

2013-3

# Augustine and John Paul II on the Goods of Marriage: Proles, Fides, et Sacramentum

Thomas Richard Finke  
*Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://www.exhibit.xavier.edu/hab>

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), [Ancient Philosophy Commons](#), [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#), and the [Other Classics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Finke, Thomas Richard, "Augustine and John Paul II on the Goods of Marriage: Proles, Fides, et Sacramentum" (2013). *Honors Bachelor of Arts*. 24.  
<http://www.exhibit.xavier.edu/hab/24>

This Capstone/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate at Exhibit. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Bachelor of Arts by an authorized administrator of Exhibit. For more information, please contact [exhibit@xavier.edu](mailto:exhibit@xavier.edu).

A.M.D.G.

Augustine and John Paul II on the Goods of Marriage:

*Proles, Fides, et Sacramentum*

Thomas R. Finke

Xavier University

Dr. Thomas Strunk, Director

Dr. Peter Huff and Fr. Cyril Whitaker, Readers

HAB Senior Thesis

Spring 2013

## Precis

As an example of the way in which the Church consistently presents her teachings on marriage, I intend to demonstrate the consistency between the writings of St. Augustine and John Paul II. Though they write in very different times socially and philosophically, their presentations on the good of marriage remain consistent in their conclusions. The framework for this presentation will be the three goods of marriage as defined by Augustine: procreation, fidelity, and the sacrament. Augustine defined these goods in his *De bono coniugali*, and John Paul II contains them in his writings: *Familiaris Consortio*, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, *Love and Responsibility*, and the *Theology of the Body* audiences. This examination will show that there has been a consistent position between these two teachers, suggesting the importance of this understanding of marriage in the life of the Church, and the improbability of future alteration of Church teaching.

## Augustine and John Paul II on the Goods of Marriage:

### *Proles, Fides, et Sacramentum*

For believing Catholics, the Church is the source of consistent truths. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, the synthesis of the fundamentals of Catholicism states how the apostles, having been instructed by Christ, entrusted the *depositum fidei* of both Scripture and Tradition to the whole Church (CCC 84). By adhering to this deposit, both the bishops and the faithful ensure a steadfast profession and practice of the faith (CCC 84). Through the bishops, in communion with the Vicar of Christ, the Catholic Church both protects the deposit of faith and interprets it for the faithful (CCC 85). Referencing *Gaudium et Spes*, a document from the Second Vatican Council outlining the position of the Church in the world, the *Catechism* notes that through the guardianship of the Holy Spirit, the teachings of the Church remain accurate and consistent, although the human members of the Church might sometimes falter (CCC 853; GS 43). Pope John Paul II recognized this consistency stemming from Scripture and Tradition when he referred to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as *immutabile semper autem novum* (FC 4), “unchangeable and ever new.”<sup>1</sup> Though perhaps presented in different styles throughout the years, the truths of the faith are the same as they were passed down from Christ.

From this understanding of the consistency of the Church in general, it follows that the Church would also be consistent in her presentation of marriage. This consistency can be shown briefly by an examination of the theme employed by John Paul II throughout his weekly audiences known as *Theology of the Body*. On September 5, 1979, John Paul II began this series of presentations by recalling an episode from Scripture. He noted that as the Pharisees asked Jesus if it was lawful to divorce, Jesus answered that marriage was to be indissoluble from the

---

<sup>1</sup> This and all subsequent translations of papal documents, including of *FC*, *MD*, *GS*, and *HV* are taken from the Vatican translations, which are accessible at [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va).

beginning of creation (Mt 19:33ff).<sup>2</sup> John Paul II shows the consistency here not only going back to the beginning of the New Testament, but even to Adam and Eve, the first marriage. This particular Scripture passage is repeatedly recalled in his presentations, reminding his audience of the idea of the Church's consistency regarding marriage.

Nevertheless, there are those who would deny the consistent position of the Church. Hans Kramer writes, "There is a naive view in the Catholic Church that the concept of marriage has remained constant and unchanging since NT [sic] times. In theology, this view has been abandoned and is considered contrary to facts."<sup>3</sup> In attempting to substantiate his claim, Kramer cites that the Church's current personal view on marriage is founded in Neo-Scholasticism, examining marriage as a static whole, and disregarding historical changes noted by social scientists.<sup>4</sup> However, as John Paul II noted, *Ecclesia enim Christum sequendo veritatem exquirat, quae non semper cum opinione maioris hominum congruit partis (FC 5)*. "Following Christ, the Church seeks the truth, which is not always the same as the majority opinion." Historical social changes do not imply a change in the immutable teaching of the Church.

Proving the consistency of the Church's teachings on marriage would require the writing of a book – well beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, as an example of the way in which the Church steadfastly presents her teachings on marriage, this paper intends to demonstrate the consistency between the writings of St. Augustine and John Paul II. Though they write in very different times socially and philosophically, their presentations on the good of marriage remain consistent in their conclusions.

Augustine and John Paul II were chosen to demonstrate consistency both because of their important roles in the Church, and because of their significant connections to each other.

---

<sup>2</sup> John Paul II 1997:25.

<sup>3</sup> Kramer 2001:356.

<sup>4</sup> Kramer 2001:357.

Augustine, who lived from 354 to 430 AD, is best known as the bishop of Hippo. Prior to that time however, he was not even Christian, and was for a time an auditor of the Manichean sect.<sup>5</sup> During his younger days he was a student of primarily Platonic philosophy. It was his philosophic mind which led him to separate from the Manicheans.<sup>6</sup> Following his conversion, he was elected bishop of Hippo in Africa, and wrote many works defending the faith against the various heresies of his day. These writings have become important theological foundations for the understanding and interpretation of the faith. In his treatise on marriage, *De bono coniugali*, Augustine defines the threefold good of marriage as *proles, fides, and sacramentum* – procreation, fidelity, and the sacrament (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 28.32).<sup>7</sup> Procreation is a good whereby children are born into the world and brought up in the faith, fidelity is the good whereby a man or woman takes only one spouse, and the sacrament is good whereby it preserves the union as indissoluble. These elements form the basis of the Church’s understanding of marriage even today.<sup>8</sup> Following his death, Augustine was popularly acclaimed as a saint, and in 1298 he was recognized as a Doctor of the Church – a testament to the number and profundity of his writings.

Pope John Paul II, formerly Karol Wojtyła,<sup>9</sup> living from 1920-2005, was very concerned with the question of Catholic marriage in particular, and all relationships in general. Having spent a good deal of time with young people as a priest in Poland, John Paul’s writings fulfill a

---

<sup>5</sup> Wills 1999:27-30. A dualist heresy, Manicheans believed that the body was created by the evil power and was therefore also evil, though it held some good in it (Noonan 1986:107-111). Since the body was evil, Procreation was an evil act as it produced more evil into the world (Noonan 1986:111).

<sup>6</sup> Wills 1999:34.

<sup>7</sup> Garry Wills notes that the popular “equation” about Augustine can be understood as “Augustine + sin = sex” (Wills 2003:3). While Wills points out that this popular understanding is flawed, and that Augustine spends rather little time focusing on sexual sins, I would like to point out that he does focus a good deal of time discussing the good of sex – in marriage.

<sup>8</sup> Coughlin 2010:356.

<sup>9</sup> As this paper examines the writings of John Paul II both before and after he became pope, there may confusion regarding his names. For the sake of accuracy, when referencing his pre-papal writings, he will be referred to in this paper by his given name, Karol Wojtyła. When referencing him as the Vicar of Christ, he will be called John Paul II.

need which he saw while ministering to these people. Also a philosopher, he attempts to construct a philosophic background based on the human person for his writings. His book, *Love and Responsibility*, written prior to his election to the papacy, is insightful into both the human and the spiritual goods of marriage. As pope, he continued to expound on Catholic marriage, both in his *Theology of the Body* audiences and in his writings such as his apostolic exhortation, *Familiaris Consortio*, and his apostolic letter, *Mulieris Dignitatem*. Despite the works of theology written in his pontificate, John Paul II will continue to be known as the philosopher pope,<sup>10</sup> as his philosophical background permeates even his papal writings. While retaining the foundation established by Augustine, John Paul II focuses more on the personal aspects of marriage and relationships.

In examining the consistency between Augustine and John Paul II, the three goods of marriage as defined by Augustine, *proles*, *fides*, and *sacramentum*, will serve as the framework for this examination. Though sometimes the philosophic approaches taken by Augustine and John Paul II are different, their conclusions are nevertheless consistent with each other.<sup>11</sup>

### *Proles*

Elizabeth Clark notes that Augustine's efforts to defend marriage are marked by an ambivalence resulting from his attempts at compromise.<sup>12</sup> His marital writings stem from attempting to draw a middle ground between strict asceticism and the overemphasis of sex.<sup>13</sup> From this compromised position, Augustine is able to argue for the truth about the good of marriage, the mean between these extremes. Despite the difficulties of formulating his balanced

---

<sup>10</sup> As opposed to his successor, Benedict XVI, who is known as a theologian.

<sup>11</sup> There are many others who could have been chosen for such a demonstration, such as Pope Pius XI, who in his Encyclical, *Casti Connubii*, structures his argument in Augustine's description of the three goods. While this is a fine source, and helps to demonstrate constancy in the whole Church, for the sake of concision, I limit my discussion to Augustine and John Paul II.

<sup>12</sup> Clark 1986:139.

<sup>13</sup> Clark 1986:140. The former position was held by both orthodox (Jerome) and heretical (Manichean) ascetics, while the latter was a position held by the Pelagian heretics.

treatise, Augustine possibly presents the most positive evaluation of marriage in comparison to the other Church Fathers.<sup>14</sup> Understanding something of the conflict he attempts to solve is helpful for both comprehending his arguments and for realizing the motive behind his particular emphasis.

Writing in response to Jovinian and Jerome<sup>15</sup>, Augustine lists three goods of marriage in his *De bono coniugali*. He lists them together in his summary, *haec omnia bona sunt, propter quae nuptiae bonum sunt: proles, fides, sacramentum* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 28.32). “These things, namely, offspring, fidelity, and the sacrament, are all good, and because of them marriage is good.”<sup>16</sup> Augustine makes his argument for the good of marriage based off of these three goods. He examines each of these points, looking at how they should affect a good marriage, but also how they can be misconstrued.

Of the three, Augustine notes that procreation is the first and most important good for the continuation of humanity. He writes, *illud nunc dicimus, secundum istam condicionem nascendi et moriendi, quam novimus et in qua creati sumus, aliquid boni esse coniugium masculi et feminae* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 3.3). “We can say now that in that condition of being born and dying with which we are acquainted and in which we were created, the union of man and woman is something of value.” It is natural for a man to realize, after looking at the world in which people live and then die, that the reproductive system is naturally good. For Augustine the

---

<sup>14</sup> Harrison 200:164.

<sup>15</sup> Jovian was a heretic whose central claim was that holiness was not relative to ascetic practices, and therefore that married persons held equal dignity to religious celibates (Hunter 2007:1;34-35). In his *Adversus Jovinianum*, Jerome defended the greater dignity of celibacy – a position that is also consistent in the Church (Kelly 1975:182-183). However, in his argument, Jerome over-emphasized his praise of celibacy and downplayed marriage (Kelly 1975:186). Although Jerome is also a Doctor of the Church, he was still human not infallible (cf: CCC 853; GS 43). This does not discount the position of Augustine as a source, though he had his own questionable positions, for example, regarding the account of Genesis 1 as spiritual creation, not physical – a position he later abandoned (Clark 1986:142-3). Furthermore, in the face of criticism for his harsh position against marriage, Jerome later denied that he had condemned marriage as an evil (Kelly 1975:188). Augustine’s *De bono coniugali* is a response to both Jovinian and Jerome, holding that marriage was not a *levius malum*, as Jerome posited, but rather a *bonum*, albeit lesser than the *bonum* of celibacy (Hunter 2007:279-280; Clark 1986:145).

<sup>16</sup> This and all subsequent translations of *De bono coniugali* are by Kearney 1999.

importance for procreation is more about increasing Christian generations rather than just continuing the species.<sup>17</sup> He further illustrates this point when he says that the marriages of the devout are more honorable than the virginity of the impious (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 8.8). Though he holds the dignity of the celibate state higher than that of marriage, personal sanctity comes first, and raising children as Catholics is an important good.<sup>18</sup>

Augustine then proceeds to examine how marriage is blessed by Jesus both by the prohibition of divorce (Mt 19:9) and His attendance at the wedding feast at Cana (Jn 2:2) (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 3.3). He writes, *cur sit bonum, merito quaeritur. quod mihi non videtur propter solam filiorum procreationem, sed propter ipsam etiam naturalem in diverso sexu societatem* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 3.3). “So with good reason one asks in what lies its value. It seems to me to be not only because of the procreation of children, but also because of the natural sociability that exists between the different sexes.” Augustine holds *proles* to be one of the goods of marriage, but there is also more. The sociability or companionship of spouses is also important.<sup>19</sup> This element is reminiscent of Genesis 2:18-25 and the creation of woman, when God realizes that Adam was without a companion. In this way, Augustine touches on the natural complementarity placed in man and woman, fulfilled through marriage. Furthermore, Elizabeth Clark notes that the added connection between *proles* and friendship is that reproduction ensures a greater opportunity for general (non-sexual) friendship by an increased population.<sup>20</sup>

Further in the text, Augustine again suggests this good of the relationship between persons. While discussing benefits given by God which are necessary for other ends, he says, *quaedam propter amicitiam, sicut nuptiae vel concubitus; hinc enim subsistit propagatio generis*

---

<sup>17</sup> Noonan 1986:127.

<sup>18</sup> Noonan 1986:127.

<sup>19</sup> Harrison 2000:162.

<sup>20</sup> Clark 1986:153.

*humani, in quo societas amicalis magnum bonum est* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 9.9). “Others such as marriage and sleeping together, are necessary for friendship. The latter also contribute to the continuation of the human race, in which loving relationships are of great benefit.” While Augustine focuses on the good of *proles*, he does have some idea of mutual friendship or love. From this passage, Michael Lawler argues that Augustine has effectively countered in advance the objection that marital relationships have been understood in light of mutual love only in recent times.<sup>21</sup> Although Augustine does not emphasize friendship or love between the couple in the same way that a modern reader would consider it, he does indicate in these two passages that it is important to his understanding.

For Augustine, *proles* is important to the relationship, however, it is not entirely a *sine qua non*. While the relationship must be open to children, the marriage is not invalid if the couple remains childless: *manet enim vinculum nuptiarum, etiamsi proles, cuius causa initum est, manifesta sterilitate non subsequatur* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 15.17). “The marriage bond remains, even if because of evident infertility no children result, despite the fact that this was the reason for entering into the marriage.” While procreation is an obvious good for marriage, it is not the only good. If the couple is unable to have children, it does not mean that their union is divisible – the prohibition against divorce still applies.<sup>22</sup> Augustine here addresses those who would cite the Old Testament fathers who would occasionally take another woman to have children by her with his wife’s consent (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 15.17). Augustine is probably thinking here of Abraham, when his wife Sarah offered her slave to him so that he might produce a son (Gen 16:1-4). Augustine is not entirely sure how to answer that objection here, but he says that there is not such an acute need for a great number of descendants now, thereby beginning the

---

<sup>21</sup> Lawler 1993:58-9.

<sup>22</sup> This prohibition is covered more in depth under the good of *sacramentum*.

argument he presents for several pages, that marriage in the Old Testament is not directly comparable to marriage in the New given the vastly different circumstances. Following his examination however, Augustine does not accept sterility as a valid reason to take another woman in the New Testament, even if it was acceptable and proper for the Old Testament fathers to act in that way.<sup>23</sup>

As a philosopher, Karol Wojtyła seeks to re-unite modern philosophy's emphasis on consciousness with classical metaphysics.<sup>24</sup> He will do this through phenomenology, that is, the study of phenomena, or occurrences as they appear to the conscious subject.<sup>25</sup> Buttiglione describes his approach saying, "To begin from the phenomenology of moral experience and to graft metaphysical reflection into the matters and the problems which phenomenology emphasizes, permits one to arrive at the question of being from the question of man."<sup>26</sup> Taking the premise: *operari sequitur esse* (act follows nature),<sup>27</sup> Wojtyła holds that an understanding of *actus humanus*<sup>28</sup> (the *operari*) can lead to an understanding of the person/being, the *esse*. From there, having established the starting point of man's conscious experience, man, conscious of his own actions, is able to reflect on them. From this reflection he realizes that being must have preceded his own acts. In this way Wojtyła relates metaphysics of being to the phenomenological understanding of consciousness – culminating in the person. In his main explication on this method, *The Acting Person*, Wojtyła says, "for something to act, it must first exist."<sup>29</sup> The "I" of consciousness, alongside the acts of the "I," reveal the person. In this way,

---

<sup>23</sup> Wojtyła rejects this position and calls the Old Testament polygamy a relationship based in use (see below), suggesting that it was a social convention rather than a marriage as intended by God (Wojtyła 1960:213).

<sup>24</sup> Reimers 2011:44-46.

<sup>25</sup> Reimers 2011:44.

<sup>26</sup> Buttiglione 1997:74.

<sup>27</sup> Or more literally, "to act follows to be."

<sup>28</sup> As opposed to an *actus hominis*. The former is a conscious human act, while the latter an involuntary act of a human being.

<sup>29</sup> Wojtyła 1969:73.

his philosophical approach begins from the perspective of man.<sup>30</sup> It is important to note here however, that Wojtyła is not seeking to lay out a philosophical proof for the foundation of the person.<sup>31</sup> Rather, he attempts to lay out a method for his readers to consider in light of their own experience, and for them to see if it does not fit.<sup>32</sup>

From this consideration, the understanding of the personalistic norm becomes evident.<sup>33</sup> Wojtyła defines this norm in *Love and Responsibility*, in its negative aspect first, saying that “the person is the kind of good which does not admit of use and cannot be treated as an object of use and as such the means to an end.”<sup>34</sup> So according to this norm, a person, experiencing both himself and others as good, is not able to be treated as a means and remain fully human.<sup>35</sup> The implication of this ethical foundation for our discussion is that a spouse cannot use the other as a means for enjoyment without damaging this good of the other.

Wojtyła subsequently states this personalistic norm positively saying, “The person is a good towards which the only proper and adequate attitude is love.”<sup>36</sup> This formulation makes it more difficult to grasp the implications. While love demands a desire for the good of the other, that good must serve the other person, and not just their body.<sup>37</sup> Love must address the other’s need for good; loving implies a will for the happiness of the other.<sup>38</sup> From this formulation, the imperative states that the best must be done for the other, rather than just ensure they are not used as a means. This norm, that the only acceptable action towards another person must be rooted in love, formulates the basis of Wojtyła’s ethical thought.

---

<sup>30</sup> Buttiglione 1997:74; Reimers 2011:45.

<sup>31</sup> Buttiglione 1997:122.

<sup>32</sup> Buttiglione 1997:122.

<sup>33</sup> Reimers 2011:159.

<sup>34</sup> Wojtyła 1960:41.

<sup>35</sup> Reimers 2011:177-181.

<sup>36</sup> Wojtyła 1960:41.

<sup>37</sup> Reimers 2011:186.

<sup>38</sup> Reimers 2011:187; Buttiglione 1997:113.

Although Wojtyła does not list *proles*, *fides*, and *sacramentum* as being the three goods of marriage, he does examine each one of them. Like Augustine, Wojtyła holds procreation to be the “primary purpose” of intercourse.<sup>39</sup> He holds that children are implicit in the idea of marriage.<sup>40</sup> In the first chapter of *Love and Responsibility*, Wojtyła spends a good deal of time examining how relationships can sometimes lead to a use of the other, which would violate the personalistic norm, as opposed to a relationship based out of love, which treats the other as an end. In continuation of his earlier caution against utility, he is careful, as he begins to discuss marriage, to make a distinction between procreation and reproduction -- that is, between the personal order and the natural order.<sup>41</sup> Both must come together, the natural and the personal, and they cannot be separated. Either one by itself is insufficient.<sup>42</sup> Desire for reproduction by itself leads to a use of the other as object, and personally there must be a manifestation of mutual love at the same time. Wojtyła understands that marital love cannot be willfully separated from procreation and still reach its fulfillment.<sup>43</sup>

As a further explanation of the importance of procreation for marriage, Wojtyła explains the connection between marriage and parenthood etymologically. He notes that the word, *matrimonium* emphasizes the role of motherhood, as the word is formed from *matris munia*, that the duties of the mother.<sup>44</sup> The institution of marriage seeks to ready the couple for parenthood and its associated responsibilities. As he says, “The birth of a child turns the union of man and a woman based on the sexual relationship into a family.”<sup>45</sup> Similarly, Augustine drew on this

---

<sup>39</sup> Wojtyła 1960:226.

<sup>40</sup> Buttiglione 1997:114.

<sup>41</sup> Wojtyła 1960:226.

<sup>42</sup> Wojtyła 1960:226.

<sup>43</sup> Wojtyła 1960:226-7.

<sup>44</sup> Wojtyła 1960:220.

<sup>45</sup> Wojtyła 1960:217.

etymological connection in a condemnation of the Manicheans.<sup>46</sup> He writes, *matrimonium quippe ex hoc appellatum est, quod non ob aliud debeat femina nubere, quam ut mater fiat* (Aug. *Con. Faus.* 19.26). “Matrimony was, of course so named because a woman ought to marry only to become a mother.”<sup>47</sup> The point of each author is consistent with the other; though each has a different reason for their argument. Wojtyła presents this etymology because of his interest in language,<sup>48</sup> and Augustine argues this connection in order to emphasize the disconnect of the Manichean position on marriage. Yet for their different styles, each shows how the construction of the word *matrimonium* demonstrates the essential connection between matrimony and motherhood.

Wojtyła understands marriage as the means by which humans are able to propagate new persons, but it must be rooted in mutual love, as opposed to utility.<sup>49</sup> Recall that Augustine considered the implications of the importance of procreation for marriage, specifically for those couples who were married and unable to have children, whether because of old age or some other infertility (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 3.3). He concludes that such a relationship would not cease to be called a marriage even though they did not have any children, because their love continued (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 3.3).<sup>50</sup> Wojtyła presents the same idea. He says that “a marriage which, through no fault of the spouses is childless retains its full value as an institution.”<sup>51</sup> He admits that the marriage would be fuller when it produces children and leads the members into a family, but the marriage does not lose its interpersonal character if it is naturally sterile.<sup>52</sup> For both

---

<sup>46</sup> Clark 1986:148.

<sup>47</sup> Translation by Teske 2007.

<sup>48</sup> Weigel 1999:32. This interest in language can also be seen through his attempt to understand theology through the language of the body (Weigel 1999:208).

<sup>49</sup> Wojtyła 1960:218.

<sup>50</sup> Harrison 2000:169. She notes that Augustine said, “intercourse of the mind is more intimate than that of the body” (Aug. *Con. Faus.* 23.8).

<sup>51</sup> Wojtyła 1960:218.

<sup>52</sup> Wojtyła 1960:218.

Augustine and Wojtyła it can be seen that although procreation is the primary purpose of marriage, it is not its only good, and natural sterility does not prohibit marriage. As pope, John Paul II noted that a naturally sterile marriage can lead the couple to fulfill other important societal roles such as adoption or missionary work (*FC* 14). Thus he provides a way for their relationship to still prove meaningful, even if they are unable to have children in the normal way.

For Augustine, the couple should only engage in intercourse for the purpose of procreation, and any other times would be venially sinful if not for procreation (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 6.6; 10.11). Without the explicit desire for children, intercourse was not proper, though forgivable through marriage. Wojtyła, however, tempers this understanding in his writings. Rather than an explicit desire for children, Wojtyła says that there must be an acceptance of the possibility for parenthood, that is, for progeny.<sup>53</sup> In fact, he clearly states that Augustine's position was incorrect. He says,

To say that intercourse is permissible and justified only on condition that the partners hope to have a child as a result of it would be an exaggeratedly strict ethical position. It would be at odds with the order of nature, which characteristically leaves the connection between the sexual act and reproduction in particular marriages a matter of some uncertainty.<sup>54</sup>

Rather than saying that every act of intercourse should be aimed towards procreation, Wojtyła explains that just as nature does not order that every marital act produces a child, so also couples need not desire a child from every act, though they should be open to it.<sup>55</sup> Children are good, and should be received joyfully, but Wojtyła focuses on the importance of mutual love for the legitimacy of intercourse rather than the desire for children. Ever watchful against utilitarianism as the enemy of fulfilled human life, Wojtyła explains that demanding the couple to hope for a

---

<sup>53</sup> Wojtyła 1960:227.

<sup>54</sup> Wojtyła 1960:233.

<sup>55</sup> Buttiglione 1997:113.

child from every embrace can lead the couple to view each other as a means for childbearing, instead of an end in their own right.<sup>56</sup>

In his audience on August 8, 1984, John Paul II revisited this issue, this time in the light of Paul VI's encyclical letter, *Humanae Vitae*.<sup>57</sup> Again, John Paul II notes and is in agreement with Paul VI that there are morally acceptable reasons for couples to desire to avoid children.<sup>58</sup> However, as he implied in *Love and Responsibility*, this can only be done naturally, without recourse to artificial means for contraception.<sup>59</sup> John Paul II cites *Humanae Vitae* for his explanation of this difference between the two methods, "In the first case married couples rightly use a facility provided them by nature; in the other case, they obstruct the natural development of the generative process" (*HV* 16).<sup>60</sup> While following one's own nature is morally acceptable, attempting to alter what happens naturally, and to change nature artificially is unacceptable.

From this discussion, it might seem as if Augustine advocates a utilitarian approach towards procreation. He says that every marital act should be done for the desire of a child for the continuation of Christian generations, a seemingly use based desire. However, this idea that Augustine advocates use of the marriage is incorrect. Augustine does signify the importance of friendship or love in the relationship; it is only through his particular perspective that he emphasized the necessity of *proles* as a primary good of marriage. First, as mentioned above, Augustine did recall the importance of sociability in marriage in addition to the importance of procreation (*Aug. De bon. coni.* 3.3). In addition, Augustine was constrained by the theological

---

<sup>56</sup> Wojtyła 1960:233.

<sup>57</sup> Paul VI, familiar with Wojtyła as the author of *Love and Responsibility*, had requested that he be a member of his Papal Commission for the Study of Problems of the Family, Population, and Birth Rate. Wojtyła was unable to leave Poland; however, he did form his own commission in Kraków and sent his findings to Paul VI. While the encyclical was not entirely based off of Wojtyła's report, it was influenced by it, and thus carries some elements of Wojtyła's philosophy. Weigel 1999:206-10.

<sup>58</sup> John Paul II 1997:395.

<sup>59</sup> John Paul II 1997:395.

<sup>60</sup> John Paul II 1997:395.

controversy regarding marriage, he was forced to emphasize reproduction over the communal importance of marriage in order to effectively address the fallacies of his opponents.<sup>61</sup>

Thus the difference comes down to a matter of scope. Augustine was facing heretics who denied the goodness of the body and held that reproduction brought evil into the world. As such he emphasized the importance of children and attacked intercourse as a satisfaction for lust.<sup>62</sup> Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae*, Noonan notes, demonstrated that the foundation of the Church's position in regards to procreation is not based in animal biology, but rather in the symbolic meaning of the act.<sup>63</sup> Written after *Love and Responsibility*, and naturally before John Paul II's writings, this teaching concurs with the personalistic approach.<sup>64</sup> Wojtyła emphasizes the importance of love and union, while seemingly more accepting of frequent intercourse, so long as it is rooted in love and not in lust. He starts with the person, and uses biology second. However, though Augustine's and Wojtyła's perspectives are different, their teachings are consistent at the core. They both oppose a *mentis habitu conceptioni* (FC 6), a "contraceptive mentality," whereby the spouses seek to selfishly satisfy their urges without the burden of children. This mentality is fundamentally opposed to the personalistic order, where the marriage requires both the unitive and the procreative meaning (FC 32; HV 12).

### *Fides*

In the examination of the good of marriage which Augustine calls *fides*, or fidelity<sup>65</sup>, it is helpful to understand that this good has two elements to it. Fidelity is that good of marriage whereby a couple both refrains from adultery and also offers mutual service to the other

---

<sup>61</sup> Clark 1986:149.

<sup>62</sup> Mohler 1991:67.

<sup>63</sup> Noonan 1986:539.

<sup>64</sup> Buttiglione 1997:114.

<sup>65</sup> Noonan 1986:127. Noonan here notes that though *fides* literally means "faith," its meaning as used by Augustine is better conveyed using the word "fidelity."

spouse.<sup>66</sup> Augustine writes, *huc accredit, quia in eo ipso, quod sibi invicem coniuges debitum solvunt, etiamsi id aliquanto intemperantius et incontinentius expetant, fidem tamen sibi pariter debent* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 4.4). “Furthermore, in performing their duty to each other, even if this is claimed somewhat excessively and without due restraint, husband and wife also have a duty of fidelity to each other.” Noonan notes that for Augustine, this good is more absolute than *proles* – if one spouse desires intercourse the other must comply.<sup>67</sup> To understand this passage of Augustine’s it is important also to understand St. Paul, from whom Augustine was drawing.<sup>68</sup>

δια δέ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν ἴδον ἄνδρα ἔχέτω. τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ. ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει ἀλλὰ ἡ γυνὴ (1 Cor. 7:2-4).<sup>69</sup>

But because of the temptation to immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. For while the wife does not rule over her own body, but the husband does; and likewise the husband does not rule over his own body, but the wife does.<sup>70</sup>

Here St. Paul allows marriage as an alleviation against temptation, but he is also adamant that the couple should assist each other; as a couple their bodies no longer belongs to themselves, but to their spouses.

The reference back to St. Paul is significant for Augustine. Pope Benedict XVI notes that in his conversion process, Augustine finally found truth revealed to him through the reading of the Pauline letters.<sup>71</sup> Paul forms a natural beginning for Augustine’s teachings. He comments on

---

<sup>66</sup> Noonan 1986:127.

<sup>67</sup> Noonan 1986:129.

<sup>68</sup> Hugo 1969:123.

<sup>69</sup> This and all subsequent Biblical Greek is from *Novum Testamentum: Graece et Latine* edited by Eberhard and Erwin Nestle 1984.

<sup>70</sup> This and all subsequent Biblical English is taken from the Revised Standard Version, Second Catholic Edition, except where noted.

<sup>71</sup> Benedict 2008:198. As Augustine was struggling with his own sinfulness he heard a voice say in the garden, *tolle lege, tolle lege*, “take and read, take and read” (Aug. *Con.* 8.12). He picked up a book of Paul’s letters and read from Romans 13:13, “Give up indulgence and drunkenness, give up lust and obscenity, give up strife and rivalries,

the word chosen here by Paul, ἐξουσία, *potestas*, authority. *cui fidei tantum iuris tribuit apostolus, ut eam potestatem appellaret* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 4.4). “The apostle considered this duty of fidelity to be so binding that he spoke of it as a power of authority.” That word chosen by Paul is important for Augustine. This demands more than an offer; it is an authority or a power. This authority might seem excessive. By surrendering such a power over one’s self to another, the result could be pain and abuse. However, that is not what Paul or Augustine is advocating. Rather, the advantage of this authority is *fides*, which roots the marriage in a mutual trust.<sup>72</sup> It is true that there is an opening for abuse through this good, however, the point is that the couple should strive towards such fidelity, towards such a trust, that neither individual would cause harm to the other.

As another example, he says, *decus ergo coniugale est castitas procreandi et reddendi carnalis debiti fides: hoc est opus nuptiarum* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 11,12). “What is honorable in marriage, therefore, is chastity in having children and fidelity in performing the conjugal duty. This is what marriage is for.” A good marriage is one in which the couple is open to children and in which the spouses help each other to avoid temptation. Shortly afterwards, Augustine adds, *exigendi autem debiti ab alterutro sexu inmoderatio progressio ... coniugibus secundum veniam conceditur* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 11.12). “Some lack of moderation in demanding the performance of the conjugal duty, by either partner, is allowed to married persons as something excusable.” In other words, Augustine realizes that there are times when a couple would have intercourse resulting from concupiscence though venially sinful.<sup>73</sup> Through the good of *fides*,

---

and clothe yourself in Jesus Christ the Lord, leaving no further allowance for fleshly desires” (Aug. *Con.* 8.12; translation by Wills 2004:103.)

<sup>72</sup> Bassett 1968:171.

<sup>73</sup> Lawler 1993:59.

this is not mortally sinful for the couple, since it was done with a spouse.<sup>74</sup> In this way, Augustine references Paul again, εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγρατεύονται, γαμησάτωσαν, κρεῖττον γάρ ἐστιν γαμῆσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι (1 Cor. 7:9). “But if they cannot exercise self-control, they should marry. For it is better to marry than to be aflame with passion.” Augustine, in much the same way as Paul, allows for couples to satisfy their passions, even if they are not acting strictly for the purposes of procreation. As Augustine says a little later, *non cogunt nuptiae, sed ferunt* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 13.15). “[It] is not something marriage demands, but something it puts up with.” So given that Augustine’s focus is on the centrality of the desire for procreation, rooted in his attempt to counter his philosophical and theological opponents,<sup>75</sup> he presents the remedy for passion through the good of *fides*.

As a young man, before his conversion, Augustine lived with a concubine for many years and had a son by her, whom he named Adeodatus, Given-by-God.<sup>76</sup> During this time, he exercised some element of *fides* (Aug. *Con.* 4,2), which was valued by the Romans as well as by Christians.<sup>77</sup> Such extramarital relationships were normal even among some Christians, despite the efforts of the Church.<sup>78</sup> With this personal history, Augustine’s questioning whether such a situation might be considered a marriage is more understandable. Augustine comments,

Solet etiam quaeri, cum masculus et femina, nec ille maritus nec illa uxor alterius, sibimet non filiorum procreandorum, sed propter incontinentiam solius concubitus causa copulantur ea fide media, ut nec ille cum altera nec illa cum altero id faciat utrum nuptiae sint vocandae (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 5.5).

It is often asked whether one should call it a marriage when a man and woman, neither of whom is married to anyone else, form a union solely for the purpose of giving in to their desires by sleeping together, and not for the purpose of having

---

<sup>74</sup> Hugo 1969:119.

<sup>75</sup> Clark 1986:149.

<sup>76</sup> Brown 2000:27, 50-52.

<sup>77</sup> Brown 2008:389.

<sup>78</sup> Brown 2008:390; Brown 2000:27; Shaw 1987:29.

children, though with the understanding that neither of them will sleep with anyone else.<sup>79</sup>

In this hypothetical question, the good of fidelity is present; however, the procreative good is thrown aside as the unmarried couple is not sleeping together so as to produce children (the sacramental aspect is also missing, but that will be examined shortly). Augustine admits that this is a tricky question, especially given his personal history, and that as long as the couple is not actively trying to avoid children it might possibly be called a marriage.<sup>80</sup> Both fidelity and openness to children must be present for it to be a marriage. The goods of marriage must be united for their full realization.<sup>81</sup>

Ultimately, Augustine is self-deprecating from this passage. He broke fidelity to his concubine; it was his action which broke the union.<sup>82</sup> He reviewed his time with the concubine, writing, *sed unam tamen, ei quoque servans tori fidem* (Aug *Con.* 4.2). “But she was the only one and I was faithful to her.”<sup>83</sup> Here he seems to have judged his actions rather gently.<sup>84</sup> However, in the *De bono coniugali*, Augustine admits that if he had married his betrothed after he separated from his companion of fifteen years, he would be have committed adultery against her (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 5.5).<sup>85</sup> For most of that time though, the good of *fides* mitigated his ultimate separation.<sup>86</sup> The good of fidelity is not enough when it is removed from the other goods of marriage.

---

<sup>79</sup> Augustine continues a little later and says that if a man lives in such a relationship for a time, but later takes a proper wife, he would be committing adultery, against not his wedded wife, but against his concubine (*De bon. coni.* 5,5). In short, he condemns his own actions (Brown 2008:393).

<sup>80</sup> At this point, Augustine has not introduced the third good of marriage, *sacramentum*, which would also not be present, unless the couple never separated.

<sup>81</sup> Hugo 1969:133; Cahall 2003:224.

<sup>82</sup> Brown 2008:393.

<sup>83</sup> Translated by Pine-Coffin 1961.

<sup>84</sup> Brown 2008:389.

<sup>85</sup> Wills 2003:5.

<sup>86</sup> Brown 2008:389.

As shown above, Augustine's understanding of *fides* originates from St. Paul's 1 Cor 7:2-4 in which the apostle exhorts the couple to give of themselves to the other. Similarly, Wojtyła understands that in a marriage the couple must make a self-gift,<sup>87</sup> but he makes an interesting addition. He says that,

It is not enough for a woman and a man to give themselves to each other in marriage. If each of these persons is simultaneously the property of the Creator, He also must give the man to the woman and the woman to the man, or at any rate approve of the reciprocal gift of self implicit in the institution of marriage.<sup>88</sup>

From this statement, Wojtyła agrees with Augustine and Paul in that there must be a gift of self in marriage. However he notes that there must also be a recognition that man and woman as creatures belong to the Creator, namely God. In marriage, there must be a requirement that God also gives the spouses to one another or, as Wojtyła says, at least approves of the relation between the couple. This occurred at the beginning in Eden and continues in every couple's union.<sup>89</sup> In this way, having been given to each other by God, they are also given the invitation to share in the role of creation of new life.<sup>90</sup> While pertaining to the good of fidelity, this passage also shows the relation of this good to that of the other goods, procreation and the sacrament (explained more fully below), whereby God witnesses the marriage professed by his children.

As pope, John Paul II continued to examine this idea in his writings. Recalling the account of the creation of man and woman in Genesis 2:18-25, he notes that as men are created "in the image and likeness of God" they are called to living out their relationships "through a sincere gift of self" (*MD* 7). John Paul II then uses this idea to construct an explanation of the connection between the self-gift and motherhood. He connects *fides*, or a giving of one's self to

---

<sup>87</sup> Reimers 2011:219; this idea is also discussed in his papal writings, see below.

<sup>88</sup> Wojtyła 1960:224.

<sup>89</sup> Buttiglione 1997:113.

<sup>90</sup> Dulles 1999:145.

the spouse, with the idea of *proles*, a special self-gift of the mother (*FC* 14; *MD* 18). The children are a reflection of the love of the spouses, and their fidelity (*FC* 14). This explanation of the importance of fidelity is simply a continuation of his pre-papal thought, with the added emphasis on theology, which he provides through the Scriptural basis. Having shown that man and woman must be given by their Creator, he deeply examines the creation story, specifically the important phrase which links man to God – “made in his image and likeness.” He concludes the importance of self-gift saying that man was made for communion, for fidelity.

Wojtyła is as adamant as Augustine that adultery is gravely wrong,<sup>91</sup> though he comes at the same result from a different perspective. For Augustine, one did not commit adultery because it was a violation of one of the Ten Commandments, and further forbidden by Christ and St. Paul. Wojtyła on the other hand, while certainly not discounting the reasons employed by Augustine, provides a more philosophical explanation in *Love and Responsibility*, as he tries to make his arguments available to anyone who pauses to consider their own experience. Based in Wojtyła’s personalistic approach, adultery is proven to be evil because, “sexual relations outside marriage automatically put one person in the position of an object to be used by another.”<sup>92</sup> In this way, Wojtyła does not negate the value of the Scriptural prohibitions against adultery, but furthers the understanding by explaining it rationally, and not just theologically, so even those who do not accept the legitimacy of religion can come to understand the good of fidelity.

Wojtyła makes reference to another matter regarding the good of *fides* which Augustine omits. In a discussion of adultery, Wojtyła recalls, “marriage is strictly a feature of man’s physical and terrestrial existence, so that it is naturally dissolved by the death of one of the

---

<sup>91</sup> Wojtyła 1960:221.

<sup>92</sup> Wojtyła 1960:221

spouses. The other is then free to marry another person.”<sup>93</sup> Augustine gave serious consideration to his question whether a spouse could remarry if the couple separated as a result of infidelity (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 7.7). Although he concluded that they could not, it seems strange that in his discussion regarding the possibility of remarriage, the question of marriage after a spouse’s death was never raised. This difference does not illustrate conflict between the two perspectives; in fact, Wojtyła draws himself closer to the austere Augustine shortly after his statement. Having stated how remarriage is justifiable following the death of a spouse, Wojtyła notes that it is equally, if not more, praiseworthy for the widow or widower to remain single as a testimony to the spiritual union which continues even after death.<sup>94</sup> Wojtyła even references 1 Corinthians 7 in his explication of this point.<sup>95</sup> As such it is rather reminiscent of Augustine’s own arguments against the remarriage of those separated – even if remarriage is allowed, remaining single and devoted to God is a more heroic course of action as it shows a continuing sign of the fidelity of God’s love for us (*FC* 20).

In his understanding of *fides*, Augustine made frequent reference to the idea that the act of intercourse was ordered towards procreation. From this he concluded that any such act which was not aimed towards that end was venially sinful, though it was permitted through marriage, that is, the spouses should assist each other in their desires so as to help the other avoid adultery. Wojtyła does not make such an argument, however, he is rather clear that when intercourse is not open to the possibility of producing children the act is ordered out of use, and not out of love.<sup>96</sup> From this understanding, it can be seen that both Augustine and Wojtyła find relations closed to

---

<sup>93</sup>Wojtyła 1960:212.

<sup>94</sup> Wojtyła 1960:212.

<sup>95</sup> Wojtyła 1960:212.

<sup>96</sup> Wojtyła 1960:228,234.

the possibility of parenthood to be wrong. Augustine calls it venially sinful, and Wojtyła utilitarian.

Furthermore, both authors focused the basis of their understanding of fidelity on the self-giving of the spouses. Augustine called this authority over the other spouse, borrowing language from Paul's 1 Corinthians 7. In *Love and Responsibility*, Wojtyła concluded the importance of self-gift in the relationship from man's relationship with his creator. In his papal writings he expanded this idea by looking at Genesis, further showing how man was made for unity with another, which is only achievable through a free gift of one's self to the other. Their difference in approach is insignificant; both conclude the importance of the mutual trust required in a marriage.

### *Sacramentum*

The third good of marriage as listed by Augustine is *sacramentum*. The Catechism defines *sacramentum* generically as “the visible sign of the hidden reality” (CCC 774). Though more directly referring to the seven sacraments, this definition hits a key idea of the good of marriage as well. This third good is defined by Augustine as holding the marriage to be both monogamous and indissoluble. As Augustine begins his discussion of the sacrament, he cites the Gospel of Matthew, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι (Mt. 5:32). “But I say to you that every one who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress.” From this statement, it is clear that divorce is not permitted for the purposes of remarriage. Augustine says, *usque adeo foedus illud initum nuptiale cuiusdam sacramenti res est, ut nec ipsa separatione irritum fiat* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 7.6). “Entering into the marriage contract is a matter of such sacredness that it is not annulled by that separation.” Augustine draws from this same passage in Matthew

affirming that marriage is so sacred that it is unable to be dissolved by a physical separation. Even if the couple no longer lives together, the marriage contract still joins them together, so a second marriage would be adulterous.<sup>97</sup>

Augustine next examines the implications of the qualifier Jesus used in Matthew when he allowed separation resulting from adultery (Mt. 5:32). With the understanding that even if the couple separates they are unable to remarry, he concludes that the aggrieved party must either live separately and not marry again, or else reconcile to the adulterer and live together (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 7.7). So although he notes it is permitted to civilly divorce from a spouse, to physically separate, he insists that remarriage is not permitted due to the sanctity of the covenant; the parties are still married, though they may not be living together anymore. Augustine concludes, *quae si ita sunt, tantum valet illud sociale vinculum coniugum, ut, cum causa procreandi conligetur, nec ipsa causa procreandi solvatur* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 7.7). “If this is so, then that bond of association between spouses is so strong that although it is tied for the purpose of having children, it is not untied for the same purpose of having children.” In this way, Augustine shows that although procreation is the primary good of marriage, it is not a reason for remarriage.

It is important at this point to say something about what the Church does and does not teach about divorce. As just shown above, through the Gospel and Augustine’s interpretation, divorce is not permitted since there is a spiritual bond uniting the spouses. Note especially Augustine’s comment on the exception granted for unchastity – that the couple might separate but not remarry. The Church continues to teach this understanding as clarified in the Catechism, where it explains that while couples should strive to bear witness to the indissolubility of marriage, there are situations in which this would be impossible (CCC 1649). In such a

---

<sup>97</sup> Harrison 2000:168.

situation, they may not remarry as they are still bound in the eyes of God (CCC 1649). While it is an unfortunate situation for all involved persons, it is not a sin to physically separate for a serious reason, though their marriage bond continues to be spiritually indissoluble (CCC 1649). This is especially important to describe, because there are many Catholics who do not understand this teaching, and following a separation, or civil divorce, they believe that they are out of communion with the Church.<sup>98</sup> Rather than shunning them, the Church calls for its members to “help these persons” (CCC 1649), and encourages them to avail themselves of the sacraments (provided they remain chaste).<sup>99</sup>

Later in his book, Augustine describes the significance for the sanctity of marriage as being representative of Christian unity (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 18.21). *sic sacramentum nuptiarum singularum nostri temporis significat unitatem omnium nostrum subiectam deo futuram in una caelesti civitate* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 18.21). “The sacrament of monogamous marriage of our time is a symbol that in the future we shall all be united and subject to God in the one heavenly city.” Even more than a simple sign of unity with God, Augustine shows marriage as a glimpse of the perpetual union Christ has to his Church.<sup>100</sup> From this sacramental understanding, one can see how it would be important that marriage be both monogamous and permanent until death. Dietrich von Hildebrand, a modern theologian much admired by Wojtyła, also comments that marriage serves as a symbol of God’s relationship to us.<sup>101</sup> The implication of this symbolism is that severed marriages distort our image of God’s fidelity towards us. This distinguishes

---

<sup>98</sup> Lawler 1993:93.

<sup>99</sup> Lawler 1993:93

<sup>100</sup> Burt 1999:85.

<sup>101</sup> von Hildebrand 1942:2.

Christian marriage from other unions – *sacramentum*, it is symbolic of stability, of unity with God.<sup>102</sup>

Augustine mentions Cato the Younger and his divorce from his wife so that she might marry his friend and bear him children (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 18.21). In this case Augustine notes a situation in which the good of *proles* was given preference to *sacramentum*. Denying that this partiality is good, Augustine asserts, *in nostrarum quippe nuptiis plus valet sanctitas sacramenti quam fecunditas uteri* (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 18.21). “In the marriages of our women the sanctity of the sacrament is worth more than the fecundity of the womb.” In other words, the desire for children cannot be a just cause for division of the couple united by marriage. As was shown earlier, while the good of *proles* is important, it still requires the unification of all three goods to bless the marriage.

Augustine’s position on the importance of *sacramentum* and the prohibition of the divorce demonstrates at least the theoretical removal of the double standard in place during this period of the empire in which the actions of adulterous husbands were ignored while unfaithful wives would be punished.<sup>103</sup> Certainly Augustine’s congregation found it difficult to change their ways, just as all humans struggle against moral reform, but this good was established and a goal set.<sup>104</sup>

In examining Karol Wojtyła’s perspective on these three goods, there are a couple important things to remember which separate him from Augustine. They are separated by a period of over fifteen hundred years, and so while both approach the issue as philosophers, they have slightly different perspectives. Augustine comes from an ascetic tradition, while Wojtyła

---

<sup>102</sup> Noonan 1986:128.

<sup>103</sup> Harrison 2000:167-8; Shaw 1987:29 n. 110)

<sup>104</sup> Harrison 2000:167.

examines marriage from the perspective of a personalistic approach.<sup>105</sup> That is, Augustine, though he clearly defends marriage as a good, presents the list as a list of “thou shalls” and “thou shalt nots.” Conversely, Wojtyła presents these goods in a way which demonstrates that his primary purpose is to enable his readers to lead fulfilling lives through good marriages. A teacher first, and a theologian second, Wojtyła is willing to avoid theological jargon when necessary to ensure his point is clear and relatable to his audience.<sup>106</sup> So while Augustine demonstrated how marriages should be monogamous and indissoluble from arguments based in scripture, Wojtyła reaches a similar conclusion through an examination of the person, desiring that even non-Catholics would be able to follow his argument. Nonetheless, Wojtyła makes sure to clarify that the Church understands that the institution of marriage was a sacrament from the beginning of creation.<sup>107</sup>

In *Mulieris Dignitatem*, focusing on Scriptural sources as well as his personalistic philosophy, John Paul II continues to present this idea that marriage is consistent from the beginning. Referencing Genesis 2:24 and Ephesians 5:31,<sup>108</sup> he notes the *peculiare illud unicumque vinculum per quod fiunt vir ac mulier in coniugio “caro una”*(MD 24). The “special and unique bond whereby in marriage a man and woman become ‘one flesh.’” Then in *Familiaris Consortio*, he says that as God made us in His image and likeness, *Deus indidit ei vocationem ac propterea potestatem et officium, cum conscientia coniunctum, amoris atque communionis* (FC 11). “God inscribed in the humanity of man and woman the vocation, and thus the capacity and responsibility, of love and communion.” Furthermore, this calling is able to be fulfilled only in a giving of self, either in marriage or in consecrated virginity (FC 11).

---

<sup>105</sup> Wojtyła 1960:211.

<sup>106</sup> Reimers 2011:110.

<sup>107</sup> Wojtyła 1960:223.

<sup>108</sup> “Therefore a man leaves his father and mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.”

Ramón García de Haro notes from this passage that John Paul II understands that not every relationship between a man and a woman constitutes a marriage – even if it results in children.<sup>109</sup> Rather, only the unions that are open to children and founded in self-giving love, love that is faithful and exclusive, can be specified as a marriage.<sup>110</sup> Just as for Augustine, all three goods must be present – *proles, fides, and sacramentum* – for the marriage to be valid.

In his argument against the consistency of the Church’s concept of marriage, Kramer tries to discredit this appeal to Ephesians 5.<sup>111</sup> Kramer argues that Eph 5:32 (the verse following the reference to two becoming one flesh) relating the union of marriage to the relationship between Christ and his church, applies theologically to the church, but not to marriage laws.<sup>112</sup> However, this contradicts what Augustine said above (Aug. *De bon. coni.* 18.21). The relationship between the couple and that between Christ and his church is significant, and not merely rhetorical. What Paul and Augustine both note is that as an everyday experience, marriage, particularly the indivisible relationship between two persons, is a way to better understand the mystery of Christ’s union with us, his church. This approach of using a human experience to understand a deeper reality suggests John Paul II’s own approach. Indeed, he notes this same connection between the *sponsalem coniunctionis Christi cum Ecclesia* (MD 23), “the spousal character of the union of Christ with the Church.” In regards to this passage, Augustine and John Paul II interpret this passage from Paul the same way; it is Kramer who tries to suggest that the symbolic character of these relationships do not inform each other.

---

<sup>109</sup> Haro 1989:343.

<sup>110</sup> Haro 1989:343.

<sup>111</sup> Kramer 2001:358.

<sup>112</sup> Kramer 2001:358-9.

In *Love and Responsibility*, Wojtyła is careful to note that marriage is not synonymous with family.<sup>113</sup> Of course marriage may lead to family as our earlier discussion on the good of procreation shows.<sup>114</sup> However, the marriage must be understood as an end in itself, and not simply a means to the end of family, for such an understanding bases the marriage in use and not love.<sup>115</sup> With this understanding, and in light of the personalistic norm, the institution of marriage must be monogamous and permanent.<sup>116</sup> Furthermore, the steadfast union between father and mother “gives the human being his first safe point of orientation for a balanced and authentic development of his personal existence.”<sup>117</sup> A permanent monogamous marriage is not only good for the married persons but also for the raising of children that they might be brought up in love. Furthermore, through the sacramental union, the grace of Christ is transferred to the couple and the family as an aid for living their own call to mirror Christ’s love for His Church (*FC* 21).

In addition to the familial importance of the sacramental good of marriage, Wojtyła notes that the sacrament also serves to justify sexual relations between the married couple establishing a lasting union of two persons within the framework of society.<sup>118</sup> This justification serves to demonstrate to the world that the union is a part of society, for lovers seek to have their love not only announced to the world, but also accepted by it. Wojtyła phrases this by saying, “Love demands this recognition, without which it does not feel fully itself.”<sup>119</sup> This desire for the public acceptance of relationships is personal, not theological. Archbishop Fulton Sheen finds

---

<sup>113</sup>Wojtyła 1960:217-8.

<sup>114</sup> Wojtyła does not hold that if a marriage is naturally childless the institutional significance of the union is diminished. Marriage is not required to produce a family to ensure its own legitimacy, though that is its primary purpose.

<sup>115</sup> Wojtyła 1960:217.

<sup>116</sup> Wojtyła 1960:211.

<sup>117</sup> Buttiglione 1997:114.

<sup>118</sup> Wojtyła 1960:219,225.

<sup>119</sup> Wojtyła 1960:219-20.

this idea of the publicity of love demonstrated by the lovers who would carve interlocked hearts in a tree.<sup>120</sup> Consider also the modern habit of announcing relationships on the internet for all to see. Love desires publicity. The sacramental aspect of marriage provides this, announcing their commitment of permanent fidelity to the Church and to the world.

In this way, Wojtyła as philosopher concludes the significance of *sacramentum* by examining the union through his personalistic lens without drawing heavily upon Scriptural references. He does this, not because he is opposed to the way in which Augustine argues this good, but rather so that he is able to reach a wider audience. Though he approaches the discussion differently, he remains consistent with Augustine in the result of the discussion – the indissolubility and monogamy of Catholic marriage. As pope, he builds more upon the Scriptural basis, approaching the issue from some of the same passages as Augustine did, but expanding the argument as well.

### The Three Goods Unified

Several scholars have noted that although Augustine describes the three goods of marriage separately, they form a single good for him – a sort of Trinitarian formation.<sup>121</sup> These scholars suggest that Augustine understood love as the essence of marriage, in which *proles*, *fides*, and *sacramentum* are all contained.<sup>122</sup> John Hugo says, “In the mind of Augustine, therefore, the three goods of Christian marriage are coordinated to realize the total good of marriage. He never envisioned their separation.”<sup>123</sup>

These scholars reference the *De bono coniugali* 1.1, in which Augustine references friendship as the binding force in society, and he places marriage in the middle of this

---

<sup>120</sup> Sheen 1996:113.

<sup>121</sup> Hugo 1969:133; Mohler, 1991:69; Cahall 2003:223-4, 232.

<sup>122</sup> Hugo 1969:134; Cahall 2003:225.

<sup>123</sup> Hugo 1969:126.

framework.<sup>124</sup> Thus David Hunter and Willemien Otten both note that even over procreation, Augustine places the bond of friendship.<sup>125</sup> This added importance of friendship they say, explains Augustine's point allowing a valid marriage even when the spouses are unable to bear children.<sup>126</sup> Citing *De bono coniugali* 3.3, Burt suggests that friendship can accompany *proles* as the first good of marriage, and then solidified by *fides* and *sacramentum*.<sup>127</sup> Understanding the idea of Augustine's three goods forming the elements of one unified good of friendship/love is helpful in understanding how a marriage requires all three goods to be valid. Hugo describes this tripartite structure saying, "There is only one *purpose* of marriage, but there are three *goods*."<sup>128</sup> However, as might be surmised from this investigation, Augustine's focus on procreation as the first good of marriage overshadowed his second purpose of friendship. Elizabeth Clark posits that this focus on the reproductive, rather than the associative, aspects of marriage result from Augustine's external constraints.<sup>129</sup> His discussions on marriage were all formed as a response to some misguided position or another. Augustine had to respond to the Manicheans, the Pelagians, and also to Jerome, affirming the importance of the body and reproduction.<sup>130</sup> Unfortunately, he was unable to emphasize both aspects equally, and so the importance of the friendship of the spouses was somewhat obscured in his writing.

It is important still that Augustine made mention of this shared purpose in marriage. It has been argued throughout this paper that the minor differences between Wojtyła and Augustine do not represent ideological disagreements, but rather demonstrate differences in perspective.

Scholars, who demonstrate that Augustine held friendship or love to be an important purpose of

---

<sup>124</sup> Cahall 2003:227; Hunter 1994:160.

<sup>125</sup> Hunter, 1994:160; Otten 1998:398.

<sup>126</sup> Hunter, 1994:160; Otten 1998:398.

<sup>127</sup> Burt 1999:83.

<sup>128</sup> Hugo 1969:133.

<sup>129</sup> Clark 1986:149.

<sup>130</sup> Clark 1986:149.

marriage, help to bring the ideas of Augustine even closer to Wojtyła, whose whole perspective was based on the person and love.

Recalling man's creation in the image and likeness of God, John Paul II says: *quocirca amor est princeps et naturalis cuiusque hominis vocatio* (FC 11). "Love is therefore the fundamental and innate vocation of every human being." Furthermore, he notes that there are two ways of actualizing this vocation to love – marriage or celibacy (FC 11). Ramón García de Haro notes that this argument demonstrates that the goods of marriage flow from the reality of the person and his innate vocation to love.<sup>131</sup> So John Paul II comes at the question by first understanding the primacy of love and thus reveals the other goods of marriage, while Augustine examines the three goods of marriage, with the result that they are all calling the couple to a mutual love. Though they employ varied perspectives, they posit the same principles.

In summary, Augustine demonstrated that while procreation is the "first" good of marriage, it is not the only one, fidelity to one's spouse and the sacramental institution must occur for the good of marriage to be realized. Through his description of these goods, he shows that marriage must be based in love, the commonality linking his three goods together. Wojtyła's position is very consistent with these elements. He begins with the dignity of every person which he holds as evident from an examination of experience. Drawing from Scripture, he infers that the call to love is placed in us from creation. Understanding that persons are made for love he affirms these three goods of marriage. Couples must be open to the possibility of parenthood, they must be faithful to each other, and the marriage must be monogamous.

In short, these authors, separated by over fifteen hundred years, remain consistent in their understanding of marriage despite different social and philosophic climates. Differences in emphasis or perspective can be answered from historical variance rather than an ideological

---

<sup>131</sup> Haro 1989:342.

difference. Augustine's approach was driven by a desire to answer contemporary heresies which denied the dignity of the body and therefore the good of procreation. So although Augustine had some idea of love as a shared purpose of marriage as shown above, he focused on the reproductive good in order to combat the heresies. Wojtyła sought to spread the truth about the good of marriage to the most people. To accomplish this, he approached the issue from philosophy, using the personalistic norm, trying to lead people to realize the centrality of the person by an examination of their own lived experience. Once his audience understands the primacy of the person, he then examines the implications for marriage, namely that the couple must be open to children, they must be faithful to each other, and that the union cannot be dissolved. So while, Wojtyła and Augustine both approach marriage from different perspectives, each affirms the good of marriage through common themes of children, fidelity, and the sacrament.

It is understood that throughout history, the vision of marriage held by these men and by the Church as a whole has not been always actualized. In *Familiaris Consortio* John Paul II notes Augustine's explanation of this historical conflict, saying it is *conflictationem inter duos amores: amorem videlicet Dei, qui usque ad contemptum sui pervenit, et amorem sui ipsius, qui ad contemptum Dei progreditur* (FC 6). "a conflict between two loves: the love of God to the point of disregarding self, and the love of self to the point of disregarding God." So even though they know that their teachings will not be universally accepted, this Doctor of the Church and this pope, along with the whole teaching authority of the Church, presents this consistent teaching on the good of marriage in the hope that men will choose the side of loving God and others while disregarding their own self-interests.

### Works Cited: Primary Sources

- Augustine. 1891. *Contra Faustum*. In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Josephus Zycha ed. 25:249-797.
- Augustine. 1900. *De bono coniugali*. In *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Josephus Zycha ed. 41:185-231.
- Augustine. 1961. *St. Augustine: Confessions*. Pine-Coffin trans. New York: Penguin.
- Augustine. 1992. *Augustine: Confessions*. James J. O'Donnell ed. Oxford: Oxford. Accessed online: <http://www.stoa.org/hippo>.
- Augustine. 1999. *The Excellence of Marriage*. In *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. John E. Rotelle O.S.A., ed. Ray Kearney, trans. Hyde Park: New City Press. I/9.
- Augustine 2007. *Answer to Faustus, A Manichean*. In *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Boniface Ramsey, ed. Roland Teske S.J., trans. Hyde Park: New City Press. I/20.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 1994. United States Catholic Conference, Inc. -- Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Ignatius Catholic Study Bible: New Testament*. 2010. RSV 2CE. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- John Paul II. 1981. *Familiaris Consortio*. [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
- John Paul II. 1988. *Mulieris Dignitatem*. [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
- John Paul II. 1997. *Theology of the Body: Human Love in the Divine Plan*. Reprinted from *L'Osservatore Romano* English ed. Boston: Pauline.
- Novum Testamentum: Graece et Latine*. 1984. Eberhard and Erwin Nestle ed. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Paul VI. 1965. *Gaudium et Spes*. www.vatican.va

Paul VI. 1968. *Humanae Vitae*. www.vatican.va

Pius XI. 1930. *Casti Connubii*. www.vatican.va

Wojtyła, Karol. 1960. *Love and Responsibility*. Willetts, H.T. trans. 1981. San Francisco:

Ignatius, 1993.

Wojtyła, Karol. 1969. *The Acting Person*. Andrzej Potocki, trans. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka ed.

1979. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.

#### Works Cited: Secondary Sources

Bassett, William W. 1968. "The Marriage of Christians – Valid Contract, Valid Sacrament?" In

*The Bond of Marriage*. William W. Bassett ed. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame

Press. 117-179.

Benedict XVI. 2008. *Church Fathers: From Clement of Rome to Augustine*. San Francisco:

Ignatius Press.

Brown, Peter. 2000. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Brown, Peter. 2008. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early*

*Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Burt, Donald X., O.S.A. 1999. *Friendship & Society: An Introduction to Augustine's Practical*

*Philosophy*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Buttiglione, Rocco. 1997. *Karol Wojtyła: The Thought of the Man Who Became Pope John Paul*

*II*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Cahall, Perry J. 2003. "The Trinitarian Structure of the St. Augustine's Good of Marriage."

*AugStud* 34:223-232.

- Clark, Elizabeth. 1986. "Adam's Only Companion": Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage." *RecAug* 21:139-162.
- Coughlin, Fr. John J. O.F.M. 2010. "Marriage and *Mulieris Dignitatem*." *Ave Maria Law Review*. 8:349-363.
- Dulles, Avery Cardinal. 1999. *The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Haro, Ramón García de. 1989. *Marriage and the Family in the Documents of the Magisterium*. William E. May, trans. San Francisco: Ignatius.
- Harrison, Carol. 2000. *Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hugo, John J. 1969. *St. Augustine on Nature, Sex and Marriage*. Chicago: Scepter.
- Hunter, David G. 1994. "Augustinian Pessimism?: A New Look At Augustine's Teaching on Sex, Marriage and Celibacy." *AugStud* 25:153-177.
- Hunter, David G. 2007. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1975. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kramer, Hans. 2001. "Changes in the Ethos of Marriage, Faithfulness, and Divorce." In *Perspectives on Marriage: A Reader*. Kieran Scott and Michael Warren eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 355-366.
- Lawler, Michael G. 1993. *Marriage and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Marriage*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Mohler, James A. S.J. 1991. *Late Have I Loved You: An Interpretation of Saint Augustine On Human and Divine Relationships*. New York: New York City Press.

- Noonan, John T. Jr. 1986. *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Otten, Willemien. "Augustine On Marriage, Monasticism, and the Community of the Church." *ThS* 59:385-405.
- Shaw, Brent D. 1987. "The Family in Late Antiquity: The Experience of Augustine." *P&P* 115:3-51.
- Sheen, Fulton J. 1996. *Three to Get Married*. New York: Scepter.
- Reimers, Adrian J. 2011. *Truth About the Good: Moral Norms in the Thought of John Paul II*. Ave Maria: Sapientia Press.
- von Hildebrand, Dietrich. 1942. *Marriage*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Weigel, George. 1999. *Witness to Hope*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Wills, Garry. 1999. *Saint Augustine*. New York: Penguin.
- Wills, Garry. 2003. *Saint Augustine's Sin*. New York: Penguin.
- Wills, Garry. 2004. *Saint Augustine's Conversion*. New York: Penguin.