

should have some normative provisions regarding the adequate and worthy remuneration of the members of the diocesan clergy.” (p.125)

Speaking from his expertise in Canon Law as well as from his long experience as pastor, the author can afford giving even some practical “Advisories” to diocesan priests on unpriestly values and actuations regarding material possessions. Thus reading his personal comments on statements such as “let them not live a luxurious life-style”; “let them not accumulate temporal goods”; “let them not run after money”; “let them not make money their master”; “let them not be bread-winners for their relatives”; “let them not be selfish with what is theirs”; “let them not give money loans”; “let them not financially secure themselves”; “let them not live an unpriestly life”; and “let them not die loaded with material possessions” (pp. 58-69) is somehow refreshing and makes one feel that the book not only pinpoints inculturated burning issues, but also that the book, although short and canonical in nature, may serve very well as companion for a personal or collective priestly retreat. In this sense, the book is highly recommended for bishops and priests living in the particular setting of the Philippines.

JAVIER GONZÁLEZ, OP

V. Gómez-Iglesias, A.Viana, J.Miras, *El Opus Dei, Prelatura Personal: La Constitución Apostólica Ut sit*, Instituto Martín Azpilcueta, Universidad de Navarra (Navarre) 2000, 165pp.

Prologued by the eminent and recently deceased canonist, Amadeo de Fuenmayor, this tome is a collection of three monographs: V. Gómez-Iglesias, *Génesis de la Constitución Apostólica «Ut sit»* (pp. 31-56); A. Viana, *Contenido del Derecho Particular del Opus Dei* (pp. 57-95); and J. Miras, *Tradicón canónica y novedad legislativa en el concepto de prelatura* (pp. 98-126). The tome includes two appendices: The *Apostolic Constitution «Ut sit»*, by which John Paul II erected the Personal Prelature of Opus Dei, and the *Codex Iuris Particularis Operis Dei*, which are the statutes for Opus Dei.

V. Gómez-Iglesias, in the first monograph, reprises a more substantial collaborative work of his with Fuenmayor – cf. A.Fuenmayor,

V.Gómez-Iglesias, J.L.Illanes, *The Canonical Path of Opus Dei: The History and Defense of a Charism*, Scepter Publishers (New Jersey) & Midwest Theological Centrum (Chicago), 1994 – in the first monograph. The merit of the present monograph is its brevity and conciseness: in barely 25 pages, the author summarizes the long and complicated legislative *iter* of the canonical figure of the personal prelature in general, and that of Opus Dei as the first personal prelature in particular.

A. Viana, on the other hand, focuses on the particular law of Opus Dei – i.e., the *Statutes* by which it is configured and regulated – which is the *Codex Iuris Particularis Operis Dei*. The author himself points out the usefulness of this study: given that Opus Dei is the first (and up to the moment the only) personal prelature erected by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority, the way it is configured and regulated in the Statutes that the same Ecclesiastical Authority has promulgated for it provides a very important hermeneutic key towards understanding the canonical nature of the new figure of personal prelatres – otherwise so briefly sketched in general lines by a few short canons in the Code of Canon Law. Given the ongoing canonistic debate on whether personal prelatres are jurisdictional figures that belong to the hierarchical structure of the Church or merely associative phenomena, the *Codex Iuris Particularis* of Opus Dei indeed is of great importance in this discussion.

J. Miras, in the final monograph, provides yet another hermeneutic key towards the proper understanding of the canons outlining the figure of personal prelatres in the Code. He does this by a simple recourse to still another important canonical principle – contained in cc. 17 and 21 – which stipulates the continuity in the meaning of words and norms in the canonical ordering and doctrine. In effect, his simple thesis is that even if personal prelatres are a novelty in Canon Law, the term and notion of *prelatura* and *prelate* are not. Hence the way these terms have used in canonical doctrine and in past legislative texts should not be forgotten at the moment of trying to determine the *mens legislatoris* behind the figure of personal prelatura, as contained in the pertinent canons of the Code. His conclusion is quite clear: in no time in the past have the terms been used to refer

to associative phenomena; on the contrary they have always referred to what we may now call ecclesiastical circumscriptions or jurisdictional-hierarchical phenomena.

Finally, we have to point out that the inclusion of the official documents regarding Opus Dei – i.e., the *Apostolic Constitution «Ut sit»* erecting it and the *Codex Iuris Particularis* configuring and regulating it – as appendices should be of particular interest to the serious researcher or even just to the impartial reader. In effect, in this moment when once again Opus Dei seems to have been placed in the limelight by the mass media (cf. Dan Brown, *The Da Vinci Code*; Sony Films, *The Da Vinci Code*; John Allen, *Opus Dei*), having the official documents canonically configuring and regulating it is the minimum requirement for intellectual honesty in making a judgment about it. The only limitation, perhaps, is that like all other official documents of the Supreme Legislator of the Church, it is in the official language of the Church – i.e., Latin.

JAIME B. ACHACOSO, JCD