

Outline of Lecture
Chapter Eight: Ray Anderson, *On Becoming Human*
As Male and Female

Xn bookstores and the new evangelical eroticism

- [1] John White and the publishers' demands for "how-to" books
- [2] evangelicalism, desperate for social ascendancy, has bought the world's agenda: better orgasms make better people.
- [3] sex as serving genuine human intimacy is lost.

(SEXUALITY AS MODALITY OF PERSONAL BEING) p105

- [1] IG is extrinsic to creaturely humanity but intrinsic to Word of God
- [2] *human* being is a polarity experienced as a complementarity
- [3] the dist'n b. male and female is a sign of the dist'n in being b. humans and God: unbridgeable
- [4] animals are sexually differentiated, but libido doesn't serve an end beyond reproduction
- [5] for humans, sexual union (mating) subserves meeting. (The peril of promiscuity: we render ourselves incapable of human intimacy and long-term, stable relationships.)
- [6] not to mate is no trifling decision
 - [a] the 1st commandment of script
 - [b] not to mate (from Xn perspective) is not to meet (as spouse)
 - To be considered here: [1] vocational celibacy
 - [2] lack of opportunity
 - [3] physical or psychological impediments to marriage
 - [c] is intentional childlessness God-honouring?
- [7] human sexuality, however, problematic, can't be escaped into either platonic love or erotic spirituality.
- [8] the irreducible mystery of human sexuality is the mystery of personhood (p107)
- [9] problems in sexual relationships are enormously alienating

(SEXUALITY AS ORIENTATION TOWARD A GOAL) P108

- [1] The Word is never merely or chiefly past tense. The Word is our only genuine future.
- [2] gender identity has me acknowledge gender specificity as an ontological dist'n -- not a programmatic or social dist'n. Gender specificity necessarily pertains to the *being* of the human, not accidentally to the *well-being*.
- [3] re: his discussion with Thielicke:
 - [a] every individual is made in IG, even as "individual" presupposes gender-complementarity
 - [b] in the eschaton gen.-comp. will "dissolve" even as IG doesn't
 - [c] none of us can anticipate exactly how this will "work"

(SEXUALITY AS COMPLEMENTARITY OF PERSONAL BEING) p114

- [1] God's being is never mere "being" (i.e., inert, static) but always "being-as": life
- [2] "subordination [of the Son] is ontological and not merely economical." BE CAREFUL!
 - [a] (Shepherd) subordinationism is a heresy: the being of the Son isn't "God-minus"
 - [b] what's subordinate is the Son's mode of relationship: the S is S of the F.
- [3] since the S is as much God as the F, therefore God himself knows what it is to be subordinate, knows what it is to obey
- [4] this God-willed *self*-subordination, rendered Incarnate, yields the self-emptying (kenosis) of Christ.
Note: in his Inc. and Cross JC didn't empty himself of deity but of the prerogatives of deity: he didn't have to come in search of us and suffer for us.
Note: such self-emptying of God isn't a renunciation of his sovereignty but rather an expression and manifestation of his sovereignty.
Recall: power is the capacity to achieve purpose.

God's purpose is a people who are persons, now reconciled to him
 God achieves this through the cross.

"Omnipotence"= no limit to God's power = no limit to the efficacy of the cross (self-
 renunciation)

- Note:** Eph. 5:21 speaks of *mutual* subordination of husband and wife, in the light of the cross
- [5] as male, I am also husband and father -- but these aspects of my life are coincidental: without them I'd still be male. "Male" has an ontic status that "father" doesn't have.
 - [6] still, as male I *am* husband and father. This entails
 - [a] I must therefore acknowledge the command of God in these dimensions of my life
 - [b] I must recognize that culture doesn't supply the content of the command
 - [c] I mustn't allow biological or social considerations to render women "the weaker sex"
 - [7] the command of God is always our blessing
 - [8] laws which the Council of Jerusalem deemed unnecessary for Gentile Xns are deemed such inasmuch as they have been fulfilled in Christ.
 - [9] (This point leads Anderson into a protracted discussion of 'submission'. See my sermon)
 - [10] Paul's teaching on mutual submission doesn't mean that (fe)maleness has been transcended in unisex

(SEXUALITY AS A BASIS FOR LOVE AND MARRIAGE)

- [1] marriage isn't necessary for people to become fully (fe)male in terms of gender identity. Therefore unmarried people aren't humanly deficient or defective.
- [2] still, marriage isn't "an alternative social form". Marriage is the God-appointed means whereby God's cov. with his people is reflected to us and in which we experience what cov.-faithfulness means.
- [3] therefore while marriage isn't essential to our being human, it *is* a God-appointed blessing, the absence of which means that *this* blessing, at least, is one blessing not enjoyed.
- [4] marriage is an "order of creation" by which God wills to bless all (not merely Xns)
 Note the implications of this for the Xn and the state.
- [5] human libido is relentless (until age reduces it). Let's not make things more difficult for those who aren't married.
 A the same time [a] the command of God perdures: marriage remains the context for sexual intimacy
 [b] unchosen celibacy may be a vocation if offered to God (Roman Catholic)

(ORDER AND DISORDER IN HUMAN SEXUALITY) p125

- [1] (Shepherd) There are paraphilias without number
- [2] autonomous sexuality becomes anonymous sexuality, and this is humanly destructive
- [3] Anderson isn't comfortable viewing marriage as an "ethical containment of sexuality".
 (Shep) [a] it implies that marriage is a "cure" for (otherwise) pathological libido
 [b] it denies the essential nature of marriage.
- [4] anonymous sex is often found in marriages
- [5] there are those who suffer from gender confusion
- [6] many homosexual relationships may appear more loving, supportive, etc., than many heterosexual relationships. But this is not the point. The creation of God and the command of God must be kept in view.

Note: the homosexual person is no greater sinner, even as hom'l expression is sin
 : there are many patterns of sexual arousal: human sexuality is enormously plastic
 : all of us necessarily exercise sexual self-renunciation *somewhere* in life.