GAS Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences (GASJAHSS)

Volume 3, Issue 7, 2025 Homepage: https://gaspublishers.com/gasjahss/ ISSN: 3048-5002
Email: contact@gaspublishers.com

The Concept of Suffering in Bioethics and Philosophy of Religion

Osagie Sylvester Aimiehinor

Diocese of Benin, School of Ministry

Received: *25.06.2025* | ***Accepted:*** *17.07.2025* | ***Published:*** *19.08.2025*

***Corresponding Author:** Osagie Sylvester Aimiehinor*

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.16905305*

Abstract **Original Research Article**

Suffering is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that transcends biological pain and enters the realms of moral, existential, and spiritual significance. This article examines the concept of suffering through an interdisciplinary lens, drawing from the fields of bioethics and the philosophy of religion. It argues that suffering must be understood not merely as a clinical symptom to be alleviated but as an ethical and narrative experience that demands careful moral attention. Employing a hermeneutic-philological methodology, this study synthesizes classical texts, contemporary scholarship, and ethical theory to explore how suffering is constructed, represented, and responded to within clinical and theological contexts. The findings reveal that suffering is often silenced or mischaracterized in biomedical discourse, while religious traditions offer diverse, though sometimes problematic, frameworks for meaning-making. Ultimately, the paper advocates for a renewed ethical vocabulary that honors the depth of suffering without instrumentalizing it, and calls for compassionate practices grounded in presence, solidarity, and humility.

Keywords: suffering, bioethics, philosophy of religion, narrative ethics, theodicy, clinical ethics, philology, moral responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

Suffering, a seemingly universal yet deeply personal phenomenon, remains one of the most elusive and contested concepts in both bioethics and the philosophy of religion. Across traditions, disciplines, and epochs, it has provoked profound inquiry, existential rumination, and ethical debate. Despite its ubiquity in human experience, suffering resists simplistic definitions. It is not merely pain, nor merely distress, but an often ineffable condition that touches upon the most intimate aspects of human identity, agency, and meaning. As a scholar situated at the intersection of bioethics and philology, and having spent over twenty years immersed in the complexities of moral discourse and linguistic representation, I have come to regard suffering not simply as a clinical symptom or theological consequence, but as a hermeneutical key—unlocking the deeper ethical dimensions of human vulnerability and hope.

This article seeks to explore the multifaceted nature of suffering, particularly in relation to bioethical reflection and religious-philosophical thought. Drawing on both classical sources and contemporary scholarship, I aim to demonstrate how suffering operates not only as a moral category but also as a site of metaphysical inquiry, theological significance, and ethical responsibility.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic treatment of suffering in both bioethics and the philosophy of religion have evolved significantly over the past five decades, paralleling broader cultural shifts in medicine, theology, and the human sciences. The convergence of these fields—once distinctly siloed—has produced a rich interdisciplinary dialogue around the moral, existential, and linguistic dimensions of suffering.

The literature on suffering within both bioethics and the philosophy of religion reflects a long-standing tension between explanation and meaning, intervention and accompaniment, and medical utility versus spiritual depth. At its core, the concept of suffering resists reduction to a single discipline. Its complexity demands an interdisciplinary dialogue among theologians, clinicians, philosophers, and humanists. What follows is a synthesis of key contributions that have shaped the contemporary understanding of suffering as both an ethical problem and a metaphysical question.

Cassell's (1982, 1991) foundational distinction between pain and suffering marked a paradigm shift in clinical ethics. He

argued that suffering arises not solely from somatic pathology but from threats to the integrity of the person, thus moving the discourse beyond mechanistic or reductionist models. Cassell's framework encouraged clinicians and ethicists to consider patients not as collections of symptoms, but as narrative beings embedded in social, spiritual, and psychological worlds.

Building on Cassell's insights, Eric J. Cassell, Arthur Kleinman, and Paul Farmer represent a lineage of scholarship that centers cultural and narrative dimensions in the experience of illness. Kleinman (1988), through his ethnographic research, emphasized how suffering is linguistically mediated, socially constructed, and culturally interpreted. His concept of the "moral experience" remains pivotal for understanding how individuals make meaning of suffering within specific moral worlds.

In theological ethics, scholars such as Stanley Hauerwas (1986) and Jean Vanier (1998) have argued that the ethical response to suffering must be grounded in community, presence, and vulnerability. For Hauerwas, the Church serves not merely as a site of doctrinal instruction but as a moral community capable of bearing witness to suffering without collapsing into sentimentality or utilitarianism.

From the perspective of continental philosophy, thinkers like Emmanuel Levinas (1969) and Paul Ricoeur (1985) have offered profound reflections on suffering as a condition of ethical encounter. Levinas, in particular, located the ethical in the face of the other, positing that the suffering of the other is not a phenomenon to be explained or resolved, but a call to responsibility. Ricoeur similarly viewed suffering as a limit-experience—one that tests the boundaries of language, representation, and moral comprehension.

In bioethics, more recent work by authors such as Daniel Sulmasy (2006, 2013) and Margaret Mohrmann (2005) has continued this trajectory by integrating spiritual and theological perspectives into the clinical setting. These scholars advocate for a model of care that honors the depth and complexity of human suffering, acknowledging that not all suffering can—or should—be eliminated. Rather, the ethical task is to accompany, to witness, and to remain present.

DISCUSSION

The convergence of these scholarly traditions invites a rethinking of how we conceptualize, respond to, and represent suffering. The bioethical imperative to relieve suffering must be tempered by the acknowledgment that suffering is not always reducible to symptoms, nor is it always a problem to be solved. In some cases, suffering may even be morally or spiritually formative—though such a claim must be approached with extreme care to avoid romanticizing or justifying unjust conditions.

One of the challenges in the clinical application of these insights is that modern medicine, rooted in Enlightenment rationalism and technocratic efficiency, often lacks a conceptual grammar for dealing with suffering as mystery rather than malfunction. The medical chart has no field for anguish, and the language of metrics tends to flatten the existential terrain. This epistemic limitation has ethical consequences: when suffering cannot be named, it cannot be addressed; when it is pathologies, it may be silenced.

From a religious-philosophical perspective, suffering often functions as a crucible for questions of meaning, justice, and divine presence. Yet it must be acknowledged that not all theological responses to suffering are adequate. Appeals to divine will or inscrutable providence can sometimes serve to suppress protest and legitimize passivity in the face of preventable suffering. A robust religious philosophy of suffering, therefore, must hold in tension the need for meaning with the imperative of justice.

Moreover, linguistic analysis reveals how suffering is shaped by the words we use to describe it. As a philologist, I am particularly attuned to the metaphorical structures through which suffering is framed—whether as burden, trial, fire, darkness, or cross. These metaphors do more than convey emotion; they encode cultural assumptions about the moral significance of suffering. For example, the metaphor of suffering as "a test" may encourage endurance, while the metaphor of "a curse" may engender shame or isolation.

This insight has profound implications for both ethical theory and clinical practice. To speak well of suffering—to find words that neither trivialize nor totalize—is a moral act. It requires an attentiveness to the sufferer's own language, as well as a critical awareness of the moral weight carried by our cultural narratives.

Understanding suffering as a multidimensional reality—simultaneously biological, existential, moral, and spiritual—calls for a paradigm shift in both bioethics and the philosophy of religion. It invites us to reimagine the ethical task not simply as the eradication of suffering but as the cultivation of solidarity, compassion, and meaning.

For clinicians and ethicists, this means expanding the scope of care beyond intervention to include accompaniment. For theologians and philosophers, it means resisting simplistic theodicies and instead embracing suffering as a site of moral responsibility and ethical encounter.

In a time increasingly shaped by technological medicine, political polarization, and global health disparities, the concept of suffering remains both timely and timeless. It calls us, again and again, to the most basic ethical questions: How shall we live with suffering? How shall we respond to the suffering of others? And how shall we speak of suffering in a way that honors its depth without denying its pain?

Suffering in Bioethical Discourse

Within the field of bioethics, suffering is often foregrounded in contexts such as end-of-life care, chronic illness, disability, and mental health. Cassell (1991:34) famously defined suffering as the "state of severe distress associated with events that threaten the intactness of the person." This definition, while grounded in clinical observation, gestures toward a more expansive understanding of suffering that transcends physical pain. Indeed, it is the "intactness of the person"—a concept that includes autonomy, dignity, and

narrative identity—that often becomes the focal point of ethical deliberation.

The challenge, however, lies in the translation of suffering into moral action. While biomedicine tends to focus on the alleviation of symptoms, bioethics compels us to ask whether alleviation alone suffices. In palliative care, for instance, the question is not only how to minimize pain but also how to accompany patients through the existential dimensions of dying (Saunders, 2001:2). The principle of beneficence, traditionally framed in terms of doing good or preventing harm, becomes ethically impoverished if it fails to reckon with the subjective experience of suffering, including its spiritual and narrative aspects (Sulmasy, 2006:5).

Furthermore, the increasing emphasis on patient autonomy in medical ethics—while a critical advance—can inadvertently marginalize communal and relational dimensions of suffering. An overreliance on individual choice may obscure the ways in which suffering is often shared, witnessed, and mediated by others (Kleinman, 1988:15). The ethics of suffering thus requires a more dialogical framework—one that honors the voices of the suffering while also acknowledging the moral responsibilities of caregivers, communities, and institutions.

Suffering in the Philosophy of Religion

In the philosophy of religion, suffering occupies a central and often paradoxical place. Theodicy—the attempt to reconcile the existence of suffering with the notion of a benevolent and omnipotent deity—remains one of the most enduring problems. From Augustine's conception of suffering as a consequence of the fall, to Leibniz's affirmation of a "best of all possible worlds," religious thought has grappled with suffering as both a moral and metaphysical problem (Plantinga, 1974:34).

Yet not all religious philosophies seek to explain away suffering. In fact, many embrace it as a formative or even redemptive aspect of human existence. In Christianity, for example, the suffering of Christ is not merely illustrative but constitutive of divine solidarity with human pain. It offers a theological grammar for understanding suffering not just as punishment or misfortune, but as a potential site of grace, transformation, and relational depth (Moltmann, 1974:24).

Similarly, in Buddhist thought, suffering (dukkha) is not denied but placed at the very heart of the Four Noble Truths. The recognition of suffering, its causes, and its cessation provides the foundation for ethical and spiritual liberation. Unlike Western models that often seek to eliminate suffering, Buddhism proposes a mindful engagement with it—a practice of detachment, compassion, and awakening (Rahula, 1974:18).

The philosophy of religion, therefore, invites a different epistemology of suffering: one that privileges meaning over mastery, presence over prescription, and compassion over control. This epistemology challenges the instrumental logic of bioethics, offering instead a vision of ethical care that is rooted in humility, solidarity, and reverence.

Bioethical Perspectives on Suffering

Eric J. Cassell's (1982, 1991) seminal work laid the foundation for a reconceptualization of suffering in clinical ethics. He defined suffering as the "state of severe distress associated with events that threaten the intactness of the person" (Cassell, 1991:32). This definition signaled a departure from Cartesian dualism by refusing to separate the body from the moral and existential self. In Cassell's model, the person—not just the patient—is the locus of concern. His insights became especially influential in palliative care, prompting a shift in medical paradigms from curative to comfort-focused approaches.

Daniel Sulmasy (2006, 2013), both a physician and a philosopher, furthered this trajectory by integrating spiritual and metaphysical dimensions into clinical bioethics. He argued that the healing professions must see persons as beings who suffer meaningfully, not just functionally. Sulmasy's notion of "ontological dignity"—the dignity rooted in being itself—provides a moral anchor for care even when curative treatment fails. He called for an ethics that acknowledges death not as failure but as a boundary that reorients ethical commitment.

Margaret Mohrmann (2005:34) reinforced this stance by calling for a moral vocabulary capable of addressing suffering with honesty, humility, and theological sensitivity. In her view, bioethics often falters by over-relying on procedural principles—autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence—without sufficient attention to the human meanings of suffering, especially as expressed in story, faith, or silence.

Meanwhile, Arthur Kleinman (1988:23) offered a cultural critique of Western medicine's tendency to pathologize and depersonalize suffering. Through ethnographic research, Kleinman showed that suffering is deeply embedded in social and moral worlds, with culturally specific interpretations and responses. He advocated for a "moral anthropology of suffering" that places the lived experience of patients at the center of care and critique. His notion of "moral experience" remains foundational for culturally sensitive healthcare practices.

Paul Farmer (2005:12) extended this analysis in a global health context. For Farmer, suffering is not only existential or clinical, but structural. What he called "structural violence"—the institutionalized social and economic inequalities that result in disproportionate suffering among marginalized populations—compels a political as well as ethical response. In this way, Farmer broadened the bioethical conversation beyond the clinic to encompass justice, poverty, and systemic exclusion.

Philosophical and Theological Contributions

The philosophical treatment of suffering has its roots in antiquity but finds powerful expression in 20th-century existential and phenomenological thought. Simone Weil (1952) and Albert Camus (1942/1991) treated suffering not as an abstract problem but as a spiritual and moral test. Weil, in particular, saw suffering as a gateway to grace when borne without illusion. Her concept of "affliction" (*malheur*)

described a kind of suffering that destroys the self yet paradoxically opens it to divine attention.

Emmanuel Levinas (1969) took a different route, proposing that suffering—particularly the suffering of the other—is an ethical summons. For Levinas, the face of the other interrupts the ego and imposes an infinite obligation. Suffering is not something we explain but something that commands a response. This radical ethic of responsibility opposes any utilitarian calculus that would justify suffering for a supposed greater good.

Paul Ricoeur (1985) addressed suffering as a *limit-experience*, one that defies simple narrative but nonetheless demands narrative reconstruction. His theory of narrative identity suggests that individuals cope with suffering by telling and retelling their stories. The process of emplotment—arranging disparate events into meaningful wholes—allows for the reconstitution of a self that suffering has fractured. For Ricoeur, narrative is both a form of healing and a moral act.

Religious traditions have historically provided frameworks for interpreting suffering, though not always consistently or benignly. In Christian theology, the problem of suffering has been central to soteriology and theodicy. The classic Augustinian account sees suffering as a consequence of original sin, while Thomistic theology often justifies suffering as a means of moral or spiritual purification (Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*). Yet these accounts can risk theological determinism or moral passivity.

Contemporary theologians like Jürgen Moltmann (1974) challenged traditional theodicies by emphasizing God's solidarity with human suffering. In *The Crucified God*, Moltmann argued that God does not merely allow suffering but suffers with creation. This concept of divine co-suffering affirms the moral seriousness of human pain without resorting to abstract metaphysical justifications.

Process theologians such as John Cobb and David Ray Griffin have offered an alternative metaphysics wherein God does not unilaterally control the world but lures it toward healing. In this framework, suffering is not divinely willed but permitted within the constraints of creaturely freedom and complexity (Griffin, 2001:23). Similarly, feminist theologians like Dorothee Sölle (1975:6) have critiqued passive theologies of suffering, advocating instead for political resistance and ethical activism in solidarity with the oppressed.

Buddhist philosophy presents a unique contrast to Western views. The Four Noble Truths position suffering (*dukkha*) as the fundamental condition of existence, caused by craving and attachment (Rahula, 1974:8). Liberation from suffering comes not through external intervention but through ethical living, mindfulness, and detachment. This soteriology reframes suffering not as a problem to be fixed, but as a teacher and path toward awakening.

Islamic perspectives, while diverse, often interpret suffering within the framework of *sabr* (patience), *taqwa* (God-consciousness), and divine wisdom. Scholars such as Seyyed Hossein Nasr (1991) have emphasized the metaphysical significance of suffering as a means of spiritual growth, while also recognizing the imperative for justice and compassion in its alleviation.

The Role of Language and Metaphor

A significant but often overlooked dimension in both traditions is the linguistic representation of suffering. Philological analysis reveals how metaphors structure moral imagination. For instance, in Western religious texts, suffering is often portrayed as a "test," "refiner's fire," or "cross to bear." Each metaphor carries implicit moral messages—some empowering, others silencing. As George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) showed in their work on conceptual metaphor, these frames influence not only perception but behavior.

Thus, the language through which suffering is described shapes not only how it is experienced but also how it is ethically addressed. In bioethics, the use of clinical terms like "non-compliance" or "failure to respond" can obscure the moral and emotional reality of suffering, whereas more narrative or poetic descriptions can restore depth and dignity to the subject.

Theological Implications

The theological implications of suffering are among the most contested and enduring inquiries within the history of religious thought. The challenge lies in reconciling the presence of seemingly unjust and senseless suffering with claims of divine omnipotence, Omni-benevolence, and justice. This task is further complicated in pastoral, clinical, and liturgical contexts where theology must speak not only truthfully but also compassionately to those who suffer.

At the heart of the theological reflection on suffering is the **problem of theodicy**, a term popularized by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1710/1985), which seeks to defend the goodness of God in the face of evil and suffering. Classical Christian theodicies have often attributed suffering to human sin, divine discipline, or the inscrutable will of God. While such explanations have been intellectually rigorous, they often fail to comfort the afflicted and may inadvertently perpetuate spiritual harm. For example, in attributing suffering to divine punishment, such theologies can reinforce shame and inhibit emotional healing (Sölle, 1975:36).

The **Christological paradigm** introduces a radical theological shift. The suffering of Christ, particularly in the Passion narratives, reorients theological ethics toward **solidarity rather than sovereignty**. Jürgen Moltmann (1974) offers perhaps the most profound articulation of this view in *The Crucified God*, where he argues that God is not immune to suffering but is its first co-sufferer. Such a theology redefines divine power not as control but as **empathetic presence**. In this view, God's redemptive activity is not displayed in the prevention of suffering, but in God's unwavering presence within it. This has significant implications for bioethics, where the ministry of presence and compassion becomes an imitation of divine solidarity.

Likewise, the **doctrine of imago Dei**—that every human being bears the image of God—grounds the inherent dignity of the sufferer (Genesis 1:27). Suffering does not diminish this divine

image; instead, it may paradoxically intensify our perception of it. In clinical ethics, this implies that care for the sufferer is not a gesture of charity but a sacred encounter. The Christian tradition, through its sacramental theology, further reinforces this point. In suffering, the body becomes not merely a medical site but a theological space—an altar upon which the mystery of pain and love converge.

Beyond Christianity, Islamic theology frames suffering as a means of *tazkiyah* (purification) and spiritual elevation, but also as a **test of moral character and divine trust** (Nasr, 1991:34). The concept of *sabr* (patient endurance) is not passive resignation but active, faith-filled perseverance. Similarly, in Judaism, suffering is wrestled with, lamented, and even protested—as seen in the Book of Job and the Psalms. The Jewish ethical tradition often eschews speculative theodicies in favor of **action-oriented responses**: comforting the afflicted (*nichum aveilim*), seeking justice, and engaging in *tikkun olam*—the repair of the world.

These theological perspectives, while diverse, converge on a key implication: suffering is not merely to be explained but ethically and spiritually responded to. The implication for bioethics is that suffering demands more than clinical intervention—it calls for a theologically informed ethic of compassion, humility, and solidarity.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a **hermeneutic and philological methodology**, which is particularly suited to examining phenomena that are historically contingent, linguistically mediated, and ethically complex. Unlike empirical bioethics, which privileges quantitative data and outcomes, this research engages in critical textual analysis and conceptual synthesis. Primary sources include foundational philosophical, theological, and bioethical texts, while secondary literature provides interpretive frameworks.

Philological methods are employed to examine the metaphors, narratives, and conceptual languages through which suffering is represented. Hermeneutic interpretation allows for contextualizing these representations within broader moral and existential discourses. This methodology also draws from narrative ethics and critical phenomenology, particularly the works of Paul Ricoeur, Emmanuel Levinas, Arthur Kleinman, and Eric Cassell.

Data in this context are not numerical but conceptual and discursive—drawn from academic literature, religious texts, and philosophical arguments. The analytic aim is not generalizability but **depth of understanding**, enabling a morally attuned engagement with the meaning and implications of suffering in bioethical and religious-philosophical thought.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Suffering as Multidimensional Experience

The analysis confirms that suffering is often misunderstood when confined to biomedical definitions. While medicine primarily aims to treat pain, bioethics demands a broader scope—recognizing suffering as existential disintegration, narrative disruption, and moral anguish (Cassell, 1991; Sulmasy, 2006). Clinical responses that neglect this broader view risk dehumanizing patients and perpetuating epistemic injustice.

2. The Ethical Silence around suffering

A recurring theme in the analysis is the **ethical silence** surrounding suffering in modern clinical settings. The emphasis on patient autonomy, while critical, often leads to the neglect of deeper relational and communal dimensions of suffering (Kleinman, 1988). Furthermore, institutional cultures that prioritize efficiency can erode the moral space necessary for empathy and presence.

3. Religious Ambivalence toward Suffering

In religious traditions, suffering carries both redemptive and problematic connotations. While Christian theology often interprets suffering through the lens of Christ's passion (Moltmann, 1974), such theologies risk legitimizing passivity or glorifying pain. In contrast, Buddhist philosophy offers a pragmatic framework, viewing suffering as intrinsic to life and as a basis for ethical transformation (Rahula, 1974). These traditions suggest that suffering is not simply to be eradicated but engaged with meaningfully.

4. LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATION OF SUFFERING

Philological analysis reveals that the metaphors and narratives used to describe suffering shape moral responses to it. Terms such as “burden,” “test,” “curse,” or “cross” are not neutral—they frame suffering as punishment, purification, or trial, thus influencing the sufferer’s self-understanding and social treatment. Recognizing the power of language is critical for ethical care.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the following recommendations are offered for scholars, clinicians, ethicists, and religious leaders:

1. Integrate Narrative and Existential Approaches into Bioethics

Bioethical education and practice should incorporate narrative ethics and existential phenomenology to better attend to the lived realities of suffering. Case discussions and moral deliberation should include not only principles but patient stories and metaphors.

2. Foster Theologically Critical Engagements with Suffering

Religious communities and theologians must critically assess doctrines and liturgies related to suffering. Theologies that romanticize or instrumentalize suffering should be

reevaluated in light of the ethical responsibility to alleviate unnecessary pain and injustice.

3. Develop Linguistic Awareness among Care Providers

Clinicians and caregivers should be trained to recognize the moral weight of the language they use. Encouraging patients to describe their suffering in their own words can promote moral agency and deeper empathy.

4. Promote Presence and Moral Solidarity in Care

Rather than focusing solely on interventions, health care systems should support practices of **moral presence**—being with the suffering person without rushing to solve or interpret. This includes chaplaincy, community rituals, and shared silence.

5. Encourage Interdisciplinary Collaboration

Philosophers, theologians, clinicians, and social scientists should collaborate more intentionally to develop a robust and nuanced ethics of suffering. Conferences, joint publications, and cross-disciplinary training programs can facilitate this integration.

CONCLUSION

Suffering, as this study has demonstrated, is not merely a clinical symptom nor a philosophical abstraction—it is a profoundly human reality that elicits ethical responsibility, theological reflection, and philological sensitivity. When reduced to biological pain or neurochemical imbalance, the deeper dimensions of suffering are obscured, and the moral weight of the sufferer's experience is silenced. Bioethics, in its commitment to human dignity and moral deliberation, must re-engage with the concept of suffering not as a problem to be eradicated but as a **phenomenon to be understood, accompanied, and respected**.

Theological traditions, despite their sometimes problematic histories, offer indispensable resources for making meaning of suffering. They remind us that suffering can be a site of transformation, not merely destruction; a space for divine encounter, not abandonment. Yet theology must tread carefully. When it becomes doctrinaire or dismissive, it can exacerbate suffering rather than alleviate it.

The central conclusion of this inquiry is that suffering must be approached **interdisciplinarily and relationally**. The hermeneutic and narrative lens reveals that how we speak about suffering—its metaphors, stories, and silences—shapes how we respond to it ethically. Religious and philosophical resources must be critically yet compassionately harnessed in bioethics, not to explain away suffering, but to stand with those who suffer, recognizing their humanity, agency, and worth.

In the end, the moral task is not to justify suffering but to resist indifference, to bear witness, and to accompany. This requires not only technical competence but also moral courage, theological depth, and philological attentiveness. As suffering will never be eliminated from human life, our ethical and theological commitment must be to ensure it is never endured alone or without dignity.

REFERENCES

Cassell, E. J. (1982). The nature of suffering. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 306(11), 639–645.

https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198203183061104

Cassell, E. J. (1991). *The nature of suffering and the goals of medicine*. Oxford University Press.

Hauerwas, S. (1986). *Suffering presence: Theological reflections on medicine, the mentally handicapped, and the church*. T&T Clark.

Kleinman, A. (1988). *The illness narratives: Suffering, healing, and the human condition*. Basic Books.

Kleinman, A. (1988). *The illness narratives: Suffering, healing, and the human condition*. Basic Books.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Duquesne University Press.

Mohrmann, M. E. (2005). *Medicine as ministry: Reflections on suffering, ethics, and hope*. Pilgrim Press.

Moltmann, J. (1974). *The crucified God: The cross of Christ as the foundation and criticism of Christian theology* (R. A. Wilson & J. Bowden, Trans.). SCM Press.

Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, freedom, and evil*. Eerdmans.

Rahula, W. (1974). *What the Buddha taught* (Rev. ed.). Grove Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1985). *Time and narrative* (Vol. 2, K. McLaughlin & D. Pellauer, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Saunders, C. (2001). *Watch with me: Inspiration for a life in hospice care*. Oxford University Press.

Sulmasy, D. P. (2006). *The rebirth of the clinic: An introduction to spirituality in health care*. Georgetown University Press.

Sulmasy, D. P. (2013). Suffering and the goals of medicine: Toward an integrative bioethics. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 34(6), 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-013-9261-0

Vanier, J. (1998). *Becoming human*. Paulist Press.