

SOME IMPORTANT DATES

- 1170 Birth of Saint Dominic in Calaruega, Spain.
- 1203 Dominic goes with his bishop, Diego, on a mission to northern Europe. On the way he discovers, in southern France, people who no longer accept the Christian faith.
- 1206 Foundation of the first monastery of Dominican nuns in Prouille, France.
- 1215 Dominic and his first companions gather together in Toulouse.
- 1216 Pope Honorius III approves the foundation of the Dominican Order.
- 1217 Dominic disperses his friars to set up communities in Paris, Bologna, Rome and Madrid.
- 1221 8th August, Dominic dies in Bologna.
- 1285 Foundation of the Dominican Third Order. Its Rule approved by the Master General, Munoz de Zamora.
- 1347 Birth of Catherine of Siena, patroness of Lay Dominicans.
- 1380 29th April, Catherine of Siena dies in Rome.
- 1405 Pope Innocent VII approves Rule of the Third Order.
- 1898 Establishment of the Dominican Order in Australia.
- 1932 Second Rule of the Third Order approved by the Master General, Louis Theissling.
- 1950 Establishment of the Province of the Assumption.
- 1964 Third Rule approved.
- 1967 First National Convention of Dominican Laity in Australia (held in Canberra).
- 1969 Fourth Rule promulgated by the Master General, Aniceto Fernandez.

- 1972 Fourth Rule approved (on an experimental basis) by the Sacred Congregation for Religious).
- 1974 Abolition of terms "Third Order" and "Tertiaries".
- 1985 First International Lay Dominican Congress held in Montreal, Canada.
- 1987 Fifth (present) Rule approved by the Sacred Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes and promulgated by the Master, Damien Byrne.

THE THIRD ORDER OF ST. DOMINIC - ENCAPSULATED HISTORY

General Definition (cf. New Cath. Encyclopedia under THIRD ORDERS)

“Third Orders Secular are associations of the laity whose members, while living a secular life, strive after Christian perfection by observing a papally approved rule, under the direction and in the spirit of a religious order (CIC c. 702). They resemble religious orders by their purpose, viz. Christian perfection; their rules approved by the Holy See; and their stability of life (requirements for admission, noviciate, permanent profession). They differ from their respective religious orders through the absence of public vows and community life, and from other associations of the faithful by reason of their end, pursuit of Christian perfection. Third Orders rank first among the three kinds of associations of the faithful mentioned in Canon Law”.

Dominican Third Order (cf. Preamble to the Rule)

Those Christian Laity “who through a special grace of the Holy Spirit, are joined to the Order of Preachers to achieve Christian perfection, are called members of the Third Order of St. Dominic. As they share in the mission of the Order, they are united into groups called Chapters of Dominican Laity, which form one family with the other members of the Order”.

Development of Third Orders and of the Third Order of St. Dominic

- i. Early 12th century
Groups of secular men and women seek spiritual guidance of Religious Orders.
- ii. Later 12th century
Societies of lay people form imitating religious life but independent of the Orders and in some cases of the Church, e.g. “Humiliati”, “Poor Catholics”, etc.
- iii 1215 - 1221
St. Dominic founds and establishes a clerical Order but in his apostolate both helps and is helped by members of the Laity.
- iv. 1221 - 1228
The lay penitential movement (Brothers and Sisters of Penance) which had begun in the 12th century was provided with a Rule whose origin is uncertain but which was re-edited during these years.

- v. 1247
Pope Innocent IV appoints Franciscans to conduct the canonical visitation of the Brothers and Sisters of Penance (formerly under episcopal control) in Italy.
- vi. Mid-13th Century
Brothers and Sisters of Penance seek spiritual guidance from Franciscans, Dominicans, or other Religious living near them.
- vii. 1284
Friar Caro (Franciscan) revises the 1221 Rule of Penance.
- viii. 1285
Dominican Master General, Munio of Zamora, made a similar adaptation of the Rule of Penance for the pious laity attached to Dominican churches and took them under his jurisdiction, granting them the benefits of the Order.
- ix. 1286
Munio's Rule implicitly approved by Pope Honorius IV. Dominican lay associations organized throughout Italy.
- x. 1289
Pope Nicholas IV explicitly approves Friar Caro's Rule and imposes it on all Brothers and Sisters of Penance living under the direction of the Friars Minor.
- xi. 1291
Pope Nicholas IV deposes Munio. Lay movement in the Order receives temporary check.
- xii. Late 14th Century
Dominican lay associations gain new impetus from the fame and sanctity of that greatest of Tertiaries, St. Catherine of Siena (1347-1380).
- xiii. 1396
Master General, Raymond of Capua, O.P. places Thomas Caffarini, disciple of Catherine of Siena, in charge of all women Dominican Tertiaries in Italy.
- xiv. From mid-14th Century
Convents of religious Sisters follow the Rule of the Third Order.
- xv. 1405

Dominican Laity become known as the Third Order of St. Dominic and their Rule approved by Pope Innocent VII.

- xvi. 1439
Further approval of the Rule of Pope Eugene IV.
- xvii. 15th Century
Throughout this century and ever since great development in the number and variety of communities of Tertiaries living under religious vows.
- xviii. 1512 - 1517
Pope Julius and the Fifth Lateran Council clarify by decree the status of Tertiaries.
- xix. 16/17 Centuries
The third Order of St. Dominic spreads to the mission territories of the Dominican Friars in the "New World" - West Indies, America, New Granada, Philippines, China, Japan - the age of St. Rose of Lima (Peru_ and of the martyred Tertiaries of Nagasaki (Japan).
- xx. 18th/19th Centuries
An age of suppression and resurgence for Religious Orders in Europe and of martyrdoms in Vietnam, Tertiaries in Spain, influenced by B. Francis Coll, O.P., and elsewhere keep the Dominican ideal alive. As persecution lessens in Ireland, Chapters of Tertiaries attached to Dominican churches grow and flourish.
- xxi. 1867 - 1889
Foundations of Dominican Sisters in Australia and New Zealand.
- xxii. 1898
Dominican Fathers come to Australia from Ireland.
- xxiii. Early 20th Century
Episcopal encouragement given in both Australia and New Zealand for the establishment of Tertiary Chapters.
- xxiv. 1930's/1940's
A period of great Chapter and personal recruitment of Tertiaries due to the efforts of Dominican Fathers like Father Ambrose Crofts, Father Vincent Ryan and Father Antoninus Costello, and of the communities of Dominican Sisters at Maitland, Tamworth and Santa Sabina, Strathfield, in N.S.W. and in St. Dominic's Priory, Dunedin, N.Z. During these years great numbers of Diocesan

Priests and even Bishops were received in Australia and New Zealand.

- xxv. 1960's/1970's
A period of growth and expansion in Australia. Tertiaries become organised on a Provincial basis. The period of the National Conventions of which five have been held between March 1967 and August 1979.
- xxvi. 1967
Master General Fernandez attends the first National Convention of the Third Order in Canberra.
- xxvii. 1977
Dominican Laity are invited to attend the General Chapter at Quezon City, Philippines. The National President from Australia, Mrs. Marjorie Ternovy, chosen to attend.
- xxviii. 1978
The Provincial Council of the Province of the Assumption creates the position of National Promoter for New Zealand, appointing Father Francis X. Brown to the position.

HISTORY OF THE DOMINICAN LAITY

Richard Weber, O.P.

In 1974, on the seventh centenary of the death of St. Thomas Aquinas, I delivered a paper entitled: "A Modern Dominican Looks at His Out-Dated Patron. " Though the title was meant to be facetious, its intent was serious: St. Thomas, not "Thomism," is the valuable heritage of Dominicans and the model of theologians.

The publication of that talk in *Challenge*, however, provoked some comment. One Dominican director warned his chapter about "smart aleck, young Dominicans" who "attack" St. Thomas today and will soon, he warned, be "attacking" St. Dominic.

This present article is based upon a talk I gave to the Provincial Council of the Dominican Laity. Their acceptance of its thesis has encouraged me to prepare it for publication. But I feel that some who "read as they run" may misinterpret this article as well. Some may feel that somehow St. Dominic is "attacked," for I must state clearly and positively that the Third Order was not founded directly by Dominic.

This opinion is not set forth in any mood of iconoclastic deprecation; I do not mean to shock anyone by playing the role of destructive critic. Truth - Veritas - is the motto of our Order; and it is a far better guide than legends, however pious. My intent is not to make the Third Order less "Dominican" but rather to show just how essentially Dominican it is. My appreciation of the Third Order has been deepened by examining its history. I present this paper to my Dominican brothers and sisters in the hope that it will also help them to deepen their love of our Order.

Beginnings

Historians are under an obligation to discover how things really happened. This task sometimes makes them less than welcome partners. Cardinal Manning, in the 19th century, stated that, "the appeal to history is treason to the Church." Yet in the 20th century, Hubert Jedin has written that, "without a knowledge of history, a purified love of the Church is impossible." Welcome or not, historians must begin. And here they have developed an annoying habit. They have a compulsion to go far back in beginning their stories. John Tracy Ellis, for instance, in writing about Catholics in colonial America, began with the Emperor Constantine in A.D. 312.

Thus, it is not surprising that the "history" of the Third Order does not begin in 1285, when the Master General Munio de Zamora officially promulgated its Rule, nor back to the early years of the 13th century,

when St. Dominic lived and worked. The "history" of the Third Order goes back many decades before that. To understand what the Third Order is and whence it came, we have to look at the Church of the Middle Ages and the society in which it lived.

For at least a century and a half, romantic notions of the Middle Ages have colored our perceptions of the reality of that time. Slogans such as "The Thirteenth, the Greatest of Centuries" have no place in a serious discussion. Medieval society was complex. These were not "the best of times"; many medieval men believed indeed that they were the worst times. Vincent of Beauvais, writing in the mid-13th century, declared that the end of the world must come very soon, since the world could get no more sinful than it was then.

Yet, though the picture of the Middle Ages as "the Ages of Faith" is overdrawn, it is undeniable that certain Christian attitudes and ideals were helping to shape the lives of many people and influencing society. One such idea was that of *creatio* (creation). This was God' s world; though men and women might be in revolt against God' s law, the idea of God informed and shaped the thinking of both saint and sinner about the world. A second attitude was that of *perigrinatio* (pilgrimage). Life was seen as a journey through this world of tears and sorrows to a better world beyond death. Our conduct on this journey was all-important.

A most important concept was that of *ordo* (order). Everything in the universe is shaped according to a divine plan. The heavens run according to God' s order; the earth, too, runs according to His plan. There is as well an order in human society and in human affairs. These various "orders" are interrelated; they mirror each other. The macrocosm, the universe, is matched by the microcosm, man. Society must exhibit this order.

How were these attitudes and concepts applied in practice? The men and women of the Middle Ages faced enormous problems in adjusting a Christian concept of life to the intractable demands of daily existence. The majority of people still lived upon the land, in an agricultural society. Villages were isolated and poor; the people were without education. The rural clergy, like the people they served, were rustic and ignorant. Leadership in this society had for centuries been the prerogative of a feudal nobility. These knights, romanticized in novels and movies as dashing, chivalric paragons of virtue, were often, in reality, a ruffianly lot: mafia-types in armor, living in drafty and unsanitary stone and timber stockades.

Problems

In the 11th century, however, the stagnation of the early Middle Ages

in its feudalistic and manorialistic ruts began to end. An "urban revolution" occurred: people began to move into rapidly developing towns; commerce and industry began to revive; new lifestyles developed; and a bourgeois middle class began to emerge. The towns challenged all the established conventions of the Middle Ages; they challenged the Church as well. People became interested in making money. The rough communalism of the early Middle Ages was challenged by a rising individualism.

Paradoxically, the greatest problem was the false assumption that this culture was a "Christian" culture. The Church was "established," the hierarchy was rich and powerful. Yet although everyone called himself "Catholic," the level of religious commitment was low; although the clergy were powerful, they were also largely corrupt.

The greed and ignorance of the clergy are a constant theme in the writings of the Middle Ages. Learned treatises and popular songs and stories told of the parish priest who knew only enough Latin to mumble through a Mass; of the priests who never preached; of the priests so avaricious that they would not administer the sacraments unless paid.

Besides the greed, there was also superstition. The conversion of tribes and kingdoms had often taken place by the simple command of a king or chief. The former shrines of pagan gods and goddesses had been transformed into shrines of Christian saints or of Mary. But people still visited these shrines with pagan ideas such as: "If I burn this candle for you, you must protect my crops," or "I will make an offering in return for your assistance." Too often the level of Christian observance was merely formal. Beneath the observance of Christian feasts and ceremonies the life was often unchristian.

Reform Movements

But the picture is not unrelievedly dark. Throughout the Middle Ages there was a constant demand for reform. It came from all classes of society. In the 10th century the German emperors tried to reform the Church; in the 11th, the reforming movement was led by monastic groups like Cluny and later the Cistercians. In the 12th, the call and dynamism for reform came from the laity.

Changed social conditions helped to call forth this lay reform movement. Towns and cities had grown up; trade and industry had revived. A demand grew for a deepening of Christian faith. An example of this can be found in the wool-weaving trade. While weavers sat around doing their work, someone read to them, often from the Bible. Between readings the weavers began to discuss what had been read. For many it was the first time they had heard the

Bible. They began to contrast what the Bible said a Christian should do with what they are doing; they contrasted what the New Testament said a preacher of the Gospel should be with how their own priests lived.

Such a movement for reform had varied effects. In some cases it led people to a deeper union with the Church, to work for reform within the body of the Church; in other cases, it led people out of the Church, to proclaim a "Gospel" that was set up against the "Church" of corruption and sin.

The lay-reform movement had no definite founders; it had no definite program, except for a return to the Gospel. This call for evangelical simplicity and values ran deep in the Middle Ages; medieval men and women had a "nostalgia for the Sermon on the Mount," as Ronald Knox expressed it.

"Order of Penitence"

The name generally applied to the movement at the time was "the Order of Penitence." This "order" expressed the deep medieval concern for the order that must underlie all of human society. The members of the movement were called "penitents." The movement cut across all borders and across all social classes. Penitents would appear in one area, then reappear in another. Orthodox or heretical, they were bitterly critical of the "establishment" in the Church: the bishops who were more concerned with politics, the lazy, greedy monks, the ignorant, grasping priests. Their cries against this kind of clergy found an echo at Rome where Pope Gregory VII had seized leadership of a reform movement that would transform the Church. The cross currents are vividly illustrated in the incident of Ramihrad, a layman of Cambrai in France. He was a "penitent" who preached against the corruption of the local clergy. He was seized and burned at the stake for heresy, in 1077, at the very time when the Pope in Rome was advocating the same thing.

The origins of the Third Order can be found in this lay reform movement, among the Penitents. The Third Order thus comes out of an unruly, pious, evangelistic, radical group, men and women unhappy with the decadence of clergy and religious, repulsed by the formalism and superstition of the merely nominal "Christians," and deeply anxious to live a truly evangelical life.

All the reform groups of the later Middle Ages will have some connection with this movement. The Franciscan and Dominican movements will have a close relation with it. Out of this group as well will come all the heretics of the 13th century. There is thus an extraordinarily complex relation here, one that must be examined.

Third Orders

One type of relation is exemplified in the group called the *Humiliati*. These lay people had dressed in a kind of "habit"; most importantly, they insisted upon their right to preach. In 1184 they were excommunicated for heresy. In 1201 Pope Innocent III reconciled a portion of this group to the Church on the basis of a distinction: those who would preach must become clerics and be ordained. They became a clerical Order of Humiliati. Those who remained as lay people would form a lay Order of Humiliati, in dependence upon the clerical Order. The lay Humiliati are the first group to be described as a "Third Order."

Another type of relation is shown in the history of the Franciscan Order. In the past it has often been alleged that St. Francis founded a lay Order, and that out of this lay Order finally evolved, to the founder's chagrin, a clerical order. Father Cajetan Esser, a contemporary Franciscan historian, has disproved this. Francis founded first a clerical order. The Franciscans were "from the beginning a canonical order, although certainly with novel and new features." Francis founded an order of men that was never consciously a lay movement nor yet exclusively a clerical community, but rather a combination of the two. But this Franciscan *fraternitas* was profoundly influenced by the lay reform movement and had close ties with it. Around the year 1221, Francis decided to found a group of lay people associated with his original group. This was the founding of the Franciscan Third Order.

Here it is important to realize what the words "religious" and "religious order" meant in the 13th century. Profession of a particular rule and the wearing of a particular habit made one then a "religious." Canon law of the time held that those who bound themselves "to a more difficult and holier life" are *religious*, contrasting them to those who lived a completely secular life. The contrast was between those who lived a "regular" life - the life of profession to a rule (*regula*) - and those who lived a totally secular life. In the 13th century meaning of the term, therefore, members of a "Third Order" were truly *religious* and their association constituted a truly religious *order*.

The Dominicans

At length we come to St. Dominic Here the relation, in one sense, is simple. Dominic founded a clerical religious order. He himself was a cleric, a canon; he founded his Order on the Rule of St. Augustine, a rule for clerics; the members of this order were clerics. But the inspiration of his Order, the spirit of his order, was the same

inspiration and spirit that informed the lay reform movement; the integral gospel, an apostolic spirit, and evangelical poverty. The aims of the lay reform movement were applied now to clerics.

The Dominican Order captured the spirit and the thrust of the times. It appealed to men from the middle classes of the towns and cities; it appealed to the students of the universities that had grown up with the towns. Dominicans were so visibly associated with this class of people that when Thomas Aquinas, scion of a great, noble family, wanted to join them, he was forcibly restrained from doing so for a year by his brothers. The family of Aquinas had determined that Thomas would be a Benedictine - an order worthy of nobility; they would not allow Thomas to lower himself in social status to join the Dominicans, a non-noble community.

The Dominican orientation was, from the beginning, toward the people of the towns, towards the universities. And these were the same people most affected by and interested in the "penitent" movement. From the first appearance of the Dominicans in their town, large number of laity sought theological and spiritual direction from the Friars Preachers. The Dominicans, when they went to Paris and Bologna, Cologne and Barcelona, found that the people who welcomed them were the laity, not the parish clergy. Again and again the records speak of friction with the local clergy; but always the records speak of an eager acceptance by laity who were seeking help to live a Christian life.

The relation between the Dominicans, a clerical community, and the lay reform movement is, therefore, one of mutual help. Dominicans find support and material help from the laity; the laity find among the Dominicans their spiritual directors and counsellors. The origins of a Dominican "third order" can be found in the "association" of the two groups, the lay groups associating and affiliating with the friars.

"Penitents of St. Dominic"

From 1225 onward, we begin to hear mention of the "Penitents of St. Dominic." The depth and the extent of the association of these groups with the Order of Friars Preachers cannot always be accurately judged. It seems certain, however, that there was some kind of dependence upon local Dominican priories. Humbert of Romans gave a sermon to a group called the "Brothers of Penance," obviously an important group of laity but not yet a "third order." A small group of laymen entered into a close association with the Order: the "oblates." They were laymen who gave their money and goods to the Order and lived in the convent under religious obedience.

The association of a "penitent" group with the Order is illustrated also

by an incident in 1260 at Perouse. A holy hermit living in that locality - Rainier, by name - was distressed at the bitter struggle between the two factions of Guelfs and Ghibellines. Feuds and bloodshed were the results of this division. Rainier began to preach a crusade of reconciliation and attracted large crowds of people. He began a march upon the city, followed by the huge throng of people singing hymns and chanting prayers.

The civil and religious authorities of the town, fearing a disturbance, diverted the crowd into smaller groups, directing one group to enter by the north gate of the city, a second to enter the south gate, and still a third group to use the west gate. The groups became identified with the church nearest the respective gate. In that city, henceforth they were known as the "Penitents of St. Augustine," the "Penitents of St. Francis," and the "Penitents of St. Dominic."

Dominican Third Order

In 1280 two factors operated toward some kind of regularization of this relation. First of all, by 1280, many of these lay penitent groups were drifting into heresy. From criticism of an individual priest there developed criticism of the entire sacramental system. "Why pay money to the priest, to give out the sacraments?" The question was then asked: "Why have sacraments at all? Why not be in direct contact with God, without priest or sacraments?"

The second reason was that Munio de Zamora, Master General of the Dominicans at that time, decided that an organization of some sort had to be devised for these people. Accordingly, in 1285, Munio de Zamora published a "Rule for Penitents of St. Dominic." This is the foundation, the origin of the Third Order. 1285 is your birthday.

Early Rule

The Rule of Munio de Zamora was in 22 chapters. In order to enter the Order of Penitents of St. Dominic (we read in one chapter) one had to have a certificate that attested to one's moral life, good reputation, and orthodox faith. According to the Rule, postulants must acquire the zeal of Dominic for the defence and propagation of the Faith. The apostolic end of the Order was clearly stated; all penitential practices were to be directed to the apostolate. The Dominican Third Order was never conceived of as a way of making salvation easier, or subjecting one to certain customs or obligations. It was from the outset to be an apostolate in the world. The Rule of Zamora demanded that one must have settled all his debts and been reconciled to all his enemies. The habit was a white tunic and black cloak of simple material.

Approval of a majority of those who belonged to the Third Order

chapter was needed for a postulant to be received. Once accepted, he was forbidden to leave, except to enter another religious order with solemn vows. In other words, one could not leave to enter another Third Order, or return to "secular life." The ceremony of profession was a real canonical entrance into an Order.

There was an obligation to recite the Divine Office, so far as possible. On Sundays and feast days from November 1 to Easter, members of the Third Order were obligated to recite the night office, Matins at 2

a.m. There were severe rules on fast and abstinence: fast every Friday and, of course, on the eve of all principal feast days; no meat was allowed except on Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday. Members were to give up all worldliness, all banquets, revelries (the word used for "revelries" is basically the word for "wedding parties"), and dances.

Tertiaries were under obedience to their directors to such an extent that they could not leave town without his permission. There were obligations to sick members, and obligations to certain suffrage prayers.

Expulsion was possible for grave and scandalous faults. The director of the Third Order chapter was chosen by the Order and named to his office. The chapter itself elected a prior or a prioress from among its senior members.

A Second Tradition

There has been a somewhat divergent tradition about the origin of the Third Order. This tradition holds that the Third Order evolved from the "Militia of Jesus Christ," a group founded directly by Dominic. The tradition rests upon a statement by Raymond of Capua in the 14th century. It is the tradition that is repeated by Benedict XV in his encyclical letter of 1920 to the Third Order. But the tradition had been undermined by historical research.

First of all, this "Militia of Jesus Christ," even if it had been a part of the penitent movement (and we are not exactly sure whether it was or was not), had a different focus. It was for the military defence of the Church and Church members in those areas where heretics had taken over the administration of towns. In those cases the "Militia of Jesus Christ," a "vigilante" organization, protected the property of the Church and the Catholics. The aim of the penitents, on the other hand, was ascetic and evangelical.

Secondly, we have the documents that prove that the Militia was founded by Fulques, Bishop of Toulouse, a close and intimate friend of St. Dominic. But no document associates Dominic with its founding. It seems very probable that Raymond concluded that since

Dominic's good friend founded it, Dominic also must have some relation with it. But there is no evidence to that effect. The bishop of Toulouse is its sole founder.

Later the Dominicans did assume some responsibility for the Militia. The Militia was officially approved by Pope Gregory IX in 1233; two years later, in a letter to the Dominican Master General, the Pope instructed the Dominicans to take over the spiritual direction and guidance of the "Militia of Jesus Christ."

Dominicans were acquainted with the work of the "Militia of Jesus Christ," and, in northern Italy, Militia chapters were founded by Dominicans. For example, the Dominican Bartholomew of Vicence began the Militia in northern Italy. This is where the tradition arises. The picture is somewhat confused. But it is well established now that the origins of the Third Order are to be found in the "Penitent" movement and not in the "Militia of Jesus Christ."*

* The "Militia of Jesus Christ" has been revived in our own time, especially in France and attempts have been made to institute chapters in this country. The Master General of the Dominican Order was petitioned by members of this *Militia* to be associated with the Dominican Order but he has refused permission.

Munio de Zamora, then, gave the Rule to the Third Order in 1285. But this action antagonized the incumbent Pope, Nicholas IV. Pope Nicholas was a former Minister General of the Franciscan Order. He had an idea of what to do with the Penitent movement: attach all the penitent groups to the Franciscan Order. Thus, he was quite unhappy with de Zamora's action in affiliating a substantial sector of the penitent movement with the Dominicans. This, along with several other grudges which he seems to have had against Zamora, caused him in 1290 to demand that the Dominican General Chapter remove this Master General from office. The General Chapter met, and refused to remove him. In the next year, 1291 - Pope Nicholas deposed him personally. But by now the Third Order was firmly established, and survived.

Subsequent History

Historians of the Order have noted that the subsequent history of the Third Order follows the pattern of the First Order. There is a flourishing, a decline, a reform, another flourishing, a decline, and a reform. In 1316, for instance, Pope John XXII complains in a letter that "tertiaries" and "beguines" in large numbers were falling into heresy. But then he adds, "I exclude the Dominican tertiary whose faith and docility to the Church are irreproachable."

By the 14th century both the Third Order and the First Order were in

deep decline and seriously in need of reform. Raymond of Capua, who became Master General in 1380, complained that there were no men in the Third Order, that at least in northern Italy, it was simply a group of pious old ladies. These groups were called the *Mantellata*. The Mantellata would receive no young ladies, only widows of mature age. Catherine of Siena, for instance, found it difficult to break into this religious elite. Raymond criticized the Mantellata, declaring that while they may have been pious, they were much too exclusive.

While he was Master General he reformed the First Order, and approved the work of another Dominican, Friar Thomas Coffarini, to reform the Third Order. Friar Thomas began in Venice; he preached the Third Order, opened it up to men and women and to young and old. Raymond wrote to Thomas that what he was doing was especially pleasing to him because it honoured the Blessed Catherine, "my mother." An eminent co-worker of Coffarini in reviving the Third Order was John Dominici, Dominican Prior in Florence, and one of the greatest preachers of the 14th century. In 1405, in the Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, Pope Innocent VII gave canonical approval to the Third Order. Vincent Ferrer in the 14th century preached the Third Order throughout France. In the 16th century the Third Order was taken by Dominican missionaries to their missions in the Orient: to Japan, to China, and to Indo-China. A great many Dominican martyrs from those regions were members of the Third Order.

But, once again, as with the First Order, there was a decline during the 17th and 18 centuries. By the time of the French Revolution, the Third Order as well as the First, were in decline. After the French Revolution the decline continued. Chapters of the Third Order in France were described as "parochial societies." In the mid 19th century, when Father Lacordaire renewed the First Order, he asserted that the first order of business was to renew the Third Order, and by way of underlining its renewal, in a ceremony in Notre Dame Cathedral, gave the Dominican habit to four youths, in 1844.

Conclusion

The conclusions I would draw from this brief history are these:

The Third Order has its origin in the desire of the laity for a radical, evangelical style of life. The Third Order found its origin in this and, I think, finds its continued reason for existence in this.

The Third Order became associated with the Order of Preachers because it found that the Dominican apostolate and the Dominican spirit of action and contemplation, was its aim, also.

The Third Order is truly an Order, an *ordo*, and Tertiaries are truly *religious* in the medieval sense of those words and the medieval sense

of these words is much more relevant to contemporary conditions than the words of modern canon law.

The Third Order and the First Order are bound together in what I call a "symbiotic" relation. Webster defines "symbiosis" as "the living together in more or less intimate association or close union of two dissimilar organisms": "a mutually beneficial relationship."

The Third Order requires a clear program of apostolic aims for full flowering and productivity.

Throughout the presentation I have referred to the Third Order. The name has now been changed; it is now "Dominican Laity." I think that this is to say, at least, a mistranslation, since it transposes the adjective and the noun. From 1217 to 1285 the term "Dominican Laity" would have been acceptable, but the history of our Order leads me to conclude that the term should be "Lay Dominican." You are members of the Order by historical association and conscious profession. Remember the groups led by Rainier the hermit. "You have gone in by the gate of St. Dominic."

*Downloaded from
<http://www.op.org/DomCentral/people/laypages/layhistory.mtm>*

THE DOMINICAN THIRD ORDER:

"OLD and NEW STYLE"

Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P.
Professor of Theology
Catholic University of the Netherlands, Nijmegen

Translator: Anselm Thomasma, O.P.

This closely reasoned article was first composed in 1960.(1) The Order has already moved beyond some of the ideas expressed in it. However, anyone who desires to understand the nature of the group now called the Dominican Laity cannot ignore Fr. Schillebeeckx' s exploration into its meaning. The Dominican Laity 1909 S. Ashland Ave. Chicago, IL 60608 1978

No perceptive person can still deny that the Third Order today has become a problem. That it is not merely a regional problem, but rather a universal one, is apparent from the words of the General Chapter at Calaruega in 1958:

"Whereas the necessity for many changes in the Rule of the Tertiaries is evident from the reports of the Promoters, we urgently petition our Most Rev. Master General to establish a special commission which must make a penetrating study of the nature of the Third Order ("circa naturam Tertii Ordinis")...It is our opinion that it would be best, before any definitive alterations in the Rule are put into effect, that in each Province certain norms "ad experimentum" (that is, which will allow for experimentation) be promulgated by the Provincial Chapter or by the Provincial with his council, after hearing the advice of the Provincial Promoter and the directors of the Third Order, so that it may be determined which of the norms are more suitable for the (changing) circumstances of our times. As a result of this experimentation those things will become evident, which, upon approbation by the Master General, can be foreseen for the future renewal of the Rule of the Third Order." (Cap. Gen. 1958, no. 254.)

I have cited the entire text with a two-fold purpose in view: first of all, to make it clear to you that even the highest leadership of the Dominican Order acknowledges the Third Order to be in a precarious position. There exists a real problem - - not merely a problem of incidental magnitude, as if only certain adventitious fringes of the Third Order have become obsolete. The problem lies deeper than this, seeing that the General Chapter has affirmed a basic uncertainty with regard to "the very nature of the Third Order", there is nothing more fundamental than this! Further, I have cited the text so that from it will appear the fact that the supreme authority of the Order itself also recognizes the wisdom of a new, experimental standing for the Third Order. Hence, this means that a critique of the Third Order "old style" may not be

invalidated by appealing to the traditional Rule of the Third Order as approved by the Church. On the contrary, out of respect for the basic inspiration of Dominican Life and upon the invitation of the supreme authority of the Order, we may critically examine the very nature of the Third Order in terms of its being either totally or perhaps not at all obsolete, and we may study how and if renewal of this Third Order is possible in our time. Concerning this Third Order "new style" I would like to sketch, at the invitation of your respective Provincial Promoters, certain perspectives, so that our critique may be constructive and not merely negative.

Only against the background of the "Third Order Old Style" can the distinctiveness of the new Third Order come most sharply into focus. Within the old style, then, we must make a positive distinction between the rule and norms as found in the book and the factual structure of the living Third Order.

As we consider this factual construction it becomes evident to us that the Third Order has become a devotional prayer society, concretely, as a matter of fact, only for older people. There is a monthly gathering with Mass, a sermon, and a bit of office, which of course is also a daily obligation. Whenever the Dominicans in their apostolate have need of the help of the laity, they do not call upon our Tertiaries, but rather upon the leaders of the modern Catholic lay organizations. At the most, the Third Order members are called upon for such things as holding fancy-fairs, typing or writing out addresses on envelopes, for special solemn ceremonies in the churches, and finally for the annual dinner in honour of St. Dominic. Certainly what I have offered here is a caricature and an over-extended picture, but the reality of this is the fact suggested in each case, and this is precisely what presents the problem. In reality the Third Order is a lay-extension of the First Order as monastic and not so much as apostolic. The conventual structures are adjusted for better or for worse to the situation of the layman in the world and imposed upon his life. The structure of life in the cloister, adjusted "ad usum laicorum" (for the use of the laity), is actually followed even down to the smallest details; one speaks of the Brother Prior or Prioress, of the Novice Master, or a novitiate, of profession, of clothing, - concepts which are essentially not lay (2) (When we speak here of "lay" we mean in contrast as much to the priesthood as to the lay-brotherhood), and which connote the apparent "monastic" tendency of Third Order life. The Third Order members have long ago felt the forced and unnatural tenor of these expressions. For this reason they are really seldom used. This feeling was but a first and superficial expression of a more general one, namely, that the laity in the Third Order do not feel themselves to be true laymen. One in fact presumes that there is a short-circuit somewhere, which lies deeper than the outer wrapping of conventual names and titles. Third Order life becomes for the laity in the world a sort of imitation of the priests' life, not as apostolic, but as monastic. Now it was in the Middle Ages that the fullness of the Christian

life was thought to reside solely in the life of a cloister; consequently, whoever wished to lead a conscious and expressly Christian life entered the monastery, or imitated the monastic mode of life as far as possible in the world. This is why one spoke of "leaving the world by profession" as applied to Third Order members as well as to religious; these laymen sought a rule of life, which, in its broad outlines, placed upon them the obligations of the monastic observances of the fathers. This monastic "air" of the Third Order appears in the first Rule formulated for the Tertiaries by Munio de Zamora, the sixth Master General of the Order, in 1285. The chief emphasis lay in separation from the world. It was even said that the Third Order members lost their "secular nature" upon their "profession" in the Third Order. ("ad seculum revertere"; See: Mortier, *Histoire des Maitres Generaux*, II, p. 238, footnote 3.)

Obviously it was thus that the worldly appendage of the First Order was seen above all as an extension into the world of Dominican life seem as monastic, not so much as apostolic. And just in that respect (not the second) is this view debatable at its very roots, as we hope to show. (One should note that, as much for this article as for any others which could be brought to bear on this question, the principle applies: "valet auctoritas quod valet argumentum"! I only remain open to an "argumentum" and not to cries of alarm.)

The fundamental Dominican inspiration of the Third Order was based quite differently than it appeared in this first official Rule of Munio de Zamora. Humbert of the Romans spoke of "doing penance in the midst of the world". (*De eruditione Praedicatorum*, bk. II, tr. 1, sermo 39: *Bibl. Patrum*, XXVII, pp. 474-S). Hence the emphasis lay on the character of "exinanitio", on Christian self-denial, as implied in dedication to the living God. In addition to this penitential lay movement, there was another movement which stemmed from a more apostolic orientation: the "Militia Christi" which was launched in the interests of the Church (following the ideas of the time and the needs of the Church). Their "penance" consisted, as documentary evidence shows, of apostolic (they were actually "armed"!) devotion for the Kingdom of God.

The help of some lay people which St. Dominic envisioned for his apostolate had something of these penitential movements and something of the "militia" movements, with the essential reservation that Br him this "militia" was not to be an armed apostolate, but a religious one through the exercise of spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and apostolate filled with prayer and reflection. With this was proffered; as M.H. Vicaire and E. Meerseman, proved, its typically lay character, With justice could Fr. Congar say that the outline of the Third Order, as it was composed beforehand in the mind of Dominic, foreseen with its own statutes and officially erected, was not as an apostolic-military "militia", nor a "penitential" movement in the Franciscan sense (self-sanctification and apostolate by good example), but a harmony of

"penance" and "apostolate" with an eye to lay-help in the care of souls engaged in by his fathers (See: "France dominicaine", Dec. 1958). We may well say that the Third Order as it was formulated for the first time in the Rule of 1285, (already expressed to a certain extent) a one-sidedness somewhat contrary to the vision of St. Dominic (although this was not yet the Third Order which he intended).

Crisis stemming from the modern Catholic Lay-Movement

Since the Middle Ages, something wholly new has taken place in the Church. The growing realization of the true place of the laity in the Church, the realization of the dedication of the Christian lay person to the world, the secular institutes, and, lastly, all sorts of new external forms of the lay apostolate have all laid aside the old idea of the Third Order, so much, that the Dominican fathers, insofar as they call upon the laity for help in their apostolate, as I have indicated, without exception, seek help from these other lay-groups. Examples lie close at hand, but I would rather not bring them up. At the most, the Tertiaries are summoned in this apostolate to perform what one could call the more "household" chores.

Nevertheless, as we wish to strike out in a new direction with the Third Order, I want to say expressly beforehand, that in doing this, we do not intend to minimize the many good things which the Third Order "old style" accomplished: devotion to our houses, deepening in the life of prayer, and in many places, a truly apostolic endeavour. To indicate a new direction does not mean to throw stones at what others have zealously built up; it means rather an encouragement to continue, but at the same time, in a purified fashion.

In order to understand the "new way", we will cite the "old" canonical definition of the Third Order in full. The first paragraph of Canon 702 gives the following decree concerning secular Tertiaries:

"They are Christians who do their best to strive for Christian perfection in the world, under the guidance of a religious order and corresponding to its spirit, and this in a manner, which corresponds to their life in the world, following the Rule approved for them by the Apostolic See."

We should adhere to this definition, yet in a way which the key words in it, namely "in the world" receive a deeper theological significance; moreover, in a way in which the apostolic element in the decree is accepted, at least for our Dominican Third Order. Just as for the First Order, the apostolate seen as the specific goal of Third Order life must be designated as the salvation of souls. To elucidate this we must first set forth, in brief, a theology of "the Christian in the world," for without this theological insight, we would stand in danger of viewing the Third Order members, against all the spiritual

currents in the Church, as an appendage of the Dominican monastic life, instead of seeing it as a secular extension of the Dominican priestly apostolate.

The Laity in the Church and in the World

The ecclesiastical distinction between "laity" and "priests" may not be based upon the fact that the priest has care of the kingdom of God, while the layman is characterized by his task in the world. Rather, the ecclesiastical distinction between layman and priest can only lie in the structure of the supernatural society which is the Church. As Christians, the laymen as well as the hierarchy have an ecclesial-sacred task.⁽³⁾ Only the latter fulfil this task in an authoritative way and from a jurisdictional principle, while the laity must have the selfsame ecclesial mission and the selfsame ecclesial solicitude for the Kingdom of God, yet as the "people of God," that is, without an authoritative function. Being lay, as an ecclesiastical category, cannot therefore be defined by the fact that the lay person takes seriously the "inner consistency" of things (as Congar calls it-as though priests and religious are not required to do this!) or by their task in the world, but rather by their task in the Church, consequently, by an ecclesial-sacred mission. The theological and ecclesiastical definition of the laity is based, therefore upon ecclesiastical membership(with an ecclesial call) in the kingdom of God, which is not the world.

Now it is certainly true, that this ecclesial mission which the laity receive by their baptism, is given to one man, that is, to each person, who as a human being, has a meaningful task to fulfil in this world consequently, to a human being who also has the calling to order the secular affairs of his human life. By this fact, the lay-believers receive simultaneously by their baptism, the mission to integrate their vocation in earthly life with their communion of grace with God in Christ. In this way, the earthly mission becomes for the laity a portion of their total religiously oriented way of life.⁽⁴⁾ The baptized must thus integrate secular life with their faith and ecclesial being, which naturally means that "apostolate in the world" shall be typical of the Christian layman.

In what does this secular apostolate ("apostolate in the world") consist?

In order to delineate what it means to be a layman, at least as an ecclesial phenomenon, we ought continually to bear in mind that baptism is the sacrament of our incorporation into the Church and so into Christ. Now the Church is the historical and tangible public sign (*verschijningsvorm*) of the victorious grace of Christ. In and through the Church, the grace of God in Christ stands in the midst of us as an historically evident reality: "signum elevatum in nationes." Due to the Incarnation and its continual presence in the Church seen as the earthly "Body of the Lord" - this tangible external sign

of grace belongs to the very essence of Christian grace. Wherever grace takes a visible and historically evident form, it becomes the "Church".

Because incorporation into this tangible community of grace is the first and immediate effect of baptism, the believer receives in and with the grace of baptism the mission to take part in the essential function of the Church; he receives the mission to make his communion of grace with God into a visible form -- in and through his own life. In this way, the life, and the whole life, of the baptized layman must become, in the here-and-now of his earthly life, a visible grace: "signum gratiae christianae," Every baptized person, each Christian layman, thus carries with him a responsibility for the Church and for her function as a sign in the midst of the world.(5) Wherever he stands as a citizen in the this-side dimension of earthly life, the layman has along with it, as baptized, that is, as a Christian layman in the Church, the mission to be the "Church" in this dimension; that is to say, wherever these Christians stand in this world, the Church had to receive from them a visible form or stature, whether it be in their normal vocation, in their social intercourse with the rest of mankind and things, in their families, or in the resultant bonds with society and the community of all men, in short, in the whole of their secular life. This taking-root in the world, as a concrete visible sign of their security in God' s grace and of their care for the kingdom of God, is typical of Christian laity.

Being lay -- as an ecclesial vocation -- thus signifies the calling and the sending: (1) to a personal intercourse with the living God in the complete ecclesial life of the Church of Christ, and (2) to fructifying this Christian life in social intercourse with men and in contacts with the things of this world. The Christian layman is seized by God in the totality of "to-be-a-man". The fact that he is a layman is a result of the whole of his human life rooted in this world, indeed an unconditionally dedicated life to the living God. Thus the worldly character of Christian lay-life is also possessed in full, although intimately bound up with the integral-religious, and hence apostolic, attitude of life. It was incumbent upon us to propose all of this before we could consider the Third Order itself as will now do.

THE THIRD ORDER "NEW STYLE"

1. The apostolic extension of the first Order

Since the secular member of the Third Order, as Canon Law states, is truly a layman and not a priest or religious,(6) it follows from the ecclesiastical meaning of "laity" that we may not, nor can we under any consideration, view the Third Order as a secular extension of the First Order as "monastic." Everything in the Rule of the Third Order that "reeks" of a lay decoction of the monastic spirituality of the

Dominican Order seems to me to be wrong. That one cannot reproach the Middle Ages for this is evident. Secular Christian spirituality was a gift by the Holy Spirit to his Church at a much later date, or better, a gift which, in subsequent penetration into Christian selfconsciousness, was only brought to an explicit expression in our time. All this new realization is for many laymen and women still vague and little understood; the layman is, as it were both willing and unwilling to be caught up in this new stream in the Church. Furthermore, as a result of this new realization, he feels the Third Order is a monastic appendage of the First Order, and inevitably, as something "foreign." The modern Christian layman does not feel at home in the Third Order and seeks to give form to his apostolic aspirations elsewhere. A demonstration of this fact is, among other things, the failure of the Third Order to attract the young.

As I set out, then, against the "monastic" implications in the Third Order, I hope no one will misunderstand me. Often the so-called Catholic lay-movement comes to rest, here or there, upon defective foundations. Those responsible for this, layman and priests alike, often forget that the laity as Christians also belong to the "ecclesia," i.e., to those called out and assembled, the "separata a mundo," the separated of God. Lay persons belong with those whom St. Paul calls the "saints": those taken from the world and consecrated to God. After the fashion of another Pauline word, each Christian is "not at home," "a stranger" to this world, but "at home" in the kingdom of Heaven. For this reason there is a type of enthusiasm for the world which can truly be called unchristian. Salvation (a fortiori the grace of redemption, which snatches us from the clutches of sin and places us in communion with God) implies by its very nature, on account of its Divine ascendancy above this world, a fundamental "exinanitio," selfdispossession or self-abnegation, as the counter part of the sanctification of our whole being to the living God, who meets us person to person and who invites us in his goodness to a personal intercourse, that of child to Father. Seen in this perspective, there exists a non-Christian conception about the so-called contemplative in action, as if our being Christian, our being cherished by God, and our prayer should not be a personal, intimate living with God in faith, but only an external living with God in works and apostolate. This would be a basic misunderstanding of theological life, of life in union with God, to which each Christian is called.

If two married people should so live for one another that they dedicated all their work, their thoughts, and their feelings to one another -- the wife at home and the man at the office -- yet in such a way that they never did anything for entertainment, to love one another by simply being together, having no time for this or never

making time for this, you would unhesitatingly say: "No! This is no genuine love." Furthermore dedication of all one's thoughts to another in such cases is often only a sham, a pretext! On the level of the relationship between men we can see through this easily.

Yet we seem all too easily to forget this, in our weakness, in our relations with God and think too readily of the "contemplativus in actione," forgetting that this is impossible unless as an abiding presence and after-effect of, and a continuously renewed desire for, the express and personal communion of prayer with God. This holds true not only for priests and religious, but equally for all the faithful, for each truly religious man. Therefore, any endeavour to bring to life a Third Order "new style" in which this fundamental aspect should be neglected would be a concession to modern "activism" or to what is called the "heresy of action"; it would be the denial of the most intrinsic value of the Third Order. This spirit of prayer, with its accompanying self-dispossession, is in fact nothing other than what some call, the "spirit of the evangelical counsels";(7) it flows from the eschatological and world-transcending character of Christendom. Seen in this way, there is an intrinsic relationship between Christian life itself and religious life, which is but an accentuation of Christianity. But this spirit of the Third Order should not be expressed in monastic form, for it has its own special worldly one.

Thus, the Third Order "new style" must also lay exacting emphasis upon the life of prayer and self-denial. In this way, the Third Order, "new style" shall be a prolongation of the medieval Dominican "penitential movement," although, thoroughly adapted to the lay manner of life and hence free of all monastic observances applied to laymen. In this sense, the first and most basic rule of the new Third Order is: the personal effort towards a conscious and formal spiritual life, in the spirit of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Of itself, this indicates that the forms of prayer used by the modern Third Order members will be other than those used in the monastery or cloister. Above all, these new forms of prayer should be conceived by the laity themselves and not from behind theological "round table" conferences, which are already surrounded by the "good aroma" of conceptions from cloistered brains; these concepts will be batted about for the worse because the "brains" will tend to read their own priestly or religious training into the situation of the laymen's life. The "without incense" and "between the concrete and the asphalt" mystique will prove this to be true!

Herein then we have offered a primary critique of the Third Order "old style" so that the truths contained in its way of life, which up to now have not been lived in a true, and consequently secular, manner will now be affirmed in a purified way.

II. The Dominican Third Order

Against this background and drawing from this inspiration, the Third Order "new style" ought formally to be seen as an apostolic lay movement. The Third Order is indeed a worldly extension of the First Order, but seen as apostolic, in this sense, then, a "Dominican lay movement." (8) What is contained in this expression? I will clarify it in three sections:

A. The secular nature of the Tertiary

The expression contains first of all the full secular life as has been schematically explained above; hence, it implies the consequent living by the laity in their mission in the Church, and of the world, with an emphasis on "apostolate in the world". From a deeper, more consciously personal religious mode of life all of this will flow, wherein dedication to God with its implication of self-denial and the accompanying gospel inspiration will be the ultimate nucleus. So viewed, the apostolate of the Third Order member is not a "help" for the fathers in their apostolic labours. It is above all: to consciously stand in the world as a Christian apostolic layman. One might object that we can find this in all the other lay movements which have grown up during the course of this century! Very true. But they have developed it while the Third Order let this golden opportunity pass it by. Isn't what we now call "actio catholicorum" and even "actio catholica" (looked at from a Dominican point of view, which we haven't done up to now) one of the deepest tendencies which Dominic had in mind for his lay movement? Catholic action, centers for religious instruction, social work, convert work, the Legion of Mary, etc., have all appeared next to the Third Order, so that this, its deepest tendency, is no longer recognized. What excellent opportunities could this all have had for the Third Order. But the most active lay movements had grown up outside of the womb of the Third Order, so that the Third Orders as well as the Sodalities of Our Lady exist and are carried over as a pale residue, which only testify to ancient glories and which did not grow along with the needs of the times. It is precisely for this reason that we no longer take counsel with the Third Order. It has become devotional prayer society for people who, for one reason or another, have contact with our cloisters; a bringing together in prayer the friends of the house, and a help for the fathers in their works. Once again, I will not deny that not a few of the members by their "entrance" and in their prayer life did not go along with this type of apostolate, and that many, in the silence of their personal Third Order life have become holy

by applying their Rule. Perhaps many would be of the opinion that because of the new organizations of lay-apostles, which moreover have the backing of the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, the Third Order should remain simply a small flock of friends of the Dominicans, which because of its relations with our house, becomes an object of frequent pastoral zeal of our Fathers. Every house, even of orders and congregations which have no Third Order, has something similar; therefore, what already exists in our case should remain. There is something to this approach.

B. Lay Cooperation with the First Order

Yet the phrase, "members of the Third Order" can receive a deeper meaning than the above, although we will have difficulty in speaking here of a "proper Dominican spirit", and most certainly will not weave an almost countless "mystique" around the concept "homo Dominicanus" (as does Fr. Congar in the article cited above: see below).

The Third Order presupposes a full lay-life with its task in the world and the Church.⁽⁹⁾ Nevertheless, as a Tertiary, the layman lives his ecclesial and worldly life of the secular apostolate from a definite standpoint; this standpoint is the only real cause of the difference between the Third Order and the many new forms of lay-spirituality and lay-apostolate. What then is the differentiating standpoint?

It has to do with a Dominican Third Order. This means that these laymen shall be involved, and from their secular situation, in attaining the goal of the Dominican Order. Now the special goal of the First Order is the "zelus amimarum," an apostolate in the universal sense of the word with a stress placed upon the proclamation of the Word (in the broadest sense of the word). Third Order members are therefore Christian laity who are involved in the apostolate of the First Order. (One might note that this, with the addition of the "Dominican character," is approximately the definition of Catholic Action, namely, lay cooperation with a priestly corps, in fact, with the priestly corps that is Dominican!) This property of the laity, besides, is wonderfully in tune with contemporary needs and unrest prevailing in the pastoral care of souls. The fact is that priests in many cases are carrying on an apostolate which, the longer it is maintained, the more proper priestly work is relegated to the background. These forms of the apostolate could be better entrusted to the laity. I am speaking

in generalities so as not to offend any particular sensitivities. The modern lay apostle is man enough, in a properly personal and responsible way, to take over many of the apostolic endeavours of our fathers, so that the Dominican priests might carry on a purely priestly task, now so often left by the wayside! In this manner, the Third Order can participate in the pure apostolate of the First Order, and the latter's apostolic radius action via the Tertiaries might extend ever wider. Thus the fathers would have a complement of their own priestly apostolate in the world, made more fruitful by the Third Order itself. Hence Third Order life is a special case of apostolic cooperation of laymen and priests. What is special in this case is that there is operative an apostolic cooperation of laymen with the priestly apostolate of distinct religious Order.

The authority of the Third Order director, who is thus to be a father, should determine the specific call of the individual Third Order members in the light of this principle of apostolic cooperation. And herein it appears that the prior, by definition, coordinating the apostolate of his fathers, must also be the director of the Third Order in his area -- at any rate, this would seem to be the best form required by the very essence of the Third Order seen as a worldly armature of the priestly apostolate of the Order. And whereas the Dominican province itself must accompany, direct, and control the ministry of the fathers according to a definite plan, it follows from the essence of the Third Order that the provincial, in this case not aided by a provincial promoter, has the ultimate supervision over the coordination of this lay apostolate with the ministry of his fathers.

C. Dominican Spirituality

At this point we are not yet finished. Cooperation demands a unified mentality for all; we can call this a distinctive "spirituality." Therefore the Tertiaries, in their apostolic cooperation with the First Order, shall make Dominican spirituality their own.

But let us not become infatuated with this word. In reality, it depends upon the amount of spiritual leadership given by the Dominican Fathers. If we wish to give a meaningful content to the word "Dominican spirituality," it immediately appears that this spirituality is not to be separated from the essential conventual forms of the monastic nature of Dominicans. If we separate this spirituality from its conventual forms, then the

properly Dominican aspect by that very fact becomes "dismantled"; then we only preserve, let me say, the "contemplari" and the "contemplata aliis tradere", a motto in which St. Thomas in his Summa did not express the Dominican ideal properly so-called (he had already treated of this in the concrete earlier), but the essential form of every Christian apostolate (and hence not only Dominican).

Dominican spirituality, detached from the concrete Dominican monastic forms in which the general Christian motto of "contemplata aliis tradere" receives its distinctively Dominican stamp, is naturally an improper expression. It holds good only for the fathers, brothers, and Dominican sisters. We could at this point only deplore that the beautiful chance which Père Loew had placed before the Order, has not been taken, namely, of a Dominican secular institute wherein would stand, as a new appendage in the Dominican Order, real "secular Dominicans" of the evangelical counsels, existing nevertheless, in the full lay condition of the world.⁽¹⁰⁾ Here we had a fine chance not only to find a happy solution to the problem of the "worker-priests," but also to link the already strongly growing tendency in the Church of the apostolate of the secular institute as a powerful organ in the apostolic dynamism of the First Order for the service of the Church. The Third Order might have then obtained her own fully proper meaning as a worldly armature of the Dominican secular institute, without the vows of this institute, of course. Nevertheless, it did not come to pass, and it now takes place outside the Order. Seen from the point of view of the Church, we can only rejoice "if Christ is but preached." From the standpoint of our specific Dominican apostolate it is easier to regret that this has passed us by, for by degrees, namely via our secular institute and the Third Order, the Dominican apostolate could have penetrated all dimensions of human life, a privilege which we do not now enjoy. That others presently do this, we can only rejoice; but the question remains: Do we still maintain sufficient feeling in contemporary situations, which are basically modified, for the original Dominican apostolic purpose as Dominic envisioned it, following the demands of the circumstances of his time? But that is beyond our scope; we are only concerned here about the Third Order.

If we do not courageously dare to adopt this apostolic way of life in the Third Order, sooner or later the Third Order institute will disappear, because no more youth will be found who will see in it any Christian opportunity. A number of other new

organisms will then appeal to their Christian dynamism. In this sense we are already too late to reflect. For this reason, I am not going to project any false expectations for the future, no matter how very much we may desire them. An Order must also dare to acknowledge a lost cause.

Yet I am not going to be so pessimistic either, although I must acknowledge that the endeavours attempted in this country and elsewhere to erect a Third Order for young people have miscarried.⁽¹¹⁾ This situation appears not only in the case of the young, but also with the Third Order "old style" itself. Once again may I say, that as the Third Order is an opportunity for older people who from their earlier work-a-day Christian life feel the need in their later years to lead a more intense life of prayer, it has a task which we may not derogate.

When we thus inquire about the Dominican character of the Third Order we must root this "Dominican" stamp in the lay cooperation with the apostolate of the First Order and thus simultaneously in the spirituality of one family, which must inspire such a cooperative society, and itself by this cooperation be inspired. Stemming from this cooperation and from spiritual direction (chiefly in and through our present Dominican way of life which had a power for expansion) is manifested the personal type of life of the Third Order members, what we within the Dominican Order itself can call "Dominican spirituality". He will see in this conception first these distinctive marks (which are not however exclusive to our Order), secondly the Dominican conception of grace, whereby our contemplative and apostolic activity is seen as the grace-filled action of God in and through us - with all the consequences for the atmosphere in which our personal goal is executed, and, simultaneously, the Dominican sense of life in the world. For this I propose, in line with St. Thomas, in opposition to the other great medieval tendency, the understanding of "structures-within-the-world" (what St. Thomas called the "secondary causes," which, because of our theocentrism we may not lose sight of). Moreover, this double Dominican sensitivity may well be called especially contemporary, since the whole of the modern problematic at present worsens in the context of the problem of the relationship between "service of God" and "life in the world." The adjective "Dominican," Third Order can account for all of this. Thus, the Dominican Third Order means:

"Under the coordinated direction of the Dominican fathers, in their spirit of dialogue with God and dialogue with the world, consciously-Christian lay persons work together (cooperate) in a permanent bond of life with the apostolate of the First Order, chiefly and precisely in those places where the Dominicans in the priestly and religious sense cannot penetrate into dimensions of the world."

Next to these two fundamental distinguishing factors of Dominicans, under the cooperative spiritual direction of Dominicans, other types of Dominican spiritual viewpoints should be imparted to the Tertiaries - for example, balance in judgement, the reasonableness of the faith, a deep spirit of trust in God, joy, etc. Nevertheless, we must be careful in stressing the Dominican distinctiveness of similar distinguishing factors chiefly because we can ascertain in our day that non-Dominicans embody these so called "Dominican attributes" more excellently THAN WE OURSELVES. All the modern Christian spiritual movements, influenced by the Bible and stressing conceptions of the "total man," tend in the direction of an attempted synthesis between "service of God" and "life in the world"; in this way the scriptural conception of grace is revived, and ideas such as trust in God, the joy of life, the reasonableness of faith, and the balance of the total human and Christian personality all hold key positions. Because of all of this, genuine "Dominican spirituality," in the proper sense of the word, cannot be torn away from its monastic forms wherein it derives its own distinctive stamp.

Accomplishing the Third Order "New Style"

In this section we will treat what is expressed in the title, The practical orienting of the Third Order "New Style" next to the existing forms of the "Old Style" is naturally a complex puzzle, and will demand of us both tact and sensitivity.

In each case, it will be necessary to fashion a whole new Rule for the Tertiaries, if one has become interested in any of the perspectives which I have outlined. For I have proposed that we cannot stand outside of history! In this rule, apart from the general norms for the spiritual life of laymen, a chapter should be formulated on "apostolate in the world" and on an occupational ethics for the Third Order members which will be needed in their function as lay apostles. Moreover, directives could be given for an adequate apostolic cooperation of these laymen with our pastoral care of souls. Here, too, the autonomy of this lay apostolate and its independence of the authority of the Dominican Order should be circumscribed in broad

outlines. The intellectually theological education (to use an elaborate phrase) of our fathers must go to the heart of these Third Order members, In fact, we note that in some of our towns, the Dominican "Centers for Religious Awareness" are being run behind the back of our Third Order. Truly another case of how our Third Order is not up to date! In this could appear another Dominican attribute.

In the ultimate analysis, the proper apostolate of most of our Third Order members should consists in the "apostolate in the world" and in their Christian testimony of life, wherever it might appear in many situations in their lives, in their families, the professional world, in day-to-day intercourse with people, in their function in society. Members who cooperate directly in the apostolate of the First Order "full time" or who frequently help in their free hours will form a smaller kernel.

Since one is not a Third Order member by the fact of his Christian life, of his will to live as an apostle, or, moreover, by his contact with a Dominican cloister, Third Order life should then be based upon a special decision of life -- a commitment; this is self-evident. But words, such as "profession," "clothing" and the like, are inappropriate to express the properly religious-secular inspiration behind this commitment to a way of life.

From all of this it follows that an institutionalizing of the Third Order must grow only out of the experience and new practices of the Third Order "New Style"; then and only then, can this experience be institutionalized and codified by the authorities of the Dominican Order, in order to bring both support and canonical status to the new members in the light of this experience .

Conclusion

In conclusion, we can determine that the name "Secular Dominicans," in the full sense of the word, really would apply only to an eventual Dominican "secular institute," which should be added as a new limb to our Order. Such an institute should be most properly a Third Order. To speak of "Secular Dominicans" in the context of our lay Third Order members remains an improper expression. I truly do not know what they might best be called, as we do not wish to empty our words and concepts completely. Various titles which can be considered are "per denominationem extrinsecam" (in contradistinction to lay-brothers, congregations of sisters, and an eventual "secular institute," which alone are essentially Dominican), that is from cooperation with the spiritual direction by Dominicans. Thus, the Third Order characteristics would be intimately related with the spirit of the First Order. It would then be more logical to call our cloistered sisters and cloistered brothers, without distinction, the Second Order, the eventual Dominican secular institutes the Third Order, and finally our present-day

Tertiaries a secular armature-in-the-world of what the Dominicans themselves, following their original vocation, must mean for the Church and for the world. The Third Order members are thus the outermost boundary of the Order' s apostolic radius of action and are where the "zelus animarum" of our Order is most deeply rooted in the worldly dimensions of family and society. This is in no sense a betrayal of the true Third Order -- quite the contrary. It follows logically from the complete worldly situation of the Tertiaries. Any other conception fights against the ecclesial current of the times, and will fail.

I have not discussed beautiful things perhaps nearer your taste. But yet I think that, provided we do not sustain outmoded and dead characteristics, there can still be a fine future in the Third Order "New Style." That one should view these proposals, still to a great extent only hesitatingly suggested, as a betrayal of the Dominican tradition, I must in each case most positively object. Not only because the highest authority of the Order has placed the question of the Third Order in a precarious position, but more fundamentally by reason of a Rule of our Constitutions which has perhaps not been satisfactorily appreciated. According to this rule, out of a trust in the "gratia originalis" of our Order -- to use a phrase of Pere Cormier -- the flexible adaptation to new circumstances of the time is asserted as a fundamental law. This daring phrase, which could be the object of envy of all orders and congregations, stands at the beginning of our Dominican Constitutions: "The means established by our Holy Father for carrying out the end of our Order are: Besides the three solemn vows of obedience, chastity, and poverty, the regular life with monastic observances, solemn recitation of the Divine Office, and the assiduous study of sacred Truth. These means may not be removed nor substantially changed in our Order." (Const. n. 4, sec. 1). Only this is the unalterable nucleus of the Dominican Order; all the rest can come into flux and movement. And moreover, even of this substantial nucleus it is stated that it (apart from the three vows, of course) can be altered appropriately "in keeping with the circumstances," so that above all the purpose of the Order may be attained (same place as cited above), namely: preaching and the care of souls (n. 3, sec. 1). I do not believe that apart from the "freethinkers" of the Church -- as someone had been so good as to call us -- one religious Institute had foreseen in its own Constitutions this enormous principle of plasticity and continual renewing power. For that reason we need not rely upon tradition in the call to solve modern apostolic problems, and yet simultaneously we do not contradict the original constitutional tradition of the Order! In this spirit of our Constitutions, the Third Order still has a fine future.

Additional Notes

For the purpose of explanation and in anticipation of misunderstandings I would like to give, in conclusion, a few theological definitions of the conceptions found in the terms frequently used in this article.

- A. Worldly or secular (secularity): By this we understand the "presence au monde", but as a portion of the total-religious attitude of life; therefore, to fulfil in and towards this world an earthly task. (Thus, this embraces not only the earthly vocational life, which does not comprise the whole of human life, but the whole of life within the world.) "Secular" or "worldly" stands in opposition to: (1) "of the world," that is, the "world" in the Joannine sense, the sinful world, or the attitude of men who so conduct themselves upon the earth that they fail to appreciate the world-surpassing character of the redemption -- the being not-of-this-world of the Kingdom of God, to: (2) "the profane", that is, the worldly inasmuch as this is now not included in a religious mode of life (materially then, this coincides with "worldly or secular"), as to (3): The religious life, which is state of life building its structure upon the world-transcendence of the life of grace. Hence a religious is not-secular by his very nature.
- B. Lay, (layman, laity): These words are sometimes used (not theologically) as synonymous for worldly, secular, and secularity (they apply then to the non-priest and the non-religious). Theologically there is still another distinction. A layman is an ordinary member of the Church' s community in distinction to the specialized membership (the cleric).

The lay person can live his ecclesial lay-life, however, in two ways: in a secular way, or in a religious, non-secular way. In the second case: Lay brothers and sisters; in the former case: the so-called laymen in the world and (although seen from the nucleus of the evangelical life of perfection) the lay-life of a secular institute.

- C. The "state of perfection": Since the foundation of the secular institutes, this does not coincide with the religious life. The religious life is naturally "non-secular", while in the fourth canonical grade of the states of perfection (the secular institutes) the evangelical counsels (under the form of vows, promises, or oaths) are lived in a secular manner, i.e., in and towards the world and worldly activities. Secularity can therefore not only be a portion of the total religious attitude of life, but also of the evangelical life of perfection in the canonical sense of the word. Precisely for this reason, we must handle the phrase, "flight from the world" ("fuga mundi") very carefully.

- D. The secular activity of religious (i.e., of those consecrated to God in a non-secular way) forms its own problem. We have left this problem untouched in this article.

FOOTNOTES:

1. This article was originally published in the Dutch Tertiary Magazine, *Zwarp of Wit*, Aug-Sept., 1960. Before it was published, it was delivered as an address to the regional directors and administrators of the Third Order, first at Louvain on June 6, 1960, and then at Utrecht on June 29, 1960. (trans. footnote)
2. "on-laiccal": This is just one of the words which are difficult to translate into English. Schillibeeckx uses, "laicaal," "monachaal," "theologaal," and "kerkelijk" to emphasize the concrete manifestations of the root words involved, in opposition to the abstract and structural aspects so often connected with words such as "ecclesiastical" and "theological", etc. For an excellent explanation of these terms and similar ones, see: E. Schillebeeckx, O.P., *The Sacrament of the Encounter with Christ* (NY: Sheed & Ward, 1964). especially the footnotes from p. 19ff. (trans. footnote)
3. "Kerkelijk-sacrale": This is translated as above in order to set it apart from the shade of meaning in the word "ecclesiastical,o.

THE ORIGINS OF THE DOMINICAN ORDER

by Henry Peel, OP.
(reproduced with permission)

The Dominican Order has its origins in Northern Spain, where St. Dominic was born at Calaruega in the year 1170. His schooling began at the age of six under the care of a priest uncle. At fourteen he was sent to the University of Palencia, and ten years later, at the age of twenty four, he became a member of the Cathedral Chapter of Canons Regular at Osma.

It was at Osma that Dominic experienced the reality of living in a fervent religious community. The Canons Regular were representative of a Reform movement, designed to imbue the clergy with the spirit of the Gospel. These Canons lived under the rule of St. Augustine, supplemented by customs derived from the monastic tradition.

It was basically a contemplative life, its central activity being the public worship of the Church. These were elements which St. Dominic retained as essential for the formation of the kind of preachers which he envisaged when he founded his own Order many years later. His Preachers were to be men of prayer, preaching the realities which they had absorbed in a life of contemplation.

The idea of founding an Order which would have the preaching of the Gospel as its specific function was the result of Dominic' s own experience of preaching during the nine years preceding 1215. And his decision to adapt what was a contemplative and monastic way of life to the requirements of an active preaching apostolate was occasioned by his experience of the disintegration of Christianity in the South of France. A diplomatic mission in the company of his bishop, Diego, had brought Dominic into contact with this situation.

He reached the conviction that the only way to combat religious error was by effectively propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The traditional methods of the Church establishment and of the monastic Orders had proved inadequate to cope with widespread disaffection. So Dominic took to the roads.

When the time came, he founded his Priors and Convents in University towns and centres, so that Dominicans could study and preach there. Although very much attracted to the liturgy, Dominic cut short the time set apart for the Divine Office to allow more time for study.

Dominic' s Order of Preachers dates its canonical existence as a Religious Order from its confirmation by Pope Honorius III. The document of confirmation was given to him at St. Peter' s in Rome on December 22nd in the year 1216. The Order then consisted of a single Priory, that of St. Romain in the Diocese of Toulouse in France. One of Dominic' s early biographers, Constantine d' Orvieto, records a vision which was granted to the saintly priest about this time. He writes:

"Whilst God' s vassal, Dominic, was in Rome and was pouring out his prayers in the presence of God in the Basilica of St. Peter ... the hand of God came upon him. He saw Peter and Paul, those princes full of glory, appear. The first, Peter, gave him the staff; Paul the book; and both said: "Go and Preach, for God hath chosen you for this ministry.

Then in a flash it seemed to him that he saw his sons scattered throughout the world, going off two by two to preach to the people the Word of God".

That Dominic, "Being of one mind and heart with Christ", remained faithful to this revelation we have ample proof. Just as Jesus, "when he had finished instructing his disciples", sent them out into the towns and villages to preach; Dominic did likewise. On the feast of Pentecost, 14th May 1216, he announced his intention of dispersing the few friars he then had. His friends and protectors in Toulouse were disconcerted, but Dominic replied: "Leave me alone: I know what I am doing". Steeped as he was in sacred Scripture, he knew that seed when scattered bears much fruit; when hoarded rots.

Dominic sent seven of this original group to Paris. The University of Paris was then the centre for theological study, and Dominic planned that his preachers were to be lifelong students - a novel feature of the Order which founded. A second group was sent to Spain, Dominic' s homeland. Dominic himself went to Rome, where within three months he had attracted twenty more followers. Some of these he sent to Bologna, the centre of legal studies at the time. The scattered seed fructified indeed, and recruits for the new Order of Preaching Friars multiplied rapidly.

By the time of his death, at about age fifty, Dominic' s sons were fully organised. A system of government based on representative assemblies allowed for great flexibility in adapting to changing times.

Dominic' s work was complete.

In the nineteenth century, the Order was restored in France by the distinguished Dominican, Father Lacordaire, who has left us his personal testimony: "If God granted us the power to set up a Religious Order we are sure that, after considerable reflection, we should discover nothing newer or better adapted to our times and its needs than the Rule of St. Dominic. There

is nothing old about it save its history, and it would be pointless to rack our brains for the sole satisfaction of dating from yesterday".

The Dominican Laity Handbook (1994)
P60-62

