

# ON THE AFFAIRS OF THE ORDER

---

## THE RITE OF PROFESSION OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS

*The text of the “Rite of Profession of the Order of Preachers,” (including in a single volume the rites of “reception” and of profession for the various “categories” of the Dominican family), renewed under the auspices of the Liturgical Commission of the Order with an official letter of the Master [Prot. 66/97/878] and the related “illustrative document” [Prot. 66/97/879], dated June 12, 1997, has been submitted [cf. IDI, 1997, (97/230)] to the Congregation for Divine Worship to obtain its final “approval or confirmation.” Before that, on February 7, 1997, these formularies had been submitted for the “prior approval” of the Master of the Order, with an attached “submission report” [Prot. pers. CG/97/28] of the work done and the problems inherent to its approval. Given the importance of the two above-mentioned documents, a summary of their contents is reproduced here, preceded by a historical and theological account of the liturgical renewal of the Order, for the common benefit.*

### ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACG	=	“Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum”
AFP	=	“Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,” Paris-Rome 1931 ss.
AGOP	=	Archivum General Ordinis Praedicatorum, ad. S. Sabinae, Rome.
ASOP	=	Analecta Sacri Ordinis Praedicatorum, Rome 1893 ss.
CC.GG.	=	General Chapters
CIC	=	Codex Iuris Canonici, auctoritate Ioannis Pauli II promulgatus, January 25, 1983: EV 8.
CL	=	Liturgical Commission of the Order
EDIL	=	Enchiridion documentorum instaurationis liturgicae: I (1963-1973) Turin, 1976, II (1973-1983) Rome 1988.
IDI	=	Informazioni Domenicane Internazionali, Rome 1969 ss.
LCO	=	<i>Liber Constitutionum et Ordinationum O.P.</i> , (1968), Rome 1998.
LCM	=	<i>Liber Constitutionum Monialium O.P.</i> , ed. D. Byrne, ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 20-81.
LG	=	Second Vatican Council, the dogmatic Constitution on the Church <i>Lumen Gentium</i> , November 21, 1964; EDIL 8, pp. 87-101.
LHOP	=	<i>Liturgia Horarum. Proprium Officiorum Ordinis Praedicatorum</i> , ed. de Couesnongle, Rome 1982.
MLOP	=	<i>Proprium Ordinis Praedicatorum. Missale et Lectionarium</i> , ed. de Couesnongle – D. Byrne, Rome 1985.
MOPH	=	<i>Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica</i> , Louvain – Rome 1896 ss.
OPR	=	SCCD, <i>Ordo Professionis Religiosae</i> , ed. typica February 2, 1975 <sup>2</sup> : Praenotanda, EDIL I, pp. 653-659.
PROP	=	<i>Professionis Ritus Ordinis Praedicatorum</i> , ed. typica (in the course of being printed in the next issue of AOP, January-April 1999).

RFL	=	<i>Regula Fraternitatum Laicalium S. Dominici</i> , ed. D. Byrne, ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 83-88.
RFS	=	<i>Regula Fraternitatum Sacerdotalium S. Dominici</i> , ed. D. Byrne, ASOP 95, 1987, pp.199-206.
SC	=	Second Vatican Council, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy <i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i> , December 4, 1963: EDIL I, pp. 1-27.
SCCD	=	Sacra Congregatio pro Cultu Divino (Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship)
SCSCD	=	Sacra Congregatio pro Sacramentis et Cultu Divino (Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship).
S. Th.	=	Summa Theologiae of Saint Thomas Aquinas (with the division of its parts).

## I

### PRESENTATION ON THE PROCESS OF RENEWAL OF THE LITURGY OF THE ORDER [\*]

1. After the Second Vatican Council, several of our General Chapters diligently dealt with the renewal of the *proper Rite* of the Order. In Bogotá (1965)<sup>1</sup>, it was specified that, once the Roman Rite had been renewed, the Order was to ensure the “updating” of its own Rite, while at the same time reaffirming the *maintaining* of the Rite. The General Chapter of River Forest (1968)<sup>2</sup> and then the General Chapter of Tallaght (1971)<sup>3</sup> specifically called for the *adoption of the Roman Rite*, however while retaining the elements that are specific to the “Dominican tradition.”

---

[\*] Nothing could be more enlightening – in order to grasp the *nature* of the task involved [III], its *characteristics* [IV], the *problems* inherent to it [V] and how to *overcome* them [VI] – than to first trace, in an overview [I-II], the preceding process of renewal of the liturgy of the Order. Of this – after the Major Books [*Missal / Lectionary and Breviary*], already renewed – the most notable part to be renewed remain that of the books concerning “the liturgical rites that accompany the regular life of our community.” Taken as a whole, they form the “Rituale O.P.” This work includes the Rites of vestition and profession for the various “categories” of the Dominican Family – recently renewed in conformity to the norms of the Second Vatican Council, not without due attention to the directives of the General Councils of the Order and the “wishes” of the Provinces polled – which are here submitted to the competent authority for their due “approval” and offered to those are to make use of them, in various circumstances, when they have been approved.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Bogotá the Order had identified the appropriateness of an “adaptation” of our rite, as soon as the revision of the Roman Rite would be finished: “We entrust to the Master General the task of the adaptation of our Rite, after the complete renewal of the Roman Rite, even if is necessary to have recourse to the Holy See.” (*Acta*, no. 289).

<sup>2</sup> By adopting the same *procedure*, provided for in our constitutional law – which, as is known, confers on the Master of the Order broad autonomy in carrying out the mandate – although this Chapter stipulated: “We entrust to the Master of the Order that, after the complete renewal of the Roman Rite, he should see to its adoption for our Order, retaining certain proper elements to the extent possible.” (*Acta*, No. 58).

<sup>3</sup> ACG, 1974, n. 134: *We entrust to the Master of the Order the charge of adopting the reformed Roman Breviary for our entire Order, as has been done for the Missal. However, a commission of experts should take care of compiling the Proper of the Saints and Blessed of the Order.* Also: *We entrust to the Master of the Order that, after hearing the experts on liturgical matters, he take care to gather together elements that are truly peculiar to our Rite.* (*ibid.*, no. 135).

2. In response to this request, the Master of the Order A. FERNANDEZ appointed a special Commission<sup>4</sup> - [called by the name of its chairman the “D’Amato Commission”] – which, in 1973-1974, in view of the General Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco (1974), carried out an important task of making an inventory of certain “proper elements” (rites and texts) belonging to the ancient liturgical tradition of the Order, evaluating<sup>5</sup> the liturgical, historical and traditional value of these elements and the appropriateness of maintaining them. The Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco (1974) approved the documents<sup>6</sup> prepared by that Commission and gave the Master of the Order the mandate of seeing to their execution<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Master of the Order A. FERNANDEZ, “Institutio parvae Commissionis de re liturgica” (“Establishment of a small Commission on liturgical matters” [April 18, 1973, Prot. n. 730418/PI], ASOP 41, 1973, p. 106. See previous ASOP 40, 1972, p. 367 [“Litterae ad instituendam Commissionem specialem de Liturgia”] (“Letter for the establishment of a special Commission on the Liturgy”). For a complete treatment of the subject, see V. Romano, *Elementa peculiaria et adaptationes propriae Ritus nostri* (“Peculiar elements and adaptations proper to our Rite”).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Commissio specialis de Liturgia, «Elementa peculiaria Ritus nostri, 10 November 1973,” ASOP 41, 1974, pp. 340-345 – With their titles reworded in Chapter (1974), they were definitively approved by the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship (Prot. CD 671/76 of July 15, 1977); cf. ASOP 85, 1977, pp. 129-131.

<sup>6</sup> Cf/ ACG. 1974, no. 170. The capitular Commission on “liturgy and prayer” was composed of Fathers: J. KOPF, Chairman, L. MAGRINI, V. ROMANO, Secretary, TH. VIERA, G. CORREA, A. LEÓN, V. SCOCCIMARRO, M. RIGHETTI, A.G. FUENTE, R. GALLEGOS, J.M. DIAZ CONDE and A. LEMAIRE.

The *reporter* at the general assemblies, as the *Secretary* of the Commission, was Father V. ROMANO, who later was to be appointed Assistant General of the Master of the Order, with the charge of “Promoting the life of prayer and the Liturgy in the Order” [cf. IDI, 1975, (75/20 AND /48) in application of the “wish” of that same Chapter of 1974 (Acta, no. 173). From then on, later confirmed as chairman of that same office as *Chairman of the Liturgical Commission of the Order*, he had to personally monitor all of the work on the liturgy that had been requested on the direct responsibility of the Master of the Order, and to obtain its final “approval and confirmation” from the Holy See.

<sup>7</sup> ACG, 1974, no. 171: “To the Master of the Order we entrust the task, once the revision and necessary adaptations have been made, of submitting for the approval of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship the “peculiar elements of our rite” selected by the special Commission on the liturgy and presented to this chapter...” The list referred to her, since it was subsequently approved by the SCSCD [Prot. CD 671/76], was officially made known, when the work of implementing it began; cf. V. ROMANO, *Elementa peculiaria et adaptationes propriae Ritus nostri*, ASOP 43, 1977, pp. 135-140. – For an overview of the situation of the liturgy of the Order following Vatican II and the general problematic relating to the work of the D’Amato Commission (1973-1974), see D. Dye, *Le Rite dominicain à la suite de la réforme liturgique de Vatican II*, (“The Dominican Rite following the liturgical reform of Vatican II”), ASOP vol. 43, 1977, pp. 193-275, reprinted by “Notitiae” 14, 1978, pp. 334-417; 463-499; - Id., *Relevé des modifications du Rite O.P. et indications pour la vie liturgique dans l’Ordre de 1955 à 1977* (“A Summary of the modifications to the Dominican Rite and indications for liturgical life in the Order from 1955 to 1977”), ASOP vol. 43, 1977, pp. 277-306.

3. Then there was the necessary question of the *juridical status* of the liturgical books of the Order. For the *Ordo Missae*, the question had practically been resolved with the adoption of the renewed Roman rite<sup>8</sup> and the later clarification in the extraordinary meeting of the Council of the Generalate.<sup>9</sup> For the *other parts of the Missal* and for the *Breviary*, it remained to decide on one part of the question, that relating to the *Proper*. As for the “*other liturgical Books*,” their ancient status remained and, by that very fact, their juridical status. In short, the principle to be followed remained the following: “The liturgical decrees or reforms concerning the Roman rite apply to the *other Latin rites* only if the ecclesiastical authority specifies so explicitly, or if those rites so request.”<sup>10</sup> In the future, therefore, with regard to them, it would be a matter of specifying *from time to time* the juridical status, on the basis of their content, the nature of the approval requested and the norms emanating from the ecclesiastical authority. After mature reflection, the Commission agreed that the provision of Tallaght [n. 135] had to be interpreted in the light of that of River Forest [n. 58]. For this reason, it could in no way be asserted that the Order had lost its own rights regarding its own Rite, or its own liturgical Books.<sup>11</sup>

4. On the basis of this clarification, the subsequent work of the Commission was able to be resumed with real freedom, since the Commission had become aware of the intentions of the Order in relation to the renewed liturgy. Thus, after the decisions of the General Chapters of River Forest, Tallaght and Madonna dell’Arco, the liturgical books published by the order were to have *the juridical status specified in each case*, according to their contents, the nature of the approval requested and the legislation which, in fact, is established in the Church with respect to religious families.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. SCCD, *De Missali Romano et novo Calendario pro Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum* [Decree, June 2, 1969, Prot. N. 98/69], ASOP 39, 1969, pp. 250-251.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. A. DIRKS, *De novo Ordine Missae. Relatio Consilio Generali extraordinario oblata* (“*On the new Order of Mass. Report submitted to the extraordinary General Council*”), ASOP 39, 1970, pp. 572-574. See also ID., *De Ritu Dominicano*, “*Notitiae*” 8, 1972, pp. 17-18.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Interview with the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission* [D’ Amato], in IDI, May 1, 1974, 74/96, § 1, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> See D. DYE, *Le statut juridique des livres liturgiques (dominicains)* (“*The juridical status of the (Dominican) liturgical books*”), in “*Le Rite dominicain à la suite de la Réforme liturgique de Vatican II*”: ASOP 43, 1977, pp. 193-275 [on this point: pp. 196-197]. Cf. V. ROMANO, *Evoluzione della nostra Liturgia domenicana dopo il Vaticano II* (“*Evolution of our Dominican liturgy after Vatican II*”) in *Relazione al Cap. Gen. di Oakland (1989)*, ASOP 97, 1989, pp. 101-130; where [in pp. 116-124], at the request of the Master of the Order FR. DAMIAN BYRNE, I fully illustrated this aspect of the question in relation to the “*Frères de Chémer*” On this point, it is worthwhile to recall what Father P.-M. GY wrote on his own, in a line of the *Letter to the Master of the Order*, dated March 31, 1989, and then repeated almost to the letter in the “*Nota*,” edited by himself and by Father DUVAL, by the General Chapter of Oakland (1989) at the request of the Master of the Order. Therein is underlines what we might define as the *particular ecclesiological status of our renewed liturgy*, in the following terms: “Thanks to the zeal of the liturgists of the Order and the favorable reception of the *Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship*, the present *Proper of the Order of Preachers*, probably already surpasses the proportions of all the other existing Propers, while still has to be completed by a third volume, that of the “*Ritual*,” without counting the books of Gregorian chant. In fact, since it is juridically a Proper, our liturgical books are halfway between a Proper and a particular Rite, because they have preserved, from among the treasures of our liturgical tradition, everything that was compatible with the letter and the spirit of the *Constitution Sacrosanctum Concilium*” (Cf. Archivio della Curia, Prot. 3/89/36).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 3.; SRC, *Instruction Inter Oecumenici*, no. 9. This principle has been periodically re-invoked for our rite: cf. ASOP I, 1894, pp. 549-550; ASOP 36, 1964, pp. 404-405; ASOP 36, 1964, p. 485.

## II

### IMPLEMENTATION PHASE OF THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL IN THE ORDER

#### *“The decisive turn”*

5. At this point, first of all, the decisive turn that, in the area of the Liturgy of the Order, was seen with the implementation of the “Votum” (“wish”)<sup>13</sup> of the General Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco. Once the “transformation” of the Liturgical Institute into an “institution of culture and scientific research” had been established in the Council of the Generalate (with its consequent transfer to the Pontifical University of Saint Thomas Aquinas in Rome [the “Angelicum”]); the Master of the Order, from the beginning – without waiting for the definition of the complex alternative problem of instituting a “permanent liturgical Commission” – decided to entrust to “someone he trusted to be in charge” (duly assisted according to modalities and directives he himself would indicate in pursuing the work), and also the responsibility concerning “the life of prayer and the renewal of the Liturgy of the Order,” expressed by the “Votum”, and also the responsibility for preparing the new *Proper of the Saints and Beatified Members of the Order of Preachers*, since he had received from that same General Chapter the mandate of seeing to this directly<sup>14</sup>, in complete freedom and full autonomy.

6. Thus it was that, in carrying out the “reform” of the Curia of the Generalate intended by the General Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco (1974)<sup>15</sup>, the Master of the Order Father VINCENT DE COUESNONGLE, after having appointed me as his Assistant General for Italy [= Southern Europe]<sup>16</sup>, Father Vincenzo Romano, entrusted to him that “special charge,” as provided for by those same ordinations<sup>17</sup>, that of the one “responsible for the life of prayer the renewal of the liturgical books of the Order.”<sup>18</sup> This appointment, which was reconfirmed at the end of the six years of his term as Assistant General (November 1980)<sup>19</sup>, when, having been elected in the meantime (January 2, 1981) Provincial of his own Province of Sicily, he had to leave Santa Sabina. Upon the expiration of the term of Father DE COUESNONGLE (1983), Father Romano was later appointed to the position by new Master of the Order Father DAMIAN BYRNE<sup>20</sup>, while awaiting a definition of the problem of the Liturgy Commission that was to be set up. Subsequently, therefore, upon setting up that commission, he himself officially bestowed on that same Father Romano the charge of being

---

<sup>13</sup> ACG, 1974, n. 173: “The general Chapter makes the “wish” that the promotion of the life of prayer of the brothers be an object of particular care on the part of the Order – both by the permanent commission on the Liturgy and through an appropriate reform of the Liturgical Institute – while using appropriate means of communication and information.”

<sup>14</sup> Cf. ACG, 1974, n. 168: “We entrust to the Master of the Order the task of seeing to the compilation of the “Proper” all the Saints and Beatified members of the Order, taking into account of the texts that have already been prepared by the Liturgical Institute and the Postulation General or those which serve that purpose, and submitting it, along with a particular calendar for the use of the provinces, for the approval of the Holy See.” And furthermore: “To the Master of the Order we entrust, once the revision and the adaptations have been completed, the task of submitting the “peculiar elements of our rite” selected by the special [D’Amato] commission and presented to this chapter, for the approval of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship...” (Ibid., n. 171).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. ACG, 1974, nn. 101-106; 121; 251; 249-250.

<sup>16</sup> Master of the Order Fr. VINCENTIUS DE COUESNONGLE, *Litterae Prioribus Provincialibus... totius Ordinis circa curarum partitiones Adistentium Generalium MO* (“Letter to the Prior Provincials of the entire Order concerning the divisions of responsibilities of the Assistants General of the Master of the Order”): “... 3. The Assistant for Italy shall have responsibility for: the six provinces of Italy, the province of Croatia, the communities of Turkey and Greece.” ASOP 43, 1977-78, p. 560.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. ACG, 1974, n. 102; [LCO, n. 425].

<sup>18</sup> Cf. IDI, 1975, 75/20 and 75/48.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. ASOP 92, 1984; De rebus Ordinis, p. 158.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. ASOP 95, 1987; De rebus Ordinis, p. 307-308.

chairman of the Commission (1984)<sup>21</sup>; when his term of office expired (1993), he was once again reconfirmed in his office by the present Master of the Order Father TIMOTHY RADCLIFFE.<sup>22</sup>

**\* The first operative stage of the “major” accomplishments \***

7. Thus began the fruitful period of over 20 years of intense work on the liturgy; a vast area that, in practice, encompassed the entire vast area of the “*peculiar elements of our ancient rite*,” existing within the “treasury of our liturgical tradition” [carefully selected by the D’Amato Commission, approved by the General Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco (1974) to be renewed, and finally confirmed by the SCSCD].<sup>23</sup> There we find precise indications regarding the revision of practically all the major sections of “specific rites”<sup>24</sup> that accompany the regular life of our Dominican communities.

The significant and complex task was structured in various directions:<sup>25</sup>

**A) II “Proper of the Saints and Beatified Members of the Order of Preachers”**

8. From the very beginning, obviously, attention was given, as a priority, to the *Proper of the Saints and Beatified Members of the Order* – made up of the first two “Major Books” [Supplement to the *Roman Breviary* of the Liturgy of the Hours and the *Missal and Lectionary*] – for which there were objective reasons of urgency and repeated mandates on the part of the General Chapters, subsequent to the liturgical reform of Vatican II.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Acta Magistri Ordinis, “Institutio Commissionis Liturgicae”: Prot. N. 66/84/549, ASOP 48, 1984, pp. 294-295.

<sup>22</sup> Master of the Order Fr. Timothy Radcliffe, *Litterae relatae ad Commissionem liturgicam* (“Letter submitted to the liturgical Commission”), Prot. 66/93/576, ASOP 101, 1993, p. 46.

<sup>23</sup> ACG, 1974, n. 171; - SCSCD, Prot. CD 671/76: “Elementa peculiararia et adaptations propriae Ritus nostri”: ASOP 85, 1977, pp. 129-140.

<sup>24</sup> These “rites” follow the cycle of the fundamental stages in the life that our communities exhibit as living realities. Therefore distinct sections of work were identified for study and the separate renewal of each of them (cf. below, n. 10).

<sup>25</sup> It can be followed step by step in the important documentation found: a) mainly in the General Archives of the Order [Liturgy section]; b) also significantly in the various yearly volumes of *Analecta S.O.P.* of this last quarter century, which contain: a significant portion of the *official interventions* before the Apostolic See concerning the “Proprium O.P.” (over the question of the “*particular Calendar* for the use of the Provinces”; the new texts relating to the “pastoral care of the sick” and the “liturgy of the dead”; those concerning *community life* [v.g. the *Ordo in electionibus superiorum* (“*Order for elections of superiors*”), already in use in the General Chapters and Provinces.]; the texts for “celebrations of the new Saints and Beatified Members”; the exchanges for *official works* of translations and adaptations” with the Provinces and Vicariates of the Order, etc; c) in addition, systematically, from my “reports” to the General Chapters of this period, of which the first two [of QUEZON CITY (1977) and Walbebeberg (1980)] can be found in the Archives of the Curia; the others, in contrast – as their significance increasingly grows as the activities progress – are also printed in the *Analecta S.O.P.* in relation to the General Chapters of ROME (1983): ASOP 48, pp. 158-170; - of AVILA (1986): ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 307-336; - of OAKLAND (1989): ASOP 97, 1989, pp. 101-130; - of MEXICO CITY (1992): ASOP 1992, pp. 279-298; - of CALERUEGA (1995), still being printed.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. V ROMANO, *De “Proprio Ordinis Praedicatorum” nuper recognito et Apostolicae Sedi subiecto pro approbatione* (“On the newly recognized ‘Proper of the Order of Preachers’ and submitted to the Apostolic See for approval”), a report forwarded to the Holy See [dated October 13, 1977, Prot. N. 63/77/1240-IT, 11 p.], along with the texts submitted for approval or confirmation, and then printed in ASOP 43, 1978, pp. 479-491, with a *summary* in three languages (Spanish, English and French). This is a document of noteworthy interest by the fact that the broad outlines of the work completed are indicated in it, showing the criteria used and the methodology, the spirit and the various steps followed in the preparation of the formularies, and also a brief analysis of the various parts of these Offices and Masses of the *Proper* calendar of the Order.

The two “Major Books” that comprise it are:

1. – *Proprium Officiorum O.P.: Liturgia Horarum* [LHOP], ed. typ. de Couesnongle, Rome 1982, I – LXXXVI, 824 pp. – II – *Proprium O.P.: Missale et Lectionarium* [MLOP], ed. typ. De Couesnongle – Byrne, Rome 1985, I – LVI, 548 pp. – Both volumes are the result of the collaboration of various commissions and “teams” of experts, all appointed for that purpose by the Master of the Order, to whom had been entrusted the task of providing for the completion of the work, with the broadest discretionary and decision-making power concerning the modes to be followed and the means to be employed. On this important question, see the explanations pertinent to the case in: V.

---

Romano, *Relazione al CG 1986 [di Avila] sui lavori concernenti le edizioni liturgiche dell'Ordine* (“*Report to the General Chapter 1986 [of Avila] on the work done on the liturgical editions of the Order*”): ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 307-336, under nn. 55-64, and the abundant documentation cited.

## B) Other various sections of “rites”

9. After the publication of the two “Major Books” of the *Proper* of the Order, the most important portion of the remaining work to be done of the Liturgical Commission became the revision of the various sections of the “rites” that accompany the regular life of the Dominican communities in their specific life dynamism.

### *Therefore three orders of work were planned:*

- a) For the rites of initiation into Dominican life:
  - “*The Rite of Admission into the Order*” [with or without “vestition”]
  - “*The Order of Profession*”
- b) For the rites pertaining to the ordinary course of community life and ministry under the guide of the competent authority:
  - “*Ordo in electionibus superiorum servandus*”  
(“*Order to be observed in elections of superiors*”)
  - “*Benedictionale*” (“*Collection of Blessings*”)
- c) For the Christian rites for accompanying people in illnesses and in death:
  - “*Ordo unctionis infirmorum eorumque pastoralis cura*”  
(“*Order of the anointing of the sick and their pastoral care*”)
  - “*Ordo exequiarum*” (“*Order of funeral rites*”)

10. These various rites were all worked on and considered in their structure with reference to their specific nature, and then they were published individually, until the reformulation was gradually completed:

For the intermediary rites [b]): it was already planned to complete the “*Ordo in electionibus superiorum servandus*,” by sending the first copy to the Provinces (July 1983) as a preliminary consultation and also by using it “on an experimental basis” already in the General Chapter of Rome, held that same year. From the reactions received, no significant changes were registered, but it was noted that it would be appropriate to broaden its scope [= on the occasion of superiors elected in *their absence*, for the “welcome” of these superiors *upon their arrival*]. This has already been printed and officially disseminated in its Latin typical edition<sup>27</sup> in 1992.

This was not the case for the “*Benedictionale*”, for which we will have to wait a little while longer, in order to have a clearer vision of what is to be done – given the diversity in the nature and use of the texts that are available in our tradition and their *location* – with the additional factor of the still fluctuating situation of the Roman rite.

For the rites to accompany a Christian in illnesses and in death [c]): the “proper elements” have already been *approved* by the General Chapter of Madonna dell’Arco and also *confirmed* by the competent Congregation and even “*made known*” in print in *Analecta O.P.*<sup>28</sup>: the only thing that is lacking is their “*formatting*” as a Ritual [already in the advanced stages of preparation]. It was thought that it was *appropriate not to rush* the final edition of these materials (already known, and by that fact, therefore they can be used provisionally as alternatives to the “common” texts of the Roman rite), in order to have the time to arrive at valid mature decisions, by observing what has been prepared by the competent Congregation concerning these same rites; this, in order to avoid producing *books already out of date* as soon as they are published. Now this is already being provided for, and we foresee final publication within a short time.

Therefore it is on the rites of initiation to Dominican life [a]) that the attention of the Liturgical Commission has been turned, in other words, the “Rites of reception and profession”:

<sup>27</sup> Proprium Ordinis Praedicatorum, «Rituale»: *Ordo in electionibus superiorum servandus*, editio typica, Fr. Damian Byrne, Santa Sabina, 1992, ASOP 99, 1991, pp. 257-288.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. ASOP 43, 1977-78, pp. 143-159.

*\* A long-awaited work \**

11. Precisely with regard to these “rites of vestition and profession,” as already mentioned, there had been various *requests* on the part of the various categories or “branches” of the Dominican Family, and precise “official indications” for a reexamination of them; among the “*peculiar elements*” to be renewed:

a) With regard to the *Ceremonial* for the profession “of cloistered nuns and the sisters” of the Order [ed. GILLET, 1930], the appropriateness of a revision<sup>29</sup> as requested had been made evident, obviously not on account of contemporary sensibilities and the new Roman ritual (the *Ordo Professionis religiosae* [OPR] of February 2, 1970), but also in order to promote the liturgical unity of the entire Order.<sup>30</sup>

b) Concerning the Rite of reception and vestition of the “novices” (*Processionarium O.P.*, ed. SUAREZ, 1949), an indication was given as to the timeliness of also subjecting this rite to revision, with the added note: “*as has already been done for the Order of Profession.*”<sup>31</sup>

c) Concerning the “*Rite of Profession*,” the question was considered to have been already resolved, as indicated by the renewal of the *Ordo Professionis* that had taken place. This is an indication that, at first glance, surprises and confuses us, because we find that, even today, there is still work to be done on the *Ordo Professionis* itself.

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. ACG, 1974, N. 171, “De quibusdam elementis peculiaribus ritus nostri”: “... 30 a) *proper elements of the rite of Profession of nuns and sisters* [Caeremoniales, ed. GILLET, 1930, pp. 1-28] *ought to be reconsidered, with attention to the new Roman Order for the profession of religious women* [OPR, ed. 1970].”

<sup>30</sup> This is how the General Chapter of Tallaght had already expressed itself in 1971: “We entrust to the Master of the Order the task of providing a timely adaptation of the rites of vestition and profession for the *nuns and sisters* of our Order, in order to foster the unity of the liturgy of the entire Order.” (*Acta*, no. 172).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. ACG, 1974, n. 171, “De quibusdam elementis peculiaribus ritus nostri”: “... 30 b) As has already been done for the Order of religious Profession, it seems appropriate that the rite for reception of novices [cf. *Processionarium O.P.*, ed. SUAREZ, Rome 1949, pp. 149-156] *be subjected to revision*,” SCSCD, Prot. CD 671/76, n. 30/b: ASOP 85, 1977, p. 138.

12. All of this finds its obvious explanation in the fact that, particularly at that time, an *Ordo Professionis* had already been actually drawn up<sup>32</sup> in the context of that same General Chapter of Tallaght (1971) and then *submitted for approval* to the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship (1972). The Congregation, however, while appreciating the reasons of traditional *simplicity* that had been adopted, judged the formulary to be insufficient in conformity with the requirements of a true rite, in the full sense of the word, and in turn advanced the request for a more congruent reworking of the text.<sup>33</sup> This new text was finally approved, but only *ad interim*.<sup>34</sup>

13. Was this then a missed opportunity? It is not up to us to judge. Today we can only regret it and, without any recriminations, we can quickly move toward remedies with serenity and wisdom. It is a fact that, things being what they are, the Order has found itself with the need to subsequently provide for the renewal of its own rites, ones of such great importance, the rites of welcome and profession, in times and circumstances that have now profoundly changed.

The only thing that remains for us to do is to submit to the Apostolic See our legitimate requests, giving our reasons and in a convincing matter. Those requests are, as we might say, of great interest for us, although they are not so easy to obtain.

### III

#### PLANNING OF THE WORK

14. After mature reflection, the planning of the work, directed to reviewing and profoundly renewing the rites of welcome and profession, has been conceived in a *unitary manner*; in other words, to provide for a revisiting and “overall presentation” of the various formularies relating to individual categories of the Dominican Family, in their totality: Friars, Nuns, Sisters, secular Institutes and Fraternities [both of priests and laity] of Saint Dominic.

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. ACG, 1971, *De Ordine Professionis Religiosae O.P.*, “Appendix II,” p. 115.

<sup>33</sup> The request, from the Procurator of that time, Father B. JOSEPH, was thus presented in ASOP 41, 1973, p. 23: *De ordine professionis religiosae O.P.*: “On February 11, 1976, we requested that the Congregation for Divine Worship would approve or confirm the rite of religious profession in the Order of Preachers, as revised and approved by the most recent General Chapter held in Tallaght.” (cf. Acta, 1971, “Appendix II,” p. 115).

However, on April 18, 1972, the Sacred Congregation replied:

“Before the requested confirmation is given, this Sacred Dicastery would like to express its mind:

The matters requested shall be carried out so that, according to most ancient custom, the rite of religious Profession in the Order of Preacher will always shine forth in noble simplicity.

2. However it is expected that the rite *be shown to be defined more precisely*, by determining what may or should be referred in it either from the Roman Missal or from the Order of Religious Profession [OPR]. Likewise *it is fitting that it be more clearly apparent what in fact is the full form to be observed* in the rite of Religious Profession within Mass.”

<sup>34</sup> The explanations given by that same Procurator general B. JOSEPH can be seen in ASOP 41, 1973, pp. 23-24. In the conclusion we read: “... The aforesaid Sacred Congregation, by rescript dated February 13, 1973, Prot. n. 250/72, approved and confirmed the proper order of religious Profession of the Friars Preacher “ad interim,” as it is in the form which is shown... in the present fascicule.”: “*Ritus professionis solemniss intra Missam peragendus*” (“*The Rite of solemn Profession to be carried out within Mass*”) (pp. 24-27); “*Ritus professionis simplicis intra Missam peragendus*” (“*The Rite of simple Profession to be carried out within Mass*”) (p. 27). In the light of all of this, there is therefore the explanation of the lack of a more direct and explicit indication of the revision of the *Ordo Professionis*, among the “peculiar elements of our rite” to be renewed, and reiterated on many occasions, brought about that generic indication, placed at the bottom of that same document that lists them (cf. “De elementis peculiaribus Ritus O.P.,” Prot. CD, 671/76: “... III. From other books: nn. 27-30: “Other texts or proper rites [of the *Processionarium*] should be recognized in a timely manner according to the mind of the restored liturgical books,” in ASOP 85, 1977, pp. 138-140), among which this one certainly also belongs.

**\* Prior consultation of the Provinces, the Monasteries of Nuns, the Congregations of Sisters and the Fraternities of Saint Dominic \***

15. With the intention of gaining knowledge, along with the early data of ancient tradition, and also how the successive orientations and those of today have manifested themselves, the work of study and research on these rites was done in various stages:

*First stage:*

- a broad consultation among the various “branches” of the Dominican Family<sup>35</sup>;
- gathering the responses pointing out local usages (among the entities consulted)<sup>36</sup>;
- compilation and analysis of this documentation at the various sessions of the Liturgical Commission of the Order.

*Second stage:*

- careful historical, theological and liturgical research by Father V. Romano;
- subsequent meetings of the Commission to draw up the individual “projects.”

For each section the Liturgical Commission benefited from the differentiated contributions of its members and the valuable help given by our sisters Maria Grazia Bianco and Elena Malaspina of the Missionaries of the Schools. Both are specialists in Latin studies and in Dominican spirituality (as well as being competent for the “schemas” relating to the Nuns and Sisters), and also good use was made of the qualified collaboration of a large number of experts consulted on individual matters.

*Third stage:*

- Over 50 copies (April 30, 1994) were sent out to various “experts” and representatives of all the categories of the Dominican Family worldwide<sup>37</sup>; the Curia of the Generalate, Friars, Nuns, Sisters, Leaders of Fraternities of Saint Dominic: a truly select “championship team” completely covering the linguistic areas represented in the Order<sup>38</sup>.

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. IDI, April 1984.

<sup>36</sup> The responses were numerous: 11 Provinces, 6 Vice-Provinces, 13 Monasteries, 8 Congregations of Sisters, 1 Secular Institute: all contained interesting indications and even “schemas” or formularies used locally *on an experimental basis* in the various communities (cf. Archives of the Curia of the Generalate, Liturgy section).

<sup>37</sup> **The “list of experts”** to be consulted for the examination of the “draft” was carefully prepared by Father D. DYE, upon the request of the Chairman of the Commission, Father V. ROMANO who, because of demands of the ministry was unable to personally see to the sending out of the “dossiers” (cf. Archives of the Curia of the Generalate, Liturgy section: « *Liste d’Experts pour l’examen du Projet d’Ordo Professionis* », Paris 19 avril 1994).

<sup>38</sup> The sending out of the copious material [done on April 30, 1994, with a deadline of 4 months for sending in responses] required a significant task of preparation, photocopying and the sending out of the numerous copies carried by the Professor E. Malaspina, who was helped in this task by Sr. M. H. Kennedy. Because of this difficult situation in the execution of the work, it happened that precisely some of the “closest” experts were inadvertently *skipped*, precisely with the idea of delivering them the dossier “by hand,” (as is customarily done between the Angelicum and Santa Sabina). After the embarrassing discovery was made some time later, I offered my deep apologies to the interested parties, expressing to them my sincere regret.

*Fourth stage:*

- Gathering the numerous responses that came in<sup>39</sup>: over half of the 50 copies that had been sent out and individuals interviewed; a percentage that can be calculated upward, if we take into account the responses from the Sisters and the Nuns, who had already given their views at the time of the previous consultation.<sup>40</sup>

*Fifth stage:*

- Examination and sorting of the valuable material in the special session of the Liturgical Commission, which met at Santa Sabina from September 12 to 28, 1994.

- Revision of the various “formularies,” on the basis of the observations that had come in, at the completion of which the definitive elaboration of the draft was attached.

- Send back the solutions of certain points that were still posing problems<sup>41</sup>, including that of simplifying the “*Praenotanda*,” the “reduction” of which was to have been done by Fathers P. M. GY and D. DYE, starting from the text that had already been drawn up by Father V. ROMANO and in part synthesized by E. MALASPINA and Father D. DYE himself.

*Sixth and final stage:*

- The Liturgical Commission had met in Paris in the summer of 1996 to put an end to any further delays, but above all, to benefit from the qualified presence of Fathers Pierre-Marie GY and Dominique DYE, who were there and who were to have worked together.

---

<sup>39</sup> All the responses that had come in, as stipulated, by the end of the summer of 1994, were gathered (cf. Archive of the Curia of Generalate, Liturgy section) and carefully examined. While they were different in their thickness and wealth of details, they show how great is the interest and attention to the rites of welcome and consecration, even today, in the Order. We were encouraged by the large number of *agreements* to the solutions proposed, and pleasantly surprised by the *contrary reactions*.

<sup>40</sup> See above, n. 14, in the note.

<sup>41</sup> Father P. M. Gy – to whom our Liturgical Commission had sent a particular invitation for his collaboration as a specialist – in a first letter dated September 15, 1994 (in response to the consultation of April 30, 1994) and in a second response to our insistent requests, dated September 19, 1994 (cf. Archives of the Curia of the Generalate, [Liturgy section], Prot. CL/94/106 and 107), wrote as follows: “First of all, I would like express by my gratitude and high esteem for the thorough work, which is historical, theological, liturgical and canonical in its scope, which is represented by the *Ordo Professionis* Project in its current state. To the workers who have done this work, a great work of thanks! And I do not doubt that a large portion of these elements will be found in the final text of the *Ordo*, while there are other points, which are essential in my view, which must be corrected before approval by the Order and by the Apostolic See. In the second place, may I be allowed to take a special interest in this Project, because of the fact that I took part, in the framework of the *Consilium ad exequendam Constitutionem de S. Liturgia* (“*Council for implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*”), in the *Coetus* that draw up the *Ordo Professionis Religiosae* [OPR]. “ Thus, while expressing a flattering appreciation of the draft of the *Ordo Professionis* as a whole, he had manifested some perplexity on certain points, particularly concerning the “*Praenotanda*” (which should be reduced even more or, better still, put in a separate place, along with the historical annotations and critical apparatus); and also other sensitive points in the text (to be simplified more and to be accepted with various toned down expression [“it may be appropriate,” “it is recommended,” “it is greatly recommended”], without in any case making them absolutely obligatory [“I think that in no case should the additions be obligatory”] and to thus respect the golden “simplicity” that characterizes our “ancient rite.”

- In the course of the long session (which extended from July 31 to August 11), the Liturgical Commission brought its work on the *Ordo Professionis* to a conclusion, adding of “*draft text*” of the *Rituale*, which may be considered satisfactory in reference to the various demands of the different categories of the Dominican Family who are its intended receivers, while responding at the same time to the liturgical norms that have emanated from the Church.

Here is a brief and summarized presentation of this:

#### IV

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK

**16.** The new *Ritus Professionis O.P.*, which is presented here to request the necessary prior “approval” of the Supreme Moderator of the Order and subsequently the *final* :”confirmation” on the part of the Apostolic See, primarily responds to a precise prescription of the Second Vatican Council.<sup>42</sup> In turn, the overall project concerning it and the various formularies that go along with it were drawn up by the Liturgical Commission of the Order [CL]<sup>43</sup> in a prompt respond to the requests of the General Chapters that followed the Council<sup>44</sup> - in particular those of Tallaght (1971) and Madonna dell’ Arco (1974) – and by mandate of the three last Masters of the Order, Fr. Vincent de COUESNONGLE, Fr. Damian BYRNE and Timothy RADCLIFFE, who succeeded one another.

#### \* *Collaboration among experts* \*

**17.** Its completion by the Liturgical Commission of the Order, is the fruit of careful and systematic work:

- on a *philological level*: with respect to the multiple variations of texts from the liturgical and spiritual heritage that is proper to our Order;

- on a *methodological level*: concerning the adaptation of the “Ordo Professionis Religiosae” [OPR] common to all, to the particular requirements of the various “categories” of the Dominican Family;

- on *historical-critical level*: with regard to its own ancient customs, adopted by the Order from the beginning and to the legislation of the first generations of Dominicans<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy “*Sacrosanctum Concilium*” n. 80: “... *In addition there should be drawn up a rite for religious profession and the renewal of vows, which will contribute to a greater unity, sobriety and dignity; that, with the exception of particular laws, must be adopted by those who make profession or renewal of vows during Mass. It is praiseworthy that religious profession should be made during Mass.*” It should be noted that the Council itself lists among the goals that it intends to be pursued greater sobriety, as well as the explicit intention of safeguarding particular laws that are inherent to peculiar “*traditional rites.*”

<sup>43</sup> Subsequently reconfirmed for the remaining work, it is composed as follows:

Fr. VINCENZO ROMANO, O.P., Doctor of Theology, an expert in the History and Spirituality of the Order; Chairman.

Fr. DOMINIQUE DYE, O.P., a degree holder from the Institut Supérieur de Paris, already Director of “La Maison Dieu.”

MARIA-GRAZIA BIANCO, O.P, Ordinary Professor of ancient Christian literature at the Free University Maria SS. Assunta in Rome.

ELENA MALASPINA, O.P., Missionary of the Schools, associate Professor of the history of the Latin language at the Università degli Studi Roma Tre.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. nn. 1-2; ACG: Bogotá (1965), River Forest (1968), Tallaght (1971), Madonna dell’ Arco (1974) [n. 171].

<sup>45</sup> This is all dealt with, in a very systematic way, in the final text of the “*Introductio generalis.*”

18. For each sector of the work, the Liturgical Commission benefited from the differentiated contributions of all its members as well as those of various “experts”<sup>46</sup>: qualified collaborators, both men and women, specialists in various disciplines (as well as being competent on the ceremonies relating to the Nuns and the Sisters). In addition, use was made of the qualified collaboration of a conspicuous number of “experts”<sup>47</sup>, consulted in various linguistic areas of the world, as was explained above, on all the materials and, in some cases, on its individual parts.

**\* Critical Revision \***

19. For the development of the present work, besides the *ancient* “sources,” critically more accredited<sup>48</sup>, occasional recourse was also had to the more *recent* texts, both to the new *Constitutions* – both those of the Friars and those of the Nuns<sup>49</sup> – and also, as has been said, of the new *Rules* of the Fraternities [of priests or of laypeople] of Saint Dominic; and account was taken of the “results” of the broad *consultation* carried out among the various categories of the Dominican Family<sup>50</sup>.

However, before inserting into the new *Ordo Professionis* the various elements of the peculiar “treasury” of our ancient tradition and all the other data gathered, a *critical review* of these elements was carried out, to verify their correspondence with the general principles:

of the liturgical renewal (Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*);

of religious life (Constitution *Lumen Gentium* and the Decree *Perfectae Caritatis*);

of relations with the contemporary world (Constitution *Gaudium et spes*);

of subsequent doctrinal developments on the consecrated life (post-conciliar documents).

Also the special “*norms and directives*” emanating from the Apostolic See for this specific sector<sup>51</sup>.

20. Concerning the “*Praenotanda*,” we are all in agreement on the application of the following criteria:

a) to attribute to them the title of “*Introductio Generalis*”;

b) to achieve in the text the *maximum sobriety* (within the limits allowed by the numerous alternatives that are obligatorily provided in the “basic text” of OPR), with few footnotes (except those that are *essential*), consigning all the historical annotations and critical apparatus, still present in the original draft, to a more extensive *independent study*<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Because it is so long, I will refrain from providing the long “list of experts” consulted on April 30, 1994 (cf. above n. 15), prepared at my request by Father D. Dye, O.P. and stored in the Archives of the Curia of the Generalate, “Liturgy” section [*Liste d’Experts pour l’examen du Projet d’Ordo Professionis*, Paris, April 19, 1994].

<sup>47</sup> Among these was particularly Father Pierre-Marie Gy, O.P., Ordinary Professor at the «Institut Catholique» of Paris, a member of the «Centre National de Pastorale Liturgique» and already a Consultor of the SCSCD.

<sup>48</sup> Essentially: a) the *Constitutiones antiquae* (going back to 1216 and codified in 1221); b) the steps relating to the rites in question, presented in the “Prototype” of the *Ecclesiasticum Officium* of the Order [cf. AGOP XIV L1, f 50r AB]; c) the *Directorium* of the Code of Rodez (sec. XIII), a privileged witness to our original tradition; d) the *Processionarium O.P.*; e) the *Caerimoniale* of the Order [Jandel] (1869).

<sup>49</sup> See below, no. 22, note 55.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, n. 15.

<sup>51</sup> I am referring to the “provisions” contained: a) in the *Ordo Professionis Religiosae* [OPR] of February 2, 1975<sup>2</sup>, pp. 1-128; b) in the *Lettera ai Presidenti delle Commissioni liturgiche nazionali e ai Superiori degli Ordini religiosi* (“*Letter to the Chairpersons of national liturgical Commissions and to the Superiors of religious Orders*”) of July 15, 1970 and to the *Indicazioni* in the appendix concerning the translations of OPR into modern languages, published in French on the same date in “*Notitiae*” 53, 6, 1970, pp. 317-322; cf. EDIL, 1, pp. 697-701.

<sup>52</sup> This decision to publish separately, in an independent critical study, the elements of scientific erudition, was made in consideration of the peculiar nature of liturgical Books, which do not allow for the presence of commentary notes within them. Therefore, given the value of these elements for their historical-critical and theological and spiritual character, it seemed appropriate to still publish them, but separately, for the common benefit. Thus I myself will continue to occupy myself with them, by freely reworking my text (previously reduced significantly in an attempt to include it in the “*Praenotanda*”), for publish it in Italian, possibility within a short time of the *typical* edition of the Ritual, which is currently in the process of being printed.

c) always to cite in the first place the general laws of the Church on religious life, in order to give value and specificity to our particular provisions, placed afterwards to be approved and recognized by the Apostolic See.

**\* Structure and divisions of the work \***

**21.** In analogy to the basic text, represented by OPR, concerning the structure and divisions of the entirety of this *Ritual of welcome and of profession* of our Order, it was agreed to do the following:

a) to present in a *unitary manner* all of the rites that comprise the new *Ordo Professionis* of our Dominican Family under the broader and more meaningful perspective of “Gospel life” – an expression that has thus become the “*starting point*” of the Introduction itself: from the moment that the Rite of Profession does not refer only to the members of “consecrated life,” but also to the “Laity” and other “secular” members of the Dominican Family (like priests and deacons) who are not *religious*, while these are also provided with “rites of profession of the gospel life”;

b) to regroup, for the same reason, into a single treatment, the examination of the principle theoretical and structural problems, concerning the various formularies of welcome and profession proper to the various “categories” of the Dominican Family, while also taking into account of the indications of the General Chapters<sup>53</sup>, so that, in these rites of welcome and profession, there will be fundamental elements common to all the various categories of the Order;

c) to distinguish, within the single treatment, four sections dedicated to the various “branches” or categories of the Dominican Family:

a) *Pars I*: for the Friars;

b) *Pars II*: for the Nuns;

c) *Pars III*: for the Sisters and other secular Institutes;

d) *Pars IV*: For the Laypeople and other “*secular*” members of the Fraternities of Saint Dominic;

all include within them:

\* the rite of welcome (with or without “vestition”);

\* the rite of “simple” or temporary Profession;

\* the rite of “solemn” or perpetual Profession,

with the addition, in the appendix, of other texts – taken from the OPR – for an optional celebration of the Eucharist, on the 25<sup>th</sup> or the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of profession.

d) to provide, nonetheless, for the Latin typical edition, a *single volume* of the new “*Ordo Professionis*” for the entire Dominican Family, although subsequently, naturally, in creating *translations and adaptations* in the various current languages, each linguistic group will publish an *independent edition* of the section concerning it, with the prior approval of the competent Authority.

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf. General Chapter of Tallaght (1971), Atti, n. 17.

**\* Differentiated special attention \***

22. Special attention was given to the analysis of “Pars I,” which corresponds to the Ritual for the Friars, in consideration of the fact that the other parts, from a historical standpoint and that of liturgical methodology, all derive from it – as from a “prototype” – although with the variations and additions that are proper to each individual category.<sup>54</sup>

Still, it should be noted in this regard that, at their explicit request, the formulary for the Nuns, unlike that for the other categories, was worded in the *singular*.

23. Given, then, the new vision of the *vocation and mission* of the Laity in the Church, special care was devoted to the Rites of “welcome” and “aggregation” or “profession” of Dominican *Laity* and of the other *secular* members (priests, deacons, etc.) of the Fraternities of Saint Dominic, with special attention to the indications contained in their respective *Rules*<sup>55</sup>, rewritten on the basis of the new ecclesiology of Vatican II.

24. Furthermore, for the purpose of conferring on them a clear *ecclesial connotation*, for these formularies intended for the “lay” and “secular” members of the Dominican Family, care was taken to show a certain *affinity* with those of the “consecrated” members of the three other branches of that same Family, so that the *welcome and aggregation* of these members to the Order will be characterized by the celebration of a true *sacred rite* [as is explicitly required for the members who are priests]<sup>56</sup>, and not of simple rites of “enrolment,” that are strongly laicized, i.e. stripped of any congruent ecclesial character. This dimension, *liturgically* qualified, has been retained as all the more indispensable in order to illustrate the *baptismal character* of this “form of gospel life” and to underscore *the union of the “Dominican Laity”* and the other “*secular members*” with their respective Dominican Fraternities and their belonging to the Order of Saint Dominic.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> See above, n. 14.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *Regula Fraternalium Laicalium S. Dominici*, ed. D. BYRNE, ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 83-88. On a parallel track, constant recourse was had to the *primitive* text of the *Regula Fratrum et Sororum de Poenitentia Beati Dominici, Fundatoris et Patris Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum* (“*Rule of the Brothers and Sisters of Penance of Blessed Dominic, Founder and Father of the Order of Friars Preacher*”), ed. G. G. MEERSSEMAN, in *Dossier de l’Ordre de la Pénitence au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (“*Spicilegium Friburgense*,” 7), Fribourg 1961, pp. 144-156. Concomitantly due reference was made to the *Regula Fraternalium Sacerdotalium S. Dominici*, ed. D. BYRNE, ASOP 95, 1987, pp. 199-206, the recent one (December 3, 1996) was *definitively* approved by the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life (Prot. n. D. 37-1/96). In conformity with the pattern sanctioned by the new Rules, these rites are led alternatively by the *lay leader* and the *religious Assistant*.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. RFS, n. 12, § 1.

<sup>57</sup> It was considered to be helpful to also insert into them some historical references that are specific in character, even in view of the fact that they will presumably be disseminated separate from the others and thereby separated from the context of the other historical premises and critical annotations presented in the Ritual as a whole.

**\* Textual Variations \***

25. To carry out its own work, the Liturgical Commission made use of the faculty provided for by the OPR<sup>58</sup> and specified in greater detail in the “supplementary Indications”<sup>59</sup> in the annex and dealing with the various *particular rites* of welcome and profession, in order to make them suitable for expressing “the nature and spirit of our Order, in line with the particular charism of Saint Dominic and the Order’s specific vocation and mission.”

26. Thus there are some “variations” with respect to the basic text of OPR. I am not going to repeat what was summarily but clearly explained in the *Introduzione generale* about the “rites that accompany the various stages of Dominic life.” It will be easy to repeat them, since we followed the criterion of pointing out the reference to the OPR alongside the various texts, according to the corresponding number, or else to cite the other references in footnotes. For some secondary ceremonies in the rites of welcome and temporary profession, we have sometimes omitted giving the reference of the OPR, by simply saying that we do the same thing but in a different way.

I – As for the *Rites of welcome and of first profession*, we would point out:

The OPR provides, both for religious men and for religious women<sup>60</sup>, simply the “rite of welcome” *without the bestowing of the habit*, which is ordinarily given at the time of first Profession, and is to be put on without any particular rite<sup>61</sup>.

In the *Professionis Ritus Ordinis Praedicatorum* (PROP), in contrast, with respect to the men (the Friars and Members of the Fraternities of Saint Dominic) and the Nuns, the bestowing of the habit to the candidates normally takes place “*before* the beginning of the novitiate”; and when it is given “*in the course* of the novitiate,” as is presently allowed by the new Constitutions<sup>62</sup> – or even only on the day of first profession – as is provided for the Nuns<sup>63</sup> – this rite is to be adapted in the manner that is indicated in the proper place.

The OPR, for religious women, provides [II, nn. 15-17] that the habit [without the veil] is to be blessed *separately* [n. 16] and then bestowed on them in the presence of the community, but in private, on *the eve* of first profession.

In our Ritual, in contrast, even for the Nuns and for the Sisters:

a) the habit is ordinarily bestowed at the *beginning* of the Novitiate (because it is primarily a sign of “welcome” into Order).

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *Ordo Professionis Religiosae*, ed. cit., Praen. IV, nn. 12-14.

<sup>59</sup> I am referring to the provisions contained in the *Lettera ai Presidenti delle Commissioni liturgiche nazionali e ai Superiori degli Ordini religiosi* (“*Letters to the Chairpersons of National Liturgical Commissions and to Superiors of Religious Orders*”) [Prot. n. 2354, dated July 15, 1970] and to the “*Indicazioni*” in the annex concerning the translations of OPR into modern languages, published in French on that same date [“*Indications pour l’adaptation de l’Ordo Professionis Religiosae*”] in “*Notitiae*” 53, 6, 1970, pp. 317-322 [EDIL, 1, pp. 697-701; EV, 3, nn. 2674-2684, pp. 1596-1603].

<sup>60</sup> Cf. OPR, Pars I and II, chap. I, nn. 1-13.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. OPR, I, 31.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. LCO, n. 176; CM, n. 140, § 1.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. CM, n. 140, § 2.

b) as for the veil of “professed women,” it is provided [PROP, II, nn. 43-44; III, 45-46] that it be given during the rite, *after* profession has been made, at the act of the blessing of the habit with its own formula, however still with the option, for the Sisters [III, nn. 32-33] of bestowing the habit on the eve of Profession (as is provided in the OPR), in the event a Congregation is involved that has a habit for the “professed members” that is different from that of the novices and there is a preference for the habit to be put on before the celebration.

The OPR proposes a single rite of profession for religious women, without any distinction between Nuns and Sisters, along with a separate “Ritus promissionis” (“Rite of Promise”) for Secular Institutes.

In our Ritual, on the other hand (as was brought out earlier), there is a separate section devote to the Nuns [Section II] and another for the Institutes of consecrated life [Section III] that have a specific link with the Order<sup>64</sup>.

**N. B.** The fact that all these various “branches” of the Dominic Family were put together was dictated by practical reasons, namely for the purpose of offering the various Congregations and Institutes (for which the Order *does not legislate*, but which *share* its charism and mission), a set of “*texts to be adapted*” according to their own nature, culture and language, for the purpose of promoting the unity of the liturgy of the entire Order as a whole,” as was expressly requested, after the Vatican Council, by the General Chapters<sup>65</sup>. Thus, each Institute, with respect to such translations and particular adaptations, must in turn request their due approbation and confirmation by the competent authorities. However, in the sections concerning the Friars, the Nuns and the Laity, the respective “*Rules*” are cited, concerning which the Order does legislate, in the section concerning the Sisters and the related Institutes (for which the Order does not legislate), the references are normally made only to the Constitutions of the Order, in whose spirit they share.

**II** – In the matter of the *rite of perpetual profession*, it should be pointed out that the Liturgical Commission, after carefully sifting through the problem and consulting noted authorities in the area of Liturgy and Divine Worship<sup>66</sup>, came to the determination that it should advance the proposal relating to an *optional* maintaining of some elements of the OPR that are provided as obligatory. These include, as we will note in greater detail later on, the “*Litany of the Saints*” and the “*Solemn prayers of blessing or “consecration” of those professed,*” for which our Liturgical Commission hopes that the Order will be granted an optional use, while preserving the optional use of the respective texts, placed for that purpose in the Appendix<sup>67</sup>. On the other hand, it is to be borne in mind that, in the meantime, the text of the OPR has already come into use among various entities of the Dominican Family and, therefore, still constitutes the basic text to which all have the right of access.

---

<sup>64</sup> Cf. PROP, III, c. 1 [initial asterisk], p. 78 (Latin text).

<sup>65</sup> See the General Chapter of Madonna dell' Arco (1974), n. 171; and earlier the General Chapter of Allaght (1971), n. 172. Cf. above, notes 29 and 30.

<sup>66</sup> See n. 31, note 47.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Professionis Ritus Ordinis Praedicatorum [PROP], Appendix IV, nn. 71-74.

## V

### PROBLEMS INHERENT TO THE APPROVAL OR CONFIRMATION OF THE WORK BY THE APOSTOLIC SEE

27. At the act of the presentation of the finished work to the Master of the Order for his *approval* as “Supreme Moderator of the Order,” which, as is known, is stipulated *before* submitting the text to the Congregation for Divine Worship<sup>68</sup> to obtain the necessary “approval and *confirmation*” for it, the Liturgical Commission considers it to be extremely important to bring to his attention and that of his Council some delicate aspects, for the purpose of preventing eventual difficulties both on the part of the Order itself and the Apostolic See, and thus to avert possible problems.

#### \* *Problematic Data* \*

28. In reality, there is some rather problematic data to be considered. On the one hand, it should be emphasized that, despite our own preference, in obedience to the norms sanctioned by the Apostolic See<sup>69</sup>, we might have to “introduce” into the new formularies some elements that are at odds with the *traditional simplicity* of our ancient rites<sup>70</sup> and even others that are in clear opposition to our *doctrinal* tradition concerning the “*consecratory character of profession.*” On the other hand, there are some of special *requests for certain things to be optional*, which are *cumbersome* – to put it that way – in regards to such elements, that they might constitute an obstacle to the granting of their approval or confirmation. Note well, this is so much not on account of excessive rigor on the part of the Congregation, as instead the lack of a *convincing presentation* on our part of the appropriateness and “legitimacy” of those requests. In both cases, the maximum diligence is being employed, so as not to run the risk of “torching” an *Ordo Professionis* that is so noteworthy, the fruit of so much labor and difficult sacrifices, as the one the Order has attained and is now on the point of presenting to obtain its approbation.

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. SCSDC, “De Calendariis particularibus atque Missarum et Officiorum Propriis reconoscendis” (“On recognizing particular Calendars and Propers of Masses and Offices”), *Notitiae* XIII, pp. 557-558 and already *Ivi* X, 1974, pp. 87-88. See V. ROMANO, “Indicationes quaedam pro adaptatione Proprii liturgici O.P. a Provinciis perficienda” (“Certain indications for carrying out the adaptation of the liturgical Proper of the Order of Preachers”), ASOP 44, 1979, pp. 13-30 [p. 9].

<sup>69</sup> I am referring to the directives of the SCCD: a) in the *Ordo Professionis Religiosae*, dated February 2, 1970 (ed. Typis pol. vat. 1975, pp. 1-128; cf. EDIL, I, pp. 653-659); b) in the *Lettera ai Presidenti delle Commissioni liturgiche nazionali e ai Superiori degli Ordini religiosi* (“Letter to the Chairpersons of national liturgical Commissions and to the Superiors of religious Orders”) of July 15, 1970, concerning the translation of the text into modern languages; c) in the annexed *Indicazioni*, published in French on that same date, in *Notitiae* 53, 1970, 6, pp. 317-322; cf. EDIL I, pp. 697-701.

<sup>70</sup> The numerous complaints that came to us from everywhere, as a result of the consultation carried out throughout the Order (cf. IDI, April 1984), concerning such *alterations* of the original *golden simplicity* of our primitive rite might be defined as a “chorus” of protests. Moreover, on that occasion, we had been the first to take great care to point out (cf. accompanying letter of March 19, 1994: Prot pers. CL/94/92; AGOP, Liturgy section) the incongruence of “several elements that were *extraneous* to our liturgical tradition, so to speak, and present in the new formularies, which in certain cases (as, for example the *Litany of the Saints* and the *Great Blessings*, in the rite of perpetual Profession) do not satisfy me either [...] and do not fit in well with the noble simplicity of our rite, but that *we were forced to accept* in dutiful obedience to the dispositions of the SCCD.”

29. The problem appears to be rather complex. Already from the *formal* standpoint, the *Ordo Professionis*, with respect to the ancient “*capitular rite*,” is presented not only as *liturgically “reclassified”* – in other words as a “*liturgical rite*” in the modern sense (i.e. modulated in connection with the Eucharistic Celebration, the Liturgy of the Hours or the Liturgy of the Word) – but also, as already cited, *structurally “modified”* by force of the *prescriptions* of OPR and the other *norms* absolutely sanctioned. In summary, it is extensively *expanded* by various elements that are “alien” to our tradition (like the *Litany of the Saints* and the so-called *consecratory Prayers* in the rites for perpetual profession, etc.). This is something that, on the one hand, significantly *modifies* it (and in a certain way “alters” it), both in its structure and with regards to *our* conception of profession itself under the *doctrinal profile*, with respect to its *consecratory* character. Within our tradition, this character is to be attributed to the very act of religious Profession, as we shall see in Saint Thomas (who, until it is proven to the contrary, still has right of citizenship in the Church!); and, furthermore, it is placed in “striking contrast” with the exemplary *sobriety and simplicity* of certain of our ancient conventual usages (which were experienced in antiquity as true and proper “liturgical rites,” even though they were carried out *in chapter*)<sup>71</sup>.

---

<sup>71</sup> The following attest to this: a) the presence of the rites in question in the *Ecclesiasticum Officium* of the Order – which has liturgical value – approved in the General Chapters of 1254, 1255, 1256 and officially confirmed by Pope Clement IV (with the Bull *Consurgit in nobis* of July 7, 1267) and handed down to us in the so-called “Prototype” of Master Humbert of Romans [cf. AGOP LIX, L1, f. 50r AB]; b) the “*Directorium*” of the Codex of Rodez (section XIII), a privileged witness to our earliest tradition. In this respect, Father D. DYE notes: “The relationship between “liturgy” and “life customs” in the Middle Ages was closer than it is nowadays” (in *Le Rite dominicain à la suite de la Réforme liturgique de Vatican II* [“*The Dominican Rite following the liturgical reform of Vatican II*”], ASOP vol. 43, 1977, p. 200). Cf. P. M. GY, *Typologie et ecclésiologie des livres liturgiques médiévaux* (“*Typology and ecclesiology in medieval liturgical books*”), LMD 121, 1975, pp. 17-18; A. DUVAL, “La liturgie dans la fonction de l’Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs”, (“The Liturgy in the functioning of the Order of Friars Preachers”), *Journées d’étude de Dacie*, Paris (“*Provincialia*” 7), 1966, pp. 36-38; A. G. FUENTE, “Liturgia y vida dominicana” (“Liturgy and Dominican Life”), *Teología espiritual* [Valencia] 47, 1972, pp. 165-203.

30. There is the need to reflect clearly before proceeding to the resolution to be made, and to study together the best way to present to the Congregation for Divine Worship our *peculiar* requests. In the face of such a serious problem, the Liturgical Commission believes that it is important to point out, even in the submission document that we, despite everything, fully support this reform, but we are respectfully asking (as we have already done and obtained for the other elements of our Proper)<sup>72</sup>, so that we might be able to also follow our ancient tradition and that, therefore (despite certain provisions of the *Norms* sanctioned for “*particular Rituals*”), our “Rite of profession,” renewed according to the directives of the Council, would be approved in its qualification as an “*ancient Rite*,” by virtue of the exception for such cases recognized in these *Norms* themselves<sup>73</sup> and already provided for by Vatican II<sup>74</sup>.

**\* *The “juridical status” of our proper Rite* \***

31. The underlying problem, then, relates to the “juridical status” of the liturgical Books of our Order and their relationship to the proper traditional Rite<sup>75</sup>. In other words, we must proceed in such a way that the Congregation for Divine Worship will recognize the “legitimacy” of our *ancient* Rite of Profession, in its *proper characteristics*. Therefore, we must ask ourselves together what the best way is to express this reality. For us on the Liturgical Commission, it seemed opportune to distinguish between what was in the Ritual itself from what should be pointed out separately (already in the course of the previous “negotiations” with the Congregation itself) and then be auspiciously taken up in its *Decree of Confirmation*.

---

<sup>72</sup> SCSCD, Prot. CD 671/16, of July 25, 1977; ASOP 85, 1977, p. 133; LHOP, pp. V-VI; MLOP, pp. V-VI.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Documentum II [PROT. N. 2354/70] of July 15, 1970: “*Notitiae*” 53, 6, 1970, pp. 318-319 [EV, 3, n. 2671, p. 1594-].

<sup>74</sup> Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 80.

<sup>75</sup> See above, n. 3 and the related documentation cited in the notes. Cf. D. DYE, *Le statut juridique des livres liturgiques* (de l’Ordre) in *Le Rit dominicain à la suite de la Réforme liturgique de Vatican II*, ASOP, 43, 1977, pp. 193-275 [pp. 196-197].

32. In the meantime, precisely with regard to the “juridical status” of our *Proper* (of which the “Rite of Profession” is a part), an important presentation of historical data was made in the course of the last session of our work in Paris by Father P. M. GY, O.P., the essential part of which was inserted in summary form in the first numbers [nn. 2-3] of the *Introductio Generalis* [with the related documentation, both on the part of the Order and of the Apostolic See]. Obviously, a fuller illustration will have to be made in the *official submission document* of the Rite to the Congregation for Divine Worship<sup>76</sup>; but prudently already before, in the course of previous “informal contacts”<sup>77</sup>, which the Liturgical Commission deems prudent to practice in order to pave the way. This is how we proceeded on the issue.

**\* Important historical surveys \***

33. As scholars are well aware<sup>78</sup>, our Order, even before Saint Raymond PEÑAFORT (1238-1240) became Master General, began to establish its own “uniform” proper *liturgical use*, in other words adapted to the needs of religious who led a life that was no longer purely canonical in its style, but at the same time apostolic<sup>79</sup>. In the middle of the thirteen century, Master HUMBERT OF ROMANS (1254-1263) brought to completion this work, which also includes the Rite of welcome and profession in the Order<sup>80</sup>. In its definitive texts – included in the “Prototype” of the *Ecclesiasticum Officium* that bears his name – it was approved, as was the norm, from three requests of General Chapters [of 1254, 1255 and 1256]<sup>81</sup>, and then, on the request of the Master of the Order, Blessed GIOVANNI DA VERCELLI (1264-1283), it obtained the later “approval and confirmation” from Pope CLEMENT IV with the Bull *Consurgit in nobis*<sup>82</sup> of July 7, 1267. Thus the *Rite of Profession of the Preachers*, preserved in its definitive form up to our times, is part of our “prototypical”<sup>83</sup> liturgy, approved by the Apostolic See, and is also reliably connected with the “primitive Constitution” of Saint Dominic and with the spiritual and apostolic nature of the Order he founded. This is a most noteworthy fact, to which reference must always be made. Likewise it is fitting to highlight the great ritual sobriety that characterizes it.

---

<sup>76</sup> In a point-by-point response to this acknowledged requirement, a more complete exposition of data was inserted by the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission, Father V. ROMANO, in the *Letter of presentation* of the renewed Rital addressed to the Pro-Prefect of the CCDDS, Mons. JORGE ARTURO MEDINE ESTEVEZ [Prot. 66/97/879] dated June 12, 1997. From that letter, the historical surveys are reproduced below in their synthetic but complete wording.

<sup>77</sup> Also in this direction, a concise presentation of «data» regarding the “juridical status” of our Proper (which are reused here) was made by the same Chairman of the Liturgical Commission, first by way of a Letter addressed to the Head of the Office of the CCDS, Father MARIO LESSI ARIOSTO, S.J. [Prot. pers. CL/97/92] dated June 3, 1997], and then in the planned “informal conversation,” held with him shortly afterward, on the ‘variations to the new text of the *Rite of Profession O.P.*, in regards to the optional use of the above-cited elements (*Litany of the Saints* and solemn “prayers of blessing or consecration” of those professed”) of the OPR provided as obligatory. With the desire of making profession “during the Eucharistic Celebration,” it was requested that we might be able to make use of that faculty, without however having to find ourselves faced with the incongruent alternative: either of tying in, within our own ancient rite, those other “heterogeneous” elements, so to speak (thus upsetting, among other things, the balance of the whole and finally by altering its doctrinal profile – as we might say -), or else of finding ourselves in the penalizing situation of having to give up the faculty of making profession during the Eucharistic Celebration.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. L. Rousseau, *De Ecclesiastico Officio Fratrum Praedicatorum secundum ordinationem Ven. Mag. Humberti de Romanis* (“On the ‘Officium Ecclesiasticum’ of the Friars Preacher according to the ordination of Venerable Master Humbert of Romans”), Rome 1927. Also see ASOP 32, 1924, fasc. 5, p. 3. The documents concerning the “juridical status” of our *Proprium* are all there. We will have to draw attention to these documents in order to derive all the legitimacy and the juridical value of our ancient *Rite of profession*.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *PROFESSIONIS RITUS O.P.*, “Introductio Generalis,” n. 2-3 and respective notes. – Cf. Humbertus, II, pp. 508.

<sup>80</sup> The “attesting manuscript” of such an important collection of the entire liturgy of the order, known by its epithet the “PROTOTYPE,” is preserved in the Archives of the Order [cf. AGOP XIV-L-1]. Concerning it, important updates can be found in the Acts of the *Colloquio scientifico* held in Rome from March 2 to March 4, 1995 (cf. ASOP 103, 1995, pp. 110-11) under the direction of Father P. M. Gy, O.P., which will be published in 2000.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. ACG, I, 1898, pp. 68, 73 and 78.

<sup>82</sup> *Bullarium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. A. Brémond, vol. I, Rome, 1729, p. 486.

<sup>83</sup> Contained in the “Prototype” of the Order preserved at Santa Sabina (cf. AGOP XIV-L-1, f. 50r AB): see above, note 79.

34. The “liturgical rite” of the Preachers, thus established and officially approved by the Apostolic See, was in use for many centuries, gradually with the necessary adaptations to the books of the Roman Liturgy, renewed after the Council of Trent and also following upon the reform of Saint Pius X, received by the Order in 1921<sup>84</sup>. Finally, with the more radical renewal of the books of the Roman liturgy, mandated by the Second Vatican Council, our Order – taking into account the introduction of the variety of liturgical languages into the Latin Church and the demands of its own pastoral and liturgical action – requested and obtained<sup>85</sup> permission to adopt the *Missale Romanum* of 1970 and the *Liturgia Horarum* of 1971, but with the addition of the *Proprium Ordinis Praedicatorum* in which, according to the expression of the Decree of approval (July 25, 1977), the “particular treasury [*peculiaris thesaurus*] of our tradition” is preserved.<sup>86</sup> Thus it is indisputable that the Order did not at all lose possession of its proper liturgical elements<sup>87</sup>, while it remained agreed that Order should examine – section by section – its own liturgical tradition and to see how it is to be placed in relationship to the renewed Roman liturgy.<sup>88</sup>

35. Therefore, gathered into the volume of our *Proper* are the rites of “welcome” and profession, which were included (within the “Prototype” at first, and then separately) in our *Processionarium*<sup>89</sup>, renewed according to the new norms. Although it is offered to all the members of the Dominican Family to be used with the *adaptations* indicated here and there, so that – taking into account local differences, and also the needs of the liturgical pastoral activity of the Order and the characteristics of the various “categories” of the Dominican Family itself – all the children of Saint Dominic, by using a single rite, may preserve, even today, that “uniformity” already

<sup>84</sup> Cf. B.M. Hespers, *Pianae reformationis Breviarii Ordinis Praedicatorum brevis expositio*, ASOP 18, 1927-1928, PP. 97- 103.

<sup>85</sup> SCCD, «*De Missali Romano et novo Calendario pro Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum*» [Decretum 2 iunii 1969, Prot. N. 98/69], ASOP 39, 1969, pp. 250-251. See A. Dirks, “*De novo Ordine Missae Relatio Consilio Generalitio extraordinario oblata*” (“*Report on the new Order of Mass presented to the Generalate Council*”), ASOP 39, 1970, pp. 572-574; Id., “*De Ritu Dominicano*,” “*Notitiae*” 8, 1972, pp. 17-18. Cf. P. M. GY, “*La Constitution “Sacrosanctum Concilium” sur la liturgie des Frères Prêcheurs*” in: Provinces Dominicaines d’Europe-Nord, *Consultation d’experts sur Vatican II et l’Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, Paris, 1966, pp. 18-20.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. ASOP 42, 1977, pp. 196-197; LHOP, p. VI; MLOP, pp. IX-XI.

<sup>87</sup> This is the definitive judgment reached by the special D’ Amato Commission (See above, n. 3) in its important work relating to the elements proper to the ancient liturgical tradition of the Order and concerning the appropriateness and the legitimacy of maintaining them – (despite the adoption of the *Roman Missal* and the *Breviary*), as we are informed by the Secretary of the Commission, Father D. Dye: “After a detailed exchange of views, the Commission admitted that number 135 of the Acts of the General Chapter of Tallaght had to be interpreted in the light of number 58 of the Acts of the General Chapter of River Forest. *It could not be asserted that the Order had lost its rights concerning the Missal or the Breviary.* Having made this clarification, the work could be envisaged with real freedom.” (D. DYE, *Le statut juridique des livres liturgique (dominicains)* in “*Le Rit dominicain à la suite de la Réforme liturgique de Vatican II*”: ASOP, 43, 1977, pp. 193-275 [on this point: pp. 196-197]. Cf. V. ROMANO, *Evoluzione dela nostra Liturgia domenicana dopo il Vaticano II* in “*Relazione al. Cap. Gen. di Oakland (1989)*,” ASOP, 97, 1989, pp. 101-130; thus [on pp. 116-124], upon the request of the Master of the order Fr. Damian Byrne, I have amply illustrated this aspect of the question in regard to the “Frères de Chémeré.”

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Intervista del Presidente della Commissione Liturgica* [D’Amato]: IDI, May 1, 1974, 74/96, § 1, p. 5.

<sup>89</sup> The *Processionarium O.P.* is one of the fourteen books that comprise the Dominican liturgy: “Most carefully edited and finished, it should be numbered among the books of the *Ecclesiasticum Officium*, although it may not belong to its substance as to all of its parts.” (cf. L. ROUSSEAU, *De Ecclesiastico Officio Fratrum Praedicatorum secundum ordinationem Ven Magistri Humberti de Romanis*, Rome, 1927, p. 66). It was printed for the first time in 1494. It should be noted, however, that the elements relating to the ancient rites proper to the Order, to vestition (*Ritus receptionis ad habitum*) and to “profession” (*Ritus professionis*), were only included in the editions subsequent to that of 1545, which means those that came to light *after the reform of the entire complex of the liturgical books of our Order*, which was carried out, as we know, at the end of that same sixteenth century. Clear witness to this is given by the following editions: GALAMINI (1610); DE MONROY (1679); CLOCHE (1707) – in which, however, there is found only the admission of nuns to receive the veil [“*De Officio ad ponendum velum monialibus*”]; RIPOLL (1737); SANVITO (1873); FRUHWIRTH (1894); CORMIER (1913); GILLET (1930); SUAREZ (1949); this final edition remained in effect until the recent renewal promulgated by the Second Vatican Council.

recommended by the Apostolic See in the ancient documents of approval, in order to promote in apostolic mobility the “love for its unity.”<sup>90</sup>

\* *The leverage point or “historical fulcrum”* \*

**36.** Things being as they are, the Liturgical Commission considers **a)** that, in one way or another, it is necessary to point out to the Congregation, as well as to Dominican readers, as a “historical fulcrum,” the well attested fact that our *Rite of profession* is closely related to the *primitive usages* of the Order, which means that – as was already underscored – it is part of the ancient “liturgical treasure”<sup>91</sup> of the Preachers, approved by Clement IV and linked to the primitive Constitutions of Saint Dominic. Moreover the Commission believes **b)** that the fact should be emphasized that *the essential of our ritual resides in the formula*, and also in the elements connected to it. Thus it must be indicated **c)** that our formula of Profession, from the very beginning (1216-1221) has made reference to the Blessed Virgin Mary and (starting from 1254)<sup>92</sup> also to Saint Dominic, and **d)** that it contains a *single vow*: that of obedience to the Master of the Order, without thereby excluding the evangelical counsels, while also contemplating *the whole set* of the other obligations of the regular and apostolic<sup>93</sup> life, comprised in the structural project of the Order. That is why the promise is made “in accordance with the Rule of Saint Augustine and the Constitutions of the Order of Friars Preachers,” as is said in that same formula.

**37.** At this point it is worthwhile to recall that in formulating the rite of Profession proper to the Order, the Liturgical Commission has simply followed the primitive tradition<sup>94</sup>, *while refraining from adopting any particular historical analysis* (such as that which tends to attribute the character of *a rite of full incorporation* into the Order to the “bestowal of the habit,” rather than properly to profession)<sup>95</sup>.

---

<sup>90</sup> Cf. CLEMENT IV, Bull *Consurgit in nobis*, to the Master and to the Friars of the Order of Preacher, of July 7, 1267 in BOP I, p. 486; cf. HUBERTUS, II, pp. 5-8.

<sup>91</sup> SCSCD, Prot. CD 671/76 of July 25, 1977; cf. ASOP 42, 1977, pp. 196-197. See LHOP, p. VI; MLOP, pp. V-VI.

<sup>92</sup> This fact is documented in the ACTS of the three General Chapters of 1254, 1255, 1256 (cf. MOPH, III, pp. 70, 74, 78).

<sup>93</sup> Indeed it must be asserted, as do the present Constitutions (LCO 189, II) that “with the single vow of obedience, we promise that we will also fulfill the other obligations inherent to the profession of the evangelical counsels” (LCO 3, II and 17, II), together with everything that is contained in our laws: thus the obedience is promised “according to the rule of Saint Augustine and the laws of the Order” (formula of Profession, LCO 199, I and 211).

<sup>94</sup> Cf. the “Constitutiones antiquae Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum” (1215-1237) [*I Const.*], ed. A. H. THOMAS, Louvain, 1965, pp. 309-369; the “Constitutiones Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum” [1239-1241] [*II Const.*], ed. R. CREYTENS, AFP 18, 1948, pp. 5-69 [in particular 29-69]: the “Directorium” of the Codex of Rodez (sec. XIII), and R. CREYTENS, *Le Directoire* [see Abbreviations], AFP 26, 1956, pp. 98-126 [in particular pp. 109-126], a privileged witness to our original tradition; cod. ms. AGOP, XIV, A 4, pp. 11-26; cf. also the books of the *Processionarium S.O.P.* [ed. SUAREZ (1949), pp. 149-156] and of the *Caeremoniale O.P.* [ed. JANDEL (1869), nn. 1790-1797, pp. 531-534].

<sup>95</sup> Historians do not fail to underscore the recourse, even of the first Dominicans, to the “manual oath” [*obedientia manualis*], as the first “commitment” [*votum, promissio*] to express (sometimes long before profession properly speaking) the “explicit intention” [*propositum*] of the postulants “to submit themselves to the full regular discipline and to renounce the world” [*se velle cuncta servare et seculo abrenuntiare*] (cf. *I Const.*, d. 1, c. 14). This fact, and also the relative frequency, during the first years, of simultaneous “professions-vestitions,” with or without a period of probation, is characteristic [*I Const.*, d. 1, c. 15]. For this reason there are some who have pushed the significance of this so far as to wonder whether, among the Dominicans, the reception of the habit itself [*receptio ad habitum*] – to which that promise was attached – should be considered the true rite of incorporation into the Order, rather than the subsequent rite of profession (cf. S. TUGWELL, *Dominican Profession in the thirteenth Century*, AFP 53, 1983, pp. 5-52). All the more since Pope Gregory IX, and then Pope Innocent IV were to end up reacting against the pressures exerted by the Order on its own postulants, since these pressures went against the institution of the novitiate. Precisely because of this, there was the prescription of one complete year of novitiate, with the bull *Non solum* of June 19, 1244, also issued by Innocent IV (cf. BOP, I, p. 144); and also there was the suppression, on the part of the Order (in the General Chapters of 1255-1257: MOPH III, pp. 75, 79, 84), of the formula of that “pre-profession” [*promissio*], to live in religious life and to renounce returning to the world [“... *de cetero in religione victurum et numquam ad seculum reversurum*”] which had been introduced into the legislation at the beginning as a precaution (cf. ACG, vol. I, p. 84),

---

even though it was practiced only voluntarily by the new recruits, before their incorporation into the Order with profession in the strict sense of the word (cf. CREYTENS, *Constitutions*, p. 39).

. Today, moreover, it would be most difficult to propose a procedure of such a kind, nor would it be in any way acceptable in the framework of the new liturgical law of the Church. Thus the “rite of bestowing the habit” to the candidates, in the new formularies, is normally provided for “before the start of the novitiate”; or may be given “in the course of it [i.e. the novitiate],” as the new Constitutions<sup>96</sup> allow today – or even only on the date of first profession – as is provided for the Nuns<sup>97</sup> – this rite must be adapted, as indicated in the proper place.

It should be noted, moreover, that in the framework of the Dominican tradition that has developed over the course of the centuries, the habit has always been a sign of “entrance” into the conventual fraternity and of “welcome into the community”<sup>98</sup>, and not of “definitive incorporation” into the Order. Furthermore, the novitiate itself, from its very origin, is by definition only a “time of probation” [*tempus probationis*]<sup>99</sup>. Note, however, that while the dimension of “consecration” was to be attributed to the habit, it was in the act of profession or consecration when, precisely, it was to become the distinctive sign<sup>100</sup> of that consecration and, therefore was blessed (at least the scapular)<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Cf. LCO, n. 176; CM, n. 140, § 1.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. CM, n. 140 § 1.

<sup>98</sup> In the ancient Constitutions (1239-1241), edited by Saint Raymond Peñafort, in reference to the novices who are accepted for vestition, we read: “Now having put aside secular clothing and having put on religious clothing, let them be received into our society in chapter” (II Const., d. I, c. 13: ed. R. CREYTENS, AFP 18, 1948, p. 38).

<sup>99</sup> The same ancient sources (cf. *ibid.*), in reference to the novitiate, define it as a «time of probation” with a notably temporal character (one year or, in the beginning, even less), at the discretion of the superior, appropriate to the experiential purpose that characterizes it: “During this time – as we read in the text of the Rodez ms (section XIII), which has been again included in the Rite – the brothers will test your conduct and you will try our your aptitude to sustain the austerities of the Order and its mission. After this year is completed, you may join yourself to the Order with profession, if it thus pleases you and the friars; otherwise, you may freely do as you want” (*Directorium*, AGOP 14, A4, pp. 11-27: XI, 8; ed. R. CREYTENS, AFP 26, 1956, pp. 98-126 [p. 118]).

<sup>100</sup> Cf. LCO, n. 51; CM, n. 59. See PC, n. 17; OPR, n. 5. Saint Thomas was to clearly explain in terms of “consecration “ the value of the very act of “solemn” Profession (*S. Th.*, II-II, 1. 88, a. 7). Moreover, the habit is also defined by him as a “signum obligations” (*S. Th.*, II-II, q. 186, a 7, 2 m), as a sign of the commitment that is contracted with the vows of religious profession. “Therefore,” he concludes, “the ‘regular habit’ is given and blessed at the act of profession [Unde habitus regularis simul datur, vel benedicatur, cum professione]” (*Ibid.*).

<sup>101</sup> This determination that the “clothes of the novices, at least the scapular, were to be blessed when they make profession” was introduced into the Order by the General Chapter of 1236 (cf. MOPH III, p. 8) by disposition of Pope Gregory IX, “to remove any ambiguity between the habit of the professed and the habit of the novices” (Cf. GREGORY IX, bull *Non solum in favorem*” to the Master and to the Friars of the Order of Preachers, dated July 11, 1236, in BOP I, p. 90).

## VI

### TOWARD OVERCOMING SOME PROBLEMATIC FACTORS

38. In approaching the overcoming of the problematic factors inherent to the new text of the Rite of Profession O.P., we will have to direct our attention to the “optional variations” which the Liturgical Commission considered necessary to add and to specify, concerning those other elements, the optional use that it intends to obtain, pointing out the underlying reasons and, finally, to indicate the “iter” (“route”) for the approval of the whole.

#### \* *The optional variations* \*

39. I am not going to repeat what was summarily explained in the *General Introduction* of the work, concerning the *rites that accompany the various stages of Dominican life*. It will be enough to get a general overview.

40. Concerning some ceremonies of the *rites of welcome* and those of *temporary profession*, which are different from our ancient rite, in order to avoid possible conflicts, we have omitted making reference to the ORP, by simply saying that “we do the same thing, but in a different way.”

41. On the other hand, in the parts concerning the *Rite of solemn Profession*, special attention must be devoted to the *Litany of the Saints* and the *Consecratory Prayers* over the newly professed. These elements, in fact, are prescribed in an obligatory manner by the Norms concerning adaptations of the rite, while, in our shared opinion, they should not be an “obligatory” part of our rite:

a) the *Litany of the Saints*: essentially on account of their “extraneous” nature with respect to our rite (it seems to have come in to replace some medieval “litany-like prayers” that were much simpler and of a different kind);

b) the “*solemn Prayers of blessing or ‘consecration’ of those professed*”: on account of the fact that the Liturgical Commission considers that the *consecratory character* should be attributed to the “*very act of the solemn vow*” of the Profession, apart from any other “ritual formulas” of blessing or consecration, in keeping with the theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas<sup>102</sup>. On this point, having reflected a great deal, the Liturgical Commission – at the conclusion of its work – placed Father P. M. Gy in charge of drawing up a summary study “on the consecratory character of the very act of the solemn vow in the theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas,” which he promptly drew up and forwarded on November 18, 1996.<sup>103</sup>

42. With this as a backdrop, the Liturgical Commission considers it to be important to point out that it fully supports the recent reform of these rites, however it respectfully requests that our ancient tradition also be taken into account. Therefore, in the formularies we have prepared, the matter has been dealt with as follows:

A) As for the “*Supplicatio pro fratribus professuris*” (“*Supplication for the brothers who are about make profession*”) [OPR, I, nn. 60-63] or the Litany of the Saints:

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. S. Th., II-II, q. 88, aa 7 and 9.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. P. M. Gy, « *Sur le caractère consécratoire de l'acte même du vœu solennel dans la théologie de S. Thomas d'Aquin* » (“*On the consecratory character of the very act of the solemn vow in the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*”), in AGOP, sec. Liturgy, “corrisp. esperti” [1996]. A copy of this was attached to the report to the Master of the Order and then also to the document of the presentation of the “dossier” to the Congregation. The text can be found in this same issue of AOP, 1998, immediately after the present article.

After the foregoing monition of the celebrant [PROP, n. 69], provided for at that moment, two possibilities are indicated:

- 1) either to merely “pray in silence” [*omnes in silentio orant*];
- 2) or, as an alternative, to make “free use” of the Litany of the Saints [*vel Litaniae habentur*] with the reference to the text of the litany placed for that purpose in the Appendix<sup>104</sup>.

B) For the “*Solemnis benedictionis seu consecrationis oratio*” [OPR, I, n. 67], in other words the great *Prayers of blessing or consecration* of the men or women who have just been professed:

We asked whether it might be possible to also consider these formulas of prayers as optional (placed in the OPR as an *addition* to the formula of profession), since the basic conciliar text (LG, 45), as well as that of the OPR *do not contain any reference to them*:

- a) either to make the Pauline allusion in Ephesians 1:3 [*benedictio spiritualis*] into an argument in the strict sense;
- b) or to take as its basis the ancient Roman prayer of the “consecratio virginum” and the tradition of the “*benedictio monachorum*,” which, in the Latin Church up until Vatican II, was specifically monastic.

**43.** This particular optional alternative was carefully weighed, especially in consideration of the fact – in itself very significant – that in our ancient Dominican tradition, the *consecratory character* is attributed directly to the very act of the solemn vow of profession, as well as to the use of other ritual formulas of blessing or consecration. This is in conformity with the theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas<sup>105</sup>, who affirms, in rather strong theological terms, that “*the solemn vow implies in and of itself a certain spiritual consecration, or a blessing, of which God is the cause, although man functions as the minister.*”<sup>106</sup> And also: “... *The solemnity (or ‘solemnization’) of the vow consists – as already been said (a. 7) – in a certain spiritual blessing and consecration.*”<sup>107</sup>

**44.** In anticipation that the *optional use* of these prayers (with the reference to the respective texts in the Appendix) will be granted, in the new Rite of Profession O.P., a monition<sup>108</sup> is inserted to clearly indicate the *consecratory character of the very act of perpetual Profession*, for which the Order has preserved the ancient expression “solemn Profession.”

---

<sup>104</sup> Cf. PROP, Appendix IV, nn. 71-74. The preference for an *optional use* of these formulas was expressed almost unanimously by the various categories of the Dominican Family. This was motivated by the fact that they are, so to speak, *extraneous* to the sober nature of our ancient rite, which contemplated only very simple “litany prayers,” of a medieval type (much simpler and of various kinds).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. S. Th., II-II, q. 88, aa. 7 and 8. See II-II, 184, a. 3 and parallel locations.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. S. Th., II-II, q. 88, a. 7, 1 m: “*Solemnitas (voti) ad Deum pertinet in quantum habet aliquam spiritualem consecrationem seu benedictionem, cuius Deus est auctor, esti homo sit minister.*”

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, a. 9: “*Solemnitas voti in quadam spiritali benedictione et consecratione consistit, ut dictum est [a. 7], quae fit per ministerium Ecclesiae*” – Observe in this regard what Father Pierre-Marie GY says in his brief study cited above: “It remains that the view of religious profession as a reality that is not only canonical, or only a consecration of oneself to God, but being in and of itself a spiritual blessing and a consecration by God, *represents an authentic value that deserves to be respected.*”

<sup>108</sup> PROP, n. 73 proposes: “Then, unless the solemn blessing is to be given, the Prior admonishes the newly professed friars in these or similar words: “*Beloved brothers, through this solemn profession, you have given yourself over to God and His will: therefore God through the ministry of the Church has consecrated you to Himself.*”

45. After various discussion and careful considerations, the Liturgical Commission reached the determination to suggest to the Master of the Order the opportunity of intervening in the manner deemed most suitable, for the purpose of obtaining “the optional use” [*ad libitum*], in other words, the “non-obligatory” use of these elements by the members of the Order. This is all the more appropriate since those same norms acknowledge the possibility of applying “eventual changes,” which are to be pointed out and justified in the report of the presentation of the text.<sup>109</sup> Concerning such changes, in the course of informal conversations, the Congregation has expressed its prompt willingness to take into consideration any clear *proposals*, presented on our part.

\* *“Iter” (route) for the approval of the work* \*

46. As for the “iter” (route) to be followed for the approval of the present Ritual, in the judgment of the Liturgical Commission, the absolute discretion of the Master of the Order is evoked and underscored, since it involves a transaction (as has already been pointed out earlier) *requested of him personally* by the General Chapters. This, in the juridical practice of our constitutional law, corresponds precisely to a *procedure that evidences a great autonomy on the part of the Master of the Order* in applying and carrying out certain decisions of the General Chapters. Having assumed this and borne it in mind, the Liturgical Commission still expressed its unanimous opinion in considering that – since the Ritual is an asset that concerns the Order as a whole – the dossier that deals with it should therefore be “presented” to the Generalate Council, not, however, for a true “examination of merit,” but rather to make it known to the members of the Council, so that they can reinforce the view of the Master of Order in a consultative manner concerning the approval that *he* would have to give to it.<sup>110</sup>

47. In view of this, as the chairman of the Liturgical Commission, I took care to confirm my personal availability – along with that of Father Pierre-Marie GY, who took such a major part in the definition of the work – to take part in any such meeting of the Generalate Council [if it were to see fit to invite us], for purpose of being able to respond together to the queries that would be made of us and to provide all the opportune clarifications concerning the work that has been done and about anything else that might prove helpful in order to effectively prepare the “route” to be followed, in order to obtain the final *approval or confirmation* on the part of the Apostolic See.

---

<sup>109</sup> SCCD, OPR “Documentum III”; “It is necessary for each Institute to submit its work [...] *with a report giving the reasons for any eventual adaptations and changes.*”: *Indications pour l’adaptation de l’Ordo Professionis Religiosae*, [July 15, 1970], “Notitiae,” 53, N. 6 (1970), p. 322; EV, 3, n. 2684, e).

<sup>110</sup> I had already taken care to give the Master of the Order direct communication of this [Prot. pers. CG/96/15: Letter of October 24, 1996], while awaiting an invitation from him to comply with this first necessary fulfillment of *his* “approval,” before proceeding to the final step of the “approval or confirmation” on the part of the Congregation for Divine Worship.

48. At this point the approval of the Master of the Order<sup>111</sup> unexpectedly arrived. Then, after we set aside the procedures that we had agreed to follow at the close of our work, in order to facilitate the process of the *prior* approval on the part of the Master of the Order and his Council, the way was open for us to directly proceed on the path we had undertaken to obtain the *definitive* “approval or confirmation” of the Congregation for Divine Worship. Thus began the work of editing the other document of “*presentation*” of the new “Rite of Profession O.P.” to the Apostolic See, including the summary presentation of the data illustrating the text and also the annexed requests for “optional variations,” submitted for approval.

49. From the compilation of the data comprised in the two respective documents synthesized here, it has turned out to be helpful to present an overview of the nature of the new Rite of Profession O.P., together with the annexes related to its approval that we hope for, and to offer a synthesis of their contents for the common good.

50. Two different orientations, which, however, complement one another, characterize the close of the two documents brought together in synthesis, both worthy of being cited at the end of this presentation, because they reveal the underlying intent that animated the work of the Liturgical Commission better than any other addition.

a) In the first document – directed to the *Master of the Order and his Council* – the following is said:

“I am grateful for the attention that will be devoted to the *new* “draft” in question – concerning the *Rite of Profession O.P.* for all the branches of the Dominican Family – on the part of the Master of the Order and his Council, while I express the confidence that it will be possible to reach, together, an appropriate assessment and definition of the rite as being worthy of the necessary “approval” of the Master of the Order and, at the same time, to find the most suitable and convincing ways to also successfully obtain the definitive “*approval and confirmation*” on the part of the Congregation for Divine Worship.”

b) In the other document directed to the *Congregation for Divine Worship*, the following is emphasized:

---

<sup>111</sup> When he returned to his office, after mature reflection, on March 3, 1997, the Master of the Order notified me *by telephone*, through the Secretary General, of his “full approval” of the *Rite of Profession O.P.* – without any need to go through the Generalate Council – while expressing his “complete confidence” in the Liturgical Commission. This was clearly a reflection of the fact that the Liturgical Commission, in carrying out its own work, had undertaken a broad *consultation* of those for whom the rite was intended and had called upon the *collaboration* of numerous “experts” and the direct *participation* of Father Pierre-Marie Gy in the work of the Liturgical Commission, even in the final session, held in Paris in the summer of 1996. As soon as possible, I thanked the Master of the Order for this [Prot. pers. CG/97/86: Letter of April 27, 1997], deferring to a better time our hoped-for personal meeting.

“In short, it is requested that the *Rite of Profession O.P.* – restructured according to the directives of Vatican II, to be used during Mass [but with the intent of obtaining the *optional* use of those elements that do not form a part of our traditional rite] – will be approved in its recognized status as an “ancient rite” [*per modum antiqui ritus*]<sup>112</sup>, in line with the principle of *the due honor to be accorded to the* “particular rites,” solemnly sanctioned by the Second Vatican Council [*ad mentem principii de debito honore tribuendo Ritibus particularibus a Concilio Vaticano II solemniter statuto*]<sup>113</sup>, just as the Congregation for Divine Worship itself expressed itself in approving the *Proprium* of the Order, of which this rite is a part.<sup>114</sup>

FR. VINCENZO ROMANO, O.P.  
*Chairman*  
*of the Liturgical Commission of the Order*

---

<sup>112</sup> It is important to point out, for this purpose, that already our *Proprium O.P.* has been approved by the Congregation for Divine Worship “*per modum antiqui ritus*”, which means that, taking into consideration the presence in it of those peculiar liturgical values from antiquity, which safeguard its recognition and acceptance among the “particular rites” by the new liturgical law of the Church and that that same document of approval defines “the special heritage of the liturgical tradition of the Order [*peculiarem thesaurum traditionis liturgicae (Ordinis)*]” (SCSCD, Prot. CD 671/76 of July 25, 1977; CF. ASOP 85, 1977, p. 133.

<sup>113</sup> SC, n. 4.

<sup>114</sup> SCSCD, Prot CD 671/76, of July 25, 1977. [See LHOP, pp. V-VI; MLOP, pp. V-VI].