Marriage as a sacrament

How did marriage come to be regarded as one of the sacraments? The doctrine was not defined as a dogma of faith until 1563, when the Council of Trent declared that marriage was properly one of the seven sacraments of the New Law and spelled out the implications of the dogma. Criticism of the doctrine by Luther and others had made it seem an indispensable pillar of Catholic teaching. Any narrative that follows the development of something over a long duration presupposes an end point – although the historian must try to regard each stage as if nothing came next, since at that time the future did not yet exist – and the end point for this monograph is the Council of Trent.

When did the doctrine emerge? By the sixteenth century, it was already well established in Catholic theology and practice. Tracing the development of the doctrine retrospectively, one reaches its origins during the first half of the twelfth century, and the trail peters out around 1100. The emergence involved two surges of constructive theology: one during the first half of the twelfth century, and another during the first half of the thirteenth. But belief that marriage was a holy estate, a Christian vocation, and a way of participating in the life of the church was ancient. What was new was the decision on the part of churchmen to account for that holiness by construing marriage as one of the sacraments of the New Law. This decision was not a sudden event but a complicated development of thought, practice, and imagination that took place over a period of more than a century.

Two major shifts in perspective resulted from that decision. First, marriage as a sacrament was primarily the transient act of marrying rather than the enduring condition of being married. Hitherto, theologians and moralists had focused on the married estate. But now, just as the sacrament of baptism was the rite that took place at the church font and not the resulting baptismal character, so the sacrament of marriage was the couple’s exchange of mutual consent, which ideally took place in a church. Second, the doctrine entailed a new use of Scripture.
The “great sacrament” of Ephesians 5:32 became identified with marriage, which theologians now characterized as the “sacrament of Christ and the church.” Exegetes from the patristic period until the late eleventh century, on the contrary, had identified St Paul’s sacramentum magnum either with the union between Christ and the church or with Genesis 2:24, construed as a prophecy. St Paul’s discourse on marriage in Ephesians (Eph 5:22–33) became the chief biblical authority on the holiness of marriage in theology – albeit not in the nuptial liturgy, which remained untouched by theological developments for several more centuries. Use of this discourse to illuminate marriage was rare before 1100, as was the notion that literal, human marriage – the institution in reality rather than figurative marriage – should be interpreted as representing Christ’s union with the church. A handful of patristic and early-medieval texts comparing marriage to Christ’s union with the church and alluding obliquely to Ephesians 5:32 became crucial in theology and canon law during the central Middle Ages, when they were frequently quoted, misquoted, and analyzed. That use has tended to disguise the rarity of the comparison before 1100, when churchmen often regarded the church as the bride of Christ but rarely regarded literal, mundane marriage in that light.

1.1 THE DEVELOPMENT IN RETROSPECT

On March 3, 1547, at Session VII, the Council of Trent declared that there were seven sacraments of the New Law: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage (Section 18.2.1). The first of the canons on the sacraments in general anathematizes anyone who says that these were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, or that there are more or less than seven, or that any of them is not “truly and properly” (vere et propre) a sacrament. These sacraments are collectively necessary for salvation, for “faith in the divine promise” does not suffice. Each sacrament contains a grace that it signifies, conferring it ex opere operato on any recipient who puts no obstacle in its way. The seven sacraments differ fundamentally from the sacraments of the Old Law, therefore, and not only in respect of ceremonies and external rituals. Marriage was no exception.

The general dogma implied that the seven sacraments constituted a closed genus, of which each member was a species. Unlike good things, for example, or sacred signs, the sacraments were countable, and each member was fully
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1. Session VII (March 3, 1547), Canones de sacramentis in genere, canon 1 (Tanner-Alberigo 684).
2. Ibid., canons 4, 6, 8 (684, 685). To say that a sacrament confers grace ex opere operato was to say that the recipient would receive the grace by virtue of receiving the sacrament (rather than as a result of any personal work or effort or pre-existing grace), provided that he or she did not present an obstacle to grace, such as a wrong intention in receiving the sacrament or a mortal sin.
3. Ibid., canons 5 and 2.
individuated. Their number was fixed and rather small, like that of the primary colors. The historical category of sacraments of the New Law was coextensive with the ontological category of sacraments properly so called, or sacraments in the strictest sense. These shared a common essence, which could be predicated univocally of all seven sacraments. The common definition defined the genus, whereas each sacrament had its specific differences and other salient properties. Any theologically literate reader would have understood what that generic essence was. These were by definition sacred signs that conferred graces that they signified. In other words, they were efficacious sacred signs, or saving signs. Each sacrament conferred its own specific and unique grace, and all the sacramental graces flowed or ramified from the Passion of Jesus Christ (Plate 2). Together, they made up a complete system, providing all the sacramental graces that were necessary for salvation.

The council went on to publish specific doctrines on each of the seven sacraments in turn, treating them in the standard order (as listed earlier) and coming at last to marriage. The decrees on the sacrament of marriage were published on November 11, 1563, at Session XXIV (Section 18.5). The first of several dogmatic canons on marriage confirmed the particular implications of the dogma of the sacraments in general. Marriage is not something “invented in the church by human beings,” as Luther claimed. Rather, it is “truly and properly [vere et proprie] one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law,” it was instituted by Jesus Christ, and it confers grace.

The preface to Trent’s decrees on marriage explains the role of this sacrament in the economy and history of salvation. Adam, inspired by the Holy Spirit, said: “This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh” (Gen 2:23–24). Adam implied that marriage was an indissoluble bond. Jesus Christ was referring to Adam’s dictum when he said, “they are no longer two but one flesh,” adding: “What God has joined, therefore, let not man separate” (Matt 19:4–6, Mark 10:6–9). But marriage is also a sacrament of the New Law. Jesus Christ, who instituted and perfected the seven sacraments, merited through his Passion a grace that would perfect the natural love in marriage, confirm the indissolubility of the union, and sanctify the spouses (see Plates 2–5). St Paul implied all this when he said that husbands should love their wives as Christ loved the church (Eph 5:25), and that marriage was a great sacrament in Christ and the church (Eph 5:32). Through this grace, Christ raised

5 Canon 1 (Tanner-Alberigo 754/25–27): “Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicae sacramentis, a Christo domino institutum, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum, neque gratiam conferre: a[nathema] s[it].”
marriage above what it had been under the Old Law, so that it was henceforth one of the sacraments of the New Law, as “our holy fathers, the councils, and the universal tradition of the church have always taught.” But recently, the decree continues, diabolical errors have beset the church. The Protestant heretics have rejected the church’s teaching on this and other sacraments. “Introducing the freedom of the flesh under the pretext of the Gospel as is their wont,” the Protestants have “asserted in writing and in speech many things that are alien to the mind of the Catholic church and to custom proven since apostolic times, and not without doing great damage to Christ’s faithful.”

This last admonition alluded to the Protestant attack on priestly and institutionalized celibacy, but in the eyes of the prelates at Trent, as well as of the Protestants, the sacramentality of marriage and the superiority of celibacy went hand in hand and were aspects of a single ideology.

The canons did not identify the specific grace that the seventh sacrament conferred, but anyone familiar with Catholic theology of the period or with the proceedings at the council would have recognized this grace in the reference to Ephesians 5:25. Marriage chiefly signified the union between Christ and the church (Eph 5:32). In an obvious sense, the marriage of any couple was not the cause of that union. Nevertheless, the love between husband and wife could not sufficiently emulate the love between Christ and the church, as Ephesians 5:25 required, without grace. The dual citation of Ephesians 5:25 with 5:32 was an answer to the criticisms of Erasmus and Luther, who had pointed out that Ephesians 5:32 by itself was not proof that marriage was one of the sacraments. The prelates at Trent, like most sixteenth-century theologians, identified the sacramental grace of marriage with a supernatural, God-given enhancement of conjugal love that enabled the spouses to remain together until parted by death. This was the grace that “perfects that natural love” between the spouses. Christian spouses could not justly claim, therefore, that as mere human beings they were not strong enough to remain married for life.

The preface to Trent’s canons on marriage seemed to imply that orthodox Christians had always recognized marriage to be “truly and properly” one of the seven sacraments of the New Law, but everyone knew that that was not the case. Most of the prelates conceded that in Peter Lombard’s opinion marriage did not confer grace; and, according to the Lombard’s own premises, that denial implied in turn that marriage was not properly one of the sacraments of the New Law. Even from the perspective of sixteenth-century observers, therefore, whose sense of history was much weaker than ours, the doctrine was less than four centuries old.

If the doctrine indeed went back to the apostolic era, it must have existed then only implicitly and obscurely, beyond the awareness of councils, clerics, and theologians. No general council or pope before Trent had declared as a matter

6 Tanner-Alberigo 753–54.
of dogma that there were “truly and properly” seven grace-conferring sacraments or that marriage was a sacrament in that sense, although the prelates at Trent could cite a series of official statements that seemed to confirm the dogma.

Regarded in retrospect, Peter Lombard’s treatment of marriage was a definitive moment or milestone on the way to the doctrine defined at Trent (Section 11.4). One may look forwards from that vantage point to marriage in scholastic theology and eventually to marriage at the Council of Trent, and backwards to the Lombard’s sources and to the origins of the idea. Writing in the 1150s, the Lombard began the last of his four books of Sentences by explaining what the sacraments were in general and distinguishing the sacraments of the New Law from those of the Old. The sacraments of the New Law were “baptism, confirmation, the bread of benediction (that is, eucharist), penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage.” The Lombard did not say that these were the only sacraments of the New Law, but the composition of his treatise on the sacraments and its apparently comprehensive scope implied that there were no others. The list was still fairly new, for its first extant appearances date from the 1140s (Section 11.2). The Lombard listed the seven sacraments in what would become the standard order, and he went on to devote a treatise to each of the seven in turn. He took his material on marriage mainly from a few favorite sources written during the previous quarter of a century, chiefly Gratian, Walter of Mortagne, and Hugh of Saint-Victor. They had in turn drawn liberally on earlier twelfth-century sources, including florilegia. The Lombard harvested and compiled the results of an extraordinarily vibrant and creative period in sacramental theology, collecting and sorting his material on marriage in his usual manner, which was pedestrian but practical, serviceable, and astute: a marvelous tabulation of current thought.

The Lombard’s division of theological topics as well as what he said about them would become fundamental after his Sentences became the standard textbook of theology in the 1220s. The master who pioneered of this use of the work was Alexander of Hales, an English member of the theology faculty in Paris (Section 15.3.1). The textbook became the subject of countless commentaries. Masters of theology were free to disagree with Peter Lombard – the Parisian masters published lists of his mistakes during the thirteenth century – but his Sentences established the agenda for theological studies until the sixteenth century. From the 1220s until the sixteenth century, therefore, discussion of the sacrament of marriage would always be located within the framework that Peter Lombard had established: a setting that raised as many questions as it solved.

Peter Lombard wrote more about marriage than about any of the other six sacraments. The number of distinctiones devoted to each sacrament in Book IV suffices as a rough guide, although these units are not equal in length, and the
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7 Peter Lombard, Sent. IV, 2.1.1 (239).
division was the work not of Peter Lombard but, again, of Alexander of Hales.\textsuperscript{9} Here is a conspectus of the treatment of the sacraments in Book IV, with the number of distinctions devoted to each sacrament in parentheses:

- **Baptism**: distinctions 2–6 (45)
- **Confirmation**: distinction 7 (1)
- **Eucharist**: distinctions 8–13 (6)
- **Penance**: distinctions 14–22 (9)
- **Extreme unction**: distinction 23 (1)
- **Orders**: distinctions 24–25 (2)
- **Marriage**: distinctions 26–42 (17)

This distribution does not mean that the Lombard found marriage to be more important or more interesting than the other sacraments, or that he considered it to be the most worthy, sacred, or sanctifying. Like most medieval theologians, he considered marriage to be the least of the sacraments in intrinsic worth albeit the greatest in what it signified. Marriage required so much space because of all the rules and regulations that it entailed, such as those regarding the impediments. Most of the Lombard’s contributions to the sacramental theology of marriage occur in the first two distinctions on the topic, whereas the remaining distinctions are largely devoted to the canonical rules. Likewise, most of what medieval theologians wrote about marriage in commentaries on the *Sentences* and in summas of theology was devoted to the same rules and regulations. Discussion of them was largely independent of properly theological premises, such as those regarding the saving work of Christ. Following Peter Lombard’s agenda, which had evolved during the first half of the twelfth century, most scholastic theologians from the thirteenth century throughout the Middle Ages treated marriage as the last of the seven sacraments, beginning their treatment with an account of its definition, purpose, sacred history, and sacramentality before proceeding to the canonical aspects.

Having listed the seven sacraments of the New Law, Peter Lombard divided them into three sorts: those which “fortify us with grace and virtue,” such as eucharist and orders; those which “offer a remedy against sin and confer helping grace,” such as baptism; and those which work only as remedy, such as marriage.\textsuperscript{10} But he had already established that saving efficacy was what distinguished the sacraments of the New Law from those of the Old. A sacrament in the proper sense of the term was “a sign of the grace of God, and the appearance of an invisible grace, in such a way that it bears its image and is its cause.”\textsuperscript{11} The sacrifices, offerings, and other rituals of

\textsuperscript{9} Peter Lombard divided each book into a continuous series of chapters. Alexander of Hales seems to have been responsible for inserting the level of distinctions between books and chapters as an aid to teaching and commentary.

\textsuperscript{10} *Sent.* IV, 2.1.1 (239–40).

\textsuperscript{11} *Sent.* IV, 1.4.2 (233). “Sacramentum enim proprie dicitur, quod sua signum est gratiae Dei et invisibilis gratiae forma, ut ipsis imaginem gerat et causa essitat.”
the Old Law were sacraments in a broader sense of the term, but they were not sacraments in the proper sense because they had no supernatural efficacy. They promised and signified the future advent of Jesus Christ and its graces, but they did not confer grace.12

Peter Lombard’s assumption that marriage, unlike the other six sacraments of the New Law, was merely remedial and conferred no gift of grace was conventional and remained virtually unquestioned until around 1220. Until then, theologians accepted what I call the “preventive model” (Sections 11.5.3 and 15.1). They assumed that marriage obviated sin without bestowing any positive gift. Whereas the other sacraments reformed the soul, bestowing grace and virtue and cleansing the soul from guilt, marriage only prevented the subject from committing sexual sins, chiefly by providing a licit setting in which to satisfy compulsive sexual desire. Theologians were not concerned about the apparent inconsistency. Those who noticed it solved it by pointing out that marriage had not been instituted under the New Law but in Eden. Institution implied innovation. Jesus Christ did not institute marriage but rather gave his approval (approbatio) to it.13 In what sense, then, was marriage one of the seven sacraments of the New Law? Not in the sense that it was a member of a physical or ontological genus, sharing the salient features of the common essence. But marriage was at least analogous to the other six sacraments in certain respects, and, above all, it belonged among them in a functional sense: as a member of a collection of things that fulfilled a certain instrumental role in the life of the church, and that together constituted a system.

For reasons that are not obvious, theologians moved away from the preventive model after around 1220, and by the middle of the thirteenth century the consensus of the profession was that marriage conferred sanctifying grace ex opere operato (Section 15.3). Alexander of Hales was a pivotal figure at the beginning of this development. Canonists hardly noticed the development and continued to rehearse the old assumptions until well into the fourteenth century. The theologians’ contention that marriage conferred its own specific sanctifying grace ex opere operato was part of a broad effort to assimilate marriage to the sacramental paradigm by showing that it exemplified all the essential and salient features of the genus. As Trent would later put it, marriage was “truly and properly” one of the sacraments of the New Law.

For many years after the formation of that theological consensus – at least a century – questions about the full sacramentality of marriage and about whether marriage conferred grace ex opere operato remained technical matters that were of concern only to professional theologians. Canonists, bishops who had no formal training in theology (always the majority), and parish priests considered marriage to be a sacrament of the church without taking that premise to its logical conclusions or trying to defend it against objections. Pious lay folk presumably regarded marriage

12 Sent. IV, 1.6 (235–36). 13 For example, Peter of Poitiers, Sent. V, c. 14 (PL 211:1257D).
in the same light, for no one was instructing them differently. What mattered was that everyone understood the place of marriage in sacred history, in the hierarchical structure of the church, and in personal salvation, and that lay folk followed the rules and regulations of marrying. Bonaventure discussed the question of conjugal grace carefully in his commentary on Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, composed in the 1250s (Section 15.3.4), but he did not raise it in the chapter on marriage in his *Breviloquium* (c. 1256), a compendium of theology that he wrote for his Franciscan students in Paris after completing his commentary. Indeed, Bonaventure said nothing in the latter work about marriage that that could not have been written a century earlier, and nothing to show that marriage was a sacrament in the proper sense. Similarly, Guido of Monte Rochen said nothing about the sacramentality of marriage or about marriage as a means of sacramental grace in his handbook for parish clergy, composed in the 1330s. Guido explains at length how to marry, who can marry whom, and the impediments, but his explanation of the nature of marriage and its place in the Christian life is limited to a commonplace summary of the circumstances and reasons for its institution, the proper motives for marrying, and Augustine’s three conjugal goods: faith, offspring, and indissolubility.

There are early signs of change in the reaction against Peter John Olivi, O.F.M. (d. 1298). Olivi conceded that marriage was a sacrament in some sense, but he denied that it had full univocity (*plena univocatio*) with the other six sacraments, and he questioned whether marriage conferred sacramental grace. In 1283, a committee of Franciscan theologians commissioned by their Minister General to examine Olivi’s orthodoxy found numerous serious errors in his work. Although his position on marriage was not among the issues that motivated this inquiry, it was the only one of his errors that the commission found to be potentially heretical. “Marriage is a sacrament of the New Law that confers grace,” they countered. “To affirm the contrary is erroneous; to sustain the contrary is heretical; to doubt it is entirely forbidden” (Section 14.8.2). Nevertheless, another contrarian friar, Durandus of Pourçain, O.P. (d. 1334), could still claim with good reason that whether marriage conferred sanctifying grace was an open question, and not a settled dogma. Like Olivi, Durandus conceded that marriage was a sacrament in some sense while denying that it had full univocity with the sacraments of the New Law (Section 14.8.3). He cautiously declined to say whether or not marriage conferred grace, but he noted that the jurists held one position, and the theologians another (Section 15.3.8). Almost all “modern theologians” held that marriage conferred sanctifying grace *ex opere operato*, he conceded, but the jurists took the opposite position, which he tacitly favored:

The jurists — who know the text of the decrees and decretals by which the position of the Roman church is expressed, and who have expounded and glossed the
canons and decretals, and some of whom have belonged to the College of Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church — hold that grace is not conferred in the sacrament of matrimony.\footnote{Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, IV Sent. 26.3, \S 6 (367v). Durandus describes the consensus among theologians at ibid., \S 8.}

Durandus was factually correct, but he erred if he implied that the jurists defended their negative position in the same way as the theologians defended their own affirmative position. The question of conjugal grace was still the preserve of professional theologians, and the canonists were still content to repeat what their predecessors had said about the matter during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The question of conjugal grace appeared in a very different light in the sixteenth century, when Luther and his followers attacked the system of the seven sacraments and the entire medieval doctrine and canon law of marriage, along with the elaborate impediments and the preference for celibacy. In the minds of the prelates at Trent, therefore, the univocity of the seven sacraments and the full sacramentality of marriage were indispensable articles of faith. The critiques of Luther and Erasmus prompted them, as they had been prompting Catholic theologians since the 1520s, to propose new arguments and to revisit the basis of the doctrine in Scripture.

Sixteenth-century Catholic clerics and theologians insisted that the Bible had to be interpreted in light of tradition, especially of the official pronouncements of councils and popes. In their view, Luther’s purported reliance on Scripture alone was arrogant and foolhardy. Thus, they appealed not only to the work of the most authoritative “scholastic doctors” of the central Middle Ages to defend the sacramentality of marriage, but also to a series of official declarations on the sacraments, especially to Pope Lucius III’s \textit{Ad abolendam} (1184), to the profession of faith that Pope Innocent III sent to the bishops of the Vaudois in 1208, to the \textit{Profession of Faith} of Michael Palaeologus from the Second Council of Lyon, convened by Gregory X (1274), and, above all, to Pope Eugenius IV’s \textit{Bull of Union with the Armenians}, from the Council of Florence (1439). But none of these declarations about the sacraments in general and about marriage as a sacrament in particular amounted to a formal definition of a dogma, and none of them affirmed or even implied that marriage was a sacrament in the proper sense of the term.\footnote{X 5.7.9, \textit{Ad abolendam} (CIC 2:780–82).} The profession of faith that Pope Innocent III sent to the bishops of the Vaudois in 1208 was a standard of orthodoxy for the Waldensians. As well as emphasizing the insolubility of marriage and the right of widows to remarry, it required acceptance of the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, the anointing of the sick, and
marriage. (Priesthood, which was still not always counted among the sacraments at this time, is mentioned as a prerequisite for eucharist.)

The Profession of Faith of Michael Palaeologus (1274) was part of a summary of the Roman faith that Pope Clement IV had sent to Michael VIII, the emperor of Byzantium, in an effort to reunite the Roman and Byzantine branches of the church. It affirmed that “the Holy Roman church holds and teaches that there are seven ecclesiastical sacraments,” namely, baptism, confirmation, penance, eucharist, orders, marriage, and extreme unction (in that order). This was the first formal enumeration of the seven sacraments in an official declaration. Pope Eugenius IV’s Bull of Union with the Armenians, issued at the Council of Florence in 1439, incorporated a summary of the doctrine of the sacraments adapted from an exposition of the articles of faith and the sacraments by Thomas Aquinas.

The summary followed the plan established by Peter Lombard, beginning with an account of the sacraments in general before expounding each of the seven in turn. It is remarkable that this bull presented the doctrine of the seven sacraments as something that the Armenians would have to accept if they wanted to belong to the Roman church, but the bull said nothing specific about the sacramentality of marriage in the section on this sacrament in particular. What would later be cited as proof that marriage was a sacrament in the proper sense was in the bull’s preliminary account of the sacraments in general. This affirms that whereas the sacraments of the Old Law only prefigured the grace that would be given through the Passion of Jesus Christ, the sacraments of the New Law not only signify but also contain and cause this grace, conferring it on those who receive the sacraments worthily. Furthermore, these sacraments result from the coming together of “things” (res), which serve as matter, and of words, which constitute the form, with “the person of a minister, who confers the sacrament with the intention of doing what the church does.”

No sacrament is complete, the bull adds, unless all three components are present: word, element, and minister. But this affirmation proved to be problematic. Because virtually all theologians conceded that the priestly blessing was not essential to marriage, they had to explain how in this respect the bull did not imply what it seemed to imply.

If one traces the development further back beyond Peter Lombard, one comes first to his immediate sources, especially Hugh of Saint-Victor (Chapter 10), Walter of Mortagne (Section 11.3), and Gratian (Section 6.4), and thence to the anonymous treatises composed of “sentences” (sententiae) during the first quarter of the twelfth century (Chapters 8 and 9). For want of a better term, I refer to the authors of this
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99 DS 794. 200 Profession of Faith of Michael Palaeologus, DS 860.
100 Tanner-Alberigo 542b–8: “Haec omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi, quod facit ecclesia. Quorum si aliquod desit, non perficitur sacramentum.”