

A Philosophical Appraisal of the Presuppositions and Implications of Christian Ethics

PETER O. OTTUH
&
FELIX O. ERHABOR

Abstract

Christian ethics is informed by the Bible's metaphysical underpinning which views God as the ultimate source of all authority. This research looks at Christian ethics from a philosophical perspective, focusing on its assumptions and consequences. It looks at how Christians think about good and wrong, as well as the philosophical implications of moral evil. Using a critico- historical method and evaluative analysis, the research tried to place Christian ethics in the context of consequentialism, deontologism and virtue ethics ideas. Findings reveal that Christian ethics from the context of a virtue ethic promotes moral character development while a deontological ethic emphasizes responsibility. It concludes that Christian ethics will no longer be valid if it gives up its history, meaning and values by adopting secular standards.

Keywords: *Philosophical, Christian Ethics, Presuppositions, Implications.*

Introduction

Christian ethics, often known as moral theology, is a two-part ethical system: a virtue ethic that stresses moral character development and a deontological ethic that emphasizes responsibility. It also includes natural law ethics, which is based on the notion that human nature - made in God's image and capable of morality, collaboration, logic, and discernment, among other things - guides how life should be lived. Christian ethics refers to a thorough examination of Jesus' way of life as exhibited and taught, as applied to the many challenges and dilemmas that face humanity. If Christian ethics either sells its inheritance by accommodating secular norms or refuses to honour and learn from the moral knowledge of the centuries, it is then on dangerous footing. Christian ethics sees God as the ultimate source of all authority and is based on the metaphysical ideas in the Bible. The relevance of ethics in determining how individuals live is shown by an examination of both philosophical and Christian ethics.

Ethics is a branch of philosophy concerned with the logic and significance of moral concerns to a pleasant earthly existence. When people employ terms like right, wrong, good, bad, virtuous, sinful, ought, duty, and obligation, they are instantly in the realm of ethics. Philosophy, in its written and organized form, is ascribed to the Greeks, and ethical philosophy is no exception (Serfontein, 2021). Socrates is said to have jolted humans of his day into a living understanding of the necessity to live a life guided by reasoned appraisal of beliefs and actions in the fifth century B.C (Ozumba, 2001). Human beings have acted as fantastic role models for leading a respectable life in the midst of a corrupt and misguided society throughout history. Philosophical systems that

try to give ethical standards might be helpful for Christian ethics, but the Bible should still be the most important source for all Christian ethics.

This study is designed to explore Christian ethics and appraise it from a philosophical standpoint, with emphasis on its presuppositions and implications. It examines the Christian understanding of right and wrong, as well as the intellectual implications of sin and salvation. It discusses Christian values and compares them to secular ethics such as Aristotle's, Hume's, and Nietzsche's. It also attempts to situate Christian ethics in the context of normative theories such as consequentialism, deontology, and virtue ethics. It then examines the relevance of natural law in Christian ethics as well as the significance of action metaphysics. It also talks about the metaphysical foundations of Christian ethics, like realism versus idealism, as well as truth and meta-ethical realism.

Christian Understanding of Good, Right and Evil

In terms of ethical standards, "good" refers to what is ethically correct, desirable, and beneficial to humans. Evil, on the other hand, is defined as anything that is deemed very immoral, wicked, or bad. Humans may know and identify truth and moral virtue via the use of both reason and revelation, according to Christian ethics (Andersen, 2001). The means of such knowledge include observation, reasoning, and personal experiences, which include grace. The Christian life may be a joyful experience of doing good and Christian ethics should be a pleasure. It is an assumption that God's essence defines moral excellence, and all he commands is in line with his flawless and just goodness, else, when he gives instructions and moral standards, he does not compare himself to an abstract standard of virtue; and does not consult anything other than his own nature (Andersen, 2001). This implies that God's moral rules are not made up on the spot because they are based on his eternal moral righteousness. Philosophers have offered many frameworks for evaluating ethics and morality outside of Scripture. Some people have looked for justification for ethics in the repercussions of specific actions. Something is regarded as excellent in these systems if it has positive implications that exceed the negative ones. Some individuals consider just the repercussions for themselves, but the majority would want the greatest benefit for the largest number of people. In reality, this may be difficult to assess, but the underlying sensibility seems to be ubiquitous and useful. Other ethicists have focused more on the moral value of acts and people than on the moral value of what they do.

Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative is perhaps the most famous example. He claimed that humans should only act if they have a good will and that a good will executes its moral obligation only for the sake of duty, not for the purpose of consequences. He said that human beings should only behave in such a manner that our actions become universally recognized and followed by everybody. Consider lying: Would humans prefer that everyone speak the truth all of the time or that everyone lies all of the time? If people cannot wish for everyone to lie all of the time, Immanuel Kant would argue that lying should be strictly prohibited at all times (Oshitelu, 2003). Another school of ethics has emphasized the development of virtuous character and the motivations of the acting agent. In this sense, ethical activities (such as executing moral

obligations) should help the person acting to grow in virtue. All of the issues outlined in the preceding paragraph have a place in Christian ethics. None of those systems can stand alone; they should be founded on God's truth. Things are right or bad in relation to God's character, according to the Bible. As a result, morality is objective, and we must follow God's instructions. However, this does not rule out the possibility of repercussions. Although the morality of an act is not solely determined by its consequences, the Bible contains numerous warnings and encouragements about the positive and negative consequences of obeying or disobeying God. People need to think about what will happen if they do not obey God and what will happen if we do.

Sin Concept and its Philosophical Implications

One typology of evil is moral evil. The theological term for moral evil is "sin". In many of the world's main faiths, sin plays a significant role, and this function is undoubtedly its core connotation (Graham, 2007). Without being committed to sin as a state of being, one might acknowledge the presence of both bad deeds and sinful tendencies. One of the most prevalent ways that sinful activities have been described is as actions that are in opposition to the behaviors and life patterns that God has called humankind to. Certain Christians believe that involuntary or accidental crimes are acceptable in Christianity and that some feelings and impulses may be immoral even if they are not directly within their personal control. Even when our feelings are involuntary, neglecting to accept responsibility for our emotions and reasons, according to Adams (1985), is both self-alienating and blameworthy. Wainwright (1988) also agrees that people can be held responsible for actions they do not want to do. He calls these actions "wishes and beliefs."

Philosophers such as Swinburne (2009) and Aristotle (2002) believe that there are immoral activities that do not breach any norms. The difference between objective and subjective sins made by Swinburne (2009) might be useful. Objective sins happen when someone does something that is objectively wrong, whether or not they understand it. Subjective sins arise when a person acts contrary to their own sense of right and wrong (Quinn & Taliaferro, 1997; Stump, 2003). Based on this distinction, it is conceivable for an activity to be both objectively and subjectively wicked. In current philosophy of religion, the majority of studies on sinful deeds have been in relation to the issue of evil. The concept of sin encompasses more than just the conceptual issue of moral evil. It also comes up in talks about evidentiary kinds of bad concerns, including natural evils. The "Free Will Defense," coined by Plantinga (2000, p.241), is one of the most well-known replies to this form of the problem of evil. The presence of moral evils or sinful behaviours is at least feasible, according to this viewpoint, since God created human beings with free will. And it's possible that free beings made in God's image have a higher chance of falling.

Plantinga (2000) has a libertarian view of free will, which is incompatible with compatibilism. While all Christian viewpoints must explain how God is not implicated in sin given the principles of conservation and concurrence, compatibilists and theological determinists must explain God's relationship to sinful human activities in particular. Theological views of the need for forgiveness, redemption, and atonement are strongly

linked to descriptions of the nature of sinful actions. While some philosophers say that comprehending these ideas as a whole is the best way to understand them, there is great dispute over how to best grasp them individually and in relation to one another (Copan, 2003; Stump, 2018; Crisp, 2020). For example, there are many different perspectives on how to effectively comprehend the atonement.

It is neither required nor sufficient to have a sinful propensity to commit a sinful act. A complete understanding of sinful tendencies is contingent on one's wider normative framework. According to Thomas Aquinas (cited in McCluskey, 2017), only acts are wicked in the strict sense, while vices are harmful habits without being sinful in them. Within Christianity, there is a historical tradition of understanding sin in terms of both dispositions and deeds. Insofar as sin as an action, disposition, condition, and epistemic component may all affect human society, the theory of original sin has strong social ramifications (Swinburne, 2009). A bad action may cause not only damage to others but also retaliatory immoral behaviours by the one who was initially wronged. The noetic consequences of sin have an influence on social learning and teaching, and those effects are handed along from one person to the next. In short, sin corrupts not just individuals' moral imaginations but whole societies as well.

Christian Virtues and Secular Ethics

Humans, not God, create the rules, according to secular ethics. Because there is no God under secular ethics, it is up to humans to define and maintain a system of ethical standards. Because its basis is not founded on reality, secular ethics cannot accomplish morality. Truth, on the other hand, is the cornerstone of Christian ethics since God is truth. The Christian moral life is one of cultivating and practicing virtue. Both human and theological virtues must be practiced in order to live a moral life that is successful. Human qualities shape the soul by instilling in it habits of thought and will that encourage moral action, restrain desires, and prevent sin. They are gained by a habit of good conduct that is established through the repetition of virtuous deeds. The Christian virtues are so termed because God is their goal, yet they do not operate on God as their object or subject. Stories that motivate them to want such values aid in their development. God's grace is also given to us in order to cleanse and enhance our human qualities. Prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude are the four Christian moral qualities.

Faith, hope, and love are Christian theological virtues. Faith gives our minds a new ability to grasp truth. Faith and humanity will give us a new ability to reach out toward goodness, hope, and compassion (love). Hope enables humans to long for ultimate oneness with God, to believe that it is possible, and to recognize that it is difficult. Charity gives people the ability to love God and all creatures created in his image and likeness. According to Christian virtue ethics, virtue is acquired by following Christ, and living virtuously requires mirroring Jesus' character. God himself pours out and generates the gifts of virtues in us via the merits of Christ. God's efforts are classified into three categories: faith, hope, and love, all of which are above and beyond human natural powers. Because Christian believers are new beings created in the image of God via faith and hope, they should embrace all of God's traits of love, power, and justice.

The most well-known of the Christian virtue theorists is St. Thomas Aquinas (Stump, 2003; Aquinas, 1984). They added and changed cardinal virtues along the way to make the new hybrid system less pagan and more Judeo-Christian. The person of Jesus Christ is the highest moral ideal for Christians; their whole faith is based on behaving as Christ did. The fundamental concept of Christian discipleship is predicated on the same behaviours of observation, learning, and modeling that Aristotle thought about in his exemplar thinking. According to Aristotle (2002), the four fundamental Christian virtues required to treat one another fairly are wisdom (both theoretical and practical), bravery (confidence but not recklessness), temperance (control over pleasure and suffering), and justice. These qualities were taught in Greek culture via tales of individuals' doing virtuously. The *telos* (purpose) of human existence is still to flourish, and flourishing is still accomplished via virtuous behavior. But as you genuinely thrive, you will inexorably draw closer to God.

Throughout the Middle Ages, many Christians held Christian virtue theory in high esteem. Reason-based Enlightenment views had a straightforward sales pitch: if people employ reason, they get the correct answer every time, and faith and tradition are doomed (MacIntyre, 2007). Virtue theory has been largely ignored by mainstream Christian thought since the beginning of the Enlightenment. In the 1970s and 1980s, several renowned Christian theologians and philosophers initiated a brief revival of Christian virtue theory (Bavinck, 2011). People cannot be happy, according to Aristotle, unless they pursue an inner good (Aristotle 2002). Human satisfaction, according to the philosopher, cannot be attained by money or pleasure. Being joyful entails adopting a certain state of being via education and practice. The ideal society, according to Aristotle, is a polis in which people value virtue development (Aristotle, 2002). The ideal society suggested by capitalism differs fundamentally from Aristotle's ideal in that it lacks the notion of the common good. Society operates, according to current economic theory, because each individual pursues his or her own interests. Human behaviour is predictable according to the prevalent economic theory, since individuals behave in order to maximize utility. Simply said, utility is another word for money and all that can be purchased with it. *Homo oeconomicus* is easy to predict because he always acts in a way that helps him make the most money and spend it in the most satisfying way possible.

According to David Hume's moral theory (cited in Fate, 2000; Beam, 1996), acceptance is neither a logical judgment concerning conceptual connections nor an actual fact. That is one of the reasons Hume uses to refute Clarke's (cited in MacIntyre, 2007) position, which is an analogy of arboreal parricide. According to Hume, moral judgements are not based on factual facts but on one's own sentiments of disapproval. He claims that this shift from "is" to "ought" is unjustified and that it is the reason why people mistakenly assume that morality is based on reasonable judgements. The moral actor, the moral receiver, and the moral spectator are the three players that make up this component of Hume's moral theory. All of a moral agent's activities, according to Hume, are driven by character features, especially virtuous or wicked character traits (Herdt, 1997). Some virtuous character traits, such as kindness, are instinctual or inherent, while others, such as justice, are acquired or artificial. As an agent, human actions have an impact on a receiver, and as a spectator, he or she sees the receiver's pleasant sensations.

Because the person feels this joy, he or she says that the trait that drives him or her is a virtue instead of a vice.

Hume (cited in Fate, 2000) argues in his *Treatise on Human Action* that it is possible to establish whether a driving character characteristic is natural or artificial. Benevolence, humility, kindness, and generosity are among Hume's innate qualities. The artificial qualities, on the other hand, are justice, upholding commitments, loyalty, and chastity. The inconsistency was quickly pointed out by Hume's critics, who only labeled the more supererogatory qualities as natural (McPherson, 2018). In Hume's theory of morals, there are four irreducible categories of moral virtue: qualities useful to others, such as benevolence, meekness, charity, justice, fidelity, and veracity; qualities valuable to oneself, such as industry, perseverance, and patience; qualities immediately agreeable to others, such as wit, eloquence, and cleanliness; and qualities such as self-esteem and pride cited in Fate (2000). The majority of ethically relevant behaviours seem to fit into many categories. Here, Hume often used utility as a synonym for the beneficial effects of an agent.

There are two fundamental components to Friedrich Nietzsche's ethical thinking. The first is critical, providing a comprehensive criticism of present morality. The second is positive, and it focuses on what it means to be healthy, vibrant, and thriving for some people, known as higher sorts. In *On the Genealogy of Morality*, Nietzsche argues that the worth of moral values should be investigated for the first time. He employs two separate concepts of value: one is the target of criticism, or the item to be criticized, and the other is the criterion by which we should evaluate these values (Clark & Dudrick, 2012). In this sense, he makes a number of substantive statements of his own, both critical and positive, as well as a number of general ethical arguments. Nietzsche's criticism of the Judeo-Christian moral-religious viewpoint is one broad target, but he is also eager to attack the moral code's post-religious secular legacy, which he perceives as prevalent in his then society in Europe. He is interested in Kantian morality as well as the utilitarianism that was popular in the period, particularly in Britain.

Other sections of the critical project are focused on specific evaluative commitments, such as a commitment to the primacy of pity or compassion (Leiter, 2015). Nietzsche also has an issue with morality's normative content, the things it values and devalues, as well as the behaviors it prescribes and proscribes. The significance of *Mitleid* (pity or compassion) to the moral rules he perceives in his culture is one of his main targets here. In the midst of our sick modernity, Nietzsche refers to Christianity as the religion of pity and claims that nothing is less healthy than Christian pity. But Nietzsche's criticism of pity is not restricted to Christianity; in fact, he claims that the morality of pity is more of an offshoot of Christianity than an integral element of it. In *The Genealogy of Morality*, Nietzsche argues that humans do not need to know about morality's historical beginnings to judge its worth in the present (cited in Clark & Dudrick, 2012). It could be debated and concluded whether he is guilty of a genetic fallacy, which involves incorrectly inferring an appraisal of a thing's present meaning or worth from its genesis or origins. But he seems to be aware of the error in the issue, so the genealogy effort should be taken seriously as part of his critical endeavour.

Relationship between Christian Ethics to Normative Systems

To cope with the issue of consequentialism and deontology, the Enlightenment gave birth to two fundamental ethical paths. Thus, whether an egoist or a utilitarian, a consequentialist seeks the best result for the greatest number of individuals. Deontologists, Kantians, and divine command theorists all try to do the right thing out of a feeling of universal responsibility. The new Christian virtue theorists, on the other hand, feel that the Enlightenment's options were false dichotomies; the Enlightenment methods were essentially inadequate since they dealt with the surface problem of decision-making while overlooking the underlying question of human teleology (the end goal, the purpose of being human). This is perhaps the most important divergence between Christian virtue theory and Christian Enlightenment theories: virtue theory necessitates a departure from current epistemology (the theory of the nature of truth, knowledge, and justification). Virtue theory examines how we think about making judgments as well as how we make moral decisions. This is crucial, at least from a Christian standpoint, and it's a pity that it's been so overlooked in the Western Church. To summarize Christian virtue theory, it teaches Christians to be ethical people who see Christ as God and the *telos*, with the ultimate aim of flourishing and indivisible intimacy with God. This method is about becoming a decent person at heart, not merely making moral judgments.

Consequentialism is a group of normative, teleological ethical theories that claim that the consequences of one's actions are the ultimate foundation for determining whether that behavior is right or wrong (Darwall, 2002). Ethical egoism is a consequentialist theory that holds that a person should act in ways that benefit him or her alone. Some say that a certain amount of egoism benefits society's overall well-being for two reasons: people know best how to delight themselves, and if everyone were an austere altruist, overall well-being would certainly decline. Most consequentialist theories are concerned with promoting positive outcomes, whereas negative utilitarianism is a theory that is purely concerned with limiting negative outcomes. Auguste Comte, who came up with the word "altruism" and whose ideas can be summed up by the slogan "Live for others," pushed for this.

Consequentialism is an ethical theory that claims that it is human beings' moral obligation to behave in such a manner that the greatest positive outcomes for individuals are achieved. Consequentialism concentrates decision-making on the possible results of an action; the outcome, along with purpose to some degree, becomes the moral norm. Situation ethics, utilitarianism, and pragmatism are all forms of consequentialism, a wider school of ethical theory. The notion that the goals justify the means is a simplistic but frequently effective method of describing consequentialism (Keller, 1989). To put it another way, if it is thought essential, ostensibly immoral methods may be used ethically as long as the end result is ethical. Consequentialism seems obvious, even natural at first. Christian ethics, on the other hand, searches for God's finest acts. Instead of pursuing what they believe is the best outcome; they must seek God's will in humble submission. God's will may line up with what we think is the best conclusion, but it won't have anything to do with why we came to that conclusion.

With this discrepancy between Christian ethics and consequentialism in mind, several broad criticisms of consequentialism might be made. The main problem with consequentialism is determining who chooses the optimum course of action in any particular scenario. Who decides what goal to pursue if the end justifies the means? The utility principle and the love principle are among the themes available, but neither theme can ever be deemed objective. Consequentialism lacks a sufficient knowledge basis to identify what is good and what is harmful (Scheffler, 1994). Many activities should be acknowledged as currently unclear unless one can see into the future. To put it another way, any perceived result is based primarily on one's personal experience as well as the best available data, facts, and information. One may easily envisage incorrect conclusions being drawn from excellent data, good facts, and good knowledge based on our prior experiences. Moral obligations originate in response to God's commands (Keller, 1989). God has no moral obligations since he does not give commandments to himself. God's actions must instead be compatible with his flawless goodness. As a result, consequentialist may argue that God has no moral obligations. However, this may beg the question, why God is committed to redemption if he has no moral obligation to salvage humanity. Appealing to St. Paul's exhortation, it is not the fault of creation that it did not attain its purpose; it was made so by God (Gonzalbo, 2006). As for consequentialism, the consequence of the sufferings of Jesus is the salvation of souls. This is summed up by Isaiah when he declared, "By his suffering will my servant justify many, bearing their mistakes upon himself" (Isaiah 53:11). This similar idea is used by Christianity in John's Gospel, where John the Baptist asserts that Christ is the person who atones for sins committed by all people (John 1:29). In this sense, God's acts, including allowing certain evils in the face of greater good, could simply be compatible with his nature as an all-loving and evil-punishing God.

Virtue (or goodness) ethics refers to a group of normative ethical systems that place a premium on moral virtue. A virtue is a morally excellent propensity to think, feel, and act well in some sectors of life, whereas a vice is a disposition that causes its bearer to conduct poorly. Socrates said that knowledge is virtue, implying that there is only one virtue. The four cardinal virtues, according to the Stoics, were simply elements of genuine virtue (Devettere, 2002). The Stoics' four cardinal virtues are: (1) ambition, (2) humility, (3) love, and (4) bravery and honesty.

In 4th-century Athens, what qualifies as a virtue would be a ridiculous guide to right behaviour in 21st-century human society, and vice versa (Russell, 2013). Attempts to consider and practice virtues, on the other hand, may provide the cultural resources that enable individuals to alter the ethos of their own civilizations, however slowly it may take. Some philosophers argue that virtue ethics is culturally relative since various individuals, communities, and civilizations sometimes disagree about what defines a virtue.

Aristotle, for example, regarded the following nine qualities as the most important: knowledge, prudence, justice, fortitude, bravery, liberality, grandeur, magnanimity, and temperance. MacIntyre (cited in Darwall, 2003) also holds this stance. One criticism of virtue ethics is that it focuses on what attributes one should cultivate in order to become a decent person rather than on what activities are ethically permissible and which are not.

Some virtue theorists reply by denying the concept of legitimate legislative power altogether, thereby proposing anarchy as the best political system. Others suggest that rather than rules, a judicial system might be founded on the moral concept of virtues. Many Kantian arguments against virtue ethics say that it is contradictory or that it is not really a moral theory at all (Swanton, 2003). Kantian objections often come from the idea that virtue ethics doesn't give the idea of obligation enough weight, which is what Kant spent most of his time talking about.

Natural Law and Christian Ethics

According to natural law doctrine, every human being has inherent rights that are granted by God, nature, or reason rather than by government. Natural law was mentioned by Aristotle and others in ancient Greek philosophy (Finnis, 2020). It is also mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible. In his epistle to the Romans, Paul writes that Gentiles, who do not have the law, should do the things that the law requires (Romans 2:14–15). In the New Testament, Paul describes the natural law as a law inscribed in humans' hearts and recognized by reason, separate from the positive law of any state or what he regards as God's revealed law. The Abrahamic discourse is expanded upon in the New Testament, with references to a later Greek expose on the issue (Murphy, 2019). Natural law ideas emerged during the Enlightenment, drawing on Roman law and medieval philosophy for inspiration. Natural law is sometimes used interchangeably with natural rights or natural justice (Burns, 2000). Others differentiate between natural rights and natural law. In natural law, purpose, circumstances, and the nature of the act are used to assess acts. The apparent good or bad effect of a moral act has no bearing on the act itself. Consequences are in God's hands, and they are seldom within our control. Natural law appeals to Christian ethics because it promotes a sort of moral realism that asserts that moral norms are established by reality rather than by human judgments. The hypothesis is based on the notion that all people have a moral sense of good and evil.

Realism in contemporary philosophy is used to describe a theory that postulates that everything of sense experience, such as tables and chairs, has an existence apart from their perception. It is antithetical to idealism in this way. Idealism is the metaphysical belief that all physical things are mind-dependent and can exist only in the presence of a conscious mind. Idealism is a reality theory in which awareness, or the immaterial mind, plays a central part in the creation of the universe. Moral realism is now expressed in a variety of ways in philosophy, including metaphysical, semantic, epistemic, explanatory, and other theses (Miller, 2009). Inside and outside of religious ethics, the concept that moral truths are not found but formed by some hypothetical mechanism or the attitudes of rational beings has gained traction in recent decades. This meta-ethical perspective, known as constructivism, posits that moral facts are established by agents' attitudes, or what individuals would agree to given some reasonable or idealized construction methods, rather than facts determined by independent moral reality. This leads to analytic *reductio*, which states that the meaning of any moral statement is synonymous with, and hence reducible to, the meaning of a non-moral statement; their similarity is analytically true, that is, true in virtue of their words' meanings (Railton, 2007). Synthetic reduction,

on the other hand, suggests that although moral and non-moral concepts do not have the same meaning, their identifications can only be determined experimentally. In this sense, moral realism is an effort to retain the objective character of moral truths by rooting ethics in the divine arrangement of reality rather than societal consensus. In modern Christian ethics, this means that morals should be based more on patterns in nature than on what people agree on.

Fundamentals, Presuppositions, and Implications of Christian Ethics

Through its teachings, Christianity instills a moral code in its adherents. Religious writings claim that several religious individuals discussed what was good and wrong. Moses, Mohammad, Buddha, Confucius, and many more religious and political figures all made an effort to construct a group of people's morally acceptable way of life. An approximate 2.2 billion people practice the monotheistic religion of Christianity, which is founded upon Jesus Christ's teachings and contains moral ideals (Oshitelu, 2003). This is the same Christian moral framework as it is given in Christian sacred writings along with its history, tenets, and implications. The prior moral code bequeathed to Jacob's lineage, for instance, is expanded upon by the Christian code. The Bible claims that Moses' collection of rules, which served as the Israelites' official moral code was given to them. When Jesus started to teach, he validated the Mosaic Law but also made reference to a more profound set of principles. The Christian sense of morality is built upon these precepts: love for God and love for humanity. The Christian God expects his followers to love him with everything in their heart, soul, mind, and strength. Wrongful conduct entails seeking anything else, including such things as money, power, and fame, among others, whereas right behaviour involves directing one's life toward that core. Christians believe that certain ritualistic practices are crucial to their devotion to God.

A presupposition is indeed an assertion that has not been proved but is taken for granted and is used to support other claims. Christianity's fundamental tenet or ethics claims that even the Bible is God's inspired word. Thus, a belief that has priority over all others is referred to as an ultimate assumption. Hence, the Bible's teachings are assumed as a Christian's ultimate premise for every human action. This assumption simply reflects the lordship of the Christian deity over human cognition—a belief that is more important than another and is used to evaluate other belief systems (Bavinck, 2011). This kind of belief is a belief that is claimed to have priority over all others; hence, it is referred to as an ultimate assumption. A Christian's ultimate ethical premise is the substance of the Christian Scripture (Frame, 2008). It just extends this idea of biblical inerrancy to the field of knowledge—in this case, Christian ethics. The evidential apologetics stance on this is that the historical accounts and other truth claims made in the Bible are more likely true than false, thus allowing adherents to rationally accept the entirety of scriptural revelation. In cases where adherents are unable to approach absolute certainty, they must accept the explanations that are most likely to be accurate, as the case may be. On the other hand, presupposition apologetics seeks to demonstrate that certain beliefs about God, humans, and the universe that they profess not to hold are also implied by the presuppositions and behaviour of adherents of other religions.

Christian ethics is more than merely good deeds or virtue; it is based on the Bible, which serves as the cornerstone of Christian ethics (value). It is the ethical performance of a biblical text in relation to the political landscape of the present. A Christian worldview holds that God is the absolute, all-knowing creator of all that exists. A Christian worldview is more than just a theory or one individual's distinctive way of explaining their faith. It is a style of living that pervades all parts of your life and seeks to address some of the most basic issues that confront us all. Because they were made in the image of God, individuals are inherently moral beings, according to a Christian viewpoint. We also accept that Jesus Christ embodies kindness, love, holiness, grace, and truth to the maximum extent possible (John 1:14-18). A Christian worldview therefore provides a basis for moral thinking. In contradiction to deism, naturalism, and materialism, a Christian worldview is a rational method of seeing reality. When confronted with contemporary age religiosity or locally and internationally pluralistic conceptions of truth and morality, such a theistic worldview provides direction and direction. Fear of the unknown, suffering, sickness, and poverty are all affected by a Christian worldview that is based on Christ's sacrifice and God's greatness.

A Philosophical Appraisal of Christian Ethical Presuppositions

In ethics, emphasizing "the good" is important. Diverse schools of moral philosophy have been shaped significantly by various ways of defining the good. Virtue Ethics, Deontology, and Consequentialism are the three main categories of ethical philosophy. In the end, Kant (cited in MacIntyre, 2007; Guyer, 2006) implies respect for humanity as the source of the moral law when he talks of respect for the law. Therefore, when Christians claim that Christian ethics may complement Kant's ethics, they do not seem to understand the fundamental contradiction between Kant's self-sufficient human and God in Christianity. The only distinction between philosophical and theological ethics for Christians might be one of emphasis. Both must consider how Scripture should be used to explain the moral life throughout all of its manifestations. One cannot embrace a Christian-theistic notion of an ultimate God, an absolute Christ, or an absolute Scripture without also embracing the others. One can begin a discourse on ethical issues that face humanity by holding the Scriptures up as the last, all-encompassing authority. In some philosophers' opinions, the attitude of outright positivism and pragmatism is the only option to this.

Theological relational ethics, which are a qualitatively distinct kind of ethics, are built as an extremely important and integrated element of a reconstructed holistic theology. This is the only way to truly reform theological or Christian ethics because moral theology's foundations are fundamentally different from those on which modern theological ethics should always be based. Although Christianity is not essentially a system of morality and even if not all of its moral precepts are distinctly Christian, it does represent a unique viewpoint on morality. Christian theologians have studied some of the connections, contrasts, and conflicts between their Christian worldview and the tenets of moral philosophy from the beginning (Rooker, 2010). For instance, Thomas Aquinas, for instance, pursues this goal of using Christian ethics and moral philosophy to complement one another in the deepest depth. The effect of Christian faith is neither consistent nor

clear-cut, and it does not always drive moral philosophers down a single, clear path. According to Newman (cited in Anderson, 2017), the conscience motivates individuals to behave properly even when doing so is against their own interests, which supports the idea that there are objective moral truths.

Many moral arguments are founded on moral universalism and need the presence of God in order to be valid. They often think that morality looks like it is obligatory since it implies that the responsibility will remain, regardless of other reasons or interests. Obligations are considered to express more than simply a desire. According to Newman (cited in Anderson, 2017), there must be a God for morality to be binding. Although utilitarianism has long taken pleasure in distilling morality down to a single rule, it is unable to provide a definitive response to the issue of how much a life is worth. Recent modifications, such as rational preference utilitarianism, make an effort to capitalize on a moral obligation that is implied but not explicitly stated. While clearly highlighting significant moral principles, Kant's (cited Guyer, 2006) focus on universality, responsibility for the sake of duty, and respect for individuals in their own right leaves much of the substance of morality lacking in specificity. Christian ethics has never attempted to provide an overall ethical theory. The theories of Plato and Aristotle were already in the field when Christianity arrived with its new way of life and will of God ethic. Now, as then, it brings to moral theory an overall vision of life, a way of relating to God and others, and a concern for specific values such as loving kindness, justice, and mercy for the weak and defenseless.

A Workable Synthesis

Christian ethics is a detailed assessment of Jesus' way of living in relation to humanity's numerous issues and conflicts. Christian ethics is on shaky ground if it either sells its legacy by adopting secular standards or refuses to honour and learn from millennia of moral wisdom. Christian ethics should be enjoyable, and the Christian life should be a happy experience of doing the good. The nature of God in religion is moral perfection, and all he commands is in accordance with his perfect and just goodness. Some ethical schools place a premium on the development of virtuous character and motives in actors. The Christian Bible, for instance, has both cautionary and encouraging passages regarding the benefits and drawbacks of following or disobeying God. Thus, one must weigh the risks of disobedience against the rewards of following God's lead. In Christianity, some Christians feel that unintentional or inadvertent crimes are justified. When a person acts against their own sense of good and evil, they commit subjective sins. According to this perspective, the existence of moral evils or sinful activities is at least possible. It is also possible that free beings created in God's image have a greater risk of falling.

Theological perspectives on the need for forgiveness, redemption, and atonement are inextricably linked to descriptions of the nature of sin. Only certain acts are wicked in the strict sense, according to Thomas Aquinas, whereas vices are harmful habits without being sinful. Virtue cultivation and practice are central to the Christian moral life. Human attributes mold the soul by creating thinking and will habits that promote moral behaviour, restrict wants, and avoid sin. The four Christian moral characteristics are

prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude. Christian theological qualities include faith, hope, and love. In the middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle, and others established Christian virtue theory. Since the Enlightenment, virtue theory has been largely ignored by mainstream Christian thought. According to David Hume's moral theory, moral acceptance is neither a logical judgment about conceptual connections nor a real fact. Character qualities, particularly virtuous or evil character traits, influence human behaviour. Human acts have an influence on receivers as agents, and as spectators, they perceive the receiver's pleasurable experiences. For Friedrich Nietzsche, moral values should be investigated. He uses two distinct ideas of value: the object of criticism and the standard by which these values are assessed. His own substantial remarks, both critical and favourable, are included. For Nietzsche, humans do not need to know about morality's historical origins to judge its value in the present. Furthermore, pity morality is more of a side effect of Christianity than a core component of it. Christian virtue theory looks at how we make moral decisions and how we think about making them. Christians are told to be moral people who see Christ as God and the *telos*, and that their ultimate goal should be to flourish.

Consequentialism is a collection of ideas that concentrate on the outcomes of one's actions. According to ethical egoism, a person should do things that benefit him or herself only. Christian ethics, on the other hand, seeks God's best while remaining humble. The difference between Christian ethics and consequentialism is that God has no moral responsibilities. The Stoics claimed that there is only one virtue, wisdom, and that vice is just a bad temperament that leads to bad behavior. Some contend that virtue ethics is difficult to define culturally. The criticism of virtue ethics is that it emphasizes what qualities one should develop in order to become a good person rather than what acts are morally permitted and which are not. Some virtues theorists respond by dismissing the idea of legitimate legislative authority entirely, arguing that anarchy is the greatest political system. In the New Testament, Paul characterizes the natural law as a rule engraved in human hearts and perceived by reason. The aim, circumstances, and character of the act are utilized to judge actions in natural law. God controls the consequences, and humans seldom have influence over them. On the other hand, moral realism, on the other hand, is an endeavour to keep moral facts objective by basing ethics on the divine order of reality rather than social agreement, a contrast to idealism.

Conclusion

So far, it is affirmed that Christian ethics is a thorough examination of Jesus' way of life in light of humanity's many problems and conflicts. It is also affirmed that Christian ethics can be approached philosophically. In this sense, if Christian ethics either sells its past by embracing secular norms or refuses to honour and benefit from millennia of moral insight, it is on a precarious foundation. It is also posited that the formation of moral character and motivations in performers is valued by several ethical philosophies. Human beings can make moral judgments and consider them on the basis of Christian virtues. Christian ethics, on the other hand, should be modest and seek God's finest deeds for humanity. God-given intelligence should be considered the sole virtue, while vice should be seen as a poor disposition that leads to bad action. Therefore, for Christian

ethics to maintain its validity, it should not appeal to secular standards, which will cause it to lose its history, meaning, and values.

References

- Adams, R.M. (1985). Involuntary sins. *The Philosophical Review*, 94(1), 3-31.
- Anderson, O. (2017). Natural law and philosophical presuppositions. In N. Doe (Ed.), *Christianity and natural law: An introduction* (pp. 205-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, S. (2001). Theological ethics, moral philosophy, and natural law. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 4(4), 349-364.
- Aquinas, T. (1984). *Treatise on the virtues*. J.A. Oesterle (transl.). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Aristotle (2002). *Aristotle Nicomachean ethics*. C. Rower & S. Broadie (transl.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bavinck, H. (2011). The kingdom of God. The highest good. *The Bavinck Review*, 2, 133-170.
- Beam, C. (1996). Hume and Nietzsche: Naturalists, ethicists, anti-Christians. *Hume Studies*, 12, (2), 299-324.
- Burns, T. (2000). Aquinas's two doctrines of natural law. *Political Studies*, 48, 929-946.
- Clark, M. & Dudrick, D. (2012). *The soul of Nietzsche's beyond good and evil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Copan, P. (2003). Original sin and Christian philosophy. *Philosophia Christi*, 5(2), 519-541.
- Crisp, O.D. (2020). On behalf of Augustinian realism. *Toronto Journal of Theology*, 35(2), 124-133.
- Darwall, S. (Ed.) (2002). *Consequentialism*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Darwall, S. (Ed.) (2003). *Virtue ethics*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Devettere, R. J. (2002). *Introduction to virtue ethics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Fate, D. (2000). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finnis, J. (2020). Natural law theories. In Zalta, E.N. (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. London: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Frame, J. (2008). *Doctrine of the Christian life*. Phillipsburg: P&R.
- Guyer, P. (2006). *Kant*. Taylor & Francis.
- Gonzalbo, E. F. (2006). *In the eyes of God: A study on the culture of suffering*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- Graham, G. (2007). Sin and salvation. In Chad Meister & Paul Copan (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy of religion* (pp. 576-584). New York: Routledge.
- Herdt, J.A. (1997). *Religion and faction in Hume's moral philosophy*. New York: CUP.
- Keller, J.A. (1989). Christianity and consequentialism: A reply to Meilaender faith and philosophy. *Journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers*, 6, 2.
- Leiter, B. (2015). *Nietzsche on morality*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Leiter, B. (2019). *Moral psychology with Nietzsche*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study of moral theory*. Notre Dame: UND Press.
- McCluskey, C. (2017). *Thomas Aquinas on moral wrongdoing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McPherson, K.C. (2018). Hume as secularizer: An assessment of Hume's secular moral philosophy. *Journal of Religion & Society*, 70-87.
- Miller, C.B. (2009). The conditions of moral realism. *Journal of Philosophical Research*, 123-155.
- Murphy, M. (2019). The natural law Tradition in ethics. In Zalta, E.N. (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. London: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Oshitelu, G.A. (2003). *A background to Christian philosophy*. Lagos: Oputoru Publishers.
- Ozumba, G.O. (2001). *Ethics: A philosophical approach*. Lagos: G.O. Publishers.
- Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian belief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quinn, P.L. & Taliaferro, D. (Eds.). (1997). *A companion to philosophy of religion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Railton, P. (2007). Moral realism. In Shafer, Landau Russ & Cuneo, Terence (Eds.), *Foundations of ethics: An anthology* (pp. 186-205). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rooker, M. (2010). *The ten commandments: Ethics for the twenty-first century*. Nashville: B&H Academic.
- Russell, D.C. (Ed.) (2013). *The Cambridge companion to virtue ethics*. New York: CUP.
- Scheffler, S. (1994). *The rejection of consequentialism: A philosophical investigation of the considerations underlying rival moral conceptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Serfontein, B. (2021). Moral origins and Christian ethics: An interdisciplinary approach in conversation with J. Wentzel van Huyssteen. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 42(2), a2341.
- Smith, A. (1976). The wealth of nations. In R.H. Campbell & A.S. Skinner (Eds.), *The Glasgow edition of the works and correspondence of Adam Smith*. (p. 456). London: OUP
- Stump, E. (201). *Atonement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stump, E. (2003). *Aquinas*. London: Routledge.
- Swanton, C. (2003). *Virtue ethics: A Pluralistic View*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swinburne, R. (2009). Natural evil and the possibility of knowledge. In Kevin Timpe (Ed.), *Arguing about Religion* (pp. 236–245). New York: Routledge.
- Wainwright, W. J. (1988). Original sin. *Morris*, 31-60.