**Redeemed Vision:
Theology of the Body as a New Way of Seeing?**

***Abstract***

*A paradox of Western culture is that current fascination with bodily fitness and beauty is putting the psychological health and serenity of a generation at risk. John Paul II’s Theology of the Body not only challenges the disintegrated anthropology of our times, it offers a different, redeemed way of seeing. Drawing on biblical and contemporary theological paradigms, this presentation will consider how ‘having eyes to see’ demands that Christians ‘look different’ and how that might impact on pedagogies in religious education and youth ministry contexts.*

**A Contemporary Problem?**

Back in 2011,[[1]](#endnote-1) Christopher West, describing some of the challenges of the *Theology of the Body* (ToB) project, alluded to a remark made by Bono from the music group U2 that ‘we need a new way of seeing’. This resonated strongly with my own theological instincts at the time which were coalescing around two foci: first, that cosmic reality and *a fortiori* anthropology is essentially relational and that secondly, lived Christianity is essentially a sacrament of recognition.[[2]](#endnote-2)

Hence on the one hand we might note that a generation of scientists have concerned themselves with cosmic relationality and quantum-entanglement.[[3]](#endnote-3) On the other we would indeed be blind not to notice the centrality of light and sight in both the Old and the New Testament (Cf. Gen 1:3, John 1:4-5, 8:12). Christ’s call that we might have ‘eyes to see’ (Mark 8:18, Matt 13:16) is key to the revolution of the mind and ultimately the changes in our lives that the life of the Kingdom calls us to (Matt 25:31-46). Thus, not just ToB*,* but Christian revelation itself suggests that the way we see each other and the way we see ourselves, is crucial to our well-being and in the present day, this constitutes a particular challenge.

We have long been a televisual culture which Marshall McLuhan famously said had reduced the world to a ‘global village’.[[4]](#endnote-4) In more recent times, the internet and social media seem to have radicalized locality such that we are effectively living in a ‘global bedroom’ where nothing is truly private, where intimacy is presumed and where our self-worth can be measured by a publically available census of likes, followers or retweets. In the past six months everything from a banal picture of someone’s evening meal, through to a horrific video of the New Zealand mosque killings have come to me via *Facebook* which is apparently a tame medium compared to platforms more popular among the young such as *Instagram* which is even more explicitly visual.

Alas none of this seems to be fostering human flourishing. Restricting myself to what is happening in the UK, there have already been consequences for our young people and our educational system. Medical journals are reporting an alarming increase in rates of self-harm in British society[[5]](#endnote-5) Responding to data which suggests over 62% of 10-17 year old girls are unhappy with the way they look, support websites for mental health are attempting to ameliorate the damage as a national campaign relating to ‘cyber bullying’ on all TV channels as head teachers wrestle with the insidious nature of the problem on a daily basis.[[6]](#endnote-6)

And yet . . . while this unbuttoned *zeitgeist* of the body shows little sign of embracing modesty, we are also witnessing what could be understood as a protest of the soul. The last couple of years have witnessed the ***#metoo*** campaign, which, whatever we may think of in its totality, is at heart a cry that there is more to intercourse than sex. By at least raising the status of consent, ***#metoo*** does echo a key insight of Christianity in general and ToB in particular that love involves freedom, decision and self-gift, a challenge which, as John Paul II has so thoroughly illustrated, is at the heart of what it is to be human.

**A Perennial Problem?**

By rooting his *Theology of the Body* in the early chapters of Genesis, John Paul II weaves together the universality of Genesis 1 with the specificity of Genesis 2 and 3. Light, sight and appetite are key to understanding these texts as darkness is shattered by the word of light ‘Light be! And Light Is’Gen 1:3.

If light is the first good thing when we fast forward to Genesis 2:23 we find that Love is the first spoken thing! At the *sight* of woman, Adam breaks forth into poetry and gives voice to his longing. Yet all too quickly the allure of the forbidden fruit proves too much and another drama of seeing unfolds - 3:6 The woman looks at the fruit…pleasing to the eye desirable to eat, but like so many of our wants, it does not yield what Eve hoped for. I’m persuaded by the interpretation that knowing good and evil is not just a reference to sexual knowledge but that it is the poetic equivalent of knowing everything from A-Z, from top to bottom such that, with appetite unleashed, human beings are apt fixate upon anything in order to know and possess it. It is the root of all forms of idolatry and in the immediate case renders Adam and Eve vulnerable – they can be objectified, exploited, instrumentalized by one another. Instead of being "together with the other"—a subject in unity, in the sacramental unity of the body—man becomes an object for man, the female for the male and vice versa.[[7]](#endnote-7)

**Biblical Seeing – Old Testament**

At the centre then of the biblical drama which is a family history of love and life, jealousy and death, it so often turns upon the way we look. Just to take a few examples from Genesis, when Cain’s countenance falls it leads to violence (Gen 4:5). Jacob is able to trick Isaac whose sight is failing in Genesis 27:1-40. He then flees and falls in love with Rachel whom he sees at a well - Genesis 28:10 he loves her so much he works for seven years and they seem only a few days. But he in turn will be tricked by Laban who, in the dark, has him lie with Leah, Gen 20:1-30. Meanwhile the story of Joseph, the dreamer, also culminates in Gen 45:1-15 (12) when he meets his brothers in a drama of recognition.

Yet seeing and recognition are also key to divine encounter in the Bible – the God who is seen and unseen. We think of Moses in Exodus 3:1-14 the *mysterium fascinans et tremendum,* and later the drama of his veiled face, shining because of his having sight of God (Ex 34:29-35). We can think of the testimony of Isaiah, his vision of the heavenly Court (6:1-7) and his unusual mission to confuse the way the people *see* (6:10), fruitfully contrasted with Deutero-Isaiah 53:2 ‘he had no form or majesty that we should look at him and no beauty that we should desire him.’[[8]](#endnote-8) More examples could easily be gleaned from the prophetic tradition but the Wisdom literature is also suffused with luminosity e.g. Psalm 4:6 – ‘What is Happiness? Let your face shine!’ and Psalm 36:9 – ‘In your light we see light’ (cf. Proverbs 4:18, 6:23). Moreover I submit that it is what Job *sees* rather than what God *says* that constitutes the answer to his questioning (Job 42:5).

**Biblical Seeing – New Testament**

Turning to the New Testament we have the revelation of Jesus hidden, as it were, in plain sight. Arguably the call to repentance – to act differently - is predicated on an ability to see differently. Matt 13:13 ‘For this people’s heart has become calloused; they hardly hear with their ears, and they have closed their **eyes**. Otherwise they might **see** with their **eyes**, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts and turn, and I would heal them’.(cf. Mark 8:18, Romans 11:8, Acts 28:27, John 12:40). We know from the Dead Sea Scrolls that the restoration of physical sight was an expectation of the Messiah[[9]](#endnote-9) and the profile of Bartimeus - ‘son of fear’ whose sight is restored (see Mark 10:46-52 and parallels) is taken to another level by John 9 where the story of the Man born blind serves as a parable of both seeing and believing.

It is interesting that the *way* Jesus looked is remarked upon by the Evangelists. He looked with such compassion on the leper that it turned his stomach (Mark 1:41). In the story of the Rich Young Man which provided the scriptural underpinning for John Paul II’s *Veritatis Splendor,* it says inMark 10:21 that Jesus ‘Looked at him and loved him’. And yet in trying to teach the disciples, he used the example of a little child (Matt 18:1-4) for whom the world is new, who delights in wonder and whose eyes are not jaundiced from scanning the horizon for success and personal power - things that the disciples were looking for and the kind of blind alley so many of us are apt to walk down (cf. Matt 20:20-28 and Mark 10:35-45).

The power of sight and indeed the role of the body and its importance in the context of relationship is noted by Jesus quite dramatically. In discussing adultery he says that if your right eye causes you to sin it would be better to cut it out. John Paul II offers a detailed consideration of this passage and notes how the ‘look of lust’ is blind to the nuptial and procreative nature of union and is, therefore, a kind of separation of the body from the act of love.[[10]](#endnote-10) Ulrich Luz points out that what is under review is not the kind of wide eyed astonishment that can happen in the presence of beauty but rather the deliberate look that leads to adulterous behaviour which renders the eye and hand instruments of sin.[[11]](#endnote-11) It may seem odd to impute guilt on individual parts of the body, but as a pedagogy it does add to the incarnational sense of self that Christ is trying to teach. ‘The eye,’ says Jesus, is ‘the lamp of the body’ (Matt 6:22) and Paul in his extended metaphor of the body has an entire conversation between bodily parts (1 Corinthians 12:12-26). Meanwhile John earnestly warns against the ‘desire of the eyes’ (1 John 2:16) a theme which John Paul II specifically took up in his ToB catechesis.[[12]](#endnote-12)

We are given a glimpse of what transformed humanity looks like in the Transfiguration (Matt 17:1-9, Mark 9:2-10, Luke 9:28-36), but we are warned by Paul, Matthew, Luke and John that in everyday life, the task is to see the extraordinary in the ordinary for now ‘we see as in a glass darkly’ (1 Cor 13:12)[[13]](#endnote-13). Hence Matthew – ‘when did we *see* you Lord?’ (Matt 25:37-40), Luke - ‘When [the Samaritan] *saw* him he had compassion (Luke 10:33) and John – ‘He who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen.’ (1 John 4:20). Ultimately Colossians 1:15 puts it succinctly that Jesus is the ‘Icon of invisible God’ and at his return, the wedding banquet ‘There will be no more night. They will not need the light of a lamp or the light of the sun, for the Lord God will give them light. They will reign for ever & ever’(Rev 22:5).

**Vision as Destiny?**

At the risk of labouring the point, we might note that the importance of *seeing* is attested down the ages. Restricting ourselves to just three exemplars, Augustine remarks in the *City of God* XXII:1 ‘the eye is more excellent than the other members, because it is capable of perceiving light’[[14]](#endnote-14) and we see the strong association of sight at least by analogy with the ultimate destiny of humanity, the beatific vision. Centuries later Thomas concurs: Sight of God is our final end, beatific vision in which we attain perfect happiness through contemplation of love since "Man is not perfectly happy, so long as something remains for him to desire and seek."[[15]](#endnote-15) This perforce cannot be attained by physical pleasure, power, fame or finite reality. It can only be found in the unmediated knowledge of God which is love (cf. *ST* I q.12 & q.26). Likewise, even with the greatest poetry of our tradition, the best analogy we can find for the delight of heaven is through sight which takes over as words fail. Thus the *Vita Nuova* of Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) begins with his seeing Beatrice - *Ecce Deus fortior me, qui veniens dominabitur mihi.*[[16]](#endnote-16)She becomes a portal to beatitude, a quest which leads him ultimately to compose *La Divina Commedia* and the final Canto of the *Paradiso* where he beholds the divine mystery in a circle of light:

*A l’alta fantasia qui mancò possa;*

*ma già volgeva il mio disio e ’l velle,*

*sì come rota ch’igualmente è mossa,*

*l’amor che move il sole e l’altre stelle.*

Here force failed my high fantasy; but my

Desire and will were moved already – like

a wheel revolving uniformly – by

the Love that moves the sun and the other stars

(Canto XXXIII)[[17]](#endnote-17)

**The Contemporary Challenge: Seeing with blind eyes?**

Despite the biblical testimony and the inspiring words of our forebears, however, we seem to perennially struggle to fix our gaze on Christ and it might be worth paying attention to two distinct contemporary challenges.

First, while the scholastics *taught* the importance of *habitus* and disposition, it would appear that for good and for ill, their wise reasoning is increasingly supported by medical science. Through frequent thought patterns we can actually *myelinate* our neurones such that we automate our perceptions, resulting in awareness of some things and ignorance of others. It is astonishing how we can be inattentive to the witness of our senses. I heard of an experience of a Christian minister walking down a busy road with a Native American who remarked upon the sound of the crickets. The Minister said he couldn’t hear them “It’s too noisy”. Just then someone dropped some coins onto the pavement and *everyone* turned around, essentially because most Westerners are acutely attuned to the sound of money! As in hearing, so in sight, the way we look is far from neutral as recent experiments in what might be called psycho-optics seem to show whereby the young may actually see things differently to older people and depending on what we have been *told* to look for, we may find ourselves simply screening out the most obvious visual elements.[[18]](#endnote-18) The danger of such myelination in our context is obvious, that as the *habit* of seeing others as objects is systematically conveyed by our culture, it risks becoming ever more deeply ingrained in the individual.

The second problem aggravates the issue. The prevailing Western anthropology we are up against, is a strange form of instrumentalizing dualism completely at odds with the insights of ToB. I attribute it to an Anglo-French Philosophical *débâcle* which understands Descartes’ inner thinking homunculus (located in the pineal gland of the brain) as the real ‘me’ which instrumentalizes the body in classic *Utilitarian* fashion in order to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. To note – the more socially aware Utilitarian tradition epitomized by the likes of J.S. Mill helped to transform cities across Britain and indeed society with the slogan of ‘the greatest good for the greatest number’ but latterly this has degenerated into what Kenneth Arrow and others have identified as the only universally legitimate good which is to maximize personal choice.[[19]](#endnote-19) Antithetical to the notion of social solidarity, this has contributed to a ‘tyranny of autonomy’ which is apt to label any critique derived from other cultural, philosophical or religious traditions as intolerant in a mistaken assumption that love and freedom are contiguous with the word ‘yes’. At this point the words of my beloved Dutch scripture scholar, Goswin Habets, come to mind: ‘in my humble but correct opinion, this opinion is mistaken!’

**‘No’ as a Freedom Word?**

I’ve often said that outside the context of faith, Catholicism may be broadly perceived as a five syllable way of saying ‘No!’ Yet for all the troubles of the Church, I don’t think it is Catholicism but rather ‘No’ that needs a makeover. Let me explain.

We have noted that in Eden it was the desire for the fruit that proved irresistible (Gen 3:6) and we don’t have to be religious to know that our appetites can present us with a challenge either to our waistline or to our mental health. An addict, after all, is someone who can’t say ‘no’ to something and is therefore enslaved by a peculiarly powerful appetite whether it be drugs, alcohol, sex, gambling, shopping etc. such that their personal liberation and perhaps their very life becomes dependent upon being able to say ‘No!’

‘No’ is a freedom word and I think it is credible to understand the wisdom inherent in the covenants described in the Bible as that of the challenge to humans as gifted individuals to learn to choose the good. Parallels can easily be drawn here to the universal appeal of Frodo from *Lord of the Rings*, Luke Skywalker from *Star Wars* and Harry Potter and Hermione from Hogwarts. In each case, the narratives turn on the drama of their choices, and their universal appeal to old and young alike is the central figures choose the greater good and say ‘no!’ Although taken from works of fiction, they nonetheless bear witness that society *needs* heroes who will choose the harder path *and we know it!*

In this reading, far from being a narrow confessional collection, the Biblical books and the lives of the saints become an extended case study in Character ethics – an area of much discussion in educational circles in the UK, especially associated with the University of Birmingham.[[20]](#endnote-20) As Aristotle says, the aim of our studies is not just to know what virtue is but to become good. Yet this liberation comes from the exercise of restraint: Saying ‘no’! And people of all ages but maybe especially the children in our classrooms face this self-same existential drama which is at the very core of the anthropology of John Paul II. Whether we reference *The Jeweller’s Shop, Love and Responsibility* or *Theology of the Body*, he never tires of reminding us that love involves a decision, despite its presentation in our contemporary context being ludicrously eroticized and rarely characterized by restraint.[[21]](#endnote-21)

**An Alternative Vision?**

Yet I think that we have to do better than offer a critique, we have to offer an alternative vision. One of the original protagonists of Transcendental Thomism, the Jesuit, Pierre Rousselot (1878-1915) explained that the "light of faith" was not a new object seen; it was a new "power of seeing” more like a new "eye," conferred upon the mind by elevating grace.[[22]](#endnote-22) It is along these lines that I have in mind the kind of approach long advocated by another notable Twentieth Century Thomist, Josef Pieper:

How splendid water is, or a rose, a tree, an apple! But as a rule we do not say such things, at least when we are in full possession of our faculties, without implying, to some degree, an affirmation which transcends the immediate object of our praise and the literal meaning of our words – an assent touching the foundation of the world. In the midst of our workaday cares we raise our heads and unexpectedly gaze into a face turned towards us, and in that instant we see: everything which is, is good, worthy of love, and loved by God.[[23]](#endnote-23)

Creation as a miraculous canvas is an obvious starting point, but pedagogically, a different *way* of seeing *may* be prompted by giving people something different to look at. John Paul II and Benedict XVI have long drawn upon the theological aesthetics of Von Balthasar and in this regard and it is no surprise to me that protagonists of ToB such as Christopher West and David Clayton are advocating *The Way of Beauty.*[[24]](#endnote-24)Inmy own field of Religious Education we were afforded an opportunity by the 2016 Reform of all publicly examined subjects in England to bring a much richer picture of Catholic expression into the syllabus than before and I for one, am delighted. As well as the architecture of Gaudì and the art of Elizabeth Wang, music, sculpture even dramas like *Les Misérables* can offer an access point for Catholic anthropology and engagement with sacramental imagination. Great works of religious art have distinct power, as even Julia Kristeva would acknowledge since they can ‘spread out the logic of speech to the most inaccessible folds of significance.’[[25]](#endnote-25) In my view if we ignore these treasures, the martyrs of the Iconoclast crisis died in vain.

**A New Vision of Humanity?**

So what am I proposing? At one level, a theologian and teacher of Catholic Religious Education, I am eager to see the insights of ToB integrated into High School curricula, and I am pleased that I have been able to effect that at least partially through the AQA syllabus for Catholic schools at GCSE level where last year saw, I think, the first public examination question on Theology of the Body ever asked in England.[[26]](#endnote-26) I should be noted, however, that since the GCSE reform coincided with new legislation on same-sex marriage, the section of the syllabus on Relationships and Family proposed by the DfE led to an almost exclusive focus on partners while hardly discussing the generally more enduring parent-child relationships, still less siblings and grandparents.

Moreover, on an intellectual and personal basis, I would also lament the absence in English Religious Education of any systematic discussion of friendship. I am not saying spousal love is over-rated nor that the nuptial paradigm properly understood is not inclusive! Yet it should be noted that Aquinas has *amicitia* rather than *amor* at the centre of his understanding of society and piety. He defines *caritas* – as ‘a certain type of friendship with God’ and uses it to explain everything from good politics to the purpose of Real Presence in the Eucharist, [[27]](#endnote-27) I thus applaud work done by educators in the US (Collyer/ Ashour/ Mausolf et al) who are developing pedagogies of friendship based on ToB.[[28]](#endnote-28) Moreover, in a Catholic context, it also needs to be acknowledged that such a life of love can be lived by those who are single – another area where Jesus might be seen as model and liberator.

Yet in a very obvious way, I *am* suggesting that ToB implies we must make sense of our senses and in that regard attention to *how* we see is important. Pope Francis asks that the Church be like a field hospital – well we definitely need an optical department! We should have periodic reviews of the way we *look* in the manner of Cardijn whose wonderful formula - ‘see, judge act’ has inspired millions and continues to guide so many. We can surely learn from our heroes such as Mother Theresa who could recognize Jesus in his ‘most distressing disguise’, Karol Wojtyla who could see the drama of our age unfolding and the many less famous but no less extraordinary people who have had a clear vision of God’s from whom we could learn.[[29]](#endnote-29)

For all the visual addiction of our time, it is liberating to me that we have no descriptions of what Jesus looked like, and it is challenging to me that in terms of clothing – we only know he put on an apron. And while God clothed our shame in the garden, it is a deep theology of the body that he took away our shame when we disrobed him on the cross.

It is surely a holy gift to be free to see as God sees. If we wonder what this might be like, perhaps the testimony of a young man regaining consciousness after a near death experience might help.

I no longer saw the uniform a person wore, let alone desired the uniform for myself, the position for myself, the prestige for myself, the pay for myself. Somehow – don’t ask me how – I saw the person’s heart and felt enormous love and compassion. I wanted to know each person who crossed my path, from the doctors to the orderlies. I wanted to know their stories their heartaches. I felt compassion for complete strangers, which was so unlike the person I was before. It was strange. No, it was supernatural. I don’t know what happened during those three days in a coma, but something happened that I couldn’t explain. A new way of seeing. Which was leading me to a new way of thinking and feeling. And ultimately to a new way of living.[[30]](#endnote-30)

*Domine, ut videam, ut serviam –* ‘Lord. Grant I might see, so I might serve’*.* We don’t know what Jesus looked like, but we are called to look like him. Thus to conclude I would like to thank Monica Rapeanu for drawing my attention to this wonderful line of Pope Benedict from *Deus Caritas Est:* ‘Seeing with the eyes of Christ, I can give to others much more than their outward necessities; I can give them the look of love which they crave.’[[31]](#endnote-31)
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