Dissertations                                    Theses and Dissertations

1996

# The Image of God as the Foundation of a Right to Health Care: A Comparison of Selected Papal and U.S. Texts, 1979-1993

Timothy L. Doherty
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

THE IMAGE OF GOD AS THE FOUNDATION OF A

RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE:   A COMPARISON OF SELECTED

PAPAL AND U.S. TEXTS, 1979-1993

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY

BY

TIMOTHY L. DOHERTY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1996

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The process of research and writing undertaken for this
dissertation has been enhanced by a number of people. I am
grateful to the graduate faculty and staff in the Department
of Theology, Loyola University Chicago. Dr. James J.
Walter, my director, provided stimulating and constructive
criticism at every stage of this project. His mentoring has
benefitted the discipline of my work and my health. I am
indebted to my readers, Fr. John C. Haughey, S.J., and Dr.
Jon Nilson, for their kind guidance both in matters of
substance and style.

I acknowledge and thank Very Rev. J. Cletus Kiley of
Niles College, and Rev. Kenneth C. Simpson of the Sheil
Catholic Center, Evanston, Illinois, for inviting me into
their communities to live and worship from 1991-1995.

This dissertation represents a culmination of work
commissioned by Most Rev. Arthur J. O'Neill, D.D., bishop
emeritus of Rockford, and by his successor, Most Rev. Thomas
G. Doran, D.D., J.C.D. I am grateful to them and the people
of the Diocese of Rockford for underwriting my doctoral
studies.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

## AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

In 1981 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of the United States of America asserted that there is a human right to health care.[1] The Catholic Health Association of the United States has echoed the conference statement repeatedly. Policies of both organizations appeal to the Catholic social justice writings of Vatican Council II and of recent popes.

The present work will compare two sets of selected documents, those published by the United States National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) along with those by the Catholic Health Association of the United States (CHA), with the first ten encyclicals of Pope John Paul II. Each of these three sources maintains that human rights are expressions of the respect for human dignity. Each of the three offers the image of God as a theological warrant for this dignity and related rights in terms of "image of God" language. Specifically, human dignity is said to have a sacred character because humans are creatures made in the image of God. Each relies upon the authority of the Book of

---

[1]National Conference of Catholic Bishops, "Health and Health Care," Origins 11, no. 25 (3 December 1981): 397. Chapter III will cite the U.S. bishops' historical support for health care rights and national health insurance since 1919.

Genesis, especially at 1:26 and 27.

> Then God said: "Let us make man in our image,
> after our likeness. Let them have dominion over
> the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and the
> cattle, and over all the wild animals and all the
> creatures that crawl on the ground." God created
> man in his image, in the divine image he created
> him; male and female he created them.[2]

However, as a group, they do not uniformly reflect how the
New Testament recasts the creation theme, reconfiguring
theological anthropology in terms of Jesus Christ as 'the'
image of God (Col. 1:15).[3] This project will attribute the
lack of uniformity partly to different authorship, and also
to their intentions to address different audiences. The
differences raise questions about the content of Catholic
anthropology as it applies to statements on human rights,
including the right to health care.

To arrange the task of comparing these sets of texts,
the work of the present chapter is three-fold: to describe
the issue which will be examined; to justify the choice of
speakers and of issue-related documents used to make the
comparison; and to present criteria for the categorical
comparison of the selected documents.

The first goal, then, is to state the problem at issue.
It is this: the perceptible differences in the content of

---

[2]The New American Bible version, Catholic Study Bible
(New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), will be used apart
from biblical quotations which appear within cited texts.

[3]Cf. Gerald O'Collins and Edward G. Farrugia, "Image of
God," in A Concise Dictionary of Theology (New York: Paulist
Press, 1991).

the theological warrant for human dignity and rights produces uncertainty concerning the identity of the subject of human rights, and specifically of a right to health care. Differing "image language" implies variant interpretations about the definition of the human subject. It also implies a potential for ambiguity in the content of the object of a right to health care.

The proposed comparative methodology offers both the necessary and sufficient elements for a Catholic "image of God language" which theologically grounds human dignity, and, as such, provides a warrant for human rights. Generally speaking, this means that this language must account for both its Old and New Testament roots. Neither alone is sufficient. One would hope to find elements of this integral tradition applied to an understanding of the human subject of such rights. A unified viewpoint should serve to identify both the human subject(s) and the goods necessary for serving the dignity of the subject(s) of rights. Conversely, an ambiguously defined or interpreted human subject creates difficulty in establishing clear objects (such as claims, entitlements or immunities) for these same rights.

The aim of this particular theological research is not to justify human rights themselves, but to cast a light on

the foundations of Christian action in a rights domain.[4] Differences in terms of the content of a theological warrant can have implications for both the theological and the political spheres, including the very definitions of health and care. This study will restrict itself mainly to the basic theological warrant. Its focus will remain upon the intra-ecclesial, theological comparison. In the case of a right to health care, the prior theological understandings of human dignity also shape the mission of Catholic institutions, including the health care ministries. They do this by defining the understanding of who it is that needs and receives care. It follows that the goals of care, understood as caring activity and as those goods being sought, are concomitantly defined.

This theological focus also has implications for the public conversation about health care. Direct attention to the theological principles which undergird human rights suggests critical questions which may help to clarify public discourse. In other words, this attention can expose the operative anthropology that governs the relationship between private persons and the common good, and so can guide secular legislative responses to social needs.

---

[4]See Gustav Thils, "Theological Reflections," 71-92, in Human Rights: A Christian Approach, trans. Andrew Gonzalez and Rolando de la Goza (Manila: UST Printing Office, 1988), 77.

<u>Justifying the Choice of Speakers and Documents</u>

John Paul II, the NCCB, and the CHA are the authors of the primary sources chosen for analysis and comparison.[5] The selection of documents is made on the basis of a number of criteria: the prominent sources of the texts are legitimate Catholic authors; publication in a common time span (1978-1993); their treatment of human dignity, the basis of human rights, via image of God language; an articulated relationship of the image to human dignity as it applies to a right to health care or other rights issues.

The encyclical letters by John Paul II (elected 1978) have been selected as representative of his teachings on human dignity. Their designation as encyclicals underlines their relative importance. These ten letters are samples of his sustained and prolific writings which reveal his theological anthropology. Harkening back to the body of Catholic social doctrine, a number of them assert the existence of human rights, including the right to health care.[6] These documents not only constitute authoritative pronouncements because of their authorship, but also because

---

[5]The primary documents are listed at the beginning of the bibliography.

[6]For a commentary on John Paul II's rehabilitation of the phrase "social doctrine" in papal discourse, see Marie-Dominic Chenu, <u>La "Doctrine Sociale" de l'Église comme Idéologie</u> (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979), 8-13. See also Charles E. Curran, "The Changing Anthropological Bases of Catholic Social Ethics," <u>Thomist</u> 45, no. 2 (April 1981): 303, which describes 'social doctrine' in terms of deductive, natural law propositions and ideology.

John Paul II has identified ecclesial ministry with the
ministry of promoting human rights.[7]

The NCCB and the CHA are presences in U.S. Catholic
history extending from the early twentieth century.[8]
Beginning in the mid-1970's, a collaborative effort of the
NCCB and the CHA produced the 1981 NCCB statement, "Health
and Health Care."[9] This was the first of the bishops'
documents specifically targeting health care and health care
reform. It was the conference's first documentary support
of the Catholic health apostolates as an integral part of
the Catholic mission in the U.S. It also asserted a "right
to health care," a statement consistent with the bishops'

---

[7]Franco Biffi, "I Diritti Umani da Leone XIII a Giovanni
Paolo II," 199-243, in I Diritti Umani: Dottrina e prassi,
ed. Gino Concetti (Rome: Editrice AVE, 1982), 226.

[8]With its offices in Washington, DC, the NCCB was
established in 1967 after the Second Vatican Council called
for such national organizations of bishops. The bishops
gathered before 1967 as the National Catholic Welfare
Conference, the 1919 successor to the National Catholic War
Council of 1917. The U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) is the
public policy arm of the U.S. bishops. The NCCB is a
canonical entity and the USCC is a civil corporation. Cf.
relevant entries in Catholic News Service, Stylebook on
Religion (Washington, DC: Catholic News Service, 1990). The
St. Louis-based CHA was founded in 1915. Its recent
publications describe it as "the national organization of more
than 1,200 Catholic health care sponsors, systems, facilities,
and related organizations and services."

[9]"The Pastoral Letter on Health and Health Care: A
Roundtable," Hospital Progress 63, no. 5 (May 1982): 33.
Bishop Joseph M. Sullivan, Director, Catholic Charities of
Brooklyn, provided this author with a more detailed history of
the statement in a January, 1994, in a telephone interview.
In 1981 he was an NCCB Social Development Committee member.
He states that in 1976 the directors of the CHA requested a
pastoral letter in support of hospital and health apostolates.

support for a national health insurance dating to 1919.[10]
Both organizations continued through 1993 to make statements
about socio-economic rights, periodically specifying the
right to health care.

Evidence of the NCCB's theology of human dignity will
be gleaned mainly from "pastoral letters," documents which
are issued after a passing vote of the entire conference
membership at its annual Fall meeting in Washington, DC.
Statements by committees, individual bishops or groups of
bishops will only be used to illuminate the consensus.

Texts from the Catholic Health Association of the
United State have various levels of authority. They have
considerable importance in that they represent a public side
of the largest, identifiable Catholic health association in
the country. Some of these publications bear the stamp of
CHA board approval. Other texts are CHA collaborations with
other institutions, and some are the writings of one or more
authors published under CHA auspices. As a body they
profile the depth of the association's reliance on the value
of human dignity and image-related theology.

Regarding another selection criterion, all the selected
texts share publication dates from 1979 to 1993 inclusive.
This span represents the interval from the first to the

---

[10]Hugh J. Nolan, ed., "Program of Social Reconstruction,"
255-271, in Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic
Bishops, Volume I, ed. Hugh J. Nolan (Washington, DC: United
States Catholic Conference, 1984, 1989), 266.

tenth of John Paul II's encyclicals, and the addressing of human rights by all of the authors.  The selected NCCB and CHA texts were published throughout this period, in a time when the promotion of human rights had become a priority for the papal ministry.  The duration is sufficient for seeing the existence or emergence of critical theological vectors.

Third, the selected documents present the "image of God" as a theological foundation for human dignity.  Genesis 1:26-27 and the creation narrative provide the biblical origins of the image of God language.  Because references to Christ himself as the image of God (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15-16; Heb. 1:3), and as the image-model for human development (Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18), are evident in New Testament and patristic traditions, they are properly included in the Catholic theology of human dignity.

Finally, while not every selected document relates dignity directly to the right for health care, each reveals the speaker's theological anthropology.  Each treatment of human dignity becomes a window to the theological values supporting social and economic rights.  With this in mind, for example, NCCB texts on race relations or capital punishment help to corroborate its values in its rights and health care policy statements.

## The Analytical Criteria

Why should the phrase 'image of God' rate center stage

in terms of an examination of human dignity and rights? There is little question that the "image of God," as the basis of human dignity, is the theological core of Catholic assertions of human rights. As K. Lebacqz notes, "It is the dignity of the person 'created in God's image' that sets the stage" for Catholic social teaching.[11] It is difficult to overstate the significance of this biblical and theological doctrine. Seemingly everything hinges on 'image of God' as the theological definition of humans where it becomes the basis for defining an authentic Christian anthropology.[12]

---

[11]Karen Lebacqz, Six Theories of Justice (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 67. See also David Hollenbach, Claims in Conflict (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 42; J. Bryan Hehir, "Policy Arguments in a Public Church: Catholic Social Ethics and Bioethics," Journal of Medicine and Philosophy 17, no. 3 (June 1992): 348 and 361; and Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, "Doctrinal Document on Threats to Life Proposed," trans. L'Osservatore Romano from Ital., Origins 20, no. 46 (25 April 1991): 755-759. Citing Genesis 1:26; 3:20; 9:6; 9:19 and Gal. 3:28, the Cardinal says: "This biblical message, identical from the first page to the last, is the bedrock of human dignity and human rights; it is the great inheritance of the authentic humanism entrusted to the church, whose duty it is to incarnate this message in every culture, and in every constitutional and social system." Cf. also Knut Walf, "Gospel, Church Law and Human Rights: Foundations and Deficiencies," 34-45, in The Ethics of World Religions and Human Rights, Concilium Series, ed., Hans Küng and Jürgen Moltmann, trans. Leo C. Hay (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990, no. 2), 34: "Westermann has stated that the question of human rights can also be put to the Old Testament, though only in indirect fashion." For a brief survey of the ecumenical (includes Catholic) and theological tasks which "image of God" implies for human dignity and human rights, see Jürgen Moltmann, On Human Dignity: Political Theology and Ethics, trans. with an introduction by M. Douglas Meeks (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 3-35.

[12]Peter Chereso, "Image of God," New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967 ed.; cf. Walf, "Gospel, Church," 35: Seemingly unbridgeable anthropologies long stood in the way of

As such, the accompanying anthropology is not an isolated, Catholic concern. For example, whether one agrees with him or not, E. Brunner had placed the issue in strongest relief: "The doctrine of the imago Dei determines the fate of every theology. The whole opposition of Catholicism and Protestantism originates here."[13] Brunner maintained that "the whole Christian doctrine of man hangs upon the interpretation of this expression [in his image and after his likeness].... The history of this idea is the history of the Western understanding of man."[14] His convictions were never merely academic. In the mid-1930's, National Socialism was stirring the image debate. Even the doctrine of the image of God in humankind was not immune to the "poisonous gases of totalitarianism."[15] This realization generated an echo in Catholic social ethics which heretofore favored the social responsibilities incumbent upon persons. Contact with totalitarianism produced a papal literature which began to emphasize the rights, dignity and freedom of

---

a positive evaluation of human rights by Christian theologians.

[13]Emil Brunner, "Die andere Aufgabe der Theologie," Zweischen den Zeiten 7 (1929): 263n3, quoted in Garrett Green, Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989), 84.

[14]Emil Brunner, Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947 [Germ. 1937]), 92.

[15]David Cairns, The Image of God in Man (London: Collins, 1973), 11 and 286.

the individual.[16]

## The Image of God: A Brief Survey

The project which this dissertation undertakes is to test the consistency of a theological warrant for human dignity as it appears in Catholic assertions of human rights, particularly a right to health care. The result of this exercise will not exhaust the definitions, interpretations, or historical uses of the *imago Dei*. But establishing some points of reference in this section will serve several purposes. First, the history of the phrase reveals how it can serve as a rich, reflective resource. Second, it will establish the main elements of the contemporary Catholic conception of the image of God, and indicate its commonality with some of the principal interpretive strains in this history.

The historical debating points about image of God language have considerable bearing upon the human rights arena. Some of the questions about such language are given here not as a preface to resolution, but to help frame important issues. One can begin by asking whether being created in God's image indicates the worth of humans as individuals or the meaning of their existence? Is the image a quality-possession or is it a relationship? Is the image resident in individuals, in social units, or in all

---

[16]Curran, "Changing Anthropological Bases," 292-293.

humanity?[17]  Is it a statement about creation or about the

essence of creatures?  Is it meant to tell us about the

divine nature or the human?  What is left of the image after

the Fall?  Is the image present in the non-believer and the

believer alike, and in the same way?

Third, the history reveals that interpretations of the

image produce applications and critical standards for a

variety of levels; for example, doctrinal, ecclesial,

political.[18]  Assertions based on image of God language

deserve careful scrutiny so that synthetic efforts are not

"Trojan horses by which the church unwittingly invites the

enemy inside the precincts of Christian truth."[19]  There

are contemporary problems with the use of 'image of God,'

and some are briefly noted below.

From its roots in the Scriptures and the Fathers, image

---

[17]When the issues are so stated, they appear to take the Scriptural account of human origins at face value; that is, that Adam and Eve were the original parents; that their "Fall" affects all humans insofar as Eve is the mother of all the living (Gen. 3:20); that the whole earth was peopled by the sons of Noah (Gen. 9:19).  This dissertation assumes the unity of the human race, while acknowledging questions which hypothetical polygenesis or polyphylatism have raised in dogmatic quarters.  The literature of social rights ethics does not raise this point when it derives the human dignity for human rights from the biblical message.

[18]A. Michel, "Image," in Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, II, 1960:  "The theological notion of the image implies different applications, depending upon differing degrees of the analogy with the original."  The image is not just a representation (as with idols or Caesar's image on a coin).  In the theological case, it is a representation "which produces a real and existent archetype."

[19]Green, Imagining God, 1.

of God language undergirds the three theological doctrines

which are pivotal in Christian discussions about human

rights. These are the doctrines of creation, Incarnation

and redemption-destiny.[20] In the first, humans are created

in the image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:26ff). It is a

theological statement confirming the existence and the

activity of God. It is also an anthropological statement

which qualifies and distinguishes the creation of humans

from that of other creatures. The relations of humans to

God and then to other creatures are unique.[21]

## Scriptural Origins and Interpretations

The Book of Genesis (at 1:26) is the "lexical gate to

the doctrine of the imago Dei,"[22] continuing the reference

to the image in 5:1 and 9:6 even after the Fall. The

concept that human beings are created in the image and

---

[20]Gerhard Ladner, The Idea of Reform (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 52: "The sequence of creation, Incarnation and reform is a fundamental pattern in early Christian and mediaeval historical consciousness and theology of history. . . ." David G. Hunter recommends this Ladner text as still "one of the best introductions" to a humanity created in the image of God, in "The Paradise of Patriarchy: Ambrosiaster on Women as (Not) God's Image," Journal of Theological Studies 43, no. 2 (October 1992), 447.

[21]John L. McKenzie, "Aspects of Old Testament Thought," 1284-1315, in The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, and Roland E. Murphy, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), 1295. See also Michel, "Image," col. 2182.

[22]Darrel W. Cox, "The Imago Dei and Inalienable Rights," (M.A. thesis, Regent University, 1993), 6.

likeness of God is known only from revelation.[23]  It points

to a unique relationship between God and humans: "the whole

man, composed of body and soul, is created in the image of

God (Gen. 1:26f.) as God's partner and ruler of the

world."[24]

The New Testament reflects the Old in 1 Cor. 11:7 and

in James 3:9.  It also views Christ himself as "the" image

of God (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:12-16; Heb. 1:3), the model to whom

men and women are to be shaped (Rom. 8:29).[25]  It is by the

power of the Holy Spirit that the believer specifically is

said to be renewed in God's image (2 Cor. 3:18; cf. Col.

3:10).[26]  Regarding the interpretation of only these few

biblical citations, the evangelical theologian C. Westermann

tells us that, "From the period of late Judaism and the

---

[23]Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, "Image and Likeness of God," in Theological Dictionary, 1965 ed.

[24]Ibid. Cf. F. Lakner, "Gottebenbildlichkeit; Dogmatisch" in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, ed. Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner (Freiburg: Herder, 1960).  Where the term image of God refers to the relation of man to God as exemplar and as final cause in this concrete world and in the order of salvation (Heilsordnung).  It is grounded in the notion of God and knowable only through Revelation (Offenbarung).

[25]O'Collins and Farrugia, "Image of God."  Cf. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Phil. 3:13.

[26]James F. Childress, "Image of God (Imago Dei),"
The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Ethics, 1986 ed.  Cf. Rahner and Vorgrimler, "Image."  See also Albert Vanhoye, "Cristo recreatore dell'uomo e dei suoi diritti," 23-39, in Gino Concetti, ed., I Diritti Umani (Rome:  Editrice AVE, 1982), 36; Edward Mason Curtis, Man as the Image of God in Genesis in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels (diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1984), 13-17.

fathers of the Church, the phrase has aroused such a lively

interest that one can scarcely control the literature."[27]

There is no single, systematic answer as to whether or how

one can describe the image of God 'in' men and women, or in

their relation to one another, or to creation and to Christ.

Some traditions and writers embrace image of God language

more than others.[28]

---

[27]Claus Westermann, <u>Creation</u>, trans. John J. Scully (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 56.

[28]In addition to entries on the 'image of God' to be found in dictionaries and lexicons, the following list, while not exhaustive, provides histories as well as criticisms of its theological content and usage. Walter J. Burghardt, <u>The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria</u> (Woodstock, MD: Woodstock College Press, 1957); David Cairns, <u>The Image of God</u>, supra; Jean-Yves Calvez and Jacques Perrin, <u>The Church and Social Justice</u> (London: Burns & Oates, 1961); Gino Concetti, ed., <u>I Diritti Umani</u>, supra; Dominic Crossan, <u>Imago Dei: A Study in Philo and St. Paul</u> (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1959); Edward Mason Curtis, <u>Man as the Image</u>, supra; Garrett Green, <u>Imagining God</u>, supra; James M. Gustafson, <u>Ethics from a Theocentric Perspective: Vol. I, Theology and Ethics</u> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Roger Haight, <u>An Alternative Vision: An Interpretation of Liberation Theology</u> (New York: Paulist Press, 1985); Adrian Holderegger, Ruedi Imbach, and Raul Suarez de Miguel, eds., <u>De Dignitate Hominis</u>, Festschrift on the 65th birthday of Carlos-Josaphat Pinto de Oliveira, Études d'Éthique Chrétienne 22 (Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, Freibourg; and Vienna: Herder, 1987); Elizabeth A. Johnson, "The Incomprehensibility of God and the Image of God Male and Female," <u>Theological Studies</u> 45, no. 3 (September 1984): 441-465; idem, <u>She Who Is</u> (New York: Crossroad, 1992); Gunnlaugur A. Jonsson, <u>The Image of God: Genesis 1:26-28 in a Century of Old Testament Research [1882-1982]</u>, trans. Lorraine Svendsen, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 26 (Lund, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1988); Catherine Mowry LaCugna, <u>God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life</u> (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991); Gerhart B. Ladner, <u>The Idea of Reform</u>, supra; Vladimir Lossky, <u>The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church</u> (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976); idem, <u>In the Image and Likeness of God</u>, John H. Erickson and Thomas E. Bird, eds. (New York: St. Vladimir's

In his <u>Creation</u>, Westermann addresses the meaning of the phrase 'image and likeness of God.'[29]

> It is not a declaration about man, but about the creation of man.... Creation in the image of God is not concerned with an individual, but with mankind, the species, man. The meaning is that mankind is created so that something can happen between God and man. Mankind is created to stand before God.... Man in the image and likeness of God had been cut off from the Creation event and had become the object of an endless speculation about the alleged quality which he is supposed to have received....[30]

The Genesis phrase itself does not indicate a "quality" in humans, but rather a human relation to God. The human

Seminary Press, 1985); George A. Maloney, <u>Man, The Divine Icon: The Patristic Doctrine of Man Made According to the Image of God</u> (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1973); Georgios I. Mantzaridis, <u>The Deification of Man: St. Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition</u>, trans. Liadain Sherrard (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984); Jürgen Moltmann, <u>God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation</u>, The Gifford Lectures, 1984-1985 (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1985); Wolfhart Pannenberg, <u>Anthropology in Theological Perspective</u>, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985); Karl Rahner, "The Dignity and Freedom of Man," 235-263, in <u>Theological Investigations Vol. II</u>, Karl-H. Kruger, trans. (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963); Cristoph Schwöbel and Colin E. Gunton, eds., <u>Persons, Divine and Human</u> (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991); John Edward Sullivan, <u>The Image of God: The Doctrine of St. Augustine and Its Influence</u> (Dubuque, IA: Priory Press, 1963); Gustav Thils, <u>Droits de l'homme et perspectives chrétiennes</u>, Cahiers de la Revue Théologique de Louvain (Louvain: Faculté de Théologie, 1981); Phyllis Trible, <u>God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality</u> (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); Otto Weber, <u>Foundations of Dogmatics Vol I.</u>, trans. Darrell L. Guder, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981); Westermann, <u>Creation</u>, supra.

[29]Westermann, <u>Creation</u>, 55-60. See also Jonsson, <u>Image of God</u>, 162-168.

[30]Ibid., 56.

creature is not esteemed apart from this relationship.[31]
Neither does the Old Testament reflection on humanity reveal
an awareness of any division of the bodily and the
spiritual.[32] Westermann agrees with the opinion that the
image does not "consist in something belonging to the
individual; it lies rather in something not quite
demonstrable which belongs to the whole of human
existence."[33]

We may note two things about Westermann's position as
it relates to a Catholic point of view. First, there is a
point of agreement. He says that the image is not a
property of individuals, but of persons insofar as the word
"person" has a social connotation. Social life is not
"something added on" to a human being, but is a constitutive

---

[31]Cf. Kathryn Tanner, "The Difference Theological Anthropology Makes," Theology Today 50 (January 1994): 575.

[32]Westermann, Creation, 57. See also Marianne H. Micks, Our Search for Identity: Humanity in the Image of God (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 7.

[33]Westermann, Creation, 57. Westermann here specifies the opinions of Th. C. Vriezen and F. K. Schumann. Westermann is cautiously aware of how image relates differently to the distinction of the individual and of the person. Cf. Lossky, In the Image, 117-123. He admits that in the East and West the term human person coincides with human individual. But there is a notion not identical to that of 'individual' and "yet remains unfixed by any term.(117)" If the solution is in metaontology, only God understands person, "that God whom the story of Genesis shows stopping His work to say in the Council of the Three Hypostases: 'Let us make man in our image and likeness.'"

element of what she or he is.[34] Second, he does not
subscribe to a Catholic tendency to identify ontological
elements in the image of God in a human being. The Catholic
point of view suggests certain similarities in divine and
human activity: rational and free -- and therefore personal
-- action.[35] In his view, the attempt to define the
"alleged quality" of the image is misdirected because it
diminishes the integrity of a dynamic relationship between
God and humankind (which is addressed here in later
chapters). He appeals to the original unity of image and
likeness which is evident in the Priestly writings, source
of Gen. 1:26.[36] It was a later, early Christian,
distinction of these terms that profoundly influenced
Christian anthropology.

## Why Not Distinguish Image from Likeness?
## An Eastern Perspective

The roots of the separation of the terms image and
likeness in Gen. 1:26 reach from the pre-Christian era. The
historic translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek
propelled the discussion about these two terms. When the
Greek language entered the religious literature via the

---

[34]See Gaudium et Spes (GS), "Pastoral Constitution on the
Church in the Modern World," 199-308, in The Documents of
Vatican II, ed. Walter M. Abbott (London: Geoffrey Chapman,
1966), art. 25; David Tracy, "Religion and Human Rights in the
Public Realm," Daedalus 112, no. 4 (Fall 1983): 244-245.

[35]Michel, "Image," col. 2182.

[36]Cf. Micks, Our Search, 6.

Septuagint, it brought the seeds of a theology of image
forward to greet the advent of Christianity.[37]  The Hebrew
expressions <u>selem</u> (image) and <u>demut</u> (likeness) take on a
more precise direction in the Greek translation, where, V.
Lossky points out:

> <u>eikon</u> and <u>homoiosis</u>, governed by the preposition
> <u>kata</u>, are already loaded with a promise of future
> theology, denoting a progress of tradition, a
> 'preparation for the Gospel' in a brighter light
> of Revelation.[38]

Lossky optimistically sees the translation as an opportunity
for the Scripture to inform culture, rather than be co-opted
by it.  Even so, the translation provided an opening for a
Greek anthropology to displace the Hebrew.  The imaging of
God becomes specified in human intelligence and will, rather
than in the human closeness to God, the intent of Genesis
1:26.[39]  Human superiority over animals is central to the
Greek viewpoint, whereas the Hebrew sees human superiority
at creation as the result of human closeness to God.[40]

Irenaeus (d. 200) is the first Christian writer to
systematically use the analogy of image and likeness in the

---

[37]Lossky, <u>In the Image</u>, 127-128.

[38]Ibid., 137.  Lossky recognizes here the issue of whether
the translation adds to the content of revelation.  He notes
that it is precisely here that we come face to face with the
dynamics by which the canons are established.

[39]J.F.  Fallon, "Image of God (In the Bible)," in
<u>Encyclopedic Dictionary of Religion</u>, 1979 ed., at 1770.

[40]Ibid.

range of his teachings.[41]  Specifically, it was his
response to the Valentinian gnostics, the first ones known
to make a distinction and an antithesis of _eikon_ and
_homoiosis_ in Gen. 1:26, which influenced the direction of
Christian theology in this matter.  In light of the
Incarnation, he rejected the gnostic belief that the image
resided in material, non-corporeal bodies.  He did share
their higher regard for the _homoiosis_:  once the human
becomes a likeness by the breath of God, it receives the
spirit of life (_pneuma zoes_) as its substance.  Clement of
Alexandria and Origin, perhaps through Irenaeus, later
subscribed to this valuation.[42]

Gregory of Nyssa (d. 395) considered the likeness to be
a realization of what was in the _eikon_.  When referring to
Gen. 1:26, he used 'image' and 'likeness' interchangeably,
and also the terms _homoima_ (static alikeness) and _homoiosis_
(a dynamic becoming alike).[43]  Gregory shares with the
Greek fathers their belief in the mystical recovery of the
lost resemblance to God.  The recovery is understood as
deification.[44]  The full nature of the image remains
unknowable, just as the divine Being is unknowable.[45]  And

---

[41]Maloney, _Man_, 31.

[42]Ladner, _Idea_, 83.

[43]Ibid., 94.

[44]Ibid., 106.

[45]Lossky, _Mystical_, 118.

Gregory says that the image is not the property of the
individual apart from humanity, any more than one can say
that the persons of the Trinity are parts of God.  The image
is proper to universal humanity.  "For the image is not in a
part of the nature, nor is grace in one individual among
those it regards; this power extends to the whole human
race." (De hominibus opificio, XVI, P.G., 185 BC.)[46]

Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) routinely exchanges image
and likeness, maintaining they are two forms of an hendiadys
in the Semitic sense.[47]  He shares with Gregory the
understanding of the image made in human beings through
Christ.  Gregory refers to Phil. 3:13f.:  "I press towards
the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in
Christ Jesus."[48]  Cyril names the vocation as one to
adoptive sonship.  The image of Christ is "stamped" on us
"through the vocation to adoptive sonship (In Ioannem
1,9)."[49]  The image and likeness of God in man is in the
framework of Cyril's christology.  In the Alexandrian
tradition of Clement, Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory
Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, he denied that the human
material body mirrored God's image.  He placed it in the
soul, perhaps to fight the anthropomorphites who featured

[46]Lossky, Mystical, 120.

[47]Maloney, Man, 166.

[48]Ladner, Idea, 105.

[49]Cited in Burghardt, Image, 165.

God in the bodily human likeness.[50]

The point is this: because the fathers distinguished
image and likeness in the course of battling heresy
(gnosis), their usage is not entirely interchangeable.[51]
Even so, they are synonymous, rather than disparate,
concepts yielding a flexible variety of meanings, especially
among the Greek fathers.[52]  Modern commentators refer to
the "image-likeness" structure in the theology of the
fathers.[53]

The image of God in the East came to be understood in
economic-relational terms, centered in the human
relationship to God through Christ.  It anchored the theme
of personal reform, a recovery of likeness to God, for the
sake of participation in the Divine life.  The purpose of
image language was a matter of maintaining a theocentric
perspective, rather than one of inventorying human ontology.

## Latin perspective

Augustine (d. 430) believed that the human created
according to the image and likeness of God in Gen. 1:26 was
essentially rational and spiritual.  He also maintains a
necessary connection between image and likeness.  Writing in

---

[50]Maloney, <u>Man</u>, 165.

[51]Lakner, "Gottebenbildlichkeit," 1092.

[52]Burghardt, <u>Image</u>, ix; and Maloney, <u>Man</u>, 187.

[53]For example, Ladner, <u>Idea</u>, 2; and Maloney, 187.

419, Augustine is aware that likeness is missing from Gen.
1:27, but he suggests that "where there is image, there is
necessarily likeness, too," but not vice versa.[54] His
concepts of image and likeness overlap, meaning that the
human image-likeness is inferior to the resemblance of
Christ to God.[55] For him the human image-likeness is
imperishable and therefore redeemable.[56] He rejects the
view that the likeness is achieved only at the
resurrection.[57]

If the soul bears the image of the Creator, the triune
God, it would have some "vestiges" of the divine nature

---

[54]Quaestiones in Heptateuchum (Quaest. de Deut. ) 4 (CSEL
28/2, 371-72) cited in Burghardt, Image, 9. See also Ladner,
186, which seconds that Questions on the Heptateuch is
Augustine's clearest definition of the biblical terms 'image'
(imago) and 'likeness' (similitudo) together with questions 51
and 74 of Augustine's On Diverse Questions; and David N. Bell,
"The Image of God and the Basic Principles of Augustine's
Mystical Theology," Ch.1, in The Image and Likeness: The
Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry, Cistercian
Studies Series: Number Seventy-Eight (Kalamazoo, MI:
Cistercian Publications, 1984), 40, 46. For an anthology of
Augustine's works exclusive of De Trinitate, see J. Heijke,
St. Augustine's Comments on "Imago Dei" (Worcester, MA: Holy
Cross College, 1960).

[55]Bell, Image and Likeness, 53: "Man is the imago
imaginis Dei, the imago Christi, and as such is the imago
Dei." Bell's note 126 refers to Serm. 90, 10, likening man to
a coin stamped with the image of the ruler. Between the imago
imaginis and the "true, begotten imago Dei there cannot be any
interval."

[56]Ladner, Idea, 187, 196-197; Bell, Image and Likeness,
35.

[57]Sullivan, Image, 12; Bell, Image and Likeness, 62.

(<u>vestigia</u> <u>trinitatis</u>).[58] Augustine conceives of the image
in terms of a trinitarian psychology. The threefold nature
of the soul (memory, intellect, and will or love) is a
vestige of the Trinity. This was an influential system in
the Middle Ages.[59] The human capacities of memory,
intellect, and will represent our participation in God, an
idea that is central to understanding Augustine's doctrine
of image and likeness.[60] By the grace of the Holy Spirit,
our participation in the Father proceeds through the Son.[61]
This relationship does not reside in a distant future.
Augustine pointed to baptism as the renewal of the image, a
growth in likeness to God. Revelation, reformation and
restoration of the image go hand in hand as one's vision of
God grows. Furthermore, says D. Bell, Augustine believed
that we do not simply "regain the justified, blessed, and
illumined state of Adam in Eden before the Fall, but
something more than this. It is not a <u>renovatio</u> <u>in</u>
<u>pristinum</u>, but a <u>renovatio</u> <u>in</u> <u>melius</u>."[62]

The specifics of Augustine's meditations on the image

---

[58]Weber, <u>Foundations</u>, 563, cites <u>On the Trinity</u>, X, and
<u>The City of God</u>, XI, 26.

[59]Weber, <u>Foundations</u>, 563. See Thomas Aquinas, <u>Summa
Theologica</u> (ST), trans. Fathers of the English Dominican
Province (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981), I, q.93
and I, q.45, 7.

[60]Bell, <u>Image and Likeness</u>, 22, 29, 39.

[61]Ibid., 61.

[62]Ibid., 62.

changed over time. The "location" of the image might be in
the mind, the soul, interior man, spirit or elsewhere. In
one place (Serm. 52) the memory, intellect and will do not
equal the Father, Son and Spirit; later (De Trinitate 15,
43) he says they do, analogously.[63]

It is beyond the scope of the present work to detail
all the difficulties with the notion of the image that have
roots in Augustine's theology. Some of these are based in
the emphases that schools or individuals wish to find there.
On the one hand, O. Weber can assert that Augustine himself
saw the ontological-psychological interpretation of the
image of God as secondary to the rightly ordered
relationship it implied between God and humankind. On the
other hand, it was the Middle Ages, says Weber, that began
to see the image in terms of a character in a human being, a
"primal condition" that existed before the Fall.
"Righteousness" comes to be seen as a human property rather
than an attribute of God.[64] By situating this image in the
soul as a human characteristic which once possessed an
'original righteousness,' a strain of Augustinian theology
steered theological anthropology on a path subject to
serious misunderstandings.[65] Placement of the image in the

---

[63]Ibid., 43-45.

[64]Weber, Foundations, 563-564.

[65]Ibid., 564. Augustine's viewpoint is susceptible to
criticisms of individualism, and overemphasis on the
intellectual nature of humans at the expense of their bodily

individual human and then in the soul are among the
controverted emphases. The relationship of the image of God
to the effects of sin thus remains a central question.

Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) echoes Augustine's
predisposition to locate the soul as home to human
intellectual nature. He observes that the upright stance of
the human body is a symbol of the nature of the image in the
mind.[66] By this nature, humans participate in the
transcendent sphere. It is in this nature that a person
expands and grows in reflection of the divine, for the human
being is meant to be an image of God.[67] The mature Aquinas
says that the likeness will be specific to the image, not a
"vestige." He appeals to Augustine when he relates likeness
necessarily to the image.[68] The "lower" human powers,
though good, are a "vestigial likeness."[69]

Aquinas thus continues the distinction of image from
likeness in two ways.[70] The latter is common to more
existing things than is the former, which properly belongs
to intellectual properties. And likeness may also serve to

---

existence.

[66]ST, I, q.93, a 6, ad 3. See also Sullivan, *Image*, 231.

[67]Ian Hislop, O.P. *The Anthropology of St. Thomas* (Oxford, England: Blackfriars, 1950), 6.

[68]ST, I, q.93, 2. See also Sullivan, *Image*, 220-221.

[69]Sullivan, *Image*, 7.

[70]ST, I, q.93, 9.

express or perfect the image. This second understanding

appears to be at the heart of his reading of the <u>Ordinary</u>

<u>Gloss</u>, a medieval compilation of scripture interpretation.

In a three-fold distinction common to the greater

scholastics, the <u>Gloss</u> refers to facets of the divine image

in the human being: an image of creation, an image of re-

creation, and an image of similitude and likeness.[71] St.

Thomas, adding his own nuances, sees the image of creation

> to be found in every human; the image of re-
> creation is to be found only in those who are in
> the state of grace; the image of likeness or
> similitude is found in those who are in heaven.
> And so we have the image of nature, the image of
> grace, and the image of glory.[72]

His usage of the terms nature and grace represents an

elemental scholasticism which the Reformation resisted.[73]

This viewpoint, which implies that the image is intrinsic to

(imparted to) a person as God's creature, differs from the

Protestant view that the image (and therefore human dignity)

is imputed. The Reform tendency is to see image and dignity

as contingent upon God's sovereign evaluation of a person,

---

[71]Sullivan, <u>Image</u>, 231.

[72]Ibid., 232. See also, ST, I, 93, 4.

[73]It would be a mistake to compress Aquinas's estimation of human dignity into the three levels of image. He maintains that any human truth or dignity are tied to one's relation to the Creator, the origin and end of human life. Therefore, in terms of what is called the virtue of religion, dignity rises from a just, authentically ordered relation to God. See ST, II-II, 81, 1; also Cristoph Schönborn, "L'homme créé par Dieu: le fondement de la dignité de l'homme," <u>Gregorianum</u> 65, no. 2-3 (1984): 354-355.

and not as inherent in him or her.[74]  This explains the
line of Protestant thought that associates any human rights
with God's rights, not with any inherent human worth.

## The Reformation: Another Influence

Today the different usages of image and likeness in
Genesis emanate from conflicting Catholic and Protestant
understandings of the effects of the Fall (Gen. 2-3).
Protestant theology from its beginnings considers the
juxtaposition of the image of God and the likeness of God to
be a Hebrew parallelism.[75]  There is an integral vision of
the human creature.  Reformation theology is consistent,
then, to say that the human core -- the image, not only the
likeness -- is affected by the Fall.[76]  The Catholic view
has tended to see the similitudo Dei as supernatural
endowments which were lost in the Fall, and see the imago as
fundamentally unaffected.  From the Protestant viewpoint,

---

[74]Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Toward a Christian Theory of Human
Rights," Journal of Religious Ethics 8, no. 2 (Fall 1980):
279-280.

[75]Cf. A Catholic Dictionary, 16th edition, revised (St.
Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957), s.v., "Image of God."
Appealing to Gen. 1:26 in the Hebrew, the respected historian
and theologian Petavius (Denis Petau, S.J., d. 1562) also
rejected Irenaeus's distinction of image and likeness.

[76]Childress, "Image of God," 292.  See also Weber,
Foundations, 566:  What Irenaeus derived from Valentinian
gnosticism became a standing element in Catholicism's
theological-anthropological differentiation of nature and
grace.  Righteousness came to be seen as a superadditive gift,
added to human nature or to the image of God.  Robert
Bellarmine (d. 1621) "formulated this in its most radical
form."

this makes the human creature appear to have a two-level anthropology.

The Reformers reject both the idea of a superadditive gift and the corresponding notion of humanity existing without it in a 'pure nature.' They identify the 'image of God' with 'original righteousness' which, in principle, signifies that the image of God was completely lost in the Fall.[77] They attacked the medieval doctrine of imago Dei and other doctrines if they apparently contradicted the point of Luther's sixty-second of Ninety-five Theses which insisted on the priority of the glory and grace of God in the Gospel. Beginning with Augustine's experiments[78] with various kinds of images of the Trinity in human persons, some medieval speculation had implied that the doctrine of the image of God could also be expressed in a natural theology. In other words, some of Augustine's medieval followers proposed the idea that there was "something rationally self-evident about the vestiges of the

---

[77]Weber, Foundations, 567.

[78]Jaroslav Pelikán, "The Doctrine of the Image of God," 53-62, in The Christian Roots of the European Nations (Florence, Italy: F. Le Monnier, 1982), 58; and John L. Thompson, "Creata ad Imaginem Dei, Licet Secundo Gradu: Woman as the Image of God according to John Calvin," Harvard Theological Review 81, no. 2 (April 1988): 125-143. Calvin, like Luther, was reluctant to isolate and dogmatize upon the imago, and was also uncomfortable with Augustine's speculating (philosophatur). Thompson cites Calvin's Comm. Gen. 1:26 (CO 23.26), n4.

Trinity."[79]  What flowered in Augustinianism,[80] suggesting
there was little for revelation and redemption to do in
renewing the image, was a Pelagianism which Augustine
himself would have condemned.  In the eyes of the Reformers,
Christ is the most perfect image of God, and only in Christ
could humans be restored to bear that image.[81]

As Martin Luther defines it, "The likeness and image of
God consists in the true and perfect knowledge of God,
supreme delight in God, eternal life, eternal righteousness,
eternal freedom from care (Weimarer Ausgabe)."[82]  He
teaches that the image of God is "almost completely lost" as
the result of the Fall.[83]  However, John Calvin differs by
allowing for remnants of the imago in the sinner, just as
one might find an image reflected in a mirror:  "we are
. . . to look upon the image of God in all persons, to which

---

[79]Pelikàn, "Doctrine," 58.

[80]As distinguished from Augustinism, Augustine's own
views; refers to a semi-pelagian development by Aegidius
Romanus (1243-1306), a pupil of Thomas Aquinas, that became
dominant among the Hermits of St. Augustine.  M. Luther
belonged to one of the reformed congregations of this order.
See "Augustinianism," in O'Collins and Farrugia, A Concise
Dictionary of Theology; and "Augustinian Hermits," in F.L.
Cross and E.A. Livingstone, eds., The Oxford Dictionary of the
Christian Church, Second Edition (London: Oxford University
Press, 1974).

[81]Pelikàn, "Doctrine," 58-59.

[82]Pannenberg, Anthropology, 49 n.22.

[83]For a discussion of the primary sources, see Weber,
Foundations, 569, and Pannenberg, Anthropology, 49n.22, n.23,
74-79.

we owe all honor and love."[84]  From what Calvin deduces

from the scriptures (Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:23), the _imago_ _Dei_

refers to "the perfection (_integritas_) of our whole nature,

as it appeared when Adam was endued with right judgement,

had affections in harmony with reason, had all his senses

sound and well regulated, and truly excelled in everything

good."[85]  For Calvin, the image is not entirely static, as

in an artistic representation.  Instead the image in the

reflection is more dynamic and relational.[86]  K. Barth and

E. Brunner debated about this difference (a lost versus a

residual or reflected image) again in 1934 and later.  Barth

argued that humans have no intrinsic worth because of the

"infinite qualitative difference" between them and God.[87]

O. Weber sketches a picture of the Catholic-Protestant

impasse existent up until the Vatican Council II.  The

Catholic Church, in warding off what it feared was

Protestantism's incipient monophysitism, wanted "to preserve

the purity of the concept of grace," according to von

---

[84]Cited in Martin Shupack, "The Churches and Human Rights: Catholic and Protestant Human Rights Views as Reflected in Church Statements," _Harvard Human Rights Journal_ 6 (Spring 1993):  149.

[85]Quoted from _Comm. Gen. 1:26_ in Thompson, "_Creata ad Imaginem_," 128.

[86]Thompson, "_Creata ad Imaginem_," 128, and n.13.

[87]Pannenberg, _Anthropology_, 49 n.23; Weber, _Foundations_, 569; Cahill, "Toward a Christian Theory," 279-280.  See also Joan E. O'Donovan, "Man and the Image of God:  The Disagreement between Barth and Brunner Reconsidered," _Scottish Journal of Theology_ 39, no. 4 (1993):  433-459.

Balthasar in 1951.[88]  However, Weber says, the Protestant

viewpoint would not concede that talking about pure nature

will preserve the purity of the proclamation of grace.  Any

purity is to be sought in terms of the Creator, not the

creature.[89]

Unseen in this sketch of Weber's summation is the polar

tension between schools of biblical exegesis that arose

though the nineteenth century.  In some spheres, historical-

critical methods were becoming refined and accepted.  The

official Catholic attitude resisted these methods well into

the twentieth century.  Only after a Catholic appropriation

of newer tools of biblical scholarship could its image

language be unabashedly christocentric and less defensive of

its philosophical framework for nature and grace.

While detailing it here is beyond the scope of this

survey, the path to that christological common ground was

not the result of a continuous evolution of biblical

exegesis.  Exegetical method had undergone no less than a

paradigm shift.  According to G. Jonsson, ·the critical uses

of the _imago_ _Dei_ in exegesis and the Fathers are qualified

by a shift that was well established by 1882.[90]  The shift

had come within the confluence of discoveries in three

---

[88]Weber, _Foundations_, 569.

[89]Ibid., 579.  See Thils, _Droits_, 57, for comments on the limitations which the "three _sola_'s" of grace, faith, and scripture place upon Protestant speculation.

[90]Jonsson, _Image_, 15.

fields of knowledge. Theological reflections upon the image of God were being recast by new findings in natural science, religio-historical studies, and historical-critical research.[91] However, an official Catholic acknowledgement of the new science and an integration of the revised data would be delayed. The issues of scriptural historicity, inerrancy, and the authoritative interpretation of texts would be taken up in the next century.

## Contemporary Catholic Understanding of the Image of God

The image of God has continued as an influential theological element in Church teachings at the highest levels. The manner in which it is used has evolved somewhat. During the Vatican Council, a change of emphasis in Catholic formulation bypassed scholastic technicalities in favor of an emerging christocentric focus.[92] Even though the scholastic framework is detectable in Gaudium et Spes, its terminology is muted, and philosophical details of human ontology give way to the eschatological dynamics related to the image of God in Christ.[93]

---

[91]Ibid., 23-24.

[92]Joseph Ratzinger, "The Dignity of the Human Person," Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Vol. 5 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 159-160.

[93]GS, 12 and 22. See also Thils, Droits, 68-74, for comments on both the essentialist and personalistic perspectives here. See also Cronin Regan, "Grace and Nature," in New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967 ed., with references to: Rahner and Mersch; the creation of humanity in grace; and the

He who is 'the image of the invisible God'
(Col. 1:15), is Himself the perfect man.  To the
sons of Adam He restores the divine likeness which
had been disfigured from the first sin onward.
Since human nature as He assumed it was not
annulled, by that very fact it has been raised up
to a divine dignity in our respect too.  For by
His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself
in some fashion with every man.[94]

The christological interpretation of the image of God

is normative for the Vatican II documents.[95]  By attending

to the Scriptural references about Christ as the image of

God, the Catholic Church's anthropological stance and

conception of human dignity has become more reflective of

Orthodox and Protestant sensibilities.  It is no longer

proper to talk of 'pure human nature' apart from the work of

God through Christ.[96]  All this is not to imply that the

Council generated a completely novel perspective.  For

example, in a speech to Fiat employees in the Fall of 1948,

Pius XII told the workers:  "Man is the image of the one and

---

supernatural destiny of humankind.

[94]GS, 22.

[95]Ibid., 10, 12, 22, 24, 29, 34, 41, 48, 52, 61, 68; the
following are likewise found in The Documents of Vatican II,
Abbott, ed.:  "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" [Lumen
Gentium], 14-101, arts. 2, 7, 41, 50; "Declaration on the
Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions [Nostra
Aetate]," 660-668, art. 5; "Decree on the Apostolate of the
Laity [Apostolicam Actuositatem]," 489-521, art. 8; "Decree on
the Church's Missionary Activity [Ad Gentes]," 584-633, art.
7; see also "Declaration on Religious Freedom [Dignitatis
Humanae]," 675-696, art. 2, note 6.

[96]Christoph Schönborn, O.P., "L'homme créé par Dieu:  le
fondement de la dignité de l'homme," Gregorianum 65, no. 2-3
(1984):  353; Nicolò Loss, "La Dignità dell'Uomo nella
Dottrina Biblica," 41-59, in Concetti, ed., I Diritt Umani.

triune God and, therefore, he is also a person, brother of
the man Jesus Christ and with him and by him, the heir to
eternal life.  Such is his dignity."[97]

In the late 1970s and early '80s the International
Theological Commission reiterated the christological focus
of the image of God.  All creation, as well as the human
image of God, are subsumed in Christ.  The image acquires a
cosmic dimension in Christ, "under whose feet (the Father)
placed all things," an expression of 1 Cor 15:27, Eph. 1:22,
Heb. 2:8, and equivalently in Col. 1:18.[98]  This saying,
very possibly connected to Gen. 1:26 through Ps. 8:7,
"refers first of all to the glorified humanity of Christ,
and not to his divinity alone."[99]

The commission also articulated the Christian meaning
of the deification of man (that is, human beings) in terms
of the image of God.[100]  Deification is not communicated to
the individual, as such, but ultimately as a member of the
Communion of Saints.[101] Humans are called to this sharing

---

[97]Calvez and Perrin, The Church, 104.

[98]International Theological Commission, Select Questions
on Christology (Washington, DC:  United States Catholic
Conference, 1980), 20.

[99]Ibid.

[100]International  Theological  Commission,  Theology,
Christology,  Anthropology,  trans.  Michaël  Ledwith
(Washington, DC:  United States Catholic Conference, 1983),
11.

[101]Ibid., 11-12.

in the life of God through the incarnation of Christ, which
makes of humans God's children and co-heirs (Rom. 8:17),
partakers in the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4).

The biblical and theological roots for human dignity
remain central to post-Vatican II revisions of Catholic
Church Law (1983) and the Catholic catechism (1992). The
Code of Canon Law is a Catholic, ecclesial embodiment of
theological constructs in juridical language.[102] The
promulgation of the 1983 Code is sometimes called the final
act of Vatican II. In its statements on civil liberties and
clerical involvement in matters of the public common good,
canons 227 and 287 stipulate human dignity as the basis of
fundamental rights. Canon 747, §2 asserts "the Church's
competence to proclaim" about the social order and
fundamental rights. Because the Code treats primarily the
external relations of persons baptized within the church,
the canons themselves do not mention or define the "image of
God." However, they do rely upon conciliar and synodal
statements which elaborate dignity in Catholic theological
terms.[103] Other commentaries on church law likewise relate

---

[102]James H. Provost, commentary on Canons 204-231, in The
Code of Canon Law: A Text and Commentary, ed. James A.
Coriden, Thomas J. Green, Donald E. Heintschel (New York:
Paulist Press, 1985), p. 122.

[103]Ibid., The Code of Canon Law, pp. 163 and 228. See
also James H. Provost, "Rights of Persons in the Church," 296-
322, in Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American
Public Philosophy, ed. R. Bruce Douglass, David Hollenbach
(Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994),
319n.55; and "Acta Commissionis," Communicationes 12 (June

human dignity to human, ecclesial, and ecclesiastical

rights, both procedural and substantive.[104]

Because it is directed at purposes different than those

in the Code, the Catechism of the Catholic Church uses image

of God language more directly while treating of human

dignity. In the first major part, the explication of the

Profession of Faith reviews doctrines about human creation

in God's image, and the effects of the Fall.[105] It notes

that human limits and errors "disfigure the image of

God."[106] The 'soul' is said to refer to the "innermost

aspect of man, that which is of greatest value in him, that

by which he is most especially in God's image."[107] The

human body "shares in the dignity of 'the image of God': it

is a human body precisely because it is animated by a

spiritual soul."[108] The unity of the body and soul is "so

_____

1980): 32, c. 3.

[104]Canon Law Society of America, Protection of Rights of Persons in the Church: Revised Report of the Canon Law Society of America on the Subject of Due Process (Washington DC: Canon Law Society of America, 1991), 1-12 and 46-47. See also Edward G. Pfnausch, ed., Code, Community, Ministry, Second Revised Edition (Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America, 1992), 62-70.

[105]Catechism of the Catholic Church (Ligouri, MO: Ligouri Publications, 1994), pars. 355-421. The original French-language text of this catechism was officially introduced by John Paul II on 11 October 1992 with the Apostolic Constitution Fidei Depositum.

[106]Ibid., par. 844.

[107]Ibid., par. 363.

[108]Ibid., par. 364.

profound that one has to consider the soul to be the 'form' of the body."[109]

The third major part of the catechism, entitled "Life in Christ," begins with the section "Man's Vocation, Life in the Spirit."  The first chapter within it is called "The Dignity of the Human Person," and its first subheading is "Man, The Image of God."[110]  The reader is told:  "It is in Christ, 'the image of the invisible God,' that man has been created 'in the image and likeness' of the Creator."[111]  The eschatological implications are evident.[112]

In a subsequent treatment of social justice, the catechism elaborates the relation between human dignity and rights, specifically mentioning that such dignity arises from creaturehood, being created in God's image, and from being redeemed by Christ.[113]  Later still there is a reminder of the anthropology of nature and grace; a human

---

[109]Ibid., par. 365.  See James F. Keenan, S.J., "Christian Perspectives on the Human Body," Theological Studies 55, no. 2 (June 1994):  335-336, wherein the unified composite of body and soul in the image of God is said to be a discovery of late Christian antiquity.

[110]Ibid., pars. 1699 to 1715.  See also pars. 1962, 2501, and 2566.

[111]Ibid., par. 1701.

[112]Ibid., par. 16:  "The third part of the catechism deals with the final end of man created in the image of God: beatitude, and the ways of reaching it . . . ."

[113]Ibid., pars. 1928-1948.  Note the mention of humans created in the "image of God" and having "rational souls" at par. 1934.

could find himself or herself "losing through sin his likeness to God."[114] Throughout, the continuing tension or complementarity between a Scholastic natural law and a theological anthropology, between a sort of ascending and descending anthropology, is noteworthy.[115]

In summarizing the importance of image of God language, it is clear that the interpretations of the image and likeness follow different theological emphases in the East and West. The East developed the image as an economic statement, while the West pursued an ontological one. From Christ the East learns how humans are made into new creatures who participate in the divine nature (2 Pet 1:4). The West, led by Augustine and Thomas, employs image and likeness to work out a theological anthropology.[116] The East leans toward theocentric and eschatological emphases. These poles are best seen in a complementary relationship today. The Reformation, for its part, supported the theological protest against ontological categories in its attempt to re-confirm the sovereignty of God in renewing humanity through Christ.

The present Catholic perspective on the image of God, then, seems to consist in many layers. There is still a

---

[114]Ibid., par. 2566.

[115]The prominence of 'soul,' and the 'shared dignity' of the body in the catechism raises again some question of individualism for discussions of personhood and soteriology.

[116]Lossky, In the Image, 133-134; Maloney, Man, 198.

philosophical, natural-law component, represented by the
human capacities for reason, freedom to act, and dominion
over earthly creation.  There is the theological component
that recognizes the human relationship with the Creator as
the source of dignity and the human superiority to non-human
creation.  The theological element which is resident in
Genesis is recast in christological terms suggested in the
Scriptures:  all humans are touched by the incarnation of
Christ; Christ shares the nature of all humans, renewing the
image-likeness damaged in the Fall; all share the capacity
for divine filiation or adoption; all are called to be
conformed to Christ, the model of human life; and all are
called to share a divine destiny.

Having made a brief survey of the theological usage of
the 'image of God,' summary responses can be offered for the
questions posed earlier.  Is being created in God's image
indicative of individual worth?  In theological terms, the
worth of individual human beings is intrinsic both to their
creaturehood and to their essential association with other
humans sharing a vocation to a God-given destiny.  In other
words, an individual is an image of God in terms of his or
her personhood; the image is not a property or attribute of
individuality.  Defined in personal terms, then, the image
is an attribute of an individual only in the way that
personhood is with its relational implications.  It is here
that we lack a term to encapsulate the individual, social,

transcendent and eschatological connotations which "person" is meant to carry.[117] For this same reason it can be said that the doctrine of the imago Dei is both a statement about creation and the essence of creatures, bound up with one another and comprehensible only in relation with the Creator. Only in the attempt to separate these elements can we imagine that there is any meaning to the question, "Does the 'image of God' reveal more about the divine nature or the human?"

In terms of the question about the effects of the Fall on the image of God in humanity, the central Catholic perspective is constant: it holds that the image was not destroyed. However, the positive description and estimation of that image has been influenced by an evolving personalism in the light of a christological emphasis. It is on this point, hinging on the dynamics of personal religious faith, that speculation remains as to whether the image is present in the non-believer and believer alike, and in the same way. There is no question that all the 'sons of Adam' have been dignified by Christ.[118] Given the scriptural indications that believers in Christ enjoy the transforming presence of the Holy Spirit, a question could be raised about whether equality in human dignity is measured by actual status (an ontological measure) and/or by sharing a vocation-to-destiny

---

[117]See notes 33 and 34 above.

[118]GS, 22.

(an economic, eschatological measure).

## Contemporary Theological Reflection: Problems Related to Image of God Language

It is one thing to repeat the biblical datum that humans are created in the image of God, it is another thing to use it as a warrant for human rights. It is yet another to reduce the divine image to aspects of personal relationships or to attributes of individual human beings. Because it lacks a uniform definition and fulfills so many different functions (for example, dogmatic, ethical, and mystical), there is some critical disagreement among contemporary theologians as to the usefulness of image of God language as a construct for social and ethical norms or deliberation.

Most of the Fathers attempted some specification of the image.[119] They generally limited the image to an inner element or to the intellect. This is not to deny their accounting for bodily elements in the image-likeness. For example, Cyril of Alexandria describes six facets in the image: reason, freedom, dominion over the earth, sanctification, incorruptibility, and sonship.[120] Over the course of time, the image refers also to the soul or spiritual nature, to the mind or reason (logos). Sometimes the image is said to reside in a quality of the soul:

[119]Micks, Our Search, 8.

[120]Burghardt, Image, ix.

immortality, simplicity, the ability to know God, the capacity for communion with God, or of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.[121]  For a period that includes most of the twentieth century, human reason and freedom -- as capacities for serving God, for dominating nature, and for divine adoption -- have been at the heart of Roman Catholic visions of the image of God as the foundation human dignity.[122] But they have not enjoyed an unquestioned status.

It is worth mentioning that being suspicious of the definition or "location" of the image of God is not an exclusively modern prerogative.  In 394 Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, said attempts to specify the image, in dominion or elsewhere, are "drunken belches."[123]  The use of imago Dei today draws criticism either when it represents a precritical mentality, or when it fails to communicate a value that is comprehensible within a pluralistic culture. To some, the very attempt to speak of the image of God may be symptomatic of a pre-critical mind set, camouflaging a penchant for the projection of human traits or ideologies onto (the idea of) God.

J. Gustafson is among those who caution that image

_____

[121]Lossky, Mystical, 115.  See also Childress, "Image of God," 292.

[122]Calvez and Perrin, Church, 102-105; Pope John XXIII, Pacem in Terris (New York:  Paulist Press, 1963), art. 9.

[123]Burghardt, Image, 58.

language is susceptible to ethical circularity.[124]  He

cites evidence of this circularity in extreme

anthropomorphism, in the unbalanced exploitation of nature,

and the proliferation of warrants for unlimited human

rights.[125]  Gustafson doubts the validity of translating

human experience (freedom, will, agency) into our construals

of God and divine plans.[126]

An epistemology of human experience is not the only

lens that raises questions about image of God language.  The

continued use of _imago_ language may carry the seeds of an

increasingly controverted metaphysics of the human 'soul.'

As an expression, its use may lack an adequate counterpart

in modern language and thought.  G. Green associates these

problems with the traditional identification of the image of

---

[124]Gustafson, Ethics, Vol. I: 269-270; idem, "Genetic Therapy:  Ethical and Religious Reflections," Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy 8 (Spring 1992): 194; idem, "Theology, Biology, Ethics and Theology," TMs, 2 May 1994, pp. 109-110.  See also Alan Gewirth, Human Rights (Chicago and London:  University of Chicago Press, 1982), 28 and 44.

[125]Ibid., 104.

[126]Cf.  Kenneth  Robert  Himes,  "Freedom  and  Self-Realization:  Toward a Theology of Human Rights," (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1981), places freedom at the center of how the human person images God.  Cf. GS, 17; also in Catechism of the Catholic Church, par. 1705 (and 1712):  "By virtue of his soul and his spiritual powers of intellect and will,  man  is  endowed  with  freedom,  an  'outstanding manifestation of the divine image.'"  For a pointed critique which locates the presence of various and conflicting concepts of the image of God in a single document, see Jan Jans, "God or Man?  Normative Theology in the Instruction Donum Vitae," Louvain Studies 17, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 48-64.

God with human reason.[127]

Still there is an extensive body of literature that
uses the image of God either to guide ongoing projects, or
to purify and reclaim it as a theological warrant. Even so,
authors who analyze social justice issues, for example,
raise cautions about image language that can cloak
ideological biases. They are keen to test image-reliant
anthropologies for a balance of individual, interpersonal,
social and transcendent aspects.[128]

Perhaps the best known criticisms of how the image of
God is understood and used in Catholic circles come from
theologians with feminist concerns. The notion of the image
of God is pivotal for understandings of Church polity, of

---

[127]Green, Imagining, 98: "The traditional identification
of the imago Dei with human reason, for example, leads
naturally to an emphasis on ideas and right doctrine.
Virtually all the theological treatments of the doctrine from
the church fathers to the Enlightenment assumed the creation,
fall, and restoration of the image of God to be something
affecting the soul. The philosophical revolution of modern
times has left this doctrine, like so many others, an
intellectual orphan. With the demise of the metaphysics in
terms of which the doctrine had traditionally been explicated
-- for example, the very assumption that human nature is
essentially constituted by an immaterial but substantial
'soul' -- the biblical language that had given rise to it in
the first place came to be heard either as indefensibly
'dogmatic' (precritical and therefore implausible) or else as
simply unrelated to modern language and thought forms
('irrelevant')."

[128]For example, see Roger Haight, Alternative, 50-51 and
102-103; B. Andrew Lustig, "The Common Good in a Secular
Society: The Relevance of a Roman Catholic Notion to the
Healthcare Allocation Debate," Journal of Medicine and
Philosophy 18, no. 6 (December 1993): 572-573; Moltmann, On
Human Dignity, 15-17; and R. M. Goldie, ed., The Image of Man
in Human Rights Legislations (Rome: Herder, 1985).

sexuality, and for discussions about the ordination of women. P. Trible identifies in Gen. 1:26-30 human responsibilities for procreation and dominion over the earth, but no textual differentiation between the sexes for assigning the work.[129] She considers the image of "God male and female," and sees the human community of "male and female" as an image of God.[130]

In a 1978 research report for the Catholic Theological Society of America, the use of 'image of God' is central to an inventory of the status of women in church and society. The report includes the text of a 1976 statement by the Leadership Conference of Women Religious, which says:

> In particular, it is noted that when women argue for ordination, they are questioning hierarchical models of the Church, affirming the central importance of the humanity over the maleness of Jesus, and 'pressing for a more adequate articulation of the notion of the imago dei' in theological anthropology.[131]

The question raised asks whether male and female are equal in their humanity and identical in their capacity to be images of God. This and other reports reject any anthropology which is suspected of being tainted by the patriarchal bias which enforces a "dual nature" (where

---

[129]Trible, God and the Rhetoric, 19.

[130]Ibid., 22, 23.

[131]The Status and Roles of Women, cited in Sara Butler, ed. Research Report: Women in Church and Society, 1978 (New York: Catholic Theological Society of America, 1978), 22-23.

complementarity is the rule).[132]

For some analysts, this attempt to ameliorate women's status in the Church might unconsciously import another vice: individualism.  C.M. LaCugna traces the genealogy of individualistic understandings of the image of God from Augustine, through Thomas, then to B. Lonergan and K. Rahner.[133]  She criticizes their focus upon the individual soul since it omits too much of our social understanding of the self in the economy of salvation.  But she also rejects Orthodox and Catholic anthropologies which support the theology of complementarity, which she considers to be at the root of their refusal to ordain women presbyters.[134]

E. Johnson agrees with Trible, against the claims of patriarchal privilege, that all members of the human species equally share the theological identity of imago Dei.[135]
She advances her argument in terms of imago Christi:  "the baptized are recreated in every dimension of their existence: . . . those who live the life of Christ are icons of Christ. . . . the capacity of women and men to be

---

[132]Ibid., 36-40.   See also Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue in the U.S., "Images of God:   Reflections on Christian Anthropology," Origins 13, no. 30 (5 January 1984): 505-512, esp. 507.

[133]LaCugna, God For Us, 103.

[134]Ibid., 415, note 70.   Cf. Hans Küng, Global Responsibility:  In Search of a New World Ethic (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 66-67, 90.

[135]Johnson, She Who Is, 70, 75.   Idem, "The Incomprehensibility of God," 441-465.

<u>symmorphos</u> to the <u>eikon</u> of Christ is identical."[136]

In yet another problematic area, there are objections to mentioning the image of God in the public spheres of the 'hard sciences' or of civic discourse because their methodologies or proprieties seemingly allow it no admission. In countering this type of objection, it might be enough to recall that science is a human endeavor, part of which continues to ask what a human being is, and what makes the species unique.[137] This task perennially falls to science no less than to theology as it examines not only the history of human life, but also plans the future by means of manipulating environmental and reproductive processes. "The implications of theological anthropology for secular ethics are certainly material and more than merely formal," according to K. Tanner.[138] At the very least, the implications warn us against individualism and ecological irresponsibility. They also can alert a people to encroaching totalitarian tendencies.

Regarding the specific value of the 'image of God' as it informs the notion of human dignity, D. Tracy remarks that it

bears discussion and scrutiny in the public realm

---

[136]Johnson, <u>She Who Is</u>, 72-73. Cf. Drew Christiansen, "On Relative Equality: Catholic Egalitarianism After Vatican II," <u>Theological Studies</u> 45 (December 1984): 651-675.

[137]O'Donovan, "Man and the Image," 433.

[138]Tanner, <u>Difference</u>, 579.

> itself, even for those who do not share its
> explicitly theistic warrants.  For the notion of
> the dignity of the human person suggests a
> category that is not reducible to traditional
> liberal notions of the 'individual' or to
> traditional Marxist notions of 'society.'  In sum,
> a disclosive classic religious symbol, highly
> particular in its religious origins, suggests a
> category -- namely, the dignity of the human
> person -- that deserves scrutiny and argument in
> the public realm on that realm's own terms.[139]

What can the disparity in perspectives about the

contents and use of "image of God" provide for the present

work?  It provides an elevated sense of caution for the

theological enterprise.  As Tracy says, the imago offers a

highly disclosive symbol.  A heightened awareness of its

history and misuses can help to detect circular arguments,

and questionable or unprovable assumptions about human

reality.  The twentieth century raises questions about

whether the  understanding of the image have been co-opted

by a particular ideology, or whether the practical usage of

image of God is inclusive or exclusive of certain people.

Likewise, an analysis of its usage can reveal potentially

faulty or self-serving representations of·the Creator.  The

public realm can also benefit from an awareness of the

disparity.  Generally speaking, the disclosive nature of the

idea of the image of God, or of the idea of human dignity,

---

[139]Tracy, "Religion and Human Rights in the Public Realm,"
244-245;  idem,  "Catholic  Classics  in  American  Liberal
Culture,"  196-213,  in  Catholicism  and  Liberalism:
Contributions  to  American  Public  Philosophy,  ed.  R.  Bruce
Douglass,  David  Hollenbach  (Cambridge,  England:   Cambridge
University Press, 1994).

can serve to uncover latent anthropological assumptions in political and legislative discourse.

## The Criteria for the Categorical
## Comparison of Documents

As previously stated, image of God language is central to the theological understanding of human dignity and rights. This subsection presents three steps that will establish the criteria for evaluating 'image of God' language in the selected documents. The first step exposes the manner in which the image typology is situated within the methodology of contemporary Catholic social ethics statements. The prominence of the 'image of God' justifies making it the focus for analysis and comparison. Second, Catholic theological values included by use of the term "image of God" will be set forth. Third, criteria will be selected that expose the presence or absence of the theological values in the selected documents.

The first step entails recognizing that much of 'Catholic social teaching' is today presented from three levels.[140]  These levels are explained in Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Teaching in the Formation of Priests (30 December 1988).

> The goal is to arrive, in the light of permanent
> principles, at an objective judgment about social

---

[140]I am indebted to Kevin T. Kelly, New Directions in Moral Theology (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992) at 49-51, for his concise exposition of these levels, and for citation of some of the relevant documents.

> reality and, according to the possibilities and
> opportunities offered by the circumstances, to
> make concrete the most appropriate choices....[141]

The "principles" at the first level of analysis correspond

to person-centered values based on an anthropology formed by

the Gospel. The second level is concerned with discerning

the facts in a situation and the methods for doing so. The

third looks to the formulation of practical directives by

means of dialogue, shared struggle for justice, and by

consulting people with relevant expertise.[142]

The above-mentioned Vatican document implies in its

twenty-fifth note that the tri-level division originates in

Pope Paul VI, Octogesima Adveniens (1971).[143] This format

is apparent in a number of other documents.[144]

This dissertation will concentrate its investigation,

---

[141]Vatican Congregation for Catholic Education, in Origins
19, no. 11 (3 August 1989): 173.

[142]Ibid.  See also K. Kelly, New Directions, 49.

[143]Paul VI, "Apostolic Letter of His Holiness Pope Paulus
PP. VI on the Occasion of the Eightieth Anniversary of the
Encyclical Rerum Novarum," 343-374, in The Teachings of Pope
Paul VI 1971 (Washington, DC:   United States Catholic
Conference, 1972) at article 4.  K. Kelly, New Directions, 49.
Cf. Mary Elsbernd, O.S.F., "What Ever Happened to Octogesima
Adveniens?, Theological Studies 56, no. 1 (March 1995):  39-
60.

[144]For example, NCCB, The Challenge of Peace (Washington,
DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1983), and Economic
Justice for All (Washington, DC:   United States Catholic
Conference, 1986); Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of
the Faith, "Instruction on Certain Aspects of the 'Theology of
Liberation,'" Origins 14, no. 13 (13 September 1984): 193,
195-204; John Paul II, On Social Concern [Solicitudo Rei
Socialis] (SRS), December 30, 1987, (Washington, DC:   United
States Catholic Conference, 1988).

analysis and comparison at the first level, the person-
centered Catholic anthropology.  The central focus is upon

the use of "image of God" as a warrant for grounding human

dignity and human rights.  This approach does not imply any

claim that the "image of God," as a principle, is actually

the temporal "starting point" in each select document.[145]

These levels are rarely separate in practice.  As can be

inferred from the brief survey of image language, its

theology bears the marks of its sometimes confusing history

and traditions.[146]

The second objective of this subsection is to set forth

the theological parameters and values denoted by the image

of God. The content of Propositions on the Dignity and

Rights of the Human Person by the International Theological

Commission offers a significant explanation of the

theological themes that must be accounted for in a treatment

of the idea of the image of God and of human dignity.[147]

It is an appropriate resource for the work at hand.  By

---

[145]There is no purely inductive or deductive relationship
between the present theological understanding of human dignity
and human rights.  Rights have historically developed with the
aid of a method which traces freedom to human dignity as it is
viewed in Revelation.  See Walter Kasper, "The Theological
Foundations of Human Rights," The Jurist no. 1 (1990): 149;
also Thils, Droits, 49.

[146]For a caution on this point, see William E. Murnion,
"The American Catholic Bishops' Peace Pastoral:  A Critique of
Its Logic," Horizons 31, no. 1 (1986):  67-89.

[147](Washington, DC:  United States Catholic Conference,
1986).  Page v. notes that the propositions were passed by the
vote of the entire membership of the Commission.

publishing its working documents,[148] the Commission

provided an "authentic commentary" on the seventeen-page

Propositions. The Commission presents the propositions in

order to cast the "light of Catholic theology" on the issues

of dignity and rights.[149]

The Commission forms a biblical context to frame its

"theology of the dignity and rights of man." Its major

features are: the Covenant in Israel, basis of moral and

social life; and the new Kingdom, marked by the new creation

in Christ where human beings are "given the dignity of being

God's adopted children."[150] It then describes the

contemporary Roman Magisterium as moving along the

complementary lines of ascent and descent.[151] The line of

ascent begins with the natural law of peoples (GS 73) which

is confirmed and raised to a higher level by the Gospel.

The line of descent places the basis of human rights in

Christ, the Word of God sharing the human condition,

> so that all men should be endowed with the dignity
> of God's adopted sons . . . this christological
> foundation for human rights will get very special
> attention when considered in the light and grace

---

[148]Gregorianum 65, no. 2-3 (1984): 229-481.

[149]Propositions, v.

[150]Ibid., 4.

[151]This two-pronged approach is already in place in 1974. See Pontifical Commission Justitia et Pax, "The Church and Human Rights," 344-393, 483-491, in Vincent P. Mainelli, ed., Social Justice, (Wilmington, NC: Consortium/McGrath Publishing Company, 1978). See also Kasper, "Theological Foundations," 147.

of the theology of salvation history.[152]
Even the philosophical principle of reciprocity, which is
widely affirmed as the foundation of human rights, has
christological meaning in the preaching of Christ (Lk. 6:36,
31).[153]  The Gospel is the interpretive standard for both
the ascending and descending lines.

The center of the Propositions is its exposition of
three necessary and connected movements in naming the source
of human dignity.  These movements meet the theology of the
image of God at three intersections:  the creation of
humans, the meaning of the gift that is Christ, and the
redemption and destiny to which all are called.  Taking
cognizance of today's situation, the Commission says that
"human dignity, both actively and passively, should be
viewed in man as created (2.2.1), in man as sinner (2.2.2),
and in man as redeemed (2.2.3)."[154]  Beginning with
creation, Gen. 1-3 reminds one that the human is a created
being, endowed with reason (Rom. 1:20), a trait which
converges with philosophical estimations of humanity.  The
human is fully spirit, soul and body (1 Thes. 5:23), and a
social being as well.  Humanity has a God-given mission to
preside as a 'terrestrial viceroy' over non-human

---

[152]Propositions, 5.

[153]Ibid.

[154]Ibid., 1-2.

creation.[155]

The second movement addresses the reality of sin, and acknowledges the damage done to human dignity by unjust domination and irresponsibility of every kind. Sinful humanity continues to retain "God's image," retaining dignity and rights even in its deformed but reformable state. The doctrine of metanoia is to be lived out in a two-fold dynamic. Christians can make an "original contribution" to the promotion of rights both by abandoning injustice and by actively embracing justice.[156]

According to the third movement, the importance of Christ's redemptive act effects the "gifts, tasks, and rights [of] redeemed nature."

> [T]he Gospel opens up a new and specifically
> Christian religious foundation for human rights
> and dignity, and gives men new and wider
> perspectives as God's adopted sons and brothers in
> Christ -- who suffered and rose again.[157]

Christ, as the image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15-16), confers maximum dignity on human nature by his incarnation. For this reason Christ is united in some way to every human. In Christ are "found the first fruits of the new man,

---

[155]Ibid., 6.

[156]Ibid., 7.

[157]Ibid., 8. See Kasper, "Theological Foundations," 158: For this reason it can be said, without negating Gen. 1:26, that "the real theological foundation" of dignity and rights is christological.

transformed and transformable to a higher state."[158]
Through a new life human beings are called to "bear the
likeness of the heavenly Adam (cf. I Cor 15:49)."[159]

The three movements outlined in the Propositions are
important to the analysis that follows because the second
and third are not uniformly evident in the theological-
anthropology of the United States documents. The resultant
anthropology suggests graded differences in the theological
identity of the human subject. Or more to the point, these
differences reveal multiple, perhaps antagonistic,
anthropologies. In principle, there appear to be time-bound
individuals populating the world along with personal beings
whose relation to other people and concrete circumstances
has eschatological significance. The encyclicals of John
Paul II, on the other hand, bring to bear not only the
element of creation, but also the person of Christ as the
image of the invisible God, and the destiny of human
beings.[160] In the final analysis, it is the proportion of
theological elements that helps to define the nature of the
human subject and the correlative objectives of rights and

---

[158]Ibid., 8-9. See also GS 22 and RH 8.

[159]Ibid. Note that eikona is the word which appears twice
in the Greek text of this verse.

[160] For example, see RM, 17-19, and VS, 15 and 45. See
also Cardinal Karol Wojtyla [John Paul II], Sources of
Renewal, trans. P.S. Falla (San Francisco: Harper & Row,
1980), p. 116. Wojtyla cites GS 19: "...the dignity of man
rests above all on the fact that he is called to communion
with God."

health care.

Based on a number of already stated values attached to the image of God, a range of analytical criteria can be presented. Any one of them may be considered necessary as part of a Catholic understanding of the image of God. However, no one of them (for example, divine creation of the human) sufficiently encapsulates a Catholic theological anthropology.

The criteria that indicate the underlying theological content of image of God (and also human dignity) language can be listed under Old and New Testament headings. The presence of the values represented by each criterion helps to constitute a balanced theological anthropology. Terms under the former expose image of God language as it relates to Gen. 1:26 and traditional image attributes such as the human capacities for intelligence, freedom and dominion.[161] Terms under the latter have a christological reference point. These connect personal dignity to the image of God in terms of that dignity's source and destiny. The Catholic theological understanding of the image of God attains its shape by the doctrines of the incarnation of Christ, divine filiation or adoption, and redemption. All of these are parts of a divine vocation to the beatitude of an eternal

---

[161]The terms may be signaled by reason, rational nature, liberty; also stewardship, work or participation as expressions of dominion over creation. Admittedly these can also be so-called natural law categories, but they are also to be interpreted as having theological origins and ends.

destiny.

The examination that follows is, then, based upon a reasonable contention that the analytical criteria can expose the presence or absence of key Catholic theological values in the select texts. No claim is being made that these criteria are exclusive or exhaustive, but only that they adequately test a specifiable content for purposes of comparison.

## Chapter Summary

In the next chapters, the work of analyzing and comparing the use of image of God language among select Catholic voices is based upon the three exercises of this first chapter: stating the problem, explaining the choice of speakers, and choosing and applying the analytical criteria. This introductory chapter proposes that a problem surfaces in the comparative reading of John Paul II, on the one hand, and the NCCB and the CHA on the other hand, as regards a human right to health care. The problem is this: is there a sufficiently unified understanding of 'the image of God' as a theological warrant so that one may speak of a "Catholic position" on the right to health care? Because image language helps to determine a theological anthropology in the rights domain, it molds understandings both of the dimensions of the human subject and the objectives of rights proposals. The degree to which the content and usage of image language coheres has consequences both for intra-

ecclesial discussions of theology and mission, and for the
role the church plays in shaping public policy.

The chapter presented the selection of Catholic
institutional speakers.  Each brings a level of recognized
authority to its assertion of a human right to health care.
Each relies upon 'the image of God' as a warrant for the
existence of such a right.  After a brief survey of how the
image of God typology has been and continues to be
understood and used, a number of theological concommitants
have been proposed as analytical criteria to test the
content of the image language in the selected documents.
The same criteria will be applied to each selected text.

Chapter II will be an analytical survey of how the
image of God appears and is construed in the ten encyclical
letters of John Paul II that were promulgated between 1979
and 1993.  The same survey of the selected NCCB and CHA
texts, the aggregate of which represents a United States
Catholic perspective, will be conducted in Chapter III.
Chapter IV will compare the two sets of texts, analyzing
their points of agreement and difference.  The final chapter
will make concluding proposals based on the comparison.

The conclusions will respond to the original problem:
how do the differences -- concerning the image of God in two
sets of texts -- impact the coherency of a Catholic position
regarding a human right to health care.  They will point out
some consequences for the intra-ecclesial formulations of

Catholic anthropology, social ethics, and institutional
missions.   Some suggestions about the public importance of
these findings will be offered, since these same
consequences influence the positioning of the Catholic
institutional voice in public and secular legislative
discourse.

CHAPTER II

IMAGE OF GOD LANGUAGE IN THE ENCYCLICALS OF JOHN PAUL II

This second chapter proceeds in four steps to examine the image of God language in the encyclicals. It begins by acknowledging that the papacy of John Paul II has emphasized the cause of human rights. Second, using the analytic categories listed in Chapter I, this chapter surveys the image of God language used in each encyclical. Third, it demonstrates that John Paul bases his support of rights upon a conception of human dignity that reflects a christocentric notion of the image of God. The survey indicates that the consistent, if not homogeneous, papal interpretation of the image of God in the first nine encyclicals receives a contrasting emphasis in the tenth. A brief evaluative summary will conclude the chapter.

Searching out the image of God language in the encyclicals brings one into the core of John Paul's theological anthropology, the heart of his encyclical teachings and human rights concerns. Analyzing this anthropology in terms of the image of God will provide two vantage points. One will uncover those theological strands that John Paul shares with traditional understandings about the image of God. The other will expose his particular

understanding of the image of God and facilitate a

comparison with the NCCB and the CHA theologies.

There is no denying that John Paul II has identified

church ministry with the promotion of human rights.[1]  His

assertion of these rights, and his particular vision of a

democratic society, is in keeping with the main lines of

Catholic theology.[2]  His anthropology offers a basis for

civil liberties, yet remains within the Catholic

communitarian understanding of society.[3]

In a letter dated 1 March 1978, the then Cardinal

Wojtyla stated to the editor-in-chief of Wiez that his

heartfelt concern was not directly with rights per se but

the human subject of these rights.[4]  The theological

---

[1]Franco Biffi, "I Diritti Umani," 226 and 242; Jerzy Galkowski, "Jean-Paul II et les droits de l'homme," in The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations, Vol. 2, ed. Pontifical Lateran University, Catholic University of Lublin (Florence, Italy: F. Le Monier, 1982), 1130.  John Paul II repeats his continuous advocacy of human dignity and rights in "As the Third Millennium Draws Near (Tertio Millennio Adveniente)," Origins 24, no. 24 (24 November 1994): 401, 403-416, especially at par. 22.

[2]See John Paul II, Laborem Exercens ["On Human Work"] (LE) (Washington, DC:  United States Catholic Conference, 1981).  Citations of the encyclicals will refer to their article numbers.  John Paul II surveys Catholic social thought in order to demonstrate that his viewpoint indeed follows a tradition.  Articles 1-3 provide a synopsis.  Consult footnotes in LE for a listing of the main documentary sources of the magisterium's vision of society.

[3]Baum, "The Originality of Catholic Social Teaching," 55-62 in Rerum Novarum:  A Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching, ed. John Coleman, Gregory Baum, Concilium Series (Philadelphia, PA:  Trinity Press International,1991), 56.

[4]Galkowski, "Jean-Paul II," 1130.

dimension of human dignity would remain his primary

interest. From his viewpoint human rights are at the

service of actual, living human beings: "The whole of the

rights of man correspond, in effect, with the substance of

the dignity of the human being, understood in his entirety

and not reduced to a single dimension."[5] He goes beyond a

descriptive human ontology formulated in natural law terms,

to pursue a notion of rights based in persons who are

entitled to just relationships. John Paul II emphasizes

justice as a service to the common good (and to persons)

rather than to individuals.[6] By situating the human person

in this way, he counters the individualism and the

individualistic liberty that lead to the privatization of

life.[7] Liberty and autonomy continue to be attributes of

---

[5]John Paul II, "International Relations: The Church's Task," Origins 9, no 35 (14 February 1980): 572. This text cites GS, 26, and John Paul II, Redemptor Hominis ["On the Redemption and Dignity of Man"] (RH), 245-273, in The Papal Encyclicals 1958-1981, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. (Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing, 1981), 13.

[6]John Langan, "Personal Responsibility and the Common Good in John Paul II, " 132-147, in Ethics, Religion, & the Good Society, ed. Joseph Runzo (Louisville, KY: Westminster/ John Knox, 1992), 138. Langan notes that John Paul uses the common good to replace Thomas Aquinas's uniquoque. He also observes that the pope's early writing tended to be more concerned with the ontology of the individual, later attending to person as the subject-in-community. For this reason, the terms individual and person are not readily interchangeable.

[7]Giannino Piana, "I diritti del'uomo nel magistero di Giovanni Paolo II," 471-485 in De Dignitate Hominis: Festschrift for Carlos-Josephat Pinto de Oliveira, ed. Adrian Holderegger, et al. (Freiburg - Vienna: Herder, 1987), 477.

persons, not of the super-subjective society or state. But

the structure of the social "subject" known as community

does have two meanings for this pope, both real and ideal,

ontological and normative. Human identity exists and

develops in relation to a principle of social

participation.[8]

The related elements of freedom, equality, and

participation have for some time now been the basic formal

expressions of human rights.[9] The recognition of these

formal elements, and the supply of those goods necessary for

free and equal participation, serve what John Paul sees as

the "high destiny of human beings to assume responsibility

---

[8]Galkowski, "Jean Paul II," 1135. This stance is apparent in John Paul II's characterization of justice and rights in RH, 17. See also Karol Wojtyla, The Acting Person (1969) trans. Andrzej Potocki, definitive text by Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, 1977 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979), especially Part Four, Chapter Seven, "Participation," pp. 261-300. Wojtyla refers again to this chapter in a later article, "The Person: Subject and Community," pp. 219-261, in Person and Community, trans. Theresa Sandok, OSM. Series: Catholic Thought from Lublin, Andrew N. Woznicki, gen. ed, vol. 4 (New York: Peter Lang, 1993). At 254-255 he states: "Participation . . . is a property of each I, by virtue of which the I fulfills itself by existing and acting together with others. The realization of the human we is in its full authenticity a true subjectivity of the many." For an example of the theological complement to this, see Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, Sources of Renewal, 61: The human resemblance to God finds "its basis, as it were, in the mystery of the most holy Trinity . . . by reason of his social nature, if by this we understand the fact that 'he cannot fully realize himself except in an act of pure self-giving.'"

[9]M. Douglas Meeks, intro., in Moltmann, On Human Dignity, 6; Drew Christiansen, "On Relative Equality," 651-675.

for their social existence."[10]  This pope challenges the

human subject to assume his or her proper social

function.[11]  He advocates two objectives implied by the

recognition of rights properly understood:  the limitation

of political or state power, and the ability of persons

actually to participate in building the common good.[12]

In addition to his advocacy of human rights generally,

John Paul II has specified that the right to health care is

included among them.  For example, in an address to the

United Nations on 2 October 1979, he endorsed the right to

"sufficient health care" as enumerated by Article 25 of the

1948 "Universal Declaration of Human Rights."[13]  He

mentioned this right four days later in an address to the

diplomatic corps in Washington, DC, and then to diplomats at

the Vatican the following January.[14]  Speaking later in

1980 about the various goals of medical research and care,

he enunciated that "the individual's personal right to

physical and spiritual life, to psychic and functional

---

[10]Baum, "The Originality of Catholic," 4.  See LE, 14, and
SRS, 15.  Also Langan, "Personal Responsibility," 139.

[11]Joseph Joblin, "La doctrine sociale de l'Eglise est-elle
universelle?," Gregorianum 74, no. 4 (1993), 685.

[12]RH, 17; Piana, "I diritti," 476.

[13]John Paul II, "Address to the XXXIV General Assembly of
the United Nations Organization," 35-60 in U.S.A.:  The
Message of Justice, Peace and Love (Boston:  St.  Paul
Editions, 1979), article 13 at p. 48.

[14]John Paul II, "International Relations," 572.

integrity" is a controlling value.[15]  Health and the right

to health care appear regularly in his social commentaries,

including those in the encyclicals.[16]

The Image of God:  Its Connection with
Human Dignity in the Thought of John Paul II

The assertion of human rights based on human dignity is

a standard of contemporary Catholic and papal social

teaching.  The concept of human dignity itself was not

prominent in papal encyclicals before Pius XI (1922-

1939).[17]  Dignity, rather than human nature as such, became

the standard of justice for Pius XII, and continued in the

papal encyclicals of Paul VI, John XXIII, and John Paul

II.[18]  Beginning with Pius XII, according to J.A.

---

[15]John Paul II, "Address to the Eighty-first Congress of
the Italian Society of Internal Medicine and the Eighty-second
Congress of the Italian Society of General Surgery," 22
October 1980, Hospital Progress 61, no. 12 (December 1980):
18.

[16]LE, 15, speaks of the necessity of health insurance, and
LE, 19, names a right to health care.  SRS underlines health
concerns at 14 and 42.  Readers of the more recent encyclicals
will notice the opening salutation, "health and the Apostolic
blessing."  See also John Paul II, Centesimus Annus, ("On the
Hundredth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum"), hereafter CA
(Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1991), 7,
8, 15.

[17]Mary Elsbernd, "Papal Statements on Rights:    A
Historical Contextual Study of Encyclical Teaching from Pius
VI - Pius XI (1791 - 1939)," Ph.D. diss. (University of
Louvain, 1985), 567n1.

[18]John A. Gallagher, "Theological Categories in the Social
Encyclicals," 36-46, in Rerum Novarum, ed. John Coleman, 42;
CA, 61; John Paul II gives a formal definition of a human
right as something that serves the essential dignity of the
person in CA, 11 and 24.  Cf. Michael J. Schuck, That They Be

Gallagher, "human dignity increasingly supplants human
nature as the basic standard of justice" in papal social
thought.[19]  The church had begun to react to experiences
with twentieth-century wars and non-democratic
governments.[20]

With the social encyclicals of John XXIII, human living
and working conditions began to receive the attention that
had been reserved previously to the distribution of goods.
In Mater et Magistra, he addressed contemporary social and
cultural realities, while including in the scope of the
common good, "the sum total of those conditions of social
living whereby men are enabled more fully and readily to
achieve their own perfection."[21]  Paul VI also championed
economic and cultural development, while insisting that the
correct measure of success in these enterprises should be an

---

One:  The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989
(Washington, DC:  Georgetown University Press, 1991), 178-180.

[19]Gallagher, "Theological Categories," 42.  Gallagher's
article argues that a "new set of meanings" began to replace
those associated with natural-law theory.  John Paul II, he
says, looks less to "a metaphysical reading of human nature"
than to the law of grace and one's being a child of God as the
foundation of one's dignity (43-45).

[20]Pius XII, "Christmas Radio Message," 24 December 1944,
Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS) 37, no 1 (1945):  10-13.  John
Paul cites Pius's 1941-1944 Christmas radio addresses in RH,
note 103.

[21]John XXIII, "Mater et Magistra" [Christianity and Social
Progress], 217-274, in Seven Great Encyclicals (Glen Rock, NJ:
Paulist Press, 1963), article 65.

integral promotion of the whole good of each person.[22]

Vatican Council II both reflected the growing centrality of human dignity for theology and politics, and provided a basis for its continuing elaboration.[23] The Council taught that human rights are based on God-given human dignity.[24] In Dignitatis Humanae, the Declaration on Religious Liberty, the council recognized an increased modern consciousness of human dignity as the warrant for freedom. The evolution of this doctrine -- influenced by Bishop Wojtyla's pleading[25] -- eventually included emphases that are repeated later by John Paul II: truly free human decisions ultimately relate to one's highest destiny. The Declaration made sure that "the freedom of the person is approached from the point of view of man's duty to assume responsibility for his relation to God in personal

---

[22]Paul VI, Populorum Progressio, 14, published as On the Development of Peoples in Pope Paul VI (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1967); see also Gallagher, "Theological Categories," 43.

[23]Hollenbach, Claims, 130.

[24]GS, 27 and 41. See also Walter Kasper, "The Theological Foundation of Human Rights," 47-71, in Human Rights and the Church (Vatican City: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 1990), 54.

[25]Avery Dulles, "The Prophetic Humanism of John Paul II," America 169, no. 12 (23 October 1993), 7. See also Carolus Wojtyla, intervention, 11-13, in Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II, IV-2 (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis, 1977); Kenneth L. Schmitz, At the Center of the Human Drama: The Philosophical Anthropology of Karol Wojtyla/ Pope John Paul II (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993), 114-115.

decisions."[26] Freedom serves self-existing truth which is

God himself (art.3). At the center of the relationship

between humanity and the revealed truth of the order of

things (art. 10) is the "Word made man."[27] This

relationship is pivotal in the thinking of John Paul as he

holds for the integrity of human reason, freedom and

truth.[28]

John Paul's philosophical conception of human dignity,

rooted in "the capacity to transcend mere self-interest and

embrace what is objectively true and good,"[29] is detailed

---

[26]Pietro Pavan, "Declaration on Religious Freedom," 49-86, in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Vol IV, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 67.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Kasper, "Theological Foundations," 56, notes that Catholic moralists such as B. Schuller often appeal to Thomas Aquinas's view of human reason to assert an autonomous morality. However, Aquinas (ST I II, q 91 a 1; q. 93 a 1-2) posits the participation of human reason in divine reason, which means "an innate orientation of human reason to truth in the Thomistic interpretation."

[29]Dulles, "The Prophetic Humanism," 7. See also Bishop Wojtyla's 1964 Vatican Radio address, "On the Dignity of the Human Person," in Person and Community, at 179. The proper end of the human being, "is intimately connected with truth, because the human being is a rational being, and also with the good, because the good is the proper object of free will.
"There is no way to acknowledge the dignity of the human being without taking this purpose and its thoroughly spiritual character into account. . . . The dignity of the human person finds its full confirmation in the very fact of revelation, for this fact signifies the establishment of contact between God and the human being. To the human being, created in 'the image and likeness of God,' God communicates God's own thoughts and plans. But this is not all. God also 'becomes a human being;' God enters into the drama of human existence through the redemption and permeates the human being with divine grace.

in his book <u>The Acting Person</u>.[30] Compare this with his

theological formulation of dignity that initially recalls

the creation narratives of Genesis: the human being was

created in the image and likeness of God, and given dominion

over creation (Gen. 1:26-28). But the measure and truth of

whatever is truly human resides in Christ. A. Dulles, an

American theologian, aptly summarizes this point for many

commentators when he states that, for John Paul, "the full

meaning of human life cannot be grasped except in the light

of Christ, who, in revealing God, reveals humanity to itself

(<u>Redemptor Hominis</u> Nos. 8-9)."[31]

---

"For those of us who are believers, this is where the
dignity of the human person finds its fullest confirmation."

[30]At xxi., A.-T. Tymieniecka, Wojtyla's English-revision
editor, indicates that this book is "strictly
anthropological."

[31]Dulles, "The Prophetic Humanism," 8. See J. Brian
Benestad, <u>The Pursuit of a Just Social Order: Policy
Statements of the U.S. Catholic Bishops, 1966-1980</u>
(Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1982), 120:
John Paul's anthropology is based on two fundamental beliefs:
we are created in God's image, and we are redeemed by Jesus
Christ; Archbishop Jean Honoré, "Christ the Redeemer, Core of
John Paul II's Teaching," trans. Nelly Marans, 12-26, and
Alfonso Cardinal Lopez Trujillo, "The Truth of the Human Being
in Christ," trans. Robert Barr, 122-143, in <u>John Paul II: A
Panorama of His Teachings</u>, G. Biffi, et al. (New York: New
City Press, 1989); see also F. Biffi, "I Diritti Umani," 228:
He describes the christocentrism of John Paul, insofar as
Christ is the key to understanding man. Also Piana, "I
diritti," 484: This author refers to this pope's
christocentric vision of the human being (<u>dell'uomo</u>) according
to Christian revelation as the "epicenter" of his pontifical
teaching. Cf., "Two Cheers for John Paul II," <u>The Christian
Century</u> 96 (4 April 1979): 364. The christocentric tendency
seemed so pronounced when it was promulgated that Kenneth
Woodward of <u>Newsweek</u> said that RH "sound[ed] almost
Protestant."

For John Paul II human dignity has its foundations

(Grundprinzipien) in the redemptive nature of the

Incarnation of Jesus Christ.[32]  The originality of his

ethics and his theology stems from his making Gaudium et

Spes, 22, the core of his estimation of the human being:[33]

"For by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in

some fashion with every man."  This is the keynote for human

dignity to which John Paul's proclamations consistently

return.[34]  In such unity each person shares a call and a

---

[32]C.-J. Pinto de Oliveira, "Die theologische Originalität Johannes Pauls II.," 60-91, in Johannes Paul II. und die Menschenrechte:  Ein Jahr Pontifikat, ed. O. Höffe, et al. (Freiburg, Switzerland, and Paris:  Universitätsverlag and Paulusverlag, 1981), 61, and at 82 note the phrase, "die erlösende   Inkarnation."     See   also   Vanhoye,   "Cristo Recreatrice," 34.   At p. 37, Vanhoye says that having the assurance   of   an   authentic   rapport   with   God   is   the 'insubstitutible' basis of human dignity.

[33]The authors' introduction, Johannes Paul II. und die Menschenrechte, 10, and Oliveira particularly at 61 and 82. See also Edouard Hamel, "L'Eglise et les droits de l'homme. Jalons d'histoire," Gregorianum 65, no. 2-3 (1984): 288:  John Paul   II's   greatest   originality   in   relation   to   his predecessors, is in his use of GS, 22.   Says Hamel, "Each person,   whether   he   knows   it   or   not,   exists   and   lives integrated into the mystery of Christ who·joins each man, as he lives his historical situation. . . ."  Also René Simon, "Le concept de dignité de l'homme en éthique," 265-278, in Holderegger, et al., De Dignitate Hominis, at 266: It is in the writing of John Paul II, "taken with its anthropological and theological connotations, that it [dignity] has come to the front line for the defense of mankind."

[34]See RH, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 18; Dives in Misericordia ["Rich in Mercy"] (DM), Origins 10, no. 26 (11 December 1980): pp. 401-416, art., 1; LE, 6, an article that refers to the whole of GS, Chapter 1; Dominum et Vivificantem ["Lord and Giver of Life"] (DViv), Origins 16, no. 4 (12 June 1986): 77-102, art. 53; Redemptoris Mater, ["Mother of the Redeemer"] (RM), Origins 16, no. 43 (9 April 1987): 745-766, arts. 4, 46; SRS, 47; Redemptoris Missio ["Mission of the

destiny whose ends, just as Christ's, are in God.[35]

It is worth noting here that John Paul also has employed the image of God as a psychological device in his dramatic writings. A piece of poetic prose he published in 1964 provides the outline and some of the passages for his 1979 play Radiation of Fatherhood.[36] This play, published under a pseudonym, was performed in Warsaw in 1983.[37] As K. Schmitz synopsizes this Polish-language drama, the character named Adam

> finds the invitation to participate in God's own fatherhood to be not a gift but a burden, an intrusion upon his loneliness . . . Adam rejects the burden of carrying the image of God within him and of communicating it to others.[38]

This connection between his philosophical, theological and

---

Redeemer"] (RMis), Origins 20, no. 34 (31 January 1991): 541-568, arts. 10, 18, 28; CA, 6, 47, along with 53 and 55 that cite RH, 13, which has a basis in GS, 22; Veritatis Splendor, ["The Splendor of Truth"] (VS), Origins 23, no. 18 (14 October 1993): 297-334, arts. 2, 28, 73; there is no noted citation of GS, 22, in Slavorum Apostoli, ["Apostles of the Slavs"] (SA), Origins 15, no. 8 (18 July 1985): 113-125.

[35]Cf. VS, 8: "At the source and summit of the economy of salvation as the Alpha and Omega of human history . . . Christ sheds light on man's condition and his integral vocation."

[36]Schmitz, At the Center, 19.

[37]See Karol Wojtyla, The Collected Plays and Writings on Theater, Trans. with introductions by Boleslaw Taborski (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), ix: The 1964 Reflections on Fatherhood was signed "A.J.," Andrzej Jawien. The Radiation of Fatherhood, published in 1979, is signed Stanislaw Andrzej Gruda.

[38]Schmitz, At the Center, 24. Regarding the connection of this play, the image of God, and John Paul's personalism, see also Schmitz, pp. 26-27, 76, 86-89, 93-95, 100-104.

literary interests underscores John Paul's ongoing attention to the _imago_ _Dei_ as a value for his anthropology. The relation of God to his Son, extended to those adopted in Christ, indicates a clear christological vector of the image that informs the pope's perception of the existence and function of human rights. The substance of dignity, as it exists both in and among human persons, derives from the human person as the image of God in Christ.[39]

Pope John Paul II's philosophical and theological anthropologies merge in the issue of human rights. He supported the _International Declaration of Human Rights_ from both perspectives during his 1979 address to the United Nations. The pope clearly rated the theological perspective as the more important one. Through Christ's relation to the human race comes confirmation of the rational assertion and legitimation of human rights.[40]

John Paul's construal of _Gaudium et Spes_, 22, coincides with some understandings of the image of God surveyed in Chapter I. Archbishop Honoré observes that the pope develops this part of the Council's message (GS, 22) along the lines of Cappadocian anthropology, giving priority to

---

[39]See DViv, 52, for example, which relates adoption to the mystery of the Incarnation.

[40]Otfried Höffe, "Philosophische Überlegungen," in _Johannes Paul II._, ed. O. Höffe, et al., 29; cf., Schmitz, _At the Center_, 121ff. The pope's understanding of person never allows him to separate rights from responsibilities (125).

person over nature.[41] This christology, and perforce the
anthropology, is defined by its economical aspect,
approaching "realities less in their truth per se than in
their significance, less in their ab aeterno essence than in
their relation to the order of salvation."[42] Cardinal
Lopez Trujillo calls attention to the pope's inclusion of
the theme of adoption or filiation of each person being
restored as a child of God, of being restored to the
likeness of God because of unity in Christ.[43] The
redemptive element of the Incarnation effects the adoption
and restoration associated with the human being as an image
of God. Restoration (deification) and the re- or con-
formation of persons to Christ as the image of God is
strongly suggested by the climactic use of 2 Cor. 3:5-6, 17-
18, in Veritatis Splendor, 117, especially when paired with
this encyclical's promulgation on the feast of the
Transfiguration.[44]

---

[41]Honoré, "Christ the Redeemer," 12-13, 22-23; he cites
GS, 22 and RH, 8.

[42]Ibid., 13.

[43]Trujillo, "The Truth of the Human," 129-130, 133.

[44]See VS, 117; also the Vatican Summary of VS, Origins 23,
no. 18 (14 October 1993), 335. Regarding the economic
relationship of truth and persons, the summary is careful to
point out that truth is first of all in the person of Christ
(Jn. 14:6), and that freedom and truth shine from "the face of
Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 3:5-18)." Cf. the official Latin VS, 117,
speaks of "imaginem," in AAS 85, no. 12 (9 December 1993):
1225, while the Vatican English-language translation uses
"likeness."

## Analysis of the Encyclicals

What follows here are analyses of John Paul II's encyclicals, 1979-1993, in ten treatments of unequal length. Please note that the encyclicals' use of image-of-God language is both direct and indirect. Direct use means that the words "image" and/or "likeness" appear in a text, or that a Scripture passage that contains these words is cited. For example, the Genesis text at 1:26-28 is obviously quite important, as is Col. 1:15. Indirect use, on the other hand, refers here to words or concepts that signal qualities attributable to the presence or growth of the image of God in human beings. For example, human intelligence or reason and freedom signal human attributes of the image.[45] Human dominion and stewardship of the created world are also attributes. Certain mentions of Incarnation, redemption, adoption or filiation, and human vocation or destiny reveal attributes of the human imaging the divine.

The use of image of God language across the ten encyclicals points up various consistent components of John Paul's theological anthropology. Such language is more pronounced in some documents than in others. Each of the texts does not reflect every analytical category. Neither do the texts use the theological themes (for example, creation or adoption) in the same proportion. For example,

---

[45]Chapter I has stipulated that there are good reasons for linking attributes to the image-likeness, and not to the likeness alone.

there is simply more image language in some encyclicals than in others, and a brief citation in one may refer to a sizeable treatment in a previous one. The encyclicals will be treated in the order of their chronological appearance to demonstrate both the main lines of his theology of the imago, and to highlight the seeds of an inconsistency that appears in the tenth.

The first four encyclicals provide a good indication of the varying theological emphases produced by differing uses of image of God language. The first of John Paul II's encyclical letters, Redemptor Hominis, is a detailed exposition of his theological anthropology. The Old and New Testament bases for image of God language in the Catholic tradition are well presented. The image, as it was revealed in Genesis and is renewed in Christ, incorporates most of the ontological-to-relational range indicated in Chapter I. Incarnation and adoption function as the doctrines that complete a Christian understanding of the imago. With his anthropology now "on record," it is not necessary to repeat it fully in his subsequent letters. As will be demonstrated in the following pages, sonship becomes the primary metaphor for the second encyclical; creation the foundation for the third; and without explicitly mentioning "image," the fourth highlights adoption through the Incarnation, with its accompanying vocation and destiny.

1) The term dignity, as human dignity, appears twenty-

one times in the text of <u>Redemptor Hominis</u> (1979). Genesis

is invoked once directly to underline freedom as an

attribute of that dignity.[46] For this pope, the notion of

the image of God in Genesis supports human dominion and

stewardship at a number of places.[47] The primacy of

persons over things, as well as human kingship and dominion,

share also in the <u>munus regale</u> of Christ himself.[48] John

Paul II refers to Gen. 1:26 to underline intellect, will,

and heart (the capacity for a relationship with God) as

attributes of the <u>imago Dei</u>.[49]

Article eight of this encyclical, "Redemption as a New

Creation," has already been noted for its link with <u>Gaudium</u>

<u>et Spes</u>. John Paul says "only in the mystery of the

Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light,"[50]

because, as he quotes the Council,

> "He who is the 'image of the invisible God' (Col
> 1:15), is himself the perfect man who has restored
> in the children of Adam that likeness to God which
> had been disfigured ever since the first sin.
> Human nature . . . in him, has been raised in us
> also to a dignity beyond compare. For, by his
> Incarnation, he, the son of God, <u>in a certain way</u>

---

[46]RH, 21.

[47]Ibid., 14, 15, 16.

[48]Ibid., 16.

[49]Schuck, <u>That They Be One</u>, 136, points out that this "ontological and psychological reality" of the <u>imago</u> is present in RH, 1, 7, 8, 14, and DViv, 54 and 59.

[50]RH, 8.

<u>united himself with each man."</u>[51]

John Paul inextricably weaves together the life and existence of each human being with the incarnate Son. In article eighteen he ties the Incarnation together with the "new man," the new creation, to transformation, redemption, adoption, and human vocation and destiny. It is, in effect, a summary of his anthropology.

> This union of Christ with man is in itself a mystery. From the mystery is born 'the new man,' called to become a partaker of God's life [fn 2 Pet 1:4], and newly created in Christ for the fullness of grace and truth, [fn Cf. Eph 2:10, Jn 1:14, 16] Christ's union with man is power and the source of power, as Saint John states so incisively in the prologue of his Gospel: '(The Word) gave power to become children of God.' [fn Jn 1:12] Man is transformed inwardly by this power as the source of a new life that does not disappear and pass away but lasts to eternal life.[fn Cf. Jn 4:14] This life, which the Father has promised and offered to each man in Jesus Christ, his eternal and only Son, who, 'when the time had fully come,'[fn Gal 4:4] became incarnate and was born of the Virgin Mary, is the final fulfilment of man's vocation. It is in a way the fulfilment of the 'destiny' that God has prepared for him from eternity. This 'divine destiny' is advancing, in spite of all the enigmas, the unsolved riddles, the twists and turns of 'human destiny' in the world of time.[52]

Redemption is therefore linked to a renewal and transformation of that image first revealed in Genesis,[53]

---

[51]Ibid. The emphasis is in the original as it cites GS, 22.

[52]Ibid., 18. For convenience the author has incorporated the contents of the footnotes (fn, in brackets).

[53]Ibid., 9 and 20.

and renewed in the person of Christ.[54]

As indicated above, adoption or filiation in the first-born Son comes about in the effects of the Incarnation upon the image.[55]  Textual references to adoption or filiation reflect a newness in the human image of God through Christ. Human dignity is now seen as the fruit of a renewed likeness to God, restored by what people share with Christ.[56]  Unity in Christ now defines the vocation and eschatological destiny of humans and humanity.  The finality of human history in Christ becomes the proper measure for human action.[57]

2)  _Dives in Misericordia_, the second encyclical written by John Paul in 1980, mentions dignity twenty times. It carries a definite but secondary treatment of justice and

---

[54]Ibid., 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 20.

[55]Ibid., 9, 11, 18, 20.  Mentions of the paternity or fatherhood of God in the encyclicals will be signals of the adoptive relationship, now an attribute of the image of God.

[56]Ibid., 20:  "The 'price' of our redemption is likewise a further proof of the value that God himself sets on man and of our dignity in Christ.  For by becoming 'children of God,' [fn Jn 1:12] adopted sons, [fn Cf. Rom 8:23] we also become in his likeness 'a kingdom and priests' and obtain 'a royal priesthood,' [fn Rev 5:10, I P 2:9] that is to say we share in the unique and irreversible restoration of man and the world to the Father that was carried out once for all by him, who is both the eternal Son [fn Cf. Jn 1:14, 18; Mt 3:17; 11:27; 17:5; Mk 1:11; Lk 1:32, 35; 3,22; Rm 1:4; 2 Cor 1:9; 1 Jn 5:5, 20; 2 Pet 1:17; Heb 1:2] and also true Man."  Citations [fn] included in text by the author.

[57]Ibid., 16.  See also articles 8, 14, 15, 16, 18.

rights issues.[58] Article seven twice mentions that humans are created in the image of God. Article one alludes to the dignity due to this image by reference to Christ the new Adam, who "reveals man to himself and brings to light his lofty calling. . . ."[59] The full measure of personal dignity cannot be manifested without reference to God.[60]

The primary metaphor in this document is sonship, the relation of father to son. Dignity resides in this relationship itself.[61] Even if the son is prodigal, "a son does not cease to be truly his father's son."[62] The father achieves a good through "the mysterious radiation of truth and love."[63] Article seven likens the relation of the Father to human beings, "created in his image," as an adoptive one. The pope recalls "the unheard-of greatness of man" addressed by <u>Redemptor Hominis</u>, and the chosenness of humans through God's own Son.[64] This adoptive bond is

---

[58]DM, 11, 12, 14.

[59]Ibid., 1, wherein GS, 22, is cited.

[60]Ibid., 1.

[61]Ibid., 5.

[62]Ibid., 6.

[63]Ibid. Cf. "<u>Dives in Misericordia</u>," AAS 72, no. 9 (29 December 1980): 1198: "impletum esse propter arcanum quandam veritatis amorisque communicationem." The official Polish text uses "promieniowania," that is, radiation. This is suggestive of the pope's attention to the <u>imago</u> in <u>Radiation</u> [Promieniowanie] of Fatherhood.

[64]DM, 7.

greater than that of creation as it grants participation in
the life of the Trinity.[65]  Because of divine adoption,
"the least of these" in Mt. 25:40 assume a doubly notable
dignity and an elevated status in John Paul's
anthropology.[66]  Finally, it is in the calling transmitted
to us through union with Christ in the Incarnation that the
great human vocation is a grounds for our "incomparable
dignity."[67]

3)  In the 1981 Laborem Exercens, the first of three
social encyclicals, human dignity warrants nineteen
mentions, and the dignity of work tallies six.  This
treatise "On Human Work" places human labor within the light
of a "living participation" in Christ's mission as priest,
prophet and king.[68]  It asserts the broad range of human
rights as complements to this participation.[69]  It supports
health care for the worker, rest from work, pensions, work-
accident and old-age insurance.[70]  The treatment of human
dignity, work and rights is backed by ten Genesis-based
(1:26-28) direct references to the image or likeness of God

---

[65]Ibid.

[66]Ibid., 1.  Where John Paul II cites Mt. 25: 31ff., there
is more to recognizing the needy than "as if" they were
Christ, the image of God, or true children of God.

[67]Ibid., 15.

[68]LE, 24.

[69]Ibid., 14, 16, 19.

[70]Ibid., 19.

in human creatures.[71] Human intellect or rationality,[72] as well as human work and dominion over the earth,[73] are the indirect references to humans as the image of God. These creation-oriented attributes receive a fuller sense in terms of Christ. It is the Incarnation that elevates the human subject and gives personal value to human work.[74] It is the personal, earthly labor of Christ which gives human work a redemptive purpose.[75] The text recalls that Gaudium et Spes, Chapter 1, lists the "principal truths" of how the human being, image of God, fulfills the calling to be a person.[76] By reference to God as "the creator and redeemer," the human being as the image of God has, in the same moment, an inseparable dignity and a vocational destiny.[77] By enduring toil human beings collaborate in the redeeming work of Christ.[78] Dignity is assigned to individual human beings, but not as a property of their

---

[71]Ibid., Introductory paragraph, arts. 4, 6, 9, 25, 26, 27.

[72]Ibid., 6, 11, 12, 13, 18, and 25 (citing GS, 34).

[73]Ibid., Introductory paragraph, arts. 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 16, 21, 26, 27.

[74]Ibid., 6.

[75]Ibid., 27.

[76]Ibid., 6; see 12: "Man alone is a person."

[77]Ibid., 4, 6, and 24.

[78]Ibid., 27.

individuality.[79] In other words, because of the social nature of human beings, dignity is an aspect of being a person among persons in community. Furthermore, dignity is evidenced in the complementarity of respect for persons and their actual participation in the upbuilding of the human community. A person "becomes more a human being" (art. 8) when one's work benefits oneself and humanity.

This encyclical does not directly employ the themes of divine adoption or filiation in order to elaborate upon image and likeness. It is in and through Christ, however, that we see how human toil and suffering are related to a "participation in the activity of God himself," as facets of the human "likeness with God, the creator and father."[80]

4) Slavorum Apostoli commemorates Cyril and Methodius, and is coincident with the eleventh centenary of the latter's death in 885. In this relatively brief encyclical, which celebrates a melding of faith and culture, dignity is said to be a characteristic of a nation, of culture, and of the human as a child of God.[81] Adoption and eschatological vocation are primary themes.

The "image of God" is not explicitly mentioned in the text. Scripture passages usually associated with the image of God in Genesis or the New Testament are absent from the

---

[79]Ibid., Introductory paragraph, 8, 20, 26.

[80]Ibid., 26, 27.

[81]SA, 1, 21, 30.

text and notes. Article thirty, the beginning of John

Paul's concluding creedal prayer for the Slavic people,

commends the Slav nations to the Trinity. He addresses God

as the Creator, who, through the Son, has called human

beings to unending life. Through the Incarnation every

human being "may in [Christ] receive the dignity of a child

and become co-heir of the unfailing promises you have made

to humanity."[82] Given the sequence of thought in the text,

adoption seems broadly available through the incarnation of

Christ, and narrowly and definitely through sacramental

baptism. Nevertheless, all people have dignity "as human

beings and children of God."[83]

The vocation and destiny of people and nations

according to God's plan garners considerable attention

within this letter.[84]

5) Dominum et Vivificantem, published in 1986,

mentions human dignity or the dignity of persons nine times.

The image and likeness of God has fourteen direct references

in the text.[85] The pope describes the nature of human

personhood, its function, relations and perfection, and

portrays a human as a created being, one in complete

---

[82]Ibid., 30.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Ibid., 16, 19, 20, 27, 30.

[85]See DViv, 12, 34, 36, 37, 52, 59, 60, 62, 64, 67. Image
is mentioned without likeness twice in 36. Likeness appears
alone three times in 59 and 62.

ontological and ethical dependence on the Creator.[86]

In _Dominum et Vivificantem_, John Paul speaks especially
of the role of the Holy Spirit.  He addresses godless
materialism as an affront to the dignity and destiny of
humankind.  Here again he uses the encyclical mode to place
his anthropology in high relief as the third Christian
millennium approaches.[87]  In doing so he reaches into the
Vatican Council's _Gaudium et Spes_, 24, to the union of
divine persons and the union of the children of God in truth
and charity.  He says that the human person finds the sum of
the whole of Christian anthropology in the gift of self to
God:

> that theory and practice, based on the Gospel, in
> which man discovers himself as belonging to Christ
> and discovers that in Christ he is raised to the
> status of a child of God, and so understands
> better his own dignity as man . . . .[88]

The phrase "image of God" carries the flow of all sorts
of doctrinal traffic within this encyclical.  The
ontological and economic facets of the _imago_ described in
the last chapter are in evidence here.  The gifts of
rationality and freedom represent both closeness to God and
the properties of intelligence and will.  The Incarnation
reveals that Christ is the model and means of relationship
to God.  Human psychological traits which mirror the divine

---

[86]Ibid., 44, 59.

[87]Ibid., 59; also 67.

[88]Ibid., 59.

enable human participation in that relationship according to a conceptual model suggested by Augustine and popular through the Middle Ages. The image carries the mark of the ongoing self-giving of the Trinity through the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18). And so as the encyclical speaks of bearing the mark of creation, "man in our image, after our likeness" reflects the Trinitarian society and God's self-giving.[89] "The mystery of the incarnation constitutes the climax of this giving, this divine self-communication."[90] The image and likeness is a gift which includes the properties of rationality and freedom, and the capacity to have a personal relationship with God, a friendship wherein the "'depths of God' become in some way opened to participation on the part of man."[91] The "image and likeness of God which man is from his very beginning is fully realized" in the human being through the Holy Spirit. This truth has to be continually rediscovered in the light of Christ.[92]

Dominum et Vivificantem reasserts that Christ remains the locus of relationship between the human and the divine.

---

[89]Ibid., 12. At no. 64, "The triune God communicates himself to man in the Holy Spirit from the beginning through his 'image and likeness.'" At no. 67, human beings are "created through love in the image and likeness of the most holy Trinity." It is the nature of this participation that seems to be brought into question in Veritatis Splendor.

[90]Ibid., 50.

[91]Ibid., 34, 36.

[92]Ibid., 59. The note (255) at this point refers to Gen. 1:26 and to Thomas Aquinas, ST Ia, q.93, aa. 4, 5, 8.

"The conception and birth of Jesus Christ are, in fact, the greatest work accomplished by the Holy Spirit."[93]  The openness of God is revealed at the point of Mary's obedient openness to the Holy Spirit, giving the human creature the fullness of freedom at this same moment.[94]

Article fifty-two is notably dense with signals of the creational, incarnational, and adoptive aspects of the image of God.  It bears the marks of the scholastic categories of grace and the supernatural, and of divine filiation planted in the soul.  Its resonance with patristic notions of deification is unmistakable.[95]  The mystery of the Incarnation is credited as the highest work of the Spirit. "The filiation of divine adoption is born in man on the basis of the mystery of the incarnation, therefore through Christ the eternal Son."[96]  Ontological and economical elements accrue to the adoptees by a particular outpouring (radiationem) on God's "little ones" by the Holy Spirit who

---

[93]DViv, 50.

[94]Ibid., 51.  See Schmitz, At the Center, 76, where he says that the opening to transcendence is the issue which Wojtyla presses more than the other phenomenologists.  This opening, Schmitz conjectures, is the opening to grace of which Wojtyla/Gruda writes in Radiation of Fatherhood.

[95]Chapter I mentions the idea of deification shared by Gregory of Nyssa with the Greek fathers, as well as its treatment by the International Theological Commission in Theology, Christology, Anthropology, 11-12.

[96]See also DViv, 49, 53, and 59 for mentions of adoption.

"radiates" new life in God's children.[97]

In the course of divine action, "Creation is thus completed by the incarnation and since that moment is permeated by the powers of the redemption, powers which fill humanity and all creation," thereby initiating in each and all a partaking of the divine nature. "Thus human life becomes permeated through participation by the divine life, and itself acquires a divine, supernatural dimension."[98]

The redemptive effect of the incarnation of Christ, which "completes" creation, is emphasized by the attention to divine adoption.[99] Otherwise this encyclical textually attaches redemption to the work of Christ as it is symbolized by the wood of the cross.

A divine, ultimate vocation is offered to each and all, an attribute of their being an image of God.[100] It is a call to friendship and fellowship with God, where "as image and likeness" one is called to participate in truth and love

---

[97]DViv, 20 and 60.  Again, adoption is central to the dynamics of the image of God in John Paul II.  This theme, which surfaces in his Radiation of Fatherhood, is echoed here. See Dominum et Vivificantem in Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS) 78, no. 9 (2 September 1986), 809-900, at article 20: "huius paternitatis radiationem [Pol., promieniowaniem] ad ipsius 'parvulos'. . . ."; at article 60: "quo Spiritus Sanctus sine intermissione lucem virtutemque immittit vitae secundum 'libertatem filiorum Dei.'"

[98]DViv, 52.

[99]Ibid., 52; also 49, 53, 59.

[100]Ibid., 53.

in union with God.[101]

In sum, _Dominum et Vivificantem_ brings to the image of God a range of traditional understandings which matches that in _Redemptor Hominis_.[102] It reflects Genesis themes where the human is a rational, free creature capable of a covenant with God. It accounts for the dynamics of Incarnation, adoption, redemption and vocational destiny. The ontological (human as creature; rationality, intelligence and freedom as properties[103]), functional (dominion, resistance to materialism), and relational (child of God, children through the Son by the work of the Spirit; having a capacity for personal relationship with God[104]) understandings of a human person as the image of God are used to name the origins of the dignity that humanity possesses.

6) _Redemptoris Mater_ was the first of two encyclicals promulgated in 1987. John Paul reflects upon "The Mother of the Redeemer," repeating various elements of his anthropology. Its general structure is aligned with scholastic constructs of nature and grace.[105] In the overall picture, human dignity springs from being a creature

---

[101]Ibid., 34, 37.

[102]Cf. RH, 8 and 18.

[103]DViv, 34, 36, 38, 51.

[104]Ibid., 34, 36, 52.

[105]RM, 8, 9, 10, 38, 45.

of God,[106] and from being adoptive children of God.[107]
However, the dignity of Mary derives from her being the
mother of Jesus, her freely chosen role undertaken in
obedient response to God.[108]  This special dignity is
associated with Mary's wholly unique election by God, rather
than the dignity which is attributable to divine
adoption.[109]

There are two direct mentions of the "image and
likeness" of God.  The first connects Gen. 1:26 and the
eternal design of God in Christ, Eph. 1:3.[110]  The other
instance notes that "in creating man, God gave him the
dignity of the image and likeness of himself."[111]  Mary
participates in these universally shared terms of the image
where she entrusts herself to God with "full submission of
intellect and will."[112]  In describing Mary's openness to
God, John Paul II places these ontological attributes within
the economy of salvation.  He relates the spiritual
dimension of her motherhood and the actualization of the

---

[106]Ibid., 37; in 46, see the citation of GS, 22.

[107]Ibid., 8, 9.

[108]Ibid., 10, 31, 39, 46.

[109]Ibid., 9.

[110]Ibid., 7.

[111]Ibid., 37.

[112]Ibid., 13, citing Dei Verbum [Documents of Vatican II],
5.  Also RM, 37: "[S]he is the most perfect image of freedom."

human "brotherhood" as a dynamic of "the salvific radius of God's fatherhood."[113] Her openness to being the image God makes way for the image in whom all people newly become children of God.

Adoption through the energies of the Incarnation plays a central role in the encyclical where, as the first article indicates, humans are destined to be God's children through Christ.[114] Everyone shares this destiny that has its beginnings in Christ. Just as Mary was the servant of the Incarnation, so is the church said to be in service of "the mystery of adoption to sonship."[115] Human dignity, and the vocation and destiny that ground it, flow from this adoption wherein Christ "reveals man to himself."[116] Being taken into Christ just as he is taken into human nature[117] returns to the keynote of John Paul's anthropology.[118] The human unity with Christ, who is the image of God, is a fact of the Incarnation, although it is, at the same time, an historically progressive and incomplete one. John Paul says

---

[113]Ibid., 21, Vatican English-text; official Latin, "in salvifico paternitatis Dei ipsius ambitu," "Redemptoris Mater," AAS 79, no. 4 (2 April 1987), 388.

[114]Ibid., 1, 7, 46.

[115]Ibid., 43.

[116]Vocation and destiny are mentioned in many ways, but particularly in RM, 46, and 7, 8, 11, 52.

[117]RM, 51.

[118]Ibid., 46, cites GS, 22, as does RM, 4 (twice).

that, "from the moment when the mystery of the incarnation was accomplished, human history entered 'the fullness of time.'"[119]  God, he relates,

> has matched the "divinization" of man to
> humanity's historical conditions, so that even
> after sin he is ready to restore at a great price
> the eternal plan of his love through the
> "humanization" of his Son, who is of the same
> being as himself.[120]

The text of the next and concluding article weaves together the faith and motherhood of Mary and the Incarnation with each and every individual.  Every human dimension is touched by Christ within history as it exists in Genesis right to the final end, within historical awareness and within the church, from the Fall to ultimate rising, from the eternal vocation to the goal of the eternal providential plan.  All are affected by the "'great transformation' which the mystery of the incarnation establishes for man."[121]  John Paul's concluding use of the terms divinization and transformation (arts. 51, 52) echo the patristic and eastern traditions that espouse the divine reformation of the image of God.[122]

    7)  The second of the 1987 letters, dated 30 December,

---

[119]Ibid., 49.

[120]Ibid., 51.  Emphasis in the original.

[121]Ibid., 52.

[122]Note Chapter I reference to Gregory of Nyssa and the Greek fathers, and to the International Theological Commission.

is also the second of John Paul II's social encyclicals.
Solicitudo Rei Socialis begins by reaffirming the church's
concern for "all dimensions of the human person." It
supports the existence of human rights, and actively rejects
their violation.[123] It addresses medical care as an
integral part of human development even where such care is
not the object of a specific right.[124]

Solicitudo assays the theological and ethical aspects
of human dignity insofar as the human being is created by
God, redeemed by Christ, made holy by the Spirit and called
to live according to this dignity.[125] Creation implies
"the unity of the human race," a fact carrying its own
"moral content."[126] Regarding a specifically Christian
dimension, this unity for "children in the Son" takes the
Trinitarian communion as the model for human solidarity.
Awareness of this communion presents a "new criterion" for
interpreting our worldview.[127] There is an identical human
dignity in each person as an image of the Creator.[128] This

---

[123]SRS, 26.

[124]Ibid., 14, 42. "Health" is in the salutation. Less
directly related to medical care specifically, the church has
a vocation to relieve suffering (art. 31). Where
participatory government is the desirable end, there is
mention of the "'health' of a political community (art. 44)."

[125]Ibid., 47.

[126]Ibid., 14.

[127]Ibid., 40.

[128]Ibid., 47, 29, 30, 33.

image is the basis of human dominion over nature,[129] an
attribute that is inseparable from the call to eternal
destiny.

Human life and endeavor have their full dignity in
relation to Christ, who is the perfect image of the
Father.[130]  One's neighbor is not only another person with
rights and a fundamental equality, but "a _living_ _image_ of
God the Father, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ."[131]
The adoption theme is implied at the mention of the common
fatherhood of God, and brotherhood in Christ for those who
are "children in the Son."[132]  The text recalls _Redemptor_
_Hominis_, art. 8, and _Gaudium et Spes_, 22:

> [The Church] well knows that -- in spite of the
> heritage of sin, and the sin which each one is
> capable of committing -- there exists in the human
> person sufficient qualities and energies, a
> fundamental "goodness" (cf. Gen 1:31), because he
> is the image of the creator, placed under the
> redemptive influence of Christ, who "united
> himself in some fashion with every man",  and
> because the efficacious action of the Holy Spirit
> "fills the earth" (Wis 1:7).[133]

The objective of all human, and therefore social,
activity is reflected in the call or vocation that expresses
human dignity.  The common good is at the service of the

---

[129]Ibid., 29, 30, 34.

[130]Ibid., 31, also 29, 40, 47.

[131]Ibid., 40, emphasis in the original.

[132]Ibid., 40.

[133]Ibid., 47, where note 86 specifies GS, 22 and RH, 8.

true good.[134]  Because of the high dignity of each person,
all goods are to serve the good of the human subject.  The
possession, dominion and use of created things and human
products are subordinated to "man's divine likeness and his
vocation to immortality."[135]  Even human rights are "based
on the transcendent vocation of the human being, beginning
with the right of freedom to profess and practice one's own
religious belief."[136]  Ultimately, human history and
authentic human achievement are said to be directed toward a
goal "which is always defined by its relationship to the
work of Christ . . . redeemed by Christ and destined for the
promised Kingdom."[137]

8)  The mystery of the redemption and Incarnation is
again a unity in the 1990 Redemptoris Missio, an encyclical
that maintains the continuing validity of the missionary
mandate of the Church.[138]  The text assumes the unity of
Christ with every human being, and specifically where John
Paul returns to his Vatican II keynote.[139]  The valid work
of religion in the support of human rights is contrasted

---

[134]Ibid., 28, 31, 36.

[135]Ibid., 29.

[136]Ibid., 33, emphasis in original; cf. arts. 28, 29, 30,
41, 47.

[137]Ibid., 31.

[138]RMis, 4, 88; also 31, 83.

[139]Ibid., 6, 10, 18, and 28 each cite GS, 22.

with ideological proselytism.[140]

Redemptoris Missio explicitly refers to Gen. 1:26, the "lexical gateway" to the doctrine of the image of God mentioned in the last chapter, stating that God created male and female in his image.[141] Equality, dominion over the earth, and the obligation to work for the development of the whole person and the whole of humanity are part of the grandeur of that image.[142] This image is understood in its unity with Christ, and only in him is any real freedom now a possibility.[143] The dynamics of adoption-filiation stamp the concept of the image[144] and the eschatological vocation.[145] Human persons and human activity, including missionary work, share a call to the same end.[146]

Up to this point in his encyclicals, the theological anthropology of John Paul II presents a vision of a human person as the image of God (revealed by Genesis 1:26) that

---

[140]Ibid., 37 and 86 talk about human rights for individuals and peoples; 46, the right to hear the good news; 71 and 77 refer to missionary activity as a right and a duty; 83 reminds that missionary activity is not reducible to defending human rights.

[141]Ibid., 58, 60.

[142]Ibid., 58.

[143]Ibid., 6, 11, 18, 87.

[144]Ibid., 11, 20, 43, 48, 60.

[145]This is distinct from the "missionary vocation" referred to by RMis, 11, 46, 48.

[146]RMis, 8, 11, 13, 20, 39, 59.

is historically transformed and transforming in Christ,
himself the image par excellence. In light of this
consistent feature, article seventeen presents a notable
caution. It warns against an anthropology that too easily
translates into ideology, that is, a program or horizon that
is closed to the transcendent. He objects to what he would
term omissions in socio-economic and cultural definitions of
the kingdom of God. He criticizes "kingdom centered"
conceptions which are silent about Christ in order
theoretically to attract a sympathetic audience in
pluralistic settings. "For the same reason," he says,
"[such conceptions] put great stress on the mystery of
creation, which is reflected in the diversity of cultures
and beliefs, but they keep silent about the mystery of
redemption."[147]

Chapter IV of this dissertation will argue that this
point is a key to understanding where John Paul's
anthropology can be compared with selected American
statements about the nature of human dignity, the human
person, and the proper object of human rights. Some of the
American documents do indeed hearken to creation and omit
mention of Christ and the vocation to redemption.

9) With the 1991 issue of his ninth encyclical, the
third of the social encyclicals, John Paul II brings the
mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption into high relief.

---

[147]Ibid., 17.

He recounts that the church fulfills her mission by following the way of Christ. It is "This, and this alone, [that] is the principle which inspires the Church's social doctrine."[148] <u>Centesimus Annus</u> leaves no doubt that, in the pope's view, a creation-based anthropology that is silent about Christ is inadequate for the theological and ethical-political understanding of human dignity and rights. The Church's "contribution to the political order is precisely her vision of the dignity of the person revealed in all its fulness in the mystery of the Incarnate Word."[149] Human dignity registers over thirty mentions throughout this letter.

The image of God that warrants dignity and rights is described in terms of the intelligence, freedom, and dominion associated with Genesis 1:26-28.[150] Without further qualification these attributes can just as well be asserted by a natural-law philosophy. However, this dignity

---

[148]CA, 53.

[149]Ibid., 47, citing GS, 22. Regarding the human vocation and destiny, CA, 6, refers the reader to LE, 6, which, in turn, cites the anthropology of GS, Chapter 1, including art. 22. See the previously cited International Theological Commission's <u>Propositions</u> on dignity and the Incarnation.

[150]CA, 9, 11, 22, 31, 32, 37, 43, 44, 47; Art. 22 states "that every individual -- whatever his or her personal convictions -- bears the image of God and therefore deserves respect." At one level, John Paul II stresses the image and likeness in Gen. 1:26 for the sake of continuity with Pope Leo XIII's encyclical. It should be noted that in article 57 of <u>Rerum Novarum</u>, cited by CA, 9, Leo acknowledges that the path and eternal destiny ahead of people are also bases of their dignity.

is subsumed and transformed because the human person has

been united to Christ.  In an allusion to Col. 1:15, we see

reference to "the transcendent dignity of the human person

who, as the visible image of the invisible God, is therefore

by his very nature the subject of rights which no one may

violate."[151]  Recall that Col. 1:15 is at the heart of

Gaudium et Spes, 22.  The theological categories that John

Paul is using here extend beyond natural law and grace that

are the principal, but not exclusive, controlling values in

his anthropology.[152]

The essential relatedness of people, which originates

from creation and is intensified in Christ, occupies a

significant place here.  The needy and the marginal are

represented in terms of Matt. 25:31ff., with a particular

identification of each human being as not only an image

(reflection) of Christ but as a presence of Christ

himself.[153]  The scriptural context suggests this is no

overstatement.  As was mentioned in the earlier survey of

how the imago was understood, Christ's presence in renewed

humanity is accomplished in the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18);

---

[151]CA, 44.

[152]See Edward Kaczynski, "La Dottrina Sociale della Chiesa
è Teologia Morale?," Angelicum 70, no. 2 (1993): 233-254,
responds to Gallagher, "Theological Categories," (natural law
and grace) with at least six categories, including
trinitarian, pneumatological, and sacramental.  These other
categories can be understood in christological terms: one
might say that being united with Christ is part of our nature.

[153]CA, 51, 57; cf. SRS, 40.

Patristic sources proposed a deification of persons who
shared in the restored image of God; and christological
interpretation of the image of God is normative in Catholic
theology. While the theme of divine adoption is not
explicitly present, its influence is felt in the reference
to the "human family" and the exhortation to care for one's
"brother and sister."[154]

It is plain in Centesimus that the image of God that
underlies human dignity is more than an attribute of a
distant destiny. The dignity attached to a personal
vocation and destiny is somehow in the historical present of
the 'new creation.' The nexus of dignity, vocation, and
destiny in the encyclical underlines the presence of the
renewed image.[155] As John Paul says in the concluding
article to this social encyclical,

> the Christian well knows that the newness which we
> await in its fullness at the Lord's second coming
> has been present since the creation of the world,
> and in a special way since the time when God
> became man in Jesus Christ and brought about a
> "new creation" with him and through him (2 Cor
> 5:17; Gal 6:15).[156]

The high dignity of persons so described requires, in
justice and truth, that fundamental human needs be met in
order that people can make an active contribution to

---

[154]CA, 51.

[155]Ibid., 13, 29, 39, 41, 51, 53, 59.

[156]Ibid., 62. Emphasis in the original.

humanity.[157] The provision of hygienic working conditions
and health insurance are products of modern reforms helping
to fulfill fundamental human needs and to foster social
participation.[158] Personal freedom and rights have an
intermediate end in the common good[159] but transcend
economics through a prior personal vocation that entails a
right and duty to seek God and live accordingly.[160]

10) The encyclical of 1993 discusses the foundations
of moral theology. John Paul again declares his
anthropological focus in the first sentence of Veritatis
Splendor, referring to "man, created in the image and
likeness of God (cf. Gn. 1:26). Truth enlightens man's
intelligence and shapes his freedom, leading him to know and
love the Lord." The first of this document's one-hundred-
eighty-four footnotes cites Gaudium et Spes, 22, the keynote
for the pope's anthropology and teachings about human
dignity and rights.[161] However, unlike previous
encyclicals, this one seems to resurrect a substantial
tension between conceptions of the image and the likeness of
God. In the end one might ask whether there is one idea of

---

[157]Ibid., 34.

[158]Ibid., 7, 8, 15. "Health" is again included in the
opening salutation, and is a practical concern in articles 36
and 57.

[159]Ibid., 47.

[160]Ibid., 29.

[161]VS, 2.

the image of God for politics and eschatology (relational, mystical, Cappadocian), and another for ecclesiology and moral instruction (ontological, scholastic).[162]

The encyclical contains over forty direct mentions of human dignity; the human image and/or likeness to God receives fifteen. Christ himself as "image" receives at least six direct and seven indirect mentions:[163] that Christ is the image of God; that persons reflect or conform to the image of Christ; and that human persons are themselves that image of God (99, 117). The combined mentions of the core human vocation, and the destiny or supreme good of that vocation, number over two dozen in a document having a manifest eschatological and teleological preoccupation.[164] The sublime vocation integral to persons is a part of being "sons in the Son" (18, 115), of being children of God (115).

Veritatis reconfirms the social doctrine that

---

[162]See William E. May, An Introduction to Moral Theology, revised ed. (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1994), 23-26. May's subsection "Two Kinds of Human Dignity" describes one kind as God's gift and the other as "the dignity that we are to give ourselves (with the help of God's unfailing grace). . . .(24)"

[163]VS, 2, 19, 45, 73 (twice), 117; indirect, 8, 21 (twice) 45, 86, 95, 99.

[164]Ibid., 64, cites St. Thomas on the connaturality between man and the true good; see also VS, 73-75; 73 relates morality "to God, the supreme good and ultimate end (telos) of man;" also VS, 1, 7, 8, 10-12, 17, 18, 30, 37, 42, 52, 58, 72, 78, 79, 82.

individuals have fundamental rights.[165] Mentions of health
and health care appear, but not in connection with rights
issues.[166] In evaluating one of the twentieth century's
major theological themes, it states that, at root, modern
totalitarianism denies "the transcendent dignity of the
human person who, as the visible image of the invisible God,
is therefore by his very nature the subject of rights which
no one may violate."[167] This "singular dignity" extends to
each and every human being, including the "neighbor" (Matt.
19:16ff; 25: 31ff.) who is another Christ.[168]

A Catholic philosophical, natural-law focus is evident
in John Paul's accounting of intellect, will, and dominion
over nature. This focus ostensibly satisfies two purposes.
The first is that it connects with a predominant twentieth-
century Catholic anthropology, as mentioned in Chapter I,
that finds the image of God in human reason and freedom.
Second, these traits are in the vocabulary of a wider
discourse. These attributes of the image of God -- when
seen as gifts of God -- figure importantly in the
encyclical's denial of a purely autonomous human reason.
Proper human freedom is in the service of the truth, and

---

[165]Ibid., 13, 30, 31, 51, 97, 98-101.

[166]Ibid., 116.

[167]Ibid., 99.

[168]Ibid., 13; see also articles 12, 14, 15, 52; DM 1.

truth is a precondition of freedom.[169] The mystery of sin

may darken the capacity for knowledge and weaken the will,

but because reason and freedom are attributes of the image

of God -- in which the human person participates -- they are

reliable.[170] John Paul rejects as false any distinction

between reason in an ethical order and the order of

salvation.[171] Reason and genuine freedom that shape the

world indicate a developing likeness to God, a dominion that

in a certain sense includes that of humanity over

itself.[172]

At the same time, Jesus as the image of God, redefining

the human creature in terms of the Incarnation and

redemption, is mentioned throughout. Christ is the

"essential and primordial foundation of Christian morality,"

which involves "holding fast to the very person of Jesus,

---

[169]Ibid., 34, 84, 86-88, 96. See also Richard A. McCormick, S.J., "Some Early Reactions to Veritatis Splendor," Theological Studies 55, no. 3 (September 1994): 502.

[170]VS, 1, 32-34. Acknowledging the susceptibility to erroneous perception is not the same as the automatic discounting or devaluing of the rational capacity in humans. There is here an issue of fundamental theology (the relation of God to humankind) related to christology: what is the relation of Christ with humans in the Incarnation? When he comes to substantiating concrete moral norms, perhaps John Paul II tends to adopt a subordinated image of God. See Jan Jans, "Participation - Subordination: (The Image of) God in Veritatis Splendor," 153-168, in The Splendor of Accuracy: An Examination of the Assertions Made by Veritatis Splendor, ed. Joseph A. Selling and Jan Jans (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995), 165.

[171]VS, 37, 45.

[172]Ibid., 38.

partaking of his life and his destiny," and imitating the

Father by imitating "the Son, 'the image of the invisible

God' (Col. 1:15). . . ."[173]  To this point the encyclical

has moved the image of God through two familiar levels: that

of the human creation in the image and likeness (Gen 1:26),

and that of reflecting, imitating or 'putting on' Christ as

one would a garment (Gal. 3:27).[174]

There is a third level, an intimation of a human person

actually being a new or renewed image, that begins its

appearance at article forty-five.  At this level there is a

new law:  a "fulfillment of God's law in Jesus Christ and in

his Spirit," an "interior" law, an attitude of heart that is

integral to a person.  As a way of caring for the world and

people, God predestines men and women "to be conformed to

the image of his Son."[175]  This appears to anticipate the

transformed and transforming image celebrated in 2 Cor.

3:18.  However, and without necessarily excluding non-

Christians, the pope writes that

the Christian is a "new creation," a child of God;

---

[173]Ibid., 19.  Here is an echo of John Paul's
philosophical allegiance.  Elsewhere he has written that
"Scheler emphasized in a special way the significance of love
for the person and the role of imitation of an ethical model
(eines ethischen Vorbilds) for the whole ethical life (das
gesamte sittliche Leben)";  from Karol Wojtyla, Primat des
Geistes: Philosophische Schriften (Stuttgart: Seewald Verlag,
1980), 38, quoted in Schmitz, At the Center, 37.

[174]VS, 19, 21, 95.

[175]Ibid., 45 and 21.  Arts. 2 and 19 name Christ the image
of the invisible God.

by his actions he shows his likeness or unlikeness
to the image of the Son who is the firstborn among
many brethren (cf. Rom. 8:29) . . . As St. Cyril
of Alexandria writes, Christ "forms us according
to his image . . . . The beauty of this image
shines forth in us who are in Christ, when we show
ourselves to be good in our works."[176]

With this amplification concerning human works, John Paul

seems to contrast the image from likeness in a manner that

is not as pronounced in previous encyclicals. His own

tradition had been to celebrate the image of God, or the

image-likeness of the Greek Fathers. The separation of

image and likeness suggests the reemergence of a previously

noted problem, one that continues to mark Catholic and

Protestant dialog. The question is this: in the

transformation of persons, how does the effect of the

Incarnation, redemption and adoption compare to the

influence of personal will and works?[177] Is the image

whose dignity, which warrants human rights, affected by

---

[176]Ibid., 73. Here note 123 quotes text from GS, 22, in
order to affirm Christ's relation "not only to Christians but
to all men of good will in whose hearts grace is secretly at
work." (Emphasis mine.) The note appears to be an implicit
attempt to span the contradictory human images of God: one is
a gift, one is the product of human activity. The tendencies
correspond to the foundations of Wm. E. May's two kinds of
human dignity (Moral Theology, rev. ed., 23-24). Jan Jans
("Participation," 167) sees the contradiction in terms of two
other images: either "God as the transcendental mystery of
involved love and the human person as categorical moral
subject," or "God as ruling king and human beings as obedient
servants."

[177]VS, 72: "If the object of the concrete action is not in
harmony with the true good of the person, the choice of that
action makes our will and ourselves morally evil, thus putting
us in conflict with our ultimate end, the supreme good, God
himself."

one's works?

The inference that image and likeness are again distinct realities is not diminished by the use of 2 Cor. 3:5-6, 17-18 (art. 117). The overall tone of the encyclical emphasizes the existence of genuine freedom, that "outstanding manifestation of the divine image in man."[178] But it attaches the image (with an implication of likeness) to a personal adherence to moral commandments, creating a tension between the foundations of human dignity that radiate from the incarnation of Christ,[179] and that which springs from obedient human action. The tension is reinforced by what may be a faulty translation. The Vatican English-text gives "likeness" for _imaginem_ (Gk., _eikona_) in v.18: "All of us . . . are being changed into his [Christ's] likeness from one degree of glory to another."[180] Where the present study is concerned, a logical question for Catholic social ethics is whether the possession or recognition of human rights (for example, the strength of personal entitlements or obligations) can depend upon a dignity whose warrant is measured by the existence --

---

[178]Ibid., 34, 38, 71; each of these cites GS, 17.

[179]Cf. GS, 22, and CA, 44.

[180]Ibid. VS, 117. The NAB text: "All of us . . . are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory." See also note 41.

as well as the intensity -- of an underlying image-likeness.[181]

## Chapter Summary

The encyclicals of John Paul II unquestionably rely upon the image of God in human beings to ground human dignity and to assert the existence of human rights. These rights are understood as the necessary social conditions for human dignity. When he asserts "the right to life and subsistence," the pope asserts that these rights are more than procedural in light of the principle of the common use of goods.[182] Beyond subsistence, the object of these rights includes a person's making an active contribution to the common good.[183] The person, the subject of human rights, is understood "as the visible image of the invisible God."[184] The Pope's conceptions of the image represent both the ontological and economic-relational theological tendencies described in Chapter I. The ontological side is contained in the properties or capacities resident in a

---

[181]For example, if Wm. E. May's assertion of two human dignities is assumed, in what proportion do they ground rights? Claims to goods or services could be granted to those whose behavior is judged to be morally commendable, and denied to those whose behavior is not. What tribunal would decide this? And how would the values of behaviors be weighted? Discussions about health care rights in the main have rejected distributions based on personal behavioral worthiness.

[182]LE, 18; also 14, 19.

[183]CA, 34.

[184]Ibid., 44.

human being. This tendency marks the Western definition of the image of God, with its roots in St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and in Scholastic theology. Recall that both Augustine and Thomas placed human intellectual nature in the soul, and it is the soul that images God. In general, the ontological focus in John Paul's encyclicals presents human beings as created in God's image and likeness as revealed in Gen. 1:26. In light of the cooperative work with which the first humans were charged by God, the image and likeness are seen in the attributes of human reason, freedom, equality,[185] and dominion over created things. This pope also attaches "heart" to the often paired intellect and will in order to connote a capacity to form a relationship with God.

The second tendency in the encyclicals, the economic-relational understanding of the image of God, is primarily delimited by New Testament revelation and patristic theology. Chapter I noted that this represents more of an Eastern and Orthodox understanding of the image which also has the sympathy of Protestant theology. The image of God in human beings has been renewed by way of the Incarnation of Christ. This is the keynote in Gaudium et Spes, 22, to which John Paul often returns. Through Christ the ontological attributes of human persons are transformed in their relation to a new, graced economy. Humans are far

---

[185]SRS, 40, and RMis, 58.

more than the sum of their capacities. Their personhood is
related to participation in the life of the Trinity, to
communion with God and one another, and to shared solidarity
among all humans. This newness is a consequence of each
human person being united to Christ, the perfect image of
God, by means of the redemptive energies of the Incarnation
which effect one's adoption as a child of God. The renewal
of the human image carries with it a vocation to
transcendence and to a final destiny with God. The image
that is understood in terms of creation is now renewed and,
in one sense, is completed in the person of Christ. The
tenth encyclical shares this preponderant sense with the
first nine, but it poses something of a contrast as well.
In it the openness of human will and the content of human
behavior are determinative, if not of the image itself, of
the likeness to God as it shows or reflects the image.[186]
This pronounced contrast, if not an outright inconsistency,
is not a complete surprise. The potential for an opposition
between image and likeness is foreshadowed by the presence
of scholastic categories in John Paul's previous writings.
The inconsistency, however, raises questions about
interpreting the pope's theological concept of human dignity
as it relates to the image of God, and about how it affects
his notion of rights. Theologically speaking, the
differentiation of image from likeness in the discussion

---

[186]See VS, 73.

about human dignity surfaces a difference existing between
argumentation and exhortation, between normative foundation
and parenesis.[187]   A question remains as to whether the
pope's various usages somehow compromise a normative formula
(human dignity) that warrants rights by means of a parenetic
style that implies states of imperfect dignity.  There is at
least one implication for the definition of human rights
themselves.  The existence of measurably unrealized or
imperfect types of human dignity could form the foundation
of unequal rights, claims, and obligations for social
participation.  To say that one has rights based on the now
differentiated image and likeness to God suggests a grading
of rights.  Or worse, the _imago_ could be seen as a
functional rather than substantive element in Catholic
theological anthropology.

When one takes these encyclicals as a group, one sees
that John Paul II holds that the image of God and human
history can now only truly be fully understood through the
incarnate Son of God.  He has cautioned against the
shortcomings of creation-based theological and ethical
constructions that lack reference to Christ.  By their
omission of reference to Christ, he contends that such

---

[187]See Salvatore Privitera, "L'antropologia di San
Basilio:  La dignità dell'uomo e l'argomentazione etica nella
teologia ortodossa," in Holderegger, et al., 36; cf. the
"indicative" and "imperative" of a person's transcendent
dignity in David Hollenbach, Justice, Peace, and Human Rights:
American Catholic Social Ethics in a Pluralistic World (New
York:  Crossroad, 1988), 95-96.

constructions are less open to the transcendence of human purposes, and more liable to ideological manipulation.[188] The lack of a transcendent perspective might, for example, encourage the formulation of individual rights at the expense of the common welfare. Such a lack might also restrict personal interests in religion, or permit the state to legislate that it is the horizon of highest good. As it happens, each of his social encyclicals carefully locates Christ at the source of the church's social doctrine.[189] These three encyclicals feature dignity mainly in light of different aspects of the human relationship to God: work is a share in the dominion of Christ; human solidarity has the Trinitarian communion as its source and model; persons benefit from the mystery of the incarnate Word. When the fourth chapter of this dissertation compares the papal and American documentary evidence about the contents or attributes of the image of God, the presence or absence of christological elements will provide the telling contrast.

The next chapter takes up the analysis of image of God language in some United States documents. The selections were published by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Health Association from 1979 through 1993. Paralleling the development of this present chapter, it will explain that human rights, including the

---

[188]RMis, 17.

[189]E.g., LE, 24; SRS, 47; CA 47.

right to health care, are ongoing concerns in the social ethics of these organizations. The chapter will survey how "the image of God" undergirds the understanding of human dignity in the foundation of rights, first in NCCB, then in CHA documents. Points of contact between the documents and the traditional notions of the image of God will be recorded. The surveys will be thematically summarized to set the stage for a thematic comparison.

# CHAPTER III

## IMAGE OF GOD STATEMENTS

## IN THE UNITED STATES DOCUMENTS

The conceptual content of the image of God has implications for both the human subject and the object of rights, particularly for any right to health care. As we have seen, the doctrine of the imago has roots in Genesis, but its Catholic understanding is properly defined by the Incarnation. This understanding implies several gross differences for theological-anthropology, for human rights, and for health care. First, the human being -- as a pre-eminent creature, with his or her capacities for reason, will, and dominion/stewardship -- is reformed by the Incarnation. Protestant and Catholic theologies reflect this reform, the latter, for example, in literature from Vatican Council II, John Paul II, and the International Theological Commission. The nature of this reform makes it clear that while human dignity remains an attribute of individual people, it does not reside in their individuality. Instead, it is theirs because they are somehow united with Christ (GS, 22), adopted children of God, and called to an eternal destiny in God. By sharing in the image of Christ, the dignity of persons flows from this

114

relationship which effects a relationship with all others who are also united with Christ, with those who are now our brothers and sisters, and with whom we share a destiny. Through Christ we understand the image of the trinitarian God to be a social one, and so the "person in society" becomes a decisive anthropological construct. This latter construct is the second gross difference, where the human subject is less an individual with a certain capacity for dominion, and more definitely the whole person in society who shares a call to a transcendent end. Without fully elaborating the implication at this juncture, it should be noted that definitions of mental, physical, and public health express anthropological assumptions: the concept of healthy human living depends upon one's concept of a human being. This implies a third difference. The substance of health or health care, as possible objects of a human right, are also shaped by theological-anthropological assumptions. For example, one's share of monetary resources or claims to physical integrity, rather than one's social functioning and participation, might be more important to an individualist than to the Christian who sees herself as a person-in-society. Points of view would also direct one's ideas about rights claims, resource-allocations or rationing in health care. For example, how should they behave who profess to live in the image of Christ if Jesus himself did not avoid suffering or death at all costs?

Having examined the conception and use of the image of God in recent papal encyclicals, our attention turns now to its content and function in pronouncements made in the United States. The present chapter analyzes selected documents published by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Health Association of the United States.[1] It pursues two objectives by using the same analytical categories for the American texts as for the papal encyclicals: first, to describe the image-based theological content, and to record both anthropological complements and differences among American perspectives; second, preparatory to Chapter IV, to arrange these findings so that they can be compared with those in Chapter II. The comparison will counterpose the papal and American understandings of the image of God as it is applied to human dignity and rights, particularly the right to health care.

The NCCB and CHA publication dates, ranging from 1979 to 1993, match the time span of the first ten encyclicals by John Paul II. In both the NCCB and the CHA statements, human dignity based on the image of God is presented as the main theological warrant for human rights. Each of the selected documents represents a theological anthropology that is relevant to the present discussion about dignity and rights. For this reason, even if a selected NCCB or CHA

---

[1]See Chapter I, n.8, for brief descriptions of these organizations.

document does not specifically mention a right to health care, it still reflects a theology operating in that particular organization. Please note that the NCCB and the CHA are linked by more than nationality, Catholic identity and theology. They have collaborated in crafting position statements and policy recommendations for both the U.S. Catholic ecclesial and federal governmental spheres.

Analysis will reveal an element in these American sources that will be crucial in the comparison of their theological anthropologies with that in the encyclicals of John Paul II. This element resides in the relatively weak christology of the majority of these United States documents. For example, the words or the actions of Jesus carry some normative weight within these documents, but they overlook the effects of the <u>fact</u> of his incarnate existence in the world. Or, to recall from Chapter I Augustine's appreciation of human reformation in Christ, we need to ask whether the image of God that humanity now bears is the pristine nature of Adam, or the reformed and "better" image of God in Christ. The next chapter will speculate about the origins of this weakness and its intra-ecclesial and public implications for Catholic social ethics.[2]

---

[2]For example, one might argue that low versus high christologies are the root cause, or that some documents were crafted for pluralistic, non-sectarian readership.

## National Conference of Catholic Bishops

The body of United States Roman Catholic bishops had
endorsed the right to health care and the need for national
health insurance even before the 1981 pastoral letter
"Health and Health Care."[3]  This same body had also been
accustomed to seeing rights as a function of human
dignity.[4]  As was stated in Chapter I, the 1981 letter had
its genesis in a request from the CHA, and was the first to
be titled and focused on health care and the human right to
that care.  In the 1993 "Resolution on Health Care Reform,"
the NCCB reasserted the right to health care as one of "the
means which are suitable for the full development of

---

[3]Bishop Peter Muldoon, Chairman, NCWC, "Program of Social
Reconstruction," (1919) 255-271, in Nolan, ed., Pastoral
Letters, Vol. 1, at 266-67.  After the reorganization in 1966,
pastoral letters and statements were not signed; Committee on
Health Affairs, USCC, "Statement on National Health
Insurance," (2 February 1971), 256-257, in J. Brian Benestad
and Francis J. Butler, eds., Quest for Justice: A Compendium
of Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on the
Political and Social Order 1966-1980 (Washington, DC: United
States Catholic Conference, 1981); NCCB, "Society and the
Aged:  Toward Reconciliation," (5 May 1976), 138-145, in
Nolan, ed., Vol. 4, at 139 and 144; USCC, "Political
Responsibility:  Choices for the 1980's," (26 October 1979,
updated March 1984), 317-329, in Nolan, ed., Vol 4, at 323 and
326.

[4]See NCWC, "Present Crisis," (25 April 1933), 375-403, in
Nolan, ed., Vol 1; NCWC, "A Statement on Man's Dignity," (21
November 1953), 448-455, in David M. Byers and John T.
Pawlikowski, eds., Justice in the Marketplace:  Collected
Statements of the Vatican and United States Catholic Bishops
on Economic Policy, 1891-1984 (Washington, DC: United States
Catholic Conference, 1985).

life."[5]  Again the right is said to be based on a

fundamental principle, the sacredness and dignity of "all

human persons, who are made in the image of God."

The purpose of this subsection on the NCCB is to

analyze the pastoral letters that connect a theological

anthropology based on the image of God with its use as a

warrant for human rights, including the right to health

care.  The designation "pastoral letter" denotes a document

that has received the deliberation and passing vote of the

entire episcopal conference, yet it serves us to notice that

---

[5]_Origins_ 23, no. 7 (1 July 1993): 99, 101.  Health care
is included among basic rights warranted by human dignity in
"A Century of Social Teaching:  A Common Heritage, A
Continuing Challenge," a Pastoral Message of the NCCB on the
100th Anniversary of Leo XIII's _Rerum Novarum_, 13 November
1990, 1-9, in NCCB, _Contemporary Catholic Social Teaching_
(Washington, DC:  United States Catholic Conference, 1991).
The USCC, the secretariat for the NCCB, has also restated the
right.  See "Statement on Social Security," March, 1983, 487-
490, in Nolan, ed., _Pastoral Letters_, Vol. 4, 488; "Political
Responsibility:  Choices for the 1980's," A Statement by the
Administrative Board of the USCC, March 1984, 95-108, in
Nolan, ed., Vol. 5, specifically at articles 40-42, where
health care is called a basic human right, and the bishops
repeat their support for "the adoption of a national health
insurance program"; Cardinal John J. O'Connor, "The Right to
Health Care," _Origins_ 15, no. 12 (5 September 1985): 166-168.
Some might distinguish the "basic right to health care" in
this text from a "basic human right" in the editor's
introduction; "Political Responsibility:  Choices for the
Future," Statement by the Board of the USCC, September 1987,
in Nolan, ed., Vol. 5, at 534-535; "Testimony to Democratic
and Republican Platform Committees," Testimony presented by
the director of the USCC Government Liaison Office on Behalf
of the Bishops of the United States, 10 May 1988, 645-656, in
Nolan, ed., Vol. 5, at 651; "Health Care Reform Criteria,"
adopted by the Domestic Policy Committee on 28 January 1992,
photostat; Bishop James W. Malone, chairman, USCC Domestic
Policy Committee, letter to Congressional Representatives,
dated 14 April 1992, photostat.

"statements" carry a similar authority in practice.[6]   A

number of statements will be cited to yield a fuller picture

of the conference's anthropology.

From 1979 to 1993 the NCCB issued six pastorals that

portray a theological anthropology having conceptual roots

in the imago Dei.[7]  As will be demonstrated, each of them

touches upon the orders of creation and redemption in

defining social relationships.   Perhaps because the last one

examines "contributive justice," rather than distributive

justice and rights, the text of Stewardship does not employ

the term "dignity."[8]

1)   The christocentric associations of the image of

---

[6]In the prefaces to both Vols. 4 and 5 of Pastoral
Letters, Hugh J. Nolan, ed., advises his reader that it is not
possible to draw a clear-cut line between Pastorals and the
Statements issued by the bishops collectively.

[7]"Brothers and Sisters to Us," U.S. Bishops Pastoral
Letter on Racism, Origins 9, no. 24 (29 November 1979): 381-
389; "Health and Health Care," Pastoral Letter on Health and
Health Care, Origins 11, no. 25 (3 December 1981): 396-402;
The Challenge of Peace:  God's Promise and Our Response,
Pastoral Letter on War and Peace (Washington,DC:   United
States Catholic Conference, 1983); Economic Justice for All:
Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S.
Economy (Washington, DC:   United States Catholic Conference,
1986); Stewardship: A Disciple's Response, Pastoral Letter on
Stewardship   (Washington,   DC:      United   States   Catholic
Conference, 1993).

[8]Stewardship, 36.   "Dignity" does not appear in the text,
nor in the official summary, pp. 45-48.  A discussion question
on p. 38 mentions "dignity, equality, and unity."   For the
justice perspective that is more commonly applies to sharing
one's property, see Charles E. Curran, "The Right to Health
Care and Distributive Justice," 139-170, in Transition and
Tradition in Moral Theology, ed. Charles E. Curran (Notre Dame
[IN] - London:  University of Notre Dame Press, 1979).

God, so prominent in the Vatican II documents and John Paul
II's first encyclical, is evident in "Brothers and Sisters
to Us," the 1979 letter on racism.  Calling several times
upon the theology in <u>Redemptor Hominis</u>, it proposes that the
remedy for racial injustice "is the re-creation of the human
being according to the image revealed in Jesus Christ.  For
he reveals in himself what each human being can and must
become."[9]  Racism is itself described as an evil "dividing
the human family and denying the new creation of a redeemed
world."[10]

Human dignity, which the document mentions eight times,
flows from our being made in the image of God,[11] and from
sharing in the image of Christ[12] as children of God and as
brothers and sisters.[13]  The divine adoption is at the
heart of human dignity:  "It is in Christ, then, that the
church finds the central cause for its commitment to justice
and to the struggle for human rights and the dignity of all

---

[9]"Brothers and Sisters," 386.  The christocentric
assertions of this letter are particularly intense in light of
possible strong readings of RH.  See Roger Hazelton,
"Redeeming Humanity:  The Pope's Theological Vision,"
<u>Christian Century</u> 96 (3 October 1979), 945: "True redemption
is offered by God in Christ for human appropriation, but not
as a remedy or reparation for sin only; here it is conceived
as nothing less than the total re-creating of humanness
itself. . . . by virtue of the incarnation."

[10]Ibid., 387.

[11]Ibid., 383, 385, 387.

[12]Ibid., 386 especially, and 383, 385, 387.

[13]Ibid., 381, 383, 385, 387.

persons."[14] A striving to provide "health care for all" is part of that commitment.[15]

This relatively brief pastoral letter does not advert to the full scope of properties or relationships that the use of "image of God" can imply. It does not refer to human intellect, will, and dominion over the earth. Unlike the majority of NCCB documents to be cited here, it has a predilection for seeing people and social relations in the light of New Testament teachings.

2) "Health and Health Care," approved by the NCCB membership in November, 1981, was written in collaboration with the CHA, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the USCC.[16] Among the expressed designs for this pastoral letter were a reflection "on the biblical and theological principles which undergird the Church's vision of health and healing," and a presentation of "basic principles for public policy on health."[17] There are thirteen mentions of human dignity. The phrase "image of God" is used three times.[18] One finds the assertion that

---

[14]Ibid., 383. At p. 385: "This is the mystery of our church, that all men and women are brothers and sisters, all one in Christ, all bear the image of the eternal God."

[15]Ibid., 388.

[16]"Health and Health Care," 402.

[17]Editorial comment, Nolan, ed., Pastoral Letters, Vol 4., 296.

[18]"Health and Health Care," 397, 402.

"Every person has a basic right to health care. This right flows from the sanctity of human life and the dignity that belongs to all human persons, who are made in the image of God."[19] The presence of image-language in the document functions as a formulary bridge between the concepts of creation and dignity. It never cites Genesis 1:26-27 itself in connection with the image of God, although it does speak of the human capacity for a "reasonable dominion over nature."[20]

The effects of the Incarnation receive minimal attention. "[Christ] came to the world to make us fully human, to help us realize our human dignity as creatures made in the image of God. He came to bring fullness of life."[21] Even though Mt. 25:34ff. is quoted, only the teaching and example of Jesus (as an image-model or pattern) are accounted for in relation to the human situation. While the order of creation is a foundational component within this pastoral document, there is no development concerning the redemptive effects of the Incarnation upon human dignity. A concluding comment simply quotes the Book of Revelation to the effect that Christ "will make all things new."[22] Fairly weak allusions to divine adoption through

---

[19]Ibid., 402.

[20]Ibid., 400.

[21]Ibid., 397.

[22]Ibid., 402.

Christ, or even the divine vocation or destiny of human beings, restrict theological implications for the notion of health. The absence of incarnational or christological connections here is pivotal for testing the theological interpretations of health, and of the care to which people have rights.

"Health and Health Care" defines "health" in two related ways. First, health "in the biblical perspective means wholeness -- not only physical, but also spiritual and psychological wholeness; not only individual, but also social and institutional wholeness."[23] Second, if it is true that health goes beyond medical concerns alone, healing and health maintenance are not the sole the responsibility of health professionals.[24] Given this foundation, the portrait of the object of health care rights is similarly diffuse. There is a "responsibility by society to provide adequate health care which is a basic human right." Add to this also "preventative health measures," the "maintenance of health," aid to the common good by "adequate health care" and "adequate health insurance." Yet again there is "access to that health care which is necessary for the proper development and maintenance of life," with special attention to "the basic health needs" of the poor.[25] Any

---

[23]Ibid., 397.

[24]Ibid., 398.

[25]Ibid., 402, emphasis added.

comprehensive health system should use "the cooperative resources of both the public and private sectors."[26]

These definitions and objectives would be modified if there was an accounting for the effects of the Incarnation. The mortality of Jesus by itself raises questions about the health and wholeness of a society. For example, any fruitful discussion of resource allocation or community housing assumes that death is a necessary "resource" in the distributions of materials and living space. The moment of individual extinction is an actual pulse in the continuing life of a community. This is a theological, economic and political fact. It is also a medical fact whose occurrence comes increasingly under the influence of medical technologies and personal decisions. The tension between individualistic and social definitions of personal health-rights mirrors the tension one might find between the duties of an internist and those of her colleagues in public-health; that is, the understanding of health involves a tension between individual and community needs. As the Catholic Church talks of personal needs, it assumes the existence of a person-in-community. This is how "person" is understood, for example, as "Health and Health Care" quotes John Paul II in a 1980 talk to Italian physicians and surgeons: "The person, in fact, is the measure and

---

[26]Ibid.

criterion of good or evil in all human manifestations."[27]

3) Taking this project's analytical criteria as the standard, there is a comparatively wide theological vision in The Challenge of Peace (1983). The phrase "created in the image and likeness of God" appears only once, as an attribute of the Soviet people and its leaders.[28] Personal or human dignity is mentioned ten times, and it is addressed in a more dynamic context than in the above two pastorals.

The religious vision is presented near the beginning of the whole text: "The biblical vision of the world, created and sustained by God, scarred by sin, redeemed in Christ and destined for the kingdom, is at the heart of our religious heritage."[29] We are then told:

> At the center of the Church's teaching on peace and at the center of all Catholic social teaching are the transcendence of God and the dignity of the human person. The human person is the clearest reflection of God's presence in the world; all of the Church's work in pursuit of both justice and peace is designed to protect and promote the dignity of every person. For each person not only reflects God, but is the expression of God's creative work and the meaning of Christ's redemptive ministry.[30]

The combination of human nature and destiny[31] is pivotal

---

[27]Ibid., 400.

[28]Challenge, 258. This document's article numbers are cited unless noted otherwise.

[29]Ibid., 14.

[30]Ibid., 15.

[31]Ibid., 65.

for the interpretation of dignity as a warrant for
rights.[32]  Both the ontological and the economic-relational
elements of the theology of the image of God that were
surveyed in Chapter I are evident here.

Challenge presents an anthropology circumscribed by the
theological vision just quoted.  Human beings are described
as stewards of the earth.[33]  Unlike "Brothers and Sisters
to Us," this document never explicitly links humanity to
Christ in terms of the image of God.  Nonetheless, the
effects of the Incarnation are implied.  "For each person
not only reflects God, but is an expression of God's
creative work and the meaning of Christ's redemptive
ministry."[34]  "[T]he risen Christ is the beginning and end
of all things.  For all things were created through him and
all things will return to the Father through him."[35]  The
theme of divine adoption is evident where human beings are
said to be children of God, and brothers and sisters in
Christ.[36]

4)  It is worthwhile to note here that the whole of the

---

[32]Ibid., 66, 69, 70, 75, 106.  Human rights are specified
in 69, 70, and 213; general use of the term, p. iv, arts. 222,
238, 250, 251, 272, 313, 315; rights and duties, 106; right of
dissent, 328; of defense, 75, 82; and values, 92.

[33]Ibid., 280, 339.

[34]Ibid., 15.

[35]Ibid., 338.

[36]Ibid., 255 and 263.

<u>Challenge</u> section designated by the letter "I" (on religious

perspectives and principles) was later adopted by the NCCB

pastoral letter on Hispanic ministry in order to explain

human dignity.[37]  Among the rights specified in this

subsequent text is the human right to "health."

5)  <u>Economic Justice for All</u> (1986) provides a

theological and ethical complement to the peace pastoral.

Its second chapter proposes a bible-based anthropology to

guide its critique of social economics.  Economics questions

are framed in terms of "a larger vision of the human

person."[38]  The phrases "human dignity" or "the dignity of

the human person" appear a total of fifty-six times in the

main document, and eleven times in the NCCB's separate

introductory message.[39]  The reader is told that dignity is

the value against which a society properly judges itself,

and the value that warrants human rights can be expressed as

civil, political or economic rights.[40]  Human rights, as

---

[37]NCCB, "The Hispanic Presence:  Challenge and Commitment," Pastoral Letter on Hispanic Ministry, <u>Origins</u> 13, no. 32 (19 January 1984): 537.

[38]<u>Economic Justice for All</u> (hereafter EJA), 341.  Article numbers are used unless noted otherwise.

[39]"A Pastoral Message:  Economic Justice for All," pp. v-xvi, in EJA.  Chapter III, C, "Food and Agriculture," begins by speaking of God's creative action and human collaboration, but omits applying "dignity" for the redress of human problems in this sphere.

[40]"Message," 14, 17.  Article numbers are used unless noted otherwise.  See also EJA, 25, 28.  Article 25 says that the tradition, rooted in the bible and developed over the last century with the popes and Vatican II, "insists that human

"the minimum conditions for life in community" that

guarantee the freedom and fulfillment of persons who

participate in the common good, are bestowed by God and not

created by society.[41]  The public evidence of true dignity

springs from a person's participation in the life and work

of a society.  Having the wherewithal to participate is

considered a  necessary condition for participation.

Therefore, medical care and adequate health care are

included among specified human rights.[42]  Adequate health

and medical care are major components in this document's

economic philosophy because health is a condition of a

person's social and economic participation.[43]

Human dignity is said to be rooted in the "image"[44] or

the "image and likeness" of God.[45]  Article thirty-two

makes the point that women and men share in God's creative

activity and have dominion over the earth:

> At the summit of creation stands the creation of
> man and woman, made in God's image (Gn 1:26-27).
> <u>As such every human being possesses an inalienable</u>

---

dignity, realized in community with others and with the whole
of God's creation, is the norm against which every social
institution must be measured."

[41]EJA, 79.

[42]"Message," 17; EJA, 80, 103.

[43]See EJA articles numbered 20, 80, 86, 90, 93, 103, 141,
172, 191, 196, 212, 230, 247, 254, 278, 286, 351; for health
insurance see 177, 180; for hospitals see 58, 348.

[44]Ibid, 28, 32, 40, 61, 90.

[45]Ibid., 79.

> dignity that stamps human existence prior to any
> division into races or nations and prior to human
> labor and human achievement (Gn 4-11).[46]

The manifestations of this dignity are in the abilities to
reason and understand, to freely shape one's own personal
and community life, and in the capacity to love.[47]  These
"properties" of the image have been noted previously.

The anthropology which can be gleaned from articles 41-
60 cites Rom. 8:18-25 to underline the Christian belief that
we now live in a restored creation.  And while this section
notes the influence of the Incarnation in the vocation to
discipleship, moral transformation and ultimate redemption,
there is no mention that Christ is the image in which
humanity shares.[48]  One reads that "life has been
fundamentally changed by the entry of the Word made flesh

---

[46]Ibid., 32.  Emphasis in original.  Westermann, Creation,
is cited here.  Whether Westermann himself holds that men or
women individually can image God may be open to discussion.

[47]Ibid., 61.

[48]The contrast might be just as apparent in the
subheadings.  The Old Testament section is headed "Created in
God's Image," and the New Testament section begins, "The Reign
of God and Justice."  Something of Christ-as-image and GS, 22
(John Paul II's "keynote") are present in EJA.  Article 60
cautions that the "concerns of the pastoral letter are not at
all peripheral to the central mystery at the heart of the
Church," footnoting the 1985 Extraordinary Synod of Bishops in
Rome, A Message to the People of God and the Final Report
(Washington, DC:  United States Catholic Conference, 1986).
The text of the Final Report states at p. 13:  "Because Jesus
Christ is the Son of God and the new Adam, he at once
manifests the mystery of God and the mystery of man and his
exalted vocation (cf. Gaudium et Spes, 22).  The Son of God
became man in order to make men children of God.  Through this
familiarity with God, man is raised to a most high dignity."

into human history," and that the "Christian walks in the
newness of life (Rom 6:4), and is 'a new creation; the old
has passed away, the new has come' (2 Cor 5:17)."[49]  Even
so, Jesus Christ is presented as the pattern or model of
unity and solidarity, rather than its very substance.[50]

Economic Justice for All does account for the effects
of the Incarnation upon the human sharing in the image of
Christ.  Recall that divine filiation or adoption is one of
the criteria that signals these effects.  The pastoral
letter speaks of all persons as the children of God, as
sharers in the adoption effected by God.[51]  More
importantly, implied in the citations of Mt. 25:31ff., there
is a caution against rejecting Christ, Emmanuel, who "is
hidden in those most in need; to reject them is to reject
God made manifest in history."[52]  In other words, for all
practical moral purposes, Christ is one's neighbor.
Finally, through Christ there is the call to transcendence
that marks personhood with eschatological characteristics,
directed toward an ultimate destiny.  On balance the
economics pastoral presents the germ of this transcendence

---

[49]Ibid., 54; see also 55, 60, and 328 for "new creation."

[50]Ibid., 64; also 42, 47. A means of unification with and
in Christ is certainly suggested later. Article 330 speaks of
a unity of worship in the Eucharist, and in prayerfully
calling upon the Holy Spirit to unite all into the Body of
Christ.

[51]Ibid., 87, 182.

[52]Ibid., 44; "Mission," 4 and 16.

in terms of the theology of creation whose God we know from Genesis. Even though it does not synthetically account for the fact that New Testament revelation has recast the terms of that invitation, it would be misleading to suggest that the pastoral omits or undervalues the recreative acts of Christ .[53]

6) The U.S. Bishops voted on the drafts of two pastoral letters at their meeting in November, 1992. Before commenting on the one they approved, the image-related theology of what has come to be called "the pastoral on women in the Church" merits recognition.[54] "One in Christ Jesus" cites Gen. 1:26-27 to say that both men and women are the image of God with "no hint of superiority." The text offers these verses as "the centerpiece of our Christian understanding of the human person."[55] It also asserts that the equal dignity of women and men exists "by virtue of our creation in the image of God and our redemption by Christ Jesus."[56] Being created in God's image means that human beings can know and love God, and that the ultimate goal of intelligence and freedom is the vision of and union with

---

[53]EJA, 41, 53, 64, 332, 339, 341, 365.

[54]NCCB, "One in Christ Jesus: Toward a Pastoral Response to the Concerns for Women for Church and Society," Origins 22, no. 29 (31 December 1992): 489, 491-508.

[55]Ibid., 492, par. 17.

[56]Ibid., 505, par. 156.

God.[57] The dignity of women was presented in direct relation to domestic, public, and economic rights.[58] This draft document failed to gain approval as a pastoral letter, but it deserves mention as a well-publicized project which, at least, attaches both creation and redemption by Christ to the notion of human dignity.[59]

During the course of that same November meeting, the bishops did ratify a pastoral letter on the theme of stewardship. This reflection on ecclesial affairs refrained from using rights language, and virtually omitted the term "dignity." In describing the relationship of people in the Church, the NCCB included an anthropology that grows out of Gen. 1:26-27: God "bestows" on humans "the divine image and likeness".[60] Humans are collaborators with God, sharing dominion in order to care for the earth.[61] Everyone is said to have some natural responsibility for the world, but there are those who are stewards by grace, that is, by baptism.[62] From baptism arises a fundamental obligation to

---

[57]Ibid., par. 18.

[58]Ibid., pars. 11, 33, 36-40.

[59]Elements of this document are evident in the NCCB's "Strengthening the Bonds of Peace: A Pastoral Reflection on Women in the Church and in Society," Origins 24, no. 25 (1 December 1994): 417, 419-422.

[60]Stewardship, p. 25.

[61]Ibid., 26.

[62]Ibid., 28.

place one's gifts at God's service in and through the
Church.[63] The predominance of a theology of creation as
well as scholastic categories of nature and grace are
evident. Divine adoption is accomplished by way of baptism.

Without adverting to the fact that the image has been
re-created in the Incarnation, there is nonetheless a
christological focus.[64] The centrality of "vocation"
signals one of our analytical criteria that indicates the
effects of the Incarnation upon the image of God.
Discipleship grows from a call to follow Jesus and to
collaborate with God in the work of creation and
redemption.[65] The community of disciples is called into
existence as the Body of Christ.[66] Solidarity grounded in
charity is the value that expresses this call, and it
commends a world order, a model for which is the Trinity
itself.[67] If Christians would fully understand it, "they
are no less than 'God's co-workers' (1 Cor 3:9), with their
own particular share in his creative, redemptive, and
sanctifying work."[68]

---

[63]Ibid., 34.

[64]Ibid., 22, 23, 37, 43.

[65]Ibid., 7 and 44; see also pp. 11, 12, 14, 18, 20-22, 24, 26.

[66]Ibid., 14 and 33.

[67]Ibid., 36.

[68]Ibid., 42; see also pp. 7 and 44 for creative and redemptive elements.

The pastoral letter on stewardship leaves undefined the nature of the Incarnation's impact in terms of the image of God in human beings. In one sense Jesus is a pattern, a model to follow. At another level, the Eucharist enables Christ's very self to flow through his disciples.[69] And yet the document overlooks the deeper implications of its own use of Scripture after it says: "In Christ, God has fully entered into human life and history."[70] The scriptures from Luke's (9:46-48) and Matthew's (25:34ff.) gospels themselves portray people as more than mere models or imitators of Christ.[71] Jesus said, whoever receives this child in my name receives me; whenever you visit the sick, you are visiting me. However, the immediacy of Christ's presence is again muted by the apparent tendency to refer to the unsullied image as it existed in Adam, and to remain silent about the dignity inherent in that which Christ has recreated in his unity with human nature.

7) Image-of-God language appeared in other NCCB statements, reports, and guidelines during the span from 1979 to 1993. In each case it was used in addressing social and economic issues. These texts can be loosely catalogued according to simple or complex usages of the concept of God's image. The documents that employ a simple usage

---

[69]Ibid., 37.

[70]Ibid., 22.

[71]Ibid., 23 and 43.

hardly do more than mention the image of God and dignity, while omitting christological references. The documents that employ the more complex usages more actively relate the image and human dignity to rights, while noting how Christ is the source of human dignity. Comments on the simple-usage documents will be followed by those on the complex.[72]

The bishops' statements on capital punishment (1980), on school-based clinics (1987), and on food and agriculture (1988) each advanced "the image and likeness of God" as the basis for the human dignity of every person.[73] The last says this about dignity and rights:

> It is central to the church's teaching on
> human dignity that everyone has a legitimate claim
> to the goods and services required to live a truly
> human life. This central element underpins a set
> of specific personal rights which constitute the
> base line against which we assess society's
> ability to secure them.[74]

This same set of values is repeated in a related 1989 NCCB statement, including the specification that dignity is

---

[72]Thoroughness demands a mention of a theological exchange on the image of God and human rights that was engaged by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, 1976-79. See the Roman Catholic / Presbyterian-Reformed Consultation, Ethics and the Search for Christian Unity (Washington-Princeton: United States Catholic Conference, 1981). These treatments about abortion and human rights are neither pastoral letters nor statements.

[73]"Statement on Capital Punishment," Origins 10, no. 24 (27 November 1980): 375; "Statement on School Based Clinics," Origins 17, no. 25 (3 December 1987): 435; "Report on Food and Agriculture," Origins 18, no. 25 (1 December 1988): 408.

[74]"Report on Food," 408.

bestowed by Creation.[75]

An NCCB statement released for the tenth anniversary of the 1983 pastoral letter on peace reminds its readers that: "We are all created in the image of the same God and destined for the same eternal salvation."[76] Its one reference to "the unifying power of Christ's redemption" is not explicitly connected to the image of God, but it is related to the "call" of the Holy Spirit for the renewal of human unity. The relation of image of God to Christ that is offered here abides in one's personal imitation of Christ (in the works of peace), rather than in one's renewal or reform through Christ.[77]

The previously cited NCCB "Resolution on Health Care Reform" (1993) lists the following fundamental principle: "Every person has a right to adequate health care. This flows from the sanctity of human life and the dignity that belongs to all human persons, who are made in the image of God."[78] The term "dignity" appears one dozen times, but the document lacks a meaningful use of Scripture, a christological frame of reference, a mention of divine adoption, and has no accounting of the destiny of human

---

[75]"Food Policy in a Hungry World," Origins 19, no. 25 (23 November 1989): 415.

[76]"The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace," Origins 23, no. 26 (9 December 1993): 458.

[77]Ibid., 452.

[78]"Resolution," 99.

life.  It will later be argued that these omissions have

theological and ecclesial implications, even if the

religious elements were purposely undeveloped to facilitate

the church's participation in public discourse.

There are four other documents whose christological and

eschatological features give them standing as "complex"

reflections on the image of God.  The first three, however,

do not convey a sense of the image as it is affected by the

Incarnation itself.  Among these, the two committee

documents that address life-sustaining medical treatments

(1984, 1992) share the same theological formulation.  The

life of each human being is made in the image and likeness

of God, is redeemed by Christ, and is called to share

eternal life with him.[79]  A third document, a 1985 NCCB

affirmation of pro-life activities incorporates John Paul

II's theological anthropology.  It opens with a quote from

the pope's 1979 speech in the Capitol Mall:  each unique

human being is "a creature of God, called to be a brother or

sister of Christ by reason of the incarnation and the

---

[79]NCCB, Committee for Pro-Life Activities, "Guidelines for Legislation on Life-Sustaining Treatment," Origins 14, no. 32 (24 January 1985): 526; idem, "Nutrition and Hydration:  Moral and Pastoral Reflections," Origins 21, no. 44 (9 April 1992): 706.  The fifty-bishop Administrative Committee approved this text in March, 1992.  A parallel to this formula on dignity and destiny later appears in the bishops' "Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services," Origins 24, no. 27 (15 December 1994): 449, 451-462.

universal redemption."[80]  Later it states:

> Ultimately, the duty of individuals and
> society to respect human life is grounded in the
> dignity of the human person, made in the image of
> God.  Recognition of this duty is thoroughly
> consistent with the legal traditions of our own
> nation, whose Declaration of Independence names
> the right to life as first among the unalienable
> rights conferred by our Creator.[81]

The fourth of these documents, the bishops' 1989

statement on the AIDS crisis (superseding the 1987 "The Many

Faces of AIDS"), is the most nuanced anthropology since the

pastoral letter on racism.[82]

> We, the Catholic bishops of the United States,
> approach this task from the perspectives of faith
> and reason:  faith, which believes that health and
> sickness, life and death have new meaning in Jesus
> Christ [cites Romans 14:7-8]; and moral reasoning,
> which supports the insights concerning human
> nature and individual dignity which we here
> affirm.[83]

Always giving precedence to Christ, a section on the dignity

of the human person states that "Jesus revealed something we

could not have known by ourselves:  There is a likeness

between the unity of the divine persons in the Trinity and

the unity of human persons with one another."[84]  Then we

---

[80]NCCB, "Pastoral Plan for Pro-Life Activities:  A Reaffirmation," Origins 15, no. 24 (28 November 1985):  401.

[81]Ibid., 402.

[82]"Called to Compassion and Responsibility:  A Response to the HIV/AIDS Crisis," Origins 19, no. 26 (30 November 1989): 421, 423-34.

[83]Ibid., 421.

[84]Ibid., 426.

are told:  "All human beings are created in God's image and
are called to the same end, namely, eternal life in
communion with God and one another."[85]  Affirming its
christocentric social-ethic, "Called to Compassion" offers a
theology that can have important implications for health
care:

> The church makes an invaluable contribution
> to society by pointing out that the full meaning
> of human integrity is found within the context of
> redemption and its call in Christ to 'live in
> newness of life' (Rom. 6:4)."[86]

### Summary of NCCB Use of Image

A series of observations can summarize the NCCB's
connection of human rights to human dignity and its roots in
the image of God.  The fact of the NCCB's connection of the
image of God to dignity and to rights is not in question.
These summary comments focus first upon the conference's
general understanding of rights, and secondly upon the
ontological and relational tendencies in its definition and
use of the imago.  A final summary point evaluates the
similarities and differences in the elaboration of the image
of God among the selected documents, and how this coincides
with creaturehood and destiny as marks of the operative
anthropology.

The American Catholic bishops follow a course of social

---

[85]Ibid.

[86]Ibid., 427.  Emphasis added.

ethics that is grounded in the belief that human persons are images of God. The image is the theological anchor for the idea of human dignity that supports any assertion of human rights. The fact that each person is an image of God grounds the theological warrant for human rights.

The nature of the human rights that people claim can be generally described through an analysis of a sampling of the selected documents. On the basis of human dignity, U.S. Church teaching asserts that everyone has (1) a "legitimate claim to the goods and services required to live a truly human life"; (2) for the proper development, maintenance, and fulfillment of life that come from building the common good; (3) which means being assured the wherewithal to participate in society. These human rights are bestowed by God, not created by human society. Included in the means to participate are health and medical care as conditions of that participation.[87]

The interpretation and usage of "image of God" in the NCCB documents is not so easily summarized. There is no modular formulation that is used in the social ethics pronouncements. The lack of uniformity is readily demonstrated by recalling a few of the basic scriptural conceptions of the image that were presented in Chapter I. First, there is the creaturely image of God in Gen. 1:26-27

---

[87]See "Report on Food," 408; "Health and Health Care," 402; EJA, arts. 80, 83.

whose attributes are intellect and will, dominion over
nature, and a capacity for a relationship with God. These
attributes are also reflective of natural philosophy and the
scholastic traditions wherein nature and grace retain their
distinctiveness. Second, the New Testament presents Christ
as a pattern for human living, that is, as an image-model
for human conformation (Rom. 8:29). Third, likewise from
the New Testament, there is an understanding of Christ as
the image of God (Col. 1:15) in whom all have been created
and joined. The selected group of NCCB documents explicitly
favors the first two, with the exceptions of the documents
on racism (1979) and AIDS related issues (1989) that favor
the third.

The NCCB texts share an ontological interpretation of
the image of God insofar as they all assume that human
beings are creatures of God. The text of Gen. 1:26-27 is
their touchstone, though other Genesis texts are employed
also. Most of the documents present an anthropology that
accounts for the properties or capacities of intellect, will
and relationship (love, heart). A few of them include a
mention of dominion over creation or the capacity for co-
creation as attributes of existence in God's image.[88]
There is no mention that the person or works of Christ have
superseded, remade, or reformed the created image as it is

---

[88]For example, "Health and Health Care," 400; EJA, art.
32; Stewardship, 26.

understood in Gen. 1:26-27. However, even though there is
generally no explicit accounting for an evolved notion of
the imago itself, some qualitative change has been
registered by the recurrent use of Matthew 25, particularly
by article forty-four of Economic Justice for All.

There is also an economic-relational understanding of
the image of God that bears a resemblance to New Testament
and patristic sources. This tendency is defined more by
seeing the image as reflected by Christ ("the image of the
invisible God") as a pattern or model,[89] than by seeing
human persons themselves as being images of God in and
through Christ. The notion that the image in human beings
has been reformed or newly created in the incarnate Christ
is only implicit in the documents on racism and the HIV/AIDS
crisis. Missing are the influential parts of the Christian
tradition that suggest that a deifying or divinizing
transformation of the human person results from the
Incarnation.

There are, however, a number of documents that point to
an effect of Christ's existence that places human ontology
into a graced economy. These imply that a transformation is
in effect. The transformation occurs not so much in the
human image of God itself as it does in the conceptual
relation of persons: that is, persons are related as if by

---

[89]"Health and Health Care," 397; EJA, arts. 42, 47, 64;
"Harvest of Justice," 452; Stewardship, 7.

adoption[90] or by the vocation to a destiny in God.[91]  This
represents a transformation in a thought process rather than
an actual change in the human subject.  In other words,
there is a paranetic or metaphorical use of the terms
adoption and vocation, rather than a substantial or
normative use.  This establishes an ethics that goes from
"as if" to ought, rather than from "is" to ought.  This is
the same kind of separation that the last chapter suggested
might prove to be problematic for John Paul II's
anthropology.  But unlike the theology of Veritatis
Splendor, there is no suggestion of species or grades of the
human image or likeness to God, no grades of dignity.

The 1989 NCCB response to the HIV/AIDS crisis
communicates a definite sense of Christ as the image of God,
and that all human beings share in that image.  Its
formulation is reminiscent of St. Augustine's psychological
model of how the human being images God.  Human dignity is
said to arise from the "likeness between the unity of the
divine persons in the Trinity and the unity of human
persons."  Again in 1993 the pastoral letter Stewardship
referred to "the intimate life of the Trinity itself" as the

---

[90]The adoption theme runs throughout "Brothers and Sisters
to Us," and is operative in EJA, arts. 87 and 182.

[91]Stewardship, pp. 7 and 44 and generally.  Human beings
are called to collaborate in the creative and redemptive work
of God.

model for world order and the unity of the human race.[92]

If the body of selected NCCB texts is viewed as a whole, one can see a theological anthropology that is shaped by the image of God. There are overarching and explicit connections to creation theology and to Gen. 1:26-27. The effects of the Incarnation are apparent in the sense that adoption and vocation both enrich and inform certain relationships between humans and God. But there is no overall sense that each human being enjoys an enriched nature because Christ is united to each one, or that human relationships are different because, after Christ assumed a human nature, we ourselves are different. This kind of omission, consistent as it is, can be interpreted to mean that the fact of the Incarnation itself neither informs nor reforms human ontology. This is at the heart of the "gross differences" mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. This dissertation contends that a christocentric understanding of the imago demands an accounting of certain elements of human existence as essential to an operating anthropology. Certainly the particularity, the historical aspect of human life is somehow endorsed by the particularity of Jesus's existence. Likewise the physicality and mortality of human life can be thought of less as limits or punishments for moral imperfection, and

---

[92]This 1993 reflection on solidarity and charity cites John Paul II, Solicitudo Rei Socialis, art. 40.

more as proper aspects of creaturely existence. As will be suggested later, resource-allocation issues can be seen in different ways depending upon the assumptions one brings to the intersection of end-of-life alternatives with values (or disvalues) associated with mortality.

The issue of how one might deduce a definition of the human moral subject from NCCB documents entails a complex exercise, one that cannot be fully drawn here. In one part of the exercise, there is the challenge of matching the human subject to the objects of her/his rights claims. This engages the area of distributive justice, a "third person" morality: determining that which is due to people given the body of social structures and resources. Most of the NCCB documents on social justice undertake this particular perspective in the service of promoting and protecting personal integrity, flourishing, and active participation in the social, economic and political spheres. But another implicit part of the exercise is to determine its effects on personal responsibilities and obligations by means of a fuller vision of the image of God in one's self as a person in society. The question raised here is, "who am I to be as a member of this society?" This "first person" assessment is closer to the "contributive justice" promoted by Stewardship, a text that implicitly asks, "in Christ, who am I and how should I act?" in place of, "what claim does the other person make?"

The guidelines established by the previously cited
Propositions on the Dignity and Rights of the Human Person
offer another analytical perspective by which to assay the
image-based anthropology in these NCCB texts.  The
anthropology of human dignity is to be measured in relation
to three theological terms:  the creation of humans, the
gift that is Christ, and the redemption and destiny to which
we all are called.  The selected documents do not agree on
the nature (the person?) of Christ's gift to humanity.
However, there is a unanimity regarding the human creaturely
origin in God.  Likewise there is an accord among all the
documents regarding the divine and ultimate destiny of each
person.  This accord is articulated by the last element of a
quasi-formula that appears in several texts:  the life of
each human being is made in the image and likeness of God,
is redeemed by Christ, and is called to share in eternal
life with him.[93]

It is important to note that the NCCB texts appear to
unequally account for the nature or the effects of the
second element of the above-stated formula.  In the first
place, some documents have little or no reference to Christ.
Second, where there is some christological reference, it

---

[93]"Guidelines for Legislation on Life-Sustaining Treatment
(1984)," 526; "Called to Compassion and Responsibility:  A
Response to the HIV/AIDS Crisis (1989)," 426; "Nutrition and
Hydration: Moral and Pastoral Reflections (1992)," 706.  The
formula appears again later in the NCCB, "Ethical and
Religious Directives," Part 2, Introduction.

remains unclear what elements of redemption flow from the Incarnation itself (in terms of the very person of Jesus), including a reformation of the human person as an image of God. Third, in terms of human dignity, the unexplained absence of reference to Christ could be taken to mean that the Incarnation and fact of bodily existence add nothing to idea of dignity, much less to the idea of the human being as the image of God. The differences cannot be explained only on the grounds that these documents speak to various audiences, including non-religious ones. The NCCB writes to inform and admonish American society and government, but its teachings, particularly in the pastoral letters, have an intra-ecclesial target audience.

### Catholic Health Association of the United States

In addition to other capacities, the Catholic Health Association of the United States (CHA) functions both as an author and publisher. It also issues the monthly magazine Health Progress.[94] From time to time the CHA Board of Trustees commissions or approves specific documents or statements. When this is the case, the board's role is ascribed on title pages or in introductory comments. In other instances, the CHA has commissioned studies or papers, sometimes crediting committee members by name. In yet another format, it prints books and pamphlets about health

---

[94] Formerly Hospital Progress until 1983.

care and ethics by authors who retain a title-page credit.
Of the scores of texts and articles it generated from 1979
to 1993, many of these assert the human right to health
care.[95]

The purpose of this subsection about the CHA is to
analyze its documents that connect a theological
anthropology based on the image of God to its use as a
warrant for human rights, including a right to health
care.[96]  The goal is to assay the conceptual range

---

[95]In addition to the CHA collaboration with the NCCB in
the 1981 pastoral letter "Health and Health Care," the
assertion of the right appears in many texts approved by the
CHA Board of Trustees.  Unless noted, each of the following is
published in St. Louis by the CHA:  Evaluative Criteria for
Catholic Health Care Facilities (1980), 61; Joseph M. Boyle,
Jr., "The Developing Consensus on the Right to Health Care,"
75-90, and "Assumptions on Health and Health Care:  A
Direction for the Development of National Policy (1983)," 231-
233, in Justice and Health Care, ed. Margaret John Kelly,
D.C., (1985), no. 2; Future Directions for the Catholic Health
Care Ministry (1984), 20; No Room in the Market Place:  The
Health Care of the Poor (1986), x, 31-32, 49-50; Charting the
Future:  Principles for Systematic Healthcare Reform (1990),
1, 2, 19; With Justice for All?:  Ethics of Healthcare
Rationing (1991), vii, 1, 20, 21, 32; "Health Care Reform
Proposal," Origins 22, no. 4 (4 June 1992):  60-63; Setting
Relationships Right:  A Proposal for Systematic Healthcare
Reform, revised ed. (1993), x, 3, 80.  Articles addressing the
right include Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, "The Consistent Ethic
of Life," Health Progress 67, no. 6 (July-August 1986):  48-
51; and Dennis Brodeur, "The Rights Debate," Health Progress
71, no. 5 (June 1990):  48-51, 74.  Over time the CHA has
taken to spelling healthcare as a single word.

[96]Chapter I recorded that the "image of God" does not
appear in Church canon law because it treats only visible
institutions and quantifiable relationships.  Two substantial
documents were not selected for analysis because the image is
not a factor in their rationale:  Adam J. Maida, Nicholas P.
Cafardi, Church Property, Church Finances, and Church-Related
Corporations (St. Louis:  CHA, 1984); John R. Amos, Melanie
DiPietro, Jordan Hite, Francis Morrisey, Peter Campbell, The

indicated by the use of "image," as well as the

organizational consistency evidenced in the use of image

language. The underlying question is again: who is the

subject of the right to health care? The examination of

eleven documents will produce a theological profile.

1) Five of the selected documents have been approved

by the CHA trustees.[97] The first of these to appear,

Evaluative Criteria for Catholic Health Care Facilities

(1980), bases human dignity on the belief that people are

created in the image of God.[98]

> The Catholic health care facility . . . recognizes
> an equal and immeasurable dignity in every person.
> All are created in the image of God and share in
> the unique preeminence that human persons enjoy in
> God's creation.[99]

Given its understanding of human nature, the CHA portrays

the work of healing as occurring on three levels, the

physiological, psychological, and spiritual: "Quality care

for the whole person implies the unity of the human person,

---

Search for Identity: Canonical Sponsorship of Catholic
Healthcare (St. Louis: CHA, 1993). The fifty-seven page Human
Genetics: Ethical Issues in Genetic Testing, Counseling, and
Therapy (St. Louis: CHA, 1990) was not selected because of the
minimal attention to human rights. Human dignity and the
rights to bodily life and integrity (pp. 25-26) are implicitly
linked to the image of God as an expression of "the
theological doctrine of creation (30-31)."

[97]Evaluative Criteria for Catholic Health Care Facilities
(1980); The Dynamics of Catholic Identity in Healthcare
(1987); Charting the Future (1990); With Justice for All?
(1991); Setting Relationships Right (1993).

[98]Evaluative Criteria, 2, 21; cf. 17.

[99]Ibid., 2.

body and mind, flesh and spirit."[100]  Such care, to which a

person in justice has a human right, holds open the

"opportunity to strive to fulfill his or her human dignity

and contribute to the common good."[101]  The CHA relies on

Pope John XXIII's encyclical Pacem in Terris (1963) in its

assertions about the content and purpose of a right to

medical care.[102]  That encyclical (art. 11) proposed that

individuals have a right to bodily integrity and medical

care insofar as these enable the person to participate in

the economic and political orders.[103]  The CHA text places

human dignity in the natural order, with intelligence and

free will (art. 9) as uniquely human natural capabilities.

The CHA presentation leaves aside article ten, where Pope

John said that the human person is esteemed even more highly

by having been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and by being

a child of God and an heir of eternal glory.

2) Before examining a specifically theological

document, there are three other texts that employ a rights

---

[100]Ibid., 2 and 15.

[101]Ibid., 61.

[102]Ibid.

[103]PT, art. 11, was again cited in a major CHA position
paper approved by the Board of Trustees, 24 April 1986.  See
No Room in the Marketplace:  The Health Care of the Poor,
Final Report of The Catholic Health Association's Task Force
on Health Care of the Poor (St. Louis:  CHA, 1986), p. x. This
report does not explicitly use the imago as one of its
theological principles.  It does speak of human beings as
children of God (x, and 21), and as sharing humanity with
Christ (20-21).

language based on the image of God. <u>Charting the Future</u>

(1990) also relies on <u>Pacem in Terris</u> in its interlacing of

creation, dignity, and rights. Medical care is deemed

necessary for the proper development of human life, and for

its fulfillment and perfection. The preamble to "Principles

for Systemic Healthcare Reform" states:

> Our Catholic faith tells us that every human being
> is made in the image of God (Gen 1:27). Because
> this is so, every human being possesses an
> inherent dignity that must be revered; and every
> human being has both the right and the
> responsibility to realize the fullness of that
> dignity. For this to happen, all members of
> society must protect and promote those rights that
> belong essentially to what it means to be fully
> human.[104]

This is followed by a set of General Principles. The first

of these principles states: "Access to those healthcare

services necessary for the development and maintenance of

life is a basic human right." The second principle calls

for a determination of comprehensive services to promote

health, to treat persons with disease and disability, and to

care for the chronically ill and dying.[105]

Referring to a November 1989 talk by J. Hug, S.J., of

the Center of Concern in Washington, <u>Charting</u> insists that

"Catholic healthcare providers need to reflect on the

theology of creation, which states that everyone is a child

---

[104]<u>Charting the Future</u>, 1. The principles were approved
by the CHA trustees in April 1990.

[105]Ibid., 2.

of God."[106]   Beside its activity with and among poor

people, the Catholic tradition needs to reexamine what

constitutes a right.   "While civil and political rights are

recognized as ones necessary to ensure human dignity,

economic and social rights are needed before other rights

can be exercised."[107]   To this end, Catholic social and

ethical principles carry "implications for access, coverage,

cost control, financing and allocation of resources."[108]

Hug said that "access to good health is a fundamental right

based on the dignity of every individual as a child of

God."[109]

   3) The CHA published the fifty-four page With Justice

for All?   The Ethics of Healthcare Rationing in 1991.   An

appendix repeats the above-mentioned preamble and

"Principles for Systematic Healthcare Reform" that include

the assertion of a right to care.[110]   The twin principles

---

[106]Ibid., 18.

[107]Ibid., 18-19. Civil and political rights are generally
guarantees against interference, while economic and social
rights require positive social programs.   Both kinds of
rights, civil-political and socio-economic (or self-executory
and programmatic), are named by the 1948 United Nations
Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by two later
Covenants.   Pope John XXIII also named both kinds in PT, 1963.
See also Hollenbach, Claims, Chapter 1; and Michael T. Ryan,
Solidarity:   Christian Social Teaching and Canadian Society,
Second Edition (London, ON:   Guided Study Programs in the
Catholic Faith, 1990), 29-31.

[108]Charting the Future, 19.

[109]Ibid., 19.

[110]With Justice for All, 32.

of personal responsibility and the common good shape the

understanding of such a right.[111]  Human dignity is a focal

value throughout.  The creation of human beings in the image

of God (Gen. 1:27) is the source of the sacredness and

dignity of human life.[112]  Furthermore:

> Human dignity involves life, bodily integrity, and
> the means for the proper development of life, one
> of which is healthcare [fn., Pacem in Terris, art.
> 11].  Human dignity is realized through
> participation in community; it is threatened when
> social and economic conditions make such
> participation impossible.[113]

Responsible stewardship is a correlative value because life

and the resources of nature and society are themselves gifts

of God.[114]

4) "Principles for Systemic Healthcare Reform" is again

an appendix for the foundations of values in Setting

---

[111]Ibid., 16, and 15:  "The common good is realized when
the prevailing economic, political, and social conditions
allow 'groups and their individual members relatively thorough
and ready access to their own fulfillment.'"  EJA #80 is
mistakenly cited for #79, which borrows this description from
GS, 26.  If the scope of human fulfillment is limited to the
creation of "constructive forms of social, political, and
economic interdependence. . . . bodily integrity, and the
means for the proper development of life (p. 16)," it
forecloses on the transcendent sacredness and destiny of every
human life.  The larger transcendent sense might be seen by
tracing citations of EJA back to GS 25-27.  In fact, it would
be hard to establish this sense from the present text alone.

[112]Ibid., 31.

[113]Ibid., 16.

[114]Ibid., 15, 17-18.

Relationships Right (1993).[115]  These principles explicitly

mention Gen. 1:27, the creation of humans in the image of

God, human dominion (as stewardship), and the call to

solidarity as a people.  There is no mention of the

Christian scriptures, nor of the person or actions of Jesus

Christ.

In the most recent context the CHA argues that,

"Healthcare reform is essentially a debate about

values."[116]  It reiterates a commitment to four Catholic

values:  human dignity, the common good, social justice, and

responsible stewardship.[117]  Creation by God endows each

person with a sacredness and dignity.  The CHA bids to enter

the public discourse about health care by juxtaposing the

Catholic values of human dignity and the social nature of

individual persons with the secular counterparts of human

rights and service to the common good.  Responsible

stewardship over creation also "has a secular parallel in

the widespread recognition that natural and other resources

are not unlimited and must be managed wisely."[118]  The

objects of the right envisioned by this document include:

"a right to basic and comprehensive health care," the

---

[115]Setting Relationships Right:  A Proposal for Systemic
Healthcare Reform, revised ed., 1993.

[116]Ibid., ix.

[117]Ibid., 1.

[118]Ibid., x-xi, 2-6.

client's choice of an integrated delivery network (IDN),

access to a health plan regardless of health status,

preventive and long-term acute care, appropriate levels of

care, and comparative information on IDN service and

quality.[119]

There is a common theological thread woven into the

preceding four documents.  Relative to the propaedeutic

survey in Chapter I, there is a decidedly limited

representation of the Catholic image-of-God tradition.  On

the one hand, these CHA texts hold out human dignity as a

property of individuals who have been created in the image

of God (Gen. 1:27).  That the world was created by God

remains an underlying assumption.  To be an image of God

implies one's capacity and responsibility for stewarding

creation.  Only one source reports that everyone is a child

of God by virtue of having been created by God.  The dignity

of each person is said to be realized in community in a

reciprocal relationship with the growth of the common good.

In the CHA documents presented so far, there is scant

allusion to the more developed Christian interpretations of

"the image of God."  There is no mention of Christ as the

image of God or otherwise.  The effects of the Incarnation

are overlooked, the nature of divine adoption is faintly

---

[119]Ibid., x, xii, xiii.  These remain essentially the same
as stated in the 1992 working draft.  See the CHA executive
summary, "Health Care Reform Proposal," Origins 22, no.4 (4
June 1992): 60-63.

addressed, and the vocation to ultimate transcendence is
seemingly absorbed in a secular notion of the common
good.[120]

5) The Dynamics of Catholic Identity in Healthcare
(1987) provides a robust theological contrast to the first
four documents. Its formulations are shaped by explicit
references to biblical and social justice, even though
"rights" and "the common good" appear nowhere as foundations
to support "access to basic healthcare."[121] Here one
encounters an unapologetically christocentric and Catholic
viewpoint. Dynamics asserts that it is

> our sacramental identity that gives us our unique
> warrant for our presence in health care. . . . who
> we are is not in question. Whether or not our
> actions bear witness to what we say we are is what
> is in question. Thus, integrity rather than
> identity should be the center of concern.[122]

It is the symbolic nature of Catholic sacramental identity
that focuses the whole document. Such an identity
presupposes that Catholics and all Christians have been
called to respond to God's reality, goodness, and healing
power as revealed in creation, and "most fully in the person

---

[120]While the central idea of Catholic social doctrine is
the bonum commune, its utility value seems to dominate in CHA
texts. Concerning the distinguishable notions of the common
good, common welfare, and the perfection of human nature, see
Oswald von Nell-Breuning, "Social Movements, Christian Social
Doctrine," 108-113, in Sacramentum Mundi, Vol. 6 (London:
Burns & Oates, 1970), 110.

[121]The Dynamics of Catholic Identity in Healthcare, 7, 9-
10, 32.

[122]Dynamics, 26.

and actions of Jesus Christ."[123]  These principles are

developed more fully later:

> The premier symbol of the personal God is the
> human person.  People are made in the image of
> God.  Male and female God created them.  In the
> divine image God created them. (Gn.1:27)  Also
> this truth of creation is intensified in the
> doctrine of the incarnation.  God becomes flesh in
> Jesus Christ.  This close connection between the
> divine and human personhood means that the human
> person is a symbol of the divine.[124]

Dynamics looks at health care especially in terms of Jesus's

healing presence among the poor and sick.  For this reason,

it says, the Letter to the Colossians (1:15) calls Jesus

"the image of the invisible God."[125]

Nowhere here is human dignity explicitly tied to Gen.

1:26-27 or to the Incarnation.  Yet there are suggested

links to each of them.  Dignity is said to be "the

recognition of people . . . as daughters and sons of the one

God and brothers and sisters to one another."  It is "the

birthright of each person."[126]

While it is true that the effect of the Word-become-

flesh upon the "image" revealed by Gen. 1:26-27 is not

---

[123]Ibid., 19.

[124]Ibid., 49.  See p. 51:  Dynamics summarizes that its
own analysis and recommendations contain "The foundation of
sacramental identity in divine call, its full expression in
Jesus Christ, the essential appropriateness of the human
person as the symbol and not just an arbitrary sign of divine
personality, the stress on human mediation of divine reality,
and the reciprocal relationship between identity and action."

[125]Ibid., 38.

[126]Ibid., 41.

clearly developed, <u>Dynamics</u> does indicate that "this truth of creation is intensified in the doctrine of the incarnation." Given this much, it is easily inferred that both adoption by God and human dignity are also "intensified." It follows that the Incarnation ratifies God's original invitation to humans to pursue a transcendent destiny. The "person and actions of Jesus Christ" are brought to bear in redefining the human situation, reshaping what was known from the Genesis account: that a human being is a creature of God, is a child of God, and that dominion or stewardship are uniquely given to humanity.

There is a secondary group of selected documents whose differing origins and variegated theologies -- all under CHA auspices -- provide new information. These texts do not bear the explicit stamp of the CHA Board of Trustees. Their constructions of image-based anthropologies cover a range from creation-based natural law to Christ-centered theology.[127] They reveal a distinct theological attention to a personal, ultimate destiny in God. They exhibit an awareness of the theoretical dialectic between the constitution of human dignity, and the definition of health

---

[127]CHA publications generally portray the important relationship among theology and mission and ethics. One book appears to exclude the possibility that Christian theology adds anything substantive to human ethical self-understanding. See Robert P. Craig, Carl L. Middleton, Laurence J. O'Connell, eds., <u>Ethics Committees: A Practical Approach</u> (St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1986), 13.

and the content of the right to health care.

6) A 1982 CHA round-table discussion examined a number of issues raised by the NCCB pastoral letter "Health and Health Care." It acknowledged that "dignity" and "the wholeness of the human person" are concepts whose content is not comprehended by the average American. Even so, Sister M. Martin McEntee cited the pastoral letter's mentions of the image of God, the existence of human dignity, and the right to health care as "necessary for the proper development of life."[128]

The participants wrestled with the idea of health itself in broad, though not uniform, terms. Some commented that asserting a right to care or to health does not define the practical level of care or technology. Any definition of health also has a bearing on the objectives included by institutional mission statements. The participants in this discussion agreed that terms like image of God, dignity and rights needed greater specification if they were to guide any practical plan for national health.

7) In 1983 the CHA published a book by K. O'Rourke who upholds the right to health care as warranted by the sanctity of human life.[129] The sacred nature of human life

---

[128]"The Pastoral Letter on Health and Health Care: A Roundtable," Health Progress 63, no. 5 (May 1982): 34.

[129]Kevin D. O'Rourke, O.P., Reasons for Hope: Laity in Catholic Health Care Facilities (St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1983), 38-40, 61.

is rooted in creation.

> Because men and women are created in God's image
> and because God created life, human dignity
> transcends life.  Each person's holiness, or
> sanctity, arises not from what he or she does or
> accomplishes but simply from the fact that God has
> given him or her life, that he or she is an image
> of God.[130]

Christian revelation tells us that Christ's coming and dying for each human being is a mark of the dignity and sanctity of human life in its wholeness.  "Jesus . . . came into the world to make us fully human, to help us realize our human dignity as creatures made in the image of God."[131] O'Rourke laments the fact that training in health care often ignores spiritual and social powers, and that certain illnesses are symptoms of social or spiritual distress affecting the whole person.[132]  The knowledge of health, he says, "demands knowledge of the human personality and the destiny of the human person."[133]

A creation-centered notion of the image of God prevails

---

[130]Ibid., 21-22.

[131]Ibid., 38.

[132]Ibid., 39.  At 66:  "The word health, however, is derived from words that signify holiness or wholeness, completeness.  This completeness is not structural, for even a person lacking arms or legs can be healthy; rather it is functional.  Health is present when physiological, psychological, spiritual, and social functions act cooperatively and harmoniously."  He refers to chapters one and two of his and Benedict Ashley's Health Care Ethics:  A Theological Analysis (St. Louis: CHA, 1982) for an explanation of health.

[133]Ibid., 67.

in O'Rourke's treatment. It conveys the sense that Christ
has helped to repair the Adamic image rather than refigure
it as Augustine and others have suggested. O'Rourke says
that dignity is not based on what one accomplishes, an
important point to recall among those who distinguish the
image of God from likeness to God. To recall Wm. E. May's
interpretation of John Paul II's Veritatis Splendor, one of
the two kinds of human dignity has no basis in personal
merit.

8) J. Gremillion spotlights dignity, human rights, and
social justice as the root-truths underlying the Church's
social mission since Vatican II (1962-1965). When seen in
the context of the constitution Gaudium et Spes, human
dignity is the cornerstone of Catholic social teaching.

> The whole of the Constitution stands on the
> teaching of Scripture that man was created 'to the
> image of God,' is capable of knowing and loving
> his Creator, and was appointed by him as master of
> all earthly creatures that he might subdue them
> and use them to God's glory.[134]

In recalling John XXIII's advocacy of a right to substantial
medical care, Gremillion points out that health is required
for fulfilling most other human rights and duties.[135]  He
also says that human communion with matter in a bodily
existence is part of human dignity. With a nod toward human

---

[134]Joseph Gremillion, "Papal and Episcopal Teaching on
Justice and Health Care," 31-43, in Margaret John Kelly, DC,
ed., Justice and Health Care (St. Louis:  Catholic Health
Association of the United States, 1985), 35.

[135]Ibid., 37.

destiny, he sees the "body as good and honorable since God has created it and will raise it up on the last day."[136]

9) The notion of human rights is closely bound up with image-language in an article by B. Ashley.[137] He depicts the human person as created in the image of God and restored through Jesus Christ. Ashley aims not only at grounding rights but also the norms of moral behavior. He posits that the true human self is recovered in Christ, where we are "adopted into his company."[138] There is a common human nature

> constituted by certain fundamental needs and
> capacities, such as the need for bodily health,
> family life, human society, and knowledge of the
> world, oneself and other persons, and, above all,
> of the three divine persons. These basic human
> needs that unite us to Christ and to the whole
> human community throughout space and time are the
> foundation of our relations with one another and
> of our inalienable human rights. From these
> rights and the moral obligations to respect these
> rights arise certain exceptionless moral
> norms.[139]

What makes certain norms exceptionless is their respect for the "sacredness of the human person in his or her essential

---

[136]Ibid., 35.

[137]Benedict Ashley, O.P., "Ethical Methodologies: A Current Controversy," 24-43, in Margaret John Kelly and Donald McCarthy, eds., Ethics Committees: A Challenge for Catholic Health Care (St. Louis: Pope John Medical Moral Research and Education Center and Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1984), 34, 36-37.

[138]Ibid., 34.

[139]Ibid.

constitution as an image of God in Christ."[140]   Ashley

holds that the erosion of this belief, expressive of human

qualities and goals, threatens basic human rights.

Ashley's perspective is important here because he has

articulated a synthetic anthropology that recognizes the

image of God in Christ.   Human personhood is connected to

the whole human race and to the Trinity through Christ.

Compared to some contemporary health care definitions that

are colored by an encroaching selfishness, this author lays

down considerations that have immense implications.   Aside

from potential consequences for medicine, there are

practical implications for the psychological, legal, and

spiritual spheres.   These implications are more readily

translated by the language of responsibility or social

obligation than by rights.   Ashley recalls those elements of

Catholic anthropology that contain correctives for the

recurring individualistic and atomistic tendencies in

liberal democratic societies.

10) Healthcare Leadership (1988) places at the core of

clinical, social, and corporate ethics "the belief in the

dignity of the human person as one created in the image of

---

[140]Ibid.   Cf. Most Rev. Joseph L. Bernardin, "Personalist
Humanism," Hospital Progress 61, no. 10 (October 1980): 46-48.
While this article does not mention rights, it relates the
image of God and the 'natural' human dignity (or what some
Protestant writers call 'alien dignity') that is a benefit of
Christ's redeeming action.

God."[141]  This text offers a comparatively rich

anthropological understanding of the image of God, similar

to that in Dynamics (item 5, above).  "For Christians, Jesus

Christ is the true revelation of the divine and the human.

He is the 'image of the invisible God, the first born of all

creatures' (Col. 1:15)."[142]  A lengthy quotation here

serves better than a summary.

> In Christian faith, the dignity of the human
> person is grounded in the doctrines of creation
> and incarnation.  God created people in the "image
> of God, male and female" (Gen. 1:27).  This image
> of God in all people means that they are co-
> creators with God; their actions join with God's
> initiative to make a better world.  This also
> means that in themselves, people are good.  As
> participators in the Holy and reflections of the
> Holy, people are to be reverenced.  Dignity comes
> with the moment of creation.
>   The doctrine of incarnation deepens the
> reality of creation.  In Jesus Christ, divinity
> has entered into a permanent union with humanity.
> The incarnation is not just a truth about Jesus.
> As Pope John Paul II says, 'by his Incarnation he,
> the Son of God, in a certain way united himself
> with each human being.' [cites Redemptor Hominis,
> #278]  The Pope spells out the implication of this
> insight:  'Human nature, by the very fact it was
> assumed, not absorbed, in him (Jesus Christ), has
> been raised in us also to a dignity beyond
> compare.' [RH, no number]  Human dignity is
> established by divine reality uniting itself to
> each human life.
>   Human dignity, therefore, becomes the basis
> for a critical appraisal of all dimensions of
> society.  Institutions and programs are evaluated
> in terms of whether they safeguard and promote
> human dignity or whether they compromise or
> jeopardize it.  This is an ultimate norm and takes

---

[141]Healthcare Leadership:  Shaping a Tomorrow, a formation
program (St. Louis:  Catholic Health Association of the United
States, 1988), 65.

[142]Ibid., 59.

precedence over other interests. How the norm of
human dignity is applied in each instance is the
creative task of ethical reflection.
      Every aspect of a healthcare system needs to
be examined in terms of its regard or disregard of
human dignity.[143]

An eschatological dimension is implicit in this

understanding of human dignity, justice, health and care.

One's destiny is part of one's personal nature.[144] This

seems to be the point when Healthcare Leadership draws upon

Mt. 25:31-46, identifying the poor, the sick and the needy

with Christ. It is important to notice that the ontological

aspect of this theological anthropology is inseparable from

the relational aspect of human and divine society. Humans

are not only reflections of, but "participators in the

Holy." In effect, this uniting (not identity) of divine and

human realities in the person of Christ becomes the basis

for a critical appraisal of all dimensions of society.

11) The third edition of Healthcare Ethics was

published by the CHA in 1989.[145] The authors Ashley and

O'Rourke assume that there are human rights in the

political, economic and theological senses.[146] They argue

---

[143]Ibid., 78. The final paragraph ends citing Elizabeth
Johnson, "Christology and Social Justice: John Paul II and
the American Bishops," Chicago Studies (August 1987): 155-165.
The article is relevant for criticisms in the next chapter.

[144]Ibid., 46, 98.

[145]Benedict M. Ashley and Kevin D. O'Rourke, Healthcare
Ethics: A Theological Analysis, 3rd ed. (St. Louis: Catholic
Health Association of the United States, 1989).

[146]Ibid., 5, 15.

that

> the basic principle of healthcare ethics is the
> dignity of the human person (1.1).  However, the
> human person can be healthy and whole only in a
> human community, because to be a person is to be
> capable of interpersonal relations (1.2).  By
> implication, an ethics of health must also be a
> politics of health.[147]

To facilitate these assertions they formulate a Principle of
Human Dignity in Community:  "all ethical decisions,
including those in healthcare, should satisfy both the
innate and cultural needs (biological, psychological,
social, spiritual) of every human person as a member of the
world community and some national community."[148]  The
explicit theological formulation can be seen in a later
chapter, "Norms of Christian Decision Making in Bioethics."

> In short, human dignity in community sums up the
> true goal of human life:  self-actualization in
> relation to God and neighbor.
>     The Christian specification of this principle
> comes from what Jesus Christ added to our
> understanding of ourselves as created by God in
> his own image to share his eternal Triune life in
> total personhood as bodily and resurrected beings.
> The community in question, therefore, is not only
> this temporal human community, but also the
> Kingdom of God into which even the least and most
> unworthy of human beings are called.[149]

The common good is seen as a complement to the Principle of
Human Dignity in Community.  The common good in this context
"is not opposed to the personal good; rather it is the

---

[147]Ibid., 2.

[148]Ibid., 19.

[149]Ibid., 193.

deepest heart of the personal good of each person."[150]

## Summary of CHA Use of Image

The Catholic Health Association provides another forum in which the theology of the image of God functions as the foundation for human dignity. Like the NCCB, the CHA has its own general understanding of human rights. It also has ontological and economic-relational tendencies in its definition and use of the imago.

The existence of the image, then, is the heart of the CHA's theological warrant for human rights. It likewise grounds this warrant in the published works of John Paul II and the NCCB. But the assertion of similar theologies cannot be sustained without qualification, however, and this fact suggests the existence of a substantial discordance, if not incoherence. The nexus of the difficulty is this: in what way can the authors or institutions be speaking of the same image of God if the effects of Incarnation are accounted for differently, or if any mention of Christ is altogether absent from the discussion? Chapter IV will embark upon the comparison that expands upon this emergent problematic, and its implications for defining the human subject and the substantial object of health care rights.

The CHA does have its own understanding about the

---

[150]Ibid., 13. For a parallel development, see Kevin D. O'Rourke and Philip Boyle, Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teachings (St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1989), 2-13, 273-274.

nature and objectives of rights. Like our other selected authors (the pope, the NCCB), it promotes both procedural guarantees and substantive social and economic claims as expressions of human rights. Rights enable the proper development of human life, its fulfillment and its perfection. Certain needs have to be met so that individual people, by contributing to the common good, can express and confirm their dignity at the same time. A person requires health in order to fulfill his or her rights and duties.[151] Among the objects of the right is health care that is basic and comprehensive, offering both preventative and long-term acute care.[152]

The CHA's portrayal and usage of the _imago_ can be represented by two general tendencies; these are the ontological and the economic-relational. The ontological encompasses that which a human person is in himself or herself and as defined by a role or function in creation. Virtually every selected CHA document draws from Gen. 1:27 by featuring human beings as creatures of God. There is room to question whether, in each case, the human individual is thought to be co-extensive with the human person.[153]

---

[151]Gremillion, "Papal and Episcopal," 35; _Charting_, 18-19.

[152]_Setting Relationships_, x, xii, xiii.

[153]Let it be noted that the first Genesis text cited by John Paul II and the NCCB is 1:26ff. The CHA cites Gen. 1:27, and so may avoid the term "likeness" and the historical debate about that term. This selection may leave to one side the more social implications of verse 26.

Nonetheless, human dignity derives from this fact of creation.[154] Other ontological assertions surface from different documents: human beings enjoy preeminence over other non-human creatures, are the masters of creation, and are the stewards over the creation into which God places them. The unity of humankind comes from being the children of the same Creator.

A survey of CHA texts reveals relatively infrequent presentation of the image of God in its christocentric and economic-relational aspect. Several things can account for the absence of this aspect. There must be some allowance for the fact that the target audiences for the CHA texts and policies are not theologians or all Catholics. But in texts that do offer Scriptural and theological background, there is the lack of an articulated, base-line christology that helps to theologically define human existence and dignity; and the lack of a theology that accounts for the relation of the Incarnation and the imago. The first presents a difficulty because one should reasonably expect the CHA to have a definite Christian theology (i.e., evangelical and incarnational). The second difficulty is of greater concern here. Various parts of the CHA anthropology reflect the three traditional understandings of the image of God: image

---

[154]With Justice for All, 31, notes that this creation is the source of both sacredness and dignity. Setting Relationships Right, 2, says that by creation God endows each person with a transcendent value which is called dignity.

as creature; the human image as reflecting the person of Christ who is the image, the model; or a human being as an image of God in Christ. The first understanding of the image pervades the CHA documents, but the second is rare, and the third is almost non-existent.

If the difficulty were to be cast in a liturgical, doxological form, it could be said that the explicit CHA theology points to a person's (not necessarily a Christian) journey "with" Christ, but the group of documents gives little evidence of one's personal dignity being also "through" and "in" Christ. It seems to offer an evolving, chronological placement of Christ's words and acts in history between the moment of original creation and the eschatological goal of life with God. Christ is not presented as the source of a new creation. The third definition of the image of God, an image that exists through and in Christ, is more encompassing than the incremental or evolving human nature implied by a chronological interpretation of the image. Human dignity is a fact because Christ is somehow united to each human person (GS, 22). Divine adoption, human solidarity, a relationship with the Trinity, and a call to a divine destiny are "present" in the full conceptual inventory of the image. The CHA accounts for these latter aspects in only a few texts, and certainly not in any trustee-approved statement.

The preceding analysis is supported by criteria posted

in Propositions on the Dignity and Rights of the Human
Person by the International Theological Commission.  The
Commission's christocentric perspective is applied to each
term of its theological base-line: the creation of humans,
the gift that is Christ, and the redemption and destiny to
which we are all called.  Christ has not simply entered into
human chronology, but is the alpha, the omega, and a
definition of everything in between.  In other words, there
is no theological-anthropology, no image, apart from Christ.
In the absence of a consistent christocentric focus, one can
certainly question whether a Catholic anthropology functions
in many CHA policies and documents.  Again, in many CHA
presentations the human subject appears to be characterized
by a dignity that resides in certain capacities for agency,
rather than in the fact of one's human existence.

Of all the selected CHA documents, The Dynamics of
Catholic Identity in Healthcare (1987), Healthcare
Leadership (1988), and a couple of articles offer a
christocentric emphasis.  Apart from a shared concentration
on the vocation-destiny of all persons, CHA texts only
intermittently refer to the Incarnation, to divine adoption,
redemption in Christ, or to a unity with the life of the
Trinity.  An article by one author plainly speaks of dignity
as coming from adoption in and through Christ, rather than

in terms of creation.[155] This matches with the 1987
Dynamics that records how we are all "called in the person
and actions of Christ," and that "the human person is a
symbol of the divine."[156] Only three documents acknowledge
the relationship of human beings to the life of the
Trinity.[157]

In sum, the anthropology contained in the board-
ratified texts is fairly representative of the majority of
CHA documents. It is a creation-based theology that is
dependent upon Gen. 1:27 as a starting point: every human
being is made in the image of God. It adopts the natural
law emphasis displayed in Pacem in Terris that registers
human uniqueness in terms of intelligence and free will.
These attributes give human beings the capacity to be
members of a participatory society, each one responsible for
making her or his contribution to it. The dominion that
human creatures enjoy is not absolute, but is best
understood in terms of stewardship. Human destiny in God is
presented as a heritage of the creation, and less so as part

---

[155]Ashley, "Ethical Methodologies," 34; Bernardin,
"Personalist Humanism," 51, says that dignity is a gift of the
Creator-God, but that Christian theology has added a new
dimension -- the role of Christ.

[156]Dynamics, 19.

[157]Ashley, "Ethical Methodologies," 34, the human need of
the Trinity; Healthcare Leadership, 78, that humans are
"participators in the Holy"; Ashley and O'Rourke, Healthcare
Ethics, 193, notes the humans are created to share in God's
Triune life.

of the vocation humans have been given through Christ.

The range of CHA documents reveals distinct and somewhat differing focuses in its representing the image of God as the theological warrant for human dignity. Usage of the image of God is largely uninformed by the Christian scriptures. The CHA anthropology gleaned from documents ratified by the board of trustees does not employ New Testament or christological frames of reference. This is evident in the repeated use of "Principles for Systematic Healthcare Reform."[158]

The next chapter will deal with the inevitable objection to grouping CHA documents, which were perhaps crafted for differing audiences, and subjecting them to a single analytical standard. And yet, analogous to the purposes of NCCB public documents, the CHA texts also have a largely "in house" (Catholic) readership. The adequacy of the different explicit christological perspectives (descending, ascending) will be discussed.

## Chapter Summary

Selected documents from the NCCB and the CHA have been surveyed for the content and application of "image of God" in their respective anthropologies. Within the publications of each organization, the image of God is the theological foundation for the human dignity that is expressed in, and

---

[158]See With Justice for All?, 31-34.

served by, human rights.  The survey has confirmed that both the NCCB and the CHA share a reliance on Gen. 1 and its revelation that all people are made in the image of God. Both acknowledge that the human attributes of intellect, free will, dominion-stewardship, and social living are parts of the Catholic traditions in religion and natural philosophy.  The elements of this project's analytical criteria reflect the fact these attributes have roots in an Old Testament, pre-Christian worldview.

Both the NCCB and the CHA differently present the image of God in humans once their documents venture beyond the Old Testament and the related natural law attributes or properties of human dignity.  The differences occur at several levels relative to the specifically Christian reading of the image.  First, the words, actions, and the person of Christ may be substantially absent from their conceptualizations of the image of God, as if there were no specifically Christian theological content in the notion of the image.  Second, sometimes the words and actions of Christ are recalled as models or patterns for the human who is made in the image of God.  Third, relatively few documents convey the notion that Christ has remade and is somehow united with the human image of God.  Each particular use (or non-use) of the traditional components in the definition of the image of God has implications for theological anthropology, the basis of human dignity, and

the objects that rights can claim.

The next chapter undertakes a comparison of the two sets of documents (Papal and United States) along the lines provided by the analytical criteria guiding this project. The content and function of image of God understandings can be categorized by how they reflects rich sources in the Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures, and in the tradition of the church fathers. The categories of the Old Testament, creation-based theology are repeated above. The marks of the Christian Tradition surface in terms of the Incarnation and its redemptive effects, divine adoption or filiation, and the vocation and destiny of human beings. These categories help in the comparison of various conceptions of the image of God in terms of the ontological and the economic-relational tendencies that have been outlined in the preceding analyses. By juxtaposing similarities and differences, the comparison will suggest implications for the anthropology of the human subject, and how these translate into definitions about human health and the objectives of human rights claims to health care. Simply stated, a working conception of a human being assumes a certain idea of a healthy human being. In turn, the objectives of health care, or the objects of the right to health care, should logically be crafted to serve the health of human beings as persons in society.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPARISON OF PAPAL AND U.S. TEXTS

Previous chapters have already introduced the existence and function of the image of God in humankind as a Catholic theological theme. This idiomatic theme is fundamental to the social ethics of Pope John Paul II, of the National Council of Catholic Bishops, and of the Catholic Health Association of the United States. This chapter will compare the theological anthropology in the selected set of encyclical letters with that in the selected set of United States documents. It will proceed by establishing differences in the intra-ecclesial, Roman Catholic usage of "image of God" in humans where it functions as a theological warrant for dignity and rights. The important finding is that "image of God" does not have the same meaning in each document. Therefore, each text does not use the same theological warrant for human rights. The reader is reminded that Chapter I stipulated a "Catholic" focus for this project. This is to say that the present work deals with Catholic textual presentations of theological anthropology inasmuch as they affect social-justice and human rights statements and activities.

The scope of the present chapter includes several

objectives. The comparison between the two sets of selected documents reveals areas of complementary focus and content in their theological-anthropologies. It also reveals divergences. The comparison brings to light some implications of the _imago_ for: the identity of the human subject; for the definition of human dignity; for the nature of human rights; and, given all of the above, for the object of health care. The chapter also addresses the issue of comparing disparate types of texts. On one hand, the selected texts were generated by different authors or institutions. On the other hand, significant differences might be attributed to their having different intended audiences. Briefly stated, the audiences range from theologically informed and interested Catholic parties, to parties in the pluralistic realm of public discourse.

In meeting the objectives of the comparison, the chapter will show that the event and doctrine of the incarnation of Christ are central to a comprehensive Catholic image-of-God theological-anthropology. The New Testament, the Fathers of the Church, and theological reflections within the Eastern Church all contribute to this perspective. The anthropology of the papal encyclicals depends upon the fact and effects of the Incarnation. The United States documents differ with the papal teaching (and sometimes among themselves) in generally not bringing the New Testament and an explicit doctrinal understanding of the

Incarnation to bear upon the concept of the image they employ. Because Catholic social ethics writings base human dignity and human rights on our being "in the image of God," it is therefore important to understand the complementarity and difference among the selected Catholic voices and presentations. For example, there is a common and consistent content and focus regarding the image and human dignity as a rights warrant that springs from the use of Gen. 1:26-27 and Natural Law perspectives. Differences in presenting this warrant mainly revolve around whether an explicit christology is used to support anthropological constructs and assertions of human dignity. The differences can be explained at one level in terms of the audiences addressed by the pope, the NCCB, and the CHA. The more comprehensive theological articulations are appropriate for interested ecclesial and theologically informed audiences. In contrast, theological elaborations may be minimal or absent in texts that are designed as contributions to public discourse. However, there are also theological and practical disadvantages that arise from reading the selected texts at face value. These involve the potential for theological and anthropological ambiguity. In other words, efforts to communicate in a different style may implicitly communicate a different content, a different theology. The next and concluding chapter speculates about the consequences of the differing theological focuses in terms

of the identity of the human subject, of the nature of human rights, and of the objects claimed under those rights. In health care terms, Catholic ethical principles carry "implications for access, coverage, cost control, financing and allocation of resources."[1] In addition to affecting the issue of theological formulation, differing anthropologies directly influence the understanding and execution of Catholic health care missions and ministries.

## Complementarity in the Content and Usage
## of the Image of God

The theological anthropologies presented in the two sets of selected texts share several complementary features. These features represent mainly the image of God tradition that is based in the first chapter of Genesis. For instance, the creaturely status of human beings implies a certain dignity. The human creature is not esteemed apart from relationship to the Creator. Dignity is bestowed by creation. Human origins and terrestrial dominion come from the Creator. Creation is therefore the first ground of human dignity. Creation also implies the unity of the human race, a fact that carries its own moral content.[2] The Catholic natural law tradition sees a reflection of the Creator in human rational capacities (intellect and will). Along with human dominion over creation, these capacities

---

[1]CHA, _Charting the Future_, 19.

[2]SRS, 14.

are favored in the ontological descriptions of human beings.
These ontological descriptions appear more frequently in the
selected texts than the relational or interpersonal ones.
(This fact is related partly to a text's target audience, a
matter to which we will return.)  These capacities dominate
the Genesis-based anthropologies of the selected United
States speakers; one can justifiably infer that the human
rational capacity is the location of the image of God.  The
human is said to have a dominion over all creation by virtue
of these capacities or properties, and of the human origin
from God.  This preeminence is understood in contemporary
construals as stewardship rather than domination.  Humans
express God's own stewardship over creation by their
ongoing, intelligent and deliberate participation in God's
governing action.

Human participation in dominion/stewardship, as a
relational activity and way of being, is a second ground for
dignity, although it is consistently understated or
unrecognized in the U.S. texts.  The intellectual and
volitional capacities, traditionally attributed to human
creatures alone, offer a foundation for the uniqueness of
human dignity relative to that of other creatures.  It is
safe to say that these are the capacities and attributes
that are generally assumed when a Catholic author or
institution invokes "the image of God" to anchor assertions

of human dignity and rightful immunities or entitlements.[3]

There are several implications from reading Genesis in this fashion that coincide with a tradition of Catholic natural law constructs. The focus on capacities implies that individuals themselves are in the image of God. The underlying anthropology defines a certain individuality of the human subject. After all, there is a sense that the image resides where the capacities reside. This connection functions as a theological warrant for human rights that conventionally concern the treatment and activities of individuals. However, this connection itself does not warrant any individualistic notion of the human being. But the focus on individual capacities, and the attribution of the image and dignity to individuals implies a number of questions, including one about the nature or object of a human right.[4] For instance, does a right wane or disappear

---

[3]By way of exception, the NCCB's "Brothers and Sisters to Us" is christocentric in its treatment of human dignity. It does not explicitly address human dignity in terms of intellect, will or dominion over the earth.

[4]Chapter I of this work briefly addressed this issue. There are nuanced differences between saying all human beings are made in God's image, and saying each is made in God's image. The ontology of the human subject and the nature of his or her dignity have different qualities depending upon how much of one's nature and dignity are shared, and how much one "possesses." Common pronouns (all, every) signal different assumptions than do singular pronouns (each, every). One could argue for a more precise use of the word "person" and how it qualifies the human being. So, for example, one could make strong claims for individuals using EJA, 32: created man and woman are "made in God's image (Gn 1:26-27). As such every human being possesses an inalienable dignity. . . ." (Emphasis in original.) And granting the exegetical accuracy

if the above-mentioned capacities are diminished or absent?
There are also implied questions about the nature and
definition of health.  Assuming that the image and
capacities remain intact, how does a human right to health
care translate for a human subject in her/his individuality?
This question will be retrieved later, but the implications
of an individualistic interpretation of the object of health
care can be treated under the related labels of completion,
integrity, adaptation, and allocation.  For example, what
health resources are sufficient to complete the
developmental needs of a child?  Does functional adaptation
take second place to one's rights to bodily integrity where
birth, injury or age have left relative deficits?  What is
the strength of an individual claim when it meets either the
claims of other individuals or a limitation of resources?
It seems that individuals could make the stronger rights
claims where the temporal subject-as-individual, rather than
the person-in-community, is the image of God.

### Differences in the Concept and Usage
### of the Image of God

The theological analytical criteria for this project
expose different theological scopes and focuses in the
image-based anthropologies of the two sets of selected

---

of EJA, 79, one wonders whether the dignity of individuals
requires the individuality of the image as a capacity or
possession:  "The Bible vigorously affirms the sacredness of
every person as a creature formed in the image and likeness of
God."

documents. The operative thesis is that differences in content and presentation can produce critical differences in the identity of the human subject, the nature of human rights, and the objects claimed as health care. Again note that the fact and effects of the Incarnation determine the theological anthropology of the papal encyclicals. In contrast, the anthropology in the set of United States documents less often and less comprehensively reflects the theological substance of the New Testament and doctrinal understandings of the Incarnation. Differences between the sets are partly due to the range of ecclesial and political audiences to which the documents speak. At the same time, the theological foundation that might appear adequate in a particular appeal may not itself represent what is particularly key (or Catholic) in a comprehensive understanding of the image of God.

The Christological Focus: A Key Difference

For Catholics, it is the _imago Christi_ that represents the comprehensive theological conception of the image of God in humans. Issues of complementarity and focus among the selected sets of documents are to be viewed in terms of whether and how adequately their explicit anthropology is influenced by the image of Christ. The two sets of texts share a vision of the _imago_ and human dignity with its roots in Genesis and in natural law. However, it is no longer proper to talk of pure human nature _apart_ _from_ the work of

God through Christ.[5]  The New Testament record of the fact

and the effects of the Incarnation is the reason for a

redefinition of the image of God.  Christ is now the heart

of the image.  "It is in Christ, 'the image of the invisible

God,' that man has been created in 'the image and likeness'

of the Creator."[6]  Christ is the theological source and

focus of comprehensive Catholic construals of human dignity

that warrant human rights.[7]  Human identity and

relationships are further defined by the fact of Christ who

is somehow united with each human being.[8]

<div align="center">Establishing the Differences in Christological
Content: Between the Sets of Texts</div>

It is possible to demonstrate theological differences

in and among the selected Catholic representations of the

image of God, the foundation for human dignity.  Not all the

documents offer a christological basis for human dignity.

Using the analytical criteria, this work has demonstrated

that christological terms are not represented consistently

across the full range of our selected texts.  Because of the

influential nature of these texts, the differences

potentially have ramifications in the areas of theological

---

[5]Schönborn, "L'homme créé," 353; Loss, "La Dignità dell'Uomo," 41-59.

[6]Catechism of the Catholic Church, par. 1701.

[7]International Theological Commission, Propositions.

[8]GS, 22.

principle and ethical practice (not to mention mystical
theology).  A number of texts, all of which treat the image
of God, make no mention of Jesus or the significance of his
existence in terms of the Incarnation with its adoptive and
vocational implications.  Rather than assume that such
omissions imply that the existence and life of Christ have
no bearing on our understanding of the image (and,
therefore, human dignity), it is better to ask whether the
image understood in terms of the Genesis text and
ontological categories is unaffected by the Incarnation and
its consequences.  The answer from the perspectives of the
New Testament and the history of ongoing theological
reflection must be "no."  There is considerable
christological impact on the conception of "the image of
God" and its formative influence on theology and practice.
The incarnation of Christ itself transmits ontological and
relational effects by way of divine adoption.  Another
effect is the basic human vocation to live in God (as the
Trinity), and to share a transcendent destiny.  The
definition of the human subject in his or her being, as a
socially defined being with a transcendent destiny, presents
an anthropological model that implies certain parameters for
rights objectives in terms of equality and solidarity.

The following segments catalog significant differences
between papal and United States documents.  The theological
analytical categories that have been in use throughout this

project will help to expose these differences. Following
the list of differences between the two sets, there will be
some notes on implicit problems internal to each set.

Incarnation

While the selected documents take up the image of God
and relate it to human dignity, not every one takes account
of the Incarnation as a constituent element of human worth.
And for some that do, they omit any substantive (compared
with metaphorical) connection between Christ, the image of
God in humans, and human dignity. Creation in the image of
God (Gen. 1:26) and natural law categories remain the first
grounds for dignity among the selected texts. Vatican
Council II provides a major recognition of the more
comprehensive Catholic theological vision. The Pastoral
Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, article 22,
is an authoritative modern Catholic text that brings the
force of Scripture to bear in assessing the Incarnation's
effect on human dignity. As the "image of the invisible
God" (Col. 1:15), Christ has not only renewed the human
likeness to God, but raised in humans a "dignity beyond
compare," and united himself in some way with every human
being. Besides enhancing human dignity, Christ redefines
the human image.[9] Rather than enhancing capacities (as
properties of individuals), Christ opens and creates

_____

[9]VS, 19; see also RH, 18.

potential and actual relationships among people, and between humans and the Trinity. Using the language of Chapter I, the Incarnation redefines human ontology and enables human participation in the life of the Trinity. Rather than our individual properties, the source of all relationships (God) defines us and our dignity.

John Paul II is, as we have seen, very mindful that all people, simply by being human, are taken into the process of being transformed into that image (2 Cor. 3:18). Christ has brought, and continues to make of us, a "new creation" through him (2 Cor. 5:17, Gal 6:15).[10] His three social encyclicals cite Mt. 25:31ff. in their treatment of people as presences of Christ, not merely as reflections.[11] For John Paul, Christ is the source of the Church's social doctrine. The aspects of human life that are redefined by the Incarnation are present in his various encyclicals, but each extending fundamentally from the anthropology set out by his first one.[12] The Incarnation is itself a redemptive event. In this event every person enters into Christ, the image of God. Christ is the necessary connection among people, the source of a real and transcendent unity and equality among all. Christ is the revealer of, and the condition for, true human freedom. It is Christ who

---

[10]CA, 62.

[11]CA, 51, 57; SRS, 40.

[12]RH, 18.

provides to human beings the means to rediscover continually the meaning of the image of God that is the call to participate in the depths of God's life.[13] It is this participation that so specifically marks the dynamics of the Incarnation as a redemptive event. John Paul II is chary of theologies that depend on the energies of creation alone to explain human identity and activity, precisely because they can imply that redemption in Christ is either extrinsic or superfluous to the human vocation and destiny.[14]

In the body of selected United States documents, two from the NCCB are exceptional in noting how humans share the effects of the Incarnation upon human dignity. "Brothers and Sisters to Us" and "Called to Compassion and Responsibility" are truly "Christian" in tone, acknowledging Christ at the core of human identity. The first notes how human beings are in the image of Christ. The second not only includes reason and moral freedom as a feature of basic

---

[13]DViv, 34, 36, 59.

[14]John Paul II is concerned about reductive anthropocentric ideas about building the Kingdom of God. See RMis, 17. "Kingdom" talk that omits mention of Christ and the Church may promote an enriching dialog among cultures and religions. However, together "with positive aspects, these conceptions also reveal negative aspects as well. First, they are silent about Christ: The kingdom of which they speak is 'theocentrically' based, since, according to them, Christ cannot be understood by those who lack Christian faith, whereas different peoples, cultures and religions are capable of finding common ground in the one divine reality, by whatever name it is called. For the same reason, they put great stress on the mystery of creation, which is reflected in the diversity of cultures and beliefs, but they keep silent about the mystery of redemption."

dignity, but states that health and sickness, and life and
death have new meaning in Christ.[15]  It emphasizes the
point that the full meaning of human integrity is found in
"the context of the redemption and its call in Christ to
'live in newness of life.'"[16]  This includes relationships
with and through the Trinity.

The balance of the NCCB texts does little to relate the
image of God to Christ himself.  The Challenge of Peace
never specifies Christ as the image of God, but does
register the effects of the Incarnation when it speaks of
humans returning to God the Father as adopted children.[17]
Economic Justice for All makes no mention of Christ as the
image, but the anthropology of articles 41-60 recalls that
we live in a restored creation (Rom. 8:18-25).  Article 44
records the fact that Jesus identifies himself with the
needy (Mt. 25) in a context (the Final Judgment) that
suggests something more substantial than that a needy person
bears a metaphorical likeness to him.  Nevertheless, neither
of these pastoral letters of the 1980's appeals to the
doctrine of the Incarnation.[18]  The later Stewardship does
not develop the implications of the same text from Matthew.

---

[15]NCCB, "Called to Compassion," 421.

[16]Ibid., 427.

[17]NCCB, Challenge of Peace, 14, 15, 338.

[18]Cf. S. Elizabeth Johnson, CSJ, "Christology and Social
Justice," 164.

The image-based anthropolgy in the NCCB documents stems
primarily from the first chapter of Genesis and a natural
law framework. There are infrequent but important
expositions of a more comprehensive conception of the image,
ones that relate christological constructs to the dignity of
the human subject in the social justice realm.

Compared with the selected papal or NCCB texts, the
christological content of the selected CHA documents is
somewhat spare. The CHA's conception and use of the image
of God is not explicitly connected to, and nor influenced
by, the New Testament. This means that there is little
evidence of the image of God as a christological construct.
Only the writings of B. Ashley, published by the CHA,
connect the comprehensive elements of image, human dignity,
and human rights.[19] A small number of CHA texts articulate
a theological viewpoint that depends on the person and
actions of Christ as they affect the nature of human beings
and human activity.[20] Only in these limited instances is
the person and ministry of Jesus definitive of human
dignity, well-being and destiny. Colossians 1:15 is the
touchstone for these texts. The effects of the Incarnation
gain scant notice elsewhere, as in such passing comments as

---

[19]Ashley, "Ethical Methodologies," in Kelly, 34; also
relating Christ to the image and the Trinity, see Ashley and
O'Rourke, Healthcare Ethics, 3rd ed., 193.

[20]Dynamics of Catholic Identity; Healthcare Leadership;
Care of the Dying, 46; Bernardin, "Personalist Humanism," 51.

those that speak of human destiny, or of the raising of the body on the last day.

The comparison reveals that the encyclicals of John Paul II obtain much of their direction and energy from the Incarnation. In these there is no question that Christ has a reforming effect upon the human image of God, thereby enhancing human nature and dignity. Using its texts as an indicator, one see that the NCCB's outlook on human dignity is much less indebted to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Human intellect and will, and the expectation that people have a right to share in the work and fruits of the earth, are more to the forefront in the estimation of human worth. Over time the CHA also relies on these capacities and expectations in order to define dignity. The role of health care ministry, for the most part, is a matter of imitating Jesus's solicitude for the vulnerable, sick and dying person, although there are a few passages where one can sense that sick or suffering persons, as they image God, are somehow united to Christ. Also missing is the attribution of the image of God to the agents of justice, care and healing. Granted that much of this literature is trying to focus on the sick and vulnerable who, as images of God, can claim our care, the discussion is richer when care givers can understand that they, too, are in the image of God.

Adoption

The theme of divine adoption is an explicit element in

seven of the ten selected encyclicals, and implicit in the
tenth.  It is much less in evidence with the NCCB and the
CHA.  The American texts often recognize the lofty dignity
of needy persons without citing the New Testament or a
christological value.

John Paul II echoes the patristic tradition wherein
filiation brings to the child of God a particular energy of
the Holy Spirit.  Through the fact of the Incarnation,
creation is completed in the adoptee in a special way, in a
partaking in the divine nature.[21]  Human life becomes
permeated by divine life, acquiring a supernatural
dimension.[22]  The church is at the service of the mystery
of adoption to sonship.[23]  The image of the Father exists
in each neighbor.  The children in the Son have a special
unity, a solidarity that has the Trinitarian communion as
its model.[24]  Human life and endeavor have their full
dignity in relation to Christ, who is the perfect image of
the Father.  Adoption, then, signals the nature of human
life and dignity because it is a thematic crossroad for

---

[21]DM, 7:  This adoptive bond is greater than that of
creation as it grants participation in the life of the
Trinity; DViv, 27, 69: both ontological and economical
elements flow to adoptees; see also RMis, 17:  the fact of
creation alone cannot fully explain the basis of human
dignity.

[22]See especially DViv, 52.

[23]RM, 43.

[24] SRS, 40.

creation and redemption, for vocation and destiny. At the same time, the adoptive relation is not merely thematic or metaphorical, but indicates a status for humans that implies moral imperatives.

The adoption theme has a strong theological and rhetorical presence only in the NCCB's "Brothers and Sisters to Us." The pastoral statement on economic justice mentions how the adoption implies a vision of our common cause, but does not elaborate how this is related to the transformation that the Incarnation works on human dignity. Otherwise, divine adoption is a minor theme in the list of other selected NCCB documents.[25] Because the CHA texts support so few assertions of human dignity by using the New Testament, it is no surprise that the divine adoption is hardly mentioned. One policy statement mentions our being the children of one God, and being as brothers and sisters to one another.[26] Apart from this, only one presentation by a single author speaks of how the Incarnation has adopted us into God's company, and how this is related to the image of God, vocation, destiny, and the warrant that grounds human rights.[27]

---

[25]Challenge of Peace, 255, 263; "Health and Health Care"; Stewardship.

[26]CHA, "Dynamics of Catholic Identity," 41.

[27]Ashley, "Ethical Methodologies," 34. This point and an extended quote appear in Chapter III of this work.

## Vocation and Destiny

The Incarnation has reconfigured what it means to be in the image and likeness of God. The new creation conveys a call to participate in a union with God. This theme is broadly present in John Paul II's writings. In one place he says that, in the Incarnation, our vocation is the ground for the incomparable human dignity.[28] In another place, the pope says that even human rights themselves are based on the transcendent vocation of the human being.[29] This vocation, which is received along with being an image of God, has an eschatological goal, a destiny. Vocation and destiny are expressions of divine adoption.

Compare the frequent and substantial references to vocation in the encyclicals to those infrequently and mostly implied in NCCB and CHA documents. The NCCB pastoral statement on stewardship is really the only one from the Conference that adverts to the goal of the divine vocation. In fact, the concept of the human vocation in that particular composition functionally substitutes for human dignity. The CHA documents generally portray the object of

---

[28]DM, 15.

[29]SRS, 33, and 28-30, 41, 47. The presence of the renewed image of God at the nexus of vocation, destiny, and human dignity is evident in CA, 13, 29, 39, 41, 51, 53, 59. While one might argue that there is a similar calling by virtue of being created in God's image (Gen. 1:26), the nature of the called human subject is somewhat different. The subject is less a thing in itself and more a product of, and participant in, human social life and the life of the Trinity.

the human vocation as a secular notion of the common good, sometimes called the common welfare. Here the lack of an explicitly transcendent dimension is a function of a non-theological communication about human dignity.

The transcendent goal of the human vocation is the destiny that increases the value of human dignity.[30] Comparing various senses in which documents employ the term "destiny" reveals information about the nature and function of the concept of being in God's image. By taking account of the ultimate destiny, it is possible to distinguish where projects of the temporal common good (the common welfare) diverge from, or lead into, or are guided by human social solidarity and union with the divine. Human destiny, which comes through the call to unity with Christ to be eternally alive in the presence of the Trinity, is a constant feature in the anthropology of John Paul II.[31] Destiny is a less constant theological feature in the set of United States documents. The NCCB gives destiny a prominence in several of the selected pronouncements. For example, the nature of peace requires a prior understanding of how the nature and destiny of the human person is pivotal for dignity.[32] Economic progress is only truly so when it corresponds to

---

[30]See GS, 19.

[31]For example, see VS, 8, and its foundation in the pope's theological keynote at GS, 22.

[32]NCCB, <u>Challenge of Peace</u>, art. 65.

the needs of the "universal common good," and is informed by elements of social and spiritual transcendence.[33] And true compassion is effected by the realization that human beings are called into a solidarity with each other and with God who is their ultimate goal.[34] However, the CHA articulates the importance of destiny only within a limited range. K. O'Rourke alone notes that the definition of health "demands knowledge of the human personality and the destiny of the human person."[35] The comparison between the sets of texts reveals that divine vocation and destiny figure less in the American documents than in the encyclicals. Through the Incarnation, the attributes of vocation and destiny qualify the image of God in human beings in important ways. Human persons and societies image God by a present and future participation in a divine economy. Any theological talk of perfecting a human life -- of recognizing and/or actualizing its capacities -- must be qualified by the transcendent aspects of vocation and destiny. These aspects frame human life within a divine economy.

The human image of God, with its capacity to participate in the divine, is called to imitate the Trinitarian model of perfection in this present existence,

---

[33]NCCB, EJA, 323, which cites PT.

[34]NCCB, "Called to Compassion," p. 426.

[35]O'Rourke, Reasons for Hope, 67. See also Ashley and O'Rourke, Healthcare Ethics, 3rd ed., 193; and CHA, Care of the Dying, 46.

and finally to share life in eternity. This model, at once personal, social and transcendent, is most apparent in the papal encyclicals.[36] This relational, Trinitarian model is far less evident in the U.S. episcopal statements or in the CHA literature.[37] The theological tradition of seeing human beings as participants in a relational economy, as described in Chapter I of this work, represents a comprehensive Catholic theological context in which to interpret the ontological attributes or capacities of human individuals.[38]

<div align="center">

Inside Each Set:  Problematic
Internal Differences

</div>

Each set of documents has an internal theological tension that bears on the identity of the human subject of rights.  It is worthwhile to mention these for a couple of reasons.  First, registering somewhat incompatible perspectives within the papal theological-anthropology is an interesting matter of fact.  This fact encourages caution regarding an uncritical endorsement of John Paul II's theological outlook, even though it is undoubtedly

---

[36]Dviv, 12, 64, 67; SRS, 40, 47.

[37]NCCB, "Called to Compassion," 26; Stewardship, 36; CHA, Healthcare Leadership, 778; Ashley and O'Rourke, Healthcare Ethics, 3rd. ed., 193; Ashley, "Ethical Methodologies," 34.

[38]See references to Gregory of Nyssa and the Greek Fathers, and to the International Theological Commission in Chapter I of this work; also RM 51, 52; also Chapter II, at note 202.

sympathetic to the assertion of personal human rights. In spite of the pope's unquestionable use of, and regard for, the rich theologies of the image of God, a particular difference merits attention. It can be argued that there are at least two anthropologies at work, and that they might be incompatible with each other in their application to human rights.

The second reason for mentioning differences that are internal to each selected set has to do with when and how christology functions in the U.S. documents. In particular, some U.S. documents rely solely on Gen. 1:26-27 and a natural law anthropology. The next chapter will also treat some implications of this focus. Does such a focus imply that the person and the work of Christ have simply restored the Adamic image of God? Some assessment will be offered on whether the papal and U.S. christologies differ only in their so-called descending (metaphysical) and ascending (historical) perspectives, and end up in complete agreement.[39]

The inconsistency among the encyclicals appears in Veritatis Splendor. Chapter II of this work outlines its dimensions.[40] Generally, John Paul II presents a Catholic anthropology based on his understanding of the image of God

---

[39]Johnson, "Christology and Social Justice," 164-165.

[40]See the treatment of VS in Chapter II, and especially note 337.

that we all share through Christ.  Only within this tenth
encyclical does the pope appear to waver from his idea of a
christocentric and unmeritable image of God in persons.

The set of United States documents presents its own
ambiguity.  The distinct minority of these documents does
present an image of God theology that relies on the fact and
effects of the Incarnation.  The majority suggests that the
pristine Adamic image warrants current Catholic notions of
human dignity and rights.[41]  The focus on the image of God
as a characteristic of individual human beings can appear to
be a prima facie endorsement of liberal democratic
individualism.  Differences in the content and usage of
image-based language about human dignity can contribute to
an ambiguity about the identity or definition of the human
subject, the idea of human rights, and the object of rights,
including health care.

Analysis of the Differences

Further inquiry about the comparison will help to
clarify the nature of the differences between the two sets
of documents.  Differences in the identity of the human
subject have implications for our conceptualizations of
human dignity, the nature of human rights, and the objects
of rights.  The following paragraphs, then, summarily speak

---

[41]This creation-based image situated in Gen. 1:26-27 was
addressed in Chapter I of this work, in the section on the
Latin perspective, notes 58-62.

of differences among the selected texts that in some part
are related to the differences in audiences. At the same
time, the theological content (or lack of it) of particular
text can have a prima facie significance.

As Chapter I laid out the framework for this study, it
pointed out the importance of the authors and of the various
audiences that these documents address. While texts
obviously bear marks of their particular authorship and
intended particular audiences, we cannot automatically
assume that we know what these are. In reality, the
influence of a text is not limited to a particular occasion
or audience. It is helpful to stipulate something about
these marks for the sake of the present project. In terms
of authorship, John Paul II issues his encyclicals as a
pastor, introducing his texts with salutations of health and
a blessing. The NCCB speaks from a certain perspective in
its "pastoral letters," sometimes as teachers of Catholics,
and other times as participants in public discourse
regarding national concerns.[42] The CHA speaks as an
association to its own members in matters of administrative
or religious concern, but it also addresses the public
sphere in administrative and legislative matters.

It is worthwhile to stipulate ways in which the
selected texts are audience-conscious. There is no pretense

---

[42]It was already noted that Hugh Nolan, ed., _Pastoral Letters_, said that no definite line can be drawn between pastoral letters and some other NCCB statements.

here of making a comprehensive list of these ways, but
certainly the authors were conscious of whether they would
try to speak to an interested Catholic audience, for
example, or to an audience bounded by professional concerns,
or to a general audience in pluralistic setting. There is
undoubtedly a correlation between the presence and
concentration of theological material and the nature of the
intended audience. In the interest of communicating in a
common language, theological argumentation may be
understandably less comprehensive in statements designed to
engage a publicly debated issue. Theological language may
be thought to be unhelpful to the attainment of political
needs. The social encyclical <u>Laborem Exercens</u> supports the
dignity of human labor with a less than comprehensive
theological-anthropology. The CHA arguments for national
health care contained in <u>With Justice for All?</u> and <u>Setting
Relationships Right</u> set their limited theological components
within appendices. A number of NCCB statements assert that
human dignity arises from being created in God's image
without further embellishment. At the same time, the
documents become part of the Catholic library on human
dignity and rights. The contents of these texts have a
certain face value both in recording and shaping Catholic
consciousness about human dignity in both theological and
social terms. In other words, no matter who or how
disparate the intended audiences, these texts are locations

where Catholics would expect to find employed the foundations and values of their own tradition. By weight of their sources and the style of their argumentation, the selected texts are at the same time informational and also formative of Catholic theological and social attitudes. The concern here is this: if indeed the different styles of argumentation suggest different theological focuses, then we should attend to definitions of the human subject that might be reasonably inferred, as well as those articulated in relatively comprehensive theological presentations. The next and concluding chapter will assess this possibility.

The comparison of the sets of texts reveals different theological focuses based on the presence, implied presence, or absence of christological influences. It is well to question whether the encyclicals, because of their comprehensive christology, are substantively different from the U.S. documents in terms of the warrant they offer for human rights. A correlative question asks whether and how the less comprehensive documents establish the theological warrant for dignity and rights, and is it the same warrant?

Certainly the papal and United States selected texts substantially agree on the ontological aspects of the image as they apply to individuals: intelligence, freedom of will, dominion-stewardship of creation, and living in society. These comprise the recurring list of attributes that are associated with Gen. 1:26-27, and with Scholastic

anthropology. The U.S. documents, and particularly the CHA texts, make less of the social, cultural, and perhaps covenantal constitution of personhood than of the individual's independent dignity. Nonetheless, papal and U.S. presentations of the image of God differ in terms of comprehensiveness and focus. The notable difference involves the articulated consciousness of the meaning and effects of the Incarnation. As a set, the U.S. documents are infrequently explicit about, and at other times entirely lack reference to, Jesus or the Incarnation. Historically, theological reflection upon the Incarnate Word reveals aspects of the economy between and among humans and the divine persons of the Trinity.

The more comprehensive and christological conceptions of the image of God produce a particular identity of the human subject. It should not be surprising that a Roman Pontiff looks to the light of Christ for the full meaning of human life.[43] John Paul II can see in Christ the basis of the dignity that exists, as he describes it, in and among human persons.[44] The dignity ascribed to individuals is theirs by virtue of the many shared attributes of their humanity. Dignity is not a property of atomic individuals, but a mark of the person in society with God and other people. Human dignity is not ours solely in light of the

---

[43]Dulles, "Prophetic Humanism," 8.

[44]DViv, 52.

creation.

To repeat one of John Paul's observations, Catholic
teaching cannot be silent about Christ and the mystery of
redemption just because some people judge that talk of the
creation alone might win a wider hearing in a pluralistic
setting.  The Church's contribution in the political order
is precisely in its insistence upon the connection of human
dignity and the Incarnate Word.[45]  This much was indicated
by Vatican Council II when it stated that human dignity and
equality have foundations in the human likeness to God, our
participation in the redemption, and the shared human
calling and destiny.[46]  These themes are woven in and out
of the pope's encyclicals.

The contrast with the vast majority of the selected
United States documents is clear.  The anthropology that can
be gleaned from these U.S. texts locates the image of God
(and, therefore, human dignity) primarily as a property or
attribute of each individual.  The individual bears the mark
of creaturehood (Gen. 1:26-27), is capable of reason, and
can take initiatives in shaping and stewarding the creation
of which she or he is a part.  The emphasis on situating
dignity and humanity in each individual (rather than in the
community) functions as a brake against forces that are

---

[45]CA, 47.

[46]See GS, 29.  Cf. Drew Christiansen, "On Relative
Equality," 662.

theologically or politically tempted to discount individual worth. Indeed it translates into rights as substantive claims or immunities. At a certain point, this emphasis on individuals functions as a bulwark against social and governmental forces that ignore the liberty and well-being of individuals. However, if that is where Catholic anthropology would stop (and it does not), the image-value of human dignity may become disconnected from duty and obligation. That is to say that dignity in a rights context would tend to function as a warrant for entitlement, and not a character that also socially obligates agents. If dignity only attached itself to independence, equality would become disconnected from solidarity. The bias toward individualism is not, in fact, something that Catholic institutions favor. One does need to ask, then, how effectively Catholic social ethics in the U.S. can promote solidarity if its language omits reference to the Incarnation, its key doctrinal and metaphysical ingredient.

John Paul II presents a more nuanced theology that focuses on Christ as the new and renewing image of God. At the same time, his anthropology might be susceptible to the same criticism leveled at Gaudium et Spes, sections 12-45. This "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World" has been criticized for being overly optimistic, and for overlooking sin as a debilitating component of a world moving toward Christ. This objection can be countered by

pointing out that sin does not vitiate the image-based

warrant for dignity found in the creation and the destiny

that have been remade through the Incarnation.[47]  For this

reason, John Paul can maintain a belief in the reliability

of the human capacities for reason and freedom.[48]

Another question about the comparative project at hand

asks whether there is simply a difference in the

christological approaches taken by the pope, the NCCB and

the CHA.  This can be answered in two parts.  The first part

asks about the effects of little or no christological

reference within some of the chosen texts.  The second part

will grant christology an influence in each set of texts,

but asks if it is represented by differing approaches.

First, in a good number of instances, the U. S. documents

cite only Genesis as the image-of-God basis for human

dignity.  Mention of Christ, or of the consequences of the

Incarnation (as described in the analytic criteria for this

project), is mostly absent in the anthropology of the U.S.

documents.  This means that often there is neither an

explicit nor implicit christology.  One hesitates to make

the questionable assumption that its absence implies that

christological doctrine is inconsequential.  It is correct

to say that, as a set, the selected Catholic Health

Association documents lack an explicit christology,

---

[47]Ibid., 672-673.

[48]VS, 1, 32-34.

particularly those texts representing the Board of Trustees. (Exceptions to this characteristic can be found in those previously noted texts that are explicit about a transcendent human destiny.[49]) The association's "Principles for Systemic Healthcare Reform" (April 1990), appearing in the text or appendix of a number of statements, asserts the dignity "inherent" in every person, and the right and responsibility to realize the fullness of that dignity, because "every human being is made in the image of God (Gen 1:27)." The focus is provided by an Old Testament passage seen in terms of human capacities for reason and dominion.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops presents a number of social justice letters and statements that employ an image of God and human dignity component with christological aspects. This component is not drawn equally well in each statement. It was previously noted that the lengthier 1980's statements on peace and on the economy did not appeal directly at all to the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Challenge of Peace does see human history and nature as being marked by redemption and destiny in Christ, and accounts for the ontological as well as the economic-relational aspects of our anthropology and dignity.[50] Recall, too, that the religious perspectives

---

[49]See Ashley and O'Rourke, and Care of the Dying, 46.

[50]NCCB, Challenge, 15 and 65, for example.

and principles of this pastoral statement on peace were
cited within the letter on Hispanic ministry in order to
explain human dignity.[51]  Economic Justice for All
complements Challenge in its use of biblical perspectives.
Its citation of New Testament texts illuminates the
conceptions of human dignity and the practical values that
must govern national economies.  But while it holds up
Christ's words and behavior as standards for our own, Christ
is portrayed as a reflection of how we should act, leaving
aside his intimate sharing of our very nature.  Without a
more nuanced theology, Christ seems not fully the image of
God but a reflection.[52]  As the previous chapter of this
work points out, only the statements "Brothers and Sisters
to Us" and "Called to Compassion and Responsibility" brought
together Christ as the image of God -- somehow united to
each human being -- and human dignity itself.

This brings us to the second part of the question.  Is
the difference between the selected sets simply a difference
in their christological approaches?  Is it possible that the
papal encyclicals and the U.S. bishops' pastoral statements
are using different christologies but arriving at the same

---

[51]NCCB, "The Hispanic Presence," p. 537.

[52]Recall how Chapter I presented three "steps" in the
concept of the image.  The human being:  is created in the
image (Gen. 1:26); reflects or imitates Christ; shares in or
participates in the image with Christ.  The final step
represents an ontological and relational reality, though the
human being and Christ are not merged.

result?  That is, is there a christocentric understanding of
human dignity that makes impossible an indifference to world
forces that create terror and misery?[53]  The real question
remains for the selected texts that each posit image
language:  do the pope and the U.S. bishops employ the same
theological warrant for human dignity?  On the face of the
textual content, there is a difference regarding the
substance of the warrant.  The identity of the human subject
is portrayed somewhat differently.  John Paul II presents a
Catholic anthropology based on his understanding of the
image of God that we all share in and through Christ.  Only
within the tenth encyclical, <u>Veritatis Splendor</u>, does he
appear to compromise his idea of a christocentric and
unmeritable image.  The U.S. anthropology is predominantly
creation-centered, reliant on Gen. 1:26 and scholastic
categories.  The encyclicals take up the ontological
categories utilized in the U.S. texts and redefine their
significance in terms of a personalistic and divine economy.
The U.S. texts are more focused on the ontology of
individual human beings.

Regarding the conception of the image of God, it is not
sufficient to say that the pope has a metaphysical or
"descending" christology (from above), and that the bishops

---

[53]Johnson, "Christology and Social Justice," 164-165.

subscribe to an historical or "ascending" one (from below).[54] The assumption that both approaches can bring us to the same conclusions about human dignity is not necessarily accurate. Each may present elements necessary to a Catholic viewpoint. Each lacks some important anthropological elements that are present in a more comprehensive theology. Each brings personal and communitarian nuances for the defining the human subject of rights.[55] Certainly this interplay can be lost on segments of a pluralistic audience. Where the Church-related readership of the selected and identifiably Catholic pronouncements is concerned, it is reasonable and desirable that the person of Christ -- who is the heart of our ecclesial existence and human dignity -- should figure into the theology employed in the selected texts. The full scope of Catholic thought understands the imago in Genesis 1:26 and 27 in terms of complementary New Testament references to Christ's life and words, to Christ as the image of God, and to the implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation.[56]

---

[54]Ibid. Cf. O'Collins and Farrugia, Concise Dictionary, s.v., "Christology from Above," and "Christology from Below."

[55]Certain persons, whose welfare is subject to another's responsible agency, are affected by the weakness or strength of the other's obligation. The present evaluation is again concerned with normative versus parenetic implications of given theological interpretations.

[56]Johnson, "Christology and Social Justice." Cf. the International Theological Commission in statements relating to christology, 1980 and 1983.

Genesis is a necessary basis but a limited focus for the Catholic anthropology of the human subject.[57]

Differences that are internal to each set of texts merit some attention also. In Pope John Paul's _Veritatis Splendor_ one might reasonably infer that human dignity is one of two things: it is a worth derived from sharing in the image of God in Christ, or it is merited by the fruits of good personal will and activity.[58] If the image of God is either gradable (greater or lesser) or non-existent in some people,[59] then the nature of their rights claims might be unequal or non-existent as compared to the rights of others. Consequently, the substance of what people claim could be unequal based on their moral worth or activity.

The differences within the American set of documents present an additional problematic ambiguity. This has to do with the nature of the so-called pristine Adamic image, with an possible interpretation that Christ's actions simply restore the human image of God to its prelapsarian dignity. The problem is in the potential for individualistic inferences based on the way the Genesis text functions in

---

[57]John Paul II is explicit on this point. Creation is completed by the Incarnation (DViv, 52). The Incarnation produces an adoptive bond that is greater than that of creation, because it grants participation in the life of the Trinity (DM, 7).

[58]See VS, 73 and note 123, compared with VS appeals to GS, 22, and CA, 44, where human dignity radiates from the incarnation of Christ.

[59]See the author's treatment of VS in Chapter II.

the U.S. texts. Admittedly this is an assertion about the
nature of the general U.S. audience as much as it is an
evaluation of texts themselves. The propaedeutic
information in Chapter I of this work mentions an
implication of St. Augustine's thought that applies here.[60]
Whether through Christ generally or through Baptism
specifically, the reformation and restoration of our being
in the image of God is not a return to "the illumined state
of Adam in Eden before the Fall."[61] In other words, when
Catholic Christians cite only the Creation and Gen. 1:26 or
27 as the scriptural warrant for human dignity, they cite a
partial or initial piece of a more comprehensive tradition.
The comprehensive anthropology that is informed by the
existence and actions of Christ reflects his person which
both informs the substance of the warrant and gives the
Church authority to teach it.

<div align="center">Implications for the Human Subject</div>

From a doctrinal and metaphysical standpoint, an
exclusive use of the Adamic-image warrant for dignity has
theoretical and practical implications. There are several
that are particularly germane for the nature of human rights
in relation to health care issues because they are pivotal
for defining the human subject. The reader is reminded of

---

[60]See Chapter I, subsection on the Latin perspective.

[61]Bell, Image and Likeness, 62.

the central importance of this definition:  it helps to
shape our definitions of dignity, of the nature of rights,
and of what we understand by human health.  The first
implication is a reinforcement of an individualism.  The
second is a reinforcement of an immediacy, that is, a human
being's immediate need and immediate claim is not tempered
by the prospect of similar claims by others, not by the
limited resources in their given environment, nor by the
claims of future generations on the pool of limited
resources.  A third inference encourages a tendency to
distance suffering and mortality from the list of ordinary
or necessary human realities.  These three implications can
be briefly described.

Consider individualism as the first problematic
implication of the Adamic image as offered by the U.S.
texts.  This can be done without impugning the competence or
intentions of their authors.  The inclination to impute an
individualism to the Adamic image (as found in Gen. 1:26-27)
is part of the American societal tendency to see the
individual as the image of God.[62]  The grammar of a number
of documents does little to mute this tendency.  Both NCCB
and CHA publications hold up Genesis to teach that "man," as
male and female, is created in God's image.  Both NCCB and
CHA publications describe "each" and "every" man as being an
image of God.  These texts can be represented equally by the

---

[62]Brodeur, "The Rights Debate," 51;

preamble to "Principles for Systematic Healthcare Reform."
It asserts that "every human being possesses an inherent
dignity that must be revered; and every human being has both
the right and the responsibility to realize the fullness of
that dignity."[63]  Apart from such language prescinding from
the social nature of the human subject that is suggested by
the Genesis text, it clearly implies that individuals, as
individuals (not persons in community), can make claims.  It
follows that the resources that an individual claims for the
restoration of physical integrity after an illness or injury
could be unrelated to their age-normal health or their
social identity and function.

Add to this the implication for a reinforced immediacy:
an individualistic interpretation of the image can make
claims that are not substantively qualified by respect for
other humans (present or future generations), the
availability of resources and services, or other parts of
the created environment.  At this level there is no
transcendence in terms of being part of a larger context in
time or eternity.

Finally, human suffering and death may be slighted as
integral features of the human experience.  The problem with
the belief in a restored or pristine Adamic image, by the

---

[63]CHA, <u>Setting Relationships Right</u>, 79; this book states
that:  "Every person is the subject of human dignity.  The
most important secular consequence of this view is commitment
to individual human rights." (page x.)

effects of Baptism or otherwise, comes with the implication that suffering and death are not proper to human nature, nor to a prelapsarian anthropology.[64]  In other words, there would be no dignity -- perhaps no humanity -- attached to suffering and death.  The avoidance of suffering and death, with no place in the scheme of human dignity, could be pursued without limit.  Conversely, the belief that Christ has shared pain and mortality make them hard to exclude from how we ourselves image Christ.[65]  The exclusion of suffering and death from those who image God, and from the definition of normal human experiences, can only raise the prospect of almost limitless rights claims.  These might include claims for individual care, and for resources to maintain individuals in a non-suffering, extended-dying state.  All three of these individualistic reinforcements have significant implications for the objectives of resource allocation or the rationing of health care opportunities.  The consequences for local, national, international and environmental policy-making are profound.

Those documents that employ a more comprehensive and christologically informed notion of the image of God and human dignity contain elements for different anthropological emphases relating to dignity, human rights, and human health

---

[64]On restoring the image to its original beauty, see Catechism, par. 1701.

[65]Recall that a human being is imago Christi, the imago imaginis Dei.  See also GS, 22.

care. These elements qualify our views on death, and the distinction between the common welfare and the common good. In the first case, if Adam and Eve (as portrayed in the biblical text) indeed enjoyed being in God's image without the prospect of suffering or biological death, what would it mean to have them now as the defining model for our own dignity? An uncritical use of Genesis 1:26-27 as the keynote scriptural warrant for human dignity may offer no contextual limitation pertaining to the use of reason or dominion to extend the duration of one's temporal existence. This is where the pristine Adamic image itself (as pure human nature) is problematic for Catholic theology and social ethics.[66] It is problematic in one sense if one does not distinguish its notional content from the image of Christ. It is problematic in another sense if it is presented (or interpreted) to reinforce a notional equality between the Genesis conception of a human being and the liberal-individualist conception often portrayed in public discourse in the United States. The scriptural and

---

[66]See Denzinger-Schönmetzer, eds., Enchiridion Symbolorum, 34th ed., (Barcelona: Herder, 1967), number 222; and Josef Neuner and Heinrich Roos, The Teaching of the Catholic Church, Karl Rahner, ed. (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1967), p. 127, n. 1. In the first Christian centuries, human "nature" in its original state was taken to include supernatural and preternatural gifts. The original state included natural capabilities, supernatural elevation, and preternatural gifts (including immortality). While this understanding fits a Scholastic point of view, it is not as compatible with those that do not contrast image and likeness. This long-recognized conceptual gulf produces some questions about Adam and about the death of Jesus.

doctrinal understandings of Jesus Christ's own experience certainly temper our expectations of temporal longevity or permanence, and for our personal share of resources that nourish and protect life. The notions of equality and solidarity that Catholic theology offers today are informed, in practice, by both the high and low christologies, by metaphysical constructs and reflection on temporal experience. The notion of the common welfare that guides the distribution of resources, for example, is shaped by the theologically informed notion of the common good. The extent and intensity of claims on natural and social resources will theoretically be qualified by perceptions of personal and social purpose and destiny. The common good that includes the transcendent teleological character of the universal common good implies that the biological integrity and survival of individuals are not the definitive goods. A comprehension of the transcendent constitutive elements of human dignity can contribute to establishing a standard (a limit) for what gets claimed by a human right to health care. It also contributes to a hermeneutic for examining current social policy, and measuring future personal and social needs and obligations. The next chapter will assess some further uses of this hermeneutic.

To recapitulate briefly, the comparison between sets of papal and American documents reveals that they conceptualize the image of God differently. Differences affect the

definition or identity of the human subject of rights. The theological definition of human dignity is also affected because it is conceptually dependent on the idea of the image. For Catholic purposes, the Incarnation is pivotal to understanding the image of God in human beings. Those American presentations that omit its effects on the image may produce misunderstandings, such as an incomplete notion of salvation. Furthermore, when they concentrate on ontological characteristics (nature), they implicitly underemphasize the economy of dynamic social and spiritual relationships (person). This economy is signified by the effect of the Incarnation that grants participation in the life of the Trinity.[67]  Relative to the range and nuances of much Catholic anthropology, American set of documents can be interpreted as individualistic by Catholic and United States audiences that are often culturally and conceptually predisposed in this direction. This bias is not directly challenged when the image of God is so often presented in terms of creaturehood and the capacities or ontological properties of individuals. Dignity is attached to these properties. In contrast, the papal encyclicals subsume the ontological characteristics in the divine economy that defines them. The relationships that define personhood

---

[67]Recall the earlier acknowledgement given to the dynamics of deification or divinization as effects of the Incarnation on the image of God. See also Ashley and O'Rourke, Healthcare Ethics, 3rd ed., 193.

overtake the focus on ontological properties (such as rational capacities) and become their defining context.

The next chapter will assess the use of the image of God in terms of what is necessary and sufficient to its definition and use as a warrant for health care rights.

CHAPTER V

THE IMAGE OF GOD:
ASSESSMENT AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

The preceding analysis and comparison of selected papal
and United States documents underscore different conceptions
and presentations of the image of God by John Paul II, the
NCCB, and the CHA.  This chapter will assess these
differences, from a Catholic perspective, in terms of what
is necessary and sufficient when an image-based anthropology
functions as a warrant for human rights, particularly a
right to health care.  Conclusions will be offered about the
advantages of relatively comprehensive intra-ecclesial
articulations of the image of God, in which the imago
Christi becomes the suggested best focus.  Particular
attention needs to be paid to the function that certain
Catholic documents perform for people and institutions
within the ecclesial orbit.  This project has performed the
important task of raising consciousness about often
unappreciated, but significant, differences in what we
understand the image of God in humans to be.  Awareness of
these differences is necessary for crafting theoretical and
practical instruments in theology and ethics.

Differences at the level of theological formulation

raise important questions about how the various groups representing the ecclesial community can authoritatively generate, test, or confirm definitions of human rights, health and the objectives of health care. These concerns have a carryover into the sphere of public discourse. Even though the main focus of this present project aims at Catholic intra-ecclesial understandings and usages, implications for Catholic institutional participation in the public sphere will bear mention within the concluding prospective.

## Assessment

The last chapter compared different ways in which the image of God is presented and understood. The foregoing comparison has provided us with data that can now be more fully assessed. The focus of the assessment is to underline those conceptual components of the _imago_ that adequately and sufficiently represent a Catholic theological anthropology. The constitutive elements of the theological warrant for a human right to health care have implications for the nature and the object of the right. The assessment will offer some account of different emphases between the sets of selected documents. It will also reiterate two problems raised in Chapter I of this work. Is the _imago_ simply a conveyance which masks Western interests, rights talk being one? And is the use of the image an exercise in circular logic?

In plain terms, any explicit or inferred anthropology

that is individualistic or atomistic to the detriment of the interpersonal and social cannot function as an integral part Catholic theology or ethics.  This seems to be quite obvious where one speaks in terms of the fuller understandings of the common good.[1]  The comparison has illuminated the danger of individualism in some of the less comprehensive presentations of the image of God.

For practical and political reasons, the set of United States documents reflects a less comprehensive treatment of the _imago_.  As a set it includes texts that often must address a number of audiences simultaneously.  This places limitations on the possibility of communicating in theological terms, because prospective readers might not understand or be engaged by them.  Even so, it seems desirable that, in the future, those people who are either professionally or casually interested in Catholic assertions of a human right to health care should be able to detect the fuller theological foundation for such assertions.  It may not be practical to expect each document to repeat the fuller foundation, but it could be advantageous if its substance were detectable in a survey of an author's or an organization's publications.  Where the readership of identifiably Catholic pronouncements is concerned, it is desirable that the person of Christ -- who is the heart of

---

[1] Nell-Breuning, "Social Movements," 110; cf. Gregory Froelich, "Ultimate End and Common Good," _The Thomist_ 57, no. 4 (October 1993): 619.

our ecclesial existence and human dignity -- should figure
into the theology employed in the selected texts.  In other
words, mention of the imago in Genesis 1:26 and 27 needs the
complement of New Testament references to Christ's life and
words.  This is because statements by the pope, NCCB, or CHA
are never merely informative; they are formative of the
Catholic readership and their theoretical and practical
responses to concrete situations.  The defect or absence of
the formative aspect sets up an intra-ecclesial problematic
for the attempt to explain or to apply notions of dignity
and human rights.  Even though this critique has an intra-
ecclesial concern, its substance addresses tendencies in the
larger U.S. social picture.  This is because the cultural
mind set is predisposed to see dignity and personal rights
in terms of individual autonomy and procedural entitlement.
Much of political theory sees the vocabulary and grammar of
rights and justice from the point of view of the person who
benefits in a justice relationship.[2]  The society at large,
and Catholic members included, are prepared to understand
Genesis 1:26 and the individual "made in the image of God"
as a warrant for the immunities and claims that personal
rights entail.  But human rights include social and economic

[2]Michael J. Perry, Morality, Politics, and Law (New York:
Oxford University Press, 1988), 186.

rights that imply limits on the disposal of property.[3]

The idea of human rights that relates to the Catholic social ethics notion of distributive justice depends on a conception of the image of God that includes certain elements. The list of elements ranges from the ontological to the relational, where social and economic participation are part of what it means to be a person. It is legitimate to designate one or more of them as necessary to a theological foundation for our anthropology or definition of human dignity. It is questionable whether any single one would be sufficient to establish the personal, social, and eschatological aspects that constitute an idea of dignity that can both support rights claims and be normative for directing social obligation. A more comprehensive view of what it means to be in the image of God reminds us that as persons we are both claimants and moral agents.

The first chapter of this work indicated that the image of God can be explicated in three levels. The first is based in Genesis: we are created by God with the intelligence and freedom that facilitate our mission to have dominion over the earth. The next ones have a more specifically Christian aspect. The second level indicates that we are reflections of Christ who is the image of God.

---

[3]Cf. Brodeur, "The Rights Debate," 51. See M. Douglas Meeks, God the Economist (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), 66. There is a manner of imaging God that identifies divine freedom with claims to exclusive property.

The third indicates that we are images of God in our own right because we are somehow united with Christ with the capacity to participate in the life of the Trinity. In the western Catholic tradition, the first level provides the basis for identifying the human subject in ontological terms: a creature of God with rational capacities. Thus the first ground of human dignity is the human being's origin from God and in the capacity for agency. The second and third levels of how Christians conceive of the image of God are defined christologically. At the second level, humans are in the image of God by reflecting or imitating Christ. This is the level where notions of image and likeness could be differentiated according to the manner of some schools of thought. In the third level, the Incarnation of Christ and the divine adoption of human beings means that humans are the image of the image of God. Human anthropology is redefined by the Incarnation. The new ground of human dignity is in Christ whose person and actions have completed creation. The restoration that comes with Christ carries a newness that is not adequately described by the idea that he restored human nature to its prelapsarian condition, what this dissertation has been calling the Adamic image. Christ has enabled human beings to participate in the life of the Trinity.[4] The dignity

---

[4]Recall the earlier acknowledgment given to the dynamics of deification or divinization as effects of the Incarnation on the image of God.

associated with the divine adoption and destiny is also the grounds for an equal dignity of persons and a solidarity that transcends geographical and even temporal boundaries. There are contexts in which any of these three levels can function to provide a necessary theological basis for human dignity. The first two provide a foundation by grounding dignity on human origins in God, by the dominion over creation, in rational capacity, and in the potential for reflecting God or imitating Christ. Only the third, which subsumes the first two, presents elements that function comprehensively, in ways both necessary and sufficient to, an anthropology that can ground and test rights statements and the correlative types of obligations. The image of God that is Christ has the comprehensive wherewithal to speak of the personal as a quality of the individual subject, to speak of rights and obligations, and to avoid a foreclosure on those human needs and aspirations that are related to the ultimate end or good.

Because he explicitly connects the person and meaning of Christ with human dignity, John Paul II reflects a more complete version of Catholic anthropology. Its completeness is not simply because there is an explicit mention of Christ and christological doctrine. Its completeness lies in its more thorough accounting of the human subject in terms of origins, relationships and destiny. Compared to the overall content in the selected U.S. texts, the pope's encyclicals

present a more intricate metaphysics of human personhood.
His reader is moved by stages to see that transcendent
aspects of personhood correspond to the actual states of
human needs and situations.  He brings the element of
personalism to his characterizations of rights and
obligations.  The transcendent and relational dignity of
human beings comes from and contributes to equality and
solidarity.

It should not be surprising that a Roman Pontiff looks
to the light of Christ for the full meaning of human life.[5]
John Paul II can see in Christ the basis of the dignity that
exists, as he describes it, in and among human persons.[6]
One must not overlook the fact that this same pope has given
a rather prominent treatment to the idea of likeness to God.
When both image and likeness function to situate and shape
human dignity, the nature of the bridge between dignity and
human rights is opened to a question.  Included among
theological concerns about the use of image of God language
is the question of whether human dignity is truly
unalienable and equally attributed to each individual, or
whether it is diminishable and possessed by degrees.  If
likeness, apart from image, is a locus of human dignity (as
one can conclude from Veritatis Splendor, and from Wm. E.

---

[5]Dulles, "Prophetic Humanism," 8.

[6]DViv, 52.

May[7] ), then we need to ask: does sin diminish human
dignity in such as way as to render it gradable or
completely absent? Is there, then, an implicit minimum-
dignity threshold for the assignment or the recognition of
human rights? Take, for example, a person who chooses to
smoke cigarettes, knowing their damaging effects on herself
and others. Does her potentially injurious behavior
indicate a diminution of her personal dignity, resulting in
a diminished claim on a society's health care services?[8]

It seems desirable to stipulate from a Catholic
anthropological perspective that, if there is a theological
construct fundamental to our view of human dignity, it
should reflect the doctrine of the Incarnation, which itself
is normative for any Christian analysis or reflection upon
all Catholic theological anthropology. What exactly is the
practical difference, and what is to be gained by a more
comprehensive conceptual representation of the image of God?
The groundwork for both the difference and the gain begins
with the doctrinal and metaphysical understanding of the
person of Jesus Christ who is normative for our theological
understanding of human identity. For example, Gaudium et

---

[7]VS, 73; May, An Introduction to Moral Theology, 23-26.

[8]Cf. Stephen G. Post, "Health Care Rationing?," America
167 (5 December 1992), 455. While this assessment might have
its theoretical appeal, Post echoes many writers in saying
that "the interrelationship of environment, genetics,
injustice and human imperfection suggest that denial of
effective health care on the basis of lifestyle is practically
and morally unacceptable."

Spes (art. 22), tells us that each human being is somehow
united with Christ in the Incarnation.  The basic equality
that flows from being redeemed in Christ translates into an
equal dignity and the possession of basic personal rights
(art. 29).  These metaphysical constructs direct a Catholic
conception of human identity that informs our view of our
embodied, historical, and social reality.  There is a
substance in these constructs that is more demanding than
the merely rhetorical or metaphorical interpretations that
can arise from a "low" christology alone, or in the absence
of a christocentric influence altogether.  As Chapter III of
this work unfolded the christology of a good many NCCB
statements, they present Christ as a model for our actions,
and his words as guides for our own philosophical
imagination.  This approach, based on the view we have of
the person of Jesus in the New Testament, can well enough
suggest norms of equality and of solidarity that reflect
Christ's shared embodied and historical existence.  In
contrast, the metaphysical or doctrinal understanding of the
effect of the Incarnation on the identity of the human
subject veritably demands an equality of dignity and a
practical solidarity among persons.  It seems, then, that
the articulation of a high christology might be necessary to
establish firmly the strong connection between human dignity

and human rights.[9]

To be a human image of God who is somehow united with Christ, and to be an adopted child because of what God has given us in Christ, add a moral urgency to the nature of the dignity implied in Scripture. The adopted child of God has a duty to act in response to her or his high dignity.[10] Our relation to God and to one another is clearly recognized in Matthew 25:31-46. But so also is some element of the substance of who we are, some ontological fact. Matthew does not record Jesus as saying that giving a cup of water to a thirsty person is "like" giving it to Jesus. Rather, the needy share in the image of God with the person of Christ. As Paul says in his own meditation, "All of us . . . are being transformed from glory to glory into his very image by the Lord who is the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18)." By human participation in the image of God through Christ, the "indicative" of that sharing translates into an "imperative"

---

[9]These views are akin to the Christian intent to see "imitation" of the Lord as our norm, or "relation to" the Lord and others as the norm. Is the economy of being in God's image a matter of reflecting or copying what Jesus did, or do disciples follow Christ more authentically and creatively? See Brian L. Hebblethwaite, "The Varieties of Goodness," 3-16, in Ethics, Religion, and the Good Society (Louisville, KY: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1992), 5.

[10]See Pavan, "Differenze e convergenze," 1149: Because we are adopted children of God in Christ, our moral responses must reflect our great dignity; "Operari sequitur esse."

in terms of dignity and rights.[11] It is important, given the Catholic understanding of the common good, not to overlook that this image and this dignity should be normative in the persons of moral agents as well.[12] This does not mean that a good moral agent must necessarily be a Christian. The effects of the Incarnation are imparted to all. In other words, one will serve the common good not only because one's neighbor is in the image of God. The Christian understands himself or herself to be in that image, and so understands an imperative to be the agent of service to others. This admittedly mystical function of the image-symbol provides a motivational impetus for its ethical function.

Nevertheless, we cannot forget that human rights theory stresses what individuals can claim for themselves, and the dignity that grounds their claims. It is the warrant for these claims, and its attendant anthropology, that are of central concern here. Different approaches may not define equally well the identity of the subject of human rights. A comparison of the two sets of documents verifies the primary difference between the papal and U.S. presentations: in the

---

[11]Recall Privitera's distinction between the parenetic and normative understandings of human dignity. See Chapter II, n.24. This is related to what Hollenbach has termed the indicative and imperative aspects regarding dignity and rights.

[12]Bell, Image and Likeness, 39, observes an implication tendered by St. Augustine: De Trinitate, 14.11, tells us that one who is capax Dei is required to do something about it.

encyclicals, person of Christ is the root of human dignity,
while his connection with the image of God and dignity is
included intermittently or hardly at all among the American
documents that connect the image and dignity. Within the
content or construction of Catholic anthropology, the
christocentric element helps to provide a counterbalance to
an audience's tendency toward an individualistic or non-
transcendent conception of the human subject. As it
contributes this corrective to our notion of who is the
image of God, it balances the inclination to see the human
subject as the recipient in justice relationships, with the
imperative to act out the image that one is. It is not a
simple thing to include these notions, especially where
there is a concern that this language might be thought
ineffective in a pluralistic democracy like the United
States. On the other hand, John Paul II has said that the
Church's contribution in the political order is precisely in
its insistence upon the connection of human dignity and the
Incarnate Word.[13] This much was indicated by Vatican
Council II when it stated that human dignity and equality
have foundations in the human likeness to God, our
participation in the redemption, and the shared human
calling and destiny.[14] Although destiny is valuable to the

---

[13]CA, 47.

[14]See GS, 29. Cf. Drew Christiansen, "On Relative
Equality," 662.

intra-ecclesial Catholic view on human nature and
activities, it does not translate calmly into public
discourse. And while its connotations of "salvation" may
not contribute much in settling immediate public needs, it
does correspond to the need for meaning in the political
sphere where people do act upon their hopes. In this sense,
an idea of destiny implicitly functions in the public
sphere.[15]

### Regarding the Nature of Rights

It should not be forgotten that differing theological
anthropologies affect the attempt to define the nature of
human rights. The selected Catholic documents reflect their
own understandings of human rights. Their descriptions of
the nature of rights are not very detailed, and their
definitions are usually compact. The ecclesial pedigree of
these definitions certainly reflects an idea of rights that
grows out of a sense of obligation to God or society. But
during the past half-century, the dignity of the individual
person has become the prominent value, partly in reaction to
twentieth-century regimes that have injured or killed with
impunity countless innocent people. For example, Pius XII
began highlighting human dignity in his Christmas radio

---

[15]Philip J. Rossi, S.J., "Conflict, Community, and Human
Destiny: Religious Ethics and the Public Construction of
Morality," 114-125, in Ethics, Religion, and the Good Society,
ed. Joseph Runzo (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox
Press, 1992), 115-118.

addresses during the Second World War. The current Catholic

definitions reflect the writings of Pope John XXIII and the

documents of the Second Vatican Council. They contain

formal and procedural elements, but also support claims to

be made for the goods necessary for free and equal

participation in building the common good. Human rights

ensure the necessary social conditions for human dignity.[16]

They represent the means suitable for the full development

and maintenance of life, and the minimum conditions for life

in community. A human right is bestowed by God, not created

by human society. Economic and social human rights are

legitimated by the argument that their benefits need to be

effected so that civil and political rights can be

exercised. In this light, care for health is a prerequisite

for the fulfillment of most human rights and duties.

Overall there is a belief that the health and functioning of

social groups and individuals are interdependent. One has

reason to expect the underlying theological-anthropological

principle would be consistent with this dynamic view of

human social life. Without the image of Christ, in which

all humans share, the subject of rights could claim less

because of the diminished scope of their personhood. This

is why the different treatments of the image of God are in

significant. There is also some inconsistency within each

---

[16]See GS, 26; LE, 14, 18, 19; EJA, 79; NCCB, "Report on
Food," 408.

set of documents. The fact that there are differences in the implied or articulated Catholic anthropology as it is presented in the United States creates a challenge for the discipline of theology itself, for the church's understanding of its own mission as an advocate of human rights and health care, and for an authoritative ecclesial role in public discourse about rights.

## Regarding Health and Health Care

This present project sees the theological notion of the image of God within the image of Christ. However, the description or the interpretation of this symbol sometimes appears to offer two separate first principles that guide anthropological or ethical speculation and application. By way of illustration, it could be said that we have been looking at two "images" at work in the selected documents. It is being suggested that this difference has its disadvantages. But the immediate point here is not to argue for an integrated notion, but to assert that a limited idea of the image of God may support relatively limited ideas of health and health care. The _imago_ that is qualified by creaturehood and reason can be uncritically proposed or interpreted as a bulwark of individualism. In contrast, the image of Christ qualifies the individual human being with his or her own specific dignity, as a person in society, whose dignity also arises and expresses itself in relationships and social participation. There are elements

of these relationships that transcend the present historical
moment, and go beyond the community of people presently
alive. And because persons exist within social systems,
within reciprocal relationships, health and care can more
easily be seen as functions or expressions of these
relationships. Health and illness are in so many ways
relative to these relationships, or our expectations for
these relationships. Simple illustrations of this point are
proper to the spheres of mental health, epidemiology, or
even spirituality. Health and care often cannot be measured
in these spheres without reference to the comfortable,
reciprocal functioning or perceived satisfaction of a group
or community. It is in terms of the personal (the subject
in community) that health and care are defined more
adequately by origins, present relationships, and ends
(destiny).

The theological articulation of the image of God needs
to be comprehensive enough to inform or evaluate adequately
ideas of human health (or illness). Definitions of health,
whether the products of local experience or from the field
of medical anthropology, doubtlessly can have some influence
on the understanding of the image. Another way that this
might be expressed is to say that the threats and realities
of illness expose the cultural conception that humans have

of themselves and their universe.[17] The nature of the
human subject can seem different to different health
specialties which deal with specific concerns and unique
threats. The practice of surgery might assume a more
individualistic attitude toward patients and health than
that of epidemiology. Where health might be defined by some
in terms of individuals' well-being, others might look to
the overall systemic and shared health of a family, tribe or
a town. Consequences of individualistic interpretations of
an image-theology imply that health can be defined generally
in terms of the biological individual, rather than in terms
of the social being.[18] The idea of human health, in the
areas of mental and public health especially, takes into
account a person's social participation and functioning as
much as it does physical integrity.[19] There is enough
substance in the broad Catholic apprehension of the imago to
counteract the extremes that would befall society due to an
individualistic version of proprietary dignity and human
rights. For instance, definitions of health that depend

---

[17]Edmund D. Pellegrino, "Medicine, History, and the Idea
of Man," in Medical Anthropology, ed. George M. Foster,
Barbara Gallatin Anderson (New York: John Wiley & Sons,
1978), 39; James Walter Summers, "Resource Allocations and the
Choice of a World," Dissertation Abstracts 43/06A (Ph.D.
diss., Tulane University, 1982).

[18]For a related discussion, see Bishop William Friend,
"Frontiers of Genetic Research: Science and Religion,"
Origins 24, no. 31 (19 January 1995): 522-528.

[19]In this line of thought, the phrase "healthy individual"
is not necessarily very descriptive.

upon intelligence, awareness, and integrated social interaction (all pointing to the image of God as a rational agent) might not be broad enough to include various categories of people within the overall population.[20] The social nature of the image of God and the spiritual destiny of human beings suggest critical values for evaluating the nature of human rights, the health of society and individuals, and the definition of care insofar as limiting or allocating certain resources. The nuances that image-as-steward carries to these areas indicate the need to attend also to ecological implications.

The same anthropological categories (in what sense are we individual, in what sense are we part of a system) that recognize the interplay among individuals, groups and societies can be used to define health <u>care</u>. This is a difficult and complex issue that cannot be settled within the confines of this project. But it returns us to the issue of how much of health is maintained or restored by treating people individually or collectively. Questions about resource needs and allocations implicitly ask "for whom?" Of course, the business of matching needs, services, resources and persons defies easy or stable formulae. Needs change, services evolve, technologies emerge, and perceptions about what human dignity requires also change.

---

[20]Arthur J. Dyck, "The Image of God: An Ethical Foundation for Medicine," <u>Linacre Quarterly</u> 57, no. 1 (February 1990): 36-37.

Nevertheless, the image of God can help to concentrate and refine the "for whom" part of the health care equation.

Before issuing a prospective look, two questions from the introductory chapter need to be touched upon. What of the criticism that Catholic notions of the image and human dignity may be narrow expressions of a Western ideology? And is the attempt to define the image of God in the human being merely a circular theological exercise? It is necessary to ask whether the discussion of dignity and rights, connected as it is with the image of God, is simply the exercise of a Western agenda.[21] The answer is "yes" if the operant anthropology supports an individualism. If the identity of the image of God (and so, the identity of the human subject) is defined personally (more relationally and more socially), the answer might be "not necessarily." The critique, as has been seen earlier, is not limited to conflicting worldviews between East and West. Feminist thought is particularly interested in what is truly human among social constructs. It is particularly attuned to the principles of privilege, and has noted that the imago has been employed to support types of inequality. So if image-language is to function positively, some critical awareness

---

[21]See Brunner, Man in Revolt, 92; Guy Jucquois, "'Images de L'Homme, Realites de Soi' ou 'Aspirations Narcissiques et Pratiques Juridiques,'" 59-81, in Image of Man in Human Rights Legislations, R.M. Goldie, ed. (Rome: Herder, 1985); Joblin, "La Doctrine Sociale," 668. Joblin, for example, says that the ideas of person, final end, sin, rights and common good are foreign to Asian ways of thinking.

is needed to minimize the theological or cultural myopia that subverts the _imago_ as a norm or a disclosive symbol.

What of the caution sounded by J.M. Gustafson that the usage of the image of God tends to be a circular logical exercise, and so is hardly useful for theological and political analysis?  It is worth heeding D. Tracy who does not recommend abandoning the image of God symbol.  He counters as unreasonable any reflex disregard of theological symbols like the _imago_.  The symbols of the image and human dignity can assist also in determining a religious content in ostensibly scientific constructs.[22]  He maps a larger middle ground between the religious and scientific that can be useful for the examination of civic discourse.

Both of these questions simply remind us that the image of God, either as an idiom or a symbol, requires critical understanding and usage.  As Chapter I pointed out, values, norms and practice are not solely the products of our ethical first principles.  In reality, these principles are shaped and interpreted, or re-interpreted and somehow purified, in the light of experience.

## Prospects for the Future

Because the phrase "the image of God" plays such a pivotal role in Catholic anthropology and ethics, great care needs to be exercised in its use.  What follows are four

---

[22]Tracy, "Catholic Classics," 209-211.

brief cautions or recommendations concerning its use. The
first one encourages some discussion about establishing a
more comprehensive theological description of the image.
The second suggests that a more comprehensive understanding
will be useful in guiding and evaluating not only abstract
theological speculation, but in the formation and evaluation
of Catholic spirituality and ethics. A more unified
conception of the image of God will also better inform and
evaluate the mission of the Catholic health care apostolate.
According to the fourth observation, it will also provide
for a greater cohesiveness among Catholic voices addressing
social issues in the public sphere.

A recommendation to articulate and use a more
comprehensive notion of "image of God" is the first
recommendation. It not only has layers of meaning, it
performs functions in dogmatics, ethics, and mysticism. It
is also a caution in the sense that the other prospective
points depend upon it. The variety of content associated
with the image of God in the selected Catholic documents by
itself recommends that greater attention be paid to its
usage. The use of the phrase "image of God" alone, in
conjunction with the citation of Genesis, is, for many, a
short-hand symbol for a rich anthropology and spirituality.
But its use in some documents casts doubt on whether it was
this wealth that was communicated. In many instances there
is an implicit, if not explicit, focus on the individual,

rather than on the person-in-society. The more comprehensive documentary uses, set in a context where the effects of the Incarnation are apparent, contain both the necessary and sufficient aspects of what Catholics understand by the image of God. Even apart from a theological treatment, there should be a "Catholic position" on the image for ethical and political analysis. An ambiguous use of image-language, or one that corresponds easily to the liberal democratic view of the individual person, could mislead because it does not carry with it the tensive aspect of Catholic anthropology. The tensive aspect is that bi-polar or tri-polar feature that exists in the relation of the ontological and economic-relational. It is a symbol of the connection of the essentialist and personalist (or existential) view of human beings. It represents the image that is an expression of the relation of a person in him or herself, with others human persons, and with God. The first chapter noted that we do not have a word to name this personal complex that we term the image of God. With these things in mind, definitions and usages of the image of God must undertake to reflect adequate or necessary elements of human dignity. From a Catholic and purely theological point of view, a definition or usage is sufficient only when it aims at being comprehensive. To leave aside the ontological aspects of individuals overlooks their particular dignity, and leaves persons vulnerable in

the face of totalitarian political tendencies. Leaving
aside the economic-relational also diminishes the
ontological: we are a new creation through Christ.
Likewise, an inattention to the relational can translate
into an individualistic anthropology. Over and above all
this, recall that image of God has always had a theocentric
sense. It is much more than an analytical tool.

The second point carries the concern that we sometimes
underestimate the formative nature of instruction and policy
documents. It is understandable that theological and
doctrinal propositions are left out of pastoral statements
or texts distributed for general consumption. While
segments of the Catholic readership might comprehend these
formulations, they often do not communicate meaning to, and
may alienate, potential discourse partners. On the other
hand, the point was made that these documents have a
formative function in the Catholic community that is also
trying to understand its place and responsibility in a
pluralistic culture. A comprehensive and consistent
presentation of what the image of God means presents a rich
stimulus for reflection on who we are, or who God has made
us through Christ. The multifaceted dignity warranted by
the Incarnation is good news that needs to be shared. It
outstrips an idea of dignity based on our existence and
capacities alone. In a human rights context, it adds
encouraging dimensions to the way human subjects can think

about themselves on both sides of the justice relationship. In the cultural environment in the United States, individuals need to be encouraged to see moral agency as an expression of their image-related dignity. It is not only the sick and the needy who are in the image of God. The content of the image informs one's self understanding, one's manner of imagining social relationships, and brings an exciting realization of who and what is involved in the acts of prayer and worship. Consciousness about the mystical import of image-doctrine could motivate moral agency.

The third point touches upon another ecclesial interest: the struggle to articulate and advance the institutional mission in the health care apostolate. The delivery and intensity of care to individuals or to the community will theoretically be related to an interpretation of the image of God. Numerous ideas and contexts can be probed for an underlying anthropology. Is the image of God a possession of individuals? Is a right to health care a trump that the indigent individual can toss, with no restriction, at a hospital admissions clerk? The nexus of personal, social, and transcendent characteristics of human dignity suggest otherwise. The image of God does not subsist in the subject as temporal individual, but in the subject as person-in-relation to the immediate and the transcendent. The mission of health care should then be at the service of the proper anthropology. For the sake of the

identity and the integrity of Catholic providers of care,
consistent principles, reflective of the fuller
understanding of the image of God, need to be in place.
Specifically Christian aspects of the image are important
here, because health care is the crossroads of those who act
and those who are acted upon, of those who are agents, and
those who lack capacities of knowing and choosing the
direction of their life or treatment.  The image that is
Christ exists in everyone involved in health care.  It tells
them that they are related by divine adoption, and that
their dignity comes also from a call to participate in God's
life now and forever.  This christocentric image also
signifies how integral suffering and death are to the whole
of human existence.[23]  To accept these limits is to accept
limitations on one's functioning and existence.

Let us return to categories used earlier to reflect on
an individualistic notion of the human subject:  completion,
integrity, adaptation and allocation.  A comprehensive
notion of image supports the social nature of the human
subject.  In an economy of persons, for example, the
resources that are sufficient to meet the developmental
needs of a child are partially determined by the needs of
other children.  Restoration of health should be judged by a

---

[23] See Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, "The Consistent Ethic
of Life," Health Progress 67, no. 6 (July-August 1986): 49.
Catholic doctrine holds that human life on earth is not an end
in itself.

person's ability to participate at a number of social levels
rather than by physical integrity alone. An individual's
health deficits, whether caused by birth, injury or age,
have less absolute than contextually relative value. If the
dignity of social participation is a greater (and more
accessible) goal than physical integrity, then functional
adaptation might be the normative indicator of health. A
person-centered, socially defined human dignity will
accomodate the necessity of resource allocation or
rationing. Clearly there must be some specification of the
underlying anthropology for dignity and rights and health.
Seeing dignity as a shared characteristic in relationships
rather than as a possession helps to frame other issues as
well. For example, a relational conception of the imago
will influence the particulars of allocation (for example,
rationing or triage) because individual and corporate
concerns are perceived as related in specific ways. The
operation of pastoral services departments will favor
relating to the needs of individuals as they exist in a
concrete community. The proportionate strength of claims
made by individuals and the community may not be so clear in
other constructions. For instance, how can we interpret a
client's dignity or a health care institution's agency in
terms of the image of God after they enter for-profit,
share-holder owned health management (HMO) agreements? The
purpose of asking these questions about the institutional

mission is simply to suggest that wide variances in board-level goal-setting and administrative and medical practice might result if the underlying anthropologies are different.

It may be that the implications of the image for human destiny can contribute evaluative norms for a health care provider. The mission statement of a Catholic institution reminds its canonical stewards of the reasons for their own existence. The mission is published to inform and direct trustees, administrators, employees and patients. At the root of the steward's reason-for-being is a mission for the salvation of souls. A Catholic institution's ability to provide holistic care hinges on the provision of care for souls as its highest law.[24] In the end, a comprehensive conception of the image of God needs to be applied consistently so that inadequate symbolic and critical usages will not serve non-personal, unsocial, anti-social or purely mundane goals. Without a theologically informed notion of the image of God, people in a Catholic environment may overlook a symbol that can reveal secular or cultural agendas within its purportedly religious expressions and goals.

The fourth point deals with the possible function of the image of God in relation to the institutional Catholic participation in public discourse. It is necessary to speculate a little about an area into which the pope, the

---

[24]Maida and Cafardi, Church Property, vi, 228-229.

NCCB, and the CHA will continue to attempt to inject their influence. Political considerations involve not only the public audience in the United States, for example, but an astute estimation of one's own constituency. Political influence is based not only on titles and bullet-proof arguments, but also on having numbers of people committed to an identifiable point of view. Any use of the image of God as a warrant for human dignity will be politically significant when it enjoys a shared meaning among those who use it (Catholics), because this will indicate a unified voice. At the same time, the shared meaning must be able to withstand scrutiny from those who might wish to prove a lack of solidarity (for example, Catholics do not agree on this, so they are not a block to deal with), or a lack of consistency (the idea of image seems to lack a content, so the basis of Catholic assertions on social ethics are not reasonable). A failure on either of these counts could impair the church's ability to, as B. Hehir puts it, create a "space . . . for explicit moral argument" in the public political sphere.[25]

There are, for the audience-related reasons listed in Chapter IV, teachings and policy statements by Catholic speakers that omit theological principles and explanations. On the other hand, the dynamics of public and legal

---

[25]J. Bryan Hehir, "A Public Church," Origins 14, no. 3 (31 May 1984): 42.

discourse do not entirely dichotomize the secular and religious. Certainly the idiom "image of God" is plainly religious. This does not mean that people in general, or Catholic people and institutions, have to forego personal convictions or expectations about the practical expressions of human dignity. Dignity is a value among many different groups. It is interesting to note, as does R. Dworkin, that once "the idea of religion is separated from the idea of a god," U.S. courts, "have great difficulty in distinguishing between religious and other kinds of conviction."[26] From this point of view it is understandable why the NCCB or CHA might leave behind types of religious language in order join others at the level of shared convictions.

But to return to the importance of religious categories, the Church is well served by asking how central the image of God is to its interventions on behalf of human rights. If it is a necessary principle in Catholic social doctrine, but if there is no "Catholic position" on human dignity because of differing or conflicting interpretations of the image of God, how effective will public interventions be? For instance, what damage might the Church incur if a secular interlocutor challenged the legitimacy of Catholic institutional admonitions on public policy because they lack a consistently principled basis? It is one thing for the

[26]Ronald Dworkin, Life's Dominion: An Argument about Abortion, Euthanasia, and Individual Freedom (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 162-163.

theological warrant for the human dignity of poor people to evanesce amid academic argumentation. It would be another thing for a Catholic agency to risk a public rebuke or dismissal because it did not pay enough attention to the concepts that validate its own authority. This seems to be a good reason why the person of Christ and certain christological constructs are essential to Catholic definitions of human dignity. It was stated earlier that Christ is the foundation both of the dignity of the person, and the dignity and authority of the Church.

It is also important, both in intra-ecclesial and public affairs to be able to discern whether the Catholic idea of solidarity is a figure of speech, or if it means that human beings share an essential and historical solidarity that is normative for relationships.[27] The latter case makes more sense.[28] What can only be regarded as arguable or rhetorically attractive within ecclesial circles would have even less probative influence in civic discourse. This is why it may be questionable practice to

---

[27]Cf. Michael J. Perry, Love and Power (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 34. It is one thing to suppose or deny that ideas of human nature are socially constructed. It is another to "insist that there is such a thing as human nature."

[28]Recall how SRS, 14, says that creation implies that the unity of the human race is a fact carrying its own moral content. Apply an analogous reasoning to the Incarnation. It carries a moral content as well, creating a unity rooted in a number of relationships, including Trinitarian, human social and transtemporal and transgenerational ones.

proffer an anthropology that lacks reference to the normative implications of the Incarnation. Especially in case once one's argument has entered the theologosphere through the lexical gate at Genesis 1:26-27, what advantage is there in ignoring the relevance of the New Testament?

Less comprehensive definitions limit the function of the _imago_ in the public realm as well. Without a consistent presentation of a sufficiently comprehensive understanding of the image of God, civic discourse might be deprived of a symbol that could reveal hidden religious or sectarian assumptions within supposedly secular pronouncements or activities. For example, particular legislative proposals for "animal rights" might be expressions of pantheism. The nineteenth-century doctrine of Manifest Destiny, that the United States had the right and duty to spread across North America and beyond, had a religious as well as a political foundation.[29] Even in that era, the image-symbol functioned to disclose the misguided religious agenda it contained. The image of God is not immune from the poisonous gasses of totalitarianism.

## Conclusion

The main contribution of this study has been to point out that use of the term "image of God" does not necessarily

---

[29]See Anders Stephanson, _Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of the Right_ (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), xi, 4-12.

establish the same basis for human dignity, nor the same warrant for human rights. The first ten encyclical letters of Pope John Paul II present the image of God as the basis for a complex and comprehensive theological anthropology. The human subject is a person whose self-understanding and relationships are defined by the redemptive effects of the Incarnation. The set of United States documents shares this explicit anthropology in some texts, but not in others. The two sets complement each other's use of the image of God based on creation and some philosophical categories. There are differences in christological content, which is not present in all the U.S. texts that speak of the image of God and human dignity. The difference translates into both an actual or implied comparatively narrow understanding of the image of God that may favor an ethical and political individualism. While it is arguable whether there should be a uniform or "Catholic position" on the definition or function of image-language, the comparison of documents selected for this study points out that it has yet to be established.

The image of God has been described as a classical symbol whose use need not be limited to theological discussions. Some caution is required to guard against cultural tendencies being uncritically smuggled into the meaning of the _imago_. Even with this limiting possibility, it is a disclosive symbol, one that can help test ethical

constructs for cultural bias, and test public discourse for hidden religious values.

The image of God functions to guide construals of human rights and health and health care. Admittedly this study has, for the sake of argument, made its comparisons while looking to the poles of individualism versus a social definition of persons. Of course, the contents of the selected documents would not always fall totally to one side or the other. By emphasizing the contrast where it exists, it is easier to present ways in which differing interpretations of the image of God shape the underlying anthropology. There is a correlative effect that translates into a conception of health care, awareness of which provides a critical benefit to the mission of Catholic health care. In this connection, the image of God provides a means of shaping the mission of this apostolate and evaluating its structures and activities.

Finally, a suggestion about using the image of God, even the more comprehensive image of Christ, in the public sphere. Concern about a common discourse language should not inhibit our ability to form the Catholic community. If and where religious language (not always easy to define) may be judged unsuitable, one needs to ask if and how it is used in intra-ecclesial settings. It should not be forgotten that there is a public sense in which churches are political institutions because they form and provide leaders and

participants for civic activities.  In those discussions where the church is able to create a public space for moral discourse, the image of God can help to disclose and evaluate religious values or agendas in what are only apparently secular ideas and initiatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Texts

Papal Encyclicals

John Paul II. Redemptor Hominis. 4 March 1979 ["On the Redemption and Dignity of Man"]. In The Papal Encyclicals 1958-1981. Edited by Claudia Carlen, IHM, 245-273. Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing, 1981.

_____. "Dives in Misericordia." 30 November 1980. ["Rich in Mercy"]. Origins 10, no. 26 (11 December 1980): 401-416.

_____. Laborem Exercens. 14 September 1981. ["On Human Work"]. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1981.

_____. "Slavorum Apostoli." 2 June 1985. ["Apostles of the Slavs"]. Origins 15, no. 8 (18 July 1985): 113-125.

_____. "Dominum et Vivificantem." 18 May 1986. ["The Lord and Giver of Life"]. Origins 16, no. 4 (12 June 1986): 77-102.

_____. "Redemptoris Mater." 25 March 1987. ["The Mother of the Redeemer"]. Origins 16, no. 43 (9 April 1987): 745-766.

_____. Sollicitudo Rei Socialis. 30 December 1987. ["On Social Concern"]. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1987.

_____. "Redemptoris Missio." 7 December 1990. ["Mission of the Redeemer"]. Origins 20, no. 34 (31 January 1991): 541-568.

_____. Centesimus Annus. 1 May 1991. ["On the Hundredth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum"]. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1991.

_____. "Veritatis Splendor." 6 August 1993. ["The Splendor of Truth"]. Origins 23, no. 18 (14 October 1993): 297-334.

United States Documents

<u>National Conference of Catholic Bishops</u>

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. "Brothers and Sisters
To Us." <u>Origins</u> 9, no. 24 (29 November 1979): 381-389.

_____. "Statement on Capital Punishment." <u>Origins</u> 10, no.
24 (27 November 1980): 373-377.

_____. "U.S. Bishops' Pastoral Letter on Health and Health
Care ('Health and Health Care')." <u>Origins</u> 11, no. 25 (3
December 1981): 396-402.

_____. <u>The Challenge of Peace</u>. A Pastoral Letter on War and
Peace. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference,
1983.

_____. "The Hispanic Presence: Challenge and Committment."
<u>Origins</u> 13, no. 32 (19 January 1984): 529, 531-541.

_____. "Pastoral Plan for Pro-Life Activities: A
Reaffirmation." <u>Origins</u> 15, no. 24 (28 November 1985):
401-406.

_____, Committee for Pro-Life Activities. "Guidelines for
Legislation on Life-Sustaining Treatment." <u>Origins</u> 14,
no. 32 (24 January 1985): 526-528.

_____. "A Pastoral Message: Economic Justice for All." In
<u>Economic Justice for All</u>, v-xvi. Washington, DC: National
Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1986.

_____. <u>Economic Justice for All</u>. Washington, DC: National
Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1986.

_____. "Statement on School Based Clinics." <u>Origins</u> 17, no.
25 (3 December 1987): 433, 435-441.

_____. "Report on Food and Agriculture." <u>Origins</u> 18, no. 25
(1 December 1988): 407-412.

_____. "Food Policy in a Hungry World." <u>Origins</u> 19, no. 25
(23 November 1989): 414-420.

_____. "Called to Compassion and Responsibility: A
Response to the HIV/AIDS Crisis." <u>Origins</u> 19, no. 26 (30
November 1989): 421, 423-434.

_____. <u>Reflections on the Sacrament of Penance in Catholic
Life Today</u>. Washington, DC: United States Catholic
Conference, 1990.

_____. "Nutrition and Hydration:   Moral and Pastoral Reflections." Origins 21, no. 44 (9 April 1992): 705-712.

_____. "One in Christ Jesus:   Toward a Pastoral Response to the Concerns of Women for Church and Society." Origins 22, no. 29 (31 December 1992): 489, 491-508.

_____. "Communities of Salt and Light:   Reflections on Parish Social Mission." U.S. Bishops Justice Statement. Origins 23, no. 25 (2 December 1993): 443-448.

_____. "The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace." Origins 23, no. 26 (9 December 1993): 449, 451-464.

_____. Stewardship:   A Disciple's Response. A Pastoral Letter on Stewardship. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1993.

_____. "Resolution on Health Care Reform." Origins 23, no. 7 (1 July 1993): 97, 99-102.

United States Catholic Conference. "Statement on Social Security (March 1983)." In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Vol. 4, edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 487-490. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1984.

_____. "Political Responsibility:   Choices for the 1980's (March 1984)." In Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Vol. 5, edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 95-108. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1989.

_____. "Statement on National Health Insurance." In Quest for Justice, edited by J. Brian Benestad and Francis J Butler, 256-257. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1981.


Catholic Health Association of the United States

Ashley, Benedict, O.P. "Ethical Methodologies:   A Current Controversy." In Ethics Committees:   A Challenge for Catholic Health Care, edited by Margaret John Kelly and Donald McCarthy, 24-43. St. Louis: Pope John Medical Moral Research and Education Center and Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1984.

Ashley, Benedict M, and Kevin D. O'Rourke. Healthcare Ethics: A Theological Analysis. Third Edition. St. Louis, MO: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1989.

Bernardin, Joseph Cardinal.   "The Consistent Ethic of Life."
     Health Progress 67, no. 6 (July-August 1986):   48-51.

Catholic Health Association of the United States. Evaluative
     Criteria for Catholic Health Care Facilities. St. Louis:
     Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1980.

_____.  "The Pastoral Letter on Health and Health Care:  A
     Roundtable." Hospital Progress 63, no. 5 (May 1982): 33-
     48.

_____. The Dynamics of Catholic Identity in Healthcare. St.
     Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States,
     1987.

_____.   Healthcare  Leadership:    Shaping  a  Tomorrow.
     Formation Program. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association
     of the United States, 1988.

_____.  "CHA  Principles  for  Healthcare  Reform."  Health
     Progress 71, no. 5 (1990): 52-53.

_____.  Charting  the  Future:    Principles  for  Systmatic
     Healthcare Reform. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association
     of the United States, 1990.

_____.  With  Justice  for  All?   The  Ethics  of  Healthcare
     Rationing. St. Louis, MO: Catholic Health Association of
     the United States, 1991.

_____.  Care  of  the  Dying:   A  Catholic  Perspective.  St.
     Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States,
     1993.

_____.  Setting  Relationships  Right:   A  Proposal  for
     Systematic Healthcare Reform. revised ed. St.  Louis:
     Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1993.

Gremillion, Joseph. "Papal and Episcopal Teaching on Justice
     and Health Care." In Justice and Health Care, edited by
     Margaret John Kelly DC, 31-43. St. Louis: Catholic Health
     Association of the United States, 1985.

Gula, Richard M. Principled and Virtuous Care of the Dying:
     A Catholic Response to Euthanasia. St. Louis: Catholic
     Health Association of the United States, 1991.

Kelly, Margaret John, ed. Justice and Health Care. St. Louis,
     MO: Catholic Health Association of the United States,
     1985.

O'Rourke, Kevin D., O.P. Reasons for Hope:  Laity in Catholic

Health Care Facilities. St. Louis: Catholic Health
    Association of the United States, 1983.

O'Rourke, Kevin D., and Philip Boyle. Medical Ethics: Sources
    of Catholic Teachings. St. Louis: Catholic Health
    Association of the United States, 1989.


Secondary Sources

Abbott, Walter M., and Joseph Gallagher, eds. The Documents of
    Vatican II. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966.

Addis, William E., and Thomas Arnold. "Image of God." 16th
    edition (revised). In A Catholic Dictionary, 429-430. St.
    Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957.

Amos, John R., Melanie DiPietro, Jordan Hite, Francis
    Morrisey, and Peter Campbell. The Search for Identity:
    Canonical Sponsorship of Catholic Healthcare. St. Louis:
    Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1993.

Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue in the United States. "Images
    of God: Reflections on Christian Anthropology." Origins
    13, no. 30 (5 January 1984): 505-512.

Augustine, St. St. Augustine's Comments on "Imago Dei." An
    anthology from all his works exclusive of the De
    Trinitate. Edited by J. Heijke, CSSp. Classical Folia.
    Worcester, MA: Holy Cross College, 1960.

Baum, Gregory. "The Originality of Catholic Social Teaching."
    In Rerum Novarum: A Hundred Years of Catholic Social
    Teaching, edited by John Coleman and Gregory Baum, 55-62.
    Concilium. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International,
    1991.

Bell, David N. The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian
    Spirituality of William of St. Theirry. Kalamazoo, MI:
    Cistercian Publications, 1984. Cistercian Studies Series:
    Number Seventy-eight.

Benestad, J. Brian. The Pursuit of a Just Social Order:
    Policy Statements of the U.S. Catholic Bishops, 1966-
    1980. Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center,
    1982.

Bernardin, Most Rev. Joseph L. "Personalist Humanism: Value
    System for Medicine." Hospital Progress 61, no. 3 (March
    1980): 48-51ff.

Biffi, Franco. "I diritti umani da Leone XIII a Giovanni Paolo

II." In _I Diritti Umani_, edited by Gino Concetti, 199-
243. Rome: Editrice AVE, 1982. Professor of Sociology,
Lateran University.

Brunner, Emil. _Man in Revolt:  A Christian Anthropology_.
German publ., 1937. Translated by Olive Wyon.
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947.

Burghardt, Walter J. _The Image of God in Man according to
Cyril of Alexandria_. Studies in Christian Antiquity, No.
14. Woodstock, MD: Woodstock College Press, 1957.

Butler, Sara, M.S.B.T., ed. _Research Report:  Women in Church
and Society, 1978_. A Report on the Status of Women in
Church and Society:  Considered in Light of the Question
of Women's Ordination. New York: Catholic Theological
Society of America, 1978.

Byers, David M., and John T. Pawlikowski, eds. _Justice in the
Marketplace_. Washington, DC: United States Catholic
Conference, 1985.

Cahill, Lisa Sowle. "Toward a Christian Theory of Human
Rights." _Journal of Religious Ethics_ 8, no. 2 (Fall
1980): 277-301.

Cairns, David. _The Image of God in Man_. Introduction by David
E. Jenkins. London: Collins, 1973.

Calvez, Jean-Yves, and Jacques Perrin. _The Church and Social
Justice:  The Social Teaching of the Popes from Leo XIII
to Pius XII (1878 - 1958)_. Translated by J. R. Kirwan.
London: Burns & Oates, 1961.

Canon Law Society of America. _Protection of Rights of Persons
in the Church_. Revised Report of the Canon Law Society of
America on the Subject of Due Process. Washington, DC:
Catholic University of America, 1991.

_Catechism of the Catholic Church_. Edited by Libreria Editrice
Vaticana. Ligouri, MO: Ligouri Publications, 1994.

Catholic Health Association of the United States. _Future
Directions for the Catholic Health Care Ministry_. Summary
Report of the Stewardship Task Force. St. Louis: Catholic
Health Association of the United States, 1984.

_____. _Human Genetics:  Ethical Issues in Genetic Testing,
Counseling, and Therapy_. St. Louis: Catholic Health
Association of the United States, 1990.

_____. "Health Care Reform Proposal." _Origins_ 22, no. 4 (4

June 1992): 60-63. An executive summary of "Setting Relationships Right: A Working Proposal for Systematic Health-Care Reform." 44 pp.

_____. "CHA Principles for Healthcare Reform." Health Progress 71, no. 5 (1990): 52-53.

_____. No Room in the Market Place: The Health Care of the Poor. St. Louis, MO: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1986.

Catholic News Service. Stylebook on Religion. Washington, DC: Catholic News Service, 1990.

Chenu, Marie-Domenique. La "Doctrine Sociale" de l'Église comme idéologie. Paris: Cerf, 1979.

Chereso, Peter. "Image of God." In New Catholic Encyclopedia. Washington, DC: McGaw-Hill, 1967.

Childress, James F. "Image of God (Imago Dei)." In The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Ethics, edited by James F. Childress and John MacQuarrie, 292-293. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Christiansen, Drew. "On Relative Equality: Catholic Egalitarianism after Vatican II." Theological Studies 45 (December 1984): 651-675.

Coleman, John A., S.J. "Vision and Praxis in American Theology: Orestes Brownson, John A. Ryan, and John Courtney Murray." Theological Studies 37, no. 1 (March 1976): 3-40.

Coleman, John A. An American Strategic Theology. New York: Paulist, 1982.

Concetti, Gino, editor. I Diritti Umani. Rome: Editrice AVE, 1982.

Congregation for Catholic Education. "Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests." Origins 19, no. 11 (3 August 1989): 169, 171-192.

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. "Instruction on Certain Aspects of the 'Theology of Liberation'." Origins 14, no. 13 (13 September 1984): 195, 197-204.

Coriden, James A., Thomas J. Green, and Donald E. Heintschel, eds. The Code of Canon Law: A Text and Commentary. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

Cox, Darrel W. "The Imago Dei and Inalienable Rights."
     Master's thesis. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University,
     1993.

Craig, Robert P., Carl L. Middleton, and Laurence J.
     O'Connell, eds. Ethics Committees: A Practical Approach.
     St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United
     States, 1986.

Cross, F.L., and E.A. Livingstone, eds. "Augustinian Hermits."
     In The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Second
     Edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Crossan, Dominic M. Imago Dei: A Study in Philo and St. Paul.
     Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1959.

Curran, Charles E. "The Right to Health Care and Distributive
     Justice." In Transition and Tradition in Moral Theology,
     edited by Charles E. Curran, 139-170. Notre Dame [IN] -
     London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979.

_____. "The Changing Anthropological Bases of Catholic
     Social Ethics." Thomist 45, no. 2 (April 1981): 284-318.

Curtis, Edward Mason. Man as the Image of God in Genesis in
     the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels. PhD diss.
     University of Pennsylvania, 1984.

Denzinger, Henricus, and Adolfus Schönmetzer, S.J., eds.
     Enchiridion Symbolorum: Definitionum et Declarationum de
     Rebus Fidei et Morum. 34th, amended. Barcelona: Herder,
     1967.

Dulles, Avery. "The Prophetic Humanism of John Paul II."
     America 169, no. 12 (23 October 1993): 6-11.

Dworkin, Ronald. Life's Dominion: An Argument About Abortion,
     Euthanasia, and Individual Freedom. New York: Alfred A.
     Knopf, 1993.

Dyck, Arthur J. "The Image of God: An Ethical Foundation for
     Medicine." Linacre Quarterly 57, no. 1 (1990): 35-45.

Elsbernd, Mary. "Papal Statements on Rights: A Historical
     Contextual Study of Encyclical Teaching from Pius VI -
     Pius XI (1791-1939)." Ph.D. diss. University of Louvain,
     Belgium, 1985.

_____. "What Ever Happened to Octogesima Adveniens?"
     Theological Studies 56, no. 1 (March 1995): 39-60.

Fallon, J.F. "Image of God (In the Bible)." In Encyclopedic

*Dictionary of Religion*, 1770. Washington, DC: Corpus Publications, 1979.

Friend, Bishop William. "Frontiers of Genetic Research: Science and Religion." *Origins* 24, no. 31 (19 January 1995): 522-528.

Galkowski, Jerzy W. "Jean-Paul II et les droits de l'homme." In *The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations: An International Colloquium in the Vatican (Vol. 2)*, edited by Pontifical Lateran University and Catholic University of Lublin, 1130-1138. Florence, Italy: F. Le Monnier, 1982.

Gallagher, John A. "Theological Categories in the Social Encyclicals." In *Rerum Novarum: A Hundred Years of Catholic Teaching*, edited by John Coleman and Gregory Baum, 36-46. Concilium. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International, 1991.

Galot, Jean, S.I. "La définition de la personne, relation et sujet." *Gregorianum* 75, no. 2 (1994): 281-299.

Gewirth, Alan. *Human Rights*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Goldie, R.M., ed. *Image of Man in Human Rights Legislations*. Rome: Herder, 1985.

Green, Garrett. *Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Gross, H., F. Mussner, and F. Kakner. "Gottebenbildlichkeit." In *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, edited by Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner, 4, cols. 1087-1092. Freiburg: Herder, 1960.

Gula, Richard M. *Principled and Virtuous Care of the Dying: A Catholic Response to Euthanasia*. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1991.

Gunton, Colin E. "Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Cristoph Schwöbel and Colin E. Gunton, 47-61. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Gustafson, James M. *Ethics from a Theocentric Perspective. Volume One: Theology and Ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

_____. "Genetic Therapy: Ethical and Religious Reflections." *Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy* 8 (Spring 1992): 183-200.

_____. "Theology, Biology, Ethics and Theology: Further Explorations." TMs. 1994.

Haight, Roger, S.J. An Alternative Vision: An Interpretation of Liberation Theology. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

Hamel, Edouard, S.J. "L'Eglise et les droits de l'homme. Jalons d'histoire." Gregorianum 65, no. 2-3 (1984): 271-299.

"Health Defined." The Moment 6, no. 3 (1993): 2.

Hebblethwaite, Brian L. "The Varieties of Goodness." In Ethics, Religion, and the Good Society, edited by Joseph Runzo, 3-16. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Hehir, J. Bryan. "A Public Church." Origins 14, no. 3 (31 May 1984): 40-43.

_____. "Policy Arguments in a Public Church: Catholic Social Ethics and Bioethics." Journal of Medicine and Philosophy 17, no. 3 (June 1992): 347-364.

Hislop, Ian, O.P. The Anthropology of St. Thomas. The Aquinas Society of London, Aquinas Paper No. 13. Oxford, England: Blackfriars, 1950.

Höffe, Otfried. "Philosophiche Überlegungen." In Papst Johannes Paul II. und die Menschenrechte: Ein Jahr Pontifikat, edited by O. Höffe, et al, 15-35. Freiburg, Switzerland, and Paris: Universitätsverlag and Paulusverlag, 1981.

Holderegger, Adrian, Ruedi Imbach, and Raul Suarez de Miguel, eds. De Dignitate Hominis. Festschrift on the 65th birthday of Carlos-Josaphat Pinto de Oliveira. Études d'Éthique Chrétienne, 22. Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, Freibourg, 1987.

Hollenbach, David. Claims in Conflict. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

_____. Justice, Peace, and Human Rights: American Catholic Social Ethics in a Pluralistic World. New York: Crossroad, 1988.

Honoré, Archbishop Jean. "Christ the Redeemer, Core of John Paul II's Teaching." In John Paul II: A Panorama of His Teachings, 12-26. New York: New City Press, 1989.

Hunter, David G. "The Paradise of Patriarchy: Ambrosiaster on

Women as (Not) God's Image." <u>Journal of Theological Studies</u> 43, no. 2 (October 1992): 447-469.

International Theological Commission. <u>Select Questions on Christology</u>. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1980.

_____. <u>Theology, Christology, Anthropology</u>. Translated by Michael Ledwith. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1983.

_____. <u>Propositions on the Dignity and Rights of the Human Person</u>. [6 October 1984]. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1986.

Jans, Jan. "God or Man? Normative Theology in the Instruction <u>Donum Vitae</u>." <u>Louvain Studies</u> 17, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 48-64.

_____. "Participation - Subordination: (The Image of) God in <u>Veritatis Splendor</u>." In <u>The Splendor of Accuracy: An Examination of the Assertions Made by Veritatis Splendor</u>, edited by Joseph A. Selling and Jan Jans, 153-168. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995.

Joblin, Joseph, S.J. "La doctrine sociale de l'Eglise est-elle universelle?" <u>Gregorianum</u> 74, no. 4 (1993): 659-687.

John Paul II. "Address to the XXXIV General Assembly of the United Nations Organization." In <u>U.S.A.: The Message of Justice, Peace and Love</u>, 35-60. Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1979.

_____. "Address to the Eighty-first Congress of the Italian Society of Internal Medicine and the Eighty-second Congress of the Italian Society of General Surgery." 22 October 1980. <u>Hospital Progress</u> 61, no. 12 (December 1980): 18-19.

_____. <u>Sources of Renewal: The Implementation of Vatican II</u>. Translated by P.S. Falla. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980.

_____. "International Relations: The Church's Task." <u>Origins</u> 9, no. 35 (14 February 1980): 570-572.

_____. "Dives in Misericordia [Rich in Mercy]." <u>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</u> 72, no. 9 (29 December 1980): 1177-1232.

_____. "Laborem Exercens [90th anniversary of the publication of Rerum Novarum]." <u>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</u>

73, no. 9 (5 November 1981): 577-647.

_____. "Dominum et Vivificantem (De Spiritu Sancto in vita Ecclesiae et Mundi)." Acta Apostolicae Sedis 78, no. 9 (2 September 1986): 809-900.

_____. "Address to the Textile Workers in Lodz." Origins 17, no. 6 (25 June 1987): 90-93.

_____. "The Pope's Address." Address to the Catholic Health Association. Origins 17, no. 17 (8 October 1987): 292-294.

_____. "Redemptoris Mater [On the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Life of the Pilgrim Church]." Acta Apostolicae Sedis 79, no. 4 (2 April 1987): 361-433.

_____. "Veritatis Splendor [On Questions of Fundamental Moral Doctrine in the Church]." Acta Apostolicae Sedis 85, no. 12 (9 December 1993): 1133-1228.

_____. "As the Third Millennium Draws Near [Tertio Millennio Adveniente]." Origins 24, no. 24 (24 November 1994): 401, 403-416.

John XXIII. "Mater et Magistra [Christianity and Social Progress]." In Seven Great Encyclicals, edited by Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. and William J. Gibbons, S.J., 219-274. Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1963.

_____. Pacem in Terris [Peace on Earth]. New York: Paulist Press, 1963.

Johnson, Elizabeth A. "The Incomprehensibility of God and the Image of God Male and Female." Theological Studies 45, no. 3 (September 1984): 441-465.

Johnson, S. Elizabeth. "Christology and Social Justice: John Paul II and the American Bishops." Chicago Studies 26, no. 2 (August 1988): 155-165.

Johnson, Elizabeth. She Who Is. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Jonsson, Gunnlaugur A. The Image of God: Genesis 1:26-28 in a Century of Old Testament Research [1882-1982]. Translated by Lorraine Svendsen. Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 26. Lund, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1988.

Jucquois, Guy. "Image de l'homme, realites de soi ou aspirations narcissiques et pratiques juridiques." In Image of Man in Human Rights Legislations, edited by R.M.

Goldie, 59-81. Rome: Herder, 1985.

Kasczynski, Edward. "La Dottrina Sociale della Chiesa e Teologia Morale?" Angelicum 70, no. 2 (1993): 233-254.

Kasper, Bishop Dr. Walter. "The Theological Foundations of Human Rights." The Jurist 50, no. 1 (1990): 148-166.

Kasper, Walter. "The Theological Foundation of Human Rights." In Human Rights and the Church, 47-71. Vatican City: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 1990.

Keenan, James F., S.J. "Christian Perspectives on the Human Body." Theological Studies 55, no. 2 (June 1994): 330-346.

Kelly, Kevin T. New Directions in Moral Theology: The Challenge of Being Human. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.

Kelly, Margaret John, D.C.. "Summation: Toward a National Health Policy." In Justice and Health Care, edited by Margaret John Kelly DC, 195-226. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of America, 1985.

Küng, Hans. Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Crossroad, 1991.

LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Ladner, Gerhart B. The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Lakner, F. "Gottebenbildlichkeit; Dogmatisch." In Lexikon für Theologie un Kirche, vol. 4, edited by Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner, cols. 1090-1092. Freiburg: Herder, 1960.

Langan, John, S.J.. "Personal Responsibility and the Common Good in John Paul II." In Ethics, Religion, & the Good Society, edited by Joseph Runzo, 132-147. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Lebacqz, Karen. Six Theories of Justice. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.

Loss, Nicolò M. "La dignità dell'uomo nella dottrina biblica." In I Diritti Umani, edited by Gino Concetti, 41-59. Rome: Editrice AVE, 1982.

Lossky, Vladimir. In the Image and Likeness of God. Edited by

John H. Erickson and Thomas E. Bird. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

_____. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, [1957] 1976.

Lustig, B. Andrew. "The Common Good in a Secular Society: The Relevance of a Roman Catholic Notion to the Healthcare Allocation Debate." The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy 18 (1993): 569-587.

Maida, Adam J., and Nicholas P. Cafardi. Church Property, Church Finances, and Church-Related Corporations. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1984.

Maloney, George A., S.J. Man, The Divine Icon: The Patristic Doctrine of Man Made According to the Image of God. Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1973.

Mantzaridis, Georgios I. The Deification of Man: St. Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition. Translated by Liadain Sherrard. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

May, William E. An Introduction to Moral Theology. Revised ed. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1994.

McCormick, Richard A. "Some Early Reactions to Veritatis Splendor." Theological Studies 55, no. 3 (September 1994): 481-506.

McKenzie, John L. "Aspects of Old Testament Thought." In The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy, 1284-1315. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Meeks, M. Douglas. "introduction." In On Human Dignity: Political Theology and Ethics. by Jürgen Moltmann. Tranlated by M. Douglas Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

_____. God the Economist. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989.

Michel, A. "Image." In Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, II, cols. 2181-2186. Paris, 1960.

Micks, Marianne H. Our Search for Identity: Humanity in the Image of God. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Moltmann, Jürgen. On Human Dignity: Political Theology and Ethics. Translated by M. Douglas Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

_____. God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation. The Gifford Lectures, 1984-1985. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1985.

Muldoon, Bishop Peter. "Program of Social Reconstruction (1919)." In Pastoral Letters, edited by Hugh J. Nolan, 255-271. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1984.

Murnion, William E. "The American Catholic Bishops' Peace Pastoral: A Critique of Its Logic." Horizons 13, no. 1 (1986): 67-89.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. "Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services." Origins 24, no. 27 (15 December 1994): 449, 451-462.

Nell-Breuning, Oswald von. "Social Movements, Christian Social Doctrine." In Sacramentum Mundi, vol. 6, edited by Karl Rahner, 108-113. London: Search Press Limited, 1968.

Neuner, Josef, S.J., and Heinrich Roos, S.J. The Teaching of the Catholic Church. Edited by Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by Geoffrey Stevens. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1967.

Nolan, Hugh J., ed. Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops 1792-1988. Vol. I-V. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1984, 1989. 5 vols.

O'Collins, Gerald, S.J., and Edward G. Farrugia, S.J., eds. A Concise Dictionary of Theology. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1991.

O'Connor, Cardinal John J. "The Right to Health Care." Origins 15 (5 September 1985): 186-188.

O'Donovan, Joan E. "Man and the Image of God: The Disagreement between Barth and Brunner Reconsidered." Scottish Journal of Theology 39, no. 4 (1993): 433-459.

O'Rourke, Kevin D., and Philip Boyle. Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teachings. St. Louis: Catholic Health Association of the United States, 1989.

Oliveira, C.-J. Pinto de. "Die theologische Originalität Johannes Pauls II." In Johannes Paul II. und die Menschenrechte: Ein Jahr Pontifikat, edited by O. Höffe,

et al, 60-91. Freiburg, Switzerland, and Paris: Universitätsverlag and Paulusverlag, 1981.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. _Anthropology in Theological Perspective_. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985.

Paul VI. _Populorum Progressio [On the Development of Peoples]_. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1967.

_____. "Apostolic Letter of His Holiness Pope Paulus PP. VI on the Occasion of the Eightieth Anniversary of the Encyclical _Rerum Novarum_." In _The Teachings of Pope Paul VI 1971_, 343-374. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1971.

Paul VI, Pope. _Octogesima Adveniens_. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1971.

Pavan, Pietro. "Declaration on Religious Freedom." In _Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Vol. IV_, edited by Herbert Vorgrimler, 49-86. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

_____. "Differencze e convergenze nel concepire l'impegno sociale tra Cattolici e Ortodossi." In _The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations: An International Colloquium in the Vatican_. Vol. 2. edited by Pontifical Lateran University and Catholic University of Lublin. 1148-1158. Florence: Le Monnier, 1982.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. "The Doctrine of the Image of God." In _The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations: An International Colloquium in the Vatican_, Vol. 2. edited by Pontifical Lateran University and Catholic University of Lublin, 53-62. Florence, Italy: F. Le Monnier, 1982.

Pellegrino, Edmund D. "Medicine, History, and the Idea of Man." In _Medical Anthropology_, ed. George M. Foster, Barbara Gallatin Anderson. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Perry, Michael J. _Morality, Politics, and Law_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

_____. _Love and Power_. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Pfnausch, Edward G., ed. _Code, Community, Ministry_. Second Revised Edition. Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America, 1992.

Piana, Giannino. "I diritti dell'uomo nel magistero di Giovanni Paolo II." In De Dignitate Hominis: Festschrift for Carlos-Josaphat Pinto de Oliveira, edited by Adrian Holderegger, Ruedi Imbach and Raul Suarez de Miguel, 471-485. Freiburg - Vienna: Herder, 1987.

Pius XII. "Christmas Radio Message (24 December 1944)." Acta Apostolicae Sedis 37, no. 1 (1945): 10-13.

Pontifical Commission "Justitia et Pax." "The Church and Human Rights." In Social Justice, edited by Vincent P. Mainelli, 344-393, 483-491. Wilmington, NC: Consortium/McGrath, 1974.

Post, Stephen G. "Health Care Rationing?." America 167 (5 December 1992): 453-455.

Privitera, Salvatore. "L'antropologia de San Basilio: La dignità dell'uomo e l'argomentazione etica nella teologia morale ortodossa." In De Dignitate Hominis, edited by Adrian Holderegger, Ruedi Imbach and Raul Suarez de Miguel, 15-37. Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, Freibourg, 1987.

Provost, James H. "Rights of Persons in the Church." In Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public Philosophy, edited by R. Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach, 296-322. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Rahner, Karl. "The Dignity and Freedom of Man." Translated by Karl-H. Kruger. In Theological Investigations Volume II, translated by Karl-H. Kruger, 235-263. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.

Rahner, Karl, and Herbert Vorgrimler. "Image and Likeness of God." Translated by Richard Strachan. In Theological Dictionary, edited by Cornelius Ernst, translated by Richard Strachan, 222. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Ratzinger, Joseph. "The Dignity of the Human Person." In Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol. V, edited by Herbert Vorgrimler, 115-163. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph. "Doctrinal Document on Threats to Life Proposed." Translated by L'Osservatore Romano. Origins 20, no. 46 (25 April 1991): 755-759.

Regan, Cronin. "Grace and Nature." In New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 6, 685. Washington, DC: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Rossi, Philip J., S.J. "Conflict, Community, and Human Destiny: Religious Ethics and the Public Construction of Morality." In Ethics, Religion, and the Good Society, edited by Joseph Runzo, 114-125. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Ryan, Michael T. Solidarity: Christian Social Teaching and Canadian Society. 2nd. ed. London, Ontario: Guided Study Programs in the Catholic Faith, 1990.

Schmitz, Kenneth L. At the Center of the Human Drama: The Philosophical Anthropology of Karol Wojtyla/Pope John Paul II. with an appendix by John M. Grondelski. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

Schönborn, Christoph, O.P. "L'homme créé par Dieu: le fondement de la dignité de l'homme." Gregorianum 65, no. 2-3 (1984): 337-363.

Schuck, Michael J. That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991.

Senior, Donald, Mary Ann Getty, Carroll Stuhlmueller, and John J. Collins, eds. The Catholic Study Bible: New American Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Shupack, Martin. "The Churches and Human Rights: Catholic and Protestant Human Rights Views as Reflected in Church Statements." Harvard Human Rights Journal 6 (Spring 1993): 127-157.

Simon, René. "Le concept de dignité de l'homme en éthique." In De Dignitate Hominis, edited by Adrian Holderegger, Ruedi Imbach and Raul Suarez de Miquel, 265-278. Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, Freibourg, 1987.

Stephanson, Anders. Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of the Right. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.

Sullivan, John Edward, O.P. The Image of God: The Doctrine of St. Augustine and Its Influence. Dubuque, IA: Priory Press, 1963.

Sullivan, Joseph M., Bishop, Director, Catholic Charities of Brooklyn. Interview by author via telephone. 28 January 1994.

Tanner, Kathryn. "The Difference Theological Anthropology Makes." Theology Today 50, no. 4 (January 1994): 567-579.

Thils, Gustave. Droits de l'Homme et Perspectives Chrétiennes. Cahiers de la Revue Théologique de Louvain. Louvain-la-Neuve: Publication de la Faculté de Théologie, 1981.

_____. "Theological Reflections." In Human Rights: A Christian Approach, edited by translated, Andrew Gonzalez and Rolando de la Goza, 71-92. Manila: UST Printing Office, 1988.

Thomas Aquinas, St. Summa Theologica. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1948.

Thompson, John L. "Creata ad Imaginem Dei, Licet Secundo Grado: Woman as the Image of God According to John Calvin." Harvard Theological Revue 81, no. 2(April 1988): 125-143.

Tracy, David. "Religion and Human Rights in the Public Realm." Daedalus 112, no. 4(Fall 1983): 237-253.

_____. "Catholic Classics in American Liberal Culture." In Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public Philosophy, edited by R. Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach, 196-213. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Trible, Phyllis. God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Trujillo, Alfonso Cardinal López. "The Truth of the Human Being in Christ." In John Paul II: A Panorama of His Teachings, 122-143. New York: New City Press, 1989.

"Two Cheers for John Paul II." The Christian Century 96 (4 April 1979): 364.

Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa. "The Origins of the Philosophy of John Paul the Second." In The Human Person, vol. 53, edited by George F. McLean, 16-27. Washington, DC: Office of the National Secretary of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, 1979.

Vanhoye, Albert. "Cristo ricreatore dell'uomo e dei suoi diritti." Translated by A. Garuti. In I Diritti Umani, edited by Gino Concetti, translated by A. Garuti, 23-39. Rome: Editrice AVE, 1982.

Walf, Knut. "Gospel, Church Law and Human Rights: Foundations and Deficiencies." Translated by Leo C. Hay. In The Ethics of World Religions and Human Rights, edited by

Hans Kung and Jurgen Moltmann, translated by Leo C. Hay, 34-45. Concilium. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.

Weakland, Rembert G. "Social Justice in a Time of Crisis: Catholic Tradition Offers Creative Ideas for Solving the Problems of Healthcare Costs and Access." Health Progress 72 (April 1991): 48-52.

Weber, Otto. Foundations of Dogmatics Vol. I. Translated by Darrell L. Guder. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981. .

Westermann, Claus. Creation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Wojtyla, Karol. The Acting Person. Translated by Andrzej Potocki. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979.

_____. The Collected Plays and Writings on Theater. Translated by Boleslaw Taborski. Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

_____. Person and Community. Essays by the future pope, dating from 1950's up to his election as pope. Translated by Theresa Sandok, OSM. Catholic Thought from Lublin. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Wojtyla, Carolus. "De libertate religiosa." An intervention at the 133rd General Congregation, 22 September 1965, on the discussion of religious freedom. In Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II, IV-2, 11-13. Vatican City State: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, [1965] 1977.

Woznicki, Andrew N. "The Christian Humanism of Cardinal Karol Wojtyla." In The Human Person, vol. 53, edited by George F. McLean, 28-35. Washington, DC: Office of the National Secretary of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, 1979.

VITA


The author, Timothy Lawrence Doherty, was born in
Rockford, Illinois.

In September, 1968, Rev. Doherty entered St. Ambrose
College, Davenport, Iowa, receiving the degree of Bachelor
of Arts in May, 1972.  In October, 1972, he entered the
Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, receiving the degree
of Baccalaureate in Sacred Theology cum laude in June, 1975.
In October, 1975, he entered the Alfonsian Academy of the
Pontifical Lateran University, Rome, receiving the degree of
Licentiate in Sacred Theology magna cum laude in June, 1982.

Father Doherty is a priest of the Catholic Diocese of
Rockford.

APPROVAL SHEET


The dissertation submitted by Timothy L. Doherty has been read
and approved by the following committee:

    James J. Walter, Ph.D., Director
    Professor, Theology
    Loyola University Chicago

    John C. Haughey, S.J., S.T.D.
    Professor, Theology
    Loyola University Chicago

    Jon Nilson, Ph.D.
    Associate Professor, Theology
    Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the
dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies
the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and
that the dissertation is now given final approval by the
Committee with reference to content and form.

The  dissertation  is,  therefore,  accepted  in  partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy.



APRIL 3, 1996
Date                          Director's Signature