

The “Good of the Human Person” As Emerging End of Marriage: A Re-Interpretation of Genesis 2:18-25

*Revenendo R. Vargas**

Institute of Religion, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines

Abstract: The human person is destined to God, and is morally and naturally ordered to be with God, his/her absolute end.

In Genesis, for man to be alone is *not good* (Gen. 2:18), and so He created the helpmate, the woman. Hence, major philosophies adopted this biblical account as the institutional foundation of Marriage.

Through the centuries, theological views were articulated towards the ends/ purposes of marriage. From the Old Testament’s traditionally accepted procreative dimension, grounded on biblical perception as the *propagation of species*, regarded as the primary end by Pope Leo XIII in the 18th century; to Vatican and Pope John Paul II’s emphasis on *mutual love*; and with the confronting secular opinions- developments and new ends of marriage are likely to emerge.

The “GOOD OF THE HUMAN PERSON” encapsulates the ends where marriage now points to a vertical union with the Creator, consistent with the spouses’ role, bestowed to them in creation.

Keywords: *Good, Human Person, Marriage, Ends, Creation*

*Revenendo R. Vargas can be contacted at rrvargas@ust.edu.ph.

Man's ultimate end is God, and that is defined with his relationship to Him, the Creator. In this relationship, man's actions and decisions are geared towards attaining his full potentials according to God's design. This relationship is endowed by God right at the moment of creation. And man is obliged to respond to the call of the Creator.

Right at creation, prior to his disobedience, man already enjoys a state of perfection. Created in God's own image and likeness (Gen. 1:26), and made little less than the angels (Ps. 8:6), making him the crown of creation, man assumes the apex of all of creation.¹ The fact that man exists in indissoluble relationship with the rest of creation and this remains a fundamental and irreducible distance, it is distinct that man is its climax with the Scriptural expression that man is called God's image and likeness.²

With this supernatural elevation of the human nature in Adam and Eve, the human person is seen at the highest value of his nature, endowed with preternatural gifts, they possess the following: *bodily immortality; freedom from suffering; freedom from concupiscence; the gift of knowledge; and the world was different before the first sin.*³ Haag exclaimed, "before his sin, man lived in peace and confident intercourse with God. He as yet knew no fear of God's revelation and of what was divine. The harmony between men and animals, and further, the harmony in the entire material and animal world accompanied the harmony between God and man."⁴

Whether humanity loses these preternatural gifts, the moral call to perfection remains. Humanity is called back and restores its relationship with the Creator. This call also reminds the human persons' relationship to the other parts of creation, and revealed to them their utmost responsibility, as stewards of creation; that humanity's satisfaction and fulfillment is also found within the guidance of the created realities around them. The preternatural gifts are not justifications for the human beings' evil desires, showing off its sinful capacities, but a picture of what was rather innate in their nature, that beyond and above the wickedness, is a perfection that humanity already possessed.

¹ Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education (ECCCE), *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Manila: Word and Life Publications, 1994), 91-92. Henceforth CCC. See also CCC 343-356.

² Michael Schmaus, *Dogma 2: God and Creation, The Foundations of Christology* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), 111.

³ Herbert Haag, *Is Original Sin in Scripture?* translated by Dorothy Thompson (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), 23-25.

⁴ Haag, *Is Original Sin in Scripture?* 26-27.

The good of the human person is not an immediate option or an overnight assumption in the divine plan. It was a cooperative masterplan, with the full participation of the human beings towards its fulfillment. In any sort, all other realities surrounding the human person, classified beyond their gifts of free will and stewardship, are under humanity's care and protection. All other beings, equal and above, were given the same and equitable responsibility for the creation's proper ordering involving primarily both the man and the woman.

While the economy of salvation is transacted through faith and reason and realized in Creation, in particular to the human society, it narrows down to the individual person's participation and role as steward, that giving justice to this specific role serves a heavenly reward of eternal life, to be with God. Viewed as a social institution then, Marriage sets the mode for fundamental family values that shall form basic deeds in social norms. It is then that Marriage, universally recognized as an institution, situates this paper, from its institutionalization from the book of Genesis to today's complex marital issues.

Genesis: The Institution of Marriage

Adam and Eve did not get married or at least performed a rite for their union, neither a cultural confirmation as husband and wife, nor partners recognized in the traditions of Genesis. The creation detail of the woman, apparently a tale from a storyteller is read from the second story of Genesis (chapter 2) while the first story is observed to be that of a "systematic" theologian.⁵ Both accounts narrated the first human beings' responsibility, one of which is "to be fertile and multiply; to fill the earth and subdue it (Gen.1: 28)." As a story, it can be a standalone tale that can be independent from the preceding verses in the same chapter.⁶ The creation of the woman then, as narrated in Gen. 2:18-25, has a description in a special section. It is through this special recognition in creation that prompted and stimulated more theologians to put more attention into this aspect in creation.⁷

Was the woman forgotten? Or was God experimenting if man alone can surpass challenges? No! It was rather emphasizing that something of peculiar importance to the human creature is missing: namely, community.⁸ Thus, a

⁵ John J. Scullion, *Genesis: A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers*. (Makati: St. Paul, 1994), 33-34.

⁶ Scullion, 34; Victor P. Hamilton, *Handbook on the Pentateuch, 2nd Edition* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005), 28.

⁷ Hamilton. *Handbook on the Pentateuch*, 28.

⁸ Clauss Westermann, *Genesis: A Practical Commentary*, trans. David E. Green. (Grand Rapids Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: 1987), 20. See also Scullion, *Genesis: A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers*, 34.

community of human beings, not of human beings cohabiting with animals and other created beings. The parade of animals did not sustain a suitable partner for the man (Gen. 2:19-20). Man's suitable partner is proven to be someone of his own kind. From the ribs of the man, the woman was created (Gen. 2:21-23). The man exclaimed, "This one, at last, is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called 'woman,' for out of 'her man' this one has been taken." Through the perceived woman, man finds her his suitable partner, his complementarity. After being finished and provided with all of life's necessities, something still is not good without the woman, she will make good for the man, and each of them will be good for one another.⁹

The role to establish a community is immediately seen in the human person. This role was given with specific moral demand in Genesis 2, which was the natural duty for both the man and the woman, as helpmates in carrying out their role in creation.

The scripture aptly described man's capacity in creation and was tasked further by God to give names and may call them as he wishes. Remember, the earth was formless, man is in creation to "till the soil" (Gen. 2:6). The human nature is highlighted in this narrative, where man was placed at the comfort of creation, whose primary role is to multiply or fertilize what has been given. To speak then of a union between the man and the woman is essential in carrying out their mission. To be fertile and multiply needs a substantial and complementing partnership, a helpmate that can naturally progress creation, according to their feature and nature, as human beings.

Citing a Near East Literature, the woman's entry in the biblical narrative separate from the other creatures is ancient.¹⁰ This ancient literature has a notably different framework from those of the Christian conception of marriage, which is more on the sociological nature than religious.¹¹ The nature of human relationship between Adam and Eve has to be rendered value since nothing in Genesis was explicit on the matter. Relative to the ancient Eastern civilization, the man-woman framework needs to be profound and eventually focus on human sexuality because it plays a crucial role in their identity, and a more recognition and realization of their position in creation. As Pierre Grelot clearly states:

Here, the divine is not concentrated in a unique personal God, completely transcendent by comparison with the actual realities of human experience. It

⁹ Westermann, *Genesis: A Practical Commentary*, 20.

¹⁰ Hamilton. *Handbook on the Pentateuch*, 28.

¹¹ Pierre Grelot, *Man and Wife in Scriptures* (London: Burns and Oates, 1964) 14-15.

is dispersed among a quantity of secondary figures, gods and goddesses, who themselves are or can form couples; as archetypes these couples are the concrete expression, each in their own way, of the various aspects of the man-woman relationship: fecundity, love, the **marriage institution**.¹²

Fecundity was innate in creation, it was implied upon their call to fertility and mandate to multiply. The model for this aspect of fecundity is founded basically on the human persons. Only the human persons were given this command. When both of them, man and woman realized their nakedness, it was neither a shameful conduct but of opening up for a more awareness of their sexual being. The aspect of passionate love in the human context of the man and the woman in creation here was also stressed.¹³ There was no direct and verbal command to love but it was in the human nature to fall into passionate state of relationship, which is essential for the implication of marital union. The two archetypes, man as god and woman as goddess; and the second archetype on sexual attraction, both manifested respectively in fecundity and passionate love, profess the man and woman relationship, of fertility and love into a marital union, which see a divine society modeled on human society.¹⁴ God's desire for flourishing and continuation is seen possibly happening in the union of the man and the woman. Thus the scripture says, "That is why a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife, and the two of them become one body" (Gen. 2:24). The love for the wife is different to the love of the father and the mother, that makes each one of them cling to their spouses. This biblical text becomes a major source of marriage, wherein its institution was initially grounded, affirming a biblical view of marriage in the Old Testament.

The Development of the Ends of Marriage

As a biblical reference, Genesis' treatment to the creation of the human beings have opened all interpretations making succeeding concepts and theological views allude to the creation accounts. Genesis' morality implicated to the human person validates articulating the purpose of marriage. With the first human beings' ironic unstated ritual union, but highly regarded as a married couple, contemplating on the ends of marriage then becomes very essential in going deeper into the nature and purposes of the human beings.

Marriage in the Scriptures

The Old Testament people have adapted to what have been obvious in the creation story. To be fruitful and multiply was more of propagation than its moral

¹² Grelot, *Man and Wife in Scriptures*, 18. Highlighting supplied.

¹³ Grelot, 20.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 23.

aspects. So as not to be prejudicial on the moral implications, it has been rampant in the Old Testament period that divorce, polygamy, levirate law and some sexual issues were even civilly acceptable. Consequently, Christ's teaching on marriage found in the gospels were almost, if not totally running against the traditional practices of the Israelites. The Mosaic law which prescribed to divorce, and was taken full recognition by the Israelites, is contradicted by Christ, even with the challenges upon him by the Pharisees:

But Jesus told them, "Because of the hardness of your hearts he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of creation, 'God made them male and female. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother (and be joined to his wife), and the two shall become one flesh.' So they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, no human being must separate." (Mark 10:5-9)

Hosea was the first in the Old Testament to see the value of covenant in marriage. Hosea's real life marriage mimics God's fidelity to His people. In the age where promiscuity was obscured by paternal and sexual dominance, a loving and faithful husband, amidst his wife's infidelity is phenomenal that openly explains the necessities of a moral view on marriage.

Christ's valuing of marriage was very evident. His first recorded miracle in John's Gospel happened at the wedding in Cana where the event was added with something extraordinary by making sure of a continuous supply of wine in order to complete the joy of celebration.¹⁵ On the issues of love and marriage, Christ preached primarily on love of neighbors, as well of enemies. By imposing the issue of love and marriage, the kind of love between a man and the woman marrying each other must be of utmost importance. This issue was given stress especially when Christ dealt with the subject on divorce which ensued a confrontation with the Pharisees. At this point, Jesus reminded them of the original intention of marriage leading to a controversy especially when a particular practice citing the Mosaic law was raised.¹⁶ In that confrontation, Christ cited a much older law, the law of Creation, where he referred, "but from the beginning of creation, 'God made them male and female.' For this reason, a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one (Mk. 10:5-8)." Jesus was very clear. His reference to marriage was from Creation. Divorce, although practiced, was never in the plan, its inclusion was rather an emergence from the peoples' "*hardness of hearts*" (Mk 10:5; Mt. 19:8).

¹⁵ Tamerlane R. Lana, et. al. *Marriage and Family: A Life of Love and Commitment*. (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2004), 19.

¹⁶ Cf. Mk. 10:1-12; Mt. 19:3-11.

Paul’s view was rather eschatological. Paul sees Christ’s valuing of the marital union of the husband and the wife as the union of Christ and His Church. Paul’s implied position on marriage directs a more conclusive relationship, which is founded not only between the husband and wife, but in the union between Christ and His Church. This view gives the impression of subscribing to the celibate life where Paul sort of distracted from marriage as he raised consciousness to a higher reality, the Heavenly Kingdom. When Paul called for marriage “because of the temptation to immorality” (1 Cor. 7:2), yet continued to encourage prayer amidst conjugal responsibilities “to avoid Satan’s temptation due to lack of self-control” (1 Cor. 7:5), he was implicating a vision beyond, beyond marriage, beyond the union of human relationships, where “marriage will no longer be necessary”¹⁷ but the union of God and the human person.

Marriage in the Early Christian Views

St. Augustine’s three objective goods: offspring (*proles*); fidelity (*fides*); and persevering commitment (*sacramentum*) were also discussed by St. Thomas Aquinas but differently dealt in terms of precedence. Determining precedence is essential in analyzing the emerging ends due to its development through theological interpretations. The Thomistic thought differs with emphasis on the moral and natural order. St. Thomas teaches that persevering commitment (*sacramentum*) was primary among the three goods of marriage in the order of dignity; while in the order of nature, offspring (*proles*) is the most essential to marriage, fidelity (*fides*) is second and persevering commitment (*sacramentum*) is third.¹⁸ With Thomas’ emphasis on *sacramentum* for dignity while comparatively stressing *proles* for the order of nature, the ends of marriage are up to further articulation as it may lead to disproportionate understanding. There is no deliberate contradiction between St. Augustine and St. Thomas. Augustine, in fact, did not explicitly state that a certain hierarchy exists between these benefits, but it is clear from his thought that offspring is primary.¹⁹ From 400 AD up to the modern period, Augustine’s *proles*, *fides* and *sacramentum* have been the standing description of the goods of marriage in the Catholic teaching. Thomas’ order of dignity: *sacramentum*, *fides* and *proles*, to that of his order of nature: *proles*, *fides*, *sacramentum* are running complementary, not exactly contradictory. The emphasis of Thomas on the values of mutual help justifies the stress on *sacramentum* while his stress on procreation adopts Augustine’s schema,

¹⁷ Lana, et. al. *Marriage and Family: A Life of Love and Commitment*, 22.

¹⁸ Paul F. Russel, *The Development of the Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage Since Pope Leo XII’s Encyclical Letter Arcanum* (Brighton, MA: Mgr Paul F. Russel, 2007), 11.

¹⁹ Russel, *The Development of the Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage Since Pope Leo XII’s Encyclical Letter Arcanum* 10.

following the ancient traditions of the primacy of procreation. With a view of the good of the human person as an emerging end of marriage, Thomas' perspective sheds further implications to the under-explored ends of marriage.

Pope Leo XIII's *Arcanum*, promulgated on February 10, 1880 made tremendous development on the ends of marriage. Leo XIII asserted that God instituted marriage so that the life of the spouses might be made better and happier (*par. 27*), so the better life (*vita melior*) is directed to the moral order and encompasses the values of holiness and eternal salvation; and the happier life (*vita beatior*) is directed to the temporal order and encompasses the personal value of love and the sharing of life.²⁰ For Leo XIII, marriage has to be seen with its benefits to the human person: the better life and the happier life. The ends of marriage are to be taken as the propagation of children/good of the offspring (*ad prolem*) and the good of the spouses (*ad bonum coniugum*). As a result, propagation of offspring and mutual love or good of the spouses come into hierarchy.²¹ Leo XIII sees that a relative weight has to be assigned according to the ecclesiastical jurisprudence to determine its hierarchical ordering, that one is primary over the other.²²

From the beginning of the world, indeed, it was divinely ordained that things instituted by God and by nature should be proved by us to be the more profitable and salutary the more they remain unchanged in their full integrity. For God, the Maker of all things, well knowing what was good for the institution and preservation of each of His creatures, so ordered them by His will and mind that each might adequately attain the end for which it was made. If the rashness or the wickedness of human agency venture to change or disturb that order of things which has been constituted with fullest foresight, then the designs of infinite wisdom and usefulness begin either to be hurtful or cease to be profitable, partly because through the change undergone they have lost their power of benefiting, and partly because God chooses to inflict punishment on the pride and audacity of man.²³

Leo XIII encourages the faithful to see the original intention of marriage, thus, putting them into hierarchical ordering. He placed the propagation of children for the Church for the worship and religion of true God as “*primo*” while the mutual love is to be seen as “*secundo loco*.”

Furthermore, the Christian perfection and completeness of marriage are not comprised in those points only which have been mentioned. For, first, there

²⁰ Russel, 13.

²¹ Michael R. Prieur, “The Articulation of the Ends of Marriage in Roman Catholic Teaching.” *Studia Canonica*, 33 (1999): 528.

²² Russel, 80.

²³ Leo XIII, *Arcanum*, 25.

has been vouchsafed to the marriage union a higher and nobler purpose than was ever previously given to it. By the command of Christ, it not only looks to the propagation of the human race, but to the bringing forth of children for the Church, “fellow citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God;” so that “a people might be born and brought up for the worship and religion of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”²⁴

Until the 21st century, the ends of marriage are primarily the propagation of children for the worship of God, and for their education, while the secondary end is the mutual love and support of the couples.

Marriage According to Vatican II

With the traditional teaching in pastoral ministries and catechism on the ends of marriage which are the “*procreative*” and the “*unitive*” aspects, the Second Vatican Council (Vatican II) develops relevant teachings which are grounded from the previous theological insights.

Pope Pius X made a historical breakthrough when he called that all Church laws be collected into one single Code.²⁵ The Cardinal Secretary of State, Cardinal Pietro Gasparri,²⁶ was then delegated by Pope Pius X as the president with five Cardinals appointed as members of the commission’s Executive Council. For the first time, the terminologies, “primary end” and “secondary end” have become official under an official Church document, the Code of Canon Law.²⁷

Pius XI’s *Castii Connubii* also referred to Leo XIII’s *primo* and *secundo loco* but makes an appropriate reference to the spouses’ mutual love, with a formal stress on the aspect of love in marriage.²⁸ The aspect of love on marriage was hardly emphasized in the earlier teaching, even regarded as secondary under the codification of 1917.

This mutual inward moulding of husband and wife, this determined effort to perfect each other, can in very real sense, as the Roman Catechism teaches, be said to be the **chief reason and purpose** of matrimony, provided matrimony be

²⁴ Leo XIII, *Arcanum*, 10.

²⁵ Pius X, *Arduum Sane*, March 1904.

²⁶ Archbishop **Pietro Gasparri** was a diplomat of the Holy See, appointed Apostolic Delegate in Peru and named Titular Archbishop on January 2, 1898. During the codification, he was created Cardinal, then became Secretary of State and Chamberlain of the Holy Roman Church on separate occasions.

²⁷ Michael Lawler, *Marriage and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Marriage* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 66.

²⁸ Prieur, “The Articulation of the Ends of Marriage in Roman Catholic Teaching,” 529.

looked at not in the restricted sense as instituted for the proper conception and education of the child, but more widely as the blending of life as a whole and the mutual interchange and sharing thereof.²⁹

The hierarchical ordering was then an indirect point for discussion based from the codification of 1917.³⁰ Some conciliar Fathers wanted to repeal the use of the terms *primo* and *secundo loco*. They wanted to give emphasis on the pastoral approach to the ends of marriage than engage with its juridical aspects, thereby relying on the procreative undertones of marriage which seem to adopt more on the older thoughts within the Church, namely the procreative aspect.³¹ There is neither devaluing of the natural dimension of childbearing or offspring, but there is also an orientation towards children but with emphasis and promotion of the inherent value of mutual love in marriage.

*Gaudium et Spes*³² has treated marriage with certainty but not enough emphasis on the hierarchical ordering. With the conjugal love's sustained prominence unprecedented in the official Church teachings and the indirect avoidance on discussing or engaging with the issue on hierarchy of the ends of marriage, even without enough discourses on its formulation,³³ mutual love is clearly gaining significance towards the procreative aspect of marriage as it was almost repeatedly written in the document.

Magisterium had never understood conjugal love as a secondary end of marriage. Therefore, Vatican II will be able to locate it – without disturbing but rather developing the Tradition – as the formal, life giving principle of the conjugal community: a community of life and love, whose ends is the procreation and education of children. He says that what is new in Vatican II is that now both the institutional aspect of marriage and conjugal love “tend toward [the procreation of children].”³⁴

As the post Vatican II conciliar meetings approached (1965-1998), the aspects of marriage were presented in high profile, where covenant is seen as a partnership of love. The use of “primary and secondary” ends is gradually

²⁹ Citing *Casti Connubii*, 24. Highlighting supplied.

³⁰ The **Codification of 1917** (The 1917 Code of Canon Law), also referred to as the Pio-Benedictine Code, was the first official comprehensive codification of Latin canon law. It was promulgated on May 27, 1917 and took legal effect on 19 May 1918.

³¹ Prieur, 529.

³² Pastoral Constitution On The Church In The Modern World-**Gaudium et Spes**, Promulgated by Pope Paul VI. [Vatican City]: 1965.

³³ Prieur, 530.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 530.

understated. Its non-prominence in the document is an indicative of further focus to the biblical sources with a trace to the proper anthropological, religious, social, and cultural origin.

Post Vatican II views on Marriage

Several encyclicals have not established in any form the hierarchical language of Leo XIII, except Pope John Paul II when he implicated an ordering of the ends of marriage during a general audience on October 1984. In John Paul II's acknowledgment, he stressed the role of love in marriage without actually mentioning its ends.³⁵

Catechism of the Catholic Church

The Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) treated marriage by adopting the terminology highlighted by the 1917 Code of Canon Law, namely *mutual help* and *remedy for concupiscence* as the purposes of marriage. However, in one of Pope John Paul II's general audience on October 10, 1984, he stressed that:

Love, as a higher force which man and woman receive from God along with their special “consecration” in the sacrament of matrimony, demands a correct coordination of those ends, according to which – in the traditional teaching of the Church – the moral order (or rather the “theological and moral order”) of the life of the spouses is constituted. The doctrine of the Constitution “*Gaudium et Spes*,” as well as that of the Encyclical “*Humane Vitae*,” clarify this same moral order in **reference to love**, understood as a higher force which confers an adequate content and value to conjugal acts according to the truth of their **double significance**, *unitive* and *procreative*, in respect to their inseparability. In this renewed formulation, the traditional teaching on the ends of marriage (and on their hierarchy) is both confirmed and deepened from the viewpoint of the **interior life of the spouses**, or from the viewpoint of conjugal and familial spirituality.³⁶

John Paul II sees conjugal love as the inner form – the “soul” – of marriage.”³⁷ He reaffirms the traditional teachings of the 1917 Code of Canon Law which equates marriage and marital love, where everything is directed towards the traditional ends.

The intimate partnership of married life and love has been established by the creator and qualified by His laws. It is rooted in the conjugal covenant of irrevocable personal consent. [...] For God Himself is the author of matrimony, endowed as it is with various benefits and purposes. [...] By their very nature, the institution of matrimony itself and conjugal love are ordained for the procreation

³⁵ *Ibid*, 531.

³⁶ John Paul II, General Audience (October 10, 1984).

³⁷ Russel, 21.

and education of children[...]. For this reason, Christian spouses have a special sacrament by which they are fortified and receive a kind of consideration in the duties and dignity of their state.³⁸

The CCC's final version showed a formulation of the statement on marriage as included in the Creator's original plan resulting to replacing the title from "Natural Sacramental Marriage" to "Marriage in God's Plan."³⁹ This manifests the teaching's directive towards the original plan, consistent with the priority on the loving relationship. All approaches to the order of Creation: marriage under the regime of sin; under the pedagogy of the law; marriage in the Lord; and for the sake of the Kingdom (Cf. CCC, 1603ff).

Theology of the Body

Theology of the Body (TOB), subtitled "Man and Woman He Created Them," is one of Pope John Paul II's greatest contribution to the Church. John Paul II's great power of speculative penetrations, shows further the deep connections between the divine communion of persons in the Trinity and the human communion of persons between man and woman, mediated by their male and female bodies. John Paul II showed that the bodies have great interior subjective and personal depth.⁴⁰ Affirming the body as a sacrament:

The sacrament, as a visible sign, is constituted with man, inasmuch as he is a "body," through his "visible" masculinity and femininity. The body, in fact, and only the body, is capable of making visible what is invisible: the spiritual and the divine. It has been created to transfer into the visible reality of the world the mystery hidden from eternity in God, and thus to be a sign of it.⁴¹

Referenced with the Thomistic view where *Sacramentum* takes precedence, John Paul II gives a clear hint indicative of a more significant end of marriage as directed to the union with God. The carnal union experienced in the male and female bodies, manifested in their conjugal and mutual love is ordered to God's eternal plan. Sacrament aspect is also given emphasis in John Paul II's vision on the ends of marriage. The elaborate and practical presentations of the physical natures of the human beings are too vivid with more stress on the sexuality.

These are experienced "in the beginning" before sin (Original Man); as man

³⁸ GS, 48.

³⁹ Wojciech Kowal, "Twenty Years After the Promulgation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Doctrinal Foundations of Marriage." in *Studia Canonica* (vol 47/1 2013): 183-206; Cf. CCC, 1601ff.

⁴⁰ Michael Waldstein, "Foreword" in Christopher West, *Theology of the Body Explained* (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2007) xxviii. Citing St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.1.4.

⁴¹ John Paul II. *Man and Woman He Created Them*. Translated by Michael Waldstein. (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006).

experiences them in human history affected by sin, yet redeemed in Christ (Historical Man); and as man will experience them in the resurrection of the body (Eschatological Man), forming his “adequate anthropology.”⁴²

John Paul II alludes to the schematic ordering of the human person with a strong reference to its original solitude. TOB highlights that everything is ordained to the Father in Heaven. The good or the ends of the human person is ordained to the Kingdom, amidst the body’s susceptibility to sin and corruption, is still promised resurrection in the end. John Paul II formed “adequate anthropology,” that the human person indeed, is adequately and properly equipped for fulfillment, by his very human physique, by his sacramental body, and this sacramental experience, as an experience of obedience, takes its full satisfaction in the sacramental presence. All that is needed for fulfillment has already been possessed.

Although celibacy provides a sufficient claim that a higher order more than the physicality of the human being is the spiritual being, both Christian celibacy and Christian marriage in light of this “total vision of man” demonstrates a better assumption that both are geared towards the heavenly union.

John Paul II concludes with a reflection on *Humanae Vitae* demonstrating that “the doctrine contained in this document is organically related to the whole biblical question of the theology of the body” (General Audience 11/28/84).

John Paul II is very clear, a better assumption of the ends of the union of man and woman, is not entirely rooted in the marital union. Paul aptly described marriage in order to be safer from evil, but better than having a wife is in line for the good of the human person. Leo XIII’s “good of the spouses” can be an individual spouse, or spouses in the sense of their unity as husband and wife. But as spouses, the union is too significant, that it makes better and flourishing for the spouses to be in this union, ordained and directed to the Father.

Re-Interpreting Genesis 2:18-25: A Creation’s Tale on Marriage

Following the unfolding of the ends, from Genesis up to the current trends, there is now a recognized emphasis that points back to the origin. The Israelite’s practice of divorce was due to the hardness of their hearts. It took centuries until Christ came to remind them of their misunderstanding. While searching for the meaning and purposes of marriage, some Church authorities have gone into conflicting views. The Conciliar documents and the encyclicals have presented

⁴² Christopher West, *The Pope’s Theology of the Body*, Catholic Education Resource Center. Accessed from <https://www.catholiceducation.org/en/marriage-and-family/sexuality/the-pope-s-theology-of-the-body.html> on December 6, 2017.

somehow a unanimity, but in the details of the presentations, there lies a remarkable identity that nevertheless, the teachings remain and direct to the human person's dignity and communal responsibility, seen in love and mutuality.

All ends are directed to the beginning. Even Paul and the great Popes who have greatly involved themselves in contemplating the ends of marriage, looked back to the beginning. With an attempt on looking at the origin, the beginning and the biblical texts on marriage will be re-interpreted. For John Paul II and Benedict XVI, in all their efforts of evangelization, reference to Genesis is seen to be essential and a great facility in determining an emerging end of marriage. The method is consistent with the interpretation of the Genesis accounts, but in a simpler term, where the theological views remain faithful to the doctrines proclaimed by the Church.

The approach is employed with a different framework. There's no new interpretation in this approach, it is more of a re-arranging of the teachings, putting together and analyzing previous thoughts, and gaining emphasis with what have already been effectively established.

Initially, the approach begins with the Creation of the world. The Catechism for Filipino Catholics⁴³ (CFC) provides a substantial proof that marriage was indeed instituted in the Creation time, and it justifies that the man and woman are the most important parts of creation. The positioning of both of them and their descendants play a great implication of the human person's role in Creation. These gifts bestowed only to the human person, is a manifestation to this greatness given by God.

Correlating celibacy in the aspect of reinforcing marriage in its procreative aspect is given value beyond spiritual insights. To feature celibacy as a means to be closer to God, with its eschatological dimension validates a very extensive support to claim that the good of the human person is carried out both by marriage and celibacy.

The Creation of Man and the Universe

When order was established and when "the heavens and the earth and all their array were completed" (Gen. 2:1), God rested, the larger picture comes in for humanity to participate. Instead of concluding on the seventh day, it was instead an opening to a different yet same stage of creation. The succeeding days are not anymore numbered. There was nothing more conclusive than the creation story

⁴³ Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education, *Catechism for Filipino Catholics* (CFC), (Manila: Word and Life Publications, 1997). The **Catechism for Filipino Catholics**, or CFC, is a contextualized and inculturated Roman Catholic catechism for Filipinos prepared by the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) and approved by the Holy See. Henceforth CFC.

on seven days. Apparently, God created rice, but he did not cook, God created the wood, but he did not build a house, God created the man and the woman, but continuing the creation of the human race, was not made explicit in the scriptures. God continues his creation in most striking sense of His continuing activity, as going on now.⁴⁴ This continuation has now involved the human person through the personal dimension with which they are invested the responsibility. By making them and letting them have dominion all over creation, God continues creating.⁴⁵

The human person, endowed with knowledge and wisdom, as a moral agent considered in the light of both reason and faith (CCC, 682) shall discover things according to his own accord. He now discovers how to cook the rice, or build the house, and so on. The succeeding narratives in biblical history now involve the human beings, giving them the role in the preservation and propagation of creation. The dramatic and dynamic presentation of God, creating something from nothing is even made clear as the story unfolds, and rests on the seventh day. Thus, if an eighth and so forth days thrive in the narrative, it was an eternal and continuous creation, with the human person acting in behalf of his/her mission, to become stewards, and to subdue the earth.

The human beings, created in God's own image and likeness are neither subjected to exploitation, where God made them intending to further satisfy His will. It is by the divine image in man, making him little less above the angels that his (man's) actions are then bound to God's glory. The inner call of the persons' being is guided towards God. This divine image bestowed in the human person in creation shows a special bond between God and humanity, that all actions are directed towards God. The point was the realization of the human persons as communal creatures. The human race is God's creation, male and female. All human community is based on the community of male and female.

In Genesis 2:4-7, the human being was created because "there was no one to till the soil." The human person holds the key for creation to flourish. By his intellect and free will, man finds means to discover how to cover his body with clothing, how to cook the rice, to look for his shelter, and so on. And in doing so, creation gradually flourishes.

Creation of the Woman

God's intention was further revealed when He realized the need for a helpmate, a suitable partner. For mankind to flourish, God instituted marriage.

⁴⁴ See CCC, 301; CFC, 339.

⁴⁵ See CFC, 339§3.

The drama unfolding from this account narrates how God formed the woman from the ribs of the man, made them equal, “*male and female He created them*” and together commanded them to go forth and multiply, giving them dominion over the earth.⁴⁶ The immediately succeeding narratives of the Creation story elaborated a relationship built between and among them, the man and the woman establishing their descendants. The Genesis proclamation whereby a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife clearly affirms a purpose for their very beings, as individuals, as created by God, to be with someone their equal. This is a way of imitating in the flesh the Creator’s generosity and fecundity.⁴⁷ It is through this that all generations of human beings come.⁴⁸

God knows the creation of mankind was not complete. When God realized it is not good for the man to be alone, he sees the need for humanity to enter into relationships. This relationship does not exclude the environment, his work, his community and his relationship to his Creator.⁴⁹ Man did not initially realize this need, God does. Man was not complaining of being alone. It was God who thought that “it is not good for the man to be alone (Genesis 2:18).”

At this point when the man is “finished” and apparently provided with all of life’s necessities, the Creator pauses in his work and asks himself whether this is how the Creator intended to create: whether the man is all right just as he is. He comes to conclusion: No, something is still lacking.⁵⁰

In need of a helpmate? “God formed the animals” (Gen. 2:19). “But none proved to be the suitable partner for the man (Gen. 2:19-20).” He further stated that animals are likely helpers. However, it is left to the man himself to discover how the animals can help him.⁵¹ This is meant for him to participate and understand in the order of creation.

The woman and all its forms were not chosen by the man. In fact, he was in deep slumber (Gen. 2:21) while the woman is being created. Through the animals, “male and female,” proposing partnership, he finds nothing suitable for him. Man’s participation in understanding the order of creation is highlighted when he seeks a suitable partner for him. With the creation of the woman, the man exclaimed, “This one, at last, is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called ‘woman,’ for out of ‘her man’ this one has been taken.” Through the perceived woman, man finds her his suitable partner, his completion. After being finished and

⁴⁶ Cf. Gen. 1:27-29.

⁴⁷ Cf. CCC, 2335.

⁴⁸ Cf. Gen. 4:1-2, 25-26; 5:1.

⁴⁹ Westermann, 19.

⁵⁰ Westermann, 20.

⁵¹ Westermann, 20.

provided with all of life’s necessities, something still is not good without the woman, she will make good for the man, and each of them will be good for one another.⁵²

Here the narrator is emphasizing something of peculiar importance to the human creature: namely **community**. The reflection of the Creator, that this is not yet the true human being that he had intended, elevates the **bisexuality** of the human race from something taken for granted to the realm of conscious reflection: “It is not good for the man to be alone.”⁵³

“Community” is pictured and “bisexuality” is elevated. The two are not explicit in Genesis. But with man’s rationality conferred with the dignity of a person, can initiate and control his own actions, so he seeks God.⁵⁴ God conveys for man to propagate. Together with the animals, male and female, they were commanded to be fertile and multiply. The procession of animals did not convey a dissatisfaction on the part the man, it is rather assumed man’s capacity to put things in place and understand the order of things established by the Creator.⁵⁵ The parade of animals before the human highlighted their dual sexuality, male and female, and thereby accentuated the loneliness of the human being.⁵⁶ Looking at the animals, male and female, the man have figured out what is lacking of him. But the desire for something lacking did not start through the procession of the animals. It was God himself who saw what is not good for the man. The purpose of creation has now advanced to clarity, after being established and completed in Genesis- that is **to propagate community and to enhance the human person’s sexuality**.

A more contextualized theology becomes truly important in integrating the ribs of the man into making more significant the creation of the woman. Looking at “what is good for the man” poses a new and emerging end in Marriage.

The First “Not Good” in Creation according to Genesis

All of Creation is good. The antiphons of every creation end with “*and God saw good it was!*” When God created the human person, created in His own image and likeness, sharing His divine responsibility, the more the human person deserves these good attributes in him. From the preternatural gifts bestowed on man, man is good from the beginning.

Ironically, there is something which is “not good” in creation! And this condition is situated where everything is supposedly “good.” Was the woman’s

⁵² *Ibid*, 20.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 20.

⁵⁴ GS, 17; CCC, 1730.

⁵⁵ GS, 15§2.

⁵⁶ James McKeown, *Genesis* (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdsman, 2008), 34.

initial non-inclusion in Genesis 2 intentional, while Genesis 1 reveals that the two, male and female were consequential in creation? Or was God trying to highlight the woman in creation that humanity must see, and the impact of something which is “Not Good” truly brings the best in all sorts of God’s creation? Scullion described: “It is not as if God has forgotten to create the woman, or that He was testing the man if he could find a partner in the animals. Man could have chosen the animals and that would be chaotic, which is non-sense to think God creating chaos!”⁵⁷ It is most likely that the creation was not meant to be “Not Good,” it is rather meant to be something better. But how in the world can be explained of the woman not part of a creation which chants antiphons of “Goodness?”

The equilibrium of the “good” and “not good” in Genesis is in discussion as the latter patches a solution through the creation of the woman. When all of creation are almost perfect, the need for the woman offsets its beauty, a significant and valuable creation of God, a partner to the man. The woman was not created from something else new, she was created from an already existing piece in the physical world. The notion of her from the man strongly suggests equality with the man. Why God did not take the woman from another clay? God wanted to free man from his loneliness, and he remedied it, not by presenting the beasts as replacement, but as man’s necessary assistance. Thus in man’s giving names to the beasts, these animals are brought to their proper nature. But the creation of the woman was not an unsuccessful enterprise, as if God has forgotten the woman? No! The parade of the beasts and the presentation of the woman were a condescension by the inspired author that man’s helpmate cannot be from the animal kingdom but with the woman, who does not stand beneath, but beside him.⁵⁸ What was needed was a partner. Man’s obvious partner must be something of his own kind. When the woman was created, the two become one. What is good for the man, the woman, and marriage in this biblical foundation, is the good of the individual spouses.

Conclusion

In the parameters of articulating the developments of the ends of marriage, what emerges as essential is a re-interpretation of the prescribed scriptural texts, Gen 2:18-25, with valuable consideration of historical-cultural contexts. In this context, it is modestly concluded that:

First, the paper has postured that the articulation of the ends of marriage which originated from the scriptural traditions to the modern concepts have brought

⁵⁷ Scullion, 34.

⁵⁸ Schmaus, *Dogma 2: God and Creation, The Foundations of Christology*, 119-120.

consistency in theological thoughts, emphasizing further the traditional purposes such as the *procreative* and *unitive* aspects, but not in the language of hierarchy and in terms of primacy.

Second, the observation now sees re-interpretation, as emerging thoughts reinforced by adaptations to socio-cultural foundations, find the ordering of the ends of marriage essential to further establish its natural and moral purpose. The ordering implicates variability in determining the ends, thus, a re-reading of the source scriptural texts is essential.

Third, in its exegetical review, a more consistent interpretation was the call to the human persons towards holiness. This call reverberates in all aspects of Christian teaching, and tantamount to this call is the role of the human person and their participation in Creation, on stewardship, as God's co-creator.

Finally, the substantial re-interpretation of the text sees further the flourishing of creation towards a community, brought by the man and the woman's participation. This participation is primarily imbibed by the moral call to love one another. This loving one another, which established a horizontal union among the spouses elevates to a higher reality, of good, of vertical union towards the Creator.**PS**

References

Church Documents

Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education (ECCCE), *Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC)*. Manila: Word and Life Publications, 1994.

Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education (ECCCE), *Catechism for Filipino Catholics (CFC)*. Manila: Word and Life Publications, 1997.

Leo XIII, *Arcanum*, Feb. 10, 1880.

Paul VI, *Gaudium et Spes*. Dec. 7, 1965.

Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, July 25, 1968.

Pius X, *Arduum Sane*, March 19, 1904.

Pius XI, *Castii Connubii*, Dec. 31, 1930.

Books

Grelot, Pierre. *Man and Wife in Scriptures*. London: Burns and Oates, 1964. pp. 14-15.

Haag, Herbert. *Is Original Sin in Scripture?* translated by Dorothy Thompson. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.

Hamilton, Victor P. *Handbook on the Pentateuch, 2nd Edition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005.

- John Paul II. *Man and Woman He Created Them*. Translated by Michael Waldstein. Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006.
- Lana, Tamerlane et. al., *Marriage and Family: A Life of Love and Commitment*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2004.
- Lawler, Michael. *Marriage and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Marriage*. Collegeville, Minnesota. The Liturgical Press, 1993.
- McKeown, James. *Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.
- Russel, Paul F. *The Development of the Doctrine on the Ends of Marriage Since Pope Leo XII's Encyclical Letter Arcanum*. Brighton, MA: Mgr Paul F. Russel, 2007.
- Schmaus, Michael. *Dogma 2: God and Creation, The Foundations of Christology*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.
- Schmaus, Michael. *The Essence of Christianity*. Chicago: Scepter Publishers, Ltd., 1961.
- Schleck, Charles. *The Sacrament of Matrimony: A Dogmatic Study*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1964.
- Scullion, John J. *Genesis: A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers*. Makati: St. Paul, 1994.
- West, Christopher. *Theology of the Body Explained*. Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2004.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis: A Practical Commentary*, trans. David E. Green. Grand Rapids Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: 1987.

Journal Articles

- Kowal, Wojciech. "Twenty Years After the Promulgation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church: Doctrinal Foundations of Marriage" in *Studia Canonica* Vol. 47/1 (2013) pp. 183-206.
- Prieur, Michael R. "The Articulation of the Ends of Marriage in Roman Catholic Teaching." *Studia Canonica*, 33 (1999): 527-535.

Article in a Book

- O'Keefe, John J. "Marriage is Good, but Celibacy is Better," in *Marriage in the Catholic Tradition* edited by Salzmann, et. al. New York: The Crissroad Publishing Company, 2004. pp. 76-84.

Online Articles

- Szterszky, Subby. *Why is there no Marriage in Heaven?*, Focus on the Family. www.focusonthefamily.ca, 2018. Accessed from <https://www.focusonthefamily.ca/content/why-is-there-no-marriage-in-heaven> on March 28, 2018.
- West, Christopher. *The Pope's Theology of the Body*, Catholic Education Resource Center. Accessed from <https://www.catholiceducation.org/en/marriage-and-family/sexuality/the-pope-s-theology-of-the-body.html> on December 6, 2017.