, psychopathology, and culture.* New York: Oxford University Press. Pages 225-245)

**GREIDANUS, S.** 1989. The modern preacher and the ancient text: interpreting and preaching biblical literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

**GRENZ, S.** 1994. Theology for the community of God. Nashville : Broadman and Holman Publishers.

- HADLEY, J.M.** 2001. אֱלֹהִים (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HAMILTON, V.P.** 2001. אֱלֹהֵינוּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HAMILTON, V.P.** 2001. Genesis:Theology. The structure of Genesis. ((In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HAMILTON, V.P.** 2001. אֱלֹהֵינוּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HAMILTON, V.P.** 2001. אֱלֹהֵינוּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HANSEN, C.F. AND RANKIN, J.** 2003. Adam and Eve: did they really exist? [In A dialogue on the authority, inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. Mars Hill Forum #44. <http://www.mars-hill-forum.com/forumdoc/m044cont.html>.] [ Accessed 11/14/2004]
- HARDER, A.F.** 2002. The Developmental Stages of Erik Erikson. [In <http://www.learningplaceonline.com/stages/organize/Erikson.htm>.] [Accessed:21/3/2005.]
- HARPER, J.M. AND HOOPER, M.H.** 1990. Uncovering shame. An approach integrating individuals and their family systems. New York:W.W.Norton and Company.
- HARRISON, R.K.** 1973. Jeremiah and Lamentations. An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press
- HARRISON, R.K.** 1988. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids:William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- HART, K.** 1999. A spiritual interpretation of the 12 Steps of Alcoholics Anonymous: From resentment to forgiveness to love. *Journal of Ministry and Addiction and Recovery*, 6. p. 25-39. New York: The Haworth Pastoral Press.)
- HART, K.** 2002. Counselors Treatment Manual. Spiritual Repentance Treatment (SPI\_RT). (February). Department of Psychology. Windsor: University of Windsor.
- HARTLEY, J.E.** 2001. אָפֿטֿערֿטֿעֿן (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HEITINK, G.** 1999. Practical Theology. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans
- HEITINK, G.** 1999. Practical Theology. History, Theory, Action domains. Bruinsma, R. *Trans.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.
- HELLER, A.** 2003. Five approaches to the phenomenon of shame. [*In* [http://articles.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2267/is\\_112943733](http://articles.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_112943733).] [Accessed: 22/6/2004.]
- HENDRICKSON, W.** 2002. Exposition of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- HESCHEL, A.** 1962. The Prophets. An introduction. New York: Harper Torchbooks
- HEYNS, L.M. & PIETERSE, H.J.C.** 1998. A primer in Practical Theology. Pretoria : Gnosis.
- HILL, A.E.** 2001. אָפֿטֿערֿטֿעֿן (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HO, Y.F.D., FU, W. AND NG, S.M.** 2004. Guilt, shame and embarrassment. *Culture and Psychology*, 10(1), 64-84.
- HOEHNER, H.W.** 2002. Ephesians. An Exegetical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

- HOLLADAY, W.L.** 1986. *Jeremiah Volume 1. Hermenia. A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible.* Philadelphia:Fortress Press.
- HOLLANDER, M.** 2003. Losses of face: Rembrandt, Masaccio, and the drama of shame [*In* [http://articles.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2267/is\\_112943746.](http://articles.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_112943746)] [Accessed:22/6/2004.]
- HOOKS, S.M.** 2001. **כבוד** (*In* Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- HOTCHKISS, S.** 2002. *Why is it always about you? Saving yourself from the narcissists in your life.* New York:The Free Press.  
[http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2267/is\\_4\\_70/ai\\_112943740.html.](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_4_70/ai_112943740.html)] [ Accessed: 8/10/2004.]
- HUEY, F.B.** 1993. *Jeremiah, Lamentations. The new American commentary. An exegetical and theological exposition of the Holy Scripture.* Nashville:Broadman Press.
- JENSON, P.** 2001. **כבוד** (*In* VanGemeren, W. A *ed.* *Zondervan Reference CD.* Zondervan Publishing House.)
- JOHANNESSEN, R.L.** 2002. A role for shame in communication ethics. Keynote address for the seventh national communication ethics conference. Western Michigan University. May 31, 2002.
- JOHNSTON, P.S.** 2000. Humanity. (*In* Alexander, D. T.; Rosner, B.S.; Carson, D.A. and Goldsworthy, G. *eds.* *New Dictionary of biblical theology. Exploring the unity and diversity of Scripture.* Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press. P. 564-567.
- KARDAS, E.P.** 2004. Ego, id and super-ego. [*In* [http://peacesaumag.edu/faculty/kardas/courses/GPWeiten/C12Personality/EgoIDSuper.html.](http://peacesaumag.edu/faculty/kardas/courses/GPWeiten/C12Personality/EgoIDSuper.html)] [Accessed:10/11/2004]
- KAUFMAN, G.** 1989. *The psychology of shame. Theory and treatment of shame-based syndromes.* New York:Springer Publishing Company.

**KEIL, C.F. AND DELITZSCH, F.** 1991. Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Volume 1, The Pentateuch. Three Volumes in one. Grand Rapids : Eerdmans.

**KIDNER, D.** 1967. Genesis. An introduction and commentary. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.

**KIDNER, D.** 1987. The message of Jeremiah. The Bible Speak Today. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.

**KIHLSTROM, J.F.** 2000. Is Freud Still Alive? No, Not Really (*In* Atkinson, R., Smith, E.E., Bem, D.J. and Nolen-Hoeksema, *eds.* Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology, 13th Ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.)

**KOENIG, H.G.; MCCULLOUGH, M.E. AND LARSON, D.B.** 2001. Handbook of religion and health. New York: Oxford University Press.

**KOHUT, H.** 1986. Forms and transformations of narcissism (*In* Morrison, A.P. *ed.* Essential papers on narcissism. New York:New York University Press. Pages 61-87)

**KOHUT, H.** 2001. The Analysis of the Self. A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders. Madison:International Universities Press. Inc.

**KONKEL, A.H.** 2001 **תְּהִיָּה** (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**KONKEL, A.H.** 2001 **רָחֵם** (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**KONKEL, A.H.** 2001. **רָחֵם** (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**KROEGER, C.C. AND EVANS, M.J.** 2002. Jeremiah (*In* The IVP Woman's Bible Commentary. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.)

- LANSKY, M.R.** 1992. *Fathers who fail. Shame and Psychopathology.* Hillsdale:The Analytic Press.
- LANSKY, M.R.** 2004. Trigger and Screen:Shame dynamics and the problem of instigation in Freud's Dreams. *Journal of American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry*, 32(3), 441-468.
- LANSKY, M.R. AND MORRISON. A.P.** 1997. The legacy of Freud's writings on Shame. (*In* Lansky, M.R. and Morrison.A.P. *eds.* The widening scope of shame. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press. Pages 3-40.)
- LEWIS, H.B.** 1971. *Shame and guilt in neurosis.* New York:International Universities Press, Inc.
- LEWIS, M.** 2003. Social research: The role of the self in shame. [*In*
- LEWIS, M.** 1992. *Shame. The exposed self.* New York:The Free Press
- LEWIS, M.** 2004. Self-conscience emotions: embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. (*In* Lewis, M. and Haviland-Jones, J.M. *eds.* *Handbook on emotions.* Second Edition. New York:The Guilford Press. Pages 623-636).
- LEWIS, M.** 2005. Telephone interview with Dr Michael Lewis, University Distinguished Professor. Department of Pediatrics, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. . 21 March, 2005. Questions and Transcript Available
- LIDMUS, G.** 2004. The doctrine of Imago Dei and its relation to self transcendence in the context of practical theology. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Helsinki.
- LIEFELD, W.L.** 1997. *Ephesians. The IVP New Testament Commentary.* Downers Grove:InterVaristy Press.
- LINCOLN, A.T.** 1990. *Ephesians. Word Biblical Commentary. Volume 42.* Nashville:Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- LOUW, J.P. AND NIDA, E.A.** 1993. *Volume One and Two. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic domains.* Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

**LYE, J.** 2004. Some Post-Structural Assumptions.

[<http://www.brocku.ca/english/courses/4F70/poststruct.html>. P.1-5][Accessed:7/2/2005.]

**LYND H.M.** 1958. Shame and the search for identity. New York:Science Edition Inc.

**MACDONALD, J.** 1998. Disclosing shame. (*In* Gilbert, P. and Andrews, B. eds. Shame. Interpersonal Behavior, psychopathology, and culture. New York:Oxford University Press. Pages 141-157)

**MACDONALD, W.** 1995. Believer's Bible Commentary. Nashville:Thomas Nelson Publishers.

**MACHEN, J.G.** 1965. The Christian view of man. London:The Banner of Truth.

**MALCOLM, W.M. AND GREEBERG, L.S.** 2000. Forgiveness as a process of change in individual psychotherapy. (*In* McCullough, M.E., Paragament, K.I., Thoresen, C.E. *Eds.* 2000. Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice. New York:The Guilford Press. p.179-202)

**MALINA, B.J.** 1993. The New Testament world. Insights from cultural anthropology. Louisville:Westminister/John Knox Press.

**MALINA, B.J.** 1993. The New Testament world. Insights from cultural anthropology. Louisville:Westminister John Knox Press.

**MALINA, B.J.** 1993. The New Testament World. Insights from cultural anthropology. Revised Edition. Loiusville:Westminister John Knox Press.

**MARTENS, E.A.** 1996. Theology of Jeremiah. (*In* Evangelical dictionary of biblical theology. Baker Book House.)

**MARTINSEN, D.A.** 2003. Surprised by shame. Dostoevsky's liars and narrative exposure. Columbus:The Ohio State University Press.

**MATTHEWS, D.A.** 1998. The Faith Factor. New York:Penguin Books

**MATTHEWS, K.A.** 2002. Genesis 1-11:26. The New American Commentary. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of the Holy Scriptures. Nashville:Broadman and Holman Publishers

**MCCONVILLE, J.G.** 2001. Jeremiah Theology. (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**MCCULLOUGH, M.E., AND WORTHINGTON, E.L.,** 1999. Religion and the forgiving personality. *Journal of Personality, In Press.*

**MCCULLOUGH, M.E., PARAGAMENT, K.I., THORESEN, C.E. Eds.** 2000. Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice. New York:The Guilford Press

McCullough, M.E., Paragament, K.I., Thoresen, C.E. Eds. 2000. Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice. New York:The Guilford Press. p. 17-40)

**MCCULLOUGH, M.E., SANDAGE, S.J. AND WORTHINGTON JR.,E.L.** 1997. To forgive is human. How to put your past in the past. Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press

**MCDOWELL, J.** 1999. The new evidence that demands a verdict. Nashville:Thomas Nelson Publishers.

**MCMINN, M. AND MEEK, K.R.** 1996. Forgiveness. (*In* McMinn, M. Psychology, theology and spirituality in Christian counseling. AACC counseling library. Wheaton:Tyndale.)

**MCMINN, M.R.** 1996. Psychology, Theology and Spirituality in Christian Counseling. Wheaton:Tyndale House Publishers.

**MCNISH, J.L.** 2004. Transforming shame: A pastoral response. New York:The Haworth Press.

**MEDICONF.** 2004. World Calendar of Medical Events. Deconstructing Shame & Guilt - and Opening Space for Apology, Restorative Action, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation. [In <http://mediconf.de/recstitl/22953804.htm>.] [Accessed: 27/3/2005.]

- MEEHAN W, O'CONNOR LE, BERRY JW, WEISS J, MORRISON A, ACAMPORA A.** 1996. Guilt, shame, and depression in clients in recovery from addiction. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, Apr-Jun 28(2):125-34.
- MEIER, S.** 2001. אָפּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- MERRILL, E.H.** אָפּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- MERRILL, E.H.** 2001. אָפּ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- MIDDELTON-MOZ, J.** 1990. Shame and Guilt. Masters of disguise. Deerfield Beach:Health Communications.
- MILLER, S.B.** 1996. Shame in context. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press.
- MORRIS, L.** 1993. Sin. Guilt. (In Hawthorne, G.F. Martin, R.P. and Reid, D.G., eds. Dictionary of Paul and His Letters. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press. Pages 887-881)
- MORRISON, A.P.** 1986. Shame, ideal self and narcissism. (In Morrison, A.P. ed. Essential papers on narcissism. New York:New York University Press. Pages 348-372).
- MORRISON, A.P.** 1989. Shame. The underside of Narcissism. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press.
- MORRISON, A.P.** 1996. The culture of shame. New York:Ballantine Books
- MOXNES, H.** 1993. Honor and Shame. (In Rohrbaugh, R.L. ed. The social sciences and New Testament interpretation. Peabody:Henrickson. Pages 19-40).
- MOXNES, H.** 1993. Honor and Shame. [In <http://www.hendrickson.com/pdf/chapters/1565632397-ch01.pdf>.] [Accessed: 5/12/2003]

**MULLER, R.** 2000. Honor and Shame. Unlocking the door. Philadelphia:Xlibris Corporation

**MULLER, R.** 2000. Honor and Shame. Unlocking the door. Xlibris Coroporation.

**MUNDAY, J.C.** 1996. Eden's geography erodes flood geology. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 58(1):123-154, Spring.

**NAKKEN, C.** 1996. The addictive personality. Understanding the addictive process and compulsive behavior. Center City:Hazelden.

**NARAYANAN, V. AND WILLIAMS, J.G.,** 2000. Religious Perspectives on forgiveness. (*In*

**NATHANSON, D.** 1987. A timetable for same. (*In* Nathanson, D. *ed.* The Many faces of shame. New York:The Guildford Press.)

**NATHANSON, D.** 1992. Shame and pride. Affect, sex, and the birth of self. New York:W.W.Norton and Company.

**NATHANSON, D.** 1997. Affect theory and the compass of shame. (*In* Lansky, M.R. and Morrison.A.P. *eds.* The widening scope of shame. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press. Pages 339-354)

**NATHANSON, D.** 1997. Shame and the affect theory of Silvan Tomkins. (*In* Lansky, M.R. and Morrison.A.P. *eds.* The widening scope of shame. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press. Pages 107-138)

**NEL, P.J.** נֶלְ (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**Nel, P.J.** 2001. נֶלְ (In VanGemeren, W. A *ed.* Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**Nel, P.J.** 2001 נֶלְ (In VanGemeren, W. A *ed.* Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**NEL, P.J.** 2001. בּוֹשׁ (In VanGemeren, W. A ed. Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**NEL, P.J.** Shame Theology. (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**NEWBERG, A.B., d'AQUILI, E.G., NEWBERG, S.K. AND deMARICI, V.** 2000. The neuro-psychological correlates of forgiveness. (In McCullough, M.E., Paragament, K.I., Thoresen, C.E. Eds. 2000. Forgiveness. Theory, research and practice. New York:The Guilford Press. p. 91-110.)

**NEYREY, J.** 1998. Honor and shame in the gospel of Matthew. Louisville:Westminster John Knox Press.

**NEYREY, J.** 2005. Telephone interview with Dr. Jerome Neyrey, SJ. Department of theology, University of Notre-Dame. 28 March, 2005. Questions and Transcript available.

**NEYREY, J.H.** 1995. Despising the shame of the cross: Honor and shame in the Johannine passion narrative. [In <http://www.nd.edu/~jneyrey1/shame.html>.] [Accessed: 4/5/2003]

**NEYREY, J.H.** 1996 "Despising the Shame of the Cross: Honor and Shame in the Johannine Passion Narrative," Semeia 67: 113-37

**NEYREY, J.H.** 1998. Honor and shame in the gospel of Matthew. Louisville:Westminster John Knox Press.

**NEYREY, J.H.** 2000. Connecting personhood to group values. [In <http://www.goshen.edu/~joannab/peace.html>] [Accessed: 5/12/2003]

**NICHOLS, M.P.** 1995. No place to hide. Facing shame so we can find self-respect. New York:Prometheus Books.

**NIEBUHR, R.** 1949. The nature and destiny of man. A Christian Interpretation. New York:Charles Scribner's Sons.

- NYE, R.D.** 1975. Three views of man. Perspectives from Sigmund Freud, B.F. Skinner, and Carl Rogers. Monterey:Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- PARAGAMENT, K.I.** 1997. The psychology of religion and copying. Theory. Research. Practice. New York:The Guildford Press.
- PARTRIDGE, C. AND ELLIOTT, M.** 2001. The Spiritual nature of human beings. (*In Elliott, M ed. The Dynamics of human life. Waynesboro:Paternoster Press*)
- PASCAL, B.** 1980. Pensees. (*In Hutchins, R.M. ed. Encyclopedia Britannica. Great Books of the Western World. Volume 33. Chicago:University of Chicago.*)
- PATTISON, S.** 2000. Shame. Theory, Therapy, Theology. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- PATTISON, S.** 2005. Telephone interview. Dr Stephen Pattison. Head of Department.Cardiff School of Religious and Theological Studies. Cardiff University. March 21, 2005. Questions and Transcript available.
- PETERSON, E.** 2002. The Message Colorado Springs. Navpress.
- PFEIFFER, R.H.** 2004. A brief psychoanalytic look at shame. [*In <http://www.growthcentral.com/>*] [Accessed: 3/3/2005]
- PHILLIPS, W.G. AND FOUTS, D.M.** 1997. Genesis 1-11 as historical narrative. [*In [http://www.ankerberg.com/Articles/\\_PDFArchives/science/SC1W0100.pdf](http://www.ankerberg.com/Articles/_PDFArchives/science/SC1W0100.pdf)*] [Accessed:2/1/2005]
- PLEVNIK, J.** 1998. Honor/Shame. (*In Pilch, J.J. and Malina, B.J. eds. Handbook of Biblical Social Values. Peabody:Hendrickson Publishers. Pages 106-114*)
- PLEVNIK, J.** 1998. Honor-Shame. (*In Plich, J.J. and Malina, B.J. eds. Handbook of Biblical Social Values. Peabody:Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.*)
- PORTER, S.** 1999. Idioms of the Greek New Testament. Sheffield:Sheffield Academic Press

- POTTER-EFRON, R.** 2002. Shame, guilt and alcoholism. Second Edition. New York: The Haworth Press.
- POTTER-EFRON, R. AND POTTER-EFRON, P.** 1999. The secret message of shame. Oakland: New Harbinger Publications Inc.
- POTTER-EFRON, R. AND POTTER-EFRON, P.** 1989. Letting go of shame. Understanding how shame affects your life. Hazelden
- POULSON, C.F.** 2000. Shame and Work. (In Ashkanzy, N.; Hartel, C. and Zerbe, W. *eds.* Emotions in the workplace: research, theory and practice. Westport: Quorum Books. P 250-271.)
- RABICHEV, R.** 1996. The Mediterranean concepts of honor and shame as seen in the depiction of biblical woman. [*In* <http://www.unisa.ac.za/dept/press/rt/31/rt196con.html> P 1-10.] [Accessed: 1/1/2003]
- RABICHEV, R.** 1996. The Mediterranean concepts of honor and shame as seen in the depiction of biblical women. [*In* <http://www.unisa.ac.za/dept/press/rt/31/rt196con.html>] [Accessed: 1/1/2003.]
- REID, D.G.** Satan. (In Hawthorne, G.F. Martin, R.P. and Reid, D.G., *eds.* Dictionary of Paul and His Letters. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press. Pages 862-867)
- REINECKER, F. AND ROGERS, C.** 1980. Linguistic key to the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library.
- ROBERTS, R.O.** 2002. Repentance. The first word of the gospel. Wheaton: Crossway Books.
- ROSS, A.P.** 1988. Creation and Blessing. A guide to the study and exposition of Genesis. Grand Rapids : Baker.
- ROWE, C.R.** 2002. Sorting Out the Maze of "Self Psychologies". [*In* <http://www.selfpsychologypsychoanalysis.org/rowe.html>.] [Accessed: 21/3/2005.]

**RUSSELL, J.A. AND LEMAY, G.** 2004. Emotion concepts. (*In* Lewis, M. and Haviland-Jones, J.M. *eds.* Handbook on emotions. Second Edition. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 491-503)

**RYE, M.S.; PARGAMENT, K.I.; ALI, M.A.; BECK, G.L; DORFF, E.N; HALLISEY, C.;**

**SAILHAMER, J.H.** 1998. Genesis (*In* Expositors Bible Commentary. Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**SALMOND, S.D.F.** 1983. The Epistle to the Ephesians. (*In* Nicoll. W.R. *ed.* The Expositors Greek Testament. Volume 3. Grand Rapids: Willaim B. Eerdmans Publishing Company)

**SAPONE, V.** 2004. Original sin. Five problems with the doctrine of original sin. [*In* <http://after-hourz.net/ri/originalsin.html>] [Accessed:10/12/2004]

**SCAER, D.P.** 1977. The problems of inerrancy and historicity in connection with Genesis 1-3. *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 41:21-25.

**SCHAEFFER, F.** 1991 The complete works of Francis A Schaeffer. A Christian Worldview Volume 3:A Christian view of spirituality. Chicago:Crossway Books

**SCHEFF, T.J.** 2005. E-mail questionnaires and correspondence. [scheftj@cox.net](mailto:scheftj@cox.net). Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara. 13 March, 2005.

**SCHEFF, T.J.** 1994. Microsociology. Discourse, emotion, and social structure. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

**SCHEFF, T.J.** 1997. Emotions, the social bond, and human reality. Part/whole analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**SCHEFF, T.J.** 1997. Shame in social theory. (*In* Lansky, M.R. and Morrison.A.P. *eds.* The widening scope of shame. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press. Pages 205-230)

**SCHEFF, T.J.** 2000. Shame and Community. Social Components in depression. [*In* <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/scheff/12.html>]. [Accessed:23/3/2005]

- SCHEFF, T.J.** 2003. Cognition and emotion? The dead end in self esteem research. [*In* <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/scheff/27.html>.] [Accessed: 23/3/2004]
- SCHEFF, T.J.** 2005. Telephone interview. Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara. 23 March, 2005. Questions and Transcript available.
- SCHEFF, T.J. AND RETZINGER, S.M.** 1997. Helen Block Lewis on shame: appreciation and critique. (*In* Lansky, M.R. and Morrison.A.P. eds. *The widening scope of shame*. Hillsdale:The Analytic Press. Pages 139-154)
- SCHEFF, T.J. AND RETZINGER, S.M.** 2000. Shame as the master emotion of everyday life. [*In* <http://www.mundanebehavior.org/issues/v1n3/scheff-retzinger.htm>.] [Accessed:4/5/2003]
- SCHEFF, T.J.** 2000. Shame and social bond: applying the part/whole approach to a case study. [*In* <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/scheff/13.html>.] [Accessed:24/11/2004]
- SCHEFF, T.J.** 2001. Working class emotions and relationships. Secondary analysis of classic texts by Sennett and Cobb, and Willis. [*In* <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/scheff/22.html>.] [Accessed: 21/3/2005]
- SCHNEIDER, C.D.** 1990. Shame. (*In* Hunter, R.J. ed. *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*. Nashville:Abingdon Press.)
- SCHNEIDER, C.D.** 1992. *Shame, exposure, and privacy*. New York:W.W. Norton and Company.
- SCHONWEISS, H.** 1971. εἰπισημια (*In* Brown, C. ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Volume 1. Grand Rapids:Regancy.)
- SEEVERS, B.V.** 2001. עָרוֹם (*In* VanGemeran, W. A ed. *Zondervan Reference CD*. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- SEEVERS, B.V.** 2001, עָרוֹם (*In* Van Gemeren, W.A. ed. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**SEEVERS, B.V.** 2001. עָרַם (In Van Gemeren, W.A. ed. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**SEWELL, C.** 2000. The Tablet Theory of Genesis Authorship. [In <http://www.ldolphin.org/tablethy.html>. P. 1-17] [Accessed:2/2/2005.]

**SHORT, J.** 2002. The image of God. [In [http://www.geocities.com/apokrinomai/scripture\\_studies/image\\_of\\_God.htm](http://www.geocities.com/apokrinomai/scripture_studies/image_of_God.htm). P 1-16] [Accessed:4/2/2005.]

**SHUSTER, M.** 2004. The Fall and sin. Grand Rapids:Michigan.

**SHWEDER, R.A.** 2003. Towards a deep psychology of shame. [In [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2267/is\\_4\\_70/ai\\_112943737.html](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_4_70/ai_112943737.html).] [Accessed:21/2/2004]

**SKINNER, J.** 1951. Prophecy and religion. Studies in the life of Jeremiah. Cambridge:University Press.

**SLICK, W.** 2004. The Documentary Hypothesis of the Pentateuch also known as the JEDP Theory.

**SMEDES, L.B.** 1993. Shame and grace. Healing the shame we don't deserve. San Francisco:Harper Collins

**SNODGRASS, K.** 1996. Ephesians. The NIV application commentary. Grand Rapids:Zondervan.

**SPYKMAN, G.** 1992. Reformational Theology. A new paradigm for doing dogmatics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

**STIEBERT, J.** 2002. The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible. The Prophetic Contribution. Journal for the study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. 346. London:Sheffield Academic Press.

**STIEBERT, J.** 2002. The construction of shame in the Hebrew Bible. The prophetic contribution. Journal for the study of the Old Testament. Supplement series 364. London:Sheffield Academic Press.

**STOTT, J.** 1994. Romans. God's Good News for the World. InterVarsity Press.

**SUSSEKE, R.** 2004. What does Heinz Kohut mean by 'the Self'? [*In* [http://www.suesske.de/Kohut\\_self\\_english.htm](http://www.suesske.de/Kohut_self_english.htm).] [Accessed: 22/3/2005]

**SWINDOLL, C.** 2004. Getting through the tough stuff of shame (*In* Getting through the tough stuff. Nashville: W. Publishing Group. 47-60)

**SWINDOLL, C. AND R.B. ZUCK.** 2003. Understanding Christian Theology. Nashville:Thomas Nelson Publishers.

**TALLY, D.** 2001. ׀׀׀ (*In* Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**TANGNEY, J. P. AND DEARING, R.L.** 2002. Shame and guilt. New York:The Guilford Press.

**TANGNEY, J., FEE, R., REINSMITH,C., BOONE, AL. AND LEE, N.** 1999. Assessing individual differences in the propensity to forgive. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting in Boston. Draft Manuscript. p. 1-37.

**TANGNEY, J.P. AND DEARING, R.L.** 2002. Shame and Guilt. New York :The Guilford Press.

**THIELICKE, H.** 1961. How the world began. Man in the first chapters of the Bible. Philadelphia:Fortress Press.

**THOMAS, R. AND PARKER, S.** 2004. Toward a theological understanding of shame. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*. Volume 23. Number 2. 176-182.

**THOMAS, R. AND PARKER, S.** 2004. Toward a theological understanding of shame. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*. Volume 23. (2):176-182.

**THOMPSON, B.** 2001. Genesis 1-11 – mythical or historical? [*In* <http://www.apologeticspress.org/defdocs/2001/dd-01011.htm>. P 1-22] [Accessed:2/1/2005]

**THOMPSON, J.A.** 1987. *The Book of Jeremiah. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids:William B. Eerdmans Publishing House.

**THOMPSON, J.A. AND MARTENS, E.A.** 2001. אָרֶשׁ (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**TRACY, J.L. AND ROBINS, R.W.** 2003. Putting the self into self-conscious emotions. A Theoretical model. [In <http://psyweb2.ucdavis.edu/labs/robins/lab/sctheory.pdf>.] [Accessed:21/3/2005]

**TSUMURA, D.T.** 1996. Genesis and ancient Near Eastern stories of Creation and the Flood: an introduction. [In <http://christiananswers.net/q-abr/abr-c001.html> P.24-34] [Accessed 8/6/2004]

**TURNER, M.** 2000. *Ephesians.* (In Wenham.G., Motyer. J., Carson. D, and France. R, eds. *New Bible Commentary.*Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.)

**VAN DAM, C.** 2001. אָרֶשׁ (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**VAN GRONINGEN, G.** 1996. *Wrath of God.* (In Elwell, W. ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of biblical theology.* Baker Book House.)

**VAN LEEUWEN, R.C.** 2001. *Form, Image Theology.* (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**VAN PELT. M. V. AND KAISER. JR., W.C.** 2001. אָרֶשׁ (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**VERHOEF, P.A.** 2001. אָרֶשׁ (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

**WAKELY, R.** 2001. אָרֶשׁ (In Van Gemeren, W. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

- WALLACE, D.B.** 2004. Ephesians: Introduction, Argument, Outline. [*In* [Http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page\\_id=1332.html](http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=1332.html). P 1-19.] [Accessed:8/2/2005]
- WALTKE, B.K. AND FREDRICKS, C.J.** 2001. Genesis. A commentary. Grand Rapids:Zondervan.
- WALTON, J.** 2001. אֱלֹהֵי עֵינַי (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)
- WALTON, J.H.** 1990. Ancient Israelite Literature in its cultural context. A survey of parallels between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- WEBB, T.** 2003. Towards a mature shame culture: Theoretical and practical tools for personal and social growth. PhD Thesis, University of Western Sydney. [*In* <http://library.uws.edu.au/adt-NUWS/uploads/approved/adt-NUWS20040401.112759/public/pdf.>] [Accessed: 21/3/2005]
- WENHAM, G.J.** 1991. Genesis 1-11. Word Biblical Commentary. Milton Keynes:Word Publishing
- WENHAM, G.J.** 2000. Genesis. (In Wenham.G., Motyer. J., Carson. D, and France. R, eds. New Bible Commentary.Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.)
- WENNER, S.** 2000. How DNA Breakthroughs Are Revolutionizing Roots Research
- WHITE, G.** 2004. Representing emotional meaning: category, metaphor, schema, discourse. (In Lewis, M. and Haviland-Jones, J.M. eds. Handbook on emotions. Second Edition. New York:The Guilford Press.P. 30-44)
- WIERSBE, W.** 1992. Wiersbe's Expository Outlines on the New Testament. Colorado Springs:Victor Books.
- WILLIAMS, P.A.** 2001. Doing without Adam and Eve. Sociobiology and Original Sin. Minneapolis:Fortress Press.
- WILLIAMS, W.C.** 2001. אֱלֹהֵי עֵינַי (In Van Gemeren, W. Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)

- WILLIAMSON G.I.**, 1993. *The Heidelberg Catechism. A study guide.* Phillipsburg, NJ :P & R publishing
- WILSON, J.R. AND WILSON, J.A.** 1992. *Addictionary. A primer of recovery terms and concepts from abstinence to withdrawal.* Minnesota:Hazelden
- WILSON, S.** 2002. *Released from shame.* Downers Grove:InterVarsity Press.
- WILSON, S.** 2001. *Hurt people, hurt people.* Grand Rapids:Discovery Publishing House.
- WOOD, S.** 1998. *Ephesians. (In Expositors Bible Commentary. Zondervan Reference CD. Zondervan Publishing House.)*
- WRIGHT, K.** 2001. *Religious abuse. A Pastor explores the many ways religion can hurt as well as heal.* Kelowna:Northstone Publishing.
- WRIGHT, N.T.** 1997. *What Saint Paul Really Said.* Grand Rapid: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- WUEST, K.S.** 1973. *Ephesians. (In Word studies in the New Testament. Volume 1. Mark. Romans. Galatians. Ephesians. Colossions. Grand Rapids:William. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.*
- YANKE, F.** 1998. *The Integration of Christian Distinctives in Addressing Shame in Marital Therapy. Journal of Religious and Social Research. [In <http://www.oxnet.com/sofschol/yanke-a.htm>. ] [Accessed:23/3/2005]*
- YOUNG, R.A.** 1994. *Intermediate New Testament Greek. A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach.* Nashville:Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- ZIMMERLING, R.** 2003. *'Guilt Cultures' vs 'Shame Cultures': Political Implications?. A Paper given at the International Conference on Reassessing Democracy: New Approaches to Governance, Citizenship and Multiple Identities in Comparative Research, AK InterKultureller Deomokratievergleich. June 20-21, 2003, IU Bremen.*