

Monika Menke

BIRITUALISM IN THE PRACTICE OF THE CZECH CHURCH

INTRODUCTION

In their particular Church, bishops are responsible not only for their faithful, but also for Christians of another rite.¹ They carry out this care in collaboration with their own shepherds, but situations arise where it is not only necessary but sometimes appropriate to allow one clergyman to celebrate the Eucharist in both ceremonies. The Catholic Church in the Czech Republic is formed by a network of parishes of the Latin Church, which are covered by (territorially much larger) parishes of the Exarchate.² The faithful of the Latin rite are subject to their bishops, and the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavic rite to the apostolic exarch.³ But there are

DR. MONIKA MENKE – Department of Church History and Canon Law, Sts. Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology, Palacký University of Olomouc; correspondence address: Na Hradě 2, 779 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic; e-mail: monika.menke@upol.cz; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2814-2524>

¹ Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, *Decretum de pastorali episcoporum munere in Ecclesia Christus Dominus* (28.10.1965), AAS 58 (1966), p. 673-701, no. 23.

² The Apostolic Exarchate in the Czech Republic was established by the bull *Quo aptius consuleretur* of Pope St John Paul II of 15th March 1996, see: <https://www.exarchat.cz/bula-apostolsky-exarchat/> [accessed: 14.07.2021].

³ If there are believers from other than these two rites in the Czech lands, they do not have their own hierarchy and are subject to the diocesan bishops of the Latin Church according to their place of residence. This follows from the founding bull of the exarchate, which is established only for Byzantines and in the context of can. 916 § 5,

territories where one clergyman serves both groups of believers. The issue of biritualism was more complicated in the Czech Catholic Church as a result of some decisions after the end of totalitarianism and the way priests were ordained during communist totalitarianism (especially from the so-called circle around Felix Davídek, as will be briefly explained below) into pastoral care. In this article, we want to process it with the passage of time and after (perhaps) the blunting of some of the then wrongs, but also in the context of the emergence of a new generation of priests growing up in times of freedom after 1989.

1. TERMINOLOGY AND REASONS FOR BIRITUALISM IN GENERAL

Both codes state the duty of bishops to care for all believers in their territory. The eparchial bishop has a serious duty (*gravi obligatione*) to take care of everything that will enable the faithful of another Church *sui iuris* to maintain and revive his own rite (can. 193 § 1 CCEO). In addition to the classical tools in the field of creating the governing structures of the Church, such as the appointment of a bishop vicar for a group of believers of another rite (can. 476 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law;⁴ can. 24 CCEO) or the establishment of personal parishes (can. 518 CIC; can. 280 § 2 CCEO), we can also understand the privilege of biritualism (which concerns the liturgical area, not the governing one) to some extent as such care, even for several groups of believers with different ceremonial traditions, by one priest. Biritualism is an opportunity in the Catholic Church for one clergyman to use two rites in the liturgy,⁵ usually Roman (Latin) and Byzantine-

see *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*, AAS 82 (1990), p. 1045-363 [hereinafter: CCEO].

⁴ *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus* (25.01.1983), AAS 75 (1983), pars II, p. 1-317 [hereinafter: CIC].

⁵ The definition of the rite (ceremony) can be found in can. 28 § 1 CCEO, which is a reflection of the Council document *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* no. 3: "These individual Churches, whether of the East or the West, although they differ somewhat among themselves in rite (to use the current phrase), that is, in liturgy, ecclesiastical discipline, and spiritual heritage, are, nevertheless, each as much as the others, entrusted to the pastoral government of the Roman Pontiff, the divinely appointed successor of St. Peter in primacy over the universal Church. They are consequently of equal dignity, so that none of them is superior to the others."

-Slavic in our environment. Linguistically, this term includes the connection of two ceremonies (bi = two; rite = rite, ceremony) [Adamowicz 2019, 292]. We do not find a legal definition in the Church Code: both codes (CIC and CCEO) do not explicitly use the term biritualism and they refer to its possibility in a single canon. Can. 674 § 2 of the CCEO stipulates that the ordinary of the sacrament is to celebrate, according to the liturgical regulations of his own Church, *sui iuris*, unless the law provides otherwise or unless he has received a special faculty from the Holy See. Can. 846 § 2 of the CIC is even more concise and does not say as much: the minister administers the sacraments according to his own rite. The practice of allowing this possibility is determined by the practice of the Holy See. Thus, we can look at the concept of biritualism from different perspectives – most often in terms of the pastoral need of the faithful, less often in terms of the specific spirituality of the priest, or the enriched spirituality of a particular community in the Church. A biritual priest is technically a priest who has been granted this privilege by the Holy See, who has practically mastered ministry in a different rite (than the one in which he was ordained) and it would be best that he also (without prejudice to his initial incorporation into the Church) “clung to the heart and reason” and was thus able to combine the richness of both traditions in specific conditions. If this overlap into the life of the Church fails, biritualism can be a problem somewhere in the sense already stated in the Bible and St Paul’s denounced temptation of discord (1 Cor 1:10-13). Nor can we identify with the opinion of some of our evangelical brethren, who describe biritualism as a kind of “fulfilment of the unity of the Church in the person of the celebrant, but as a very contradictory unity and from this also great internal tensions” [Vokoun 1996]. This is not about mixing, merging one rite into another, but precisely about the purity of traditions, preserving the richness of both rites, passed on by one person. During the celebration of the sacraments, the sacred ministers are bound to observe strictly liturgical rites and their discipline: they cannot change them (can. 40 § 1-2 CCEO).⁶ The priest (Latin and Eastern) celebrates the sacraments in his own rite and uses his own liturgical robes; this general principle is then also recalled in the individual sacraments (can. 694, 695, 707 § 2, 748 § 2,

⁶ *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia Sacrosanctum concilium* (04.12.1963), AAS 56 (1964), p. 97-134, no. 22 § 3; *Idem, Decretum de Ecclesiis orientalibus Catholicis Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (21.11.1964), AAS 57 (1965), p. 76-89, no. 6.

836 CCEO and can. 850, 928, 1015 § 2, 1119 CIC) [Salachas and Sabbarese 2004, 270]. Properly lived and understood biritualism can rather be a contribution to such unity of the Church and a foretaste of what Pope St John Paul II wrote at the end of the great Jubilee in 2000: the memory of the times when the Church breathed “with both lungs” should encourage Eastern and Western Christians to walk together in unity of faith and respect for legitimate differences and help each other as members of the one Body of Christ.⁷ Therefore, it would be necessary to write about biritualism as an attempt to respect what was not accepted by the individual churches as a liturgical tradition without the inspiration of the Spirit, as well as an effort to respect the dignity and equal rights of all believers in specific conditions; the biritual celebrant then embodies rather the Catholicism and the ministry (diakonia) of the Church towards all the people of this country [Bugel 1996].

Therefore, if there is a sufficient understanding of one’s own tradition behind practically lived biritualism, based on a sufficient understanding and theological education of the priest, transmitted to the community entrusted to him, there should be no undesirable excesses (Latinisation of Eastern traditions, Western tradition, schizophrenic approach, etc.) but rather to inculturation. It must be a revival of one’s own traditions and include spiritual riches for those to whom the biritual serves in the second rite. This is evidenced by the testimony of those who grew up from childhood in both traditions, for example, as children of a Roman Catholic father and a Greek Catholic mother, etc. For some of them [ibid.] a holistic understanding of biritualism is a necessary environment so much that when trying to “push” into the box only one rite, one spirituality and theology would begin “to suffocate.” Then, when the priest in question (consecrated in the Western Rite with the Faculty of Biritualism) himself served the faithful of an almost entirely Roman Catholic parish, he perceived that his spirituality brought welcome enrichment [ibid.]. The new generation, growing up already in the time of freedom, understands this enrichment not only in theological anchoring (more evangelistic but also more evangelical), but also practically and not only out of necessity and due to the lack of priests.

⁷ Cf. Ioannes Paulus II, *Epistula apostolica Novo millenio ineunte* (06.01.2001), AAS 93 (2001), p. 266-309, no. 48.

2. THE PROCESS (PRACTICE) OF GRANTING A PRIVILEGE IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Guidelines from the Czech Bishops' Conference for this process do not exist and neither from the individual Roman Catholic dioceses. The particular norm of the Czech Greek Catholic Church (exarchate) only in 2004 recapitulated the possibilities of acquiring or renewing the Faculty of Biritualism.⁸ It recalls the well-known fact that concelebration (can. 701 CCEO) and the administration of the sacrament of reconciliation in another ceremony without special permission is possible, but for presiding over the celebration of the Eucharist in a second rite it is necessary that this faculty is granted by the Holy See. All the privileges of biritualism which were granted to the priests of the Latin Church by someone other than the Holy See before the CIC came into force are revoked (can. 4 CIC); similarly, these privileges for Greek Catholic priests which were granted before the entry into force of the CCEO are revoked unless they have been granted by the Holy See. The provision also recapitulates and explains some of the canons that apply to the administration of the sacraments and could apply to Eastern priests administering the sacraments to Latin Catholics (can. 671 § 1 CCEO and 844 § 1 CIC; 678 § 1 CCEO and 862 CIC; 678 § 2 CCEO; 683 CCEO and 696 § 1-3 CCEO; 701 CCEO; 707 § 2 CCEO; 717 CCEO; 722 § 4 CCEO and 966 § 2 CIC; 739 § 1 CCEO; 741 CCEO; 829 § 1 CCEO; 830 § 1 CCEO and 1111 § 1 CIC and 835 CCEO).

In practice, the granting of the faculty is solved in such a way that if a priest of the Byzantine-Slavic rite seeks it for the Latin rite, he asks for it through the relevant diocesan bishop of the Latin Church in whose jurisdiction he intends to operate. If a priest of the Latin rite wants to acquire the faculty for service in a Byzantine-Slavic rite, then he turns to the Holy See (Congregation for the Oriental Churches) through an apostolic exarch who seeks the opinion of his own bishop. Consent is usually not granted indefinitely, but only for a triennium or quinquennium, then it is necessary to apply for an extension of the privilege or its renewal. The application to the Congregation states the motivation for obtaining the privilege and usually also a brief positive report about the readiness of the

⁸ See *Otázka biritualismu*, "Věstník AE" 3/04 from 24.05.2004, no. 96/04.

candidate.⁹ The Congregation for the Oriental Churches in a similar way then grants the required faculty.¹⁰ In the case of a religious, the application to the Congregation is submitted by his own ordinary, in this case the superior, e.g., provincial, with the consent of the apostolic exarch.

3. CONTROVERSY OVER BIRITUALS IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The situation in the Czech Republic is not the same as, for example, in eastern Slovakia, where in fact Catholics in many communities live in a symbiosis of both Catholic rites, moreover in the belief that this has been the case since the Cyril and Methodius mission, which brought them Christianity. The Czech Republic is less religious; Christians often live in the diaspora here, but this leads them to more frequent search for ways “outside of confinement” and more broadly, not only within both traditions, but often within a more generous understanding of ecumenism. However, the “help” of the priests of both ceremonies is not unknown here. After the banning of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia in 1950, several Slovak Greek Catholic priests were forcibly evicted from Slovakia, mainly to parishes in northern Bohemia and to the borderlands, where they served Western Catholics. Although the Greek Catholic Church was re-authorized in 1968, it was severely restricted until 1989. On the day of the establishment of the independent Czech Republic by the division of Czechoslovakia, a special vicariate for Czech Catholics of the

⁹ For example, in these words: with the full consent of the exarch, we ask for the priests N. N. the Faculty of Biritualism. This priest knows the Latin rite well, and was also formed in the Latin seminary. He is a celibate priest working in the Litoměřice diocese, which is facing a shortage of priests and would be of help in the pastoral care and celebration of the Eucharist also in the Latin rite.

¹⁰ Pater N. N., presbyter ritus byzantini, Exarchie Apostolicae in Reipublicae Cechae humiliater postulat, ut facultas sibi fiat Sacrum litandi atque cetera sacerdotalia munera ritu quoque latino obeundi. Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, vigore facultatum quibus pollet ex Concessione Summi pontificis N. N. pp. omnibus mature pensis, graiam petitam benigne largitur, iuxta preces, cauto tamen u Orator de Hierarchae seu Ordinarii loci sententia ritum latinum scite didicerit, remoto quovis vel admirationis periculo et excluso omni illegitimo syncretismo liturgico ceterum servatis iure servandis. Praesentibus in quinquennium valituris. Contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Byzantine rite was established in Prague on 1st January 1993. The Church was headed by the current Bishop-Exarch Mons. Ladislav Hučko.

However, the situation of the Catholic Church in the Czech Republic is still influenced by some acts from the time of totalitarianism before 1990. During the persecution of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia, there took place in the underground Church (around the secretly consecrated Bishop Felix M. Davídek)¹¹ the ordinations of married men to the priesthood together with the transfer to the Greek Catholic Church, with the bishop at the same time conferring on them the Faculty of Biritualism so that they could operate within the secret structures of the Roman Catholic Church [Dvořáček 2020, 41].¹² Other birituals were members of some orders: the Greek Catholic branches of the Redemptorists or the Jesuits. The heart of the problem from the point of view of canon law, in the case of priests from Davídek's circle, was the authorisation to change Church affiliation (in the old terminology "change of rite") and the question of biritualism. There were several reasons for the ordination of married men in this group, one of them being the fear of persecution of the Church after the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact troops in August 1968 [Liška 1999, 82]. Secretly ordained married men were also supposed to be less conspicuous to state authorities than celibates. In order for married candidates to receive priestly ordination, they first had to transfer from Latin to one of the Eastern Catholic Churches *sui iuris*, in this case to the Slovak Greek Catholic Church, then represented by the Prešov Eparchy. Felix Davídek, together with his consecrator, the secret bishop Jan Blaha, was convinced that both powers were part of the special papal faculties received from Pope Paul VI. According to Bishop Blaha, the (secret) papal faculties for the ordination of new bishops during the persecution included, from a canonical point of view, the transition to another Eastern Church

¹¹ Felix Maria Davídek (12th January 1921 in Chrlice – 16th August 1988 in Brno) was a Czech Catholic priest, secretly ordained bishop (1967) and founder of a large community of the Koinótés underground Church. He built a secret parallel Church structure in the Czechoslovakia, because he expected from the Soviet occupation the imprisonment and deportation of Church leaders to the USSR and an attempt at the complete liquidation of the Church. By 1970, he had consecrated eight priests as bishops. He formed and ordained seventy priests, married and celibate.

¹² This project is known as O. V. E. S. (Opus Vocationum Ecclesiae Silentii) and they learned about it in Rome through the Bishop of Meissen, Gerhard Schaffran. These priests were then referred to as *Clandestins*.

and the possibility of granting the faculty of biritualism.¹³ However, this is a highly controversial assumption, which was both defended [Fiala and Hanuš 1999, 90] and refuted [Liška 1999, 84-85] in later evaluation works. After 1968, the Greek Catholic eparchy in Prešov was restored, but without its own diocesan bishop – it was headed by an apostolic administrator with the rights of a diocesan bishop, namely the priest Ján Hirka, and the text of the appointment bull explicitly stated that his appointment invalidated any other authority. And since the first priestly ordinations began to be accepted by married men in secret Church structures only in 1969, they could not be ordained on the legal basis of the above-mentioned faculties [Dvořáček 2020, 42]. These priests were secretly ordained for their time for the underground Church (*Ecclesia silentii*) in an Eastern rite with the Faculty of Biritualism. In practice, however, Slovak Greek Catholics, accustomed to the conditions of the diaspora among Latin believers in the Czech environment, had no problem with such secretly ordained priests, and by the end of the 1980s the administrator Hirka had no problem with them, but around 1989 he distanced himself from them. After the end of the persecution (after 1969), the Greek Catholic Church itself had a problem with the number of priests, so these ordinands could be of help. However, we still describe the period of totalitarianism, when in the Czech territory, apart from Prague, Greek Catholic services in the Czech Republic were carried out only occasionally. Any religious act – baptism, wedding or funeral – had to always be given special state consent. Several priests of the “Moravian” group helped out without state consent¹⁴ in Greek Catholic parishes in Slovakia, e.g., in the village of Kojšov near Košice, where believers secretly met in a cemetery and served the Greek Catholic liturgy without a priest, and occasionally with him [Smejkal 1997, 100].

¹³ Even according to the then valid canon law (CIC 1917), only the Holy See granted permission for biritualism. However, Davidek believed that he was the holder of a special papal commission to grant this faculty.

¹⁴ State consent to the performance of clerical work was a decision by which in communist Czechoslovakia the state authorities allowed clergy churches to perform their activities in the clerical administration and was also a condition for the award of salary. State authorities commonly used its granting and withdrawal to blackmail clergy, relocate them within the republic, or remove them from clerical administration. Operating without state consent was usually classified as a criminal offense of obstructing the supervision of churches and religious societies (Section 178 of the Criminal Code, repealed as of 31 January 1990).

After November 1989, the situation of the underground Church changed fundamentally. Although the situation was initially favourable to them (a lack of priests in official pastoral care and experience with other underground Church activities), in the end their incorporation into official Church structures did not turn out well, at least from a human point of view. Secret priests and bishops were invited to register with their diocesan bishop by the end of August 1990 at the latest. A list of approximately 130 priests and several secret bishops who heeded this call was sent to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in spring 1991. The Bishops' Conference also did not have the same approach in Bohemia (where the Roman Catholic bishops were more accommodating) and in Slovakia (where there was complete rejection by the Roman Catholic bishops). The result of the whole event was, in the end, very unhappy and unworthy of human beings. These *Clandestini* priests were to submit to the solution introduced in the so-called Norms,¹⁵ that is, conditional consecration (sub conditione), which these priests perceived as often an internally insurmountable condition [Liška 1999, 153-55], for they subjectively had no doubt about the validity of their consecration, their intention, the intention of the ordainer, and the exceptional nature of the situation which justified many others. In his article from April 2020, Jiří Dvořáček already openly names the main problem: the Slovak nationalism of some bishops who did not tolerate that Czech priests were not under their obedience and did not want their work in Slovakia [Dvořáček 2020, 42].

And here we touch on the realm of biritualism: the great problems of integration into the official ecclesiastical structures. The married and secretly ordained priests and bishops mainly had great problems with integration into the official Church, although they had worked in both ceremonies and were ordained by Felix Davídek with the consent of the Greek Catholic Ordinary. Some of these priests and bishops confirmed the existence of this consent (Ján Krajňák and Fridolín Zahradník in their "Manifesta-

¹⁵ "Norms" were issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 5th February 1992, after being approved by Pope John Paul II during an audience of the Congregation's Prefect, Joseph Ratzinger, on 27th January 1992. "Norms" were issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 5th February 1992, after being approved by Pope John Paul II during an audience of the Congregation's Prefect, Joseph Ratzinger, on 27th January 1992.

tion Oath” of 12th November 1993); Bishop Hirka,¹⁶ however, denied all such powers in a letter dated 1st May 1994, addressed to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, to the Apostolic Nunciature in Prague, and to all Czech and Slovak bishops.

Thus, in the mid-1990s, the Catholic Church addressed the issue of how to approach secret ordinations and how to incorporate married priests from this group into pastoral care. The question of secret ordinations was resolved by the “Norms” and because in March 1996 the Apostolic Exarchate was established in Prague,¹⁷ it was assumed that these priests would be included in its structures – but even that was problematic. Most of the priests concerned proposed to apply for the establishment of a personal prelate, in which specific methods of pastoral care (largely outside the ordinary parish pastoral care) and the special character of the underground Church presbyterate were to be preserved, but they were not supported by the Episcopal Conference and rejected. The inclusion of priests within the exarchate was then associated (in addition to the conditional consecration) also with the need to supplement the theological education and knowledge of the Eastern liturgy,¹⁸ and a new permission of biritualism (which would not be automatic, but on the basis of a previous recommendation of the apostolic exarch and the relevant Latin bishop). The apostolic exarch would then take care of the “change of rite” (i.e., the transfer to the Eastern Church) and the new ordination sub conditione of the candidates who received approval, and entrust them with respective tasks in spiritual administration [Dvořáček 2020, 47]. After completing these courses and subsequent exercises, only 18 married secretly ordained priests finally received conditional ordination from the Apostolic Exarch Ljavinec on 22nd October 1997 (later joined by the secret bishop Pavel Hájek, who was dealt with separately and received conditional ordination

¹⁶ Ján Hirka was appointed full eparchial bishop of the Prešov eparchy on 21st December 1989, and he received episcopal ordination on 17th February 1990.

¹⁷ Ivan Ljavinec became the first exarch, one of the bishops ordained by Felix Davidek in 1968 (4 months before him, Ján Eugen Kočiš was ordained as the first bishop in this group, who became the auxiliary bishop of the exarchate in 2004). However, Ljavinec was also “re-consecrated” – on 30th March 1996 his public episcopal ordination took place in Rome in the Basilica of St Clement’s.

¹⁸ Thus, those interested in the General Study of the Dominicans from 1st October 1996 to 18th January 1997 completed a theological course ending with a commission exam. At the same time, a course on the Eastern Liturgy was organised for these priests.

on 17th June 1998). Before ordination, each priest had to sign a declaration of the change from “Latin to Byzantine-Slavic rite” dated 4th October 1997 (in the sense of canons 36-37 of the CCEO). This statement was preceded by the Holy Father’s consent to the ‘change of rite’ communicated to the priests by the Apostolic Nuncio Coppa [ibid., 48]. Inclusion in the exarchate often meant for these priests rather a restriction of their activities. Although they could work pastorally within the exarchate, they were not allowed to celebrate Latin Masses themselves as the main celebrants, but only to concelebrate, which meant a substantial restriction of their original biritualism (at that time only a few of them received this faculty) [Fiala and Hanuš 1999, 201]. At present (beginning in 2021) only eight of these priests work within the exarchate (the others have since died) and four of them are also birituals in the Latin rite.

CONCLUSION

Due to historical events during the lack of freedom in the Czech Republic, the situation with birituals was not easy, although to a certain extent it was an artificially induced problem and clumsily solved mainly for the “Church-political” ambitions of the then Slovak episcopate. However, this time is over, the coexistence of both ceremonies in the Czech Republic is currently peaceful and both branches of the Catholic Church are facing a shortage of priests. Today, the Greek Catholic Church in the Czech Republic has 17 parishes and 19 branch municipalities in seven deaneries (protopresbyteraty)¹⁹ with 31 priests, and birituals are about half of them. When it comes to Latin priests with a faculty of biritualism from this recent age, there are not many of them (around five). However, the Greek Catholic Church in the Czech Republic in reality lives in the diaspora, celebrates “its” services only on Sundays and holidays, and for Eastern priests with this faculty, pastoral involvement in the service of Latin be-

¹⁹ These parishes have a somewhat different form: the territory of one Greek Catholic parish usually includes the territory of several districts. According to the last census of 2011, the number of people who declared their affiliation with the Greek Catholic Church has increased: 9,883 people have registered, which is about a 29 percent increase over the 2001 census (7,675 people registered at that time). This number is growing significantly mainly due to immigration from abroad, especially from Ukraine.

lievers is such a welcome improvement. A biritual priest in the Czech environment can currently be a benefit even in the context of increasing migration and enabling the religious life of migrants in their own ceremony. Moreover, if he is truly a spiritual person, he can bring enrichment to the faithful of both rites. Of those priests who were controversial as a result of secret ordinations, many are no longer alive, and in practice very few of them work biritually, especially those who have actually mastered the second rite internally. At present, a number of young Greek Catholic priests have applied for this faculty and strengthened the Roman Catholic Church not only in parishes but also in categorical pastoral care (in the army, in prisons, but also in clerical service in hospitals and charities). This is also due to the fact that these priests know the local situation of both rites, they were mostly formed in Latin seminaries (a Greek Catholic seminary and the faculty is not in the Czech Republic), and Latin bishops welcome their help due to a lack of their own clergy.

REFERENCES

- Adamowicz, Leszek. 2019. "Birytualizm." In *Leksykon Prawa Kanonicznego*, ed. Mirosław Sitarz, 292. Lublin: Stowarzyszenie Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Bugel, Walerian. 1996. "Aby biritualismus nemusel být problémem." <https://www.getsemany.cz/node/2039> [accessed: 14.07.2021].
- Dvořáček, Jiří. 2020. "Vliv skryté církve na Apoštolský exarchát v České republice." *Paměť a dějiny* 4:41-50.
- Fiala, Petr, and Jiří Hanuš. 1999. *Skrytá církev. Felix M. Davídek a společenství Koinótés*. Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury.
- Liška, Ondřej. 1999. *Církev v podzemí a společenství Koinótés*. Tišnov: Sursum.
- Salachas, Dimitrios, and Luigi Sabbarese. 2004. *Chierici e ministero sacro nel Codice latino e orientale*. Roma: Urbaniana University Press.
- Smejkal, Milan. 1997. "Řeckokatolíci v podzemí." *Teologické texty* 3:100.
- Vokoun, Jaroslav. 1996. "K problému biritualismu." <http://www.getsemany.cz/node/1983> [accessed: 14.07.2021].

Biritualism in the Practice of the Czech Church

Abstract

Both codes of canon law state the duty of bishops to care for all believers in their territory. This applies not only to the faithful of their Church, but also to the faithful of another Church *sui iuris* (in the case of the Czech Republic, especially the Greek Catholic Church). For pastoral help as well as support and revival of their rite, it can be in the field of liturgical help, where the priest of one ceremony receives from the Holy See the so-called faculty of biritualism. The article describes the situation in the Czech Republic, moreover complicated by the lack of priests of both ceremonies and the fact that in times of imprisonment before 1989 there were secret ordinations of married men with the Faculty of Biritualism. After the situation was relaxed, these priests were involved in the life of the Church mainly within the Greek Catholic exarchate.

Keywords: biritualism in the Czech Republic; Felix M. Davídek; communist regime; Greek Catholic Church; rite; privilege of biritualism

Birytualizm w praktyce Kościoła Czeskiego

Abstrakt

Obydwa kodeksy prawa kanonicznego określają obowiązek biskupów do opieki nad wszystkimi wiernymi na ich terytorium. Dotyczy to nie tylko wiernych ich Kościoła, ale także wiernych innego Kościoła *sui iuris* (w przypadku Czech, zwłaszcza Kościoła greckokatolickiego). Dla pomocy duszpasterskiej, a także podtrzymania i ożywienia ich obrzędu może to być w zakresie pomocy liturgicznej, gdy kapłan jednego obrządku otrzymuje od Stolicy Apostolskiej tzw. fakultet birytualizmu. Artykuł opisuje sytuację w Czechach, dodatkowo skomplikowaną przez brak księży obu obrządków oraz przez fakt, że w czasach uwięzienia przed 1989 r. dochodziło do tajnych święceń żonatych mężczyzn udzielając fakultet birytualizmu. Po rozluźnieniu sytuacji politycznej księża ci zaangażowali się w życie Kościoła głównie w ramach egzarchatu greckokatolickiego.

Słowa kluczowe: birytualizm w Republice Czeskiej; Felix M. Davídek; reżim komunistyczny; Kościół greckokatolicki; ryt; przywilej birytualizmu

Informacje o Autorze: DR MONIKA MENKE – Katedra Historii Kościoła i Prawa Kanonicznego, Cyrylometodiański Wydział Teologii, Uniwersytet Palackiego w Ołomuńcu; adres do korespondencji: Na Hradě 2, 779 00 Olomouc, Republika Czeska; e-mail: monika.menke@upol.cz; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2814-2524>