

## Outline of Lecture

### Chapter Six: Ray Anderson, *On Becoming Human* In the Image of God

p69 Note the *theocentricity* of the discussion re: IG (= Image of God)

Recall: [i] God doesn't create because he's defective or deficient

[ii] in glorifying God we don't furnish him what he otherwise lacks

[iii] other creatures are created "after their kind"; humans are created "in the image and likeness of God". This alone renders us human.

(WHAT IS AT STAKE?)

Since the IG constitutes us human, this actuality controls what it will mean to be a human being reconciled to God and redeemed by him. (What are the consequences to thinking the IG lost in the Fall? to thinking that redemption makes us superhuman?)

p70 **I:** *humanum* and *imago*:

[1] it doesn't mean that God and humans share the same being.

[2] JC is the IG in the two senses: eternal Word and as faithful *human* covenant partner.

[3] there is a correspondence (but not a correlation) between divine and human *being*.

p71 **II:** *particular* and *universal* humanity (Recall *anhypostasia* & *enhypostasia*)

p71 **III:** relation of IG to our physical body

[A] our essential humanity is more than our mind

[B] yet the IG isn't identified with our body

[C] the IG can't be identified with our body but also can't be separated from it

[D] Xn faith honours our body but doesn't worship it

[E] to violate the body is to violate the person

[F] care for persons must include care for their body

[G] "embodied soul" = "ensouled body"

p72 **IV:** IG and the Fall

The IG is defaced but not effaced.

[i] the *substantive* aspect of the IG

[ii] the *relational* " "

[iii] therefore we approach everyone as [a] stamped with IG

[b] needing to recover it through faith in JC

[c] distorted by denying what can't be fled

[iv] (a) the most optimistic thing to be said: "we are sinners."

(b) when society denies IG, people are unprotected. This fact alone explains gloriously inconsistent behaviour pertaining to humans.

p72 **V:** The relation of the "old" and the "new" in redemption

[i] the new person is the old person renewed, but not a different creature

[ii] the new is new in that it's a divine act

[iii] the new is a new orientation to person (now facing God) but not a wholesale personality change (a sign of psychiatric imbalance)

[iv] my body is related to all of this: in the life to come I'm promised all that's essential to my identity.

[v] since humans are created in IG, and it presupposes creaturely physicality, therefore

creaturely physicality is implicated in the restoration of the IG

(THE IMAGO DEI AS ENCOUNTER AND RELATION)

p73-74 God relates to himself (Trinity). We relate to ourselves. Yet "I" can encounter myself only in the person of the opposite gender. I.e., gender differentiation is the condition of the primordial human/human encounter, which encounter is essential to *my* humanity.

p74 Note the difference between killing and murder. (Murder pertains only to humans.) *Any* contempt visited on another tacitly denies her humanity and is therefore murder (Jesus).

p74-75 The church has traditionally overlooked *co*-humanity. Result: we fail to ground ethics in anthropology. Rather, the *claim* of the other is grounded in our co-humanity, not merely in our "charity."

p76 Note the significance of the denial of *analogia entis* (analogy of being).

It gathers up God and hk in a greater, metaphysical "Being" or "Being-Itself".

Herein there is lost [i] the irreducible distinction between Creator and creature

[ii] God's lordship of his creation. The absolute dist' b. God and creation becomes relative.

The "similarity" in the analogy of being: God encounters himself as F, S and Sp; we encounter....

The "dissimilarity": God's 'I-thou' relationship with himself is qualitatively different from ours.

p78 Note: [i] by God's *grace* God speaks to us without crushing us

[ii] still, in his grace he *remains God*, never collapsing his lordship

[iii] yet in his grace he *continues* to speak to us: the IG is indefeasible.

(FREEDOM IN DEPENDENCE)

p79 In philosophical anthropology the core of human selfhood is a dialectical tension between a sense of freedom and necessity. But this is not biblically correct, where freedom is *freedom to obey*. Humans, unlike other animals, aren't blindly determined. We are *called* to participate *freely, gladly, willingly* in our divine appointment.

While we and they are created on the 6<sup>th</sup> "day", we are oriented to God (7<sup>th</sup> "day") in a way that they aren't.

7<sup>th</sup> "day": [i] we gain an understanding of Creator and creation and our place that they lack;

[ii] we worship.

This freedom is *not* human autonomy (=indeterminism).

Freedom is freedom *from* the bondage of sin (from the "freedom" of autonomy)

*to* live as God's covenant partner

*for* the neighbour who is essential to my humanity.

(RESPONSIBILITY IN HEARING) p82

God's address makes us response-able and therefore -ible. It is this "answerability"

(*Antwortlichkeit*) that constitutes us human; **not** rationality or morality or religiosity

Note the relation of "akouein"(=hear) to "hupakouein"(=obey).

Disobedience is always a sign of *wilful* deafness, ingratitude, disdain, rebellion, folly.

Not to obey is to be confirmed in one's deafness (Heb: purpose clause expresses result. Jesus)

Therefore not to hear isn't to be irreligious but to be inhuman, even as God in his mercy doesn't permit this.

(DIFFERENTIATION IN UNITY) p85

NB #1: "...human personhood is not supported by structures of reality inherent in creaturely nature itself." Atheists disagree: the universe *as it is* **does** support personhood.

(Shepherd: the personhood of humans is gravely threatened today as the 'indirect illumination' of the gospel recedes in our society.)

NB # 2: we are summoned into communion with God's own life "in such a way that the human person never becomes divine." We never are made, or render ourselves, "gods" in any sense. (Contrary to "She gods me.")

p85 Note Anderson's point: **w.r.t. God**: "Father and Son" means that God exists as differentiated, with the Holy Spirit, in the *unity* of Father and Son.

**w.r.t. humans**: "Man and woman" means that the human exists as differentiated, but their unity isn't an aspect of the human but rather an act of God himself: God himself participates in their polarity and thereby prevents man/woman differentiation from becoming divisiveness. For this reason "two can become one."

The only form of this differentiation at the creaturely level is **gender**: not race, economics, education, culture, social position. And this relation w.r.t. gender) is ontological: "I am Victor only in relation to woman"

not merely ethical: "Victor has a moral obligation to women: I mustn't disdain them"

not merely functional: "Victor finds women useful."

In short, woman is essential to Victor's being, not (merely) his well-being.

p86 Plainly, then, gender specificity is essential to IG without thereby projecting gender back into God.

In all of this remember that the IG is not superimposed (a "religious" concept) on the human as understood apart from the IG; rather, the IG constitutes the human as human. The IG is indefeasible *no matter what* -- even in the wake of the Fall, wherein people aren't chiefly sick but rather disfigured, distorted, grotesque, self-abused, self-contradicted -- yet gloriously God-loved.

Rev. Victor Shepherd