For the exam you should be competent in the following areas:

1. Definitions of technical terms
   a. Know the meaning moral terminology such as deontology, libertine, norms, moral dilemma vs moral conflict, etc. There is a high concentration of such terms in the first handout given at the start of the course.
   b. Also know technical terms and concepts from lecture content such as the Euthyphro Dilemma, Doctrine of Two Wills, Categorical Imperative, etc.

2. Diagnostics
   a. For each school of ethics (i.e. Biblical Absolutism, Divine Command Theory/Non-Conflicting Absolutism, Conflicting Absolutism, Graded Absolutism:
      i. What are the defining, diagnostic characteristics of that schools approach to ethics? (In a disease analogy, what are the symptoms you would use to identify what medical condition – i.e. the school of ethics – you are facing and how does that "disease" operate?).
      ii. What are the core principles and values of each school?
   b. Be sure to check Rae (textbook) on the basic concepts to define Virtue Ethics and Natural Law Ethics (especially the Catholic form of Natural Law Ethics).
   c. Do not forget our lectures (and a brief bit of Rae but also lots of Kainer’s book) on Joseph Fletcher’s Situation Ethics (SE).
      i. Focus on the raw idea of why it is called SE
      ii. What is the pithy phrase/concept often used to diagnose something as SE, and what does it mean?
      iii. How does SE view itself against “legalism” and “relativism?”
      iv. What is the one “absolute” in SE? How is it defined (what it is and what is it not).
      v. How did Fletcher use Scripture to support his position and how did we critique that?

3. Differentiation:
   a. When you have highly similar schools of ethics (Examples: Biblical vs Divine
Command Theory/Non-Conflicting Absolutism; Graded vs Conflicting Absolutism), what characteristics would differentiate them from each other?

b. Be able to differentiate between all schools of ethics we covered, though the less similar schools are fairly easy to differentiate.

4. Evaluation: What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each school of ethics according to Rae or lecture materials?

5. Be able to answer questions about Beckwith's critique of Moral Relativism including, but not limited to the following:

a. What are the 3 characteristics of a moral system and how Beckwith see Moral Relativism comparing to those?

i. (Do not confuse Beckwith's views with some of the professor's comments on Moral Relativism functioning as a quasi-moral system – keep the professor's points and Beckwith separate in your mind).

ii. What did Beckwith argue about Moral Relativism and Tolerance? What is needed for true tolerance? Is Moral Relativism truly tolerant?

6. Have a basic familiarity with the language and interpretation of the Personal Power (Kenotic) Approach to the 10 Commandments and how this differs from the Rule-Compliance approach to the 10 Commandments.

7. For Sexual Ethics, Marital Ethics, and Divorce, organize and identify concepts attached to Biblical book/chapter (and secondarily the name attached to it like Jesus or Paul).

i. Example: Can you isolate Paul’s instructions on Divorce in 1 Cor 7 from the law of divorce in Deut 24? Jesus on divorce in Mat 19?

8. While these are the major areas, do not restrict your preparation to just the items mentioned in this sheet. These are guidelines for you to prepare with all the materials assigned and covered up to the midterm exam.

9. There will be a few basic reading questions from assigned reading, mostly but not exclusively tied to reading questions already used in quizzes.

10. Final note: Part of my testing goal is to test the ability to correlate, recognized contradictions, make synthesis, and demonstrate the ability to assess and analyze 2-3 concepts blended in one question. One possible example is the ability to distinguish secular Unqualified Absolutism from Biblical. Thus if a question focuses on Kant, and you have options about morality grounded in divine revelation, you should know that Kant rejected divine revelation as possible, so would not endorse any revelation-basis for
morality. The Christian absolutist will appeal to divine revelation but not Kant.