

René Balák  
Department of Philosophy and Applied Philosophy & Center for Bioethics,  
The University of SS. Cyril and Methodius Trnava, Slovakia

## Sacramental marriage and love versus irregular unions. Reflection on divergent interpretations of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Amoris laetitia*

Małżeństwo sakramentalne i miłość  
wobec związków nieregularnych.  
Refleksja nad rozbieżnymi interpretacjami  
8. rozdziału *Amoris laetitia*

### Abstract

*The theological and moral debate, focused on the new theological proposals, brings controversy not only into the area of methodology but also in the content of the problem. Therefore it is necessary to ask questions about to what biblical foundations the theologians, who bring in these new proposals, want to appeal. By drawing in to the comparative method the author shows the lability and discontinuity of new proposals, which diverge from the theology of creation as well as from the evangelical message of marriage. In moral sacramentology the issue of marriage was being reflected in the context of vocation of spouses to holiness, where fidelity is connected with indissolubility as a way of life vocation. The transcendent vertical dimension of the sacramental marriage is essential to marital *communio personarum*, while the new theological proposals level out sacramental marriage to being something ideal and impossible, which is not suitable for every person who was called by God to married life. The sacramental marital union is, however, a divine plan, which spouses are to realize in the spirit of sacramental love whose characteristic features can not be realized in the so-called irregular unions. People in such unions can not logically receive the gifts of grace, for what they are based on, Christ has*

clearly condemned as evil. Christ's words of truth about marriage are to be the reference to theological criterion for the merciful approach to this negative phenomenon, as well as to persons who find themselves in difficult situations that are not morally good.

**Keywords:** sacramental marriage, sacramental love, theology, biblical foundations, vocation, *communio personarum*, irregular unions.

### Streszczenie

Dyskusja teologicznomoralna, dotycząca propozycji nowych rozwiązań teologicznych, przynosi ze sobą kontrowersje nie tylko w zakresie metodologii, lecz także w zakresie treści problemu. Dlatego istnieje potrzeba zadawania pytań, na jakie fundamenty biblijne powołują się teologowie proponujący te nowe rozwiązania. Autor przy pomocy metody komparatywnej wskazuje na labilność oraz nieciągłość nowych propozycji, które odbiegają od teologii stworzenia, jak również od ewangelicznego orędzia o małżeństwie. W ramach sakramentologii moralnej problematykę małżeństwa poddano refleksji w kontekście powołania małżonków do świętości, gdzie wierność łączona jest z nierozzerwalnością, co jest pokazane jako droga powołania życiowego. Transcendentny wymiar pionowy małżeństwa sakramentalnego ma podstawowe znaczenie dla *communio personarum* małżonków, przy czym nowe propozycje teologiczne pokazują małżeństwo sakramentalne jako ideał nie do osiągnięcia, jako coś, co nie jest dostępne dla wszystkich powołanych przez Boga do życia w małżeństwie. Sakramentalna jedność małżonków jest jednak Bożym zamiarem, który małżonkowie powinni urzeczywistniać w duchu miłości sakramentalnej. Cech charakterystycznych dla tej miłości jednak nie można urzeczywistniać w tzw. związkach niesakramentalnych. Osoby żyjące w nowych związkach oczywiście nie mogą czerpać z darów łask, ponieważ to, na czym są zbudowane, Chrystus wyraźnie potępił jako zło. Chrystusowe słowo prawdy o małżeństwie powinno stanowić kryterium teologiczne w miłosiernym podejściu do tego zjawiska negatywnego, jak również w podejściu do osób przeżywających trudne sytuacje życiowe, które nie są moralnie dobre.

**Słowa kluczowe:** małżeństwo sakramentalne, miłość sakramentalna, fundamenty biblijne, powołanie, *communio personarum*, nieregularne związki

In the era of ideological promotion of the various forms of cohabitation between men and women, which are gradually acquiring the status of legality, a few decades ago concepts proposing such forms of cohabitation that want to imitate sacramental marriage emerged, but nevertheless they cannot fulfill the fundamental assumptions of sacramental marriage.

First of all, it is needed “to point out that when we say divorced and civilly remarried we refer to those who, after contracting a valid canonical marriage, that is, marriage under the laws of the Church, after being unsuccessful in this marriage, are unable to celebrate a second canonical marriage given existing bond, and therefore have undertaken a new, civil marriage. They are therefore bound by a religious bond (canonical marriage) and a civil bond (civil marriage)” (De Paolis 2014, 183).

The issue of sacramental marriage and various new forms of cohabitation among people in the third millennium is the subject of scientific research in various science disciplines as well as the subject of ideological manipulations that ignore the reality of man and woman.

“The problem concerning members of the faithful who have entered into a new civil union after a divorce is not new. The Church has always taken this question very seriously and with a view to helping the people who find in themselves in this situation. Marriage is a sacrament that affects people particularly deeply in their personal, social and historical circumstances” (Müller 2014, 148).

### New theological proposals?

“In the present period, the corruption of morals has increased, and one of the most serious indications of this corruption is the unbridled exaltation of sex. (...) As a result, in the course of a few years, teachings, moral criteria and modes of living hitherto faithfully preserved have been very much unsettled, even among Christians. There are many people today who, being confronted with widespread opinions opposed to the teaching which they received from the Church, have come to wonder what must still hold as true“ (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 1975, 1). Taking into account the increasingly deteriorating status of marriage and family by post-Christian society as well as ideological trends aimed against marriage and family (Francis 2016, 32–45), it is necessary to reiterate the urgent need to respect the fundamental anthropological truth about marriage and family that is contained in the biblical revelation (Francis 2016, 9–13).

In postmodern societies there is a new construction of the “normality” and this leads to the deinstitutionalisation of marriage (Pokrywka 2011, 69). In the historical and theological context, there is a real danger of taking over false theological visions in the field of theology of marriage and family, which by means of the new sacramental theology create a new theological language that

is moralless. One of them is Marxist collectivism, that is, the absolute unification of the unique and unrepeatable entities of man and woman in marriage, immeasurably bound up with the desire of absolutization of human will regarding marital cohabitation, where a new “theological” terminology is being artificially created, different from the Biblical foundations and traditions, which is partially manifested in the Church’s doctrine.

Thus, at first glance, the linguistic problem on the level of moral sacramentology not only leads a person to gain control over another in marriage, which often leads to an objectively sinful situation where marriage collapses and a man enters the other “marriage” but no longer a sacramental bond, but it sometimes also leads to the fact that the person in marriage or external theological authority wants to redefine the essence of marriage itself according to the concept of situational ethics.

The disciplinary dimension of the irregular unions (objectively sinful situation by *Codex Iuris Canonici*, § 915) is clear because: “...grave sin, understood objectively, being that the minister of communion would not be able to judge from subjective imputability; obstinate persistence, which means the existence of an objective situation of sin that endures in time and which the will of individual member of the faithful does not bring to an end, no other requirements (attitude of defiance, prior warning, etc.) being necessary to establish the fundamental gravity of the situation in the Church; the manifest character of the situation of grave habitual sin” (Pontifical Council for Legislative Texts, 2).

Another theological extreme, intervening conscience of a person more creatively and subjectively, is hypocritical liberalism and individualism in moral theology, which in new theological language and by help of new theological terminology emphasizes the disparity and instability of entities of man and woman, so that the existing exclusive understanding of the Gospel concept of marriage is becoming only an ideal that is an unachievable fantasy, reserved only for some.

The linguistic equilibrium of the new theological language reminds the language of Wittgenstein’s games and the Hegelian methodology that have gained the control of theological thinking. That is why, in moral theology, there is an urgent necessity of needed *propositio* of theological and religious education of a person to the true understanding of marriage according to the Gospel message.

## What biblical foundations?

Even though in the Bible message the issue of marriage and family can be reflected as one of the most important areas of Revelation in terms of the moral conduct of a human being, we can see that in the third millennium various theologians (Kasper 2014)<sup>1</sup> propose such interpretations of Revelation as well as new theological concepts that not only differ from the Revelation, but also conflict with each other, which logically causes theological uncertainty, confusion and disorientation.

The dynamic dimension of the biblical teaching about marriage and family, having its anthropological origin in the book of Genesis (Gn 2:24) and conclusion in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 19:7.9), is partially built up as an equivalent to new theological proposals. “Finally, it teaches that man and woman become one flesh. While the theological, biological and legal implications of this one flesh have been interpreted variously, it is clear that the phrase points to (1) the coming to by of a new entity, distinct from either of the constituent persons; (2) the fact that this entity is single, that is, no subject to recombination internally or externally; and (3) the fact that the entity is not an abstraction but an organism, defleshed and endowed with life” (Mankowski 2014, 39).

A distinctive feature of new theological and moral reflections is the evident absence of the biblical foundation of marriage and family on the fundamental theological level of argumentation, although the theological and moral angle of critical view on this issue must inevitably be based on the biblical and anthropological basis.

If these basic Biblical principles of doctrine and discipline were ignored (Gn 1:28; Gn 2:18; Gn 2:23; Mt 19:4-6; Mt 19:8; 1 Cor 7:4, 1 Cor 7:7, Heb 13:4) it will logically cause the lack of convergent theological point in the Church not only for marriage and family itself, although marriage and family are, by their very nature, a natural reality throughout the history of human civilization, but in the Church there will be a theological division of opinions in conflict with the essence of the Church and evangelical message. It is that only from biblical revelation we can ascertain the truth about magnificent mystery, institution and meaning of marriage and family, while it is clear that the biblical message does not concentrate solely on the origin and goal of marriage and family, but also on the current issues related to the reality of life.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kasper's book about family, where the fifth chapter introduced the ideas that incite theological controversies similar to some statements of cardinal R. Marx or archbishop B. Forte, M. Lintner and many others.

The universal and complex biblical (Benedict XVI 2007, 29) message (Mk 10:2-12), which is supposed to be *ex genere suo* the basis of today's theological solution to the issue of broken marriages and families, is by new theological proposals replaced with selectively chosen parts of the Revelation. The Church has always confirmed the practice of method that is according to biblical foundation. Since the Revelation of marriage and family in its complexity gives a final sense, not the correct methodological process, which in the new theological proposals for the solution of objectively sinful situations obscure the essence of the problems by redefining them in a new and different way, inspired by exhortation (Francis 2016, 301 and 305).

Therefore, in the practical (universal and concrete) solution to the overthrown problems, the fundamental anthropological truth must be respected that God created man in his image (Gn 1:26), created him out of love and called him at the same time for love (Gn 2:18-23), which, however, in some new theological propositions is absent, because only with great difficulties (in the field of theological logic) it can be considered as a manifestation of love, which ideologically redefines its essence in the contradiction to the Revelation in order to justify immoral sinful conduct of a human being by their subjectivization. After all, marriage and family are a lifelong vocation to holiness (Francis 2016, 72), to the gravity and nobility of which we want to point out, and a person realizes it in their unified integrity (spiritual and physical) (John Paul II 1981, 11).

By redefining hypocritically and ideologically the objective state of the moral problem of new non-sacramental unions, nothing will change to its sinful nature (Mk 10:10-12), whereby much more serious in the Church today is that there is, as a consequentialism, the widespread moral theological confusion about the role of subjective consciousness in the area of Catholic moral thinking. Marriage, as a realization of the vocation to procreation – giving life as well as love (Benedict XVI 2005, 11; Francis 2016, 166), is the covenant between man and woman through which they form the “partnership of the whole life” (Codex iuris canonici, can. 1055 § 1) and therefore no new divergent theological concepts, clothed in mercy, can ideologically do anything against the biblical truth of marriage, but only for the truth” (2 Cor 13:8).

Scientific dialogue in finding the truth about marriage and family in the context of the overthrown problems of living reality in the theological field is not possible if it is to be realized within the atmosphere of fear and authoritarian intimidation. The climate of fear from the biblical truth of marriage is a very sad experience, especially since usually everyone in the Church speaks of the dialogue of culture, but the reality in the theological and moral context is that in the Church there are persons openly teaching theological and moral delusions

in the field of sacramentology, thus creating an illusion that nothing is wrong, and the ideological justification lies in the fact that it is only a theological view in the sense of freedom of inquiry.

Regarding marital and family community it is necessary to put theological and moral questions openly and free from fear of ideological repression, while not forgetting that for theological expression of the essence of this community the Second Vatican Council uses the term *communio personarum* (Gaudium et spes, 48–50, John Paul II 1981, 11) to emphasize that marriage is a community of persons, a community of life and love, and its creator is God Himself. Theological dialogue in this complicated theological and moral issue cannot be accepted in the present Church only if the theologian thinks the same as all others or as only those who are uncritical supporters of new theological tendencies that are divergent from the biblical foundation.

Repeated accentuation of the call for theologians to zealously keep on the Magisterium indissolubility of marriage (for example: Leo XIII 1880; Pius XII 1930; Paul VI 1968; John Paul II 1981; Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2364) in terms of the current state of instant uncertainty, not just a response to the current situation. The history of salvation is a testimony of when Christ proclaimed the Gospel 2000 years ago, the culture and civilization spirit of that time was radically against the Gospel of marriage and family. It was not just about religious syncretism and Gnosticism, present among the social and theological elites, but especially (similar as today) about the indifference and the concession of masses. That is, Christ wanted, especially with regard to the institution of marriage, to reveal the ultimate truth to this world.

### What vocation and to what?

Words inspired by the Holy Spirit maintain its prophetic value, especially with regard to the spreading doctrinal and practical pastoral confusion as to the sacrament of marriage in contemporary world, because... we can not do anything against the truth but only for the truth” (2 Cor 13:8). In the truth of the theological and moral reflection on the issue marriage and family are being presented as a biblical vision of the life-long vocation of man and woman. The whole life on the part of God has a character of religious vocation addressed to a person who affirmed this call.

So, marriage and family in its nature for a believer is a religious vocation (Catechism of the Catholic Church 1604) that is of fundamental importance for his moral conduct. God initially invites man to existing unity and free participation

in his work of creation. It's a call to realization of the fundamental ends of marriage: Procreation and education of children, a mutual assistance and completion in love (Peschke 1992, 470–474) by the unity and indissolubility of marriage. He also always invites individually by name, addressing unique human being, and always unrepeatably at a particular moment in the history of salvation. “By the fact that it is a vocation, marriage must involve a carefully considered choice, a mutual commitment before God and the constant seeking of his help in prayer“ (Pontifical council for the family 1995, 27).

*Magisterium ecclesiae* always opposes moral relativism, claiming that the morality of acts regarding marital fidelity and purity, as well as indissolubility, depends only on the subjective consciousness of man in his unlimited creativity. At the same time, *Magisterium* recognizes that distinguishing and examination of moral responsibility always takes into account unrepeatable subjective elements, which are full of consciousness and complete willingness. Nowadays, in the theological and moral understanding of marriage occurred paradoxical situation when people do not put up with sound doctrine (2 Tim 4:3-5) because they are in a state of sin that has dominated the most important interpersonal relationships.

As part of the theological and moral reflection, it should be noted that new theological propositions, which have brought controversial and contradictory pastoral interpretations, do not openly deny the indissolubility of marriage, but in fact even confirm it. However, from ambiguous and unclear text it is logical that in practice it denies the necessary negative interpretative consequences resulting from the partial ignorance of the undeniable marital indissolubility, precisely because it omitted the clear imperative of Christ: what God has united, man must not separate (Mk 10:9).

It does so through a meandering and intricate theological and moral discourse, using such expressions that encompass a whole range, believed to be various complex practical situations, some being more extreme and some more mild. However, all of these darkly presented cases are, in their moral nature, clear, easily distinguishable and defined as objectively sinful, which brings its sacramentological consequences.

It is natural that each sacramental marriage has its own unique life story of vocation, each of which is written in a different way in a community of persons, each having its own unique journey through life. God's call and vocation to marriage and family life, the goal of which is the gift of life and mutual love, addressed to a particular person, is always at the same time a capability. If God speaks to man, his words do not allow exceptions regarding good and evil, that is, when God commands a person not to separate what God has connected



(Mt 19,6), this imperative is about an infinite wisdom that predicts all possible events. Therefore “the love of the spouses requires, of its very nature, the unity and indissolubility of the spouses’ community of persons, which embraces their entire life”: “so they are no longer two, but one flesh” (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1644).

While looking for theological and moral solution for the emerging interpretative ambiguities there is no exception to the law of God, especially to the words of Christ, about marriage, so that contradictory theological speculations can not be accepted. These theoretical speculations essentially state that this divine law on marriage, which has always said that marriage is inseparable, that it is possible, despite all (Revelation), to grant exceptions in the sense that divorced and remarried in this state of mortal sin could be in the state of grace, so they could receive the sacrament of the Eucharist. It is clear that these speculations lack the fundamental theological logic of the biblical Revelation, and that it is replaced by Hegel’s logic.

It should be emphasized here that God never calls a particular human person for something (to marital holiness) for which he would not give him the gifts of grace and ability first (Francis 2016, 73), necessary for free and responsible realization of a lifetime marital vocation. Sacramental marriage must first uncover the gift of God’s love and grace, and then the sacramental gifts necessary for the life-long realization of the marital vocation. Christ “...also promised a new and superabundant afflatus of grace, of divine help, so that no person however fragile should find it impossible to do God’s will” (Mankowski 2014, 63).

If the theological development of the understanding of marriage, which is the service of life based on God’s gift of marital love, directed itself to an illogical and manifestly obscure understanding of the essence of holiness and sinfulness that would be artificially connected to one whole, it would logically end up in a blind aisle of the inner contradiction with the Revelation. Consequently, the whole concept of marriage, as a lifelong vocation to holiness, would collapse, where the primary task of people preparing for marriage is the understanding of marriage and parenthood as God’s call, gift, and vocation.

In this way, new theological speculations would come into an open conflict with the Revelation, because the whole Biblical Revelation dynamically unrolls the idea that marriage is God’s created reality (Mt 19:4-6), which is at the same time raised by Jesus Christ to the level of sacrament. Marriage always appears to be a religious reality, into which personal God comes in (Catechism of the Catholic Church 1639–1640), giving it a transcendental seal of salvation that goes beyond temporal perspective of earthly existence.

If God's law of marriage was not valid for every marriage, it then by means of these new theological speculations would contradict the fact that God calling man to holiness in marriage is the One who by grace enables people to love. That is why God puts moral demands on all spouses, obliging them to holiness reached in indissolubility (Mt 19:6; Catechism of the Catholic Church 1615).

In the universal questions of morality, the author of which is God's authority, it is impossible to apply pastoral process that would lead to resignation from these moral criteria due to different local customs. Thus, the application of the biblical moral teaching on marriage, the author of which is God, is not subject to the moral enculturation of the unique ethical situation, but on the contrary, the unique ethical situation (e.g. irregular situations) is subject to the biblical moral teaching, that is to say, Christ's words.

### What *communio personarum*?

New theological concepts no longer emphasize the Gospel message that the love of spouses is the image and sign of the communion of fruitful love between God and his people (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1617), and its purpose is the gift of life that can be realized in indissoluble sacramental marriage. Offered theological trends of understanding of sacramental dimension of indissolubility of marriage do not focus on the fact that marriage contract affects the very essence of being a woman and being a man and is "a fruit and a sign of necessity that is deeply human" (John Paul II 1981, 19).

It is the ideological theological horizontalization of raised issues of the so-called "irregular unions", which marginalizes the vertical dimension of the transcendence of the problem, allows moral relativism and subjectivism in distinction as well as in moral valuations. The transcendent dimension of the so-called "irregular situations" in their diversity, which, on the other hand, morally objectifies the reality of those who have entered into a new non-sacramental relationship, does not allow speculation on possible approach to the Eucharist on the theoretical level.

That is, the spring and foundation of marital love is always God (Gn 2:18 and 2:23), and He is also the prototype of this community (John Paul II 1994, 6), so that new unions (defined as irregular) by their nature cannot be theologically defined as sacramental, which is bringing blessings from transcendent granter for the members of such unions. Because God in the act of creation confirms natural need of completion between a man and a woman (Gn 2:24) and at the same time purifies and elevates it to perfection in the sacrament of marriage (John

Paul II 1981, 19), it would be a logical denial of the biblical truth about sacramentality and holiness of marriage if new irregular unions (despite the existence of the original sacramental marriage), be even partially considered theologically accepted and approved on the level of *Magisterium*.

It is exactly sacramental marital love that is to be the horizontal retrieval of the transcendent love of Christ to the Church, and therefore it can be characterized as a sacrificial love, so as Christ gives his life for the Church, so the Church gives herself to Christ, which is a clear reference to the transcendent foundation of this love. Therefore, new theological tendencies in solving the burning issues of so-called irregular unions avoid the vertical level of the problems that arise, because in any of these diverse, complex but immoral situations, they would not be able to accept what they want to deal with, so called, pastoral care without its thorough theological definition and biblical anchoring.

Such “merciful guidance” of persons living in objectively sinful relationships, as well as speculative reflections on their participation in the sacramental Eucharistic community, divergently diverts from the biblical foundations of sacramental marriage, and also from the present biblical concept of love in marriage. “Aware however that authentic understanding and genuine mercy are never separated from the truth, pastors have the duty (author’s note: moral theologians also) to remind these faithful of the Church’s doctrine concerning the celebration of the sacraments, in particular, the reception of the Holy Communion” (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 1994, 3). The sacrificial character of marital love is legitimately manifested in all the richness of the life of spouses and so is logical also its spiritual and physical character, which means that marital love is human, which embraces the whole person and is the expression of a complete personal gift of himself as well as the ability to accept this gift from the other person.

In the new theological propositions how will this original sacrificial character of the sacramental marital love (penetrating the whole human being) be applied to the so called irregular unions without ignoring the theology of creation, incarnation and redemption, which is a fundamental part of the *Magisterium* teaching?

The second essential theological question is in the new theological pastoral concepts, how will the perspective of an interpersonal existential gift in sacramental marriage, which is not established between spouses, but is existentially open to the gift of life and the service of life, if so called irregular union is not a sacramental marriage by its nature, but a sinful cohabitation? For in the teachings of *Magisterium*, sacramental marital love is characterized as fruitful love, according to the pattern of Christ’s love for the Church, which is constantly

giving birth to new members, that is, children in a sacramental marriage are accepted by spouses as an undeserved gift.

What will be the fruit of “love” in an objectively sinful union, and how will this new love be theologically defined and where will it be biblically anchored? Will it also be love that embodies the betrothal of Christ with the Church and the so called irregular union will also be presented as a sacramental marriage that allows Christ to deepen the union of spouses with the Church and the Church with Christ? Will the new “irregular unions”, the same as sacramental marriage, represent an eschatological reality, which is the eternal betrothal of Christ and the Church?

Is it possible to theologically call irregular unions a great mystery and compare it with the relationship Christ – the Church (Francis 2016, 292) (Eph 5:32), and is it possible in new theological propositions to point on real presence of Christ in irregular unions by the power of their real existence when they are not a sacrament? Certainly not, for the Church has always taught that marriage between baptized is a sacrament, and as the sacrament is a memorial, actuation and prophecy of the work of salvation (John Paul II 1981, 13, Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1617), which absolutely cannot be claimed about so called irregular unions.

\*

This makes it logical that if the family through the sacrament of marriage has a special participation in the grace of Christ, which is why it can fulfill its life as a way of salvation, whereas irregular unions cannot reach it because of the absence of sacramentality and grace deriving from it.

The second option is that there will be new theological forms of “unity” that contradict the unity of Christ and His Church, forasmuch as adultery pseudo marriages arranged after divorce are objectively sinful. It is necessary to point that such different forms of unification are not variations of that same, but radically differ in their substance and not just in degree.

Because, Church in the third millennium “...has the mission of announcing the gospel of marriage. She has the mission of announcing even the gospel - let me repeat: the gospel of indissolubility, true treasure that the Church guards in vessels of clay. This is the most urgent and inescapable priority” (Caffarra 2014, 180).

Concluding with a marvelous excerpt from papal *magisterium*: „It is, in fact, to the families of our times that the Church must bring the unchangeable and ever new Gospel of Jesus Christ, just as it is the families involved in the pres-

ent conditions of the world that are called to accept and to live the plan of God that pertains to them“ (John Paul II, 1981, 4). That is, through God’s mysterious design, which Christ confirmed, the word of Christ is to be announced, not the marriage leveling theological views.

## Bibliography

- BENEDICT XVI. 2005. *Deus caritas est*. Vatican.
- BENEDICT XVI. 2007. *Sacramentum caritatis*. Vatican.
- CAFFARRA, C. 2014. Sacramental ontology and the Indissolubility of Marriage. In: *Remaining in the Truth of Christ. Marriage and Communion in the Catholic Church*. Ed.: R. Dodaro. San Francisco Ignatius Press. P. 166–180.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 1992. Vatican.
- Codex iuris canonici*. 1983. Vatican.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. 1975. *Persona humana*. Vatican.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. 1994. *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church concerning the Reception of Holy Communion by the Divorced and Remarried Members of the Faithful*. Vatican.
- DE PAOLIS, V. 2014. The Divorced and Civilly remarried and the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance. In: *Remaining in the Truth of Christ. Marriage and Communion in the Catholic Church*. Ed. R. Dodaro. San Francisco Ignatius Press. Pp. 181–209.
- FRANCIS. 2016. *Amoris Laetitia*. Vatican.
- JOHN PAUL II. 1981. *Familiaris consortio*. Vatican.
- JOHN PAUL II. 1994. *Gratissimam sane*. Vatican.
- KASPER, W. 2014. *Das Evangelium von der Familie. Die Rede von dem Konsistorium*. Freiburg im Breisgau.
- LEO XIII. 1880. *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae*. Vatican.
- MANKOWSKI, P. 2014. Dominical Teaching on Divorce and Remarriage: The Biblical Data. In: *Remaining in the Truth of Christ. Marriage and Communion in the Catholic Church*. Ed. R. Dodaro. San Francisco Ignatius Press. Pp. 36–63.
- MÜLLER, G.L. 2014. Testimony to the Power of Grace: On the Indissolubility of Marriage and the debate concerning the Civilly Remarried and the Sacraments. In: Ed. R. Dodaro. *Remaining in the Truth of Christ. Marriage and Communion in the Catholic Church*. San Francisco Ignatius Press. Pp.148–165.
- PAUL VI. 1968. *Humanae vitae*. Vatican.
- PIUS XI. 1930. *Casti connubii*. Vatican.

- PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR LEGISLATIVE TEXTS. 2000. *Declaration concerning the Admission to Holy Communion of Faithful Who Are Divorced and remarried*. Vatican.
- PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR THE FAMILY. 1995. *The truth and meaning of human sexuality*. Vatican.
- PESCHKE, K.-H. 1992. *Christian Ethics. Moral Theology in the light of Vatican II*. Vol II: *Special Moral Theology*. Bangalore.
- POKRYWKA. M. 2011. *Antropologiczne podstawy moralności małżeństwa i rodziny*. Lublin.
- THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL. *Gaudium et spes*. Vatican 1965.

Data wpłynięcia: 21.09.2017

Data uzyskania pozytywnych recenzji: 05.10.2017