

Spring 1999

Christian Family As Church? Inquiry, Analysis, and Pastoral Implications

Ennio Pasquale Mastroianni

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Mastroianni, E. (1999). Christian Family As Church? Inquiry, Analysis, and Pastoral Implications (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/888>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS CHURCH?:
INQUIRY, ANALYSIS, AND PASTORAL IMPLICATIONS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
ENNIO PASQUALE MASTROIANNI

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
February 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
PURPOSE OF THESIS.....	4
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM DOMESTIC CHURCH.....	5
METHOD AND OVERVIEW.....	5
CHAPTER I. AN ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC CHURCH IN <u>LUMEN GENTIUM</u> , ARTICLE 11	10
PART ONE: PARTIAL EXEGESIS OF <u>LUMEN GENTIUM</u> 11	10
IMMEDIATE CONTEXT	10
ARTICLE 11	12
THE MATRIMONIAL UNIT	13
PART TWO: DEVELOPMENT OF THE MATRIMONIAL UNIT.....	20
SESSION ONE.....	21
SESSION TWO.....	28
SESSIONS THREE AND FOUR.....	41
CONCLUSIONS.....	50
CHAPTER II. EPHESIANS 5:21-33 AND ITS USE IN HISTORY	54
PART ONE: THE NEW TESTAMENT.....	55
FOUNDATIONAL STATEMENTS.....	56
<i>Ephesians 5:31</i>	56
<i>Ephesians 5:32</i>	57
<i>General Comments</i>	58
<i>Concluding Remarks</i>	58
BRIEF COMMENTARY OF VERSES 31-32	59
<i>Textual Commentary</i>	59
<i>Commentary of Verse 31</i>	60
<i>Commentary of Verse 32</i>	64
MOVEMENT OF THOUGHT IN EPHESIANS 5:21-33.....	68
THEOLOGICAL SPECULATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WHOLE	72
PART TWO: SELECT HISTORICAL SURVEY	77
PATRISTIC PERIOD.....	78
SCHOLASTIC PERIOD TO 1962	82
CHAPTER III. AN INQUIRY INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOTION OF CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS DOMESTIC CHURCH	90
CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS AN ECCLESIAL REALITY ON MISSION	91
<i>Vocation</i>	97
<i>Sacrament</i>	101
<i>Symbolic Quality</i>	103
<i>One Interlocking Reality</i>	105
<i>An Ordered Community</i>	107
<i>On Mission</i>	110
THE ECCLESIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.....	114
<i>Priestly Function</i>	120
<i>Prophetic Function</i>	127
<i>Ordering (Kingly) Function</i>	132
CHAPTER IV. THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS AND PASTORAL IMPLICATIONS	136

PROPHETIC FUNCTION: BASIS OF ECCLESIAL FUNCTIONS	139
<i>Faith and the Word of God</i>	139
<i>Sacrament of Marriage As a Hard Way</i>	141
<i>Religious Conversion As a Foundational Experience</i>	146
<i>The Situation of Cohabitation</i>	155
PRIESTLY FUNCTION: SACRAMENTS OF INITIATION AND MARRIAGE.....	161
<i>Grace: Sanctifying and Operative</i>	162
<i>Grace: Cooperative</i>	164
<i>The Situation of Absent Fathers</i>	166
<i>Staying Married</i>	168
ORDERING (KINGLY) FUNCTION.....	173
ENDNOTES	178
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	244

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to determine in what sense the Christian family can be called Church: not at all, analogically, and/or univocally. Integral to my thesis is that the hierarchical magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church has developed significantly the ecclesial nature of the Christian family during the past three decades. During the Second Vatican Council the council fathers developed a seed text in which they use the term "domestic Church" to connote this ecclesial dimension of Christian marriage and the family which derives from it.¹

The core of this study is two-fold: first, to determine the meaning, use, and significance of the term "domestic Church" in select, official Roman Catholic Church teaching since Vatican Council II; and second, to provide a theological critique of the findings and to reflect upon some implications for theology and pastoral ministry. Beginning with The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (1964) and ending with A Family Perspective In Church and Society: A Manual For All Pastoral Leaders (1988), I will attempt to clarify the meaning and use of the term and to express its significance for understanding the nature of the Christian family and of the Church.²

Significance of the Term Domestic Church

The council's first use of the term "domestic Church" is in LG 11. The official text is: "In hac velut Ecclesia domestica parentes verbo et exemplo sint pro filiis suis primi fidei praecones, et vocationem unicuique propriam, sacram vero peculiari cura, foveant oportet."³ Joseph Gallagher renders the following translation:

The family is, so to speak, the domestic Church. In it parents should, by their word and example, be the first preachers of the faith to their children. They should encourage them in the vocation which is proper to each of them, fostering with special care any religious vocation.⁴

Although the documents contain the exact words "domestic Church" only once, one should not conclude that it is an insignificant term. I will attempt to demonstrate that the term has been significant in shaping contemporary church teaching on the nature of the Christian family and has significant implications for contemporary church renewal. Additionally, I will attempt to demonstrate that the reality conveyed by "domestic Church" has historical antecedents, particularly as inspired by Eph. 5:21-33.

Method and Overview

I will use a historical-critical method in this thesis. Chapter One is entitled "An Analysis of Domestic Church in Lumen Gentium, Article 11." It has two parts. Part One consists of a partial exegesis of LG 11 and aims to determine the meaning of domestic Church in this text. Part Two attempts to verify the conclusions of Part One by tracing the development of the text during the four sessions of the Council.

In Chapter Two, "Ephesians 5:21-33 and Its Use in History," I will attempt to show that Vatican II's vision of the Christian family as Church has a major theological root in the Catholic Tradition's interpretations of Eph. 5:21-33.

In Chapter Three, "An Inquiry into the Development of the Notion of Christian Family as Domestic Church," I will attempt to show that "domestic Church" functions as a heuristic model for understanding the ecclesial nature of the Christian family. Finally, in Chapter Four, "Theological Reflections and Pastoral Implications," I suggest several ways that the teaching of the Christian family as domestic Church contributes to the theory and practice of Church and sacraments.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study and a key term, family, which needs clarification. The most notable limitation is that this is not a comprehensive theology of the Christian family. Such a theology is not yet possible: (1) because of the newness in the West of explicating in a systematic fashion the explicitly ecclesial character of Christian marriage and its family and (2) because of the diverse structures of contemporary families.

During the twentieth century the paradigmatic shift to understanding ecclesiology and sacramentology primarily from institutional and legal categories to communal and covenantal categories has enabled insights into the ecclesial character of Christian marriage and its family to gain prominence. As theologians continue to develop the ecclesiological and sacramental foundations of this shift, then the development of the theology of the Christian family will expand because the latter depends upon these. Thus, at this time, one will not find extensive theological treatises solely on the Christian family. One does find, however, abundant theological literature about marriage, and much of this material will be beneficial and essential to developing a theology of the Christian family.

Regarding diverse family structures, let it suffice to say that previous to the twentieth century, the vast majority of Christian families in explicitly Christian cultures commenced with marriage. The number of diverse families (e.g., which began out-of-wedlock, divorce and remarriage, or after childbearing age) were relatively few compared to the general Christian population. Today, however, the sociological situation is more complex. For example, in the United States of America large numbers of baptized Christians commence new families out-of-wedlock, after divorce and remarriage, or after childbearing age. Additionally, it is not uncommon to hear about single adults--including those who have never married and do not intend to marry--who adopt children, and thus, begin a new family. This complex situation requires one to define the term "family" as an important step toward constructing a theology of the Christian family.

Unfortunately, this is no easy task. The Ad Hoc Committee on Marriage and Family Life (National Conference of Catholic Bishops, U. S. A.) admitted to its struggle to define the term family in its excellent document A Family Perspective In Church and Society.⁵ Based upon Familiaris Consortio and the Catholic Tradition, it defines family "as an intimate community of persons bound together by blood, marriage, or adoption for the whole of life."⁶

This definition, however, can not serve as a starting point for constructing a theology of the Christian family because it is too broad. The definition begs for a qualifier. In fact, the document provides one in the very next sentence. It states: "In our Catholic tradition, the family proceeds from marriage--an intimate, exclusive, permanent, and faithful partnership." Because Christian tradition has understood the Christian family to commence with marriage and because conciliar and papal documents of the

past three decades focus on the understanding of the Christian family as one deriving from the sacrament of marriage, this dissertation will limit its scope to the Christian family which derives from the sacrament of marriage. Consequently, the universal Church as Christian family and diverse families beginning outside of marriage will be beyond the scope of this study.

This does not mean, of course, that the Christian community does not recognize various family structures, especially the extended family (spouses, children, relatives) and the household (spouses, children, others). From early Christianity to the twentieth century the prevailing experience of family has been the extended family and/or household. The presumption, however, is that marriage is understood to be the foundation of the family. In other words, marriage creates a new family unit in the sense that it differentiates and enlarges the extended family. Furthermore, Catholic Tradition comes to understand that the sacrament of marriage commences a new Christian family that differentiates and enlarges the Church. The understanding of the council at Vatican II is that by the power of the sacrament of matrimony a new Christian family is derived by which the Church grows qualitatively and quantitatively. Thus, the Christian family is called a "domestic Church" and is understood to be a foundational cell of the Church.

Thus, the scope of this study is limited to the Christian family deriving from the sacrament of marriage, which is the smallest unit of Church. The scope entails some additional and notable exclusions. Already mentioned are the notion of the universal Church as Christian family and the various family structures beginning outside of marriage. Now, I propose two more exclusions. First, this study will not delve into the first century experience of house churches because this is not a sociological study. The

focus will be on the theological, more precisely, the ecclesiological underpinnings of the Christian family as Church. The influence of Ephesians 5:21-33 in this enterprise will be of particular significance.

Second, as stated above, this is not a comprehensive theology of the Christian family. Therefore, other biblical sources such as the Cana Story from John 2: 1-11, the Matthean Account On Divorce (19:3-12), the married couples who were heads of Christian communities and served as missionaries (e.g., Priscilla and Aquila), the Holy Family, the creation accounts (Gen. 1 & 2), the sacred marriage between Yahweh and Israel (Ez. 16, Hosea, Song of Songs), as well as the host of other Old Testament figures and images will not be able to be considered in detail. All of these, of course, would contribute significantly to a complete understanding of the nature and functions of marriage and the Christian family.

In summary, a comprehensive theology of the Christian family is years away: given the recentness of the paradigmatic shift in ecclesiology and sacramentology, given the centuries of relatively stable family life (in the sense of beginning with marriage), and given the diverse beginnings of contemporary Christian families. This dissertation hopes to contribute towards a theology of the Christian family by focusing on the Christian family as an ecclesial entity. The starting point will be the sacrament of marriage as the beginning of a new Christian family.⁷ In LG 11 the council states that marriage is a sacrament and that from it comes the Christian family, which is a sort or type of Church.⁸ The council uses Eph. 5:32 as a source to support this idea. This dissertation examines the validity of these claims.

CHAPTER ONE

AN ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC CHURCH IN LUMEN GENTIUM, ARTICLE 11

Chapter One has two parts. Part One will provide a partial exegesis of article 11 of LG, the citation containing "domestic Church."⁹ Part Two aims to verify the conclusions of Part One by tracing in the Council records the development of the pertinent section of LG 11.

PART ONE

PARTIAL EXEGESIS OF LUMEN GENTIUM 11

The purpose of this partial exegesis is to provide Vatican Council II's ecclesial vision of the Christian family as it is portrayed in LG 11. The critical goal will be to define the term "domestic Church."

Immediate Context

The term "domestic Church" can be found in a few places in the Documents of Vatican Council II.¹⁰ In LG 11 the Council uses for the first time in a conciliar document the Latin text Ecclesia domestica.¹¹ Both the Abbott and Flannery¹² editions of the Documents of Vatican II correctly translate Ecclesia domestica as domestic Church.

If one enlarges the context, however, then one can see differences between the translations in the two editions: "The family is, so to speak, the domestic Church" (Abbott); and "In what might be regarded as the domestic Church the parents, by word

and example, are the first heralds of the faith with regard to their children" (Flannery). An examination of the Latin text reveals that both translators have taken the liberty to shorten the official text. The original sentence is: "In hac velut Ecclesia domestica parentes verbo et exemplo sint pro filiis suis primi fidei praecones, et vocationem unicuique propriam, sacram vero peculiari cura, foveant oportet."¹³

To determine the meaning of Ecclesia domestica, one needs to translate the Latin phrase, 'in hac velut'. It functions as an introductory example. It provides for continuity and transition among sentences by connecting 'Christian Spouses' and 'family' with 'domestic Church'. The 'domestic Church' is descriptive of 'family', and this family derives from the marriage of Christians.¹⁴ In other words, Christian spouses give rise to a Christian family, and this Christian family is understandable as a type of Church. The Council uses 'domestic Church' to describe and illumine the nature of the Christian family.

From the immediate context of Ecclesia domestica, some initial observations and conclusions can be drawn. First, the term domestic Church is used in the most important ecclesial document of Vatican Council II. Secondly, the meaning of domestic Church can not be adequately understood by examining the sentence which contains it. In fact, the two major English translations are ambiguous as to the meaning of domestic Church. To determine its meaning one needs to refer to the Latin text. There are three sentences which form the immediate context, and all three are essential for determining the meaning of domestic Church.¹⁵

Thirdly, the relationship between Christian family and domestic Church is clear. The text asserts that the term domestic Church illuminates the nature of the family which

arises from the marriage of Christian spouses. Fourthly, the text is silent about the specific type of term that domestic Church is. That is, the immediate context of domestic Church is not conclusive whether domestic Church is a sign, an image, or a symbol. Fifthly, the Christian family helps to illuminate the nature of the Church. Thus, to speak of the "Christian family as domestic Church" may operate heuristically by disclosing data relevant to both the Christian family and the Church. Fifthly, the Christian family helps to illuminate the nature of the Church. Thus, to speak of the "Christian family as domestic Church" may operate heuristically by disclosing data relevant to both the Christian family and the Church.

Article 11

The Latin translation is most beneficial for acquiring a sense of the structure of article 11. The article has three paragraphs, and its structure is diagrammed below in Table One. The numbers below the paragraph designations represent the numerical order of the sentences comprising the paragraph. Thus, 1 equals the first sentence; 2 equals the second, etc. The word following the number represents the content of the sentence, e.g., paragraph one, sentence two is about the sacrament of Baptism.

TABLE TWO

PARAGRAPH 1	PARAGRAPH 2	PARAGRAPH 3
1--Theme	1—Penance	1--Transition
2--Baptism	2—Anointing of Sick	
3--Confirmation	3—Ordination	
4--Eucharist	4—Matrimony	
5--Eucharist	5—Matrimony	
	6—Matrimony	

A cursory look at the diagram shows that article 11 is about sacraments. An in-depth look discloses that paragraph one is about the sacraments of initiation, paragraph two is about the other four sacraments, and paragraph three is a transition to article 12. The Council allots one sentence to each of the sacraments except Eucharist and Matrimony. It treats Eucharist in two sentences and Matrimony in three.

From the structure one can form a few conclusions. First, the Council is confirming the number of sacraments to be seven. Second, each sacrament is important and has a significant role or function within the Church. Third, because the Council allots Matrimony three sentences, one can construe that the Council intends to emphasize something about Matrimony.

In addition to the structure of article 11, the theme is also instructive. From Table One it is clear that the theme is in paragraph one, sentence one: "The sacred nature and organic structure of the priestly community is brought into operation through the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues."¹⁶ The purpose of article 11 is to demonstrate that the priestly community--the Church as it reflects the priestly office of Christ--is brought into operation through the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues.¹⁷ Given this theme, the reader might expect to find how the sacrament of Matrimony--as an element (a constituent part) of the Church--enables the Church to actualize or realize Herself in history, presuming God's activity, of course.

The Matrimonial Unit

The question that will guide our continuing exegesis follows: How does the matrimonial unit demonstrate how the priestly community is brought into operation

through Matrimony and the married couple's exercise of the virtues? Let us begin with the text:

[Sentence one:]

Finally, in virtue of the sacrament of Matrimony by which they signify and share (Eph. 5:32) the mystery of the unity and faithful love between Christ and the Church, Christian married couples help one another to attain holiness in their married life and in the rearing of their children. Hence by reason of their state in life and of their position they have their own gifts in the People of God (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7).

[Sentence two:]

From the marriage of Christians there comes the family in which new citizens of human society are born and, by the grace of the Holy Spirit in Baptism, those are made children of God so that the People of God may be perpetuated throughout the centuries.

[Sentence three:]

In what might be regarded as the domestic Church, the parents, by word and example, are the first heralds of the faith with regard to their children. They must foster the vocation which is proper to each child, and this with special care if it be to religion.¹⁸

All three sentences have ecclesiological significance. I will comment upon each sentence in turn, noting key words and phrases which will elucidate the Council's vision of Christian marriage and its family as an ecclesial reality.

In sentence one the first word, 'finally' (tandem), means that there is still one more sacrament to consider in order to complete the survey of sacraments. The description of the sacrament of Matrimony, like the descriptions of the other sacraments, is undertaken to show the relationship between an individual sacrament to the total sacrament of the Church. "This very helpful 'ecclesiological' survey of all the sacraments shows how the Church is built up on the sacraments and how the total sacrament of the Church is explicated in the sacraments."¹⁹ In the matrimonial unit, therefore, one should expect to find--and actually does find--the individual sacrament and the Church.

Sentence one speaks about the sacrament of Matrimony and the mystery between Christ and the Church.

The subject of sentence one is 'they', Christian spouses (coniuges Christiani), who are the sacramental symbols. In and through the sacramental ritual of the marrying of two Christians (sacramentum tantum), the mystery of Christ and the Church are made really present ('they signify'). This conjoining entails a mystery of persons, a relationship. The key relational characteristics are unity (unitatis) and fruitful love (fecundi amoris).²⁰ The Christian couple doesn't merely point to the mystery of Christ and The Church. The couple also shares or partakes in this mystery.

From the text one can deduce that by the sacrament of Matrimony the two individuals become one couple (unity), i.e., within the mystery of Christ and Church each marrying individual undergoes a change of status or position in the Church (res et sacramentum).²¹ By their exchange of vows (Matrimonium in fieri) they are bonded together as one being, albeit in the category of accidental being.²² Thus, together the Christian spouses become a new being, and what comes into being is a 'new' manifestation of the mystery of Christ and the Church (fruitful love). Because love is fruitful, one should expect this new creation to be expansive and ongoing (Matrimonium in facto esse). Thus, two Christians, who through Baptism are incorporated into the Church and share in the common priesthood of the faithful (articles 10 and 11), by signifying and partaking in the sacrament of Matrimony are acting as Church and give existence to a new manifestation of Church. In other words, the sacrament of Matrimony is one self-realization²³ of the Church. It is simultaneously the Church unifying and loving fruitfully.

In the above exegesis of sentence one, one sees how two marrying Christians--as members of the common priesthood of the faithful--in and through the sacrament of Matrimony bring into operation the Church, which is understood as the People of God. Within sentence one there is another aspect of the ecclesiological function of priesthood which needs to be considered. By God's grace the married couple continues to bring the Church into operation beyond the celebration of Matrimony as they grow in mutual holiness and the exercise of the virtues (res tantum).

Thus, it is of ecclesiological significance that "marriage is considered in the light of the task which married people have to perform in the People of God as a whole: to sanctify each other 'through conjugal life' and to build up the People of God by the rearing and education of children."²⁴ Relative to growth in holiness, it is understood that married life possesses within the substance and structures of its own reality the dynamism, path, or way of holiness. Consequently, for a married couple to exercise the virtues it must be and become itself, i.e., recognize and cooperate with the dynamism which is the core of the conjugal life. This core is God's liberating grace which initiates and enables a sharing in the life of the Triune God--Who freely wills to sanctify the couple and its family. In other words, married life is sacramental--it points to and makes present a transcendent reality--and presents the possibility for a holy way of life.²⁵

Married couples, therefore, do not need to escape their married condition or add onto their married condition in order to live a holy life. Their state of life is as holy and dignified as the hierarchical order,²⁶ and married life has as a goal to manifest unity and fruitful love.

I suggest that the language of Catholic moral theology regarding conversion can be applied by analogy to help elucidate the couple's path to holiness. The term "fundamental orientation" can refer to the couple's inherent movement toward its goal to manifest unity and fruitful love. The term "fundamental option" can refer to the couple's freedom to choose the fundamental orientation for its common life: either for or against manifesting the unity and fruitful love which is sacramental. More specifically speaking about Christian spouses, one can say that their common life becomes a mutual path to holiness and is a sacrament of the relationship between Christ and the Church.

Thus, married couples have the choice to offer their common life--directed towards unity and fruitful love--as gifts for the building up of the People of God (cf. last half of sentence one). This offering is a priestly act which flows from their "instituted" position in the People of God.²⁷ They offer their common life, which includes their children if they are so blessed, and this offering is a unique gift within the People of God.

In conclusion, sentence one establishes three significant doctrinal statements for ecclesiology. First, as a sacrament, Matrimony is an essential element of the Church and a means for bringing into operation the People of God. Second, married life, as the marriage in becoming which includes the family deriving from it, is a means for holiness and for building up the People of God by manifesting unity and fruitful love, and the latter, of course, includes the rearing and education of children. Third, the couple has an instituted position, rank, or office within the People of God and offers its gifts on behalf of building up the People of God.

Sentences two and three together--both combine to make a fourth significant ecclesiological statement: the family which proceeds from Christian spouses perpetuates

both human society and the Church. In the case of the latter, the Council uses the term 'domestic Church' to convey this truth. Aloys Grillmeier offers an excellent summary of the teaching contained in sentences two and three.

Marriage is finally considered in the light of the truth that the family is the cell or fundamental unit of humanity and the Church. Natural procreation and re-birth in baptism combine to maintain and develop historically the people of God. In conclusion, the family is termed significantly a "Church of the home" (domestica Ecclesia), where a sort of Church service is already performed, the first proclamation of the gospel, the first cherishing of the vocations which mirror in their diversity and rank the whole life of the community.²⁸

Because the family from Matrimony is an element of the Church and the fundamental unit of the Church, one must obviously conclude that there would be no ongoing earthly Church unless there were Christian spouses and their offspring. In LG the Council Fathers portray the earthly Church as one on an historical journey through the generations. To conceive of the Church as an all adult community of converts not from Christian spouses, as a gathering of one-sexed Christians after a nuclear holocaust, or as some other hypothetical grouping is akin to taking a hypothetical historical snapshot which is not unlike asking the hypothetical question of how many angels can fit on the tip of a pin head. It appears obvious that an all adult community which claimed to be Church in and of itself and freely chose to fixate as an all adult community,¹⁹ would not only be against the spirit of the document, but more significantly, would be the end of the earthly Church.

Furthermore, one can construe that the Council proposes that Matrimony and its family is a normal and esteemed way for building up the Church. In fact, descriptively speaking, one can say that Christian spouses and their offspring are the vast constituency of the earthly Church, the People of God. In short, the matrimonial unit expresses that an

essential way by which the Church as the People of God will self-actualize is in and through Christian spouses and their offspring. In this sense, Matrimony --as well as the other sacraments--are essential elements which bring into operation the Church, and the term "domestic Church" conveys the ecclesial dimension of Christian spouses and their children.

Additionally within the matrimonial unit, the Council applies the Church's mission and functions to the family from Christian spouses, thus suggesting the aptness of the term domestic Church. The couples/parents actualize the Church's mission precisely by being a visible sacrament and by being the first proclaimers of the gospel to their children (a prophetic function). When the spouses manifest unity and fruitful love they offer themselves and others back to God, especially when they offer their children for baptism (a priestly function). When parents conscientiously participate in the rearing and education of children, they serve them and order or guide them toward the vocation God has for them (a kingly function). The participation in the mission and functions of the Church as listed above expresses a position or office within the Church and a unique gift for building up the Church.

To summarize, within LG, and specifically within article 11, one finds in seed form the Council's ecclesial vision of Christian marriage and its family, and the term "domestic Church" connotes this. The exegesis of the immediate text, article 11, and the matrimonial unit suggests that the Council teaches that Christian marriage and its family is both a sacramental reality and an ecclesial reality. The Council posits the following ecclesial points:

1. Matrimony is a sacrament, an essential element of the Church, and a means for bringing into operation the People of God.

2. The married life and family which derives from Matrimony expresses the "marriage in becoming" and is a means for holiness and a self-realization of the Church, manifesting unity and fruitful love.
3. The couples have an instituted position, rank, or office within the People of God and offer their gifts, including its children, on behalf of building up the People of God.
4. This marriage and its family perpetuates the Church historically by becoming a new fundamental unit which brings into operation the Church's mission and functions.
5. The term "domestic Church" conveys this ecclesial reality, and as such, it is descriptive of the Christian family.

As was demonstrated above in the section on the matrimonial unit, one can use the image of "domestic Church" reflectively and critically. Avery Dulles defines an image which "is employed reflectively and critically to deepen one's theoretical understanding of reality . . . a 'model'."²⁹ He distinguishes two uses of theological models: explanatory ("serves to synthesize what we already know or at least are inclined to believe") and exploratory (heuristic by leading to new theological insights).³⁰ The term "domestic Church" is a model of the family derived from Christian spouses. Chapter Three will attempt to demonstrate that Vatican II and the post-conciliar Catholic Church does indeed develop the ecclesial nature of the Christian family. Our next step, however, is to trace the development of the matrimonial unit in the Council records.

PART TWO

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MATRIMONIAL UNIT

In Part Two I will show that the previous conclusions are supported by the speeches and reports of the Council. By tracing the development of the matrimonial unit

through the four sessions, I hope to show that the Council explicitly envisioned the Christian family to be the smallest unit of Church and an essential agent for Church renewal.³¹ Although the Council provides in the matrimonial unit of LG 11 its ecclesial vision of the Christian family only in seed form, the speeches and reports which undergird this seed vision are rather extensive.

SESSION ONE

Session One occurs between October 11, 1962, and December 8, 1962. During the 31st General Congregation on December 1, the Council begins debate on Schema 1962.³² According to Gerard Philips, many cardinals and bishops react strongly against the draft, and they request a major shift in emphasis. The request is twofold: (1) to shift from the image of Church as society or institution to the image of Church as community and (2) to discuss the various aspects of the Church within the framework of community. Examples of these aspects are common solidarity (Konig), the general priesthood, and the call of all to holiness, including the laity (Ritter) and married people (Fiordelli).³³

Regarding married people and their families, the matrimonial unit is absent from Schema 1962. However, there are precursory concepts in it. The most direct ones are in Chapter 6, "De laicis," especially in articles 21-25, with articles 21 and 24 being the more important ones. A sketch of the salient points follows.

Article 21 is about the universal priesthood and the ministerial priesthood. Regarding the universal priesthood, all members of the Body of Christ are incorporated by Baptism and Confirmation and are to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice, albeit in different ways. Although there is no explicit reference to marriage and family here, this article

will be revised so as to include the matrimonial unit: article 21 of Schema 1962 will become article 24 in Schema 1963, and the matrimonial unit will be interjected into the latter.³⁴ Thus, Christian marriage and its family as an "ecclesial reality" will be introduced for the first time in a conciliar document in Schema 1963, and this will occur in the context of the universal priesthood.

In the commentary on article 22 the authors write that the term "laity" has a positive sense derived from baptismal incorporation into the Church and that it has a restrictive sense too, i.e., not the clergy nor religious (45). In the next few articles the Council continues to develop the teaching on the laity.

In article 23 they state that the laity participate in the three munere or offices of Christ--priestly, prophetic, and kingly--in their own way (40).

The title of article 24 is "Concerning the Salvific and Apostolic Life of the Laity" (40-41). Because article 24 contains the most pertinent points, some of it merits direct quoting.

a) . . . all should cooperate in increasing the outward extension and inward deepening of the whole body of Christ. This spouses do foremost who sanctify one another in the Christian life by the sacramental power, catholic parents and educators and indeed catechists of whatever kind, who labor to share faith and grace with exceptional fruit to their children or comrades.³⁵

In the Council's commentary on article 24, it adds that beyond the directly religious order of the active participation of the laity in the saving life of the Church that there is an office of father and mother.³⁶

It is interesting to note that although article 24 contains the specific points about Christian marriage and its family; it will **not** come to serve as the article which houses the matrimonial unit in the next schema. In fact this marital text will be deleted in the next schema when article 24 of Schema 1962 becomes article 25 of Schema 1963. In

short, the precursory concepts of Christian marriage and its family will be shifted from the specific teaching on the laity to the general teaching about the Church.

Next, in article 25 the Council acknowledges the principal forms of collaboration of the laity, and it gives special mention to those personal and collective apostolates which promote family life (41-42).

To reiterate, while there is no direct precursor to the matrimonial unit in Schema 1962, there are precursory concepts. First, there is the reality of the universal priesthood and the category of laity which derives from baptismal incorporation into the Church and which calls all the baptized to participate in the three-fold office of Christ in their own way.

Second, and more specific to the married state, the following points are posited in Schema 1962, and these will be developed in Schema 1963: (1) marriage is a sacrament and a state of life; (2) Christian spouses live out their ecclesial duty of building up the body of Christ by sanctifying one another through Christian marriage and by sharing faith and grace with their children (and implicit is that parents are evangelists and catechists to their children); and (3) there is an ecclesial office of father and mother.

Although these important points do exist in Schema 1962, Bishop Pietro Fiordelli judges these to be a woefully inadequate expression of the place and role of spouses and their families in the Church. Because his speech with notes is the decisive intervention on behalf of the ecclesial identity and role of Christian spouses and their families and because to my knowledge it has never been translated in entirety into English, I will provide it intact after a brief comment.

One does well to notice that Fiordelli's speech is almost halted by the Presider who apparently does not immediately apprehend the "ecclesial" identity and role of Christian spouses and their families. However, Bishop Fiordelli, a long-standing pioneer in family ministry, is not to have his convictions ignored. Also, it appears that the following three convictions are fundamental to his understanding: (1) the divine vocation

and mission of the married couple and how they are given a place in the Church by Christ (Eph. 5); (2) the married couple is part of the fecundity of the Church and helps to increase and to deepen the Church; and (3) the Christian family, and not the parish, is the smallest unit of the Church, being a holy cell or little Church.

The text of Fiordelli's speech and notes follow:

The schema deals with the Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ. The dogma of the Mystical Body of Christ is, as I was saying, a great dogma of our times. It is good, therefore, that the schema deals with the whole constitution of the Church. And therefore, after [the schema] speaks of the head and of the members in general, in distinct chapters it deals with the Roman Pontiff in Chapter I, the episcopacy in Chapters III-IV, the priesthood in Chapter III, the states of perfection in Chapter V, and finally with the laity in Chapter VI.

. . . (1) I humbly assent to the commission, and indeed to those Fathers who prefer that these chapters remain, since it is entirely good--as in the present schema, which all judge to be fundamental--not to be silent concerning the intimate constitution of the Church.

But, having granted these things, it humbly seems to me that it must be lamented that in the whole schema no special chapter is found which deals with a certain state in the Church which is of the greatest nobility and holiness and of the greatest fecundity in increasing the Mystical Body of Christ, namely, the state of sacramental matrimony. I think that this proposition will be a cause of surprise and wonder to none of you. For it seems today to many that a special place in the Mystical Body of Christ must be attributed to those who have been placed in the state of Christian matrimony. Since, however, my petition may be new enough, permit me to offer my reasons. These reasons are:

1. The state of Christian matrimony, which arises from the sacrament of matrimony, certainly is a special supernatural, indeed, sacramental, state in the Church. Without doubt, above all other states the episcopal and sacerdotal state holds the first place. Then follow those who are called in pontifical documents, the states of perfection (2).

Presider: May your excellency hold me excused: what he says seems very useful, but it seems to be outside the order of this schema.

Speaker: May I conclude?

Presider: Certainly.

Speaker: My conclusion: My humble petition, therefore, which I submit reverently but ardently to the judgment of the Fathers, is this: most rightly the chapters on the episcopacy, priesthood, and states of perfection placed ahead of all; afterwards, however, let there certainly be added at least a humble and brief chapter, but expressly dedicated in the schema to the state of Christian matrimony. It is not permitted to leave indiscriminately among the laity those whom Christ himself reserved a special place in his Mystical Body.

This, which I propose for the schema, is not a mere formality, but, as it seems to me, a great [very important] thing.

In the Church it will be a light for fostering the most precious family apostolate. Moreover, it will have the ontological foundation for establishing relations between the Church and the family, family and state, to protect the rights of the family, for example, in the order of education of children, etc. Finally it will be, on the part of the ecumenical Council, a great gift and joy for more fervent Christian spouses, who often are truly admirable, and sometimes heroic; for less fervent spouses there it will be a maternal invitation and spur. I have spoken.

Note (1): In the written text I hand over: Some Fathers propose that these particular chapters be transferred to the schemas particularly dedicated to these arguments. But, what are able to be common to the priests, then religious, then--after the most felicitous constitution "Provident Mother Church" on the secular Institutes--the laity.

But inopportunately, it seems to me, it goes immediately from the states of perfection in the schema to the laity in general--where it is a question of the lay apostolate--only a very few words are dedicated to the state of matrimony.

Certainly spouses are lay people. But the secular institutes are also laity, and yet most rightly the schema speaks of them [the secular institutes] in chapter V.

Christian spouses are laity, but laity constituted in an altogether special state in the Mystical Body of Christ, and indeed, by divine right, for Christ himself instituted the state of matrimony.

But why did the Lord make marriage a sacrament? Precisely because in the divine mind the state of matrimony has the highest weight, influence, and impetus for increasing quantitatively and qualitatively his mystical body.

Note (2): The ecclesiological reason in particular comes near to the point.

Generally the constitution of the Church is thus set forward: The catholic church, which is divided into dioceses. Dioceses, which are divided into parishes. In the parish under the priest is the parochial mass of laity.

But, in my humble judgment, this is neither true nor good.

It seems to be that this is the true structure of the Church of Christ: to be sure, the universal church, whose invisible head is Christ, and the visible head is the highest pontiff, his vicar on earth.

The universal church is divided into so many dioceses, over which preside the bishops, but with Peter and under Peter.

Dioceses, from the ecclesiastical constitution, are divided into parishes, over which priests sent by a bishop preside.

Now, however, is the parish the last division of the Church? No.

The parish is further divided into so many holy cells, which are Christian families, which we are able to call, following the example of the Holy Fathers, as little churches, over which preside, from the divine mandate, the husband and wife, father and mother.

St. John Chrysostom said, "Make your home a church" (Commentary on Genesis, ch. 6, par. 2; PG 54:607).

And St. Augustine wrote, "We consider your home a not insignificant church of Christ." (Letter 188, 3; PL 33:849). And elsewhere [he writes] "with your whole domestic church or "church of the home" (PL 40:450)).

The final division of the Church, or even better, the last of the holy cells by which the Church is composed, is not the parish but the Christian family.

And this is not from the constitution of the Church as a parish is, but from the will of Christ himself, who made holy, indeed sacramental, this familial institution. Thus in the course of time the parish can be changed, since it is from ecclesiastical law, but the family never, since it is of divine right [or law].

Not without cause did St. Paul see in the mystery of matrimony the communication of the mystery of the union of Christ with the Church.

Then the pastoral reason must be attended too. Certainly with the greatest trust in God and in the Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church, nevertheless it must be said that our times certainly are difficult for the true Christian life, especially in youth, and for religion itself.

Now, having recognized certainly the superiority of sacred virginity over matrimony, I wish however to say this: there are two most powerful helps of divine grace for the mission of the Church: the apostolate of priests and of consecrated souls before all else, and immediately after, the Christian family.

For us who are pastors in regions that have been Catholic for many years, the Christian family truly is the greatest help against the perils of indifferentism, worldliness, and sometimes the practice of materialism.

For bishops, especially loved and heroic, who are pastors in regions where there is persecution of religion, I think that the Christian family is as it were the last and especially precious stronghold for guarding the Christian religion.

Finally, for the venerable bishops who are in mission territories, I think that Christian families are solemnly constituted as the most sweet hope for nourishing and spreading the Christian religion.

In the schema (ch. 6, n. 25) which speaks of the Catholic action of the laity, it is said that the Church gives them a "a mandate and true canonical mission." But if these things are true, by a much higher reasoning, venerable Fathers, do Christian spouses have not only a canonical mission but rather a divine one.³⁷

From Fiordelli's speech and written text one can readily abstract his fundamental convictions which I stated in the paragraph preceding his comments. Furthermore, it is to be noticed that he requests a separate chapter on the married state and that it should express the "ontological foundation for establishing relations between the Church and family." Additionally, he makes the case that his request is derived both from ecclesiological and pastoral reasons.

Judging from the fact that a matrimonial unit does appear in Schema 1963, one can surmise that the Theological Commission gives serious consideration to Fiordelli's ideas between Sessions One and Two. Although it does not grant his request for a special chapter, it does integrate his fundamental convictions into the constitution of the Church, provides an ontological foundation for the relation between the Church and family, and accepts in principle his ecclesiological and pastoral reasons.

Before proceeding to Session Two I want to make an important qualification. The appearance of a matrimonial unit in the subsequent schemas is not the sole triumph

of Fiordelli. While he is a major contributor, other persons make significant contributions. It is essential to recognize the efforts of those who struggled to articulate a fresh vision of the Church which would overcome the triumphalism, clericalism, and juridicism in the Church.³⁸ Part of this struggle included the recognition that a description of the nature of the Church must account for real people who form a real priesthood and comprise a real family of God. Cardinal Dopfner of Munich, representing the German-Austrian Conference, spoke pointedly in reminding the Council that the universal priesthood is not a metaphor; and Pope John XXIII exclaimed joyfully to the throngs gathered in St. Peter's square as the first session wound down: "What a spectacle we see before us today--the Church grouped together here in full representation: ecco, its bishops; ecco, its priests; ecco, its Christian people! A whole family here present, the family of Christ!"³⁹

SESSION TWO

During the final days of Session One, Pope John XXIII--acting through the secretary general--provided the Council with instructions which would result in major changes in Schema 1962 and the other documents under consideration.⁴⁰ Before the Council would reconvene on September 8, 1963, mixed commissions would revise the documents and send them to the bishops for their response. To facilitate this work Pope John formed the Coordinating Commission which consisted of the following cardinals: Cicognani, Lienart, Urbani, Spellman, Confalonerie, Dopfner, and Suenens.

More specifically with reference to Schema 1962, by the end of Session One there was general agreement among the Council members that the Constitution of the

Church was to be the center and climax of the Council. According to Philips, who will become the new secretary general, De Ecclesia is to respond to the question of its own existence: "Quid dicis de teipso?"--What do you say of yourself?"⁴¹ In his commentary on these closing days, he adds that Suenens is influential in directing the Council to consider both the inward nature and the outward form of the Church and that Montini is influential in the strong Christological attitude--the title Lumen Gentium applies to Christ and not the Church (107). Also, Philips writes that Lienart reacted negatively to the Roman Church being too closely identified with the Mystical Body of Christ in the first schema (107) and that Dopfner and Frings wanted to see the mystery of the Church emphasized (108).

The month after Session One ended was a busy one for the Coordinating Commission. In an interview with Walter Abbott, Cardinal Suenens disclosed much of the inner workings of the commission.⁴² For example, he mentioned that the Coordinating Commission met at Cardinal Cicognani's place in the Vatican between January 21-28. The commission divided the schemas among the seven cardinals and by the end of the seven days each cardinal had completed the revision of the schemas entrusted to him. Also, the cardinals unanimously accepted the work of each cardinal and Pope John approved the work of the commission. It was Suenens who was entrusted with the tract on the Church.

Under Suenens' supervision, the new version of De Ecclesia, Schema 1963, consists of four chapters instead of eleven. Listed in sequential order, these are "The Mystery of the Church," "The Hierarchical Constitution of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular," "The People of God and the Laity in Particular," and "The Call to Holiness

in the Church."⁴³ However, it is to be noted that before the Council commenced debate on Schema 1963 during Session Two; Cardinal Suenens was influential also in emending this second schema by greatly restructuring it. He suggested, and the Fathers almost unanimously approved the following revisions to Schema 1963:

. . . eliminating from Chapters I and III [of Schema 1963] anything that dealt with the people of God in general, and keeping it for a new chapter, whose proper place was immediately after the mystery of the Church. The chapter on the laity should treat only of matters affecting the faithful in their contact with the world, while the fourth chapter should speak explicitly of religious orders when dealing with the call to holiness.⁴⁴

According to Philips the reordering of the chapters and the shifts in content relative to the nature of the Church indicated that the Fathers wanted to emphasize love as the inward supernatural reality of the Church. Also, the use of biblical terms, especially Pauline ones of mysterium or sacramentum, underscored the emphases which the Council wanted to give to understanding the nature of the Church. He writes: "In the New Testament the mystery is the general plan of salvation, which was decreed by the Father, accomplished by the redemptive incarnation of the Son and implemented by the mission of the Spirit in the community of the Church as visible organ of union with the divine persons."⁴⁵

Having provided the general context of Schema 1963, I will now comment specifically on the material pertinent to the Christian family. The precursory concepts in Chapter Six of Schema 1962 will be developed in Chapter Three of Schema 1963. The latter is entitled "The People of God and the Laity in Particular." As mentioned above, before debate begins on Schema 1963, the Coordinating Commission had decided that some material in this chapter would be shifted to a new chapter on the People of God and some material would be shifted to a chapter specifically on the laity. Since most of the

precursory material is about the family apostolate and its contact with the world, the Commission decided to shift this material, which is in article 25 of Schema 1963, to a new chapter on the laity.

However, in addition to the precursory material, the Commission adds new material on Christian marriage and its family in Schema 1963. This new material is the first draft of what I have called the matrimonial unit. It is inserted into article 24 which is about the universal priesthood. Because the universal priesthood--"which rests upon the sacraments of initiation and for the laity leads to a special application in matrimony and the Christian family"--concerns the internal nature of the People of God, the Commission determines that article 24 will be shifted to the new chapter on the People of God.⁴⁶

The first draft of the matrimonial unit follows.

From the power of the sacrament, by which the mystery of the unity and love between Christ and the Church is represented (cf. Eph. 5:32), **Christian spouses** sanctify each other in the conjugal life and in the education of their children, and for that reason they have their proper gift in the Church according to their state of life and rank (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7). For from chaste marriage proceeds the family, where new citizens of human society are born, who, under the grace of the Holy Spirit, are constituted children of God, for the perpetuating throughout the ages of the Body of Christ. In this sort of domestic Church parents often are the first heralds of the faith; they exercise, as Augustine says as it were an episcopal office, and foster, with God rendering religious vocations.⁴⁷

In the matrimonial unit the Coordinating Commission introduces the concept of "domestic Church" for the first time in a conciliar document.⁴⁸ To support this new material the Coordinating commission attaches an extensive note which demonstrates that the vision of Christian marriage and its family is ancient.⁴⁹ The commission draws its references both from the West and the East. In addition to calling the Christian family a domestic Church, it explicates this notion by including many references to various ecclesial aspects of the Christian family. Some examples of these aspects follow: the

family's role in Christian education; the spouses' state of life as a professed state, an office, a rank, and an order; and marriage as a gift of God for building-up the Church.

I already commented above that before the Council commenced debate on the chapter on the laity that the commission attached emendations to Schema 1963. Specifically, I mentioned those proposed by Cardinal Suenens that restructured Schema 1963. Also pertinent for our purposes are the emendations originated by Bishop Carli of Signia, especially emendations 32-35. These apply to sentence two of the matrimonial unit. In order, these are:

32 - 1.38: Say: "through grace," instead of "under grace" (Carli).

33 - l. 39: Say: "for the perpetuation of the mystical Body of Christ and visibly extending it through the ages" (Carli).

34 - p. 8,1.1: Omit: "often" [It is an office, which does not cease even if sometimes parents do not comply with it] (Carli).

35 - ibid.: Say: "they act in turn like a bishop, as Augustine says" (Carli).⁵⁰

Two other sets of written emendations are pertinent to setting the context for debate during the second session. First, there are the comments of Bishop Paul Leo Seitz. His comments relative to the second paragraph of article 24 concern the organization of the paragraph and the content of the matrimonial unit. He wants the paragraph to flow from sacrament in general, to the sacraments of initiation, to the other sacraments. What is especially important is the understanding that a sacrament is an efficacious sign of divinization which is constitutive of the People of God. He also affirms the order of conjugal life followed by the educating of children and that these are places of sanctification. Finally, Seitz insists that the family which proceeds from marriage is matter constituted from the People of God. The commission will incorporate Seitz's views when it revises Schema 1963. It does so when it shifts the emphasis in sentence two of the matrimonial unit from the Body of Christ to the People of God. The

important point here is that Christian marriage and its family, along with baptism, is constitutive of the People of God.⁵¹

Following Bishop Seitz are the emendations of Bishop Arthur Tabera Araoz of Albacete, Spain. Bishop Tabera makes two significant emendations which the commission will use when it revises Schema 1963. Regarding sentence one of the matrimonial unit, he requests the addition of the word "susceptione" (receiving and raising) to the phrase the "education of children." Regarding sentence three he wants the phrase "by word and example" added to the notion that the parents are the first heralds of the faith to their children.⁵²

Having established the origins of the matrimonial unit as it was before the Council commenced its debate, let us now turn our attention to the bishops' reactions to it during session two. It is on October 17, 1963, the 50th General Congregation, that the Council commences full debate on chapter three of Schema 1963. On this first day of debate on the chapter on the laity, Fiordelli is the fifth speaker and he addresses solely the section I have come to call the matrimonial unit.⁵³ His comments are largely a restatement of his written text attached to his speech in session one and of his written text submitted between sessions one and two.⁵⁴

One can readily observe that Fiordelli's comments flow out of an ecclesiology of the Mystical Body of Christ, which emphasizes articulation. Accordingly, he criticizes Schema 1963 for an inadequate development of the communitarian structure of the Church. He wants the document to state explicitly that the universal Church is articulated into diocesan Churches, these into parishes, and these into Christian families. He also wants the document to openly identify the heads of these ecclesial communities.

In his understanding Christ is the invisible head while the Pontiff is the visible head of the universal Church; bishops oversee dioceses; priests preside over parishes; and Christian parents exercise authority over their families.

Given this context, as well as the historical one provided by the Patristics, Fiordelli prefers that the Christian family be called a "little Church" (parva Ecclesia) rather than a "domestic Church." Furthermore, he would like the emphasis of this section to shift from the married spouses to the "state of the married spouses" which is the Christian family. He does, however, praise the commission for including the matrimonial unit explicitly within the dogmatic constitution of the Church. Fiordelli also emends the matrimonial unit by substituting his own version.

The commission will not incorporate Fiordelli's version into Schema 1964. Perhaps one major reason is paradigmatic. The commission will construct the new Chapter Two of Schema 1964 upon the paradigm of the People of God, while Fiordelli builds his ecclesiology on the Body of Christ. This is significant because the former model emphasizes what is common to all while the latter model emphasizes what is peculiar to the parts.⁵⁵ The commission, although it does consider the Christian family to be a little Church, will also abstain from incorporating Fiordelli's request to change the term "little Church" to "domestic Church."⁵⁶ Perhaps, this is because the former term is not specific enough to the Christian family. For example, Fiordelli himself also applies "little Church" to the parish. Also, in Schema 1964 the commission will maintain its balance between Christian spouses and the state of Christian spouses (family), i.e., maintaining them as correlative.

In fairness to Fiordelli, the commission did not disregard him. Quite to the contrary, the commission's decisions--to include the notion of Christian marriage and its family as an ecclesial reality in Schema 1963 and to maintain this notion in Schema 1964--signal affirmation of Fiordelli's interventions. Also, Fiordelli makes two additional critical comments which are significant to the development of the matrimonial unit. First, Fiordelli asserts that Christian marriages and their families are more than a representation of the love and union between Christ and the Church. They are a communication of this mystery. The commission will credit this point to Fiordelli in the Relationes De Singulis Numeris to Schema 1964.⁵⁷ Second, Fiordelli proposes that the phrase "parents exercise as it were an episcopal duty" be deleted because it sounds bad in a conciliar text, even though it sounds good in a speech by the Patristics.⁵⁸ The commission does delete this in Schema 1964.

The sixth speaker of the day is Archbishop Marcel Dubois of Besancon, France. He states that the "people of God" is an actual reality, not a poetic figure, and that both union and unity ought to be desired within the family of God.⁵⁹ While these comments are not directly about the matrimonial unit, these do reflect the mind of the Council regarding the nature of the Church, i.e., a real people ordered toward God as brothers and sisters in a family. The fundamental and foundational sacramentality of Christian marriage and its family is quite apparent in this context.

Coadjutor Bishop Herbert Bendnorz of Katowice, Poland, speaks fourteenth on this first day of debate. His comments pertain to sentence three of the matrimonial unit. More specifically, he states that the sentence--in the family as a sort of domestic Church parents often are the first herald of the faith--"expresses a truth which in the past in many

Catholic societies was often universally carried out for the good of the Church and of civil society."⁶⁰ He laments that today this is realized too little by families; therefore, this sentence should emphasize the moral obligation parents always have to be the first heralds of the faith to their children. Furthermore, he states that marriage preparation classes ought to stress this principle as well as the one that catholic apostolic activity begins in the family. By assuming this ecclesiastical good, parents also serve the good of humanity.

Bishop Philbin of Down and Connor, Northern Ireland, is the final speaker of the first full day of debate on the People of God and the laity. He wants emphasized that the Christian family is the "fundamental stone of Christian society."⁶¹

Approximately a week later, during the 56th General Congregation, Bishop Francis Tomasek speaks in the name of the Bishops of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. These bishops address the third sentence of the matrimonial unit. Using as a starting point "in this sort of domestic Church," they want this sentence to stress that parents "are gravely obligated" to be the first heralds of the faith to their children.⁶² The remainder of the speech provides support for this change.

For example, they cite the pedagogical reason that "domestic education, especially during the first seven years of life of the child, regularly has the greatest influence for the whole future life." Consequently, they continue: the fundamentals of Christian life must be put forth first during family education. They quote Pius XI and John Chrysostom for sources.

The Bishops of Czechoslovakia also mention a pastoral reason, derived presumably from their experience of communism. They state: "Christian education in the

family is practically the only medium of fostering the religious life of children in some parts of the world." Unfortunately, they continue: many parents are not conscious enough of this obligation, which is also contained in Canon Law. Furthermore, many parents who know their obligation do not possess the skills to fulfill their obligation. Therefore, they state: it is incumbent for pastors of souls "to instruct parents well to this end and to give them methodical helps in these writings." To promote Christian education in the family, they recommend the establishment of catechetical institutes for the laity.

Having examined the speeches concerning the matrimonial unit, I will now examine the pertinent written critiques which the Council Fathers submitted during session two.⁶³ Cardinal Augustine Bea's extensive critique is found first among the more than 90 written critiques of Chapter Three.⁶⁴ Several of his comments directly affect the revising of the matrimonial unit of Schema 1963. Regarding sentence one he wants to revise it from "they sanctify each other" to "they help each other to grow in holiness." His reason is "for the word 'to make holy' is better reserved to the action of Christ through grace and the sacraments." The commission accepts this change.⁶⁵ Regarding sentence two Bea requests that "under grace" be changed to "through grace." This change will also appear in Schema 1964. Regarding sentence three Bea makes two comments that will become incorporated into Schema 1964. First, he agrees with so many others that "parents ought always to be the first heralds."⁶⁶ Second, he too requests that "quasi-episcopal duty" be deleted because overseeing a diocese is different than overseeing a family.

In the observations of Cardinal Silva Henriquez of Chile, one finds that his comment on sentence two of the matrimonial unit will be used to revise Schema 1963. He wants "chaste" marriage to be changed to "this" marriage because the marriage of Christian spouses corresponds to a great reality.⁶⁷

Bishop Carl Ferrari requests that an emphasis be placed upon married couples building up the People of God in correspondence to their graced state and particular ecclesial office.⁶⁸ The commission does shift the emphasis from the Body of Christ to the People of God in the second sentence of Schema 1964.⁶⁹

Bishop A. Franco Cascon of Nivernais, France, provides insight into sentence three.⁷⁰ He identifies three aspects to the priestly office of the father in the family. These are "to be heralds or teachers of the faith in this temple, to consecrate their home and children to the service of God, and to promote religious vocations." Because families do not adequately grasp this teaching, he wants the matrimonial unit to be more emphatic about this priestly office.

Bishop Dragutin Nezic addresses each of the three sentences of the matrimonial unit, and the commission makes use of each comment.⁷¹ Regarding sentence one he wants to revise "they sanctify each other" to "they help each other in the conjugal life and to seek (or to acquire) holiness." His reasoning is that God is able to sanctify us, that grace enables one to sanctify oneself, but no one is able to sanctify another.

Regarding sentence two Bishop Nezic proposes an important change. He asks that the notion of baptism be connected with the grace of the Holy Spirit. Thus, rather than say "under the grace of the Holy Spirit," say, "who in baptism through the grace of the Holy Spirit."

Regarding sentence three Bishop Nezic adds his voice to the group of bishops calling to strengthen the obligation of parents to be the first heralds of the faith. In his case, he wants the commission to emphasize that "from the office of Christian spouses they are the first heralds of the faith."⁷² Furthermore, he states, that in the sacrament of matrimony "Christian spouses receive by the sacrament the right to the grace for the religious education of their children."

Bishop Seitz, in his written critique during session two, deepens his insights which were submitted in his emendations between sessions one and two.⁷³ In his emendations he writes that a sacrament is an efficacious sign of divinization which is constitutive of the People of God. He also asserts that the family which proceeds from marriage is matter constituted from the People of God. In his written critique he uses Eph. 5:32 to serve as the foundational premise that through Christian marriage the laity are signs and a state. He continues: "For these extol the union of bodies even to the order of Christ and the Church, indeed they thus extol the fruitfulness of the body so that new Christians are generated not only in their offspring but even in leading non-Christian brothers to the faith, as if a fruit of their love." Thus, Seitz sees in the charity of spouses ("example of their life" and "their genuine giving") a fruitfulness which increases the People of God both physically by adding children and spiritually by evangelizing others, even non-Christians.

Bishop Augustine Sepinski is the General Superior of the Franciscans, O.F.M. He addresses sentence three, and like so many others, he has the two-fold request to delete "quasi-episcopal" because it may be interpreted incorrectly and to stress the

obligation of parents as first heralds of the faith and as vocational guides to their children.⁷⁴

Bishop Francis Von Streng of Basel and Lugano, Switzerland, provides an extensive critique of the matrimonial unit.⁷⁵ Like Bishop Fiordelli he provides his own version of the matrimonial unit, revised and expanded. Bishop Von Streng wants the matrimonial unit to be moved from the chapter on the People of God to the chapter on the laity so that it can be better considered in more explicit focus and greater detail. In Schema 1964, however, the commission will choose to put the matrimonial unit in the chapter on the People of God; but it will also develop it in a more focused and detailed way in the new chapter on the laity.

A review of Von Streng's major points is instructive. First, he states that the dignity of marriage deserves to be extolled because Christ Himself extolled it. This can be achieved by clearly explaining the nature and sacramental character of marriage and by emphasizing this more than the duties of the office of spouses.

Second, to demonstrate the sacramentality of marriage, Von Streng integrates the Pauline teaching in Ephesians 5:32 (both the relationship of Christ and the Church and the relationship of the spouses in marriage are covenantal relationships) with the teaching of the Council of Trent on a sacrament (sacraments confer grace and the right to actual grace). This integration yields a dynamic synthesis of a covenantal relationship with the effects of a sacrament.

Von Streng's own words are helpful here:

Since this relation of Christian spouses to the covenant of Christ with the Church is a living and life-giving union according to the doctrine of the Council of Trent on the sacrament of matrimony: the sacrament of matrimony causes an assimilation and incorporation of Christian spouses to the covenant of Christ with the Church, in

this, that the spouses are made as if one flesh (Gen. 2:24), they participate in a certain new and special manner in the dignity and holiness of the Christ as Spouse of the Church and the dignity and holiness of the Church as the Spouse of Christ. In this, indeed in our opinion, consists the increasing of sanctifying grace of spouses and of Christian parents indeed the help of grace is given for this as a right, so that they might fulfill the offices of spouses and parents. Theologians speak of a "quasi-character," i.e., of something which remains in the mode of a habit. Therefore, with matrimony persisting it even remains as a sacrament conferring holiness (sanctifying grace) and help (helping grace).⁷⁶

Third, Von Streng moves from the effects of the sacrament of marriage as a union with the covenant of spiritual marriage of Christ and the Church to discovering in this very union the dignity and mission of Christian spouses, as well as their proper gift. Thus, he understands the remaining ideas contained in the last two sentences of the matrimonial unit as derivations of the proper gift of Christian spouses. For example, there are the ongoing growth in their joining with God and one another, the ongoing participation in the covenant of Christ with the Church, the increase of society and church through their children, the evangelistic and catechetical tasks in their domestic Church, etc.

SESSIONS THREE AND FOUR

Session three is held between September 14 and November 21, 1964. Gerard Philips remarks that the Constitution on the Church will be expanded from six to eight chapters and that the first six will not have to undergo public debate again.⁷⁷ The two new chapters will concern the eschatological goal and end of the Church, as well as the communion of saints in glory, where the Blessed Mother Mary has an exalted place. According to Philips "these last two chapters are also logically connected, and lead on to

the contemplation of the fulfillment, when the mystery will radiate in the glory of the end."⁷⁸

One can infer from this brief introduction that the major debate over the matrimonial unit occurs during session two. Fortunately, the commission writes an excellent revision of the matrimonial unit between sessions two and three. Thus, the matrimonial unit in Schema 1964 will be almost in final form.

On the second day of session three (September 15, 1964), Schema 1964 appears on the agenda of the Council. The emended text of the matrimonial unit follows. Note that the bold face words signify changes from Schema 1963 and the letter within parenthesis refers to a reference in the Relationes De Singulis Numeris.⁷⁹

Finally, Christian spouses, by the power of the sacrament of Marriage by which they **signify and participate** in the mystery of unity and **fruitful** love between Christ and the Church (cf. Eph. 5:32) (I), **help each other acquire holiness** in the conjugal life and **indeed** by the **welcoming** and education of children (K); and thus, they have their own gift in their own state of life and **proper** rank in the **People of God** (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7).⁷ For from **this** (L) marriage of Christians there proceeds the family, in which are born new citizens of human society, who, **through** the grace of the Holy Spirit, are constituted children of God by **baptism** to perpetuate the **People of God** throughout the ages (M). In this sort of domestic church parents **should be by word and example** the first heralds of the faith **for their children**, and foster the **proper vocation of each one, with special care for** the religious vocation (N).

"N. 7 - 1 Cor. 7:7: 'Each one has his own gift (idiom charism) from God: one has this gift, another has another gift'. Cf. Augustine's, On the Gifts of Perseverance 14, 37: PL 45, 1015s.: "Not only celibate chastity, but the conjugal chastity is a gift of God."⁸⁰

Some Council Fathers submitted written objections to specific points, and the commission responded in its report to the Council. Specific to the matrimonial unit are the following:

#26. Pag. 32, lin. 32: Let there be added: "they minister the sacrament to each other and they . . . help each other."

Response: It is not opportune, because it is not admitted by all, especially the Orientals, that the spouses are the ministers of the sacrament.

#27. Pag. 32, lin. 34: Let "acquiring" be suppressed because the sacrament is given for the "perfecting" of holiness.

Response: Agreed.

#28. Pag. 32, lin. 39: In the place of "People of God," write "Family of God."

Response: It is not expedient because the word family in the context can lead to an equivocation with the human family.

#29. Pag. 33, lin. 3: The sentence should be expressed not by the optative mood, but by the indicative or imperative mood.

Response: It was finally written: "they should foster."⁸¹

The final vote on the emended text is: 1,924 present: 1903 yes; 17 no; 3 yes with reservation; 1 invalid vote.⁸²

Thus, the final and approved text is as follows:

Finally, Christian spouses, by the power of the sacrament of Marriage by which they signify and participate in the mystery of unity and fruitful love between Christ and the Church (cf. Eph. 5:32), help each other to holiness in the conjugal life and indeed by the welcoming and education of children; and thus, they have their own gift in their own state of life and proper rank in the People of God (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7). For from this marriage of Christians there proceeds the family, in which are born new citizens of human society, who, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, are constituted children of God by baptism to perpetuate the People of God throughout the ages. In this sort of domestic church parents should be by word and example the first heralds of the faith for their children, and should foster the proper vocation of each one, with special care for the religious vocation.⁸³

Having established the final two texts of the matrimonial unit and the Council's response to these, I want to complete my analysis of the matrimonial unit by accomplishing two more tasks. First, I want to explain why I translated susceptione as "welcoming" in sentence one. Hopefully, my explanation will demonstrate several nuances of the word which can be useful and challenging to spouses in their vocation as parents. Second, I want to explain the significance of the word velut in sentence three. I

hope my analysis will demonstrate that the use of velut maintains rather than weakens the understanding that the Christian family is an ecclesial reality.

Recall that during session two Bishop Tabera Araoz requested that "susceptione" be added to sentence one of the matrimonial unit because it is important. In other words, more needs to be said than parents help one another to grow in holiness by educating their children. Bishop Tabera Araoz, and the commission as well, are convinced that it is important to add the word susceptione. It is my contention that "welcoming" is a better translation of susceptione than "rearing," which is found in the Abbott and Flannery editions of the Documents of Vatican II.

Because susceptione has several layers of meaning, the American translator is going to have difficulty translating it. An additional problem arises because Tabera Araoz's reason for adding susceptione--that it is important--is not readily helpful to the translator. Thus, how is susceptione to be understood and translated? Is there an adequate American equivalent? To answer these two questions I will compare various definitions of susceptione, examine the translations found in Abbott and Flannery, then suggest two alternative translations.

I mentioned above that susceptione can have several layers of meaning. Some examples can be garnered using three references.⁸⁴ First, Cassell's Latin Dictionary of classical Latin defines susceptione as an "undertaking." Some translations of the verb suscepio are "to take up, catch up; to support or raise." Additionally, Cassell's provides three transferred (altered or metaphorical) uses for the verb: "(1) **to accept, receive a person into a community or relationship . . . (2) to take a thing upon oneself; to undertake, begin, take up . . . (3) to maintain a thing, be ready to prove.**" These

transferred uses provide rich nuances. I will consider these in relationship to two other references.

Alexander Souter's A Glossary of Later Latin: To 600 A.D. provides a second reference. He identifies three uses of susceptio which are germane to our analysis: (1) "welcome **to the gifts of divine Grace** . . . (2) receiving (**of baptism**) . . . (3) help, assistance."

A third reference is provided in a work of modern ecclesiastical Latin. In Wilford Diamond's Dictionary of Liturgical Latin, "susceptio" is rendered "protection, receiving, defense."

I would like to tease out three layers of meaning from this analysis. First, I suggest that the notions of "welcoming," "receiving," and "accepting" point to **an attitude of openness** by those who welcome and receive. In the case of parents, it involves an openness to children; and ultimately, it involves a trust in God's goodness. Second, I suggest that these notions point to **an attitude of inclusion**. The Christian spouses include into their relationship and community their children, thereby, expanding their family (unity and fruitful love). Third, I suggest that these notions point to **an attitude of responsibility**. Concomitant with the privilege of receiving children is the responsibility which parents accept to help, assist, protect, and defend their children.

In short, "susceptione" is a term rich in meaning. It can refer to the whole project of the parents-children relationship: beginning with an openness to receiving children as gifts from God, moving to including children within the community of the family, and maintaining responsibility for the growth of each child.

Interestingly, a French translation of the Latin text of the matrimonial unit, which Yves Congar assisted, renders susceptione with l'accueil.⁸⁵ According to Collins-Robert French-English Dictionary, l'accueil means "welcome, reception." The verb accueillir also has the sense of "to take in" as into one's home or community. Thus, the French translators favor the first two senses of openness and inclusion as suggested by the meanings of welcome and reception.

The second task in this analysis is to assess the translation of susceptione which appears in the Abbott and Flannery editions of the Documents of Vatican II. Both editions translate susceptione as "rearing." Thus, the statement renders: "by the rearing and education of children." Is this translation of susceptione as "rearing" adequate?

Before answering the question I will perform two preliminary steps. First, I will examine the definition of rearing; and second, I will examine the definition of educatione. According to Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary "rear" can mean "to raise upright"; and, "upright" can mean "marked by a strong moral rectitude." Of course, this is a laudable goal for parenting. But does this adequately convey the three layers of meaning derived from the analysis above? I suggest that "rearing" refers more directly to the third meaning, an attitude of responsibility, than to the attitudes of openness and inclusion. The consequence of translating susceptione as rearing is to recede into the background the two meanings of openness and inclusion.

Regarding the definition of educatione, Cassell's defines it as "bringing-up, training, education." It appears that this definition is very similar to the one for rearing. In fact, it could be construed from this similarity that susceptione and educatione are synonyms. Thus, a case could be made to translate educatione as "rearing" also. This is

a problem, however, because the addition of susceptione would be redundant and unimportant, which is a contradiction to Tabera Araoz's reason for requesting the addition of susceptione.

From the analyses above, I conclude that "rearing" is not an adequate translation of "susceptione." Because "rearing" does not capture the three layers of meaning of susceptione and because it is very similar to the meaning of educatione, an alternative translation is required. Thus, the third task of the analysis is to provide an alternative.

From the beginning I must admit that I do not know have a perfect American equivalent for susceptione. The options are to use more than one word to convey the various meanings of susceptione or to use one word which captures as many of the meanings as possible. Regarding the first option, I propose that susceptione be translated by three words to convey its three layers of meaning. I recommend translating "susceptione" as "receiving, accepting, and rearing." Thus, the text would be rendered "by the receiving, accepting, rearing, and education of children."

Regarding the second option, I propose that susceptione be translated "welcoming" because it beautifully captures the first two senses of openness and inclusion while still suggesting responsibility, albeit not in the "maintaining" sense of "rearing." Additionally, the use of "welcoming" appears adequate because the notion of "rearing" is included in "education." Therefore, I propose that combining "welcoming" with "education" serves as an adequate translation of the phrase as a whole. Thus, the second option renders the text as "by the welcoming and education of children."

This next task will conclude my analysis of the matrimonial unit as it develops in Lumen Gentium. Here, I want to explain the significance of the word velut in sentence

three. I hope to demonstrate that the use of velut maintains rather than weakens the understanding that the Christian family is an ecclesial reality.

Recall that in the analysis of Bishop Fiordelli's work that the "ecclesiological reasons" for including marriage and Christian family in the Schema on the Church are because marriage is a "communication of the mystery" of the union with Christ and the Church and because the Christian family is the "smallest unit of the Church."

Regarding the latter, Fiordelli makes this claim in the context of his description of how the Church is articulated. He calls the diocese an ecclesia dioecesana and the parish an ecclesia parochia. But he chooses to call the Christian family a "little Church" (parva ecclesia) rather than a domestic Church (ecclesia domestica). The writing commission, however, does not accept this change. It repeats "domestic Church" in Schema 1964 and in the final text (1965). By choosing to call the Christian family the domestic Church, the writing Commission, and the Council which accepts its use, actually is consistent with Fiordelli's own description of how the Church is articulated--dioceses to parishes to families--and with Augustine's and Chrysostom's language of domestic Church or Church of the home. Thus both the 1963 and 1964 schemas, as well as the final document, refer to the Christian family as a "sort of domestic Church" (velut Ecclesia domestica).

One can gain further insight into the sort of Church the Christian family is by comparing the use of velut in the matrimonial unit with the use of velut in the introduction of Lumen Gentium (article 1). Incidentally, these are the only two occurrences of velut that I found in chapters one and two. In article one the Church is described as a "kind of" (veluti) sacrament of the intimate union with God and of the

unity of all humankind, "that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity."⁸⁶

The commission uses velut to avoid confusion by exercising precision in language, for the term "sacrament" is not a univocal one but an analogical one, having several related meanings. In the strict sense the word "sacrament" refers to the seven sacraments. But in a related broader sense the Church Herself is a "sacrament" of Christ's presence in the world.⁸⁷

Thus, in chapter one the Church is described as a "sacrament." For, like the seven sacraments, the Church herself is both a sign and instrument of Christ's presence in the world. When, in Chapter One, the Council Fathers call the Church a "sacrament," they preface this term which is rich in meaning with the word velut. They do this to show that they are using the term "sacrament" in a related, extended, and true sense rather than in its strictest sense.

Does the "analogical" usage of the word "sacrament"--indicated by the use of the word "velut"--weaken its meaning and significance when applied to the Church? No. Because the Church is a mystery, a religious and theological reality, one must use analogical words which are rich in several layers of meaning to express its nature. The word "sacrament" as applied to the Church is not a mere metaphor. For while the Church is not a sacrament in the strictest sense, it is a sacrament in a broad and significant sense because the term "sacrament" discloses an essential truth about the Church. For in and through the Church the union with God and the unity of humankind are both deepened and furthered.

What has been said about the analogical meaning of the word "sacrament" as applied to the Church can help one to understand the true force and meaning of the term "domestic Church" which the conciliar Fathers apply to the Christian family. First, the meaning of the Christian family as "domestic Church" is not weakened because of the analogical nature of the word "Church." Because the Christian family is a mystery, one must use analogical terms which are rich in several layers of meaning to express the Christian family's nature. Second, the term "domestic Church" is not a mere metaphor; it discloses an essential truth about the Christian family. For while the Christian family is not in itself the fullness of the Church (a communion of local eucharistic communities under the leadership of their bishops in communion with the Bishop of Rome); nevertheless, the Christian family by its very origin in the sacrament of marriage is both a true participation in the Church and a realization and embodiment of the Church. For in and through the Christian family the union between Christ and the Church and the unity of humankind are deepened and furthered.

CONCLUSIONS

The key point about all that precedes is that the Vatican II vision of the "Christian family as domestic Church" is that the Christian family is the smallest unit or type of Church. One finds numerous affirmations in the Acta Synodalia that the Christian family is an ecclesial reality. The Christian family is typically referred to as a cell, organ, or fundamental stone of Christian society. One finds no remarks in the Acta Synodalia which negate the phrase "in hac velut Ecclesia domestica." Furthermore, it is upon the

Christian family's ecclesial nature, i.e., "what" it is as Church, that the Council specifies the vocation, mission, office, and tasks of married spouses and their family.⁸⁸

A review of the development of the matrimonial unit will disclose that even after the first full day of debate that the Council fathers had laid several building blocks toward a theology of the Christian family. Most fundamentally, or perhaps normatively although this word is not used, the Council understands the Christian family to be derived from the sacrament of marriage. They understand Christ Himself as the One who calls the spouses into covenantal relationships (vocation) and to be a communication of the mystery of the unity and fruitful love between Christ and the Church (mission). It appears that we have here a basis for understanding that the mission of the spouses is to begin and to grow into a Christian family, and thereby, to participate in renewing the larger Church both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Also apparent in this vision of Christian marriage and its family is a key presupposition: Church and sacraments are correlative and coextensive realities, i.e., mutually complementary and mutually bound realities. It appears that the ascension of an explicit ecclesiology of the People of God has produced the effect of dereifying the understandings of the nature of Church and sacraments. The Church is a community and a communion; and the Christian family is a sub-community in communion with the larger community. The Christian family is born from the larger Church and increases the larger Church. Thus, it seems appropriate to visualize from below the parish or the diocese as a community of communities.

It also appears that the ascension of an explicit ecclesiology of the People of God has produced a closer relationship between the Church and the World, and the

Christian family serves as a channel in this relationship. After all, the designation "People of God" can be used in a broad sense to refer to the whole family of God. In this latter sense the Christian family as a family is also a fundamental cell of the human family. Thus, one can say, and the Council makes this point, that the Christian family is a fundamental cell in both the society of the Church and in the society of the World. Consequently, the Christian family discovers its identity and role within the new creation started by Christ and His ongoing mission of redemption. Thus, the Christian family is an agent of creation and redemption.

Another aspect of the ecclesiology of the People of God is that the initiated belong to a common priesthood of the faithful. The mission, functions, and elements of the Church are the responsibility of all the faithful. In the matrimonial unit the Council demonstrates in seed form how these are specified in Christian marriage and its family. It even indicates that some expressions of these ecclesial aspects are proper to Christian spouses and their families. Some examples of what is proper to them now follow. It is proper to married spouses to grow in holiness in their married life and in the welcoming and education of their children (a priestly function). It is proper to them to participate in the mission of the Church by being the first heralds of the gospel to their children (a prophetic function). Within the Church parents possess an office (munus), duty, and obligation to oversee and guide the growth and development of their children (a kingly or servant-leader function), particularly in the children's religious education and selection of a vocation. They also are endowed with their own gift or grace, i.e., a charism, to implement their responsibilities.

It is my thesis that in this seed text the Council asserts these examples as ecclesial functions and elements which it develops later in Lumen Gentium and other Vatican II documents. Additionally, Popes Paul VI and John Paul II will also develop these functions and elements.⁸⁹ These are called ecclesial because they are derived from what the Christian family is, that is, the smallest unit or type of Church. It is the task of Chapter Three to verify this claim. The task of Chapter Two, however, is to show that Vatican II's ecclesial vision of the Christian family has a major theological root in the Catholic Tradition's interpretations of Eph. 5:21-33.

CHAPTER TWO

EPHESIANS 5:21-33 AND ITS USE IN HISTORY

When the Council discusses Christian marriage and family in LG 11, it cites Eph. 5:32 and 1 Cor. 7:7 as its biblical references. Relative to the ecclesiological and sacramental foundations for understanding Christian marriage and family, Ephesians 5:32 is the more important of the two references. The Council uses the Ephesians' reference to establish "what" Christian marriage and family are. They are a sacrament and a type of Church. The Council uses the 1 Cor. 7:7 reference to establish that spouses possess a special gift which is appropriate to their state and order of life. In the New Testament, however, 1 Cor. 7:7 is a general statement about each state of life possessing its appropriate gift.⁹⁰ Thus, in this situation the council fathers are applying a general statement to a specific situation. Because the ecclesial nature of the Christian family receives its most explicit and developed biblical exposition in chapters five and six of Ephesians, I will focus on the Ephesians' reference in this chapter.⁹¹

This second chapter consists of two Parts. Part One is a partial exegesis of the most significant verses of Ephesians for understanding the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and family. First, I focus on 5:31-32, then enlarge the scope to 5:21-33, the haustafel (household code). I will also comment briefly on the parents-children relationship in Eph. 6:1-4. Part Two is a historical survey of select sources that use Ephesians for understanding the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and its family. The

time period extends from the second century to the beginning of the Second Vatican Council (1962). I will include the work of select theologians and Church leaders from the East and West; and, I will briefly describe the lay and evangelical climate within the Roman Catholic Church during the 1950's which enabled the formal recognition of the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and its family.

PART ONE THE NEW TESTAMENT

Eph. 5:31-32 occupies a prominent place in the Tradition relative to understanding the ecclesial and sacramental nature of Christian marriage and family. While preaching on Eph. 5:22-33, John Chrysostom instructs the husbands in his congregation to love their wives and to exercise headship in their families or household. He concludes this exhortation with the comment: "If we regulate our households [families] in this way, we will also be fit to oversee the Church, for indeed the household [family] is a little Church."⁹² Thomas Aquinas, based upon his understanding of these verses, considered matrimony as one of the four great sacraments "by reason of its signification, for it symbolizes the union of Christ and the Church."⁹³

But at least since the Reformation, there have been strong opposing views to marriage as a sacrament. Calvin and other reformers have negated the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox teaching that marriage is a sacrament. Calvin stated the following conclusion after his commentary of vv. 31-32: "But who would discover here anything like a sacrament? This blunder arose from the grossest ignorance."⁹⁴

As shown in chapter one, Vatican Council II does not accept the reformers' position that marriage is not a sacrament. It reaffirms the Roman Catholic position that

Christian marriage is one of the seven sacraments; and furthermore, it uses Eph. 5:32 in the matrimonial unit of LG 11 to substantiate this position. The purpose of this partial exegesis is to determine if these verses are primarily ontological statements (judgments about the nature of a reality) or functional statements (judgments about the activities of a reality). Based upon this determination, I will suggest some hermeneutical implications.

The exegesis develops as follows:

1. a listing of foundational statements
2. a brief commentary of vv. 31-32
3. an exposition of the movement of thought of 5:21-33
4. and an excursion of theological speculation of 5:21-33 within the context of Ephesians as a whole, including 6:1-4

In the last section of Part One I attempt to identify several hermeneutical topics or questions that are suggested by the analysis of Eph. 5:31-32. Some of these topics will be within the scope of this dissertation and will be developed later in appropriate chapters.

Foundational Statements

Below is a select list of foundational statements that are rather obvious and for the most part noncontroversial. They are important because they serve as a backdrop for the ensuing exegesis. I will conclude this brief section with some remarks that will help to guide my interpretation of vv. 31-32.

Ephesians 5:31

1. Verse 31 is a quotation of Gen. 2:24.

2. Eph. 5:31 is not an exact quotation of Gen. 2:24. Eph. 5:31 RSV is as follows: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife and the two shall become one." The Gen. 2:24 RSV translation is "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh."⁹⁵
3. Both the Jewish and Christian traditions have applied Gen. 2:24 to designate the divine ordination of marriage. However, it is to be noted that the term 'marriage' is not in the text.
4. Gen. 2:24 is part of the second creation account, which is the older of the two creation accounts. In the first creation account the emphasis of Gen. 1:28 is the dictate to perpetuate God's people: "Be fruitful and multiple." In the older account, Gen. 2:24, the emphasis is on the couple's personal fulfillment: "they become one flesh."⁹⁶
5. Gen. 2:24 expresses that marriage is the beginning of a new unit ("a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife"), is between a man and a woman, and is a monogamous union ("they become one flesh").

Ephesians 5:32

1. The author of Ephesians observes a correlation between the traditional marriage text of Gen. 2:24 which is quoted in v. 31 and the relationship between Christ and the Church. Verse 32 RSV is as follows: "This is a great mystery, and I take it to mean Christ and the Church."
2. The author is making an authoritative statement in v. 32 RSV ("I think it to mean").
3. The author presumes Jesus is risen and is the Christ. The Christ is united to the Church. The author, therefore, is making both a christological and an ecclesiological statement.

4. The author's Christology is high, and his ecclesiology is of an exalted and universal Church.

General Comments

1. Eph. 5:31-32 is part of a literary unit called a haustafel (a household code). The haustafel has two sections, husband-wife (5:21-33) and parents-children/masters-slaves (6:1-6:9).

2. Ephesians is part of the Pauline heritage. It probably was written between ninety to one hundred A.D.,⁹⁷ and if the dating is accurate, then it could not have been written by Paul who died in the sixties.⁹⁸

3. The author of Ephesians knew most of the earlier Pauline writings.⁹⁹

4. The preoccupation of Ephesians is with the unity of the Christ-Church relationship. Although Ephesians borrows heavily from Colossians, it differs from the latter significantly in its theological outlook and in its change in pastoral objectives. While Colossians tends to possess a christological emphasis, Ephesians possess an ecclesiological one. While Colossians calls for a "'heavenly' conversion on earth," Ephesians calls for "the confrontation with the non-Christian environment."¹⁰⁰

Concluding Remarks

Eph. 5:31-32 and the haustafel which houses it are themselves examples of an exegetical and hermeneutical enterprise. The author of Ephesians takes an Old Testament text and uses it to give authority to his ideas, and he reinterprets the meaning of the text in the context of a contemporary code of conduct. Additionally, he expands and deepens the household code that he borrows from Col. 3:18-4.1 to convey his ecclesiological and pastoral insights.¹⁰¹ Thus, he utilizes the process of development of

thought by the application of tradition for the sake of articulating the significance of the Mystery of Christ and the Church for his contemporaries. We too are charged with this enterprise.

A second remark cautions against creating false dichotomies when correlating v. 32 to v. 31. The pertinence of this statement will become evident during the exegesis of v. 32. For now let it suffice to say that although the author of Ephesians is preoccupied with the relationship between Christ and the Church, he can not be excluding the institution of marriage from this mystery. Why not? Precisely, because there is no historical Church apart from married people, and it would be absurd and a contradiction to consider that the author of Ephesians would exclude married people from the Body of Christ.

Brief Commentary of Verses 31-32

Textual Commentary

A textual commentary focuses on the prior step of establishing the original text of a passage.¹⁰² This is an important step because no one has any of the original biblical documents and the existing copies differ from one another. A transliteration of the RSV Greek text for Eph. 5:31-32 follows.¹⁰³

Verse 31

anti toutou kataleipsei anthrōpos [ton]
 patera kai [tēn] mētera kai
 prokollēthēsetai pros tēn gunaika autou,
 kai esontai oi duo eis sarka mian.

Verse 32

to mystērion touto mega estin,
 egō de legō eis Christon
 kai [eis] tēn ekklēsian.

The above Greek text encloses three words in brackets: ton and tēn in v. 31 and eis in v. 32. The brackets indicate disagreement among biblical documents relative to textual validity. In the case of our three words enclosed in brackets, Westcott and Hort judge that the better readings include the words. The omission of ton, tēn, and eis mark texts which are to be considered secondary readings.¹⁰⁴

In addition to the textual variations above, WH points to another textual problem. In v. 31 it designates 'pros tēn gunaika' as the primary reading. It recognizes 'tē gunaiki' as a probable secondary reading.¹⁰⁵ Both the RSV and the Greek New Testament neglect reference to this textual variation.¹⁰⁶ Markus Barth updates the assessment of the above textual variances in light of twentieth century archaeological discoveries such as Papyrus 46, and he formulates the following conclusion: "At any rate, whether a longer or a shorter form of Gen. 2 is considered more authentic, the sense of 5:31 does not differ."¹⁰⁷

In conclusion, there does not appear to be any major textual problems in Eph. 5:31-32. Thus, I can proceed to the next step of my exegesis with a high degree of confidence that I am working with the best available text, and most likely, the original text.

Verse 31

anti toutou kataleipsei anthrōpos [ton]
 patera kai [tēn] mētera kai
 prokollēthēsetai pros tēn gunaika autou,
 kai esontai oī duo eis sarka mian.
 For this reason a man shall leave
 his father and mother and
 be joined to his wife,
 and the two shall become one.

'For this reason' is a good translation of anti toutou.¹⁰⁹ Throughout history commentators have suggested various referents for verse 31. Sampley has demonstrated, however, that vv. 31-33 are a recapitulation of vv. 21-30, and consequently, v. 31 must be understood in light of the essential interrelationship between Christ-Church and husband-wife.¹¹⁰

Regarding kataleipsei, prokollēthēsetai, and esontai--the three verbs are the gnomic future,¹¹¹ which is "the statement of a fact or performance which may be rightfully expected under normal conditions."¹¹² Barth says that dabaq, the Greek is proskollaomai, "means a voluntary, passionate, close relationship which involves a man's soul and body."¹¹³

Two other important words which need comment are anthrōpos and sarka. Robertson bluntly states that it is absurd to render Christ for anthrōpos [man as species].¹¹⁴ Barth too rejects allegorical notions of Christ's parousia, but he still holds for a Christological interpretation of v. 31 on the basis of v. 32. Sampley's exposition of vv.

31-32 within the context of the haustafel will shed more light on a Christological interpretation, but first we must make another point.

It concerns the use of anthrōpos rather than anēr [man as male] in v. 31. Throughout the haustafel, vv. 21-33, the author of Ephesians uses anēr/andrōs for rendering the Hebrew ish when referring to the husband and wife relationship, except for v. 31. In v. 31 the author remains faithful to the LXX rendering of anthrōpos as cited in Gen. 2:24, and Barth sees in the immediate shifting back to anēr/andrōs in v. 33 as an indication that Eph. 5 can not be used as an underestimation of the dignity of women.¹¹⁵

J. Jeremias notes that anthrōpos has several connotations: e.g., "'Man' as species a. as distinct from animals (Mt. 12:12), angels (1 C. 4:9), Jesus Christ (Gl. 1:12) and God (Mk. 11:30)."¹¹⁶ Oepke notes in his commentary on anēr, man as male, the following:

Paul gives the order (1 C. 11:3ff.) God, Christ, man, woman, each preceding link being the --> kephaln of that which follows, and each that follows the --> doxa of the preceding. . . . In marriage Christianity demands the subordination of the wife . . . but also unselfish love from the husband such as that shown by Christ for the Church.¹¹⁷

I noted in the above paragraph that the author of Ephesians uses anēr throughout the haustafel except in v. 31, the Old Testament quotation. Barth explained this use as a faithful quoting of the LXX. Sampley notes that the insertion of a pentateuchal quotation into a haustafel is "a widespread early Christian convention of a reference to the . . . understanding of the position of women in marriage in early Christian times."¹¹⁸ It should be noted, however, that the author of Ephesians could select freely from various appropriate passages. So, why did he choose Gen. 2:24 which uses anthrōpos, instead of a verse which uses anēr? After all, anēr would be more consistent with his choices throughout the remainder of the haustafel.

I propose that another reason the author uses anthrōpos is that it emphasizes 'commonality' or 'oneness', while anēr emphasizes 'difference' or 'separateness'. This choice is consistent with Ephesians' general theme of unity in the Church. Furthermore, it is supported by the remainder of the verse which proclaims that the "two shall become one [flesh, sarka]."

Additionally, if the whole passage from vv. 21-30 is the referent for v. 31, then it is reasonable that the clause "two shall become one flesh" can have various levels of meaning. On one level, there is the husband-wife relationship. By marrying, the husband and wife become a new reality; i.e., their separate condition in life becomes unified by marrying, affecting their very being and effecting a new way of life. This is especially clear in vv. 28-31 where the author describes a movement of identification. He begins with identifying men's wives as their bodies, then as one's self, and finally as one's flesh. Thus, body, self, and flesh are used equivalently, designating that a new reality is brought into being. Thus, I conclude that v. 31 is primarily an ontological statement, a judgment about the nature of a reality although not of its total essence since the union of two persons is a mystery. On this level of the husband-wife relationship, v. 31 states "what" a man and woman become when they join in marriage.

Another level of meaning arises when one recalls the earlier point that there is an essential interrelationship between the husband-wife relationship and the Christ-Church relationship. A solidarity exists within the Church so that what happens to individuals affects the whole. Thus, the "new reality" resulting from the marriage of two believers will affect the Christ-Church relationship. Furthermore, there is an interconnectedness between the two relationships which necessitates a mutual sharing of

life. Perhaps this is why future generations will come to speak about family life as ecclesial and Church life as familial.

The author of Ephesians introduces still another level of meaning for the "one flesh" new reality when he correlates the organic imagery of the "Body of Christ," which is found within the haustafel, with the marital relationship. Faithful to the Pauline tradition the author reasserts that the "Body of Christ" is a union which is both corporate and corporal (vv. 28-33).¹¹⁹ To appreciate the significance of this union it is helpful to turn to 1 Cor. 10:16-17. Here Paul asserts that the corporate and corporal union of Christ-Church is realized in the eucharist. In Eph. 5:21-33 the author asserts that the corporate and corporal union of Christ-Church is realized in Christian marriage.¹²⁰ Thus, both eucharist and marriage point to the transcendent union between Christ and the Church, and it will be v. 32 which unveils this fullest meaning: Christian marriage--by what it is as an intimate, loving union of two believers which is corporate and corporal--signifies the transcendent union between Christ and the Church (an intimate, loving union which is corporate and corporal).

Commentary of Verse 32

Verse 32

to mystērion toutou mega estin,

egō de legō eis Christon

kai [eis] tēn ekklēsian.

This is a great mystery,

and I take it to mean Christ

and the church.

I concluded the previous section with the intimation that v. 32 will reveal the fullest significance of v. 31, and indeed it does. In this sense one can speak of the prophetic nature of vv. 31-32, and in fact, of the whole unit, vv. 21-33. Regarding to mystērion toutou mega estin, mystērion is translated mystery and "refers to matters made known through revelation."¹²¹ According to Sampley, "touto does not designate the specific referent of mystērion, but could conceivably refer to any part or parts of the section beginning with 5:21."¹²²

Barth and Sampley argue that the translation "This is a great mystery" is not the preferred one. Both agree that mega has a predicative relationship rather than an attributive one to mystērion. According to Sampley, mega as a predicate adjective, "allows its immediate context and the use of mystērion in the remainder of the epistle to determine what it asserts about mystērion here."¹²³

Verse 32b, egō de legō eis Christon kai [eis] tēn ekklēsian, provides the best means for understanding mystērion.¹²⁴ The link between v. 32a and v. 32b is the postpositive conjunction de. In the case of 32b, de has an explanatory usage.¹²⁵ Eis means 'with reference to' and it follows egō de legō.¹²⁶

Sampley remarks that there is considerable disagreement over how egō de legō is to be understood.¹²⁷ On the one hand, there is the position that the author is defending his interpretation against his opponents (Dibelius, Bornkamm, Schlier). On the other hand, there is the position that he is merely "going beyond the obvious meaning of the passage" (Brown). Sampley favors the former position based on Morton Smith's work with tannaitic materials.¹²⁸

The tasks still remain to establish the meaning of mystērion and the function of the OT verse. I will continue to use Sampley as the main guide because he has demonstrated convincingly that vv. 31-32 must be understood within the literary form of the haustafel. Sampley notes that most commentators explain to mystērion touto mega estin as referring "either to the immediately preceding quotation or to the 'institution of marriage'."¹²⁹ He rejects their position because the haustafel form alone "accounts for a large percentage of what is said about the 'institution of marriage' and greatly lessens the possibility that mystērion refers to marriage per se."¹³⁰ To understand mystērion one must analyze the six other uses of it in Ephesians.¹³¹ After a lengthy commentary on the various shades of meanings of mystērion in Ephesians and on the role of the OT verse, he concludes that the author of Ephesians suggests "not only the relationship that should subsist between husband and wife but also the relationship of Christ and the church."¹³²

Although marriage imagery is obviously evident, the author of Ephesians does not limit himself in vv. 21-33 to this imagery. Sampley insightfully remarks:

The last clause of Gen. 2:24--'and the two shall become one flesh'--can be understood not only of the uniting of two marriage partners, but also can be seen as the occasion for the introduction of organic terminology. For example, since Gen. 2:24 states that 'the two shall become one flesh', it is possible for the author to speak of the man as the head of the wife (v. 23a) and Christ as head over the church, his body (v. 23b). The language of head, body and members is imported by the author and can be understood as brought in on the basis of the last clause of Gen. 2:24.¹³³

Gen. 2:24, therefore, can be used to elicit marital and organic terminology. The marital terminology provides for an ontological statement, while the organic terminology provides for a functional statement.

In any case, marital union and Body of Christ union are correlated. The clear emphasis is union, and one can infer that the author of Ephesians is providing "a teaching

on the unity of all Christians in Christ."¹³⁴ Fitzmyer remarks that the corporal union between Christians and Christ is derived, although not exclusively, from their physical consumption of the one loaf and from the physical marital union of two believers as they become one flesh.¹³⁵ How are these transcendent unions possible? He asserts:

And yet Christians and Christ are not physically united like the yoke and the albumen of an egg. Hence theologians later called the union 'mystical', an adjective that Paul does not use. The ontological reality that is the basis of the union is the possession of the Spirit of Christ: 'We have all been baptized in one Spirit to form one body' (1 Cor. 12:13; cf. Rom 8:9-11). The possession of the spirit springs from the incorporation of believers through faith and baptism; it is, as it were, the term of Paul's christocentric soteriology.¹³⁶

Another insight about the union within the Body of Christ can be found in the phrase eis Christon (v. 32). Again, the context is sacramental incorporation of Christians into the Body of Christ. In his commentary on Paul's thought, Fitzmyer says the following about the meaning of the phrase eis Christon, "into Christ":

In fact, the phrase is mainly found in these two contexts: belief or baptism in Christ. It pregnantly expresses the movement toward Christ that these initial experiences imply, the beginning of the Christian's condition en Christō (see 1 Cor. 10:2). Torn from one's original condition ('in Adam', 1 Cor. 15:22), from one's natural inclinations ('in the flesh', Rom. 7:5), and from one's ethnic background ('under the law', 1 Cor. 9:20), one is solemnly introduced 'into Christ' in faith and baptism. Eis Christon denotes, then, the movement of incorporation.¹³⁷

If eis Christon is found mainly with belief and baptismal statements, then can one find any baptismal reference in the haustafel? Indeed, one finds it in v. 26b, "having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word." Just as one was able to correlate marriage with eucharist, one can now correlate marriage with belief and baptism. Immediately before the baptismal reference, there is marital imagery: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her" (vv. 25-26a). In this latter context the author of Ephesians connects the YHW-

Israel hieros gamos to speak of Christ and the Church.¹³⁸ The Old Testament declares that Yahweh will cleanse his bride Israel, and the New Testament declares that Christ will cleanse his bride the Church.

In Ephesians, thus, the author correlates marriage to eucharist and to baptism. Each of these three sacraments bespeak a union between Christ and believers which is an ontological reality that is based on the possession of the Spirit of Christ. Each of the sacraments also bespeak a diversified functional relationship based on the headship of Christ (Jesus is Lord!). I suggest that marriage is so closely linked with eucharist and baptism that it would be inconsistent to affirm or deny the status of 'sacrament' of any one of these without the others. If baptism and eucharist are sacraments, then Christian marriage is one also. A key reason is expressed in v. 30 which is the end of the correlations between husband-wife and Christ-Church relationships, "because we are members of his body."

Movement of Thought in Ephesians 5:21-33¹³⁹

In his monograph on Eph. 5:21-33, Sampley demonstrates that the verses from 21-33 form a literary unit called a haustafel and that this unit serves as the context for interpreting the meaning of the individual verses from 21-33. Therefore, to establish the meaning of vv. 31-32, it is important to establish the movement of thought within the haustafel, the role of vv. 31-32 in that movement, and the resultant meaning.

Sampley enables one to readily decipher the movement of thought by providing several perspectives for examining the haustafel. I will refer to two of these. First, on the basis of subject matter, he separates the verses as seen in table one below. All of the verses are in two columns, A & B,¹⁴⁰ except the two and one half verses which do not fall

into the columns. Column A lists verses which pertain primarily to the husband-wife relationship. Column B lists verses which pertain more directly to the Christ-Church relationship.¹⁴¹ Outside the columns are vv. 21, 31, and 32a. Verse 21,

TABLE 1

Column A	Column B
	(21) ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ χριστοῦ
(22a) Αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (22b) ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (23a) ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυνακός	(23b) ὡς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. (23c) αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. (24a) ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ χριστῷ
(24b) αὐτῶς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί. (25a) Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπατε τὰς γυναῖκας	(25b) καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (25c) καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, (26a) ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγίαση (26b) καθάρισας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ρήματι, (27a) ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐνδοξὸν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, (27b) μὴ ἔχουσιν σπῖλον ἢ ρυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων (27c) ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ ἀγία καὶ ἄμωμος.
(28a) οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν [καί] οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. (28b) ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾶ (29a) οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν, (29b) ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν,	(29c) καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (30) ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.
(31a) ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος [τόν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, (31b) καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. (32a) τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν	(32b) ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς χριστόν

καί [εἰς] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

(33a) πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα
ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ,
(33b) ἢ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβηται τὸν
ἄνδρα.

"Be subject to one another out of deference for Christ," acts as a superscription over the entire haustafel. Verses 31-32a are excluded from either column because they do not fall readily into either column.¹⁴²

The second perspective is on the basis of grammatical analysis. Sampley demonstrates that the author of Ephesians oscillates the flow of thought between column A (husband-wife relationship) and column B (Christ-Church relationship) by employing comparative particles and adversative conjunctions at the transition points between columns A and B. The comparative particles are located at v. 23b (ὄς), v. 24b (outōs), v. 25b (kathōs), v. 28a (outōs), and v. 29c (kathōs). The adversative conjunctions are located at v. 32b (de is a postpositive particle being used as an adversative conjunction) and v. 33a (plēn, an introductory adverb acting as a conjunction). Regarding plēn, Sampley remarks that it is used in place of ὄς or one of its compounds for at least two reasons: first, "since the coordination between familial relations and the relationship of Christ and the church does not extend beyond the OT quotation, there is no call for such a particle; and second, . . . plēn may be concessive or may serve to close off a discussion."¹⁴³

These two perspectives are sufficient to indicate the flow of thought. Sampley succinctly outlines it as follows:

(1) an exhortation to the wives (provided by the haustafel form) combined with a statement about the preeminence of the husband (column A) [22a-23a], (2) a descriptive statement of the relationship of Christ and the church (column B) [23b-

24a], (3) a closing injunction to the wives (almost an exact parallel of v. 22a) (column A) [24b], (4) an exhortation to the husbands (given in the haustafel form) [25a], followed by (5) an extended rehearsal of what Christ did for the Church (column B) [25b-27c], (6) a return to a discussion of the duties of the husband with regard to the wife (column A) [28a-29b] and (7) a closing statement concerning Christ and the church (column B) [29c-30]. At this point the author introduces the OT quotation and the statement, 'this mystery is great' [31-32a].

The pattern seen so clearly prior to the OT quotation in 5:31 is continued in the last part of v. 32 with (8) the statement egō de legō eis Christon kai [eis] tēn ekklēsiān (column B) [32b], followed by (9) a continuing double admonition, including the duties of both husbands and wives (column A) [33].¹⁴⁴

The highlighting of the above two perspectives illustrates that the verses can be separated on the basis of subject matter and grammatical construction. After presenting these perspectives, Sampley makes a couple of observations. First, that although the literary form is a haustafel, the author's attention is focused on Christ and the Church, thereby, eclipsing the household code.¹⁴⁵ Second, that "even though a separation . . . can be established, it must also be noted how closely related these two columns are."¹⁴⁶ Sampley notes that the use of comparative particles can substantiate both the separation of the material as well as some essential interrelationships between the husband-wife relationship and the Christ-Church relationship. The fact that the particles are 'comparative' enables one to observe the essential interrelationships.¹⁴⁷

A second way to substantiate the interrelationship is by the way that the verbs are shared between the husband-wife and Christ-Church relationships. According to Sampley, "the ways in which verbs are supplied or assumed from the immediate context as well as repeated point up the limitations of any attempt to make a radical distinction between the two sides of this table [one]."¹⁴⁸ The three places which provide verbs which are shared are: v. 23a (estin), v. 24a (hupotassetai), and v. 29b (ektrephei and thalpei). At v. 25a and again at v. 25b the verb agapaō is employed. Thus, before the Old

Testament quotation in v. 31, the author interrelates the relationships between husband-wife and Christ-Church. What is said about one relationship is applied to the other relationship, albeit analogically. The meaning of vv. 31-33 is to be found in vv. 21-30; i.e., vv. 31-33 are a recapitulation of the literary unit.

Theological Speculation in the Context of the Whole

Based upon Sampley's conclusion of the interrelationships between both relationships, I will do some theological speculation in light of the doctrine of Ephesians which is expounded in chapters 1-3.¹⁴⁹ I propose that the author of Ephesians presents the proper use of power (vv. 22a-24b) and love (25a-30) between husband and wife and that the paradigm for this usage is the imitation of Christ.

For instance, I previously mentioned that v. 21, "Be subject to one another out of deference for Christ," is a superscription or title for the entire haustafel. This superscription is consistent with the author's second part of his letter which begins at 4:1: "I therefore, a prisoner for the Lord beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called." Verses 2-3 continue: "with all lowliness and meekness, with patience, forbearing one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

Moreover, 5:22a-24b provides the statement about the use of power. It begins with the haustafel admonition to wives: "Wives, be subject to your husbands." It presents the model for the exercise of power in the married relationship in v. 23b, "as Christ is head of the Church." Finally, v. 24b ends the section on power by returning to a statement about the wife.

In addition to the superscription and the initial section of the haustafel, the doctrinal context of chapters 1-3 is instructive. It expresses, I suggest, that Christ's exercise of power is a sharing of God the Father's power and is at the service of redemption, forgiveness, salvation, reconciliation, revelation of God's plan, and unity. Examples follow:

1. 1:11 NAB states: "In him [Christ], we were also chosen, destined in accord with the purpose of the One who accomplishes all things according to the intention of his will."
2. 1:7 states: "In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses."
3. 2:15b-17 affirms the efficaciousness of Christ's salvific deeds: "that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end."
4. Finally, 1:10 states: "as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth."

Besides Christ's sharing of God the Father's power which is in the Spirit (1:13-14; 2:17-22), Christ shares power with believers. For example, the author recognizes that God's power is at work in himself (3:7), who is an apostle of Christ Jesus (1:1). Thus, as Jesus glorified His Father by preaching, the author glorifies Christ and God by preaching. In a succinct statement, the author declares "to whom," "what" and "why" he preaches: "To the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things; that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and

powers in the heavenly places" (3:8-10). In the author's obviously high christology and ecclesiology, he proclaims that it "was according to the eternal purpose which he [God] has realized in Christ Jesus our Lord" that all believers would have access to God through faith in Christ (3:11-12). Finally, he exhorts, believers ought to realize that it is "by the power at work within us [that we are] able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think" (3:20-21).

Ephesians 1:17-23 provides a valuable summary and illustration of my points that Christ's exercise of power, in the context of Ephesians, enables believers to share in the Triune God's power and that it is at the service of redemption, forgiveness, salvation, reconciliation, revelation of God's plan, and unity:

That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that you may know what is the hope to which he has called you, what are the riches of this glorious inheritance in the saints, and what is the immeasurable greatness of his power in us who believe, according to the working of his great might which he accomplished in Christ when he raised him from the dead and made him sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come; and he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all.

The awareness of the awesomeness of this mystery becomes amplified when one acknowledges that the Christ who is head over all things is the same Christ who "may dwell in your hearts through faith; that you, being rooted and grounded in love, may have power to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled with the fullness of God" (3:17-19).

From this broad sweep of quotations, one can conclude that there is no competition or contradiction between genuine power and love. The Christ who reigns is the Christ who loves. In Christ, one discovers the perfect harmonious use of power and love. The believer has Christ indwelling, and it is the indwelling Christ who grounds the believer in love and provides the power to follow the Christian walk. Christian believers who are married are called to imitate Christ's harmonious use of power and love as the pattern of their relationship. Their way of being-with-each-other is to be a response to the indwelling Christ, rather than a continuation of the course of this world under the prince of the power of the air (2:2). Why? Because we have been made alive together with Christ (2:5).

Furthermore, based on the Pauline tradition, especially as evident in Rom. 1:16-17, the term "power" entails the gospel: "[The gospel] is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith . . . For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; . . . 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.'" Christ, who is head of his body is its savior (Eph. 5:23c), and He is the power for salvation to everyone who has faith. Those who have faith shall live. Christ's power is the power to have life in the Triune God, in and through His Body, the Church. Because married couples of faith are alive in Christ, they are empowered to imitate Christ's exercise of power. In other words, the exercise of power in the Christian married relationship--one with faith in Christ as its foundation--is to be a participation in God's life and to be a service of redemption, forgiveness, salvation, reconciliation, revelation of God's plan, and unity. The precondition, therefore, for the proper exercise of power in the Christian married relationship is faith in Christ which is rooted in love; and the sign of its genuineness is

the service of redemption, forgiveness, salvation, reconciliation, revelation of God's plan, and unity.

Two examples of applications follow. First is an example of decision-making within marriage and the family. The married couple could ask during important deliberations: "Which course of action will enable us and our family to experience God's saving power in Christ, i.e., which course of action will promote unity, reconciliation, and be life-giving? An acceptable answer might also include an element of love that is willing to be stretched even to the point of death. In other words, the marital relationship is to manifest God's power and love as revealed in Christ. This power-love flows from the divine wellspring, who is the indwelling Spirit of Christ. Thus, one can recognize in the husband-wife relationship and its family a sacramentality which future generations will come to recognize as a sacrament and a little church.

A second application involves the parent-child relationship. In Ephesians 6:1-4 one can recognize functional statements for family conduct. These statements, like the one's in the previous section on the husband-wife relationship, are governed by the mutual deference superscription in 5:21 and by the Christian fact of being-in-the-Lord. Thus, the motif of the use of Christian power and love in imitation of Christ will also undergird this section of the haustafel.

More specifically, in accordance with contemporary social norms, the author notes the father's general role to exercise headship; but he adds for the Christian parent the specific role to exercise spiritual headship on behalf of the child. Spiritual headship includes the parents' authority and duty to educate and to admonish the children in the ways of the Lord, and this bringing up in the instruction of the Lord entails firmness and

kindness (v. 4).¹⁵⁰ On the children's part, there is the admonition to honor the parents by their obedience, and this is undergirded by the motivation of a promise to a long life (vv. 1-3).

In conclusion, one can state that the exercise of power in the Christian parent-child relationship is similar to the married relationship in a few ways. First, the foundation is faith in Christ which is rooted in love. Second, the exercise of power entails a service of redemption, forgiveness, salvation, reconciliation, revelation of God's plan, and unity. In the theology of Ephesians this service is ecclesial, and not surprisingly, therefore, the parent-child relationship activates the mission of the Church to spread faith in Christ and to make disciples. Correctly, future generations will come to articulate that the Christian family is a little Church and that parents exercise ecclesial functions. Church documents will come to articulate the latter in terms of the three-fold office of Christ as priest, prophet, and king. Additionally, one can in hindsight also discern a special ranking, status, or office for parents relative to the mission and functions of the Church. In other words, there exists an obligation and responsibility to exercise power and love as a service in imitation of Christ, and parents have access to a special charism to raise their children toward Christian discipleship (1 Cor. 7:7).

PART TWO SELECT HISTORICAL SURVEY

In his commentary on Ephesians Schnackenburg has included an excellent, albeit, brief section on the influence of Ephesians 5:21-33 in the ongoing debate within Christianity on whether marriage is or is not a sacrament.¹⁵¹ Relative to our thesis, the essentially ecclesial dimension of Christian marriage and the family which flows from it,

Schnackenburg makes several points which are significant. These points are made during his historical survey of Eph. 5:21-33.

Patristic Period

First, Schnackenburg uncovers the contributions made by patristic exegetes. He mentions that although the entire passage, vv. 21-33, is important for determining the meaning of marriage between Christians, especially regarding whether marriage is a sacrament; it is vv. 31-32, where Genesis 2:24, is quoted that the Church Fathers place the greatest emphasis. They quote these verses often to expound the nature of Christian marriage.¹⁵²

Before noting the contributions of individual patristic exegetes, Schnackenburg makes six observations that are applicable to this group:

(1) The writers of the early Church without exception took the quotation in v. 31 to refer directly to human marriage and then only in a second step referred the 'great mystery' to Christ and the Church; (2) The Fathers, who look back to the divine establishment of marriage on the morning of Creation, make no basic difference between a 'natural marriage' and Christian marriage; (3) the marriage established by God is regarded as good and holy in the repulsing of other conceptions, especially in Gnosticism; (4) [sic] considerable consideration is given to the figurative character of marriage in relationship to Christ and the Church, but it is evaluated in various ways; (5) the character of the 'great mystery' is only partly explained in more detail; (6) in the area of the Latin writers, too, where mysterium in one version of the Vetus Latina (especially in Africa) and in the Vulgate is translated as sacramentum, the expression in the patristic period was not specifically interpreted in the sense of the concept of Sacrament which only developed slowly.¹⁵³

After commenting upon the interpretations of the Fathers of the East (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom) and writers representative of the West (Tertullian, Marius Victorinus, Pelagius, Augustine), Schnackenburg draws several conclusions.¹⁵⁴ First, he states that the patristics were

strongly influenced by the perspective of looking at things, in our case marriage, from the beginning of creation to its highest fulfillment in Christ and His Church. Second, it is marriage in paradise which serves as the model for understanding the relationship between Christ and the Church. Third, generally speaking, the patristics held firmly to describing marriage in light of the divine intention at creation--as good, holy, and monogamous--and defended this position from forces without (Gnosticism, Manichaeism) and from forces within (deep respect for virginity and reservations against concupiscence).

Another important observation is that the patristics do not use the relationship between Christ and the Church as a model for Christian marriage. He speculates that this may be due to not considering 5:21-33 as a whole, or perhaps, that they failed to recognize that Gen. 2:24 is also directly applicable to the relationship of Christ and the Church. While this observation may be true generally, it is not entirely accurate for John Chrysostom's theology. In "Homily 20: Ephesians 5:22-33" he reinforces his teaching on the wife's obedience to her husband by correlating it to the Church's obedience of Christ; and, he reinforces his teaching on the husband's love for his wife by correlating it to Christ's love for the Church.¹⁵⁵

From among the patristic authors, John Chrysostom's homilies on marriage and family life are especially illustrative for understanding the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and family. Typically, he reasons from marriage and its family as a natural institution (although he doesn't use the word "institution") to Christian marriage and its family as an image or archetype (*typos*) of Christ, of Church, and of the Christ-Church relationship.¹⁵⁶ Yet, one must qualify this statement with the fact that Chrysostom writes

within the explicit Christian horizon that the husband and wife are one in Christ and that they are members of His Body, the Church.¹⁵⁷ Thus, both of these facts co-exist in Chrysostom's thinking as he exhorts Christians to grasp the significance of their marriage and family.

Some explication is certainly warranted. Fact one: John Chrysostom explicates the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and its family by reasoning from the husband-wife relationship to the Christ-Church relationship. His starting point is that marriage is a great mystery.¹⁵⁸ One reason for this is that God sows love in men and women. He provides three examples to substantiate this reason. First, a husband and wife leave his or her familiar and secure family to intertwine their hearts with an outsider, which remarkably results in a more powerful bond than the familiar one. Second, a baby recognizes immediately upon first sight the parent, even without being able to speak. Third, Christ leaves His Father's throne to intertwine His heart with His bride the Church.¹⁵⁹

A second reason marriage is a great mystery is because the "two join to become one flesh."¹⁶⁰ Again, Chrysostom provides three examples. First, God ordains marriage to be a bond by which husband and wife become one organism, which is a symbol of God himself. Second, through intercourse the husband and wife become one flesh, two decrease into one; and thereby, they can increase by procreation, which yields children who are one flesh with them. Thus, the family derived from marriage is also one flesh and one body. Third, Christ and the Church form one organism through a spiritual intercourse, namely communion; and thus, Chrysostom logically concludes that both the

husband-wife relationship and the Christ-Church relationship are a great mystery and that the former is an image and archetype of the latter.

In summary, Chrysostom teaches that Christian marriage and its family are a great mystery which manifest a greater mystery: Christ, Church, and the Christ-Church relationship. Furthermore, he claims that both mysteries, the husband-wife relationship and the Christ-Church relationship, are ordained by God to be mysteries of God's love, unity, and fruitfulness. Thus, he logically concludes that Christian marriage and its family are ecclesial in nature.

One can gain further insights into the nature of Christian marriage and its family by accounting for fact two: John Chrysostom teaches from the explicit Christian horizon that the husband and wife are married in the Lord and are members of His Body, the Church. There are several implications to the Christian fact that the husband and wife, married in the Lord, are members of Christ's flesh, of His Body.¹⁶¹ The implications can be grouped according to the themes of obedience and love.

Regarding obedience, the spouses and their children are to follow the way of the Lord, who submitted to His Head, God. The spouses and their children, who are members of Christ's Body, follow God by obeying Christ, their Head. For Chrysostom, there are two important implications. First, Christians are to give primacy to obedience to Christ, i.e., to do Christ's will always, even when there is conflict with some other authority. Second, out of reverence for Christ, the wife is to obey the husband, her head, and the children are to obey their parents. Chrysostom concludes this reflection with the statement that a husband who orders the household in this way is "fit to oversee the Church, for indeed the household is a little Church."¹⁶²

Regarding love, the husband as head of the family is to love as Christ loves His Body, the Church, even to giving up his life for his wife.¹⁶³ Additionally, Chrysostom notes that the husband's love is expressed by providing and caring for the wife and children.¹⁶⁴ He remarks that individual righteousness is not enough, and therefore, a husband must steadfastly care for those under his charge.¹⁶⁵ Of particular importance is the spiritual formation of children.¹⁶⁶ The wife, in turn, loves her husband because he is her head and he is a part of her body.¹⁶⁷

The husband's and wife's duties of love and obedience converge in the spiritual formation of their children. Parents are to raise their children to be godly and virtuous in preparation for their final judgment. Thus, parents should teach their children to obey the Lord by going to Mass together, discussing the readings and prayers of Mass, and praying as a family. Thus, by lovingly and obediently offering their children to the Lord, by forming their household for discipleship, and by ordering their household for peaceful living; the parents are acting ecclesially: in imitation of their Head Who is Priest, Prophet, and King.

In conclusion, Chrysostom clearly portrays the ecclesial nature of Christian marriage and its family from two perspectives: (1) by reasoning from the husband-wife relationship to the Christ-Church relationship and (2) by deducing from the Christ-Church relationship to the husband-wife relationship.

Scholastic Period to 1962

Moving to the Scholastic Period, Schnackenburg observes that the scholastics refine the theological understanding of sacrament.¹⁶⁸ Regarding the teaching that marriage is a sacrament, the interpretation of Eph. 5:31f. plays a significant, if not,

principal role. For example, Aquinas, who bases the sacramentality of marriage on the Ephesians' text, concludes that "the Sacraments cause what they indicate and that this Sacrament [marriage] gives participation in grace to the people being married in that they belong to the imperishable union of Christ and the Church."¹⁶⁹

By the Council of Trent, Catholic theologians and bishops generally agreed that marriage is a sacrament, but there was not general agreement that Ephesians 5:32 could be cited as evidence. Schnackenburg states that the consultations at the Council of Trent were divided. He concludes his comments on the Council of Trent as follows:

That is why in the final formulations it [Trent] says only that the Apostle Paul in Eph. 5:25 and 32 indicates (innuit) [sic] the grace which Christ earned for us through his death which completes the natural love, secures the insoluble unity and sanctifies the partners in marriage. Because marriage in the New Covenant through the grace brought by Christ stands out above marriages of old, it is rightly considered among the Sacraments of the New Covenant.¹⁷⁰

Schnackenburg next shifts to the Protestants' rejection of Trent's teaching that marriage is a sacrament. He makes the case that the intense polemics between Catholics and Protestants led to serious misunderstandings of one another's position. Yet, one must admit that beyond the closed-mindedness toward one another, there did exist deep differences in their respective understanding of sacrament and grace.¹⁷¹ Additionally, Schnackenburg notes, the real battlefield seemed to be ecclesiastical jurisdiction relative to marriage. Against the Catholic position, the Protestants maintained that marriage is essentially "worldly," and thereby, not a subject to be governed by the church.

Schnackenburg also notes the common ground between Catholics and Protestants that existed during the Reformation and continues today. Both sides hold that Christian marriage is to be lived "in the Lord" and is to recollect or reflect Christ's love for the Church.¹⁷² Using Karl Barth as representative of Protestantism and using Vatican

Council II as representative of Catholicism, Schnackenburg provides the quotes below to express that future agreement about the sacramentality of marriage may be constructed upon the idea of "Christ's covenant of Grace with his Church which is reflected and effective in marriage."¹⁷³

In his [K. Barth] view, in the account of Creation (Gen. 2.24) we find ourselves 'before the mystery of the divine covenant of grace as the inner basis of the divine creation' and that is 'imperiously suggested by the explicit reference in Eph. 5.32'.¹⁷⁴

The idea is also echoed in the Pastoral Constitution of the Second Vatican Council: 'For as God of old made Himself present to His people through a covenant of love and fidelity, so now the Saviour of men and the Spouse of the Church comes into the lives of married Christians through the sacrament of matrimony. He abides with them thereafter so that, just as He loved the Church and handed Himself over on her behalf, the spouses may love each other with perpetual fidelity through mutual self-bestowal'.¹⁷⁵

From my biblical exegesis of Eph. 5-6, from Schnackenburg's historical survey of Eph. 5:21-33, and from John Chrysostom's exegetical and hermeneutical exposition of Eph. 5-6; it is evident that Christian theologians have grappled with Eph. 5-6 in order to understand the nature and functioning of Christian marriage and its family. During the twentieth century Roman Catholicism has taken a great leap forward in developing the explicit ecclesial dimension of Christian marriage and its family. Within Roman Catholicism, the French theologian Yves Congar is the key theologian responsible for retrieving Chrysostom's insights and for advancing in a systematic fashion the ecclesial character of Christian marriage and its family. Much of his research would eventually be incorporated into formal Roman Catholic teaching. In fact, one could say that Congar provided the theological foundation for understanding the Christian family as domestic Church (LG 11).

In his book Lay People in the Church, Congar states, during the middle of his exposition on the priesthood of fathers and mothers of families, that "families are actually and literally cells of the Church."¹⁷⁶ By the word "cells" Congar means "living cells in which the life and mystery of the whole Body exists in an elementary way."¹⁷⁷ Thus, he concludes, following Chrysostom's reflections upon Eph. 5-6, "a family is a Church in little."¹⁷⁸ As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, Vatican II incorporates this insight by making it part of the conciliar teaching on the nature of Christian marriage, its family, and the Church. Immediately prior to the Council, John XXIII also described the family as a living cell of the Church; and after the Council, Paul VI confirmed this teaching. The following quote by Paul VI is quite to the point and worthy of further reflection:

It is an interior spiritual reality that transforms the couple's community of life into what could be called, according to the authorized teaching of the Council, "the Church of the home," a true "cell of the Church," as our well-beloved predecessor John XXIII expressed it to you on the occasion of your pilgrimage of May 3, 1959. It is a basic, germinal cell--the smallest, to be sure, but also the most fundamental one in the body of the Church.¹⁷⁹

From this quote Paul VI remarks that a living ecclesial cell results from a transformation of the couple's community of life. Before Paul VI, Congar also makes this point, and it is a critical one for a Roman Catholic understanding of Christian marriage and its family. According to Congar, "marriage is the sole example in the Christian economy of a natural institution, in itself and as such, being taken into the order of grace and made sacred."¹⁸⁰ It is the Lord himself who brings about this transformation, and this transformative experience builds on the foundations of baptism.¹⁸¹

As baptized believers, Christian spouses already share before marrying a participation in Christ's priestly, prophetic, and kingly offices. As Christian spouses this

participation in the triple offices is raised to a new level, one that can be said to be "instituted."¹⁸² Thus, Congar explicitly states that "the priesthood of Christian husband and wife is therefore more than a simple application of the spiritual priesthood of holiness to a particular situation, as is found, for instance, in the case of a school teacher with reference to his charge."¹⁸³ Congar also states that the spouses' "instituted" priesthood is founded upon more than an officium, a public responsibility.¹⁸⁴

According to Congar, the instituted priesthood of husbands and wives is due to a "sacramental consecration, that of baptism being echoed in that of marriage."¹⁸⁵ Furthermore, following the Pauline tradition, he states that marriage is a charism; and following Catholic tradition, he states that marriage is "a function in the mystical Body and an ordo."¹⁸⁶ The ecclesiology which manifests these insights is "the Church considered as organism, a body organically diversified and articulated."¹⁸⁷

Furthermore, Congar develops two important considerations from the priesthood of husbands and wives. First, he considers family worship, which he claims is "necessary in its order, as the completion of what is ordinarily received from the parish."¹⁸⁸ Examples of family worship are prayer in common (e.g., meal and bed time prayers), parents' personal intercession for children, teaching children to pray and to offer themselves to God, Bible-reading, faith-sharing, and home celebrations connected to sacraments.¹⁸⁹

Second, Congar claims that the state of husband and wife is a true priestly state in the sense of sacrifice.¹⁹⁰ He refers to sacrifice both in the sense of daily renunciations through life's trials and in the sense of the very structure of marriage. Regarding the former sense, Congar mentions Augustine's insight that parents exercise a type of

episcopacy by wholly devoting oneself in love to the family as a bishop devotes himself in love to the Church.¹⁹¹

Regarding the latter sense, Congar follows Augustine's definition of sacrifice "as that which one does in order to put oneself in a right relation towards someone else or someone above oneself."¹⁹² Congar considers this latter sense to have deep roots in the mystery of the Christ-Church relationship, i.e., to Eph. 5:21-33. The marriage relationship, he states, is a mystery that is great because it is like Christ's union with his Church. His own words are illuminating:

It [the union] is nothing less than a matter of Christ's love for and agreement with the Church, and the Church's love for and agreement with Christ. A love and agreement which bind both sides to a death and resurrection; which are realized only in a new birth, to one and the other in one, after a death to the life led only for self: ". . . as Christ also loved the Church and delivered himself up for her. . . . For this shall man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall come to be one flesh."¹⁹³

Congar also sees a kingly character to this priesthood of ordering. By implication, therefore, husband and wife are called to order their common life by exercising Christian freedom: i.e., to co-create a common life to be lived entirely for God.¹⁹⁴ I see in this insight that Christian marriage serves as a means for reversing the effects of original sin; i.e., Christian marriage serves as an agent to further Christ's salvation and redemption. In this way Christian marriage and its family manifest a true ecclesial mission.

This ecclesial mission is evangelization, and it is noteworthy that evangelization during the 1950's was an urgent need, especially in the Catholic Church in Europe which was experiencing a sharp decline in lay participation in the Church's life. The Church leadership recognized that an important component to reversing this trend was to have

the entire faithful recognize their identity as Church and their obligation and responsibility to be agents for evangelization.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, the leadership recognized that from among the faithful, parents have a particular and essential charism and role for fulfilling the Church's mission.

Auxiliary Bishop Leon Suenens' (Malines-Brussels) writings and radio talks during the 1950-60's provide many examples of this last point. It is significant that Archbishop John Baptist Montini (Milan) echoed his agreement with Suenens in the preface to Suenens' book The Gospel to Every Creature. It is also significant that contemporaneously the Belgian theologian Gerard Philips reiterates the ecclesial identity and mission of the Christian family in his book The Role of the Laity in the Church. Additionally, it is significant that Bishop Pietro Fiordelli (Prato, Italy) was continuing his pioneering efforts to promote the Family Life Movement in Italy.¹⁹⁶

Why are these figures--Congar, Suenens, Montini, Philips, and Fiordelli--significant? As I showed in chapter one, it is because of their influential role in the writing and passage of LG--which is where the ecclesial identity, mission, and functions of the Christian family are posited in seed form for the first time in a conciliar document.

As a postscript to chapter one, I will comment briefly on these figures' influence. First, Archbishop Montini becomes Pope Paul VI. He opens Session II of Vatican Council II, giving LG emphatic christological, ecclesiological, and evangelical thrusts. Second, Bishop Suenens becomes Cardinal Suenens. After Session One he is appointed to the Coordinating Commission of seven cardinals who are responsible for the movement of the council through its several sessions. Between sessions one and two, he is the cardinal responsible for revising the schema De Ecclesia, which eventually

becomes entitled LG. He provided for the significant restructuring and reordering of the chapters of this dogmatic constitution.¹⁹⁷ Third, Bishop Fiordelli delivers the Council speech which criticizes the first schema for neglecting to give Christian spouses their particular place as leaders of their family, which is a little Church.¹⁹⁸ His intervention on behalf of the Christian Family as a little Church becomes incorporated in the second schema. Fourth, Congar is "a," if not "the," key theological expert for revising De Ecclesia; and in any case, his theological mark is clearly evident in the second schema, especially in the rich footnote for the Christian family as little Church.¹⁹⁹ Finally, Philips serves the dual role as General Secretary of the Council and Suenens' theologian. If he did not agree with the theology of the Christian family that was proposed by Fiordelli, it is unlikely that it would have been incorporated into the second schema.²⁰⁰

In this second chapter I attempted to demonstrate the ecclesiological foundation of Christian marriage and the family which derives from it. Using Vatican Council II as a guide, I provided a partial exegesis of Eph. 5:31-32 because it is the best New Testament source for the essential, ecclesial dimension of Christian marriage and its family. I followed this with a select historical survey of the use of Eph. 5:31-32 as it pertained to the ecclesial dimension of our topic. Finally, I attempted to sketch the lay and evangelical climate of the 1950's that enabled for a formal recognition of the Christian family as an ecclesial reality. The next step is to show that from Vatican Council II onward, official Roman Catholic Teaching uses "domestic Church" as a heuristic model for understanding the ecclesial nature of the Christian family.

CHAPTER THREE

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOTION OF CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS DOMESTIC CHURCH

In chapter three I extend the argument that the Council presented an ecclesial vision of the Christian family in LG 11. Here I attempt to show that the hierarchical magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church has developed significantly the ecclesial nature, mission, and functions of the Christian family from Vatican Council II onward.²⁰¹

The ecclesial nature of the Christian family becomes evident as one observes the direct correlation of much of the official teaching on the Christian family with much of the official teaching on the Church. To illustrate this observation I will use the following general outline in the ensuing sections: the results of my analysis of the matrimonial unit of LG 11;²⁰² the correlation of these results to what the Council states about the nature, mission, and functions of the Church in chapters one and two of LG;²⁰³ and, the ensuing development of the ecclesial vision of the Christian family in select official teaching. The main content of the ensuing development will be derived from select documents of Vatican Council II and of post-conciliar papal documents, especially Familiaris consortio.²⁰⁴

Before I proceed, I will clarify the key terms--definition, mission, functions, and elements--which will govern the correlation.²⁰⁵ Definition is "a statement expressing the essential nature of something." Mission is being used in two senses: (1) "the act or an instance of sending" and (2) "a specific task with which a person or a group is charged."

Function also has two senses: (1) "official position" and (2) "the action for which a person or thing is specially fitted or used or for which a thing exists: purpose." Function is being used synonymously with office as "a service expected of a person by reason of . . . his special relationship to others." Element is "a constituent part." As an essential part, element refers to "incapable of removal without destroying the thing itself or its character."

Christian Family As an Ecclesial Reality on Mission

The analysis of the matrimonial unit led to the conclusion that Christian married couples/parents, called by Christ Himself, actualize the Church's mission precisely by being a visible sacrament which expresses itself through the three ecclesial functions deriving from Christ's triple-office of priest, prophet, and king. The Christian family is a type of reality theologically referred to as a mystery. More specifically, the Council teaches that Christian marriage and its family is both a sacramental reality and an ecclesial reality.

Properly speaking, Christian marriage and its family is one of the seven sacraments--elements of the Church--which are privileged and efficacious signs for believers to encounter God in friendship and to grow in holiness and salvation. There is an essential interrelationship between the relationship of the spouses and the relationship of Christ and the Church. Christian marriage and its family makes present the mystery of the covenantal relationship between Christ and the Church as it unifies and loves fruitfully. The assimilation and incorporation of the spouses into the covenantal relationship of Christ and Church is effective, becoming a living and life-giving union, conferring holiness and help. Thus, Christian marriage is a creative and dynamic reality,

e.g., there are the ongoing growth in the spouses' joining with God and one another, the ongoing participation in the covenant of Christ with the Church, the increase of society and Church through their children, the evangelistic and catechetical tasks in their domestic Church, etc. Additionally, Christian marriage is one of the sacraments which is constitutive of the People of God and a state of life in the Church. From the perspectives of an element and a state of life the family which proceeds from Christian marriage is recognized as matter constituted from the People of God.

Analogically speaking, Christian family is one of the units of Church, the smallest. As a type of Church, it is a cell or foundational community of Church (and of Society) in which the spouses/parents preside as they begin and grow into a family. Christian families perpetuate and renew the Church (and Society) historically as it brings into operation the Church's mission and functions, especially by mutual growth in holiness and by the welcoming and education of children. Furthermore, although the Christian family is not in itself the fullness of the Church (neither is the parish), Christian families are covenanted together--by the Holy Spirit into the People of God through the sacraments and life of virtue--under the leadership of pastors and bishops into parishes and dioceses. The Council uses the image (model) of "domestic Church" to connote its ecclesial vision of the Christian family. For in and through the Christian family the union between Christ and the Church and the unity of humankind are deepened and furthered.

The above results about the nature and mission of the Christian family are correlated closely to what the Council teaches about the Church in chapter one of LG.²⁰⁶ It is significant that the title of chapter one is "The Mystery of the Church." The biblical and theological understandings of "mystery" serve as the context for the ideas about the

nature and mission of the Church; and consequently, also for the Christian family. Hence, a correlation of some key ecclesial points from chapter one of LG which apply to the Christian family follows.

First, the Council focuses on the mystery of Christ as the starting point for elaborating the nature of the Church. The Council explicitly teaches that the Lord calls the Church into being: "The mystery of the holy Church is manifest in her very foundation, for the Lord Jesus inaugurated her by preaching the good news, that is, the coming of God's Kingdom, which, for centuries, had been promised in the Scriptures" (5). Regarding Christian marriage, it has already been posited that the Lord continues to take the initiative by calling believing couples to marriage. Hence, a specific vocation ensues.

The second correlation point is the element of sacrament. Christ gives the Church the vocation to be a sacrament of Himself. In fact, the Church receives her identity and mission from her relationship to Christ. The Council states: "By her relationship with Christ, the Church is a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind, that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity" (1). In a summary text, the Council reiterates the Church's sacramental nature: "The Church shines forth as 'a people made one with the unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit'" (4). Like the larger Church, Christian marriage and its family is called to be a sacrament of intimate love and unifying power. Believing partners and their families are given the mission to continue to share in the Triune life by creating a common life which, hopefully, will respond to the divine initiative throughout the whole of life. The expected effect of this creative, dynamic, life-giving, and sacramental union

is the expansion of the covenantal love between Christ and the Church and the furthering of the reign of God. Thus, one hopes to discover in Christian marriage and its family a drawing close to God and each other in friendship, growth in holiness, fruitful love, and service to the world.

The third correlation point is the symbolic quality of Christian marriage and the Church. Rather than define the Church, the Council chose to begin LG by declaring that the Church is a mystery. To state that the Church is a mystery, the Council was indicating that "it [Church] cannot be exhaustively defined, but its nature is best communicated by studying the various biblical metaphors."²⁰⁷ As both the Old Testament and the New Testament reveal the kingdom through various images, so too, "the inner nature of the Church was now to be made known to us through various images" (6). Examples of biblical images are sheepfold, flock, field, vineyard, branches, edifice of God, house of God in which dwells His family, household of God in the Spirit, holy temple, holy city, new Jerusalem, our Mother, bride of Christ, Body of Christ, Temple of the Holy Spirit, and People of God (6-7).²⁰⁸ It is to be noted that the Council also chooses not to define Christian marriage. Rather, it foreshadows the need to use symbolic language by referring to matrimony as a signifying and partaking of "the mystery of that unity and fruitful love which exists between Christ and His Church" (11). Thus, one can anticipate the use of symbols or metaphors which manifest the reality of Christian marriage and its family, e.g., covenant, household of faith, domestic sanctuary of the Church, little Church, cell of the Body of Christ and the People of God, cell of society, circle of love.

The fourth correlation point is the essential interrelationship between the relationship of the members of the Church and the relationship of Christ and the Church. This point becomes apparent when one recognizes that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between proper and metaphorical usage of images. Although most images are used metaphorically, the "Body of Christ" and "People of God" images are considered more than metaphors.²⁰⁹ For example, the Council states: "By communicating His Spirit to His brothers, called together from all peoples, Christ made them mystically into His own body" (7). Centuries earlier, Thomas Aquinas wrote that it is the Holy Spirit who brings about the inner unity between Christ and his Church and among the members with one another.²¹⁰

The Spirit unifies the Church by bestowing himself as uncreated grace. He is numerically one in all the faithful and this unites them very intimately to one another and to Christ their head. Identically the same person the Holy Spirit is active both in Christ the Head and in all the faithful as members.²¹¹

In other words, the Church, patterned after the Incarnate Word, has a divine and a human element, forming one interlocking reality (8). This necessitates avoiding a separation of the relationship of the members from the relationship of Christ and the Church. This reality which is sacramentalized in baptism, confirmation and eucharist is echoed in matrimony.

Dulles, reflecting on Aquinas' ecclesiology, concludes that the Church as Body of Christ "is constituted of those who receive grace through Christ, have it in lesser degree, and are governed by him."²¹² This insight introduces the fifth correlation point of an ordered community or society. After generally referring to the Church as a "community of faith, hope, and charity" (8), the Council adds that the Church is "constituted and organized in the world as a society" (8). Established and sustained by

Christ, the Church on earth is a visible structure, "governed by the successor of Peter and by the bishops in union with that successor" (8). In chapter two, "The People of God," the Council also presents the Christian family as an ordered society. In the Christian family as a foundational society parents have an instituted, ecclesial office with incumbent obligations and responsibilities. Furthermore, the Council's teaching on the Christian family demonstrates the analogical quality of the Church and of the Christian family. More specifically, the Church may be understood as a family and the family may be understood as a little church.

The sixth correlation point, which derives from the mission of the Church, is for the Church to continue Christ's work of salvation. Christ inaugurated the Church by proclaiming the reign of God and commissioned her to continue it throughout history. Furthermore, Christ mandates the Church to serve all and to give particular attention to the poor. Because the Church consists of sinful people, she is to walk in humility and to be open to renewal (8). As a historical reality and as an eschatological reality the Church is the People of God, who like a pilgrim in a foreign land, always presses homeward and always announces the gospel (8). While acknowledging that many elements of truth and sanctification can be found outside the visible structure of the Church, the Council affirms that these elements properly belong to the Church of Christ. That is, it affirms "the doctrine that salvation is given only to those united to the Church",²¹³ allowing of course, "for the salvation of those who were in good faith outside the church's sociological boundaries."²¹⁴ In the foundational communities of the People of God, Christian couples/parents lead by example and word; and they encourage the ongoing

conversion of each member so that the presence of Christ may be experienced in everyday life and in all corners of the world.

As to the specific, ecclesial ways by which parents fulfill their mission; this will be presented in the next part, “The Ecclesial Functions of the Christian Family.” The next task will be to demonstrate that the above correlation points on the nature and mission of the Christian family as an ecclesial reality are developed in the ensuing official teaching. However, I raise two cautions before proceeding. First, I will not present an exhaustive selection of future teachings. Second, many of the passages which I will cite to make my argument will not fit easily under one criterion. These descriptions can apply to multiple criteria and often contain material which refers to the ecclesial functions of the Christian family. This situation, however, is not a problem. Rather, it supports the “mystery” dimension of the Christian family.

Vocation

Vocation is the first criterion I correlated above. The Council first locates the vocation of the married couple and its family within the entire priestly community.²¹⁵ In latter chapters of LG when the Council speaks about specific groups, the Council situates this vocation within the laity. For example, in chapter three which is entitled “The Laity,” the Council expounds on Christ’s call to the laity to participate in his triple-office (34-36).²¹⁶ In article 34 (priestly office) and article 35 (prophetic office) married couples and parents are highlighted from among the laity. The following quote from LG 35 serves as a window for understanding the importance of the married/familial vocation:

In connection with this function [prophetic, especially as evangelization], that state of life which is sanctified by a special sacrament is obviously of great value, namely, married and family life. For where Christianity pervades a whole way of life and ever increasingly transforms it, there will exist both the practice and an

excellent school of the lay apostolate. In such a home, husband and wife find their proper vocation in being witnesses to one another and to their children of faith in Christ and love for Him. The Christian family loudly proclaims both the present virtues of the kingdom of God and the hope of a blessed life to come. Thus by its example and its witness it accuses the world of sin and enlightens those who seek the truth.²¹⁷

In chapter 5 of LG, “The Call of the Whole Church to Holiness,” the Council takes up the common vocation to holiness. In article 41 the Council specifies this call to the various states of life. After speaking about the ordained and other ecclesiastical servants, the Council immediately turns to married couples and Christian parents. Its description of their vocation to holiness is basically a reiterating of LG 11. Of particular note is the living of family life within the larger context of the larger Church. In other words, the explicitly ecclesial vocation of the family is apparent. The text follows:

Married couples and Christian parents should follow their own proper path to holiness by faithful love, sustaining one another in grace throughout the entire length of their lives. They should imbue their offspring, lovingly welcomed from God, with Christian truths and evangelical virtues. For thus they can offer all men an example of unwearied and generous love, build up the brotherhood of charity, and stand as witnesses to and cooperators in the fruitfulness of Holy Mother Church. By such lives, they signify and share in that very love with which Christ loved His Bride and because of which He delivered Himself up on her behalf. A like example, but one given in a different way, is that offered by widows and single people, who are able to make great contributions toward holiness and apostolic endeavor in the Church.

The teaching in LG that Christian marriage and its family is a vocation is quickly reiterated in the other great conciliar document on the Church, The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.²¹⁸ Opening its commentary on Christian marriage and family in GS, the Council intentionally describes this vocation to be a “lofty one.”²¹⁹ It highlights the esteemed nature of marriage by noting that “God Himself is the author of matrimony, endowed as it is with various benefits and purposes”²²⁰ and that “the well-being of the individual person and of human and

Christian society is intimately linked with the healthy condition of the community produced by marriage and family.”²²¹

Drawing from Scripture and Vatican Council II, John Paul II derives the vocation of the spouses and parents from the vocation of every human being. His starting point is a biblical account of creation. John Paul states: “God created man in his own image and likeness: calling him to existence through love, he called him at the same time for love.”²²² He adds, referring to GS, that it is God who “inscribed in the humanity of man and woman the vocation, and thus the capacity and responsibility, of love and communion.”²²³ Thus, John Paul II posits that every human person has love as its “fundamental and innate vocation.”²²⁴

John Paul continues his reflection on the vocational nature of love by commenting upon the two ways to realize love as a total self-gift of the person. He claims, that according to Christian revelation, the two ways are marriage and virginity or celibacy. He defines marriage as “the covenant of conjugal love freely and consciously chosen, whereby man and woman accept the intimate community of life and love willed by God himself.”²²⁵ Significantly, he continues that marriage secures, rather than restricts, a person’s freedom to live according to God’s plan. In fact, he states: “It [the institution of marriage] is an interior requirement of the covenant of conjugal love which is publicly affirmed as unique and exclusive in order to live in complete fidelity to the plan of God, the creator.”²²⁶

After reflecting upon the meaning of vocation derived from the act of creation, John Paul looks to what he considers the central word of revelation, “God loves his people.”²²⁷ This message is proclaimed in the love relationship of God and people as

revealed in the faith experience of Israel. Throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, marital imagery connotes the level of fidelity in the communion of love between God and his people. The marital covenant becomes an image and symbol of the covenant which unites God and his people. Here, Israel comes to realize the total fidelity of God, and finds in God's faithfulness, the model for the love between the spouses.²²⁸

The next stage of John Paul's reflection moves to Jesus Christ, the "definitive" fulfillment in the communion between God and his people.²²⁹ Here Christ is understood as "the bridegroom who loves and gives himself as the savior of humanity, uniting it to himself as his body." Jesus Christ himself reveals the original truth about marriage as revealed in Genesis. Furthermore, Christ makes it possible for persons to be freed from their hard hearts, and thereby, capable to "realize this truth in its entirety." Using the Ephesians 5 text, John Paul states:

In this sacrifice [which Jesus Christ makes of himself on the cross] there is entirely revealed that plan which God has imprinted on the humanity of man and woman since their creation [cf. Eph. 5:32-33]; the marriage of baptized persons thus becomes a real symbol of that new and eternal covenant sanctioned in the blood of Christ. The Spirit which the Lord pours forth gives a new heart, and renders man and woman capable of loving one another as Christ has loved us. Conjugal love reaches that fullness to which it is interiorly ordained, conjugal charity, which is the proper and specific way in which the spouses participate in and are called to live the very charity of Christ, who gave himself on the cross.

Succinctly speaking, the vocation of the Christian married couple begins with the call of Christ. Their vocation is "to follow Christ and to serve the kingdom of God in the married state."²³⁰ This call, thus, extends to all the aspects of everyday family life, as well as the particular social and ecclesial situations which the couples encounter.²³¹ By immersing themselves in everyday relationships precisely as Christians, "the Christian family has a special vocation to witness to the paschal covenant of Christ by constantly

radiating the joy of love and the certainty of the hope for which it must give account.”²³²
 Sometimes, this vocation may even lead the church of the home to far away lands.²³³

Sacrament

The second correlation point is the element of sacrament. In GS the Council develops the sacramentality of marriage before it develops the sacrament of marriage.²³⁴ According to the Council, it is the Creator who establishes marriage as an “intimate partnership of married life and love.” The conjugal covenant of love is described as sacred and accessible to all religious people.²³⁵ The Council roots the “community of life and love” in the marital or conjugal covenant,²³⁶ which is brought about by the irrevocable personal consent of the couple. The object of the matrimonial consent is identified as the persons of the spouses themselves: they “give and accept each other.”²³⁷ They form a new relationship (a community), a sacred bond, which is a human act, i.e., involving the whole person.²³⁸ Within the intimate love union itself the Council can locate the demand for fidelity and indissolubility.²³⁹ These are also demanded by the good of the children.²⁴⁰

After developing the teaching on marriage in general, the Council focuses on the sacrament of marriage. It identifies divine love, caritas, to be the origin of conjugal love. It identifies Christ to be the one who blesses this love and who structures it to the “model of His union with the Church.”²⁴¹ Patterned after God’s covenant of love and fidelity and His own loving the Church unto death, Christ now “comes into the lives of married Christians through the sacrament of matrimony.”²⁴² His presence and example continue beyond the celebration as an abiding and dynamic presence so that “the spouses may love each other with perpetual fidelity through mutual self-bestowal.”²⁴³ Thus, the Council

makes it clear that the terms of the marriage covenant between Christians are fidelity and love; both of which are pledged by the covenanters to each other.²⁴⁴ Furthermore, authentic married love is effective. It can lead the spouses to God and strengthen them for the office of being a father or a mother.

In conclusion, GS 48 teaches that Christian marriage is a sacrament which is a kind of consecration within the People of God. It concludes by quoting Eph. 5:32 as it summarizes its comments on the sanctity of marriage and the family. In effect, GS 48, like LG 11 before it, expresses the essentially sacramental and ecclesial dimensions of Christian marriage and its family. It states: “Thus the Christian family, which springs from marriage as a reflection of the loving covenant uniting Christ with the Church, and as a participation in that covenant, will manifest to all men the Savior’s living presence in the world, and the genuine nature of the Church.”²⁴⁵ From this vantage point, one can see that LG 11 and GS 48 are like two mountain peaks situated at opposite ends of a valley. In the valley is the reality of the People of God living in families. From LG 11 one sees the family mainly from the viewpoint of its ecclesial manifestation. From GS 48 one sees the family mainly from its sacramental manifestation. In any case, one can say that Christian marriage and its family is both an ecclesial and a sacramental reality.

While GS acknowledged that it did not state all that can be stated about the theology of Christian marriage and its family, in 1977 the 4th General Assembly of the Committee For the Family did likewise. In fact, it gave the following theological tasks to the Papal Committee For the Family:

- Reflect on what constitutes the family, and on what are its essential elements. Reflection on the value of conjugal love, the Christian vision of sexuality, the holiness of the family.

- Deepen the social and ecclesial dimensions of the Sacrament of Marriage. Reflect on the links between Marriage and the other sacraments: the family is the only human reality that has been raised to the dignity of a sacrament.²⁴⁶

Three years later, Pope John Paul II convened the international synod of Catholic bishops to express the best of Catholic thinking and practice on the Christian family. One year later, in 1981, John Paul II affirms the dignity of the sacrament of marriage and its family by crystallizing the synod's work in his FC. He says that a faith vision of Christian marriage and family reveals that it is God's plan to make "them [Christian marriage and family] a sign and meeting place of the loving covenant between God and man, between Jesus Christ and his bride, the church."²⁴⁷ He repeatedly states that the Christian family is derived from the sacrament of marriage. In FC he states: "By means of the sacrament of marriage, in which it [the Christian family] is rooted and from which it draws its nourishment, the Christian family is continuously vivified by the Lord Jesus."²⁴⁸ Both within the family and in its missionary activity to others, the church of the home is called to be a "luminous sign of the presence of Christ and of his love."²⁴⁹ Thus, in and through marriage, the married couple and its family have "a real share in the very love with which God himself loves humanity."²⁵⁰ By celebrating the sacrament of marriage, the "Christian spouses profess their gratitude to God for the sublime gift bestowed on them of being able to live in their married and family lives the very love of God for people and that of the Lord Jesus for the church, his bride."²⁵¹

Symbolic Quality

The third correlation point is the symbolic quality of Christian marriage and its family. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World clearly expresses this idea. Here one finds Christian marriage and Christian family described as a "loving

community”²⁵² and as a “loving covenant,” manifesting Christ and the Church in the world.²⁵³ By speaking of community, and especially of covenant, the Council places Christian marriage and Christian family centrally into the biblical notion of the People of God. Thus, an analogical relationship exists between God’s people as a whole and Christian marriage and family.²⁵⁴

This becomes apparent when one examines article 48 as a whole. In the first part, the primary subject is the married couple: “Thus a man and a woman, who by the marriage covenant of conjugal love ‘are no longer two, but one flesh’ . . . Christ the Lord [has] abundantly blessed this many-faceted love, . . . structured as it is on the model of His union with the Church.” In the second part the primary subject is the family, and much of what was said for the married couple is repeated for the family. Thus, one reads that the family too participates in a “loving covenant.” The covenant that is initiated in the sacrament of Matrimony provides the matrix for initiating offspring into the larger loving covenant uniting Christ with the Church. Thus, to understand the nature of the domestic Church, it is necessary to understand the nature of Christian marriage. By extrapolation, one can add that to understand the nature of Church--and I suggest on all levels which would include local and universal--it will be necessary to consider the implications of the nature of Christian marriage and Christian family.²⁵⁵ The reverse direction is also true. To understand the nature of Christian marriage and its family, it is necessary to consider the implications of the nature of the Church as a whole.

Pope Paul VI affirms the deep bonds between the Christian family and the larger church. The symbolic dynamism of this bond is captured by speaking of the Christian family as the smallest unit of Church. Pope Paul VI states: "The family has been rightly

called the domestic church and this title has been confirmed by the second Vatican council. It declares that in every Christian family the various features and characteristics of the universal church should be found."²⁵⁶ In his footnote for this statement his first reference is to LG 11. From this statement one can infer that he supports Bishop Fiordelli's description that the universal Church is articulated in various forms, one of which is the Christian family. John Paul II continues this line of thinking about the Christian family as a domestic Church or "church in miniature," and like his predecessor, refers to LG 11 as support for his position.²⁵⁷

John Paul II, furthermore, in FC 49 comments upon the kind of participation that the Christian family has in the life and mission of the Church. The Christian family is grafted into the Church in such a profound way and to such a degree that the family "is a living image and historical representation of the mystery of the Church" and "is a fruit and sign of the supernatural fecundity of the church, it stands also as a symbol, witness and participant of the church's motherhood."²⁵⁸ From this organic incorporation into the Church, he concludes, the family is called to become a saved community and a saving community. Hence, because the Christian family is the "little domestic church," John Paul speaks about the need for the Christian family, like the greater Church, to be "constantly and intensely evangelized."²⁵⁹

One Interlocking Reality

The fourth correlation point is that Christian marriage, its family, the larger Church, and Christ form one interlocking reality. In other words, there is an essential interrelationship between the relationship of the members of the Church and the

relationship of Christ and the Church. The nature of love provides a window for understanding some of this concept.

The nature of conjugal love is developed in GS. The source of this “many-faceted love” is divine love and the model for its structure is Christ’s union with the Church.²⁶⁰ The Council posits the potential efficaciousness due to the interrelationships of “authentic married love,” “divine love,” “Christ’s redeeming power,” and the “saving activity of the Church.”²⁶¹ Married love, because it is caught up in divine love and enriched by Christ and the Church, can lead the spouses to God and aid them in the office of parenthood.²⁶² In other words, “the sacramentality of marriage is explained in terms of the transforming influence which the conjugal partnership has upon the spouses, and then, through their gradual growth and Christian maturation, the life-giving effects of the union are communicated to the offspring and beyond.”²⁶³ The sacramental efficacy of matrimony is clearly posited: “By virtue of this sacrament, as spouses fulfill their conjugal and family obligations, they are penetrated with the Spirit of Christ. The Spirit suffuses their whole lives with faith, hope, and charity.”²⁶⁴ In short, sacramental marriage is a graced reality, a participation in “the loving covenant uniting Christ with the Church.”²⁶⁵ Article 49 continues this theme by speaking explicitly about the divine-human interrelationship. It states:

Such love [true conjugal love], merging the human with the divine, leads spouses to a free and mutual gift of themselves, a gift proving itself by gentle affection and by deed. Such love pervades the whole of their lives. Indeed, by its generous activity it grows better and grows greater. Therefore it far excels mere erotic inclination, which, selfishly pursued, soon enough fades wretchedly away.”

The Council promotes this concept of “one interlocking reality” in a direct way in the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity. After defining the term apostolate and

stating that each member of the Church has a vocation to the apostolate,²⁶⁶ the Council reemphasizes strongly the point of one interlocking reality. It remarks:

No part of the structure of a living body is merely passive but each has a share in the functions as well as in the life of the body. So, too, in the body of Christ, which is the Church, the whole body, 'according to the functioning in due measure of each single part, derives its increase' (Eph. 4:16). Indeed, so intimately are the parts linked and interrelated in this body (cf. Eph. 4:16) that the member who fails to make his proper contribution to the development of the Church must be said to be useful neither to the Church nor to himself.²⁶⁷

In the preparation paper (Lineamenta) for the 1980 Synod of Bishops on the Family, the position is posited that marriage and its family form a covenant, which is "a complex of new relationships and communications."²⁶⁸ Furthermore, this covenant is a new reality "before God, before the married couple, and before society."²⁶⁹ It also includes the children who are "indissolubly united with the parents by the bond of blood relationship."²⁷⁰ This brief reflection on the nature of marriage and its family as covenant, of course, includes comments about the meaning of marriage "in light of the covenant between God the Creator and the People of Israel and the covenant between Christ and the Church."²⁷¹ Here, the significant point is made that "the privileged, exclusive and definitive covenant between a man and a woman in marriage and the family"²⁷² is "an ontological reality and a communion and loving union between God and human beings."²⁷³

An Ordered Community

The new community (family) formed in and through Christian marriage is an ordered community or society, which is our fifth correlation point. According to Paul VI, the union of the spouses "constitutes a unique reality, namely the couple, founded on the mutual gift of self to the other."²⁷⁴ He continues: "They are but one flesh, one couple--

we could almost say one being.” This unity, he teaches, will take on social and juridical form through marriage. It is important that the new unity be not understood as a merging or a fusion. Paul states: “Each person remains distinct and in no way loses its identity and individuality in the mutual self-giving. Rather, each personality is strengthened. It affirms itself. It matures and develops throughout the course of married life, in accordance with this great law of love: give yourselves to one another, so as to be able, together, to give yourselves to others.”

Thus, all married couples are to share an orientation toward mutual love. This fact is affirmed in GS when it makes the statement that “Marriage to be sure is not instituted solely for procreation.”²⁷⁵ The Council claims that the very nature of marriage demands a rightly ordered mutual love between the spouses, whether they have children or not. Furthermore, GS states that married love is “to grow and ripen.”²⁷⁶

Paul VI adroitly links the orientation of the intimate communion of married love to its ecclesial effect. He states:

It [married love] is an interior spiritual reality that transforms the couple’s community of life into what could be called, according to the authorized teaching of the Council, ‘the Church of the home’, a true ‘cell of the Church’, as our well-beloved predecessor John XXIII expressed to you on the occasion of your pilgrimage of May 3, 1959. It is a basic, germinal cell--the smallest, to be sure, but also the most fundamental one in the body of the Church.²⁷⁷

Paul repeats the important teaching that the Christian family is the smallest unit of Church in EN. He states: "The family has been rightly called the domestic church and this title has been confirmed by the second Vatican council. It declares that in every Christian family the various features and characteristics of the universal church should be found."²⁷⁸ In his footnote for this statement his first reference is to LG 11. From this statement one can infer that he supports Bishop Fiordelli's description that the universal

Church is articulated in various forms, one of which is the Christian family. John Paul II in FC 49 continues this line of thinking about the Christian family as a domestic Church or "church in miniature," and like his predecessor, refers to LG 11 to support his position.

Let us now take another brief look at GS. By linking authentic married love with divine love and ecclesial activity, the Council reiterates in GS the theology found in LG that sacraments have an ecclesial dimension.²⁷⁹ Besides helping toward mutual sanctification, the sacrament of marriage strengthens couples for the "sublime office of being a father or a mother." In fact, GS adds that the sacrament of marriage bestows "a kind of consecration in the duties and dignity of their state."²⁸⁰ This ecclesial office is oriented to help others, especially children, to grow in faith and holiness. The Council writes:

As a result, with the parents leading the way by example and family prayer, children and indeed everyone gathered around the family hearth will find a readier path to human maturity, salvation, and holiness. Graced with the dignity and office of fatherhood and motherhood, parents will energetically acquit themselves of a duty which devolves primarily on them, namely education,²⁸¹

Lest, anyone presumes that ministry is one-directional; the Council proceeds to comment upon how parents can receive benefit from their labor. Referring to the children, the Council states: "As living members of the family, children contribute in their own way to making their parents holy. For they will respond to the kindness of their parents with sentiments of gratitude, with love and trust. They will stand by them as children should when hardships overtake their parents and old age brings its loneliness."²⁸²

In the above comments, the ordered community of the family is called a cell of the Church. Reflecting on the themes of the 4th General Assembly of the Committee for

the Family, The Papal Committee on the Family makes a distinction which broadens the understanding of the nature of the Christian family. It recognizes the family to be both a cell and a society. The distinction between cell and society is important because it challenges an excessive individualism which hinders the family from realizing its mission. The Committee's antidote to individualism is the idea of complementarity, which envisions family to consist of a complex of relationships and to be more than the nuclear family. Because this insight is important, it warrants a full quotation:

One daily hears reference to the family as a 'cell', but one no longer hears reference to the family as a 'society'. This is a vital difference. The cell forms part of the tissue, but it is not in itself a social perfection. The family is, however, a society: it contains within itself its own complementarity. The family can live a certain part of its life for itself. This is not something that can be overlooked. This is particularly so when the nuclear family has become so general. The nuclear family tends to weaken the idea of the complementarity that exists with the family itself. One speaks a great deal about the relationship between parents and their children, and this is good. But one must not overlook the fact that the relationship between brothers and sisters is also an essential, and not an accidental, element, and that they form part of the family. The same applies in regard to the relations between the generations.²⁸³

Recognizing that these comments raise implications, the Papal Committee found itself challenged to provide deeper theological and pastoral reflection on the nature of the Christian family. A sampling of the issues which need further development follows:

- Set out clearly the rights of parents and help prepare them to be able to implement these rights in all areas which affect the family: education, habitat, health, the organization of work and leisure, social communications, legislation.
- Stimulate reflection on the proper place of children and the elderly within the family and also in society and in the Church. Assist them in making their own specific and original contribution and stimulate ways which will lead to the acceptance of these contribution by society.
- Underline the values of marriage and the family in various cultures and social milieux. Promote openness and dialogue in this regard.
- Reflect on the place of women in the family and in society, and devote special attention to the value of motherhood.²⁸⁴

The sixth correlation point, which derives from the mission of the Church, is the Church's mandate to continue Christ's work of salvation. GS boldly proclaims that the mission of the Christian family is to manifest Christ and Church in the world.²⁸⁵ More specifically, Christian couples properly do so "as spouses fulfill their conjugal and family obligations."²⁸⁶ Regarding responsible parenthood, the Council states the mission in these words:

Parents should regard as their proper mission the task of transmitting human life and educating those to whom it has been transmitted. They should realize that they are thereby cooperators with the love of God the Creator, and are, so to speak, the interpreters of that love. Thus they will fulfill their task with human and Christian responsibility. With docile reverence toward God, they will come to the right decision by common counsel and effort.²⁸⁷

In the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, the Council speaks about the mission of the Church in terms of the apostolate, and specifically, how it refers to the laity. In a general way it describes the apostolate as follows:

For this the Church was founded: that by spreading the kingdom of Christ everywhere for the glory of God the Father, she might bring all men to share in Christ's saving redemption; and that through them the whole world might in actual fact be brought into relationship with Him. All activity of the Mystical Body directed to the attainment of this goal is called the apostolate, and the Church carries it on in various ways through all her members. For by its very nature the Christian vocation is also a vocation to the apostolate.²⁸⁸

Hopefully, formation for the apostolate will begin in the family. Thus, the Council speaks of the whole of family life as an "apprenticeship for the apostolate."²⁸⁹

From the perspective of papal teaching as it reflects the mind of an international synod of bishops, it was Paul VI who sounded the keynote for the mission of the Christian family. The keynote is article 71 in EN. The entire text follows:

We must not fail to draw attention to the role played by the family in the sphere of the apostolate which is proper to the laity. It has rightly been called the *domestic church* and this title has been confirmed by the second Vatican council. It declares

that in every Christian family the various features and characteristics of the universal church should be found. And accordingly the family, just like the church, must always be regarded as a centre to which the gospel must be brought and from which it must be proclaimed.

Therefore in a family which is conscious of this role all the members of the family are evangelizers and are themselves evangelized. Not only will the parents impart the gospel to their children's lives. Such a family will bring the gospel to many other families and to the whole social circle to which it belongs. Families of mixed marriages must teach Christ to their children, stressing the significance and efficacy of a common baptism. There is also incumbent on them the difficult task of making themselves the architects of unity.

In November of 1977 the Papal Committee for the Family met to follow-up on the work of the 1977 Synod of Bishops on Catechesis. Because many of the bishops underscored the importance of the family for the transmission of the faith, the Papal Committee had the task to contribute "by providing some clear notions concerning the role and the importance of the family in the overall pastoral task of the Church."²⁹⁰ Reflecting first on the common thinking among the Episcopal conferences about the family apostolate, the Papal Committee stated: "The family is seen as the first place of evangelization, as the first school of life, as one of the major forces in the expansion of the Gospel and the implanting of the mission of the Church."²⁹¹ Because of the specific character of the sacrament of marriage, the Committee understands parents to be decision-makers in the areas of evangelization.²⁹² For the family to take its proper role in the mission of the Church, the Papal Committee recognized the need for a deepening of the theology of the Sacrament of Marriage "in order to bring out more fully its biblical, social and ecclesial dimensions, and thus to appreciate its value in the faith and life of individuals and communities, and in order to allow the Sacrament fully to achieve its role in evangelization and in the missionary vitality of the Church."²⁹³ In other words, the larger Church recognizes that now is the time for a genuine partnership with the domestic

Church, the two are interdependent. The closing statement of this document makes this point abundantly clear.

This is the time to present the family as the center of the pastoral reflection of the Church. It is all the more so in that the various forms of renewal proclaim that they have great need of the family in order to be able to pass to the level of action. If the Church evangelizes and sanctifies the family, the family will, in its turn, construct and sanctify the Church.²⁹⁴

In the preparation paper (Lineamenta) for the 1980 Synod of Bishops on the Family, the reason is given for choosing the theme “the Role of the Christian Family.” The document states: “The aims under consideration by the Synod are recognition of ‘the special gift’ that God confers on married couples and the family through the sacrament of marriage, and the study of the conditions necessary for the family to take its part in the mission of the Church.” Immediately following this statement, the document begins the section “The Role Comes Down To Evangelization.”²⁹⁵ It states:

It could be said that the Christian family has a single function or role, that of evangelizing, as evangelizing has been described in the previous Synods, namely as ‘bringing the Good News into all the strata of humanity, and through its influence transforming humanity from within and making it new’.¹ For by acting this way, the family well deserves the name of ‘domestic Church, and in it should be found the various aspects of the universal Church’.^{2, 296}

In developing the concept of the Christian family as an evangelizing community, John Paul II situates the Christian family in the context of the larger Church.²⁹⁷ He states that the evangelizing function “of the church of the home is rooted in and derives from the one mission of the church and is ordained to the upbuilding of the one body of Christ.”²⁹⁸ He claims that the ecclesial service performed by the church of the home is essential; therefore, “it [church of the home] must remain in intimate communion and collaborate responsibly with all the other evangelizing and catechetical activities present and at work in the ecclesial community at the diocesan and parochial

levels.”²⁹⁹ This evangelizing activity may even compel some couples and families to spread the faith in foreign lands.³⁰⁰

The Ecclesial Functions of the Christian Family

It has been my thesis that in the matrimonial unit of LG 11, the Council provides a seed text, which it will develop in future official teaching, relative to the “ecclesial” nature, mission, and functions of Christian marriage and its family. These are described as ecclesial because they are derived from what the Christian family is, that is, the smallest unit or type of Church. The part on “The Christian Family As an Ecclesial Reality on Mission” basically addresses “what” the Christian family is. This new part basically addresses “how” the Christian family expresses what it is, i.e., the ecclesial functions of the Christian family.

The foundational proposition of this section is that the Council chooses Christ’s triple-office of priest, prophet, and king to delineate the ecclesial functions of the Church.³⁰¹ The Council also makes it clear that the mission and functions of the Church are the responsibility of all the faithful. Thus, it speaks about the common priesthood of the faithful.³⁰² In the matrimonial unit the Council demonstrates in seed form how the functions are specified in Christian marriage and its family.

The analysis of the matrimonial unit led to the following conclusions.³⁰³ First, regarding the priestly function, it is proper to married spouses to grow in holiness in their married life and in the welcoming and education of their children. Thus, a married couple grows in holiness and the life of virtue precisely by becoming itself, a sacrament, pointing to and making present a transcendent reality. Their state of life, therefore, is potentially holy and dignified. Married couples have the choice to offer their common

life--directed toward unity and fruitful love--as gifts to build up the People of God. This offering is a priestly act which flows from their “instituted” position in the People of God. They offer their common life, which includes their children (especially in baptism) if they are so blessed, and this offering is a unique gift within the People of God.

Second, regarding the prophetic function, it is proper to married spouses to participate in the mission of the Church by witnessing by their shared life and by being the first heralds of the gospel to their children. Finally, regarding the kingly function, spouses and parents exercise headship in their families. Spouses and parents possess within the Church an office (munus), duty, and obligation to support mutual growth in holiness and to oversee and guide the growth and development of their children, particularly in the children’s religious education and selection of a vocation. Christian spouses and parents are endowed with their own gift of grace, i.e., a charism, to implement their responsibilities.

The above results about the functions of the Christian family are correlated closely to what the Council teaches about the functions of the Church in chapter two of LG, “The People of God.”³⁰⁴ In article nine, the Council proclaims that God wills to make people holy and to save them by making them into a single people. God is the initiator in establishing a covenant, first with Israel, and later through Christ, those of the new covenant. The Council exhorts the Church, the messianic people of the new covenant, to let Christ use her. She is to serve as a sign and agent of salvation and redemption on behalf of the world, and her members are to love one another as Christ has loved them.³⁰⁵ In the matrimonial unit the Council strongly exhorts married couples to cooperate with God’s grace for the sake of the other’s growth in holiness, and the

Council strongly exhorts parents to do their duty as religious leaders of their little Church for the sake of their children's salvation.

In articles ten and eleven the Council addresses the priestly function. It states that Christ is the High Priest offering himself and creation back to the Father (worship); and the Church, as a holy people consecrated by the Holy Spirit, participates in Christ's one priesthood. Within the common priesthood is the hierarchical priesthood--and together, but in different ways--the priestly people participate in building up the Church by participating in the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues. Each sacrament is a celebration and a proclamation of God's saving power. Likewise, the lives of the individuals are to be a testimony and witness of God's saving power. True worship includes both prayer and way of life; it is a proclamation and a service both to its members and non-members.

According to the Council, the hierarchical priesthood functions differently than the remaining faithful in the common priesthood. The hierarchical priesthood "molds and rules the priestly people," "brings about the Eucharistic sacrifice, and offers it to God in the name of all the people." The faithful offer their total self back to God and proclaim God's saving power in several ways: e.g., they "join in the offering of the Eucharist by virtue of their royal priesthood, . . . by receiving the sacraments, by prayer and thanksgiving, by the witness of a holy life, and by self-denial and active charity."

In the matrimonial unit the idea of "one flesh" expresses the corporate and the eucharistic dimensions of marriage and family. Together as a couple and a family, the household is called to manifest the unifying and generative power of the covenantal love between Christ and the Church. Towards this effort, the family worships both by prayer

and by way of life. Beginning with the spouses through the sacrament of matrimony, the individuals offer themselves for the whole of life to be one in Christ. Next, the spouses who are bonded to the Church through the sacraments of initiation and matrimony, offer their children, who are one flesh with them, to God by bringing them for incorporation into Christ and Church through the sacraments of initiation. And then, throughout the various stages of the family life cycle, the household members call one another to greater holiness through their shared life, including the evangelistic and catechetical and charitable moments of life.

After discussing the priestly function in articles ten and eleven, the Council takes up the prophetic function in article twelve. As a prophetic people, all of the People of God possess the responsibility to be on mission to others by participating in the service of witnessing to Christ by a life of faith, charity, and praise. The Holy Spirit enables this service by bestowing the prophetic people with "a sense of faith . . . in matters of faith and morals" and with "charismatic gifts." These are bestowed for building up the Church, and they are to be monitored by the sacred teaching authority and those who preside over the Church.

In the matrimonial unit the theme of witnessing is a major one. Spouses witness by passing on the faith to their children and by their shared life as a couple and as a family. They possess a gift for passing on the faith to their children. This gift is linked to their words and their actions. The use of this gift to build up the Church and Society is both an obligation and a responsibility. It is apparent to the Council that by building up the Christian family that the rest of the Church, and even Society, is built-up. Besides the

proper evangelistic and catechetical tasks, the parents are the primary educators of their children. Although the sacred teaching authority has the obligation to monitor the teaching of the Church, it is presumed that pastors and parents will be in dialogue. On the one hand, parents are to be reasonably knowledgeable about official Catholic teaching. On the other hand, since married couples and parents possess gifts of the Holy Spirit and share in the sense of the faithful, it becomes apparent that they are to be consulted in appropriate matters. In addition to witnessing by word, the couples and their families are called to develop the gift of hospitality. Beginning with the openness to welcome children into the world, the couple fosters hospitality as it nurtures the attitude of welcoming those outside the family circle, ever ready to witness to the source of their unity and love.

In article thirteen, the Council addresses the kingly function. The kingly people accept Christ's universal headship and are in communion with Christ and one another by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The kingly function is service for ordering the People of God in unity (teaching of the apostles, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers), peace, and sharing of riches. The kingly people participate in Christ's headship by summoning all to be part of the People of God, by exercising good stewardship of the gifts of all, and by prefiguring and promoting universal peace. Within the kingly people, there is uniqueness and diversity--both in giftedness and duties, both in particular churches and the Chair of Peter.

The matrimonial unit clearly specifies the couples' and parents' participation in the kingly function. Spouses and parents must exercise their headship if unity is to become a reality. The Council exhorts them to serve as "religious" leaders. Similar to

bishops in their dioceses and pastors in their parishes, spouses/parents oversee the development of the gifts, talents, and resources of the household and orient these in a just way for the good of all. As heads of their ecclesial community, they are to order the life of their household for the Christian formation of all members, paying special attention to the religious education of their children and to the children's vocational potential. The Council is adamant that parents accept their obligation and responsibility to rear and to educate their children. It is imperative that there be no abdication here. In summary, spouses/parents are called to oversee the life of the family so that it may manifest the unconditional, saving, redemptive, unifying, generative, and permanent love between the Bridegroom and the Bride.

The next step will be to demonstrate that the above points of correlation on the ecclesial functions of the Christian family are developed in the ensuing official teaching.³⁰⁶ Again, it is important to recall that my focus is the family's ecclesial task. The 1980 international Synod of Bishops identified four general tasks of the Christian family:

- 1) Forming a community of persons;
- 2) Serving life;
- 3) Participating in the development of society; and,
- 4) Sharing in the life and mission of the church.³⁰⁷

Commenting upon these, John Paul II writes that each task is an expression and actuation of the fundamental mission of the family: "to become more and more what it is, that is to say a community of life and love in an effort that will find fulfillment, as will everything created and redeemed, in the kingdom of God."³⁰⁸

The development which follows here is about the fourth general task. Thus, the focus is the ecclesial task (ecclesial functions) of the Christian family. Crystallizing in

FC the work of the Synod on the Family, John Paul develops the ecclesial functions of the Christian family as the substance of its mission, derived from the triple-office of Christ, a single reality expressed in three aspects--prophet, priest, and king.³⁰⁹

In my opinion, FC is the best commentary on the ecclesial functions of the Christian family. By “best commentary” I refer to its status as official teaching, its inspirational quality, and its applicability to pastoral practice. FC is a papal document, derived from the work of an international synod of bishops, which explicitly continues and deepens the official teaching found in the dogmatic and pastoral documents of Vatican Council II. In addition to expounding theological and pastoral insights, John Paul does genuinely exhort the reader to appreciate the dignity of the vocation to married and family life. The pastoral fruitfulness of FC can be glimpsed in the Bishops of the United States’ document, A Family Perspective in Church and Society (FPCS). Diocesan and Parish Directors of Religious Education and of Family Life throughout the United States have been using FPCS as a key resource for developing pastoral strategies for building partnerships of ministries with parents. For these reasons I will use FC as the matrix for the continuance of my argument. I will summarize its teaching and refer to other ecclesiastical sources primarily in the endnotes.

Priestly Function

From among the three ecclesial functions of the Christian family which are developed in FC, John Paul gives the greatest development to the priestly function. Unlike LG which develops the three functions in the order of priest, prophet, and king; John Paul develops the prophetic function first, followed by the priestly. This is significant because John Paul recognizes that the ecclesial vision of the Christian family

is a “faith” vision. This ecclesial vision is derived from revealed truth. The Catholic Church’s official position takes the perspective that God has a plan for the Christian family to be an essential agent in the ongoing redemption of the world.³¹⁰ In order to fulfill its mission the Christian family is to be in continuous dialogue with God. The dialogue is prayer, and worship is the proper response.

John Paul II entitles the Christian family’s priestly function as “The Christian family as a community in dialogue with God.”³¹¹ He includes eight sections here: (1) “The church’s sanctuary in the home,” (2) “Marriage as a sacrament of mutual sanctification and an act of worship,” (3) “Marriage and the eucharist,” (4) “The sacrament of conversion and reconciliation,” (5) “Family Prayer,” (6) “Educators in prayer,” (7) “Liturgical prayer and private prayer,” and (8) “Prayer and life.”

The first section is entitled “The church’s sanctuary in the home.” A sanctuary is a consecrated place, a temple of worship. Here in this title is implied the fact that the church’s holy place of worship is not only in the cathedral and parish church, but it is also in the domestic church.

In this first section John Paul reiterates the official church teaching that the Church, and the Christian family as a part of the Church, is a priestly people.³¹² By its intimate communion with the Church, the Christian family is to be a sanctified and a sanctifying priestly community, affecting both the church and society. Their priestly action is properly expressed in and through the daily realities of married and family life. Furthermore, the Lord Jesus himself calls the Christian family into “dialogue with God through the sacraments, through the offering of one’s life and through prayer.” Not surprisingly, thus, one finds references--in all of the eight sections of the family’s priestly

function--to the interconnection of marriage and its family, to the other sacraments, and to the expressing of the family's sanctifying role in daily life.

The second section, "Marriage as a sacrament of mutual sanctification and an act of worship," is the longest of the eight sections. Much of the content deals with what the Christian family is as a sacrament. Because I already referred often to this section when I developed the criterion of sacrament, I will not repeat that information here.

In this second section John Paul again reiterates the ecclesial vision that the Christian family is derived from the sacrament of marriage.³¹³ Recalling the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, John Paul writes that Christian marriage, like the other sacraments, has the purpose "to sanctify people, to build up the body of Christ, and finally to give worship to God."³¹⁴ Rooted in baptism and conformed to the paschal mystery in a new way by the sacrament of marriage, the conjugal love of Christian spouses is purified and made holy in the celebration of the sacrament and can continue as an abiding presence throughout their lives.³¹⁵ As the couple and family live the concrete realities proper to them, this love is to be continually purified and to radiate to others.³¹⁶

The couple's new participation in the paschal mystery is stated to be a gift of Christ. It entails a consecration, a new status in the body of Christ, which has incumbent obligations and responsibilities, and most importantly, gifts to do their duties.³¹⁷ John Paul also mentions the "gift" dimension from the perspective of couples. Namely, their participation in the liturgical action of the sacrament of marriage expresses their response of gratitude to Christ for the gift to be able to live in their married and family life. This new life becomes their spiritual sacrifice to God.³¹⁸ It entails a marital and familial

spirituality which is built on the great themes of “creation, covenant, cross, resurrection and sign.”³¹⁹

After rooting marriage and its family in the priestly people and in baptism, John Paul develops the third section, “marriage and the eucharist.”³²⁰ He connects the family’s sanctifying role to the eucharist as follows: that although this role is grounded in baptism, it receives its highest expression in the eucharist. He supports this by recalling Vatican Council II’s significant action of requesting that marriage be celebrated normally within Mass; which expresses clearly that the covenant celebrated in marriage and lived in the family is intimately connected to the covenant celebrated in the eucharist. Thus, the eucharist is said to be the source of Christian marriage’s and family’s communion and mission. He exhorts couples, therefore, to recognize the necessity of the eucharist to gain power, strength, and unity for living the Christian vision of marriage and family and for sustaining the missionary activity of the domestic church.

In the fourth section “The sacrament of conversion and reconciliation,” John Paul continues to interrelate adroitly the couple’s and family’s identity and role as this flow from the sacramental life of the Church.³²¹ First, he tells them they are constituted “saints” through baptism. Then he repeats the theme that marriage is an echo of baptism, a new conforming to the paschal mystery and a new opportunity to respond to the gospel. Focusing on the family’s sanctifying role, he exhorts families to accept the Gospel’s call to conversion as an essential and permanent element of family life. He asks families to connect the daily opportunities for repentance and mutual pardoning to the sacrament of penance. This sacrament, John Paul writes, is a remedy for the persistent sin in family life. Sin, which is a contradiction of the marital and familial covenants, is overcome by

the merciful God Who bestows mercy and love upon repenters.³²² Furthermore, families can place their hope in God “who reconstructs and brings to perfection the marriage covenant and the family communion.”

In the next section John Paul shifts his commentary from the sacraments to the prayer life of the domestic church. Section five is entitled “Family prayer,” and it is about the domestic church’s common prayer (husband and wife together; parents and children together).³²³ The obligation to do common prayer is built upon “the priestly gift and role received from Christ the high priest”--which forms the foundation of the baptismal priesthood of the faithful--and “as a consequence of and requirement for the communion bestowed by the sacraments of baptism and matrimony.” It is through the sacrament of marriage that the general call of the faithful to do common prayer is specified and is given characteristic qualities by making family life itself the object of common prayer.

In his comments John Paul beautifully weaves together the daily life of the family with the sanctifying role of the family. In the following quote the dignity and obligation of the domestic church to serve as an agent of redemption through its proper calling to pray as the domestic church is very apparent. John Paul writes:

Family prayer has for its very own object family life itself, which in all its varying circumstances is seen as a call from God and lived as a filial response to his call. Joys and sorrows, hopes and disappointments, births and birthday celebrations, wedding anniversaries of the parents, departures, separations and homecomings, important and far-reaching decisions, the death of those who are dear, etc.--all of these mark God’s loving intervention in the family’s history. They should be seen as suitable moments for thanksgiving, for petition, for trusting abandonment of the family into the hands of their common Father in heaven.³²⁴

John Paul concludes this section as the previous one. He emphatically emphasizes that the fulfillment of this sacramental and ecclesial vision requires the family’s dependence

upon the activity of God. In fact, he states: “The dignity and responsibility of the Christian family as the domestic church can be achieved only with God’s unceasing aid, which will surely be granted if it is humbly and trustingly petitioned in prayer.” In other words, the ongoing “transformation [of the Christian family into a sacramental and ecclesial reality] is achieved not only by celebrating the eucharist and the other sacraments and through offering themselves to the glory of God, but also through a life of prayer, through prayerful dialogue with the Father, through Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit.”

The next section, “Educators in prayer,” continues the exhortation to recognize the dignity and the mission which parents possess as members of the royal priesthood and as couples strengthened by the grace and office conferred through the sacrament of matrimony. Parents properly express this dignity and mission when they educate their children to pray. Parents fulfill this “fundamental and irreplaceable” role by their witnessing, which is done by actually praying with their children. Quoting Vatican Council II, John Paul comments that this educational process is oriented toward the “gradual discovery of the mystery of God and to personal dialogue with him.”³²⁵ John Paul closes this section with the following quote from Paul VI which reiterates the motif that the buildingup of the home community causes the buildingup of the larger church:

Mothers, do you teach your children the Christian prayers? Do you prepare them, in conjunction with the priests, for the sacraments that they receive when they are young: confession, communion and confirmation? Do you encourage them when they are sick to think of Christ suffering, to invoke the aid of the Blessed Virgin and the saints? Do you say the family rosary together? And you, fathers, do you pray with your children, with the whole domestic community, at least sometimes? Your example of honesty in thought and action, joined to some common prayer, is a lesson for life, an act of worship of singular value. In this way you bring peace to your homes: Pax huic domui. Remember, it is thus that you build up the church.³²⁶

Unquestionably, a major element of the ecclesial vision of the Christian family is that parents hold an instituted position (an office) of leadership. The priestly dimension of this leadership serves as a linchpin between the domestic church and the parish church. John Paul explicitly describes this vital role in the next section, “Liturgical prayer and private prayer.”³²⁷ This section has two parts, and John Paul makes significant points about the “domestic church” in both parts.

In part one John Paul writes about liturgical prayer. It is through the prayer life of the domestic church that parents are to gradually prepare children to participate in the liturgical prayer of the larger church. John Paul exhorts all the family members to participate in the eucharistic life of the parish, the sacraments of initiation, other sacraments, and even in the Divine Office. He closes this reflection by describing the movements of social prayer to be from the domestic church, to the larger church, and back to the domestic church. In this last movement the communal prayer of the domestic church is understood as a prolongation of the prayer of the larger community. Christian families particularly express this prolongation by adapting the prayer of the domestic church to the times and feasts of the liturgical year.

In part two John Paul writes about private prayer. As the Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy before him, John Paul recognizes that fruitful sacramental prayer, as well as domestic church prayer, must be augmented with private prayer and practices of personal piety.³²⁸ Here he acknowledges the freedom of believers to choose from among a great variety of forms and practices. He does, however, mention the following: “morning and evening prayers, . . . reading and meditating on the word of God, preparation for the reception of the sacraments, devotion and consecration to the Sacred

Heart of Jesus, the various forms of veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, grace before and after meals and observance of popular devotions.” Lastly, he recognizes in a special way the recitation of the family rosary and imitation of the example of Mary. He writes:

In this way [family rosary] authentic devotion to Mary, which finds expression in sincere love and generous imitation of the Blessed Virgin’s interior spiritual attitude, constitutes a special instrument for nourishing loving communion in the family and for developing conjugal and family spirituality. For she who is the mother of Christ and of the church is in a special way the mother of Christian families, of domestic churches.

John Paul’s final section on the Christian family’s priestly function is entitled “Prayer and life.”³²⁹ This section bespeaks religious wisdom; genuine prayer is needed for authentic freedom of spirit. Furthermore, according to the pontiff, the priestly function underscores that the Christian family’s ability to fulfill its mission to be what it is, the fundamental cell of human society, is directly proportional to “the fidelity and intensity of the prayer with which it is united with the fruitful vine that is Christ the Lord.” John Paul sums up his reflections by reiterating the Vatican II teaching that the Christian family’s mission, like that of the larger church, is the transformation of the world.³³⁰

Prophetic Function

I mentioned earlier that John Paul II begins his teaching on the ecclesial function of the Christian family by developing the prophetic dimension first. I also want to add some context by remarking that the pontiff chose to develop the Christian family’s role in the development of society before developing its ecclesial function. It is noteworthy that the Christian family’s prophetic role links its societal task and its ecclesial task. The following quote which concludes the societal task serves as an illuminating transition to the Christian family’s ecclesial task:

The spiritual communion between Christian families, rooted in a common faith and hope and given life by love, constitutes an inner energy that generates, spreads and develops justice, reconciliation, fraternity and peace among human beings. Insofar as it is a 'small-scale church', the Christian family is called upon, like the 'large-scale church', to be a sign of unity for the world and in this way to exercise its prophetic role by bearing witness to the kingdom and peace of Christ, toward which the whole world is journeying.³³¹

John Paul II entitles the Christian family's prophetic function as "The Christian family as a believing and evangelizing community."³³² He includes four sections here: (1) "Faith as the discovery and admiring awareness of God's plan for the family," (2) "The Christian family's ministry of evangelization," (3) "Ecclesial service," and (4) "To preach the Gospel to the whole creation."

In the first section, "Faith as the discovery and admiring awareness of God's plan for the family," John Paul makes clear that he is commenting about a "faith" vision.³³³ He comments that baptized believers who marry and begin a family need a "welcoming" attitude to acquire this faith vision. In other words, the way the Christian family becomes a believing and evangelizing community from the perspective of the couple is by cultivating a "welcoming" posture towards God's word and by announcing the word of God.³³⁴ Once welcomed; God's word requires "the obedience of faith." By the time Christian believers marry; the offering of the obedience of faith ought to be an ongoing part of the Christian life. Thus, one can speak about the requirement of Christian spouses and parents to offer the obedience of faith.³³⁵

Accordingly, John Paul speaks about the married state as a journey of faith. Through their ongoing openness to God's word, the couple will discover the revelation of "the marvelous news--the good news--of their conjugal and family life sanctified and made a source of sanctity by Christ himself." According to John Paul, faith is required

for the couple and for the family to know the dignity of matrimony and God's plan for the family. This is a plan so marvelous that its fruit is joyful gratitude to God.

Because the married state is a journey of faith, marriage preparation is to be viewed as a special opportunity for the engaged "to rediscover and deepen the faith received in baptism and nourished by their Christian upbringing." In the celebration of the sacrament of marriage, the couple makes their basic moment of faith. Here is a proclamation of faith: "This sacrament, in essence, is the proclamation in the church of the good news concerning married love." Here also is a profession of faith within and with the church. This profession of faith is for life-long marital and familial life and entails a duty to life-long learning in the faith:

This profession of faith demands that it be prolonged in the life of the married couple and of the family. God, who called the couple to marriage, continues to call them in marriage. In and through the events, problems, difficulties and circumstances of everyday life, God comes to them, revealing and presenting the concrete 'demands' of their sharing in the love of Christ for his church in the particular family, social and ecclesial situation in which they find themselves.

The discovery of and obedience to the plan of God on the part of the conjugal and family community must take place in 'togetherness', through the human experience of love between husband and wife, between parents and children, lived in the spirit of Christ.

Thus, the little domestic church, like the greater church, needs to be constantly and intensely evangelized: hence its duty regarding permanent education in the faith.

In the second section, "The Christian family's ministry of evangelization," the focus is the family as subject or agent of evangelization. Building upon the work of the Second Vatican Council and Pope Paul VI, John Paul reiterates the comment he made in an earlier address to the Latin Bishops.³³⁶ He said that "the future of evangelization depends in great part on the church of the home."³³⁷ Thus, he rightly continues the prophetic challenge to Christian families that they become evangelizing communities.

To become an evangelizing community, however, is not a magical endeavor. All families are not equally effective in taking up the mission of the Church. John Paul states: “To the extent in which the Christian family accepts the Gospel and matures in faith, it becomes an evangelizing community.”³³⁸ He also reminds parents that evangelization can flow in various directions within the family, e.g., spouse to spouse, parent to child, child to parent, child to child. Of course, this evangelizing activity is also to go outward to other families, to the neighborhood, etc.

John Paul repeats in this second section that the family as an evangelizing community is part of God’s plan. This apostolic mission is based in baptism and receives new strength from the grace of the sacrament of marriage. Thus, the normative vision that family life is to flow from marriage is reiterated. In clear continuity with the vision enunciated in the Second Vatican Council, John Paul writes that it is God’s plan to transform society through the family derived from marriage. Of course, it is God’s grace that provides the power to do the transformation. By God’s design and power, Christian families are to be key players in bringing about the reign of God. John Paul adds that in cultural situations which are anti-religious, there is an absolute need for family catechesis in the church of the home.³³⁹

In the third section, “Ecclesial service,” John Paul highlights the importance of the spouses’ and parents’ ministry of evangelization and catechesis.³⁴⁰ He delineates a two-fold context for the spouses’ and parents’ original, irreplaceable, and essentially ecclesial service.³⁴¹ The larger context is the whole church as an evangelized and evangelizing community. The immediate context is the domestic church conforming this ecclesial service to typical family life.

Parents are to evangelize and to catechize their children by their word and by their action in daily living.³⁴² They are to educate their children to pursue the vocation God desires for them. They are to provide this service even during the period of their children's adolescence when parents may have to suffer the rejection of the faith by their children. Although much of this ecclesial service is within the family, it is not confined to it. Because the family is in communion with the larger church, it is "to collaborate responsibly with all the other evangelizing and catechetical activities present and at work in the ecclesial community at the diocesan and parochial levels."³⁴³

In the fourth and final section, "To preach the Gospel to the whole creation," John Paul gives Christian spouses a role model for their evangelizing function.³⁴⁴ Turning to the Acts of the Apostles, he holds up Aquila and Priscilla. In imitation of this first century married couple, Christian spouses are to have zeal for the Church's evangelizing mission. Genuine faith propels believers forward to spread the faith. Furthermore, all believers have the obligation, which is commanded in Christ's commission and rooted in baptism and confirmation, to spread the gospel to the whole creation. Thus, in a way particular to each couple, Christian spouses are to be missionary couples and the church of the home is to be a missionary community. They are to be missionaries "in the true and proper sense, of love and life."

More concretely, John Paul describes the family's missionary activity to be both by example and by witness and to be directed to those within and to those outside the family.³⁴⁵ As an example of this activity within the family, he states: "This happens when some member of the family does not have the faith or does not practice it with consistency. In such a case the other members must give him or her a living witness of

their own faith in order to encourage and support him or her along the path toward full acceptance of Christ, the savior.” Examples of missionary activity to those outside the family are “[to] those who are ‘far away’, for families who do not yet believe and for those Christian families who no longer live in accordance with the faith that they once received.” He adds that the special contribution couples can make to the missionary cause flows from raising their children to recognize God’s love for all people and to foster missionary vocations among their children.³⁴⁶

Ordering (Kingly) Function

The title of the kingly function is “The Christian family as a community at the service of man.” John Paul divides this function into two sections: “The new commandment of love” and “To discover the image of God in each brother and sister.” In the introduction to the first section, he gives a summary statement of the ecclesial task (mission) of the Christian family as it is expressed in the triple-office of Christ. He states: “The church, a prophetic, priestly and kingly people, is endowed with the mission of bringing all human beings to accept the word of God in faith [prophetic], to celebrate and profess it in the sacraments and in prayer [priestly], and to give expression to it in the concrete realities of life in accordance with the gift and new commandment of love [kingly].”³⁴⁷

This first section puts the emphasis on the activity and power of the Holy Spirit. The pneumatic dimension of the sacrament of marriage is made continuous with its roots in baptism. In effect, John Paul is again repeating the theme that marriage is an echo of baptism. In Christian marriage the Spirit writes anew and deepens the evangelical law of

love into the hearts of Christian husbands and wives. Logically, the pontiff describes conjugal love as a fruit of the Holy Spirit.

The ecclesial dimension of the sacrament of marriage and its Christian family is also reiterated. The pope writes: “Thus the Christian family is inspired and guided by the new law of the spirit and, in intimate communion with the church, the kingly people, it is called to exercise its ‘service’ of love toward God and toward its fellow human beings.” One senses here that sacraments, celebrated and lived in a particular place and time and people, have universal effects. In other words, in and through Christian marriage, which unifies and makes peace between a particular man and a particular woman, the larger church is acting as a sign and instrument of the Triune-God who is unifying and making peace within humankind.

John Paul also develops the moral dimension in this first section. It is the Spirit who empowers the couple and family to live in responsible freedom. Authentic human freedom harmonizes power and love. In imitation of Jesus the Lord, the family members are to choose to exercise their royal power in loving service. Hence, John Paul has intertwined christological, pneumatic, ecclesial, sacramental, and moral themes.

Next, John Paul deepens his reflection on the kingly function by shifting from the exterior activity of serving others to the interior activity of victory over personal sin. In the following quote he cites Rom. 6:12: “Christ has communicated this power to his disciples that they might be established in royal freedom and that by self-denial and a holy life they might conquer the reign of sin in themselves.”

Finally, he concludes section one by stating that the goal of reigning with Christ is to “lead their brothers and sisters to that King whom to serve is to reign.”³⁴⁸ Thus, the

Kingdom of God is the goal of the entire kingly people, and the Christian family is a key element in this effort.

In the second section, “To discover the image of God in each brother and sister,” John Paul writes about kingly service from the perspective of a familial community.³⁴⁹ He takes the general commandment of love and views it as an empowering love, i.e., one that inspires and sustains believers. Rather than viewing the “commandment” of love as a shackle, he describes it as sustaining powerfully the Christian family’s vocation to discover in each person dignity and identity (a child of God).

According to John Paul, the family’s effort to welcome, to respect, and to serve others finds its dynamism in the inner communion of love (grace). The act of loving is particularized in the Christian family. For example, love is between husband and wife and among family members. It is shared with the larger ecclesial community, and it is extended beyond to all people.

Additionally, John Paul depicts the effectiveness of familial love. The domestic church, which is a part of the ecclesial community, has the capability to affect the quality of life and the characteristics of the larger church. John Paul states: “Thanks to love within the family, the church can and ought to take on a more homelike or family dimension, developing a more human and fraternal style of relationships.”

Obviously, the Christian family contributes a valuable gift to the larger church as the latter takes on a “family dimension.” John Paul characterizes this gift or service as the family’s evangelical way. It entails a genuine buildup of the Church in love. However, the family’s influence goes beyond the ecclesial community by causing a genuine “human advancement” in the world. In other words, the Christian family’s love

is not only fruitful by adding children to the church and society, but familial love is fruitful also by advancing humankind toward the Kingdom of God.³⁵⁰

CHAPTER FOUR

THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS AND PASTORAL IMPLICATIONS

From the beginning I have insisted that this is a modest study. At this time in history, it is unlikely that one can write a comprehensive and definitive book on the Christian family. I have attempted in the previous chapters to present the hierarchical magisterium's vision of the Christian family as it has crystallized during the past sixty years. In this final chapter I will suggest several ways that the teaching of the Christian family as domestic church can contribute to the theory and practice of church and sacraments.

More specifically, I want to reflect on the concept of Christian family as domestic Church from the theological foundations of grace and conversion. Secondly, I want to derive some pastoral implications for Church renewal. There are three concerns that connect these two aims: first, to contribute to the enterprise of developing a contemporary family spirituality; second, to integrate the efforts to renew the Christian family with the efforts to renew the parish; and third, to comment upon the contemporary situation among many Christians of living alternative life-styles, especially cohabitation and absent father households. I choose to reflect on select aspects of these latter phenomena because I have been experiencing these as major crises for implementing the vision of the Christian family

as domestic Church and for working toward the genuine renewal of parish life. What are some theological insights from which pastoral leaders can derive attitudes and skills to more effectively minister to cohabiting couples and unwed single-parents? While I acknowledge that there are many other serious crises affecting the various levels of Church life, these two are particularly numerous and acute. Hopefully, my theological and pastoral reflections will serve as a modest contribution toward renewing Church and Society at their foundational levels.

From a theological perspective, the concept of Christian family as domestic Church is a heuristic model for understanding the Christian family as a sacramental reality and an ecclesial reality. From within the Roman Catholic tradition, one can gain a glimpse of the theological roots of this vision by making a contrast between the work of Theodore Mackin and Yves Congar. Mackin's brilliant presentation of the theology of Christian marriage is contained in his post-Vatican II, three-volume Marriage in the Catholic Church. This work's primary focus is upon the "sacrament" of marriage and his analysis of Vatican II theology centers primarily on the speeches and writings during the debate on GS. In Congar's Lay People in the Church, a pre-Vatican II work, one finds a different theological root. Here the focus is on Christian marriage and its family as a "little" church. This latter concept makes its way into the ecclesiological and evangelistic thrusts of the 1950's and 1960's. During Vatican Council II, this theological root appears first and most importantly during the speeches and writings which laid the foundation for LG.

From this contrast, it is evident that the reality of Christian marriage and its family has at least two discernible theological roots. These two roots--sacrament and

church--share a major biblical source, the Letter to the Ephesians. Roman Catholics, as well as other Christians, reflecting on this work of high ecclesiology, have discerned that marriage and its family is both a sacramental reality and an ecclesial reality. Vatican Council II incorporated both roots into the official teaching of the Church.

It is in LG 11 that the Council writes a seed text to articulate its understanding of the Christian family as an ecclesial reality. Thereafter, the Council, popes, bishops' synods and committees have expanded upon the notion of Christian family as domestic Church. In other words, today, one can say that the hierarchy has posited for the Christian family a vision, mission, and tasks for actualizing its essential ecclesial and sacramental nature.

In chapter one I showed that sentence one of LG 11 serves as an introduction to the article. Here the bishops state that the Church is built up by the sacraments and the life of virtue. I think this is a keynote for how church and sacraments are interrelated. Karl Rahner makes this point by saying that Christian marriage is a self-realization of the Church. He also says that a new cell, a domestic church, results.³⁵¹ Michael Schmaus makes the same point this way: "The seven sacraments as we know them are to be understood as particular forms of the total sacramentality of the Church expressing itself in particular situations in the life of the Church and of the individual believer."³⁵² My point is that church and sacraments belong together.

This point, I suggest, has an important implication for doing theology and for pastoral practice. Perhaps ecclesiology and sacramentology need to be more thoroughly integrated. For example, relative to ecclesiology, theologians may produce a more complete depiction of church leadership by balancing the centuries of reflection on

church leadership from “above,”--namely from universal church and local church perspectives where the ordained are most conspicuous--with reflection on church leadership from “below,”--namely from the domestic church perspective where the married are most conspicuous.

This penetrating insight could provide a pastoral benefit; namely, the ordained and non-ordained leaders could use their offices in a highly evangelical manner by awakening the married to their true ecclesial vocation of leadership. This may help to address a more than fifty-year lingering concern of the larger Church leadership, i.e., how to motivate the laity to engage whole-heartedly in the mission of the Church which is to proclaim the gospel to all.

In no way do I intend to equate the two different kinds of leadership. Nor, do I intend to replace the invaluable and proper leadership role of the ordained. Rather, I want to exhort those who reflect on the self-understanding of the Church to accept the vision of leadership which the Council proposed and the hierarchy continues to propose relative to Christian marriage and its family. Since the 1950's the hierarchical magisterium has frequently and continuously taught that the future of the Church is directly related to the future of the Christian family. Furthermore, the Council has brought to our collective consciousness the dignity, responsibility, and obligation which belongs to the married and which is incumbent upon them, i.e., to accept and to exercise their explicit “ecclesial” office/role.

Prophetic Function: Basis of Ecclesial Functions

Faith and the Word of God

It is significant that in FC, when John Paul II reflected on the triple-office of Christ as it is specified in the Christian family, that he began with the “prophetic” office. The prophetic office, he says, is based on a faith vision. Faith-filled married couples will welcome the word of God, he adds. At this point, I recall the biblical image of God's word as a two-edged sword. It cuts two ways. It shows the light of God's will and the status of our accepting it. This is typified throughout the Judeo-Christian Scriptures when the biblical writers use marital imagery to communicate their evaluation of their people's relationship to God, i.e., the status of the covenant between God and His People.

To reiterate a point previously made, Christian couples have a kind of consecration to mediate this covenantal love relationship. I suggest that theologians and pastoral leaders empower the married by helping them to understand and to dedicate themselves to live their common lives as a prophetic, cutting-edge ministry. This is no easy task because each family is a unique self-realization of the Church. In order for families to become a unique domestic church, they must learn to welcome and to listen to God's word. This welcoming and listening are indispensable elements for building up the Church of God at all levels, including the smallest. I suggest, therefore, that parochial leaders support families by helping them to do faith sharing based on scripture. This can begin at the weekly Eucharistic liturgies. For example, homilists can model a process which can be imitated by home leaders, and they can integrate a family perspective into their homilies.³⁵³ Furthermore, parishes can support families by providing children's liturgy of the word and small-group, faith-sharing sessions as an ongoing parish service.

For example, Trehaus publication has a family journal that is based upon the children's lectionary.³⁵⁴ It provides one of the Sunday readings, offers questions for family discussion, provides suggestions for family activities, and provides a family ritual/prayer service. In our parish, we ask Christian families to use the journal in their homes on a weekly basis. Then, we convene the families monthly for Sunday Eucharist, which includes an experience of Children's liturgy of the Word, followed by a dialogue session with other Christian households. After the dialogue, there is a communal meal, which is followed by a challenge to the families to deepen the service dimension of their lives. This approach parallels the processes used in various religious movements like Renew, Small Christian Communities, Marriage Encounter, Crucial, Charismatic Renewal, etc.

Sacrament of Marriage As a Hard Way

If the exercising of the prophetic office requires a faith vision, then how well will our generation and the next ones fare in this prophetic context? I ask this question among baptized Catholic adults in the United States. On the one hand, one will readily recognize exemplary married couples among their families and acquaintances. Truly, these people provide a witness which is inspiring, to say the least. On the other hand, one frequently meets a man and a woman living together out of wedlock, many of whom claim to be believers. This situation is not limited to young adults. One does not need to look far to find examples of older adults who are living together out of wedlock; some of whom are even grandparents. For the most part, prophetic voices seldom denounce publicly this situation. No one seems to want to throw stones, perhaps, because we live in glass houses; or perhaps, lamentably, because we live in a time when marriage is

extremely fragile, held together by the functional threads of intimacy and economics.³⁵⁵

Yet, the Christian fact remains. Christian marriage and its family is a church of the home.³⁵⁶

After twenty-three years of marriage and family and of working professionally for the Catholic Church, I am convinced that we, the church, must speak and write honestly and comprehensively about ourselves as Church. If our experience commands it, then we must proclaim joyfully and shamelessly that Christ reigns among us. Let us at all times be completely honest and admit that we are eminently a pilgrim people, striving together to live a life of virtue and to overcome the effects of original and personal sin. In our community God's love, power, freedom, truth, goodness, unity, and peace are to reign. Let us be honest and admit that we often fall short in our cooperation with God's reign.

As a community, we believe that God has elected us to walk on the road to glory. Being honest, however, let us admit that it is a narrow way, the way of the cross. It is known for its grace and disgrace. Married life is frequently very hard. Inevitably, there will be suffering. Yet, families can proclaim many joy-filled experiences, and ultimately, that the unsurpassing gift of the Holy Spirit is their growing joy. Let families say to the unevangelized: "You are welcome to live in God by journeying with us. Come and see how we live." In other words, family members must put their personal, familial, and parochial lives on the line: rejoicing when they live virtuously and repenting when they sin.

A well-formed conscience is indispensable in order to live by the spirit in truth. I suggest that for a married couple and its family, a clear and discernible identity will

facilitate conscience formation.³⁵⁷ Individually, a person is a beloved child of God. Collectively, a family is a Church of the home, which in communion with other families forms a parish church and a diocesan church. Thus, I suggest that a model of church as community may become more meaningful for spouses and families if this model would be nuanced as a “community of communities.”³⁵⁸ An advantage of this nuance would be to help family members to appropriate an ecclesial identity, and hopefully, thereby, to act accordingly.³⁵⁹

To restate all this in a more formal way, one can turn to Schmaus for context. In his dogmatic treatise on the Church, he articulates four aspects of the Church: the sacramental aspect (“The Church is the instrument by which God makes salvation present and at the same time the place where he does so.”); the christological aspect (“Christ makes himself present and accessible through the word of the Church, which is his instrument in virtue of the activity of the Holy Spirit.”); the pneumatological aspect (Church functions as the dwelling place of the Spirit); and the eschatological aspect (“God’s gift of himself to man, although it is given once and for all and definitively as its source, brings fulfilled salvation only in the future.”).³⁶⁰ While it would be worthwhile to reflect theologically and pastorally on the Christian family as domestic church in the context of these four aspects, I will comment at this time on the eschatological character because I think so little is written from this point of view in our time; yet, it is a much needed one.

The eschatological aspect highlights the Christian fact of the kingdom/reign of God. The vision of all Christian life is that it exists to be fulfilled in God.³⁶¹ So, Christians speak about fulfillment in terms of God’s kingdom, heaven, the beatific vision,

etc. The notion of a pilgrim people is an image that reminds us of our need to be totally transformed into a new creation, a new people. It connotes a sense that God is not done transforming us. The Triune God wants to make us completely one by obedience to the divine will. For the Church of Christ, the divine will is our salvation³⁶² and redemption by living, dying and rising in Christ by the unifying power of the Holy Spirit for the glory of the Father. For Christians to live authentically, they must pick up their cross daily and follow Christ.³⁶³ It is normally in and through the apostolates of the domestic church, the parish church, and the diocesan church that the fully initiated are formed and empowered by God to witness to the Triune God's reign.

Focusing on the domestic church, one can say that in and through the sacrament of marriage and its family; the relationship of Christ and Church is made present in a particular time and place. Yet, one must also say that marriage and its family is not an absolute reality. It does not exist for fulfillment in itself. Rather, as a self-actualization of the Church, the Christian family exists, like the larger church and as a part of the larger church, for fulfillment in God.³⁶⁴ Like the larger Church, Christian marriage/family is a sacrament pointing to Christ, who is the beloved Son of God and who perfectly fulfilled the divine will to make the Father present.³⁶⁵ In and through the cross of Christ (life, death, and resurrection), the unconditional love of the Father is revealed and Christ as true child of God is vindicated. The Father's glory is made known in and through the obedience of the only-begotten Son of God. We, one body in Christ, are elected to join in the paschal mystery as the root metaphor of our life.³⁶⁶ In Christian marriage and its family this conformity to the cross becomes specified as an orientation toward unity and fruitful love through the ordeals of daily married and familial life.

Applying the parable of the Vine and the branches to the Christian family, it is apparent that the future of Christian families entails being joined to Christ and staying joined to Christ.³⁶⁷ If Christian families stay joined to Christ, then they will yield fruit. However, two conditions seem presumed: (1) being joined to Christ (conversion) and (2) staying joined to Christ (sanctification). The latter requires an ongoing pruning. I suggest that we Christian leaders must form our people to expect “pruning” and to expect “fruit.” The good news is that the fruit will be the fruits of the Holy Spirit,³⁶⁸ experienced personally and collectively, manifested in personal virtue and communal virtue. Borrowing the parabolic image of “building one’s house on rock,”³⁶⁹ it makes sense to be honest and explicit when catechizing our people for Christian married and family life to give thorough attention to the theological themes of the indwelling of Christ, the paschal mystery, and discipleship. Theologians and catechists would do well to articulate these themes from multi-points of view, e.g., the individual, the couple, the family, and the parish.

My experience from living in three dioceses over the past quarter of a century is that the catechetical formation during proximate sacramental preparation for those marrying for the first time consists of three options: Pre-Cana (four two-hour sessions), Engaged Encounter (a weekend experience similar to Marriage Encounter), and the Sponsor-Couple Program (one married couple, using basically the same content as Pre-Cana, catechizing one or more engaged couples). From among four general topic areas during this preparation, one topic is reserved for spirituality. This topic contains the explicitly "religious" content of the Christian vision for marriage and its family. For the most part, the theological content is about Christian marriage as a sacramental reality.

Very little, if any, of the content focuses on Christian marriage as an ecclesial reality. Thus, the curriculum generally lacks the ecclesial vision, mission, and tasks of Christian marriage and its family. Thus, an obvious pastoral implication is to expand the curriculum to include the topic of Christian marriage as an ecclesial reality. Furthermore, the curriculum needs to be expanded to include other explicitly Christian themes like the indwelling of Christ, the paschal mystery, and discipleship. After expanding the curriculum, pastoral leaders ought to create catechetical processes that help learners to appropriate these themes at the various levels of person, couple, family, and parish.

Many of the above comments about the proximate sacramental preparation for marriage apply to the proximate sacramental preparation for couples presenting infants for baptism. It is not enough to catechize parents about how baptism incorporates the person into the church, if by church, one means the parish Church. Additionally, a more comprehensive catechesis would enable the parents to investigate how the incorporation into the Church can be understood from the point of view of the "little" Church. Catechists would do well to help parents to explore the three-fold ecclesial functions from the perspectives of their own ecclesial leadership as it extends toward their children and toward their parish.

Finally, I would like to suggest that this pastoral tact be applied systematically to other forms of sacramental preparation, e.g., first Eucharist, first Reconciliation, and Confirmation. Of course, the entire religious education curriculum for grades one to twelve needs to be analyzed for its development of sacramentology and ecclesiology in order to assure both the perspectives from "above" and from "below."

Religious Conversion As a Foundational Experience

Theological reflection on the concept of religious conversion can help one to gain a foundation for fundamental insights into the prophetic function of the Christian family and to derive pastoral implications for renewing the Church. If one posits that Christian religious conversion, metanoia and/or epistrephein,³⁷⁰ is initiatory or foundational to Christian life, then what are some of the implications for Christian marriage and its family? Usually, when I reflect on the messages sent to spouses and parents through the documents of Vatican Council II, the post-conciliar synods, and the popes, I feel highly exhorted. However, the messages have the feel that they are written to believers, who are fully initiated and presumably religiously converted. This feeling leads me to ask several questions. How important is religious conversion to those who present themselves for Christian marriage, a sacrament that echoes the sacraments of initiation, which celebrate religious conversion and incorporation into Christ and church? Ought religious conversion be a condition for the Christian sacrament of marriage? If yes, then would it be a normative condition? Furthermore, how would a community empirically verify the presence or absence of religious conversion? Would expecting religious conversion as a condition for Christian marriage and parenthood result in elitism or simply a renewed Church? What would the effect be on the size of Catholic congregations?

In the spirit of inquiry, I will speculate on some of these questions by bringing the notion of religious conversion to the foreground and comment upon it from the perspective of married/familial love. As I begin, an old American saying runs through my mind: “You can’t get blood out of a turnip.” How effectively can we expect to promote an ecclesial vision of Christian marriage and family, which is derived from the

Christian norms of Scripture and Tradition, without relating it to the foundational Christian experience of religious conversion? In other words, can we expect Christian families to function effectively as little churches if the household leaders lack Christian religious conversion? To what extent can we hold spouses and parents accountable to the standards of their office when religious conversion is lacking? Two examples of such standards are a life-long marriage which promotes the mutual growth of the spouses in holiness and the spouses/parents exercising of the triple-office of Christ in their marriages/families.

These questions about religious conversion as a foundational experience undergirding a little church are slightly different questions than the frequently discussed “faith” questions around the celebration of the sacrament of marriage.³⁷¹ According to Bernard Lonergan, “faith is the knowledge born of religious love.”³⁷² The experience of love is previous to faith. I refer here particularly to the initiative of God’s love, to one’s orientation toward the God who is love, to one’s awakening to God’s love, and to one’s accepting of God’s love.³⁷³

Conversion

I will use the conversion theory of Bernard Lonergan as the guide through this difficult and complex subject. Lonergan describes three forms of conversion: intellectual, moral, and religious. He states that each of the three is connected, but because each is a different type of event one should first consider each separately. After that task is completed, then one may relate one to the others.³⁷⁴ I will follow this suggested order, but I will not treat each type of conversion equally because the focus is religious conversion.

According to Lonergan conversion is basic to Christian living, and its objectification provides theology with its foundations.³⁷⁵ The converted person has “a self to understand that is quite different from the self that the unconverted have to understand.”³⁷⁶ Consequently, the converted person will interpret reality differently than the unconverted because one’s interpretation is affected by one’s self-understanding. Conversion is concerned with the transformation of the subject and his/her world.³⁷⁷

Although conversion is normally a “prolonged process though its explicit acknowledgment may be concentrated in a few momentous judgments and decisions,” it is not the result of development or a series of developments.³⁷⁸ Yet, “it is a resultant change of course and direction.”³⁷⁹ A new self with a new world emerges as the old self with its old world passes away. “Conversion is a matter of moving from one set of roots to another. . . . It occurs only inasmuch as a man discovers what is unauthentic in himself and turns away from it, and embraces it with his whole being.”³⁸⁰ In short, the actual achievement of conversion is always dialectical,³⁸¹ and conversion is defined as a dialectical shift in horizon. “Such an about-face and new beginning is what is meant by conversion.”³⁸²

Lonergan also speaks of conversion as a modality of self-transcendence. Self-transcendence occurs when one moves from one level of consciousness and intentionality to a higher level. He identifies four of these levels: The empirical, intellectual, rational, and responsible.³⁸³ The self transcends by the process of sublation. By sublation he means:

. . . what sublates goes beyond what is sublated, introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with the sublated or destroying it, on the contrary needs it, includes it, preserves all its

proper features and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization within a richer context.³⁸⁴

Conversion occurs on the fourth level of consciousness and intentionality, i.e., the responsible level.³⁸⁵ He describes this as the level “on which we are concerned with ourselves, our own operations, our goals, and so deliberate about possible courses of actions, evaluate them, decide, and carry out our decisions.”³⁸⁶

At this fourth level Lonergan identifies three modalities of self-transcendence, which are intellectual, moral, and religious conversion. He describes these as follows:

Intellectual conversion is to truth attained by cognitional self-transcendence. Moral conversion is to values apprehended, affirmed, and realized by a real self-transcendence. Religious conversion is to a total being-in-love as the efficacious ground of all transcendence, whether in the pursuit of truth, or in the realization of values, or in the orientation man adopts to the universe, its ground, and its goal.³⁸⁷

In summary, Lonergan states that self-transcendence by sublation is an essential concept for understanding conversion. According to Lonergan conversion occurs on the fourth level of responsible, existential consciousness.³⁸⁸ He identifies three types of conversion: intellectual, moral, and religious. Each is a modality of self-transcendence,³⁸⁹

a crucial instance entailing a dialectical horizon shift. I now will examine in more detail the concept of religious conversion.

Religious Conversion

This examination of Lonergan’s notion of religious conversion will be based on the quote below. Because Lonergan includes the fundamental characteristics of religious conversion in this quote, I will do a brief commentary on it.

Religious conversion is being grasped by ultimate concern. It is other-worldly falling in love. It is total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualifications, reservations. But it is such a surrender, not as an act, but as a

dynamic state that is prior to and principle of subsequent acts. It is revealed in retrospect as an undertow of existential consciousness, as a fated acceptance of a vocation to holiness, as perhaps an increasing simplicity and passivity in prayer. It is interpreted differently in the context of different religious traditions. For Christians it is God's love flooding our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us. It is the gift of grace, and since the days of Augustine, a distinction has been drawn between operative and cooperative grace. Operative grace is the replacement of the heart of stone by a heart of flesh beyond the horizon of the heart of stone. Cooperative grace is the heart of flesh becoming effective in good works through human freedom. Operative grace is religious conversion. Cooperative grace is the effectiveness of conversion, the gradual movement towards a full and complete transformation of the whole of one's living and feeling, one's thoughts, words, deeds, and omissions.³⁹⁰

Lonergan begins his explanation of religious conversion with Tillich's definition of "being grasped by ultimate concern."³⁹¹ God initiates the experience of religious conversion. Human beings are incapable of initiating this experience. However, Lonergan immediately adds his emphasis of mutuality. "Religious conversion is other worldly falling in love."³⁹² Here, he is emphasizing the human response: a freely chosen acceptance of God's love and subsequent effect of becoming a being-in-love with the Transcendent.

Religious conversion is primarily a love experience between God and a particular human being who becomes a new creation. Lonergan continues his explanation of religious conversion by describing it as a "total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualifications, reservations." Here, we have the great paradox that one expands his/her freedom and being through 'self-surrender'. By giving oneself away (self-donation or 'lose' oneself) one becomes his/her genuine self, and this is experienced as becoming a new creation. Although Lonergan is speaking of self-surrender from the human perspective, it is proper to speak first of God's unreserved self-surrender. This is a Judeo-Christian truth. In Is. 49:16 it states that our names are carved

into the palms of God's hand. In the world of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is a common practice to brand the slave's palms with the name of his or her master. In the Christian Scriptures we have the witness of Jesus: who washes the feet of his disciples and accepts freely the crucifixion. The latter is the supreme act of total and permanent self-surrender-love unto death.

Because the self-surrender is permanent, religious conversion cannot be reduced to an act or event. It is better understood as a foundational experience that commences "a dynamic state that is prior to and principle of subsequent acts." Consequently, we can speak of religious conversion as a transformative experience. The horizon of the heart of stone is replaced by the new horizon of a heart of flesh. Elsewhere, Lonergan writes that the experience of being in love with God is the fulfillment of the capacity for self-transcendence.³⁹³ He writes: "That fulfillment is not the product of our knowledge and choice. On the contrary, it dismantles and abolishes the horizon in which our knowing and choosing went on and it sets up a new horizon in which the love of God will transvalue our values and the eyes of that love will transform our knowing."³⁹⁴

Christians attribute this transformation to the activity of the Holy Spirit, and thereby, acknowledge the experience as the gift of grace. At this point Lonergan recalls the traditional distinction between operative and cooperative grace. Operative grace is religious conversion, and cooperative grace is the effectiveness of the conversion. In other words, operative grace is the replacement of the heart of stone with a heart of flesh (dialectical horizon shift), while cooperative grace is "the gradual movement towards a full and complete transformation of the whole of one's living and feeling, one's thoughts, words, deeds, and omissions (fundamental option or orientation).

For Lonergan, religious conversion causes a profound effect upon the subject. This is seen clearly when he uses the concept of sublation to relate religious conversion to intellectual and moral conversion. His eloquent description follows:

Questions for intelligence, for reflection, for deliberation reveal the eros of the human spirit, its capacity and its desire for self-transcendence. But that capacity meets fulfillment, that desire turns to joy, when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love. Then there is a new basis for all valuing and all doing good. In no way are fruits of intellectual or moral conversion negated or diminished. On the contrary, all human pursuit of the true and the good is included within and furthered by a cosmic context and purpose and, as well, there now accrues to man the power of love to enable him to accept the suffering involved in undoing the effects of decline.

It is not to be thought, however, that religious conversion means no more than a new and more efficacious ground for the pursuit of intellectual and moral ends. Religious loving is without conditions, qualifications, reservations; it is with all one's heart and all one's soul and all one's mind and all one's strength. This lack of limitation, though it corresponds to the unrestricted character of human questioning, does not pertain to this world. Holiness abounds in truth and moral goodness, but it has a distinct dimension of its own. It is other-worldly fulfillment, joy, peace, bliss. In Christian experience these are the fruits of being in love with a mysterious, uncomprehended God.³⁹⁵

At this point, a comment about affective conversion is appropriate. Although Lonergan doesn't develop the notion of affective conversion, he does suggest it.³⁹⁶ He states that the subject is self-transcendent affectively when he or she falls in love and breaks the isolation of the individual so as to be able to function both for oneself and others.³⁹⁷ This type of love has many forms, but it is not identical to other-worldly love. Lonergan would consider the latter as a sublation of the former.³⁹⁸

Regarding other-worldly love, Lonergan further distinguishes it from acts or a series of acts. Other worldly-love is "a dynamic state whence proceed the acts, that constitutes in a methodical theology what in a theoretical theology is named sanctifying

grace.”³⁹⁹ This dynamic state, in the traditional language of Christian spirituality, manifests itself in three ways:

... the purgative way in which one withdraws from sinning and overcomes temptation; the illuminative way in which one’s discernment of values is refined and one’s commitment to them is strengthened; the unitive way in which the serenity of joy and peace reveal the love that hitherto had been struggling against sin and advancing in virtue.⁴⁰⁰

Hence, this other-worldly love which is religious conversion is the foundation of the Christian life, or in traditional language, the spiritual life.

To this point the development of conversion has concretized the fact that it is a personal phenomenon. Lonergan cautions the reader not to infer that conversion is a purely private phenomenon.⁴⁰¹ Both the individual and his/her social group contribute the elements which comprise one’s horizon. Consequently, the converted subject must choose a social group to which to belong. Lonergan remarks:

It follows that conversion involves more than a change of horizon. It can mean that one begins to belong to a different social group or, if one’s group remains the same, that one begins to belong to it in a new way. Again, the group will bear witness to its founder or founders whence originated and are preserved its high seriousness and mature wisdom. Finally, the witness it bears will be efficacious in the measure that the group is dedicated not to its own interests but to the welfare of mankind.⁴⁰²

Thus, there is an intrinsic relationship between the experience of religious conversion and belonging to a social group. The religiously converted person eventually needs to be incorporated into a specific social group. To refuse to be bonded to the appropriate social group would be a violation of conscience, i.e., alienation from one’s authentic being, which Lonergan identifies as sin.⁴⁰³

The religiously converted person, thus, ordinarily seeks to belong to a social group. In Christianity the social group is called the Church, the People of God.⁴⁰⁴ The People of God, covenanted to Christ, can be structured in various ways.⁴⁰⁵ As a priestly

people “it is through the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues that the sacred nature and organic structure of the priestly community is brought into operation.”⁴⁰⁶ Matrimony is the Christian sacrament of Marriage, and as such, the covenantal love of the spouses manifests the covenantal love of Christ and Church and realizes the organic structure of the Church. More specifically, it realizes the Christian family, i.e., the family which arises from the marriage of Christians. The Council captured this vision by bestowing upon this family the title of domestic church. The religiously converted Christians who marry, thus, are participating in the formation of a cell of the Church and this has moral ramifications.⁴⁰⁷

The Situation of Cohabitation

Employing the heuristic model of the Christian family as domestic Church, one can explore various life-style choices. In the United States families are highly diversified. A look at recent U.S. Census Bureau data for households by type provides a demographic

sketch of the current marital, familial, and nonfamilial households.⁴⁰⁸ Before giving some general statistics, I will clarify two key terms, household and family. The Census Bureau's definition of household "is a person or group of persons who live in a housing unit." It states that a "family is a group of two or more people (one of whom is the householder, the person in whose name the housing unit is owned or rented) living together and related by birth, marriage, or adoption."

The report states that in 1997 there were 101,018,000 total households:

- 70,241,000 Family households and 30,777,00 Nonfamily households.

The following table,⁴⁰⁹ which is taken from the same study, divides these figures further:

	(Numbers in thousands)	
Type of Household	Number	Percent
Total households	101,018	100.0
Married couples with children	25,083	24.8
Married couples without children	28,521	28.2
Other families with children	9,583	9.5
Other families without children	7,054	7.0
People living alone	25,402	25.1
Other nonfamily households	5,375	5.3

There are approximately 2,344,000 marriages annually.⁴¹⁰ The median age at first marriage for women is 24, and it is 25.9 for men.⁴¹¹ NCHS states that the likelihood of new marriages ending in divorce is 43 percent.⁴¹² The median age for women at re-marriage after divorce is 34.2, and it is 37.4 for men.⁴¹³ Mercifully, the steep decline of households of married couples with children has been stabilizing since 1990.⁴¹⁴ Roman Catholics comprise about 25 percent of the population.⁴¹⁵

In this section, I will reflect on one particular life-style choice, cohabitation. I am using this sociological term in a narrow sense to mean "living-together" as if a couple were married.⁴¹⁶ According to Arlene Skolnick, by the 1980's many young Americans and their families had come to accept cohabitation and even preferred it to early marriage.⁴¹⁷ This preference for cohabitation is understandable, perhaps as a lesser of two evils, "because most cohabitations are short term, typically leading to either a marriage or a break-up within a year."⁴¹⁸ This latter fact also accounts for the rather low cohabitation rate.

However, cohabitation is an increasingly serious concern in society. Along with the major factors of delaying first marriage, of increasing divorces, and of slowing remarriages, cohabitation is a significant contributing factor to marriage declining "as the central institution under which households are organized and children are raised."⁴¹⁹ Also, cohabitation has influenced an increase in these other deleterious factors.⁴²⁰ Cohabitation has increased from 1.1 percent of all couples in 1960 to over 6 percent in the mid-1990s.⁴²¹ Approximately 33 percent of Baby Boomers cohabited before marriage.⁴²² Now, "cohabitation has become the norm for both men and women both as their first form of union and after divorces."⁴²³

The General Social Surveys of the National Opinion Research Center has determined that 64 percent of women born in 1963-1974 will cohabit before marrying.⁴²⁴ This is in sharp contrast with the 7 percent of women born in 1933-1942. This trend is similar for men. Unfortunately, "those who cohabit before marriage and then wed are more likely to eventually divorce than those who do not cohabit before marrying."⁴²⁵ These trends have had a dramatic effect on children. Fifty-one percent of children "no longer live in a traditional household headed by their two married parents who had not been previously divorced."⁴²⁶

These trends affect religion, too, because religion and families are closely connected. Smith states that "religions are organized around families and most people are introduced to religions as part of being raised by their parents."⁴²⁷ Religions, generally, support marriage and become alarmed when divorce increases. Smith's research shows that marrieds tend to be more conservative than the divorced, separated, and never married. Furthermore, marrieds tend "to be better connected to society as a

whole with more group memberships, church attendance, involvement in volunteering, and charitable giving."⁴²⁸ In any case, there is an obvious conflict between cohabitation and the Catholic vision for marriage and family. Catholic leaders need a radical pastoral strategy to address this grave problem. Can they expect much help from secular society?

According to two important studies, the government and secular universities do not have a good record in recent times for supporting marriage and two-parent families. In 1997 the Hudson Institute published a monograph entitled Fathers, Marriage, and Welfare Reform.⁴²⁹ Here the authors account for how the modern welfare system played a major role towards increasing out-of-wedlock births, discouraging marriage, and increasing fatherlessness among the nation's poor.⁴³⁰ Astonishingly, 90 percent of current families who receive cash welfare do not have a father living in the home.⁴³¹ A key piece to designing a solution to move families toward self-sufficiency is to promote policies and practices which privilege marriage in the distribution of welfare benefits.⁴³² On the bright side, the report claims that the new federal welfare law gives states a revolutionary opportunity to make marriage and its family a stronger foundational unit of society.⁴³³

At the other end of the economic spectrum, one finds the college educated. There is some unfortunate news on this front, also, according to the Council on Families, a project of the Institute for American Values. In the executive summary of the report Closed Hearts, Closed Minds: The Textbook Story of Marriage, Norval Glenn, the research director, begins with the question: "What are we teaching the next generation about marriage?"⁴³⁴ His response is: "Judging from a careful review of twenty recently published undergraduate marriage and family textbooks, the answer is: not very much.

Moreover, what these students are being taught by these textbooks is probably doing them more harm than good."⁴³⁵

Glenn criticizes the current generation of marriage and family textbooks for inaccurately reflecting the best sociological research which has been providing an accumulating body of data "that marriage itself is good for people."⁴³⁶ He claims that the textbook authors are uniformly biased against accounting for the importance of family structure: generally, by overemphasizing process or by separating it from structure. He claims that they mislead both potentially marrying students and future family-helping professionals.⁴³⁷ In short, he claims that the textbooks are practically propaganda which fail to meet the goal of helping students to understand marriage and family.⁴³⁸ The textbooks appear to be more concerned with "catering to fashion or advancing desirable political objectives." He continues:

Reducing prejudice, discrediting Reaganomics, defending the welfare system, promoting gay rights, engendering sympathy for the elderly--all of these may be worthy objectives. But when they become a major focus of textbooks ostensibly devoted to disseminating social science's understanding of marriage and family as institutions, they undermine these books' capacity to carry out their core educational mission.⁴³⁹

There is some hope that the government and the university communities will improve their contributions to addressing the problem of marriages and families. The larger institutional Church, too, as a responsible partner, must continue to improve its services to marriages and their families. Based on my theological research, I have a few recommendations to make relative to the situation of cohabitation.

First, dereify the situation of cohabitation. Avoid making a "thing" or a "problem" of cohabitation. Over a half-century ago, the existentialist Gabriel Marcel warned against merely treating marriage and family as a scientific problem that can be

solved and fixed. He said that the family is a mystery, a reality that continuously creates a solidarity among people. A living reality must be lived with, discovered, encountered, valued, etc.⁴⁴⁰ In LG the Church is called initially a mystery, which is better encountered and understood through biblical images than canonical definitions. Furthermore, the Church is eminently called the People of God, the Body of Christ, and the Temple of the Holy Spirit. In other words, we are a community of persons who are described primarily in our relationship to God. Whenever cohabiting couples come to the parish Church, they must be encountered in their uniqueness, acknowledging their unique faith journey as pilgrims along the way.

Second, focus tenaciously on the Church's mission to be a sign and an instrument of unity and peace. Primarily, the goal is to deepen intimate union with God and to broaden the unity among humankind. In my opinion, the Catholic Church has a special charism to build-up the priestly community through the sacraments. In the case of a couple requesting the sacrament of marriage, in order to do justice to the reality of marriage as a self-realization of the Church in the particular common life of particular believers, pastoral leaders must discern carefully the presence of faith flowing from the love of the couple. Often, I surmise, pastoral leaders will have to serve as spiritual midwives, coaxing the growth of religious conversion, including its ecclesial dimension. The latter entails accepting the "social group" aspect of religious conversion. Furthermore, it entails being aware of the demands of discipleship as they are manifested in one's personal life, one's spousal relationship, familial life, parish life, etc.

Third, infuse systematically the Church's vision, mission, and tasks of Christian marriage and its family into the life of the parish Church. In the spirit of prophecy,

pastoral leaders can exhort the membership to embrace and to live the fact that Christian marriage and its family is both a sacramental and an ecclesial reality. Furthermore, they can proclaim that a major way that God saves and redeems the world is in and through Christian marriage and its family. Periods of proximate preparation for sacraments, catechetical experiences, liturgical celebrations, Community-building events, and apostolic projects are opportune times to bring to the fore the family's vocation.

Fourth, learn from the parable of the prodigal father and son.⁴⁴¹ This entails approaching the cohabiting situation as love gone astray. We who wait expectantly for our brothers and sisters to celebrate sacramentally their covenantal love are to welcome them with an extravagant love. We need to welcome them into our parish life as the situation merits: giving them the attention and care they need to become a community of faith.

Priestly Function: Sacraments of Initiation and Marriage

In this century the Roman Catholic tradition through theologians, pastors, family movements, Vatican Council II, synods of bishops, popes, and laity, have articulated a vision, mission, and functions for the Christian family. The Christian religiously converted, whose way of life (spirituality) is opened up by divine love and who discern divine love calling them forth to join oneself with another in the sacrament of marriage, have opened up to them a new way of life which conforms to a type of new being, that of a married couple.

In other words, there is a correlation between the sacraments of initiation and the sacrament of marriage. More precisely, I describe this correlation as an analogical relationship. Namely, while the sacraments of initiation celebrate Christian religious

conversion (an other-worldly love with incorporation into the mystery of Christ and Church),⁴⁴² matrimony echoes this experience by celebrating married-love as a new representation of the unity and fruitful love between Christ and Church.⁴⁴³

Grace: Sanctifying and Operative

In previous chapters we also called this “echoing” a “specifying.” One can use the concept of sanctifying grace as a correlation point. We have been speaking about sanctifying grace as effecting a state from which flows good acts.⁴⁴⁴ Lonergan, using traditional spirituality language, writes that sanctifying grace becomes manifest in the purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways. However, sanctifying grace is present also in the celebration of the sacrament of marriage. I speculate here that one can speak analogically of sanctifying grace manifesting anew in the life of the “married couple” as the purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways for the couple/family itself. This insight is derived theologically from the notion of “two becoming one flesh” as two individuals “marry in the Lord.”⁴⁴⁵ From a philosophical perspective (see my chapter one), we spoke of two bonded together as one being, albeit in the category of accidental being. If these two perspectives are correct, then from a psychological perspective, a married, religiously converted person must balance, or perhaps integrate, or perhaps put into dialectical tension his/her growth as an individual self and as a married self. To explain this further, more research is needed. Perhaps family systems theory can be helpful here. Are the terms “individual self” and “married self” ways to describe “dimensions” of self. After all, one is only one person. Also, is the phenomenon observed in a couple’s tug-of-war between the forces of togetherness and individuality pertinent to this discussion?⁴⁴⁶

Earlier in this chapter, I referred to Lonergan speaking about religious conversion as operative grace. Here, a new self is born with its new horizon and with its incorporation into a new social group or relating to the current one in a new way. Again, an analogy can be made with the married love of the religiously converted. What is born in and through the marriage of religiously converted Christians is a new self-understanding. While one remains a beloved child of God, one also becomes one with another and is a married person. One has in a sense a “married” self. While one remains fundamentally oriented toward God as the foundation for choosing, one does so as a married person. When one joins with another in marriage, one’s path toward God is specified in a fundamental way through the call to effect unity and fruitful love. One’s decision-making relative to life-decisions is conditioned by this vocation.⁴⁴⁷ In a sense the vocation establishes criteria for evaluating the authenticity of one’s decisions and actions.⁴⁴⁸ It orients or orders the personal conscience (moral and religious)⁴⁴⁹ as a married self.⁴⁵⁰ Therefore, to choose against unity and fruitful love, which violates the vocational norms of the married person who is religiously converted, is likely to choose alienation from one’s married self, from others, and from God.⁴⁵¹ In other words, speaking generally, an immoral situation likely arises which will likely produce decline in one’s life and its sphere of influence.⁴⁵² Thus, I want to support the notion of the permanence of marriage in the case of two religiously converted married people, i.e., the permanence of their covenant is inviolable. Furthermore, I am placing internal to the marriage of the religiously converted a moral imperative for the permanence of the matrimonial covenant, i.e., for as long as the covenant exists. Additionally, I draw the conclusion that it is generally immoral for the Christian, religiously converted to violate

the vocational norms of marriage by living together out of wedlock (man and woman living a common life and engaging in genital sexuality outside the sacrament of marriage).⁴⁵³

The above correlation between Christian religious conversion (operative grace) and Christian married love demonstrates the advantage of two religiously converted persons bonding their lives together as a Christian couple. Here the conscious other-worldly love transvalues married love into a horizon and a community which is open to living life as a married couple and family which signifies and partakes in the unity and fruitful love between Christ and the Church. Their process of decision-making, thereby, becomes oriented toward unity and fruitful love. Furthermore, life-long marriage/family as permanent covenantal love becomes a matter of conscience and not merely external law. Thus, it is obvious from this point of view that the larger Church profits greatly when a religiously converted man and a religiously converted woman join as one in the sacrament of matrimony. Therefore, the processes that the larger Church uses to dispose the elect for spiritual birth, i.e., in and through the total processes of the sacraments of initiation, are critical. Also critical to the Church's life as a historical manifestation is the most common way it gives physical birth to potentially new Christians, i.e., in and through the couples joined in the sacrament of matrimony. I will develop my key pastoral implication from these observations about the sacraments of initiation and matrimony at the end of this chapter.

Grace: Cooperative

Before that, however, I will make a comment on the kind of grace Lonergan identified as cooperative grace, which is the effectiveness of religious conversion. This

can be observed as growth in holiness, the process of sanctification. From an ecclesial point of view, one can refer to this process as the Christian religiously converted participating in the triple-office of Christ. The way they do so would be their spirituality.⁴⁵⁴ In FC we saw how John Paul II applied the triple-office to the situation of Christian married couples and their families.

Returning to the analogy of the sacrament of marriage as an echo of the sacraments of initiation, one can redraw an analogy of the married self as an echo of the personal self. The coming to be of a married self entails a new understanding of self, or at least a specifying of the self as married. In any case, according to Paul VI, the union of spouses “constitutes a unique reality, namely the couple, founded on the mutual gift of self to the other.”⁴⁵⁵ He continues: “They are but one flesh, one couple--we could almost say one being.” This unity, he teaches, will take on social and juridical form through marriage; however, it is important that the new unity not be understood as a merging or a fusion. Paul states: “Each person remains distinct and in no way loses its identity and individuality in the mutual self-giving. Rather, each personality is strengthened. It affirms itself. It matures and develops throughout the course of married life, in accordance with this great law of love: give yourselves to one another, so as to be able, together, to give yourselves to others.” Part of the spirituality of Christian married life, therefore, is to promote the growth of the spouse in accordance with the end of giving one’s self to others. This extension to others extends in a primary way to the children, who in turn, develop the capacity to return love to the parents and to others. This act of offering ones love and life to others is eminently a priestly act, and has, as the ultimate goal, love of God.

The Situation of Absent Fathers

However, what about the situation where there is no spouse to whom to give oneself? This is a complex question. Often in the course of parish ministry, parish leaders encounter the widowed with children, the unwed single parent who has children out of wedlock or adopts children, etc. All these situations call for nuanced pastoral responses. In this next section, however, I want to limit my comments to one of those situations, the one of absent fathers.

The perspective of "absent fathers" was opened-up to me at a public lecture at Duquesne University by Dr. Wade Horn, president of the National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI).⁴⁵⁶ Interestingly, the aim of NFI is not to begin a father's rights movement. Nor is it to serve as a counterpoint to the feminist movement. Rather, "the mission of the NFI is to improve the well-being of children in America by increasing the number of children who are raised by a responsible, committed and loving father."⁴⁵⁷

At this lecture Dr. Horn remarked that the two main reasons for fatherless homes are divorce and fatherhood out of wedlock.⁴⁵⁸ The latter phenomenon has grown nationally as follows: 1960 - 5 percent, 1970 - 8 percent, 1980 - 10 percent, 1990 - 28 percent, and 1997 - 33 percent. Another perspective is that "the number of children living only with their mother grew from 5.1 million in 1960 to 16.3 million in 1994."⁴⁵⁹ Furthermore, writes Wade in a recent publication: "About 40 percent of the children who live in fatherless households haven't seen their fathers in a least a year. Of the remaining 60 percent, only 20 percent sleeps even one night per month in the father's home. Only one in six sees their father an average of once or more per week."⁴⁶⁰

The gravity of the effects of absent fathers upon a host of social ills can be surmised from the following quote:

Today, nearly four out of every ten children in the United States are being raised without their fathers. Seventy percent of long-term prison inmates grew up without their fathers, as did 60 percent of rapists and 75 percent of adolescents charged with murder. Children without fathers are also three times more likely to fail at school, three times more likely to experience emotional or behavioral problems requiring psychiatric treatment, three times more likely to commit suicide as adolescents, and up to forty times more likely to experience child abuse compared with children growing up with both a mom and a dad.⁴⁶¹

In other words, children need their mothers and their fathers, even if the father often fails to be fully psychologically present. For example, one unsettling study reports that "the amount of time a father spends with his child, one-on-one, averages less than ten minutes a day."⁴⁶² So, the type of household does matter, as is noted in the following: "When asked whether they felt their parent 'really care' about them, 97 percent of children ages 10 to 17 living with both biological parents said 'yes' for their fathers. Of children living in a stepfamily, only 71 percent said 'yes' for their fathers. And of children living with only one parent, only 55 percent said 'yes' for their fathers."⁴⁶³ The next fact reinforces the importance of family structure: "Studies reveal that even in high-crime inner-city neighborhoods, well over 90 percent of children from safe, stable, two-parent homes do not become delinquents."⁴⁶⁴

The importance of family structure is reiterated in the case of adopted children, too. Those who are raised in two-parent families do better physically, emotionally, educationally, and socially than those raised in families headed by unmarried mothers.⁴⁶⁵ Also, the economic advantage is dramatic: "Less than one percent of adopted children receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children, whereas among white children born outside of marriage and raised by their biological mother, 32 percent were receiving

welfare."⁴⁶⁶ In light of the above, it is unfortunate that the rate of married couples adopting babies has been declining. The National Committee for Adoption reports: "In 1979, 598,000 babies were born out of wedlock; almost one in thirteen was adopted. In 1991, of the 1,225,000 born out of wedlock, only one in 25 was adopted."⁴⁶⁷

Both my theological reflection on the priestly function of marriage and its family and my sociological reflection on the situation of absent fathers demonstrate that family structure does matter. Children do significantly better when they are welcomed into and reared in families headed by a married father and a married mother who had not previously cohabited nor previously divorced. Thus, pastoral leaders must boldly be proactive to promote the merits of premarital abstinence, of marriage, of marital enrichment experiences, and marital fidelity. Stated in a negative fashion, pastoral leaders must give priority to helping its members to avoid sexual permissiveness and divorce. This is a huge task because it entails a mammoth countercultural stance.⁴⁶⁸

In other words, these positions are not highly popular among the majority of people. Thus, there is the fear that many members will leave the fold. It reminds me of Jesus' teaching about the eucharist in the gospel of John.⁴⁶⁹ After teaching "For my flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink," many of his disciples did not believe him and left his company. So, if the sacrament of marriage is an echo of the sacraments of initiation, it too can be expected to have hard demands that some will not believe. Yes, there will be defections; yet, there may be renewal, too.⁴⁷⁰

Staying Married

In the perspective of the priestly function, Christian family life requires sacrifice. To participate in God's salvific and redemptive work, Christian spouses and their

families, in imitation of their Lord, will need to practice renunciation and the way of the cross. Hardship will be inevitable. Indubitably, a locus of the hardship will be in the mission to bring about intimate union with God and unity among people. For spouses, the quest for genuine intimacy between one another is at the heart of their vocation and spirituality.

Thus, if spouses are to stay married for the whole of life, then they can expect to walk the purgative, illuminative, and unitive paths. The arduousness of these paths is lucidly depicted in a book by Joan Meyer Anzia and Mary G. Durkin.⁴⁷¹ They sketch a cycle of marital intimacy leading through phases of falling in love, of settling down, of bottoming out, and of beginning again. Unfortunately, when honest relationships come crashing down, spouses often abandon the marriage prematurely. Interestingly, during the bottoming out phase, it is through courageous and honest fighting that spouses recognize the intensity of their anger, grief, jealousy, alienation, and ultimately, their cry for help. This awareness of powerlessness to heal ones relationship is a moment of grace.

The authors own words are worthy here:

A language of grief evolves from our language of anger. We cry out for what has been lost and destroyed between us. We remember the joy and pleasure of our original love and the memory brings bitter tears. We weep over our relationship, much as Jesus wept over Jerusalem. It is as painful as death, it is a death, and we mourn like widows and widowers. We cannot sleep well, if at all. Our eyes are hollow. We move through the day, going about our usual tasks with leaden steps. We feel terribly remote from each other; we are alienated from the life that was between us.

...
But grief and its agony are testimony that things are not right. So our grief can be an empowering cry. Only those who mourn will be comforted (Matt. 5:4). We must engage this suffering unto death. We must embrace the inscrutable darkness. An embrace of endings permits beginnings.

Yahweh has not deserted us. For in our alienation, we ache for each other.⁴⁷²

In this Catholic perspective, the role of faith is priceless. A relationship with a personal God sustains us through life, suffering, death, and new life. Prayer, in all its varied expressions, is our source of power for walking together toward our eternal home. Thus, personal and communal prayer experiences will be part of the sanctuary of the home. Believing couples and their families will rely on God to bring them home.

In an innovative project about young Catholic families, Andrew Greeley of the National Opinion Research Center and the University of Arizona has documented empirically that prayer, sexuality, and religious imagery are interconnected. Here, I want to report a few of his numerous findings, and more specifically, those that illuminate the priestly function of marrieds.⁴⁷³ Greeley derives his data about Catholic families during the first ten years of marriage from a larger pool of data which focuses upon young adults. Thus, Greeley will be able to make various correlations among those who are married (Catholic and religiously mixed) and not married (never married, widowed, divorced, separated, cohabiting).

The study's key contribution is the description (a model) of a marital life cycle during the first ten years of marriage.⁴⁷⁴ For the population group, and not necessarily for each couple, couples appear to experience a two-year period of rather high relational satisfaction; they appear to experience a decline in satisfaction during years three to eight; and hopefully, they come to experience a rebound of satisfaction during years nine and ten. Thus, marriages take a long time to build and satisfaction is strongly related to the duration of the marriage.⁴⁷⁵ Furthermore, satisfaction in the relationship has three powerful predictors: sexual fulfillment, agreement in basic values, and emotional satisfaction.⁴⁷⁶

The rebound of satisfaction at the close of the first decade of marriage is evidently a dramatic crisis of growth whose main components are love, conflict, values, and sex.⁴⁷⁷ This rebound is not automatic and is not of the same intensity for all couples. For example, cohabiting couples have low levels of satisfaction that is directly correlated to the instability of cohabitation.⁴⁷⁸ Also, religiously mixed marriages (a Catholic and a non-Catholic) rebound significantly better than cohabiting relationships but not as well as Catholic marriages (two Catholics).⁴⁷⁹ Evidently, married couples do better than cohabitants because marriage in itself tends to cancel out much of the social and institutional alienation and much of the attitude of sexual permissiveness which is characteristic of many in their twenties.⁴⁸⁰ Additionally, marrieds tend to be more devout than the unmarried, and from among the marrieds, Catholics in sacramental marriage tend to experience higher levels of marital satisfaction and of sexual fulfillment.⁴⁸¹

Greeley's research verifies that religious devotion is a significant factor in marital happiness. He describes the casual flow in the relationship of religious devotion, marital quality, and marital satisfaction as follows:

Religious devotion has a direct influence on marital satisfaction and also an indirect influence through its impact on sexual fulfillment and value consensus. The more devout a couple is, the more likely they are to think of their marriage as sexually fulfilling and as enjoying value consensus and these new characteristics, as well as religious devotion, directly also lead to a greater propensity of the couple to describe their marriage as 'very satisfactory'. The more religious a Catholic marriage is, both in devotion and in its sacramental origin, the more mutually fulfilling a marriage is likely to be and the more satisfying to both husband and wife. These relationships grow stronger rather than weaker with the passage of time.⁴⁸²

Greeley is quick to observe that church renewal is most likely to come from the marriages of two Catholics, and it is their sharing of warm religious images/stories which helps the renewal to occur.⁴⁸³ This sharing also helps the formation of a family religious

stance, which is a complex phenomenon whereby the couple "fashion a religious story which is no longer 'yours and mine' but 'ours'."⁴⁸⁴ Greeley posits that warm religious images/stories are the 'residue' of our experiences of grace, and also possibly the result of traditional aesthetical practices, spiritual readings, retreat, recollection, spiritual direction, and sermons.⁴⁸⁵ He finds that the following are strong and significant correlations influencing warm religious imagery:

- the joyousness of the approach to religion in the family background
- religious experience
- aesthetical practices
- quality of sermons
- spouse's religiousness.⁴⁸⁶

A significant conclusion, then, is that prayer, sexuality, and religious imagery are intimately interconnected. Religious experience and familial joy directly shape a hopeful worldview within families.⁴⁸⁷ There is, for devout families, an interrelationship between two love stories, their own and God's and His people.⁴⁸⁸ Gratuitously, these families find a resonance of hopefulness in the Christian stories which are full of 'warm' religious images of a God of fidelity, commitment, promises made, honored, and kept permanently.⁴⁸⁹ Naturally, the more hopeful the family the higher the marital and familial satisfaction.

Finally, it is noteworthy that neither propositional orthodoxy, nor educational attainment, nor religious education are key factors in personal and familial religious development. Rather, it is "warm religious images [that] are the strongest predictors of prayer, hopefulness, and social commitment."⁴⁹⁰ Greeley's explanation is worth quoting:

Some readers may be uneasy with the notion that religion exists primordially in the creative imagination and only reflectively in the intellect--even if there is a powerful correlation between the two. However, instead of the words 'creative imagination', one merely uses the word 'spirit'--in the sense of St. Paul's words 'the spirit speaks to our spirit'--then it becomes easier to comprehend the distinction our theoretical perspective is making. The human personality and its 'spirit' experiences God's love, his warm and passionate love, through the various sacraments which manifest and reveal that love, especially the sacrament of the family. Then the human rationalizes and analyzes the meaning of that experience and develops a self-conscious world view which enables it to cope, hopefully, with tragedy and death. In many cases it seems safe to assume this analysis is not formal or explicit, not an elaborate act of theological abstraction, but a quick leap of religious reflection. If God is a lover, and heaven a paradise of pleasure and delight, why should not one be hopeful, at least moderately, in the face of suffering and tragedy?⁴⁹¹

Ordering (Kingly) Function

In the exposition above on the priestly and prophetic functions, one can observe that there is a strong theological correlation between religious conversion and Christian married love when one uses the criterion of grace. Perhaps this is so because both religious love and Christian married love have the identical fundamental source. All love is of God. The Holy Spirit, the love of Father and Son, is the dynamic principle of love which infuses reality. Without the activity of the Holy Spirit there can be no new spiritual births and no growth in holiness. The church in all its structural expressions is carried forward to its eternal destiny by that love who is the Holy Spirit. Thus, the initiative of God--as well as the will of God--begins all love, sustains love, and carries love to its completion; and thereby, one can posit that Christian reality is a graced reality.⁴⁹² Our greatest need, therefore, is to build a Church who is a Spirit-filled People, and in turn, our greatest hope is the Holy Spirit's unceasing activity.

It is the building-up of a Spirit-filled People from the foundational cell level of Church that is the ordering function of Christian spouses, and derivatively, of Christian

parents. In order for them to do so, however, they need more than love. They need the faith which is born of religious love in order for the ecclesial functioning to become an explicit ministry. It is worthy of further research to inquire into the dynamics of faith which raise the functioning of the triple-office of Christ from implicit ministry to explicit ministry. In other words, spouses/parents can unconsciously do behaviors which are appropriate to their office; however, they can do these behaviors more explicitly and creatively by being deliberate as they lead their families. In other words, their ecclesial behaviors can become more meaningful and fruitful for themselves and others.

Additionally, spouses/parents need to make adjustments in order to transform their participation in the triple-office of Christ as an individual to participation as a married self. In a sense one has to die to the individual self and allow a married self to emerge.⁴⁹³ By doing so, the couple will need to struggle in an ongoing way with the task of harmonizing love and power.⁴⁹⁴

The creative fidelity by which couples stick to this task becomes a participation in Christ's rule. This struggle touches their whole life, including their families and larger circle of acquaintances. Their enduring governing mission is to order their family life so that it becomes a sacrament which is an ecclesial community in communion with others and to effect unity and fruitful love by engaging in the battle to harmonize power and love.⁴⁹⁵

If the Christian family fulfills its mission, then it will provide society with a great service. Like the larger Church, the Christian family will serve as an instrument and sign for deepening the union of all with God and for furthering unity and diversity within the human family. To accelerate the fruitfulness of the Church's mission, my key pastoral

suggestion is to advocate for a national Church policy which takes a comprehensive and integrative approach to initiation ministry and marital/familial ministry. Here are a few suggestions upon which to build an appropriate policy.

1. Fund a national initiative to create models of formational processes (similar to the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults) for couples preparing for marriage and for parents presenting children for the sacraments of initiation. These processes should be of sufficient length and rigor so that couples and parents can come to interiorize an identity as ecclesial leaders. This presumes that after extensive evangelizing and catechizing of participants, pastoral leaders will feel confident that these members have explicit faith and are ready to fulfill their roles in the family and parish communities.
2. Mandate dioceses and parishes to evaluate and revise the content and the process of their formational programs for sacramental preparation and for pastoral leadership. The content and the process should reflect an ecclesiology, a sacramentology, and a spirituality (built upon religious conversion and growth in holiness as an individual, a couple, a family, a parish, etc.) that empowers Christian families to function as domestic churches and that empowers parishes to function as a community of communities.⁴⁹⁶
3. Mandate dioceses and their parishes to implement initiation ministry for adults and children and marriage preparation ministry for couples which give priority to disposing candidates to experience religious conversion and/or sanctification. Formational processes, like the Rites of Christian Initiation of Adults and of Children, are a tremendous blessing for helping people to grow in love, faith, and hope.

Pastoral leaders ought to be able to discern in the appropriate persons the presence of explicit faith, including an ecclesial dimension, before celebrating the sacraments of initiation or of marriage. Marriage preparation processes, in particular, need to be reviewed and revised. It is very doubtful that the "spirituality" component of most of the current programs is of sufficient length and depth to assure that weddings are celebrations of explicit faith.

4. Promote an attitude and a practice within the parish which relates to the heads of domestic churches as "religious" leaders and which expects them to serve as ecclesial leaders. For example, ask the bishops' conference to mandate diocesan family senates or councils, which would be similar to those that exist for the presbyterate. Furthermore, ask pastors to establish correlative pastoral organs for the parish. Here, for example, the parish overseer or delegate can convene the respective ecclesial leaders to do common pastoral planning.⁴⁹⁷ These ecclesial leaders can include, for example, the representative heads of domestic churches and pertinent parish ministers (ordained and lay who prepare adults and children for the sacraments of initiation, who prepare couples for marriage, and who co-minister with the parents of children preparing to participate in sacraments).
5. Provide adequate funding and support of programs whose main goal is to empower and train couples/families to serve as essential partners in parish ministry.
6. Request publishers of religious education textbooks to review and to revise their curriculum to assure that both theological roots of Christian marriage and its family as a sacramental reality and an ecclesial reality are fully developed according to age appropriateness. In other words, infuse these pertinent concepts into parish religious

education curriculum from early childhood through adult religious education programs.

Certainly, all the elements for a national policy are not included here; however, there are sufficient major ones here to build an appropriate policy.

St. Paul writes that there are three things that last: faith, hope, and love; and of these, love is the greatest.⁴⁹⁸ Let us, who are Church, commit ourselves to empower families to become communities that find fulfillment in participating in a mystery that has an eternal and triumphant destiny. From an ecclesial perspective, let us make love our end by properly and thoroughly initiating all of our members through the sacraments of initiation. Then, Christian marriage will hopefully become an echo of the sacraments of initiation.

In closing, I reiterate the words of Jesus the Christ that the Reign of God is at hand. As He has promised, the Spirit is present, filling our hearts with hope and joy and forming us into the Body of Christ for the glory of the Father.⁴⁹⁹ Today, the ever-active Spirit calls married couples and parents to fulfill their proper ecclesial mission and office. Let the Church labor accordingly, bearing glad tidings of new life.

NOTES-INTRODUCTION

¹By seed text I mean a cluster of sentences laden with meaning and potential for ongoing theological reflection. Theodore Mackin gives an example of a seed text when he claims that a brief paragraph in the Schema Pro Concilio Oecumenico is the "seed of a comprehensive text," the latter being the schema De Castitate, virginitate, matrimonio, familia. See Divorce and Remarriage (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 462-63.

In chapter one I will claim that in the Vatican Council II Documents there is a matrimonial unit in art. 11 of The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, and this matrimonial unit functions as a seed text. That is, it acts as a foundation upon which much of the contemporary Roman Catholic teaching on the nature of the Christian family develops.

²The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, in Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M. Abbott, (America Press, Association Press, 1966). Throughout the dissertation references to the documents of Vatican II will be from the Abbott edition, unless noted otherwise. Abbreviations for the documents, derived from the Latin titles, will be used after the initial citation of a document. The number following a citation will be the article number, unless noted otherwise. For example, article 11 of The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium) will be rendered LG 11.

Ad Hoc Committee on Marriage and Family Life, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, A Family Perspective in Church and Society: A Manual For All Pastoral Leaders (Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference: Washington, D.C., 1988).

³Constitutio Dogmatica De Ecclesia, in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 57 (1965), 16.

⁴LG 11.

⁵A Family Perspective in Church and Society, 19.

⁶Ibid. John Paul II, Familiaris consortio (On the Family, FC) in Origins 11 (December 24, 1981).

⁷To begin with marriage as the beginning of family life is also supported from a socio-psychological perspective. In contemporary family systems theory, the family is understood in terms of family life cycles. The first stage of the family life cycle is "Establishment: new family without children. This is the time for the newly married couple to become a separate, but connected unit of their extended family systems." Quoted from A Family Perspective In Church and Society, 26.

⁸Vatican Council II also recognizes the family as the basic unit of Society. The Christian family participates both in Society and the Church as a basic unit. The focus of this thesis is the Christian family as the basic unit of the Church.

NOTES-CHAPTER ONE

⁹My exegesis will be a modest one. It is not comprehensive, i.e., not all aspects of art. 11 are considered. The focus is the ecclesial aspect of Christian marriage and the family derived from it. Also, I will use LG as the abbreviation for Lumen Gentium.

¹⁰In addition to art. 11 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, "domestic Church" can be found as domesticum sanctuarium Ecclesiae in the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, art. 11. In the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, art. 48, the passage does not contain the explicit term, domestic Church, but it does describe the reality of a domestic Church. It does so by speaking of Christian marriage and Christian family as a manifestation ". . . to all men [of] the Savior's living presence in the world, and the genuine nature of the Church."

¹¹Constitutio Dogmatica De Ecclesia, chap. 2, art. 11, par. 2, in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 57 (1965), 15-16.

¹²Church, in Documents of Vatican II, ed. Austin P. Flannery (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 362.

¹³De Ecclesia, in Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 57, 16.

¹⁴In hac velut can be translated 'in this as'. 'This' (hac) is a feminine, singular, demonstrative pronoun. To determine the antecedent of 'this' (hac), one has to examine the previous two sentences. The immediately preceding sentence is: "Ex hoc enim connubio procedit familia, in qua nascuntur novi societatis humanae cives, qui per Spiritus Sancti gratiam, ad Populum Dei saeculorum decursu perpetuandum, baptismo in filios Dei constituuntur." 'Family' (familia) is the antecedent of the demonstrative pronoun, 'this' (hac). However, 'family', as in the case of domestic Church, is also used in a qualified sense. It is the family which comes from marriage, but not marriage in a generic sense. 'Ex hoc enim connubio' refers back to a specific type of marriage. 'Hoc' needs an antecedent.

To determine this specific type of marriage, one must refer to the preceding sentence to find the antecedent, which serves as an additional qualifier.

Tandem coniuges christiani, virtute matrimonii sacramenti, quo mysterium unitatis et fecundi amoris inter Christum et Ecclesiam significant atque participant (cfr. Eph. 5,32), se invicem in vita coniugali necnon prolis susceptione et educatione ad sanctitatem adiuvant, adeoque in suo vitae statu et ordine proprium suum in Populo Dei donum habent (cfr. 1 Cor. 7,7).

'Christian Spouses' (coniuges christiani) is the antecedent of 'hoc'. Thus, the Council is speaking of the marriage of Christian spouses.

¹⁵The three sentences refer to the Latin text. The English translations have more sentences for literary purposes.

¹⁶Flannery Edition.

¹⁷Abbott Edition. Cf. arts. 30 and 33.

¹⁸Here, I choose to use the Flannery edition of the documents because it is more literal. It also more closely adheres to the original paragraph structure. The three sentences are arranged according to the Latin text.

¹⁹Aloys Grillmeier, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Chapter II, the People of God," in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol. 1 (1966), ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth and Richard Strachan (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 163.

²⁰Flannery's translation of "faithful" love is inadequate.

²¹George Worgul, From Magic to Metaphor: A Validation of Christian Sacraments (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), 144-51. Worgul argues that the scholastic notion of res et sacramentum entails a change in one's ecclesial status or position.

²²Schleck, Charles, The Sacrament of Matrimony: A Dogmatic Study (Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Company, 1964), 123. "The res et sacramentum of matrimony is something real, that is, that the bond exists in the persons not just as a juridical entity but as a permanent supernatural ontological reality modifying the baptismal character, . . . It [the bond] is a relation, a predicamental relation, an accident whose whole nature consists in its esse ad, a reference to another."

²³Karl Rahner, "Marriage as a Sacrament," in Theological Investigations, vol. 10, trans. David Bourke (New York: Seabury Press, 1977; first trans., 1973), 214.

²⁴Grillmeier, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 164.

²⁵Yves Congar, Lay People in the Church: A Study for Theology of the Laity, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1957), 192. "Now in marriage it is the natural reality itself which is made sacred or sacramentalized, . . . Marriage is the sole example in the Christian economy of a natural institution, in itself and as such, being taken into the order of grace and made sacred."

²⁶Grillmeier, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 164.

²⁷Congar, Lay People in the Church, 193-94. Congar insists that the priesthood of marrieds is not simply an application of the spiritual priesthood of holiness to a particular situation. He states:

There is something 'instituted' about it, and that not only on the basis of an officium, a public responsibility, but of a sacramental consecration, that of baptism being echoed in that of marriage. Marriage is a charism, says St. Paul; it is a function in the mystical Body and an ordo, says tradition: these statements are fundamentally concordant; but they have reference to the Church considered as organism, a body organically diversified and articulated.

²⁸Grillmeier, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 164.

²⁹Avery Dulles, Models of the Church (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1974), 21.

³⁰Ibid., 22-23.

³¹Before proceeding with the development of the matrimonial unit during the four sessions of the Council, I will make a few comments regarding the immediate historical context. At the end of Chapter Two I will posit two major factors in the 1950's that enabled Vatican Council II to articulate in LG a formal vision, albeit in seed form, of the Christian family as an ecclesial reality. These are an emerging theology of the laity and the pastoral need for all Church members to evangelize. Undergirding these two factors are ecclesiologies which gave prominence to the images of the Body of Christ and the People of God.

In addition to these developments Theodore Mackin adds another one which enlarges our understanding of the historical context. He claims that during the 1950's various lines of thought from various disciplines converged to cause a "seismic shift" of methodology in the theology of marriage. The sources of these ideas flowed from theologians, philosophers, and psychologists. Representatives include Schillebeeckx, Haring, Janssens, Fuchs, Oraison, Michel, Philips, Moeller, and Suenens. In short, they enabled a transition from primarily understanding marriage as a contract to primarily understanding marriage as a religious covenant. In the latter marriage is understood as a subcommunity within the Church [See Theodore Mackin, What Is Marriage?, vol. 1, Marriage in the Catholic Church (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 239-42]. I speculate that this seismic shift in methodology is mirrored analogously in the seismic shift of ecclesiology between De Ecclesia: Schema 1962 (Church as Perfect Society) and De Ecclesia: Schema 1963 (Church As People of God). Incidentally, future references to the various drafts of De Ecclesia will be designated by the shortened form Schema 1962, Schema 1963, and Schema 1964.

³²Schema constitutionis dogmaticae de Ecclesia. Acta Synodalia, I, IV, 12-91. [The Schema of the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church]. The translations of the ensuing texts from the various drafts, speeches, and records are my own unless otherwise noted.

³³Gerard Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, History of the Constitution," in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol. 1 (1966), ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth and Richard Strachan (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 109.

³⁴That art. 21 of Schema 1962 becomes art. 24 of Schema 1963 is observed by comparing the titles, respectively: "De sacerdotio universali et de sacerdotio ministeriali" and "De sacerdotio universali, necon de sensu fidei et de charismatibus christifidelium." However, it must be noted that art. 21 is significantly revised in art. 24. While much of the content of the first paragraph of the two articles is revised little, their respective second paragraphs are very different. It is in the second paragraph of art. 24 that the matrimonial unit will be added, along with content about the sacraments of initiation which had been moved from art. 24 of Schema 1962. The Latin text and translation of the matrimonial unit are given below in the discussion of session two.

³⁵Acta Synodalia, 1.4, 41.

a) . . . **omnes** oportet ad augmentum extensivum et intensivum totius Corporis Christi cooperati. Quod praeprimus faciunt coniuges qui se invicem in vita christiana ex virtute sacramentali sanctificant, parentes et educatores catholici necnon cuiusvis generis catechistae, qui ad fidem et gratiam proli vel fratribus suis impertiendam eximio fructu adlaborant.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 46. "But a certain cooperation in diffusing the faith and grace is incumbent upon all according to circumstances, markedly upon parents and educators; many Christians moreover are called to the office of father and mother." The original Latin text follows: "Sed omnibus incumbit quaedam cooperatio ad diffusionem fidei et gratiae secundum adiuncta, signanter parentibus et educatoribus; ad officium autem patris et matris plerique christiani vocantur."

³⁷*Ibid.*, 309-311.

³⁸For an excellent representation of the Bishops' efforts, see Xavier Rynne, Vatican Council II (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1968), 109-20. Note especially Konig, Ritter, De Smedt, Dopfner, Marty, Suenens, and Montini.

³⁹Regarding Dopfner's comment on the universal priesthood, see Acta Synodalia, 1.4, 608. For John XXIII's quote, see Rynne, Vatican Council II, 119.

⁴⁰Rynne, Vatican Council II, 119.

⁴¹Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 164.

⁴²Walter Abbott, Twelve Council Fathers (New York: Macmillan Company, 1963), 36-39.

⁴³Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 110.

⁴⁴Ibid. Suenens presents these changes on October 9, 1963, see "Emendations," Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 324f.

⁴⁵Ibid., 111.

⁴⁶See n. 24 in "Commentary," Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 259. The Latin text follows: "De sacerdotio universali. Dignitas illa, quae omnibus christifidelibus competit, secundum placita S. Scripturae exponitur. Nititur autem in sacramentis christianae initiationis, et pro laicis specialem applicationem in matrimonio et familia christiana inducit."

⁴⁷Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 259. The Latin text follows:

Coniuges christiani ex virtute sacramenti, quo repraesentatur mysterium unitatis et amoris inter Christum et Ecclesiam (cf. Eph. 5, 32), se invicem in vita coniugali et prolis educatione sanctificant, atque adeo in suo vitae statu et ordine habent proprium suum in Ecclesia donum (cf. 1 Cor. 7, 7). Ex casto enim connubio procedit familia, ubi nascuntur novi societatis humanae cives, qui sub gratia Spiritus Sancti, ad perpetuandum saeculorum decursu Corpus Christi, in filios Dei constituuntur. In hac velut Ecclesia domestica, parentes saepe sunt primi fidei praecones, quasi munus episcopale, ut ait Augustinus, exercent, et sacras etiam vocationes Deo dante fovant.

⁴⁸Martin H. Work, "Nature of Lay Apostolate to be Discussed in Council," in Council Daybook Vatican II: Sessions 1 and 2, ed. F. Anderson (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965), 56. According to Work Vatican Council II is the first of twenty-one ecumenical councils to treat the laity as a separate matter.

⁴⁹Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 264-65. The Latin text to n. 8 follows:

S. Augustinus ita patresfamilias alloquitur, Serm. 94: PL 38, 580 s.: <<Agite vicem nostram in domibus vestris. Episcopus inde appellatus est, quia superintendit, quia intendendo curat>>. Ideo, ait, parentes debent suos in fide instruere. Cf. In Io. tr. 51, 13: PL 35, 1768. Secundum S. Io. Chrysostomum, domum suam ecclesiam efficere debent, In Gen. Hom. 2, 4: PG 53, 31. In Gen. serm. 6, 2: PG 54, 607. Cf. ib. 7, 1; col. 607 s.: <<Cum heri dixissem: unusquisque vestrum domum suam ecclesiam efficiat, magna voce acclamastis ac voluptatis qua vos illa verba profunderunt, significationem dedistis>>. De educatione christiana, cf. S. Gregorius Nyss., Vita S. Macrinae: PG 46, 961-964. S. Io. Chrysostomus, In Eph. Hom. 21, 2: PG 62, 151. S. Hieronymus, Epist. 107 ad Laetam: PL 22, 867-878.

Status coniugatorum in Ecclesia apud S. Augustinum vocatur vitae genus vel professio: Enarr. Ps. 36, I, 2: PL 36, 356 s.; Enarr. Ps. 132, 4: PL 37, 1730. Vel officium: Serm. 96, 7, 9: PL 38, 588; ib., 267, 4; col. 1231. Vel gradus: Serm. 192, 2: PL 38, 1012. S. Gregorius M. in Ecclesia distinguit ordines, scilicet pastorum (praedicatorum), continentium et coniugatorum: Mor. I, 14, 20: PL 75, 535; In

Ezech. I, 8, 10 et II, 7, 3: PL 76, 858 et 1014. De gradibus et ordinibus loquuntur etiam S. Fulgentius, De Trin. 12: PL 65, 507, et S. Beda Ven., In Io., cap. 2: PL 92, 661. Theodoretus adhibet vocem <<tagmata>>, In 1 Tim. 2, 15: PG 82, 803; S. Io. Chrysostomus vocem <<fratreias>>, In 1 Cor. 30, 4: PG 61, 254.

De matrimonio ut dono Dei, cf. 1 Cor. 7, 7: <<Unusquisque proprium donum (idion charisma) habet ex Deo: alius quidem sic, alius vero sic>>. Cf. Theodoretus, Haeret. fabul. compend. V, 25: PG 83, 540, et In 1 Cor., 7, 7: PG 82, 273. S. Hieronymus, Epist. 48, 4: PL 22, 496. S. Augustinus, De Dono Persev. 14, 37: PL 45, 1015 s.: <<Non tantum continentia Dei donum est, sed coniugatorum etiam castitas>>. Serm. 354, 4: PL 39, 1564 s.: <<Est enim coniugalis vita laudabilis, et habet in corpore Christi locum suum... Coniugalem agentes vitam, si tenent humilitatem, superbis castis meliores sunt>>.

⁵⁰See nos. 32-35 in "Emendations," Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 332. The Latin text follows:

32 - l.38: Dicatur: <<per gratiam>>, loco: <<sub gratia>> (Carli).

33 - l. 39: Dicatur: <<ad perpetuandum saeculorum decursu Corpus Christi mysticum illudque visibiliter dilatandum>> (Carli).

34 - p. 8, l.1 Omittatur: <<saepe>> [est enim officium, quod non ces sat, etsi aliquando parentes ei non obtemperent] (Carli).

35 - ibid.: Dicatur: <<quasi vicem episcopalem, ut ait Augustinus, agunt>> (Carli).

⁵¹Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 719. The original text from the French follows:

Art. 24, par. 2 alinea: gagnerait a etre organise davantage: a) le sacrement (en general), signe efficace de divinisation, constitutif du peuple de Dieu; b) les sacrements de l'initiation chretienne; c) les autres sacrements.

Ligg. 34, 35: saluons, en passant, l'ordre heureux: vie conjugale et education de la progeniture comme lieux de sanctification.

Lig. 37: <<procedit familia>>, on pourrait insister: se constitue la matiere du peuple de Dieu.

For the citation relative to the Relationes De Singulis Numeris to Schema 1964, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "M."

⁵²Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 740. The original text from the Latin follows:

Lin. 35: <<prolis susceptione et educatione sanctificat...>>. Puto esse non parum momenti hanc simplicis verbi additionem.

Lin. 1 (pag. 8): <<saepe sunt, verbo et exemplo primi...>>.

For the citations relative to the Relationes De Singulis Numeris to Schema 1964, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "K" and "N."

⁵³Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 21-24.

⁵⁴For citation of Fiordelli's written text which was submitted between sessions one and two, see Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 794-95.

⁵⁵For an excellent analysis of these two ecclesiologies, see George Worgul, Jr., "People of God, Body of Christ: Pauline Ecclesiological Contrasts," Biblical Theology Bulletin 12 (1982): 24-28.

⁵⁶Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "K." In the commission's report on Schema 1964, it reaffirms the extensive n. 8 of the matrimonial unit in Schema 1963, especially noting that the "patristic testimonies are held about the family as 'a little church'" (de familia ut <<ecclesiola>>).

⁵⁷Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "I."

⁵⁸Cardinal Ruffini also raises an objection to the use of the words "parents' episcopal responsibility." He wants to reserve the use of the word "episcopal" to bishops because the bishops' office of overseeing is different than that of parents'. See Acta Synodalia, 2.2, 632.

⁵⁹Giovanni Caprile, ed. Il Concilio Vaticano II: Cronache del Concilio Vaticano II, Secondo Periodo, 1963-1964 (Roma: Edizioni "La Civiltà Cattolica," 1966), 117. Italian text: "Il 'popolo di Dio' non è una figura poetica, ma rappresenta una realtà attuale. Noi dobbiamo desiderare non soltanto l'unione, ma l'unità, in una piena comunicazione delle ricchezze de quanti appartengono alla famiglia di Dio."

⁶⁰Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 41-42. Regarding the parents' obligation to be the first heralds, cf. the speech during the 51st General Congregation by Archbishop Leo Duval of Alger, 98. The word "often" will be deleted in Schema 1964, and the sense of "obligation" inserted.

⁶¹Caprile, Il Concilio Vaticano II, 119.

⁶²Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 357-58.

⁶³Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 393ff. These written critiques or observations are collected in a section entitled "Animadversiones Scripto Exhibitae: Quod Cap. III Schematis De Ecclesia."

⁶⁴*Ibid.* His comments upon the matrimonial unit are on page 395.

⁶⁵Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "K."

⁶⁶Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "N."

⁶⁷Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 402. For the commission's acceptance of this point, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "L." The commission does not comment further here on the reasons for this change. Perhaps the Cardinal and the commission want to emphasize Christian sacramental marriage rather than simply a chaste marriage in general.

⁶⁸Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 458.

⁶⁹Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "M."

⁷⁰Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 464-65. Although the commission does not cite Bishop Cascon in its report of Schema 1964, these insights are useful for obtaining a sense of the explicitly ecclesial dimension of Christian marriage and its family.

⁷¹Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 511-12. For the commission's report, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "K," "M," and "N," respectively.

⁷²Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 512. <<ex officio coniugii christiani sunt primi fidei praecones>>.

⁷³Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 543.

⁷⁴Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 546. The commission recognizes his intervention in Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. Cf. "N."

⁷⁵Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 558-60.

⁷⁶Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 559-60. Part of the Latin text follows: ". . . sacramentum matrimonii assimilationem et incorporationem coniugum christianorum in foedus Christi cum Ecclesia causat, eo quod coniuges quasi <<una caro>> facti (Gen. 2, 24) modo aliquo novo et speciali participant dignitatem et sanctitatem Christi ut Sponsi Ecclesiae et dignitatem et sanctitatem Ecclesiae ut Sponsae Christi. . . ."

Also, cf. Acta Synodalia, 2.3, 642. When commenting upon article 30 of Schema 1963, Cardinal Bea makes a similar observation. He states:

Must it not rather be indicated in this place of pure exhortation for spouses, how from the very power of the sacrament of matrimony, they [Christian spouses] are able to draw forth graces for sanctifying one another and their offspring? For the sacrament of matrimony is "a great mystery . . . in Christ and in the Church" (Eph. 5:32), that is, to what extent it signifies the mystical union of Christ the spouse with his spouse the Church. From this quality of Christian matrimony, in so far as it is a sacrament, flow precisely the necessary graces for a holy Christian life of the spouses and of the whole family.

⁷⁷Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 127.

⁷⁸Ibid., 131-32.

⁷⁹Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 184-85. The Latin text follows:

Tandem coniuges christiani, virtute matrimonii sacramenti, quo mysterium unitatis et **fecundi** amoris inter Christum et Ecclesiam **significant atque participant** (cf.

Eph. 5, 32) (I), se invicem in vita coniugali **necnon prolis susceptione et** educatione ad **sanctitatem acquirendam adiuvant** (K), adeoque in suo vitae statu et ordine **proprium** suum in **Populo Dei** donum habent (cf. 1 Cor. 7, 7) (7). Ex **hoc** enim connubio (L) procedit familia, in qua nascuntur novi societatis humanae cives, qui per Spiritus Sancti gratiam, ad **Populum dei** saeculorum decursu perpetuandum, **baptismo** in filios Dei constituuntur (M). In hac velut Ecclesia domestica parentes **verbo et exemplo sint pro filiis suis** primi fidei praecones, et vocationem **unicuique propriam, sacram vero speciali cura**, foveant (N).

For the citations relative to the Relationes De Singulis Numeris to Schema 1964, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. I have already discussed the individual items in the Relationes during my analysis of session two, therefore, this will not be repeated. I will present only new analysis in this section.

⁸⁰Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 192.

⁸¹Acta Synodalia, 3.6, 97. Also relevant to this last point about parents fostering the vocations of their children is "N" in the Relationes De Singulis Numeris to Schema 1964, see Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197, where it states: "According to the commission, parents ought to be solicitous about all vocations, with special care, however, for the religious vocations." For the submitted corrections, see Acta Synodalia 3.6, 103.

⁸²Acta Synodalia, 3.6, 105.

⁸³Acta Synodalia, 3.8, 793. The Latin text follows:

Tandem coniuges christiani, virtute matrimonii sacramenti, quo mysterium unitatis et fecundi amoris inter Christum et Ecclesiam significant atque participant (cf. Eph. 5, 32), se invicem in vita coniugali necnon prolis susceptione et educatione ad sanctitatem adiuvant, adeoque in suo vitae statu et ordine **proprium** suum in **Populo Dei** donum habent (cf. 1 Cor. 7, 7) (7). Ex hoc enim connubio procedit familia, in qua nascuntur novi societatis humanae cives, qui per Spiritus Sancti gratiam, ad **Populum Dei** saeculorum decursu perpetuandum, **baptismo** in filios Dei constituuntur. In hac velut Ecclesia domestica parentes **verbo et exemplo sint pro filiis suis** primi fidei praecones, et vocationem **unicuique propriam, sacram vero peculiari cura**, foveant oportet.

⁸⁴Respectively, the three references are: (1) Cassell's Latin Dictionary, 5th ed. and rev., D. P. Simpson (New York: Macmillan, 1977); (2) Alexander Souter, A Glossary of Later Latin: To 600 A.D.; and (3) Wilford Diamond, Dictionary of Liturgical Latin.

⁸⁵Vatican II: La Constitution dogmatique sur l'Eglise, "Lumen Gentium," vol. 1, Latin text and trans. Th. Camelot with collaboration by Y. Congar, H. Legrand, and A.-I. Mennessier, in Unam Sanctam, 51, L'Eglise De Vatican II (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1966), 32-33. Collins-Roberts, French-English, English-French Dictionary (1978).

⁸⁶English translation is from Documents of Vatican II, Abbott Edition. Latin text, chap. 1, art. 1, Acta Synodalia, 3.8, 785: "Cum autem Ecclesia sit in Christo veluti sacramentum seu signum et instrumentum intimae cum Deo unionis totiusque generis humani unitatis, naturam missionemque suam universalem, praecedentium Conciliorum argumento instans, pressius fidelibus suis et mundo universo declarare intendit."

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 15. In the Abbott edition of the Documents of Vatican Council II, the commentator, Avery Dulles, includes a footnote about the use of the term "sacrament." The contents of the note are: "The term 'sacrament' is here applied to the Church by analogy with the seven sacraments properly so called, which are particular actions of Christ in and through the Church. The Church itself is a sort of "general sacrament," since, as the Constitution here explains, it is a 'sign and instrument' of the grace which unites men supernaturally to God and to one another."

⁸⁸See Commission's Report, Acta Synodalia, 3.1, 197. "(K) . . . Especially the affirmations of the [Council] Fathers about the religious task [munere may also mean function, office, service, or duty] of parents are indicated in the prior text, ed. 1963, Ch. III, n. 8, p. 13, where the patristic testimonies are held about the family as "a little church" (ecclesiola), about the state and rank of spouses and about their particular gift." Latin text: "(K) . . . Praecipuae affirmationes Patrum de munere religioso parentum indicantur in textu priore, ed. 1963, Cap. III, nota 8, p. 13, ubi etiam habentur testimonia patristica de familia ut <<ecclesiola>>, de statu et ordine coniugatorum et de eorum dono particulari."

⁸⁹Presented here as a preview, some important developments of LG 11 in Vatican II documents are: LG, arts. 34-35, addresses spouses' and family's role in lay apostolate, art. 41, path to holiness and cooperators in fruitfulness of Mother Church; Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, art. 48, about the family manifesting Christ and Church in the world; Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, art. 11, family as vital cell of society and Church as domestic sanctuary, art. 30, family as a place of formation for the apostolate; Declaration on Christian Education, arts. 6-8, parents obligation regarding education and development of their children and cooperation with civil society. Two important papal documents upon completion of synods: Paul VI's Evangelization in the Modern World, art. 71, each member in the family is called to be an evangelist; John Paul II's The Christian Family in the Modern World, too many references to cite even the most important ones, as examples, cf. arts. 49-50, the family within the mystery of the Church, arts. 51-64, participation in Christ's priestly, prophetic, and kingly offices.

NOTES-CHAPTER TWO

⁹⁰Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The First Letter To the Corinthians," in The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy; with a foreword by Carlo Maria Cardinal Martini, new rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990), 804.

⁹¹Other biblical material will be cited, however, throughout this chapter.

⁹²John Chrysostom, "Homily 20," in St. John Chrysostom on Marriage and Family Life, trans. Catherine P. Roth and David Anderson (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986), 57. Augustine also spoke about parents having an ecclesiastic mission toward their children, a true ministry, a sort of 'bishopric'. Citation to Tract li in Joan. Ev. (c. xii, n. 13; PL., 35, 1768) are provided by Yves Congar and Gerard Philips. Cf. Yves Congar, Lay People in the Church, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957), 193 [Jalons pour une theologie du laicat (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1953)]; Gerard Philips, The Role of the Laity in the Church, trans. John R. Gilbert and James W. Moudry (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956), 65 and 68.

⁹³Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, trans. and intro. by Matthew L. Lamb, vol. 2, Aquinas Scripture Series (Albany, New York: Magi Books, 1966), 225.

⁹⁴John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians, trans. by Wm. Pringel (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948), 326.

⁹⁵I will comment upon some of the differences between Gen. 2:24 and Eph. 5:31 when I do a textual commentary of 5:31.

⁹⁶Maurice Gilbert, "One Only Flesh," Theology Digest 26 (Fall, 1978): 206-9.

⁹⁷Raymond E. Brown, The Churches the Apostles Left Behind (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 47. Rudolf Schnackenburg acknowledges that although there is no consensus regarding authorship and dating of Ephesians, the placing of Ephesians "at the beginning of the post-apostolic period (around AD 90) . . . proved to be the hermeneutic key for the interpretation of the whole." See Rudolf Schnackenburg, Ephesians: A Commentary, trans. Helen Heron (Edinburgh, Scotland: T & T Clark, 1991), 24-29.

⁹⁸Gunther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. T. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), xii.

⁹⁹Brown, The Churches the Apostles Left Behind, 48.

¹⁰⁰Schnackenburg, Ephesians, 30-33.

¹⁰¹Ibid., 241. Cf. Chap. 2.

¹⁰²Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, 3d ed. (United Bible Society, 1971), xiii.

¹⁰³The R.S.V. Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: The Nestle Greek Text with a Literal Translation by The Reverend Alfred Marshall, D. Litt (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1968). This edition will be used during the textual criticism unless otherwise noted.

¹⁰⁴Brooke Foss Westcott and John Anthony Fenton Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (New York: Macmillan, 1941; 1st ed. in 1893), 436. Future references will be designated WH. Also, Brooke Foss Westcott, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, intro. by Philip Edgcumbe Hughes (New York: Macmillan, 1906; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), 86, 581 (page references are to reprint edition).

¹⁰⁵WH., 436.

¹⁰⁶The Greek New Testament, eds. Kurt Aland, et al. (New York: American Bible Society, 1966), 677. Future references will be designated GNT.

¹⁰⁷Markus Barth, Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4-6, in Anchor Bible, vol. 34A (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1974), 721.

¹⁰⁸The next two sections consist of an exegetical commentary of Eph. 5:31 and 5:32, respectively. I begin with the Greek text, which will be followed by an English translation (RSV). Next, I proceed to comment upon key words and phrases, except for a few remarks regarding some of the other verses in the haustafel. More extensive comments concerning the context will be provided later. I end each section with some concluding observations.

¹⁰⁹Maximilion Zerwick, A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament, 2 vols. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 589.

¹¹⁰J. Paul Sampley, 'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh': A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21-33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 143. In my opinion, Sampley's proposal is a more complete answer than Barth's is. Barth's answer isn't wrong, but it is partial because it omits the husband-wife relationship. More will be said about the essential interrelationship between Christ-Church and husband-wife relationship in the section "Movement of Thought in Eph. 5:21-23."

Cf. Barth, Ephesians, 636-39. Barth suggests that there are four possibilities for referents to the conjunction 'for this reason'. (1) As Gen. 2:24 it can refer to the creation of Eve out of Adam and to his joyful recognition of Eve as part of himself (638). (2) As the synoptics it can combine the two creation accounts so as to take the sense that "man leaves his father and mother in order to follow his wife, because God created them male and female" (638). (3) As a prophetic futuristic announcement it can predict "Christ's parousia and the future marriage of the lamb as is described in Rev. 19:7-8; 21:2,9" (638-39). Barth rejects the first three possibilities and poses the following one. (4) 'For this

reason' refers "to the event which is described in the context of Ephesians: the Christological-soteriological origin of the church and its unifying effect, as described in 5:25-30" (639). He continues:

Presupposed in this case is the question: Why has it been written, 'A man will leave . . . be joined . . . become one'? And the answer is given: Because in that great event in which the Messiah proved to be 'savior of the body', the church (vs. 23), all that was said of Adam and Eve in Gen. 2 was fulfilled! This, indeed, is most likely the meaning of the conjunction 'for this reason' in 5:31, for in the very next verse Paul says explicitly that he interprets Gen. 2:24 as referring to 'Christ and the Church'. Thus Paul combines the aetiological with the prophetic senses of al-ken, anti toutou, and gives both a specific turn: instead of a present-day name or custom, they describe the sense and validity of a Scripture verse. Instead of referring to a purely future event of unification, Paul proclaims that 'in the church and in the Messiah' the miracle predicted in Gen. 2:24 is fulfilled; now God is praised as the one whose promise and 'power' prove effective 'in us' (Eph. 3:20-21), and whose completed 'work' is manifest to the ages (2:7,10) [639]. Barth, 639. Zurwicz states that kataleipsei is the future tense, and it can be translated 'shall leave behind'; prokollēthēsetai is the future passive, and is translated 'shall join oneself to' or 'shall adhere to'; and, esontai is the future for 'to be'. See Grammatical Analysis of Greek New Testament, 589.

¹¹¹Barth, 639. Zurwicz states that kataleipsei is the future tense, and it can be translated 'shall leave behind'; prokollēthēsetai is the future passive, and is translated 'shall join oneself to' or 'shall adhere to'; and, esontai is the future for 'to be'. See Grammatical Analysis of Greek New Testament, 589.

¹¹²H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantley, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 195. Thus, the three verbs are not to be interpreted as a pure future, and therefore would not be referring primarily to the parousia as proposed by Meyer. See S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in The Expositors Greek Testament, vol. 3: 201-305, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), 373.

Because a man is to leave, join, and be one flesh with his wife, one interpreter has suggested that the passage reflects a matriarchal society. Barth has called such an interpretation questionable. He states that the Hebrew dabaq and "its Greek equivalents describe an intimate relation which can exist at most diverse stages of cultural and societal development" (640).

¹¹³Barth, 640.

¹¹⁴Archibald T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament: Volume VI The Epistles of Paul (Nashville, TN: Boardman Press, 1931), 547.

¹¹⁵Barth, 639.

¹¹⁶Joachim Jeremias, "Anthrōpos," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), 36.

¹¹⁷Albrecht Oepke, "Anēr," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), 363.

¹¹⁸Sampley, Ephesians 5:21-33, 99.

¹¹⁹Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch, 2d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989), 91. "For the 'two,' Scripture says, 'shall become one flesh'. The union implied here [1 Cor 6:15-17] is more than moral; somehow Christ and the Christian share in a union that connotes 'one flesh.' Recall what was said above (-->102-3) about the meaning of soma and sarx as designations, not of the physical body as something distinct from the soul, but as equivalents of the whole person under different aspects. In speaking of the 'body of Christ' Paul is not speaking merely of members of a society governed by a common objective, but of members of Christ himself; their union is not only corporate but also somehow corporal."

¹²⁰Ibid. "A similar conclusion [regarding a corporate and corporal union in 1 Cor. 6:15-17] is suggested by 1 Cor. 10:16-17, where Paul insists on the union of all Christians achieved by their share in the one eucharistic bread and cup: 'Because there is one loaf, we, many as we are, are one body, for we all share the one loaf'. The unity of Christians is thus derived from their physical consumption of the one loaf; the oneness implied transcends a mere extrinsic union effected by cooperation to attain a common goal. (The figure of marriage in Eph 5:22-33 also points to the same transcendent union.)"

¹²¹Zerwick, 589.

¹²²Sampley, 86. Sampley discerns the function of mystērion in 5:32 by examining the demonstrative pronoun outos in the phrase 'to mystērion touto'. The pronoun "modifies mystērion and limits the reference of mystērion to something 'comparatively near at hand' or 'immediately present to the thinking of the writer'."

¹²³Sampley, 86-87. He argues:

True, the adjective does not need an article for it to be considered attributive in the phrase to mystērion touto mega estin, but 'the predicate adjective occurs invariably without the article' as is the case here. Also, the presence of the copula estin necessitates the context. The difference at stake in the understanding of 5:32 is whether mega ascribes a quality to mystērion--as attributive--or whether it makes an assertion concerning mystērion--as predicative. . . . Properly taken as a predicate adjective, mega allows its immediate context and the use of mystērion in the remainder of the epistle to determine what it asserts about mystērion here.

Cf. Barth, 641. Barth renders v. 32a as "This [passage] has an eminent secrete meaning."

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Dana and Mantey, 244.

¹²⁶Zerwick, 589.

¹²⁷Sampley, 87-89.

¹²⁸Ibid., 89. Sampley's own words are helpful:

In a chapter entitled "Parallels of Idiom" he [Smith] examines the occurrences of egō de legō in the so called antitheses of Matt. 5. Smith notes that the use of this phrase in Matt. 5 functions 'to introduce a legal opinion contradicting that generally accepted'. There follow five examples from tannaitic materials where a similar formula is used to supplant dominant positions of the time: these texts provide evidence for Smith's judgment. Egō de legō, therefore, appears to have been a rather standard form, derived ultimately from Judaism, for use in opposing established interpretations of scripture. Since the egō de legō in 5:32 occurs with a quotation from the OT, it would seem that, in part, Smith's position would hold true here as well: at stake is the interpretation of the OT verse, and the author of Ephesians sets forth his own interpretation eis Christon kai [eis] tēn ekklēsian.

¹²⁹Ibid., 90.

¹³⁰Ibid., 91.

¹³¹Ibid.

¹³²Ibid., 101.

¹³³Ibid., 113-14.

¹³⁴Fitzmyer, Paul and His Theology, 90-91.

¹³⁵Ibid., 91.

¹³⁶Ibid., 91-92.

¹³⁷Ibid., 89.

¹³⁸Sampley, 133.

¹³⁹This subtitle is taken from chapter four of Sampley's book.

¹⁴⁰Sampley, 104. The reader will need to refer repeatedly to the haustafel chart in table 1.

¹⁴¹Ibid., 103. At this point one must heed Sampley's caution, "This separation is not to be considered a distinction, since there is a definite interplay and relatedness that will be examined later".

¹⁴²Ibid., 105.

¹⁴³Ibid., 105-6.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., 106.

¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., 107.

¹⁴⁷Ibid.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹The following theological speculation is my own. I realize that I am laying aside a technical-historical exegesis, and that I may be misusing verses. However, I feel justified in this endeavor as an opportunity to gain some insight by looking at material in Ephesians in broad sweeps and from select perspectives.

¹⁵⁰Schnackenburg, Ephesians, 262-63. "Christ's Lordship gives to every necessary command and reprimand the spirit of love. The two concepts connected here-- 'education' (paideia) and 'admonition' (nouthesia) have each in themselves a different emphasis. The first has more the sense of a (strict) total education, the second more a verbal reprimanding, a more lenient way as is more appropriate for dealing with older children. But by the addition of 'of the Lord' both concepts are made subordinate to a higher principle in which the clear, firm and yet kindly instruction of the Lord is the decisive factor."

¹⁵¹Schnackenburg, 331-37.

¹⁵²Ibid., 331-32.

¹⁵³Ibid., 332.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., 334.

¹⁵⁵John Chrysostom, "Homily 20," in St. John Chrysostom on Marriage and Family Life, trans. Catharine P. Roth and David Anderson, intro. Catharine P. Roth (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986), 44-58 (esp. 54). While Chrysostom insists that wives obey their husbands as the Lord, he also cautions that the word "as" does not always express equivalence (45).

¹⁵⁶John Chrysostom, "Homily 12: On Colossians 4:18," in St. John Chrysostom on Marriage and Family Life, trans. Catharine P. Roth and David Anderson, intro. Catharine P. Roth (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986), 75-77. According to Schnackenburg (333), Chrysostom understands that "human marriage is a typos of the spiritual union of Christ with his Church." Schnackenburg provides the following footnote: "¹⁰This is especially clear in his exegesis of Col. hom XII (MPG 62.387) but also on Eph., hom XX (MPG 62.140)." Xavier Le'on-Dufour in Dictionary of the New Testament cross-references typos with the words archetype, example, figure, type, and typology (454). Some of the nuances of typos gained from these words are "model, prototype, mirrors pointing to God, fulfillment of Old Testament within the New Testament, and Platonic exemplarism.

¹⁵⁷Chrysostom, "Homily 20," 43, 46, 50-51.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., 52-53. Also "Homily 12," 74-75, 77, 79 and "How to Choose a Wife," 95-96.

¹⁵⁹Chrysostom, "How to Choose a Wife," 95-96. Chrysostom does make a distinction in reference to Christ: "As the bridegroom leaves his father and comes to his bride, so Christ left His Father's throne and came to His bride. He did not summon us on high, but Himself came to us (of course when you hear that He left, you must not imagine a change but a condescension; for even when He was with us, He was still with the Father). For this reason when Paul said, 'This is a great mystery', he added, 'I understand it in relation to Christ and the Church'. Since you know, therefore, how great a mystery marriage is, and how great a matter it represents, do not consider marriage lightly or casually."

¹⁶⁰Chrysostom, "Homily 20," 50-51, 62; "Homily 12," 75-79; "How to Choose a Wife," 94-96. These references apply to the whole paragraph. Two quotes corresponding to the second example about the children will be provided here because these provide a clear perspective about the marriage evolving into a family and how this marriage in becoming so appropriately symbolizes church and how logical a step it is to call the marriage and its family a "little church" ("Homily 20," 57). Quote one:

'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife and the two shall become one flesh' (v. 31). There is another aspect of marital obligation: Paul shows that a man leaves his parents, who gave him life, and is joined to his wife, and that one flesh--father, mother, and child--results from the commingling of the two. The child is born from the union of their seed, so the three are one flesh. Our relationship to Christ is the same; we become one flesh with Him through

communion, more truly one with Him than our children are one with us, because this has been His plan from the beginning (51).

Quote 2:

How do they become one flesh? As if she were gold receiving the purest of gold, the woman receives the man's seed with rich pleasure, and within her it is nourished, cherished, and refined. It is mingled with her own substance and she then returns it as a child! The child is a bridge connecting mother to father, so the three become one flesh, as when two cities divided by a river are joined by a bridge. And here that bridge is formed from the substance of each! Just as the head and the rest of the body are one, since the neck connects but does not divide them, so it is with the child. That is why Scripture does not say, 'They shall be one flesh', but that they shall be joined together 'into one flesh', namely the child. But suppose there is no child; do they then remain two and not one? No; their intercourse effects the joining of their bodies, and they are made one, just as when perfume is mixed with ointment (76).

¹⁶¹Chrysostom, "Homily 20," 51-58; "Homily 12," 66; "Homily 21," 67-72. This material refers to this paragraph and the next three.

¹⁶²Ibid., 57.

¹⁶³Ibid., 50-54.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., 58, 67-68.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., 72.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., 61, 67.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., 53.

¹⁶⁸The following material continues the summary of Schnackenburg's work, 334-36.

¹⁶⁹Schnackenburg provides the following footnote: "¹⁹Summa theol., Suppl. q. 42, a.1. Cf. Schillebeeckx, Marriage (n. 17) 326f.; Lawrence, Sacr. Interpretation (ibid.) 56-9." Conversely, as already noted at the beginning of this chapter, Aquinas considered matrimony as one of the four great sacraments "by reason of its signification, for it symbolizes the union of Christ and the Church." See Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, 225. Additionally, Aquinas clearly asserts here that Gen. 2:24 is a kind of passage which "can be explained as referring to Christ and others; to Christ principally, and to others as they were types of Christ" (226). He also understands the effect to which matrimony is directed to be the common life in family matters. See Summa Theologica, Suppl. q. 44, a. 3, 2712.

¹⁷⁰Schnackenburg provides the following footnote: "²¹D 969-70."

¹⁷¹Ibid., 336.

¹⁷²Ibid., 336-37.

¹⁷³Ibid., 336.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., 337. Schnackenburg cites the following footnote: "³²CD III/I Edinburgh, (1958), 312; cf. also ibid. 332; III/2 (1960) 312-19, especially 316f."

¹⁷⁵Ibid., 337. Schnackenburg cites the following footnote: "³³On the Church in the World of today' (Gaudium et spes) [sic] Art 48 (Abbott p. 251)."

¹⁷⁶Yves Congar, Lay People in the Church, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957), 193. [Jalons pour une théologie du laïc (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1953)]. Most of the material for the next couple of pages is derived from the section entitled "The Laity's Part in the Church's Priestly Function," 181ff., esp. 192-96. In addition to retrieving the insight that the Christian family is a little Church, Congar gives the broad perspective of a priestly people consecrated to God, which is a biblical insight (185). He builds upon Chrysostom's assertion that in baptism 'you are made king, priest and prophet' (186). Finally, Congar emphasizes the profoundness of this reality by asserting that the spiritual priesthood of believers is "real" and not metaphorical (195). It is also worth noting that Congar does not consider the priesthood of marrieds to be analogous to that of sacramental orders (193). Rather, the priesthood of marrieds "has its own particular position, three things meeting and mingling in it, namely: the natural priesthood of which mention has been made, identified with the father's authority (and how many fathers abdicate their authority and priesthood, leaving it to the mother . . .); the priesthood of holiness, which here has a specially wide application, in view of its exercise according to each one's conditions and responsibilities; and the baptismal priesthood, a true consecration that confers a religious power (puissance cultuelle). It is on the foundation of baptism that the contract of the marriage partners becomes a sacrament" (193).

¹⁷⁷Ibid., 193.

¹⁷⁸Ibid. Congar provides the following footnote: "¹³⁰Cf. Chrysostom, In Genes., sermo 7, I (PG., 54, 608) and 2, 4 (53,31). See La vie intellectuelle ["la famille, Église en réduction"], 10 July 1939, pp. 9-29); and the Orthodox writer P. Evdokimov, Le mariage, sacrement d'amour (Paris, 1945), ch. ix."

¹⁷⁹"Paul VI, "The Transformation of Married Love Through Christian Self-Giving: Address of Pope Paul VI to the International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 4, 1970," cited in National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Plan of Pastoral Action for

Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy (Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1978), 31. Paul VI refers to John XXIII's "Address to International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 3, 1959."

¹⁸⁰Congar, Lay People in the Church, 192.

¹⁸¹Ibid., 192-93.

¹⁸²Ibid., 193-94.

¹⁸³Ibid., 193.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., 194.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

¹⁸⁶Ibid. Congar cites the following footnote: "¹³²See the references given by S. Tromp in his annotated edition of the encyclical 'Corporis mystici' (Rome, 1946), p. 76, and in Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia (2nd ed. Rome, 1946), p. 144. In 'Casti connubii', Pope Pius XI compares marriage with the charism given in priestly ordination."

¹⁸⁷Congar, 194.

¹⁸⁸Ibid.

¹⁸⁹Ibid.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., 194-95.

¹⁹¹Ibid., 195. Congar cites the following footnote: "¹³⁴Marriage, says St Thomas, is conformed to Christ's passion 'quantum as caritatem, per quam pro Ecclesia sibi in sponsam conjungenda passus est' (Sum., Suppl., q. xlii, a. I, ad 3)."

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³Ibid.

¹⁹⁴Ibid., 196.

¹⁹⁵I do not want to give the impression that the need for the laity to understand themselves as the Church and agents of evangelization did not arise until the 1950's. For example, Pius XII spoke clearly about this in the 1940's: "The faithful, and more precisely the laity, are stationed in the front ranks of the life of the Church, and through them the Church is the living principle of human society. Consequently, they especially

must have an ever clearer consciousness, not only of belonging to the Church, but of being the Church, that is, of being the community of the faithful on earth under the guidance of their common leader, the Pope, and the bishops in communion with him. They are the Church. . . ." See "Pius XII, Allocution to the Sacred College, Nov. 20, 1946. Cf. Acta Ap. Sed., 38, 1946, p. 149." Cited in Gerard Philips, The Role of the Laity in the Church, trans. John R. Gilbert and James W. Moudry (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956), 5. At the time of this writing Philips is also aware of and in agreement with Congar's work on the laity (16f.).

¹⁹⁶Leon-Joseph Suenens, The Gospel to Every Creature, trans. Louise Gavan Duffy, with a preface by the Most Reverend John Baptist Montini, Archbishop of Milan (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957) [L'Eglise en état de mission (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1956)]. At the time of this writing, Suenens is familiar with and in agreement with Congar's work on the laity; and like Congar, he builds his case on the notion of the common priesthood (66). Regarding the Christian family, Suenens also agrees with Congar: "the Christian family is a cell of the Church and of Society." Some implicit issues this raises are authority in the home, the raising of children, sexual relations, evangelizing children, education of children, etc. (69). It should also be observed that Suenens sees his book as a repeating of Pius XI and Pius XII's urgent efforts to call the faithful to accept the universal duty of the apostolate (missionary activity), especially in light of the growing dechristianization of the masses (1-4). In the same vein, Archbishop Montini writes in the preface: "The book begins by calling for a general mobilization of all the children of the Church for the purpose of making good her losses, defending her positions, of recovering her scattered members and of winning new ones. The Church is entering a dynamic phase in her history, her whole organism is being set in motion in order to increase her apostolic efficiency. This immense effort, far from exhausting the Mystical Body of Christ, reinvigorates it, rejuvenates it, and causes it to flower anew" (vi). Cf. Suenens, Love and Control: The Contemporary Problem, trans. George J. Robinson, 2d ed., rev. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1962) [Un problème crucial: Amour et Maîtrise de Soi (Bruges, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1960)]. Here Suenens speaks frequently about the apostolate of the family for the increase of Christianity, both quantitatively and qualitatively (humanizing and christianizing the world); also, he links tightly the complementarity of Holy Orders and Holy Matrimony, esp. 27-34. He also concludes again that Christian marriage and its family is a cell of the Church, and thus, has an evangelizing vocation: "Finally, this grace [of the Sacrament of marriage] consecrates the couple as they carry out their peculiar role in the Church: once a home is established it becomes, without ceasing in any way to be a home and precisely because it is a home, a household of charity, a cell of the Church, a source of apostolicity. As Mr. Eliot says, 'Home is where one starts from'" (59). In this work Suenens also writes about the parents' duty to train their children "to include simultaneously the natural and supernatural education of the child's character and heart" (159-63).

Furthermore, Suenens adds: "We must not forget that, if a Christian home is to develop and reach its potential harmony, it should not be isolated and closed in on itself. It has to be wide open to the demands and appeals of the world and the Church. A home's social

and apostolic involvement is a necessary part of Christian life, none of whose parts and aspects can be disregarded lightly" (59).

It is important to note that Suenens' thought is representative of the higher echelon of the Catholic hierarchy. There is a letter in the front of this book from the Cardinal Secretary of State, who writes that Pope John XXIII approves of Suenens' work. Later, the Pope reinforces his respect for Suenens by asking him to serve on various Commissions both before and during Vatican Council II, and most importantly, he assigned Suenens to the Coordinating Commission of seven cardinals who were most instrumental in the successful completion of Vatican Council II [cf. Walter Abbott, Twelve Council Fathers (New York: Macmillan Company, 1963), 34.]

For Suenens' radio and television broadcasts which promote the family apostolate and family prayer, cf. Christian Life Day By Day: Talks to the Family, trans. S. F. L. Tye (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1963) [original in French, 1961].

See n. 111 below for comments relative to Gerard Philips.

Regarding Bishop Fiordelli, cf. James I. Tucek, "50th General Congregation, October 17, 1963," in Council Daybook Vatican II: Sessions 1 and 2, ed. F. Anderson (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965), 190.

¹⁹⁷Walter Abbott, Twelve Council Fathers, 34-36. Also, Xavier Rynne, Vatican Council II (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1968), 120. And, Gerard Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, History of the Constitution," in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol. 1, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 110-11.

¹⁹⁸Pietro Fiordelli, in Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1976), 1.4, p. 311. The Christian family is the smallest unit of Church: <<Ultimo divisio Ecclesiae, seu melius ultima ex cellulis sanctis quibus componitur Ecclesia, non est paroecia, sed familia christiana>>. "The parish can be changed . . . but the family never, since it is of divine right or law <<cum sit iuris divini>>.

¹⁹⁹The first reference that the Christian family is a domestic Church is found in the second schema (Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 259). Footnote 8 provides the rich patristic references to support this claim, (Acta Synodalia, 2.1, 264-65). If one compares footnote 8 to the French edition of Congar's Lay People in the Church, one will readily observe that footnote 8 is basically a compilation of Congar's footnotes 280, 281, and 283. Congar's direct influence is certain.

²⁰⁰Gerard Philips, The Role of the Laity in the Church, 64-67. In the section "The Family Sanctuary," Philips writes about the vocation to Christian marriage. His biblical inspiration is Pauline, especially Eph 5:21-33:

For him [Paul] marriage between baptized spouses pertains fully to the mystery of salvation by which God became man to communicate His Life to us in Jesus Christ, the Saviour, Head, and Spouse of the Church. The conjugal union is invigorated by the reflected light of the sublime mystery that unites Christ to His Church. From

the union proceeds the sanctity of marriage. 'For it is necessary,' says Pe'guy, 'that Christianity continue,' and that the Mystical Body attain its perfect stature with the passing of the centuries. . . . Christian marriage unquestionably forms a smaller community, distinct but in no way hermetically sealed or totally cut from the whole society of the Church. The family will not shut itself off from this Holy Nation's beneficent influence and it will certainly not refuse to play its part. Only under such conditions can it be something great. . . . There is not one, but two Sacraments whose social purpose is particularly essential: Marriage and Holy Orders" (66).

²⁰¹In other words, my thesis is that the Council uses the notion of “domestic Church” as a model for understanding the ecclesial nature of the Christian family. I use the term model as developed by Avery Dulles, which I explained in chapter one.

²⁰²I developed these results in chapter one.

²⁰³My presupposition is that the Council presents its vision of Church in chapters one and two of LG. In the subsequent chapters it expands and applies this vision to the church's various aspects.

²⁰⁴I do not intend to imply that “official teaching” is limited to conciliar and papal documents. However, these select documents are sufficient for demonstrating the hierarchical magisterium’s deliberate development of the model of domestic church for illuminating the ecclesial nature of the Christian family. It should be noted that the three major papal documents to which I will mainly refer-- Evangelii nuntiandi (Evangelization in the Modern World), Catechesi Tradendae (Catechesis in our Time), and Familiaris consortio (On the Family)--are papal confirmations of the work completed by international synods. In accordance with the Latin titles of the three documents, I will use respectively the following abbreviations for future referencing: EN, CT, and FC. These documents can be located as follows: Paul VI, EN, in Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1982), 711-61; John Paul II, CT, in Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1982), 762-814; John Paul II, FC in Origins 11 (December 24, 1981).

²⁰⁵I will be following Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1987).

²⁰⁶Unless otherwise specified, the references to the Council’s documents will be from the Abbott Edition of The Documents of Vatican II (America Press, Association Press, 1966). In my text the number within parentheses is a citation of the article number and not the page number. Likewise, in the endnotes, the number refers to the article number unless otherwise stated.

²⁰⁷LG 6, fn. 12.

²⁰⁸Two points are to be made here. This listing is a sample of ecclesial images, and marital and familial imagery are highly important as the Council indicates by concluding article 7 as follows: “Having become the model of a man loving his wife as his own body, Christ loves the Church as His bride (cf. Eph. 5:25-28). For her part, the Church is subject to her Head (cf. Eph. 5:22-23). ‘For in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily’ (Col. 2:9). He fills the Church, which is His Body and His fullness, with His divine gifts (cf. Eph. 1:22-23) so that she may grow and reach all the fullness of God (cf. Eph. 3:19).”

²⁰⁹Avery Dulles, Models of the Church (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1974), 18.

²¹⁰Avery Dulles, A Church to Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 154, citing E. Vauthier, “Le Saint-Esprit principe d’unité de l’Eglise d’après saint Thomas d’Aguin,” Mélanges de science religieuse, 5 (1948), 1975-196; 6 (1949), 57-80.

²¹¹*Ibid.*, citing De ver. 29.4 resp. (Parma ed., 9:451); In 3 Sent. D 13.2.2 (Parma ed., 7:142).

The Council makes this point beautifully in LG 7, when it recalls the Fathers way of speaking of the Holy Spirit as the soul of the Body of Christ: "In order that we may be unceasingly renewed in Him (cf. Eph. 4:23), He has shared with us His Spirit who, existing as one and the same being in the head and in the members, vivifies, unifies, and moves the whole body. This He does in such a way that His work could be compared by the holy Fathers with the function which the soul fulfills in the human body, whose principle of life the soul is."

²¹²Dulles, A Church to Believe In, 156.

²¹³Avery Dulles, "Vatican II and the Church's Purpose," Theology Digest 32 (1985): 345.

²¹⁴*Ibid.*

²¹⁵LG 11. Another pertinent perspective about the entire church sharing a common vocation is the call of the faithful to the apostolate. See the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (Apostolicam Actuositatem, AA), 2.

²¹⁶The vocation of the Christian community to be a sign of God’s presence in the world precisely by exercising the triple-office of Christ appears to be a favorite theme of the Council. Perhaps one can say it is a motif. In art. 15 of the Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity (Ad Gentes, AG), missionaries are instructed to build up Christian Communities precisely according to this theme. After setting this vision the Council then gives instruction for building up the community. The family is a key piece of this strategy. The Council states:

From the very start, the Christian community should be so formed that it can provide for its own necessities insofar as this is possible.

This congregation of the faithful, endowed with the riches of its own nation's culture should be deeply rooted in the people. Let families flourish which are penetrated with the spirit of the gospel and let them be assisted by suitable schools. It is noteworthy that the footnote for this statement is LG 11, 35, and 41.

²¹⁷The Council resounds the importance of the parents' vocation from the perspective of catechesis in the Declaration on Christian Education (Gravissimum Educationis, GE). In art. 3 the Council again calls parents "the first and foremost educators of their children." It says "the family is the first school of those social virtues which every society needs." Then it further expounds the teaching presented in LG 11 and 35:

It is particularly in the Christian family, enriched by the grace and the office of the sacrament of matrimony, that from their earliest years children should be taught, according to the faith received in baptism, to have a knowledge of God, to worship Him, and to love their neighbor. Here, too, they gain their first experience of wholesome human companionship and of the Church. Finally, it is through the family that they are gradually introduced into civic partnership with their fellow men, and into the people of God. Let parents, then, clearly recognize how vital a truly Christian family is for the life and development of God's own people.

Paul VI has a beautiful way of speaking of this vocation in art. 25 of Humanae Vitae. He begins this article, thus: "And now our words more directly address our own children, particularly those whom God calls to serve Him in marriage." He then proceeds to elaborate on their vocation and he supports his description by appealing to LG 35. The text follows:

Christian married couples, then, docile to her [the Church's] voice, must remember that their Christian vocation, which began at baptism, is further specified and reinforced by the sacrament of matrimony. By it husband and wife are strengthened and as it were consecrated for the faithful accomplishment of their proper duties, for the carrying out of their proper vocation even to perfection, and the Christian witness which is proper to them before the whole world. To them the Lord entrusts the task of making visible to men the holiness and sweetness of the law which unites the mutual love of husband wife with their cooperation with the love of God the author of human life.

See Paul VI, Humanae Vitae: Encyclical Letter on the Regulation of Birth (Washington, D.C., 1968), 15-16.

²¹⁸Henceforth, I will use the abbreviation GS, in accordance with the Latin title, Gaudium et spes.

²¹⁹GS 47.

²²⁰GS 48.

²²¹GS 47. The theme of the importance of the specific vocation of the Christian family for the future well-being of society and church is a persistent one for the bishops. For example, see The Papal Committee for the Family, The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church: Some Reflections on the Work and on the Conclusions of the 4th General Assembly of the Committee for the Family (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1978), 6.

²²²FC 11. The creation quote is from Gen. 1:26-27. He also cites 1 Jn. 4:8 as a reference for his quote: “God is love and in himself he lives a mystery of personal loving communion.”

²²³FC 11. Cf. GS 12.

²²⁴FC 11.

²²⁵FC 11. Cf. GS 48.

²²⁶FC 11.

²²⁷FC 12.

²²⁸FC 12.

²²⁹FC 13. The following comments upon Christ and vocation are taken from art. 13.

²³⁰FC 51.

²³¹FC 51.

²³²FC 52. John Paul posits the apostolic mission of the family in baptism. What makes the family’s vocation “special” is the grace it receives from the sacrament of marriage which provides “. . . new strength to transmit the faith, to sanctify and transform our present society according to God’s plan.”

²³³FC 54.

²³⁴GS 48. The following quotes and comments are based upon this article unless otherwise noted. I am using the term “sacramentality” as used by Richard McBrien, see Catholicism, study edition (Oak Grove Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1981), 1180. McBrien writes:

No theological principle or focus is more characteristic of Catholicism or more central to its identity than the principle of *sacramentality*. The Catholic vision sees God in and through all things: other people, communities, movements, events, places, objects, the world at large, the whole cosmos. The visible, the tangible, the

finite, the historical--all these are actual or potential carriers of the divine presence. Indeed, it is only in and through these material realities that we can even encounter the invisible God.

²³⁵Cf., B. Haring, "Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and the Family," in Commentary on Vatican II, ed. Vorgrimler, Vol. 5 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 235. Haring, one of the major early commentators upon GS, claims that this description of marriage maintains that love belongs to the essence of marriage (232).

Mackin admits that the bishops claim a serious need for love in marriage; however, he thinks that the bishops are inconclusive about marital love being "essentially necessary." By "essentially necessary" Mackin means "that its absence keeps the relationship from being a marriage." See Theodore Mackin, Divorce and Remarriage, vol. 2, Marriage in the Catholic Church (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 477.

While generally speaking, theologians have come to understand marital love as essentially necessary for marriage, in the late 1960's and 1970's a controversy developed among Rotal judges about the essentialness of love in marriage. See next endnote.

²³⁶Haring and Fellhauer differ as to the significance of the term "covenant." Haring attributes much significance to it. Covenant corresponds to the mutual self-giving, but not the single act but the whole community of life and love ("Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and the Family," 233). Fellhauer attributes little significance to the use of covenant. He claims the term is merely an accommodation to the Orientals. See David E. Fellhauer, "The Consortium omnis vitae as a Juridical Element of Marriage," Studia Canonica 13 (1979): 109, no. 19.

In the Flannery edition of the Vatican II documents, the term "contract" is used instead of "covenant." The translation of the first sentence of art. 48 is as follows: "The intimate partnership of life and the love which constitutes the married state has been established by the creator and endowed by him with its own proper laws: it is rooted in the contract of its partners, that is, in their irrevocable personal consent." See Pastoral Constitution On the Church In the Modern World, in Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, new rev. ed., ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1992), 950. While the use of "contract" as a translation of "foedere" is far from the literal translation of "covenant," the meaning given to this term by Paul VI in the debate about married love as essential to marriage, which occurred in jurisprudence following Vatican II, is closer to contract than to covenant. See Theodore Mackin, What Is Marriage?, vol. 1, Marriage in the Catholic Church (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 297-327, esp.320-321. Following is Mackin's conclusion (322) of Paul VI's discourse to the Rota on February 9, 1976:

A credible case can be made that Gaudium et spes did not state exactly the place of love in a marriage. Certainly the bishops thought this love grievously important to the happiness and survival of a marriage. They acknowledged that it is in fact the most common source of modern marriages, and that the realizing of this love's possibilities is marriage's goal. But did they say that it belongs to marriage's nature in such an essential way that its absence keeps the relationship from being a marriage?

To this question Paul's answer in his discourse is an emphatic 'no' . . .

He explained that what creates a marriage as its immediate cause, a cause both necessary and sufficient, is the parties' consent provided that it is made freely. Their love has no essentially necessary place in this creating.

Again, what this consent has as its immediate and proportioned effect is not the spouse's love, not a process of growth in them of love and perfection--which are not elements essential to a marriage in any case. What this effect is, is the marriage in actual existence (in facto esse). It is decidedly not marriage in the process of coming into existence (in fieri).

And, most significantly, Paul said of marriage in facto esse that it is a *juridical* effect, a *juridical* reality. Continuing his exact predicating he named this effect, this reality, the marital bond. It is, he said, a thing of the objective order. The partners create it by their consent. But once they create it, it takes on a kind of existence of its own, apart from their minds and wills, and has an unassailable immunity from the latter. Nothing they can do subsequently can affect it. Even their will to end the bond, the withdrawal of their consent, leaves it untouched. By their consent they enter an institution which exists in its own right, and they cannot exit from it in any way short of death. (*Here, without Paul's naming it, we have the return of the contract invented by the medieval canonists--a unique invention in legal history, because the contract is non-voidable. In reintroducing the non-voidable contract in order to reassert a marriage's invulnerability to subsequent withdrawal of wills by the spouses, Paul accompanied Cardinal Staffa and his commission in their departure from the teaching of Gaudium et spes, which placed the unfailingness of marriage not in the indissoluble bond, alias the non-voidable contract, but in the spouses' irrevocable personal consent.*) [Italics mine within the parentheses]

²³⁷Fellhauer, "Consortium omnis vitae," 109.

²³⁸Jack Dominian asserts that "bestowal of each other" elevates the marriage from a mere verbal exchange to the recognition of the reality of marriage as a physical, psychological, and spiritual relationship between a man and a woman. See J. Dominian, "Vatican II and Marriage," Clergy Review 52 (1967): 26.

²³⁹W. LaDue, "Conjugal Love and the Juridical Structure of Christian Marriage," The Jurist 34 (1974): 40. According to Fellhauer, this statement does not negate the traditional teaching that the procreative dimension of marriage is also essential to the meaning of marriage (114).

²⁴⁰The Council chooses to say that conjugal love and matrimony are ordered indole sua to procreating and educating children. See LaDue, "Conjugal Love," 38. Fellhauer claims that the Council intends to balance the procreative and personal dimensions of marriage and that "an exaggeration of either aspect to the detriment of other was contrary to Catholic teaching" (114).

²⁴¹GS 48. The Council states: “Christ the Lord abundantly blessed this many-faceted love, welling up as it does from the fountain of divine love and structured as it is on the model of His union with the Church.” Cf. T. Mackin, “Conjugal Love and the Magisterium,” The Jurist 36 (1976): 285. Mackin’s translation about conjugal love which flows from Christ is as follows: “and is fashioned according to the exemplar that is the union of Christ and His Church.”

Cf., Haring, 235, who provides valuable commentary on the sacramental nature of conjugal love and its ecclesial connection:

. . . in regard to the mystery of the Church, the essential theological connection between love and fruitfulness is observed. The love which the Church receives from Christ and gives him in return is not a subsidiary purpose juxtaposed with the apostolate. The Church by its love and in proportion to its love is the mother of the living. Accordingly the ‘abundant blessing’ which Christ bestows on marriage is introduced as a blessing on the covenant of love, not merely as a blessing of fecundity. The sacramental nature of marriage is here described in very personalist terms, as a meeting with Christ. He abides with the couple who in his name has [*sic*] become an indissoluble unity. The purpose of his abiding presence, which is understood dynamically, is to make their love increasingly resemble his own love for the Church, so that it will truly become mutual dedication in absolutely faithful love. Marital love itself in its entirety becomes more genuine and richer through the sacrament, because it is more closely united to the primal source of all love.

²⁴²GS 48.

²⁴³GS 48.

²⁴⁴See P. Palmer, “Christian Marriage: Contract or Covenant,” Theological Studies 33 (1972): 643. Mackin concludes that the Council sees conjugal love as a pars essentialis of the sacramental marriage of Christians. He writes: “(though implicitly) the [Council] fathers affirm that their (Christian couple) marriage cannot be a sacrament unless it live this love.” See “Conjugal Love,” 286. In a later writing, Divorce and Remarriage, Mackin examines in detail the development of the marriage articles in GS. He notes on p. 468 that at the time of the writing of this document, it was not clear what is meant in Cardinal Alfrink’s speech that love is a “constitutive” element of marriage. Mackin writes:

Cardinal Alfrink here touches momentarily an issue that was later to perplex and divide authorities and scholars in the Church. He says that marital love is a constituent element of marriage, yet not so constituent that its absence makes an attempt at marriage null, but only leaves the marriage incomplete. This may not have been the time and place for him to explain his understanding of the word ‘constitutive’. But even if he stopped short of saying that love is essentially necessary for a marriage’s existence, he did say that it is necessary for its completion. So even if love’s absence does not keep a relationship from being a marriage, its absence seems to block its consummation. Would this then leave the marriage a candidate for dissolution by the papal power to dissolve? The answer to

this question had to wait for a definition of consummation fitted to the new understanding of marriage's nature for which Cardinal Alfrink was arguing.

²⁴⁵GS 48. This passage is an obvious expansion of LG 11. It reiterates the theology of the Christian family springing from Christian marriage and manifesting the presence of Christ and the nature of the Church.

²⁴⁶The Papal Committee for the Family, The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church, 12.

²⁴⁷FC 51. The importance of faith to sacraments is declared by the Second Vatican Council. See, for example, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium, SC), 59: "Because they [sacraments] are signs they also instruct. They not only presuppose faith, but by words and objects they also nourish, strengthen, and express it; that is why they are called 'sacraments of faith'."

²⁴⁸FC 55. See also 56: "The sacrament of marriage is the specific source and original means of sanctification for Christian married couples and families. It takes up again and makes specific the sanctifying grace of baptism."

²⁴⁹FC 54.

²⁵⁰FC 51.

²⁵¹FC 56.

²⁵²GS 47.

²⁵³GS 48.

²⁵⁴In describing marriage the Council consistently chooses to avoid juridical terminology for defining and describing Christian marriage and its nature, e.g., the use of covenant instead of contract. One effect of this symbolic approach is to balance the past emphasis upon the procreative aspect of marriage with terminology stressing the conjugal--personal aspects. Cf., David E. Fellhauer, 113.

²⁵⁵See Leonard Doohan, The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1984), Chapter 3.

²⁵⁶EN 71.

²⁵⁷FC 49. The term "church in miniature" is a translation of ecclesia domestica. John Paul also cites in fn. 114 his "Homily for the Opening of the Sixth Synod of Bishops" (Sept. 26, 1980), 3: AAS 72 (1980) 1008."

²⁵⁸John Paul supports this statement by citing LG 41. The pertinent text from art. 41 follows:

Married couples and Christian parents should follow their own proper path to holiness by faithful love, sustaining one another in grace throughout the entire length of their lives. They should imbue their offspring, lovingly welcomed from God, with Christian truths and evangelical virtues. For thus they can offer all men an example of unwearying and generous love, build up the brotherhood of charity, and stand as witnesses to and cooperators in the fruitfulness of Holy Mother Church. By such lives, they signify and share in that very love with which Christ loved His Bride and because of which He delivered Himself up on her behalf.

²⁵⁹FC 51.

²⁶⁰GS 48.

²⁶¹“Authentic married love is caught up into divine love and is governed and enriched by Christ’s redeeming power and the saving activity of the Church. Thus this love can lead the spouses to God with powerful effect and can aid and strengthen them in the sublime office of being a father or a mother.¹⁶⁰” GS 48. The reference given here is as follows: “Cf. *Second Vatican Council, dogmatic constitution “Lumen Gentium”*: AAS 57 (1965), pp. 15-16; 40-41; 47.”

²⁶²GS 48. See paragraphs 5 and 6.

²⁶³LaDue, 40.

²⁶⁴GS 48.

²⁶⁵GS 48.

²⁶⁶For a definition of apostolate see AA 2. I quote the definition in the section “On Mission.”

²⁶⁷AA 2.

²⁶⁸Synod of Bishops, *The Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World: For the Use of the Episcopal Conferences* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1979), 17.

²⁶⁹Ibid.

²⁷⁰Ibid.

²⁷¹Ibid.

²⁷²Ibid., 16.

²⁷³Ibid., 18.

²⁷⁴Paul VI, “The Transformation of Married Love Through Christian Self-Giving: Address of Pope Paul VI to the International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 4, 1970,” in National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1978), 30. The remainder of quotes in this paragraph is from this source.

²⁷⁵GS 50.

²⁷⁶Ibid.

²⁷⁷Paul VI, “The Transformation of Married Love Through Christian Self-Giving,” 31.

²⁷⁸EN 71.

²⁷⁹GS 48.

²⁸⁰Ibid.

²⁸¹Ibid.

²⁸²Ibid.

²⁸³The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church, 10.

²⁸⁴Ibid., 12. These tasks were assigned to the Papal Committee by the 4th General Assembly of the Committee For the Family.

²⁸⁵GS 48.

²⁸⁶Ibid.

²⁸⁷GS 50.

²⁸⁸AA 2. The duty of each Christian to participate in the apostolate and of the special role of parents is seen clearly relative to Baptism and the other sacraments of Initiation [Respectively, cf. General Introduction To Christian Initiation, Per initiationis Christiannae (second edition), 24 June, 1973, art. 7 and Introduction to the Rite of Infant Baptism, Nomine parvulorum (second edition), 24 June, 1973, art. 5. Both references are in Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1982), 24 and 30-31, respectively.

²⁸⁹Ibid., 30.

²⁹⁰The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church, 2.

Also, in 1977, the 4th General Assembly of the Committee For the Family gave the following theological task to the Papal Committee For the Family: “Promote the co-responsibility of the family in the pastoral mission of the Church, never simply as a right, but also as a duty. Assist the exercise of this responsibility, especially with regard to catechesis and liturgical life” (12).

²⁹¹Ibid., 4.

²⁹²Ibid., 7.

²⁹³Ibid., 5. The Committee also commented about the obstacles that families encounter in realizing a Christian vision of marriage and its family. Remarking on the unique problems in Europe and North America, it wrote:

The crisis which gravely affects the family in these countries arises directly from the development of a mentality which stresses material success, individualism, efficiency, technology that is becoming more and more refined, and the development of a life-style that stresses money, action and power. More and more, the authentic values of family life: love as gift of self, the generous acceptance of life, fidelity, permanence in married life, the spirit of sacrifice, are being regarded as less important and are being relegated to a secondary level. The stress placed on individual fulfillment, the strong pressures placed by the mass media on public opinion have weakened the impact of the teaching of the Church. The bishops of the West are aware of and sensitive to these situations which threaten and disorientate the family. . . . [which includes] the introduction of laws which contribute to the gradual destruction of the family by facilitating contraception, abortion, the removal of all restraints to sexual liberty, divorce, pornography, etc. (6).

The Papal Committee also identified numerous marital and familial issues which need further doctrinal reflection and a pastoral response (7-11). It looked for a common factor among many of the issues and formed this conclusion:

In fact, one can notice in all of them an excessive stress on individualism and on individual rights. One is passing almost unnoticed from a society which was based on the common good (and, as its counterpart, the responsibility of society to care for the support of the family unit) to a concept which attributes the primary position to the individual and his sovereign rights, thus justifying the situation just mentioned (9).

It seems that we have an important pastoral reason here for an ecclesial vision of Christian marriage and family life, i.e., it provides an antidote to the excessive individualism which undermines the Church’s mission to evangelize.

The family is so important to the evangelistic mission of the Church that the Committee makes the point that the seminary formation of priests should teach seminarians to help families become agents of evangelization: “Too often priests are

formed in seminaries for a ministry to individual, independently of their social milieu. It is necessary to help priests to be more attentive to the family as a social unit, and to the place of each of its members in the evangelical renewal of the family as the first milieu of life” (10).

²⁹⁴Ibid., 14.

²⁹⁵Ibid., 28.

²⁹⁶Ibid. Footnotes cited: “¹Pauli VI Adhort. Apost. *Evangelii nuntiandi*, n. 18: AAS 68 (1976), P. 17. ²Cfr. *ibid.*, n. 71, p. 60.”

²⁹⁷John Paul states this clearly in the introduction to the Christian family’s ecclesial task or function: “The family is placed at the service of the building up of the kingdom of God in history by participating in the life and mission of the church.” FC 49.

²⁹⁸FC 53.

²⁹⁹Ibid.

³⁰⁰Ibid., 54.

³⁰¹LG 10-13.

³⁰²LG 10.

³⁰³It is important to keep in mind that what is specified or proper to the spouses and family does not equal the total number of ways that they grow in holiness and participate in the mission and functions of the Church.

³⁰⁴As early as 1940, M. D. Koster suggested that the People of God is the "only and non-metaphorical objective designation of the Church." M. D. Koster, *Ekklesiologie im Werden* (1940), 143, quoted in Aloys Grillmeier, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Chapter II, The People of God," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I (1966), 153, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth and Richard Strachan (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

³⁰⁵In summarizing art. 9, the Council comes very close to defining the Church and its mission. It says: “God has gathered together as one all those who in faith look upon Jesus as the author of salvation and the source of unity and peace, and has established them as the Church, that for each and all she may be the visible sacrament of this saving unity.” It is to be remembered that the functions are derived from what the Church is and from its mission.

³⁰⁶Again, I reiterate the caution that many of the passages which I will cite to make my argument will not easily fit under one criterion. These descriptions may apply to multiple criteria.

³⁰⁷FC 17.

³⁰⁸Ibid.

³⁰⁹Ibid., 50.

³¹⁰These points are developed below where I summarize John Paul's development in FC of the Christian family's prophetic role.

³¹¹FC 55-62.

³¹²The following comments are from FC 55. See also LG 10-11.

³¹³Ibid., 56. The following comments are from FC 56.

³¹⁴Ibid. Quoted is The Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy [Sacrosanctum Concilium, SC], 59.

³¹⁵John Paul refers to GS 49 and 48 for this insight. He is correct. GS 49 is about true conjugal love. It has the power to move the spouses, their families, and others along the path of holiness. The undivided affection of the spouses and the use of the will to affect the good of the whole person combine to make genuine conjugal love "worthy of special gifts, healing, perfecting, and exalting gifts of grace and of charity."

³¹⁶The reference here is to LG 41, which states:

Married couples and Christian parents should follow their own proper path to holiness by faithful love, sustaining one another in grace throughout the entire length of their lives. They should imbue their offspring, lovingly welcomed from God, with Christian truths and evangelical virtues. For thus they can offer all men and example of unwearying and generous love, build up the brotherhood of charity, and stand as witnesses to and cooperators in the fruitfulness of Holy Mother Church. By such lives, they signify and share in that very love with which Christ loved His Bride and because of which He delivered Himself up on her behalf.

³¹⁷John Paul understands Christian conjugal love to be a gift of Jesus Christ. He quotes GS 48 in detail:

Jesus Christ 'abides with them so that just as he loved the church and handed himself over on her behalf, the spouses may love each other with perpetual fidelity through mutual self-bestowal . . . For this reason, Christian spouses have a special sacrament by which they are fortified and receive a kind of consecration in the duties and dignity of their state. By virtue of this sacrament, as spouses fulfill their

conjugal and family obligations they are penetrated with the spirit of Christ, who fills their whole lives with faith, hope and charity. Thus they increasingly advance toward their own perfection as well as toward their mutual sanctification, and hence contribute jointly to the glory of God’.

³¹⁸Here John Paul refers to 1 Pt 2:5 and LG 34. The latter refers to the spouses' and family's role in the lay apostolate.

³¹⁹FC 56.

³²⁰This summary is from FC 57.

³²¹This summary is from FC 58.

³²²John Paul II quotes Paul VI’s Humanae Vitae and gives the following reference: “Section 25: AAS 60 (1968), 499.” He also provides two other references: Eph 2:4 and his encyclical Dives in Misericordia, 13: AAS 72 (1980) 1218-1219.

³²³This summary is from FC 59.

³²⁴Ibid.

³²⁵Ibid., 60. Here John Paul II refers to the Vatican II document, “Declaration of Christian Education” (Gravissimum Educationis), 3, and to his own work Catechesi Tradendae, 36: AAS 71 (1979), 1308.

³²⁶This reference is endnote 152: “General Audience Address, Aug. 11, 1976: Insegnamenti di Paolo VI, XIV (1976), 640.”

³²⁷FC 61. The Following summary and quotes are from here.

³²⁸John Paul refers to SC 12.

³²⁹This summary is from FC 62.

³³⁰John Paul cites AA 4.

³³¹FC 48.

³³²FC 51-54.

³³³Ibid., 51. This summary is from art. 51.

³³⁴Obviously in Christian theology, faith is a gift and always begins with God’s initiative. Nonetheless, a person’s disposition is also a factor. A person does cooperate

with God's grace by disposing oneself in and through a welcoming attitude, i.e., "openness" or "docility" to the Spirit.

³³⁵In a sense believers begin their preparation for the married state in the same way that most believers do: beginning with their baptism and nurtured in their Christian upbringing, believers are to offer "the obedience of faith." See FC 51.

³³⁶FC 52. John Paul quotes extensively from EN 71 and refers to his earlier address at Puebla. Cf. Address to the Third General Assembly of the Bishops of Latin America (Jan. 28, 1979), IV A: AAS 71 (1979), 204. John Paul also refers to LG 35 when he states: "Particularly today the Christian family has a special vocation to witness to the paschal covenant of Christ by constantly radiating the joy of love and the certainty of the hope for which it must give account: 'The Christian family loudly proclaims both the present virtues of the kingdom of God and the hope of a blessed life to come'."

³³⁷Ibid.

³³⁸Ibid.

³³⁹John Paul inserts into his text a quote from his Catechesi Tradendae, 68: AAS 71 (1979), 1334: "In places where anti-religious legislation endeavors even to prevent education in the faith, and in places where widespread unbelief or invasive secularism makes real religious growth practically impossible, 'the church of the home' remains the one place where children and young people can receive an authentic catechesis."

³⁴⁰FC 53. Comments which follow in the text are from art. 53. Cf. The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church, 11. The Papal Committee on the Family noticed the situation that Catholics often neglect the Catholic vision for marriage and family life when deliberating about responsible parenthood or when in mixed marriages. This situation is obviously to be remedied. The remedy is to include doctrine and the call to conversion in all pastoral work. The Committee explains it this way:

But over and above ignorance, a great deal of confusion exists in the pastoral area. One cannot have a pastoral approach that is disassociated from doctrine. Both aspects must remain rigorously united. The position of the Church must be presented in all its clarity; all critical situations must be explained in the light of the doctrine; pastoral work should never abandon the effort of conversion and of support which is demanded by faith in Christ.

³⁴¹John Paul again refers to Catechesi Tradendae. There in art. 36 he describes how this service begins from the earliest days of childhood:

One moment that is often decisive is the one at which the very young child receives the first elements of catechesis from its parents and the family surroundings. These elements will perhaps be no more than a simple revelation of a good and provident Father in heaven to whom the child learns to turn its heart. The very short prayers that the child learns to lisp will be the start of a loving dialogue with this hidden

God whose word it will then begin to hear. I cannot insist too strongly on this early initiation by Christian parents in which the child's faculties are integrated into a living relationship with God. It is a work of prime importance. It demands great love and profound respect for the child who has a right to a simple and true presentation of the Christian faith.

³⁴²Cf., AA 11.

³⁴³See also the Declaration on Christian Education, arts. 6-8, regarding the parents' duty and right toward the education and the development of their children and the partnership parents have with the larger church, Catholic schools, and civil society in this venture.

³⁴⁴FC 54. Comments which follow are from this article.

³⁴⁵John Paul supports this assertion by citing LG 35, and AA 11. In LG 35, the Council is extolling the dignity and the necessity of the lay apostolate, i.e., for the laity to go forth as heralds of the faith. The Council gives prime consideration to the domestic Church. It states:

In connection with this function [the prophetic], that state of life which is sanctified by a special sacrament is obviously of great value, namely, married and family life. For where Christianity pervades a whole way of life and ever increasingly transforms it, there will exist both the practice and an excellent school of the lay apostolate. In such a home, husband and wife find their proper vocation in being witnesses to one another and to their children of faith in Christ and love for Him. The Christian family loudly proclaims both the present virtues of the kingdom of God and the hope of a blessed life to come. Thus by its example and its witness it accuses the world of sin and enlightens those who seek the truth.

In AA 11 the Council is practically providing a partial commentary of LG 11. In other words, one finds in AA 11 an expansion of the matrimonial seed text (LG 11) and one would do well to read all of AA 11. While LG 11 provides a theological perspective of the ecclesial vision of marriage and its family, AA 11 provides a pastoral perspective of this vision. For example, AA 11 states:

The family has received from God its mission to be the first and vital cell of society. It will fulfill this mission if it shows itself to be the domestic sanctuary of the Church through the mutual affection of its members and the common prayer they offer to God, if the whole family is caught up in the liturgical worship of the Church, and if it provides active hospitality and promotes justice and other good works for the service of all the brethren in need. Among the multiple activities of the family apostolate may be enumerated the following; the adoption of abandoned infants, hospitality to strangers, assistance in the operation of schools, helpful advice and material assistance for adolescents, help to engaged couples in preparing themselves better for marriage, catechetical work, support of married couples and families involved in material and moral crises, help for the aged not

only by providing them with the necessities of life but also by obtaining for them a fair share of the benefits of economic progress.

³⁴⁶John Paul cites AA 30 and AG 39. In AA 30 the Council states that the formation for the apostolate is to begin with a child's earliest education. It is the parents' proper role to initiate this life-long formation, especially by their example. They do this by "training their children from childhood to recognize God's love for all men . . . little by little to show concern for the material and spiritual needs of their neighbor."

From the two cited passages it is easy to understand how profoundly significant the simple act of love for others can be. One can see from these how the sin of racism and other sins against people are sins which hinder the evangelistic mission of the Church.

³⁴⁷FC 63. The following comments are from this article.

³⁴⁸John Paul cites LG 36.

³⁴⁹FC 64. The following comments are based upon this article.

³⁵⁰John Paul refers the reader to cf. AA 8, and the Synod of Bishops' Message to Christian Families (Oct. 24, 1980), 12. See also LG 41.

NOTES - CHAPTER FOUR

³⁵¹Karl Rahner, "Marriage As a Sacrament," Theological Investigations, vol. 10, trans. David Bourke (New York: Seabury Press, 1977; first trans., 1973): 199-221. This is the article which compelled me to begin thinking about the Christian family as a church unit. Rahner maintains that a sacrament is "an event in which the Church realizes her own nature and thereby 'actualizes' herself" (201). Marriage as the manifestation of married love is an event of grace achieving union with mankind and God, and for believers it has a sacramental character. Significantly, Rahner states that "the term 'Church-house', signifying the sort of local Church which is constituted by a family unit, is more than a mere pious image" (212). After his analysis of the famous Eph. 5 passage, Rahner concludes:

Genuine Christian marriage has at all times the force of a real representation of the unifying love of God in Christ for mankind. In marriage the Church is made present. It is really the smallest community, the smallest, but at the same time the true community of the redeemed and the sanctified, the unity among whom can still be built up on the same basis on which the unity of the Church is founded, in other words the smallest, but at the same time the genuine individual Church. (221)

³⁵²Michael Schmaus, The Church: Its Origin and Structure, vol. 4, Dogma (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, 1984), ix.

³⁵³For a thorough development of the concept and of the application of the notion of family perspective see Ad Hoc Committee on Marriage and Family Life, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, A Family Perspective in Church and Society: A Manual For All Pastoral Leaders (Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference: Washington, D.C., 1988). By family perspective, the committee means: “1. Viewing individuals in the context of their family relationships and their other social relationships” and “2. Using family relationships as a criterion to assess the impact of the Church’s and society’s policies, programs, ministries, and services” (8). An excellent bibliography is included in this manual.

³⁵⁴Gerard Pottebaum and Marilyn Wickel, Bread of Life: Gospels/Year C (Loveland, Ohio: Treehaus Communications, 1997).

³⁵⁵James G. Stemler, “Trends in the American Marriage and Family,” The Jurist 42 (1982): 110. In Stemler’s section, “The Changing Functions of the Family,” he shows that the number of functions provided by the family has decreased through the centuries. Basically, the family teaches the culture to the young, but it shares this function with other institutions. Families and marriages are held together largely by two functions: “being a consuming unit, dependent upon the nature of the economy; and meeting the need for intimate personal relationships.” The decline in functions makes the family and marriage very susceptible to external changes. Disruption in either of the two above functions can increase the probability of disruption of the family itself. Thus, the family is “fragile” in our society.

I think this fragile situation has implications for pastoral practice. Regarding function one, “being a consuming unit, dependent upon the nature of the economy,” the Church needs a strong social justice prophetic voice. A family must be taught to communicate about its lifestyle so that the implications of its lifestyle will become clear. An unbridled compulsion to consume can likely lead to the destruction of the marriage and family; and I dare say, will have serious impact on the larger Church and Society. I believe unrestrained consumption leads to reducing, rather than improving, the genuine quality of life. It can lead to an overcrowding of our lives that leaves little room for the manifestation of grace: loving interpersonal relationships, beauty, generosity, and the fruits of the Holy Spirit. I believe this will also diminish our ability to live sacramentally, and consequently, reduce the quality of our public worship. If the Church takes a strong prophetic stance, as it has done with the United States Bishops’ pastorals on War and Peace and on the Economy, the Church simultaneously does its duty and jeopardizes its popularity.

The second function, “meeting the need for intimate personal relationships,” also has implications. Stemler notes in his section, “Divorce,” that a major factor which probably influences the divorce rate is the extent to which our society idealizes romantic love (117). Many couples fail to make a transition from a “romantic love” to a new type of love referred to as a “caring love.” Stemler concludes this section with the insight that “couples with more practical expectations are more satisfied with their marriages than those expecting a high degree of loving and a highly expressive relationship” (117).

I think Christianity can help with growth in genuine love by continuously pointing beyond people to God. Religion has the responsibility to warn against idol worship. Couples and families need to be reminded that the crowning fulfillment of life can come from nothing earthly minded. Toward this end, we need to recapture for married life its eschatological dimension. Also, the teaching on the Supernatural, although difficult, can be immensely helpful [see Henri DeLubac, esp. The Mystery of the Supernatural, trans. Rosemary Sheed (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966)]. I suspect that a correlation of married love, one of the deepest expressions of personal love as “mutual gift-giving,” and the “Supernatural” as “gift-giving” can be illuminating. DeLubac does, in fact, use an analogy of “gift-giving” to explain his theology of grace. Some examples follow. First, grace is a gift. Second, although we must use analogies in order to understand, we must always recognize the limitations of the analogies and not confuse the analogies for the reality: particularly, when the analogies apply to the Supernatural. Thus, to suggest that the Supernatural is a gift requires one to find an analogy for the giving of the gift. DeLubac suggests human gift-giving. A truly free-giving of a gift implies that the giver is free from any demands or debts, that is, the giver is free to withhold the gift. When humans give to one another the implication is that there already exists an ‘I’ or a ‘self’ to receive the gift. This analogy is helpful because it gets us started, for example, it makes the point of the giver having no obligation to give the gift. But the limitations of the analogy soon become evident when we apply it to God. For example, God and human beings are not equal. When God gives the gift of the supernatural there exists no “I” or ‘self’ to receive the gift. When God creates he gives the gift of myself to myself--not only initially but also continuously. Furthermore, God imprints my self with a supernatural finality (keep in mind that the imprinting is different from the possessing), and God offers the gift of the supernatural finality. These three phases--gives myself to myself, imprints myself with a supernatural finality, and offers the gift of a supernatural finality--should not be considered as successive moments with time in between each act. Divine gift-giving is different from human gift-giving. The divine is not subject to time as humans, but creates absolutely.

For example, this deepest of personal loves (married love) can take us to the limits of human love, but by itself it does not have the power to grant us all that we desire; but, it can serve as a springboard to an other-worldly love, which is given as a gift by the Transcendent. The point of all this is that married/familial love cannot be completely satisfying. The experience of a satisfying “married/familial love” points to a greater end, who is God.

Although the Stemler article claims that marriage is fragile, it does not claim that the dissolution of the institution of family is upon us. Cf. William C. McCready, “Marriage As an Institution of Socialization,” Chicago Studies 18 (Fall, 1979): 297-310. In McCready’s longitudinal study McCready claims that we are becoming a nation of families. Even people who divorce are likely to remarry. A satisfying family life is a major factor which influences one’s sense of well-being. Thus, family is an important value to which the Church can appeal when addressing society. Unfortunately, McCready also documents that in the sixties and seventies a major change occurred in the relationship between religion and marriage. American Catholics are disassociating religion and marriage. Both realities, religion and marriage, are important to Catholic

couples but the high majority no longer see the Church as the repository of religious inspiration for married couples. The Church has lost credibility on marriage, family, and sexuality issues.

Almost three-quarters of the Catholic population think that remarriage after divorce should not be considered wrong, and about the same majority feel that husbands and wives do not have to intend procreation at every act of intercourse, pleasure alone is sufficient motive. Two-fifths approve of sexual relations between engaged people and more than two-thirds think the Church does not have the right to teach about the means for family limitation (305).

In between 1963 and 1974 the percent approving of artificial contraception changed from 45 percent to 83 percent. American Catholics have chosen to ignore the Popes about sexuality, but are choosing to stay in the Church.

In addition to dispelling the notion that the family is in dissolution, McCready dispels two other false stereotypes: that life gets worse with age and that intimacy decreases with age. Two research projects have shown that life gets better; and second, life gets better if you are committed to a quest. The key insight is that a close intimate relationship is a prerequisite for it doing so. When intimacy deteriorates into boredom and apathy it frequently happens because of two barriers to intimate physical sexuality in marriage: shame and the fear of passion. Couples who appear to be successful at long-term sexual intimacy are characterized by at least two properties: "a) they have overcome a debilitating sense of shame regarding their own sexual nature, and b) they have nurtured and refined their sense of 'passion' with the result that they have increased the sexually oriented communication skills" (308).

According to McCready, sociologically speaking, marriage is an extension of the socialization begun in childhood. "It is one of the ways in which people confirm their maturity and express the adult virtue of caring for the future" (309). Marriage is closely related to religion because "the very nature of the intimacy pushes us to believe, ever so tentatively, in a hopeful cosmos, one in which life can go on forever" (310). This process is a religious one and the Church can help couples by teaching them to deal with shame and passion. Is the Church up to the task?

Mary Durkin, using a process theology starting-point, provides another view of the family in relationship to economics and intimacy ["Intimacy and Marriage: Continuing the Mystery of Christ and the Church," *Concilium* 121 (1979): 74-81]. After a brief sketch of the historical development of marriage, Durkin shows that in advanced technological societies it is only within the last 200 years that a need for the economic survival of the individual, the family, and the society at large has not been the primary motive for marriage. Durkin claims that most people in these societies marry because of love. In contemporary society there are critics who claim a life-long commitment of two people is too demanding and those who claim it is still possible. She reflects critically on these two positions, then concludes: "We acknowledge that the Christian community (the Church) can intuit a connectedness between the fidelity and love needed to achieve intimacy in contemporary marriage and the mystery of Christ and the Church; and therefore, can legitimately continue to consider marriage a sacrament. It must also recognize that many particular marital unions, even between baptized Christians, do not and cannot achieve a capacity for marriage" (80).

³⁵⁶See Leonardo Boff, "The Sacrament of Marriage," Concilium 87 (1973): 22-33. Boff's starting point is that marriage is a mystery and that it is on this level that marriage takes on its sacramental character, and also in this mystery dimension that marriage can be seen as a matter of grace and salvation. Boff relies on G. van der Leeuw's insights about human beings as beings who are capable of thinking sacramentally-- ". . . everything has to be a sign, symbol, or image of a higher reality" (24)--and that marriage is a natural sacrament.

According to Boff, this latter insight implies that "in some ways the end of marriage is not mutual comfort or procreation, but the salvation to be found through it" (26). Thus, whenever there is genuine love between the married couple there will also be the grace of God, which makes human love possible: ". . . keeping it [love] open in its transcendence and ensuring that, through the love of one person for another, God's saving action is brought about" (27). In other words marriage ultimately expresses God's love for humankind.

Also, according to Boff, to discover what is specific about Christian marriage one cannot look to the structure and pattern of marriage as an organization. Rather, one must look to how Christ and the Church places the natural sacrament of marriage in a context of special relationship to the Christian mystery. Paul captures this clearly for us by saying marriage among Christians is to be a marrying in the Lord (1 Cor. 7:39). Boff then proceeds with an exegesis of Eph. 5 and Col. 1. "What belongs specifically to Christian marriage is the full revelation, in Christ and the Church, of the ultimate meaning of love in the created order between husband and wife: the love of Christ and his saving covenant with mankind, particularly with the believing section of mankind, the Church. The sacrament of marriage is a moment and a particular means of realizing the primordial sacrament that is the Church, confers ex opere operato the grace of God that is always and indefectibly present in the Church" (31). Just as there are various degrees of explicitness in the Church realizing itself so too in marriage there are various degrees of explicitness in expressing its sacramental character. Boff concludes that marriage is a "domestic Church." The Rahnerian influence is quite apparent here.

³⁵⁷Regarding the family's role in shaping identity, see James P. Hanigan, As I Have Loved You: The Challenge of Christian Ethics (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 81-92.

³⁵⁸Leonard Doohan, The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1984), chap. 3, pp. 62-89. He concludes this chapter, "The Church As Family," with the following paragraph:

Catholic ecclesiology has generally been descending, both in that its teachings are deduced from revealed principles and in its hierarchical structures. But this present emphasis on family implies that there is also an ascending component to a Catholic ecclesiology. Laity have much to contribute to Church life, for Church is constituted by the Lord on values by which the laity live each day. The Church is a community of communities, a family of families (89).

³⁵⁹This does not suggest that a Christian family can have only an ecclesial identity. One must respect that relationships are complex and interrelated. Thus, a person can be associated with numerous groups and have diverse responsibilities in each group. However, a proper understanding of sacraments must have a Christological and ecclesial foundation. Thus, we are Christians and Church in a core way. The Christian family has a fundamental role in shaping this ecclesial identity in its members. Regarding the family's role in shaping identity, see Hanigan, As I Have Loved You, 81-92. Also, see James P. Hanigan, Homosexuality: The Test Case for Christian Sexual Ethics (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 187-88, where Hanigan highlights the critical relationship between identity and behavior when he speaks about the relationship between personal and vocational identities and sexual behaviors. More specifically, he states:

While human sexuality faces all of us with the same challenge, experience and vocational possibility, it also makes different vocational choices available and necessary. As was explained at some length in Chapter IV, different sexual behaviors are appropriate to different sexual vocations. The virtue of chastity has a different material content in different sexual ways of life (Chapter V). But this difference in the norms of sexual morality appropriate to different vocations is not based on the difference between male and female, or on the difference between homosexual and heterosexual orientation, and still less on such difference as those of class, race, religion or ethnic origin. Rather the difference in the sexual behaviors morally appropriate to different individuals is rooted in the differences in their personal and vocational identities, and ultimately, of course, have their foundation in the graces God gives to each individual. This diversity in vocation, and so in sexual behaviors proper to a particular vocation, does not negate the universal applicability of the sexual ethic proposed in this book. For all vocations can be equally paths to holiness for those called to adventure upon them, and the essence of the sexual ethic I have argued for is vocational fidelity.

³⁶⁰Schmaus, The Church: Its Origin and Structure, ix-x.

³⁶¹1 Cor. 15:28.

³⁶²Hanigan, Homosexuality: The Test Case for Christian Sexual Ethics, 191. Hanigan provides the following endnote regarding God's will for all: "1. The classical biblical text in regard to God's desire that all be saved is 1 Tim. 2:1-6. See also Karl Rahner, "Universal Salvific Will," Sacramentum Mundi V, ed. Karl Rahner, *et al.* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970, pp. 405-409."

³⁶³Mk. 8:34-9:1; Mt. 16:24-28; Lk. 9:23-27.

³⁶⁴See 2 Cor. 5.

³⁶⁵Jesus also deabsolutizes the family by putting the emphasis on "doing" the Father's will. See Mt. 12:46-50.

³⁶⁶For a thorough and illuminating exposition of this point, see Worgul, From Magic To Metaphor, chapter 11, “Sacraments and Ecclesial Root Metaphors,” 184-95. According to Worgul, Christian communities are cultures within humankind. Root metaphors are the life-force of a culture, and ritual is the vehicle for the transmission of metaphors (185). In Christianity, we call our chief rituals sacraments. The paschal mystery is the root metaphor of Christianity:

There are distinctive values in examining Christian sacraments in relation to root metaphors. First, the specificity and uniqueness of the Christian world view becomes obvious. Believers can become so caught up in the multiple issues of sacramentology that a vision of the whole is omitted. In relating Christian sacraments to root metaphors, one is brought face to face with the heart of Christian faith and the heart of sacramentology i.e., the death and resurrection of Jesus. Second, the relation of sacraments and root metaphors clarifies the real purpose of sacraments. Since the expression of root metaphors is ritual’s primary function, the main purpose of sacraments is to proclaim, make present, and realize the effects of Christ’s death and resurrection. There are, no doubt, many reasons why people participate in sacraments. The main reason, however, should be contact with the charter-event which encompasses all the experiences of life, interprets them, and gives them meaning beneath the Christian paradigm of the Paschal mystery. Sacraments offer this contact in and through the ritualizing Christian community. Third, in relating sacraments to root metaphors, a theological framework emerges which does justice to both the anthropological and theological dimensions of ritual in general and Christian ritual in particular. This framework permits a real interrelatedness and essential bond between human symbolic activity, the Christological and ecclesiological foundation of sacramentology, and the interpersonal-communal character of grace (195).

Since Worgul uses “root metaphor” in a highly technical sense, we turn to his own words for a description:

Root metaphors are analogical, primordial, and operational. As analogical, they attempt to comprehend, relate, and resolve the multiple facets of experienced reality in terms of one element which is selected as the “clue,” “model,” or paradigm for the total network or system. As primordial, they fall within the category of “first principles” or *creencias*. They are the foundations for the whole system of thought and action within a culture, without necessarily being available in conscious reflection or common sense. They are similar to cultural archetypes buried deep within the cultural unconscious. As operational, root metaphors are the focal points or nodal images of the social drama. They are expressed in the social structure and await new birth in the anti-structure. Their operational character is correlational rather than juxtapositional (184-85).

³⁶⁷Jn. 15:1-17.

³⁶⁸Gal. 5:22-23.

³⁶⁹See Mt. 7:24-27 and Lk. 6:47-49.

³⁷⁰Hanigan, As I Have Loved You, 72. Hanigan clearly and simply contrasts these two terms:

In the New Testament two Greek words are used to refer to conversion. One word, metanoia, means literally to have a change of mind and heart. If taken seriously, this means that we are called to think differently, to understand life in all its complexity in a new way, to put on the mind of Christ. It does not ask us to be blind to what we already see or to falsify what we know, but to see more deeply and more truthfully what is there to be seen, the grace and glory of God at work among us, as well as the power of sin to mar and distort reality. It asks us to evaluate and love life differently, to embrace what before we found distasteful, or to reorder our priorities so that what was once of small importance becomes of greater importance.

The second word for conversion, epistrephein, means literally to turn oneself around physically, to turn away from this and toward that. In the New Testament context, to turn away, for example, from the fishing boats and, leaving them behind, to turn toward and follow Jesus. When one turns oneself around physically, what happens is that one sees the world from a new perspective, one directs one's attention and interest in a new direction. It is this turning, this new way of attending to and intending that is the beginning of, and an ongoing need in, the Christian life.

³⁷¹For a thought provoking article on the need for faith in Christian marriage, see Ladislav Orsy, "Faith, Sacrament, Contract, and Christian Marriage: Disputed Questions," Theological Studies 43 (1983): 379-98. Orsy addresses two questions concerning marriage: first, is faith necessary to receive the sacrament of marriage; and second, can the marriage contract be separated from the sacrament of marriage? Orsy begins his exposition by placing the questions into a context. The context is the Catholic tradition of the uniquely sacred nature of Christian marriage. From within this context Orsy clearly shows that the two disputed questions are closely connected. Orsy's presupposition is that the belief that marriage is an "event of salvation and sanctification is the clue to understanding the debated issues and their resolution" (379). He concludes his article by pointing to other urgent needs in theological and legal research of Christian marriage.

A few more comments from Orsy's article can further illuminate my thesis that Christian marriage is the beginning of a small church. To establish the context for the two disputed questions Orsy gives a brief historical survey of Christian marriage. The purpose of the survey is to recall the uniqueness of Christian marriage in our tradition primarily through the norms of Scripture and Tradition. Relative to my thesis, the most significant point in his scriptural survey is that the doctrine of Ephesians, which is usually rendered as "Christian marriage is the symbol of love of Christ for the Church," would be more accurately rendered by the theme "that the bond between the husband and the wife is rooted in the bond which binds Christ to his Church . . . the union of man and wife, if they are believers, is much more than an external sign of the 'great mystery'." Paul's intuitive insight has led the more alert theologians to speak of Christian marriage as the beginning of a small ecclesia" (381). The most significant point in his Vatican II

survey is that the sacrament of marriage is called a covenant. There is the bilateral covenant between husband and wife and the unilateral covenant of God giving and the couple receiving. "In Christian marriage God covenants with the couple before they can covenant with each other" (382).

Regarding the faith and sacrament issues, Orsy asks: "Is faith necessary to receive the sacrament? More practically it can be restated: what should the Church do if baptized unbelievers (no faith in the Christian mysteries) wish to marry in Catholic form? Because the Code of 1917 and the new Code of Canon Law still equate a baptized person with a Christian person, Canon Law provides no answer. Theology, represented by the International Theological Commission, proposes a firm answer that faith is necessary to receive the sacrament: ". . . a grown-up person cannot be considered Christian in the full sense of the term unless he has responsibly and freely accepted the reality of Christian mysteries--that is, unless he holds the Christian revelation for true" (385). Orsy's opinion is that faith is necessary to receive the sacrament. The present state of affairs is that there is a conflict between the canonical norms and theology. Orsy foresees that the coming years will be ones of development in the application and interpretation of the law, because the theological insight of the requirement of faith is solidly established.

Next, Orsy raises the question whether "contract" can be separated from sacrament? More practically it can be stated: "Can baptized persons make the marital promises on merely human terms, without the covenant 'being raised to the dignity of a sacrament'?" (387). For the case of two baptized believers to speak of separating the contract from the sacrament does not make sense. For the case of two baptized unbelievers Orsy claims "baptized Christians can indeed marry without receiving the sacrament" (390). Orsy recognizes his opinion is in conflict with both present Church practice and the Theological Commission, which hold that nonsacramental unions of baptized persons cannot be recognized as marriages. Orsy favors "progressive marriages" and gives the example of the Diocese of Autun, France, as an experiment for various forms of marriage (civil, welcomed civil, and sacramental). Orsy contends the contract and the sacrament are not notionally identical (394).

³⁷²Bernard Lonergan, Method in Theology (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), 115.

³⁷³Both the initiative of God's self-bestowal and the person's acceptance in freedom are required for a genuine event of salvation. See Rahner, "Marriage As a Sacrament," 201-2.

³⁷⁴Lonergan, Method in Theology, 238.

³⁷⁵Ibid., 130.

³⁷⁶Ibid., 271.

³⁷⁷Ibid., 130.

³⁷⁸Ibid.

³⁷⁹Ibid.

³⁸⁰Ibid., 271.

³⁸¹Ibid., 284.

³⁸²Ibid., 238.

³⁸³Ibid., 9.

³⁸⁴Ibid., 241.

³⁸⁵Ibid., 106.

³⁸⁶Ibid., 9.

³⁸⁷Ibid., 241.

³⁸⁸Walter E. Conn, Conscience: Development and Self-Transcendence (Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1981), 185.

³⁸⁹Lonergan, 241.

³⁹⁰Ibid., 240-41.

³⁹¹Ibid., 106, 240, citing D. M. Brown, Ultimate Concern: Tillich in Dialogue (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

³⁹²Ibid., 240.

³⁹³Ibid., 105-6.

³⁹⁴Ibid., 106.

³⁹⁵Ibid., 241-42.

³⁹⁶Walter Conn writes that affective self-transcendence is a conversion to being-in-love, which is not necessarily an other-worldly love. Conscience, 188.

³⁹⁷Lonergan, 289.

³⁹⁸After explaining that the various types of conversion are related by sublation, Lonergan immediately cautions against making an incorrect inference regarding the

sequence of conversions. One cannot infer that one experiences intellectual conversion first; then experiences moral conversion, and finally religious conversion. Rather, he states:

On the contrary, from a causal viewpoint, one would say that first there is God's gift of his love. Next, the eye of this love reveals values in their splendor, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion. Finally, among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths taught by the religious tradition, and in such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion. For the word, spoken and heard, proceeds from and penetrates to all four levels of intentional consciousness. Its content is not just a content of experience but a content of experience and understanding and judging and deciding. The analogy of sight yields the cognitional myth. But fidelity to the word engages the whole man (243).

Conn works out an account for a variety of sequences of conversion, and he concludes that it is more accurate to speak of sublation of levels of consciousness rather than sublation of conversions (188-94). Donald Gelpi agrees that there can be a variety of sequences in the order of conversions. His explanation emphasizes the integration of the four conversions, which he calls the process of a four-fold integral conversion. He allows for a person to enter the conversion process at any one of the conversions. The authenticity of a particular conversion is judged by an individual's commitment to grow in the other forms of conversion. See Charism and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Conversion, (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 19.

³⁹⁹Lonergan, 289.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., 269.

⁴⁰²Ibid.

⁴⁰³Ibid., 364.

⁴⁰⁴I am not using the term Church and People of God in the broadest sense of all of humanity since we all are children of God by creation nor am I referring to what the Church signifies. For example, according to Rahner, "Marriage As a Sacrament," Church "is also the basic sacrament of grace and of the love which unites us all precisely in virtue of the fact that in her a *social* unity of truth, hope and love is brought about among men in themselves" (211). Here I am using the narrow sense and am referring to Church in its sign function of her unity with Christ as described by Rahner:

. . . We shall put forward the following proposition: the same 'sign' function which is found in marriage is also present in the Church. For the Church is, in Christ, the arch-sacrament, the basic sacrament: in him the love of God for mankind in his act of self-bestowal achieves its historical manifestation through grace in the loving unity of mankind. . . . Here too the sign ('Church as basic sacrament') and the

reality signified are not simply identical. For what the Church points to is not herself. Rather as sign, i.e., as a socially organized community constituted by a common creed, a common cult and common works of charity, she is precisely the sign of that humanity, consecrated and united by grace (in interior faith and justification), the grace-given unity of which extends beyond the social organism of the Church (210-11).

⁴⁰⁵Ibid., 219. Cf, Eph. 5. According to Rahner “covenant” gives creation direction toward a goal. The goal is Christ “in whose being and work precisely this imparting of grace finds its eschatological culmination and manifestation.” In other words, by the order of creation (Gen. 2), genuine marriage has “the significance of pointing forwards to this order of grace.” “Covenant,” however, gives direction to marriage in general and gives it the character of unmerited grace. This has far reaching consequences not only for “marriage in the Lord,” but for all morality: “This means that objectively speaking everything that takes place in terms of human morality has a hidden relationship to Christ. . . . Because he is the goal of it all he provides the basis for the whole dynamism of human history as imparted to it through grace, impelling it towards the immediacy of God.”

⁴⁰⁶LG 11.

⁴⁰⁷It must be kept in mind that as I develop this correlation between religious conversion and married love that I do not claim that this is the case only for the religiously converted. I am simply doing an inquiry which is considering the case for Christian religiously converted people who marry. I am not dealing with canonical issues, e.g., the conditions that are needed for a marriage to be a sacrament. I am purposely limiting the scope of my inquiry because I do think the larger Church can improve significantly the quality of its initiation ministry, i.e., to initiate in a manner which disposes people to experience religious conversion as a significant transformative experience. In any case, I have been building the case that the correlation of religious conversion and married love is worth doing because it has a crucial implication for the way Roman Catholics do initiation ministry and other sacramental preparation in the parish. See my concluding “key” suggestion at the end of this chapter.

⁴⁰⁸The following statistical information was gleaned from the March 1997 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau. "Households by Type," Internet release date, May 28, 1998, see <http://www.census.gov/p...emo/hh-fam/htabHH-1.txt>.

⁴⁰⁹March 1997 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau. "Households by Type," Last revised: September 29, 1997, see <http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/pub/1997/hhldtype.htm>.

⁴¹⁰"Marriage," Monthly Vital Statistics Report (1996), Vol. 45, No. 12. Reference acquired from National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), FASTATS, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchswww/fastats/marriage.htm>.

⁴¹¹Ibid., Monthly Vital Statistics Report (1990), Vol. 43, No. 12 Supplement. Reference acquired from NCHS, FASTATS.

⁴¹²NCHS, FASTATS, source is unpublished data, 1988.
<http://www.cdc.gov/nchswww/fastats/divorce.htm>.

⁴¹³Monthly Vital Statistics Report (1990), Vol. 43, No. 12 Supplement. Reference acquired from NCHS FASTATS.

⁴¹⁴Ken Bryson and Lynne Casper, "Family Composition Begins to Stabilize in the 1990s," U.S. Census Bureau, Press Release, May 28, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/cb98-88.html>. Ken Bryson, co-author of the report, stated: "For example, the percentage of married couples with children fell from 50 percent to 37 percent of all families between 1970 and 1990. It only dropped 1 percentage points (to 36 percent)."

⁴¹⁵United States Almanac, 1995. In Microsoft Expedia.com., <http://expedia.msn.com/wq/places/United States/BGSHBD.htm>.

⁴¹⁶For a broader understanding and description of cohabitation see Arlene Skolnick, Embattled Paradise: The American Family in an Age of Uncertainty (New York: BasicBooks, 1991), 90-95.

⁴¹⁷Ibid., 90.

⁴¹⁸Tom W. Smith, "Changes in Families and Family Values: Report Prepared for the National Italian American Foundation," (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, August, 1997), 2, citing Frances K. Goldscheider and Linda J. Waite, New Families, No Families? The Transformation of the American Home (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

⁴¹⁹Ibid., 2-4.

⁴²⁰Ibid., 2.

⁴²¹Ibid. See also Table 2A & 2B, p. 15.

⁴²²Ibid., 8.

⁴²³Ibid., 2.

⁴²⁴Ibid.

⁴²⁵Ibid., 8.

⁴²⁶Ibid., 3.

⁴²⁷Ibid., 6.

⁴²⁸Ibid., 13.

⁴²⁹Wade Horn and Andrew Bush, Fathers, Marriage, and Welfare Reform (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hudson Institute, 1997).

⁴³⁰Ibid., esp. 11-14.

⁴³¹Ibid., 14.

⁴³²Ibid., 20-22.

⁴³³Ibid., 20-29. The authors give six major recommendations and include strategic steps to realize the recommendations. The six recommendations follow:

1. Privilege marriage in the distribution of welfare benefits;
2. Increase the marriage potential of low-income males by increasing their workforce attachment;
3. Increase the opportunity costs for men who father children out of wedlock;
4. When births do occur out of wedlock, do more to encourage adoption as a first option rather than a last resort;
5. Transform the child support enforcement program into a father-involvement program; and,
6. Rigorously measure the impact of welfare reform on families.

⁴³⁴Norval Glenn, Closed Hearts, Closed Minds: The Textbook Story of Marriage (New York: The Council on Families, Institute on American Values, 1997), 3.

⁴³⁵Ibid.

⁴³⁶Ibid., 10f.

⁴³⁷Ibid., 14.

⁴³⁸Ibid., 16-18.

⁴³⁹Ibid., 19.

⁴⁴⁰Gabriel Marcel, Homo Viator: Introduction to a Metaphysic of Hope, trans. Emma Craufurd (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951; Harper Torchbook, 1962), 69-72. Of particular pertinence is the chapter "The Mystery of the Family," 68-97, which is dated March - May, 1942.

⁴⁴¹Lk. 15:11-32.

⁴⁴²National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States of America, Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults. Study Edition. (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1988), art. 1. “The rite of Christian initiation presented here is designed for adults who, after hearing the mystery of Christ proclaimed, consciously and freely seek the living God and enter the way of faith and conversion as the Holy Spirit opens their hearts. By God’s help they will be strengthened spiritually during their preparation and at the proper time will receive the sacraments fruitfully.” See also arts. 4, 6, 7, 8, 41, and 42. Article 42 is particularly instructive (note the “signs” used to verify conversion):

The prerequisite for making this first step is that the beginnings of the spiritual life and the fundamentals of Christian teaching have taken root in the candidates. Thus there must be evidence of the first faith that was conceived during the period of evangelization and precatechumenate and of an initial conversion and intention to change their lives and to enter into a relationship with God in Christ. Consequently, there must also be evidence of the first stirrings of repentance, a start to the practice of calling upon God in prayer, as sense of the Church, and some experience of the company and spirit of Christians through contact with a priest or with members of the community. The candidates should also be instructed about the celebration of the liturgical rite of acceptance.

⁴⁴³Rahner, “Marriage As a Sacrament,” esp. 213-21. Marriage in general is a sign of married love, “the most intimate and personal unity in love between two individuals (of different sexes)” (203). Also genuine married love, i.e., before it attains its sacramental significance, “[is] of its very nature and on the basis of the grace of God which sustains it, a state in which we achieve union with mankind, impelled as it is by the selfsame grace. It follows, then, that right from its very origins married love, if its true nature is really attained to, also constitutes a relationship with God, an event of grace, a loving concord with that basic movement in which, through grace, mankind considered as the people of God arrives at the unity of the kingdom of God” (209). Thus, speaking of marriage in general, Rahner says “Marriage . . . is the sign of *that* love which is designed in God’s sight to be the event of grace and a love that is open to all” (209). Thus, deepening his reflection, Rahner states that marriage in general also effects the unity of the Church: “*the love that unites married spouses contributes to the unity of the Church herself because it is one of the ways in which the unifying love of the Church is made actual. It is just as much formative of the Church as sustained by the Church*” (212). Rahner also observes that love in the Church and love in marriage have a common root:

For marriage as such is, taken as a whole, the manifestation which is creative of *that precise* love which, as the love of God and for God in the divine act of self-bestowal, is constitutive of the union of mankind with one another and with God, and constitutive too of the basic sacrament of this which is the Church. In this we must not overlook the fact that the Church and humanity as made manifest, sanctified and unified in her are in no sense mythical entities but precisely those

concrete individuals in themselves who love God and love in God, and give their intrinsic unity a manifest expression in the dimension of history in the unifying society that is the Church (212).

What makes marriage a sacrament is its ecclesial dimension, i.e., marriage of two baptized taking place in the sphere of the Church (212ff.). It is important to state an important distinction between the spouses as a sign and the Church (taken as the whole community) as a sign: “The ‘sign’ function in the case of a particular marriage can sinfully be degraded into a lie when that which it is intended to manifest and to render present is not present in itself, namely the love that is grace-given and unifying. In the Church as a whole the intrinsic connection between sign and reality signified can no longer radically be destroyed in virtue of the eschatological victory of grace in Christ” (211). According to Rahner, marriage in general can never be seen merely as a “worldly affair” because “married love has the character of a pointer and a sign” (213). He states: “For this love itself is no worldly affair, but rather the event of grace and love which unites God and men” (213). Applying this notion to marriage as sacrament, precisely in its ecclesial dimension, he continues:

When a marriage of *this* kind, therefore, takes place in the Church, it is an element in the process by which the Church fulfills her own nature as such, one which is brought into being by two baptized Christians who, through their baptism, have been empowered to play an active part in this self-realization. As baptized, therefore, they act in a manner which is precisely proper to the Church herself. They make manifest the sign of love in which *that* love is visibly expressed which unites God and men.

Now when the Church achieves the fullness of her own nature in this way precisely at this *essential* level, making it effective in the concrete and decisive living situation of a human individual, there we have a sacrament. In that case there is no need for this purpose of any *explicit* words of institution uttered by Jesus (we could never establish as a matter of historical fact that he ever uttered such words, nor is it even probable that he did so), such as for instance are to be found in the case of the Eucharist. The ‘word of institution’ in this case consists in two factors: on the one hand in the fact that the religious relevance of marriage is acknowledged and that it is recognized that this too is something that is achieved through the word and deed of Jesus himself. It also consists in the fact that marriage has been instituted by the Church as an eschatological sign of salvation for the kingdom of God (considered as the absolute proximity of God to man) until the end of time. On the other hand marriage itself and of itself carries with it its own profoundly significant theological dimension (213-14).

Rahner also clarifies the ecclesial dimension of marriage through the traditional sacramental language of *opus operantis* and *opus operatum* (213-14). The former term applies to marriage as a sign of married love in general as an event of grace. The latter term applies to marriage as a sign of married love in sacrament as an event of grace, i.e., mediating “the character of *unconditional* pledge of grace from God, . . . when it takes place in the Church and takes its place in the concrete in the context in which such a pledge acquires its historical manifestation. This is the Church herself considered as basic

sacrament” (214-15). Rahner’s explanation of this ecclesial dimension of marriage further clarifies this important concept:

When a marriage takes place between baptized people in the Church it constitutes and element in the Church’s role as basic sacrament, so that the parties actively share in and contribute to the Church’s role as basic sacrament, for both give manifest expression to the unifying love of the grace of God, and a marriage of this kind between them achieves this precisely *as* an element in the social unity of the Church herself. Now because of this the marriage as an event of grace gives rise to a ‘sacramental’ event of grace in which this sign actively contributes to the irrevocable manifestation of God’s pledge of grace to mankind, that pledge which is constantly in force and of which God himself never repents. And this manifestation is nothing else than the Church herself. (215)

Rahner finally concludes this line of thinking by making the point that genuine married love has its goal, cause, and origin in the unity between Christ and the Church (218-221). Therefore, marriage receives its full manifestation in the unity of Christ and the Church (220). Lastly, after cautioning that spouses will experience this reality in measure to their openness to it in faith and love, he concludes:

. . . genuine Christian marriage has at all times the force of a real representation of the unifying love of God in Christ for mankind. In marriage the Church is made present. It is really the smallest community, the smallest, but at the same time the true community of the redeemed and the sanctified, the unity among whom can still be built up on the same basis on which the unity of the Church is founded, in other words the smallest, but at the same time the genuine individual Church. (221)

For the development of a sacramentology which begins with marriage as a basic sacrament, see Bernard Cooke, Sacraments and Sacramentality (Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third, 1983), esp. chapter 7, “Christian Marriage: Basic Sacrament,” 79-94. Cooke’s thesis is that “human friendship gives us some insight into the Christian revelation that God is a ‘self’” (93) and that “within human friendship there is a paradigm role played by the love between a Christian wife and husband” (93). Regarding the community which Christian marriage gives rise, he states: “The Christian family is meant to be the most basic instance of Christian community, people bonded together by their shared relationship to the risen Jesus” (92).

⁴⁴⁴In the Western Church we have the theological tradition of distinguishing different types of grace. The most basic distinction is between uncreated and created grace. The former refers to the inner life of the Godhead, and the latter refers to its manifestations. It is created grace where several distinctions are made as it affects the relationship between the divine and the human. One distinction is sanctifying grace, which is the principle of love as the dynamic principle of our life. Sanctifying grace makes both religious conversion and married love possible. See GS 48 & 49.

See also, Bernard Cooke, Sacraments and Sacramentality, 80. He provides a simple and lucid distinction between the two: “‘Uncreated grace’ refers to God himself in his graciousness towards human beings; ‘created grace’ refers to that special (‘supernatural’) assistance God gives to humans to heal and strengthen them and to raise them to a level of being compatible with their eternal destiny.”

⁴⁴⁵Maurice Gilbert explores the exegetical meaning of the Gen. 2:23-24 text, “they become one flesh.” He concludes that although this text includes carnal union, the primary interpretation is much fuller. The expression “one flesh” refers to the unity of two corporal beings (the couple) in every aspect of their being” (208). According to Gilbert, in Eph. 5 this Genesis text is expanded from the spouses’ becoming one body to include the couple’s becoming one with Christ. Such total union, says Gilbert, calls for the indissolubility of marriage. “One Only Flesh,” Theology Digest 26 (Fall, 1978): 206-9.

The “we” which constitutes married love can have a dark side or a light side. Genuine married love forms a “we” which opens up to others. Here is an explanation from Rahner, “Marriage As a Sacrament,” 207-8:

. . . it would be false if we sought to understand married love from the outset as an act of withdrawing behind closed doors where the two partners are isolated from the rest, for this would be, at basis, an egoistical state. Marriage is not the act in which two individuals come together to form a ‘we’, a relationship in which they set themselves apart from the ‘all’ and close themselves against this. Rather it is the act in which a ‘we’ is constituted which opens itself lovingly precisely to *all*. This aspect of the basic essence of such love ‘appears’ already in the very fact that those united by married love themselves already come from a community. In their love they do not abandon this--indeed they must not abandon it. And their love becomes fruitful in the child that they produce, which for its part in turn must not become enclosed within the ‘we’ relationship, but must be set free to enter into the wider community of the ‘all’. Married love, therefore, is, even in respect of its concrete physical forms, a source of, an initiation into a wider community, and must therefore itself also intend this right from the outset.

This idea needs to be still further deepened. Married love cannot be so intimate and exclusive that it ceases to be love at all. Now of its very nature it is love only when it does not exclude, but rather opens itself to and includes, when it really commits itself ever anew to that which is strange in the other even before it has explored and seen into it; when it trusts itself without condition to accept that which is really ‘other’ in the beloved as its own (which, in fact, must also constantly be taking place in the intimate partnership of the marriage itself). In the *specific* love for the *concrete* individual man must precisely *experience* what ‘love’ is in general.

. . . Married love too is a readiness, an exercise, a promise and a task, to *love* man in *himself*--something which is more than merely ‘respecting’ him, merely giving him ‘his due’ instead of being ready again and again to trust him with one’s *self*, to commit one’s self to him ‘with one’s whole heart and with all one’s resources’. We are always in debt to all, often, perhaps to those most remote from us even more than to those who are closest. Marriage is the concrete state in which we begin to pay this endless debt, not a dispensation from this endless task which can only be fulfilled by God’s help.

⁴⁴⁶See Thomas F. Fogarty, "System Concepts and the Dimensions of Self," in Family Therapy: Theory and Practice, ed. Philip J. Guerin (New York: Gardner Press, 1976), 145-49.

⁴⁴⁷For example, see notes above on Hanigan regarding the influence of vocational calling and sexuality. Also, helpful is his endnote 6, p. 106, Homosexuality:

To say that marriage is a vocation, or is embraced as a vocation, is to say among other things that the parties to the marriage do not create the terms and conditions of their union entirely by their own will. Rather they accept a pre-structured call, within which they work out their common life together. The more traditional way of speaking of this pre-structured call is to say that God is the author of marriage (*Gaudium et Spes*, 48) or that marriage has been divinely instituted. The acceptance of some basic conditions as essential to marriage, e.g., sexual fidelity, permanence, openness to children, are minimal signs of the recognition of marriage as a vocation. Most married couples will grow into a sense of the vocational significance of their marriage rather than fully grasping it at the outset.

⁴⁴⁸The accepting of a specific vocation as a state of life is a categorical choice. According to Hanigan, "A categorical choice is a choice to do this action or live this way of life rather than to do something else. Categorical choices are by their nature limiting or excluding choices." Homosexuality, endnote 16, 107.

⁴⁴⁹I am using moral and religious conscience as formulated by Conn, Conscience, 203:

We may think of mature personal conscience, then, as being either merely potential (before moral conversion) or actual (after moral conversion). And this actualized (normative) conscience will be critical or not depending on the nature of the moral conversion, as we have seen. Within this framework, the term 'religious conscience' may refer to either potential or actual conscience, before or after religious conversion. In any case, the designation 'religious' specifies not the functional or structural aspect of conscience, but the nature of the ground which supports and the matrix which shapes one's judgments and choices of value. Insofar as conversion transforms one's whole orientation and being, the source and principle from which flow the judgments, decisions, and actions of the religiously converted person has little if anything in common with that of the unconverted person.

⁴⁵⁰According to Conn, a person does not have a conscience, but is a conscience (204). In other words, conscience is not a faculty, but a person. Following Lonergan, he agrees that conscience is the subject operating at the fourth level of consciousness. More specifically, however, Conn provides a normative understanding of conscience (other meanings of conscience must be understood in terms of it). He states: "the radical meaning of human conscience, I am suggesting, is the reality of the authentic personal subject, intellectually, morally, affectively, and religiously converted, operating on the fourth and highest level of moral, responsible, existential consciousness" (203).

⁴⁵¹For an explanation of sin as an alienation from God's will and as a "missing of the mark," see Hanigan, As I Have Loved You, 103-5.

⁴⁵²I deliberately use the qualifiers "generally" and "immoral" because no one can claim in a general and abstract way with absolute certainty that another has violated his/her conscience or sinned. I prefer to follow the prudent example of James Hanigan, who writes: "To call an act a sin is not only to judge the ontic worth of a concrete act in specific circumstances, but also to pass judgment on the motivational integrity and psychological capacities of those doing the act. I do not think such judgments are in every case impossible and unwarranted, but they are without foundation when made in general, abstract ways." Homosexuality, 133.

⁴⁵³It is not the purpose of this study to do a comprehensive analysis of the moral issue of living together out of wedlock. Yet, from the viewpoint of Christian religious conversion the normative ideal of genital sexuality within marriage is apparent. One additional comment is that I do not claim to know concretely what it means for a person to choose unity and fruitful love in the specific situations of one's life. All I want to claim is that one can discern in the tradition that unity and fruitful love are criteria to include during a couple's and families' deliberations .

⁴⁵⁴Doohan, The Lay-Centered Church, chap. 4, pp. 90-127. Doohan provides a refreshing explanation of spirituality as rooted in baptism rather than simply sharing in the ministry of the bishop.

⁴⁵⁵Paul VI, "The Transformation of Married Love Through Christian Self-Giving: Address of Pope Paul VI to the International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 4, 1970," in National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1978), 30. The other quotes in this paragraph are from this source.

⁴⁵⁶Lecture was delivered on November 19, 1997. Information on the National Fatherhood Initiative can be acquired by writing to Dr. Wade at One Bank St., Suite 160, Gaithersburg, MD 20878

⁴⁵⁷Fatherhood: A Lifetime Commitment: National Fatherhood Initiative, 1997 Annual Report.

⁴⁵⁸"Recent studies have concluded that contact between the father and his child begins to diminish soon after divorce. In a nationally representative sample of 11-to-16-year-old children living in mother-headed households, almost half had not seen their father in the last twelve months." Wade F. Horn, Father Facts 2 (Gaithersburg, MD: National Fatherhood Initiative, 1996), 28. He cites the following source: F. Furstenberg, "Good Dads-Bad Dads: Two Faces of Fatherhood," in The Changing American Family and Public Policy, ed. A.J. Cherlin (Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1988).

⁴⁵⁹Horn, Father Facts 2, i. He cites the following source: Arlene F. Saluter, Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1994 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P20-484, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996).

⁴⁶⁰Ibid. Horn cites the following source: Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. and Christine Winquist Nord, "Parenting Apart: Patterns of Child Rearing After Marital Disruption," Journal of Marriage and the Family (November 1985): 896.

⁴⁶¹Horn, Fathers, Marriage, and Welfare Reform, 3.

⁴⁶²Horn, Father Facts 2, 28. He cites the following source: John P. Robinson, Vladimir G. Andreyenkov and Vasily D. Patrushev, The Rhythm of Everyday Life: How Soviet and American Citizen Use Time (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988).

⁴⁶³Ibid., i. He cites the following source: The National Commission on Children, Speaking of Kids: A National Survey of Children and Parents, Washington, D.C., 1991.

⁴⁶⁴Ibid., 55. He cites the following source: John E. Richters and Pedro E. Martinez, "Violent Communities, Family Choices, and Children's Chances: An Algorithm for Improving the Odds," Development and Psychopathology 5 (1993): 609-627.

⁴⁶⁵Ibid., 60. He cites the following source: Mary Jo Coiro, Nicholas Zill and Barbara Bloom, Health of Our Nation's Children, U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., 1994.

⁴⁶⁶Ibid., 59. He cites the following source: Nicholas Zill, Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, May 10, 1995.

⁴⁶⁷Ibid. He cites the following source: The National Committee for Adoption, The Adoption Factbook, NCFA Memos, June, 1991.

⁴⁶⁸I have already made the case that cohabitation and divorce are commonly accepted in our culture. Smith's research shows that "age" is a key factor in describing the prevailing sexual attitudes of our time. For example, while the widowed are the least sexually permissive and the never married the most permissive, this is a function of age as much as of marital status. Smith also makes the point that the married are less sexually permissive than the divorced and separated (12). However, it must be noted that the demographic picture about sexual permissiveness is complex. For example, when considering all adults, only 25.6 percent will state the pre-marital sex is always wrong; yet, 78.7 percent will state that extra-marital sex is always wrong and 69.3 percent that teen sex is always wrong.

Interestingly, Andrew Greeley states that the liberal attitudes towards sexual permissiveness decline as young people approach thirty years old. One reason is because most are now married. Marriage, apparently, cancels much of this attitude because it overcomes much of the institutional alienation singles experience during their twenties. Also of interest, is Greeley's pastoral recommendation to overcome sexual permissiveness by preaching a loving God, i.e., instilling warm religious imagery, especially through sermons, into the religious imagination of people. This he claims will be more effective than denouncing sexual permissiveness as sinful. See Andrew M. Greeley, The Young Catholic Family: Religious Images and Marriage Fulfillment (Chicago: The Thomas More Press, 1980), 62-66, esp. 64.

⁴⁶⁹Jn. 6:22-71.

⁴⁷⁰See Avery Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," America 178 (June 20-27, 1998): 14-17. Following quote is very thought-provoking:

In a secularized society such as our own, consistently orthodox Catholics will constitute a minority, not only in the society at large but even, I would say, within their religious community. The majority are carried along by the tide of public opinion, which they receive daily in large doses through the popular media of communication. Although they are relatively few, these countercultural believers, because of the strength of their commitment, have an importance disproportionate to their numbers.

Revealed religion, beleaguered though it may be, has an indispensable role to play in the modern world. The secular relativism of our day stands on very weak grounds and holds no attraction for people looking for light and clarity. Many hear in a confused way the call to a higher life and feel in their hearts a craving for abiding truth. They welcome the word of God because it comes from beyond and transcends the vicissitudes of time and culture. A religion that firmly adheres to its sacred heritage can make itself a sign of hope and a beacon of truth to the multitudes who are repelled by the easy relativism and cheap hedonism of popular culture. For these reasons I am convinced that orthodoxy rather than accommodationism offers greater promise for the future.

With the progressive de-Christianization of society, it is inevitable, I think, that the church will suffer some defections and a measure of disaffection on the part of many who remain. Some of those who leave will join churches whose teaching seems more consonant with modern secular thinking. Others will find Catholicism too complicated and well embrace severer styles of Christianity, such as those found in biblicist sects. These negative developments will have to be countered by measures designed to increase the numbers and the loyalty of the Catholic faithful. Four particular steps occur to me as promising.

1. *Hierarchical Governance.* . . .
2. *Doctrinal Firmness.* . . .
3. *Formation.* . . .
4. *Evangelization.* . . .

⁴⁷¹Joan Meyer Anzia and Mary G. Durkin, Marital Intimacy: A Catholic Perspective (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1980).

⁴⁷²Ibid., 52-53.

⁴⁷³Greeley, The Young Catholic Family.

⁴⁷⁴Greeley's actual report is much more complex and nuanced than I am relating in my text. My objective is not to give a full rendering of his study. One can read Greeley's 249-page report for him/herself. My objective is simply to give empirical support for my comments about the priestly function to demonstrate the reasonableness of the priestly function and to provide some pastoral implications for ministering to young families, especially those in their twenties and thirties. The pastoral implications that I derive will be mainly about Christian marriage and its family as an ecclesial reality. For sixteen pastoral implications which pertain to Christian marriage and its family as a sacramental reality, see Greeley, ch. 9, pp. 104-12.

⁴⁷⁵Greeley, 5 and 16.

⁴⁷⁶Ibid., 7, 16, 27-29, and 45.

⁴⁷⁷Ibid., 32.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid., 22-23. Stability is a key factor of satisfaction for married and non-married couples. If couples don't perceive a stable relationship, then they will experience low satisfaction, whether they are married or not. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of marrieds and cohabitants. "Forty-nine percent of those who are married described the stability of their relationship as 'excellent' as opposed to 20 percent of those who are living together" (23).

⁴⁷⁹Ibid., 22.

⁴⁸⁰Ibid., 66.

⁴⁸¹Ibid., 34-38. "When husbands and wives both pray frequently (not necessarily together), when they both go to church frequently (again, not necessarily together), and when they both believe in the after life, these forms of religious devotion are likely to have a statistically significant impact on their marriage relationship. . . . Particularly it is worth noting that all three kinds of devotion affect the consensus between husband and wife that their sexual fulfillment is excellent" (33). Furthermore, "presumably, it is religion that affects marital happiness and not vice versa. . . . Nonetheless, in the real world there is probably a reciprocal causality" (33). Approximately 82 percent of these religiously devout couples report very satisfied marital relationships (36-37). Table 3.7, p. 154, shows that during years nine and ten couples with low devotion rebound to only 58 percent. Also, it should be noted that both highly devotional and lowly devotional

couples begin their marriages at practically the same level of marital satisfaction (67 percent and 69 percent respectively) and that the lowly devotional plummet to 44 percent during years three to eight while the highly devotional only drop to 62 percent. Religious devotion also raises significantly the couple's agreement in basic values (36-37).

⁴⁸² Greeley, 38.

⁴⁸³ Greeley, 73-75.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 76-77. More than half of the rebound in marital satisfaction for catholic spouses is attributable to mutual prayer (daily), religious images/stories, spouse's having more religious influence on one another, and self-consciousness about the spouse's influence (103).

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 88. "Religious images are thought of as spontaneous reactions of the creative imagination, or of the prerational or preconscious personality to experiences of grace, major and minor. . . . They represent the necessary consideration, explication, formalization and rationalization of our experiences of grace" (90).

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 89. From among these, the quality of sermons provides the highest correlation.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 63, 90-92.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 107-8. "To summarize in a sentence the theoretical assumption and the empirical findings of the present report: If you grow up in a warm family, you are more likely to have 'warm' religious imagery; if you have 'warm' religious imagery and grew up in a warm family, you are more likely to have a 'warm' sexual life with your spouse; if you have grown up in a 'warm' family, have 'warm' religious imagery, and a 'warm' sexual relationship with your spouse, then you will have a 'warm' marriage relationship--no matter how cold it may get during the critical years of the middle of the first decade of your marriage" (111).

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 93-94.

⁴⁹² Obviously, God's love is active in other religions too.

⁴⁹³ Of course, I am not advocating the dysfunctional behavior of fusion (using family system theory language). Rather, I advocate for a self-understanding which knows oneself in relation to another. I would like to propose that further research which would identify the content and the processes which comprises the adjustments of moving

from an individual self to a married self would be very instructive. Andrew Greeley has already done some of this when he explained how spouses begin to develop a common religious story from their individual ones. See Greeley, 102.

⁴⁹⁴Michael P. Chester and Marie C. Norrisey, Arise: A Christian Psychology of Love (Charlottesville, Va.: The Open Door, 1981), 108-13. This is an especially insightful book. The theme is “that love, wholeness, maturity, or sanctity become authentic, active, and growing only in the presence of an ever-increasing tension between opposite poles” (108). Interestingly the cross is understood as a dialectic:

“The cross expresses the mysterious necessity of the conjunction of opposites in all existence. All forms of energy, including psychic and spiritual, originate as a result of this interaction between opposites. The cross is the symbol which best expresses the union of opposites that must occur in any healthy, mature life and existence. The cross is a very positive symbol when we consider the new life that results from it. Without the cross there can be no growth in love or maturity, no wholeness and balance, no life and energy, no personal relationship between God and mankind.

The cross also signifies struggle, conflict, suffering, even death itself. The crucifixion of Jesus was the supreme expression of God’s love for us. Our expression of love for God and others entails a similar crucifixion. ‘I solemnly assure you, unless the grain of wheat falls to the earth and dies, it remains just a grain of wheat. But if it dies, it produces much fruit. The man who loves his life loses it, while the man who hates his life in this world preserves it to life eternal’ (John 12:24-25). The reconciliation of opposites always involves suffering and struggle but the tension results in a new psychic or spiritual energy. Sometimes only death will relieve us of the pain; but even then, if we believe Christ’s promises, a resurrected life will be ours. . . . (108-9)

The Christian solution does not consist of a naive denial of the reality of evil but rather in maintaining a constant tension between the good and evil within ourselves and within the world. . . . The split between good and evil in our personality will continue throughout our life on earth. The primary cross we all must carry is living constantly under this very tension of good and evil and the knowledge that it is part of human existence. . . . (109)

One of the greatest abuses of love is the abuse of the power and authority that one human has over other human beings. Authority and obedience are the necessary complements of any well-organized and efficient gathering of human beings. However, because of the elation that the exercise of such authority begets in the human heart, there is a tendency for those possessing power to increase and hold it far beyond what is necessary for the well-being of the group. This is applicable not only to appointed or elected officials of civil government and church but also to parents, teachers, counselors, and even friends! To counterbalance abuses of power, there is the need of some human beings to follow the example of Jesus in emptying themselves of all power (111-12).

⁴⁹⁵For a Christian psychological approach to the task of creative fidelity, see Clayton Barbeau, Creative Marriage: The Middle Years (New York: Seabury, 1976). For

a feminist theological critique see Eileen Zieget Silberman, The Savage Sacrament: A Theology of Marriage After American Feminism (Mystic, Ct.: Twenty-Third Publications, 1983). Silberman is skeptical about a theology of marriage which begins with papal and clerical authorities. She claims this “. . . is still largely determined upon the preservation of an ideal, and preserving it by fear, law, and moral sanction. . . . The theology written in this vein is more a theology of power than a theology of conjugal love” (96). She prefers to begin a theology of marriage from the real stories of couples, especially women since they have been so underrepresented (30, 37, 49, 89). She calls marriage the savage sacrament because a couple enters into the sacrament with individual histories of unredemption and broken freedom which makes marriage as a redemptive experience difficult to live.

⁴⁹⁶It is notable to recall that this is the vision that Bishop Fiordelli presented during the deliberations of Vatican Council II.

⁴⁹⁷Hopefully, the leaders are religiously converted people who are committed to discipleship.

⁴⁹⁸1 Cor. 13:13. These three virtues are traditionally know as the theological virtues because their term or object is God. See Hanigan, As I Have Loved You, 153.

⁴⁹⁹ Rom. 5:1-5; Eph. 5:20-33.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Schema 1962 (Schema 1). *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus: Series Secunda. De Ecclesia et de B. Maria Virgine.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXII.
- Schema 1963 (Schema 2). *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus. Schema Constitutionis dogmaticae De Ecclesia. I - II.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXIII.
- Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Relatio super Schema Constitutionis dogmaticae De Ecclesia.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXIII.
- Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Propositiones Congregationis Generalis suffragiis subiciendis quoad Caput II Schematis De Ecclesia.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXIII.
- Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Emendationes a Concilii Patribus scripto exhibitae super schema Constitutionis dogmaticae De Ecclesia. I - II.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXIII.
- Schema 1964 (Schema 3). *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Secundum: Schema Constitutionis De Ecclesia.* (Sub secreto). Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis - MCMLXIV.
- Constitutio Dogmatica De Ecclesia: Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II. In Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 57 (1965): 5-71.
- Constitutio Pastoralis De Ecclesia In Mund Huius Temporis: Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II. In Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 58 (1966): 1025-1120.
- Decretum De Apostolatu Laicorum: Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II. In Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 58 (1966): 837-64.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbott, Walter. Twelve Council Fathers. New York: Macmillan Company, 1963.
- _____. 1966. ed. The Documents of Vatican II. New York: America Press.
- Acerbi, Antonio. Due Ecclesiologie: Ecclesiologia Giuridica Ed Ecclesiologia Di Comunione Nella "Lumen Gentium." Bologna: Edizion Dehoniane, 1975.
- Anderson, F. ed. Council Daybook Vatican II: Sessions 1 and 2. Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965.
- _____. 1965. ed. Council Daybook Vatican II: Session 3. Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference.
- _____. 1966. ed. Council Daybook Vatican II: Session 4. Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference.
- Anzia, Joan Meyer, and Mary G. Durkin. Marital Intimacy: A Catholic Perspective. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1980.
- Augustine of Hippo. Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects. The Fathers of the Church Series, ed. Roy J. Deferrari. Translated by Charles T. Wilcox and others, no. 27. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1955.
- Barbeau, Clayton. Creative Marriage: The Middle Years. New York: Seabury, 1976.
- Barauna, Guilherme. ed. L'Eglise de Vatican II: Etudes autour de la Consitution conciliaire sur l'Eglise. Vol. 2, 3. French edition under direction of Y. Congar. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1966-1967.
- Barth, Markus. Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4-6. Anchor Bible, no. 34A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 197.
- Boff, Leonardo. "The Sacrament of Marriage." Concilium 87 (1973): 22-33.
- Bornkamm, G. Paul. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Brown, D. M. Ultimate Concern: Tillich in Dialogue. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Brown, Raymond E. The Churches the Apostles Left Behind. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

- Bryson, Ken, and Lynne Casper. "Family Composition Begins to Stabilize in the 1990s." U.S. Census Bureau, Press Release, May 28, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/cb98-88.html>.
- Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. Translated by Wm. Pringel. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1948.
- Caprile, Giovanni. ed. Il Concilio Vaticano II: Cronache del Concilio Vaticano II, Secondo Periodo, 1963-1964. Roma: Edizioni "La Civiltà Cattolica," 1966.
- Cassell's Latin Dictionary, 5th ed. and rev., D. P. Simpson. New York: Macmillan, 1977.
- Chester, Michael P., and Marie C. Norrisey. Arise: A Christian Psychology of Love. Charlottesville, Va.: The Open Door, 1981.
- Coiro, Mary Jo, Nicholas Zill, and Barbara Bloom. Health of Our Nation's Children. U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., 1994.
- Collins-Roberts, French-English, English-French Dictionary (1978).
- Congar, Yves. "la famille, Église en réduction." La vie intellectuelle (10 July 1939): 9-29).
- _____. 1953. Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf. [Lay People in the Church: A Study for Theology of the Laity. Translated by Donald Attwater. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1957.]
- _____. 1964. Le Concile au jour le jour: Deuxième Session. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- _____. 1984. Le Concile de Vatican II: Son Église, Peuple de Dieu, et Corps du Christ. With a Preface by Rene Remond. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Conn, Walter E. Conscience: Development and Self-Transcendence. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1981.
- Cooke, Bernard. Ministry to Word and Sacraments. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- _____. 1983. Sacraments and Sacramentality. Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications.
- Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantley. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- DeLubac, Henri. The Mystery of the Supernatural. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

- Diamond, Wilford. Dictionary of Liturgical Latin.
- Dominian, J. "Vatican II and Marriage." Clergy Review 52 (1967): 19-35.
- Doohan, Leonard. The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Winston Press, 1984.
- Dulles, Avery. Models of the Church. New York: Doubleday, 1974.
- _____. 1982. A Church to Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom. New York: Crossroad.
- _____. 1985. "Vatican II and the Church's Purpose." Theology Digest 32: 341-52.
- _____. 1998. "Orthodoxy and Social Change." America 178 (June 20-27): 14-17.
- Durkin, Mary. "Intimacy and Marriage: Continuing the Mystery of Christ and the Church." Concilium 121 (1979): 74-81.
- Evdokimov, Paul. The Sacrament of Love: The Nuptial Mystery in the Light of the Orthodox Tradition. Translated by Anthony P. Gythiel and Victoria Steadman. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985. [*Le mariage, sacrement d'amour*. Paris, 1945]
- Fellhauer, David E. "The *Consortium omnis vitae* as a Juridical Element of Marriage." Studia Canonica, 13 (1979): 7-171.
- Fatherhood: A Lifetime Commitment: National Fatherhood Initiative, 1997 Annual Report.
- Fesquet, Henri. The Drama of Vatican II. Translated by Bernard Murchland. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Fitzzymer, Joseph A. Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1989. First Edition in 1967.
- Flannery, Austin P., ed. The Documents of Vatican II. Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Fogarty, Thomas F. "System Concepts and the Dimensions of Self." In Family Therapy: Theory and Practice. ed. Philip J. Guerin New York: Gardner Press, 1976.
- Furstenberg, F. "Good Dads-Bad Dads: Two Faces of Fatherhood." In The Changing American Family and Public Policy. ed. A.J. Cherlin Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1988.

- Gelpi, Donald. Charism and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Conversion. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- General Introduction To Christian Initiation (Per initiationis Christiannae). 2d ed., 24 June, 1973. In Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1982.
- Gilbert, Maruice. "One Only Flesh." Theology Digest 26 (Fall, 1978): 206-9.
- Glenn, Norval. Closed Hearts, Closed Minds: The Textbook Story of Marriage. New York: The Council on Families, Institute on American Values, 1997.
- Goldscheider, Frances K., and Linda J. Waite. New Families, No Families? The Transformation of the American Home. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- The Greek New Testament. ed. Kurt Aland, M. Black, B. Metzger, and A. Wikgren. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.
- Greeley, Andrew M. The Young Catholic Family: Religious Images and Marriage Fulfillment. Chicago: The Thomas More Press, 1980.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Chapter II, The People of God." In Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler. Translated by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan. Vol. 1, 153-85. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- _____. 1968. "The Mystery of the Church." In Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. ed. Herbert Vorgrimler. Translated by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Hanigan, James P. As I Have Loved You: The Challenge of Christian Ethics. New York: Paulist Press, 1986).
- _____. 1988. Homosexuality: The Test Case for Christian Sexual Ethics. New York: Paulist Press.
- Haring, Bernard. "Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and the Family." In Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. ed. Herbert Vorgrimler. Translated by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan. Vol. 5, 225-46. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- Horn, Wade F. Father Facts 2. Gaithersburg, MD: National Fatherhood Initiative, 1996.

Horn, Wade, and Andrew Bush. Fathers, Marriage, and Welfare Reform. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hudson Institute, 1997.

Introduction to the Rite of Infant Baptism (Nomine parvulorum). 2d ed., 24 June, 1973. In Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents, ed. Austin Flannery. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1982.

John Chrysostom. Selections from St. John Chrysostom. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, LTD., 1940.

_____. 1957-60. Commentary on St. John the Apostle and Evangelist; Homilies. The Fathers of the Church Series. Translated by St. Thomas Aquinas Goggin, nos. 27, 41. New York: Fathers of the Church.

_____. 1986. On Marriage and Family Life. Compiled and Translated by Catharine P. Roth and David Anderson. With an Introduction by Catharine P. Roth. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

_____. 1986. Homilies on Genesis. Translated by Robert C. Hill. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press.

_____. 1988. Daily Readings from the Writings of St. John Chrysostom. Edited by Anthony M. Coniaris. Minneapolis, Minn.: Light and Life Pub. Co.

John XXIII. "Address to International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 3, 1959." In National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1978.

_____. Apostolic Constitution Convoking the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: *Humanae Salutis*. Translated by National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1962.

John Paul II. Redemptor Hominis. Origins 8 (1979): 625-44.

_____. 1979. "Address to the Third General Assembly of the Bishops of Latin America." (Jan. 28) IV A: AAS 71.

_____. 1980. Dives in Misericordia. 13: AAS 72.

_____. 1980. "Opening Homily for the Synod on the Family." Origins 10: 257-60.

_____. 1981. Familiaris Consortio (Apostolic Exhortation on the Family). Origins 11: 437-68.

- _____. 1982. Catechesi Tradendae (Catechesis in our Time). In Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents. ed. Austin Flannery, 762-814. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company.
- _____. 1986. "Homily" delivered at Perth, Australia, November 30, 1986. Washington, D.C.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. S.v. "Aner," by Albrecht Oepke.
- _____. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. S.v. "Anthropos," by Jeremias, Joachim.
- _____. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. S.v. "Mysterion," by G. Bornkamm.
- _____. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. S.v. "Sarx," by Eduard Schweizer.
- Kung, Hans, Yves Congar, and D. O'Hanlon, D. Council Speeches of Vatican II. Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1964.
- LaDue, W. "Conjugal Love and the Juridical Structure of Christian Marriage." Jurist 34 (1974): 36-67.
- Léon-Dufour, Xavier. Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated from the second (revised) French edition by Terrence Prendergast. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980.
- Lonergan, Bernard. Method in Theology. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Mackin, Theodore. "Conjugal Love and the Magisterium." Jurist 36 (1976): 263-301.
- _____. 1982. What Is Marriage? Marriage in the Catholic Church. New York: Paulist Press.
- _____. 1984. Divorce and Remarriage. Vol. 2, Marriage in the Catholic Church. New York: Paulist Press.
- _____. 1989. Marital Sacrament. Vol. 3, Marriage in the Catholic Church. New York: Paulist Press.

- Marcel, Gabriel. Homo Viator: Introduction to a Metaphysic of Hope. Translated by Emma Craufurd. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951; Harper Torchbook, 1962.
- McCready, William C. "Marriage As an Institution of Socialization." Chicago Studies 18 (Fall, 1979): 297-310.
- McBrien, Richard P. Catholicism. Study Edition. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1981.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. United Bible Society, 1971.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The First Letter To the Corinthians." In The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. With a Foreword by Carlo Maria Cardinal Martini. New Rev. Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). "Marriage," In Monthly Vital Statistics Report, FASTATS, (1990), Vol. 43, No. 12 Supplement.
- _____. 1996. "Marriage," In Monthly Vital Statistics Report, FASTATS, Vol. 45, No. 12. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchswww/fastats/marriage.htm>.
- The National Commission on Children. Speaking of Kids: A National Survey of Children and Parents. Washington, D.C., 1991.
- The National Committee for Adoption. The Adoption Factbook. NCFM Memos, June, 1991.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1978.
- _____. 1988. Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults. Study Edition. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Ad Hoc Committee on Marriage and Family Life. A Family Perspective in Church and Society: A Manual for All Pastoral Leaders. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1988.
- O'Callaghan, D. "The Purposes of Marriage." Irish Ecclesiastical Record 108 (1967): 266-72.

_____. "Love in Marriage: How New Was Vatican II?" Irish Theological Quarterly 46 (1979): 221-39.

Orsy, Ladislav. "Faith, Sacrament, Contract, and Christian Marriage: Disputed Questions." Theological Studies 43 (1983): 379-98.

Palmer, P. "Christian Marriage: Contract or Covenant." Theological Studies 33 (1972): 617-65.

The Papal Committee for the Family. The Family in the Pastoral Activity of the Church: Some Reflections on the Work and on the Conclusions of the 4th General Assembly of the Committee for the Family. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1978.

Patrologia cursus completus. Series Graeca. ed. Jacques Paul Migne. Paris: J.P. Migne, 1857-65.

Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina. ed. Jacques Paul Migne. Paris: J.P. Migne, 1878-90.

Paul VI. Humanae Vitae (On the Regulation of Birth). Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1968.

_____. 1970. "The Transformation of Married Love Through Christian Self-Giving: Address of Pope Paul VI to the International Meeting of the Teams of Our Lady, May 4, 1970." In National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Plan of Pastoral Action for Family Ministry: A Vision and Strategy. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1978.

_____. 1975. Evangelization in the Modern World. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1975. Evangelii nuntiandi (Evangelization in the Modern World). In Vatican Council II: More Postconciliar Documents. ed. Austin Flannery, 711-61. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company.

_____. The Teachings of Pope Paul VI. Citta del Vaticano: Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1969-1977.

Philips, Gerard. The Role of the Laity in the Church. Translated by John R. Gilbert and James W. Moudry. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956.

_____. 1967. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, History of the Constitution." In Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. ed. Herbert Vorgrimler. Translated by Kevin Smyth. Vol. 1, 105-37. New York: Herder and Herder.

- Pius XI. "*Casti Connubi*. In Papal Teachings: Matrimony. Translated by Michael J. Byrnes. Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1963.
- Pius XII. The Pope Speaks: The Teachings of Pope Pius XII. Compiled and edited with the assistance of the Vatican Archives by Michael Chinigo. New York: Pantheon, 1957.
- Pottebaum, Gerard, and Marilyn Wickel. Bread of Life: Gospels/Year C. Loveland, Ohio: Treehaus Communications, 1997).
- Karl Rahner. "Universal Salvific Will." In Sacramentum Mundi, ed. Karl Rahner, *et al.*, Vol. V, 405-09. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.
- _____. 1973. "Marriage as a Sacrament." In Theological Investigations. Translated by David Bourke. Vol. 10, 199-221. New York: Seabury Press.
- Richters, John E., and Pedro E. Martinez. "Violent Communities, Family Choices, and Children's Chances: An Algorithm for Improving the Odds." Development and Psychopathology 5 (1993): 609-627.
- Robertson, Archibald T. Word Pictures in the New Testament: Volume VI The Epistles of Paul. Nashville, TN: Boardman Press, 1931.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. Commentary on Ephesians: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1979.
- Robinson, John P., Vladimir G. Andreyenkov, and Vasily D. Patrushev. The Rhythm of Everyday Life: How Soviet and American Citizen Use Time. Boulder: Westview Press, 1988.
- The R. S. V. Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: The Nestle Greek Text With a Literal Translation by The Reverend Alfred Marshall. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1968.
- Rynne Xavier. The Second Session. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1962.
- _____. 1963. Letters from Vatican City. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co.
- _____. 1964. The Third Session. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co.
- _____. 1965. The Fourth Session. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co.
- _____. 1968. Vatican Council II. First Printing. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co.

- Salmond, S. D. F. "The Epistles to the Ephesians." In The Expositors Greek Testament. ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 3, 201-305. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964.
- Saluter, Arlene F. Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1994. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P20-484, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996.
- Sampley, J. Paul. "And the Two Shall Become One Flesh": A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21-33. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. 14 Vol. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Co., 1886-1890. [v. 1-8, Selected Works of St. Augustine; v. 9-14, Selected Works of St. Chrysostom.]
- Schamaus, Michael. Dogma 4: The Church: Its Origin and Structure. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1984. First Edition, 1972.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. Marriage: Human Reality and Saving Mystery. Translated by N.D. Smith. 2 vols. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.
- Schleck, Charles, The Sacrament of Matrimony: A Dogmatic Study. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1964.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Ephesians: A Commentary. Translated by Helen Heron. Edinburgh, Scotland: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Silberman, Eileen Zieget. The Savage Sacrament: A Theology of Marriage After American Feminism. Mystic, Ct.: Twenty-Third Publications, 1983.
- Skolnick, Arlene. Embattled Paradise: The American Family in an Age of Uncertainty. New York: BasicBooks, 1991.
- Smith, Tom W. "Changes in Families and Family Values: Report Prepared for the National Italian American Foundation." (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, August, 1997.
- Souter, Alexander. A Glossary of Later Latin: To 600 A.D.
- Stemler, James G. "Trends in the American Marriage and Family." The Jurist 42 (1982): 107-21.
- Suenens, Leon-Joseph. The Gospel to Every Creature. Translated by Louise Gavan Duffy. With a Preface by the Most Reverend John Baptist Montini, Archbishop of Milan. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957.

_____. 1962. Love and Control: The Contemporary Problem. Translated by George J. Robinson, 2d ed., Rev. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1962.

_____. 1963. Christian Life Day By Day: Talks to the Family, Translated by S. F. L. Tye. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1963.

Synod of Bishops (1980). The Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World: For the Use of the Episcopal Conferences. Study Guide. Washington, D.C.: USCC Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, 1980.

Synod '80 Commission of the Conference of ICOs. "Consultation of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations With Its Members on the Topic of the Family." Lumen Vitae 35 (1980): 437-52.

Thomas Aquinas. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Aquinas Scripture Series. Translation and Introduction by M. Lamb, no. 2. Albany: Magi Books, 1966.

_____. Summa Theologiae. Latin text and English Translation. 61 vols. London: Blackfriars in conjunction with Eyre & Spottiswoode. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963-81.

United States Almanac, 1995. See Microsoft Expedia.com., [http://expedia.msn.com/wq/places/United States/BGSHBD.htm](http://expedia.msn.com/wq/places/United%20States/BGSHBD.htm).

U.S. Census Bureau. "Households by Type," In March 1997 Current Population Survey. Internet release date, May 28, 1998, see <http://www.census.gov/p...emo/hh-fam/htabHH-1.txt>.

U.S. Census Bureau. "Households by Type," In March 1997 Current Population Survey. Last revised: September 29, 1997, see <http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/pub/1997/hhldtype.htm>.

Vatican II: La Consitution dogmatique sur l'Eglise, "Lumen Gentium." Vol. 1. In Unam Sanctam, 51, L'Eglise De Vatican II. Latin Text and translation by Th. Camelot with collaboration by Y. Congar, H. Legrand, and A. -I Mennessier. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1966.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1987).

Westcott, Brooke Foss. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Introduction by Philip Edgcumbe Hughes. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker BookHouse, 1979. Reprinted from 1906 edition, Macmillan.

- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. New York: Macmillan, 1941. First edition in 1893.
- Worgul, George Jr. From Magic to Metaphor: A Validation of Christian Sacraments. Forward by Piet Fransen. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.
- _____. "People of God, Body of Christ: Pauline Ecclesiological Contrasts." Biblical Theology Bulletin, 12 (1982): 24-28.
- Work, Martin H. "Nature of Lay Apostolate to be Discussed in Council." In Council Daybook Vatican II: Sessions 1 and 2, ed. F. Anderson. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament, 2 Vols. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.