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All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.

Mt 11:27; Lk 10:22
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PROLOGUE: FATHER-SON PARADIGM

The relationship of fathers and sons is an ancient drama, encompassing humanity and divinity. Since fatherhood and sonship are found both in humanity and divinity, exploration of the father-son relationship requires a theological and anthropological dialogue. This thesis aims to provide a theological anthropology of fathers and sons. To equip oneself for a theological anthropology, it is necessary to introduce a few basic concepts about fathers and sons.

To begin, vertical and horizontal relationships exist between father and son. Accordingly, personhood and difference are central to understanding their relationship. Verticality indicates difference, man is different from God. The horizontal nature of relation is evident within the Triune God, as well as in the difference of man and woman. These horizontal and vertical dimensions between persons will be more completely accounted for when difference and similitude are considered. Despite these distinctions (whether horizontal or vertical), difference underlies

---

1 John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, Vittorio Messori (Ed.), Translated by Jenny McPhee and Martha McPhee, New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1994, p. 227. The Pope writes “[t]he father-son paradigm is ageless. It is older than human history. The ‘rays of fatherhood’ contained in this formulation belong to the Trinitarian Mystery of God Himself, which shines forth from Him, illuminating man and his history.” The terms “father” and “son” denote a certain masculinity. Theologically, it is to be understood in a Trinitarian dimension (without a strict understanding of gender); and, it must be understood within the anthropological dimension of who man is and what makes him a “father” (in the strict sense of gender- his masculinity).

2 “One of the recommendations [of the synodal fathers] was for a further study of the anthropological and theological bases that are needed in order to solve the problems connected with the meaning and dignity of being a woman and being a man” (John Paul II, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, Homebush, NSW: St. Paul’s Publications, 1998, 1. Here after *Mulieris Dignitatem* will be notated as MD. See also Angelo Cardinal Scola, *The Nuptial Mystery*, Translated by Michelle K. Borras, Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005, p. 5).

3 The theology of fatherhood encompasses the biological, anthropological, sociological, psychological, and the philosophical. Throughout this work, it is necessary to understand that various references to the philosophy and anthropology (seen also in the psychology and sociology) of the human person are part of theology. Later references to these various disciplines presume a certain revealed truth about the divine. Other areas of research clearly overlap with theology. So, if a sociologist is finding various problems related to fatherhood there seems to be correlative effective on how humanity perceives God. This means that what is discovered about the human person relates to the theology. Therefore, what is found in reason also belongs to faith.

4 In general, “man” may be used in reference to all of humanity, including both male and female although references made directly to human fatherhood are intended for the male gender alone. For a woman in her femaleness is never male, or able to be a father in a literal sense of the word; her role is one of motherhood. The literary style of this work uses the masculine form “man” intentionally in order to emphasise the father-figure. This is especially necessary as some words such as “Father” have been neutralised or degendered in various settings. John Miller writes about this in his essay “The Refutation of the ‘Father’ in God in Feminist Theologies at the End of the Twentieth Century: Analysis and Critique” in *Calling God “Father”: Essays on the Bible, Fatherhood and Culture*, New York and Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1999, pp.110-126.
relationship via complementary. The difference between persons creates an openness to give oneself to the other. Complementarity exists between the relationship of persons, e.g., man and woman, God and man, father and son, et. al. Furthermore, complementarity allows for reciprocity to occur between persons and vice versa. For instance, the Father shares from all eternity the Son and the Son responds in giving himself to the Father. In essence, the Father or the Son is “gift.”

The term “gift” has many meanings and John Paul uses it as a working term. Noting this, the placement of the word is meant to fit the surrounding context. The meaning may not always be clearly marked as the reader would like; however, it allows for a certain flexibility that goes beyond the words on the page. This is especially true since “gift” often expresses something transcendent. Development of this word is intentional and a conclusion about its final use must be considered for the meaning of fatherhood. In one meaning, John Paul II describes Jesus Christ to be a gift to the Father. The development then is to see how the Father gifts the world; his Son is the manifestation of the Father’s love. Therefore, the notion of adequate fatherhood resides in being a gift. In the father-son dynamic, the Son Incarnate reveals God the Father, and thus, reveals man to himself (Lk 10:22; Mt 28:18; Jn 3:35, 10:15, 13:3, 17:25). In addition, the Father reveals the Son (Mt 17:5; Mk 9:7). The Son is eternally begotten, so the identity of the Son is a subsisting relation of another, namely, the Father.

---

5 John Paul II, *Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, Translation, Introduction and Index by Michael Waldenstein, Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006. Hereafter MW. The first number of the system indicates the audience number, ordered by date, and the second number indicates the paragraph. The page number has also been added when following Michael Waldstein’s translation. The exception to this rule is when a series of audiences has been footnoted. For reader ease, the page numbers have been excluded for these long lists. In reference to the word “gift,” it has many uses including “gift of self” (Cf. 10:5; 15:5; 17:4-6; 18:4; 20:5; 32:6; 53:3, 59:1-2, 4; 73:4; 87:1; 88:1-2; 89:7-8; 90:5-6; 91:3-6; 92:1, 3; 93:1, 3; 6; 94:1, 5; 95:6; 95b:1; 96:4, 7; 97:2, 4; 99:1; 101:10; 102:2-4, 6; 114:4, 7; 126:6). However, he also uses the word give (dono) and gift (dono). When he describes dono he describes the belonging of man and woman as gifts to each other (Cf. 13:1-4; 14:1-2). Additionally, man is a gift to the world.

6 John Paul talks about the “giving of oneself” (donarsi) and this relates to Christ’s “gift of self” (MW, 90:5; 92:4; 110:7; 111:4; 123:5).

7 Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes: Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, 22 in A. Flannery O.P. (Ed.), Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, Rev. Ed. Vol. 1. Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1996. Henceforth notated as GS. The person of Christ is unlike man in that he is the “image of God” (Col 1:15), whereas humans are created in the likeness of God (Gen 1:26). Jesus Christ is the God-man, and in his dual nature (human and divine), he restores the “children of Adam that likeness to God which had been disfigured ever since the first sin” (GS, 22). In other words, the Son reveals the mystery of the Father and his love (GS, 22).

8 It seems that the Father reveals his plan for the Son from the “beginning” (Cf. Gen 3:15-18). Another striking example is the human father Abraham (Gen 22) who mirrors the sacrifice made by God the Father. The willing sacrifice by the Father marks a promise of redemption completed in the resurrection and completed by Christ.
Pope John Paul II recognises the importance of this dramatic relationship. He devotes a five year catechesis on man and woman in relation to one another and to God. For the purposes of this thesis, divine and human fatherhood will be looked at in selected writings of John Paul. Since he has written a multitude of works, the work here is restricted by the brevity of its analysis and fatherhood will be primarily considered within the context of his Wednesday Audiences (1979-1984) titled *Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body.* From this translation, he describes a biblical record of man as dependent on the Creator where “the truth about his particular vocation...springs from the eternal mystery of the person as the image of God, incarnated in the visible and bodily fact of the masculinity and femininity of the human person.” The identity of man comes through an ‘[o]ther,’ and the distinction between male and female accentuates the difference between persons created in the image of God. The ‘other’ denotes one that is “not me,” so the way to discover “me” is through “you.”

I. Description of Chapters

The work of this thesis will proceed in four chapters. The first chapter defines fatherhood in light of John Paul II’s *Man and Woman He Created Them*. Within the context of personhood and relationality, John Paul’s “adequate anthropology” is applied to human fatherhood in order to

---

9 This discussion can be viewed in light of the Father-Son relationship, but also in the God-man relationship and the man-woman relationship. The relationships between Father and Son and God and man will be focused on throughout this analysis.


11 *MW*, 58:1, p. 356. Masculinity and femininity are not reserved exclusively as male and female characteristics. Rather, they make a distinction between identity and difference. “The question of difference cannot be reduced to a simple problem of roles, but needs to be thought out ontologically” (Scola, *Nuptial Mystery*, p. 26; *MD*, 10). Man and woman commonly share humanity, making it possible to be a “unity of two.” “[S]ince the creation of man...the relation between man and woman- as well as those of paternity, maternity, and sonship to which it gives rise- can represent the revelatory nucleus of the horizontal dimension of communion” (p. 27, also pp. 25, 26, 28-30) found in the “unity of the two.”

12 The created reality of another person produces a relationality found in the God-head, and also to man and woman.

13 For instance, the difference and likeness of man and woman is found in the *imago Dei* (Gen 1:27).
describe what “authentic fatherhood” means for historical man. In historical man’s lived experience, he suffers sin and its effects (Gen 3) although he retains the grandeur of being created in the image and likeness of God. Wounded by original sin, he experiences suffering and death. The meaning of his identity is now obscured. It is not always easy for historical man to know authentic fatherhood. Man’s difficulty in knowing himself is a consequence of the fall, but this struggle was not always so.

Accordingly, the second chapter looks at man in the state of original innocence. Prior to sin, original man discovers fatherhood in the imago Dei. John Paul relates original man as imago Dei to that of the relationship found between Father and Son. The first and second chapters of Genesis describe man created in God’s likeness. In light of this, the following sections interpret man’s creation; original solitude and original unity are introduced. From original unity, man and woman form a communion of persons and it is the difference of persons that makes them complement each other. Found in original nakedness, man’s (male) differences and similarities to woman (female) allow these persons to better understand how they are in God’s likeness. They are not God, but they live in a gifted state. This state is one of grace, living in communio with God and an ‘other’ person. The three distinctive ways of fatherhood include an ability to guide, to protect, and to love. Unfortunately original man falls from grace through original sin. The next chapter views original sin as a rejection of fatherhood.

In the first chapter “father” is defined for historical man. The second chapter looks at original man, and the third chapter evaluates life without God. For man, to live without God (in sin) suggests death. Man commits “patricide” in order to do what he wills. His rebellion corresponds to a false autonomy, and this falsehood comes in a temptation to be god. Like modern ideologies, man faces the problem of acting as if he is the source of all good, when in fact, God is the source of goodness. Man’s rebellion is an outward sign of an inward reality. He rebels because he doubts his role and; therefore, displays disobedience to the Father.

---

14 Historical man is the present state of man, which includes his fallen nature.
15 This is original man and his state of original innocence is before the fall.
16 MW, 9:3, pp. 163-164.
Before he disobeyed God, man lived as an obedient son. Obedience and disobedience are explained more extensively to illustrate the change that followed the fall. Because original man disobeyed the voice of God, historical man faces challenges in every age. Besides a false autonomy, man deals with atheism. The philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche and the psychology of Sigmund Freud have advanced notions of atheism. Using their ideologies, man loses faith in God, or at the very least, man is influenced by their constructions about fatherhood and atheism. These two thinkers also share a common trait; they had weak fathers. This chapter also argues that man’s poor relationship with his human father influences his beliefs in divine fatherhood. The conclusion to the chapter finds that atheism is a rejection of fatherhood. Despite this dilemma, man needs to look forward.

The final chapter completes the vision of fatherhood found in original man and historical man which is achieved in eschatological man.\textsuperscript{17} Taking into account the eschaton, the fourth chapter offers a few simple directives that help man to live life to the full (Jn 10:10). Sacraments and prayer grant historical man the means to reach heaven.

Several themes in Revelation\textsuperscript{18} provide a rich theological course in the chapters to come. These themes encompass creation, redemption and the eschaton. Based on Scripture, John Paul grounds each subject in the Judeo-Christian tradition.\textsuperscript{19} A short introduction of how he uses the three themes in his Wednesday Audiences follows.

\textsuperscript{17} Eschatological man is the state of man who fulfils the beatific vision.

\textsuperscript{18} MW, 46:1, p. 310.

II. Central Themes of Creation, Redemption and Eschaton

There are three central themes that must be considered. The theme of creation is central to John Paul II’s Wednesday Audiences. He refers to the “beginning” as a reasonable place to understand man and woman, fatherhood and motherhood. Specifically in Genesis there exists a relationship and an encounter of fatherhood in the creation of man (Gen 1:26-28) and in the generation of children (Cf. Gen 4). More importantly, man is created in God’s likeness. This is especially evident in original man.

Paralleling the creation of the first man, God so loved the world that he gave his only Son (Jn 3:16). His love is marked in the “rays of fatherhood” and all of humanity is restored. These “rays” are orientated towards truth and find fulfilment through authentic freedom. Such freedom values and respects the dignity of the other. The second theme, redemption, is necessary for historical man since he suffers the effects of concupiscence. Only in the Son, however, can man overcome sin.

The third theme evaluates the reality of salvation. The sign of hope is given to historical man when the Son is sent as a sign of the Father’s love. Directed back to the Father, man meets his end. The “last things” or the eschaton are made known through the Son who conquers death and brings forth new life.

Despite the promise of new life, the “rays of fatherhood” find the “first resistance in the obscure but real fact of original sin.” In other words, the earliest resistance to God made by man is in original sin. Original man opposes creation by resisting redemption and simultaneously he avoids fulfilling his destiny in accordance to God’s plan. Several problems arise out of sin and

---

20 John Paul II references the “beginning” from his first audience on 5 September 1979. Since this study is based on these catecheses, fatherhood will be considered primarily within this context.
21 The underlying importance of woman is recognised, as is the complementarity shared between man and woman through their human nature. It is recommended that further analysis continue on motherhood. It would be useful to consider motherhood within the context of John Paul II’s Man and Woman He Created Them. Other references by John Paul II include: Redemptoris Mater (RM): Mother of the Redeemer, Washington, D.C: Office of Publishing and Promotion Services (USCCB), 1987; MD: Letter to Woman (LW), Boston, MA: Pauline Books and Media, 1995; and Woman’s Dignity” in Origins 9, no. 2, 31 May 1979, pp. 31-32.
22 These “rays” (seen in historical man) appear to be abolished by original sin (John Paul II, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, p. 227).
23 John Paul II, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, pp. 227-228.
these remain with historical man. The problems consist of 1) man rebelling against the Father’s commands; 2) man seeking a false autonomy; and 3) man living without God.

III. Problems of Rebellion, False Autonomy and Living Without God

The first problem occurs when the son rebels against the father. He doubts the “gift” and alienates himself from the father; thereby, depriving himself of participation in the structure of the gift and rendering himself an orphan. For the purposes here, man is the highest expression of the divine love, and he carries within himself the inner dimension of the gift.

The son’s rebellion found in original sin gives rise to a second problem–the problem of living a false autonomy. This particular problem fully manifested during the time of the Enlightenment and the philosophical questions from that time period continue to shape the cultural values of today’s world. In fact, modernity shifted value to the individual, human person. A strength of this value allowed modern man to look at the subjective character of his being. However, the focus of man and his subjectivity to the neglect of God lends to modern man’s current dilemma.

Still, the Church did not adequately address the notion of subjectivity. Instead, it relied on its previous objective rationales while modernity gained momentum. Over time, the Church

---

24 As mentioned earlier, the references to the notion of ‘gift’ abound, especially in Man and Woman. John Paul mentions the idea of persons being “gift” in many of his other writings. One could look at his plays, e.g., The Jeweller’s Shop or the Radiation of Fatherhood. The idea of “gift” also appears in other papal writings. For instance, one finds notions of this in RH, RC, VS, and FC to name a few. His thoughts of man being a “gift” are also in Love and Responsibility and Crossing the Threshold of Love. This list of sources is not exclusive; rather, these resources provide various developments of thought by John Paul II and reiterate that man is made to love and to be loved. Man is a gift. His very creation is the first gift from the Creator. There are many other meanings to this gift, including man becoming a “gift of self” (MW, 13:1-4, 14:1-2, pp.177-182).

25 MW, 27:2, p. 239. “Gift” and the “structure of the gift” mean two different things. For instance, man receives the gift of life, which is given to him by the father. With a true understanding of the gift, man is directed towards the Creator. Through original sin, the son misunderstands the structure of the gift. This causes him to be self-centred and he sees structure of the gift as a hindrance to his self-sufficiency. He starts to live in fear and finds himself rebelling against the structure of the gift. The great paradox in this is found in the account between man and woman. Man (male) receives a gift of an ‘other’, similar to his reception of “gift of self.”

26 Both complementarity and difference between persons allows fulfillment to occur through the reciprocated gift of self. Giving and receiving are interpenetrated. The external dimension of this is found between man and woman, and which paradoxically mirrors the Trinity. MW, 19:3, 5; 20:5; 21:1, 3, 6; 22:4; 26:4; 27:2; 30:3; 32:1-6; 33:1-2, 4; 39:5; 40:1; 41:3; 43:6; 46:4; 48:1,3; 49:5-6; 51:5; 53:3; 56:1, 4; 57:2-4; 58:6-7; 59:2; 60:7; 61:1-2, 4; 62:1-4; 68:2-3; 69:6; 72:6; 73:4; 75:3; 76:4; 77:2-3; 78:4-5; 79:8; 80:5-6; 81:6; 82:2; 83:4; 84:1, 8; 85:4-5, 7-8; 86:8; 88:2; 90:5-6; 91:8; 92:3; 94:1-2, 5; 95:3; 95b:2, 4; 96:1, 3, 5; 97:2; 101:2-3, 5, 10; 103:4-6; 104:4; 110:2, 7, 9; 111:2, 4-5; 113:3; 116:1; 117b:4-5, 123:5, 7; 124:5; 128:1-3; 130:4; 131:1-2, 4-6 and 132:1-5.
delineated a balance between the subjective and objective, and decidedly began to address the autonomous ‘self’.  

These recent attempts of the Church notwithstanding, a third problem rests in the cultural tendencies of the modern era, an attempt to live without God. How can another inform man’s life? More specifically, the Father’s command becomes a threat to man since God tells man that he will die if he eats of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:16). As such, it frustrates the capacity to understand fatherhood. A false notion of autonomy then lends to seeing the ‘self’ before God and without God.

The rejection of divine fatherhood corresponds to a rejection of human fatherhood. André Malraux commented that this would be a “century of religion or it would not be at all” and at the centre of this is either the dilemma of fatherlessness or the rejection of fatherhood manifested as atheism. The widespread errors of modern ideologies of communism, capitalism, materialism, and socialism all focus on the individual to the neglect of the specific roles within the context of the family. Because of these problems, humanity needs to rediscover the meaning of fatherhood. This rediscovery is above all a return to faith in God and his fatherhood.

Moreover, the revival of ‘father’ is relevant to marriage and family. Without the father, one loses the concept of living with and for others. The language of the father also has a theological implication of being in relation. To accept man’s identity, it is necessary to realise that his identity is in the likeness of God and by its nature is in relation to the Father.

---

27 GS, 19-21. John Paul II contributed to the discussion of modernity during his pontificate, addressing the notion of subjectivity within the context of his Wednesday Audiences. He understood the influences of the Enlightenment. So, he appealed to the heart. Rather than disregard human experience, he draws on it while maintaining objectivity.

28 Paraphrased by John Paul II, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, p. 229. (It appears that religion or belief in God is important to relationship).

29 Historians agree that atheism (unbelief in God) is a Western phenomenon. Atheism is the rejection of God since it claims that God does not exist. It creates problems of meaninglessness and alienation (consequences of original sin). Atheism also became a central assumption of many modern ideologies including communism, socialism and modernity. Paul C. Vitz, Faith of the Fatherless: The Psychology of Atheism, Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 1999, pp. 4-5, 124-125.
CHAPTER ONE: HISTORICAL MAN

John Paul II’s catecheses on the book of Genesis provide a source to understanding fatherhood;\textsuperscript{30} he notes that the focus on this community of “human and Christian life [namely the family] has been fundamental ‘from the beginning’.” An analysis of community finds some common points that allow for a deeper understanding of God’s plan for the father.\textsuperscript{31} Persons and relationships help define a community. For this reason, the first section of this chapter defines fatherhood by incorporating the notions of personhood and relationality. The next section elaborates on the problems for historical man in relation to fatherhood. The struggle between ‘self’ versus ‘other’ will be examined in light of original sin, and the struggle seems to occurs in the intellect and will.\textsuperscript{33} The fall of original man also results in suffering and death. Other areas that pertain to the fall include the loss of ‘original innocence’ and ‘original justice.’\textsuperscript{34} Despite the problems that historical man faces, he has the potential to overcome them. The last section of this chapter shows that the father acts as a provider, protector and leader in order to defeat self-deception, lust and self.

\textsuperscript{30} In fact, one finds that the “divine Father” is mentioned fifty-six times and that the “human father” is mentioned forty-five times throughout John Paul II’s Wednesday Audiences between 1979 and1984. These references do not include the words “paternity, fatherhood, or parenthood.”

\textsuperscript{31} MW, 1:1, p. 134. “Beginning” signifies therefore what Genesis speaks about (1:3, p. 132). The idea of family will also be further explored later in this chapter and in the following chapter. The family is analogous to the blessed Trinity.

\textsuperscript{32} Further research should investigate motherhood and children. The concern of man’s role must be centred on its foundation of anthropology, namely found in the Holy Trinity (Scola, The Nuptial Mystery, pp. xxv-xxvi).

\textsuperscript{33} The mind, body, and soul could be added to this list. Classically, the state of sin is found in the intellect, will, and death. One may also note that the intellect and will are faculties that can be understood in the heart. Christ appeals to the heart (Mt 5:27-28), and John Paul devotes a tremendous amount of time on this interpretation (MW, 24:1-59:7, pp. 225-363).

\textsuperscript{34} ‘Original innocence’ (innocenza originaria) is introduced by John Paul II. MW, 2:1; 3:3-4; 4:1-4; 11:4, 12:1, 3-4; 15:5. It is considered a fruit of grace or participation in God’s inner life (MW, 16:2-4), seen in the reciprocal experience of the spousal meaning of the body (16:5; 17:1-2), and found in accepting the other according to the gift (MW, 17:3, 5; 18:1-5; 19:1-5; 20:1; 21:2, 7; 25:1; 26:4-5; 27:3; 28:1-3; 29:4-5; 30:1; 31:1, 5-6; 33:1; 49:4; 55:4, 6; 58:2, 5; 61:2; 87:2; 96:1, 3, 5-7; 97:1, 3, 3; 98:4; 99:7; 102:4). ‘Original justice’ (giustizia originaria) is usually referenced within the context of accepting the gift, and parallels the notion of ‘original justice’ (MW, 16:3; 18:1; 19:3; 27:2; 87:2; 96:2, 5; 97:1, 3; 98:304; 99:7).
I. Defining Fatherhood

The definition of fatherhood is multi-faceted in the context of theology. Still, various areas of study can reveal much about fatherhood. A father physically gives his seed to the ‘other.’ The suggestion of the ‘other’ proposes that man exists contingently; meaning, his biology bespeaks that he is a unique self. As an individual, he is able to enter a relationship of both giving and receiving. The theological paradox is that self-donation requires a relationship of both difference and similitude. From a psychological perspective, the differences may feel strained. How can one be autonomous while at the same time contingent? Due to original sin, resentment arises from the other’s demands. For example, the desire of a son to overcome a father’s authority challenges the paradoxical relationship of being alike, yet different. Nonetheless, a son seeks to fully realise his identity. Knowing self is a philosophical matter where one asks “[w]ho am I?” The answer resides in the theological understanding of fatherhood. The father is a self-emptying gift to the ‘other,’ which means he is capable of self-donation, transcendence, and knowing self.

More importantly, the father is in relationship, and in this relationship, the father is love (1 Jn 4:15-16). Out of love, fatherhood transmits life.35 In the book of Genesis, a father is realised in creation (Gen 1:27) and procreation (Gen 4:1).36 The language of “father” speaks first of God, the first origin of all things, who is all good and loves his children. This language also speaks of human parents as the first representatives of God for man (CCC 239). The language of faith thus draws on the human experience of parents.37 In everyday language, “father” is defined as 1) a man who has begotten a child; 2) one that originates or institutes; and 3) God, the first person of the Trinity. More specifically, “[m]an’s resemblance to God finds its basis, as it were, in the mystery of the most holy Trinity.”38 To explain, the Trinitarian God is in relation and man is in this image. “Then

35 Regarding the human transmission of life, man and woman do not always have children out of love for each other. Sometimes a life is created out of passion; whereas, God creates all life out of love.
36 MW, 2:1, p. 134. He indicates that Genesis 4 “deals with the conception and birth of a human being from earthly parents.” This is an early distinction of human fatherhood found in the context of procreation (CCC 239).
37 MW, 2:1, p. 134.
God said: ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness’” (Gen 1:26). In God’s likeness, man is directed towards a reality that transcends the world. The significance of this will be more clearly assessed in the section on relationality and then in the proceeding chapter on original man.

There are traces of what it means to be a “father” both in the human and divine life. Some commonalities include the significance of personhood and relationality; each is integral to the fundamental definition of what it means to be “father.” The following two sections consider the elements of personhood and relationality in the context of John Paul’s “adequate anthropology.”

As noted in the prologue, certain questions arise from man’s subjectivity. John Paul establishes a difference between subjectivity and subjectivism. Subjectivity leads into the meaning of man’s identity and capacity to understand and act from this identity in Christ Jesus. Karol Wojtyla uses Max Scheler’s concept of phenomenology, a method of looking at human experience. Subjectivism is “exclusively concerned with the subject and the ‘authenticity’ of the subjects feelings...” and subjectivism leads to relativism, dualism, nominalism, reductionism and ultimately nihilism.

Considering that the Church had been living with a metaphysical mentality of what it means to be human, it did not adequately explain the subject. John Paul developed an “adequate anthropology” in order to discuss subjectivity and the self regarded by the Enlightenment. An “adequate anthropology” considers what is human, and lends to understanding an “adequate fatherhood.” For a human father, this “adequate fatherhood” includes his masculinity, his

---

39 Stanley J. Grenz, *Rediscovering the Triune God: The Trinity in Contemporary Theology*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004, p. 59. Although Grenz notes this to be the “central theological task” of Karl Rahner, which is his opinion, I would like to add that Rahner himself clarifies Christian existence and experience particularly in *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, Translated by William V. Dych, New York: Seabury Press, 1978, pp. 10-11, 24-43. He utilizes the modern concepts of subjectivity in order to show humanity’s experience is directed to God (Ch. 5, especially p. 140). Rahner’s “central theological task” explains how humans are directed towards a reality that transcends all.


41 John Paul II. *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, p. 51.


44 The thought of Descartes is frequently quoted as “I think, therefore I am.” This reference exemplifies rationalist thinking and the notion of “I” versus “Thou.” One might say that the emphasis lies in personhood, or the “I.”
experiences, his relationship with woman, and his relationship with God. Although an “adequate anthropology” takes into account what is “essentially human,” a theological anthropology considers what is both divine and human. Since fatherhood is both human and divine, what is learned about fatherhood through man’s experience as “historical man,” “original man” and “eschatological man” (in his “adequate anthropology”) is not only related to man but also related to the divine. Discoveries made about human fatherhood reveal something about divine fatherhood and vice versa; thus providing, a theological anthropology of fatherhood. The basis of the theological anthropology of fatherhood can first be understood though the notion of personhood.

A. Personhood

The notion of personhood is relevant to both the divine and human father. The word “person” is usually synonymous with an “individual”; however, “person” is also used to describe God. The word “Person” is utilized because of its extensive historical and theological value. The historical and theological concept of “Person” applies therefore to the Father. In the New Testament, Jesus speaks of his Father as a distinct Person (Jn 6:37-38) while at the same time noting that the Son is one with the Father (Jn 10:30). Therefore, God the Father is a Person living in a united plurality with the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Additionally, the father is an originator and self-donator. This is more clearly seen in the family. In the human and divine sense, the father is a “person” of the family. John Paul notes that

---

45 The individual is usually understood to be human; however, individual could also refer to the distinct “persons” of the Trinity. Philip M. Parker (Ed.), Webster’s Dictionary On-line, http://www.websters-online-dictionary.org/definition/person (accessed September 2006).
46 “Person” defines the distinction between God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (CCC 252).
47 “When the magisterium and theology demarcate a concept, they do not remove it from its history and evolution…” Rahner, The Trinity, p. 108. Whereas, Balthasar observes that ‘person’ is “not limited to the history of theology… [he shows] us that we can do without the concept of “person” much longer than we think” (Hans Urs von Balthasar, Theo-Drama, vol. III: Persons in Christ, Translated by Graham Harrison, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, p. 203). In a footnote Balthasar mentions that Deodat de Basly “regrets that the concept of ‘person’ was introduced into Christology…it has confused everything” (p. 203). Despite this commentary, Balthasar finds a place for the use of “person” in his Trinitarian theology and ties it to the particular mission of the “persons” of the Trinity (p. 511).
“God in his deepest mystery is not a solitude, but a family…”⁴⁸ For example, the notion of otherness is found through the language of we and us (e.g., Gen 3:22 and 11:7). Another way to describe family is as a communion of persons (communio personarum).⁴⁹

Like God, the reality of fatherhood for historical man is one that surpasses that of original solitude.⁵⁰ “Man is ‘alone’: this is to say that through his own humanity, through what he is, he is at the same time set into a unique, exclusive, and unrepeatable relationship with God himself.”⁵¹ Man finds his personhood in the transcendent relation between himself and to the other. “Man is not alone, he is in duality and it is in this dependence on the other that his creatureliness consists.”⁵² The awareness of the need for human otherness (Gen 2:18) creates man’s awareness of the divine otherness. The “meaning of original solitude enters and becomes part of the meaning of original unity.”⁵³ His “solitude” finds man alone and incomplete; he is called to live in relation or in union with another. This is seen when a man leaves his father and mother unites with his wife and the two become one flesh (Gen 2:24; Mt 19:5). It is not good for man to be alone (Gen 2:18). Although original solitude remains, man exists in relationship to another like him.

---


⁴⁹ “Man became the image of God not only through his own humanity, but also through the communion of persons (MW, 9:3, p. 163). John Paul’s references to communio personarum take on several meanings. One meaning stems from a principle found in GS, 24 where “persons can only find themselves in a sincere gift of self” (Cf. 9:2, 5; 10:1-3; 12:1; 13:1). The communio personarum requires that persons live ‘for’ the other in relation and becomes a reciprocal gift (29:2-5; 30:5-6; 40:1, 3; 41:2, 4-5; 43:3; 49:5; 59:2, 4; 61:4; 62:1-3; 63:2, 6; 67:3, 68:1-2, 4; 69:4, 6-7; 73:1; 75:1, 3; 76:5; 77:1-2; 89:6; 95b:4; 100:1; 101: 4; 103:5; 104:7; 105:3, 6; 106:2; 107:4, 6; 110:3; 113:5; 115.; 116:3-5; 117:6; 117b:2; 123:5, 7; 125:1; 127:2, 4; 128:5-6; 129:6; 130:5, 132:5). This is also seen in the Trinitarian communion of persons (95b:4; 100:1; 103:5; 104:7; 105:3; 106:2; 107:4, 6; 110:3; 117:6; 117b:2; 123:5; and 130:5.)

⁵⁰ Original solitude has a two-fold meaning. One is found in man’s very nature (his humanity) and the other is in man-woman relationship (MW, 5:2, pp.146-147). God was never a solitude since he has always existed as a Trinity as a communio personarum. The fatherhood of God is realised in relationship.

⁵¹ MW, 6:2, p. 151.

⁵² Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3, Translated from Schöpfung und Fall, Published by Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munich, 1937, Translated by John C. Fletcher, New York: SCM Pres Ltd, 1959, p. 38.

⁵³ MW, 8:1, p. 156.
B. Relationality

Another commonality found between human and divine fatherhood is the notion of being in relation to another. This is found through the distinction of persons. However, what is learned of human fatherhood or in divine fatherhood is understood analogously. Man resembles God. It becomes apparent that “relationality is a part of the human person” and relationality is a part of the divine Person. Despite certain similarities, differences exist between God and man. One key difference is found in nature. God the Father has a divine nature; whereas, man only has his human nature. His human nature makes him distinct, which means his fatherhood is found in his identity as a man.

A distinction that must be understood from the onset is that man is distinct because of his sexuality. The Holy Trinity is not based on gender. Rather, “the language of the divine family is theological, not biological.” In all things, the Trinity is relational. However, relationality is different for God than it is for man. God the Father transcends the distinction found in the sexes, which means he also transcends human fatherhood. God is the origin of all (CCC 239, Cf. Ps 27:10; Eph 3:14; Isa 49:15). Additionally, “God created man in his image, in the divine image he created him; male and female he created him” (Gen 1:27). The key to understanding fatherhood comes from this ‘otherness’ found in his relations. As for man’s sexual nature, “[s]exuality is nothing but the ultimate realisation of our belonging to one another.” This means, male and female belong together. The relationality of human persons points them towards a communion of persons (communio personarum). John Paul notes that “communio” more accurately describes

---

55 Hahn, First Comes Love, p. 43.
56 Hahn, First Comes Love, p. 43.
57 Bonhoeffer, Creation and Fall, p. 62. “The unity denotes above all the identity of human nature; duality, on the other hand, shows what, on the basis of this identity constitutes the masculinity and femininity of created man” (MW, 9:1, p. 161).
58 MW, 9:2, p. 162. The union of persons (male and female) and the God-head forms a communion of persons (communio personarum) (GS, 12).
the relation to the other person and “indicates precisely the ‘help’ that derives in some way from the very fact of existing as a person ‘beside’ a person.”

The *communio personarum* is seen in the personal and relational nature found in the persons of the Trinity also. In his writings on St. John of the Cross, John Paul II emphasized the notion of personalism in which the Trinity is the “origin and exemplar of the gift of self.” Likewise, man must become a “gift of self” as he is in God’s likeness (Gen 1:26). Implying a parallel between the union between divine persons and the union of human persons, it follows that God wants man to discover his true self in a sincere giving of himself (Cf. Lk 17:33).

The concepts of personhood and relationality obviously relate to historical man. As such, his lived experience entails a personal relationship with God the Father. The next section clarifies historical man’s lived reality.

II. Exploring Fatherhood in Historical Man

When exploring fatherhood, it is relevant to start with historical man since this is the present state of man. More specifically historical man is the man Jesus addresses (Cf. Mt 5:27-28), although this man is also “in some way ‘each’ man, ‘every one’ of us.” Historical man “is every man before the moment of history.” Although John Paul identifies historical man after his catecheses on original man, it seems that original man is somehow part of historical man since “historical man is rooted, so to speak, in his revealed theological prehistory.” A key difference between original man and historical man is that truth comes naturally to original man; whereas,

---

59 *MW*, 9:2, p. 163.
61 “Self-gift is complete in the metaphysical sense only in the Trinity, but it is nevertheless total in the spousal sense even in God’s self-gift to creatures” (Waldenstein, *MW*, p. 698 and also John Paul II, *MW*, 95b:4, p. 501, 97:2, pp. 507-508 and 111:5, p. 580).
64 *MW*, 25:1, p. 230.
65 Historical man is addressed before original man in this analysis in order to address the current problems associated with fatherhood. After these problems are identified, the reader will re-visit original man in Chapter 2.
historical man engages in a battle to overcome the effects of sin and concupiscence.\(^{67}\) The fall from grace (seen in original sin) concerns the very nature of man.

When exploring fatherhood, it useful to look at the state of man’s relationships. For instance, man’s relationship with God and with woman have been ruptured; therefore, affecting the nature of historical man. Despite this difficulty, “[t]he words of Christ testify that the original power (and thus also grace) of the mystery of creation becomes for each one of them the power (that is, the grace) of the mystery of redemption.”\(^{68}\) Historical man is given a new grace, which is Jesus Christ and given by the Father through Jesus. “For if by that one person’s transgression the many died, how much more the grace of God and the gracious gift of the one person Jesus Christ overflow for the many” (Rom 5:25b). Through Christ then, the rift found in historical man’s relationships are remedied. To receive the remedy, however, historical man has to accept Jesus. For John Paul this acceptance is seen in the sacraments. Even with the grace of Christ, historical man still is weakened by original sin and its effects. John Paul II describes this lack of love for the Father in terms of concupiscence.

III. A Ruptured Relationship: The Reality of Sin (Genesis 3)

This section identifies that the ruptured relationship between God and the Father is ultimately a question of obedience. Although not a definitive interpretation of Genesis 2-3, John Paul’s interpretation is reliable.\(^{69}\) Biblical scholars seem to agree that the sinful disobedience of man resulted in a loss of goodness. John Paul accounts for this loss when he describes the rupture caused by the choice for sin.

The question is who orders the good? Is it God or man? For historical man, he mistakes God’s authority as repressive. Feeling constricted or repressed is a matter of subjectivity. In fact,


\(^{68}\) MW, 45:3, p. 307.

John Paul suggests that second account of creation is “subjective in nature and thus in some way psychological.”  Subjectively then, God’s command is restrictive.

There is a noticeable change in original man after the fall. Original man “found himself ‘inside’ the knowledge of good and evil by breaking the covenant with his Creator.” John Paul refers to this as a “boundary experience” which took place at the tree of good and evil. Additionally, he refers to this historical sinfulness numerous times as it illustrates that original man falls from original innocence and original justice when he disobeys God’s command. For this reason, man was banished from the garden in Eden (Gen 3:23-24) and bears the reality of sin. This reality includes suffering, death, and the loss of original innocence and original justice.

A. Suffering and Death

The moment that man disobeyed God, he was “doomed to die” (Gen 3:17). John Paul notes that “to die” is the “antithesis of what man had been endowed with.” In the ‘beginning’, man was created in God’s image (Gen 1:27) and he became one with his wife (Gen 2:24). In this relationship with God and with woman, man experienced communio personarum. In communio, there is mutual love. The reality of this love is the meaning of grace. Frequently one hears that man fell from grace. In other words, the loss of grace is a loss of the freedom, which deprives man of the dignity expressed in his masculinity. This deprivation causes much suffering for historical man. For instance, it becomes difficult to relate to others.

Historical man lives the reality of strained relationships. Due to the rupture, man no longer understands himself in the image of God. This is why he hides himself from the Father. He no longer identifies himself as a son. Thus, he lives in fear and distrust. His doubt strains his

---

70 MW, 3:1, p. 137.
72 MW, 4:1, p. 142; 11:4, p. 172.
73 MW, 4:1, 3, pp. 142-4, 58:4, p. 357.
74 MW, 7:3, p. 155.
75 MW, 95b:1, p. 500.
76 MW, 32:4-6, pp. 258-260. Being masculine is an important element of human fatherhood. “By violating the dimension of the mutual gift of the man and the woman, concupiscence also casts doubt on the fact that each of them [man and woman] is willed by the Creator ‘for himself’” (32:5, p. 259).
relationship with woman. In essence, it becomes difficult for man and woman to relate to each other. Furthermore, the reality of death is “confirmed in the experience of man’s whole earthly life.”

“You will return to the earth, for out of it you were taken; dust you are, and to dust you shall return” (Gen 3:19).

In addition to suffering and death, historical man is deprived of original innocence and original justice. In fact, “it is impossible to understand the state of ‘historical’ sinfulness without referring or appealing to the state of ‘original’ innocence.” Prior to the deprivations caused by the fall, man’s integrity was intact and his value was experienced through his relationship with others. Personhood and relationship were not a threat for original man because he lived in a state of original innocence and original justice. In some way, these qualities perfected his human nature. Due to their significance for original man, special consideration will be given to the loss (of these) experienced by historical man.

B. Loss of Original Innocence and Original Justice

John Paul II pairs original innocence with original justice. Although they are not exactly the same, certain parallels exist between the two of them. For example, both of them are prior to the fall, which means they belong to the mystery of creation. As such, they belong to the mystery of man’s existence. Inscribed in the communion of persons, original man receives the grace of participation in the inner life of God. Through creation, man is a gift and it is God that gives him life. More specifically, original innocence is at the foundation of the exchange of persons. Through the communion of persons, an ‘other’ is welcomed and accepted. Man shows himself capable of giving and receiving, especially in the ‘beginning’. For instance, when God creates

---

77 MW, 22:5, p. 214.
79 MW, 4:3, p. 143.
80 MW, 16:4, p. 192 and 18:1, p. 198.
81 MW, 16:3, p. 191.
82 MW, 16:4, p. 192. The exchange is one of love since God is love (1 Jn 4:16b).
woman, man exclaims “[t]his one, at last, is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh…for out of ‘her man’ this one has been taken’” (Gen 2:23). He receives another by giving himself.83

Original justice is the source and summit of goodness. Found in the heart, justice is linked to freedom. This means man has the freedom to accept and welcome or reject and refuse the ‘other.’ Being in communion, man is called to give of himself through self-donation. Original man is confronted with a decision to follow the Lord’s command (Cf. Gen 2:16). The original sin was a “violation of a positive command of God” and also a “violation of the will of God as expressed in that command.” Due to this violation, historical man is inclined to sin. As such, he resists fatherhood in a threefold manner: 1) in his rejection of God; 2) in his rejection of woman; and 3) in his rejection of sonship. These are found in the original sin, but also are characterized in various forms in the modern world. The immediate effect of his rejection of God is that man is no longer in communion with God.

After sin, historical man “doubts the truth about God who is love.” Although the Father orders the good, the relationship is seen as a master-slave. In reality, this could not be further from the truth. The consequences of rejecting God is that historical man no longer participates in the inner life of God, which brings him unhappiness. Outside the communio personarum, man finds himself ashamed, e.g., “I heard you in the garden but I was afraid, because I was naked, so I hid myself” (Gen 2:10). This indicates his guilt and shame. Man is “deprived” or loses awareness of the meaning of his masculinity. To be a human father, man needs to understand his the origin of his identity. A father recognizes the other as ‘other’ and this re-establishes that a father orders the

83 Woman is taken from man’s rib (Gen 2:22-23). Historical man seems to be capable of giving himself; however, it requires virtue. Because of the original sin, man is weakened (Cf. 1 Corinthians 15).
84 Justice resides in the heart of man. When Jesus goes back to the beginning, he does so to show that purity of heart is possible when one’s freedom is orientated to the truth (MW, 19:3, p. 203).
85 “Be fertile and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it” (Gen 1:28). Man’s ability to give of himself is an important component of being a father.
86 He goes on further saying, “Original sin attempts, then, to abolish fatherhood…” (John Paul II, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, p. 228).
87 In a footnote, John Paul II notes that historical man does what he does not want to do. “But in fact it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me… There is in me the desire to do good, but not the power to do it” (Rom 7:14). Although his intellect informs man of what is right, his will is weakened due to his sinful state.
88 John Paul II, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, p. 228.
89 Both guilt and shame are associated with an offence. Man clearly knows that he offended God and ruined original justice. He is no longer ‘innocent’ as he disobeyed God’s command (Cf. Gen 1:16).
90 MW, 32:5, p. 259.
good. Further discussion on man’s identity is covered in the next chapter in order to expound upon what this means for fatherhood.

Man’s relationship with God was ruptured by original sin; it also affected man in his earthly relationship with woman. When God asked him, “[w]ho told you were naked,” man blamed the woman (Gen 3:12) at the same time man casts his dominion over woman. “Because of the body, man becomes an object for man: the female for the male, and vice versa.” This relates to the loss of original justice. The sense of justice lies deep within man. The offended person usually identifies, represses, suppresses, or denies the offence or the wrong immediately following the action of the offender, since the offended person recognises his dignity has been violated. With this violation, justice is wounded. He no longer sees woman as a gift since he has lost his purity of heart (innocence). The offence against the ‘Other’ damages his natural integrity; then, original man questions the meaning of the gift in his heart and further rejects his own identity. Since the analysis is on human fatherhood, historical man rejects his identity as father. However, he also rejects his identity as a son. Nonetheless, “historical man attempts to understand this mystery of original innocence, as it were through a contrast, that is, by going back to the experience of his own guilt and of his own sinfulness.”

John Paul identifies an understanding of fatherhood that embodies self-gift and recognises the theology of the body. “The theology of the body, which is linked from the beginning with the creation of man in the image of God, becomes also in some way also a theology of sex, or rather a theology of masculinity and femininity...” For human fathers, their bodies tell them something of their origin. It allows them to further understand divine fatherhood through their own bodies.

---

91 “Concupiscence signifies, so to speak, that the personal relations of man and woman are one-sidedly and reductively ties to the body and to sex, in the sense that these relations become almost incapable of welcoming the reciprocal gift of the person” (MW, 32:5-6, pp. 259-260). Man can become a gift when he learns to master himself.
92 It is Christ who appeals to the human heart. His call in Matthew 5:27-28 demands purity of heart. “Blessed are the pure of heart, because they will see God” (Mt 5:8).
93 MW, 16:4, p. 192.
94 MW, 9:5, p. 165.
IV. Rediscovering the Vocation of Fatherhood

Because of original sin, historical man has to overcome various obstacles that stand in the way of him discovering authentic fatherhood. The “new man”\(^{95}\) conquers death; whereas the “old man”\(^{96}\) returns to dust (Gen 3:19). St. Paul said that “Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures” and was buried and then was raised on the third day (1 Cor 15:4).\(^{97}\) The resurrection is both body and soul. “We must know Christ as the source of grace in order to know Adam as the source of sin” (CCC 388). Such grace is a gift. God sent his only Son, Jesus Christ to all of mankind, “so that whoever believes in him might not perish but might have eternal life” (Cf. Jn 3:16). Because of him, historical man participates in the history of salvation.\(^{98}\) Jesus restores the relationship between man and God and in doing so, the God-man brings complete realisation to fatherhood. Not only does he call God “Father,” but Jesus helps man realise that a father protects, provides, leads others, and saves above all.

However, the dispositions of a human father to protect, to provide and to lead are challenged by his fallen nature. Hindrances to discovering authentic fatherhood include self-deception, the temptation “to use, “\(^{99}\) and the desire to gratify one’s self. Nonetheless, man hears the echo of his divine calling found in Christ’s appeal to the human heart.\(^{100}\) The next three sections will look at the dispositions of the heart of man in contrast to three effects of concupiscence.

\(^{95}\) The “new man” refers to Jesus Christ. Although, it also refers to a man that is changed. Theologically, this change is discovered in Christ.

\(^{96}\) The “old man” refers to the fallen man. Adam (original man) is the “old man” who is promised to return to dust. However, the “old man” may also refer to one who has not yet found their identity in the one who gives life (Jn 6:51).

\(^{97}\) Ps 16: 10; Hos 6:2; Jon 2. One may also look to the gospels for Jesus’ resurrection (Jn 20:9, Lk 24, Mk 16:5, and Mt 28: 6).

\(^{98}\) MW, 4:3, p. 144.

\(^{99}\) “To use means to employ some object of action as a means to an end- the specific end which the subject has in view. The end is always that with a view to which we are acting” (Wojtyla, Love and Responsibility, p. 25).

A. Protects

Words that express the concept of “protector” include “safeguard,” “shelter,” “stronghold,” and “guardian.” A father can be all these things. He protects and acting as such, man reveals the very fatherhood of God in his own fatherhood.\textsuperscript{101} Man’s love for his wife and children allows him to perform the duty of protecting his family.\textsuperscript{102} Besides, protecting his wife and offspring, he needs to protect himself from self-deception. In the “beginning,” God gives man an order to eat of any tree, except the tree of knowledge of good and bad (Gen 2:16). The consequence of eating this tree is death (Gen 2:17). God the Father seeks to protect his children from evil and deception. For John Paul, God gives this command from the onset in order for man to discover his capacity for self-gift, i.e., he learns about free choice, free will, and love.

Rather than obey the Father’s command, man lets his guard down. There seem to be two things going on when this happens. By man letting his guard down, he doubts the gift\textsuperscript{103} and he becomes fearful. After the fall, man says he was afraid when he explains why he is hiding (Gen 3:10). Man experiences shame in Genesis 3:6, and the shame is connected to his sin.\textsuperscript{104} The shame is “the first source of the manifestation in man…of what ‘does not come from the Father, but from the world.’”\textsuperscript{105} John Paul II’s analysis is that the text of Genesis 3:1-5 “seems to highlight the key moment in which, in man’s heart, doubt is cast on the Gift.”\textsuperscript{106} The doubt is motivated by the words of the tempter who says “You shall not die” (Gen 3:4).

The first deception came in the garden in the form of a snake. Historical man has to protect himself from deception. The tempter gives the illusion that he knows more than God. There is certain pride that comes in the words, “God knows well that the moment you eat of it [the tree of knowledge] your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil” (Gen 3:5).

Why does man eat of the tree? He has been warned that he will die (Gen 2:17). Besides hearing the

\textsuperscript{102} John Paul II, FC, 25.
\textsuperscript{103} MW, 26:4, pp. 236-238.
\textsuperscript{104} MW, 26:5, p. 238.
\textsuperscript{105} MW, 26:4, p. 238.
\textsuperscript{106} MW, 26:4, p. 236.
words of the tempter, man deceives himself. Because for John Paul II man questions the gift and therefore expresses fear. He convinces himself that the tempter is right, even though it goes against what the Lord ordered (Gen 2:16). Man accepts the motivation of the tempter that he will become like a god (Gen 3:5). In doing so, he rejects the gift of love and rebels against God (Gen 3:6).

With the temptation to sin, man has to guard against self-deception. For man to protect himself from the attraction of temptation, he has to humble himself to see the truth. The truth for historical man is that he is a sinner. Acknowledging this truth is not easy. However, it is necessary for man to know his identity which is rooted in original innocence and experienced in original shame. “We should not fear the truth about ourselves.”\textsuperscript{107} This is why Jesus says “Be not afraid” (Lk 5:10). Despite man’s inclination to say “Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man” (Lk 5:8), God does not want him to be afraid. God knows the truth about every man (Cf. Jn 2:25), and the truth will set him free (Jn 8:32).

To believe the truth is not always easy, especially for historical man. Many contemporary views distort the truth about man. Self-deception displays itself when a father refuses his role to protect. For instance, a man may leave his wife and offspring (abandonment or divorce), abuse his wife, or engage in other practices that harm his integrity, e.g., pornography, masturbation, contraception, etc. These are dangers to a man becoming a father and for a man to know the Father. Man’s deceives himself.

To believe truth, he must first meet Christ and gain self-knowledge through him to overcome self-deception. This is acquired in true humility. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom for man. From wisdom, man perfects the virtue of love.\textsuperscript{108} Experiencing love, he comes to know the truth about his identity. He learns what it means to protect. Although man may doubt and fear, he is encouraged to “Be not afraid.”\textsuperscript{109} From Jesus Christ, man reveals truth about himself.

\textsuperscript{107} John Paul II, \textit{Crossing the Threshold of Hope}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{109} Among John Paul II’s first words at his Installation were “Be not afraid.” He also references this in the beginning of \textit{Crossing the Threshold of Hope}, pp. 3-7. Cf. Lk 1:30, 5:10, and Mt 1:20.
Jesus addresses the divine father as “Abba” (Cf. Mt 5:9, Lk 11:2). This “reveals the content of his self-knowledge: ‘the knowledge of a particular filiation which lies in the heart of prayer (Abba)’.” Self-knowledge lies in the interpersonal relations of the family. The father is called to protect unity. He discovers this with self-knowledge, but also in relationship. So a father seeks to protect his relations, especially his relationship with God. However, he also should protect the relationship with his wife and children. Attaining knowledge, a father discovers that he also provides.

B. Provides

Earlier, it was noted that man biologically and personally provides his seed. His masculinity becomes an important to his fatherhood since he is able to give of himself in this way. When he becomes one with his wife there is a potential to create another life. Emotionally, man often provides a source of stability to his wife. From a sociological standpoint, man tends to take care of his family by providing a food and shelter. These points illustrate a part of what it means to be a father; however, one of the greatest things a father provides is his love. Although love can have more than one meaning, “love is always a mutual relationship between persons.” In other words, a father provides his love to those he is in communion with. Since man is taught to call God “Father” (Cf. Mt 6:9, Lk 11:2), love somehow transcends the earthly reality. Love between persons occurs vertically and horizontally.

Human love finds itself in the context of the man-woman relationship. The intimacy found in the male-female relationship reveals to man a clear way to provide such love. The way historical man loves a woman is analogous to the love within the Godhead. Practically speaking, man becomes a gift to the other. Unlike God, man does not always order his heart to being a gift. Analysing John Paul’s writings, he recalls Jesus’ words, “Whoever looks at a woman to desire her

110 Scola, The Nuptial Mystery, p. 244 and the interior quote is from Penna, I ritratti originali, 118.
111 “‘Knowledge’ enters the field of interpersonal relations when it concerns family solidarity (Dt 33:9) and especially conjugal relations” (MW, 20:2, p. 206).
112 Wojtyla, Love and Responsibility, p. 73.
113 The dynamic of love occurs between God and man, and also between man and woman.
[in a reductive way] has already committed adultery with her *in his heart*” (Mt 5:28). Rather than love, which is “to give” or “to provide,” one may isolate or reduce the sexual desire “to use.” “To use means to employ some object of an action as a means to an end…” The negative form of the *personalistic norm* states a person should never be used as a means to an end. This violates one’s dignity. The positive form of the *personalistic norm* states that a proper response to a person is love. Experience shows that man desires to love and to be loved. The antithesis of love is use.

By reducing love to a state of an object for use, a person becomes a means to an end. Thus, he is capable of lust or committing adultery in his heart. The [reductive] “desire” is found in the flesh, the eyes and the pride of life which comes not from the Father but from the world (1 Jn 2:16). John Paul emphasises the origin of this desire is important. Although treated previously, concupiscence is a consequence of sin and is a “fruit of the breaking the covenant with God in the human heart...”. As a result of original sin, man finds himself turned towards the world and rebels against the Father. He may be inclined to use a person as a means to an end. Concretely, this takes place when man looks to desire a woman lustfully. She becomes an object of his look. Although this takes place interiorly, the urge may manifest itself in hedonism, pornography, polygamy, fornication, and adultery. Lust is the antithesis of love since it disrupts the union of persons. Therefore, man must re-direct his heart.

To overcome lust man needs to Christ and learn the meaning of the gift and then he knows what it means to provide. The appetites need to be healed and ordered to love. Through grace, the intellect, will, and appetites are transformed. The intellect informs the conscience. To inform the

116 Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, p. 41. Personalism is about seeing the person as a good. The personalistic norm confirms that a person should never be used as an object and admits that persons are to be loved (West, *Theology of the Body Explained*, pp. 49-50).
118 “Desire” is a classical term in a positive sense while concupiscence and lust are negative, i.e., they are parasitical on desire. From the positive meaning, man and woman desire each other in marriage and in no way do they reduce the body (or the person).
121 *MW*, 26:2, p. 235.
conscience, it is necessary to listen to the voice of truth. For instance, Jesus appeals to the interior man. He says you shall not look at a woman with a lustful heart (Mt. 5:27). He is the voice of truth and the voice of reason.

Through reason, man may discover how to love and provide in a faithful way. Experience should direct man towards the mystery of God. However, “the search for truth is not always transparent…the natural limitation of reason and the inconstancy of the heart can obscure and distort a person’s truth.” For instance, the judgements of the intellect are not always formed correctly or man’s conditions experience him to conclude something that is indeed false. This matter has a certain complexity about it since the will only accepts what it understands. Even when man has good reason, he may suffer from *akrasia* (weak will). Passion and emotion may supply an ulterior motive to acting as the intellect directs it. Nonetheless, it is possible to train one’s passions.

For John Paul, it is through the grace of Christ and the development of virtue. The will commands the passions (*CCC* 1767), and to do such requires self-denial.

He must be able to die to himself in order to provide as a father. It is not enough that he acquires knowledge, but that he is transformed into self-gift by Christ via grace and a life of virtue. The following section will further consider how a father becomes a gift of self through his example of leadership.

### C. Leads

In Ephesians 5:21-33, St. Paul gives a short commentary about spousal love. A man has a dual role. He is both father and husband. As a husband, he is the *head* of his wife just as Christ is head of the church (Eph 5:23). Some misinterpret this passage to mean that a man is to dominate over his wife. Instead, his headship symbolizes his need to lead. He takes the lead by being self-gift. Reading the passage further, one finds that “Christ loved the church and gave himself for her”

---

122 *RH*, 11.
123 *FR*, 28.
124 *RH*, 1.
125 *MD*, 7. Despite this temptation, dominance takes on a negative connotation that could be associated with consequences of original sin (Cf. Gen 3:15).
(Eph 5:25). He is called to make himself a “radical” or “total” gift. In contrast to God’s gift of himself, man cannot give himself in the same way Christ gave himself. Therefore, man only has a form in the participation of the divine nature when referring to man’s “total” gift. This does not diminish the character of man’s duty to lead, either as a spouse or also as a father. His headship requires him to give himself, and through his headship he learns to serve others.

A way a father leads his family is in service. To be of service, a father needs to deny himself and take up his cross (Mk 8:34; Cf. Mt 10:38, Lk 9:23). His service includes being “the guardian of the reciprocity of donation and its true balance.” As a father, man gives his love totally and freely. Through giving, he receives and balance is maintained. Denying himself, man puts the other first. Human obedience constitutes the supreme handing over of self. Self-emptying (kenosis) conquers death, i.e., through the divine person emptying himself on the cross, death is overcome. It is death to self, in a form of a gift, where man encounters the Father. This is only possible if one gives freely. When man exercises his freedom, he shows his ability to lead.

Unfortunately, many things get in the way of man leading. Sometimes his desire to provide and protect misguides how he is to lead. Although providing and protecting are valuable to a father, they must be posited in leadership based in servitude. The obstacle that denies man’s meeting the Father is the self in sin. The three-fold levels of concupiscence (lust of the eyes, lust of the flesh, and the pride of life) cause man to reduce the gift of self. Practically speaking, this means that there is a tendency toward an egotistical satisfaction found in the flesh. A gratifying experience may feel good, but it diminishes the dignity of the other. Additionally, concupiscence darkens the intellect and weakens the will. Rather than leading, man denies true freedom.

Dying to self is not easy; however, one can master concupiscence through virtue. Man is called to love as Christ loved the church and handed himself over for her to sanctify her (Eph 5:25).

---

126 MW, 95b:4, p. 501.
127 MW, 95b:4, p. 501.
Nature builds on grace, for no one hates his own flesh but rather nourishes and cherishes it (Eph 5:29). The sacraments provide a sanctifying grace to forgive sins and heal man’s tendency to put self before others. This is significant since mastery over concupiscence capacitates unity between persons. The initiative of a man is one of service.

A father’s role to provide and to protect must accompany true leadership. For a father to lead, he must become the servant of servants.\textsuperscript{131} Leading is a new way of thinking, since it requires \textit{educare}. To educate means to be mastered, and to be disciplined. Self-mastery is necessary for historical man to overcome his tendencies toward sin. That is, he is preconditioned by the fall and seems to find it difficult to accept human and divine fatherhood. In original shame, there is a shadow of doubt cast on the gift. Despite this reality, he bears the imprint of God. In fact, a remnant of his authentic fatherhood is illustrated in his capability to protect, to provide and to lead. Knowing the human-divine relationship was ruptured, historical man deals with many problems including not knowing his true identity in the fullest sense.

The next chapter contextualizes fatherhood for original man. A comparison will be drawn between the first and second accounts of creation. John Paul II gives meaning to the experiences of original man. He develops a subjective account for original man in addition to an objective account of his being created \textit{imago Dei}. The examination of the two creation accounts show that man discovers fatherhood in original solitude and original unity. This has a variety of dimensions, both theological and anthropological. Man reflects the divine image. Through creation, man is given life. Knowing this, God’s command to be fruitful and multiply (Gen 1:28) illustrates that God desires man to procreate. He is meant to exchange the gift of self as the \textit{imago Dei}. More specifically, original man holds the meaning of “adequate fatherhood.” For original man, fatherhood demands leadership, protection and providence.

The father-son relationship impacts all of creation which historical man substantiates. He carries something from the first Adam who did not adhere to the authority of the one who is all

\textsuperscript{131} St. Gregory the Great understood that his function as “Holy Father” was to be a servant. He preferred the title \textit{Servus servorum Dei} (Servant of the Servants of God). His title of “Pope” is Greek for “Father.” By acting as a servant, a father is a sign of contradiction by leading in his servitude.
good, and he also rediscovers the Father through the second Adam who obeyed to the point of death on a cross. Thus, the authority of the divine Father radiates in the Son.
To begin this chapter, the relationship between a father and son will be explored in light of the Trinitarian relationship and the creation account of original man. Although certain parallels exist between the Son of God (the second Adam) and the first created man (the first Adam), there is a marked difference. Man is in God’s image while Jesus Christ is God’s image. The incarnate Son reveals both divine and human fatherhood. The humanity of the Son of God according to St. Paul, “from whom all fatherhood...takes its name.” It is the Son that makes known human fatherhood; he illustrates that both a spiritual and physical dynamic exists for human fathers. For instance, an exemplary model of human fatherhood is found in the Holy Family through Saint Joseph. The Holy Family images the Trinity through relationship. This parallel reminds man that “the relationship between the archetype (God) and the creaturely image (man) has its source in an intratrinitarian relationship. The Son originates from the Father in that all the Son’s being is in relation to the thought and will of the Father.” Temporally, the Son personifies fatherhood. For Jesus says, “I am in the Father and the Father is in me” (Jn 15:10). The father-son relationship carries a particular significance theologically and anthropologically as will be shown in the next sections.

I. Father-Son Relationship

Anthropologically and theologically, the Father-Son relationship is central to man discovering God and himself. “No one sees the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son reveals him” (Mt 11:27). In seeing the Son, man sees the Father (Jn 14:7, 10-11). Although the Father and Son are co-equal and co-eternal, their relationship is ordered. The Father is “the source

132 According to St. Peter Chrysologus, Adam and Christ are alike in body, but not in merit or in the origin of their being (Sermo. 117, PL 52, 520-521).
133 To read more about St. Joseph, see RC.
134 Scola, Nuptial Mystery, p. 73.
and origin of the whole divinity” (CCC 245).  The Son is the Word made flesh (Jn 1:1) who was begotten by the Father. In the Trinity, one finds a dynamic interrelationship between Father and Son, Son and Spirit, and Spirit and Father. Subsisting relations are shared, and John Paul II draws out these differences and similarities in his Genesis catecheses. John Paul II broadens the classical doctrine of the imago Dei in order to make room for an anthropological vision of the person. He establishes the relational meaning of imago Dei and builds upon the rational classical teaching. Rather than comprehend the Trinitarian mystery, it seems necessary to search for a more attainable analogy of a father-son relationship which is found in the “resemblance” among God’s creation.

II. Two Accounts of Creation

In his earliest Wednesday audiences, John Paul II addressed two biblical accounts of creation (Gen 1-2). The first account of creation (Gen 1:26-Gen 2:4a) is considered more recent than the second (Gen 2:4b-Gen 2:25). The chronologically more recent account found in Genesis 1 seems to be “more mature with regard to the image of God and in the formulation of the essential truths about man” and stems from the “Elohist” tradition. This newer account has a “theological character” because the definition of man is based on his relationship with God: “[l]et us make man in our image, in our likeness” (Gen 1:27). The theological character of man’s creation provides a theological insight into man’s nature. It carries a certain metaphysical content lending to an objective account of creation. Man is defined as “being” and “existing.” From the beginning,

135 Council of Toledo VI (638): DS 490.
136 Cf. Jn 8:42. Jesus comments that he proceeds from the Father.
138 Beginning with Matthew 9, John Paul sees that Jesus returns to the beginning when discussing the importance of man and woman being one. For this reason, John Paul II follows the tradition of scripture scholars. Cf. Anchor Bible Series, Genesis, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1989.
139 “Elohist” is a term to name God and relates to the Priestly tradition. The “essential truths about man” found in the “Elohist” account are found to be more objective (MW, 2:2, p. 134).
140 MW, 2:4, p. 135. Furthermore, the man-God relationship is shown “in the image of God he created them” (Gen 1:27).
141 MW, 2:5, p. 136.
the dimension of existing (esse) corresponds to the mystery of creation. This character of goodness provides a particular insight to the notion of fatherhood. “Being” acts as a reference to an “adequate anthropology” which will be applied to fatherhood later in this chapter.

The second account of creation (Gen 2:4b-2:25) is considered the more ancient text and is termed “Yahwist.” Like the first account, the second account lends to the understanding that man is in relationship. However, this relationship takes on a more subjective character.

A comparison of the two accounts reveals some underlying commonalities. For instance, man finds himself in relationship. The most basic relationship found at the beginning is a father-son relationship. One might add the mother-child relationship or father-daughter; however, the father-son relationship carries a specific theological weight found in the Triune God. As a son, man becomes a ray of God’s divine love. Using John Paul’s interpretation, “the mystery of his creation (‘in the image of God he created him’) corresponds [to] the perspective of procreation (‘be fruitful and multiply’)...” In a sense, the love of God expressed itself in a unique way through the creation of man. For man, he is a son of God and God is his Father.

Not only is man a “son” before God, he also theologically speaking is created like the divine Father. This is not to say that he is the same as the divine Father, nor is it to say that man’s likeness is only found in God the Father. Rather, man captures a certain essence of fatherhood and at the same time reflects the Trinity. Original man is in relationship and that relationship takes on a Trinitarian image. Original man therefore not only reflects God the Father, he is somehow in union with the Son and the Holy Spirit.

The dynamics of relationship are an essential ingredient to the analogy. The distinction found between persons is mysterious. To illustrate, the Son of God says that “I am in the Father

---

142 MW, 2:2, p. 134. The image of God is presented through ‘anthropomorphic features’, e.g., “God formed man with dust of the ground and blue into his nostrils the breath of life” (Gen 2:7, Cf. 2:2, p. 134). The use of “Yahweh” classifies this older account as “Yahwist.”

143 MW, 3:1, pp. 138-139.

144 MW, 2:5, p. 136.

145 Jesus calls all to be sons of the Father (Cf. Mt 5:45). This sonship is also mentioned in 1 John 3:1-2. Scripturally, Jesus is the first to call God “Father.” There are countless examples of Jesus calling God “Father” in the Gospels.

146 It must be mentioned that the creation of man (male) in Genesis 2:7 comes before the creation of woman (Gen 2:21-22); however, original man envelops the solitude of “man” (male and female) (MW, 5:2, p. 147).
and the Father is in me” (Jn 14:11). For instance, the divine father is recognised through the man made flesh (Jn 1:1), while at the same time a son realises the father.\footnote{In \textit{Against Praexis}, Tertullian argues that any distinctions are found in \textit{persona} rather than in \textit{substantia} in reference to the Trinity. He constructed this model in order to fight against patripassianism and sabellicanism. Patripassianism is a heresy that put God the Father on the cross rather than the Son. Sabellicanism is a modified position of patripassianism that divides salvation history into time periods (Olson and Hall, \textit{The Trinity}, pp. 30-33 and Gerald O'Collins, \textit{The Tripersonal God: Understanding and Interpreting the Trinity}, New York: Paulist Press, 1999, p. 106). Like Tertullian, Athanasius fought against heresy about the father-son relationship. In his time, it was Arianism. Arius rejected Jesus’ divinity because he did not believe the Son of God could share the same substance as the Father. Instead, he believed that the Son was a created being. Cf. Athanasius, \textit{Four Discourses Against the Arians}, NPNF Second Series, vol. 4, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.} \footnote{Although certain parallels exist between original man and the Son of God (Jesus Christ), it must be understood that a distinction clearly exists between being a son and being a father. In human terms, a son can become a father and yet, they have different roles. The difference and similitude of persons will be analysed later in this chapter.} Original man in a certain way is a son given to himself, who becomes a father, i.e., gives of himself.\footnote{Since humans are distinct as male and female, woman (female) has the potential to become a mother.} The first account of creation implies this possibility when God commands man and woman to be fruitful and multiply. This is also seen in the second account where the two become one flesh (Gen 2:24).

Anthropologically and theologically, original man encapsulates man’s most authentic identity. His capacity to procreate corresponds to the physical aspect of fatherhood and at the same time allows man to become a spiritual father through his love for another. Through this love, man has the radical potential of becoming a father.\footnote{“The words of God-Yahweh addressed to the man confirm a dependence in existing, so that they show man as a limited being and, by his nature, susceptible to nonexistence” (\textit{MW}, 7:3, p. 155). The antithesis to man’s existence and unity with God is death (\textit{MW}, 7:3-7:4, pp. 154-156).} Theologically and otherwise, he is made \textit{in} the divine image. As such, he is a rational creature who carries the capacity to love. So, he displays his love as a gift. In a certain sense, man radiates the Father’s love through the original blueprint found in the creation of original man. Thus, his love manifests itself through procreation.

Although original man has the capacity to become a father as previously described, his immediate identity is one of sonship. The particular value of this places him in a dependent relationship (original solitude).\footnote{The words of God-Yahweh addressed to the man confirm a dependence in existing, so that they show man as a limited being and, by his nature, susceptible to nonexistence” (\textit{MW}, 7:3, p. 155). The antithesis to man’s existence and unity with God is death (\textit{MW}, 7:3-7:4, pp. 154-156).} Original man relies on God for his existence. Genesis 1 records a more objective account of creation as it does not provide any specific hints to the response of original man. The second chapter of Genesis indicates that original man is alone and in need of another (Cf. Gen 2:18). He is drawn to a mystical union that is first found in relationship seen in the first account.
Contrasting the metaphysical account found in Genesis 1, the second account provides a more subjective encounter with God and original man.\(^{151}\) John Paul shows how the second account “corresponds to the objective reality of man created ‘in the image of God’”\(^{152}\) found in the first account.\(^{153}\) This is particularly useful in the modern world since it suffers from the “subjective turn”\(^{154}\) and is further witnessed in the form of relativism.\(^{155}\) In the second account then, original man receives the objective truth through his consciousness. He accepts truth in a subjective manner;\(^{156}\) and draws truth from this experience. Awareness of the objective truth of creation comes through the (subjective) experience of divine love. The first and second chapters of Genesis complement one another. The experiences of original man therefore allow him to better realise what it means to be human, and this is understood within the context of the *imago Dei.* From this, original man learns about fatherhood. These experiences allow man to know fatherhood through personhood.

In his personhood, original man recognises his unique self. John Paul identifies several unique experiences of original man. The three fundamental human experiences include: *original solitude, original unity,* and *original nakedness.* Original nakedness is part of original man’s experience; it encompasses the ideas of shame and lust.\(^{157}\) Shame and lust specifically are beyond the scope of this work since they are peripheral to the centrality of fatherhood understood in the context of its described authentic meaning. Sections on original unity and original solitude follow. The concept of original nakedness weaves between original solitude and original unity.

\(^{151}\) MW, 3:1, pp. 137-139.

\(^{152}\) Scola, *Nuptial Mystery,* p. 357.


\(^{154}\) Descartes’ mentality has trickled into the modern world of today where man considers his “experience” the only way to validate “truth.” This is especially relevant to note since a person’s experience with a human father appears to correspond negatively or positively to the divine Father.


\(^{156}\) Wojtyla prefers to use the term consciousness because it allows one to know the truth in an interior sense (*Love and Responsibility,* p. 28 and MW, 5:4-7:2, pp. 148-154).

\(^{157}\) The boundary experience of Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:7 illustrates that man crosses a threshold that relates to his original nakedness. Due to the brevity of this thesis, original nakedness is not fully explained so needs further written consideration. To learn more about original nakedness, refer to MW, 11:2, 4-5; 12:2-5; 14:6; 15:2-3; 16:1; 27:3; 29:2.
III. Original Solitude

Man and woman are created separately in the second account of creation, but “[i]t is not good that man be alone” (Gen 2:18). God makes a helper fit for him (Cf. Gen 2:18). Solitude is not evident in the first account of creation because God created them male and female from the onset (Gen 1:27). However, original solitude provides certain anthropological insights about man. John Paul II gives two meanings: 1) the first meaning of original solitude is derived from his human nature; and 2) the second meaning of original solitude is derived from the relationship between male and female.\textsuperscript{158} Since original solitude tells us about the nature of man, it seems that original solitude also reveals fatherhood. To explain, original solitude identifies the Creator; and, at the same time it identifies man. The greatest meaning given to fatherhood is found when John Paul gives an additional meaning to original solitude. He explains that man gains knowledge about his identity, finding himself a “partner of the Absolute.”\textsuperscript{159} This provides a source of fatherhood. “Thus, the created man finds himself from the first moment of his existence before God in search of his own being...in search of his own ‘identity’.”\textsuperscript{160} This subjectivity characterizes the person,\textsuperscript{161} and exemplifies that original man is in relationship with God while also capable of being in relationship to another, e.g., woman. Thus, the identity of man is two-fold.

First, then, man is given to himself; i.e., he is a son. Original man discovers his own personal identity when he first realises his dependence and submission upon God. For John Paul II, man realises his need for God from three tasks: 1) tilling the soil, 2) naming the animals, and 3) regarding the tree. From these tasks, man is reliant on God like a child relies on a mother or father when first entering the world. This analogy helps to illustrate that original man is in relationship with a “father” named God and man’s identity is found in this relationship. Original solitude directs man outwards first, and it seems fitting to call this a father-son relationship. The aloneness

\textsuperscript{158} MW, 5:2, p. 147.
\textsuperscript{159} MW, 6:2, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{160} MW, 5:5, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{161} MW, 6:1, p. 151.
experienced by original man verifies that he is first in relationship with God.\textsuperscript{162} The realisation is that personhood is “unique, exclusive and unrepeatable” in particular to being in relationship with God.\textsuperscript{163} Man’s experience of fatherhood is found in his relationships and in his humanity.

Awareness of his personhood is through his body. Of course his body is not only a physical reality but also a mystical one. He must act according to the inner workings of his heart. For instance, man is called to “till and keep” the garden (Cf. Gen 2:16), but what does this mean? The physical reality requires man to act, but to act requires an inner disposition. Man is free to choose how to live (Cf. Gen 2:16). Thus, he chooses the way to “keep” safe the freedom he has been given and his freedom is bound up in his capacity to guide his reason and help those who later come to share in his life.

Original solitude is explained in that man is a being, capable of consciousness and that great self-knowledge comes through self-awareness, thus his identity (\textit{imago Dei}). The body creates a longing to be in relationship with one who is \textit{like him}. The second meaning of original solitude is an openness to search for another like himself (Gen 2:18), which leads to original unity and reciprocity of which is original nakedness. “It is not good for man to be alone” (Gen 2:18). Original nakedness then leads to the communion of persons and the rehabilitation of the \textit{imago Dei} as a relational being.

Original man is also asked to name the animals (Gen 2:20). This shows man that he is not like the other creatures. He separates himself from the \textit{animalia} as he becomes aware of his \textit{persona} in and through his body.\textsuperscript{164} Original man thus notices an irreconcilable difference. He experiences “aloneness” because he is neither identical to the animals nor to God. Despite being like God and being in relation to God, he is different from God.

Man’s experience of his identity then not only comes in self-determination (tilling the soil) but also in self-awareness (naming the animals). He needs a human similitude, one who is \textit{like} him.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[162] \textit{MW}, 6:2, p. 151.
\item[163] \textit{MW}, 6:2, p. 151. This was first noted in Chapter One. However, it is mentioned again as it is particularly relevant for original man. Refer to Chapter One, page 13, footnote 46.
\item[164] \textit{MW}, 6:3, p. 152.
\end{footnotes}
He needs a helpmate, one who shares the same flesh. In a way, this similitude reflects the *communion personarum* found in the God-head.

Another way to look at the man-woman relationship is terms of the father-son relationship. Of course, the relationship found between man and woman is *analogous* to the father-son relationship. God’s goodness, beginning with creation, original man participates in a familial relationship that resembles the Father, Son and Spirit. To explain, the Father\(^\text{165}\) provided man with life. Creation illustrates how original man embodies fatherhood. Noting this, it is useful to make a few comparisons. From the beginning, original man carries this possibility to fill the earth and subdue it (Gen 1:28). This is possible only in the relations between man and woman, authorized by God. The dual identity of man then is not only as a son, but also as a father.

As mentioned earlier, original man learns about fatherhood through his relationship with God that began with his sonship. Following his creation, original man receives a few directives from God. The Lord God first gives the command “You may eat freely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die” (Gen 2:16-17). This command is *not* seen as authoritative since it comes from the one who is a good. So, “the original meaning of man’s solitude rests on the experience of the existence he obtained from the Creator.”\(^\text{166}\) Man’s consciousness would have allowed him to understand that the words “you shall die” are antithetical to what had been endowed to the man.\(^\text{167}\) Death suggests “patricide,” a theme which will be more carefully explored in Chapter Three. From original solitude, original man experienced a union or communion with God. Therefore, a theological purpose of original solitude encourages man to first direct himself towards the Creator.

Original solitude provides an anthropological meaning for original man. His personhood reveals that he is distinct from God while at the same time *like* God. When God observes that it is not good for man to be alone (Gen 2:18), it shows that man was lacking something. Hypothetically,

---

\(^{165}\) Although it is understood that the modes of God’s action are found in all three persons of the Trinity, the Father bespeaks a useful metaphor.

\(^{166}\) *MW*, 7:3, p. 154.

\(^{167}\) *MW*, 7:3, p. 155.
he was missing a relational character that could only be fulfilled through another person who was more alike in nature. This anthropological meaning illustrates a unity of two, which also has a theological character. The anthropological foundation of man and woman finds a dual unity within a Christological and a Trinitarian context, which will be the more thoroughly assessed in the following section on original unity.

IV. Original Unity (A Unity of Two)

John Paul explains that original solitude gives rise to the meaning of original unity. Out of solitude, he articulates that there is “unity of two” when a man leaves his father and mother to unite with his wife (Gen 2:24). The definition of their unity thus denotes an aspect of their identity found in their human nature. When the “Lord God formed man out of the clay of the ground and blew into his nostrils the breath of life and so man became a living being” (Gen 2:7)… and “[t]he Lord God said: ‘it is not good for man to be alone. I will make a suitable partner for him’”… (Gen 2:18). So then the Lord God ‘built up into a woman the rib that he had taken from the man” (Gen 2:22). Duality is found in masculinity and femininity. Although man and woman share a common humanity, their sexual difference characterizes their vocation. They share a common identity in their humanity as children of the living God. Yet, it is their sexual difference that gives rise to the possibility of physical fatherhood and motherhood. It is actually their unity in difference that gives them the identity of mother or father. This is an anthropological development and it is drawn out in John Paul’s works.

One important insight that John Paul develops is that human sexual difference is signed both spiritually and physically, which belongs to the totality of the human person. Other contemporary theologians such as Hans Urs von Balthasar and Angelo Scola agree. However, Scola notes three

---

168 MW, 8:1, p. 156.
169 MW, 8:1, p. 156.
anthropological problems related to the assertions of human sexuality participating as a part of the *imago Dei*.\(^{172}\) The three problems that he refers to include: 1) the meaning of the “double incarnation” of man in male and female; 2) the man-woman relation as the fruit of identity and difference; and 3) the relation between sexuality and being in the image of God. The most relevant for our purposes is the discussion revolving around the man-woman relation as the fruit of identity and difference, and the relation between sexuality and being in the image of God.\(^{173}\) In other words, one must consider whether human sexuality is part of the *imago Dei*. Although this case has been reasonably argued by some of the above-said scholars, the author realises that others may find this a difficult proposition.\(^{174}\) Earlier writers did not fully determine the potentiality of this vein of thought in regards to human sexuality and some even rejected human sexuality participating in the *imago Dei*.\(^{175}\) John Paul considers human sexuality and the *imago Dei* when he argues “[b]odiless and sexuality are not simply identical.”\(^{176}\) He identifies some of the same anthropological problems as Scola.\(^{177}\) Cardinal Scola also carefully draws out the distinction or difference between persons while at the same time commenting on the shared likeness. The difference and similitude of persons becomes central to identifying the personal vocation of original man.

If masculinity and femininity participate in the *imago Dei*, some assertions could be drawn. For instance, masculinity is specific to human fatherhood; whereas, femininity is specific to human motherhood. This does not mean that fatherhood is not relevant to all persons. Rather, fatherhood becomes a vocation for men in a special way due to God’s design of human similitude and sexual difference. The similitude between man and God is somehow understood through the difference of

---

\(^{172}\) Scola, *Nuptial Mystery*, p. 22. He elaborates on each problem (pp. 22-52).

\(^{173}\) Scola, *Nuptial Mystery*, p. 22.


\(^{176}\) *MW*, 8:1, p. 157.

\(^{177}\) For instance, he mentions the problem of two different “incarnations” or a “double incarnation” (*MW*, 8:1, p. 157).
persons. The following two sections elaborate on these points as they relate to original man and more specifically to fatherhood.

A. Difference and Similitude of Persons

As we have seen, original man exists as male and female.\footnote{Reading the Genesis text, some view the creation of woman to be a “double incarnation,” as if man (male) was created twice. This hypothesis tries to place the first creation to be “asexual” or “androgynous” which some deem to be more like God since God is not characterised as feminine or masculine. However, this does not take into account the spousal imagery that is used between God and his people (Hos 2:4-25; Jer 2:1) in the Old Testament; Scola, Nuptial Mystery, pp. 45-50. John Paul also briefly mentions the notion of two different “incarnations”; however, he is referring to the distinct creation of man and woman (MW, 8:1, p. 157). To clarify, he does not say that the male was created twice.} By definition, this account provides a dual unity, a distinction in body which also infers a distinction in sexuality (being male or female). John Paul shows that under its normal constitution, “the human body carries within itself the signs of sex [male or female]” while at the same time the “‘body’ belongs more deeply to the structure of the personal subject than the fact that in his somatic constitution he is also male or female.”\footnote{MW, 8:1, p. 157.} It seems that sexuality also constitutes a more interior disposition. Original man, created as man and woman, is in the image of God. This means that they are like God individually, as free and rational persons, but also in their unity.\footnote{John Paul II, MD, 7.}

The \textit{imago Dei} establishes an “analogy between the dual unity of man and woman and the relations between the three persons in God.”\footnote{Scola, Nuptial Mystery, p. 5. The Trinitarian principle established by Bonaventure can be applied to this concept (Bonaventure, \textit{Collationes in Hexaemeron} 11:9).} So, the production of one (woman) that is dissimilar to man, one must recognise a pre-existing production of the similar.\footnote{Scola, Nuptial Mystery, p. 30.} In creation, man notices the dissimilar found in another unlike him. Original man recognises the pre-existing God as distinct. So too, he finds a certain likeness in his production, no matter the vast distinction found between God and man. The similarity is eventually found in the dissimilar. The difference bespeaks “otherness.”\footnote{Scola, Nuptial Mystery, p. 26.}
Several things can be learned from understanding the concept of “otherness.” Like original solitude, original unity establishes a Father-Son relationship first in the divine Trinity. In the distinctness between persons, there is potential to see the other as other. So, the father sees the son and the son sees the father. Because father and son are complementary, they can relate to one another. They can identify the other. For example, the Son points to the Father and the divine Father also points to the Son when he says “[t]his is my beloved Son” (Mk 1:11; Mt 3:17; Lk 3:22).

Additionally, the relationship found in the Triune God is like the distinction found between human persons, specifically between man and woman. To explain, the distinction between male and female allows for a certain complementarity that brings about a certain unity. Original man accepts original unity through the distinction of persons. Through the creation of woman, there exists a new dissimilarity for man, found in the man-woman dynamic. A certain similarity is found in their human bodies. In fact, the communio found between a man and a woman mirrors the communio found between the persons of the Trinity. Although they share a commonality, they are dissimilar. Through ‘otherness’, there is a sense of communio. For instance, the Father is Father in begetting the ‘other’ similar to himself, e.g., the Son (Jn 3:16; 1 Jn 4:9-10) and the Son is the Son only in his acknowledgement of the Father as a similar ‘other’. The Father gives himself in a way, i.e., in one eternal act without beginning or end that is co-equal with the Son. Likewise, the Son is then also free in his giving of himself. The Son then carries the capability to make one free (Jn 8:31-38) because he carries the truth of the Father.

The man-woman relationship is analogous to the Father-Son relationship. When the woman receives the other, it is much like the son who receives all from the father. The problem is that when truth is corrupted with a false sense of what one is receiving, the other cannot be free. Communio, thus, requires a true understanding and participation in the gift, the most perfect model of which is found in the father-son relationship. The father-son relationship is a paradigm for all

---

184 The Holy Spirit is also included; whereas, the Father-Son relationship is exemplified here. The dynamics of intra-Trinitarian life are certainly more extensive and more nuanced, i.e., theological qualifiers of the Persons of the Trinity (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) include: consubstantial, subsisting relations, co-eternal, or co-equal.
existence. In fact, the idea of knowing the truth and being free corresponds to being in communio or acting as gift to the ‘other’.

B. Communio

Communio expresses gift-reception or the giving and receiving of another. In other words, the objective reality is that man is made in God’s image, and when he awakens, he finds communio. As seen in Genesis, man exclaims, “[t]his at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” through the consciousness of another. The communion of persons creates an awareness of otherness. Man and woman experience a spousal love by becoming one body, one flesh. It is in this union that they have the capacity to generate another human person and this new life is a manifestation of their sexuality. New life formed out of the love of man and woman creates a father-son relationship.185 The son becomes a father through the unity of persons.

Since original man is in relationship, he is called to love. Through his love he becomes gift to another, and in this expression of love he becomes more like God. In man’s giving of self, he is united with God. From the unity created between persons, a son realises what is necessary to become a father; he must become a gift. In other words, man discovers that a father gives of himself.

God gives man a sign of what it means to be a father from the beginning. His identity has been given to him by God. Arguably, God the Father (in fatherhood) reveals man to himself from the beginning.186 The Second Vatican Council specifically mentions Christ as the one who reveals man to himself. Yet, it seems reasonable to apply this reference to the Father of the divine Trinity as well. If one draws parallels to the first man made flesh, it seems particularly useful to understand the Father as the one who gives original man his identity. Referring to the beginning, the

---

185 More research should continue to assess the other familial relationships, including that of the father-daughter, mother-son, etc. For instance, it would be particularly interesting to see how the mother-son dynamic could be paralleled to Mary and Jesus. A contemporary account about the father-daughter relationship was written by Meg Meeker, M.D., Strong Fathers, Strong Daughters: 10 Secrets Every Father Should Know, NY: Ballantine Books, Random House, 2006.

186 GS, 22.
fatherhood of God is marked by his first adopted children who are in likeness to the Creator. With man’s identity given to him in the beginning, he receives an adequate anthropology. The following section will draw out the meaning of an “adequate fatherhood.”

V. Adequate Fatherhood

Both man and woman receive an “adequate anthropology.” More specifically, one could define an “adequate fatherhood.” Using the explanation of “adequate anthropology” as “essentially human,” an “adequate fatherhood” encompasses what “essentially belongs to the father.” Therefore, an “adequate fatherhood” is an interpretation of what it means to be father. This interpretation of fatherhood relies to some extent on the human experience of fatherhood. Original man is called to exist out of nothing because God is love (1 Jn 4:8). Although the description of God being love is not specifically noted in the creation texts of Genesis, it is pertinent to understanding fatherhood. Through the love of the divine father within the Triune God, there springs forth a gift. “It [the concept of giving] indicates the one who gives and the one who receives the gift, as well as the relation established between them.” There emerges a relationship in the moment of creation, in the creation of man. Seeing love as the original source of creation, the masculine and feminine mirror this through the giving of each other where “[m]asculinity-femininity – namely, sex – is the original sign of a creative donation and the same time the sign of the gift that man, male-female, becomes aware of as a gift lived so to speak in an original way.”

John Paul describes “adequate anthropology” to have both a philosophical and theological meaning. Thus, an “adequate anthropology” takes on an axiological character, giving rise to a certain ethic. This can then be applied to the way man lives out the character of fatherhood in his

---

187 MW, 13:2, p. 178 and 14:4, p. 183. The concept of an “adequate fatherhood” is new, but it is based on John Paul’s “adequate anthropology.” The reference provided therefore provides a basis to understanding fatherhood in the context of his expressed “anthropology.” Fatherhood certainly cannot be limited to merely a human experience. Rather, the phenomena of fatherhood makes itself known from an objective arrival of a new creation and the experience of fatherhood exaggerate what existed from the beginning.

191 MW, 14:4, p. 183.
192 MW, 13:2, p. 178.
masculinity. One might call this an “adequate fatherhood.” The role of fatherhood is found when original man receives a distinct vocation to use his gift to fulfill the beatific vision and to live out an ethic that is in accord with God’s plan.

To strengthen the correlation between divine fatherhood and human fatherhood, the vocational role of fatherhood is found prior to original unity when God gives man the command to guide (lead), to protect, and to provide (love) (Cf. Gen 2:18). Despite concupiscence, authentic fatherhood retains a hint of its originality. The next three sections re-examine the qualities of fatherhood revealed in original man and correspond to the same three qualities of fatherhood found in historical man.

A. Leads

Before receiving any commands, original man found that his role began first with his placement in the garden of Eden. “The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it” (Gen 2:15). In his maleness, he is to tend to the garden. The significance of the “garden” takes on several meanings. From the text, it shows that man is first created to work.

John Paul parallels the second account of creation found in Genesis 2 to the Song of Songs. From this interpretation, the “garden” takes on another meaning. “I come to my garden, my sister, my bride...” (Song 5:1a). The imagery of the “garden” is described as a “sister” and “bride.” Elaborating on this meaning, it seems the spousal mystery is distinguished by being in relation. At the beginning of creation, a mystery is found between man and woman. If the “garden” is a reference to man’s “bride,” then it seems that he man is to take care of her. This

---

193 MW, 108-113, pp. 548-592. Note: what was delivered in the Wednesday audiences was a condensed version of what John Paul II wrote originally. I will be using the extended version of his interpretation of The Song of Songs: Resuming Genesis as it contains some pertinent insights.


195 The mystery could take on other meanings as well, e.g., the Trinity; the relationship between God and man, woman and child, etc.
leaves a few “unanswered” questions. The following will be addressed: 1) Who is she? 2) What does it mean to “till and keep”? and 3) How does this relate to fatherhood?

The “garden” or “bride” is woman. The reference broadens to the Church also. Despite the fact, the spousal analogy between Christ and the Church to man and woman is not found within the Song of Songs.\textsuperscript{196} The tradition is relevant to New Testament writers (Cf. Eph 5:25-32) and also has been related back to Genesis in John Paul’s exegesis. When John Paul draws a comparison to what is found in the love song to the creation of original man, he is highlighting the human aspect of love. John Paul’s development on love is particularly relevant to fatherhood. It is through the spousal relationship that man carries a fatherly character. For instance, man’s (in his maleness) entails his willingness to lead, to protect and to provide. So, original man carries the qualities of fatherhood from the moment of his creation. He has been entrusted with a “garden” which he is to “till and keep” (Gen 2:15).

With the introduction of woman, man is called to lead in service. To till and keep then is to act in service, and to do this requires knowledge of how to serve. This knowledge to serve comes from God (Cf. Gen 16-17). Man was given a special privilege when God said, “[y]ou may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die” (Gen 16b-17). Thus, he received special instruction that should act in leadership. Like the Father, he is to act as a guide for his “bride.” He serves by tilling and keeping what he was educated to guide and protect.

As mentioned in Chapter One, historical man struggles with being a good leader. He struggles with being free. One need only be reminded that man is slave of the one he obeys either of sin (which leads to death) or to righteousness which leads to life (Rom 6:15-23, Cf. Rom 7:13-25). To contrast, original man lived the fullness of his faith and was free. This is why he was not ashamed (Gen 2:25). He was pure in heart, seeking to do what is good. In addition, original man

serves from the onset by tilling and keeping the garden. He knows that he has received life from the
God. Although historical man doubts the gift of life, he retains the desire to be guided by God, to
guard his heart and to protect his beloved.

B. Protects

Man knows he is to protect his inheritance when he is placed in the garden because God
reveals his vocation to him. Original man not only cultivates the garden through tilling, but he
keeps the garden. Synonymously, “to keep” means “to protect.” Therefore, his original desire is
for the very one who created him. The Creator, Father in heaven, gave him life. Original man
protects, as is implied when God tells man that he shall die if he eats of the tree of knowledge of
good and evil (Gen 2:17).

The fatherhood of historical man echoes the fatherhood of original man. This is altogether
similar to historical man as a father who leads the family. Since the quality of a father to protect
was explored with historical man, this section seeks to addresses how the divine father seeks to
protect his children. Much of what was said about a father protecting for historical man can be
applied to original man. Rather than focus on how original man protects, it is imperative to see that
the divine father protects his creation. Through the command that man may freely eat of any tree
except the tree of knowledge of good and evil, it is apparent that the Father is trying to protect
original man. Since man has freedom, he is capable of decision making. Knowing this, the divine
father wished to save him from “death.” Thereby, the Father provides his child with a vision of
life.197 The paternal figure orientates original man so he is driven to look at the one who provided
him with love. Although the Father seeks to protect original man, he allows man to choose. This
choice is a truly a radiation of the Father’s love. Self-determination comes from man’s decision to
love. The exchange of love is reciprocal only when one freely shares oneself. So, the Son loves the
Father as the Father loves the Son.

197 Scola, Nuptial Mystery, p. 152.
Being in this image, original man then has the opportunity to display the similar qualities as that of the divine father. Original man first has to experience being a child, a son, before he can be a father.\textsuperscript{198} In original solitude, he is most like a son. He becomes more like the Father when he has something or someone to love.

\textbf{C. Provides}

In the beginning, original man received his identity of fatherhood through self-awareness and self-determination. Fatherhood is one prominent aspect that is discovered in the beginning, seen in original solitude, original nakedness, and original unity.\textsuperscript{199} Man’s very creation points toward the love between persons. For example, “[t]here is a strong link between the mystery of creation, as a gift that spring from [l]ove...”\textsuperscript{200} The essence of this gift is therefore inscribed in the truth of man being the ‘image of God’\textsuperscript{201}. To imitate this image of love, the role of human fatherhood is completed in and through original unity. Unlike historical man, original man receives the first fruits of this love. He is “naked without shame” (Gen 2:25), and in his nature he carries the deepest characteristics of his manhood. John Paul II finds \textit{“the meaning of original nakedness”} as the \textit{“first biblical sketch of anthropology.”}\textsuperscript{202} In the mystery of man’s masculinity, he discovers a “generative and ‘paternal’ meaning of his body”\textsuperscript{203} in his experience or original nakedness.\textsuperscript{204} It is this aspect of fatherhood that is shared between original man and historical man.\textsuperscript{205}

John Paul adds that “‘knowledge’ conditions begetting” so “that man and woman insert into their reciprocal ‘knowledge’.”\textsuperscript{206} For man, procreation comes through the man and woman “knowing” each other. The knowledge of each other is exclaimed by man when he says “[t]his at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” (Gen 2:23). He then, leaves his father and mother

\textsuperscript{198} Scola, \textit{Nuptial Mystery}, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{199} \textit{MW}, footnote, 21:2, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{200} \textit{MW}, 14:4-4, pp. 182-183.
\textsuperscript{201} \textit{MW}, 14:2, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{202} \textit{MW}, 11:2-3, pp. 170-171.
\textsuperscript{203} \textit{MW}, 21:4, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{204} \textit{MW}, 11:3, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{205} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{206} \textit{MW}, 21:3, p. 211.
and clings to his wife, becoming one (Gen 2:24). Their exchange of love is mutual. Each is giving and receiving each other through an intimate union that is like the communion of persons found in the God-head.

Being in God’s image, man’s fatherhood is “explicitly connected with the account of creation of man (Gen 1:27; 5:1) and seems to attribute to the earthly father the participation in the divine work of transmitting life, and perhaps also in the joy present in the statement, ‘God saw everything that he made, and indeed, it was very good’ (Gen 1:31).” The possibility of transmitting life would not be possible without the help of God.

Providing love is a necessary part of fatherhood. Experiencing the truth about life and love, man and woman find an expression of their love for one another echoes the love of the Creator. Original man discovers love in creation and then has the opportunity to participate in this love through giving himself. John Paul calls this cycle “knowledge-generation,” and the cycle of “knowledge’ is constituted by the union of persons in love, which allows them to unite so closely with each other that they become one flesh.”

The love beginning with original man is transmitted through the family. Without original innocence, historical man experiences love differently than original man who was “naked without shame.” Original man gives his entire self to the other without reservation. For original man, however, he seeks to provide a love that is like the love of the divine father.

Original solitude first teaches original man about divine fatherhood. However, self-awareness and self-determination show original man that despite being like God he is not identical to God. The creation of woman allows man to more clearly reflect the divine image. Through original unity then, original man determines that he is not only a son, but also a father. Man discovers that he mirrors the divine father by being a human father. For original man, his human sexuality plays a key factor in his human fatherhood and on the surface his masculinity portrays in depth his human fatherhood. The difference of persons found in gender embodies the imago Dei

---

since the human distinction between persons is like the Trinity. The sonship of original man truly expresses fatherhood when he becomes a spouse. When man becomes one flesh with woman, his identity and vocation are recapitulated. Therefore, original man is naked without shame when he fully embraces his fatherhood through sacrificial love. Original man finds that to be a husband or spouse parallels the responsibilities of a good father. He receives the clues to these in both creation accounts. In his masculinity, he is called to be fruitful and multiply (Gen 1:28) and at the same time fulfil the duties to lead, protect and provide love for his bride (Gen 2:15-18). To do so requires sacrificial love to the point of “death” (Gen 2:17).

VI. Forewarning of Death

From this chapter and the previous chapter, the point of death is the moment where he has to make a choice between the life he received when he became man (Gen 2:7) or to choose death (Gen 2:17). The boundary experience found in original nakedness\(^\text{208}\) brings to mind an essential question for man, what does it mean “to die”? Original man experienced his existence through his body.\(^\text{209}\) Although he may not have understood death to mean the end of his bodily existence, he would have understood that “to die” somehow opposed what it meant “to live.” Original man had not experienced death and the words of God pose death in a conditional way... \(^\text{210}\) if he eats of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17). The boundary experience allows man to exercise his will freely. He has been given autonomy to exercise his will. As a son, man “grows to maturity and human and spiritual autonomy [where] his unique vocation which comes from God [should assert] itself more clearly and forcefully” (CCC 2232).\(^\text{211}\) From the beginning, man receives his vocation to be like the Father. Despite man’s limitations, he is dependent on his origin that is given by his Father and his being received is essential to sonship.

\(^{208}\) MW, 12:2, p. 174.

\(^{209}\) MW, 7:3, p. 155.

\(^{210}\) MW, 7:3, p. 155.

\(^{211}\) Bracketed words were added.
CHAPTER THREE: MAN WITHOUT GOD

Historical existence for man is the experience of his self-centricity. Impoverished by sin, man does not understand himself. The reason for man’s marred “image” of self is based on a contrived truth. The lie for historical man is that he thinks he can live without God, and as such he does not reflect God in the fullest sense. God’s image is distorted by sin. Thus, the tragedy of original sin (which seeks to abolish fatherhood) is that man disobeyed God and lost grace; the effect is that man does not know self, neighbour, God, or the world as he ought. In turn, man judges the law of God as something outside of himself, and he then becomes the centre of his own good. The tree of knowledge of good and evil reveals the truth about man’s freedom and tests his will, ultimately tied to man’s understanding of being autonomous. Theologically, autonomy means that man lives out love; e.g., as the love of the Father and the Son whose bond is the Holy Spirit. Authentic autonomy (i.e., freedom) is good for man allowing him to love freely, truthfully and to give himself unreservedly. A false autonomy however seeks to place self over a love that is directed towards another. The shift results in a self-law that exhibits fear, ignorance and self-love.

This chapter explores how man struggles to live out an authentic autonomy. Autonomy (self-law), in itself, provided “[t]he good is established, as the eternal law, by Divine Wisdom which orders every being towards its end...”. Without this end, man truly becomes lost and he questions the Father’s plan for him. He may ask himself, “Am I able to fully live out my vocation without compromise?” or “What does God know that I don’t know?” The real question is whether man can live an authentic autonomy (which coincides with authentic fatherhood) despite the obstacles of doubt and fear.

In an effort to answer these questions, the first section discusses obedience as a way to know goodness. The aim of the next section shows how the event of the fall is a defining moment where man attempts “patricide.” More specifically, man rejects divine fatherhood and human fatherhood.

---
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patterned in the divine image. The allure of the snake’s words gives man the impression that God can be overthrown; therefore, man feels he has been granted permission to act like a rebellious son. The temptation for man is to sin by disobeying God.

Over the centuries, the temptation to disobey God has shifted into an atheistic mentality. Many scholars note that atheism is a modern problem. The thought of two persons will be briefly considered, Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud. Nietzsche and Freud were selected because of their influence on the notions of atheism. These two men also elaborate on the role of father and son. Nietzsche looks at the Son of God and takes the “death of God” to a logical extreme that moves man to a life “without God” whereas Freud considers the rebellious son in order to account for a tyrannical, authoritarian father-figure (when he describes the Oedipal Complex). Nietzsche and Freud arrive to a similar conclusion: it is better for man to live “without God.” Man’s personal relationship with his human father seems to coincide directly with one’s understanding of divine fatherhood. Freud and Nietzsche found their earthly fathers weak and did not relate to God either. The negative image of human fatherhood corresponds to a negative image of divine fatherhood. Therefore, life “without God” (atheism) then becomes a rejection of divine fatherhood.

I. Obedience

The classical Latin oboedientia (to hear) means the action or practice of obeying authority. Obedience also means submitting to the rule of another. To obey, one must listen to the law-giver. The greatest commandment begins with “Hear, O Israel...you shall love the Lord with all your


heart, and with all your soul, and will all your might” (Dt 6:4-5). 215 The Old Testament calls man to govern his whole self, heart and soul. Man’s obedience illustrates a profound humility and love for the one who makes the command. Jesus gives the perfect example of obedience of the Father’s will even to the point of death. Ability to govern self, or to live in authentic autonomy, is bound in obeying the Father. So, the law is not the will of a person, but the law of love. 216 Such love is found in truth and exemplified by the person of Christ.

The intellect and will form man’s capacity to obey. Authentic freedom is the faculty of the will and informed by truth. There can be no freedom without truth. Truth then is a Person who orders the good. Jesus asks, “Why do you call me good?” When Jesus is called “good,” he responds: “No one is good but God alone” (Mk 10:18, Lk 18:19). John Paul also writes, “[o]nly God can answer the question about what is good, because he is the Good itself.” 217 The Son acknowledges the Father who alone is good. This goodness exhibits itself not only in and through God, but in those who are in his likeness.

A. Being Imago Dei

God and man exist in a communal dimension of being. In previous chapters the father-son relationship displays characteristics found in relationships. 218 For instance, personhood indicates difference. 219 At the same time, there is unity because of the difference. Additionally, the Father and Son are Persons in relationship. “This cycle of ‘knowledge’ is constituted by the union of persons in love, which allows them to unite so closely with each other that they become one

215 The Shema (“Hear”) is recited daily as a practice for the religious Jew. Not only does it contain the greatest commandment of love, but it establishes monotheism. Oddly enough “to obey” comes from the Latin ob-audire, to “hear or listen to” (CCC 144). The Shema then becomes a practice to hear God and obey his words.

216 The law of love comes from the Father, is made known by the Son, and lives on as the Holy Spirit.

217 VS, 9. “Ense et bonum convertuntur” [being and good are convertible] (John Paul II, Man and Woman, 2:5, p. 137). The good of the Father is thus the good of the Son. Although they are distinct persons, they remain one being who is good. This explains why the Son acknowledges the Father as Good.

218 The man-woman relationship has the capability of creating a man with the help of the Lord (Gen 4:1). This is so from the beginning and John Paul uses this to describe the knowledge-generation cycle (MW, 22:2, 5, 7, pp. 214, 216-218). So it seems that the knowledge-generation cycle could broadly be applied to the father-son dynamic.

219 Difference suggests a sort of independence or autonomy for each person. For instance, in the Trinitarian God there exist three separate, or different persons, who remain one. Scola writes, “[d]ifference, or alterity, is a path to more complete unity” (Nuptial Mystery, p. 12). Similarly, the difference found between man and woman is made indissoluble (one) through marriage.
From the union of the two (Father and Son), there springs a “third.” The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. They form a *communio personarum* in love. With love, they are united. The Son is one with the Father. He prays “that they may be one even as we are one” (Jn 17:21).

Unity and difference are also found in the God-man relationship. Being in God’s likeness, man is given an opportunity to be in *communio* with God. At God’s initiative, man is united by love. As John Paul II reiterates in his Wednesday catecheses, the dignity of man rests in his call to be fully human.

“The truth is that only in the mystery of the Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. For Adam, the first man, was a type of him who was to come (Rom 5:14), Christ the Lord. Christ, the new Adam, in the very revelation of the Mystery of the Father and of his love, fully reveals man to himself and brings him to his most high calling.”

The invitation, or calling for man to be in communion with God illustrates a unique bond of man to God. The bond between God and man carries a certain theological significance, especially as the Son of God came to remedy the earliest rejection of fatherhood. “For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 6:23). The Son of God expresses his love in the gift of self. For historical man then, and through Christ, “[t]he ‘affirmation of the person’ is nothing other than welcoming the gift, which through, reciprocity,

---

221 The “third” person of the Trinity is usually the Holy Spirit, a spiration of the love of the Father and the Son. The man-woman relationship too is designed for a third person. Eve exclaims, “I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord” (Gen 4:1).
222 Similarly, man and woman become one in flesh through their conjugal union.
224 Analogously, it may be said that the bond formed between man and woman within marriage is *like* the bond of a man and God. One also finds a similar bond between a father and son. As such, it is useful to turn to the Father-Son relationship in the God-head.
225 “The only force capable of effectively countering this philosophy [the filial fear of God who is love] is found in the Gospel of Christ, in which the paradigm of master-slave is radically transformed into the paradigm of father-son” (John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, p. 227). Through original sin, original man felt the pain of a “master-slave” relationship. The shift for historical man is found in the depths of his heart. As Christopher West describes it, man hears an “echo” of this original father-son dynamic that began with the creation of original man. The master-slave mentality creates a cause for rejecting a father who is love (West, *Theology of the Body Explained*, p. 49). This is seen not only in the God-man relationship, but also in the human, father-son relationship. A son’s rebellion of his own fatherhood portrays the dilemma of “fatherlessness,” where his own father appears as a “master” or “authoritarian.” In essence, he denies his own father only because he seeks to overthrow him. He seeks to be the “father.”
226 The power to give this love freely “fulfils the very meaning of his being and existence” (*MW*, 15:1, p. 186.)
creates the communion of persons...". The unity of the two (in this case between the Father and the Son) is found in perfect freedom and authentic autonomy.

B. Being *Imago Filio*

When Jesus lays down his life for the Church, he embodies and points to the love of the Father. The Son reveals characteristics of the Father. Unlike original man who disobeyed God’s commands, Jesus loves the Father (Jn 14:30) by doing as the Father commands. As a Son, Jesus fulfils the role of the Father by providing, protecting and leading his human family into new life. Christ the new Adam not only reveals the Father, but helps man to rediscover himself. This dual action thus calls to mind historical man’s *status naturae lapsae* in order for man to realise that he needs redemption, and that this redemption is willed by the Father. Thus, the redemption of man is made known by the Son’s obedience to the Father.

Through death on the cross, Jesus makes known the historical experience of man while at the same time revealing the future of man. Rather than rejecting the Father’s love, he embraces love. Man is like the Father when he gives of himself. Paradoxically, the Son redeems mankind by emptying himself and simultaneously glorifying the Father. Through the Son, faith becomes a “personal adherence of the whole of man to God who reveals himself” (*CCC* 176). Christ’s love is a gift of self that reveals fatherhood. He who sees Christ sees the Father (Jn 14:7). Likewise, all men are called to deny self, take up their cross daily and follow Christ (Cf. Lk 9:23). This task is not easy. The human response is not always “Father...not my will, but yours” (Lk 22:42, Cf. Mt 10:38; Jn 18:11; 5:30). However, in Christ, all are called to deny self, be strengthened by grace, and formed in virtue in order to know the love of the Father.

II. A Question of Autonomy

---

227 *MW*, 15:4, p. 188.

228 Family must be understood in the broader sense of the word. Although Jesus had a human family with Mary and Joseph, the Church forms a family through the baptism of persons (*CCC* 1213).

229 *GS*, 24.
Man became acutely aware that he was different from the other creatures. Neither bird nor beast was a fit helper for him (Gen 2:20). For this reason, man’s original solitude may have given him the impression that he is an autonomous self. Authentic contingency however is only understood in his particeps Creatoris. John Paul II explains,

“Man, being a reasonable creature, is just towards the Creator by striving in all his activities to achieve this specifically human value, by behaving as particeps Creatoris. The antithesis of this belief is autonomism, which holds that man most fully asserts his value when he is his own legislator, when he feels himself to be the source of all law and all justice (Kant). This is erroneous; man could only be his own ultimate lawgiver if, instead of being a creature, he were his own first cause. Since, he is a creature, his existence depends on God…”.

From this understanding, an authentic autonomy allows man to be fully human. His autonomy further displays what may be deemed the anthropology of man. When he behaves as particeps Creatoris, man affirms his existence in relationship. Looking at the father-son relationship, it seems that an authentic autonomy requires man to see himself as dependent on the Father.

Authentic autonomy carries a certain paradoxical nature; it is simultaneously independent (personal) while at the same time dependent (relational). To know authentic autonomy, man must know himself. As particeps Creatoris, he finds himself in God’s likeness (Gen 1:27, Cf. Ps 8:4-6). Knowledge of this likeness reminds man that he is a person in relationship, e.g., father-son relationship. In relationship, man is nothing without the other. Specifically, he would not exist without a first cause. The other is not a threat to personal freedom; rather, the other fulfills personhood. In authentic autonomy man realises the truth; he is nothing without God.

Contrary to authentic autonomy which seeks right relationship and is based on truth, a false autonomy seeks to diminish the father-son relationship. This false autonomy comes from the world. Man concludes that he can do whatever he wants without God. In an effort to be like God, man revolts. The will to know good and evil through the “tree of knowledge” opposes the will of

---

231 John Paul II prefers to use the terms “freedom” and “contingency” instead of autonomy, probably because the word autonomy carries secularist weight. However, the phrase “authentic autonomy” carries a theological meaning which will hopefully give secularists much to discuss. The Greek authentikos means primary or original and supplies reason the phrase “authentic autonomy” and appears to comply with the thought of John Paul II. Although he does not use “authentic autonomy,” he does use the word “original” to explain solitude, unity, nakedness, et. al. Since this chapter also looks at the secular view of autonomy through atheism, it seemed necessary to create a new phrase.

232 “Like the first sin, it is disobedience, a revolt against God through the will to become ‘like gods,’ (Gen 3:5) knowing and determining evil” (CCC 1850).
the Father found in God’s instruction that forbids man to eat of this tree. In other words, the intellect (or desire “to know”) may be disoriented if the will seeks ‘self’ above the ‘other’.\(^{233}\) When man puts ‘self’ first, he disobeys the ‘other’. From his disobedience man renders himself an orphan, as he desires to be a god. For this reason, it is necessary to examine man’s disobedience in relationship to the Father.

### III. Spiritual Patricide

One interpretation of the fall of man is notion of spiritual “patricide.” John Paul II observed, “It is enough to read carefully the whole passage of Genesis 3:1-5, to grasp the mystery of man in it who turns his back on the ‘Father’ (even if we do not find this name of God in the account). By casting doubt in his heart on the deepest meaning of the gift, that is, on love as the specific motive of creation and of the original covenant (see Gen 3:5), man turn his back on God-Love, on the ‘Father’. He in some sense casts him from his heart. At the same time, therefore he detaches his heart and cuts it off, as it were, from that which ‘comes from the Father’; in this way, what is left in him is what ‘comes from the world’.”\(^{234}\)

In this short commentary, John Paul II provides a glimpse to understanding that man rejects fatherhood in Genesis 3:1-5. By rejecting the Father, man rejects the motive of creation. As John Paul explains the motive of creation is love. As explained earlier, the love of the Father finds itself in a communio personarum.\(^{235}\) Man is created in the Trinitarian image, a communio personarum, which makes him in imago Dei. When “man turns his back on the ‘Father’” through original sin he becomes a man of the world, seeking to live without God. Concupiscence remains with him (as historical man). Moreover, he might apply this rejection of divine fatherhood to the rejection of his own fatherhood.

The temptation to commit spiritual “patricide” in the garden of Eden was the allure of becoming a god. From the perspective of a father-son relationship, original man in his sonship disobeyed his Father by acting against the words commanded to him in Genesis 2:16. By opposing God man dissolved the union of love found between persons, between man and God, thus

---

\(^{233}\) The capacity of the will and intellect are linked in man’s creation (imago Dei). Man’s disobedience leaves its affect on both the will and intellect. Pride and lust are a manifestation of man’s disobeying God. Generalising, the effect of pride seems to stem from the intellect and lust seems to parallel the will. John Paul II reiterates in the three-fold concupiscence, basing them on the 1 John 2:16 (MW, 26:1-3, pp. 234-236).

\(^{234}\) MW, 26:4, p. 237.

\(^{235}\) Communio personarum is a community of persons. This is first seen in the Trinitarian dimension of persons (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). It is embodied by man’s relationships. The imago Dei is fulfilled in the making of an ‘other’. For further explanation, cross-reference footnote 44 from Chapter 1.
dissolving the union found between all persons. In doing so, he accepted a false autonomy that rejects the need for the ‘other’.

As informative and constitutive as original man’s opposition to God is the subjective experience prior to the fall clearly shows man receives awareness of self through consciousness. An authentic autonomy coincides with authentic freedom, and a false autonomy corresponds to a false freedom. False freedom leads man to trust in self without a need for the other. He rejects the other by distrust and doubt, which is based on a lie. Man is presented with a false sense of autonomy and freedom in the guise of becoming a god. When presented with a choice to obey or disobey God in the garden man decides to embrace a false autonomy.

In the book of Genesis, man chooses to disobey God. He rejects divine fatherhood when he eats of the “tree of knowledge of good and evil.” John Paul refers to a three-fold concupiscence (la triplice concupiscenza), which stem from “Johannine theology” including “the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life.” The origin of concupiscence is not “‘from the Father’ but ‘from the world’.” Historical man struggles with concupiscence through three primary vices including disobedience, pride and lust. Others could be added to this list, but they would take away from the examination of this study. Pride and lust will be viewed as manifestations of disobedience in order to draw out the “patricidal” character of sin.

**IV. Disobedience**

The union between God and man is put to the test by the question posed by the serpent. Man is confronted with a choice. The serpent not only questions the authority of God (Gen 3:1),

---

236 John Paul suggests that a relationship exists between man’s freedom and God’s law (VS, 71) and man’s actions therefore are “defined by the relationship of man’s freedom with the authentic good” (VS, 72). Based in goodness, an authentic autonomy finds true freedom.

237 The three-fold concupiscence is in accord with 1 John 2:16 which states, “[f]or all that is in the world, the lust of flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father but is of the world.” Furthermore, “the world passes away, and the lust of it; but he who does the will of God abides forever” (1Jn 2:17) and MW, 26:1, 3 pp. 234, 236.

238 MW, 26:1, p. 235.

239 It is recommended that further studies be made on the fruits of the “tree of knowledge of good and evil.” The three mentioned in this work seem most relevant and this is why they are named here. Disobedience, pride and lust seem to correspond to the threefold concupiscence that was drawn out by John Paul II.
but assures man that surely he will not die (Gen 3:4). The serpent motivates a situation where man covets something that does not belong to him, e.g., the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Specifically, the fruit represents man’s desire to be god. When the serpent appeals to man, he is asking him to doubt God’s love. Instead of God being his first ordered love, man’s doubt occasions self-grasping. Man thereby breaks the communion created by the Creator and his creation. Rather than working in cooperation with the Father’s will, he becomes self-centred and his judgement is impaired. Self-love sets oneself in competition with God and attempts to overthrow that which orders his nature to relational fulfilment.

In light of the divine-human relationship the Creator first gives life to man and from this, man receives personhood. Man’s fellowship with God is lived in a communio personarum which is put to the test. Man and woman are “threatened by the insatiability of that union and unity...which fail[s] to satisfy the aspiration to realise...the reciprocal communion of persons.”240 The serpent confronts man with an alternate choice to abandon the Father.

Unfortunately, man broke the Father’s command when he disobeyed. The effects of breaking God’s commands is found when man tries to hide from God when he heard Him in the garden (Gen 3:8). Man is alienated in his “nakedness” since he is now “deprived of the participation in the Gift, man alienated from the love that was the source of the original gift, the source of the fullness of good intended for the creature.”241 Man knows he sinned. He is reminded about this disobedience when the Lord says you have “eaten of the tree of which I commanded you” (Gen 3:17). Rather than listen to the voice of God, man chose to listen to another voice who offends the truth of God’s words; thereby, wounding the “nature of man and injures human solidarity” (CCC1849).242 In other words, man’s self-exaltation was that he did not need God; more specifically, he acted as if he did not need the Father. Additionally, man covets what does not belong to him choice and action. “Man in some way loses the certainty of the ‘image of God’... [and he also loses] the sense of his right to participate in the perception of the world, which he

240 MW, 30:5, p. 252.
241 MW, 27:2, p. 239.
enjoyed in the mystery of creation.” The father-son relationship is at the heart of how man perceives his image.

To forget where man comes from strikes at the very union that is found in relationship. This means that a son who rejects his father strikes at the unity of the two. Overthrowing the father is motivated by a self-interested love where the paternal character of the relationship is no longer seen necessary for growth and maturity. Instead, a father’s presence helps his offspring to develop in a manner worthy of their calling. Appealing to a more theological disposition, “In his fatherly care for all of us, God desired that all men should form one family’ . . . [where all] ‘are destined to the same end, namely God himself.” When Jesus prayed to the Father that “all may be one. . . even as we are one” (Jn 17:21-22), he is implying a “certain parallel between the union existing between the divine persons and the union of the sons of God in truth and love.” Without basis, man cannot discover himself. The fall illustrates something contrary to being “one” with the Father. Rather than using reasons that are in accord with an authentic relationship of love, man discovered how to live a false autonomy as if it were good.

A. Loss of Original Justice

When man lives a false autonomy, he also withdraws from original justice. Justice seeks to uphold the law of love. John Paul’s teaching on the identity of man exemplifies the value of man is found from a sharing of God’s thoughts and His laws in his mind and heart. Without justice towards the Creator, man becomes resentful of his dependence on the one who gave him dignity.

Since the “creation of man is marked by a certain likeness to the divine communion (communio),” clearly, the father-son relationship found between God and man is core to man’s identity in nature. He maintains his original justice only by being in right relationship with the Father. The choice given to original man in the garden of Eden further illustrates how man’s

---

244 GS, 24.
245 GS, 24.
autonomy either demonstrates his love of ‘self’ versus the love of ‘other’. Choosing self-love over self-less love impedes the dynamic of authentic love which is fully realised in persona Christi. In authentic autonomy the law given by the Father is not the will of a person, but is a law of love. When the freedom is misused it lends to a false autonomy. As such, the law-giver frustrates man.

He compromises the virtue of justice when he does not give God or an ‘other’ what is due to them. In other words, justice disposes man to a harmonious relationship with God and neighbour. More specifically, “justice toward God is called the ‘virtue of religion’ (CCC 1807). The ‘virtue of religion’ deserves greater consideration since it values authentic autonomy which is opposed to atheism. A return to atheism and its impact on fatherhood will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Environment, social pressure, and fear can inspire a person to do evil. Although the moral quality of a sinful action does not change, the circumstances can sometimes diminish the moral consequences. In the case of original sin, the serpent receives a portion of justice because he pressured original man to do wrong (Gen 3:14) since the choice presented gives a sort of “permission” to “rebel” against the Father. Despite the pressures to oppose the Father, man is a free agent. Ultimately, the option illustrates that “[h]uman freedom is a force for growth and maturity in truth and goodness” (CCC 1731). When directed towards God, man attains perfect freedom.

B. Autonomy and Freedom

Discovery of man’s identity requires a directed motion that freely accepts what man has been entrusted with from the moment of creation. Nevertheless, the form of endowment is frequently misunderstood. Since man lives in the world, he has difficulty in identifying himself as a son or as a father. “‘That which is in the world,’ namely, concupiscence, brings with it an almost constitutive difficulty in identifying oneself...”.248 The God-man relationship helps identify

personhood; however, relationships may be disturbed by man’s subjectivity. If he misunderstands the form of the gift, or doubts it, he will also misunderstand the one who represents the gift.

In the case of the fall, man’s capacity to understand the God-man relationship is corrupted by a false notion of freedom. His freedom is limited and fallible. Predisposed to these limitations due to concupiscence, man carries the weight of sin and develops symptoms of a false autonomy. To exercise his freedom falsely implies that man is “an individual who is fully self-sufficient and whose finality is the satisfaction of his own interests in the enjoyment of these earthly goods.”

The symptoms of a false autonomy illustrate a ‘self-interested’ or ‘egocentric’ mentality. Present day autonomy reveals this in several ways. For instance, man desires to be emancipated socially and economically. Through a false autonomy, man displaces God for an earthly satisfaction, rationalising that God does not exist. For if God does exist it means that man’s reliance on money and power are void of meaning.

Selfish and prideful disillusionments create a false freedom that is rooted in something contrary to man’s vocation. He rejects his own fatherhood despite the inclinations “to accept even difficult demands of love for an ideal, and above all in the name of love for a person (love is, in fact, oriented by its very nature toward the person).” Moving away from an authentic autonomy, lived in perfect freedom, man loses faith in the other. Furthermore, this lack of faith may display itself as atheism.

V. Man without God

Atheism is a modern problem; “atheism, taken as a whole, is not present in the mind of man from the start (atheismus integre consideratus, non est quid originarium).” Rather, man’s false

---

249 CDF, instruction, Libertatis Conscientia, 13.
250 GS, 20. Henri de Lubac writes that “atheism represents no more than an inadequate emancipation since it tends to prolong the metaphysical state by continually seeking new solutions of theoretical problems, instead of ruling out all accessible researches as inherently fruitless” (The Drama of Atheistic Humanism, Translated by Edith M. Riley, London: Sheed and Ward, 1949, p. 95).
251 MW, 79:9, p. 436.
252 GS, 19.
autonomy professes an atheism that maintains “man is an end to himself.” In other words, he is a man without God. A number of individuals paved the way to such thinking. This section will briefly highlight two “atheistic” thinkers, Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud who have been selected in order to dramatize their personal relationships with their fathers and also for their elaborations on the father-son relationship. Nietzsche takes the philosophical idea of a false autonomy to an idealised “Superman” and Freud utilises a projection theory to replace fathers with sons; both men illuminate atheism or at the very least raise the questions of living without God.

The question of man without God (atheism) is just as much a question of man with God (religion). Atheism, or man living without God, infers a relationship. The relationship between God and man is central to the discussion on religion and atheism. John Finnis notes that ‘religion’ a human good that has a universal order that is based upon a relationship between man and the divine. Atheism, on the other hand, denies the transcendent; thereby, displacing God and capitalizing on man’s autonomy. If this is the case, then there is no relationship between man and the divine (or the Father). No relationship suggests a life without that person. In terms of the God-man or father-son relationship, it becomes a life without God. However, if this is not the case and the universal order can be attributed to the transcendent, then a relationship still exists between man and the divine, even if the relationship is denied. What if a child never meets his human father? Even though the relationship seems non-existent, it does not mean that the child does not have a father, nor does it mean that the father-child relationship does not exist. One could propose that ‘atheism’ is a ‘religion’ because a relationship exists even if it is denied.

Taking the Latin religare which means to link or to join, atheism could be viewed as the opposite of religion. Atheism renounces faith in God and the “link” between persons becomes detached. Both emet (faith) and religare (to join) convey a faithfulness and trust. Lack of trust in God’s command at the beginning is a cause for man to depart or reject the Father’s ways. One

---

253 GS, 20.
cannot separate faith in God from faith in Christ. The person of Jesus Christ brings a personal and anthropological component to the father-son relationship. Although the case has been argued that man has rejected fatherhood from the beginning, a look at the modern problem shows atheism has been impacted by human father-son relationships.

Paul Vitz’ book *Faith of the Fatherless* systematically shows the parallels found in weak human father-son relationships and how human relationships impact man’s view of God the Father. The tendency to abandon human fatherhood coincides with the abandonment of divine fatherhood, although the notion of human “fatherlessness” may be considered a new trend. The development in this analysis is that atheism, or the rejection of fatherhood, belongs to the fall. It may be useful to note that as man turned inward upon self, he forged an anthropological atheism. So, a man’s “religious” convictions have lost intelligibility as modern philosophies gained momentum, such as those of Friedrich Nietzsche.

**A. Friedrich Nietzsche and the Philosophy of Atheism**

The experiences Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) had with his own family and his education gave him “cause” to become an atheist, or at the very least, gave him room to doubt Christianity. He was five when his father died. Although Nietzsche had fond memories of his father, he associated him with weakness. Based on Nietzsche’s writings, the death of his father impacted him for a lifetime.

Nietzsche is probably best known for his pronouncement that “God is dead” (*Requiem aeternam Deo*). Although some interpretations have tried to draw out “theology” from this

---


257 With the age of reason, man became more interested in the human person to the neglect of divine personhood.

258 Vitz, *Faith of the Fatherless*, p. 22.

statement, this was not Nietzsche’s intent.\textsuperscript{260} He sought to deny God altogether. In fact, in Zarathustra he highlights that man’s call is to be a “superman.” Like earlier atheists such as Karl Marx and Ludwig Feuerbach, Nietzsche emphasized the domination of the human race. By giving all authority to man, he seeks to prove that man is self-sufficient in his own right, making man his own law-giver.

Living a false autonomy educates man to understand that what is external to self is a threat to his own truth. Since God appears “external,” man redefines God.\textsuperscript{261} Doing thus allows man to live without God; i.e., man does not relate to God. The problem escalates to another reality. Man lives without a Father. Without a Father suggests a life without God. In spite of his diminished understanding of the Father, man continues to formulate thoughts about him. The father-figure is removed from him and the logical framework for fatherhood becomes flawed. A poor understanding of a human father tends to correspond to a poor understanding of divine fatherhood.

In Nietzsche’s case, he spent a lifetime wrestling with philosophical questions about God’s existence, yet kept asserting a “super” being. The argument is not with the person of Friedrich Nietzsche, but with the ideologies he proposed and the determinations he made about God. Nietzsche’s philosophy centres around his pronouncement that “God is dead.” Nietzsche’s statement is flawed. A counter-argument to the mentality that “God is dead” is that “God is alive.” Nietzsche takes a theological claim made about the death of Jesus and makes a philosophical argument about the existence of God. No proof exists that God does not live.

\textsuperscript{260} Nietzsche was a philosopher, not a theologian. Although Hans Küng makes a convincing argument that Nietzsche’s denial of God makes him an anti-theist when he evaluates the rise of nihilism. He defines nihilism as a way of thinking and a practice which tends to be “nothingness” (Küng, Does God Exist? p. 388, also, pp. 343-344, 369-371, 380, 387-398.) Henri de Lubac also makes a strong case that atheism and nihilism are anti-theistic. He refers to an “atheistic humanism” (The Drama of Atheistic Humanism, p. 7). This being said, an anti-theistic declaration about God carries a particular weight among theologians who wish to refute such thinking.

\textsuperscript{261} “Even those who honestly describe themselves as ‘religious’ do not in the least act up to it and so they presumably mean something quite different by ‘religious’” (Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers From Prison, p. 279).
To avoid the philosophical arguments made about God’s existence, Nietzsche creates a false god. He replaces God with man, which is also flawed. Although, the rational seems sound if one considers God to be dead. However, if God is alive, then man cannot replace what remains.262

From this brief assessment, one finds that the discipline of philosophy has impacted the way man thinks about God. The philosophical arguments constructed by Nietzsche are multi-faceted and have greatly impacted the modern world. Many of these ideologies still exist and find various forms. For instance, explanations about God exist in the realm of psychology. Both the disciplines of philosophy and psychology are systems of thought; therein, their conclusions are not necessarily theological. However, they have been and can be applied to theology. The next section evaluates Sigmund Freud. Freud acts as a case-study while at the same time constructs his own explanations about father-son relationships.

B. Sigmund Freud and the Psychology of Atheism

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) put the hatred of the father at the centre of his psychology. “Psychoanalysis...daily demonstrates to us how youthful persons lose their religious belief as soon as the authority of the father breaks down.”263 Although the discipline falls out of the context of this particular study, the relationship that Freud had with his own father does provide a certain amount of insight to the man and his works. He associated his father with religion and God.264 Yet, he also considered his father weak, which may explain his negativity towards religion in general.

As his own theory of psychoanalysis suggests, Freud’s loss of religious belief corresponds to the lack of authority he gave to his own father. To illustrate, Freud used a projection theory of an idealized father called the “Oedipal Complex.”265 Vitz suggests that Freud’s “projection of an

262 The question of God’s existence has been argued throughout the ages. Countering the denial of God, Blaise Pascal constructed a “fundamental certainty of faith” using reason and faith.
264 Ibid.
idealized father—and presumably of God the Father” is an adaptation of Feuerbach’s projection theory. Like Nietzsche, Freud’s theory ultimately seeks to replace God with man.

Freud further relates his theory to that of original sin: “There can be no doubt...that original sin was against the Father...and if this sacrifice of a life [Jesus] brought about atonement with God the Father, the crime to be expiated can only have been the murder of the father.” The greatest rejection of fatherhood is fully lived out in a state of rebellion. The same appeal was found in the beginning when man first abolished fatherhood. The Oedipal Complex further justifies the father-figure as a tyrant. The killing of the father fools man into thinking he killed the authority. He thinks the father is domineering and controlling; no wonder that seems best to remove him from his life. The reality for the son is a life without a father.

The tragedy of the situation created by Freud’s psychological position is that man tries to kill who he thinks the father is; thereby, diminishing the understanding of fatherhood. This idea could be related to Nietzsche’s “death of God.” Both Freud and Nietzsche seek to replace God with man, and they use the son to achieve this end. Freud has the son kill the father. Whereas, Nietzsche has the Son die thus, accomplishing the death of the Father.

The son needs the father. The flaw rests in an idea that the son is better off without a father or does not need the father. Furthermore, it can lead man to nihilism which sees all as nothingness and this nothingness lends to immorality. Atheism and nihilism are two ways that man lives without God. Previews from Nietzsche and Freud certainly add to the disposition. The thoughts of these “atheistic” men are particularly relevant as conclusions are drawn about the rejection of fatherhood in various ways, such as the rejection of divine father through original sin and the rejection of human fatherhood as an act of rebellion by a jealous son.

---

266 Vitz, *Faith of the Fatherless*, p. 150.
VI. Atheism as a Rejection of Fatherhood

Several themes were discovered in the examination of atheism: 1) the relationship between human fathers and sons appears to correspond to the relationship between God the Father and man; 2) atheism exemplifies a false autonomy, putting the thrust on man as the primary end; and 3) atheism is a way in which historical man further rejects fatherhood. The first point was illustrated by looking at the lives of Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud. The human father-son relationship was weakened due to a variety of reasons, e.g., death, infidelity, inability for the father to protect his children, all of which justified negative images about fatherhood. The negative images about their human father seem to have impacted their views on divine fatherhood. It seems each of them had cause to reject God the Father. To fill this void, they conjured up a false autonomy which places man above all. More concretely, a false autonomy leads man to trust in ‘self’ rather than the love displayed by the Father. His inability to trust God frustrates his ability to trust ‘self’.

Since historical man suffers the burden of (his self-created isolation), his relationships unravel without an authentic autonomy. Living a false autonomy, he becomes incapable of giving. A person who has isolated himself cannot see the transcendent value of gift. Isolation further advances atheism and other atheistic ideologies because it cuts at the very root of relationship; it is the fullest antagonism towards fatherhood. Over the past 150 years, atheistic ideologies have pushed forward under the guise of socialism, communism, etc.

To rebound from this state of false autonomy, historical man needs to ask some questions. Where is he directed? What is his end? Fundamentally, these questions lend to a study of eschatological man.
CHAPTER FOUR: ESCHATOLOGICAL MAN

When referring to man, the eschaton refers to the last things. In *Man and Woman He Created Them*, references to eschatological man coincide with the beatific vision as described in Matthew 5; and furthermore, found in the resurrection of the Son of Man. Eschatological man prefigures the already, but not yet. In essence, Jesus Christ provides the way to the Father. Paradoxically, Christ empty themselves which brings about the fulfilled glory of God. The denial of self casts out all fear and doubt, replacing it with love and trust. To return to the Father, Jesus is the “new man” (eschatological man). The considerations to be made in this final chapter are therefore meant to assist man in knowing the Father and living out his personal, vocation with this end in mind. Through his sonship, we see fatherhood. Therefore, we must look at the father-son relationship in light of what we have already learned in order to see the last things.

The father-son relationship will be emphasised based on the findings of historical man and original man. Unlike man without God, eschatological man returns to God. More specifically, the Son of God helps man give and receive through the sacraments. Only the sacraments of Reconciliation and Holy Eucharist will be considered. Additionally, the prayer of the Son teaches man to call God “Our Father” (Cf. Mt 6: 9-14; Lk 11:2-4). Found through these words, eschatological man gains entrance to authentic fatherhood.

"Thus, in the ‘other world,’ the object of ‘vision’ will be that mystery hidden from eternity in the Father, a mystery that has in time revealed in Christ to be fulfilled unceasingly by the work of the Holy Spirit; that mystery will become, of one may express it in this way, the content of eschatological experience and the ‘form’ of human existence as a whole in the dimension of the ‘other world.’" In other words, eschatological man participates in eternal life. The “other world” becomes a sign for historical man, completing the vision of fatherhood. The next section elaborates on this vision by defining eschatological man in the context of the first and the last Adam.

---

268 Any of the seven sacraments could be included since they orient man to God.
269 *MW*, 67:5, p. 393.
I. The First and Last Adam

As has been discovered through previous analysis, death is a consequence of original sin. The eschatological perspective is "united with the reference to the 'beginning' as well as the deep consciousness of man's 'historical' situation." Death and sin pose a problem both for original man (the first Adam) and for future generations (historical man). So, man becomes a slave of corruption (Rom 8:21). The only way to remedy this slavery is through redemption for "creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God...". (Rom 8:19; 1 Jn 3:2). Through the revelation of the Son of God, creation finds his Father. The Son conquers death and furthermore reveals fatherhood to man. Furthermore, fatherhood is more fully realised in the eschaton since the "full and perfect experience of the grace (charis) of God in which man can share through faith during his earthly life and which, by contrast, will not only be revealed to those who will participate in the 'other world' in all its penetrating depth, but will also be experienced in its beatifying reality." The restoration between the first Adam is found in the last Adam, Christ. He affirms the Father as love by conquering death and rising to new life.

II. Eschatological Man

By definition, eschatological man is a "'heavenly man' – the man of the resurrection, whose prototype is the risen Christ – [and] is not so much the antithesis and negation of the 'man of earth' (whose prototype is the 'first Adam') but above all his fulfilment and confirmation." The eschatological reality is that the Son of God "is not [a] God of the dead, but of the living" (Mt 22:32). What was lost in the garden of Eden by the first Adam is restored by the second Adam; the resurrection conquers death and reveals man’s destiny. In Christ, man’s true nature or destiny is revealed. It is not a nature of selfishness; rather, it requires the Cross which is the cost of self-centricity. Through the Cross, the Father’s love is revealed while at the same time man discovers himself as a son.

270 MW, 70:5, p. 404.
271 MW, 67:5, p. 394.
The master-slave relationship felt by original sin ultimately transforms into the father-son paradigm. “The humanity of the ‘first Adam,’ the ‘man of earth,’ carries within itself...a particular potentiality (which is capacity and readiness) for receiving all that the ‘second Adam’ became, the heavenly Man, namely, Christ: what he became in the resurrection.” Through the resurrection, man is redeemed and restored to the Father. Furthermore, in Christ, man can live this eschatology in history.

III. Sacramental Life as a Means of Restoring the Father-Son Relationship

Historical man prefigures the reality of eschatological man. The sacraments are means for historical man to experience heaven on earth. Sacramentum signifies a sacred thing that lies hidden. The mystery of Christ’s life, death and resurrection are re-presented in these signs. St. Augustine further described sacrament as a sign of a sacred thing. Combining the Latin meaning of sacrament and St. Augustine’s definition, it appears that the “sacred thing” must be revealed. Turning to Sacred Scripture, a sign is given to man by God himself (Cf. Rom 4:11). Christ reveals what is hidden, including the mysterious union of being one with the Father (Jn 17:11, 21).

With the Son of God as the exemplary eschatological man, the father-son relationship is not only reconciled for all humans, but experienced by all. He established the sacraments as a way for historical man to know the Father. The parable of the prodigal son (Lk 15:11-32) demonstrates the reconciliation between a human father-son relationship and its theological underpinnings illustrate the love of the divine Father. The human display between the prodigal son and his father show that mercy and forgiveness of sin are characteristic of a loving God.
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A. Reconciliation between the Father and Son

Reconciliation restores man to his Father. To prepare for the coming of the Kingdom, man needs to repent and believe (Mt 1:15). The process is not always easy especially when the relationship has been damaged by sin. The parable of the prodigal son offers insight to returning to the father, even after offending him. The process is one of conversion. At first, the son squandered his inheritance and put distance between himself and the father. For conversion to take place, the son first had to declare himself guilty of his crimes. After seeing his errors, he journeys back to the father. When he returns to his homeland, he exclaims “Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son” (Lk 15:18). The father’s forgiveness brings about a spiritual resurrection (CCC 1468), giving the son his life back.

Contrary to death, eschatological man receives new life through faith in Jesus Christ. The Son of God is the first to rise from the dead (Jn 20:9, 17; Cf. Mt 28:6; Mk 16:6; Lk 24:5). “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous” (Rom 5:19). Man gains new life through the forgiveness of sins. Epitomising eschatological man, Jesus makes all things right by returning to the Father. In addition to the merciful Father, “[i]t is the Son, one in being with the Father, ‘in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of his grace’ (Eph 1:7).”

The man of the resurrection, namely eschatological man, finds his “prototype” in the risen Christ. Historical man bears in himself the image of Adam by his sin; yet, he bears the image of Christ when his sins are forgiven.

The parable of the prodigal son shows that reconciliation is a dual action found between father and son, but is mitigated by the father. The original Greek notes that the father gazed into the distant land and it was the look and memory of the father that moved the son. The son returns to

---

276 MW, 95:6, p. 488.
277 John Paul II calls Jesus a “prototype.” “Proto” refers to something “new.” This is fitting when one understand that Jesus becomes the “new man.” Furthermore, “[t]he humanity of the ‘first Adam,’ the ‘man of earth,’ carries within itself, I would say, a particular potentiality (which is the capacity and readiness) for receiving all that the ‘second Adam’ became, the heavenly Man, namely, Christ: what he became in his resurrection” (MW, 71:3, p. 407).
278 MW, 74:4, pp. 407-408.
the father and the father welcomes his son. Reconciliation restores unity between persons and creates a communion. In previous chapters, this communion was expressed as a communio personarum. The return and welcome between father and son might also be expressed as a perichoresis. There is a constant emptying of self in order to be received or fulfilled by the other.

B. Communion with the Father and Son

As previous chapters have shown, man needs to be selfless if he is to be his true self. In the end times, he achieves perfect unity. John Paul II eloquently describes this beatifying experience as “superior to every experience proper to earthly life.” Communion with God is a reciprocated outpouring of love. In man’s case, “[t]he reciprocal gift of oneself to God...will be the response of God’s gift of himself to man.” On earth, the response of God the Father was to give his only Son for the expiation of sins. Knowing that his hour had come, Christ made a pledge of his love to the Father. The memorial of this sacrifice is celebrated in the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist where “we offer to the Father what he has given us: the gifts of his creation, bread and wine, which by the power of the Holy Spirit and by the words of Christ, have become the body and blood of Christ” (CCC 1357).

The offering of the Son goes to the Father on man’s behalf. “At the heart of the Eucharistic celebration are the bread and wine that, by the words of Christ and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, become Christ’s body and blood” (CCC 1333). In the Mass, Christ is present sacramentally in a preeminent way in the Eucharistic species. The words of consecration during the Eucharistic prayer of the Mass make present the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ. “As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me” (Jn 6:57). Man shares in an eschatological reality. Sacrament becomes “the perfect realisation of the ‘trinitarian

---
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order’ in the created world of persons”. The discovery of Christ and moreover, the vision of love found in heaven lends to man’s rediscovery of himself. In other words, man comes to embody an “eschatological communion” when he receives the body and blood of Christ. The invitation to partake in the feast is a testament to the living God.

In the end, man returns to the beginning. He is created in the likeness and image of divine love, found in the Trinity. On earth, this love finds itself in the person of Christ (although the Holy Spirit comes later as the advocate). The Son radiates the Father, and he desires nothing more than man to rediscover “our Father” than through prayer.

C. Prayer

When asked how to pray, Jesus teaches man to call God “Father” (Mt 5:6). Jesus sets an example of calling “Father” several other times. For instance, he asks the Father that all may be one as he is one with the Father (Jn 17:21-22). As the Second Vatican Council teaches the Son is opening up a “new horizon” that implies a “certain parallel between the union existing among the divine persons and the union of the sons of God in truth and love.” The dimension of this love of God becomes man’s new vision. Not only is he called to imitate it during his earthly life, but he will one day bask in the radiation of fatherhood. These rays embrace the fullness of truth, and the truth is found in the person of Christ.

John Paul reminds man to imitate the love of Christ, and ultimately the love of the Father, is not possible for man alone. Man’s capability to love in this capacity is “only by virtue of a gift received.” Love is a gift. Like man’s creation, he exists out of the love of the Father and only finds himself in going to the Father. The error of the first Adam was rectified in the greatest expression of the Father’s love found in his Son. God sent the Son into the world as a living

---

281 MW, 68:4, p. 395. Furthermore, “[t]his revelation penetrates in some way to the very heart of the reality we experience, and this reality is above all man, his body, the body of ‘historical man’” (MW, 68:5, p. 396).
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testament to his love for man (Jn 3:16). His life, death and resurrection display a gift of self that is beyond all comprehension. And yet, all are called to imitate his way.

Unlike the teachings of the Old Testament, the New Testament sets a new standard of love. The “old” cannot be dismissed or forgotten. Rather, the “new” law is a law of love, going beyond the commandments. Jesus came to fulfil the law, not to abolish it (Mt 5:17). Saint Augustine asks a pertinent question about love and the law, “[d]oes love bring about the keeping of the commandments, or does the keeping of the commandments bring about love?” and he answers: “[b]ut who can doubt that love comes first? For the one who does not love has no reason for keeping the commandments.”285 Paradoxically, eschatological man lives out the law of love. After all, the law of love resides in man’s heart. “Blessed are the pure of heart for they shall see God” (Mt 5:8). Prayer, the sacraments of Reconciliation and Holy Communion direct man’s heart to love on earth and forever in heaven.

IV. Final Conclusions about Fatherhood

The final conclusion then is that an adequate understanding of human fatherhood corresponds to an adequate understanding of divine fatherhood which can only be realised through the Person Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father. Three conclusions arise out of this analysis: 1) fathers are relational beings; 2) fathers are called to be self-gift in a free, total, disinterested love; and 3) sons find their fulfilment in the Father. These points will be summarized by reviewing previous themes and chapters.

A. Fathers are Relational Beings

The first conclusion argued that fathers are relational beings. Reality stands outside of time which means that it is found in creation, redemption and the eschaton; and more properly expressed in original man, historical man and eschatological man. When defining fatherhood in the first

285 Augustine. In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus, 82, 3: CCL 36, 533.
chapter, relationality required personhood. And personhood is shared by human and divine fatherhood. Chapter Two developed the notion of relationship by looking at the difference and similitude found in the divine persons. Since man is created *imago Dei*, he too lives in similitude and difference. Through the two creation accounts, the reflections revealed certain truths about fatherhood for original man. Original unity and original solitude helped original man determine the difference and similitude of persons. Original man encapsulates man’s first identity which is one in relation.

As a relational being, the qualities of fatherhood carry on for historical man despite his fallen nature. The virtue of obedience was one way for him to form this communion of persons, best expressed in the Father and Son of the Triune God. Another way to be a *communio personarum* is through sacramental life. Chapter Four showed that the sacraments restore a fractured relationship, enabling man to stay in right relationship with an ‘other.’

**B. Fathers are Called to be Self-Gift**

The second conclusion argued that fathers are called to be self-gift. A father expresses this in a free and total disinterested love. Love is put in motion and from it springs forth life. The Father gifts the world with his Son, who expresses the transcendent love of God. Through the Son, man finds the means to live out an adequate fatherhood.

John Paul II raised the question about what it means to be fully human (adequate anthropology) and from this develops an adequate fatherhood. The first two chapters showed man how to live out his fatherhood in three ways. Encompassing original man and historical man, some overlap does exist in these qualities. Since historical man deals with sin, he is capable of living human fatherhood. The three fruits of authentic fatherhood then consist in protecting, providing and leading. Using these as a basic formula, John Paul supplies an indirect explanation of how man is to live his vocation and more importantly how to understand fatherhood despite the obstacles.
1. Original Obstacles to Self-Gift

Of course, by the third chapter it becomes apparent that man struggles to understand fatherhood due to original sin. Receiving a forewarning of death, original man attempted “patricide.” Doubting his existence, man experiences unrest. The inner source of division for man began with “[h]is history of sin... when he no longer acknowledges the Lord as his Creator and himself wishes to be the one who determines, with complete independence, what is good and what is evil.”286 This interpretation provides the basic premise for rejecting fatherhood. The defining moment for original man took place at the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

The third chapter shows a conflict that surrounds man’s authentic autonomy. Although the virtue of obedience directs man’s autonomous self, the tragedy of the fall is that man did not adhere to God’s voice. His obedience shifted to disobedience, his humility to pride and his love to lust. Furthermore, the father-son dynamic found between God and man changes. Man sees it as a master-slave relationship and God is the master. Man’s acceptance of the Father turns into man’s rejection of the Father.

Deceived by a counterfeit, man tries to hide. He not only experiences shame but also blame. The consequences of the fall include suffering and death. However, the integrated view of being in relationship was harmed so that historical man struggles to embrace fatherhood in both the divine and human sense. The reality of the situation is that historical man distrusts the gift of the Father. Out of this emerges a life without God.

2. Modern Obstacles to Self-Gift

The argument made was that a false autonomy produces or at the very least contributes to atheism. Superficially living a false autonomy may seem attractive; after all, historical man may be tempted to gratify himself by whatever means suit him. In other words, he becomes self-centred. This sort of living is contrary to the description of authentic fatherhood mentioned in Chapter Two.
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The definition of fatherhood implied that authentic fatherhood is only realised in self-gift. When historical man refuses to be a gift, he rejects fatherhood both in the human and divine sense of the word. He rejects his own fatherhood because he does not understand himself, and he does not understand himself because he does not understand the divine Father.

Living without God is certainly not easy. In Chapter Three there was a short commentary on goodness. For man to govern himself or to be self-sufficient, it requires obedience. John Paul reminds his audience that the moral good is fulfils man’s destiny. Noting this, the theological significance of fatherhood becomes increasingly more important. A life without God brings unhappiness. This is apparent not only for historical man but also for original man when he first sinned. Original man died in a certain sense because he cut off the relationship that he had with the God of life. Without God, man attempts to “kill” God. Of course, this should not be taken to the extreme (as Nietzsche and Freud tried to establish in their philosophical and psychological evaluations of God). Although the full influences of Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud are beyond the scope of this analysis, they illustrate a poor understanding of divine fatherhood. The premise that a misunderstanding of human fatherhood lends to a misunderstanding of divine fatherhood was strengthened by viewing weak father-son relationships, supporting atheistic ideologies. Contemporary philosophies, such as Nietzsche and Freud, sought to abolish or live without God the Father. Is it far off the mark to think that the abolition of God leads to the abolition of man?

C. Sons Find Their Fulfilment in the Father

Because the dynamic of man’s relationships have changed, it provides an explanation of how a human father-son relationship could be affected. The rejection of divine fatherhood corresponds to a misunderstanding of authentic fatherhood. If he does not understand his first Father, human fatherhood may be difficult to understand. For instance, a son who does not
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understand his human father may struggle to understand his divine Father. He may associate the weaknesses found in human fathers to that of God the Father. Either way, it is truly a misunderstanding of authentic fatherhood. The findings established in Chapter Three suggest that a rejection of human fatherhood corresponds to a rejection of divine fatherhood.

The purpose of this study is clear: Jesus Christ, the Son of God reveals the Father as the Father reveals the Son, and an adequate fatherhood can only be understood in the light of this truth. This brings us to a third conclusion; sons find fulfilment in the Father. From this, we can see that man finds himself through relationship and self-gift. He needs to return to the Father in order to be in relationship but also so that he may give himself totally, freely and disinterestedly. The progression of man relies not on his own strength but on the one who was sent to glorify the Father; and from the Son, man is revealed to himself. By its design, a son implies a father. A son explicitly comes out of the love of a father. Thus, the Son of God points back to the Father.

Despite the rejection of fatherhood found in original sin and the continuing cycle of sin that seeks to abolish fatherhood, the first chapter shows it is possible for historical man to be a father. The second chapter affirms this by reminding man is created in God’s image. Knowledge identifies the love of the Father and also acknowledges the ‘other’ fulfils this image.

The abolishment of fatherhood may exist in certain ideologies. Although analysis addressed false autonomy and atheism, further research needs to continue on the topics of socialism, communism, materialism, and feminism to name a few. Hopefully, contributions about these topics will further demonstrate the need for strong fathers that look to God the Father.

Regardless of various modern and post-modern ideologies, man can be reoriented, conquering these modern errors when he is rightly ordered to the one who is good. Goodness is found in creation and man’s life is a gift of this goodness. In freedom and truth, goodness is most fully understood by looking at the eschaton. By seeking the perfect paternity of the Father, man
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recognises himself as “God’s obedient son.” He receives new life and rises from the dead. Lead by the Son of God, man returns to the Father. The sacraments are signs of this union. In this way, every son can become a father. It takes selflessness and love to radiate fatherhood.

A final reflection about fatherhood is that man (male) learns how to be a father from his own father. In a recent lecture given by George Weigel, he commented that Karol Wojtyla was very close to his father. His strong conviction to faith and to the Father in heaven served him well. One may even say that this helped him know how to be a “Holy Father.” Human fathers “relive and reveal on earth the very fatherhood of God”.

---

290 George Weigel, biographer and friend of John Paul II, has written extensively about this man. He has over twenty books. He spoke about John Paul II at the Galtier Society Gala, St. Paul, 26 April 2008.
291 FC, 1.


Augustine.
_____. In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus. Turnhotli: Typographi Brepols, 1954.


“Woman’s Dignity” in Origins 9, no. 2, 31 May 1979, pp. 31-32.


_____. *Dei Verbum,* 1965.

_____. *Dignitatis Humanae,* 1965.

_____. *Gaudium et Spes,* 1965.

_____. *Lumen Gentium,* 1964.


