exception of the local church theology articles) are those of German theologians, is a testimony that the beneficial interaction of the local churches is already in process. One may hope that this valuable work may receive an English translation which would make its many contributions more accessible to the Third World churches. At least we may hope that Arevalo’s article may appear in its English original, or in expanded form, to serve as a basis for further research into the history of theology in the Philippine church, and as a further stimulus to a Filipino theology.

John N. Schumacher, S.J.


Ladislas Orsy, internationally respected as a leading expert in canon law and presently on the faculty of The Catholic University of America, has written a reflective essay concerning “the interplay that takes place between those who possess the Word (that is, the whole Church) and those who within that community have a special power to proclaim it and authenticate it (that is, the episcopate).” For people today want to know more about the role and extent of the “teaching power” in the church and their obligations in responding to its voice.

The essay has four parts. The first part presents the context and the foundations of the interplay. A preliminary note explains the historical context as the age (from the second part of the nineteenth century onward) when the church has been coming to grips with the laws of evolution in doctrinal matters and in the concrete reality of the church. Then the general pattern of the ongoing communication between God and human persons is outlined as the broader context for the interplay between the acts of the teaching authority and the response of the community. Subsequently three questions are clarified: (1) Who is in possession of the Word? (2) What does it mean to speak the Word with authenticity? (3) What is the meaning of the distinction between the teaching church and the church taught? Finally an immensely great cultural change is pointed out which is affecting the interplay between the episcopate and the rest of the community — the steadily rising educational level of the Christian people.

The second part concentrates on the teaching authority in the church. It first treats the term magisterium (which, since the eighteenth century, has meant “the teaching authority of the hierarchy”), the new way of exercising this teaching power through encyclicals since Gregory XVI (1831-46), and the hermeneutical problems arising from this new development. It then discusses in order: infallible magisterium, non-infallible magisterium, ordinary
magisterium (Orsy’s claim that the term “ordinary magisterium” has undergone a significant transformation in recent decades does not appear to be convincingly grounded). Subsequently the question is asked: Is there a magisterium of theologians? Orsy agrees with F. Sullivan that, given the evolution of the concept magisterium and its meaning today, to speak of two magisteria could lead to endless confusion. But he sees no reason to deny special authority to learned and holy theologians. Magisterium may not be the best term today to describe that ministry; yet under whatever name, we need their specific service — which should not be conceived as separated from or opposed to, that of the hierarchy. The second part closes with a discussion of the organic unity of Christian doctrine and an excursus on prudential decisions by popes and bishops in practical matters and their need to be advised, protected and controlled.

Part three discusses the second phase of the dialectic between the episcopate and the Christian people — the response of the people. It first indicates when surrender of faith is due; then inquires concerning the meaning of the word obsequium (in the course of which is given an illuminating treatment of the hermeneutics of conciliar documents, in particular with regard to “seminal locutions“). The author concludes that obsequium, like communio, signifies to be one with the church; one in mind and heart, which means in belief and action. Obsequium is a special expression of this communion, mainly in doctrinal matters. It is ideally perfect when someone is so well united in faith with the church that he or she believes all that the church holds firmly, and searches with the church when some point of our tradition is in need of clarification. In the first case we can speak of obsequium fidei (one with the believing church: holding firm to a doctrine), in the second case of an obsequium religiosum (one with the searching church, working for clarification).

Part three continues with a treatment of the question of dissent, one of the dominant themes in Catholic theology in the United States. As a rule, dissent means: the refusal to accept some point of doctrine officially taught, but not infallibly defined. The right to such a dissent is vindicated by many theologians and there are episcopal statements supporting it. Orsy shows that the word “dissent” with its many existential and historical connotations, is an unsuitable word and would be better abandoned. But he concludes that for the time being at least, not only must we live with it, but we have to assert the legitimate right of the faithful to scientific research and to a different opinion through the use of the confusing expression: “the right to dissent.” He then asks the question: How determine the limits of legitimate dissent? The assumption is that the dissenter is in full communion with the Catholic church, i.e., that he consents to the core of the Catholic belief as it has been handed down by the church, confirmed and affirmed by the great councils, or by the pope speaking with that infallibility with which Christ wanted his
church to be endowed. "To state simply that dissent from non-infallibly held doctrine is legitimate, is simplistic and incorrect. Before any judgement is made, the relationship of the non-infallible doctrine to the infallible core ought to be examined, and then a judicious statement should be made whether or not an act of dissent is permissible." The theologian knows that before a particular point of doctrine reaches full maturity and can be affirmed with an act of faith, there is a long process. "The pronouncements of popes and bishops have their own place in this process. They benefit from an assistance of the Spirit, not only to determine (when the time is ripe) with finality what the church must believe but also to promote the progress of such belief." Their contribution, however, should leave plenty of room for the theologians. The hierarchy should foster a favorable climate for creative theological work. This includes a trust in the persons who do the work of research and reflection, and an allowance of a reasonable margin for honest mistakes. Theologians can help create this climate if they are aware of their own limits; i.e., realize how much they do not know. But to claim that theologians should be left alone and ultimately be subject to correction only by their peers ignores the lessons of history: all too many times in the Christian past "faculties of theology" in various universities have been completely wrong. Finally the author cautions that in the real order all dissents operate in a world of strong emotional dynamics and irrational options. Those entrusted with the pastoral care of the community must take into account not only the intellectual propositions but also the waves they cause in the turbulent universe of human beings. Orsy specifies two situations and concludes with practical examples.

The main purpose of part four is to present a reasoned understanding of how a university can be Catholic, and once Catholic, how its life can be receptive and responsive to the pronouncements of the magisterium. First the idea of university is clarified. There follows a survey of the empirical reality of the Catholic university: six typical situations involving a structural link between a university and the Catholic community, moving from the loosest relationships to the closest of unions. To each description is added a note about its position in canon law. After this empirical survey, the Catholic university is defined according to its purpose as discerned in the context of concrete circumstances. Practical consequences are drawn. Then attention is turned more specifically to the interplay between the teaching authority and the believing community — as it takes place at a Catholic university. Two situations are considered. First, the relationship between the magisterium and the university (as an institution) is discussed in the case of universities which profess a bond of communion with the church but do not have a legal personality in canon law. Second, the same relationship is discussed in the case of (1) universities established by the church with a canonical charter and (2) ecclesiastical universities and faculties established by the church and dedicated to "sacred sciences." In relation to the latter, the author explains the terms "canonical
mission," "permission to teach" and "no objection," each of which is applicable to a distinct group of teachers. There follows a presentation of the issue of academic freedom in fairly general terms, answering the following questions: What is its context? What is academic freedom? How can academic freedom be assured? What are the limits of academic freedom? Can religious principles set limits to academic freedom? Who shall be the judges? In conclusion, observations are made concerning the specific problem of canonically chartered institutions: they are supervised by the episcopate whose specific task is pastoral care, and they have to function as universities whose scope is scientific research and teaching. Illustration is given from history, the *magistra vitae*.

This is a wise and judicious book. It is highly recommended to all: bishops, priests, teachers and students of theology and all the Christian people.

*Joseph J. Smith, S.J.*


As Frank C. Senn, the editor of this valuable collection of essays on seven major Protestant traditions of spirituality, tells us in his introduction (pp. 1-2) "'Spirituality' is not a word that has been current in Protestant vocabulary, although it is familiar to Roman Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox . . . . On the other hand, Anglo-Saxon Protestantism is not lacking in other terms to express what is meant by 'spirituality'. But such terms as 'godliness', 'piety', 'holiness of life', 'the devout life', etc., have acquired unfortunate connotations. The word 'spirituality' seems a clearer, more virile, less sentimental term by which to express the subject of communion with God and the way of life which emanates from that." In the Roman Catholic tradition, the word 'spirituality' is familiar and accepted — and would be nicely characterized, in Senn's words, as meaning "communion with God and the way of life which emanates from that." One's spirituality includes not only formal prayer, though this is central, but the whole of one's life lived with God.

The book under consideration makes strikingly clear that the Protestant tradition contains a much wider diversity of ideas of spirituality, and much more diverse emphases, than does the Roman Catholic. Seven great traditions are chosen for consideration "in somewhat chronological order": the Lutheran, Reformed (tracing to Zwingli and Calvin), Anabaptist, Anglican, Puritan, Pietist and Methodist. While the perspective of the book is Anglo-Saxon (all of the traditions discussed having originated either in England or in the Germanic countries) and, in the contemporary period, American, all of these traditions also have representatives or descendents in the Philippines.