
Why this 1990 translation of a 1977 book was ever published is very difficult to understand. To ignore the fact that between 1977 and 1990 a new Code of Canon Law was published in 1983, and to cite the outdated 1971 Code in support of "Explanation and Defense of Current Questions" seems to totally undermine the author's credibility and pretense to scholarship. This reviewer had come to expect a very high level of competence and scholarship from any publication of the University of Navarra in Spain. But this publication shatters all my illusions.

Anyone who took this book seriously and used it for, let us say, a lecture would be quite confused and perhaps embarrassed to find out, e.g., that canon 1081, #1 cited on p. 111 does not exist in the current Code of Canon Law. Ildefonso Adeva cited canon 1081, #1 to support the importance of the personal and irrevocable consent of the contracting parties in marriage. The present canon 1081 is concerned with informing the local Ordinary about any dispensation granted, and noting it in the parish marriage register. The translator has done Adeva a great disservice by translating the 1977 work without incorporating such a great change as a new Code of Canon Law.

Primary and Secondary Ends of Marriage. Another startling defect is to find Adeva himself ignoring the official teaching of the Church on marriage in the Vatican II pastoral Constitution Gaudium et spes, no. 50. Adeva insists on retaining the pre-Vatican II terminology of "primary or principal end of matrimony" and "secondary ends" (p. 117) when these were deliberately omitted in Vatican II. Adeva, in 1977, says that "The Church has constantly taught the existence of these ends as well as their essential subordination"
(ibid.). He does not mention the fact that Vatican II (1965) rejected that formulation. In the new formulation the good of the spouses is mentioned in the first place, the generation and education of children in the second. There is no ranking. The two ends are joined together into a unity; they are of equal importance, together they make up the integral purpose of marriage. Instead of "ends," the word "ordered" (ordinatum) is used to express the same thought. In the words of Gaudium et spes (no. 50), "Marriage and married love are by nature ordered to the procreation and education of children." In the words of Canon Law (1983) canon 1055, #1, "The marriage covenant . . . which of its own very nature is ordered (ordinatum) to the well-being of the spouses, and to the procreation and upbringing of children . . . ." The new official Church teaching shows a much deeper appreciation of conjugal love in marriage. Adeva's holding on to the old rejected terminology seems to indicate a fear of emphasizing conjugal love or at least a lack of understanding of the rich development in contemporary Church teaching. The ordinary reader would much prefer the rich insights of Pope John Paul II in "Familiaris Consortio".

Transplantation of Organs. The transplantation of organs from a living donor has been approved by almost all moral theologians who were concerned with the liceity of the operation since 1954. Adeva shows a serious bias against freedom when he argues against the liceity of such transplants. He states that "The negative reasons (emphasis in the original) given here are very strong . . . ." (p. 63). He admits that the arguments in favor enjoy "the minimum probability required for following it in practice" (p. 67). Still for Adeva it is desirable that we focus on "transplants from the dead to the living" (ibid.).

Instead of fighting such a lost cause and disturbing the good faith of the people of God who consider such cases as extraordinary examples of true Christian love, Adeva could perhaps examine his narrow, act-centered approach to natural law which looks on each part of the body as morally decisive. Vatican II, Gaudium et spes, no. 51, has given us the person as the norm. The body is mutilated when a brother donates a kidney to his brother to save his life. But the person is enriched and ennobled spiritually. This argument, which wins the approval of most people of all persuasions, is rejected by Adeva even though the Magisterium has kept a prudent silence since the first successful human renal homograft between adult identical twins in 1954. But we are sure that Adeva would not have left the sick brother die and congratulated the healthy brother for preserving his physical, bodily integrity. That would be a strange understanding of natural law.

The Fertilized Ovum a Person? Adeva answers this question in an absolute manner, leaving no room for doubt. "The fertilized egg is already a new individual, a person, at the initial point of its life . . . ." (p. 19). The Vatican position is much more nuanced, while leaning towards "a personal presence at the
moment of this first appearance of human life . . . The Magisterium has not expressly committed itself to an affirmation of a philosophical nature” (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation,” Vatican City, 1987, p. 13). Being respected and treated “as a person” is the Magisterium’s demand for the fertilized ovum. By asking a question “how could a human individual not be a human person?” (ibid.) and refusing to commit itself to an affirmation of a philosophical nature, the Magisterium shows much more awareness of the current scientific controversy about personhood than Adeva does.

Conclusion. These glaring defects in the work under review should suffice to show that it would be a great disservice to put it in the hands of any one seeking to be guided in such important questions as human life, suffering and death. In a period of great confusion in ethics and morality, this book would only add to the confusion, and discredit Catholic teaching. Translating a book that is very much dated, such as Adeva’s, only exposes the author and translator to such negative criticism.
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Amaladoss, an Indian Jesuit and member of the General Council in Rome, writes frequently on the topic of mission and evangelization. His contributions are focused on contemporary questions facing the local churches of Asia. He brings a wealth of experience and insight to his work, having served in India as Jesuit vice-provincial for formation and edited Vidyajyoti: Journal of Theological Reflection. As general assistant he now has special responsibility for the fields of evangelization, ecumenism, inculturation, and dialogue with other religions.

The complete title-subtitle is an accurate description of the scope of the book: Making All Things New: Dialogue, Pluralism, and Evangelization in Asia. To fulfill the Christian mission of “making all things new,” the Asian local churches necessarily must focus on “dialogue, pluralism, and evangelization.” This triple focus corresponds to the three sections around which the fourteen chapters are organized. An introduction and conclusion, both of medium length, complete the presentation.

Although a collection of materials previously published in mostly Asian journals, the book unfolds smoothly with a minimum of repetition. Each chapter may be approached independently; however, a better depth of insight