



Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking

An International Resource Center in Support of Restorative Justice Dialogue, Research and Training

FORGIVENESS: An Annotated Bibliography

Mark S. Umbreit, Ph.D.

Jonathan Fier, M.S.W.

July 1, 2002

Books that Define Forgiveness

Affinito, M. G. (1999). *When to forgive: a healing guide to help you come to terms with your emotions and values, make the tough choices, and put your decision into action.* Oakland: New Harbinger.

“Forgiveness means deciding not to punish a perceived injustice, taking action on that decision, and experiencing the emotional relief that follows” (p.11)

Augsburger, D. (1981). *Caring enough to forgive: true forgiveness.* Ventura: Regal Books.

“In forgiving...perceptions of love must be restored (to love is to perceive another as worthwhile and precious no matter what the wrongdoing. Wrongdoing is not a valid reason for not loving you). Negotiations of trust must begin until constructive relating is truly achieved” (p.19)

“To forgive there must be the willingness to see another’s words and acts as genuinely repentant, to trust the other by risking being wronged again, to be open to relate again in wholesome ways, [and] to venture into new closeness” (p.19).

“To receive forgiveness there must be the willingness to affirm my repentance as genuine and to choose to change, to trust my own responses and to risk being freely spontaneous again, to be open again with both candor and with caring, [and] to be close to you without fear” (p.19).

Casarjian, R. (1992). *Forgiveness: a bold choice for a peaceful heart.* New York: Bantam Books.

Forgiveness ... “is a decision to see beyond the limits of another’s personality” (p.23); ...“is an attitude that implies that you are willing to accept responsibility for your perceptions, realizing that your perceptions are a choice and not an objective fact” (p.24) ...“is a process that requires shifting your perceptions again and again...is rarely a one-time event” (p.25) ...“is a way of life that gradually transforms us from being helpless victims of our circumstances to being powerful and loving co-creators of our reality” (p.25) ...“Forgiveness is not about what we do, it is about the way we perceive people and circumstances” (p.30).

Davis, L. (2002). *I thought we’d never speak again: the road from estrangement to reconciliation.* New York: HarperCollins.

Davis offers different dichotomies of forgiveness from various authors...

“Genuine forgiveness demands every mental, moral and spiritual resource you have. . . . Nobody forgives spontaneously; victims must make an effort to move beyond their inevitable shock, rage, grief and desire for revenge” from *Forgiving and Not Forgiving*, by Jeanne Safer. “Forgiveness is the accomplishment of mastery over a wound. It is the process through which an injured person first fights off, then embraces, then conquers a situation that has nearly destroyed him” from *Forgiving the Unforgivable*, by Beverly

Flanigan. Another view defines forgiveness as an “emotion that cannot be generated, forced, or controlled, but which arises spontaneously from within. . . . [and] supporters of this perspective often compare forgiveness to love” (p.268). And yet another view indicates “you can’t forgive someone who denies that you were injured or who fails to take responsibility for having hurt you . . . In other words, forgiveness without accountability has no teeth” (p.269). Davis claims “on the opposite side of the paradigm linking forgiveness to accountability is the belief that forgiveness should be granted unilaterally” (p.274). And the last view offered about forgiveness is “resolution [even reconciliation] is possible without forgiveness” (p.278).

Davis explains “Forgiving is not something we do for another person, as the Nazi asked Wiesenthal to do for him [in *The Sunflower*]. Forgiving happens inside us. It represents a letting go of the sense of grievance, and perhaps most importantly a letting go of the role of victim. For a Jew to forgive the Nazis would not mean, God forbid, saying to them, ‘What you did was understandable, I can understand what led you to do it, and I don’t hate you for it.’ It would mean saying, ‘What you did was thoroughly despicable and puts you outside the category of decent human beings. But I refuse to give you the power to define me as a victim. I refuse to let your blind hatred define the shape and content of my Jewishness. I don’t hate you; I reject you.’ And then the Nazi would remain chained to his past and to his conscience, but the Jew would be free” (Davis, 2002, quoting Harold Kushner, p.289).

“In Buddhism, forgiveness does not mean absolution, but an opportunity for the inner transformation of both victim and perpetrator. The perpetrator of evil will suffer over many lifetimes to a degree determined by his actions, until he is ready for inner transformation. For the victim, forgiveness is a way of transforming his own grief, resentment, or hatred into good. To grant forgiveness to someone who has truly changed is not a way of condoning or forgetting his or her past crimes, but of acknowledging whom he or she has become” (Davis, 2002, quoting Monk Matthieu Richard, p.290).

Enright, R. D. (1999). Community forgiveness and restorative justice: essays from the criminal justice system and the peace movement. *The World of Forgiveness*. 2(4).

(1) Forgiveness in the Criminal Justice System: Necessary element or impossible dream?—B. A. Kittle defines forgiveness using concepts from Enright et al (1996).

(2) Prison Release & Forgiveness—R. Nichols defines forgiveness as “to cease to feel resentment against... to give up claim to... to grant relief from.” (p.12).

(3) Restorative Justice, Forgiveness, and the Ritual of Penance—J. Gehm claims “forgiveness has often been defined as the process of ceasing to feel resentment against someone or something . . . [but] whether forgiveness is used as the basis for a doctrine of undeserved mercy shown by an all-powerful sovereign to his servants or as the key to turning away anger with love in the human realm, the central component of forgiveness appears to be best understood as the antithesis of one’s natural desire for revenge and retribution” (p.17).

(4) Forgiveness in the Context of Community and Formal Institutions—D. Goodman encourages forgiveness being incorporated into the justice system, but does not define forgiveness.

(5) Can We Reconcile Peace with Justice?—N. Biggar defines forgiveness in the following context: “the public identification of perpetrators by the community subjects them to social pressure to accept responsibility for the injury they committed, and, thereby, also to recognize the dignity of the victim. This is a precondition of repentance, which is, I believe, a precondition of the granting of forgiveness, which is itself a precondition of reconciliation” (p.28).

(6) From Just Us to Justice: some thoughts on the possibilities, limitations, and challenges of restorative Justice in Northern Ireland—D. Morrow does not define forgiveness.

Enright, R. D., & North, J. (1998). *Exploring Forgiveness*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

A collection of twelve essays ranging from a first-person account of the mother of a murdered child to an assessment of the United States’ post-war reconciliations with Germany and Vietnam.

Chapter 2—The power & reality of forgiveness: forgiving the murderer of one’s child, by M. Jaeger—claims forgiveness “doesn’t mean we forget, we condone, or we absolve responsibility. It does

mean that we let go of the hate, that we try to separate the loss and the cost from the recompense or punishment we deem is due” (p.12).

Chapter 3—The “ideal” of forgiveness: a philosopher’s exploration, by J. North—claims forgiveness entails “the overcoming of negative feelings . . . [which] must be the result of an *active psychological endeavor* on the part of the injured party, even while recognizing that a real injury has been inflicted and that the wrongdoer is to blame for the infliction” (p.21). Also forgiveness is *multiperspectival*—“when we forgive another person we have to move from our own perspective, of initial hurt and internal suffering, to that of the wrongdoer, the context of his wrong and his motivation for it as well as his present situation” (p.29).

Chapter 4—The metaphysics and morality of forgiveness, by K. E. Yandell—defines components of forgiveness: “the victim must have negative feelings toward the offender because of the harm the offender did, and must at least be willing to lose those feelings, making an effort to do so” (p.38). “The significance of forgiveness rests on two facts and a consequence. The facts are that people harm people . . . and that people are inherently social and cannot flourish in isolation. The consequence is that people either forgive one another or else wither as persons; they reconcile or perish” (p.45). “Yandell extends the definition of forgiveness by distinguishing it from retribution, rehabilitation, and ‘the desire for justice.’” (p.153)

Chapter 5—The psychology of interpersonal forgiveness, by Enright, Freedman, & Rique—explains forgiveness is a “willingness to abandon one’s right to resentment, negative judgment, and indifferent behavior toward one who unjustly injured us, while fostering the undeserved qualities of compassion, generosity, and even love toward him or her” (Enright & the Human Development Study Group, 1991)

Chapter 6—Anger and the healing power of forgiveness: a psychiatrist’s view, by R. Fitzgibbons—indicates that forgiveness is “the process of relinquishing one’s feelings of resentment and thoughts of vengeance and . . . the process of fostering compassion, generosity, and even love toward those who have inflicted pain”(adapted from North & Enright) (p.65)

Chapter 7—The process of forgiveness in marriage and the family, by P. W. Coleman—“Forgiveness involves a leap of faith, a willingness to risk being hurt again” (p. 79). “Forgiveness is more than a moral imperative, more than a theological dictum. It is the only means, given our humanness and imperfections, to overcome hate and condemnation and proceed with the business of growing and loving” (p.94).

Chapter 8—Forgivers and the unforgivable, by B. Flanigan—“Forgiving, we believe, is a process; at its end, resentment is no longer harbored toward an offender” (p.98). Michelle Nelson’s three types of forgiveness: *detached forgiveness* (a reduction in negative affect toward the offender but not restoration of the relationship), *limited forgiveness* (a reduction in negative affect toward the offender along with partial restoration of and decreased emotional investment in the relationship), and *full forgiveness* (a total cessation of negative affect toward the offender along with full restoration and growth of the relationship). Individuals in Flanigan’s sample considered forgiveness complete when they (1) no longer harbored resentment against their offenders, (2) felt neutral toward their offenders, (3) once again experienced some degree of trust in their offenders, or (4) reconciled with their offenders, or when they experienced some combination of these four end-states. “Close examination of Flanigan’s distinctions suggests that full-forgiveness, as she defines it, coincides with reconciliation as defined by Enright, Freedman, and Rique” (p.153).

Chapter 11—Is there forgiveness in politics? Germany, Vietnam, and America, by D. W. Shriver, Jr.—According to Jewish and Christian traditions, “Forgiveness consists of (1) a memory of evil and a moral judgment of the evil, (2) a forbearance from vengeance, (3) an empathy for the enemy, and (4) an intention to renewed positive relation with the enemy” (p.134).

Flanigan, B. (1992). *Forgiving the unforgivable: overcoming the bitter legacy of intimate wounds*. New York: Macmillian

“Forgiveness is the method by which people in intimate relationships let each other ‘off the hook’ for various acts of ruthlessness and unkindness” (p.2) ...it occurs in a transaction (p.5)...[it] is the method by which the wounded person can readmit an outcast [and] the wounded person reopens his heart to take in and reaccept his offender”. . . [and] when it is final, it imparts peace to the forgiver and restores a modicum of kindness to the human community as a whole” (p.11)

“Forgiveness is the accomplishment of mastery over a wound. It is the process through which an injured person first fights off, then embraces, then conquers a situation that has nearly destroyed him. Forgiveness is also a gift given to the self. Once received, the gift of forgiveness releases an injured person from the burdens and shackles of hate. Forgiveness is the ultimate liberator” (p.71).

“Forgiveness is a journey; and a journey is a process...The process of forgiving begins at its point of departure, *naming the injury*, and ends at its destination, *the emergence of a new self*. The stopping-off points in between are *claiming the injury*, *blaming the injurer*, *balancing the scales*, and *choosing to forgive*” (p.72).

Choosing to forgive means “making the choice to release the injurer from debt, making the choice to cut the bonds that still hold you to the injurer, [and] making the choice to look ahead, not back” (p.145).

Luskin, F. (2002). *Forgive for good: a proven prescription for health and happiness*. New York: HarperSan Francisco.

“Forgiveness is the feeling of peace that emerges as you take your hurt less personally, take responsibility for how you feel, and become a hero instead of a victim in the story you tell. Forgiveness is the experience of peacefulness in the present moment. Forgiveness does not change the past, but it changes the present. Forgiveness means that even though you are wounded you choose to hurt and suffer less. Forgiveness means you become a part of the solution. Forgiveness is the understanding that hurt is a normal part of life. Forgiveness is for you and no one else. You can forgive and rejoin a relationship or forgive and never speak to the person again” (p.69).

McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). *Forgiveness: theory, research, and practice*. New York: Guilford Press.

Offers a brief history of forgiveness, including a Heider (1958) definition of forgiveness as “foregoing vengeful behavior, which . . . is an implicit expression of the victim’s self-worth or an attempt to be faithful to an ethical standard.” McCullough et al. propose their definition of forgiveness as being a minimalist conceptualization and they offer the following definition: “intra-individual, pro-social change toward a perceived transgressor that is situated within a specific interpersonal context.” They also offer three sets of problems to be addressed and solved before a solid, coherent base of scientific knowledge regarding forgiveness can be created: 1) conceptually & methodologically—the field lacks a thorough understanding of the influences of religion, culture, and life situation on people’s understandings and experiences of forgiveness . . . without [this understanding] scientific notions of forgiveness are likely to be disconnected from lived human experience; 2) substantively—it is not clear what steps should be taken to systematically explore the neurobiological, developmental, social, and personality substrates of forgiveness; and 3) practical research application—more exploration is needed regarding possibilities of integrating the concept of forgiveness into the practice of professional psychology and related mental health fields.

In Judaism, according to Dorff, “*mehillah* denotes the wiping away of a transgression, that is, forgiveness; while *selihah* denotes reconciliation” (p.20).

In Christianity, according to Williams, “forgiveness is generally understood as an act of pardon or release from an injury, offense, or debt and the forgiver shows compassion, while the forgiven shows repentance” (p.20).

In Islam, according to Ali, “forgiveness means closing an account of offense against God or any of His creation, and it must meet the criteria of sincerity” (p.21).

In Buddhism, according to Hallisey, “there is no unified foundation against which a single “Buddhist” concept of forgiveness might be sought. Generally speaking though, the notion of forgiveness

comprises two factors: first, the removal of an expectation of retribution, and second, the renouncing of anger or resentment toward someone who has offended you. Both factors represent changes of attitude, and both are highly valued in Buddhist cultures, but they are generally kept distinct as quite different virtues” (p.22).

In Hinduism, according to Temoshok & Chandra (Chapter 3, p.48) “forgiveness has been defined as the unaffected condition of the mind of a person, even while being reviled or chastised ... also described as absence of agitation of the mind even though there is cause for agitation.”

Chapter 7—Exline & Baumeister: “When one person harms or transgresses against another, this action effectively creates an interpersonal debt. Forgiveness involves the canceling of this debt by the person who has been hurt or wronged” (p.133)

Chapter 8—Roberts (1995): “Forgivingness . . . is a virtue in that it is a disposition to ‘abort one’s anger at persons one takes to have wronged one culpably, by seeing them in the benevolent terms provided by reasons characteristic of forgiving”” (p.159).

Chapter 12—Thoresen, Harris, & Luskin: “Interpersonal forgiveness can be seen as the decision to reduce negative thoughts, affect, and behavior, such as blame and anger, toward an offender or hurtful situation, and to begin to gain better understanding of the offense and the offender” (p.255)

McCullough, M. E., Sandage, S. J., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1997). *To forgive is human: how to put your past in the past.* Downer Grove: InterVarsity Press.

“Forgiveness is an increase in our internal motivation to repair and maintain a relationship after the relationship has been damaged by the hurtful actions of the other person” (p.22).

Nelson, M. B. (2000). *The Unburdened Heart: 5 keys to forgiveness and freedom.* New York: HarperSanFrancisco.

According to Nelson, forgiveness might help other people, but the primary reason to forgive is because . . . “When you forgive, you become human again, no longer ‘turned to stone.’ When you forgive, you no longer have ‘a clenched fist’ where your heart belongs. You unburden your heart.” Nelson claims that with practice, forgiveness can become a daily habit, and freedom (from guilt, shame, pain, anger, and the pain of constantly criticizing other people) will be the reward. She does not advocate a particular religious perspective, propose limits or conditions on forgiveness, promise or even propose reconciliation, nor see forgiveness as an end in itself. Instead she explains her one observation: Unconditional forgiveness, whether inspired by religious beliefs or not, heals. The one who is healed—the forgiver—becomes free from the pain of the past, and also free to love differently, and love more, in the future. Nelson claims a radical stance: “Forgive . . . regardless of what the other person says or does. Forgive when you’re unsure, or afraid, or resentful, or wanting to exact revenge. Forgive when the other person doesn’t apologize, or doesn’t apologize correctly. Forgive them for that: for their inability, unwillingness, stubbornness, fear.”

5 keys:

- Awareness—remember who hurt you and how
- Validation—talk to a sympathetic listener
- Compassion—strive to see the offender’s humanity
- Humility—reflect on your own faults and failings
- Self-forgiveness—open your heart to yourself

Roger, J. (1994). *Forgiveness: the key to the kingdom.* Los Angeles: Mandeville.

“If you ever had your feelings hurt and you forgave the person for it, and, inside of you, you allowed them the chance to hurt your feelings again, then you really did forgive them. You entered into real, true forgiveness because you allowed them the opportunity to come back to you again. That’s forgiveness. But if you remember who they were and what they said and what they did and the time they did it, and if you say you forgave them, you didn’t. We don’t really forgive when we still have the feeling of the memory of the hurt” (p.27).

Smedes, L. B. (1984). *Forgive & forget: healing the hurts we don't deserve*. New York: Pocket books.

“The act of forgiving, by itself, is a wonderfully simple act; but it always happens inside a storm of complex emotions. It is the hardest trick in the whole bad of personal relationships . . . We forgive in four stages [hurt, hate, healing, & the coming together]. If we can travel through all four, we achieve the climax of reconciliation” (p.18).

Wiesenthal, S. (1969). *The Sunflower: on the possibilities and limits of forgiveness*. New York: Schocken.

“I don't think the attitude of the great religions to the question of forgiveness differs to any great extent. If there is any difference, then it is more in practice than in principle. One thing is certain: you can only forgive a wrong that has been done to yourself. Yet on the other hand: Whom had the SS man to turn to? None of those he had wronged were still alive”—Bolek, a Pole who was also in Auschwitz with Wiesenthal, p.81.

Simon Wiesenthal: “...forgiveness is an act of volition, and only the sufferer is qualified to make the decision” (p.98).

Sven Alkalaj: “The question of forgiveness must be defined in individual or collective terms, just as guilt must be defined in individual or collective terms... But without recognition of what happened, there can never be forgiveness. That is exactly why today's war crimes tribunal is so important” (p.103). “You cannot have forgiveness without reconciliation and you cannot have reconciliation without at least a shred of forgiveness. This forgiveness is not for those who killed or who orchestrated mass murder and on their deathbed seek to put their minds at ease, but for those who truly feel a collective guilt for the heinous crimes their ethnic/political/religious ‘brothers’ committed in the name of that ‘brotherhood’...It cannot be stressed enough that the punishment of the guilty and some measure of justice are absolutely necessary for forgiveness or reconciliation even to be considered” (p.104).

Harry James Cargas: “Forgiveness is not something we may depend on others for. We must somehow earn it. Deathbed conversions are dramatic but in many instances they are *too easy*” (p.125).

Harriet Kaufman quoting Yoma 8:9, Mishnah: “For sins against God, the Day of Atonement brings forgiveness. For sins against one's neighbor, the Day of Atonement brings no forgiveness until one has become reconciled with one's neighbor” (p.142).

Mary Gordon: “No one can grant forgiveness as a private person in the name of another, for that would be theft of the wounded person's right to forgive or not to forgive. But one can forgive for another in a ritual context, if that ritual takes place with the authority of the community. And for the ritual to have any meaning, the atonement must match the crime. If the dying Nazi soldier wished to atone, he should have insisted that he be placed in the camps, so that he could die in the miserable circumstances of those in whose name he is asking forgiveness” (p.153).

Hans Habe: “Forgiveness is the imitation of God...To forgive without justice is a self-satisfying weakness... One of the worst crimes of the Nazi regime was that it made it so hard for us to forgive. It led us into the labyrinth of our souls. We must find a way out of the labyrinth—not for the murderers' sake, but for our own. Neither love alone expressed in forgiveness, nor justice alone, exacting punishment, will lead us out of the maze. A demand for both atonement and forgiveness is not self-contradictory; when a man has willfully extinguished the life of another, atonement is the prerequisite for forgiveness. Exercised with love and justice, atonement and forgiveness serve the same end: life without hatred” (p.163).

Harold S. Kushner: “I am not sure there is such a thing as forgiving another person, though I know there is such a thing as being forgiven. To be forgiven is to feel the weight of the past lifted from our shoulders, to feel the stain of past wrongdoing washed away. To be forgiven is to feel free to step into the future unburdened by the precedent of who we have been and what we have done in previous times...To be forgiven is a miracle. It comes from God, and it comes when God chooses to grant it, not when we order it up” (p.184). “Forgiving is not something we do for another person, as the Nazi asked Wiesenthal

to do for him. Forgiving happens inside us. It represents a letting go of the sense of grievance, and perhaps most importantly a letting go of the role of victim” (p.186).

Cynthia Ozick: “There are spots forgiveness cannot wash out. Forgiveness, which permits redemption, can apply only to a condition susceptible of redemption...forgiveness is pitiless. It forgets the victim. It negates the right of the victim to his own life. It blurs over suffering and death. It drowns the past. It cultivates sensitiveness toward the murderer at the price of insensitiveness toward the victim” (p.216).

John T. Pawlikowski: “The public form of forgiveness is reconciliation...[and] reconciliation entails several stages: repentance, contrition, acceptance of responsibility, healing, and finally reunion” (p.221).

Matthieu Ricard: “For the victim, forgiveness is a way of transforming his own grief, resentment, or hatred into good. To grant forgiveness to someone who has truly changed is not a way of condoning or forgetting his or her past crimes, but of acknowledging whom he or she has become... Both individuals and society need forgiveness so that grudges, venom, and hatred will not be perpetuated as new suffering” (p.236).

Manés Sperber: “the surest and most lasting forgiveness and reconciliation is when the descendants of the evildoers and those of the victims bind themselves into a collective and unbreakable unity—into a family, a tribe, a people, a nation” (p.247).

Nechama Tec: “Forgiveness is not a simple, discrete act. Forgiveness is a variable with many gradations. It may be attached to different degrees of approval. Just as forgiveness, non-forgiveness may come in a variety of shadings” (p.261).

Desmond Tutu: “It is clear that if we look only to retributive justice, then we could just as well close up shop. Forgiveness is not some nebulous thing. It is practical politics. Without forgiveness, there is no future” (p.268).

Arthur Waskow: “...the Four Worlds our great mystics the Kabbalists used as a profound and convenient map of God’s Reality: the Worlds of Doing, Relating, Knowing, and Being. When these are healthy, there is physical wholeness and material sharing; emotional love; intellectual communication; and the spiritual sense of shared presence within the Divine Presence... [When asking for forgiveness] What you ask of me is to join with you to restore this Unity in each of the Four Worlds. To join *with you* is reconnecting the fragments of the shattered Unity, perhaps into a wholly/holy new pattern of Unity. To make this restoration *with you* is ‘forgiveness.’ Through it, *you and I* would give away the physical damage, the emotional upset, the intellectual disjunction, and the spiritual dislocation of my self and my people’s self. *You and I* would return to a place of equilibrium and equanimity.”

Articles on Forgiveness

Al-Mabuk, R. H., Enright, R. D., & Cardis, P. A., (1995). Forgiveness Education with Parentally Love-deprived Late Adolescents. *Journal of Moral Education*. 24(4), 427-444.

Abstract: “Two studies with male and female college students (n=48 in study 1, n=45 in study 2) who judged themselves to be parentally love-deprived, engaged in a randomized, and control group design focused on forgiving the parent(s). Study 1 was a 4-day workshop centering on a commitment to forgive. Study 2 was a 6-day workshop that included more of the therapeutic regimen from the Enright and the Human Development Study Group (1991) forgiveness model. Study 1 showed only modest effects. The experimental group gained more in hope and in one aspect of forgiveness relative to the control group. Study 2 showed more broad based results. Relative to the control group, the experimental group was significantly lower in anxiety and higher in forgiveness, positive attitudes toward the parents, hope, and self-esteem. These results are a challenge to those who assert that forgivers are unhealthy weaklings. But it is believed that the positive psychological outcomes may be a function of the *process* of forgiveness rather than only one’s initial commitment to forgive. The results of this study imply that those hurt by another need to go beyond saying they will forgive and courageously explore and understand their injurer’s humanity. This is a precursor to the empathy and compassion that may be keys

to psychological healing. This empathy and compassion may allow the person to absorb the pain, which consequently may transform the person from a victim mindset to a survivor mindset. Implications for forgiveness education are drawn.”

- The authors claim “Forgiveness is one’s merciful response to someone who has unjustly hurt. In forgiving, the person overcomes negative affect (such as resentment), cognition (such as harsh judgments) and behavior (such as revenge-seeking) toward the injurer, and substitutes more positive affect, cognition and behavior toward him/her.”
- The *Psychological Profile of Forgiveness Scale* = a 30 item scale based on the theoretical premise that when one forgives there are six psychological responses: absence of negative emotions (“I do not feel bitter toward the person”), absence of negative judgments (“I do not view the person as below me”), absence of negative behaviors (“I will not act negatively toward the person”), presence of positive affects (“I feel close to the person”), and presence of positive behaviors (“I’ll show friendship”). The word “forgiveness” is not used in the scale. Five items for each of the six subcategories were generated. Each item was placed into a 4-point Likert format.
- The *Willingness to Forgive Scale* = a 12 item scale which uses items hypothetical in nature. An example of an item is “Your boss fires you without warning. You must leave tomorrow.” The person then chooses one solution out of 10 given. Example solutions are “talk with a counselor or friend,” “just forget it,” “forgive,” “emotionally let off steam,” and “other (please specify).”

Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco.

The Sense of Coherence Questionnaire—29 questions.

Azar, F., Mullet, E., & Vinsonneau, G., (1999). The propensity to forgive: findings from Lebanon. *Journal of Peace Research*. 36(2), 169-181.

Abstract: “The propensity to forgive a severe offense is studied in a sample of 48 people from 3 religious communities (Catholics, Maronites, Orthodox) who lived in Lebanon throughout the civil war. The effects of a number of circumstances: intent to harm, cancellation of consequences, religious and social proximity to the offender and apologies from the offender, on the propensity to forgive, and the variation of these effects as a function of age, gender, and educational level, were considered. The method was an application of Norman Anderson’s functional theory of cognition. 24 stories were constructed by varying systematically the levels of each of the 4 factors quoted above. Participants were asked to rate in each case their propensity to forgive on a forgiveness scale. The more important results concern: (a) the overall level of propensity to forgive, which was higher than expected, (b) the impact of the religious proximity factor, which was very slight, and (c) the effect of the apologies factor, which was extremely important.”

- The author claims “lasting peace cannot be brought about between different communities who have fought each other for many centuries if the cycle of violence (the aggression-revenge cycle) is not broken . . . [by] the members of the different parties deciding to do so, and deciding not only to negotiate, but also to forgive.”
- The author defines forgiveness as being “essentially a gift from one person to another. In the usual case, a gift is offered in order to enhance attachment, harmony, or love between people.”

Bole, W. (2001). Forgiveness makes future possible. *National Catholic Reporter*. 37(43), 17.

Abstract: “A brief article addressing forgiveness and the terrorist attacks on September 11. Bole writes that forgiveness in politics is never about forgetting, but about remembering in a certain way, as the South Africans chose to do in establishing a truth commission after apartheid. Forgiveness is not a denial of human responsibility: Rather it rests on the moral judgment that an act was wrong. Forgiveness is compatible with justice, never with vengeance. A forgiveness strategy is not incompatible with bringing terrorists and their sponsors to justice or perhaps even smoking them out of their havens. But it defies the illusion that we could be delivered from this crisis by soldiers and spies above all.”

Cole, W., Mitchell, E., Monroe, S., & Laughlin, L. (1999). Should all be forgiven? Giving up that grudge could be good for your health. Researchers are pioneering a science of redemption based on an old form of grace. *Time*. 153(13), 54.

Abstract: “Forgiveness has been one of the religious and social qualities that has often been the most difficult to practice, but research is proving that forgiveness can bring with it many psychological and physiological benefits. Traditionally, people may have refrained from forgiveness for fear of feeling less in control, but researchers are finding that a greater sense of control and power can be brought about by forgiveness. And a number of psychotherapists are testifying that there is nothing like it for dissipating anger, mending marriages, and banishing depression.”

- “...the problem with forgiveness has been that of all acknowledged good acts, it is the one we are most suspicious of. ‘To err is human, to forgive, supine,’ punned S.J. Perelman.”
- “Forgiveness has even wider social applications. An unusual coalition of liberal lawyers and religious thinkers has pioneered something called the restorative justice movement, whose favored instrument is conferences between crime victims and jailed perpetrators.”

Colson, C., & Pearcey, N. (1997). Victory over napalm. *Christianity Today*. 41(3), 96.

Abstract: “A man recounts the personal guilt he felt over the photograph of the running female child in pain from a napalm bomb. Years later she and her husband defected via Cuba to Canada. She had converted to Christianity. In 1996, at the war memorial in Washington DC, before thousands of vets, she forgave the US.”

- Phan Thi Kim Phuc—the napalm survivor—forgave and said “we cannot change history, but we should try to do good things for the present and for the future to promote peace.”
- “From Kim Phuc’s first picture, the world learned the horrors of war; from the second picture, the only source of peace.”

Coyle, C. T. & Enright, R. D., (1997). Forgiveness Intervention with Post-abortion Men. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*. 65(6), 1042-1046.

Abstract: “An interview designed to foster forgiveness was implemented with post-abortion men. Participants were randomly assigned to either the treatment or the control (wait list) condition, which received treatment after a 12-week waiting period. Following treatment, the participants demonstrated a significant gain in forgiveness and significant reductions in anxiety, anger, and grief as compared with controls. Similar significant findings were evident among control participants after they participated in the treatment. Maintenance of psychological benefits among the 1st set of participants was demonstrated at a 3-month follow-up.”

- The *Enright Forgiveness Inventory* (EFI) = a 60 item self-report measure of interpersonal forgiveness with items equally divided among six subscales: Positive & Negative Affect, Positive and Negative Behavior, and Positive and Negative Cognition.

Enright, R. D., Eastin, D. L., Golden, S., Sarinopoulos, I., & Freedman, S., (1992). Interpersonal Forgiveness Within the Helping Professions: An attempt to resolve differences of opinion. *Counseling and Values*. 36, 84-103.

Abstract: “Lakatos’s (1978) philosophy of science is used as a guide for resolving published authors’ differences of opinion about interpersonal forgiveness. We first review the ancient writings and current philosophical works regarding interpersonal forgiveness. With these ideas as a foundation we then critique six published papers on forgiveness, all of which have counseling implications. It is suggested that the works are not yet grounded in the foundational writings on forgiveness. The works, thus, may need some refinement in the area of definition, or proposed consequences for a forgiver, or in the processes used to bring about forgiveness in clients. A process model of interpersonal forgiveness then is described—but is not offered as an exhaustive description of how people forgive others; rather, as an illustration that the forgiveness journey is complex, filled with a number of progressions before the

cessation of resentment and the commencement of agape. Implications for the use of interpersonal forgiveness within counseling are drawn.”

- Lakatos’s philosophy of science: (1) Is one *construct* more *complete* than another? (2) Is one *theory* of forgiveness more *advanced*? (3) Is one theory more *parsimonious* than another?
- Modern Philosophers on Forgiveness:
 - North (1987): If we are to forgive, our resentment is to be overcome not by denying ourselves the right to that resentment, but by endeavoring to view the wrongdoer with compassion, benevolence and love while recognizing that he has willfully abandoned his right to them.
 - Downie (1965): An injury involves the severing of the relationship of agape, and forgiveness its restoration . . . Agape involves the treatment of other people not just as sentient beings but as beings who are rational and able to obey moral rules and pursue moral values just as the forgiver himself can. The forgiver is required to prevent any barrier remaining permanently between him and the forgivee (at least on his side . . .) and to renew trust in him.
 - Lewis (1980): [Drawing on Kierkegaard’s ideas Lewis stated that] forgiveness cannot be understood without explicit reference to the commandment ‘you shall love . . . It means a consent to renounce one’s own attitudes, one’s own desires for revenge and retaliation, the pain of indignity and feelings of resentment.
 - Kolnai (1973-74): the more virtuous I am the more *disposed* I am to forgive. This is simply because forgiving is an exquisite act of charity or benevolence in a meaningful context . . .
 - Twambley (1976): You are within your rights to resent his action. In forgiving him, you relinquish that right, you adjust your relationship to one equality. [Forgiveness has a] gift-like quality.
 - Hughes (1975): Forgiveness is the cancellation of deserved hostility and the substitution of friendlier attitudes. It has important consequences, for which it is highly valued—socially, in that the offender can hold up his head again, and inwardly, in the quietening of remorse.
 - Horsbrugh (1974): Forgiveness is in some way restorative. It is intended to heal some breach in a personal relationship that has occurred as a consequence of the injury . . . Forgiveness may be said normally to have two aspects: (i) a volitional aspect . . . and (ii) an emotional aspect—that which has to do with the extirpation of such negative feelings as those of anger, resentment and hostility.
 - Richards (1988): To forgive someone for having wronged one is to abandon all negative feelings toward this person, of whatever kind, insofar as such feelings are based on the episode in question.
- What forgiveness is not: “forgiveness is not the same as pardon, as reconciliation, nor is it equated with condoning or excusing the other’s actions, and is not a self-centered act for the exclusive benefit of the forgiver, nor is it a passive diminution of anger.”
- Eight guiding principles for effective counseling programs:
 - 1) a client should never be cajoled into forgiving
 - 2) a counselor must be particularly sensitive to the client’s level of anger
 - 3) distinguish between forgiveness and reconciliation
 - 4) realize that forgiveness is interpersonal
 - 5) clarify what is meant by *forgiving self*
 - 6) realize that forgiveness is sometimes a long journey
 - 7) if asking to imagine ideal parent, do not stop here—the end-point shouldn’t be fantasy but reality
 - 8) develop careful rationales of why repetitive writing of “I forgive you” is therapeutic

Enright, R. D., Gassin, E. A., Longinovic, T., & Loudon, D. (1994). Forgiveness as a Solution to Social Crisis. Paper presented at the conference, Morality and Social Crisis at the Institute for Educational Research, Beograd, Serbia.

Abstract: “This paper is divided into four sections: defining interpersonal forgiveness; describing the psychological pathway (model) to forgiving; supporting the model with empirical evidence; and, offering specific recommendations for bringing forgiveness education programs to former Yugoslavia.”

- Proposal for former Yugoslavia: “(1) challenge the intellectuals within former Yugoslavia to form a committee to explore strategies for the dissemination and implementation of programs that are faithful to the 20-step process; (2) challenge elementary and secondary school teachers to consider implementing forgiveness curricula in schools; and (3) challenge the religious institutions of former Yugoslavia to become involved in similar curricula.”

Enright, R. D., Gassin, E. A., & Wu, C. (1992). Forgiveness: a developmental view. *Journal of Moral Education*. 21(2), 99-114.

Abstract: “The concept of interpersonal forgiveness is described first through an examination of ancient writings and contemporary philosophical and psychological discourse. Two psychological models are then described. The first concerns developmental patterns in how people think about forgiving another. The second describes how people may go about forgiving another. Implications for counseling and education are drawn.”

- Forgiveness (informally defined)—“when one who is deeply hurt by another may fight against the other (even if only in feelings and thought toward the other), but then ceases fighting against the other and gives him/her the unconditional gift of acceptance as a human being.”
- Forgiveness (formally defined)—“the overcoming of negative affect and judgment toward the offender, not by denying ourselves the right to such affect and judgment, but by endeavoring to view the offender with compassion, benevolence, and love while recognizing that he/she has abandoned the right to them. (drawn principally but not exclusively from North 1987). Such a definition becomes more complex with the realization that forgiveness involves “adding certain elements” to the affective, cognitive, and behavioral systems...
 - Negative emotions are replaced by more neutral emotions and eventually by positive affect, such as compassion within the affective system
 - Positive thoughts emerge toward the other, such as wishing him/her well and viewing him/her respectfully as a moral equal
 - A willingness to join in loving community with the other, perhaps making overtures in that direction.”
- 11 points are offered for a deeper exploration of the above formal definition
- And to sharpen the definition further--what forgiveness is not is offered: “it is not forgetting; not reconciliation; not condoning the other’s act; not pardoning or letting the other off the hook; not indifference; not diminishing of angry feeling over time”
- Five objections to forgiveness are refuted:
 - Forgiveness as weakness
 - Forgiveness as a reversal of societal justice
 - Forgiveness as perpetuating injustice
 - Forgiveness as inducing inferiority in the offender
 - Forgiveness as producing hypersensitivity to hurt
- The authors claim that there is clear consensus in the journals that forgiveness is an important therapeutic goal.
- According to the authors, counselors should consider the following: “1) It may be best if a client forgives one person at a time for one incident at a time; 2) It also may work best if a client personalizes forgiving rather than attempting to forgive such abstract entities as a society or a culture; 3) One should concentrate on forgiving another for the hurt the forgiver him/herself experiences; 4) A client must be careful not to short-circuit the forgiveness process by denying

anger; 5) A counselor and client should clearly distinguish between forgiveness and reconciliation as the client decides the best course of action; and 6) Because the forgiveness process is idiosyncratic for each one of us, a counselor must be ready to spend many months with one client, yet be open to the possibility that another may forgive genuinely in a few short weeks.”

- The authors encourage educators to present “what forgiveness is not and the various philosophical arguments for and against forgiveness, allowing students to formulate their own position through discussion . . . and synthesizing ‘Just Community’ principles and principles of mercy within educational institutions could be explored.”

Enright, R. D., & Human Development Study Group. (1996). Counseling within the forgiveness triad: On forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. *Counseling and Values*. 40, 107-126.

Abstract: “The concept of the forgiveness triad—forgiving others, receiving forgiveness from others, and self-forgiveness—is introduced and discussed. Each aspect is defined, presented as philosophically rational and therefore appropriate within counseling, and described within a psychological framework of how people go about that aspect of forgiveness. The interactions of the triad are described, showing how the counseling process that employs forgiveness strategies may become quite complicated. A counselor’s awareness of all 3 aspects of forgiveness may lead to greater clarity in the therapeutic encounter. Implications for the helping professions and for moral development of the client are discussed.”

- “A forgiver may unconditionally offer this gift [forgiveness] regardless of the other’s current attitude or behavior.”
- Distinction between forgiveness & reconciliation—“reconciliation requires a behavioral change on the part of the offender, forgiveness does not.”
- “Processes of forgiving another, processes of receiving forgiveness from another, and processes of self-forgiveness should not be perceived as pathways that occur sequentially—many people follow a general pathway (see appendixes) but do so flexibly, not rigidly, putting together their own sequence.”
- A counselor whose goal is interpersonal forgiveness “must be aware of the processes involved in both giving and receiving forgiveness.”
- The authors define self forgiveness as “a willingness to abandon self-resentment in the face of one’s own acknowledged objective wrong, while fostering compassion, generosity, and love toward oneself.”
- “Synchrony across the tree pathways seems to foster a more complete, deeper, and smoother transition to forgiveness in clients.”
- The forgiveness triad “challenges us to make counseling a form of cognitive insight into the interacting perspectives of forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. Such insight takes the focus exclusively off the client and his/her conflicts, and places the focus on the relationship and on the intrinsic worth of self and other.”

Enright, R. D., & Human Development Study Group. (1994). Piaget on the moral development of forgiveness: Identity or reciprocity? *Human Development*. 37, 63-80.

Abstract: “In 1932 Piaget theorized that ideal reciprocity is the underlying cognitive operation that makes the understanding and appreciation of forgiveness possible. Basing the current analysis on modern philosophical inquiry, empirical study, and theory, it is proposed that abstract identity rather than ideal reciprocity underlies forgiveness. The philosophical and psychological adequacy of abstract identity is argued and the significance of forgiveness within human development is considered.”

- Piagetian theory implies the moral equivalence (based on mutual respect) and cognitive developmental equivalence (based on ideal reciprocity) of justice and forgiveness.”
- Piaget’s model of reciprocity requires cognitive and/or behavioral compensations, in the real or ideal, for forgiveness to emerge, whereas the author’s model of forgiveness does not.

Enright, R. D., & Human Development Study Group. (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development. Vol. 1, 123-152. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

Abstract: “Although philosophers have argued the differential merits of justice and mercy for centuries, psychological researchers have emphasized justice. Forgiveness as a specific application of mercy is described in this chapter. The focus is on the one who forgives, not on the one seeking forgiveness. Forgiveness is defined here as a forswearing of negative affect and judgment, by viewing the wrongdoer with compassion and love, in the face of a wrongdoer’s considerable injustice. The concept of forgiveness is traced from its theological origins to modern-day philosophies. Philosophical objections to interpersonal forgiveness are discussed, as well as descriptions of pseudo-forgiveness or false forms of forgiveness. Two psychological models of forgiveness are then described: a social cognitive developmental and a social processing model. It is claimed that forgiveness can be an effective problem-solving strategy in releasing one’s own anger and joining again in community with the other person. Intervention ideas are more focused on the process model rather than the stage model.”

- “It is forgiveness, not justice, that is frequently labeled divine, sublime (Morrow, 1984), humanizing (Calian, 1981), courageous (Cunningham, 1985; Kaufman, 1984), healthy (Droll, 1984), restorative (Murphy, 1982), and fulfilling (Beck, 1988). In our view . . . forgiving . . . is in the best interest of both [the offended and the offender].”
- The authors derive a brief definition of forgiveness principally, but not exclusively, from North (1987). Then their definition becomes more complex with understanding that forgiveness involves the affective, cognitive, and behavioral systems. And finally, their definition is deepened with adding 10 additional points.
- What forgiveness is not: “pardon, legal mercy, and leniency; reconciliation; condonation and excusing; justification; self-centering; or other misconceptions—a passive act allowing angry feelings to diminish across time, forgetting, simply offering the words “I forgive you,” or being synonymous with mourning.”
- The authors refute the following philosophical objections: forgiveness as weakness; as a power play; as a reversal of societal justice; as a block to personal justice; as perpetuating injustice; as a logical impossibility; as inducing inferiority in the other; as inducing inferiority in self; as a lack of respect for others; as alienation; and as producing hypersensitivity to hurt.
- The authors consider forgiveness to be superior to a strict & exclusive adherence to justice for two reasons: “first, because a forgiver views the other as equal and worthy of respect, any subsequent justice response must, out of necessity, include respect for the individual; and second, a community united in forgiveness is not united only by the justice requirements of order and obligation . . . [but in] loving support of one another.”
- The justice-forgiveness distinction: “Forgiveness is a forswearing of justice. . . when we ask for the *fairest* solution to a problem, forgiveness never enters the picture” (p.136).
- “In theory, there is a relation between justice and forgiveness stages because of the common, underlying social perceptiveness-taking skills required at each Stage” (p.137).
- Forgiveness Process Model: 1. Awareness; 2. Need to resolve conflict; 3. Deciding among strategies; 4. Forgiveness motive; 5. Decision to forgive; 6. Execution of internal forgiveness strategies; 7. Need for action; 8. Execution of behavioral reconciliation strategies; 9. Release.
- Influences on forgiveness motives: “one’s social cognitive-development stage; cultural conditioning; immediate environmental encouraging/discouraging forgiveness; philosophical and/or religious education; time since the injury; degree of suffering; conversion/change of heart”
- Strategies for internal forgiveness: “viewing the event *in context*; empathy toward injurer; compassion toward injurer; absorbing the pain; exploring insight; and acknowledging change in self.”
- Developmental features of Process model: 1. Certain aspects of model can not be taught; 2. Directional rather than arbitrary pattern of change; 3. End point is not psychologically equivalent

to the initial point; 4. As one masters forgiveness, he/she acquires expertise in it; and 5. Automatization eventually occurs

- Regarding the 6-stage model and the 9-Process model—“...people on different stages may markedly differ in the processes engaged toward forgiveness.”

Enright, R. D., Santos, M. J. D., & Al-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. *Journal of Adolescence*. 12, 95-110.

Abstract: “A social cognitive development model of forgiveness is described and tested in two studies, the second being a replication of the first. In study 1, 59 subjects in grades 4, 7, 10, college, and in adulthood were given a forgiveness interview that assessed six stages of forgiveness development, Rest’s DIT measure of justice development, and a religiosity scale. As predicted, there were strong age trends for forgiveness and justice. Both forgiveness and justice were related but distinct constructs. The more one practiced one’s faith, the higher one was in forgiveness stage. Study 2, with 60 subjects, replicated the above findings. The studies give strong evidence that people’s understanding of forgiveness develops with age. Implications for adolescent development are drawn.”

- The authors reference Mazor, Gampel, Enright & Orenstein (1988), where 18 survivors of the Holocaust refused to engage in a forgiveness strategy when examining either the Holocaust or hypothetical dilemmas—which means that they chose to use various justice strategies, but does not imply that they were on a lower forgiveness level.
- The Justice Measure was taken from Rest (1974) *Defining Issues Test* (DIT), which is an objective test of Kohlberg’s moral development construct that is designed to be used with adolescents and adults. Three dilemmas are described and then the reader is asked to rate (using a 5-point scale) 12 forced-choice statements of questions concerning the resolution of the dilemma. The statements reflect various stages of reasoning. The four most important statements out of the 12 are rank ordered and the final score represents the percentage of how many times Stage 5 and 6 appear in the subject’s rankings.
- The Forgiveness Measure was two dilemmas taken from the DIT and the reader was asked questions to tap each hypothesized stage of forgiveness development.
- The Religiosity Measure was a scale based on a modification of the Religious Belief Scale of Allport, Gillespie, & Young (1953).

Fitzgibbons, R. P. (1986). The cognitive and emotive uses of forgiveness in the treatment of anger. *Psychotherapy*. 23(4), 629-633.

Abstract: “This article presents the cognitive and emotive uses of forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic technique, which enables patients to release anger without inflicting harm on others. The benefits, process, and preventive uses of forgiveness in psychotherapy as well as obstacles encountered to relinquishing anger are discussed.”

- “When anger develops, there are three mechanisms available for dealing with this emotion: denial, expression, and forgiveness—the surrender of one’s desire for revenge.”
- Forgiveness = “the process of ceasing to feel resentment against someone or to pardon someone” (Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary)
- “Forgiveness (1) helps individuals forget the painful experiences of their past and frees them from the subtle control of individuals and events of the past; (2) facilitates the reconciliation of relationships more than the expression of anger; and (3) decreases the likelihood that anger will be misdirected in later loving relationships and lessens the fear of being punished because of unconscious violent impulses.”
- “Forgiveness frees others from their guilt, expedites the resolution of depressive episodes, and leads to a decrease in anxiety as anger is released.”
- “Forgiveness improves the ability to express anger appropriately, as the degree of repressed anger diminishes and resolves many of the physical illnesses caused by anger (Barefoot et al., 1983; Dembroski et al., 1985; Diamond, 1982; Madow, 1972; Shekelle et al., 1983; Smith et al., 1984)”

- Forgiveness Exercise—“a cognitive exercise where the patient is asked to spend time each day trying to let go of anger from present or past hurts.”

Freedman, S. R. & Enright, R. D., (199_). Forgiveness as an Intervention Goal with Incest Survivors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. __(_), 983-992.

Abstract: “An intervention, with forgiveness toward their abuser as the goal, was implemented with 12 female incest survivors. The women, from a midwestern city, were 24 to 54 years old, and all were Caucasian. A yoked, randomized experimental and control group design was used. The participants were randomly assigned to an experimental group (receiving the forgiveness intervention immediately) or a waiting-list control group (receiving the intervention when their matched experimental counterpart finished the intervention). Each participant met individually with the intervener once per week. The average length of the intervention for the 12 participants was 14.3 months. A process model of forgiveness was used as the focus of intervention. Dependent variables included forgiveness, self-esteem, hope, psychological depression, and state-trait anxiety scales. After the intervention, the experimental group gained more than the control group in forgiveness and hope, and decreased significantly more than the control group in anxiety and depression. When the control group then began the program they showed similar change patterns to the above, as well as in self-esteem improvement.”

- “Interpersonal forgiveness is defined as an unjustly hurt person’s act of deliberately giving up resentment toward an offender while fostering the undeserved qualities of beneficence and compassion toward that offender” (Enright & the Human Development Study Group, 1991: North, 1987)
- *Psychological Profile of Forgiveness Scale*—see above for description.
- *Self-Report Forgiveness Measure*—to assess whether the experimental participant had truly forgiven were given 3 definitions to read Augsburger (1981), Cunningham (1985), Enright et al. (1991), North (1987), Richards (1988), and Smedes (1984). Then participants were instructed to answer 5 questions that assessed their feelings toward the perpetrator in relation to the definitions of forgiveness. If the participant stated that she had forgiven and her rationale for doing so was valid, the forgiveness was believed to be genuine.
- Not one participant in the study showed psychological deterioration or any negative effects as a result of forgiving.

Hargrave, T. D., & Sells, J. N. (1997). The Development of a Forgiveness Scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*. 23(1), 41-62.

Abstract: “This paper reports on the development, validity, and reliability of a self-report instrument designed to assess a respondent’s perspective of pain resulting from relational violations and work toward relational forgiveness based on a frame-work proposed by Hargrave (1994a). Presented here is the five-stage procedure used in the development of the Interpersonal Relationship Resolution Scale (IRRS). Construct validity and reliability were determined from an initial sample of 164 subjects. Concurrent validity of the scale was supported by another sample of 35 respondents who took the IRRS, the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire, the Relational Ethics Scale, the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior scale, and the Burns Depression Checklist. Finally, a predictive validity study of the scale was performed with a clinical and non-clinical sample of 98 volunteers. Data are presented that support the validity and reliability of the instrument, as well as the final version of the scale.”

- Forgiveness (Hargrave 1994b) is defined as effort in restoring love and trustworthiness to relationships so that victims and victimizers can put an end to destructive entitlement.
- Exonerating (Hargrave 1994a) is defined as the effort of a person who has experienced injustice or hurt to lift the load of culpability of the person who caused the hurt.
- “Forgiving differs from exonerating in that forgiving requires some specific action regarding the responsibility for the injustice which caused the hurt.”

- “Forgiving is accomplished by *giving the opportunity for compensation* and through an *overt act of forgiving*.”
- Giving the opportunity for compensation—“is the ability to engage in interactions and relationship with the former perpetrator in a way that is perceived by the victim as non-threatening and builds emotional bonding.”
- Overt act of forgiving—“is the perceived ability of a person to discuss past relational damage with the perpetrator and resolve issues of responsibility for specific violations to the point where the relationship can be secure and trustworthy”

Hebl, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a Psychotherapeutic Goal with Elderly Females. *Psychotherapy*. 30(4), 658-667.

Abstract: “A psychotherapeutic intervention with forgiveness as the goal was implemented with 24 elderly females (mean age = 74.5). The client’s goal was to forgive one person who had inflicted considerable psychological hurt, as judged by the client. The subjects were randomly assigned to a forgiveness condition and a control group. The forgiveness group followed a treatment model based on Enright et al. (1991). Dependent variables included two forgiveness scales, a self-esteem inventory, a psychological depression scale, and a state-trait anxiety scale. Following the eight-week intervention, the experimental group showed significantly higher forgiveness profiles at posttest compared with the control group. Both groups significantly decreased from pretest to posttest on psychological depression and trait anxiety. Implications for forgiveness counseling are discussed.”

- *Psychological Profile of Forgiveness Scale*—30-item scale utilized to measure the posttest psychological profile of a person who forgives. See above for description.
- *Willingness to Forgive Scale*—see above for description.

Higgins, R. (2001). Mindful Suffering. *The Christian Century*. 118(29), 9.

Abstract: “Buddhist community in Boston, Massachusetts, recovers from vandalism to their temple by embracing vandals rather than prosecuting. The Buddha taught that when you are angry, don’t do or say anything out of that anger. Sit down and be calm and look deeply to understand what happened, what is the cause. We have to look to the root of the problem, and that root will not be changed by punishment. Thich Nhat Hanh said that the horror inflicted on September 11 ‘has been created by misunderstanding, injustice, discrimination and despair.’ He urged all people ‘to recognize the suffering, to embrace it and to understand it,’ and he gently reminded Christians that ‘Jesus never encourages us to respond to acts of violence with violence.’”

Human Development Study Group. (1991). Five points of the construct of forgiveness within psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*. 28(3), 493-496.

Abstract: “The authors address five issues about interpersonal forgiveness in psychotherapy as a response to Worthington and DiBlasio’s (1990) thought-provoking article. They argue that therapists must (1) know the subtleties in the definition of forgiveness, (2) view forgiveness as an unfolding process taking time, (3) direct client to forgive one issue at a time, (4) clearly understand what forgiveness is and is not (be aware of pseudo-forgiveness), and (5) consider whether a client should forgive even when an offender remains unrepentant.”

Jet Magazine (1999). Forgiveness boosts health and self-esteem, research shows. *Jet*. 95(6), 39.

Abstract: “Research shows that holding on to anger increases your chances of a heart attack as well as cancer, high blood pressure, high cholesterol and other illnesses; whereas forgiveness boosts your self-esteem and lowers your blood pressure and heart rate . . . [and] helps you sleep better at night and boosts a positive change in your attitude. Several tips on how to forgive: acknowledge your anger; decide to forgive; do no evil; consider the source . . . understand the background of the offender; put yourself in the offender’s shoes; and give yourself some time.”

Kanz, J. E., (2000). How do people conceptualize and use forgiveness? The forgiveness attitudes questionnaire. *Counseling and Values*. 44(3), 174.

Abstract: "This study was completed for 2 purposes: to explore how people use... conceptualize interpersonal forgiveness and to introduce the Forgiveness Attitudes Questionnaire (FAQ), an instrument designed to explore forgiveness. The instrument was administered to 155 students from 2... Midwestern colleges. Results suggest that the FAQ shows early prom... an instrument for exploring interpersonal forgiveness, although further validity studies are required. The implications of the results are discussed and suggestions for future research are provided."

Kass, J. D., Friedman, R., Leserman, J., Zuttermeister, P.C., & Benson, H. (1991). Health outcomes and a new index of spiritual experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 30(2), 203-211.

Abstract: "Clinical observations suggesting a relationship between spiritual experiences, life purpose and satisfaction, and improvements in physical health led to the development of an Index of Core Spiritual Experiences (INSPIRIT). Data from 83 medical outpatients showed the INSPIRIT to have a strong degree of internal reliability and concurrent validity. Multiple regression analyses showed the INSPIRIT to be associated with: (1) increased life purpose and satisfaction, a health-promoting attitude; and (2) decreased frequency of medical symptoms."

Konstam, V., Chernoff, M., & Deveney, S. (2001). Toward forgiveness: The role of shame, guilt, anger, and empathy. *Counseling and Values*. 46(1), 26.

Abstract: "This research explored forgiving and its relationship to adaptive moral emotional processes: proneness to shame, guilt, anger, and empathic responsiveness. Gender differences associated with forgiving were analyzed. Participants were 138 graduate students in a large northeast urban university. Results revealed that guilt-proneness was positively related to Total Forgiveness, as were Empathic Concern and Perspective Taking. A positive relationship between anger reduction and Overall Forgiveness was found. Guilt-proneness, anger reduction and detachment informed the process of forgiveness for women. For men, age, shame-proneness, and pride in behavior informed the process of forgiveness. Implications and possible research are discussed."

- "Forgiveness also includes fostering undeserved compassion, generosity, and, perhaps, love toward the perpetrator; it is interpersonal and intrapsychic; it takes place over time and involves choice."
- *Enright Forgiveness Inventory*
- *Interpersonal Reactivity Index*—28 item Likert measure to assess four dimensions of empathy: the Perspective Taking subscale, the Fantasy subscale, the Empathic Concern subscales, and the Personal Distress subscale
- *Test of Self-Conscious Affect*—assesses affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses associated with shame and guilt
- Anger assessment—used five questions on a 10 point scale

Konstam, V., Marx, F., Schurer, J., Harrington, A., Lombardo, N. E., & Deveney, S. (2000). Forgiving: what mental health counselors are telling us. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*. 22(3), 253.

Abstract: "Forgiveness is a potentially significant modality for increasing well-being & improving interpersonal relationships. Results from a survey of 381 mental health counselors regarding attitudes and practices related to forgiveness re... issues to be highly salient in clinical practice. Counselors' religiosity ...orientations were associated with attitudes toward forgiveness. Endo... activities by mental health counselors appeared to indicate a lack of ... regarding key activities designed to facilitate forgiveness with a wide ... There appears to be a need to address an existing gap between research area of forgiveness and current counseling practices."

Lang, B. (1996). The Holocaust and two views of forgiveness. *Tikkun*. 11(2), 42.

Abstract: “Two conflicting views of forgiveness are offered: (1) only the injured person may decide to grant or to withhold forgiveness; (2) the crucial condition for being forgiven is that the person who does wrong fully acknowledges his/her responsibility and is willing to do what he/she can to make good on the wrong . . . [so] someone other than the person or group injured . . . [can] grant forgiveness. The choice between the two views “must be based rather on what one hopes from the future than on evidence from the past or from moral reasoning alone. At stake is the question of what kind of human relationships we envisage—beginning with our relation to ourselves: the moral character that we hope to realize in our consideration of other people.” The author concludes that the act of forgiving cannot be readily granted even to a wrongdoer who is sincerely repentant because it effectively eliminates the difference between good and evil. Thus, the wrongdoer must look for forgiveness as a bonus but not a right.”

McCarthy, C. (1996). Mother forgives, befriends a murderer. *National Catholic Reporter*. 33(1), 14.

Abstract: “Since the 1980s, Blount had been filled only with rage and grief over the murder. But in 1992 she wrote a letter of forgiveness to the murderer on San Quentin’s Death Row. She visits him quarterly and has befriended six other death row inmates in a gesture that has helped her overcome the empty grief.”

- Blount explained that through readings in spirituality and being guided by religious teachers, she was able to move beyond hatred and vengeance to forgiveness.
- She wrote “What I learned is this: You are a divine child of God. You carry the Christ-consciousness within you. You are surrounded by God’s love even as you sit in your cell. The Christ in me sends blessings to the Christ in you.”

McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington Jr., E. L., Brown, S. W., Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 75(6), 1586-1603.

Abstract: “Interpersonal forgiving was conceptualized in the context of a 2-factor motivational system that governs people’s responses to interpersonal offenses. Four studies were conducted to examine the extent to which forgiving could be predicted with relationship-level variables such as satisfaction, commitment, and closeness; offense-level variables such as apology and impact of the offense; and social-cognitive variables such as offender-focused empathy and rumination about the offense. Also described is the development of the transgression-related interpersonal inventory—a self-report measure designed to assess the 2-component motivational system (Avoidance and Revenge) posited to underlie forgiving. The measure demonstrated a variety of desirable psychometric properties, commending its use for future research. As predicted, empathy, apology, rumination, and several indexes of relationship closeness were associated with self-reported forgiving.” Findings:

- Feelings of hurt-perceived attack correspond to a motivation to avoid personal and psychological contact with the offender (i.e. avoidance)
- Feelings of righteous indignation correspond to a motivation to seek revenge or see harm come to the offender (i.e. revenge)
- “These distinct motivations work together to create the psychological state that people refer to as *forgiveness*.”
- *Forgiving*—“or the reduction in avoidance motivation and revenge motivation following an interpersonal offense—is similar to other relationship-constructive transformations that occur in close relationships, such as accommodation (Rusbult et al., 1991) and willingness to sacrifice (Van Lange et al., 1997).”

McCullough, M. E., Sandage, S. J., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1995). Charles Williams on interpersonal forgiveness: theology and therapy. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*. 14(4). 355-364.

Abstract: "The authors explore Charles Williams' theology of forgiveness. Williams' understanding of human co-inherence has given us a framework for understanding why forgiveness might be considered an important therapeutic goal, and has guided us on how to encourage forgiveness in psychotherapy and soul care. The authors personalize Williams' theology with examples from their own lives. Based on the existing literature on forgiveness, they propose that forgiveness may have therapeutic promise and may be easily integrated into most theoretical frameworks. They summarize two techniques for encouraging forgiveness that parallel Williams' treatment of forgiveness. Finally, they discuss the use of Williams' notions in the treatment of abuse survivors and troubled relationships."

McCullough, M. E., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1995). Promoting Forgiveness: a comparison of two brief psychoeducational group interventions with a waiting-list control. *Counseling and Values*. 40, 55-67.

Abstract: "The authors studied the effects of 2 brief psychoeducational group interventions on participants' forgiveness for an offender and compared them with a waiting-list control. The Self-Enhancement group justified forgiveness because of its physical and psychological benefits to the forgiver. The Interpersonal group justified forgiveness because of its utility in restoring interpersonal relationships. Both groups led to decreased feelings of revenge, increased positive feelings toward the offender, and greater reports of conciliatory behavior. The Self-Enhancement group also increased affirming attributions toward the offender, decreased feelings of revenge, and increased conciliatory behavior more effectively than did the Interpersonal group."

McCullough, M. E. & Worthington Jr., E. L., (1994). Encouraging clients to forgive people who have hurt them: review, critique, and research prospectus. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 22(1), 3-20.

Abstract: "The literature addressing forgiving and its use as a counseling technique is reviewed. Forgiving is hypothesized to yield cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal benefits to individuals who forgive others of significant interpersonal offenses, though little evidence supports these claims. Religious counselors and clients value forgiveness and its implementation in counseling, and forgiveness is frequently encouraged in religious counseling. However, forgiveness receives little attention from many non-religious professionals and remains to be investigated critically. In light of the potential benefits associated with forgiving, researchers and practitioners are encouraged to consider forgiveness as a therapeutic technique and to investigate its effects scientifically."

- "Only after an expression of a desire to forgive *and* the resolution of the more immediate event-related difficulties should forgiving be encouraged with such clients."
- "The study of forgiveness and its use in counseling is pre-scientific: justification for its use rests in clinical lore and theological doctrine."

McCullough, M. E. & Worthington Jr., E. L., (1994). Models of interpersonal forgiveness and their application to counseling: review and critique. *Counseling and Values*. 39, 2-14.

Abstract: "Models of interpersonal forgiveness and their application to counseling were reviewed. Although many models of the psychology of forgiveness exist, their impact on empirical research and practice has been minimal. The authors evaluate the current state of model building concerning interpersonal forgiveness and offer suggestions for directing future conceptual work."

McCullough, M. E., Worthington Jr., E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 73(2), 321-336.

Abstract: "Forgiving is a motivational transformation that inclines people to inhibit relationship-destructive responses and to behave constructively toward someone who has behaved destructively toward them. The authors describe a model of forgiveness based on the hypothesis that people forgive

others to the extent that they experience empathy for them. Two studies investigated the empathy model of forgiveness. In study 1, the authors developed measures of empathy and forgiveness. The authors found evidence consistent with the hypothesis that (a) the relationship between receiving an apology from and forgiving one's offender is a function of increased empathy for the offender and (b) that forgiving is uniquely related to conciliatory behavior and avoidance behavior toward the offending partner. In Study 2, the authors conducted an intervention in which empathy was manipulated to examine the empathy-forgiving relationship more closely. Results generally supported the conceptualization of forgiving as a motivational phenomenon and the empathy-forgiving link."

- Interpersonal forgiving = "a set of motivational changes whereby one becomes (a) decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship partner, (b) decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender, and (c) increasingly motivated by conciliation and goodwill for the offender, despite the offender's hurtful actions."
- "Forgiving is not motivation per se, rather, forgiving is the lay concept that people invoke to describe the transformation that occurs when their motivations to seek revenge and to maintain estrangement from an offending relationship partner diminish, and their motivation to pursue conciliatory courses of action increases."
- "Forgiving and altruism have similar deep structures, despite their surface dissimilarities . . . and empathy is a crucial facilitative condition for overcoming the primary tendency toward destructive responding following a significant interpersonal offense."

McGinnis, L. (1997). Abbot calls his murderer 'last minute friend'. *National Catholic Reporter*. 33(28), 17.

Abstract: "The monks had been warned to leave Algeria but they choose to stay because of their close ties to their Muslim neighbors. The Abby of Our Lady of the Atlas had been there for 60 years. The monks were taken as hostages and then killed. Abbot Christian's letter spoke of thanksgiving and reconciliation."

- Abbot Christian's daily prayer during these days was, "Father, disarm them and disarm me."

Michaud, E. (1999). Discover the power of forgiveness. *Prevention*. 51(1), 110.

Abstract: "Forgiveness is the best way to express anger and clinical studies show that forgiving can actually improve one's life. Anger and resentment toward other people can be destructive to the person experiencing the negative emotions, but forgiveness lessens the burden, more so than denial or expressing the frustration."

- "It's the hot new medically proven lifesaver."
- "Anger and resentment . . . [can make one] vulnerable to chronic anxiety, serious depression, general distrust, poor self-esteem, and a pervading sense of hopelessness . . . can trigger a cascade of stress hormones that accelerate the heart rate, shut down the immune system, and encourage blood clotting, which can lead to heart attacks and stroke . . . also increases your risk of cancer, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and a host of chronic illnesses."
- "Forgiveness, on the other hand, short-circuits that process entirely . . . boosting your self-esteem and feelings of hope, as it lowers your blood pressure and heart rate. It can even help you sleep better."

Mitchell, M., & Fitch, S. R. (2001). Intentional forgiveness in experiential education: A technique for reconciling interpersonal relationships. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*. 5(2), 77.

Abstract: "Experiential education, the process of acquiring knowledge through direct experience, has the power to positively affect individuals. The authors believe experiential education has a role in helping society become one in which love, tolerance, peace, and reconciliation are practiced values. They offer a technique rooted in psychology called intentional forgiveness, a technique that focuses on reconciling interpersonal relationships. They illustrate how this technique (a) parallels the basic methodologies of experiential education and (b) is well suited to be learned in an experiential setting."

- *Intentional forgiveness*—“originally designed as an intervention in counseling . . . where an injured party is encouraged to face both his/her emotional injury & the offending party, releasing the perceived need for revenge and retribution . . . a process firmly rooted not in ‘forgive & remember,’ not ‘forgive & forget.’”
- Major components: “*vision*—the process of determining the direction, aim, or goals of a given relationship; *presence*—an individual’s commitment to resolving conflict with self & others; and 7 learning points & 9 elements of face-to-face...”
- 7 learning points: 1) is a choice; 2) that is immediate, complex & often arduous; 3) forgive & remember, not forget; 4) forgive for the sake of self, not others; 5) involves both mercy & justice; 6) intention vs. impact; and 7) forgiveness is viable & learnable.
- 9 elements of face-to-face interaction (when those is a relationship mutually desire reconciliation: evaluate areas in which intentional forgiving may prove valuable; promote reconciliation when appropriate; direct participants to maintain eye contact and have open body postures; direct the offended to name the impact(s) of the offender’s behavior; direct the offender to verbally repeat the impact(s), direct the offender to ask “will you forgive me for (the destructive behavior and its impact?”; direct the offended to respond “yes, I forgive you”; coach participants in a highly directive way until participants learn forgiving behaviors; and work toward independence—that participants are able to intentionally forgive each other without needing a mediator.

Park, Y. O., & Enright, R. D. (1997). The Development of Forgiveness in the Context of Adolescent Friendship Conflict in Korea. *Journal of Adolescence*. 20, 393-402.

Abstract: “A developmental pattern of understanding interpersonal forgiveness is proposed and examined with 30 junior high and 30 college students in Seoul, Korea. Three questions are asked: Does the developmental sequence in understanding forgiveness relate to age? Is there a relation between the understanding of forgiveness and the degree of forgiveness offered to one’s offending friend? Is there a relation between the way people understand forgiveness and how they go about restoring an actual friendship in conflict? All participants had serious and unfair conflicts with their close friends during the past 5 to 6 months. Results showed that there were developmental trends for adolescents’ understanding of forgiveness in Korea. There was also at least partial statistical support for one’s forgiveness pattern (or how one understands forgiveness) being related to how one tries to solve real life conflicts with friends. Implications are drawn for the study and implementation of forgiveness in adolescents.”

- “Mercy emphasizes a person’s going beyond duty, beyond the requirements of justice, toward beneficially aiding someone who may not deserve the kindness. Legal pardon is one example of mercy; forgiveness is another.”
- Developmental Description: “children sometimes confuse forgiveness with revenge, believing that forgiving is possible only after getting back at the offender or receiving compensation; adolescents forgive under conditions of social pressure that encourage a forgiving response; and those in late adolescence & adulthood see an unconditional understanding of forgiveness, based on the internal working moral principles of beneficence and love towards an offender (Enright et al. 1989).”
- *Restoring Friendship Strategy Scale*—10 items intended to assess the degree to which the participant proactively tries to reconcile with the other. Items were on a 5-point Likert scale from “not at all” (1 point) to “very much” (5 points). Examples: I tried to understand why my friend did that to me; I tried to see the good qualities in my friend; I have grown much more sympathetic through my conflict.
- *Degree of Forgiveness Scale*—10 items measuring how much a person reportedly forgave his/her friend. Examples of two items (on the same 5-point Likert scale as above): To what extent do you bear a grudge now? To what extent will you help if your friend is in need?

The Phoenix: Recovery, Renewal, Growth. (1991) Vol.11, num.12

From Anger to Forgiveness, by Earnie Larsen:

From the Editor: Healthy Anger, by Rosanne Bane

Befriending Anger, by M. Susan Milnor

Pingleton, J. P. (1989). The Role and Function of Forgiveness in the Psychotherapeutic Process. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 17(4), 27-35.

Abstract: "Although forgiveness is viewed by many to be essential to the healing of emotional and relational pain, there typically has been very little treatment of it in the psychological literature. This article presents a brief discussion of the nature and function of forgiveness from a theological perspective, followed by an analysis of the process and dynamics of forgiveness from a psychological viewpoint. From an integrative synthesis of these concepts, specific application is made to understanding and facilitating forgiveness in the psychotherapeutic relationship."

- Forgiveness = "giving up one's right to hurt back"
- Forgiveness process = "is an incredibly complex phenomenon, encompassing social, spiritual, volitional, cognitive, and emotional dimensions"
- "One of the most difficult obstacles remaining to the task of forgiveness occurs when the other parties are unable or unwilling to reconcile the severed relationship (Smedes, 1984)"

Pirisi, A., (2000). Forgive to live. *Psychology Today*. 33(4), 26.

Abstract: "New research suggests that harboring feelings of betrayal may be linked to high blood pressure—which can ultimately lead to stroke, kidney or heart failure, or even death. A study done at University of Tennessee showed that "high" forgivers—those who forgive easily—had both a lower resting blood pressure and smaller increases in blood pressure rate than "low" forgivers—bigger grudge-holders."

Rafenstein, M. (2000). Forgiveness: a path to a better you. *Current Health* 2. 27(4), 13.

Abstract: "Forgiveness can resolve anger and lead the way to emotional relief. According to a Gallup poll, 94% of Americans believe that it is important to forgive. Yet the same poll shows that less than half of Americans actually make forgiveness a frequent practice. Forgiveness research conducted by the University of Wisconsin has been well received by the mental health community. Richard Fitzgibbons, M.D., says, "The research on forgiveness by Dr. Robert Enright and his colleagues [at UW] may be as important to the treatment of emotional and mental disorders as the discovery of sulfa and penicillin were to the treatment of infectious diseases." Learning to forgive can help you put bad experiences behind you, so that you can concentrate on positive things—an outlook that can lead to a much healthier life."

Shriver Jr., D. W. (?). An Ethic for Enemies.

Shriver defines forgiveness as an "act that joins moral truth, forbearance, empathy and commitment to repair a fractured human relation.

Shriver Jr., D. W. (2001). Forgiveness? Now? (A Christian's Dilemma). *The Christian Century*. 118(29), 6.

Abstract: "Coming to terms with terrorist attacks in midst of grief. Grief must have its day—or its year. Moral outrage too. And a struggle against the natural precipitate of rage infused with grief: hatred. Why should we even speak of forgiveness while an enemy shows no disposition to discontinue threatening our lives or to repent of doing so? Nor can we accommodate, just now, too heavy a burden of call to nation repentance for our undoubted sins against too many of the world's poor. Were we to postpone indefinitely all thought of forgiveness or repentance, we would be abandoning our commission to live and act as a people of faith in a world where we are supposed to be salt and light."

Smedes, L. B. (2001). Keys to forgiving: how do you know that you have truly forgiven someone? (Good question). *Christianity Today*. 45(15), 73.

Abstract: “Forgiveness is a redemptive response to having been wronged & wounded that requires three actions: surrendering your right to get even, rediscovering the humanity of the wrongdoer, and wishing the wrongdoer well. This all takes time, and it does not require forgetting. Ideally, forgiving leads to reconciliation—there can be no reunion without forgiving, but there can be forgiving without reunion. Lastly, forgiving comes naturally to the forgiven—nothing enables us to forgive like knowing in our hearts that we have been forgiven.”

Spirituality & Health—Special Section on Forgiveness (1999)

J. Kornfield, in “An Act of the Heart,” explains that “Forgiveness does not in any way justify or condone harmful actions . . . Forgiveness does mean you have to seek out or speak to those who cause you harm. . . Forgiveness is simply an act of the heart, a movement to let go of the pain, the resentment, the outrage that you have carried as a burden for so long.”

A. H. Bradley, in “Seeking Forgiveness in the World’s Spiritual Traditions,” writes “Though their beliefs differ, the world’s great religions all affirm the power of forgiveness to set you free.”

E. L. Worthington Jr., in “The Forgiveness Teacher’s Toughest Test,” describes his personal struggle. He taught many how to forgive, then when his mother was murdered, he had to become his own best pupil. Days after the murder, he was able to forgive, explaining, “Forgiveness did not shorten my grief. For over a year afterward, I would periodically be overcome with sorrow. The blessing was that I did not also have to deal with my own hatred and bitterness.” Worthington’s Pyramid of Forgiveness:

- **R**ecall the Hurt.
- **E**mpathize.
- **A**ltruistic gift of forgiveness.
- **C**ommit to forgive.
- **H**olding onto forgiveness.

Subkoviak, M. J., Enright, R. D., Ching-Ru, W., Gassin, E. A., Freedman, S., Olson, L. M., & Sarinopoulos, I. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*. 18, 641-655.

Abstract: “The construct of interpersonal forgiveness is operationalized and tested with 197 college students and 197 of their same-gender parents in the Midwestern United States. The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) showed strong internal consistency reliability. The EFI correlates significantly and negatively with anxiety particularly when a person is experiencing deep hurt in a developmentally relevant area. Age differences also were observed. Particularly when the hurt concerns a developmentally relevant area, college students are less forgiving and have more anxiety than their same-gender parents. The EFI thus appears to have sound psychometric properties.”

- *Enright Forgiveness Inventory* (EFI)—see above for description.
- *Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability*—33-item, true-false inventory that assesses the degree to which a person is “faking good” on test items
- *One-item Forgiveness Question*— a validity check on the EFI: “To what extent have you forgiven the person you rated on the *Attitude Scale* (EFI)?” It was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from “not at all” to “complete forgiveness”.

Takaku, S. (2001). The effects of apology & perspective taking on interpersonal forgiveness: A dissonance-attribution model of interpersonal forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 141(4), 494.

Abstract: “The author investigated (a) the effects of a victim’s perspective taking and a transgressor’s apology on interpersonal forgiveness and (b) forgiveness as a mode of dissonance reduction. B the participants read a scenario describing a situation in which they imagined being

mistreated by a classmate, the author randomly assigned them to 1 of 4 perspective-taking conditions: (a) recalling times when they had mistreated or hurt others (i.e., the recall-self-as-transgressor condition); (b) imagining how they would think, feel, and behave if they were the classmate (i.e., the imagine-self condition); (c) imagining how the classmate would think, feel, and behave (i.e., the imagine-other condition); or (d) imagining the situation from their own (i.e., the victim's/control) perspective. After reading the scenario, the participants read an apology from the classmate. The participants in the recall-self-as transgressor condition were significantly more likely than those in the control condition to (a) make benevolent attributions, (b) experience benevolent emotional reactions, and (c) forgive the transgressor. The relationship between the perspective-taking manipulation and forgiveness was mediated by the benevolent attributions and positive emotional reactions experienced by the victims.”

Thomas, G. (2000). The forgiveness factor. *Christianity Today*. 44(1), 38.

References a Colorado Springs story regarding a neighbor who realizes after forgiving the murderer of a close friend that “anger, bitterness, and unforgiveness keeps [one] from experiencing the depths of joy.” Also explains the story of psychologist Robert Enright’s evolving research on forgiveness. Enright’s “aha!” moment occurred while wrestling with how moral research could benefit others. Enright kept asking, “If the social sciences are supposed to be part of the helping profession, and if the wisdom of the ages—the Hebrew-Christian Bible—is replete with wonderful stories about the success of person-to-person forgiveness, why haven’t the social sciences ever thought to study forgiveness as a primary investigation?” Next, the author addresses other current researchers: theologian Lewis Smedes, where forgiveness is more as a matter of self-preservation rather than reconciliation; theologian L. Gregory Jones, who recognizes forgiveness as a “complex process” which results in there being “lots of forgiveness backsliders”; Al-Mabuk, Enright, & Cardis, whom defined the forgiveness process using a three-part definition—surrender the right to get even, reinterpret offender who wronged us to avoid creating a false caricature, & gradual desire for the welfare of offender; R. Enright’s “what Forgiveness is not”—forgetting, reconciliation, condoning, dismissing, or pardoning, and “the process”—don’t deny feelings of hurt, anger, shame/ don’t just focus on the offender, but identify the behavior/ make a conscious decision not to seek revenge or nurse a grudge/ formulate a rationale for forgiving/ think differently about the offender/ accept the pain you’ve experienced without passing it to others/ choose to extend goodwill & mercy/ think about how it feels to be released from a burden or grudge/ realize the paradox of forgiveness, letting go and forgiving brings release and self-healing; and M. Nelson’s degrees of forgiveness—detached, limited, and full forgiveness.

Volf, M. (1998). Piercing the heart. *The Christian Century*. 115(27), 941.

The author is asked the question, “where does the will to embrace the enemy come from?” Some of his answer was, “we all possess the will to embrace the other, as an aspect of the desire for good implanted in us by our Creator. But conflicts with others generate and intensify a struggle within ourselves in which the will to exclusion often wins and crowds out the will to embrace.” He also referenced “the freeing of our wills by the love which God has shown to us in that Christ died for us ‘while we were still sinners’ and which was ‘poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit.’”

Witvliet, C. V. (2001). Forgiveness and health: Review and reflections on a matter of faith, feelings, and physiology. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 29(3), 212.

Reviews current research, with reflections on how Christians might engage this literature. It considers Christian and psychological conceptualizations of forgiveness, reviews the published literature on forgiveness and mental and physical health, addresses theoretical and interpretive issues, and reflects on ways that Christians may thoughtfully consider the contributions and limitations of empirical research on forgiveness and health.

- “Forgiveness and hostility generally have an inverse relationship: as one goes up, the other comes down.”

- “The small published literature of empirical investigations suggests that as forgiveness increases, so do indicators of mental health; and as unforgiveness increases, so do indicators of physiological stress and coronary heart disease (and vice versa).”

Worthington Jr., E. L. (2000). Is there a place for forgiveness in the justice system? *Fordham Urban Law Journal*. 27(5), 1721-1734.

Abstract: “Worthington sees the main role of forgiveness within the justice system as being less involved in the justice system per se than potentially within each individual participant in the justice system. Forgiveness is more a by-product of sensitivity of individuals and of establishing structures that permit and encourage sensitivity within the justice system than it is a goal of the justice system. The goals of justice are (1) provide fair (to society, to victim, and perpetrator, to plaintiffs) post-injustice settlements; and (2) protect society from future injustices. Such goals can be pursued with a hard heart aimed mostly at retribution and motivated by unforgiveness. Or such goals can be pursued with a soft heart aimed at restitution, restoration, and reconciliation, which are motivated by and motivate forgiveness. Justice is pursued in both instances. Worthington believes that the justice system operates best when reconciliation is the motivation, not retribution. There is a place for forgiveness in the justice system, but it is background, not foreground.”

Worthington Jr., E. L. (1998). An empathy-humility-commitment model of forgiveness applied within family dyads. *Journal of Family Therapy*. 20, 59-76.

Abstract: “Forgiveness is described as requiring empathy for the offender, the humility to see oneself as being as fallible and needy as the offender, and courage to commit publicly to forgive. Research supports the model in individual therapy and psycho-educational groups in which the forgiver does not have to confront the offender. Family therapy, in which partners, parent-child dyads or siblings must confess their need for forgiveness and forgive face-to-face provides special challenges. Processes of forgiveness—empathy, humility and commitment—are understood to be the same as in any interpersonal forgiveness context; that is, they are thought to occur within dyads. Techniques compatible with several varieties of family therapies are summarized for applying the model in family therapy to encourage family members to forgive.”

Worthington, Jr., E. L., & DiBlasio, F. A. (1990). Promoting mutual forgiveness within the fractured relationship. *Psychotherapy*. 27(2), 219-223.

Abstract: “Promoting mutual forgiveness within troubled relationships includes owning one’s hurtful actions, eschewing future hurtfulness, forgiving the partner for past hurts, perhaps atonement for hurting the partner, and sacrifice for each partner. Guidelines are given for preparing couples for mutual forgiveness and for conducting the forgiveness session.”

Worthington Jr., E. L., Kurusu, T. A., Collins, W., Berry, J. W., Ripley, J. S., & Baier, S. N. (2000). Forgiving usually takes time: a lesson learned by studying interventions to promote forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 28(1), 3-20.

Abstract: “Many have suggested that empathy-based interventions are often successful. It takes time to develop empathy for an offender. The authors report three studies of very brief attempts to promote forgiveness in psycho-educational group settings. The studies use ten-minute, one-hour, two-hour, and 130-minute interventions with college students. The studies test whether various components—namely, pre-intervention videotapes and a letter-writing exercise—of a more complex model (the Pyramid Model to REACH Forgiveness) can produce forgiveness. Each study is reported on its own merits, but the main lesson is that the amount of forgiveness is related to time that participants spend empathizing with the transgressor. A brief intervention of two hours or less will probably not reliably promote much forgiveness; however, one might argue that it starts people on the road to forgiving.”

Worthington Jr., E. L., & Wade, N. G. (1999). The psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18(4), 385-418.*

Abstract: “Unforgiveness and forgiveness are distinct. One cannot forgive unless unforgiveness has occurred, but one might reduce unforgiveness by many ways—only one of which is forgiveness. The authors present a model intended to further assist and guide subsequent empirical exploration. The model explains the personal, relationship, and environmental factors that lead people to either unforgiveness or forgiveness. Related areas are reviewed to stimulate as yet unexplored research and clinical efforts related to forgiveness. Clinical protocols for promoting forgiveness in enrichment, preventative, and therapeutic contexts are described.”

- Unforgiveness—“a cold emotion involving resentment, bitterness, and perhaps hatred, along with the motivated avoidance of or retaliation against a transgressor.”
- Forgiveness—“a victim’s internal choice (either unconscious or deliberate) to relinquish unforgiveness and to seek reconciliation with the offender if safe, prudent, and possible to do so.”

Witvliet, C. V., Ludwig, T. E., & Vander Laan, K. L. (2001). Granting Forgiveness or Harboring Grudges: Implications for emotion, physiology, and health. *Psychological Science, 12 (2), 117-123.*

Abstract: “This study examined the immediate emotional and physiological effects that occurred when participants (introductory psychology students—35 females, 36 males) were unforgiving—rehearsed hurtful memories and nursed grudges—compared with when they were forgiving—cultivated empathic perspective taking and imagined granting forgiveness—toward real-life offenders (common offenses included betrayals of trust, rejection, lies, and insults). Unforgiving thoughts prompted more aversive emotion, and significantly higher corrugator (brow) electromyogram (EMG), skin conductance, heart rate, and blood pressure changes from baseline. The EMG, skin conductance, and heart rate effects persisted after imagery into the recovery periods. Forgiving thoughts prompted greater perceived control and comparatively lower physiological stress responses. The results dovetail with the psychophysiology literature and suggested possible mechanisms through which chronic unforgiving responses may erode health whereas forgiving responses may enhance it.”

Yancey, P. (1993). Holocaust and ethnic cleansing: can forgiveness overcome the horror? *Christianity Today, 37(9), 24.*

Abstract: “Forgiveness is the only path that can lead to peace, since calls for revenge or just punishment perpetuate violence. Yancey compares the war in Bosnia to the Holocaust and the US civil war, and he references Simon Wiesenthal’s story about a Jew who refuses forgiveness to a Nazi. In the logic of unforgiveness, not to strike against the enemy would betray ancestors and the sacrifices they made. There is one major flaw in the inexorable law of revenge, however: it never settles the score.”

- “If everyone were to follow the ‘eye for an eye’ principle of justice, said Gandhi, the whole world would go blind.”
- “Forgiveness may be unfair—it is, by definition—but at least it provides a way to put a halt to the juggernaut of ‘justice.’”
- “...Only forgiveness frees us from the injustice of others.”—Theologian Romano Guardini
- “As so many abused children learn, without forgiving those who hurt us, we cannot free ourselves from the grip of history.”