

Studying the concept of "God's body" from Sally McFague's point of view

Nour Mohammad Ansari

Ph.D. candidate of Religions and Mysticism, Department of Religions and mysticism, Qom Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran.

Dr. Mehdi Lakzaee

(Responsible author), Assistant Professor University of Religions and Denominations, Qom, Iran.

Dr. Mehrab Sadeghnia

Assistant Professor University of Religions and Denominations, Qom, Iran.

Abstract

Sally McFague recommends both intimate and less intimate metaphors of God as mother, lover, and friend in order to move away from a transcendental theology that is centered on salvation and toward a creation theology that is focused on divine cognition. According to McFague, understanding God as a being renders the natural world devoid of any holiness and, by downplaying creation theology, reduces God to a very modest and constrained presence. McFague's main suggestion is to use the "body" model as a way of interpreting all things, where the body refers to all life forms and everything on the planet and the world and implies that the world and everything that exists is the body of God, in order to conceptualize God within the framework of a new fundamental and biological view of truth. He claims that God works internally and compassionately, not outwardly and alternatively, using the metaphor of the world as his body. God intervenes amid an incredibly intricate process of physical development and historical-cultural evolution that began in the past. God is not a being who occasionally intervenes in history and nature for good reasons (as in the king-sovereign-dominion paradigm), but rather a being who always watches over the world and cares for it with loving concern, much as a human cares for his body.

Keywords: God's body, McFague, theology

INTRODUCTION

McFague argues that the earth is the body of God in *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology*, which he wrote in 1993, in order to offer a method to consistently think about God's supremacy. In a sense, the paradigm of God's body has to be recovered since it is a fundamental one. It puts the emphasis on the incarnation and encourages us to think about God and the body, which is something that Christians haven't done much of. McFague makes use of scientific theories to explain how the cosmos came into being, how our universe came into being, and how the universe became populated. Science and theology are not being combined or overlapping in this context. However, as long as he continues to base his metaphorical theology on the context of this world, these models are employed in science

that uses modern views of physical and biological reality as sources to offer tenable theological replies to evolutionary scientific models. McFague is now searching for an arbitrary match between the fundamental evolutionary model and the postmodern cosmological theories. He became aware of the extremely acute prospect of nuclear war in the middle of the 1980s, as well as the nearly incomprehensible intricacy of the environmental challenges that became apparent to him in the early 1990s. He perceived that the burden of this environmental predicament was, regrettably, placed on the backs of huge, impoverished, and weak women. In this way, he claims that my theological and spiritual path has led me to this conclusion and that the oppressions are distinct yet interconnected, just as women's oppression

is evidently pervasive in nature. He is particularly conscious of his participation in this oppression in studying this topic because he is a Christian ecofeminist theologian. Christianity is the religion of incarnation/incarnation in opposition to excellence and superiority, but the earliest Christian texts and schools contained the seeds that eventually grew into a complete mistrust of the body, as well as a denigration of nature blasphemy, and a fear of women's bodies.

We let the metaphor of the earth as the body of God have its luck, writes McFague in his book *Models of God: Theology for the Age of Nuclear Ecology*. Let's try some nonsensical terms to see whether or not this assertion is true. What happens if God's promise that he would always be with us in the body of God, which is the world, rather than the resurrection of particular bodies that begins with Jesus of Nazareth and proceeds to another planet? What if God's assurance of eternal existence in all things and at all times were regarded as a fact of this world, a genuine and palpable presence? What if we can see ourselves being in God's presence at all times and in all locations, rather than having to travel to a specific location (church) or another location (another world) to be there? What if we consider God to be present in ourselves, others, the least, and the last? We must reaffirm to ourselves that a metaphor or model is not a description when we start this exercise. We attempt to conceptualize the interaction between God and the world using a model because we are at a loss for ideas. No metaphor fully takes into account all of its components, and some metaphors are more meaningless than others. The king-dominion type, like thinking about how God and the earth interact, appears relevant because it is familiar to us, but considering it reveals that it has no practical application in our reality.

Therefore, although initially seeming meaningless, revelational and metaphorical theology has a limited capacity for significance. Because of the resurrection of the body, the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper serve as both the body and blood of Christ and the church serves as the body of which Christ is the head; Christians are expected to find significance in words referring to the body. The Christian tradition and body rituals are

lovely, but there is a distinction between such uses and the idea that the world is God's body. As a result, the current study's goal is to examine the idea of "God's body" from Sally McFague's perspective.

The concept of the body of God and the world as the body of God

If we claim that God has a body (physical form) and sometimes assumes a physical form (is embodied), but not always, it implies that we do not have the last say in this mystery that has entangled us. It implies that we shouldn't present a conclusive case, one in which the unknowable has no role. In addition, McFague asserts that Christ may serve as both an allegory and a metaphor: the idea that Christ is God's speech and that God has somehow manifested and appeared in human existence. Jesus is a metaphor for equality of exaltation; he is the likeness of God. Being a metaphor does not invalidate it but rather emphasizes its centrality because there is nothing more complicated than human life as an expression of complete, realistic, and strange union with God as the divine abode and abode. This potent image serves as the centerpiece and core of his whole argument in the book *The Body of God*. There are several ways to characterize God's body. The incarnation and configuration/body of God in physical form may be altered and reinvented if we use the correct language and analogies. According to McFague and Ricoeur, inspiring fresh interpretations is largely facilitated by educating imagination (hermeneutics). But how can we demonstrate that Jesus is a parable or that the universe is God's body? Is all that this rhetorical discourse is just a metaphor for the term allegory? Is there a set of guidelines and standards for finding and assessing metaphorical arguments in theology, or is this merely another illustration of Derrida's fanciful theories? McFague was aware of the risks and implications such isolated metaphors and similes may have on root models, metaphors, and broader semantic units. Take God's paternity as an illustration since it serves as a fundamental metaphor and paradigm in Western Christian thought. From inner inspiration to conceptual possibilities and principled complexity, elevating a metaphor to a model is a process.

The idea that the universe serves as God's physical body illustrates how honestly and compassionately God engages in the processes of his historical and physical evolution and how concerned he is with the physical well-being of all bodies. As a result, the common perception of Christendom as being controlled by a kind, entirely remote patriarch is still widely held. In this illustration, the world is mostly devoid of the holy, humans mistreat things, and the monarch is shown as the All-Powerful God. On the other side, a composite picture of God is replaced with an embodied image when the world is seen as the body of God. This is a view of the relationship between God and the world, in which, according to McFague, nothing has an existence outside of God.

As a result, God's presence in the creation is clearly replaced by the Christian religion's explicit focus on God's superiority, which implies God's all-pervasive presence and the suitable chance to reinterpret both. When compared to his recommendations for redesigning each of these, McFague's criticisms of divine supremacy and God's presence in creation as they are now understood are identical. Here, he makes a clear transition to the experience of the divine as an unchanging force of love, seeing God as the source of existence and expressing his worry that Christianity often emphasizes God's great excellence at the expense of his presence in creation (the omnipresence and omniscience of God).

The idea that the world is a representation of God's body also implies that God loves both bodies and beings, as God loves the world as well as beings. Such a notion is a significant challenge to Christianity's long-standing anti-corporeal, anti-physical, and anti-matter legacy. In doing so, he rejected the connection between the fundamental social and material demands of embodied people and their salvation. This tradition has suppressed healthy sex, subjugated women as sexual motivators, and defined Christian salvation via spiritual means. It is a balancing act toward a universal knowledge of evolution to say that God loves beings. This implies that loving one's body passionately and in other ways is

worthwhile and that attending to the physical requirements of one's body is a necessary component of evolution. The basic requirements of physical life, such as having enough food and a place to live, are also the major characteristics of God's love for all beings with bodies, and as such, they need to be among our top priorities as God's associates. There is a soul/body distinction in a holistic perspective because, since God nor we are separated from our bodies, the scandal of the body in the form of the body, flesh, and matter must come to an end. Such division is meaningless in our world: Since the body is not an inanimate object but rather moves with energy, particularly in continuity with the soul, soul, body, and matter are all one. Therefore, adoring bodies does not imply adoring that which is in front of the soul; rather, it means adoring that which is one with it, as is well exemplified by the view of the universe as God's body.

The epistemology of attention is essential to understanding and practicing embodiment because it takes seriously the differences that set each of us apart from other beings: the particular place that we each occupy for ourselves. Embodying requires paying attention to differences; maybe the greatest way to acquire this lesson is to gauge our reaction to someone who is significantly different from ourselves. Not simply to another human person (who may differ from us in terms of skin color, gender, or economic standing), but also to a creature whose existence we are unable to fully comprehend, such as a bird (or a turtle or a tree). We would probably behave differently if we paid attention to such a creature than we do now.

Yet, we particularly think of the world's model as God's own body, not just as a body. This has two components that need more explanation. First, the kind of body utilized as the prototype for God's body depends on the emphasis placed on both unity and variety. In order to reorient theology away from an anthropomorphic perspective and towards a perspective that sees us as a people with many bodies, including all types of human bodies and beings that are not limited to the human body, McFague begins his discussion of the

body of God by highlighting the diversity of bodies that make up the world. These other bodies are valued for who they are and for what they can do. As a result, God's body should not be viewed as being similar to a human body or any other particular kind of body. God's body is distinct from other bodies; hence it actually differs entirely from all other bodies. When describing his conversations on the metaphor itself, McFague writes the following in the text: This fundamental model, which is based on the human (male) body and its oneness in an ideal shape and manner of existence, is not traditional, ordered, specified, restricted, and clearly defined sort of model. Instead, it is a daring, odd, and uncommon model (from the standpoint of the classical model) that encompasses all the bodies that have ever been and exist today across the cosmos in place of an ideal body. Coral reefs, viruses, birch/birch trees, the slimy bodies of ancient worms, supernovas, and black holes, as well as the magnificent tigers and blue pigs' and tigers' bodies. Additionally, since this body consists of everything, diversity rather than consistency is its most significant quality.

In order to avoid what he perceives as traps for the promotion of all bodies and especially the flawless body of the male human being as the original body, McFague trades off some of the clarity that might be gained by modeling the world after a specific real body in favor of a more abstract concept of the body. Since this would not be universal, he does not want to permit one body to be thought of as emblematic of all bodies. In order for McFague to present the bodies, an abstract category of the body is required due to the nature of the bodies as something distinct and particular since nobody is deemed to be a model body because it is sufficiently superior to other bodies. McFague significantly improves the coherence of this concept in a different presentation he gave in 2002 by adding observations—though they are not new—that bodies, including our own, are as varied as they are united and that this balance is crucial. Although it is still ambiguous, this approach changes the body's representation to one that is more intuitive.

McFague's central metaphor: the world as God's body and its consequences

McFague repeatedly underlines that the metaphor of the world as God's body is just that—a metaphor. He has not referred to the universe or existence as God's physical body or as a maternal, loving, or amicable connection with God. It is crucial to avoid using these analogies. Although McFague uses these religious metaphors for exploratory purposes, he also wants to manipulate people's opinions in order to figure out what is required. The metaphors may surprise and help people grasp many concepts. It can be illuminating and informative. McFague wants to offer metaphors that are appropriate for our time and place, enlightening in certain respects, and superior to those that are already available. McFague makes it clear that the tradition has strong physical senses, but the world as the body of God must have more than a resemblance to the human body by understanding the carnal language used in the Bible, in the use of bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ, as well as the metaphors in the resurrection story. However, McFague's metaphors lean more toward pantheism than traditional depictions of the monarch and kingdom, which have a tendency to be monotheistic. He makes the counterargument that if this world is the body of God, then God is not encapsulated in this universe. According to him, the metaphor of the universe as God's body can be pantheistic since God's body is capable of holding everything, even without the use of metaphors of a personal agent, among which we can include metaphors such as God as a mother, lover, and friend. However, this form is monotheistic (monistic) and is most likely chosen as pantheism; this is a perspective on God's relationship with the world, in which all beings have their original nature back to God, and there is nothing outside of God, but this does not imply that God is summed up in these beings. All beings have their original nature back to God, and there is nothing outside of God.

In the book, *God's Body:.....*, McFague deepens and broadens his use of the metaphor of the world as God's body, which he believes to be a helpful but flawed one. In his book *The Body of God*, McFague argues that while classical organic models frequently emphasize harmony and wholeness and might lack the independence of parts, current organic forms

are grounded in ancient notions. Additionally, as these templates are frequently based on the physical model and the connotations associated with men, the associated female experiences and associations are frequently disregarded in this rule. It is clear that inclusivity aims to categorize everyone's experiences in basic terms.

McFague advises imagining God as a mother, a lover, or a friend and viewing the world as the body of God. According to McFague, these forms give opportunities for thinking of power as a single entity or as interconnected entities, which is a very different way of thinking about power than thinking of it as dominating or kind. Monotheism subjugates the feeling of human responsibility, while dominance promotes a sense of separation from the outside world. It is clear from the metaphors we use to describe God that we see him as a king, ruler, judge, and powerful man. Models like dominance, colonialism, patriarchy, and other forms that seek to comprehend the connection between God and His creatures are criticized by McFague's intellectual experience.

McFague recalls five theological interpretations of God that have an impact on how we interact with nature in his quest to comprehend the world as an embodied space and toward a more beneficial method of doing so: Deism, which sees God as a watchmaker; Dialogical or conversational model, in which God converses with people, and we answer; The regal style (nostalgic monarchs are in control and have minimal interactions with other forms of nature). The agent or agent model, in which God is viewed as an agency whose aims are discernible in history and are achieved, and the organic model (for example, the world as the body of God). McFague gladly adopts process theology but pushes it in the direction of the social perspective of representation and substitution because he prefers the latter two models. He wants to rethink the connection between God and man, taking into account all of God's creations that man has refused to take responsibility for protecting. When seen from a perspective other than pantheism, which confines and lowers God to this world, McFague believes

that the soul is the spirit of God incarnated in the universe. God, according to him, is the soul that is the origin of life and the soul of all that exists. God is present in everything that exists, and everything that exists is present in God. Despite this, God is not synonymous with existence since existence depends on God in a way that God is not reliant on. McFague disassociated himself from any interpretation of the biblical creation accounts by adopting the representational/organic paradigm. These kinds of tales allude to the presence of something distinct from God. God did not construct the universe from anything; he is not an architect (Maccabees, 2:7:28). Instead, God produces from and within himself. The genesis and manifestation approach has the endorsement of McFague. However, if used in excess, these phrases may become troublesome. Having said that, in McFague's view, religious rites are how God takes on human form. God's existence has always been a mystery that has been partially and indirectly expressed in many forms.

The following are some significant ramifications of this image of the world as the body of God: 1. God acknowledges the need for the world (as a body), which is closer to empathy, closeness, and feeling than to reason. This is knowledge of awareness and knowledge, not information about anything, according to McFague, similar to how our bodies are closely linked to us. In terms of the most fundamental connections between us, everything that exists is likewise inherently tied to God. Just as we have a caring connection with our bodies, God has a compassionate relationship with the entire universe. 2. McFague rejects the idea that nature is a tool, disappointing those who think that man is the center of the universe (for the benefit of man). He opposes sentimentalism toward nature and advocates a more organic (i.e., "with structure and life") conception of the natural world. He also opposes "grading points between humans and other non-human organisms."

The desired criteria for considering the world as the body of God

Concerns were expressed with the standards that McFague employed to assess God's

models, particularly when looking at the position of models in the context of Christianity. Therefore, it is important to remember that McFague broadened his presentation of these characteristics in the model and model of God's body, even if he did not mean for this list to be all-inclusive.

Earth as the body of God

A: Earth as a body, moving from a mechanical and hierarchical state of worldview to an ecological and organic one.

We must alter our worldview in order to comprehend the environmental catastrophe and be able to affect how mankind will behave going forward in the face of this problem. This will help us to better grasp how to be proportionate in the more significant programs of affairs. This veiled self-understanding may enable us to alter practically every aspect of our lives, including how we handle foreign trade and our financial ties. In order to get through the dualities and hierarchies of an anthropological and hierarchical Christian theological worldview, McFague and other environmental theologians employ the story of the new creation. A mechanical scientific perspective and a profitable commercial perspective (commodity) of the entirety of the natural world. In addition, and in contrast to the above, the new creation story provides us with a fundamental framework for understanding how humans fit into the natural world. Indeed, a "ritual of sanctification and theological interpretation" of an ecological or cosmological worldview is the foundation of the entire body of God. Then, McFague makes the case that Christianity is a religion that beautifully balances the incarnation and incarnation of Christ, evoking the Eucharist and the Christian tradition's celebration of the Incarnation and Incarnation (this is my body, this is my blood). However, Christianity has also acquired the tendency to separate from the body and the patriarchal view of the order of reality from Neoplatonism (and later). As a result, this tradition saw the nature and bodies of women as alien and indicative of the lowest planes of existence. These ideas helped to justify the mistreatment of women, black people, and the environment. McFague pushes us to reevaluate the body-positive heritage of Christianity as it relates to feminist reflection and ecological studies. McFague is a feminist

and an ecological theologian. Indisputable evidence that we are among other bodies and beings on earth and that we are created of the same materials as everything else on the globe comes from the biological world and the new creation tale. This indicates that the earth, which is an additional but one of the bodies in the bigger cosmos, and we all together make up one body. Furthermore, by demonstrating the interconnection of matter and energy in a unified matter/energy, postmodern science has changed the conventional dichotomy of body/soul, body/soul, and non-life/life. In other words, we are passive beings connected to other bodies in the earth's body through the dynamic exchanges between matter and energy that occur during earthly existence. In order to adequately study the aspects relating to the variety of human and non-human bodies in the entire environment, he, therefore, suggests the body as a paradigm for environmental theology.

B: The new story of creation as the discourse around the holy body: Creation as the body of God

McFague offered his theory about the incarnation of God, which is the creation as the body of God, by beginning his changes in metaphorical theology and beginning to rebuild the metaphors of God as a mother, lover, and friend. He said that the prevalent theories had brought us to a scenario that would make it impossible to sustain life on this planet, given the assumptions he has made up to this point. We are up against a crafty and smart foe. We are both the culprits in the environmental problem. The extent to which this concept is entirely tenable might be debated, yet it is undeniably true that a sizable portion of our globe is now inhospitable for primitive life. He reevaluates and reviews our understanding of the body as a result of this examination. The whimsy and, in some cases, the revulsion that we observe in feminism, ecology, and religion about the body and all of its expressions points to a serious illness in our culture: self-loathing. According to McFague, [the Christian lifestyle] can be committed to the impartial continuation of life in its various forms for the improvement and unification of all aspects of life and to share the fundamental needs of life as well as their joys. This lifestyle is modeled as a parent [mother or father],

beloved and beloved of God. He now discusses the significance of the body as it relates to our embodiment. In order to do this, he looks at what he refers to as the organic model of [cosmology], which is taken from the co-creation story, in which there is both unity and difference. He cited Ian Barbour as saying that the universal system of existence integrates molecular, environmental, and evolutionary biology in demonstrating the interdependence of all things. [...] Astrophysics claims that the shared inheritance of physical components is the source of our existence. [...] Everything in the cosmos is connected. He started to reassemble based on these presumptions. In actuality, by eliminating dependency and position, he is attempting to replace the hierarchy of prevailing discourse with a new intellectual perspective. It nearly seems like he promotes a cohesive and united globe. McFague had now risen to his feet. Understanding the situation of our world is one thing, but by itself, it is useless and sterile, and if there is nothing that pushes us beyond deceit, it is a waste of time. The link and fresh sensibility to postmodern science's cosmology, which is looked at from both a physical and an organic evolutionary perspective, are something else entirely. Postmodern science's correlations and connections are included in this, properties that are undiscovered by contemporary science. Indeed, it is quite revitalizing. The co-creation story, which McFague refers to as an understanding of the evolutionary cosmology of the cosmos that began with the Big Bang, is one of the ways he builds and expands these new models of God while using his own theology. In other words, he continually develops his theology using postmodern science as a tool, which was his initial notion. This occurs particularly when someone views creation as the physical manifestation of God. This method of using science is a key advancement in the sphere of his theology since it enables him to link his concepts with postmodern scientific discoveries. He makes a strong case that modern science has brought us to this point. Our current hierarchical conception of creation is a result of atomic, deterministic, and Newtonian physics. He makes a connection

between the traditional organic (basic) conception of the church as the body of Christ and contemporary science. He sees this as a restriction at this point in his theology, but science started to function and employ a static and mechanical understanding of the universe in the second quarter of the 20th century. This was because the world was essentially uncertain (such as Heisenberg's uncertainty principle). The Phyreic evolutionary model of the cosmos emerged from Georges Lemaitre's theory of the creation of the universe, known as the Big Bang and initially verified by Edwin Hubble. Images of the physical evolution of the cosmos are abundant in the co-creation narrative (carbon sequestration), which is now connected to the co-creation narrative put forward by Darwin. The fact that the world is diversifying is a key component of such an evolutionary paradigm. It obviously does not relate to a high level of biology or physicality. The goal is not to reach human concept certainty. McFague was able to construct and solidify insights in his discourse about God and creation utilizing this strategy and postmodern scientific models as his underlying presuppositions.

He expressed concern and interest in the idea of natural theology or utilizing the accurate representation of postmodern science to rethink the relationship between God and the universe.

It is neither idolatry or pantheism (existential oneness) to radicalize (change the shape) (incarnate/incarnate) using the universe as the model of God; creation cannot be associated and mistaken with God. God is present in us at this same moment. In other words, via the process of incarnation, we have access to the enigmatic presence of God rather than His face. The image of God's body serves as a metaphor for the substance and material that make up our physical existence. The result of the action that is put in terms of physicality, humility, worldliness, uniqueness, vulnerability, distinctiveness, and need is that place. These terms all refer to various bodily functions. This also causes us to reflect on the grandeur, splendor, and beauty of the galaxy, planets, the earth, and its ecosystems. In a Christian context, the creation and redemption,

liberation, healing, and fulfillment of all bodies are all included in the paradigm of God's body. According to McFague's theological perspective, it is possible for Christians to purposefully and knowingly enter with a mystic perspective and praise the symbol of Christ's body, which was sacrificed for us and resurrected from the dead (resurrection), as the body of God. As the soul is tied to the body, so too is God related to the world in this perspective. All living things are given breath and souls, and God is the dynamic movement that continuously recreates and produces new things. The idiom "life, movement, and our being in God" is made clearer by this picture of God as the soul present everywhere in the universe. This metaphor is linked to another one for God that McFague learns, which is that of God as a woman carrying the entire universe inside her womb. According to the language of the sacrament, it acts as a bridge between the divine presence in the physical world, which McFague discusses from various points in the development of the Christian story.

The connection of God's body with three models of God: mother, lover, friend

According to McFague, it is our responsibility to paint a creative portrait of God's interaction with the world that conveys God's rescuing presence in the here and now. This rescuing presence has been regarded by us as a disruptive, all-encompassing, and non-hierarchical theory of animal evolution. Is there any use in trying to find the world as God's presence in all locations and times if what we are seeking is likely an explanation of the relationship between God and the world? Are the metaphors of mother, lover, and friend appropriate ones to describe God's connection with the world if we accept this image? Before delving deeper into this made-up image, we must first address some fundamental problems with physical metaphors. We have discussed divine physical agency up to this point. This idea is founded on the comparison of self: body: God: and the world, but we now need to discuss its viability. Why should we use physical metaphors to comprehend the relationship between God and the world? is a crucial question in the study of physical metaphors. Why are these particular metaphors appropriate to use? Not all religious traditions,

or at least not as frequently as the Judeo-Christian tradition, employ physical analogies. Some mystical religions and religions that follow natural cycles have simulations that are less realistic. Some mystical religions and religions that follow natural cycles have simulations that are less realistic. Isn't it bad to continue utilizing physical metaphors if our objective is to suggest a simulation that bridges the gap between God and the world while underlining God's presence everywhere in the world? This is a severe issue that is taken into consideration in addition to the present environmental and nuclear crises. Because it appeared to confirm the idea that God could only come and occupy the world by interfering in its affairs, many people for a long time believed the idea of a corporeal God to be impossible. This problem cannot be traced in modern history, but Schleiermacher's return to himself is the place where God's presence is felt, and the recognition of God's proximity and the universality of history are the same. The theists' God is unattainable, but he is undoubtedly one step removed from an intervening and corporeal God. These themes were carried on by Bultmann's decision to discuss God and divine activity as conceptions of human declarations and Tillich's warning against physical representations of God and preference for the function of being oneself. By thinking back to the confusion that such a simple conception of God causes, one might understand the debate about a corporeal God that has been going on for the past 20 years. When we attempt to conceive it as the deed of such a god in a universe that is an evolutionary and causal connection that forbids any involvement by external actors, it is also remarkable that this idea can be envisaged. In a time when succession, whether divine or human, is understood to occur in a highly complex evolutionary and ecological context with multiple factors, a context characterized by chance and need, isn't the physical God also a timeless event from humanity's childhood that has since been abandoned and an impossibility? Gordon Kaufman asserts that it is preferable to think of God in terms of the different physical, biological, historical, and cultural factors that have led to human existence as opposed to viewing it in a physical sense.

How we conduct our lives is the topic at hand in politics. How we live in general and how we live well is the more fundamental issue. In the same way that the traditional concept of the father as a parent emerged from this period, metaphors of mothers, lovers, friends, and bodies also do. If the accuracy of replicating mothers, lovers, friends, and bodies to represent the relationship between God and the world is established. Because of its unparalleled power—this model possesses not just the authority of monarchs but also the power of life and death—it will undoubtedly be alluring. But even if it is not advisable, it can nevertheless be essential to think of God as a physical simulation. How accurate are physical analogies in the modern world? Do they not necessitate an external knowledge of how God and the world interact? Isn't it necessary to assume that there is an external, intervening understanding of how God and the earth interact? It's true that not everyone has this opinion since, throughout the past 200 years, there has also been a movement that neutralizes the idea of God having bodily agency. The shift toward using the human self and the link between the self and the body as a fundamental model for describing God and the relationship between God and the world is, therefore, another approach to analyzing the theological history of the past two centuries. Many theologians from many backgrounds highlight this topic, not only mystics like Teilhard de Chardon or process theologians like Charles Hartshorne. The main driving force behind this shift is the current conception of bodies, which is that of beings in relation to their most extreme and complete nature, rather than as significant individuals who are separate from one another and from the rest of the world and enter into relationships of their own choosing.

Divine body and pantheism

McFague writes: No one (or at least I) can believe in God as a being, no matter how infinite, everlasting, omnipresent, benevolent, strong, or supernatural. McFague describes himself as a mystic and a Unitarian Christian. God is either Reality (or Self-Existence), which is to say that God is either everything or nothing; otherwise, there would be something

above or beyond God, which would be God. Since Christians are unlikely to follow the primary route of action towards activity, he avoids using ontological terminology, and as a result, God is seen as both the source of existence and existence itself. The universe as God's body is a metaphor for truth or existence itself. Mother, lover, and friend are relational and intimate metaphors for the power of existence. The soul is a less personal metaphor. The most crucial question, in McFague's opinion, is whether or whether the metaphor of the world as God's body emphasizes the oneness of existence, or, put another way, does it elevate God to the same level as the universe? In comparison to the king-dominion paradigm, which is more oriented toward holiness but does not regard God to be entirely identical with this world, this metaphor is closer to the oneness of existence since it reflects how we feel as one with our bodies.

The image of the world as God's body, however, puts God in danger even if He is not reduced to the level of the world. Following the metaphorical implications, we may see that God becomes reliant through the incarnation, preventing the existence of an unseen, remote God. God will be engaged in bad bodily circumstances, just as when we take care of our bodies, they make us susceptible, and we have to take care of their health. The world, which is God's physical manifestation, will be mocked and assaulted, and as we come to understand, in spite of God's tender care, it will essentially be destroyed because of us. We have the freedom to choose whether or not to cooperate with God in the conscious maintenance of the cosmos. If this thing bursts, very likely, another object will develop. As a result, God does not need to be dependent on his body in the same way that we are. However, the ideas of vulnerability, shared responsibility, and risk-taking are inescapable in the metaphor of the world as a manifestation of God – the embodiment of God. Additionally, McFague uses metaphors for the goddess rather than a supernatural creature, portraying the goddess as an all-encompassing and unfathomable presence. In addition to being a clear and central aspect of McFague's theology, this departure from traditional

theology in favor of immanentist approaches (the all-pervasive presence of God) for the divine claim is also organized and occurs outside the walls of religious institutions in North American religious culture. His organizational theology evolves in accordance with the dominant cultural currents, increasing its capacity for social transformation.

Divine body and the omnipresence of God

What matters is that McFague recognizes the connection between transcendence and God's omnipresence that is produced by this paradigm. When the world is viewed as God's body, God is not simply the world's inverse (which is a unity of being - a complete separation from transcendence). God is not depicted as a basic body but rather as an embodied soul since the world is seen as the body of God. This is in contrast to many theological disciplines, such as the study of the mind-body relationship, which examine a model of God in connection to the world. The body-of-God model, which McFague suggested, has been demonstrated to have several flaws, many of which revolve around the fact that the nature of the mind and the link between it and the body are not entirely obvious and raise issues in this area.

These criticisms are sidestepped by McFague's approach, which emphasizes the soul rather than the mind. While the soul speaks of empowerment and providing life, it stresses the mind, will, intention, and control; therefore, this concentration is also a component of McFague's feminist mission. For instance, the concept of God as soul, as opposed to God as mind, does not assert that the divine mind is the reason of what the theory of evolution informs us since evolution holds that only local causes are the cause. It actually implies that we consider these local issues when they become potent and brimming with God's presence.

As we recall, McFague hopes to do this by presenting the God-universe hypothesis in this manner. While we have no ambition to create God in our own image, we do create our own model by imitating the representations of God that we find appealing. We might be able to sustain life in all of its forms rather than control it if we use the metaphor of soul/soul rather than the mind. Theology of the soul allows us to consider ourselves as being connected to all

other living things through the soul that resides in every part of the body rather than as demonic entities that continuously rule and manipulate nature.

Conclusion

For the models of God as mother, lover, and friend, McFague employs the earth as the body of God. In actuality, this implies that in each of these conceptions, God's body functions as a partner or a recipient. God is thus the parent of God's body, the one who loves God's body, and the one who is friends with God's body. McFague performs these activities despite being aware of the contradictions in the first composite model and the risks of divine narcissism in the later for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, he is concerned with avoiding individualism, exclusivity, and privatizing connections with God, which might result from the exclusive or frequent application of mother, lover, and friend models to the person. Second, this movement is needed by that aspect of his moral ideals that places the comfort and well-being of all people above the comfort of any one person (of course, he is evasive about this). Thirdly, he wants to underline the usefulness of the models by using them in the invention itself. However, if God is actually the world's mother, lover, and friend, then just the world itself is paid attention to rather than the world as God's body, as we can see once again. By doing this action, McFague avoids the arguments that he is aware of. Unexpectedly, he also avoids the risk of neglecting the world in this model, and the picture that results becomes the image of God as the lover of God, and so on.

REFERENCE

- Annalet van schalkwyk,(2008), "The Cosmos as The Body of God: The Interpretation of The Christian Story In Sallie Mcfague's Oeuvre. ", Department of Missiology, University of South Africa. Scriptura 98 (2008), pp. 204-221.
- Cancienne, M.P, (2009). Aesthetics in the Ecotheology of Sallie McFague: A Critique and a Proposal for a Theological Aesthetics of Nature (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/236>. Spring 1-1-2009.

John T. Harwood, "Theologizing the World: A reflection on The Theology of Sallie McFague," Pp.115-116.

McFague, S., *Life Abundant: Rethinking Theology and Economy for a Planet in Peril*. Pp.182-83.

McFague, S., *A New Climate For Theology: God, the World, and Global Warming*. Pp. 113&163.

McFague, S. (1982), *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press.

McFague, S. (1987) *Models of God: Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

McFague, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

McFague, S., *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology*, p.76.

Pike, Megan (2008) "Saving God's Body from Empire: An Analysis of American Empire According to a Metaphorical Theology by Sallie McFague," *Denison Journal of Religion*: Vol. 8, Article 3.

Q. Hugh J. Gwyn, *The Metaphorical Theology of Sallie McFague: An Exploratory Study*, P.79.

Q. Hugh J. Gwyn, (2011), *The Metaphorical Theology of Sallie*

McFague: An Exploratory Study, University de Sherbrooke Faculte de Theologie et D'etudes Religieuses, Memoire De Maitrise, Programme d'etudes du religieux contemporain. ISBN: 978-0-494-88913-8. Library and Archives Canada 395 Wellington Street Ottawa ON K1A0N4 Canada.

Rev'd Richard Hainsworth, *Reforming Metaphorical Theology?: A critical assessment of the works of Sallie McFague in the light of her respondents*. P.251.

Rev'd Richard Hainsworth, (2012), *Reforming Metaphorical Theology?: A critical assessment of the works of Sallie McFague in the light of her respondents*. in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of Cardiff University 2012.

Sahinidou .Ioanna, (2015) "Reflections on The Work of Sallie McFaguei", *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)* Volume 2, Issue 8, August 2015, PP 18-22 ISSN 2349-0373 (Print) & ISSN 2349-0381 (Online) www.arcjournals.org.

Waschenfelder, Jacob, "Re-thinking God for the Sake of a Planet in Peril: Reflections on the Socially Transformative Potential of Sallie McFague's Progressive Theology" P.91.