



---

## Concept of noogenic immaturity according to the rotal jurisprudence

Koncepcja niedojrzałości noogennej według orzecznictwa rotalnego

Małgorzata Koterba MTh, J.C.D

Judge at the Diocesan Tribunal of the  
Diocese of Salford, United Kingdom

ORCID 0000-0001-8128-0355

e-mail: [margaret.koterba@dioceseofsalford.org.uk](mailto:margaret.koterba@dioceseofsalford.org.uk)

**Abstract:** The paper delves into the “noogenic immaturity” concept introduced by Msgr. Grzegorz Erlebach, judge at the Roman Rota Tribunal, in a post-Sentence reflection. Stemming from Viktor Frankl’s work, this concept expands the understanding of psycho-affective immaturity within the context of matrimonial consent. Msgr. Erlebach outlines the criteria for this psycho-affective immaturity, emphasising its dual assessment involving both the noetic and psychic dimensions. The paper explores the challenges in judicial evaluation, urging a nuanced approach considering divergent value systems among Tribunal Experts. The text also prompts further inquiries into the sources, factors, and ethical considerations surrounding noogenic immaturity. Additionally, it suggests reevaluating legal and ethical systems in the digital age and raises questions about its potential extension to other grounds for matrimonial nullity. Overall, the discussion invites a deeper exploration of the intricate interplay between the person’s system of values and psychological dimensions in the assessment of marital consent.

**Keywords:** noogenic immaturity, jurisprudence, judicial evaluation, matrimonial consent, psycho-affective immaturity, Viktor Frankl

**Streszczenie:** W niniejszym artykule zgłębiono koncepcję „niedojrzałości noogennej” wprowadzoną przez ks. dra Grzegorza Erlebacha, sędziego Trybunału Roty Rzymskiej. Pojęcie „niedojrzałości noogennej” wywodzące się z prac Viktora Frankla, rozszerza rozumienie tej niedojrzałości psychoafektywnej w kontekście zgody małżeńskiej. Ks. Erlebach zarysowuje kryteria tej psychoafektywnej niedojrzałości, podkreślając jej podwójną ocenę, obejmującą zarówno wymiar noogeny, jak i psychiczny. W artykule zbadano wyzwania związane z oceną sądową, zachęcając do stosowania zróżnicowanego podejścia, uwzględniającego rozbieżne systemy wartości wśród ekspertów trybunału. Tekst skłania również do dalszych badań nad źródłami dotyczącymi niedojrzałości noogennej. Dodatkowo sugeruje przewartościowanie systemów prawnych i etycznych w epoce cyfrowej oraz rodzi pytania o potencjalne rozszerzenie tego zagadnienia na inne podstawy nieważności małżeństwa. Artykuł ma także na celu zachęcić do głębszego zbadania zawitych

wzajemnych zależności między systemem wartości osoby i wymiarami psychologicznymi w ocenie zgody małżeńskiej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** niedojrzałość noogenna, jurisprudencja, ocena sędziowska, zgoda małżeńska, niedojrzałość psycho-afektywna, Viktor Frankl.

**Content:** Introduction. 1. Noogenic neurosis by Viktor Frankl. 2. Noogenic immaturity. Sentence *coram* Erlebach from 2017. 3. Further considerations of Msgr. Erlebach on noogenic immaturity. 4. Comments for further consideration. Summary.

---

## Introduction

In February 2017, Rev. Msgr. Erlebach, one of the judges of the Roman Rota Tribunal, acting as Ponens in the case, issued a sentence where, for the first time, we can come across the term *noogenic immaturity*<sup>1</sup>. The arguments regarding this term gained the attention of canon lawyers, especially since they had not previously been explicitly used in the jurisprudence of the Roman Rota Tribunal. In response to the interest in this new term, Ponens published a paper explaining the term without commenting on the Sentence itself<sup>2</sup>. Reading both the Sentence and the paper prompted me to attempt to present this issue in a language accessible to a larger group of canonists. Therefore, in this paper, I have relied on the Sentence and paper already mentioned, as well as, among others, literature in the field of psychology, including what refers to the term *noogenic*.

### 1. Noogenic neurosis by Viktor Frankl

The term *noos/nous* has its origin in a Greek word *nous*, (“mind” or “intellect”), and it refers to the capacity for intellectual understanding and intuitive thinking. In a more specific context, it is differentiated from discursive thought and pertains to grasping eternal intelligible

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 1-16. The sentence has been published in *Ius Communionis* 8 (2020), s. 141-169.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena*, *Ius communionis* (2) 2020, s. 265-292.

substances and fundamental principles. At times, it is associated with the supreme or divine intellect<sup>3</sup>. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* provides us with a similar definition, namely that the word *nous* is frequently translated as ‘mind’ or ‘intellect,’ the Greek term holds significant importance in the philosophical doctrines of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus. Its distinctive significance does not primarily stem from its dictionary definition, as other Greek nouns can also denote the mind. Instead, the value attributed to the activity of *nous* and the metaphysical status of entities characterised as “noetic” (intelligible and incorporeal) sets it apart from those that are perceptible and corporeal. In Plato’s later dialogues, and more systematically in the works of Aristotle and Plotinus, *nous* is considered the highest activity of the human soul and serves as the divine and transcendent principle governing cosmic order<sup>4</sup>. The modern use of *nous* does not differ much from its origins in Greek philosophy. Still, its definition is limited: “good judgement and practical availability”<sup>5</sup> and “intelligence or common sense”<sup>6</sup> and it is a faculty of the human mind necessary for understanding what is true or real.

Owing to Viktor E. Frankl, this primarily philosophical term also found its use in the psychological and psychiatric space. Viktor E. Frankl, an Austrian psychiatrist and a survivor of the Holocaust, was the creator of the terms *noö-dynamics* and *noogenic neurosis*. Over a span of two and a half years, Viktor Frankl endured life in four concentration camps: Theresienstadt, Auschwitz, Dachau,

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Britannica Online Encyclopedia*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nous> [access 9.09.2023]

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online (REP Online)*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/nous/v-1#:~:text=Commonly%20translated%20as%20'mind'%20or,of%20Plato%2C%20Aristotle%20and%20Plotinus> [access 9.09.2023]

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/nous> [access 9.09.2023]

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Collins Dictionary*, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/nous> [access 9.09.2023]

and Türkheim. Despite the harsh conditions and daily suffering in Theresienstadt, Frankl observed attempts by fellow Jews to infuse their lives with meaning and entertainment through creative activities such as painting, acting, music, and lectures. Engaging in these creative pursuits provided Frankl with a sense of purpose and allowed him to transcend the chaos of the environment, creating a form of *noö-dynamics*. Volunteering to give talks on various topics related to medicine and psychology, Frankl organised suicide-prevention programs, employing logotherapeutic techniques to help prisoners find meaning and reasons to live. Frankl's focus shifted from himself to serving others, bringing about a change in perspective and a life of meaning within an environment designed to strip away meaning. Despite the suffering and *noö-dynamics* prevalent in the camp, Frankl's engagement in activities for the benefit of others provided him with a sense of purpose and, at times, homeostasis. Another instance of finding meaning in serving others occurred when he was offered a position as a doctor after months of hard labour in Kaufering. Frankl accepted the offer despite initial scepticism, believing that caring for sick prisoners in his last moments would lend meaning to his suffering. Even in the face of daily humiliation and torture by the Nazis in Theresienstadt, Frankl endured a particularly brutal experience at the hands of an SS officer. Ordered to fill a bucket with water and pour it on a compost pile beyond his reach, Frankl faced hours of repeated beatings. Despite this torment, Tilly, a fellow prisoner, tended to his wounds and took him to a jazz concert that evening. The stark contrast between morning torture and evening jazz underscored the contradictions of existence beauty and hideousness, humanity and inhumanity. Once again, Frankl found meaning in creative pursuits and the paradoxical nature of his experiences, using them as a distraction and relief from the prevailing *noö-dynamics* of suffering<sup>7</sup>. Frankl's concept of *noö-dynamics* is a central idea of the *noogenic neurosis*, which refers to a type of neurosis originating

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. BUSHKIN, R. VAN NIEKERK, L. STROUD, *Searching for Meaning in Chaos: Viktor Frankl's Story*, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 2021, Vol.17 (3), s. 233-242.

from “existential frustration” (referring to the existential crisis). According to Viktor E. Frankl, the associate term *noogenic* pertains to the noetic or spiritual aspect of human existence. In his book “Feeling of Meaninglessness: A Challenge to Psychotherapy and Philosophy” Viktor E. Frankl discusses the innate human drive for meaning, termed the “will to meaning” which the author considers a fundamental force alongside the well-known principles of pleasure and power. The author introduces the concept of “existential frustration” asserting that humans are primarily motivated by a deep-seated striving for ultimate meaning in their existence. This existential frustration is distinguished from sexual frustration and is proposed to play a significant role in the development of certain neuroses, termed *noogenic neurosis*. *Noogenic neurosis*, according to Frankl, is a type of neurosis that arises from a person’s inability to find meaning and purpose in life. It is distinct from psychogenic neuroses, which are believed to be rooted in psychological conflicts, and somatogenic neuroses, which have physical or biological causes. *Noogenic neurosis* is, essentially, a spiritual or existential neurosis. Frankl challenges the traditional emphasis on aetiology in psychotherapy and advocates for a broader approach that recognises the importance of spiritual and ethical dimensions in addressing neuroses<sup>8</sup>. In order to diagnose the *noogenic neurosis*, J. Crumbaugh and L.T. Maholick developed a special diagnostic test to differentiate the noogenic (if the cause is spiritual) from other forms of neurosis<sup>9</sup>. The Purpose in Life Test (PIL) was designed to measure an individual’s sense of “purpose in life”<sup>10</sup>. The Test typically consists of a series of statements to which

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. V.E. FRANKL, *Feeling of Meaninglessness: A Challenge to Psychotherapy and Philosophy*, A. BATTHYÁNY (ed.), Marquette University Press, 2010, s. 226-227.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J.C. CRUMBAUGH, L.T. MAHOLICK, (1964) *An Experimental Study in Existentialism: The Psychometric Approach to Frankl’s Concept of Noogenic Neurosis*, *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 20 (1964), s. 200-207.

<sup>10</sup> It’s important to note that psychological assessment tools like the PIL are used in research and clinical settings by professionals trained in their administration and interpretation. They provide insights into an individual’s subjective experiences and can be part of a broader assessment process.

individuals respond based on their level of agreement or disagreement. Participants typically respond to each statement by indicating their level of agreement or disagreement, often using a Likert-type scale (e.g., strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree)<sup>11</sup>.

## 2. Noogenic immaturity. Sentence coram Erlebach from 2017

On 9th February 2017, Roman Rota Tribunal Judge, Rev. Msgr. Erlebach, acting as Ponens, issued a definitive Sentence where the term *noogenic immaturity* is used for the first time. The sentence was given in a case previously judged in an I and II Instance Tribunals in Poland. In the I Instance Tribunal, the Petitioner requested to examine the validity of his marriage on the ground from can. 1095 n. 3 on the part of the woman Respondent. The Tribunal though extended the formula of the doubt to the Petitioner. The I Instance Tribunal gave constat de nullitate decision on the part of the woman. According to the previous law, the case was automatically transferred to the II Instance Tribunal. The Tribunal of the II Instance issued the final decision (15th May 2015) in favour of the bond. However, the Petitioner appealed to the Roman Rota Tribunal, sustaining only the inability to assume on the part of the Respondent<sup>12</sup>. Apart from the written response to the first citation, the Respondent remained absent from the trial. In this case, only the Petitioner and his five witnesses were heard, including some family members and other

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. J.C. CRUMBAUGH, L.T. MAHOLICK, (1964) *An Experimental Study in Existentialism: The Psychometric Approach to Frankl's Concept of Noogenic Neurosis*, s. 201-202. The specific questions may vary here are some examples of statements that might be included in the PIL: I feel good when I think of what I've done in the past and what I hope to do in the future; I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life; I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time; I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality; I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life; I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future; I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful; I often feel as if I've done all there is to do in life; I have a sense of direction and purpose in life; I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 2.

friends<sup>13</sup>. To better understand the term *noogenic immaturity*, a summary of the case and the Respondent's personality characteristics will be presented now.

The parties in the case, namely David, born in 1980, and Agnes, born in 1981, both Catholics, met with the help of a mutual friend in the autumn season – 1998, when they were still attending high school. A close emotional relationship was soon established between them; however, it was marked by a few misunderstandings and was not immediately directed to marriage. The parties contracted marriage in 2006. Married life was settled at first in the house of the woman's parents. But when the opportunity arrived, the parties, after almost two years from the beginning of their marriage, commenced their independent life, which, however, turned out to be unhappy from the beginning. Having no children, after about two and a half years from the wedding, the woman eventually left the marital home. That separation became definitive. The Decree Absolute was given by the State Judge on 14th April 2010; the woman was the Petitioner in the civil proceedings<sup>14</sup>. The Respondent's family background is relevant to the case. The Respondent's mother dominated significantly, and her father did not have much to say. The Respondent herself was very subordinate to her mother; however, she was not honest in this because not only did she lie to her mother, saying that she was ill, but also exhorted her husband, the Petitioner, to behave in the same way: "We lived in an atmosphere of conspiracy, of lack of trust, towards our loved ones and relatives", said the Petitioner in his *libellus*; "she wanted to appear perfect in the eyes of her mother", he continued. The courtship lasted for about eight years, but it was quite problematic. The Respondent manifested remarkable jealousy and possessiveness, hence the frequent altercations between the parties, which led to the break-ups; however, they would always reconcile upon the Respondent's effort. The woman also gave "an impulse" to the proposal and the wedding. Moreover, according

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 9.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 1.

to the Petitioner's declaration, the Respondent and her mother took care of all the wedding arrangements<sup>15</sup>.

As to the married life, two periods are to be distinguished: living with the Respondent's parents for almost two years and the parties' life in their own house (refurbished by the Petitioner and his father). Concerning this first part of their married life, the parties spent very little time together for various reasons – most likely the work carried out by the Petitioner either in his main job or in renovating their future home. As declared by the Petitioner in his evidence, when the Respondent came to see their new home, she took a few photos and preferred to stay at her parents'. Staying there, she was not burdened with any household chores, as the Petitioner declares: "When we lived with the Respondent's parents, her mother was doing everything at home, the Respondent did nothing". The Petitioner's parents and a friend also confirmed this. Based on the Petitioner's evidence, the parties' emotional relationship was unequal then: "I showed her my love, dedication and my understanding; she did not show me this". The other significant reason for problems between the parties was their intimate life: "Our sexual life was horrific. Living with the Respondent's parents, we did not have proper conditions; the Respondent felt embarrassed and kept repeating that her parents would hear us"<sup>16</sup>. Regarding the parties' life in their own house, which began in April 2008 (according to the Petitioner's father) or in July of the same year (according to the Petitioner), serious disagreements and arguments arose between the parties two months later. The arguments occurred often because instead of the Respondent being a mother and a wife, she acted the opposite. She did not undertake the treatment to conceive. Being concerned about her physical appearance, she did not keep a healthy diet or look after the house. Modelling became her passion. The witnesses confirmed this and added: "When [...] they began to live on their own, the Respondent behaved like a teenager who began to like parties, late returns home, dances and

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 10.

<sup>16</sup> Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 10.



clubs”. One of the witnesses summed up the following description of the Respondent: “she is a woman who takes care only of herself; she does not take into consideration the other person”. Soon, there was no intercourse between the parties, so the Petitioner declared before the Judge: „Our sexual life ceased altogether. The Respondent moved to another room and locked herself up”<sup>17</sup>. In these circumstances, at the time of Christmas 2008, the parties were living separately although in the same house. Attempts to save the marriage had no effect. The Petitioner declared: “The Respondent argued that this made no sense, that it was too late, that she could not get away with it, that she did not know what she wanted anymore”. Even an attempt of a meeting with a counsellor/psychologist was to no avail. Thus, at the beginning of 2009, the woman left their home and moved in with another man<sup>18</sup>. As to the process itself, the Respondent replied to the I Instance Tribunal’s citation saying that her words against the Petitioner’s “made-up story” (the *libellus*) made no sense and, therefore, she did not attend the interview meeting and the expert examination, nor did she present her own witnesses. Consequently, her objection to the *libellus* was considered only as a kind of defence of her own image or a sign of an aversion towards the Petitioner<sup>19</sup>.

Before we move on to the relevant details and arguments based on which the term *noogenic immaturity* was formulated, it needs to be mentioned that in the law section of the rotal Sentence, Ponens refers to psycho-affective immaturity in general<sup>20</sup>. That, in turn, points in the direction of further understanding the meaning of *noogenic immaturity*. The Judge reminds us that it must be seen whether, in a particular case, the person who is said to be affected by some form of psycho-emotional immaturity is incapable of assuming all the essential obligations of marriage or is incapable of putting into practice at least one of them, or is only engaged in the condition

---

<sup>17</sup> Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 10.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 10.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 11.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 6.

of greater or lesser difficulty in behaving properly in marriage, being prevented from doing so with substantial freedom. Some forms of psycho-emotional immaturity manifest themselves, for example, as a hedonistic attitude. At the same time, they are not the result of a deliberate choice of “no value”, but simply a matter of excessive sensitivity to hedonistic or erotic-passionate stimuli, which affect the person’s reason and will with unforeseen and sometimes excessive emotional traits<sup>21</sup>.

The Tribunal of the I Instance requested an expert opinion in the above-discussed case. According to this Expert, “Their pre-marital acquaintance was rather superficial, idealised, and the plans they made were pure desire. The parties focused on their own needs and initially on life’s purely economic, existential aspects. In reciprocal relations, neither party took into consideration the needs of the other (the Petitioner expected the Respondent to assume the extremely traditional female role; the Respondent, in turn, expected more freedom, entertainment and fulfilment of herself). They lacked empathy and didn’t try to create a psychic and emotional bond; they focused on satisfying their goals and needs and weren’t oriented towards more distant goals and building lasting relationships”<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH Z 9.02.2017, n. 6: “Adhibita necessaria cautela, in agro fori canonici videndum est utrum in casu concreto subiectus, qui dicitur aliqua forma immaturitatis psycho-affectivae affectus esse, incapax sit sibi assumendi omnes obligationes matrimonii essentielles seu sit incapax in praxim deducendi saltem unam ex iis, an solummodo versetur in condicione minoris vel maioris difficultatis recte sese in connubio gerendi, praehabita ad rem libertate substantiali. Cum huiusmodi opus requirat ordinarie peritiam vel saltem votum psychologico-psychiatricum, peculiarem attentionem requirunt hae formae immaturitatis, quae tangunt valores seu respiciunt deordinationem subiecti in consequendis valoribus necessariis pro vita matrimoniali. Quaedam enim formae immaturitatis psycho-affectivae se manifestant, exempli gratia, uti habitum hedonisticum, dum tamen non sunt fructus deliberatae electionis “non valoris”, sed simpliciter agitur de “eccessiva sensibilitate agli stimoli edonistici, o erotico-passionali, che aggrediscono il soggetto con tratti emotivi non previsti e talora eccessivi, e che soprattutto per questo si sottraggono al dominio della volontà e della ragione, sebbene siano evidenti i caratteri negativi che comportano per gli interessi esistenziali ed etico-sociali del soggetto-vittima”.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. c. ERLEBACH Z 9.02.2017, n. 12.

Bearing in mind Ponens' comments on this opinion, it would, therefore, be a case of a certain psycho-emotional immaturity, confirmed by the following words of the Expert: "They had a low frustration tolerance, and every little failure could discourage them from taking further action. They didn't even have control of their emotions or the motives of their actions. The communication between them was very difficult, but for the sake of having peace, they didn't try to change it, and both tried rather to avoid finding the solution to the problems"<sup>23</sup>. The Rotal Judge does not favour this opinion and presents his critical remarks that may help us understand the meaning of *noogenic immaturity*. He particularly points out that the description of the Respondent's personality was superficial and too generic. The Expert should have looked more closely at the nature of the relationship formed between the Respondent and her mother and at the significant difference in the behaviour of the Respondent in the family and the marriage. At the same time, the parties had already led an autonomous life in their own home. Furthermore, Ponens remarks that the Expert did not apply the criteria of Christian anthropology to his opinion. However, the Expert's opinion noted the difference in the vision of the family between the parties – the Respondent expected more freedom, fun and fulfilment of herself in their married life), whereas, according to the Expert, the Petitioner expected "extremely traditional" marriage – a marriage open to having children but did not deny the possibility of the woman developing in her job or interests<sup>24</sup>. Ponens then emphasises that the Respondent had a hedonistic attitude and an irrational idea of married life. One of the witnesses confirmed that, saying: "From my observations, it appears that the real cause of the failure of the marriage of the parties was the lack of a common vision, the lack of a concept of life. The Respondent had an idyllic idea of life with money, happiness, and fun, that life consists of fun without obligations, that life runs on its own tracks and that everything goes by itself". Moreover,

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 12.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 12.

Ponens refers to the Respondent's lack of consciousness of pursuing her goals, the carelessness of her own house, which she most likely lacked the necessary aptitude for, or finally, a quickly established relationship with another man, for whom she left the family home after about six months of the married life. The Respondent strongly desired to exercise her own freedom and self-realisation. Therefore, her ideas and methods of action were incompatible with the principles of an anthropological vision of marriage – self-giving and responsibility towards the spouse and the contracted marriage<sup>25</sup>. Ponens disagrees with the Expert's conclusion that the Respondent was not gravely disturbed in functioning in the psychological sphere, which would have made it impossible for her to assume and fulfil the essential obligations of marriage. Ponens is of the opinion that the Expert only considered the strictly understood psychological dimension, but not the anthropological or *noetic* one (*noëticam*). This, however, cannot be admitted within the scope of the canonical forum. The Expert stated that psycho-emotional immaturity alone, understood in a purely psychological context, did not constitute a serious anomaly in this case. But, as Ponens rightly emphasised, when the *noetic* dimension of the psycho-emotional immaturity of the Respondent is also taken into account, the assessment of the seriousness of that anomaly certainly changes: without a doubt, it must be recognised that the Respondent entered the marriage not only with great difficulty but also with the impossibility of fulfilling the good of the spouse. In Ponens' opinion, the Acts of the case showed that her way of behaving in their married life was not the effect of a bad will but had its roots in her immaturity, already present at the time of marriage. For that reason, the same woman could not fulfil some of the essential marital obligations taken upon herself<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 12.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 12: "Interpretanda est ergo postrema conclusio Peritae, quae ita claudit suum votum: "In base al materiale probatorio raccolto agli atti della causa, non accerto né nell'attore né nella convenuta i disturbi nel funzionamento nella sfera psicologica che avrebbero reso a loro impossibile l'assunzione e l'assolvimento degli obblighi essenziali del matrimonio". Uti videtur,

The II Instance Tribunal also requested an expert opinion, which in turn is so limited that Ponens states that it is of no probative value since it was not coherent with the procedural requirements<sup>27</sup>. Ponens also challenges the opinion of the judges of the II Instance, stating that the Respondent, in fact, was not able to fulfil the essential obligations of wife, neglecting the household matters, and she was unable to establish a truly conjugal relationship to make her own contribution to the *bonum coniugum* and *bonum prolis*<sup>28</sup>. Moreover,

---

haec Psychologa prae oculis habuit solummodo arcte intellectam dimensionem psychologiam, non autem illam anthropologicam seu noëticam. Quod tamen in ambitu fori canonici admitti nequit. Sola immaturitas psycho-affectiva, intellecta in ambitu mere psychologico, non constituebat iuxta Peritam gravem anomaliam; nihil est heic obiiciendum. Cum autem prae oculis habeatur etiam dimensio noëtica immaturitatis psycho-affectivae mulieris conventae, aestimatio gravitatis illius anomaliae certo certius mutat: sine dubio agnoscendum est enim Conventam non solum gravi difficultate sed etiam impossibilitate laboravisse ad sustinendum ante omnia bonum coniugum. Eius modus sese gerendi in autonoma vita matrimoniali habendus non est uti sic et simpliciter fructus pravae voluntatis, sed radices habuit in integre intellecta eius immaturitate psychica, praesente iam tempore nuptiarum, quam ob rem eadem mulier non valuit adimplere nonnullas obligationes essentielles matrimoniales sibi sumptas”.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 13: “Stuporem suscitavit votum peritale exaratum in secundo iudicii gradu a doct. Ivona S., psychologa clinica. Post brevem resumptionem elementorum ex tabularum processualium, quae describebant “il funzionamento della convenuta”, haec Perita perfecit brevissimam analysim psychologiam et pervenit ad sequentem conclusionem: “Secondo me, la convenuta si presenta come una persona nella norma psichica, non dimostra alcuna irregolarità che la potesse rendere incapace al matrimonio. La convenuta nel periodo prematrimoniale non rivelava dei tratti della personalità irregolare”. Ergo haec Perita quoque non solum praetermisit illos aspectus immaturitatis Conventae, quae ingrediuntur sphaeram noëticam, sed insuper nullius habuit ponderis iam ex se limitata elementa immaturitatis psychicae Conventae, relata in voto peritali exarato in primo iudicii gradu. Hoc ergo votum peritale nullius est valoris probatorii cum manifeste non cohaeret cum tabulis processualibus, ne dicamus quid de gressu in ambitum iudiciale, ubi sese refert ad incapacitatem matrimonialem”.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 14: “Etsi Iudices Tribunalis secundi iudicii gradus perfecerunt sat amplam analysim depositionum Actoris et eius testium, affirmaverunt uti sequitur: “Per il Tribunale è fondamentale che il materiale probatorio non permette di indicare quale degli obblighi essenziali del matrimonio

Ponens is of the opinion that the Judges of the Appeal Tribunal did not consider that the inconsistent ways of acting of the woman were “a consequence of her defective personality” and it was recognised only in the final period of the marriage, and it is only in one direction – from immaturity to maturity, never the other way around. The Judge reminds us that this last statement is not always valid, and maturity is not a state that is achieved throughout life and then possessed without any disturbance<sup>29</sup>. Ponens also reminds about the anomalous relationship between the Respondent and her mother, which had a relevant meaning in examining the Respondent’s personality. Her mother was a domineering parent who “forced” the Respondent to project to perfection. Hence, the Respondent gradually found her own way of living in the family, which did not result in a properly formed personality. It is no wonder that after obtaining a space

---

la Convenuta non ha assunto dopo le nozze, e siccome è così, allora non si può parlare della sua incapacità ad assumerli”. Non debemus tamen in sterilem nominalismum. Conventa enim non valuit adimplere obligationes essentielles uxoris; praetermissa incongrua conductione rei domesticae, illa ante omnia non valuit instituere relationem vere coniugalem, vivere in dimensione unitaria duali et quidem coniugali, propriam dare contributionem ad efformandam unionem stabilem et ad conceptionem prolis ordinatam. Quae omnia una simul sumpta pertinent ad ambitum boni coniugum et fortasse boni prolis”.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 14: “Denique Iudices Tribunalis Appellationis utcumque sibi posuerunt quaestionem possibilis immaturitatis Conventae, affirmatae in sententia primi iudicii gradus, sed non retinuerunt incongruos modos agendi eiusdem mulieris esse “una conseguenza di una sua personalità difettosa”. Ad maximum, dixerunt, immaturus modus sese gerendi Conventae agnosci possit “solo [nel] periodo finale del matrimonio delle parti. Intanto la maturazione è un processo che va in una direzione – dall’immaturità alla maturità, mai al contrario”. Ast sub linea principii hoc postremum assertum non semper valet quia una ex parte “la maturità non è uno stato che si raggiunge per anzianità e che poi si possiede senza nessun disturbo” (G. ZUNINI, *Homo religiosus*, Milano 1966, p. 220), ex alia vero parte – quod respicit praecise causam prae manibus – Tribunal Appellatum incaute forsitan habuit modum sese gerendi Conventae tempore convictus coniugalis apud eius genitores uti omnino normalem, dum ita non erat”.

of relative freedom when the parties established an autonomous married life, its serious limits came to light<sup>30</sup>.

The Respondent's "disorder of values" could not be explained and accepted as easily crossing certain moral norms but should be indicated as a specific mental anomaly that became "immorality" deeply rooted in her personality structure. That is why the Respondent gave in to certain impulses so easily, with weak moral barriers and a low ability to control her impulses. Bearing this in mind, we can attempt to determine the initial indications of *noogenic immaturity*: dysfunctional family background, which leads to developing an inappropriate defence system; lack of honesty and trust toward loved ones (manifested in lying and manipulations); jealousy and possessiveness in relationships but on the other hand, not taking care of them and not reciprocating the love and dedication; giving in to every emotional impulse, being utterly indifferent to the needs of the spouse, following short-term benefits and aiming for pleasure, which is in opposition to the commitment to being a faithful spouse, having a hedonistic attitude, and an irrational view of married life.

### 3. Further considerations of Msgr. Erlebach on noogenic immaturity.

After publishing the Sentence, Msgr. Erlebach was approached to further explain the term and concept of *noogenic immaturity*. In particular, the question was asked whether this form of psycho-affective immaturity entails an extension of the application of can. 1095, n. 2-3.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 14: "Oblivioni enim tradi nequit factum anomalae relationis mulieris conventae cum eius matre sive sub aspectu submissionis dominanti genitrici (heic Infrascripti plene conveniunt cum Cl.ma Patrona Rotali viri actoris), sive sub aspectu magis personalis responsi exsistentialis sumpti ab hac filia, apparenter ad perfectionem proiecta, a veritate tamen interiore aliena. Qua re paulatim d.na Agnes invenit proprium modum vivendi in familia originis, quod tamen sustentum non fuit a recte efformata personalitate; nihil ergo mirum quod obtento spatio relativae libertatis, cum partes autonomam instituerint vitam coniugalem, in lucem venerunt graves eius limites".

Therefore, in his article published in *Ius Communionis* in 2020<sup>31</sup>, he clarifies the perplexities of the term and makes it explicit in a systematic way. However, Ponens is clear that this paper does not claim to be exhaustive. It is proposed only as a set of notes framing *noogenic immaturity*, as used in the above-mentioned Sentence.

Since, in his Sentence, Ponens categorises this immaturity under psycho-affective immaturity<sup>32</sup>, in his paper, he sketches out the concept of psycho-affective immaturity based on the criteria developed by a well-known Rotal Expert, Prof. D. De Caro<sup>33</sup>: (a) inability to dominate and control emotional and passionate impulses,

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 265-292.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 6.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. D. DE CARO, *L'immaturità psico-affettiva nel matrimonio canonico*, w: P.A. BONNET, C. GULLO (ed.), *L'immaturità psico-affettiva nella Giurisprudenza della Rota Romana*, Studi giuridici 23 (1990), s. 1-262.

The term affective (emotional) immaturity does not exist in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fifth edition; however, the main symptoms of psycho-affective immaturity are included in the various mental disorders formulated by the DSM or by the European ICD classification. Also, the online Dictionary of Psychology of the American Psychological Association provides us with the following description of the term: a tendency to express emotions without restraint or disproportionately to the situation. See <https://dictionary.apa.org/emotional-immaturity> [access 9.09.2023]. It is also worth mentioning a paper by G. LOAS, A. SEILLIER, C. FRÉVILLE, *Psychoaffective Immaturity in Psychiatric Disorders*, *Psychological Reports* 88/1 (2001), s. 111-114, where the following symptoms of psycho-affective immaturity were distinguished: affective dependency marked by a need for guidance and support from others, tendency to be preoccupied with fears of being left to take care of oneself; intolerance of frustrations – dealing with emotional conflict or internal/external stressors through actions or symptoms rather than reflection or feelings; sexual immaturity: characterised by a deficiency or absence of sexual fantasies and desire for sexual activity, may involve the sexual partner not having an intimate relationship, even if the immature subject sustains a stable relationship. These symptoms form a symptomatic triad, and the paper suggests that this triad is considered a stable feature of personality associated with various clinical disorders, neuroses, psychoses, or borderline. Additionally, psycho-affective immaturity is proposed to be a factor predisposing individuals to low social adaptation and is associated with increased depression and impaired professional and social functioning.



(b) excessive sensitivity to hedonistic or erotic-passionate stimuli, (c) feeling of decision – making insecurity or the tendency to remain in the affective-emotional patterns of childhood, (d) difficulty in establishing valid interpersonal and social relationships, (e) inability to face and adapt to new situations, (f) inability or unwillingness to assume marriage as a stable and irrevocable bond, (g) difficulty in transferring own emotional charges from the private-egoistic level to the public-altruistic-social level<sup>34</sup>. The Judge also cited the criteria of maturity of personality drafted by Prof. Vanni, which have been used in the rotal jurisprudence: maturity is the actual ability (in exercise) a) to control the sub-structures of the ego (drives, instincts), subordinating them to the superior structures of intelligence and will within the framework of values; b) to accept internal conflicts with moderate anxiety and calibrated hope of being able to overcome them; c) to establish relationships with others within the group, responding to obligations (roles or functions); d) to have sufficient critical capacity in the socialisation process<sup>35</sup>. The doctrine has questioned these criteria. Nevertheless, at the jurisprudence, original psycho-affective immaturity continues to be proposed by experts and accepted by judges as a multi-factorial psycho-diagnostic denomination, including various manifestations of psychic malfunction, which cannot be reduced to categories of nosographic criteria recognised or not reaching the threshold to be established in terms of these categories<sup>36</sup>.

Experts in psychology and psychiatry often remind us that symptoms of any disorder cannot be treated like ingredients in a cookbook, and they have to be widely assessed considering the person's behaviour, family and social background, personality characteristics, mental states, and abilities. Similarly, canon lawyers have to be aware of what needs to be taken into consideration when

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. D. DE CARO, *L'immaturità psico-affettiva nel matrimonio canonico...*, s. 6-7.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. F. VANNI, *Immaturità psicologica: dimensioni psicosociali e rilevanza canonistica*, *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 111 (1986), s. 340.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 269.

it comes to assessing psychological reports on psycho-affective immaturity and its possible impact on matrimonial consent. As Ponens emphasises, it must be distinguished between psychological and canonical maturity, which is defined as a minimum of maturity required to exchange valid matrimonial consent. Its elements are listed in rotal Sentence *coram* Serrano<sup>37</sup>.

As the Judge establishes in the Sentence, *noogenic immaturity* has been categorised under psycho-affective immaturity. The specificity of *noogenic immaturity* is that one of its significant components concerns the noogenic sphere which was developed by V. Frankl, mainly involving the dimension of values (or rather “disvalues”)<sup>38</sup>. The term *noogenic immaturity* was coined in analogy to V. Frankl’s *noogenic neurosis*. This psychiatrist has great merit for having distinguished this nosographic entity, distinguishing noogenic neuroses from “ordinary” mental neuroses. Not only did he distinguish them, but also explained their cause – the lack of meaning in life (and, consequently, the lack of an internalised system of values). Contrary to appearances, the sphere of the spirit (religious) to which Frankl refers has nothing of a religious dimension in *sensu stricto* and does not constitute a direct reference to the Absolute, but this is consistent with a certain understanding of Christian anthropology, which accepts the tripartition of St. Paul, distinguishing in man body, spirit and soul. Therefore, the purpose for which Msgr. Erlebach proposes and uses the term *noogenic immaturity* is purely canonical

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Dec. c. SERRANO z 24.06.1994, RRD 86 (1994), s. 359: “Ex supra allatis, igitur, iuxta N.F. iurisprudentiam, immaturitas haec habetur quando adsint in subiecto agente: a) incapacitas subordinandi passiones libidinesque rationi et voluntati vel superandi internos conflictus, propter animi anxietates; b) egoismus huiusmodi ut, cum alios amat, seipsum revera quaerat, de propria utilitate dumtaxat curans, quin aliorum utilitatem vel commodum respiciat, quatenus recipere vult, ast dare incapax sit; c) irresponsabilitas pro assumendis et adimplendis officiis essentialibus matrimonii; et tandem d) praematura sexualis activitas in subiecto, qui solummodo illogice et absurde agit”.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 283.

and refers to the causes of the invalidity of marriage. Hence, the main questions here are: did this anomaly directly impact cognitive and volitional abilities related to entering into marriage? and if so, what were the consequences? In response to these questions and with the relation to the *noogenic immaturity* Ponens states that there can be an autonomous anomaly of a merely noogenic/noetic nature without having an impact on the psychic dimension, and it is defined as a lack of values or as a disorder of values, especially concerning faith, but at the same time, it may have nothing to do with psychic anomalies<sup>39</sup>. Nevertheless, Ponens aims to present the key elements of *noogenic immaturity* from the noogenic and psychologic points of view. In his opinion, *noogenic immaturity* must possess two components: noogenic and purely psychic. But the mere presence of the noogenic component is not sufficient, obviously understood in the sense of a disturbed value system. In order for the qualification of *noogenic immaturity* to be reasonably attributed, the noogenic component must play at least a significant role, preferably dominant or prevalent<sup>40</sup>.

Msgr. Erlebach raises the question of how the two components of *noogenic immaturity* can coexist, i.e. the value dimension and the psychic dimension *sic et simpliciter*? He admits that he does not have the professional expertise to answer this question adequately; however, he can assume that this happens when the assumption of lack/disorder of values – which happens not necessarily in a completely conscious way, but simply through the individual decisions that are gradually

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 285. Ponens supports his thesis quoting two royal decisions “Accidit [...] magis ac magis modernis temporibus, ut voluntati repraesentatio detur obiecti falsa seu erronea. Ita fit ut veritates immortales penes hodiernos iuvenes, in discrimen ponantur vel, quod peius est, a simulacris unius diei substituantur” (c. PINTO, sent. del 9 giugno 2000, RRDec. vol. XCII, p. 462, n. 5); “praetereundum non est pondus vulgatae mentis et vitae rationis, in qua hodie et christifideles immerguntur et a qua haud raro difficulter eximi valent praesertim in decisione maioris momenti capienda, sicut est matrimonium” (c. VISCOME, sent. del 15 febbraio 2019, Utinen., A. 33/2019, n. 3)”.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 288.

taken by a child, an adolescent, or even a young adult – flows into the formation of their personality. In other words, it is not sufficient for a lack/disorder of values to be present on an intellectual level. Instead, they must be integrated into the personality, thus negatively influencing the freedom to act *ab imis*<sup>41</sup>.

Msgr. Erlebach states that even more difficult to delineate is the relationship between lack/disorder of values as cause and lack/disorder of values as effect. He invites the contribution of those who can investigate it with scientific rigour. The Judge puts forward the thesis that sometimes this relationship can be rather linear (as in the case of those who, as children, repeatedly seek simple and immediate gratifications, are not educated to follow higher values, and then in adolescence move on to the immoderate search for pleasure and arrive at a true hedonistic way of living), in other situations it can be decidedly complex as in the case of the unresolved or poorly resolved existential crises experienced especially in adolescence. In any case, various factors contribute to these processes, which lead to *noogenic immaturity*, starting from biological ones relating, for example, to hormonal transformations or brain development, moving on to purely psychic ones, without obviously forgetting the responses of the subject to the various endogenous or exogenous stimuli (including social ones) which are gradually given in the choices one makes or even with the “non-choices”, i.e. not assuming one’s responsibilities<sup>42</sup>. As Ponens rightfully suggests, when a Tribunal Expert assesses a disturbed value system, a difficulty of a personal nature may arise – namely, each Expert will be guided by their preferred value system. Obviously, it is difficult to find a radical divergence between the Experts appointed by the ecclesiastical tribunals, but even here, sometimes a single divergence between

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 289.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 290.

the anthropological premises followed by the Expert and Christian anthropology can make the difference<sup>43</sup>.

When an error of this kind occurs, which necessarily affects the evaluation of the anomaly, it is up to the Judge to decide what steps to take. There are two possibilities: requesting a new Expert's opinion from Experts chosen with particular care regarding the anthropological bases supported and applied by them, or in any case, appreciating the partial value of the Expert's opinion, relating only to the psychic dimension of the anomaly, and forming an own judgment on the missing side (concerning the system of values). In the abstract, the first option is appropriate, but sometimes other factors could push for the second option<sup>44</sup>.

When we are facing the question of how this immaturity impacted/affected the reason and will of the person, the Judge marks that we have to look at the person's life choices, decisions and the involvement of the person's free will, systems of values and evaluating its impact<sup>45</sup>. The introduction of this term seems to be even more justified because especially today's experts reduce psycho-emotional immaturity to the mental dimension alone, while earlier experts, rooted in Christian anthropology and often familiar with Thomistic philosophy, were particularly sensitive to the disorders of a person regarding their values. Nowadays, at the marriage Tribunals, we often deal with the combination of two factors. Although psychology and psychiatry do not distance themselves from the system of values, they limit their competencies to a strictly understood mental dimension (dissociating themselves from the noogenic dimension). The second factor is individual experts who, unfortunately, often have no understanding of anthropology and are sometimes determined by ideological trends. Therefore, distinguishing the category of *noogenic immaturity*, on

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 290.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 291.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 292.

the one hand, does not constitute a new anomaly. Still, on the other hand, it is helpful in sensitising marriage Tribunals to noogenic issues, which helps assess psychological expertise properly<sup>46</sup>.

At the end of his reflection, Ponens acknowledges challenges in judicial evaluation and suggests a deeper reflection on the concept of *noogenic immaturity*. While recognising the undeniable difficulties in judicial assessment, Msgr. Erlebach emphasises the requirement of moral certainty in judicial decisions. The direct interest in *noogenic immaturity* does not arise from a generic question on mental disorders concerning “disvalues”, but arises from another need, that of a particular cause in which the nullity of consent is deemed by the judges to be sufficiently proven. Still, at an expert level, the immaturity has not been adequately assessed. Msgr. Erlebach concludes by leaving it to others to determine the utility and applicability of the concept of canonical proceedings<sup>47</sup>.

#### 4. Comments for further consideration

Based on the above considerations, and bearing in mind that *noogenic immaturity* is a new proposal for psycho-affective immaturity that may affect the invalidity of the matrimonial consent, it is worth suggesting several directions for further research on *noogenic immaturity*. Drawing from the literature on psychology and psychiatry, it is worth undertaking further research on the root causes of this type of immaturity and factors that may contribute to the disruption/disorder of the value system (“disvalues”), including some first/main “symptoms” of it. The question here that we can ask is how these factors can be identified and assessed in the context of matrimonial consent. Finding the answers, of course, must go hand in hand with Christian anthropology to allow for the formulation of appropriate

---

<sup>46</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 292.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. G. ERLEBACH, *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena...*, s. 291.

questions for the parties or witnesses, the answers to which, at a later stage, could be used by the Tribunal Experts and judges<sup>48</sup>. This could also be prepared by looking at the questionnaire mentioned earlier prepared for diagnosing noogenic neurosis.

Let's not forget that our parties in the nullity processes live in a modern society. Hence, it is worth noticing that in order to assess if a person has a gravely disturbed system of values, one would typically look for signs of behaviours that deviate significantly from accepted societal norms, ethical principles, or legal standards, but most of all, from can. 1055 and 1056<sup>49</sup>. This involves evaluating their actions, beliefs, and attitudes to determine if they pose a threat to themselves or others. The traditional structures defining human relationships, such as family, work, and state, have been altered by the digital age. This then raises questions about the adequacy of the existing legal and ethical systems, which have been based on the dominant culture in Europe and other parts of the world rooted in Greek philosophy, Roman law, and Christianity. The discussion implies a shift in how individuals form and maintain relationships in the virtual world, and

---

<sup>48</sup> It can often be noticed the coexistence of diverse and conflicting systems of values within a society. Pluralism recognises that people within a society may hold different, and sometimes incompatible, values and moral beliefs. Therefore, it leads us to the question of how individuals navigate ethical decision-making in a pluralistic environment, considering the impact of diverse values on personal choices and societal norms.

<sup>49</sup> Can. 1055 § 1. The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life and which is ordered by its nature to the good of the spouses and the procreation and education of offspring, has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament between the baptized. § 2. For this reason, a valid matrimonial contract cannot exist between the baptized without it being by that fact a sacrament. *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*, 25.01.1983, AAS 75 (1983), pars II, s. 1-317; Polish text: *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus. Kodeks prawa kanonicznego promulgowany przez papieża Jana Pawła II w dniu 25 stycznia 1983 roku*. Stan prawny na dzień 18 maja 2022. Zaktualizowany przekład na język polski, Poznań 2022: „Can. 1056 The essential properties of marriage are unity and indissolubility, which in Christian marriage obtain a special firmness by reason of the sacrament”.

it prompts consideration of the values shaping these interactions<sup>50</sup>. Therefore, moving forward to the other possible research directions, how can a consistent and fair evaluation of value systems be ensured when assessing *noogenic immaturity* in marital consent cases in a world influenced by diverse cultural and religious perspectives? Could the concept of *noogenic immaturity* extend its relevance to other grounds for matrimonial nullities, such as total or partial simulation, and if so, how might it impact the evaluation of the will and intent of the parties involved?

### Summary

The term *noogenic immaturity* developed by Msgr. Erlebach adds a layer of complexity to the understanding of psycho-affective immaturity within the context of matrimonial consent. The concept, rooted in Viktor Frankl's work, introduces the idea that disturbances in the value system, particularly in the noetic or spiritual dimension, can impact the validity of marital consent. In response to inquiries about this term, Msgr. Erlebach's reflections shed light on the intricacies involved in assessing and categorising such immaturity. He invites deeper exploration into its sources and factors contributing to the disruption of the value system and its impact on the validity of the matrimonial consent. He emphasises the importance of integrating Christian anthropology into the assessment process.

### References

#### Sources

*Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*, 25.01.1983, AAS 75 (1983), pars II, s. 1-317; Polish text: *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus. Kodeks prawa kanonicznego promulgowany przez papieża Jana Pawła II w dniu 25 stycznia 1983 roku. Stan prawny na dzień 18 maja 2022. Zaktualizowany przekład na język polski*, Poznań 2022.

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. W. SITEK, *Il sistema dei valori nella società digitale*, Journal of Modern Science 2/49 (2022), s. 646-658.



Dec. c. SERRANO z 24.06.1994, RRD 86 (1994), s. 352-363.

Dec. c. ERLEBACH z 9.02.2017, n. 1-16.

### Literature

*Britannica Online Encyclopedia*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nous>.

BUSHKIN H., VAN NIEKERK R., STROUD L., *Searching for Meaning in Chaos: Viktor Frankl's Story*, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 2021, Vol.17 (3), s. 233-242.

*Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/nous>.

*Collins Dictionary*, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/nous>.

CRUMBAUGH J.C., MAHOLICK L.T., (1964) *An Experimental Study in Existentialism: The Psychometric Approach to Frankl's Concept of Noogenic Neurosis*, *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 20 (1964), s. 200-207.

DE CARO D., *L'immaturità psico-affettiva nel matrimonio canonico*, w: P.A BONNET, C. GULLO (ed.), *L'immaturità psico-affettiva nella Giurisprudenza della Rota Romana*, *Studi giuridici* 23 (1990), s. 1-262.

*Dictionary of Psychology of the American Psychological Association*, <https://dictionary.apa.org/emotional-immaturity>.

ERLEBACH G., *Algunas notas sobre el concepto de inmadurez noógena*, *Ius communionis* (2) 2020, s.265-292.

FRANKL V.E., *Feeling of Meaninglessness: A Challenge to Psychotherapy and Philosophy*, (ed.) BATTHYÁNY A., Marquette University Press, 2010.

LOAS G., SEILLIER A., FRÉVILLE C., *Psychoaffective Immaturity in Psychiatric Disorders*, *Psychological Reports* 88/1 (2001), s. 111-114.

SITEK W., *Il sistema dei valori nella società digitale*, *Journal of Modern Science* 2/49 (2022), s. 646-658.

*The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online (REP Online)*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/nous/v-1#:~:text=Commonly%20translated%20as%20%E2%80%99%20mind'%20or,of%20Plato%2C%20Aristotle%20and%20Plotinus>.

VANNI F., *Immaturità psicologica: dimensioni psicosociali e rilevanza canonistica*, *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 111 (1986), s. 336-349.

### Nota o autorze

Małgorzata Koterba – doktor prawa kanonicznego, sędzia w Sądzie Diecezjalnym w Salford (Wielka Brytania), 3 Ford Street, M3 6DP Salford, United Kingdom.