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If ever there was a place and time to reflect theologically on the sacrament of marriage the contemporary culture would be ideal. Not since the early church has the Catholic laity enjoyed the recognition and responsibility that was retrieved for it at the Second Vatican Council. At the same time, new and interesting developments on what constitutes sacramentality are broadening in theological circles. A new and growing movement in Catholic theology has recognized that such reflection on marital sacramentality is necessary, in part, because the mission of the laity to the world cannot succeed apart from new and more dynamic understandings of the marital commitment. According to Lumen Gentium the laity has a unique mission to the world. “These faithful are by baptism made one body with Christ and are constituted among the People of God; they are in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetical, and kingly functions of Christ; and they carry out for their own part the mission of the whole Christian people in the Church and in the world.”¹

I will argue in this paper that in order to understand the mission of the laity in the context of church, one must understand it in terms of marriage—the primary vocation of the vast majority of lay people. In order to understand that vocation, one must look carefully at the way marriage has been understood as a sacrament in traditional church teachings. What becomes evident is a serious contradiction
between an active social mission for the family encouraged by the church and a passive or receptive idea of sacrament. I will suggest that a new way of thinking about the sacrament of marriage will enable lay people to envision the family as a transforming force in our society today. With such an understanding, the sacrament of marriage and the reality of family can become the primary mode through which Catholic social thought encounters the world.

The laity in the Catholic Church is unique in that they are “secular” by nature and by their vocation they seek the Kingdom of God through “engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God.” It would seem that if the vast majority of laity is married—and they are, and that one’s primary relational commitment would affect how one approaches reality in general—and it does, then one’s marital vocation is hardly superfluous to the mission of the laity. It is central. The growing failure of marital relationships in our culture as well as the failure of traditional sacramentology to speak to the experience of married couples calls for new ways of envisioning the sacrament of marriage and integrating it into the social mission of the church. Increasingly theologians have come to recognize that marriage and the family life emerging from that commitment are life-giving forms of ministry, even discipleship, already being lived out in the Church. Further, it is also the context through which lay Catholics “learn how to distinguish carefully between those rights and duties which are theirs as members of the Church, and those which
they have as members of human society.”

What has become a new focus in the theology of marriage is the meaning and consequences of such marital sacramentality, especially as the Church engages and attempts to constructively transform the world.

**Traditional Marital Sacramentality**

Many scholars look to John Paul II’s *Familiaris Consortio* as a recent starting point for the Church’s discussion of marital spirituality, domestic church, and how both are connected to Catholic social thought.

According to John Paul II, “the Christian family, in fact, is the first community called to announce the Gospel to the human person during growth and to bring him or her, through progressive education and catechesis, to full human and Christian charity.” Further, “as an educating community, the family must help man to discern his own vocation and to accept responsibility in the search for greater justice, educating him from the beginning in interpersonal relationships, rich in justice and in love.” The notion of family early in the document is clearly one that is active, dynamic, and engaged with the world. This is further confirmed in the following:

The Church, therefore, does not accomplish this discernment only through the Pastors, who teach in the name and with the power of Christ but also through the laity: Christ ‘made them His witnesses and
gave them understanding of the faith and the grace of speech (cf. Acts 2:17-18; Rv. 19:10), so that the power of the Gospel might shine forth in their daily social and family life. The laity, moreover, by reason of their particular vocation have the specific role of interpreting the history of the world in the light of Christ, in as much as they are called to illuminate and organize temporal realities according to the plan of God, Creator and Redeemer.7

This “plan of God” is specified first by emphasizing that human beings are created to love. “Love is therefore the fundamental and innate vocation of every human being.”8

An interesting understanding of the theological significance of marriage is then introduced. This is communicated through an analogy external to the marital relationship itself, that is, the analogy employed is abstracted from married love and used to indicate and signify something else. “Their bond of love becomes the image and the symbol of the covenant which unites God and His people.”9 What precisely characterizes ‘covenantal love’ is never specified in the document.

Various Scriptural images of covenant, especially in Jeremiah and First Isaiah, speak reveal a relationship of sin and punishment that should not characterize married love or married infidelity. For example, early in the Book of Jeremiah, Israel is depicted as a new bride in love with the Lord her husband—“I remember the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride, how you followed me in the wilderness, in a land not sown.” (Jer. 2:1) This relationship drastically changes later when Israel, unfaithful to the covenant, is depicted as an unfaithful wife who pays
for her infidelity by being publicly stripped and raped. “And if you say in your heart, ‘Why have these things come upon me?’ it is the greatness of your iniquity that your skirts are lifted up and you are violated.”10 (Jer.13:22, 26) There are, however, limits to the analogy of covenant fidelity between the people of Israel and their God when speaking of married love. The reason for the analogy of covenant love is explained when the roots of married sacramentality are examined.

Receiving and meditating faithfully on the word of God, the Church has solemnly taught and continues to teach that the marriage of the baptized is one of the seven sacraments of the New Covenant. Indeed, by means of baptism, man and women are definitively placed within the new and eternal covenant, in the spousal covenant of Christ with the Church.

And later:

By virtue of the sacramentality of their marriage, spouses are bound to one another in the most profoundly indissoluble manner. Their belonging to each other is the real representation, by means of the sacramental sign, of the very relationship of Christ with the Church.11

The sacramentality of marriage, according to Familiaris Consortio, derives from the baptism of the spouses, not from the reality of their marriage. In other words, the sacramentality of marriage is extrinsic to marriage and is efficacious through previous baptism, not through a reality present in marriage in and of itself. This leads, by necessity, to an understanding of marital spirituality as passive and to the analogy that the marital relationship between spouses parallels the biblical relationship between Israel and God. The marital
relationship mirrors the relationship of the Church to Christ. If the sacramentality of marriage is derived solely from the Baptismal sacrament and is analogous to an idealized relationship between Christ and the Church, there is nothing intrinsic to the marital relationship itself that signifies its sacramentality.

This approach to the sacramentality of marriage is, of course, deeply at odds with the active and socially engaged Christian family envisioned earlier in Familiaris Consortio. A key presupposition here is that the character of a family, its values, its direction, and its capacity for service, will emerge from the quality of the marital covenant. A passive sacramentality, that is a sacramentality envisioned as a receptor of a prior sacrament, may be advantageous for the reception of certain “fixed” teachings on sexual morality. But such a view misses the crucial connection, and thus fails to communicate the relationship between the role of the family and the social transformation sought through Catholic social teaching. For example, where is “God’s plan” when a family attempts to enter into solidarity with the poor or tries to live out the principle of subsidiarity? Where is “God’s plan” when married couples and families discern how to adopt an option for the poor? Such an option could take many forms and must emerge out of the lived contextualized vocation and faith-commitment of a particular family. Further, such an option requires a dynamic notion of
sacramentality—one that emerges from and develops within the nature of married love itself, informed and formed by the community we call church.

**From Marriage to Family as Domestic Church**

*Familiaris Consortio* follows its framing of marriage as a sacrament derivative of Baptism by working out an understanding of how the family as a “domestic church” fulfills its mission “to guard, reveal and communicate love, [as] a living reflection of and a real sharing in God’s love for humanity and the love of Christ the Lord for the Church his Bride.”¹² Four concrete aspects of the family’s mission as a domestic church are then developed: 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.

The first two “missions” of the family are mainly internal. Forming a community of persons and serving life are concerned with qualitative relationships between spouses, procreation, and possibly raising and educating children. The third “mission” is mainly external as the family interacts with the society in which it lives. “Thus, far from being closed in on itself, the family is by nature and vocation open to other families and to society, and undertakes its social role.”¹³ First, the family engages society by simply being what it is, “an experience of communion and sharing.”¹⁴ Its social and political role consists in “manifold social service activities,
especially in favor of the poor,” “hospitality,” and political participation in the
process of how laws affect the rights and status of families.\textsuperscript{15} This third section
concludes with a very strong call for families to live out their faith in the context of
the challenges in their particular societies.

The social role that belongs to every family pertains by a new and
original right to the Christian family, which is based on the sacrament
of marriage. By taking up the human reality of the love between
husband and wife in all its implications, the sacrament gives to
Christian couples and parents a power and a commitment to live their
vocation as lay people and therefore, to ‘seek the kingdom of God by
engaging in the temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the
plan of God.’\textsuperscript{16}

The fourth “mission” for the family has to do specifically with the “life and
mission of the church.” This section of the document more so than any other has the
strongest “extrinsicist” notion of sacramentality—one that is buttressed by a curious
definition of “faith.” For example, a family participates in holiness when “Christian
spouses and parents offer the obedience of faith.”\textsuperscript{17} “Faith” is understood as the
“Discovering and Admiring Awareness of God’s Plan for the Family.”\textsuperscript{18} The family
is only properly family when it obediently accepts “God’s Plan.” This seems to be a
reference to Church teaching on sexuality and reproduction. “God’s plan” here
refers again to the internal mission of the family—but in determining the family as
mainly a receptor of “God’s Plan,” the possibility for actualizing the family as
engaged in society’s problems seems to be greatly diminished. Engaging society
constructively requires an active, creative dynamism springing from the interior of
marital life and love. Conversely, “God’s plan,” as the blueprint for the mission of the family, is a passive sacramentality of marriage that is dependent upon Baptism for its meaning.

Repeatedly in *Familiaris Consortio* the ground for the sacramentality of marriage is Baptism. This is stated clearly also in the fourth section: “[Marriage] takes up again and makes specific the sanctifying grace of Baptism.” While a marriage which lacks baptism for either spouse is not sacramental (regardless of the nature of the love shared), the marriage of a baptized couple for “social reasons”—i.e., for motives other than religious—is *de facto* sacramental.

Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that these engaged couples, by virtue of their Baptism, are already sharer’s in Christ’s marriage Covenant with the Church, and that, by their right intention, they have accepted *God’s plan* regarding marriage and therefore are at least implicitly consent to what the Church intends to do when she celebrates marriage.

In what can only be a direct response to this approach to sacramental theology in *Familiaris Consortio*, Michael Lawler comments:

Baptism does not give faith nor make believers in any but a very passive sense, namely, it gives the know-how to faith and to being a believer. The Code’s sweeping assumption that the Church is dealing with Christian believers from the moment of baptism, and that therefore every valid marriage between baptized persons is by that very fact a sacrament, is a rather simplistic, theologically naïve assumption, and one that is manifestly false in countless cases in our day.

A critical problem thus emerges for the theology of marriage. If the abstract ‘marriage’ is always sacramental, how does one understand its failure in so many
cases? Is this a failure of God? The Church? Baptism? And if this “sacrament” is based on the baptism of two people (usually as infants) who do not believe or do not participate in the life of the Church, is such a notion externally imposed, even contrary to human will? What form of sacramentality can answer these questions?

What does the common but insufficient understanding of sacramentality rely upon for its own justification? Partly it is a bifurcated understanding of reality as “nature,” and “super-nature” both of which require God to be absent from part of reality and fully present to the other part.

The very spatial imagery of ‘elevation’ bespeaks a two-tiered reality within which that which belongs to the lower, nature, is raised to the second level, supernature. This strong meaning of elevation is unacceptable in light of an authentic doctrine of grace flowing from and in harmony with the doctrines of the Trinity and creation.

This “strong elevation” is a dualistic way of understanding sacrament, and it flows from philosophical movements prominent at the origins of Christianity. These are problematic because their continued influence militates against new and meaningful understandings of sacramentality. Whether one speaks of the visible and invisible, the concrete and the abstract, the profane and the sacred—the message is the same. It seems that something can be deemed sacramental only as an instance of something greater than what it actually is.

With a world thus comprised, grace must encounter our world extrinsically, and transform mundane realities into truly significant events by obliterating its
“natural” essence so to speak. This oversimplified, but nevertheless prominent understanding of reality, would be contrary to the notion that all space and time is sacred because it is created by God, and that sacraments remind us of those specific events that are central to our self-understanding as a people of God, i.e., as Church. In part this is due to deficient understandings of the self, and the way in which God’s grace is operative in the world.

What is needed is an understanding of sacramentality that can both understand the grace inherent in married love, and allow for the human element within such a love to fail, even at times, to break completely. Only then can concrete married love become a form of discipleship—an active choice of mutual giving and receiving—and not a form of magic. This relationship can be a kind of ministry in and of itself, especially when it extends itself to others and eventually society. It can serve the Church by giving the vast majority of its members an adequate understanding of what they are and can be. This in turn leads not only to a deeper awareness of the community life of the Church, but also to a better understanding of the sacraments.

An Intrinsic Sacramentality?

In language used throughout theological history, something is sacramental when it “effects what it signifies,” i.e., by being what it is, it reveals what it wishes to
communicate. John Paul II affirms this as true of the family when he declares in *Familiaris Consortio* :

The role that God calls the family to perform in history derives from what the family is; its role represents the dynamic and existential development of what it is. Each family finds within itself a summons that cannot be ignored, and that specifies both its dignity and its responsibility: family, become what you are.\(^{25}\)

But what does this actually mean? Anyone who teaches undergraduates is well aware of the fact that “sacrament” is usually, if not always, interpreted as another word for “magic.” The fact is, the community of faith has done a poor job of effectively communicating a non-magical understanding of sacramentality. In part, this is due to deficient understandings of God (Trinity) and grace. The following description of sacramentality is aware of this fact.

A Sacrament makes grace (the self-communication of God outside the Trinity) effectively present for you by bringing it to your attention, by allowing you to see it, by manifesting it. Sacraments presuppose the omnipresence of grace, the fact that the self-gift of God is already there to be manifested. But because it is always present it frequently goes unnoticed.\(^{26}\)

The rather broad understanding of sacramentality presupposed for this chapter is one that understands “sacrament” to cause the effective acceptance of grace, wherever found.\(^{27}\) This grace, this communication of God is agapic love, which in the context of married love always co-exists with friendship and sexual love.\(^{28}\) It is important not to sentimentalize or romanticize such love, for to effectively will the good of another may in fact mean to challenge not only one’s self,
but the subject of one’s love, quite forcefully.\textsuperscript{29} It is this deep and rich meaning of agape, always in conjunction with friendship and sexual love, that is most appropriate for understanding the intrinsic sacramentality of married love.

To say that “marriage is intrinsically sacramental” is to understand “sacramental” in a broad, as opposed to a narrow sense.\textsuperscript{30} A narrow sacramentality confines such designation to those who possess some knowledge or have participated in a particular ritual (whether at the age of conscious consent or not).\textsuperscript{31} This limits the manner in which we understand God as present and efficacious in the world as well as our response to that presence. By extension, it also limits one’s social ethics. A broader sacramental vision acknowledges that all of reality is imbued with grace, for God communicates self as gift to all creation. It must be possible that all creation, including those outside certain ecclesial and intellectual contexts, be able to experience and respond to God’s grace. Such an experience and response may not be as refined or clear as it is within the faith community—but at the level of possibility is must exist. Within this total worldview, the Church designates seven specific events—Sacraments—as critical to the Church’s self-realization.\textsuperscript{32}

To say something is sacramental because it “effects what it signifies” is to say that it reveals what it wishes to communicate.\textsuperscript{33} This is quite different from the neo-platonic dualism mentioned earlier, for it is not an abstraction from the concrete that
reveals something else; it is in and through the concrete reality that more becomes known. This recognition of the transcendental dynamism of created reality leads to the recognition that what we seek and desire is infinite. “Our hearts are restless till they rest in you, O God,” is not an abstract heart, but a concrete one deeply imbedded in the chaos and confusion of this world. And the dynamism of this movement beyond—one that is intrinsic to human being and knowing—has its end in something much greater than the self.

Augustine’s thought develops this insight by first confirming the function of a sign in *De Doctrina christiana*, “A sign is something which besides the impression which it induces in the senses, of itself causes something else to come into thought.”^34^ This is ultimately verified by Aquinas when he confirms the “commonly used” expression that sacraments effect what they signify.^35^ So what would it mean to say that marriage is intrinsically sacramental? Note, it is not being argued that only Catholic marriage or Christian marriage is sacramental, but marriages wherein there is a real presence and interplay of sexual love, friendship and agape (as previously defined) are at least, potentially, sacramental.

From the very nature of married love as an integrative whole of sexual love, friendship, and agape, one can experience the love of God. For married people this could be the direct experience of a multi-faceted love, given and received in equality and justice. For the children it could be the primal trust and love that one
experiences first and then aspires to in one’s own development in relationship to others. For the community it could be experienced in the presence of members whose concern for others is always a part of their family life and their civic engagement. What must first be demonstrated for this to be theologically possible is the deficiency of any notion of sacramentality coming from “outside” or “above” the relationship itself. Speaking out the grace of a comprehensive love, married love by its nature in the concrete reality of human life can effect what it signifies.

**Conclusion**

The most fruitful definition for the sacrament of marriage in the present inquiry is to define it by what it does. If the point of departure from Augustine and Thomas is that sacraments “effect what they signify,” how might that be transposed into our contemporary culture in a way that is meaningful? If a sacrament effects what it signifies, than to signify God’s grace must have specific content. This rather broad understanding of sacrament can now be more fully explored. In a world where God’s grace undergirds all creation, where all creation came to be through God’s grace, then to see anything in its depth and fullness is to see the manifestation of grace.

The following may be one way to discern whether a marriage can be considered intrinsically sacramental. The spouses effectively will the good of each
other and their children through concrete choices aimed at the fullest realization of each other’s humanity. A certain respect for the otherness and individuality of each person in the family as well as others in one’s community will characterize the initial disposition to relationality. Forgiveness and understanding as well as patience and endurance characterize relationships that will bend and even sometimes break.

There will be a desire and willingness to focus on relationships over material things, status or power. Family time and energy is emphasized over other competing realities. There will be a sincere explicit mission to one’s community, especially to those weakest and most vulnerable. This may include direct service to the homeless in one’s community through serving at soup kitchens and shelters. It may include awareness and pro-active involvement of municipal policies toward the homeless. It may include active fundraising and consciousness raising about the plight of homelessness.

There will be an active seeking of knowledge of one’s context and the education of one’s children on the consequences of societal action or inaction. There will be an awareness focused on the social impact of decisions both familial and societal, and how the poor are affected. The love and nurturing that characterizes the marital relationship and by extension the familial relationship will, by definition, expand into one’s community and society through active participation in civic and ecclesial institutions. Sacramental love never simply stays at home. In short, an
intrinsically sacramental marriage will model and extend self-gift as a way of being, both inside and outside the family in a plethora of ways.

Insofar as this marriage takes place within an ecclesial community, it can both give and receive much. It can give an example of conditioned and conditional people intentionally making and maintaining an unconditional commitment to each other. The possibility for such a commitment, the unconditional love of God, can become a visible reality through the public witnessing of such love in everyday life. The Church provides the marriage a supportive community that challenges contemporary trends in relationships. In so doing, the Church fulfills its prophetic duty to put forth the Incarnation, God’s perfect self-gift, as the supreme example of love toward which Christians aspire. In a true community of love, challenged and inspired by the Incarnation of God, the Church’s mission of social transformation emerges from an understanding of faith and sacrament as an existential commitment to God and to each other through the concrete willing of the good of others. This could be the specific role and function of married laypeople and their families as they act as a leaven for the Church’s mission to the world.
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