

## XIII (b). SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE

THESIS: (a) parte biblica: sinottici; "clausole matteane"; 1 Cor. 7; Ef. 5: 21-33, esp. il grande mistero (5:32); (b) parte sistematica: sacramentalità; unità e indissolubilità; rapporto tra battesimo, fede e sacramento del matrimonio.

### I. The Sacramentality of Marriage

#### A. Scriptural Tradition.

##### 1. The prophets: Marriage - a secular reality reflecting divine love

a. **The marriage of Hosea and Gomer**; Gomer's marital infidelity (Baal prostitution) symbolizes Israel's infidelity to the covenant. God calls Hosea to take Gomer back symbolizing the love-intention of Yahweh to heal Israel of its defections and to unite Himself to her in a bond that will last forever. However, it is important to see that Hosea's marriage was **not** just a parable for God; reciprocally, God's love union with Israel tells us **something about the sacredness of marriage itself.**

b. **Jeremiah** likewise uses the **image of the broken marriage** covenant to express Israel's defection from Yahweh (cf. Jer 3)

c. **Deutero-Isaiah** -- here, the stress is laid not so much upon Israel's defection but the power of God **the creator who is the marriage partner** -- he can renew and strengthen the marriage that until now has been weakened by defection.

d. **Ezekiel 23** offers **marriage as a parable of Israel's history**: Yahweh's marriage with the two sisters Oholah and Oholibah symbolized God's relationship with the kingdom of the North and the Kingdom of the South. At the end of this parable, there is an admonition given to all men and women as how to live their lives in marriage. Thus, once again we see that the relationship between human marriage and divine covenant is one of **reciprocal illumination**:

**Revealing his covenant through the medium of human marriage, God simultaneously revealed to us a deeper meaning to marriage.**

##### 2. Marriage is a sacrament of Christ's love for the Church:

a. **Ephesians 5:21-33**: "Be subordinate to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives should be subordinate to their husbands as to the Lord. For the husband is head of his wife just as Christ is head of His Church, he himself the savior of the Body. As the church is subordinate to Christ, so wives should be subordinate to their husbands in everything. Husbands love your wives even as Christ loved the Church and handed himself over for her to sanctify her, cleansing her by the bath of water with the word, that he might present to himself the church in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish. So also husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. For no one hates his own flesh but rather nourishes and cherishes it, even as Christ does the Church, because we are members of His Body. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. This is a **mystery**, but **I speak in reference to Christ and his Church.**"

1. **Mysterion**: Marriage is a mystery, a religious symbol, figurative sign, typos. The union of man and wife is the typos of the relationship of Christ and His Church. The mystery is a great mystery because it refers to the very intimacy of Christ to his own body. **Mystery**= God's salvific will realized in Christ and His relationship with the Church.

**a. Marriage:** is a real image of this mystery of salvation on two levels:

**1. Essence:** rapport of husband and wife is a real participation in the relationship of Christ and the Church.

**2. Comportment:** must reflect the comportment between Christ and the Church.

**2. What is the difference between marriage as a mysterion in the OT and marriage as a mysterion of Christ and his Church?**

**a. In the OT** the sacred signs were only prophetic and, consequently **empty** of what they signified. They expressed something that they were incapable of producing in and of themselves. For example, the law, symbolic of the covenant, was impotent to give the righteousness necessary in the covenant relationship.

**b. In the N T**, the sacred signs are **commemorative** and **efficacious** in themselves -- they are able to create the effect that they signify. It follows then that matrimony, figurative sign of the union of Christ and his Church, contains the grace that it signifies. Thus, in the New Testament, marriage becomes the reproduction and the actualization of the union, definitively completed in the union of Christ and his Church.

**(1) It is by virtue of the union of Christ and his Church that marriage can effect the union it symbolizes.** The union of Christ and his Church is, in some respects, the *res et sacramentum* that effects the grace of union between husband and wife. (Note: JP II states that the *res et sacramentum* is the “Christian Bond” -- cf. *Familiaris Consortio*, n 13). **The grace of marriage is the grace of Christ and his Church.**

**(2) The mutual circle of illumination:** What is hinted at in the OT (marriage is a parable of God’s relationship to Israel and that relationship sheds light on the meaning of marriage) is made effective and real in the NT: The vows of marriage reflect the union of Christ and his Church; the union of Christ and his Church, in turn, make effective what is signified in the vows .

**3. Paul’s reference to Genesis:** What God wanted from the beginning of time for every marriage, his intentionality that two become one flesh, becomes an effectively saving reality because it is taken into the reality of Christ’s union with the Church. Hebrews 10:1 distinguishes between **“shadow” and “image”**. This is a good illustration of the difference between marriage as a sign in the OT, a prophetic shadow of God’s relationship with his people, and the NT reality of marriage as *eikon*, not just a functional representation, an empty parable, but a powerful manifestation, an image that contains the saving reality within it.

**4. Faith:** The sign conveys its power in faith. All marriage is called to a higher plane of representing Christ’s union with his Church; however, Christian marriage is sacramental because the partners enter into that union under the **intention** of signifying that union of Christ and His Church. Every marriage contracted by believers in faith, is a concrete real actuation of the sublime union that has already occurred. In entering that union in faith, they receive the grace of the union signified - the plenitude of grace that results from Christ’s intimacy with His bride, the Church.

**B. Trent and the Sacramentality of Marriage:**

**1. Protestant reformers** denied the sacramental nature of marriage. It did not fulfill the “reformed” definition of a sacrament: it doesn’t have the promise of grace nor does is it a sign instituted by God. Luther claims that nowhere in Scripture is it found that he who takes a wife

receives God's grace. Matrimony is a purely natural institution (sphere of creation) and had a holiness as created by God -- but, as such, it was not taken into the order of grace. They also rejected the Church's juridical power in matrimonial matters. In short, marriage is not a sacrament because it is not authorized in the SS and it existed before Christ.

## 2. Questions raised in the Middle Ages:

### a. How is marriage an efficacious sign?

1. Sign - no problem

2. Efficacious:

a. remedy to concupiscence

b. Grace to help to do the good (St. Thomas) Hugh of St. Victor was ahead of his time insofar as he emphasized the value of conjugal love and spoke of the two ends and two consents of marriage (natural consent and consent to the sexual act).

## 3. Trent's response: 24th session (1563):

a. "Christ Himself, who instituted the holy sacraments and brought them to perfection, merited for us by His passion the grace which perfects that natural love, confirms the indissoluble union and sanctifies the spouses. St. Paul suggests this when he says, 'Husbands love your wives as Christ loved the Church and gave Himself up for her.' (Eph 5:25), adding immediately, 'This is a great **mystery**, I mean in reference to Christ and the Church.' (Eph 5:32)"(DS 1799)

1. **The specific sacramental grace of marriage** is not merely **medicinal** but **elevating** (perfecting natural love) and **sanctifying** (sanctifies the partners).

2. **St. Paul suggests or insinuates** (innuit) the sacramentality of Christian marriage. It is not explicit but virtually present in the text.

b. "If anyone says that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the Law of the Gospel, instituted by Christ the Lord, but that it was devised in the Church by men and does not confer grace, anathema sit. " (DS 1801)

4. **Lumen Gentium, 11** follows the same teaching: "Christian spouses, in virtue of the sacrament of matrimony, signify and partake of the **mystery** of that unity and fruitful love which exists between Christ and his Church ( cf . Eph 5: 3 2 ). The spouses thereby help each other to attain to holiness in their married life and by the rearing and education of their children. And so, in their state and way of life, they have their own special gift among the people of God (cf . I Cor 7: 7 ) [N . B. -- there is no reference to the Tridentine declaration that celibacy and chastity constitute a better state in life. ]

## 5. Theology of Marriage (Millas):

**A. Charism:** stable; linked with a concrete mission that implies a consecration

**B. Sanctifying Grace:** given to live the charism:

1. sanation level

2. personal level: development of baptismal union

3. conjugal love: union of Christ and the Church

**C . The Sacrament of Marriage -- Instituted by Christ:**

**1. Institution at Calvary:**

Trent formally declares that the sacrament of matrimony was instituted by Christ, but it doesn't indicate the moment of institution. Perhaps we can say that Christ elevated marriage to a sacrament at the moment of his sacrificial death. Calvary is the

establishment of the new covenant with its commemorative and efficacious signs. Thus, Paul can refer to the dignity and value of marriage as that mystery which is founded upon, participates in and reflects the sacrificial love of Christ for his Church.

**2. The ecclesiological argument:** (In the footsteps of Fathers such as Augustine and John Chrysostom).

**a. Lumen Gentium, 11:** “For from the wedlock of Christians there comes the family, in which new citizens of human society are born. By the grace of the Holy Spirit received in baptism, these are made children of God, thus perpetuating the People of God through the centuries. **The family is, so to speak, the domestic Church.** “Not only is the family a societal cell, it is an **ecclesial cell** that builds up the People of God Marriage makes the Church’s perpetuity through the centuries possible, because there, in the family, future baptized children of God are born, grow and are educated in the faith.

**b. Paul VI** applies the term “domestic Church” to the Christian couple itself as an intimate, strong, rich community with a supernatural character coming from God’s heart. (cf . Discourse to Equipes Notre Dame, #8)

**c. Gaudium et Spes, 48,** marriage is described as a “partnership of life and love.”

**d. Lumen Gentium, 9,** the Church is said to be “established by Christ as a community of life and love and truth.”

**Conclusion:** In this comparison between the family and the Church, we are **not** merely speaking of a purely metaphorical analogy. **The married couple is truly a living image that not only represents the Church but makes the Church present.** The couple is not a part of the Church -- it is the place where the Church is expressed, according to its proper and specific mode (albeit limited). **The couple’s relationship to the Church is similar to the relationship of the local Church to the universal Church.** The local Church is the Church of Christ, particularized and localized in a concrete situation. The married couple is the first and most fundamental expression of the local Church, which it realizes and makes present. Thus, the union of this “local Church” participates in the grace that constitutes the whole Church. The Church is the place where salvation and Christ’s grace is communicated -- marriage, as the particularization of the Church, likewise communicates a saving grace. It therefore is founded upon the primordial sacrament who is Christ.

## **II. The Indissolubility and Unity of Marriage:**

### **A. Scriptural Witness to the indissolubility of marriage.**

#### **1. The teaching of Jesus:**

##### **a. The discussion on divorce (Mt. 19:3-9; Mk 10:2-12):**

The Pharisees raise the question concerning the permissibility of divorce “for any reason whatever.” Behind the question is the standing controversy between the two rabbinical schools of Hillel (more lenient) and Shamai (only in cases of adultery on the part of the wife). Jesus does not engage the discussion on the level of the Law of Moses, but goes to the original intention of God reflected in Genesis. The Pharisees understand the exceptionless norm that Jesus lays down -- their comprehension reflected in the following question concerning Moses’ permission for divorce. Jesus’ response that the concession was made in light of the hardness of heart of the people of Israel. Jesus adds, “At the beginning, it was not that way at all.” Then, in Matthew’s gospel, v. 9: “I now say to you, whoever divorces wife, *me epi porneia*,

and marries another, commits adultery, and the man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.”

**b. Mt 5:31-32:** The short pericope in the sermon of the Mount that contrasts the law of Moses and the new law. “Now what I say to you is: Everyone who divorces his wife, **parektos logou porneias** forces her to commit adultery. The man who marries a divorced woman likewise commits adultery.”

**c. Luke 16:18** -- “Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery. The man who marries a woman divorced from her husband likewise commits adultery.” Again, marriage is indissoluble.

## 2. Question of porneia:

**a. Adultery and then divorce? No: Jesus is transcending Shammai school.** Originally it meant fornication and latter came to mean adultery. Many of the Greeks, most Protestants and some Catholics interpret porneia in this sense. In the case of one’s wife committing adultery, divorce and remarriage is permitted. But, this interpretation of the text makes no sense in the context of the debate between the two Rabbinical schools. Jesus is clearly transcending all of the current schools, one of which (Shamai) would have allowed for divorce and remarriage in the case of the wife’s adultery. Similarly, in Matthew 5, Jesus is giving a law that goes beyond the prescriptions of the old. He certainly wouldn’t be calling for a perfecting of the law if he allowed for divorce in the cases of adultery.

**b. The classical solution (Jerome, Shepherd of Hermas, Thomas Aquinas); porneia does mean adultery -- the exception allows only for a separation of board, not for remarriage.** Some have continued to say that the following pericope, concerning those who remain chaste for the sake of the Kingdom, refer to those men who, having divorced their wives in the case of adultery, no longer remarry for the sake of the Kingdom. However, the problem is that the more precise term used for adultery in biblical greek is **moicheia**.

**c. Best: It is a translation of the Hebrew zenuth, that is, marriage within the forbidden degrees of kinship** (cf. **Leviticus 18:6-18**); Such a marriage really isn’t a marriage - it is null and void because it has contravened the matrimonial prohibitions established by Law in the first place. St. Paul calls the marriage of a person’s stepmother porneia (I Cor 5:1). Also, cf. the letter of James in Acts 15 which uses the term porneia. The irregular unions in opposition to Levitic prohibitions would seem to be the proper meaning here that would coincide with the context of the letter which, while not imposing the yoke of the Jewish law, asked the Gentiles to refrain from certain activities that would deeply disturb the consciences of Jewish Christians.

**d. Orthodox position:** a real exception

## 3. Indissolubility of marriage in Paul: I Cor 7:10-16

**a. Repetition of the dominical prohibition: verse 10:** “To the married, however, I give this instruction (not I, but the Lord): a wife should not *separate* from her husband, and if she does separate, she must either remain single or become reconciled to her husband -- and a husband should not *divorce* his wife.”

1. The words “separate” and “divorce” are in fact the same reality. Paul reflects the fact that in Jewish law, only a husband could technically “divorce” his wife; wives could only “separate”, that is, depart from their husbands.

2. In the case of two Christians, it is clear that divorce without remarriage was accepted in the apostolic community as the will of the Lord.

3. Four points:

- a. refutation of deprecation of the body
- b. marriage = remedy against impurity
- c. positive value overall to mixed marriages
- d. positive value to celibacy

**b. The “Pauline privilege”:** The special case of a Christian and a non-Christian marriage (verses 12-16): “To the rest I say (not the Lord): if any brother has a wife who is an unbeliever, and she is willing to go on living with him, he should not divorce her; and if any husband has a wife who is an unbeliever, and he is willing to go on living with her, she should not divorce her husband. For the unbelieving husband is made holy through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is made holy through the brother. *Otherwise your children would be unclean, whereas in fact they are holy. If the unbeliever separates, however, let him separate.* The brother or sister is not bound in such cases; God has called you to peace. For how do you know, wife, whether you will save your husband; or how will you know, husband, whether you will save your wife?”

**a. Is Paul referring to separation without remarriage? No.** In making this a separate issue from the case in verses 10 and 11 where remarriage is strictly prohibited, we can safely translate “is not bound” to mean is not bound to remain unmarried.

**b. Paul clearly states that, in order for this “privilege” to be invoked, the initiative for divorce must arise on the part of the nonbeliever.** The believer always remains bound to the bond of marriage.

**c. Is Paul weakening the Lord’s prohibition? No--** if anything, he is giving the Lord’s command a radical interpretation. **The privilege applies only to the non-baptized, which means that the basis for the indissolubility of marriage is Christian baptism.** In baptism, a person is incorporated into Christ in radical way; through that union with Christ, even the secular activity of marriage takes on a new meaning. For those who are one with Christ and His Church, the union of “one flesh” must reflect what they believe to be the fundamental basis of all union and communion -- union of Christ and His Church. Jesus’ logion about “one flesh” on which the indissolubility of marriage is based, is essentially connected with the communion of Christ and his Church.

**d. Schillebeeckx finds in these verses the strongest biblical basis for the sacramentality of marriage.** In Jewish custom, a mixed marriage (or any substantial contact with a Gentile) rendered the Jewish person unclean. In the case of a Christian who is married to an unbeliever, the opposite effect occurs -- there is the possibility that the unbeliever may be sanctified through the grace of the union, that is, through the ministrations of the Christian partner. A certain holiness, furthermore, is imparted to the children. [If this is true, one wonders why the marriage of a Christian and non-Christian is considered not to be a sacrament. If the unbelieving partner is made holy through the spouse, and, furthermore, the marriage is not opposed by the unbeliever, that is, they implicitly want the grace of the union, why can’t such unions be called sacramental?]

**B. Indissolubility in the Tradition:**

**1. Patristic Era:**

**a. St. Augustine:** wrote a text upon marriage and identified the **three ends of marriage** as :

**1. Proles:** generation of children

**2. Faith:** mutual fidelity of couple

**3. Sacrament:** symbol of union of Christ and the Church (indissolubility)

**b. Exceptions in the Latin West:** At the end of the 9th century, there was the conception of the indissolubility of marriage. Prior, there were some patristic texts that allowed for exceptions: Ambrosiaster, Penitential of Teodor, etc. admit the possibility of new marriages in the case of adultery of the woman.

**c. In this millennium,** the West admits of no possibility of divorce and remarriage. In the East, the legislation of Justinian was the basis of oikonomia.

**2. The Protestant reformers** denied the indissolubility of marriage and admitted the full legitimacy of divorce. They found proofs from scripture for cases where the bond could be broken. There was disagreement, however, concerning the limits wherein divorce was permitted: adultery, malicious desertion, denial of conjugal debt, heresy, maltreatment, incompatibility.

**a. Luther** maintained that scripture authorizes divorce: in the case of adultery (Mt. 5:32; 19:9) and in the case of desertion (I Cor 7:15) -- in the latter case, Luther claims that Paul's "privilege" doesn't merely apply to the unbelieving spouse leaving but to the spouse who does not fulfill the conjugal debt.

**b. Calvin** and his followers were more rigorous; still they allowed for divorce in the case of adultery or abandonment. But, nonetheless, a strong presumption in favor of marriage existed.

### **3. Trent's response in the 24th session:**

**a.** "If anyone says that the marriage bond can be dissolved because of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or because of the willful desertion of one of the spouses, anathema sit. (Canon 5 -- DS 1805)

**b.** "If anyone says that the Church is in error for having taught and for still teaching that in accordance with the evangelical and apostolic doctrine (cf. Mk 10; I Cor 7), the marriage bond cannot be dissolved because of adultery on the part of one of the spouses, and that neither of the two, not even the innocent one who has given no cause for infidelity, can contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other; and that the husband who dismisses an adulterous wife and marries again and the wife who dismisses an adulterous husband and marries again are both guilty of adultery, anathema sit."

**1. This canon deals with adultery as the motive for divorce.** Since the Oriental Church allowed for divorce and remarriage in the case of adultery, the canon is carefully worded so as to demand acceptance of the Latin doctrine without expressly condemning the Oriental standpoint. The Orientals never said that the Church erred in her teaching concerning indissolubility; therefore, they do not technically come under the anathema. The Protestants, however, did say that the Church was in error in this teaching. They, and not the Greeks, are the ones directly condemned. Regardless, this canon brought about another obstacle in the union of Roman and Greek Churches.

**2. Is this merely stating an ecclesiastical and disciplinary law for the West and not a dogma of faith. No!** Trent is intending to make a doctrinal declaration, namely in

its appeal to I Cor 7 and Mk 10, and stating that the teaching is in accordance with the “evangelical and apostolic doctrine.”

**4. Tametsi: imposed the canonical form of marriage: It was against clandestine marriages. It highlights the tension between personal actions and necessity to celebrate it in a public way (covenant).**

**C. The Unity of Marriage: The case of Monogamy.**

**1. Position of the Reformers:** Some protestant reformers maintained the legitimacy of polygamy, since it is licit in the Old Testament. (Calvin, by the way, never allowed polygamy)

a. In 1531, Melancton counselled Henry VIII to resolve his family difficulties by taking on another wife. He didn’t want to sanction polygamy, but in this case, for the sake of the kingdom, divine law didn’t prohibit it.

b. In 1539, Luther, Melancton and Bucero met in consultation with other theologians and authorized Philip von Hessen to take a second wife. They justified this, writing “because that which is permitted in respect to marriage in the Law of Moses, isn’t prohibited by the gospel, which doesn’t change the order of profane life, only “that of justice and eternal life.”

**2. Response of Trent:** “If anyone says that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time and that this is not forbidden by any divine law (Mt 19:9), anathema sit. (Canon 2).

**3. The unity of marriage is presupposed in the NT:** Jesus’ response to the Pharisees about indissolubility of the conjugal union implicitly affirms the monogamous character of matrimony. According to the Creator’s original design, He made them male and female so that the two might become one flesh. Thus, when Jesus is condemning divorce, he is condemning polygamy: “He who divorces his wife... and marries another commits adultery” (Mt 19:9). To this, Mark adds “Against her”. In other words, the adultery is not committed against the woman he takes but against the original wife to whom he is still married; she and she alone is the true spouse. Therefore, not only is **successive polygamy** condemned (divorcing one wife and marrying another) but one can conclude that **simultaneous polygamy** is also condemned.

4. Paul, in his arguments for the indissolubility of marriage, presupposes monogamy as the divine law.

## **II. Faith, Baptism and Marriage**

**Key Premise:** Marriage between two baptized is a sacrament. There is no true marriage between baptized that is not a sacrament.

**Problem:** “Baptized Non-believers.”

**Nine Essential Points:**

1. Unity of Contract and sacrament in marriage reflects the more fundamental unity between nature and grace.

2. Distinction between Validity and fruit: (opus operantum vs. opere operantis)

a. opus operantum is the reason for the existence of operantis.

b. In marriage we must distinguish between the objective reality and the fruit of the grace that results from the good disposition of the subjects (operantis).

3. Baptism must be seen as social foundation of the faith of the Church.

4. The intention of the recipients of marriage:

a. Sufficient intention: to intend to do what Christians do when they marry.

b. To avoid risk of “automatic sacrament”, we must see unity of all elements in marriage (faith, baptism, intention, etc.).

c. Intention and faith: Intention is born out of faith. There must be at least a “trace” of faith for the valid reception of marriage because the alternative is a total lack of sacramental intention.

5. Pastoral difficulties cannot force a change in the dogmatic teachings of the Church. To do so is to water down the reality of baptism.

6. A renewal of baptism is a worthwhile goal. We must see baptism as an ontological insertion into the Body of Christ. Baptism must be seen as a union between baptism, faith and the Church.

7. Marriage is seen in relation to baptism as a further realization of belonging in the Church that is begun with baptism - a deepening of the union between persons and these with the Church.

8. Implications of Vatican II’s teaching of the diverse levels of membership in the Church for the sacrament of marriage:

a. Rahner: event of grace that is marriage becomes a sacramental event of grace that it is *opus operantum* at the moment when it is celebrated in the Church between two baptized persons. He holds that the distinction between a sacramental and non-sacramental marriage is not the same as a sacrament and a totally profane act.

b. Marriage between non-Catholics? To the extent that their Christian Churches and ecclesial communities are themselves in gradations of membership with the Church of Christ, the question of these marriages being sacraments is a legitimate open question.

9. There is an analogy between Marriage and the other sacraments: ecclesial context.

a. Couple does not confer between themselves the sacrament so much as it is a sanctifying action of Christ. It is not private. To the extent that only the baptized belong to Christ, under the veil of the sacrament, in a really efficacious manner, they alone receive the sacrament of Marriage. In the faith in Jesus is found the foundation of their community of conjugal love that admits of no degrees of sacramentality.

## **B. Celibacy and Marriage: Go together**

**Celibacy:** privileged Christian testimony of “not yet” of eschatology- ultimate value

**Marriage:** privileged testimony of “already” of eschatological dimension - reality of creation and sacramental sign of salvation

## **III. The Sacrament of Marriage as an Image of the Union of Christ and the Church (M. Hunt)**

### **I. “. . . the marriage of Christian man and woman is a sign of the marriage between Christ and the Church. . .” (Nuptial Blessing, *Wedding Mass B*)**

#### **A. Biblical Tradition**

##### **1. Ephesians 5: 21 - 6:9**

- a. adaptation of the ‘household code’ from the Greco-Roman culture
- b. basis for adaptation is the relationship of Christ and the Church
- c. Baptismal cleansing
- d. Genesis 2:24

- i. proskollhqvsetai (join) - the intimate self-communication of the spouses to each other
    - e. musthvrion (mystery) - the teaching here is a divine revelation
  - 3. Revelation 21: 1-4
    - a. Nuptial imagery as a symbol of the union of the faithful with the Lord.
  - 4. Matthew 5: 27-32 and 19: 1-12
    - a. emphasis on the permanency of the union
    - b. “a vision of marriage as a covenant of personal love between spouses which reflects the covenant relationship of God and his people.” (Viviano, 643)
- B. Selections from the Patristic Tradition
  - 1. John Chrysostom - “Homily 20 on the *Epistle to the Ephesians*”
    - a. unity of Christ and the Church is based upon the marriage imagery of Eph. 5:32.
  - 2. Augustine - *The Good of Marriage*
    - a. treatment of the ‘goods of Marriage’
    - b. stress on the indissolubility of Marriage
- C. Magisterial Teaching
  - 1. Council of Florence (1439)
    - a. explicit reference is made to sacramentality of Marriage flowing from “the apostle’s” teaching that marriage is a sign of the union between Christ and the Church.
  - 2. Council of Trent (Session 24, 1563)
    - a. *Doctrina de sacramento matrimonii*
      - i. the union of Christ and the Church is understood as the basis for the “unbreakable unity and sanctity of the spouses.”
  - 3. Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*
    - a. treatment of the indissolubility of marriage is based upon the Pauline text, *Ephesians* 5:32.
  - 4. Vatican II
    - a. *Lumen Gentium* (11)
      - i. by virtue of the union of Christ and the Church, married couples help each other towards holiness in their lives.
    - b. *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (11)
      - i. situation of marriage as sacrament *in* Christ and *in* the Church
    - c. *Gaudium et Spes* (47)
      - i. the image of Christ and the Church for marriage is the basis for the Christian family to reveal the active presence of the Savior to the world.

## II. Conclusion

Agapic Love

Seen in the context of the love of Christ for the Church, Marriage as sacrament focuses on agapic love that “reconstitutes, recreates, reconciles and unifies.” (Miletic, 117)

### III. Bibliography

#### A. Sources

Augustine. *The Good of Marriage*. In Saint Augustine. *Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects, Volume 27*. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1955.

*Bull of Union with the Armenians*. Council of Florence. Text and translation in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume II* edited by Norman P. Tanner, SJ. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1990.

*Doctrina de sacramento matrimonii, Lumen Gentium, Apostolicam Actuositatem, Gaudium et Spes*. Text and translation in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume II*, edited by Norman P. Tanner, SJ. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1990.

John Chrysostom. *Homily 20 on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Revised translation and notes by Gross Alexander, DD. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Father of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.

*The Roman Missal, The Sacramentary*. English translation prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy. New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1985.

*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari from Henry Denzinger *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Powers Lakes, ND: Marian House, 1957 by B. Herder Book Co.

#### B. Literature

Collins, Adela Yarbo. “The Apocalypse (Revelation).” Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Kobelski, Paul J. “The Letter to the Ephesians.” Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Miletic, Stephen Francis. *Analecta Biblica: One Flesh: Ephesians 5:22-24, 5:31, Marriage and the New Creation*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1988.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature*. Westminster MD: Christian Classics, 1990.

Viviano, Benedict T., OP. "The Gospel According to Matthew." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.