

Outline of Lecture
Chapter Two: "Humanity As Creatureliness"
Ray Anderson, *On Becoming Human*

p20 theol' anthrop. begins with a discussion of the human creature.
But how do we know that the creature is creature and not self-existent?
not God?
not an aspect or extension of God?

This has to be *revealed*.

In script, revelation is redemption: Red Sea (Sinai) and cross. Therefore K. of the creator arises from K. of the redeemer. (K. of the redeemer generates K. of the creator: the creation doesn't.)

NB: creaturely being is *not* inherently eternal. Animals have "nephesh". Then where do we differ from them?

(IF THE SAME, WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE? p21)

Humans are creaturely, but not all creatures are human.

-6th Day solidarity. The significance of our commonality with the animals is huge:

- medical experiments with animals
- the compromises people will make for sex
- animal suffering and ours
- psychical commonality with animals
- Temple Grandin's work with cattle and abattoirs. Note her observations re: USA states and their treatment of handicapped people and animals.

I: p24 "There is a contingent or non-necessary relation between creatureliness and human being."

We and other creatures are alike contingent, finite, and dependent.

Therefore creatureliness as such doesn't acquaint us with the telos or purpose or end of the specifically human.

No examination of nature discloses the human.

Human abnormalities don't diminish anyone's humanness.

II: While the specifically human can be known only *through* the phenomena of creatureliness (e.g., bodiliness), the spec. human isn't accessible to the study of such phenomena (e.g., bodiliness.) No study of anatomy, physiology, histology, etc., acquaints us with the human -- despite all who claim it does.

p26 "All creatures but the human give up their secrets to the observing scientist." W.r.t. the human there remains an impenetrable mystery that defies comprehension and mastery. [Shepherd thinks it's an aspect of *imago Dei*: there is mystery to God, and a similar mystery to us.]

Science can't even acquaint us with the human *understood humanistically*: e.g., culture. (Music is never reducible to the physics of sound or art to the physics of colour.)

p26 While science advances by objective methodology, the human remains irreducibly subject. This preserves humans from being "nothing more than..."

p27 The "inaccessible" of the human being is [1] the condition of being human, [2] the innermost "I" which we (rightly) feel others never quite grasp, [3] that of us which God alone knows and therefore that which lends us our identity before God.

p27 Only the human can recognize what is human; at the same time, there is a specifically human creatureliness that we don't share with other creatures which still doesn't render us human theologically; e.g., our capacity for abstract thought.

III: "Creatureliness as a condition of human being is not the ultimate ground of being human." Creatureliness as such doesn't yield the purpose of our existence, which purpose is transcendent to the creaturely and comes from God alone. Because of this, serious impairments to one's creatureliness don't impair one's humanness.

p29 Creatureliness neither bestows nor diminishes humanness. At the same time, this fact never excuses mistreating someone else's body. [1] our 'self', our humanness, can never be reduced to our body, [2] yet the violation of my body is a violation of *me* (and *I* am human.) Therefore the 1st responsibility of the state is to ensure bodily security.

(IF THERE IS ALWAYS SICKNESS, THEN WHAT IS HEALTH?)

p30 K.Barth: our true nature is necessarily hidden in our radical depravity. To say that we are sinners is to presuppose our true nature as *child* of God (not merely *creature* of God) and faithful covenant partner. (see over)

Therefore [1] the most perverse human remains a perverted *human*.

[2] "Sinner" is the most optimistic thing we can say of ourselves, since [a] other dysfunctions arise through assorted determinisms, [b] redemption frees us.

p30 We mustn't confuse intra-psychic wholeness and holiness. Still, eschatologically we have been appointed to complete restoration of at every dimension of our being: we shall be sin-free, yet also free of any disfigurement or distortion that has impaired us in any way. I.e., we shall be beyond the molestation of both sin and evil.

p31 "Holiness anticipates and seeks wholeness."

p32 At the same time, our anticipating/seeking this isn't perfectionistic craving (to gain reward): i.e., the "perfect person" is rewarded with "perfect security." While it's more important to be holy than whole (our vocation to holiness entails the brokenness of crossbearing), ultimately we are going to whole as creatures and holy as humans.

p32 *Until* the eschaton we rest in the grace of God, cheerfully content in our 'tumbledown hut' (von Balthasar), since we know that God's grace guarantees the wholeness we shall never have on earth.

Rev. V. Shepherd