

significant aspects of the vision of Francis for the Church. It represents one of the most important efforts to bridge the theology of Vatican II and the institutional dimension of the Church in the Vatican.” He recalls that “for Francis, synodality must continue to be part of the new way of being Church.” He adds: “The future of synodality will depend also on the way in which the Roman Curia as reformed by Francis will interact, in ways that cannot be legislated upon, with the ecclesiology of ‘walking together’ as a people of God” (ix).

This handsome reproduction of *Praedicate Evangelium* with its engaging and extensive introduction by Dr. Faggioli is welcomed by all who wish to understand, clearly and readily, how the reform of the Roman Curia “is not an end in itself, but a means to give a more convincing witness to Christ; to favour a more effective evangelization; to promote a more fruitful ecumenical spirit; to encourage a more constructive dialogue with all” (PE, 12).

John A. RENKEN

Bosso, Armand Paul, *Munus e potestas del parroco*, Vatican City, Urbaniana University Press, 2022, 290 p. – ISBN 978-88-401-9050-1

Bosso teaches on the Faculty of Canon Law of the Pontifical University Urbaniana. In this work, his particular objective is to make a contribution to canonical doctrine on the open questions concerning the notions of the *munus* and *potestas* of the pastor (*parochus*) in the juridical and ecclesiological context of the parish. He structures the study in three chapters: on the ecclesial identity of the parochial community, the *munus* of the pastor, and the *potestas* of the pastor in the exercise of his *munus*.

The term *munus* in canon law is polyvalent, with a variety and richness of meanings. It appears 191 times in the Code of Canon Law. A common meaning is that of duty, obligation, responsibility. Often, it serves as a synonym for *officium*, as in the papal or episcopal *munus*. The term also has a theological sense, most commonly seen in the Church’s threefold *munera* of teaching, sanctifying, and ruling. While the A. does not address the optimal vernacular translations for *munus*, it is evident that the term, with its diverse meanings, should not be consistently translated using only one word, such as “function” in English.

The *munera* of the pastor are not just the obligations flowing from the sanctifying, teaching, and pastoring *munera*, as highlighted in canons 519, 528, and 529. Rather, the A. understands *munus* broadly as all the services performed in the course of a determined office. The pastor’s duties of office are not easily confined to the categories of the triple *munera*. The A. identifies

some of the manifold forms of the pastor’s activities: pastoral, spiritual, patrimonial, financial, socio-anthropological, humanitarian, etc. Instead of the triple *munera* classification, he favours a unified notion of the parochial *munus* that sums up all the activities of the pastor under the heading of *ministerialità*, which includes sacramental ministries (power of order) and all the other duties of the pastor’s office.

Concerning the power of governance, the A. argues convincingly that the pastor enjoys a true *potestas regiminis* in virtue of his office as *pastor proprius* at the service of the parochial community. He surveys the various explanations in the doctrine of the juridical nature of the pastor’s power, with some authors refusing to admit that pastors really have power of governance. Instead, they variously speak of a domestic power, a pastoral power (*Hirtengewalt*), a power of governance of an “imperfect grade,” a parochial power, a spiritual power. Bosso could have been more critical of these theories that employ ideas and terminology not based in the current law. He himself introduces his own neologism, speaking of the “pastoral parochial power of governance.” This he reconciles with the approach of the Code, which distinguishes the power of governance as legislative, executive, or judicial (c. 135 § 1). In the end, he identifies the pastor’s power as executive power. He might well have added that this is the same executive power exercised by ordinaries, religious superiors, and other officeholders when they legitimately place administrative acts. To be sure, the pastor often exercises his power orally, not only by means of written acts. Still, oral acts of executive power have the same juridical nature as those given in writing: various provisions, decisions, precepts, permissions, and grants of favours.

John M. HUELS

DEL POZZO, Massimo, *La disciplina del clero. Virtualità et criticità nella società secolarizzata*, Monografie giuridiche, no. 50, Milan, Giuffrè, 2022, xxv + 423 p. – ISBN 978-88-288-4176-0

Ce nouvel ouvrage du professeur Del Pozzo s’intéresse aux aspects juridiques de la conduite des clercs dans le domaine liturgique, l’indiscipline cléricale étant liée à la faible adhésion intérieure au sens du mandat et à la méconnaissance du droit des fidèles. Le volume se divise en trois parties.

Dans la première, l’auteur situe le sujet dans son cadre général. Il commence par analyser « la nature et la valeur de la discipline du clergé (p. 3-81) pour mettre en évidence la nécessité de récupérer la bonté intrinsèque de la discipline canonique et sa détermination juridique dans le domaine déontologique. L’auteur