

In today's class, we are asking what it means to be "in Christ," that is, how Christ's person and work affects us and what it means to be human.

1. Prelude about Jesus' Mission
 - a. "His mission alone is identical with the 'I' who is thus sent." (p. 231).
 - b. "The mission of Jesus extends to the sphere of all (human) conscious subjects, and so they are drawn into the 'area' of the unique Person of the God-man" (p. 231).
 - c. Recall the three aspects of Jesus' mission: [insert]
 - i.
 - ii.
 - iii.
2. Jesus and Human Nature (section on pp. 233-237)
 - a. "Jesus is conscious of a universal mission and of the divinity of his 'I' that this implies" (p. 233).
 - i. *Discussion Question 1*: does this mean that Jesus' 'I' is a divine I that never truly becomes an individual in the human species? Does he "assume" *human nature as such*, as a whole? If so, how does he truly live as a human being?
 - ii. *Discussion Question 2*: does this mean that Jesus' 'I' is a divine I that becomes an individual, within the human species? If so, how does he affect human nature as a whole?
 - b. Pathways forward:
 - i. *First Response*: "First to fall, it is to be noted that, even at the natural level, each individual includes all the others despite its exclusivity, in that it participates concretely in the whole of nature. (Unlike Platonism, which regards nature as concrete in a realm beyond individuation). In H. Plessner, we have already met the insight that man's 'I,' in virtue of his 'ex-centric position,' has an a priori knowledge of the 'thou' and the 'we'" (p. 233). In the Fathers, we find a similar idea introduced in the discussion of how Adam was an individual and yet "all were in him," as an expression of human solidarity—a solidarity emphasized in the proclamation of how all have been saved in Christ, the Second Adam (p. 233-4).
 - ii. Second Response: "Christ does not enter human nature as a mere conscious subject but as someone who is superior to the whole nature (where 'nature' means the species and the sum of individuals)" (p. 234).
 1. Incarnation in the totality of human nature OR incarnation in a definite, individual human being?
 2. "All this must be countered, in our view, by John Damascene's assertion that the definite profile of Jesus' divine Sonship makes him a very definite, human being. Nor does this prevent him, thanks to this same Sonship and the universal mission with which he is entrusted, from extending the scope of his work and his being to the whole of human nature. As we said in the Introduction, this can only be understood if we include in our reflections the content of Jesus' work, that is, all he is and does on our behalf—with his suffering at the center. If Jesus is effectively to act and suffer on our behalf, he must be high in personal dignity above the whole of mankind; both aspects support each other,

and the Eucharist is preeminently the place where the two meet.” (p. 237).

3. BONUS: “The Father hands over entire responsibility for the world’s salvation to the Son (cf. Jn 5:22-30); this shows that, in doing so, he is not imposing on a finite subject a task that can only be carried out by the infinite God; the bearer of such responsibility in this subject can be none other than a divine Person. Only a divine Person can measure up to ‘God’s cause’ and be God’s ‘agent’ on earth. Again, the Fathers reach this conclusion primarily for soteriological reasons: no mere man, even were he to have the most awesome mission laid upon him, can ‘take away the sin of the world.’ This needs a divine Person who has freely entered into a conscious subject and is thus able to share solidarity with all other (sinful) conscious subjects; indeed, he *must* manifest this solidarity if he is to carry their burden” (TD3, pp. 509-510).

3. **“Admirabile commercium” (The “holy” or “wondrous” exchange, the Great Business-Deal, etc.).**

- a. Read quotes by Church Fathers— aren’t these incredibly beautiful?
- b. “According to this soteriology, Jesus truly fulfills the universal mission entrusted to him in that the ... *commercium* becomes a real exchange of places; anthropologically this is not possible if it is simply *some man or other* who suffers on others’ behalf: it is only possible if ‘*one of the Trinity suffered* both in his human nature and in his divine person. For it is only by virtue of his divine person that he can enter into the desperate situation of a free human being vis-à-vis God, in order to transform it from a dead-end to a situation full of hope” (p. 239-240).
 - i. *Discussion Question 1*: What’s the difference between one person dying for another and the second Person of the Trinity dying for another?
 - ii. *Discussion Question 2*: Is Jesus’ death merely a symbolic *illustration* of God’s attitude, or did he truly effect something on the Cross? (see paragraph on the center of p. 240).
- c. “The mission of Jesus is concerned with reconciling the world with God (2 Cor 5:18f) and reconciling the tension that exists in mankind between species and individual. Therefore he has to take the initiative on behalf of this totality-in-tension; and this cannot take place from outside, as it were, as if *pro nobis* simply meant ‘for our benefit’: it must take place from inside; he must really take upon himself the personal and social situation of the sinner. Thus the *pro nobis* means ‘in our place.’ ... On the basis of this

presupposition, ... we can also see tht Christ's mission on our behalf is more than a work and a suffering on his part to spare others the punishment they have justly deserved ...

CONTINUE READING QUOTE ON P. 241.

- d. Two aspects to soteriology:
 - i. Merits/mystical body (See quote on p. 242-3)
 - ii. Personal, free will acceptance of guilt of the 'members' (pp. 243)
 - iii. Eucharist summarizes and shows us both aspects (p. 243-4).
- e. Final summary on p. 245.
 - i. *Discussion Question*: how is the Eucharist the summary?