



CLIOP

International Liturgical Commission of the Order of Preachers - Comisión Litúrgica Internacional de la Orden de Predicadores
Commission Liturgique Internationale de l'Ordre des Prêcheurs - Commissione Liturgica Internazionale dell'Ordine dei Predicatori

Convento S. Sabina - Piazza Pietro d'Iliria, 1 Aventino 00153 Roma Tel. 39 06/579401 Fax: 06/5750675 e - mail liturgical.commission@curia.op.org

SOME POINTS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION AND EDITING OF THE PROPER O.P. 1982

In the course of the last term of 2002, Brother Philippe de Roten, Student Master of the Swiss Dominican province, was invited to give a conference in the context of an ecumenical meeting, the theme of which was the Liturgy of the Hours. In preparation for his contribution, whose title was: "The Dominican Liturgy of the Hours – continuity and reform in the XXe century", he wished to ask me certain questions relative to the composition of the LITURGIA HORARUM, *Proprium Officiorum* O.P., ed. MO V de Couesnongle, Romae, 1982 (LHOP, ed. lat.) and to its French adaptation: PROPRE DE L'ORDRE DES PRECHEURS, 111. *Liturgie des Heures – Sanctoral*, Paris, French Dominican Provinces, 1983 (LHOP, ed. fr.).

Our correspondence (31 October and 4 November 2002), gave rise to a somewhat technical exchange, in the course of which, I was able to pass on to Brother Philippe de Roten certain items of information: some of these had already been indicated, whether in the article of the *Analecta S.O.P.* July-Dec. 1977, pp. 193-275: "Dominican Rite following on the Liturgical reform of Vatican 11", or in the accounts of Brother Vincenzo Romano, o.p. President of the Liturgical Commission of the Order (1974-2001), for the General Chapters, or in the presentation of documents relative to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. Other indications would point to remarks of Pere Pierre-Marie Gy (+ 20 December 2004), on the occasion of Commission meetings or with regard to the printed edition of the Liturgical Proper of the Order books

It seemed that these exchanges between Philippe de Roten and Dominique Dye, could be of use to the Liturgical Commission of the Provinces In certain instances, for example that of the "long responses", the reader will find interesting historical and liturgical clarifications for the adaptation of the Proper into living languages. In including the document in this number of INFO/ CLIOP, December 2005, I would like to point out that the method and work of the Liturgical Commission of the Order – as in the past – always bears in mind directives given in the official documents of the Apostolic See with regard to the Liturgy. Among the more important ones we might mention: *Liturgicam Authenticam* (28.03.2001) in *Notitiae* nn. 416-417, mar-apr 2001, pp. 120-174 and the modern languages versions, in the following numbers of *Notitiae*.

By way of conclusion to this number of INFO/CLIOP, I enthusiastically invite those responsible for the Liturgy in the Dominican Family to read Brother Philippe de Roten's "Dominican Liturgy of the Hours – continuity and Reform in the XXe century" in *Tagzeitenliturgie – Okumenische Erfahrungen und Perspektiven – Liturgy of the Hours* Ecumenical experiences and perspectives, edd. M. Klockener et B. Burki, Academic Press Fribourg 2004, pp. 153-168.

I wish you a very happy Christmas and a joyful 2006.

Fr. Dominique DYE, o.p.
President of the international Liturgical Commission
of the Order

REPLIES OF BROTHER DOMINIQUE DYE, O.P.,
TO BROTHER PHILIPPE DE ROTEN, O.P., CONCERNING
THE PROPER OF THE ORDER – THE LITURGY OF THE HOURS
(31 October 2002)

1) Indications concerning the volumes of the Proper O.P.

Question No 1: *In the French version of the volumes dealing with the Proper O.P., has it already been envisaged to what will correspond the following volumes: IV or V? For the volumes whose Proper is in Latin – even in the absence of volume numbering which volumes are to be edited and in what order?* (Ph. De R.)

- The idea of numbering was suggested to us by fr. P.M. Gy, who was quite sure in stating that in the future – all things being equal – the title *Proper O.P.* would be the equivalent of the older terminology *Dominican Rite*.
- In the French Dominican Proper, we have or will have the following sequence: 1. Missal (altar), 11. Lectionary (altar), 111. Liturgy of the Hours (even though the volume has appeared before 1 and 11). The *Dominican Missal for the Faithful* is an edition “derived” from 1 and 11, without any specific numbering.

As for the remainder of the Proper in French, it is normally best to take one’s inspiration from the Latin title: *Dominican Rite*, part of the *Dominican Proper*, which would correspond in general to volume/section IV, etc. Thus the titles would be as follows: Proper of the Order of Preachers, IV, V, VI etc. Ritual with the following sections:

- Rite of election and reception of Superiors (presently without numbering)
 - Rite of Religious profession = IV
 - Anointing of the sick and their spiritual assistance = V
 - Liturgy for the Dead = VI
 - ...a further section might include what corresponds to the *Libellus Precum* (?)
- For the Proper *O.P.* (Latin), the same numbering is used, with this difference that the *Officiorum O.P.* (ed. typ. 1982) was published first, and that the Missal and Lectionary in one volume in 1985 employs the Roman numbering 11. In what follows, we find Ritual, with 111= Ordo in electionibus...1982, then IV= Professionis ritus, V= Ordo unctionis infirmorum eorumque spiritualis curae 2001, VI= *Ordo exsequiarum* (O.P.) 2001, etc.

N.B. Commentary: I find that there is some difficulty perhaps, in finding one’s way. As for the French editions, we shall see. In 2001, the MO T. Radcliffe asked that the same team who were responsible for the French edition of the Missal, would also edit the Liturgy for the sick, then that for the Dead, given that by way of gift, we had made provision of certain sums at the Tipografia Vaticana. For the Profession Ritual, two thirds of a translation was submitted four years ago to the “new French-speaking commission”. The latest report, at least for the technical edition of the books, is that the Provincials of Toulouse and of France are to deal with the remuneration of the team designated for this work, with the exception of that pertaining to the “sick and the deceased” already dealt with by the MO T. Radcliffe.

2) What are the disappointments discreetly mentioned in the article by Brother Dye?

Question No 2: *Among the disappointments mentioned in your article “The Dominican Rite following on the liturgical reforms of Vatican II, ASOP 43 (1977) e.a.pp204 (and note 26 p 204s.) and 208,*

-What disappointments with regard to what the mendicant orders ought to have or could have highlighted for themselves vis a vis Rome?

- cf. also question 8. (Ph de R.)

It is not easy to reply in a few words, without giving the impression of making a judgement which could easily be used by those rejecting reform concerning the LH of Vatican II. However, this is what I would say:

- In 1969, when I was at the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie in Paris, Pere Gy showed me the project *Institutio generalis de Liturgia Horarum*. My comment in substance was: “Don’t allow a similar project to see the light of day”. The monastic current will follow its own course, but in the case of the apostolic Orders, like the O.P.s; O.F.M s, O.S.M.s, there is a too numerous spacing out of the Hours. We must aim at three prayer times during the day, and cater for what was to be the Office of Readings with one or other of the major Hours. Besides, I added that the division of the Psalter into four weeks, did not seem to me a wise move, as it sectioned off the psalms and in so doing, lost the advantage of what J.-Y. Hameline called “la psalmodie psalmodiante”. I also added that I was not too sure that this Book of Prayer corresponded to the needs of priests. Furthermore, I was not happy with the title “Liturgy of the Hours”, devaluing as it did the term “Liturgy”, and not corresponding exactly to the concept one ought to give to the Prayer of the Church.

Pere Gy gave me the following answer: “The Council suppressed Prime and Pretiosa only”, and my reply to that was: “It is possible for Paul VI to give a specific interpretation to the prayer of the divine Office, just as it happened at the same time for the reform of the Order of the Mass, etc.” Our exchange of ideas ended there. As for me, during my time at the CNLP (1971-1977), I was not engaged in a French adaptation of the LH. I know that critical remarks offered to the person responsible for the French edition of the LH were not taken into account. This is a great pity, and that goes too for the binding of the volumes, typography etc.

- In my 1977 article, I alluded to the intervention of the MO A. Fernandez concerning the structure types of the divine offices (cf. art. cit. p 205). In order for this hypothesis to come to fruition, it would have been necessary – more especially on the part of the Apostolic Orders (mendicant Orders, and probably canonical Orders also) for concrete projects to have been presented.
- With regard to the Order, one has to agree that from 1963-1964, when the tendency was towards the adoption of living languages, including in great part the Office, progress should have been made. The Liturgical Institute of Santa Sabina offered no proposal, content with: “Let’s wait until the Roman rite has reformed itself.” It was only ten years later, in 1973-1974, that it was decided to make an inventory of the former OP rite. Meantime, the living tradition, tentatively renewed in the living languages around the year 1963, had almost been lost. The French-speaking world used “Priere du Temps present”, which at the time of its presentation, had (and still has) many deficiencies, even when compared to the spirit of IGLH.
- At that time, another problem should have been addressed, that of the communities of nuns of the Apostolic Orders (e.g. Dominican nuns), whose Liturgical needs are specific, differing from those of the Brothers, and not wholly equivalent to nuns of the Benedictine way. Following on this, the Congregation for Worship made an attempt at “clawing back”, whether by an “extended” Office of Readings (but who actually adopts this?), or by a psalmody for the three Minor Hours, to which nuns are obliged...(cf LHOP, Latin ed. 1982, p 699)
- Finally, in the French context, I regret that much positive research which was done at the time in the studium of La Tourette and the Saulchoir, was permitted to be lost. The predominance enjoyed by the corpus of “La Liturgie Tolosane des Freres Precheurs”, followed by “Liturgie

chorale du peuple de Dieu” (ed. Sylvanes) is unfortunate. These publications contain very commendable elements (texts, melodies at times etc.), but several objections have to be underlined: special translation of the psalms, the structures of the Offices for the Paschal Triduum, which correspond neither to the *Liturgia Horarum* of the Roman rite, nor to the former Dominican rite, with the inclusion of questionable particularities. I say this, while at the same time acknowledging that there are in these liturgies quite beautiful elements, and that at the CNPL I have always opposed over-negative judgements about the output of A. Gouzes. I am convinced that for the Triduum Pascal for instance, seeking inspiration from the Roman rite and suggestions from the LHOP, several beautiful pieces from the “Liturgie chorale du Peuple de Dieu” might be used. Personally, I feel that too many hymns of the Roman LH adapted to the French language, are deficient. The composer-adapter tended to favour certain schools of composers. As to the period 1965-2005, greater use might have been made for translation/adaptation purposes, of the Latin hymns, e.g. “Le jour est dans tout son éclat” which have substance and are favourable to serenity in prayer.

Thus a transition would have been assured, while awaiting acceptable poetic creations. If one were to ask my advice about a new edition of LH in French, I would plead for a replacement of many of the present texts, which are neither poetry nor helps to prayer ; not to mention the old poetic typography (capital letters at the beginning of each line), happily abandoned in the Latin version of LH

3) Re the decree of confirmation of the Dominican Proper (LHOP, pV)

Question No 3: *The Decree of confirmation of 25 July 1977(LHOP, pV) reads: “ad mentem principii de debito honore tribuendo Ritibus particularibus, a Concilio Vaticano II(...SC 4) solemniter statuto”*: How are we to understand this?*

Does it mean that the Dominican “Proper” inherited as it is from a particular Rite – at least in great part – benefits from the privileges due to the former Dominican Rite, and acknowledged by SC 4? (Ph de R.)

- Your understanding of the Latin phrase “ad mentem principii de debito honore tribuendo Ritus particularibus...is perfectly correct. Pere Gy on many occasions pointed this out to the MO D. Byrne and to the MO T. Radcliffe.
- In the “Introductio generalis” of the Dominican Profession Ritual, of the Anointing of the sick and of the Ritual for the deceased, this interpretation is explicitly mentioned. At times, one or other number in the Introduction, gives a short historical note on the Liturgical right of the Order...since the 13 century. Pere V. Romano, former president of the Liturgical Commission of the Order, always put forward this point of view in diverse relations with General Chapters of the Order. At the Amato Commission (1973-1974), it was specifically stated that section by section, the Order adopted the Roman Rite, while retaining complete independence over the former parts of its tradition. Pere. Duval also remarked that in the case of the *Order of Anointing and Funeral Rites*, in the text approved at Madonna dell’Arco (1974), the resolution was not that the Order would adopt purely and simply the *Ordo Unctionis and the Ordo Exsequiarum* of the Roman Rite, but that it would adapt to its needs and according to its tradition, the orientations and the renewed elements of this Liturgy emanating from Vatican II.
- In the 1977 article of ASOP, I pointed out the particular judicial statute of our books (pp196-197). Besides, we need to leave aside the old problem prior to 1965, of Roman Rite /Dominican

* SC 9 “The holy Council declares that holy Mother Church considers as equal in right and in dignity, all lawfully recognised rites, and that she wishes henceforth, to preserve them and to favour their use in every possible way; and it is her wish that when the need arises, they be revised in their entirety and with prudence in the spirit of a sound tradition, giving them a new vitality in harmony with the circumstances and requirements of today.”

Rite – The elements of the Order’s tradition, safeguarded and renewed, are without difficulty brought into harmony with the many possibilities offered by the actual Roman Rite. We might add that the expression “ad libitum”, ought to be properly understood, and in no way means complete omission.

4) The French version of the OP Proper: “Edition typique en langue française”

Question No 4: *The books pertaining to the Proper OP in the French language, display the title” Type edition in the French language. Do the Propers of other Religious Orders in modern languages carry this sub-title? (I read your ideas on this subject in Notitiae (209/1983) 807 etc. (Ph de R)*

- Here again, your understanding of this sub-heading is correct. While working at the CNPL under the direction of Fathers Cellier, Beguerie and Millon, we had validated this concept, relying on the liturgical right itself. Translations into other languages are “translations-adaptations”, and according to the CNLP and other national centres, might lay claim to this nomenclature: “type edition”. Following on the 5th Instruction on the application of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the experts of the Congregation contested this. In my opinion, they are not wholly correct, and furthermore, this Instruction limits in a way not always justified, the legitimate and relative autonomy of Episcopal Conferences or of Religious Institutes.
- As for other Religious Institutes with similar sub-headings on their liturgical books, I cannot give you an immediate answer. Possibly, the OSM (Servants of Mary) who have accomplished and still are accomplishing remarkable work for their liturgical renewal.

5) Hymns inspired by the Prototype (traditionally so-called) of Humbert de Romans

Question No 5: *In the proper OP of the LH, which hymns are inspired by the sequences contained in the Prototype of Humbert de Romans (with reference to your article in Notitiae(209/1983) p 802? At least one example? (Ph de R)*

- At the moment I have not all the elements of an answer. You would need to consult the Commission Archives at Santa Sabina.
- By way of example: “Jubilemus in hac die”...(LHOP, p 589) for the Office “Sancta Maria Mater Dei”, use of a Sequence for the Mass of Our Lady on Saturday – “O Gloriosa Domina”, is a hymn of the Prototype.

N.B. With reference to this question, compare with M. BARGE *cantus pro Benedictionibus* O.F.P. Rome, Tournai 1909.

6) Characteristics of the particular elements of the Dominican LH and of the OP Proper, vis a vis the Roman LH

Question No 6: *How is one to characterise the specific elements of the Proper in the LHOP, in contrast to the Roman LH?*

- *taking into account the nature of the Order i.e. Canonical*
- *taking further into account its symbolic and lyrical expression (musical also)*
- *taking into account the influences of Eastern churches...*
- *original elements: prayers over the canticles, texts from modern authors at the Office of Readings*
- *different “Ritual Sequences” (Ph de R)*

- A preliminary remark: we must remember that the Office in the Order – even in the 13 century – did not belong to the traditional Benedictine monasticism, but situated itself with specific elements, in the line of the Canons, between the solemn liturgies of the cathedrals, and the Benedictine monastic tradition. Different elements also were inherited from other liturgical trends (Gallican, Hispanic). Nevertheless, we must not forget that with the application of the Reform of Pius X in 1921, the Dominican Breviary lost much of what was peculiar to it. (cf Bonniwell’s rather severe criticism in this regard)
- To reply more directly to your question, and mindful of your suggestions, I would say:
 - (a) LHOP has an Introductory section which is capital: the MO’s Letter of Promulgation; the general Introduction (in the Latin, divided into two parts); suggestions for celebrations, all constituting a fundamental reflection on Liturgical life in the Order. These documents do not run parallel to the IGLH, but clarify many questions on the nature of our liturgical life.
 - (b) In particular, you will note that in many instances, in order to avoid the vain opposition: monastic liturgy versus parochial liturgy, use is made of expressions such as “Liturgy with conventual structure” etc In OCLOP (ICLOP in Latin), a novel approach is used.: “of the nature of our liturgical assemblies”, which with communities of Brothers or Sisters bound to the recitation of the Office, includes “other members of the faithful”. Should we call it “canonical liturgy”? I hardly think so, as in our tradition, solemn cathedral-type liturgies are absent, and furthermore, while resting on a liturgical structure which supports the regular and apostolic life, the Order should avoid every form of liturgy that is “canonically inward-looking”. Such equilibrium is achieved with delicate manoeuvring, because the apostolic life largely exceeds what might very well be liturgical conventual harmony of great beauty.
 - (c) Moving from a detailed and conventual Ceremonial, which appeared to have a long life before it, to a new idea of Liturgy, Rubrics (“attributing functions”) according to the expression employed by J-Y Hameline and myself, in an article in *La Maison-Dieu* 1976, pp 133-165, on Ritual...), the Introduction of the *Proprium O.P.* accords a wider space to reflection, to a methodology dealing with symbols and gestures. On this point, we quoted several texts of General Chapters O.P., of Humbert de Romans, of St. Thomas. In this regard, I am surprised that the last General Chapter O.P. (Providence U.S.A. 2001) in treating of creativity and liturgical gestures in the Liturgy, made no reference to these sections of the LHOP/ *Adnotationes complementares*.
 - (d) The introduction to the LHOP, but also the Missal and Lectionary O.P. greatly insist on the necessity of discerning what exists and what might exist as “specific hymns of the O.P. Proper”, whether in Latin or in modern languages. This point is important if we are to avoid a standardization of our liturgical life. But here again, in the concrete case of adaptations and of the liturgical life of the Order, we have not always managed to achieve a transition between the fixed corpus of Gregorian, and what might have been created. Think of the spiritual and community importance of Lenten Compline...
 - (f) Some original points of LHOP:
 - < Careful revision of the “historical notes” or “historical readings” with regard to the saints/ blessed, male and female.
 - < A clear understanding of : the dual Calendar (for the Order as a whole and for the Provinces), this to be placed against the General Church Calendar, and lived in the spirit of the renewed Liturgy (respect for the ferial)

< Variety of antiphons over the psalms, often with a choice of series (A,B), an idea borrowed from the Servants of Mary.

< Use of ferial psalms, even with the antiphons proper to the saint, in order to avoid a monotonous repetition of the psalms of Sunday 1. This existed in the past, (e.g. in the neo-Gallican liturgies) and was accorded to us by the Congregation.

< Effort at renewal, overdone at times, (think of some of the Prefaces in the O.P. Missal) in the euchological domain: two types of prayers etc. clearly explained in the *Introductio Generalis* of the LHOP

< Prolonged Office of Readings (“vigil”): well structured, typography included, with the creation of “prayers over the canticles”. This latter point is new in the history of the Liturgy. We took our inspiration from the Servants of Mary, and in composing the texts, we drew parallels between the sense of a canticle and that of a psalm.

< Effort went into the balancing of psalm titles, patristic quotations and antiphons.

<The inclusion of Readings from a wise choice of modern authors, translated into Latin (e.g. M-J Lagrange for Mary Magdalen, P-A Liege for the Deceased etc.)

< In conjunction with the Liturgical year, the Missal and the Liturgy of the Hours, indications of celebrations which find their place at the head of Liturgical and Regular Life: e.g. the “solemn chapters” of 24 December or 25 March.

< The *Proprium de Tempore* section, with “elementa propria de Tempore”. Also to be noted, the traditional elements of Compline

< The *Libellus Precum*, of different liturgical genre, is included in the LHOP for practical reasons, and to comply with the wishes of the General Chapter of Walberberg (1980). This would be treated autonomously.

7) Exact meaning of “Long Response”

Question No 7: *What is the exact meaning of “long Response”, is there more to it than a long Response which follows a Reading at the Office of Readings?* (Ph. de R.)

- From the liturgical and historical point of view, this structure which exists or existed in monastic liturgy, but also in that of the dioceses, would make a very interesting study, and in our day, something to be re-evaluated.

- In short:

< It is a response, more typical in its text, (length), and in its melody, the purpose of which is to typify, or to set in relief, the particular characteristic of a liturgical period or of a saint.

< Often the long Reponse said at first Vespers, corresponded to the IX Response of Matins, though not always.

< Some examples for those who chanted the Dominican Liturgy in Gregorian: *Aspiciens* (First Sunday of Advent), which is also to be found in the Roman Breviary; *Judaea et Jerusalem* (First Vespers of Christmas); *Descendit de coelis*, (Christmas Matins); *Tria sunt munera* (Epiphany); *Quomodo fiet* (25 March, the Annunciation); *Media vita in morte sumus* (Lenten

Compline O.P.); *O Spem Miram* (St. Dominic), not forgetting : *Homo quidam* (Solemnity of the Body and Blood of Christ)..

< There were also those linked to “Sabbath stories” of the Sundays throughout the year, using the Biblical Lectionary. In LHOP (Latin ed. pp709-715), we arranged for three more varied series, without linking them directly to the current Biblical Lectionary of the Office. The “series” qualification allows for an intelligent use

- In adapting the Latin text, what is the future for these pieces? If, a priori, this use is deemed impossible, we have lost the game in advance. Several suggestions are possible:

< Enkindle awareness that we need to “colour” our liturgical life throughout the year. Entrance into Advent, the Eve of an important Solemnity or feast, ought to have an “overture” as it were, which corresponds to the function of a longer Response.

< In concrete terms, how is this to be realised? When feasible, now and again, the singing of an antiphon in Gregorian, use of the O.P. or Roman Antiphonary in Latin. For example: we could use : *Media Vita*, *O Spem miram*. How better to create a Lenten atmosphere (*Media vita*)!

< With regard to language adaptations – and the Australian, Fr K.P.Adams O.P., specialist of Gregorian chant pre Humbert de Romans – is also of this opinion, one could use a Responsorial psalm with a more elaborate type of antiphon, or derive inspiration from the Ambrosian tradition of “Sallenzo”, an interesting use of psalm verses. Another alternative might be the equivalent in a modern language of the longer Latin Response. (cf French edition, pp565 ss)

< Sometimes, what the liturgy of A. Gouzes calls “announcing the feasts” might play an analogous role. Worthy of note too, is the discovery of the Tropaire, or one might draw inspiration from the oriental “Kontakia”

Another suggestion: a polyphonic hymn sung by a small schola, the question always being to find the appropriate moment, so that the main theme of the celebration be safeguarded

(N.B. Without engaging in polemics, I find that in the “Liturgie chorale du peuple de Dieu” – or at least in the use made of it by the brethren, there is something strange: great solemnity for the Cantic of Lauds or of Vespers, with “melismas etc., and a modest rendering of the *Benedictus* or of the *Magnificat*. To say nothing of the daily (!) singing of the Gloria at Morning Hours. Why pass by the specific hymn chosen as the leit-motif of the Day, feast or Hour.

N.B. At the end of this reply on the “*longer response*”, it is worth while recording that the Commission of Amato (1973-1974) esteemed this practice and these elements, as a specific and interesting mark of our liturgical life.. This means that in adaptations, it is expedient to look for a manner of application that is practicable, but it must be thought out beforehand, so as to be able to present it to communities.

8) If it were to be revised, what else would need to be done?

Question No 8: *If revision were necessary?*

- *for the Latin Proper*
- *for the French Proper?* (Ph de R)
- First of all, a full-time working team should have been appointed, with a five-year deadline to finish the work. (from 1974, Madonna dell’Arco to 1981-1982, towards the end of the mandate of the M.O. V. de Couesnongle). Also, the adaptations should have been followed up more

assiduously, so that the work would be finished within a reasonable time. To give one magnificent example: the small Dominican Province of Malta finished the adaptation of all these Dominican books in record time. The Anglo-American Commission produced a mere “draft translation” Nothing has been forwarded so far in the Dutch language. On the other hand, a Flemish Brother had translated (and printed) the Proper of the Saints O.P. in two African languages.

- For the LHOP in Latin:

< The opportunity to have only one “Introductio Generalis” synthesising the present two sections. This method was also suggested for the French and Italian adaptations. Perhaps too, a shorter “Introductio Generalis” might be envisaged.

< In the Office of the saints, some antiphons were retained for their traditional Latin value and for the Gregorian. We could have or should have placed a shorter text alongside. Again, with regard to the antiphons, LHOP abounds at times in series (The Office of Christ’s Passion)

< Readings of the type “alternative reading”. Often, a choice of two or three readings is offered. We might have referred to a complementary Lectionary, but when would that be published? This is why in language adaptations, an “analogical” reduction in the number of readings is often advised.

< Latin hymns: some errors to be noted between the 1st and 7th November. Several new hymns for our saints were composed by Dom A. Lentini o.s.b. A nuanced judgement in their regard might be made.

< An evaluation of the votive Offices of the B.V.M. on Saturdays (LHOP ed. Lat., pp 588 ss) Some have contested their composition. In actual fact, they were realised before the Marian Masses of the Roman Rite. At the level of experience, it is possible to achieve harmony between both structures, by using them reasonably.

< *Preces* of the Office (Lauds, Vespers): much work was involved here, beginning sometimes from texts already in Latin, in other cases from modern language texts which were then translated into Latin. The saint’s name is over-repeated in the verses, and in the adaptations, we have made a note of this point.

< Prayers from psalms: these have a double source: an unpublished document from the Congregation for Divine Worship (1970) already in Latin, emanating from known formulae of liturgical tradition, and French texts from the Psalter of the Jerusalem Bible. We found sometimes – and this can be justified in part – that the editors were too hidebound by the original Latin source. However, with regard to other prayers of the OP Proper, a real effort at renewal in the spirit of Vatican II has been realised. See on this matter, the reflections of Fr V. Romano, and two theses submitted at San Anselmo’s Liturgy Faculty (Rome)

N.B. With regard to the Latin hymns, I would like to point out, that the absence of “Amen” at the end, is not forgetfulness on the part of the LHOP (ed. Lat.), but that we opted for this at the suggestion of Dom Cardine, o.s.b. (specialist in Gregorian). From a historical point of view, the “Amen” was an addition, often with a different melody. In the Spanish and in other editions, the “Amen” was re-added.

- For the LHOP in French:

<First team of translators in 1976-1977, under the co-responsibility of Frs. D. Raffin and D. Dye. A too-limited adaptation was at times imposed on us: for example, no effort to render the section “Elementa de Tempore”

< Following on this, continuation of work was confided to Sr Isabelle Rioux and myself, helped from a distance by several experts, under the responsibility of the Priors Provincial of Toulouse (FFrs J.L. Vesco, P. Abeberry, etc.; then J.L. Brugues for the Missal – Lectionary)

< The French LHOP has held on to the traditional names usual in our communities (e.g. Lauds, Vespers, Benedictus, Magnificat etc.) Likewise, from 1976-1977 onwards, we opted for a translation of the Response after the Readings. Unless in exceptional cases, we did not use the system of the Roman French LH (Response- versicle, trope long or short) which in fact, had as yet not been printed.

< We arranged for the Saturday Offices of the B.V.M. We should also have provided for “Votive Offices of the Lord”, had there not been “artificial” objections formulated in 1976-1977 concerning the time of composition. In any case, we had to wait for the definitive version of the Latin LH which dates from 1982.

< With regard to the hymns, an effort was made to use the “Toulouse Liturgy of the Friars Preachers” as well as the texts (Appendix) of oriental tradition. In practice, these elements are rarely used by the communities, even though their content is well worth while.

< As for the antiphons, on occasion, we ought to have done what the “Liturgie monastique des Heures” (ed. Clerveux) achieved in French, i.e. provide “abbreviated translations”. In other cases, the fact of holding on to an admirable traditional text, is a source of inspiration. It can offer advice also: see for example, the section of 25 March, the Annunciation of the Lord, “This is the day the Lord has made,” (LHOP French ed. P 66), admirable liturgical theology, and sound also.

< I know one or two Congregations of Sisters (Mere Agnes du Puy), or communities of contemplative nuns, who as a team, worked on the introductory section: Letter of the MO, General Introduction, etc. These Sisters were very happy with it.

< N.B. We would like to have included elements with music – provided by the Canadian Dominican Province, thanks to the works of Fr Skinner (+), who at the time was not willing to have his works published. The Province of Canada was very touched by our request.

- With reference to the Latin LHOP and other languages, we are preparing the publication of new texts relative to the Saints and Blesseds, rendered official after 1982. For the French edition, we might also think of completing this with the “Votive Offices of the Lord”, suggestions for the Liturgical cycle etc.

COMPLEMENTS OF BROTHER DOMINIC DYE’S REPLY
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF BROTHER PHILIPPE DE ROTEN
ABOUT HIS ARTICLE ON THE ORDER’S LITURGY OF THE HOURS
(4 November 2002)

At the conclusion of this document, while replying to the various questions of Brother Philippe de Roten, I would like to add some *reflections on the need to have an authentic liturgical life in the Order of Preachers*.

1. The O.P. Proper, the Liturgy of the Hours and the Missal, as well as the different sections which already appeared in the Ritual, makes it abundantly clear on several occasions, that these volumes are destined for the entire Dominican Family: Brothers, nuns, Sisters of the Apostolic Life, secular Institutes, Dominican Laity. It is important to be well informed about the structure of these books, in order to assure an appropriate reception (in the “ecclesiological” sense of the term) by each branch of the Dominican Family.
2. With regard to the Brothers, it is important to remind ourselves of the nature of our community relationship to the Liturgy. We are to recite the Office “chorally” and not just “in common”. This canonical distinction is still relevant. It underlines the stronger and structural link between a Religious Institute and the Liturgy when the case is that of “choral” obligation. (cf Commentary at the time of Mgr. A-G. Martimort, in the volume *Liturgy and Music* (coll. “Lex Orandi”, 28), Paris 1959, pp 106-108, commenting numbers 40-44 of the Instruction *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia*, 3 Sept. 1958). In Similar manner, PGLH (numbers 31,17,262) mentions this reality. The MO A. Fernandez, in the Letter of Promulgation of the Constitutions O.P. of 1968, gives an authorised interpretation of the section in the LCO (ns 61-62), consecrated to the Liturgy. The fact that the importance of “Lauds” and “Vespers” is emphasised, does not dispense communities from the choral obligation of the Office, hence, from the other Hours. Today, the majority of Provinces might question themselves on this constitutional and liturgical requirement. In the Introduction to LHOP (French ed. Cf references, p XCII Notes III, 192)
3. The contemplative dimension of Dominican life is directly conditioned by the quality- even with modest means – of its liturgical life, as well as by its objectivity (cf. Introduction to LHOP, French ed. No. 68, note 122). The generation of brethren who entered the Order before Vatican 11, were deeply conscious of the choral obligation, daily and annual of the Divine Office. At the present time, this perspective is less obvious. Is it not to the detriment of a certain regular and liturgical structuring of the spiritual life and even of the apostolic nurturing of our own life? On many occasions, the Masters of the Order, Peres A. Fernandez, V. de Couesnongle, underlined the nourishment which the Office of Readings is destined to provide. In the concrete, what can we expect, if the choral celebration of this Office is quasi non-existent?
4. The OP Liturgical Proper, published after Vatican 11, wished to transmit in renewed fashion, the elements of our liturgical tradition. Likewise, it wished to propose richer formulae concerning the celebration of the saints, as well as to underline elements of the liturgy which would be lived in the context of conventual brotherhood.

While newly-founded Religious Institutes and recent Church movements, offer rich liturgical compositions and have recourse to spiritual writings, communities of the Dominican Family risk allowing a great part of our liturgical tradition, indeed of our spiritual or intellectual heritage, disappear into oblivion. Many with responsible positions in the Order recognise, that at the present time, we are lacking both liturgical and spiritual resources.

5. To overcome this deficiency, and to avoid any risk of “replis canonial” out of step with our apostolic and religious vocation, I would make the following suggestions:

- (a) Make known to the brothers and sisters, as well as to lay Dominicans, the riches of the OP Proper. This should be done at the moment of initiation to the Religious life, or when engaging in a Fraternity, but also later on at appropriate moments, in the context of permanent formation in communities
- (b) Rediscover the ecclesial, liturgical and regular mandate for the celebration of the Liturgy of the Hours (PGLH, ns 24,29-32, 262). Determine the concrete and community applications which this implies, without excluding a certain “pluralism” (cf General Introduction, LHOP, French ed., no 83, pp LXXXV-LXXXVI)
- (c) Question the brothers, sisters, communities and individuals about our attitude to personal prayer, which the Letter of Promulgation of the OP Proper, by Pere V. de Couesnongle, calls to mind on several occasions, (cf ns 8,9). When compared to the secular clergy and to many Religious, are we not lagging behind?
- (d) As the *Ratio formationis* requires, provide a pastoral formation in Liturgy for the brothers and sisters, in the course of their institutional studies. Likewise, see to training in the practice of preaching a homily headlines on how to plan out spiritual instruction, or how to conduct a retreat.
- (e) The Liturgical life of our communities should be regulated in an objective manner as the Constitutions demand, and as outlined in the Proper of the Order. Attention should be paid to “Indications for Celebrations” (ns 3-10), on the nature of our liturgical assemblies, the respective roles under the responsibility of the Prior, of the various participants in the choral celebration. Notice in particular no 6, which advocates that a brother who is competent “to direct the liturgical action and the singing”, be appointed to this charge. The word “cantor” as such is not used. Besides, several numbers of the General Introduction underline – with deference to local custom – the importance of reference to the liturgical structures indicated in the books
- (f) For communities and for Religious, aim at recovering the evangelical, meditative and apostolic meaning of the recitation of the Rosary. Given the proliferation of groups or movements which risk appropriating this devotion in a not always balanced manner, do we not inherit a traditional wisdom and a balanced practice of the apostolate of the Rosary?
6. By way of conclusion to this detailed reply to Brother Philippe de Roten, and not unmindful of the experience I happen to have, I would like to emphasise that Liturgical life in the Order must follow objective criteria, and find its basis in the Regular life. It is better to have a celebration of the Office – even though a modest one – than to conduct very solemn liturgies inspired by personal wishes or desires. It seems to me useful that we rediscover the meaning of our “mandate to celebrate the Liturgy of the Hours” for the communities, as well as for the brothers and sisters.

It might be no harm to re-read the Letter of the MO V. de Couesnongle “Orationi et Praedicationi”, promulgating the Proper of the Order of Preachers, *The Liturgy of the Hours* Rome 1982 (French ed. 1983, pp V11-XV11). Below is a paragraph from No 7:

“Thus, by the mandate to celebrate the Divine Office which we have received from the Church from the beginnings of the Order, we are called upon – as members of this Order – to represent in a more special way, the praying Church, in spite of the seemingly poor resources of some of our assembled communities, or at times, the lack of means at their disposal”