

Christians firmly believe that they are already saved (inspecting at the time of salvation). It is determined that the difference in the views on the belief in salvation also lies in the different meanings of the saving sacrifice of Christ: the Orthodox in the denial of power of sin and death see an open opportunity to achieve unity with God; Evangelical Christians in the redemptive sacrifice see an absolute momentous change in the status of a person before God. It has been analyzed that Orthodox and evangelical believers understand differently the doctrine of salvation for grace, which is also the difference between the perception of confidence in salvation.

Keywords: assurance of salvation, evangelical Christianity, Orthodoxy, Comparative Theology, Biblical Textology

УДК 261.7

FAITH AND LONELINESS

V. A. CHORNOBAI, post-graduate student* of the Department of culturology
N. P. Dragomanov National Pedagogy University
E-mail: lerachern@icloud.com

Abstract: *The article is debated question whether people can have a deep attachment to God, and whether their personal faith or some other forms of religiosity can be an effective deterrent against loneliness. Although some Christian religious authors have described their faith as an effective buffer against loneliness, empirical investigations have given mixed results. Nevertheless, it is proved that Christians that have intimate relationships with God, and are securely attached to Him, who view God as a loving, protective yet just, score lower in loneliness.*

Keywords: loneliness, attachment to God, implicit religiosity, explicit religiosity, faith.

Introduction. There is a sizable amount of studies demonstrating that some aspects of religious life, such as involvement in organized religious institutions and support systems have some effects on psychological well-being and mental health of Christians (for a review, see Ellison & Levin, 1998; House, Umberson, & Landis, 1988; Mirowsky & Ross, 2003). Far fewer scholars have systematically investigated other facets of religious participation, such as intimate relationships with God that can be best described in terms of the attachment theory (Bradshaw, Ellison, & Flannelly, 2008; Ladd & Spilka, 2002; Pollner, 1989; Poloma & Gallup, 1991) [1, p.131]. The present article addresses this shortcoming by drawing on recent applications of attachment theory to religious phenomena.

* Науковий керівник – доктор філософських наук, доцент С. О. Шкіль

Building on Bowlby's (1969, 1973, 1982) theory of parent-child attachments [2], it has been shown that close, interpersonal relations are not only crucial for a child's development, but are important for adults as well. The research reviews the recent findings in this area by examining whether one's conceptualization of God have any impact on his\hers relationships with God and how these relationships correlate with feelings of loneliness.

Purpose. Therefore, in this article we focus on attachment styles and the impact of attachment to God on loneliness that the Christians experience.

Results. In brief, initially in the attachment theory John Bowlby focused on the bond between an infant and the primary caregiver. In light of this theory, four primary styles of attachment have been identified later: one secure and three insecure – anxious or ambivalent, as commonly mentioned in the literature, avoidant and disorganized. Thereafter Mary Ainsworth developed the attachment theory further by suggesting a method for measurement an infant's security and a concept of a "secure base" (securely attached children, when they are upset, will seek comfort and closeness from their parents). According to this perspective, securely attached individuals routinely display "proximity-seeking" behaviors toward their attachment figures—that is, they seek their company and protection, particularly during stressful times. Attachment figures, in turn, serve as a "safe haven" and a "secure base" in an uncertain world.

Secure attachment is characterized by feelings of love, approval, closeness, and warmth toward attachment figures. Anxious attachment is characterized by feelings of inconsistency and confusion, and attachment figures are perceived as warm, loving, and reliable at certain times and cold, distant, and unreliable at others. Avoidant attachment, a third style, is simply the inverse of secure attachment—that is, potential attachment figures are perceived as consistently cold, distant, and unreliable. And finally, there is a disorganized style, that is a combination of ambivalent and avoidant attachments.

The four styles of attachment are based on the person's core beliefs about yourself and others. The securely attached individuals are characterized by their positive attitude both toward themselves and others, and by comfortable interdependence from others. The anxious/ambivalent category represents the preoccupation with feelings of unworthiness and the need for other's approval. This style of attachment characterizes children who experienced insensitive caregiving. These children generally bring this overdependence into the adult relationships. Unlike them, avoidant individuals are identified by denial of the need or desire for intimacy, they tend to suppress their feelings. Their self-dimension is that they are self-sufficient and others are not reliable. Whereas disorganized question their sense of worthiness and other's too. These individuals shy away from intimacy because of interpersonal distrust and fear of rejection due to inconsistent or abusive family situations [3, p.12].

Thereafter, attachment theory researchers began to extrapolate their findings onto relationships between romantic partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In support of Bowlby's assertions, Mikulincer and Shaver (2004) found that individuals who had access to an attachment figure were able to facilitate self-soothing for themselves. Conversely, those who did not have access to

attachment figures demonstrated more negative affect than those who did. For example, poorer self-esteem and emotional well-being have been reported for the insecurely attached adults (Bureau, Easterbrooks, & Lyons-Ruth, 2009). Moreover, it was also asserted that individuals who were insecurely attached reported higher levels of loneliness and stress [4, p.13].

More recently, attachment research has begun to consider religion and God in the context of attachment figures (Exline, Park, Smyth, & Carey, 2011) [1, 131].

A few number of researches, which has extended attachment theory to God, suggests that intimate relationships between humans and God meet the defining criteria of attachments—that is, proximity-seeking behavior, a haven of safety, and a secure base. Kirkpatrick in his theoretical approach to religion argues that “religious belief and experience may be fruitfully conceptualized from the perspective of attachment theory.... For example, the God of most Christian traditions seems to correspond very closely to the idea of the secure attachment figure” [5, p. 29].

Empirical support for God being considered by most Christians as an attachment figure can be found throughout other recent researches. For example, Pargament, Kennell, & Hathaway’s (1988) research has shown that individuals routinely turn to God for help during stressful times. This is clearly proximity-seeking behavior, and exemplifies the haven of safety function of attachment relations. More recent scholars have even attempted to precisely measure attachment styles as they pertain to the relationship between humans and God. In the first study on this topic, Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1992) adapted Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) categorical self-report measure in order to classify respondents as securely, avoidantly, or anxiously attached to God based on their agreement with predefined descriptions of each—that is, their perceptions of God as warm and responsive, impersonal and distant, or inconsistent, respectively [1, p.133].

The attachment to God theory, which examines “styles” of attachment to the Devine, is also connected to the perceptions of the image of God, (i.e., the characteristics of God). Despite vast differences in samples, study designs, and methods, investigators have reached broad consensus regarding some of the most important dimensions of God imagery. In particular, several factor-analytic studies have shown a close association among a number of beneficent images of God—for example, as “loving,” “forgiving,” “caring,” and “protective” (Gorsuch, 1968; Spilka, Armatas, & Nussbaum, 1964) [for a review, see 1, p.133].

As was mentioned before, according to the attachment theory an attachment figure is required to have certain qualities, such as proximity (closeness) and accessibility, especially in times of trouble, sensitivity, responsiveness, and the ability to provide protection; the qualities related to provision of a secure base involve support of exploration of the world and learning.

Therefore the study of the core Bible Scriptures should give us cogent groundings to decide if the Christian God can actually be such an attachment figure. The perceived image of God is reflected first of all in His titles (names), the characteristics of His nature and His actions towards people.

From the very first chapters God in the Bible is seen as the Creator of all, Who is all-powerful and Mighty. The Bible uses name El-Shaddai, usually translated as the “All-mighty”. He is mighty to provide, to save and protect the needy (Gen. 17:1 and more). Perhaps this is the most common personal name of God, used more than 48 times in the Bible. He said to Abraham that He was his shield (Gen. 14:1); in Psalms He is called “shield”, “refuge”, “rock of salvation”, “fortress and deliverer”, “stronghold” – all describing assurance of God’s people in His ability to protect in times of trouble.

Numerous stories in Scripture such as of Noah, Abraham, Joseph, David, widow of Sidon, and so on, assert that God is capable and willing to save those who would cry for help or had relations with Him.

God is generally perceived by Christians to be not only omnipotent but also omnipresent. So the other quality (attribute) of God that is obvious in the Bible is His proximity. He is the God “Who sees” (Hebrew “El-Roi”) (Gen.16:13), and answers the prayer (Job 35:13), which gives the idea of His closeness to people and His attention to their prayers (see Ps. 145:18, Is. 50:8). Psalmist says: “The righteous cry out, and the Lord hears them; he delivers them from all their troubles. The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit” (Ps. 34:17-18).

This quality of God is also reflected in His Name as it was revealed to Moses: “God said to Moses, “I Am Who I am.... The Lord, the God of your fathers... This is my name forever, the name by which I am to be remembered from generation to generation” (Ex. 3:14-15). This quality of God relates to the very meaning of the word YHWH which is used here. It comes from the Hebrew verb “to be” and is explained in the Bible itself by the words of God: “I am Yahweh,” (Hebrew: “ehier asher ehier”, which can be translated as “I am the One who is” (Ex. 3:14). God is He Who always is there, Who is near. The people of God, the Jews, in the Book of Deuteronomy exclaim: “What other nation is so great as to have their gods near them the way the Lord our God is near us whenever we pray to him?” (Deu. 4:7).

One of the outstanding traits of God’s character as the reader can notify is His affectionate, merciful and kind love: “The Lord is good, a refuge in times of trouble. He cares for those who trust in him” (Nahum 1:7). The phrase “The Lord is good and merciful” is repeatedly used in the Bible.

Perhaps, one of the most common imagery of God in the Bible is the concept of God the Father. He is compassionate and forgiving – as the Old Testament shows (Ps. 103:13, Is. 64:8); , the concept of God the Father is more wholly revealed in the New Testament He knows what we need before asking (Mt. 6:8); gives good gifts to those who ask Him (Mt. 7:11) and sends His Holy Spirit to comfort believers (Jn. 14:26). Father loves people (Jn. 16:27) and through His Son Jesus has adopted, accepted and loved all who would believe in Him (1 Jn. 3:1).

On the other hand, to say about God’s love without mentioning about His holiness would be quite a misrepresentation. There are a number of Scriptures saying that God is loving and slow to anger yet just and “jealous and avenging God...the Lord will not leave the guilty unpunished” (Nahum 1:2-3).

Nevertheless this other angle of God's character gives a sense of security and stability that all evil ultimately will be punished.

Undoubtedly, the conception of God as a parental attachment figure is consistent with the beliefs and teachings of most Christian traditions. In other words, the perceived availability and responsiveness of a loving God is a fundamental dynamic underlying Christianity. In this religious tradition, individuals are expected to proceed with the faith that they can personally and directly interact—through prayer and worship (a proximity-seeking behavior) - with a God Who will be available to hear, to protect and comfort them in times of trouble. This is an obvious haven of safety concept. It may also be the case that the mere knowledge of God's presence and accessibility allows many religious individuals to approach the problems and difficulties of human existence with confidence and security, which is an example of the secure base function of attachment relationships [1, p. 132]. In fact, God may be the absolutely adequate attachment figure (i.e., an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and infallible one), whereas humans are often inadequate. Nevertheless despite various theoretical parallels between interpersonal relationships and relationships with God, the attachment to God is unique in many ways [6, p. 11]. For example, the degree to which God is perceived as omnipresent, not limited with space or time, yet immanent, makes it possible for God to be continually available and responsive, unlike humans. At the same time, even though we can experience closeness with God, we still remain to be in need of closeness with other people.

There has been much debate regarding whether an individual's attachment style to God is essentially carried out from one's attachment style to people that they developed in the past (the correspondence model). Or perhaps, these are two independent structures functioning so that in difficult times insecurely attached individuals turn to God to compensate their dearth of secure deep relations with people, using God as a replacement figure (compensation model).

Empirical researches, theoretical reasoning and counseling practice support the correspondence model stronger. According to Jolene Hill (2014), Hall and colleagues (2009) results, compensation is temporary and is most evident with measures that more strongly tap into external expressions of religiosity (like how often one prays or attends church). They argue that compensation does not change the individual's underlying internal working model or attachment style [4, p. 56]. Tim Clinton and Gary Sibcy as practical Christian counselors, in their book "Attachments: why you love, feel and act the way you do" add to this idea arguing that insecure attachments are revealed most in times of impersonal tragedies, when these kind of persons inwardly tend to blame God, question His love and avoid His comfort [7, p. 152].

In Hill's research God attachment predicted all outcome variables independently of external religiosity. Therefore, God attachment appears to be a different construct and not just an expression of external religiosity. In fact, external religiosity in the multiple regression was slightly, positively related to post-traumatic symptoms, while attachment to God was negatively related [4, p. 62]. It could be that when a person is facing tragedy, she/he will attempt to go

to church more, pray more, and read the Bible more in an attempt to feel better. In other words, the symptoms may cause an increase in external religious behavior; however, these behaviors, in the absence of an experience of having a secure relationship with God, are not helpful. In fact, this external religious behavior without trustful relationships with God breeds anger, disappointment and rebellion against God.

Therefore, in general, there are two separate attachment systems, related but distinct, one regarding how to be with people and the other regarding how to be with God. Hall and colleagues persuasively argue that internal attachment style arises from experiences; therefore, future research might focus on which experiences shape attachment to God. It is presumed that provided God is viewed as a secure attachment figure by Christians - as omnipresent, omnipotent and loving – those believers are likely to develop a secure attachment style to God that differs from their attachment style to people regardless their experience with people.

Weighing the results of the studies mentioned above, in samples of self-identified Christians, both secure attached to people and to God contribute to positive outcomes following upsetting events or difficult life situations. Therefore we hypothesize that if God really is an attachment figure, this should pose that secure attachment to God was associated with greater life satisfaction and lower levels of loneliness, anxiety and depression. A certain ground to assert this can be found in a follow-up study of Kirkpatrick, Shillito, and Kellas (1999) who showed that secure attachment to God was inversely associated with loneliness among women [8, p. 513]. Likewise, Jones, Carpenter and Quintana (1985), Paloutzian and Ellison (1982) have reported that some forms of religiosity are more effective as a buffer against loneliness than others; for example, “born again” Christians (those who agree to the statement that they have received Jesus Christ as their personal Savior and Lord) scored lower on loneliness ($p < .06$) than the nonreligious. Conversely, externally religious believers (those who agree to the statement that they try to follow the ethical and moral teachings of Christ) did not differ from the nonreligious. Therefore, explicit religiosity does not significantly correlates with loneliness [9, p. 135].

This raises the presumption that a non-religious person who does not have a secure relationship with God is not going to recover as well, following traumatic events (such as losing close relationships due to death of a loved one or divorce) and, hence - is going to suffer from loneliness, as a religious person who has secure relationships with both God and people. However, the non-religious person may do better than a religious person who has an insecure attachment to God. This is something that could be tested in future empirical investigations.

Conclusion and discussion. Undoubtedly, the conception of God as a parental attachment figure is consistent with the beliefs and teachings of Christian tradition. In other words, the perceived availability and responsiveness of a loving God is a fundamental concept underlying Christianity. In this religious tradition, individuals proceed with the faith that they can personally and directly interact - through prayer and worship (a proximity-seeking behavior) - with a

God who will be available to hear, to protect and comfort them in times of trouble. This is an explicit “haven of safety” concept. It may also be the case that the mere knowledge of God’s presence and accessibility allows many religious individuals to approach the problems and difficulties of human existence with confidence and security, an example of the secure base function of attachment relationships. In fact, God may be the absolutely adequate attachment figure (i.e., an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and infallible one), whereas humans are often inadequate.

Although many studies have found negative correlations between religiosity and loneliness, not all religious experiences produce positive affect. It is possible for religion to cause distress if it’s not related with deep secure relationships with God rooted in biblical Christian convictions. It was shown in this study that insecure attachment to God was associated with poorer outcomes following loneliness. Put another way, those who have assimilated implicit religiosity in their lives, rather than merely explicit religiosity, will probably be less lonely, provided their implicit religiosity includes a healthy conception of God as an attachment figure. It would be advantageous for future empirical research to address this presumption.

References

1. Bradshaw, M., Ellison, C.G., Marcum, J. P. (2010). Attachment to God, Images of God, and Psychological Distress in a Nationwide Sample of Presbyterians. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 20:2, 130-147.
2. Bowlby, J. (1982) Attachment and loss. Volume I: Attachment. Second edition. Tavistock Institute of Human Relations: Basic Books, 326.
3. Weine, K. F. (2014). Intimate relationships: adult attachment style and attachment to God. University of Massachusetts. Amherst. Masters Theses, February, 76.
4. Hill, J. M. (2014). The differential prediction of outcome following interpersonal offenses versus impersonal tragedies by attachment to people and attachment to God. Department of Psychology, Brock University. St. Catharines, ON. August, 95.
5. Kirkpatrick, L., & Shaver, P. (1990). Attachment theory and religion: Childhood attachments, religious beliefs, and conversion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 315-334.
6. Rowatt, W. C., Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2002). Two Dimensions of Attachment to God and Their Relation to Affect, Religiosity, and Personality Constructs. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41:4, 637-651.
7. Clinton, T., Sibs, G. (2002). Attachments: why you love, feel and act the way you do. Integrity publishers, 303.
8. Kirkpatrick, L. A., Shillito, D. J., & Kellas, S. L. (1999). Loneliness, social support, and perceived relationships with God. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16(4), 513-522.
9. Duffon, B. D., Perlman, D. (1986) Loneliness and Religiosity: In the World but Not of It. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 14, 2, 135-145.

ВІРА І САМОСТІСТЬ

В. А. Чорнобай

Анотація: В статті аналізується питання про те, чи можуть люди мати глибоку прихильність до Бога, чи їхня особиста віра або якісь інші

форми релігійності можуть бути ефективним захистом проти самотності. Хоча деякі християнські релігійні автори описали свою віру як ефективний захист проти самотності, емпіричні дослідження дали різноманітні результати. Проте, доведено, що християни, які мають близькі стосунки з Богом і міцно безпечно прив'язані до Нього, які бачать Бога як люблячого, захищаючого, але справедливого, мають менше почуття самотності.

Ключові слова: самотність, прихильність до Бога, неявна релігійність, явна релігійність, віра

ВЕРА И ОДИНОЧЕСТВО

В. А. Чернобай

Аннотация. В статье анализируется вопрос о том, могут ли люди иметь глубокую привязанность к Богу, или их личная вера, или какие-то другие формы религиозности могут быть эффективной защитой против одиночества. Хотя некоторые христианские религиозные авторы описали свою веру как эффективную защиту против одиночества, эмпирические исследования дали различные результаты. Однако, доказано, что христиане, имеющие близкие отношения с Богом и крепко безопасно привязанные к Нему, видят Бога как любящего, защищающего, но справедливого, имеют меньшее чувство одиночества.

Ключевые слова: одиночество, привязанность к Богу, скрытая религиозность, явная религиозность, вера

УДК 124.5 : 17.03 : 111.84 : 2+572

АКСІОЛОГІЧНО-ЕТИЧНЕ ВЧЕННЯ ЮЗЕФА ТІШНЕРА У РОЗУМІННІ ПРОБЛЕМ РЕЛІГІЙНОЇ АНТРОПОЛОГІЇ

О. М. НЕВМЕРЖИЦЬКА, пошукач* кафедри культурології
Національний педагогічний університет імені М. П. Драгоманова
E-mail: rukru@ukr.net

Анотація. Актуальність дослідження полягає у проведенні релігієзнавчого дослідження аксіологічно-етичного вчення польського філософа Юзефа Тішнера у контексті релігійної антропології.

Мета дослідження – розкриття важливості аксіологічно-етичних концепцій Юзефа Тішнера для розуміння проблем релігійної антропології. Наукові методи, що використовувалися у статті такі: феномено-

* Науковий керівник – доктор філософських наук, професор І. З. Майданюк