

Thank you John!

I appreciate the clarifications/changes you made to the PD. A few things to note that I noticed, and that were brought up during our meeting yesterday where we went through the proposed PD:

1. VII.C.1, VIII.B.5, VIII.B.6, IX.D.6, XI.C.1, XII.F.1.b: "Quorum" is defined as 2/3, the rest of the times it is not. To make it easier for everyone, it should be part of the definitions at the beginning of the document, listed as 2/3 of all eligible voters.
2. For the Definitions, the pro-fraternity should be on a separate line from fraternity (that would make more sense to me)
3. III.B.1: there was a question as to whether it should read "Persons who have made a life profession and who cannot attend meetings or functions of the fraternity, physically or virtually (if virtual participation is approved by the fraternity council), because of distance age, illness, infirmity, or other serious reason;
4. IV.A.2: the citation for Canon Law should be "Can. 303" and not "Can § 303."
5. IV.B: the numbering goes from 4 to 6 (5 is skipped)
6. VI.D.4: people thought the wording was confusing and could lead people to conflate the 6 year limit for a single profession instead of the total amount of time in temporary profession, and that people could think the postulancy and novitiate count toward the 6 years. The proposed wording was: "Members may elect any number of terms for the renewal of their profession, ~~but not beyond six years. The total period of temporary profession, which does not include postulancy or novitiate, cannot exceed six years.~~ After six years, Members will be expected to either make a life profession or withdraw. (The RULE, No. 14).
7. VI.E.2: people brought up that it would be beneficial to mention that those who request life profession and are denied may be granted an additional year of temporary profession provided that they have not already spent six years in temporary profession. I know this was something we discussed; it could be added in the paragraph or a footnote.
8. VII.C.11: small note that the text added (which we appreciate) should be red

I will follow up with Fr. Augustine on II.A.7.d.i-ii where it calls for us to pray the Office for the dead on days that the Ordo calls for the office of the day. I'll let you know what I hear.

Here are the concerns I have with the proposed PD:

1. II.A.7.d.i-ii: Praying the Office for the Dead on February 7 (Anniversary of Deceased Parents of Dominicans) and September 5 (Anniversary of Deceased Friends and Benefactors of the Order)
The PD specifies we pray the Office for the Dead on these days, where the *Liturgical Calendar for the Order of Preachers: Necrology for the US Dominican Provinces and the Province of St. Joseph the Worker* stipulates that on those days, the Liturgy of the Hours follows the weekday and not the anniversary.
In order to follow 10.d from the Rule which stipulates that the laity should participate in the "celebration of the Liturgy of the Hours in union with the whole Dominican Family," we should be praying the same Liturgy of the Hours as the friars - that is, we should be praying the office of the day. If one does not attend a Dominican church (where the Mass

would be offered for the dead) I would suggest offering the Rosary intention or reception of Holy Communion for the dead on those days.

2. II.D.1, III.B.1, V.B, virtual participation: the wording here prevents fraternities from enforcing in person being the only option, or virtual being a last resort reserved for serious impediments.
3. III.B.5: returning to active status requires forms, but said forms are not detailed (consider "forms required by the LP Council"), similarly, there's no mention of a form for becoming a prayer member, which seems inconsistent.
4. IV.A.1: there is no longer a requirement for individuals to be fully initiated Catholics, that is, to have received the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist. This was a requirement in the old PD. Similarly, there is no requirement for neophytes to wait 2 years after converting before becoming a postulant.
These items are concerning to our council. At this moment, someone in RCIA at another parish is asking to become a Lay Dominican, and I am not comfortable admitting her to the new postulancy class in the fall; she needs to wait a few years.
5. IV.A.2: it would be helpful to define "lay religious organization" - is this associations described by Can. 303, or something else?
6. IV.A.3: no interview for postulants? The old PD called for an interview, while the new one simply states that the prior(ess) informs those inquiring of the process - it seems to exclude fraternities from discerning and selecting members who can begin postulancy.
7. IV.B.8: previously the Formation Director needed to consult with the formation team before recommending reception of a postulant into the novitiate to the council; that requirement has been removed. Our chapter previously had two classes in formation, both novices and postulants, and the formation team consisted of the Formation Director and three other individuals. The Formation Director and one team member worked with the Postulants, while the remaining two members worked with Novices. It would be important for the Formation Director to seek advice of the formation team for situations like this.
8. IV.B.8, IV.C.5, IV.D.3, IV.E.2: The previous PD required the council to inform the individual seeking reception, first profession, renewal of profession, or life profession of the reason the request was denied. The new PD no longer requires this. This is not pastoral and will be devastating to individuals who are denied without reason.
I was informed by Fr. Chrysostom that the province previously did not inform men who were denied admission into the province of the reason for said denial, and that this was extremely hard for men who believed they were called by God to be Dominicans. The province currently informs men of the reason they are denied entrance, and he said that has been much more helpful for applicants.
9. IV.E.2: The previous PD encouraged councils who reject an application for life profession to instead approve an additional year of temporary profession (assuming the 6 year limit has not been reached). This has been removed
This, along with the point above, are important tools for a council. Our council previously had to reject life profession for two members, provide a reason, and offer the option of one year of temporary profession. Both individuals became better and more active members of the fraternity and made their life profession. If a reason was not provided, and certainly if the option to extend temporary profession was not offered, I do not believe both would have become life professed members.
10. IV.B.9, IV.D.2, IV.E.3: the manner for reception and profession. The previous PD called for the approved rite to be used, where the new PD calls for the Dominican formula. We have a ritual that was promulgated by the Master and approved by the then Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments on behalf of the Holy Father. Previously, there was a PDF on the LPC website that was to be used for reception and profession and which contradicted the official ritual. Seeing that our province has

historically used an unapproved ritual (and I have had to spend considerable time in my fraternity to migrate us over to the approved rite) I believe calling it out is important so we are obedient to the Master and the Holy See, and so people understand that reception and profession happen in a larger and richer rite of the Church and can be exposed to and take part in said rite.

11. IV.D.3: typo where it discusses renewal of temporary profession, it should not use the name Novice.
12. V.C: this one is confusing as it discusses responsibilities of the council in the section for the fraternity and not in the section for responsibilities of the council (VI.C)
If it is to apply to the entire fraternity, V.C.3 contradicts VI.D.9 which stipulates that the council adopts the budget, where V.C.3 stipulates the fraternity approves a budget proposed by the council.
13. VI.B.1.b.ii, VI.C.7.d: the Religious Assistant no longer has voting rights on the council. The Rule does stipulate that the Provincial Promotor does not have a vote on the LP Council, but nothing is said about the Religious Assistant. It would be helpful to know why this voting right is being removed.
14. VI.C.5.b, VI.C.5.c, IV.B.8, IV.C.5, IV.D.3, VI.D.8 these contradict each other. In VI.C.5.b, VI.C.5.c, and VI.D.8, it calls for recommendation from the Formation Director for reception and profession, along with interviews for profession and reception. These are not mentioned in IV.B.8, IV.C.5, nor IV.D.3 (only a postulant gets a recommendation from the Formation Director to become a Novice, no other stage gets a recommendation, and only life profession gets an interview, but VI.C.5.b-c and VI.D.8 imply all stages get both)
15. VI.C.6: should be Lay Provincial Chapter representative instead of Council
16. VII.C.7-8: secret ballot for online voting is difficult to achieve
17. VII.C.11: the Declarations n. 19, building upon Can. 119, state that after the third vote, if it is inconclusive, the person senior by first promise is deemed elected. The PD simply says "any further votes" implying that there can be more than 3 votes, which contradicts the Rule.
18. IX.A.1: can only life professed members transfer fraternities? I realize this is the same as the old PD.
19. IX.B.2, IX.B.5, IX.D.3, IX.D.6, XI.C.1: these have different standards for voting on serious matters. Some require a 2/3 of all eligible voters (IX.B.2, IX.D.3) while the others require 2/3 of a quorum (2/3) - in the extreme case, 4/9, which seems like a low standard for dissolving a fraternity. I recognize this is the same as the old PD.
20. IX.E.4, XI.D.8: not clear why an appeal to the Master regarding one's removal from the order does not stay the decision of the Prior Provincial, while appealing the decision of the Prior Provincial to suppress a fraternity does stay the decision.
21. X.B.3: I'm no canon lawyer, so it would be interesting to understand how this interacts with Can. 312-313 (are we a confederation, or separate associations, and likewise, public juridic persons)
22. X.C.1: speaks of a minimum number of people but does not define what that number is
23. XII.B.6.d: a committee which focuses, develops, and recommends ceremonies is confusing, seeing that we already have a ritual promulgated by the Master and approved by the Holy See, unless such committee focuses on helping fraternities follow said ritual

In Christ and St. Dominic,
Mr. Michael Fatina, OP

Prior
Blessed Sacrament Chapter

|| Dominican Laity