
Revising the Rite of Adult Initiation: The Structural Reform of the Ordo Initiationis Christianae Adulorum, Ordo Catechumenatus per Gradus Dispositus, 1964-1972

David Andrew Pitt

Publication Date

19-04-2007

License

This work is made available under a All Rights Reserved license and should only be used in accordance with that license.

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Pitt, D. A. (2007). *Revising the Rite of Adult Initiation: The Structural Reform of the Ordo Initiationis Christianae Adulorum, Ordo Catechumenatus per Gradus Dispositus, 1964-1972* (Version 1). University of Notre Dame. <https://doi.org/10.7274/f1881j94m45>

This work was downloaded from CurateND, the University of Notre Dame's institutional repository.

For more information about this work, to report or an issue, or to preserve and share your original work, please contact the CurateND team for assistance at curate@nd.edu.

REVISING THE RITE OF ADULT INITIATION: THE STRUCTURAL REFORM
OF THE *ORDO INITIATIONIS CHRISTIANAE ADULTORUM*,
ORDO CATECHUMENATUS PER GRADUS DISPOSITUS, 1964-1972

VOLUME II

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Notre Dame
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

David Andrew Pitt, B.A., M.A.

Maxwell E. Johnson, Director

Graduate Program in Theology

Notre Dame, Indiana

April 2007

CONTENTS

CHAPTER FIVE: FORMALIZING THE RITUAL EUCHOLOGY	260
5.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	262
5.1.1: Introductory Dialogue	262
5.1.2: Exorcismus.....	267
5.1.3: Renunciation of False Cults and Adhesion to Christ	268
5.1.4: Laying on of Hands.....	268
5.1.5: Signation of the Forehead and of the Senses	273
5.1.6: Giving of a Christian Name	279
5.1.7: Introduction into the Church	279
5.1.8: Celebration of the Word.....	282
5.1.9: Dismissal of the Catechumens	283
5.2: Liturgical Rites for the Time of the Catechumenate.....	289
5.3: The Second Stage: Election	290
5.3.1: Presentation of the Candidates.....	292
5.3.2: Dialogue with the Sponsors	297
5.3.3: The Inscription of Names.....	301
5.3.4: Declaration of Election	303
5.4: The Scrutinies.....	304
5.5: The Fourth Stage: The Sacraments of Initiation	324
5.5.1: The Rites of Immediate Preparation	325
5.5.2: Baptism	328
5.6: Conclusions.....	342
CHAPTER SIX: REVISIONS, CORRECTIONS, AND PAPAL PRESENTATION ...	352
6.1: Presentation to the Consilium, October 18-19, 1965, and Corrections.....	353
6.1.1: General Issues	354
6.1.2: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	358
6.1.3: The Time of the Catechumenate	361
6.1.4: The Second Stage: Election	362
6.1.5: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones.....	363
6.1.6: The Fourth Stage: The Rites of Immediate Preparation.....	364
6.1.7: The Sacraments of Initiation	364
6.1.7.1: October 18, 1965.....	365
6.1.7.2: October 19, 1965.....	368
6.1.8: The Process of Experimentation	370
6.2: Corrections, February-March, 1966.....	371
6.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	373
6.2.2: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones.....	376

6.2.3: The Sacraments of Initiation	379
6.3: Conclusions	381
CHAPTER SEVEN: EXPERIMENTATION, OBSERVATIONS, AND REVISION ..	383
7.1: Experimental Method.....	384
7.2: Experimentation and Responses	392
7.2.1: The General Structure of the Rite	393
7.2.2: Relevance of the Rite	401
7.2.3: Prayer Texts	405
7.2.3.1: Negativity in the Texts	406
7.2.3.2: Usefulness of the Texts	408
7.2.3.3: Adaptability of the Texts.....	413
7.2.3.4: Textual Options.....	416
7.2.4: Role of the Laity.....	418
7.3: Revisions, Vanves, December 30, 1968-January 4, 1969.....	422
7.3.1: General Issues	423
7.3.2: Structural and Textual Proposals	426
7.3.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	426
7.3.2.2: The Second Stage: Election	436
7.3.2.3: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones.....	440
7.3.2.4: Miscellaneous Issues.....	447
7.4: Revision of the Scrutinies, February 7, 1969	449
7.5: St-Genesius-Rode, March 3-8, 1969	452
7.5.1: Exorcisms.....	453
7.5.2: Intercessions over the Elect.....	460
7.5.3: Renunciation of Satan	461
7.5.4: Post-Baptismal Structure.....	462
7.5.5: Textual Compilation.....	464
7.6: S-344, DRi-35, June 21, 1969	464
7.6.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	465
7.6.2: The Time of the Catechumenate	466
7.6.3: The Second Stage: Election	467
7.6.4: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones.....	470
7.6.5: The Fourth Stage: The Rites of Immediate Preparation.....	470
7.6.6: The Sacraments of Initiation	471
7.7: Conclusions	472
CHAPTER EIGHT: FINALIZING THE RITE	475
8.1: Douvres-la-Délivran and Arromanches, July 15-21, 1969	476
8.1.1: Praenotanda	477
8.1.2: Scrutinies.....	488
8.2: Luxembourg, September 10-15, 1969.....	502
8.2.1: Praenotanda	502
8.2.2: Revisions to the Rite	503
8.2.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens.....	503
8.2.2.2: The Time of the Catechumenate	507

8.2.2.3: The Second Stage: Election or Inscription of Names	510
8.2.2.4: The Time of Purification and Enlightenment.....	514
8.2.2.4.1: The Scrutinies.....	514
8.2.2.4.2: The Traditiones	519
8.2.2.4.3: The Rites of Immediate Preparation	520
8.2.2.5: The Third Stage: The Celebration of the Sacraments	522
8.2.2.6: The Time of Mystagogy.....	524
8.2.3: Final Preparations.....	525
8.3: Presentation to the Relators and the Consilium, November 5-14, 1969	526
8.4: Final Amendments, December 1969-August 1971	530
8.5: Conclusions.....	537
 CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSIONS	 540
9.1: General Assessment	541
9.1.1: Advancements in the OICA	541
9.1.2: The Role of History.....	544
9.2: The Process of Revision.....	545
9.2.1: General Principles	545
9.2.2: Ritual Structure	547
9.2.3: Ritual Texts	550
9.2.4: Revisions from Experimentation.....	553
9.3: Shifts in Sacramental Theology	556
9.4: Implications for Pastoral Practice	563
 APPENDIX A: REVISIONS TO THE PRAENOTANDA OF THE OICA FROM 1969 TO 1972.....	 569
 APPENDIX B: OFFICIAL REVISIONS TO THE ORDO CATECHUMENATUS GRADUS DISPOSITUS FROM 1965 TO 1969	 614
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 739

TABLES

TABLE 5.1: INTRODUCTORY DIALOGUE IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX.....	265
TABLE 5.2: SUMMARY OF CATECHESIS TEXT IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS IN S-112.....	266
TABLE 5.3: EXORCISM BY EXSUFFLATION IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS IN S-112.....	268
TABLE 5.4: RENUNCIATION OF FALSE CULTS IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS IN S-112.....	269
TABLE 5.5: LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS IN S-112	271
TABLE 5.6: SIGNATION OF THE FOREHEAD AND THE SENSES IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX.....	274
TABLE 5.7: INTRODUCTION INTO THE CHURCH IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	280
TABLE 5.8: DISMISSAL OF THE CATECHUMENS IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	288
TABLE 5.9: SOURCES OF MINOR EXORCISMS AND BLESSINGS IN THE RITES OF THE CATECHUMENATE IN S-112.....	291
TABLE 5.10: INTRODUCTORY RUBRIC IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	293
TABLE 5.11: PRESENTATION OF THE CANDIDATES IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	294
TABLE 5.12: DIALOGUE WITH THE SPONSORS IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX AND IN S-112.....	298
TABLE 5.13: THE INSCRIPTION OF NAMES IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	302
TABLE 5.14: LOCATION OF THE TRADITIONES FROM S-77 TO S-112	306

TABLE 5.15: INTERCESSIONS OVER THE ELECT IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX	310
TABLE 5.16: DEPRECATORY EXORCISM IN THE RITE OF ELECTION AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX.....	311
TABLE 5.17: PRAYER OF EXORCISM IN THE FIRST SCRUTINY AS REVISED AT GALLORO.....	314
TABLE 5.18: PRAYER OF DISMISSAL IN THE SCRUTINIES IN S-112.....	317
TABLE 5.19: PRAYER OF EXORCISM IN THE SECOND SCRUTINY AS REVISED AT GALLORO.....	319
TABLE 5.20: PRAYER OF EXORCISM IN THE THIRD SCRUTINY AS REVISED AT GALLORO.....	321
TABLE 5.21: EPHPHATHA PRAYER AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX AND GALLORO.....	327
TABLE 5.22: PRE-BAPTISMAL ANOINTING IN S-112	331
TABLE 5.23: PROFESSION OF FAITH IN S-112	332
TABLE 5.24: PRESENTATION OF A BAPTISMAL GARMENT IN S-112.....	337
TABLE 5.25: PRESENTATION OF A LIT CANDLE S-112	339
TABLE 5.26: VARIABILITY IN THE RITE IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS IN S-112	350
TABLE 6.1: THE TRADITIO SYMBOLI IN S-147	378
TABLE 7.1: NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS INITIATED DURING THE PERIOD OF EXPERIMENTATION IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CENTERS	389
TABLE 7.2: PRAYERS OF EXORCISM TO THE FATHER IN THE REVISED SCRUTINIES.....	451
TABLE 7.3: PRAYERS OF EXORCISM TO THE SON IN THE REVISED SCRUTINIES.....	453
TABLE 7.4: PROPOSED PRAYERS OF EXORCISM FOR THE SCRUTINIES BY THE JAPANESE EXPERIMENTERS	457
TABLE 7.5: INTERCESSIONS OVER THE ELECT AS PROPOSED BY MOLIN	461

TABLE 7.6: POST-BAPTISMAL STRUCTURE IN THE REVISIONS AT ST-GENESIUS-RODE	463
TABLE 7.7: ADMONITION FOR ELECTION IN S-344.....	468
TABLE 8.1: STAGES OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION IN THE REVISED OCGD.....	486
TABLE 8.2: PRAYERS OF EXORCISM IN S-352	490
TABLE 8.3: FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE FIRST SCRUTINY IN S-352	491
TABLE 8.4: SECOND ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE FIRST SCRUTINY IN S-352	493
TABLE 8.5: FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE SECOND SCRUTINY IN S-352	495
TABLE 8.6: SECOND ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE SECOND SCRUTINY IN S-352	497
TABLE 8.7: FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE THIRD SCRUTINY IN S-352	499
TABLE 8.8: SECOND ALTERNATE TEXTS FOR THE THIRD SCRUTINY IN S-352	501
TABLE 8.9: STRUCTURE OF THE SCRUTINIES IN S-352.....	516
TABLE 8.10: ALTERNATE INTERCESSIONS FOR THE SCRUTINIES IN S-352	518

CHAPTER FIVE

FORMALIZING THE RITUAL EUCHOLOGY

The process by which the first *Schemata* of the rite was composed involved two separate meetings. At the first, at the Abbey of Clervaux in Luxembourg on June 23-26, 1965, a subcommittee composed of Fischer, Cellier, Lengeling, and Stenzel, was given the responsibility of translating the French texts composed at Le Saulchoir into Latin, as well as editing and amending, when necessary, both the French and Latin texts from Le Saulchoir.¹ The text that emerged from Clervaux (NR-C) was sent, immediately after its completion on June 26, to the members of *Coetus* XXII and XXIII for their comment. They, in turn, would send a list of their specific observations and suggestions to Stenzel in preparation for the second meeting, on September 19-24, 1965, in Galloro, Italy,² from which an intermediate draft of the first *schemata*, NR-G, and, the first *schemata* itself, S-112, would emerge.³ Those present at Galloro included members of both *Coetus* XXII

¹ “Protocollum junii 3-6 1965”, VI b: “Tamen omnes consenterunt ipsam redactionem nisi post diuturnius studium horum documentorum a coetu minis numeroso fieri debere. Pro hoc labore redactionis Relator convocabit RRDD Cellier, Lengeling, et Stenzel, et quidem diebus 23-26 junii in Abbatiam Claravalensem (Clerf) in Luxemburgo. Sensus discussionis apud Salices habiti erat hic: ultima vice de textibus redigendis – respectu iam habito materialium de quibus supra – deliberatur.”

² “Letter from Fischer to *Coetus* XXII and XXIII, June 26, 1965” in C.N.P.L. 1.C.4: “Envoi aux ‘consulteurs;’ “Envoi aux ‘super consultants’.”

³ S-112 consists of five sections: 1) the rubrics and texts for the revised rite, including some notes on sources (33 pages of rubrics and texts, 3 pages of notes); 2) an appendix with a proposed text for the blessing of the font (2 pages); 3) explanatory notes on particular revisions and adaptations (*Declarationes*, 4 pages); 4) the *Relatio* to the *Consilium* on the text of the rite (S-112 *Relatio*, 14 pages); and 5) an Appendix to the *Relatio*, providing explanatory notes and a rationale relating to the proposed text for the blessing of the font (11 pages).

and XXIII: Fischer, Molin, Ligier, Seumois, Stenzel, Lengeling, Cellier, Gy, Boniface Luyckx, Damien Sicard, Ignacio Oñatibia, Secondo Mazzarello, and Jean Rabau. Most of the changes made to the rite were relatively small; nonetheless, some reworking of shape, rubrics, and texts did occur. S-112 would be submitted to the *Consilium* on October 4. Because of the great degree of similarity between the rite during this four month period, NR-C, NR-G and S-112 can be treated simultaneously with some degree of ease. While a general sense of the rite will be provided below, the primary focus will be on changes made to the rite as it was being developed. Thus, any change noted in an earlier version should be understood as carrying through in the later versions, unless it is specifically revoked.

The single-largest overall change to the structure of the rite itself was one of terminology. The use of the term *statione* had been adopted at Trier, but a return to *gradus*, the term used in OBA1962 and SC 64,⁴ was accepted after Martimort raised this point in a series of observations on NR-C.⁵ The change, effected in S-112, was accompanied by a re-codification of the overall structure of the rite. In NR-C each station was followed by a time period. In S-112 the second period of intense preparation would be renamed the “Third Stage: Scrutinies and *Traditiones*.” Otherwise, few changes were made to the overall structure of NR-C, and those that did occur are best understood as clarifications rather than revisions.

⁴ SC 64: “The catechumenate for adults, divided into several stages, is to be restored and put into use at the discretion of the local Ordinary. By this means the time of the catechumenate, which is intended as a period of well-suited instruction, may be sanctified by sacred rites to be celebrated at successive intervals of time.”

⁵ “Observationes ab A.G. Martimort propositae in Ordinum baptismi adultorum, die 26.6.65 a Relatore *Coetus* 22 minum” in C.N.P.L. 1.C.iv: “Envoi aux consultants et super consultants, 26/6/65.”

5.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

The only structural change to the first stage was the division of the eighth element, *Introductio in Ecclesiam ad Celebrationem Verbi*, into two elements in NR-C. Otherwise, the stage retained its shape from previous versions of the rite.

5.1.1: Introductory Dialogue

The first alteration to the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum* in NR-C was a small addition to the beginning of the rite. The rite was to begin outside of the church, or at its entrance, with members of the faithful standing around both the candidates and their sponsors. The celebrant would process out to meet them and give a brief instruction about the Church's joy at the candidate's desire to become Christian and the subsequent responsibilities that the candidates were about to embrace. Here NR-C indicated that the celebrant should invite the candidates and their sponsors forward, and that a song, such as Psalm 62(63):1-9, should be sung during the movement. The interrogation of the candidates was then to begin as contained in OBA. S-112 introduced an alternate dialogue here, which emerged out of the discussions at Galloro. The proposition from Le Saulchoir had clearly indicated that there was some degree of dissatisfaction with the traditional form. Debate at Galloro included the possibilities of crafting a new dialogue which would specifically make reference to the sacraments of initiation. Seumois wisely pointed out that this dialogue might profitably express the journey of the candidates towards faith. Gy eventually made the proposal that two forms might be offered in S-112: the traditional form and an alternate.⁶ Choice of which formula to use might be left

⁶ "Coetus 22: Galloro, 19-24 Septembre, 1965" in C.N.P.L. 1.C.v: "Autour de la session de Galloro (Coetus 19-24/9/65)."

to the discretion of the Conferences of Bishops. The *Coetus* would select a dialogue from the Ambrosian rite, which was older than the thirteenth century formula from the Pontifical of the Roman Curia appearing in OBA.⁷ The Ambrosian form would be listed first in S-112, with the text from OBA appearing second. According to the *Coetus*, the Ambrosian form fostered a clear expression of the sense of the candidate's spiritual progression at this early stage in the rites of Christian initiation.⁸

Following the interrogation of the candidates the celebrant was to instruct them about the decision that they had just made. The *Coetus* focused on the instructions given to them that the text reflect Cellier's first proposal from Le Saulchoir, but referred back to OBA through reference to eternal life (instead of life as a child of God) and the reincorporation of Matthew 22:40 (see Table 5.1 below). Concerns about the ability of those at such an early stage in the development of their faith to properly understand eternal life appear to have continued at Clervaux, and so the opening phrase of the instruction was modified.⁹ Rather than beginning "If you would have eternal life..." the text in NR-C was rendered "If you wish to enter into life..." Also, the choice of the verb "enter" over "have" almost certainly highlights the entry of the candidate into the church.

⁷ See Turner, *Hallelujah Highway*, 160.

⁸ S-112 Relatione, 18: "Introduximus dialogum partim ex Liturgia Ambrosiana desumptum, cuius verba sunt magis perspicua et clarius exprimunt animum candidati eiusque fidem initialem in Christum. Tamen ex reverentia erga venerabilem (est) iuniorem formula RR eam retinuimus (forma b), ita ut option fieri possit inter has duas propositiones."

⁹ The choice of "eternal life" in the dialogue and "life" in the catechetical text is somewhat counter-intuitive. If the concern about the candidates truly understanding what eschatological life meant was a serious one, then having the candidates ask for eternal life seems odd: why should one ask for something that they can not understand? Furthermore, in adopting "life" in its catechesis, is the Church not failing in its catechetical duty – to try and explain something which is vital, yet not understood? It might have made more sense to have the candidates ask for life, and have the presider being the explanation as to why eternal life is what should be desired and sought. However, it would have made the most sense for the presider to explain that which the candidates actually asked for, whether it be life or eternal life.

However, this change might also be an attempt to clarify the nature of grace in salvation. It might appear that the statement “If you wish to have eternal life” connotes a direct Relationship between actions and salvation, whereby eternal life becomes a commodity that one can possess. On the other hand, “If you wish to enter into life” extends this Relationship, indicating that personal choice is but the beginning of the process of salvation. On the issue of Matthew 22:40, the subcommittee decided that reincorporating it into the text was premature.¹⁰

It was agreed that this catechesis needed to convey more catechetical content.¹¹ At the same time, however, the *Coetus* recognized that the candidates were still in the early stages of their spiritual development, and thus, should not be given the same type of theologically weighty catechesis that was present in OBA – greater attention was to be given to fostering a spirit of charity and discipleship, themes that could be understood by all candidates, regardless of their theological sophistication or the degree to which they had progressed in their faith.¹² Towards this end, more emphasis was placed on the

¹⁰ Ordo Baptismi Adultorum, 1965/5 in C.N.P.L. 1.C.4 (hereafter NR-C), 1(1): “ ‘Tota lex et prophetae’ hoc momento praematurum.”

¹¹ Martimort suggested that the words of John the Deacon were quite applicable in this situation: “Unless he is extricated from the devil’s toils, renouncing him among the first beginnings of faith with a true confession, he cannot approach the grace of the saving lather.” (“Observationes ab A.G. Martimort,” 3) See *DOBL* 208-209.

¹² S-112 Relatione, 19: “Placuit Vobis mense aprili textum traditionalem huius catecheseos, uti in RR invenitur, recognoscendum es tamquam condicioni spirituali catechumenorum non adaptatem et ‘magis scholam quam ecclesiam sapientem.’ Novus textus plane respondet condicioni candidatorum; est quasi summula nuntii, quem iam durante ‘praecatechumenatu’ audierunt quaeque iis declarat, in quo consistat conversio, qua homo fit Christi discipulus, inculcando prae omnibus caritatem.”

TABLE 5.1
INTRODUCTORY DIALOGUE
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

OBA 5, OBA1962 4	Cellier's Proposal 1	NR-C 1
<p>Si vultis habere vitam aeternam, servate mandata.</p> <p>Diligite Dominum Deum vestrum ex toto corde vestro, et ex tota anima vestra, et ex tota mente vestra, et proximum vestrum sicut vo ipsos.</p> <p>In his duobus mandates tota Lex pendet, et Prophetiae. Fides autem est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in unitate veneremini, neque confundendo personas, neque substantiam seperando. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti: sed horum trium una est substantia, et nonisi una divinitas.</p>	<p>Si vous voulez vivre en enfant de Dieu, observez le commandement du Christ:</p> <p>‘Tu aimeras le Seigneur ton Dieu de tout ton Coeur, de toute ton âme, et de tout ton esprit, et ton prochain comme toi-même.’</p> <p>Et encore: ‘Aimez-vous les uns les autres, comme je vous ai aimés’</p>	<p>Si vultis ingredi ad vitam, servate mandata Iesu Christi, Domini Nostri qui dixit: “Diligite Dominum Deum vestrum ex toto corde vestro, et ex tota anima vestra, et ex tota mente vestra, et proximum vestrum sicut vo ipsos.</p>

nature of God, as conveyed in the formula from OBA, along with particular scriptural allusions (see Table 5.2 below). After agreeing to remove the text from NR-C, a new text was added in describing Christ and his Relationship to the Father and to the Church as his disciples. An abridged reference to Matthew 22:40 was reinserted.

TABLE 5.2

SUMMARY OF CATECHESIS TEXT

IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS

IN S-112

[illegible]

5.1.2: Exorcismus

The next element that the subcommittee treated was the optional exorcism by exsufflation. At Le Saulchoir the *Coetus* had agreed to eliminate the text from OBA 8, and leave the creation of a suitable text to the smaller group, with the instructions that it be deprecatory, that it reflect the theology of 2 Thessalonians 2:8, and that other existing prayer texts be consulted (see Table 5.3 below). The subcommittee looked also to two other texts in OBA that had much earlier roots: the *Ephphatha* prayer from OBA 34, which was also present in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*;¹³ and OBA 21, the prayer for the third male exorcism, also was found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.¹⁴ The resulting text was one which asked God (Christ) to act and expel the demon by his breath, through the breath of the celebrant, as a sign that God's reign was approaching. S-112 altered the NR-C text only slightly, preferring instead to avoid appearing as if the work of the exorcism belonged to the priest. Instead, the prayer was reworked so that it began by referring to Christ's work— "*Dominus repellit te, diabole.*" An explanatory section of S-112 pointed to this dynamic: "Neither the priest nor the breath from his mouth, but the Lord, whose reign approaches, repels the devil."¹⁵ Suppression of the phrase "*ab eo*" was intended to clarify that the recipient of the exorcism was not possessed.¹⁶

¹³ Gelasian Sacramentary, XLII, 420. See also *DOBL*, 229.

¹⁴ Gelasian Sacramentary, XXXIII, 295. See also *DOBL* 218.

¹⁵ S-112 Declarationes 4: "... nec sacerdos nec certe flatus oris sui repellunt diabolum, sed Dominus, cuius regnum advenit."

¹⁶ S-112 Declarationes, 4: "De consulto non dictum est 'recedes ab eo,' ne denua oriatur impressio Ecclesiam considerare candidatum tamquam obsessum."

S-112 Relatione, 20: "Formula ad exsufflationem recognita est secundum votu vestrum, 'ita ut non iam de obsessione diabolica loqui videatur'."

TABLE 5.3
EXORCISM BY EXSUFFLATION
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
IN S-112

2 Thess. 2:8	OBA 21	OBA 34	NR-C 2	S-112 4
Et tunc revelabitur ille iniquus, quem Dominus Iesus interficiet <i>spiritu oris sui</i> , et destruet illustratione adventus sui eum	Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, <i>ut</i> exeas, et <i>recedes</i> ab his famulis Dei N. et N. Ipse enim <i>tibi imperat</i> , maledicte damnate, qui pedibus super mare ambulavit, et Petro mergenti dexteram porrexit.	Effeta, quod est adaperire, in odorem suavitatis. Tu autem effugare, <i>diabole</i> , <i>appropinquavit</i> enim iudicium Dei.	Imperat tibi Dominus, spiritu oris sui diabole ut recedes, quia appropinquavit regnum eius.	Dominus repellit te, diabole, spiritu oris sui ut recedes, quia appropinquavit regnum eius.

5.1.3: Renunciation of False Cults and Adhesion to Christ

The optional renunciation of false cults and adhesion to Christ had been left to be composed by Seumois, which would be included only in S-112: a new rubric and formula, based on Joshua 24:16-22 (see Table 5.4 below). The rubric clarified what the *Coetus* had earlier discussed. Local Conferences of Bishops could choose to include a renunciation of false cults where pastorally necessary, and, if desired, they could provide a formula of their own which would declare the intent of the candidate to turn away from false belief, while not being offensive to non-Christian religions.

5.1.4: Laying on of Hands

Turning to the essential element of the first stage, the laying on of hands, the subcommittee altered both the rubric and text that had emerged out of Le Saulchoir for inclusion in NR-C (see Table 5.5 below). At Le Saulchoir the *Coetus* had left the

TABLE 5.4

RENUNCIATION OF FALSE CULTS

IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS

IN S-112

Scriptural References	S-112 5
“Responditque populus, et ait : Absit a nobis ut relinquamus Dominum, et serviamus diis alienis.” (Joshua 24:16)	C: Quia, a Deo vocati et adiuti, ipsum solum Deum eiusque Christum adorare et colere decernitis, atque ipsi soli Deo eiusque Christo servire vultis, nunc hora est, ut publice renuntietis iis que non sunt Deus. Absit a vobis ut relinquatis Christum et serviatis alienis. R: Absit a nobis! C: Absit a vobis ut colatis N. et N. R: Absit a nobis! <i>Et ita porro pro unoquoque cultu, cui renuntiandum est.</i>
“Et Josue ad populum: Testes, inquit, vos estis, quia ipsi elegeritis vobis Dominum ut serviatis ei. Responderuntque: Testes.” (Joshua 24:22)	C: Testes estis vos elegerisse Dominum Christum ut serviatis ei. R: Testes sumus.

rubric from OBA unchanged, wherein the priest laid his hand on the head of each of the elect, and then extended his hand towards them while he prayed the prayer. The subcommittee, however, envisioned three gestures during the element. First, the celebrant would pray the first half of the prayer with his hands joined. Second, he would extend his hands over the candidates during the second half of the prayer. At the conclusion of the prayer the celebrant would lay his hands on each of the candidates, thereby confirming their new status as catechumens. Textually, the first half of the prayer in NR-C was retained without change from OBA. Beginning, however, with the celebrant’s extension of his hands over the candidates, the prayer text was amended several times; different versions of the prayer were contained in NR, NR-C, and S-112, each of which were distinct from the text in OBA. NR-C restored OBA’s reference to the

“gate of God’s kindness,” combining it with NR’s petition that the candidates become catechumens. NR-C altered the format of NR slightly, however, in that in NR the candidates became catechumens by God’s grace, while in NR-C it was explicitly through the laying on of hands that the candidates became catechumens. NR-C maintained NR’s naming of the Word of Life as the source of wisdom with which the candidates were to be imbued, rather than the salt, which had been suppressed. Eliminating both the petition of OBA that the candidates be kept from evil desires and the petition from NR that the candidates live the life required of a child of God, the prayer in NR-C returned to the text of OBA and its request that the candidates be perfected day by day, so that they might approach the grace of baptism. The text concluded as it had in OBA, omitting only the reference to salt. Leading up to the Galloro session, a desire was expressed to revisit the second half of the prayer yet again. Stemming from this desire, the prayer contained in S-112 was a pared down version of the text in NR-C, which drew more directly from OBA. In particular, the ordering of phrases from OBA was retained over NR-C (such as the placement of “*ianuam pietatis*” and the phrases “*de die in diem; laeti tibi*”). In the end, the only substantive changes to the content of OBA in S-112 were naming the candidates as servants of God, mention of the laying on of hands, and removing both references to salt.

TABLE 5.5
LAYING ON OF HANDS
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
IN S-112

<p>OBA 12</p> <p>Aperi eis, Domine, ianuam pietatis tuae, ut,</p> <p>signo sapientiae tuae imbuti, omnium cupiditatum foetoribus careant, et ad suavem odorem praeceptorum tuorum laeti tibi in Ecclesia tua deserviant, et proficiant de die in diem, ut idonei efficiantur accedere ad gratiam Baptismi tui, percepta medicina.</p>	<p>NR 5</p> <p>Aujourd’hui, par ta grâce, ils deviennent catéchumènes dans ton église.</p> <p>Qu’ils reçoivent avec foi la parole de vie; Qu’ils adoptent généreusement la manière de vivre qui convient aux membres de ton peuple;</p> <p>Qu’ils te servent avec joie dans ton église, progressent de jour en jour, et deviennent par ta grâce, dignes de la nouvelle naissance du baptême.</p>	<p>NR-C 4</p> <p><i>Tunc extendit ambas manus super candidatos et prosequitur:</i> Aperi eis Domine, <i>[ianuam pietatis tuae]</i></p> <p>quos hodie per impositionem manuum nostrarum in catechumenatum recepimus, ianuam pietatis tuae. Obediendo evangelio tuis</p> <p>de die in diem proficiant, laeti tibi in Ecclesia deserviant, ut idonei inveniantur accedere ad gratiam baptismi tui.</p> <p><i>Tunc singuli imponit manum.</i></p>	<p>S-112 6</p> <p><i>Tunc extendit ambas manus super candidatos et prosequitur:</i> Aperi eis Domine, ianuam pietatis tuae, ut hi famuli tui et hae famulae tuae, super quos manus imponimus,</p> <p>laeti tibi in ecclesia tua deserviant, et proficiant de die in diem, ut idonei efficiantur accedere ad Baptismi gratiam.</p>
---	--	---	---

A far more curious deletion than the elimination of references to salt¹⁷ which emerged at Galloro, was the elimination of the physical laying on of hands at the conclusion of the prayer.¹⁸ Given the importance that this gesture had in the rite, this was a surprising development indeed. The *Coetus* had argued its significance from the description contained in Eusebius' *The Life of Constantine*, where the laying on of hands had been understood as being the primary gesture of the rite. They had sought to restore this centrality to the laying on of hands: not only was it the gesture from which the following signations were understood to flow, but it was the gesture by which the candidates became catechumens. By logical consequence, NR-C switched terminology from "candidate" to "catechumen" immediately after the laying on of hands. This shift in terminology is maintained in S-112, but it is not clear when this change in status occurs. It would seem that it takes place somewhere in the second half of the prayer, perhaps even by virtue of the virtual laying on of hands, since the rubric in the midst of the prayer refers to them as candidates, and the rubric immediately following the prayer refers to

¹⁷ In an occasionally scathing note to Cellier, "Louvain, 20-7-1965" in C.N.P.L. 1.C.viii: "Notes de travail (datée ou non)," Bernard Botte argued that the suppression of salt was an unfortunate misunderstanding of the element. Stenzel, following Jungmann, had misinterpreted its significance as an act of hospitality, while Botte saw it as emphasizing the seasoning effect of Christ: "Personnellement je regrette sa disparition, parce qu'il me paraît expressif et parfaitement compréhensible, si on veut bien faire la bénédiction (en langue vulgaire) devant l'assemblée, et non venir avec un pot de sel qu'on sort d'une armoire. Ce sont des liturgistes modernes qui ont détruit ce symbolisme, parfaitement exprimé par les prières: le sel est un remède contre la corruption. C'est encore compréhensible aujourd'hui, ou bien il faut renoncer à l'expliquer: Vous êtes le sel de la terre... Du point de vue pastoral, un prêtre italien m'a dit que la jeunesse se révoltait devant un pareil symbolisme. Je lui ai répondu qu'elle avait bien raison, et que si on voulait lui faire croire qu'on offrait du sel en guise d'apéritif, les gens devaient trouver cela parfaitement idiot. Mais cette idiotie n'a jamais existé dans la liturgie romaine ni africaine (voir saint Augustin), mais uniquement dans la cervelle de certains liturgistes. Si on avait bien voulu s'en tenir à l'interprétation donnée par les textes liturgiques, il n'y aurait probablement pas de problème." While Botte's overall concerns were well heeded by the *Coetus*, his preference for maintaining the distribution of salt was not, although the *Coetus* recognized that it could be culturally significant, and would allow it as an optional element.

¹⁸ While no rationale for the elimination of the physical handlaying is contained within the texts of the C.N.P.L., it is possible that its suppression has to do with the cultural objections of Bishop Nagae.

them as catechumens. S-112 lacks clarity on this point, and as a consequence, the coherence of the entire stage is hampered.

5.1.5: Signation of the Forehead and of the Senses

In treating the signing of the forehead, the *Coetus* devised a rubric that would describe an actual signation of the forehead, as well as providing for the option, in cultures where physical contact was considered improper, that the cross would be signed in the air in front of the forehead (see Table 5.6 below). They also sought a single formula that could be used in either instance. The new formula that had been accepted at Trier, “N., I mark your forehead so that Christ will take possession of you” had been deemed better than the formula in OBA, but it still did not address the two different possibilities. The first text that emerged at Clervaux, “N., accept, in your heart, the sign of the cross that we sign on your forehead,”¹⁹ was seen as an improvement over the first attempt, but the subcommittee was still not satisfied. The subcommittee opted to return to the existing texts of the rite and edit a text for an element that had been eliminated. In OBA 9 and OBA1962 8, the gift of the Spirit by insufflation was followed by the priest signing the forehead and breast of each of the catechumens. This signation led directly to the rejection of false cults in OBA, which had been suppressed in OBA1962, and to an instruction that the catechumens worship God and Christ. This element concluded with the signation of the forehead and other senses. With the removal of the rejection of false cults in OBA1962 the ritual pattern was signation of forehead and breast, instruction on worship, signation of forehead and other senses.

¹⁹ NR 6bis: “N., accipe in corde signum crucis quo frontem tuam signamus.”

TABLE 5.6

SIGNATION OF THE FOREHEAD AND THE SENSES

IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS

AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>OBA</p> <p>10. <i>Deinde pollice facit crucem in ejus fronte, et in pectore, dicens:</i></p> <p>N., accipe signum Crucis tam in fronte, quam in corde: sume fidem caelestium praeceptorum. Talis esto moribus, ut templum Dei iam esse possis: ingressusque ecclesiam Dei, evasisse te laqueos mortis, laetus agnosce. <i>Et si Catechumenus venerit de gentilitatis errore, seu de ethnicis et idololatriis, Sacerdos dicit:</i> Horresce idola, respue simulacra. [Si ex Hebraeis/Mahumetanis/Haereticis] <i>Inde prosequitur:</i> Cole Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, et saeculum per ignem. R: Amen. Oremus, Te deprecor...</p> <p>11. <i>Deinde pollice signat Electum signo crucis in fronte dicens (singulariter singulis):</i></p> <p>Signo tibi frontem, ut suscipias Crucem Domini. Signo tibi aures, ut audias divina praecepta. Signo tibi oculos, ut videas</p>	<p>OBA1962</p> <p>9. <i>Deinde singuli praetereunt ante sacerdotem, qui pollice facit crucem in eorum fronte et in pectore, dicens:</i></p> <p>N., accipe signum Crucis tam in fronte, quam in corde: sume fidem caelestium praeceptorum. Talis esto moribus, ut templum Dei iam esse possis: ingressusque ecclesiam Dei, evasisse te laqueos mortis, laetus agnosce.</p> <p><i>Inde prosequitur:</i> Colite Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, et saeculum per ignem. R: Amen. Oremus, Te deprecor...</p> <p>10. <i>Postea denuo singuli ante sacerdotem praetereunt, et ipse pollice signat singulos signo crucis in fronte dicens:</i></p> <p>Signo tibi frontem, ut suscipias Crucem Domini. Signo tibi aures, ut audias divina praecepta. Signo tibi oculos, ut videas</p>	<p>NR-C</p> <p>5. <i>Deinde celebrans pollice facit crucem in fronte (vel ante frontem, si Conferentia episcopalis ita censet ob rationes tactum dissuadentes) uniuscuiusque catechumeni, dicens:</i></p> <p>N., accipe crucem cujus signum frontii tuae imponimus in corde tuo: sume fidem et talis esto moribus, ut templum Dei iam esse possis.</p> <p>6. <i>Deinde celebrans procedit ad signationem diversorum sensuum (quae signatio omittitur, si Conferentia episcopalis ita iudicaverit) et unicuique catechumeno signationes sequentes administrat. Pollice signat dicens:</i></p> <p>Signo tibi aures, ut audias divina praecepta. Signo tibi oculos, ut videas</p>
--	--	---

TABLE 5.6

continued

OBA	OBA1962	NR-C
<p>claritatem Dei. Signo tibi nares, ut odorem suavitatis Christi sentias. Signo tibi os, ut loquaris verba vitae. Signo tibi pectus, ut credas in Deum. Signo tibi scapulas, ut suscipias jugum servitutis ejus. Signo te totum</p> <p>in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ut habeas vitam aeternam, et vivas in saecula saeculorum. R. Amen. Oremus, Preces nostras, quaesumus, Domine, clementer exaudi, et hunc Electum tuum N. Crucis Dominicae impressione signatum, perpetua virtute custodi: ut, magnitudinis gloriae tuae rudimenta servans, per custodiam mandatorum tuorum ad regenerationis gloriam pervenire mereatur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. R: Amen.</p>	<p>claritatem Dei. Signo tibi nares, ut odorem suavitatis Christi sentias. Signo tibi os, ut loquaris verba vitae. Signo tibi pectus, ut credas in Deum. Signo tibi scapulas, ut suscipias jugum servitutis ejus. Signo vos omnes in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ut habeas vitam aeternam, et vivas in saecula saeculorum. R. Amen. Oremus, Preces nostras, quaesumus, Domine, clementer exaudi, et hos Electos tuos N., N. Crucis Dominicae impressione signatos, perpetua virtute custodi: ut, magnitudinis gloriae tuae rudimenta servantes, per custodiam mandatorum tuorum ad regenerationis gloriam pervenire mereatur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. R: Amen.</p>	<p>claritatem Dei.</p> <p>Signo tibi os, ut loquaris verba vitae. Signo tibi pectus, ut credas in Deum. Signo tibi scapulas, ut suscipias jugum servitutis ejus. Signo te totum</p> <p>in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ut habeas vitam aeternam, et vivas in saecula saeculorum. R. Amen. Oremus, Preces nostras, quaesumus, Domine, clementer exaudi, et hos catechumenos N., N. virtute crucis dominicae qua eos signamus, Custodi ut gloriae rudimenta servantes, per custodiam mandatorum tuorum ad regenerationis gloriam pervenire mereatur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. R: Amen.</p>

Two important points must be noted here. First, without the renunciation of false cults, the instruction to worship God and Christ appeared misplaced, since it now lacked any symmetry within the rite. Second, with two signations of the forehead in such close proximity they were more readily seen as duplicate elements. In order to remedy these difficulties, the *Coetus* first decided to suppress the instruction to worship God and Christ since the renunciation had been moved forward in the rite; second, they opted for the elimination of the first signation of forehead and breast, so that all of the signations would be connected and would emerge from the handlaying. While the text for the signation of the forehead that was connected to the signation of the senses was not

desirable, the text for the signation of the forehead that was connected to the signation of the breast was seen to offer a good basis for revision. The subcommittee decided to modify and shorten this text and eliminate the actual signation of the breast, thereby both suggesting and allowing for a connection between the external signation and the interior disposition. Whether there was actual or symbolic contact on the forehead, the text clearly indicated a new disposition in the heart. An option was included in NR-C for instances where there might be too many catechumens for the priest to sign each one.²⁰ As had been allowed in OBA1962, the priest would recite a single formula, during which time each catechumen would be signed by their own sponsor. This formula was a variation of the usual formula, which substituted “by which sign you are signed” for “by which sign we place on your forehead.” After this signation, the optional signing of the ears, eyes, mouth, breast, shoulders, and whole body could take place.²¹

The formula for the signation of the forehead in NR-C received sharp criticism from Bernard Botte. What the subcommittee had understood as a connection between external signation and interior disposition, Botte saw as presenting a false dichotomy between heart and mind. The proper distinction between interior and exterior significance was contained in the unedited version of the prayer, which itself, was

²⁰ NR-C, 5: “Accipite crucem cuius signo vos signamus, in cordibus vestris; sumite fidem et tales et tales estote moribus, ut templum Dei iam esse possitis.”

²¹ The Coetus allowed for what might, at first glance, seem to be a ritual deficiency. On the one hand, the signation on the forehead was of sufficient importance to be maintained, even where the number of catechumens was so great as to require persons other than the celebrant to sign each of them. And yet, the rite then allows the option of signing the other senses. One solution might be to emphasize the ritual significance of the signation of the forehead, by having the celebrant perform it, no matter how many catechumens were present. On the other hand, as the Coetus noted in the Declarationes 8, that while the single signation expressed the power of Christ over the whole person, “pastoral experience demonstrated that catechumens were better able to understand this concept by the signation of the other senses also.” Thus, the Coetus allowed the rite to remain fluid, so that it might be used fruitfully to best express the theological concept of Christ’s possession of the whole person.

contained in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, “*Item ad caticuminum ex pacano faciendum*,”²² where only a signation of the forehead – not the breast – was to occur. By the sign of the cross, the catechumen was both being distinguished as a Christian within society (even if not yet fully one of the faithful), and was being aided in spiritual growth.²³ At Galloro, the *Coetus* incorporated the formula from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*. This formula had the added benefit of clarifying that instead of simply embracing faith (which the rite affirmed was possessed by the catechumens already), the catechumens were to embrace their faith based on heavenly teaching. This choice of text and the nature of the faith possessed by the catechumens occasioned a further change to the rite in the formula for signing the ears. Here a text from the *Missale Gothicum* was inserted: “... *aures, ut audias vocem Domini*.”²⁴ Three more changes were made in this section. First, the formula for the signation of the breast was altered. The formula contained in OBA and NR-C was contained within the rite for the Exorcism of a demon. The formula in S-112 was, instead, based on Ephesians 3:17: “... that Christ may dwell in your hearts through

²² Gelasian Sacramentary, LXXI, 599. See *DOBL* 239.

²³ “Louvain 20-7-1965,” 2: “Le formule proposée par le *Coetus* ne me paraît pas heureuse. ‘Recevoir la croix dans le coeur’ va prêter à des commentaires pieux qui sont ici hors de propos. Il semble que le *Coetus* n’ait pas bien compris le sens de la formule. Le signe de la croix n’est pas le geste qu’on fait avec le pouce: c’est la marque de la croix. Le signe que l’on fait imprime au catéchumène une marque d’appartenance au Christ. Cette marque est à la fois extérieure et intérieure. Extérieure, elle distingue le chrétien du païen, car le catéchumène, s’il n’est pas *fidelis*, est déjà *christianus*. En faisant le signe de croix, il se reconnaît comme chrétien. Cette marque qu’il a reçue doit le protéger contre le démon. Mais cette marque doit aussi pénétrer l’intime de l’homme. C’est un signe sacré qui doit aider à la transformation intérieure, et c’est pourquoi on ajoute: *et in corde tuo*. Ce n’est pas l’opposition ‘tête-coeur’ (intelligence-amour), mais extérieur-intérieur.”

²⁴ PL 74, 274. *Missale gothicum seu gothicogallicanum*. XXXIV. Ad Christianum Faciendum: “Signo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, ut sis Christianus; oculos, ut videas claritatem Dei; aures, ut audias vocem Domini; nares, ut odores suavitatem Christi; conversus, ut confitearis Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum; cor, ut credas Trinitatem inseparabilem.”

faith.”²⁵ Second, the formula for the anointing of the shoulders was altered to better reflect Matthew 11:30: “For my yoke is easy, my burden light.” Rather than focusing on accepting service/slavery (“*servitur*”) in Christ, which of course, Matthew 11:30 does entail, the new text emphasized the underlying freedom in accepting Christ’s yoke. The final textual amendment to this element was to the final prayer, “*Praeces nostras, quaesumus, domine...*” This text was restored to the form in which it occurred in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.²⁶

There was only one wholesale addition to this element at Galloro, which was rather unexpected. After the signing of the forehead, a very brief command to renounce idols, reminiscent of the renunciation of false cults, and a shortened instruction to worship God and Christ alone were to be re-inserted. This was to be used whenever the renunciation of false cults had been used. The text was drawn from the order for making a catechumen in the Bobbio Missal.²⁷ This addition effectively restored two elements that the *Coetus* had wisely desired to see removed from its context in OBA. In reinserting the instruction to worship God and Christ they apparently realized that a counter-balancing instruction to renounce idols was required. With the addition of this element, however, the originally intended connection between handlaying, signation of the forehead, and signation of the senses was thoroughly ruptured, especially considering that the essential element of the rite, the handlaying, had been eliminated.

²⁵ Eph. 3:17: “Christum habitare per fidem in cordibus vestris.”

²⁶ *Gelasian Sacramentary*, XXX, 286. See also *DOBL* 216.

²⁷ PL 72, 500: “Accipe signum crucis tam in fronte, quam in corde. Semper esto fidelis. Templum Dei ingredere; idola derelinque. Cole Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et Jesum Christum Filium ejus, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, et saeculum per ignem, cum Spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum.” See also *DOBL* 270.

5.1.6: Giving of a Christian Name

As discussed at Le Saulchoir, the text for the optional giving of a Christian name had been left to Seumois for his composition. The first time this text appeared was in S-112, where it occurred in dialogue form: “Celebrant: N., from now on you are named N.; Catechumens: Amen.” In choosing this format, rather than inviting the catechumen to provide their own name, the *Coetus* understood themselves to be working within the broad context of the Roman liturgical tradition, in which the parents would give the name of the child.²⁸ The rubrics did not clarify whether or not the formula was to make reference to the old name of the catechumen, though it seems probable that the dialogue was to indicate the change in name: “X, from now on you are named Y.” Otherwise, presumably, the punctuation would have been different: “Y! From now on you are named Y.”

5.1.7: Introduction into the Church

The text for the entrance of the catechumens into the Church had been crafted in French at Le Saulchoir, and was translated almost directly at Clervaux (see Table 5.7 below). The one instance in which the subcommittee diverged from the new text was in the way they named that into which the catechumens were about to enter. Rather than entering the Church of God, as indicated at Le Saulchoir, the catechumens would be entering the “House of the Church.” Thus the intent of the modifications made at Le Saulchoir was clarified. The catechumens were not becoming members of the Church, as

²⁸ S-112 Declarationes 9: “Quia forte etiam alibi talis innovatio tanquam desiderabilis consideratur, introduximus inter ritus immediate praeparatorios initiationis brevissimum ritum impositionis novi nominis, sed est ritus facultativus tantum, quia conceptio Romana (quae est etiam CIC), quod parentes nomen imponunt, non erat abolenda.”

the text's placement in OBA foreshadowed, but they were being welcomed into the place where the Church gathered, with the hope that they would soon enough be full members of that body. A further change was made in S-112 with the elimination of the words "with the faithful." No rationale was given for this change, though mention of the faithful may have been considered redundant; in the earlier versions of the instruction it was not readily perceptible as to whether "the Church" meant the building or the faithful, so in using "the house of the Church," the text was clear that the Church referred to the faithful.

NR contained the instruction that while the catechumens, their sponsors, the faithful, and the celebrant were processing into the Church a Psalm was to be sung. NR indicated that Psalm 33(34):6-12 would be the most appropriate selection. NR-C altered this direction slightly, specifying that a Psalm or canticle, such as Psalm 33(34):6, 9, 12

TABLE 5.7
INTRODUCTION INTO THE CHURCH
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

OBA 29	NR 8bis	NR-C 8
N. et N., ingredimini in sanctam ecclesiam Dei, ut accipiatis benedictionem caelestem a	N., N., N., entrez dans l'église de Dieu pour	N., N., ingredimini in domum ecclesiae, ut
Domino Iesu Christo, et habeatis partem cum illo et Sanctis ejus.	que la parole de Dieu soit votre nourriture et que vous viviez dans le Christ avec tous ses fidèles.	cum fidelibus iam partes in mensa Verba Dei habeatis.

would be best suited for the procession. NR-G made further changes to this directive, eliminating any local choice, and prescribing the antiphon “Come, children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord” (Psalm 33(34):12) to be sung with verses from the same Psalm, Psalm 33(34): 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 15. It is noteworthy that the list of verses in NR-G excludes two of the original suggestions, verses 6²⁹ and 12.³⁰ One omission was corrected in S-112, with verse 6 replacing verse 5.³¹ S-112 also replaced verse 15³² with verse 16.³³ To the procession of catechumens, sponsors, celebrant, and faithful into the Church, S-112 included specific mention of a book of Sacred Scripture. It was to be solemnly processed into the Church, enthroned and incensed, similar to the description contained in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.³⁴

While in NR the entrance into the Church was followed by an instruction by the celebrant regarding the value of proclaiming the Word within the liturgical assembly, and then allowance for a local gesture of welcome, such as presenting the candidate with a sacred medal, NR-C proposed the inversion of these two elements. While the structure in NR made sense – one’s entrance into the Church led directly to hearing the word of God – there was also clear wisdom in the revised structure: the catechumens who had just been granted entry into the Church would be welcomed; the catechumens who had just

²⁹ Psalm 33(34):6: “Look to God that you may be radiant with joy and your faces may not blush for shame” (NAB).

³⁰ Psalm 33(34):12: “Come, children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord” (NAB).

³¹ Psalm (33)34:5: “I sought the Lord, who answered me, delivered me from all my fears” (NAB).

³² Psalm 33(34):15: “Turn from evil and do good; seek peace and pursue it” (NAB).

³³ Psalm 33(34):16: “The Lord has eyes for the just and ears for their cry” (NAB).

³⁴ Gelasian Sacramentary, XXXIV. See also *DOBL* 218-219.

been given instruction on the value of the proclamation of scripture would hear God's Word. NR-C also contained another possibility regarding the gesture of welcome, and allowed for the possibility that the gesture could be offered before the actual procession into the Church. In this location, the gesture of welcome could help prepare the way for the catechumens' entry. The preferred structure set down in NR-C would be retained through S-112: entrance into the Church; gesture of welcome; introduction to the Word; celebration of the Word. The location of the gesture of welcome was reserved, however, to the local Conferences of Bishops.

The texts concerning the local gesture of welcome had been left unwritten at Le Saulchoir, and NR-C contained only a rubric that the gesture of welcome could be celebrated. Seumoïs had originally conceived of the presentation of a holy medal as being a particularly appropriate gesture here. The giving of salt was mentioned here, as discussed during the presentation to the *Consilium*. The rubric allowed this element to be quite open: no texts were provided for the administration of salt, or for a holy medal.

5.1.8: Celebration of the Word

Except for the rubric itself, no specific texts were provided for the instruction on the significance of proclaiming the Word, but this rubric grew in the various drafts of the rite under consideration. At Le Saulchoir the directive was minimal: the celebrant was to give this instruction from the ambo. NR-C added the possibility that the celebrant could, instead, give the instruction from the chancel. S-112 further elaborated, indicating that the instruction could be delivered from the chair, or from the ambo, or from the chancel; since it is listed first, the text appears to express a preference for the use of the chair. After the instruction, NR-C clarified that the Liturgy of the Word was to be celebrated.

S-112 articulated the preference that the readings for this celebration be the calling of Abraham (Genesis 12:1-8), and the call of the Apostles (John 1:35-39). These were to be concluded with a homily. Finally, S-112 indicates that the optional giving of the Gospels could be celebrated at this point in the rite.³⁵ In doing so, it transferred the optional *traditio* of the Gospels from its location during the first scrutiny to a place far earlier in the ritual structure. The rubric simply indicated that celebrant could decide to distribute books of the Gospels to the catechumens after the homily.

5.1.9: Dismissal of the Catechumens

The final element in the first stage was the liturgical dismissal, which, from Trier, was to consist of a prayer over the catechumens, intercessory prayers for the catechumens by the faithful, the laying on of hands, and a brief formula of dismissal. The shape of the liturgical dismissals began to change, however, and increasingly reflect the pattern envisioned in the scrutinies.

In setting out a shape for the dismissals, NR-C mentioned only the prayer over the catechumens and the handlaying. Following the celebration of the Word, the celebrant was to pray a prayer of blessing over the catechumens, lay hands on them, and dismiss them. NR-C indicated that if it were not feasible that the catechumens leave the assembly, they move away to the side or to the back.³⁶ No rationale was given for the

³⁵ “Observationes ab A.G. Martimort,” 5: “Si catechumeni deinceps partem habent cum fidelibus in audiendi Verbo Dei, imo et evangelio, cur non statim eis traditi Evangelium?” Martimort’s observations on the proposed rite indicated that the *traditio* of the Gospels would make good ritual sense at this point in the rite, likely because of the nature of the procession of the Gospels, which, in the Gelasian Sacramentary, preceded the *traditio* of the Gospels.

³⁶ NR-C 10: “Si propter circumstantias speciales dimissio locum habere non potest, catechumeni post impositionem manus ad sedes remotiores recedant.”

elimination of either the litany of intercession for the catechumens or the brief formula for dismissal, and it may be that these are simply oversights, as both were named in S-112. S-112 eliminated, however, the physical laying on of hands, preferring instead, that the celebrant pray the prayer with his hands outstretched over the catechumens instead. The elimination of the physical handlaying at this point in the rite marked the second time that the element had been excised from the proposed revision. Thus, the structure of the liturgical dismissals in S-112 was fivefold: celebration of the Word; litany of intercession over the catechumens; celebrant's prayer of blessing over the catechumens, with hands outstretched; and formula of dismissal. The only difference between this pattern and the celebration of the scrutinies was the insertion of the exorcism itself, in between the litany of intercession and the prayer of blessing. S-112 concluded by articulating what had been presumed by the prior draft – if the celebration of the Eucharist was to occur, it would begin with the General Intercessions.

S-112 witnesses a structural change of great significance. The physical act of laying on hands – a gesture that the *Coetus* understood to have been found in the Roman tradition of catechumenal preparation since Hippolytus³⁷ – was eliminated in the first stage of the rite. Perhaps as a compromise, the celebrant was to stretch his hands over the catechumens in place of the physical contact. Given the nature of Bishop Nagae's objections to physical contact, it seems possible, perhaps even likely, that the elimination of this handlaying was a move made for reasons of pastoral sensitivity. One might wonder, however, if indeed pastoral sensitivity was the driving force behind the elimination of both handlaying gestures, why a pastoral alternative to handlaying that

³⁷ This gesture of dismissal is present in *Apostolic Tradition* 19,

corresponded more closely to the physical handlaying was not suggested, as in the case of the signing of the forehead. Surely, a rubric that indicated that an alternative gesture, such as the celebrant holding his hands in the air directly over the head of each catechumen, could be used, with approval from the Conferences of Bishops, in regions where physical contact was culturally offensive. This option was not made, however, and whether or not pastoral sensitivity was the reason, the result is that the gesture that had been understood to be so vitally important within the catechumenate had disappeared completely from the first stage of the revised rite. While it is true that neither the handlaying that made the candidate a catechumen nor the handlaying before the catechumens were dismissed were part of OBA, the *Coetus* appeared to have sound reasons for including it, based both on liturgical history and on the mandate to revise the rites so that their purpose is clarified: “With the passage of time, however, certain features have crept into the rites of the sacraments and sacramentals that have made their nature and purpose less clear to the people of today; hence some changes have become necessary as adaptations to the needs of our own times...”³⁸ While this passage from *SC* could be read to indicate only that accretions to the core ritual should be removed, *SC* also allowed for the introduction of new elements to the rite: “Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.”³⁹ The *Coetus* had already exercised this option, introducing both the giving of a Christian name and the giving of a holy medal. Further, the witness of

³⁸ *SC* 62.

³⁹ *SC* 23.

liturgical history provided ample testimony to the presence of handlaying in the classical catechumenate – the introduction of handlaying into the rites was unquestionably organic development. Given the development of the rite up until this point in the work of revision, the complete suppression of a physical handlaying during the first station of the catechumenate should be considered an unfortunate decision.

As discussed at Le Saulchoir, the prayer of blessing over the catechumens was to be an amended version of the prayer in OBA for the imposition of salt, albeit with references to salt removed (see Table 5.8 below).⁴⁰ Excluding the text dealing with salt, the only change to the text was the shift of reference from God as being the “source of truth” to God as “source of all creatures.”⁴¹ No reason was given for the change to the text. It may, however, have been an attempt to avoid disparaging the native belief systems of the catechumens. Seumois had earlier illustrated this attitude towards the faith of the African convert, noting that the natural truth of religion was central in the life of an African; Christianity therefore found a natural point of departure in the African spirit,⁴² which was characterized by monotheism. The description of the divine being that he heard from their culture, and that he understood as being innate within them, rather than a forced intrusion into their worldview, resonated with his knowledge of God: “all

⁴⁰ NR 9: “RR no. 15 – en supprimant le sel.”

⁴¹ A search of the *Patrologia Latina* database points to two different instances where the phrase “Deus universae conditor creaturae” occurs, including Innocent III, Sermon X. See PL 17, 353. The formulation “conditor creaturae” would have been well known to the *Coetus* as it occurs within the Gelasian Sacramentary, LIII, the *Missale Gothicum* XXVII, and the Bobbio Missal, *Missa in symboli traditione*.

⁴² Seumois, *Adaptation*, 57: “Déjà dans l’antique civilisation africaine, la vertu naturelle de religion, malgré ses ombres et ses déficiences, occupait une place de choix au point qu’on a pu dire des Noirs qu’ils étaient parmi les peuples les plus religieux de la terre. L’adaptation trouvera donc une pierre d’attente au christianisme dans le caractère naturellement religieux de l’âme africaine.”

powerful creator and ruler, immense, spirit, omnipresent, and bountiful.”⁴³ It seems at least plausible, therefore, that the group may have been acknowledging an understanding of anonymous Christianity, which had been already been developed by 1963.⁴⁴ According to Karl Rahner, the possibility of individuals being able to make an implicit choice towards Christ in their lives, despite not making that choice explicit⁴⁵ was “taught materially in the Constitution on the Church of Vatican II”⁴⁶ in 1964. The Conciliar text argued that salvation could extend beyond the Church itself to include Jews and Muslims, and it granted the possibility that God is not “remote from those who in shadows and images seek the unknown God, since he gives to all men life and breath and all things, and since the Savior wills all men to be saved.”⁴⁷ In particular, Rahner was responding to an earlier suggestion which, at the very least, demonstrates the scope of the discussion in 1965, by saying that “it would be quite foolish to think that this talk about ‘anonymous Christianity’ must lessen the importance of mission preaching, the Word of God,

⁴³ Seumois, *Adaptation*, 63: “Les Noirs on une conception très élevée de l’Être suprême. Non seulement ils sont monothéistes, mais ils reconnaissent à Dieu les attributs de toute-puissance créatrice et gubernatrice, d’immensité, d’immatérialité, d’omniprésence et de bonté.”

⁴⁴ Anita Röper, *Die anonymen Christen* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Vergal, 1963). The work was translated into English by Joseph Donceel, S.J., as *The Anonymous Christian* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966). Röper recognizes that her work is based, largely, on the insights of Karl Rahner, whose treatment of the topic “although only by way of hints and in a way which only professional theologians can understand,” would remain the foundation for her own work.

⁴⁵ See “Anonymous Christian” in Joseph A. Komonchak *et. al.*, *The New Dictionary of Theology* (Collegeville: A Michael Glazier Book by the Liturgical Press, 1990), 27.

⁴⁶ Karl Rahner, “Anonymous Christians” in *Theological Investigations VI: Concerning Vatican Council II*, Karl H. Kruger and Boniface Kruger, trs. (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1969), 390-398. The original text was published in German in 1965, though, according to George E. Griener, SJ of the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, the article was written in June 1964. See <http://www.jstb.edu/faculty/pages/griener/szt01.pdf>.

⁴⁷ *Lumen Gentium*, 16. Translation from Flannery *Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, 367.

baptising, and so on.”⁴⁸ Regardless of whether or not the article to which Rahner was responding, “*Die Taufe der Weltreligionen. Bemerkungen zu einer Theorie Karl Rahners*” by Leo Elders,⁴⁹ would have come to the attention of these group, *Gaudium et spes* was certainly familiar to them. It might reasonably be said that the change of one word in the prayer text for the dismissal of catechumens points to this broadened understanding of salvation and the role of culture.

TABLE 5.8
DISMISSAL OF THE CATECHUMENS
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

OBA 15	NR-C 10
<p>Deus patrum nostrorum, Deus universae conditor veritatis, te supplices exoramus, ut hos famulos tuos N. et N.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">respicere digneris propitius,</p> <p>et hoc primum pabulum salis gustantes, non diutius esurire permittas, quo minus cibo expleantur caelesti, quatenus</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">sint semper spiritu ferventes, spe gaudentes, tuo semper nomini servientes.</p> <p>Perduc eos Domine, quaesumus, ad novae regenerationis lavacrum, ut cum fidelibus tuis promissionum tuarum aeterna praemia consequi mereantur.</p> <p>Per Christum Dominum nostrum.</p>	<p>Deus patrum nostrorum, Deus universae conditor creaturae, te supplices exoramus, ut hos famulos tuos N. et N. et has famulas tuas N. et N. respicere digneris propitius;</p> <p>Concede eis ut sint semper spiritu ferventes, spe gaudentes, tuo semper nomini servientes.</p> <p>Perduc eos Domine, quaesumus, ad novae regenerationis lavacrum, ut cum fidelibus tuis promissionum tuarum aeterna praemia consequi mereantur.</p> <p>Per Christum Dominum nostrum.</p>

⁴⁸ Rahner, 397.

⁴⁹ L. Elders, “Die Taufe der Weltreligionen. Bemerkungen zu einer Theorie Karl Rahners” in *Theologie und Glaube* LV (1965), 124-131. Cited in Rahner, 397.

5.2: Liturgical Rites for the Time of the Catechumenate

There were no significant changes to the first time period of the rite in NR-C, as no ritual texts were appended. These would only be added in the S-112, and were intended to fulfill the requirements of SC 64, which declared that the period of the catechumenate was to be a time of both instruction and liturgical celebration.⁵⁰ Structurally, liturgical dismissals were officially added to the rite in NR-C, albeit without any description of their shape. Thus, the elements for the first time period, as described in NR-C were the liturgical dismissals and celebrations of the Word which might optionally include minor exorcisms and blessings. NR-C also noted that the *traditiones* of the Gospels, Lord's Prayer, and Creed might be included within this period. By the end of the meeting at Galloro, however, only the *traditio* of the Creed would be allowed during the period of the catechumenate, and only for grave pastoral reasons.

Once the *Coetus* was able to assemble a set of texts for this period the structure of the period changed. Instead of describing celebrations of the Word with minor exorcisms and blessings and liturgical dismissals, S-112 provided texts for minor exorcisms and dismissals with blessings, both of which were to be connected to celebrations of the Word, following the homily. Thus, the structure for this period in S-112 was celebrations of the Word with minor exorcisms, and celebrations of the Word with blessings and dismissals. The minor exorcisms were not intended to be celebrated within the context of the ordinary gatherings of the community on Sunday: the explanatory rubrics for the

⁵⁰ SC 64: "... the time of the catechumenate, which is intended as a period of well-suited instruction, may be sanctified by sacred rites to be celebrated at successive intervals of time."

minor exorcisms indicate that these were to occur either at the beginning or end of catechetical sessions,⁵¹ and make no mention of dismissals. On the other hand, it appears that the blessings might find their place during the community's Eucharistic liturgy, since an optional handlaying is mentioned as preceding the exit of the catechumens. This is not necessarily the case, however, as the rubric does not contain any litanic intercessions over the catechumens, which would complete the liturgical dismissal.

Drawing on the liturgical traditions of East and West, S-112 included eight texts for minor exorcisms, and nine texts for blessings. Of these seventeen texts, twelve were drawn from other liturgical sources and edited, and five were new compositions (see Table 5.9 below). The minor exorcisms were all deprecatory, addressing either the Father or the Son.⁵²

5.3: The Second Stage: Election

The second stage, previously named *Electione seu inscriptio*, was renamed, simply, *De electione* in NR-C, and the rite was given a formalized four-part structure. In NR, the rite had also been conceived of in a four-part structure, but in NR-C the elements were reorganized (although the ritual shape remained exactly the same). The initial instruction to the community, a separate element in NR, was merged with the presentation of the candidates, another separate element in NR, to form a single element in NR-C. These were followed, as they had been, by the interrogation of the sponsors and catechumens, and the inscription of names. The final element in NR-C was the

⁵¹ S-112 19: "Aliquoties exorcismi, de quibus nunc agitur, administrabuntur in principio vel in fine adunationum ad catechesim."

⁵² The inclusion of only deprecatory texts may well correspond to an intent to distinguish ritually between the scrutinies and exorcisms during the catechumenate.

TABLE 5.9
SOURCES OF MINOR EXORCISMS AND BLESSINGS
IN THE RITES OF THE CATECHUMENATE
IN S-112

S-112	Incipit	Source
22	Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui per unigenitum...	East Syrian (Denziger I, 272) (L)
23	Domine Deus noster, per quem vita...	<i>Testamentum Domini</i> 2.7 (L)
24	Domine Deus omnipotens, qui hominem ad imaginem...	Byzantine (Goar 276-277) and Coptic (Denziger I, 400) (L)
25	Domine Jesu Christi, hominum amator...	Coptic (Denziger I, 199)
26	Domine Jesu Christe, qui, missus a Patre et unctus...	*Is. 61:1-3, 18; Luke 4:16-30; Eph. 2:2-12
27	Domine Jesu Christe, qui discipulos tuos in monte...	*Luke 6:20-26; Matt. 5:1-16
28	Domine Jesu Christe, qui, sedata tempestate maris...	*Matt. 9:1-18, 8:23-24
29	Domine, Deus sapientiae et misericordiae...	*Gal. 1:15-16; Phil. 3:8, 13
32	Da, quaesumus, Domine, electis nostris...	OBA 4
33	Domine, qui per sanctos prophetas...	Apostolic Constitutions 8.8 (L)
34	Domine omnipotens, Pater Domini nostri...	Apostolic Constitutions 8.6 (L)
35	Domine Deus noster, qui in altis habitas...	Byzantine (Goar, 56)(L)
36	Domine omnium, qui per unigenitum filium tuum...	*Sarapion (Funk II, 161)
37	Deus, qui mundum ab errore liberasti...	<i>Testamentum Domini</i> 2.5 (L)
38	Deus, Pater noster, qui omnes vis salvari...	Byzantine (Goar, 281)(L)
39	Domine Deus omnipotens, Pater Domini Dei...	Coptic (Denziger I, 202)(L)
40	Famulos tuos et famulas tuas, qui adhaerent...	Ethiopian (Denziger I, 226)(L)

*=Source of inspiration for a newly composed text.

(L)=Inclusion in Ligier's text collection.

the declaration of the names of the elect, which, in NR, was found alongside the inscription of names.

Because the rite of Election was an innovation within the structure of adult initiation, there must have been an expectation that few pastors would readily understand the purpose of this rite. Perhaps as a consequence, the description of the second station of the rite began, in NR-C, with a rubric briefly describing the manner in which the rite was to be celebrated, thereby mirroring Cellier's proposal from Le Saulchoir. The NR introduction may be seen as a model for the text in NR-C, though the latter is, by no

means, a translation of the former (see Table 5.10 below). These texts articulated that the rite was to begin the final preparation of the catechumens – who would become Elect during the rite – for their initiation at the Easter Vigil. According to NR-C, the celebration was to occur in the presence of the community of the faithful towards the beginning of Lent (“*versus initium huius Quadragesimae*”), though S-112 provided a more precise time – the rite should be celebrated on the first Sunday of Lent, during the Eucharistic liturgy, or, if that was not possible, in the week preceding or following the first Sunday of Lent during a votive mass, or, finally, without mass at all. Given the expectation that the final preparation of the elect would serve as a model of the sort of conversion to which all of the Church was called, the strong preference remained for celebration of this rite during mass on the first Sunday of Lent. Consistent with the decision reached at Le Saulchoir, the rubric indicated that the celebrant was to give a brief address to the entire assembly, to inspire them to make their own journey towards Easter with the same fervor as the elect.

5.3.1: Presentation of the Candidates

Following the celebrant’s address, according to NR-C, the first element in the rite was to be the presentation of the catechumens. NR-G clarified that a celebration of the Word should be celebrated between the celebrant’s address and the presentation of the candidates, and S-112 further specified that the presentation was to occur after the homily. In NR the presentation was to be made by the priest who prepared the catechumens, or a deacon, or a catechist. NR-C expanded the list, to also include a representative of the community. Further, NR had limited the text for the presentation to the one contained in the rite, while NR-C indicated that it could be made in “these or

TABLE 5.10
INTRODUCTORY RUBRIC
IN THE RITE OF ELECTION
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>NR 32 Par ce rite, les Catéchumènes deviennent des “Élus.” C’est donc tendus vers le Baptême et l’Eucharistie de Pâques qu’ils vont entrer dans la célébration de ce Carême, avec l’ensemble de la Communauté chrétienne.</p> <p>1. <u>Monition</u> La monition s’adresse à l’ensemble de la Communauté: elle montre le rapport entre ce rite de l’Élection et l’appel dans l’attitude de conversion baptismale; elle est donc orientée vers la participation au Mystère Pascal.</p>	<p>NR-C 20 Qui digni habiti sunt, ut in Vigilia Paschali sacris initientur mysteriis, arctiore modo una cum communitate christiana Quadragesimam tamquam ultimam praeparationem peragunt. Versus initium huius Quadragesimae catechumeni, comitantibus patrinis (et matrinis) se sistunt in ecclesia coram communitate christiana, ut electi constituentur. Antequam praesententur, celebrans communitatem monet ut hanc Quadragesimam tali vivat fervore, qui mox eligendis adiumento sit.</p>
---	---

similar words.” The text that was given in NR-C was, in large part, a literal translation of the French text in NR (see Table 5.11 below). The single change in content was in the final request. While NR declared that the catechumens sought to “receive Baptism and the Eucharist in the joy of the Easter celebration,” NR-C indicated that the catechumens “sought to be admitted into participation in the mystery of initiation.” While NR-G displays further linguistic change to the text, the content is the same; the most significant change is in rendering the phrase “manifesting their desire” as “humbly seek (*humiliter petunt*).” The only noteworthy alteration in S-112 is in describing Easter as “solemn” (*solemniis*) rather than a “feast” (*festis*).

Once this speech had been made, the celebrant indicated that the candidates and their sponsors were to come forward. At this point, the one responsible for presenting the candidates would call out their names, and they were to come forward, one by one, after which the person who had presented the candidates indicated that the sponsors thought

TABLE 5.11

PRESENTATION OF THE CANDIDATES

IN THE RITE OF ELECTION

AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>NR 32b</p> <p>P: Père, à l'approche des Fêtes de Pâques, des Catéchumènes ont manifesté le désir de participer aux prochains scrutins et de recevoir le Baptême et l'Eucharistie dans la joie des Fêtes de Pâques.</p> <p>C: Que ces Catéchumènes s'avancent avec leurs parrains et marraines à l'appel de leur nom.</p> <p>P: N., N., N.,...</p> <p><i>Les Catéchumènes, ayant leurs parrains et marraines à leur côté, viennent se placer devant le Célébrant.</i></p> <p>P: Après avoir prié et réfléchi, leurs parrains et marraines, au nom de la Communauté, croient pouvoir vous assurer qu'ils s'y sont préparés avec foi et ferveur.</p>	<p>NR-C 20</p> <p>S: Reverende Pater! Paschalibus festis appropinquantibus catechumeni hic praesentes desiderium manifestaverunt, ut postquam scrutati fuerint,</p> <p>ad mysteria initiationis iam participanda admittantur.</p> <p>C: Procedant qui eligendi sunt cum patrinis (et matrinis) suis.</p> <p><i>Tunc is, qui praesentat, singulorum nomina vocat, ut unusquisque, procendendo se sistat cum patrino (vel matrino) coram celebrante. Postquam omnes processerint dicit fere sic:</i></p> <p>S: Post maturam deliberationem hi patrini (et matrinae) coram communitate de catechumenatu cum fide et fervore peracto testimonium perhibent.</p>
---	---

these candidates worthy of continuing in their journey. NR-C translated the latter text directly from the French in NR. There was some difference, however, in the description of the way in which the catechumens were to come forward, which, itself, is indicative of a larger issue in the revision of the rites. NR had included the description of the way in which the candidates were to come forward – “when their name was called” – in the spoken direction itself, but NR-C truncated the spoken text of NR, and instead provided a rubric describing the nature of the movement after that text. The change made in NR-C is unfortunate, as the candidates and sponsors are left trying to intuit how the movement is to occur, with no assistance provided in the spoken text of the rite. Certainly, eliminating excesses from texts was part of the *Coetus*' official mandate. In this case,

however, the “excess” of a clarifying direction would be most helpful. Pastorally speaking, the catechumens and, likely, most of the sponsors, would not have taken part in this rite previously, and thus, if the rite were celebrated as written, they would not know what to do. The spoken text in NR-C does not clarify that individuals are to come up one at a time, but, rather, implies the opposite; since the formula is written using the plural form, the logical conclusion is that the group is to come forward. It seems a foreseeable consequence, therefore, that some, if not many or all, of the catechumens might begin to come forward when the celebrant gives the instruction as it appears in NR-C. At best, the spoken direction does not give the ritual participants enough information. At worst, it misleads them. In either case, the rite is unclear at this point, and some degree of confusion will inevitably occur if the rite is enacted in the manner in which it is laid out. If steps are taken to avert the possible confusion, at least three possible solutions can be proposed, none of which, however, are better than the solution proposed in NR. First, the person responsible for preparing the catechumens could instruct the catechumens or the candidates beforehand about the proper time in which they are to come forward. Presuming that all remember this instruction, such instruction on ritual minutia is outside of the scope of the purpose of the period of the catechumenate, which was directed towards developing a mature faith. Second, the catechumens and their sponsors might “rehearse” the rite before actually celebrating it. Many pastoral liturgists have argued against this option, proposing a modified version of the *Disciplina arcani*,⁵³ and some

⁵³ According to Edward Yarnold S.J., “by the fourth century and the first half of the fifth, this practice of preserving the central elements of the faith as a secret from outsiders became universal. One can see it working at Rome; Milan, in the writings of St. Ambrose; Verona; Constantinople; Antioch; North Africa; Cappadocia... It was felt that a Christian needed to experience the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist before he was ready to receive instruction about them. Theological as well as pedagogical

suggest that the rehearsal of a rite can negatively limit the way in which it is experienced when it is actually celebrated.⁵⁴ Third, the celebrant, noting the ritual discrepancy, might attempt to clarify the movement himself, by adding his own direction to the ritual text. Even if he were able to do so succinctly and clearly (which is by no means certain), he will have simply added back in to the rite what was removed in the first place. In the end, pruning the direction for movement from the text, which, nonetheless, was and remains an instructive text, contradicts the intent of the revision of the rites. In the example of this text, the directive of SC 34 that “the rites should be marked by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people’s powers of comprehension and as a rule not require much

reasons are given for this practice [see *De Sacramentis* 1.1, and Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Mystagogical Catechesis* 1.1].” See *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation: The Origins of the R.C.I.A.* Second Edition (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 56-57.

⁵⁴ At a practical level, in discussing what should occur at the parish level for the elect, Gabe Huck argues that “the ancient practice of the church was that the elect know almost nothing about what would take place at the Vigil. They are told what garments they need to bring and little more. Godparents and others should attend a rehearsal prior to the Triduum so that they can be of real assistance to the elect at the liturgy.” See *The Three Days: Parish Prayer in the Paschal Triduum*, Revised Edition (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1992), 96.

See also Don A. Neumann, *Holy Week in the Parish* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 37-38: “In earlier times the elect were not told the details of the baptismal liturgy. It was believed that if the rites of initiation were to maintain their power, the candidates should not know them beforehand. Such discreet preparation contributed to the awesome and transforming nature of these rites. The same is possible today. Prior to Holy Saturday it is necessary to tell the candidates for baptism only that they will be invited to be bathed in the mystery of Jesus Christ. They can be instructed to come to the Vigil in their ordinary daily clothes, bringing with them clothes which will serve as their baptismal garments, reflecting the brilliance of their new life in Christ... *Rehearsals should never occur for the elect before the Vigil, since these rob the liturgy of its pneumatic power. As the early Church recorded, the best liturgy is that which is able to have an unexpected effect on the sacramental candidates.*”(emphasis added)

More recently, see J. Michael McMahon, *The Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults: A Pastoral Liturgical Commentary* Revised Edition (Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, 2002), 30: “Immediate preparation of candidates for the rites should not necessarily or even preferably include a rehearsal or even an explanation of the celebration beforehand. Free of the anxiety about what they are to do or say next, catechumens are allowed simply to enter into the experience of the rites, including the various elements of prayer, silence, proclamation, gesture, symbol, and music. Sponsors, of course, must know the order of the rites thoroughly and guide the catechumens gently during the celebrations.

This approach to preparation of candidates is in keeping with the practice of many of the ancient churches. Although present-day parish communities are not trying to enforce a *disciplina arcani*, they often find that the experience of the rites leads to fruitful reflection and catechesis.”

explanation” is not followed. The text was indeed rendered shorter, but it was not clear, it does not promote noble simplicity, it eludes the powers of comprehension, and it requires some degree of explanation. How much easier would it have been to have left those few words in the text, or, perhaps better, craft a new text that could have drawn on either Isaiah 43:1⁵⁵ or John 10:3.⁵⁶

5.3.2: Dialogue with the Sponsors

The interrogation of the sponsors followed the presentation of the candidates. NR provided a brief description of the importance of election intended to contextualize the subsequent questions, which was eliminated in NR-C (see Table 5.12 below). S-112 restored a shortened version of this description to the rite, which was to lead into the questioning of the sponsors. At this point, however, treating ritual posture would once again be the cause for textual revision. The intended posture of the sponsors while they were answering the celebrant’s questions was that they put their hand on the shoulder of the catechumen whom they represented. NR indicated this posture simply via a rubric; between the first question, “Who do you present?,” and the first answer “N.,” the sponsor was instructed, through a rubric, to place their hand on the shoulder of the catechumen. No direction is given as to how the sponsors were supposed to know this, and, presumably, the sort of scenario described in regard to the catechumens coming forward at the sound of their name would be played out here. NR-C recognized the inherent ritual difficulty in this situation, and included a direction to the celebrant to “invite the sponsors

⁵⁵ Isaiah 43:1: “But now, thus says the Lord, who created you, O Jacob, and formed you, O Israel: Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by name: you are mine.”

⁵⁶ John 10:3: “The gatekeeper opens it for him, and the sheep hear his voice, as he calls his own sheep by name and leads them out.”

to put their hand on the right shoulder of their catechumen, and respond to the following questions.” Clearly, NR-C demonstrated a greater degree of pastoral sensitivity here than NR.⁵⁷ S-112 progressed further, however, and, in restoring the descriptive introduction to the questions, included a clear directive to the sponsors to put their hand on the shoulder of their catechumen.

TABLE 5.12
DIALOGUE WITH THE SPONSORS
IN THE RITE OF ELECTION
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX AND IN S-112

<p>NR 33</p> <p>C: En tous temps, Dieu choisit ses élus. Il leur fait entendre la Bonne Nouvelle du Salut, mais Il demande à chacun d’eux d’y répondre. Aujourd’hui, l’Église veut savoir si ces Catéchumènes sont prêts au Baptême et à l’Eucharistie.</p> <p>C’est pourquoi j’invite les parrains de ces Catéchumènes à me répondre à ce sujet, autant que leurs limites humaines le leur permettent. <i>Le Célébrant s’adresse successivement à chacun des parrains.</i></p> <p>C: Qui présentez-vous? P: <i>Mettant la main sur l’épaule de son filleul,</i></p> <p>Je présente N.,</p>	<p>NR-C, 21 [S-112, 43:</p> <p>C: Ecclesia Sancta Dei certior vult reddi, num hi catechumeni digni sint, qui ad ventura paschatis sollemnia celebranda in ordinem electorum assumantur. Ideo vos, patrilinos (et matrilinas), rogo ut testimonium exhibeatis.</p> <p>Ponite, ergo manum dexteram super humerum dextrum eius, quem (quam) praesentatis, et ad mea quaesita sincere respondete:] <i>Tunc celebrans invitât patrilinos (et matrilinas) ut manum dexteram in humerum dextrum catechumenorum ponant et ad sequentes interrogationes respondeant:</i></p>
---	---

⁵⁷ That the subcommittee would insert a spoken direction here, while removing one immediately beforehand is perplexing. Clearly, they were aware of the difficulties in celebrating a rite that was new or unfamiliar to the vast majority of the participants. The removal of the prior directive is, thus, rendered even more curious.

continued

NR-C departed from the form of NR in indicating that the sponsors were to be questioned as a group, rather than individually. The worksheets from Le Saulchoir had included the notation that these might be rendered collectively if necessary, but at Clervaux this option was taken as the normative position. Thus, as a necessary consequence, each of the questions in NR-C was altered from its form in NR. In the earlier version, the name of the catechumen preceded each question about them: “N., has he/she...” After three questions to the sponsor and a fourth question to the catechumens, each beginning with the name of the catechumen, signing the names of the catechumens in the book could be seen more clearly as the culmination of the rite. In an attempt to provide ritual balance, as well, perhaps, as eliminating the possibility of the sponsors

answering the question directed towards the catechumens, S-112 included a short speech directed towards the catechumens mirroring the speech directed towards the sponsors.

The first question in NR-C, “Have they faithfully listened to the Word of God, proclaimed by the Church?” was a direct translation of NR, while the second and third questions maintained the content in a broad sense, but rendered them in a more “sober” fashion. In particular, the second question in NR-C, “Have they begun to live according to the Word that they have heard?,” made an explicit connection to the first through rooting Christian life in the Scriptures. The third question, “Have they adhered to familial communion?,” pointed to the culmination of initiation, communion with the “brotherhood” (*fraternae*). S-112 made no changes to the first question, and altered the second and third only in order to clarify their content: in the second, the verb “live” was changed to “walk in God’s presence;” and in the third the brotherhood was described as faithful.

In NR, following the interrogation of the sponsors, the celebrant was to ask the faithful if they wanted to be baptized. The question was changed only slightly in NR-C: “Do you wish to approach baptism?” This had the effect of more clearly outlining initiation as a process – something towards which one grew and progressed rather than something someone “got.” This change also pointed towards the fact that the catechumen still had to undergo the intensive preparation that occurred during the second period, Lent. The element of personal desire, the focus of the question in NR, was maintained, but the question in NR-C expanded upon that desire and broadened its impact. As noted earlier, S-112 inserted a brief introductory speech to the catechumens themselves, mirroring the interrogation of the sponsors, and clearly indicating that new subjects were

to be questioned. The question in S-112 was further altered. On the one hand, the question more readily pointed to the question asked in NR, asking if the catechumens desired to be baptized. On the other hand, the revision expanded the scope of the question, asking not only if the catechumens sought baptism, but also Confirmation and the Eucharist. To this the celebrant responded “Thanks be to God.”⁵⁸

5.3.3: The Inscription of Names

The inscription of names was to follow the interrogations. NR-C mirrored NR here, indicating that the celebrant was to give a brief statement introducing the inscription, stating that by the inscription the catechumens would become elect. The original text in NR was shortened in NR-C, though the sense of the original was, for the most part, maintained (see Table 5.13 below). The most significant portion of the text in NR that was omitted in the revision was its Christological emphasis. Instead of describing how the Church acted in the name of Christ, the text in NR-C mentioned neither Christ nor the Church, stating instead that through the writing of their names the catechumens would become elect. This text was rendered differently in S-112, although the content remained largely the same as in NR-C: “Since this is the case [the catechumens desire initiation], come forward and give your name. It will be written, in order that your election might be established.”

Despite the question that had arisen at Le Saulchoir about who should sign the book underneath the name of each elect, the manner in which the names were written

⁵⁸ Perhaps for the sake of ritual brevity, this statement of thanksgiving does not appear at the end of the dialogue with the catechumens, but at the beginning of the celebrant’s instruction to the catechumens to come forward so that their names might be written in the book.

TABLE 5.13
THE INSCRIPTION OF NAMES
IN THE RITE OF ELECTION
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>NR 34 <i>L'interrogatoire étant terminé, le Célébrant s'adresse à l'ensemble des parrains.</i> C: Puisque vous vous portez garant du progrès de ces Catéchumènes qui demandent le Baptême, au nom du Christ, l'Église accueille aujourd'hui chacune de ces demandes et nous inscrivons le nom de ces nouveaux élus.</p> <p><i>A tour de rôle, chaque parrain, accompagné de son filleul, s'approche du Célébrant et lui indique le nom de son filleul. Le Célébrant inscrit au registre le nom de l'Élu; en regard de ce nom, le parrain appose sa signature. Lorsque tous les noms inscrits, le Célébrant signe l'ensemble du document.</i> <i>Pendant ce temps, l'Assemblée chante. (?? Pss. 4, [15](16), [41](42))</i></p> <p>C: N., N., N.,... vous êtes élus pour être baptisés et pour participer à l'Eucharistie à la prochaine fête de Pâques.</p>	<p>NR-C 22-23 22. Tunc celebrans dicit:</p> <p>C: Hoc testimonio audito</p> <p>inscribimus nomina horum catechumenorum, ut de eorum electione constet.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Quisque patrinus cum suo candidato accedit ad celebrantem eique nomen eius indicat. Celebrans nomen libro inscribit</i> <i>cui patrinus (vel matrina) suum nomen ipse celebrans subsignat elenchum.</i></p> <p><i>Interim cantatur cantus aptus, v.g. Ps. [15](16)</i> 23. <i>Postea celebrans dicit:</i> C: N., N., N., electi estis ut</p> <p>in proxima nocte paschali sacris initiemini mysteriis.</p>
---	---

remained consistent with NR: the sponsor spoke the catechumen's name, the celebrant wrote it in the book, and the sponsor confirmed the name with their own signature. Once all of the names had been written, the celebrant was to sign his own name to the bottom of the list. S-112 provided the option that in cases where the number of catechumens was large, the books might be signed ahead of time, and a deacon would present the book to the celebrant, saying "These are the names of the *competenti*." A song was to be sung during the signing of the book. NR-C narrowed down the list of suggested Psalms from 4, 15(16), and 41(42) to Psalm 15(16) alone, or another suitable song. While no rationale

was provided for removing Psalm 4 from the list of possibilities, the *Coetus* indicated that Psalm 41(42) should not be used at this point because of its traditional place during the Vigil.⁵⁹

5.3.4: Declaration of Election

The inscription of names was concluded with the celebrant proclaiming those whose names had been signed as elect, and advised them about what the Paschal Vigil would hold for them (see Table 5.14 above).⁶⁰ While NR had described the process of their initiation (“to be baptized and to participate in the Eucharist”), NR-C provided a less structural description. The elect were to “initiated into the sacred mysteries.”

NR-C concluded its description of the second station by indicating that the rite should be completed with a final prayer, OBA 11, “*Deus, qui humani generis...*” The subcommittee restored this text to the form observed in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* with one exception. Instead of referring to “adopted people,” they preferred “adopted children.”⁶¹ NR-C does not mention the celebration of the Eucharist that was presumed to have followed the rite of Election, and consequently, it does not treat the liturgical dismissal. Discussions at Le Saulchoir clearly reveal that the *Coetus* had agreed to this

⁵⁹ S-112 Declarationes, 27: “Cantus ‘Sicut cervus’ tamquam inscriptionem concomitans, uti mense aprili proposuimus, quibusdam ex Vobis minum placuit; inde loco eius introduximus Ps. 15[16], ita ut canticum ‘Sicut cervus’ non occurrat nisi in loc suo a saeculis privilegato, nempe in vigilia paschali.”

⁶⁰ Again, should NR-C have retained the individual interrogation of the sponsors and catechumens as contained in NR, the proclamation of the names of the elect at the end of the rite may well have been heightened. Those gathered faithful would not be hearing the names for the first time as they are declared elect, but instead, some connections would have been made during the interrogation themselves. Further, the names would have been associated with faces – NR-C nowhere indicates that the elect were to distinguish themselves in any way as their name was called (standing, coming forward, etc.). Rather, the names were to be read off simply as a list. One possibility for personal contact appears to have been squandered here in the interests of brevity.

⁶¹ Gelasian Sacramentary, XXX, 287. See also *DOBL* 216.

proposal, and S-77 demonstrates that the *Consilium* had agreed to the Eucharistic setting of the second station.⁶² This was realized in S-112, which provided a liturgical dismissal according to the pattern used in that document for the first stage. Thus, before the prayer “*Deus, qui humani generis...*” S-112 inserted a sample text for a litany of intercession over the elect, with one petition drawn from Pope Celestine⁶³ and two inspired by John Chrysostom.⁶⁴ The remaining three petitions were newly composed. Following the blessing prayer, “*Deus, qui humani generis...*” the elect would be dismissed with the usual formula for dismissal, and the celebration of the Eucharist would continue, once the elect had left, with the General Intercessions.

5.4: The Scrutinies

The second time period, defined in NR as “*De ritibus liturgicis Tempore Quadragesimae*” had originally consisted of the scrutinies and the *traditiones*. While retaining its content in NR-C, the period was briefly renamed *De scrutiniis*. Yet another name change would be enacted in S-112, where this time period would become the third stage, “*Scrutinia et Traditiones*.” While the content of this period remained consistent through the changes in title, the connection of the scrutinies to the *traditiones* would

⁶² S-77 26: “Post orationem, quae concludit inscriptionem electi, dimittatur more solito, sed loco orationis consuetae ponetur oratio specialis ‘super electos.’ Post dimissionem electorum liturgia eucharistica incipiet cum oratione fidelium.”

⁶³ Celestine I, “Coelestini Papae, pro Prospero et Hilario, seu pro ipso Augustino, de gratia Dei, Epistola, Ad Galliarum episcopos.” in *PL* 50, 535: “ut denique catechumenis ad regenerationis sacramenta perductis coelestis misericordiae aula reseretur.

⁶⁴ These two intercessions are described as being “inspired by” works written around 400 and 402. No further information is given.

undergo considerable change (see Table 5.14 below). In NR and NR-C, preference had been expressed for the celebration of the *traditiones* during the scrutinies themselves (Gospels-optional, Creed, and Lord's Prayer), or during the period of the catechumenate, at the discretion of the local Conferences of Bishops. In NR-G the *traditio* of the Gospels was permitted as an option during the rite for making catechumens, the *traditio* of the Creed was to take place during the first scrutiny, and the *traditio* of the Lord's Prayer was to take place during the third scrutiny. Allowance was still made for the celebration of the *traditiones* during the period of the catechumenate. In S-112, however, the *traditiones* of the Creed and Lord's Prayer were suggested for celebration in the weeks following the first and third scrutiny, and lectionary readings were given for the masses during which they were to occur. They might still be celebrated during the scrutiny masses. However, only the *traditio* of the Creed was permitted, when required by reasons of grave necessity, during the period of the catechumenate.

The structure of the scrutinies presented in NR-C began according to the plan developed at Le Saulchoir. NR-C contained only texts for the first scrutiny, with a later notation indicating that the second and third scrutiny would follow the same format, but would have different texts. The only text to be shared in common between the three scrutinies was the closing prayer for the entire rite, "*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*" A basic introductory rubric was included in NR-C, which was amended at Galloro. The revised text was composed by Seumois, and expanded on the original, noting that the proper days for the celebration of the Scrutinies were the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent, and indicated that the proper Gospel readings for each were the Samaritan woman (John 4), the Man born blind (John 9), and the Raising of Lazarus (John 11). If

TABLE 5.14
LOCATION OF THE TRADITIONES
FROM S-77 TO S-112

Key:
C=Creed
G=Gospels
P=Lord's Prayer
1=optimal location
2=secondary location
()=optional
*=Grave Pastoral Reasons

	Catechumenate	First Scrutiny	Week after First Scrutiny	Second Scrutiny	Third Scrutiny	Week after Third Scrutiny
S-77	C1, P1	C2, P2 – could be celebrated during Lent				
NR	(G2), C2, P2	(G1)		C2	P2	
NR-C	(G2), C2, P2	(G1)		C2	P2	
NR-G	C2, P2	C1			P1	
S-112	C*	C2	C1		P2	P1

they could not be celebrated on their proper days, they were to be celebrated on other Lenten Sundays, or, if the rite was being used outside of the typical period, the scrutiny masses should be celebrated during the week. In each event, the scrutiny was to be celebrated following the homily. As described in NR, the elect and their sponsors were to stand in front of the celebrant, who was to instruct them to kneel and pray.⁶⁵ Here, however, the subcommittee offered a pastoral alternative to the posture of kneeling. NR-C indicated that the Conferences of Bishops could instead opt to have the elect make a profound bow, or they might prostrate themselves. Formulae for both of these options were provided in NR-C. At this point, as in NR, the celebrant was to invite the sponsors to place their hands on the right shoulder of the one for whom they were responsible (or

⁶⁵ By instructing the elect to pray, the subcommittee apparently made a decision on the debate that surfaced during their previous meeting; it was, at the very least, acceptable for the non-baptized to pray silently within the liturgical assembly.

extend their hand over them, should the elect be prostrate), and the celebrant would introduce the litany of intercession over the elect. The subcommittee decided to adapt the litany contained in *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII, 6 rather than the text from Chrysostom, both of which had been suggested at Le Saulchoir. They chose, however, to amend the celebrant's introduction to this litany from the source material, "Catechumens, pray!,"⁶⁶ presumably based on their understanding that participation in the community's prayer by the elect was inappropriate, as well as the fact that the elect had ceased being catechumens. The preference that the elect not join in the community's prayers can be seen within this same passage from *Apostolic Constitutions*, given that after the instruction for the catechumens to pray, the clarification was given that "all the faithful shall pray for them with understanding."⁶⁷ The text proposed at Clervaux, which would not be altered by the subsequent revisions, instructed the faithful to "pray for the elect, and implore the mercy of God over them" (see Table 5.15 below), while the Deacon or cantor led these or similarly phrased intercessions. S-112 removed the option of the cantor leading these prayers, naming the Deacon alone, presumably based on Martimort's argument that the ministry of cantor had not been mentioned in *SC*.⁶⁸ Martimort

⁶⁶ *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII, 6:3-4: "Ac silentio facto dicat: Orate catechumeni. Et omnes fideles pro illis cum attentione orent dicentes: Kyrie eleison." See also *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions: A Text for Students*, Alcuin/GROW 13-14, Grove Liturgical Study 61, translated, edited, annotated, and introduced by W. Jardine Grisbrooke (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1990), 22-23.

⁶⁷ Grisbrooke, 23: "Several translators render [understanding] as 'fervently' or 'with devotion,' but the point surely is that the faithful *do* understand (the faith), whereas the catechumens as yet do not."

⁶⁸ *SC* 26-32 describes the "Norms drawn from the Hierarchic and Communal Nature of the Liturgy," in which the "holy people united and ordered under their bishops" (26) celebrate the liturgy. Apart from the order of priest (6) and deacon (35), *SC* 29 lists the ministries of "servers, readers, commentators, and members of the choir," but the ministry of cantor does not appear in the document.

suggested, instead, that “another priest or the commentator,”⁶⁹ who would preferably be ordained, would be better suited to the ministerial function of leading liturgical prayer.⁷⁰

All of the intercessions for the first scrutiny in NR-C were drawn from the Apostolic Constitutions, except for a newly composed third intercession, which asked that the elect might be instructed in God’s truth. Even as a new composition, however, it was still based on its source text, as it was simply a condensed version of several intercessions that asked that the elect might have the gospel revealed to them, that they be enlightened, instructed, and taught. S-112 added the helpful invocation “*Dominum preceumur*” to the end of each intercession, and made few cosmetic changes to the text of the first two intercessions; even the most substantial change was a largely structural. The first intercession was the only one in which God was directly addressed in the intercession itself, rather than in the invocation. This text was brought into conformity with the structure of the others. However, beginning with the newly composed third intercession, NR-G offered three new compositions to replace the two found in NR-C: that the elect be filled with a yearning for the gifts of God; that they drink the water of life; and that they might become adopted children of God through the waters of baptism. In S-112 the first two intercessions for the first scrutiny retained the form given to them in NR-G. The newly composed third intercession was modified grammatically, while the content

⁶⁹ “Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schemata Coetus* XXII, De Ordine baptismi adultorum, prosequuntur” in C.N.P.L. 1.C.iv: “Envoi aux consultants et super consultants, 26/6/65,” 2.

⁷⁰ According to the 1958 instruction on sacred music and the liturgy, *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia ad mentem litterarum Pii Papae XII ‘Musicae sacrae disciplina’ et ‘Mediator Dei’* 96, “It is fitting that the role of commentator may be performed by a priest or at least a cleric. When they cannot be had, the task may be entrusted to a layman of outstanding Christian life who is well instructed in his role. Women may never assume the role of commentator.” See *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 50 (1958) 630-668, tr. Robert Hayburn, *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1979), 356-377.

remained the same. The fourth intercession was eliminated. The fifth intercession combined the texts of NR-C and NR-G, thus re-appropriating the petition from Apostolic Constitutions, and asked that the elect, by the waters of baptism, might be counted with God's flock. The intercessions for the second and third scrutiny would not be included within the text of the rite until S-112.

According to the format ratified at Le Saulchoir the intercessions were to conclude with a closing prayer before moving to the exorcism. The text for the concluding prayer from the Apostolic Constitutions was found wanting, and instead, a text from the Ambrosian Rite was included in NR-C: "*Invocamus clementiam tuam, omnipotens Deus, super hos electos tuos. Dona eis Domine tuam benedictionem caelestam et perduc eos ad fontam vitae perpetua ut renati ex aqua et spiritu sancto nova et caelesti in Christo gloria gratulentur.*" In S-112 this prayer was removed, and the decision was made that a separate prayer to conclude the intercessions was to be removed. The rite would, thus, continue with the introduction to the exorcism.

For each of the three scrutinies both an imperative and deprecatory exorcism had been composed for the Le Saulchoir meeting. The imperative and deprecatory prayers were, largely, the same composition, only changing where necessary to retain the proper form and voice, and each of these was clearly related to the Gospel readings to which they were aligned. By Clervaux, however, a preference emerged for retrieving texts from the Christian liturgical tradition – particularly from Rome – rather than composing new prayers. But while this decision was consistent with their mandate, it also posed a key difficulty – all of the Roman prayers of exorcism were imperative. The clear difficulty in this solution was that the *Coetus* had sought to avoid the appearance that the priest,

TABLE 5.15

INTERCESSIONS OVER THE ELECT

IN THE RITE OF ELECTION

AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 6:3-6 <i>Ac silentio facto dicat:</i> Orate catechumeni. <i>Et omnes fideles pro illis cum attentione orent dicentes:</i> Kyrie eleison. <i>Diaconus vero pro eis precetur dicens:</i> Pro catechumenis omnes Deum intende invocemus,</p> <p>ut, qui bonus ac hominum amans est, benigne exaudiat eorum preces et obsecrationes, et suscepta eorum supplicatione opem illis ferat ac det petitiones cordis ipsorum, prout eis expedit;</p> <p><i>[Kyrie eleison]</i> Revelet eisdem evangelium Christi sui, illuminet eos ac instituat, erudiat eos cognitione divina; Doceat eos mandata sua et iustificationes, inserat in eis castum ac salutarem timorem suum, aperiat aures cordis eorum, ut in eius lege die ac nocte occupentur; Et confirmet eos in pietate, adunet et adnumeret eos sancto suo gregi, donatis eis lavacro regenerationis, indumento immortalitatis, vera vita: Liberet vero eos ab omni impietate et non det locum adversario contra eos,</p> <p><i>[adunet et adnumeret eos sancto suo gregi.]</i></p>	<p>NR-C 24 <i>Tunc dicit:</i></p> <p>S: Oremus pro his electis et imploremus super eos misericordiam Dei et Domini nostri. <i>Prosequitur diaconus vel cantor his vel similibus verbis.</i> D: Ut Dominus benigne exaudiat eorum preces et obsecrationes.</p> <p>R: Te rogamus, audi nos.</p> <p>D: Ut liberet eos ab omni impietate et non det locum adversario contra eos. R: Te rogamus, audi nos. D: Ut inducat eos in omnem plenitudinem veritatis. R: Te rogamus, audi nos. D: Ut adunet et adnumeret eos sancto suo gregi. R: Te rogamus, audi nos. <i>(Pro rerum circumstantiis aliae invocationes adiungi possunt.)</i></p>
---	---

himself, was able to command demons. Thus, NR-C prefaced the prayer for the first male exorcism from OBA with a newly composed introduction which clarified that the

celebrant was acting in the name of Christ: “*In nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi qui principam huius mundi iam iudicavit, imperamus diabolo qui facit, ut homines plus diligant tenebras quam lucem.*” This text was intended to be used with both the imperative and deprecatory options. Following this introduction NR-C indicated that the celebrant was to raise his right hand towards the still kneeling elect, and continue with the second part of the exorcism. The first option, the imperative exorcism, was drawn directly from OBA 17 – “*Ergo, maledicte diabole.*” The second option, the deprecatory exorcism, was adapted from prayer in the Coptic and Ethiopian rites (see Table 5.16 below).

TABLE 5.16
DEPRECATORY EXORCISM
IN THE RITE OF ELECTION
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX

<p>Ethiopic Rite (<i>PL</i> 138, 934-935) Domine, Redemptor noster, amator humani generis, factor coeli et terrae; quia</p> <p>tu solus es qui perficis hoc mysterium,</p> <p>quia te adorant omne genu quod in coelo est et in terra, et omnis lingua te laudat, juxta illud Pauli, Redemptor et Dominus noster Iesus Christus omnia operatus est in gloriam Dei Patris, hos servos tuos amplectere, qui festinarunt et venerunt ut adorarent te genu flexi. <i>Diaconus dicit:</i> Orate. <i>Sacerdos autem dicit:</i> Propterea precamur et rogamus te, o amator humani generis,</p>	<p>Coptic Rite (Denziger, 199) Dominator, redemptor, hominum amator</p> <p>bone et bonorum largitor, tu solus es, per quem perficitur hoc sacramentum,</p> <p>cui omne genu flectitur coelestium, terrestrium et infernorum, et omnis lingua confitetur tibi dicens, quia</p> <p>Dominus Iesus Christus est in gloria Dei Patris, et servus tuus iste, qui ad te confugit tibi que genua flexit sua, id ipsum confitetur. <i>Dicit Diaconus:</i> Orate <i>Sacerdos:</i> Propterea rogamus et obsecramus te, o amator hominum, pro hoc</p>	<p>NR-C 25 Domine Iesu Christe, redemptor noster,</p> <p>in cuius nomine omne genu flectitur caelestrium, terrestrium et infernorum,</p> <p>precamur et rogamus te</p>
---	---	--

TABLE 5.16

continued

<p>Ethiopic Rite (<i>PL</i> 138, 934-935)</p> <p>omnem invidiam, et omnem tentationem elonga ab eis, omnem infirmitatem, et omnem afflictionem ab eisdem transfer, scrutare interna eorum, et illumina eorum corda et mentes lumine intelligentiae.</p> <p>Omne opus Satanae, et omnem</p> <p>Immutationem et defectionem fidei, et omnem adorationem idolorum, ab eis arce. Confirma et dirige eorum corda,</p> <p>per assumptionem Spiritus tui sancti, et per voluntatem</p> <p>Filii tui, quae est sine defectu, nunc.</p>	<p>Coptic Rite (Denziger, 199)</p> <p>famulo tuo, custodi eum a malo, et a corruptione, et concede ei remissionem peccatorum suorum, omnem invidiam et omnem tentationem elonga ab eo: omnem infirmitatem et omnem languorem aufer ab eo: scrutare abscondita animae ejus, illumina oculos intelligentiae ipsius lumine agnitionis, omnem magiam et omnem incantationem et omne opus Satanae pelle ab eo: omnes</p> <p>reliquias idololatriae et infidelitatis evelle a corde ejus:</p> <p>dispone animam ipsius ad recipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, utque mereatur obtinere lavacrum regenerationis et habitum incorruptibilem ac remissionem peccatorum suorum: fac eum templum sancto Spiritui tuo per voluntatem Patris tui et Spiritus sancti nunc.</p>	<p>NR-C 25</p> <p>diabolicam invidiam et omnem tentationem elonga ab his electis,</p> <p>scrutare interna eorum.</p> <p>Omne opus Satanae et omne obcaecationem cordis</p> <p>(et omnem adorationem idolorum) ab eis arce</p> <p>Per virtutem sanctae crucis tuae.</p>
--	---	--

In S-112 both the introduction to the exorcism as well as the prayers of exorcism (imperative and deprecatory) were replaced, and no deprecatory exorcism was included. The purpose of the first text in NR-C was changed in S-112. Rather than being strictly introductory, the celebrant, with his hands extended over the elect, was to pray a prayer of blessing over them. With this change, the gestures in OBA were partially restored. Then, after the prayer of exorcism, the celebrant was to lay hands on the elect in silence. This gesture, which had also been present in OBA, was moved from its former position

before the celebrant stretched his hands over the elect to after both prayers of exorcism. Both prayer texts for the first scrutiny in S-112 were based on prayers found in OBA. The first, the blessing prayer, had formerly been the first prayer in the first male exorcism located at OBA 17 (see Table 5.17 below). It was selected not only for its traditional location in the rite, but also because it offered an opportunity for modification that would highlight the theme of living water from the Gospel reading through mention of Moses. In the original text, Moses was described as having led the children of Israel out of Egypt and appointing an angel to protect them as they made their journey. The subcommittee instead focused on God having used Moses to provide water from the rock while Israel was in the desert. An additional petition was inserted into the new text which asked protection from sin and conflict with the devil. S-112 retained this newer text, but added back the names of the Patriarchs in the opening phrase of the prayer. S-112 then indicated a change in posture on the part of the elect. They were to be given an instruction to “stand and pray.” At this point, S-112 incorporated the short exorcism from the third male exorcism, adapting it, also, to the Gospel reading for the first scrutiny. Instead of referring to Jesus reaching out to save Peter, who was sinking in the sea, the revised text pointed to Jesus who offered living water to the Samaritan woman at the well. Also incorporated into this revised text was a phrase from the second prayer of exorcism at OBA 17: “*et da honorem Deo vivo et vero, da honorem Jesu Christo Filio ejus, et Spiritui Sancto.*” In NR-C the prayers of exorcism were to conclude with the same formula, which led directly to the element considered essential in the new rite, the signation with the cross. However, this gesture was eliminated from the revised rite, and instead, in S-112, the *Coetus* decided to include the provision that hands could be laid

upon the elect in silence at the end of the exorcism. In making this decision, the *Coetus* explained that they preferred “noble simplicity” through the elimination of another signation, and at the same time, retaining a traditionally Roman liturgical gesture.⁷¹

TABLE 5.17
PRAYER OF EXORCISM
IN THE FIRST SCRUTINY
AS REVISED AT GALLORO

<p>OBA 17. Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, Deus Jacob, Deus, qui Moysi famulo tuo in monte Sinai apparuisti et filios Israel de terra Aegypti eduxisti, deputans eis Angelum pietatis tuae, qui custodiret eos die ac nocte:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">te quaesumus, Domine;</p> <p>ut mittere digneris sanctum Angelum tuum de caelis, qui similiter custodiat et hos famulos tuos N. et N.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">et perducatur eos ad gratiam Baptismi tui.</p> <p>21. Exorcizo immunde spiritus, in nomine Patris et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ut exeas, et recedas ab his famulis Dei N. et N.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Ipse enim tibi</p> <p>imperat, maledicte damnate, qui pedibus super mare ambulavit, et Petro mergenti dexteram porrexit.</p>	<p>NR-G 25 Deus Abraham,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">qui Filios Israel de terra Aegypti</p> <p>eduxisti,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">custodiens eos die ac nocte, eosque</p> <p>sitientes per servum tuum Moysen de petra in deserto aqua potasti: te quaesumus Domine, ut</p> <p style="text-align: right;">similiter et hos</p> <p>famulos tuos N. et N. e servitute peccati eripias, contra impugnaciones diaboli custodias atque ad fontem baptismi perducas.</p> <p>-- Surgite et orate</p> <p>Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, ut da honorem Deo vivo et vero, Jesu Christo Filio ejus, et Spiritui sancto, recede ab his famulis Dei N. et N. nec iam eos in sortem peccati inducas. Ipse enim tibi imperat, maledicte damnate,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">sui peccatrici Samaritanae revelavit fontem aquae salientis in vitam aeternam.</p>
--	---

⁷¹ S-112 Relatione, 32: “Signatio electorum a celebrante facienda suppressa est: quia ut ritus scrutiniorum ad mentem Constitutionis ‘nobili simplicitate fulgeat,’ optio nobis facienda erat inter traditionem romanam et gallicanam, nempe inter impositionem manus et signationem. Selegimus traditionem antiquiorem, i.e. romanam, imponendi manum, praesertim quia ita repetitio ritus evitari potuit, qui iam locum habuit in Ordine ad catechumenum faciendum.”

As discussed earlier, the *traditio* of the Gospels, which could occur (pending the approval of local Conferences of Bishops) during the first scrutiny was removed. In its place, NR-G noted that the *traditio* of the Creed was the proper document to be handed over during the first scrutiny, with the Lord's Prayer retaining its position during the third scrutiny. Further change was applied to the position of the *traditiones* in S-112, where they would be permitted during the scrutinies, but were recommended to be celebrated in the weeks following the first and third scrutinies. The *traditio* of the Gospels, if it was to occur at all, was assigned to the first stage in S-112, immediately following the homily.

At Trier, the *Coetus* had decided that the scrutinies were to be concluded with the prayer "*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*" found at OBA 28. NR-C contained the prayer as it had occurred in OBA. A small change was made in S-112 that named God as the "*fons*" of life and truth instead of the "*auctor*." Both words emphasized that life and truth originated from God, but the choice of *fons* had further significance, pointing also towards the baptismal font. More significantly, however, S-112 utilized an alternate form of the prayer. Instead of using the version found in the rite for adult baptism, the decision was made to use the version of the prayer from the rite for infant baptism. These forms of the prayer differed in two petitions (see Table 5.18 below). In the adult version, God was asked to give bestow true knowledge, "so that they may be made worthy to come to the grace of your Baptism," and then to let them remain firm in hope, judgment, and doctrine, so that "they be fit to receive your grace." On the other hand, the form for infants asked for true knowledge "so that they may be made worthy of the grace of your Baptism," and then to simply let them remain firm in hope, judgment, and doctrine. Both differences pointed to a different purpose for the prayer. While the Church, in the first

case, petitioned that the adults be made worthy to come to the Church in order to seek baptism, it instead petitioned that the infants simply be made worthy of receiving the grace bestowed in baptism. Perhaps infants were more worthy candidates for baptism because they had not cognitively experienced life as a non-Christian. The second case points to the same sort of double-standard. The gifts that the Church asked be given to adults were for pre-baptismal purposes – again, that adults be made worthy of the approach to baptism, while the same gifts were sought for infants in regards to post-baptismal faithfulness. Thus, the Church appeared to be involved in inculcating a second-class status among those baptized as adults, and could be understood to suggest that having not been Christian for all of one’s life was sinful in and of itself. To compare both versions of the prayer with the original source text in the Gelasian Sacramentary⁷² indicates that the adult rite preserved the more traditional form of the prayer. The fact that two versions of the prayer did exist and had been used for centuries, however, was significant. The decision to prefer the modified version points to a new understanding of the value and place of the adult convert within the Church.⁷³

The form of dismissal contained within NR-C was simple and direct. If the elect were to be dismissed at all, it was to be with the concluding phrase of OBA, which was also used as the dismissal at the end of each stage in OBA1962: “Go in peace, and may the Lord be with you.” The only difference between the version contained in NR-C and

⁷² Gelasian Sacramentary, XXXIII, 298. See also *DOBL* 218.

⁷³ The *Coetus* described this revision more modestly as being based linguistic style: “In fine decedit clausula UT APTI SINT AD PERCIPIENDAM GRATIAM TUAM, quia inutiliter repetit quae immediate antea dicta sunt: UT DIGNI EFFICIENTUR ACCEDERE AD GRATIAM BAPTISMI” (S-112 Declarationes, 66). While this is certainly possible, not a few commentaries on the revisions critiqued the *Coetus*’ use of Latin, and the revisions to the texts display a decided difficulty with the language. One cannot help but wonder if there were more significant reasons in play than grammatical choices.

TABLE 5.18
PRAYER OF DISMISSAL
IN THE SCRUTINIES
IN S-112

<p>OBA 28 Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem tuam deprecor, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, auctor luminis et veritatis, super hos famulos tuos N. N. ut digneris eos illuminare lumine intelligentiae tuae: munda eos et sanctifica: da eis scientiam veram, ut digni efficiantur accedere ad gratiam Baptismi tui effecti, teneant firmam spem, Consilium rectum, doctrinam sanctam, ut apti sint ad percipiendam gratiam tuam.</p>	<p>OBP 9 Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem tuam deprecor, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, auctor luminis et veritatis, super hos famulos tuos N. N. ut digneris eos illuminare lumine intelligentiae tuae: munda eos et sanctifica: da eis scientiam veram, ut digni gratia Baptismi tui effecti, teneant firmam spem, Consilium rectum, doctrinam sanctam.</p>	<p>S-112 53 Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem tuam deprecor, Domine, sancte Pater omnipotens aeterne Deus, fons luminis et veritatis, super hos famulos tuos N. N. et has famulas tuas N. N. ut digneris eos illuminare lumine intelligentiae tuae: munda eos et sanctifica: da eis scientiam veram, ut digni efficiantur accedere ad gratiam Baptismi, teneant firmam spem, Consilium rectum, doctrinam sanctam.</p>
--	--	--

OBA was the elimination of the names of those who were being dismissed. Following the celebration of the scrutinies, the mass was to continue. This point was clarified in S-112, with the clear directive that the celebration of the mass resume with the Prayers of the Faithful, and, if necessary, singing of the Creed and the Offertory. S-112 added the suggestion that the Eucharistic Prayer make specific mention of the sponsors during the *Memento Domine* and the elect during the *Hanc igitur*, following the example of the Gelasian Sacramentary.⁷⁴

Once the form of the prayers of exorcism for the scrutinies had been decided, the subcommittee turned to the creation of texts for the second and third scrutinies which

⁷⁴ Gelasian Sacramentary, XXVI, 195-197. See also *DOBL* 213.

would be based on models from OBA, the broader liturgical tradition, and appropriate scriptural references. These texts would appear in draft form during the Galloro meeting, and would be contained within S-112 in somewhat revised form.

For the second scrutiny, the drafts of these texts indicated that the Gospel was to be the story of the Man Born Blind in John 9. Further, the draft indicated that a selection from Ezekiel 36, highlighting the creation of a new heart, was also to be read. The first prayer was based on the prayer from the first female exorcism in OBA, which was, itself, based on a prayer from the Gelasian Sacramentary, and was amplified by numerous references to scripture (see Table 5.19 below). This prayer was adopted into S-112 with only one change; the reference to God being merciful to all, from Wisdom, was removed. The second portion of the exorcism was drawn from the third female exorcism in OBA, which was also found in the Gelasian Sacramentary, and was likewise expanded through the use of scripture. The revision of this draft prayer that occurred in S-112 was largely the same, though the first reference to 2 Corinthians was largely omitted: “*valeas a manifestatione veritatis*” was replaced by “*audeas.*”

TABLE 5.19

PRAYER OF EXORCISM
IN THE SECOND SCRUTINY
AS REVISED AT GALLORO

OBA	Gel. XXXIII	Scripture	NR-G
23. Deus caeli, Deus terrae, Deus angelorum, Deus archangelorum, Deus patriarcharum, Deus prophetarum, Deus apostolorum, Deus martyrum, Deus confessorum, Deus virginum, Deus omnium bene viventium, Deus, cui omnis lingua confitetur, et omne genu flectitur, caelestium, terrestrium, et infernorum:	293. Deus caeli, Deus terrae, Deus angelorum, Deus prophetarum, Deus martyrum, Deus omnium bene viventium, Deus, cui omnis lingua confitetur caelestium, terrestrium, et infernorum:		Deus caeli, Deus terrae, Deus angelorum, Deus archangelorum, Deus prophetarum, Deus martyrum, Deus omnium viventium, Deus,
te invoco, Domine, super has famulas tuas N,	te invoco, Domine, ut has famulas tuas	“...scrutans corda et renes...” Ps. 2:7 “Sed misereris omnium...” Wis 11:24 “qui omnes homines vult salvos fieri” 1 Tim 2:4	qui scrutaris renes et corda, qui omnium misereris, qui omnes homines vis salvos fieri:
ut eas custodire, et perducere digneris ad gratiam Baptismi tui.	perducere et custodire digneris ad gratiam Baptismi tui.	“dabo vobis cor novum et spiritum novum...” Ez. 36:26 “Nam peccatum... seduxit me” Rom 7:11 “Ad dandam scientiam salutis...” Luke 1:77 “sed reformamini in novitate sensus vestri...” Rom 12:2	da eis cor novum et spiritum novum, ut iam a maligno non seducti, accipiant scientiam salutis et reformentur in novitate sensus sui.
27. Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, per	297. Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, per		-- Surgite et orate Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, per

TABLE 5.19

continued

OBA Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritus Sanctum, ut exeas, et recedas ab his famulabus Dei N et N:	Gel. XXXIII Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritus Sanctum, ut exeas, et recedas ab his famulabus Dei:	Scripture	NR-G Patrem et Filium et Spiritus Sanctum, ut recedas ab his famulis Dei N et N, nec iam eos fallacia tua excaecare valeas a manifestatione veritatis.
Ipse enim tibi imperat, maledicte damnate,	Ipse enim tibi imperat, maledicte damnate,	“In quibus Deus huius saeculi excaecavit mentes infidelium” 2 Cor 4:4	Ipse enim tibi imperat, maledicte damnate,
qui caeco nato oculos aperuit, et quadriduanum Lazarum de monumento suscitavit.	qui caeco nato oculos aperuit, et quadriduanum Lazarum de monumento suscitavit.	“qui dixit de tenebris lucem splendescere” 2 Cor 4:6	qui dixit de tenebris lumen splendescere, et caeco nato oculos aperuit
		“Tu credis in Filium Dei?” John 9:35	ut credat in Filium Dei.

The same format was followed for the prayers of exorcism for the third scrutiny. The base model for both was OBA. The first prayer, from OBA 19, found in the same form in the Gregorian Sacramentary and the Sarum Missal,⁷⁵ and the second prayer, which combined OBA 21 and OBA 27, both found in the same form in the Gelasian Sacramentary, were both amplified, particularly with references to scripture (see Table 5.20 below). The additions to the first prayer were exclusively scriptural, and drew out the parallel themes of Lazarus being raised from the dead and Paul’s description of baptism as death with Christ enabling resurrection with Him. The additions to the second prayer furthered this theology, indicating that the elect were rejecting the way of death by embracing Christ, whose resurrection would save them. In crafting the second prayer, the choice was made to prefer expelling the demon “in the name” of the Trinity, rather than

⁷⁵ H.A. Wilson, *The Gregorian Sacramentary Under Charles the Great: Edited from three mss. of the 9th Century*, Henry Bradshaw Society 49 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1915), 157.

“through.” Likely this decision was made to reinforce God’s action in the exorcism rather than that of the celebrant. Further, a change that was made to all of the texts of exorcism was changing the description of the spirits that were being expelled from “unclean” to “malicious.” This decision was almost certainly made with the work of Heinrich Schlier in mind, and the realization that the spirits that were being exorcized were more readily understood as those things that sought to cause disorder and discord in the world.

TABLE 5.20

PRAYER OF EXORCISM

IN THE THIRD SCRUTINY

AS REVISED AT GALLORO

<p>OBA 19 Deus, immortale praesidium omnium postulantium, liberatio supplicum, pax rogantium, vita credentium, resurrectio mortuorum: te invoco super hos famulos tuos N. et N., qui, Baptismi tui donum petentes, aeternam consequi gratiam spirituali regeneratione desiderant: accipe eos, Domine, et quia dignatus es dicere: Petite, et accipietis; quaerite, et invenietis; pulsate, et aperietur vobis: petentibus praemium porrige, et januam pande pulsantibus, ut, aeternam caelestis lavacri benedictionem consecuti,</p>	<p>Scripture</p> <p>“Consepulti enim sumus cum illo per baptismum in mortem” Rom 6:4 “...simul et resurrectionis erimus.” Rom. 6:5</p>	<p>NR-G Deus, immortale praesidium omnium postulantium, liberatio supplicum, pax rogantium, vita credentium, resurrectio mortuorum, te invoco super hos famulos tuos, N. et N. qui baptismi tui donum petentes, aeternam consequi gratiam spirituali regeneratione desiderant,</p> <p>ut, consepulti cum Christo per baptismum in mortem, participes efficiantur resurrectionis eius,</p>
---	--	--

continued

The conclusion of this section in NR-C was simply a rubric that provided directions for the second and third scrutinies, which were not present in this version of the rite. S-112, however, concluded its description of the period of the catechuminate with a description of the *traditiones*, since this document reflected the decision that the *traditiones* were optimally celebrated separately from the scrutinies. Both the *traditio* of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer were outlined: these were to take place within the

context of mass, in the week following the first scrutiny and third scrutiny, respectively; each *traditio* was given a set of lectionary readings to accompany them, and were to take place after the homily.

For the *traditio* of the Creed, S-112 named Deuteronomy 6:1-9, 1 Corinthians 15:1-3, and Matthew 16:13-19 as the appropriate readings. After the homily the deacon would instruct the elect to come forward to accept the Creed, and the celebrant would instruct them to listen to the Creed, which described the covenant between God and humanity, and into which they would soon be welcomed. Then he would recite the Creed alone. This was an alteration to the brief description of the *traditio* from the Le Saulchoir meeting, where the entire community was to hand the Creed over to the elect. Once the Creed had been presented to the elect, the celebrant was to invite the faithful to pray for the elect. The texts provided for the invitation to prayer and the collect were from the Good Friday liturgy for the catechumens. The structure from the Good Friday liturgy was maintained here also: the celebrant introduced the prayer, the deacon instructed all to kneel for silent prayer, and when the deacon instructed everyone to rise, the priest concluded the prayer with the collect. The only alteration to these texts was referring to them as “elect” instead of “catechumens,” and the only alteration to the ritual structure was that the celebrant was to extend his hands over the elect during the collect. The elect were then to leave, though the rite does not suggest that a liturgical dismissal occur.

The *traditio* of the Lord’s Prayer was organized in the same format as the *traditio* of the Creed. As outlined in S-112, the readings were to be Hosea 11:1-9, Galatians 4:7-9, and Matthew 11:25-30. Just as before, after the homily the deacon was to instruct the elect to come forward, and the celebrant would introduce the Lord’s Prayer

by alluding to Luke 11:1, instructing them that Jesus had taught his own disciples to pray using the prayer he was about to hand over to them.⁷⁶ After reciting the Lord's Prayer, the rite concluded in the same way as did the *traditio* of the Creed.

5.5: The Fourth Stage: The Sacraments of Initiation

The third station, *De ipsis initiationis sacramentis*, became the fourth stage in S-112, since in this version of the rite the scrutinies were understood as a separate stage, rather than a period. Nonetheless, this stage maintained its twofold structure from NR in NR-C: *De ritibus praeparatoriis facultativis* and *De baptismo conferendo*. NR-G excised the word "optional" from the title of the rites of immediate preparation, although their status remained the same. NR-C contained the clarifying note that these were optional according to the local Conferences of Bishops; S-112 removed the prescription, and the choice of celebrating any or all of the rites was left to the local community. NR-C indicated that the rites were to be celebrated either on Holy Saturday or during Holy Week. S-112 included a further clarification on the date of celebration, indicating that Holy Saturday was the day on which these rites were properly celebrated, though they could, if necessary, be celebrated at some other time during Holy Week. Finally, in NR-C the optional preparatory rites received some structural clarification. Instead of being comprised of three elements, *Ephphatha*, *redditio symboli*, and the optional giving of a Christian name, the structure was divided into five elements, adding the reading of the Gospel as the first element and the liturgical dismissal as the last. No change in content were made here, as the Gospel reading had previously been considered part of the

⁷⁶ This pattern was consistent with the Le Saulchoir deliberations, where the priest alone handed over the Lord's Prayer, as he stood *in persona Christi*.

Ephphatha rite, and the dismissal was included as the conclusion to the *redditio symboli*, with the allowance that the optional giving of a Christian name would occur between the *redditio* and dismissal.

5.5.1: The Rites of Immediate Preparation

The celebration of the rites of immediate preparation was to begin with an appropriate song, which was added to the structure in NR-C. The rites then moved to what had been the first element, the proclamation of scripture; Mark 7:31-37, the narrative of the *Ephphatha* rite, was retained here. Since mention of a homily had not yet been made in connection to these rites, S-112 added a brief instruction on the reading to the ritual structure. At this point the *Ephphatha* rite itself would occur. The gesture was retained from Le Saulchoir: a single formula during the touching of the right and left ear and the mouth of each of the elect. Fischer's prayer text, which had emphasized the touching of both the ears and mouth, instead of the nose as in OBA, was altered at Clervaux (see Table 5.21 below). NR-C eliminated the reference to hearing the Gospel of Christ completely. No rationale was explicitly given, although the change may have been occasioned in order to avoid suggesting that the elect were not able to hear the Word until their ears were ritually opened. If the prayer were thought to suggest this, then the anointing of the senses in the first station, the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum*, would have been ineffective. NR-C also altered the instruction to "confess God's mercy," changing it to "profess the faith that you have heard." Martimort's indication that confessing one's faith was necessarily one and the same with rendering praise to God

provides a possible rationale for this change.⁷⁷ S-112 qualified this statement, adding the clause “for the praise and glory of God,”⁷⁸ and added a ritual clarification that if the number of elect was large, the full formula would be required for the first one who was signed, after which simply saying *Ephphatha* would be sufficient. A change was made to the ritual structure at this point in the rite, as Seumois suggested that a collect be added here. The text that was inserted, without alteration, was the prayer “*Da, quaesumus, Domine, electis nostris,*” from the Gelasian Sacramentary,⁷⁹ and it both asked that God restore the elect, through baptism, to the pristine condition humanity found itself in before the Fall, and indicated that the progression of the elect to baptism was a victory for the Church over the power of sin.

When the *Ephphatha* rite had concluded, the elect were to recite the Creed. Although NR-C had indicated that the Creed was to be the Apostles’ Creed, S-112 allowed for the option to be broad here, by simply referring to the Creed. No formula or rubrics, beyond that the elect were to recite the creed, were given here. Following the *redditio Symboli*, the rite allowed for the optional giving of a Christian name. NR-C simply indicated that a new name could be taken at this point in the rite. S-112 described

⁷⁷ “Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schemata Coetus* XXII, De Ordine baptismi adultorum, prosequuntur”: “Envoi aux consultants et super consultants, 26/6/65,” 3: “Deus aperit ures ad audiendum et linguam solvit ad auda Dei simul ac fidem pronuntiandum.”

⁷⁸ The *Coetus* offered the rather vague explanation that the theme of praise of God was found in the Gelasian Sacramentary prior to the *traditio* of the Creed, rather than in the *Ephphatha* text. They argued that its inclusion here was intended to point towards the *traditio*, which was the next element in the proposed rite.

S-112 Declarationes, 80: “Formula ritum sic restauratum concomitans non tantum de apertione aurium, sed etiam de apertione oris loqui debuit, et quidem in ordine ad redditionem symboli, quae ex antiqua traditione sic dictam ‘effetationem’ sequitur. Motivum LAUDIS DEI est ex traditione Gelasiana desumptum, quae redditionem symboli praecedit.”

⁷⁹ Gelasian Sacramentary, XXVI, 193. See also *DOBL* 213.

TABLE 5.21
EPHPHATHA PRAYER
AS REVISED AT CLERVAUX AND GALLORO

NR 19 Ephpheta, quod est, adaperire ad audiendum evangelium Christi et ad confitendum misericordiam Dei.	NR-C 40 Ephpheta, quod est, adaperire ad profitendam fidem quam audisti.	NR-G Ephpheta, quod est adaperire, Ut profitearis fidem, quam audisti, in laudem et gloriam Dei. <i>Manibus ante pectus extensis, celebrans sequentem dicit orationem:</i> Da quaesumus, Domine, electis nostris digne atque sapienter ad confessionem tuae laudis accedere, ut dignitate pristina, quam originali transgressione perdiderant, per tuam gloriam reformentur.
--	---	---

the element as it had during the first stage. NR-C added the innovation of a concluding song to the structure of the rite, suggesting Psalm 18(19): 8-15 as the most beneficial option. Following Martimort's suggestion, S-112 preferred Psalm 26(27).⁸⁰ Following the song the celebrant was to dismiss the elect, though again, a liturgical dismissal was not contained within the rite. A formula for dismissal originating in the Gelasian Sacramentary with inconsequential grammatical alterations was proposed in NR-G. This exhortation directed the elect to "go back now to your homes, and wait for the hour when

⁸⁰ "Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schematata Coetus XXII*, De Ordine baptismi adultorum, *prosequuntur*" 4: "Cantus initio ritus proponendi: Illumina Domine vultum tuum super nos (Ps. 26[27], versus seligandi)."

the God's grace shall be able to enfold you in baptism.”⁸¹ This text was excised in S-112, and was replaced instead with a rubric created by Seumois, which indicated that the celebrant was to dismiss the elect, inviting them to return to the Church at the Paschal Vigil.

5.5.2: Baptism

NR-C presented the celebration of the sacraments as had been discussed at Le Saulchoir. According to the directions in NR-C, the liturgy of baptism was to commence with the Blessing of the Font. S-112 made an addition before indicating that the blessing of the font was to occur, in the form of an introductory text, intended to demonstrate how the sacraments of initiation were foreshadowed in the blessing of the font. This text was newly composed, and upon its completion the font was to be blessed. From the first full draft of the rite, NR-C, until its final promulgation, the text of the Blessing of the Font was not included in the rite itself; only the direction that this element was to take place was found.⁸²

Immediately following the blessing of the font, NR-C, consistent with NR, noted that the elect and their sponsors were to stand around the celebrant at the font. However, while NR-C had preferred the ordering of the pre-baptismal elements in the Gelasian

⁸¹ Gelasian Sacramentary, XLII, 424: *Filii carissimi revertimini locis vestris et expectantes horam qua possit circa vos dei gratia baptismum operari.*” The revised text read “*Filii carissimi revertimi [sic] ad loca vestra expectantes horam qua possit circa vos Dei gratia baptismum operare.*” Translation from *DOBL* 230.

⁸² S-112 includes an abbreviated text for the Blessing of the Font, as proposed by *Coetus* XVII and XXII. For more on the revisions to the blessing of the font, see the two articles by Dominic Serra on the subject: “The Blessing of Baptismal Water at the Paschal Vigil: Ancient Texts and Modern Revisions” in *Worship* 64 (1990), 142-156; and “The Blessing of Baptismal Water at the Paschal Vigil in the Post-Vatican II Reform” in *Ecclesia Orans* 7 (1990), 343-368.

Sacramentary of pre-baptismal anointing, renunciation, profession of faith, and baptism, S-112 overturned this decision and restored the ordering found in OBA of renunciation, pre-baptismal anointing, profession of faith, and baptism, which was also the order found in *The Apostolic Tradition*.⁸³ Thus, the first element occurring after the blessing of the font was the renunciation of Satan, as it occurred in OBA 35. The debate surrounding the possible similitude of the terms “works” and “pomps” was addressed in S-112, which offered the possibility of substituting “angels” for “pomps.” At the very least, this possibility allowed for instances in which “pomps” was insufficiently understood, while, at the same time, respecting both traditional formulations as well as the consistency in meanings between the three words.⁸⁴ Further, S-112 offered the pastoral possibility that, if the number of elect was large, the renunciation could be made by all at the same time, or by groups of elect.

Following the newly revised order, the pre-baptismal anointing with the oil of catechumens was to follow the renunciation of Satan. The description of the element in NR-C was in line with the decisions reached at Le Saulchoir. In particular, it retained the decision to allow the possible anointing of the hands instead of the traditional anointing of chest and back, according to the decision of the local Conferences of Bishops, and provided the abbreviated text from the Maronite rite. This text was removed in S-112, and instead, a revised version of the text from OBA 36 was inserted (see Table 5.22 below). The new text would attempt to address the concerns addressed by the choice of

⁸³ While Martimort pointed to the ritual pattern of the elect expressing their intentions and the Church responding (renunciation-anointing; profession-baptism), he understood the anointing as being exorcistic rather than being one of strengthening for combat. See “Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schematata Coetus XXII*, De Ordine baptismi adultorum, prosequuntur” 5.

⁸⁴ See Maertens, *Histoire et Pastorale*, 98-99, and Kirsten, 38-74.

the Maronite text, namely, its applicability to an anointing of the hands through an emphasis on being strengthened for spiritual combat with the devil. The new text would also reflect its position in the order. Rather than leading to the renunciation, it would now emerge out of it. Therefore, while spiritual conflict was a well-attested and ritually significant approach, the prayer should not focus solely on combat, but might also point forward to the profession of faith that was to follow it.⁸⁵ Consequently, instead of simply aligning (“*linio*”) one to Christ through the oil of salvation as in OBA, the text in NR-G strengthened (“*corroboro*”) the elect, as in NR-C, but also prepared the elect to adhere faithfully to Christ. The choice of *corroboro* as the verb also pointed back to the alternate formula given in OBA1962, for instances in which the hands were anointed: “*Ego te corroboro signo Crucis, in Christo Jesu, Domino nostro, in vitam aeternam.*”⁸⁶ In its footnotes, S-112 pointed explicitly towards this connection, but did not mention the Maronite text. S-112 also allowed the pastoral option of having other concelebrants perform the pre-baptismal anointing, should there be a sufficient number of elect at the Vigil.⁸⁷

Following the pre-baptismal anointing, the elect were to profess their faith. The decision reached at Le Saulchoir to include reference to Christ’s resurrection in the second question of the profession was contained in NR-C, although the word chosen was “resuscitated,” not “resurrected.” The formula for this question was changed rather

⁸⁵ S-112 Relatione, 42: “Pro unctione praebaptismali... qui ordo enim ita iam describitur a S. Hippolyte in sua Traditione Apostolica et melius correspondet sensui huius unctionis, quae potius praesupponit abrenuntiationem. Ante abrenuntiationem posita, unctio insuper facilius ansam praeberet interpretationibus magicis.”

⁸⁶ OBA1962 48a.

⁸⁷ S-112 93.

TABLE 5.22
PRE-BAPTISMAL ANOINTING
IN S-112

OBA 36 Ego te linio oleo salutis in Christo Jesu Domino nostro in vitam aeternam.	NR-C 44 Corroboram, Domine, infirmi- tatem famuli tui in praelio et da ei ut semper tentationem vincat.	S-112 89 Ego te corroboram oleo salutis ut indeficienter adhaereas Christo Domino.
---	--	---

dramatically, however, in S-112, and was expanded to be more in line with the Apostles Creed, though not completely so (see Table 5.23 below). Specifically, reference was made to Christ's birth of Mary, his burial, his being resurrected from the dead, and his being seated at the right hand of the Father. The result was an unquestionably far more robust profession of faith in Christ than was present in either OBA or NR-C.⁸⁸ Just as with the renunciation, S-112 allowed the possibility that the profession of faith could be made by all of the elect at the same time, or in groups, should their numbers be large.⁸⁹

Upon having professed their faith in the Trinity, the elect were then to proceed to baptism, a directive that was clearly enunciated in S-112. Baptism was described in NR-C just as had been decided at Le Saulchoir: baptism by immersion was the first form named in NR-C, giving it pride of place over baptism by infusion. The rubric in NR-C more fully explicated how baptism was to occur. The celebrant, holding the partially, though not scandalously, clad elect by the arm, was to thrice immerse either the whole

⁸⁸ The *Coetus* cited the *Apostolic Tradition* as being sufficient precedent here, and expanded the second item of the profession to mirror the thematic content of *Apostolic Tradition* 21. See *DOBL* 7.

⁸⁹ S-112 93.

TABLE 5.23
PROFESSION OF FAITH
IN S-112

NR-C 46 Credis in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, natum et passum et resuscitatum?	Apostles Creed Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria virgine; passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus; descendit ad inferna; tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit ad coelos; sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.	S-112 90 Credis in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, natus ex Maria virgine; passum et sepultum, qui a mortuis resurrexit, et sedet ad dexteram Patris?
---	---	---

body, or the whole head in the water, removing it from the water after each immersion. S-112 contained fewer details here. The celebrant was to be touching the elect, though not necessarily on the arm, and a description of the clothing the elect was to be wearing (or not wearing, as it was) did not occur. The manner of baptism was substantially the same, in that the celebrant thrice immersed either the elect in the water by their whole body or head, and then drew it up from the water. At the same time, the priest was to use the triple formula for baptism contained in OBA. Despite questions about using the form “N., I baptize you,” no alternate formula was provided in NR-C. Baptism by infusion was described second according to its description at Le Saulchoir, and the omission of the directive that each sponsor was to place their hand on the shoulder of the elect was corrected. S-112, already having demonstrated the concern for large numbers of elect in allowing the renunciation and profession to be made by the entire group, or in smaller groups, and the allowance that concelebrants could administer the pre-baptismal

anointing, noted the provision that multiple concelebrants might also baptize the elect.⁹⁰ NR-C concluded its description of baptism with the rubric emerging from S-77, dealing with the community's renunciation and profession of faith.

For the post-baptismal anointing with Chrism, NR-C simply used the text and rubric from OBA with the clarifications detailed at Le Saulchoir. While the text was retained in the later drafts, S-112 substantially altered this rubric. No longer was the celebrant to dip his thumb in chrism, and anoint the neophyte with the sign of the cross, but now the celebrant was to simply anoint the head of the neophyte. While the former option would certainly fall within the terms of the new direction, so too would the possibility of pouring larger quantities of Chrism, as apparently evidenced by both Tertullian and Ambrose.⁹¹ It appears to be a possibility that pouring was intended in the change, since S-112 also eliminated the rubric that the celebrant was to wipe his thumb clean after the anointing – there would be no need to cleanse one's thumb if one's hand did not come into contact with the oil. S-112 also included the pastoral alternative that the anointing with Chrism could be performed by concelebrants if the number of neophytes was too large,⁹² as well as a new rubric that when Confirmation was celebrated at the Vigil, the post-baptismal anointing was to be omitted. The post-baptismal anointing would occur, therefore, in instances where the Bishop who presided at the Vigil

⁹⁰ S-112 93.

⁹¹ Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 7: "... Sic et in nobis carnaliter currit unctio sed spiritaliter proficit..." See also *DOBL* 9.

De Mysteriis 29-30: "... Nonne illud quod ait David: *Sicut unguentum in capite quod descendit in barbam barbam Aaron?*... Quare hoc fiat intellege, *quia oculi sapientis in capite ipsius*. Ideo in barbam defluit, id est in gratiam iuventutis, ideo in barbam Aaron ut fias *electum genus*, sacerdotale, pretiosum. Omnes enim in regnum dei et in sacerdotium unguimur gratia spiritali." See also *DOBL* 182.

⁹² S-112 93.

did not administer baptism, and therefore did not perform the post-baptismal anointing, as this was the responsibility of the priest or deacon who baptized. Cases where the Bishop had not granted authority to a priest to confirm at the Vigil were not envisioned as a possibility.⁹³

The rationale for this decision had emerged during discussions in Rome during the previous meeting of the *Consilium* – whether or not it was possible to omit the post-baptismal anointing if the celebration of Confirmation was to be administered immediately after baptism by the same minister. The suggestion of contacting Bernard Botte on this issue had been embraced by all, and he apparently approved of this ecumenical gesture, siding with Ligier in noting that the post-baptismal chrismation in the Eastern traditions corresponded to the Western sacrament of Confirmation.⁹⁴ In describing the rubric, the *Coetus* cited SC 34, which argued against “useless repetition” in the rites. The neophytes, they argued, should not be first anointed on the head with

⁹³ S-112 Relatione, 45: “Si episcopus (qui baptismum non administravit) confirmationem confert, duplex chrismationem retinetur, quia secundum antiquissimam traditionem Romanam chrismatio episcopi complet chrismationem presbyteri.”

⁹⁴ Bernard Botte, *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Renewal*, tr. John O'Sullivan (Washington DC: Pastoral Press, 1988). In treating the matter and form of Confirmation, Botte noted the disagreement about whether the gift of the Spirit should be associated with the laying on of hands or the anointing with chrism (154): “Some theologians wished that we'd return to the apostolic usage. If in the past the church had the power to change, they said, it still possesses the same power, and nothing need keep the church from doing so again. This reasoning is simple, but it is perhaps a little too simple. If the church has the power, is it appropriate that it be used? At any rate, the answer to this question fell within the competence of the Council strictly speaking, and not of a post-conciliar Commission. Now the Council took care not to make a decision to that effect, and this was not a casual omission since the problem was raised at the pre-conciliar commission. I remember quite well my answer. *I remarked that, since this was an ecumenical Council, such a decision would have placed the Orientals in an awkward position. At any rate, this would break the unity existing between the East and the West*” (emphasis added). Botte's desire for maintaining unity with the East on this issue is, very likely, indicative of his position on the related question of the relationship between the anointing of Confirmation and the post-baptismal chrismation.

chrism, so that moments later they might be anointed, by the same minister, on the head with chrism.⁹⁵

Following the post-baptismal anointing of the neophytes, NR-C described the presentation of white robe. A suggestion was made, leading up to the Galloro session, that giving the neophyte a white robe be made an optional element. This suggestion, however, does not appear in S-112. Following the description offered at Le Saulchoir, the rubric allowed for the presentation of a robe of some other “festive” color in regions where this would be particularly appropriate.⁹⁶ While at Clervaux, the subcommittee had agreed that the formula accompanying the presentation itself needed to be revised. The text from OBA clearly expressed the eschatological *Symbolism* of the element. However, the subcommittee was unanimous in expressing the need for a paschal interpretation – hence allowing other colors for robes, and not merely the eschatological white robes described in Revelation 7:9. Previously paschal theology had not been seen as necessary,

⁹⁵ S-112 Relatione, 45: “Rubrica specialis versus finem n. 95 agit de casu, in quo idem minister confert baptismum et confirmationem. Hoc in casu unctio post-baptismalis omittenda esse videtur, ne neophytus eodem fere momento bis eodem Chrismate ab eodem ministro cum formula fere identica in capite ungatur; ipsum enim Concilium decrevit, ut ‘ritus liturgici repetitiones inutiles evitent’.”

⁹⁶ “Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schematata Coetus* XXII, De Ordine baptismi adultorum, *prosequuntur*” 6: Martimort rejected the suggestion of using other colors on scriptural grounds, arguing that the “color white was not festive but biblical” (“Color albis non est ‘festivus,’ sed biblicus, scilicet color coelestis et gloriae”). He referred the *Coetus* to E.B. Allo, *L’Apocalypse de Saint Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1921).

The *Coetus* responded in the *Declarationes*, indicating that while Revelation 7:9 did refer to white robes, the underlying sense of that passage was joy. They believed that neither Scripture nor the rite should insist on minute details in instances where Scriptural sensibilities did not correspond across cultures. Festivity, not white, was of primary importance.

S-112 *Declarationes* 96: “Re matura perpensa unamiter censuimus Sacram Scripturam certo noluisse universum mundum etiam ad minuta obligare, quae, uti colores festivi, determinatae condicioni culturali respondent, quae non aedem est unique terrarum. Nimis durum esset, et potius contra mentem Evangelii, si populus obligaretur colorem, quem ex saeculari traditione uti signum doloris habet, adhibere tanquam colorem paschalem et baptismalem.”

since the rite could be celebrated whenever it was necessary.⁹⁷ Given, however, the preferred surroundings for the reformed rite, mention of the death and resurrection of Christ had new significance. While the text included in NR-C was unaltered from OBA, NR-G contained a thoroughly reworked text, keeping only the first clause of the original formula and thereafter incorporating scriptural references (see Table 5.24 below). S-112 merged these two formulae into a single one, beginning the prayer with the scriptural citations from NR-G, and concluding it with the entire formula from OBA. In doing so, the text in S-112 depicted both eschatological and paschal themes. S-112 also indicated that the robe was to be given to the neophyte by the sponsors in the midst of the prayer, when the celebrant spoke the words “therefore, accept this white garment.” The text does not give any indication whether it would be allowable to alter the color of the robe in the formula, should the option for a different colored robe be exercised.

Regarding the text for the presentation of a lit candle, the Clervaux subcommittee expressed the same concerns as they had in dealing with the presentation of the white robe: the elements as described in OBA did not express paschal themes. The subcommittee dealt with this issue in two ways. First, a change to the rubric was made in NR-C. While in OBA the celebrant simply placed a lighted candle in the hands of the neophyte, NR-C indicated that the celebrant was to hold the lit paschal candle; the sponsors approached him with an unlit candle, and lit their candle from the paschal candle, thereafter giving it to their neophyte. Second, the subcommittee expressed the desire to alter the text in the same fashion as in the formula for the presentation of a white

⁹⁷ NR-C, p 28: “Formulas intactas 48 et 49 pro nunc reliquimus; commissio redactionis tamen unanimes erat in desiderio characteris non exclusive eschatologici, sed magis paschalis in sensu Concilii: vestis=nova creatura; candela=filii lucis.”

made you fit to share in the inheritance of the holy ones in light.”⁹⁹ While neither text would be used in S-112, the formula that would be developed drew on the citation of Ephesians 5:8, which had been part of the Lyons text (see Table 5.25 below), and would incorporate it into the adapted text from OBA. This new text would also draw on the formula for the presentation of a white robe, insofar as its introductory statement. Thus, the presentation of the white robe and the presentation of a lit candle were linked textually by three sets of words in the introduction: “*Per baptismum*,” “*facti estis*,” and “*in Christo*.” By these symbols, through baptism, the neophyte was made, in Christ, both a new creation and light. Further, two deletions to the text from OBA were made in S-112. No longer would the neophyte be instructed to follow the command of the Lord and be blameless in their baptism, and the marriage allusion, “*ad nuptias*,” would be removed. No rationale for the first choice was given, and it appears that the second change was made for reasons of clarity: the wedding imagery was deemed not readily understandable.¹⁰⁰

The rubric for the optional giving of a Christian name was included in NR-C as it had been discussed at Le Saulchoir. Only the direction that it could take place was present; no formula was provided. The final rubric in NR-C was, also, included in the draft as had been discussed at Le Saulchoir. The neophytes were to be confirmed if

⁹⁹ NR-G 49: “Accipite lampadem ardentem. Sicut Dominus noster Jesus Christus locutus est: Ego sum lux mundi, et dixit discipulis suis: Vos estis lux mundi. Eratis enim aliquando tenebrae, nunc autem lux in domino: ut filii lucis ambulate. Cum gaudio, gratias agite Deo Patri, qui dignos vos fecit in partem sortis sanctorum in lumine.” This text adapted several scriptural citations: John 8:12, Matthew 5:14, Ephesians 5:8, and Colossians 1:11-12.

¹⁰⁰ In describing the suppression of this phrase, Fischer suggested that even the faithful did not ordinarily understand this reference, let alone neophytes.

TABLE 5.25
PRESENTATION OF A LIT CANDLE
S-112

<p>OBA 43</p> <p>Accipe lampadem ardentem, et irreprehensibilis custodi Baptismum tuum: serva Dei mandata, ut, cum Dominus venerit ad nuptias, possis occurrere ei una cum omnibus Sanctis in aula caelesti et vivas in saecula saeculorum.</p>	<p>Ephesians 5:8</p> <p>... nunc autem lux in domino: ut filii lucis ambulate.</p>	<p>S-112 97</p> <p>Per baptismum lux in Christo facti estis.</p> <p>Accipite ergo lampadem ardentem,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ut cum</p> <p>Dominus venerit, possitis occurrere ei una cum omnibus sanctis in aula caelesti et vivatis in saecula saeculorum.</p>
---	--	--

possible, and were to receive communion under both species during the Vigil, thus completing their initiation.

The celebration of Confirmation at the Vigil only began to receive a clear shape in S-112. The rubrics and prayers were almost exactly the same as they occurred in the *Ordo de Confirmatione* (hereafter OC) in the *Rituale*. S-112 began by indicating that the minister was to be the Bishop, or, in the absence of the Bishop, the priest who had been given faculties to confirm by the Bishop. This inclusion, which caused considerable debate within the *Consilium*, was not without foundation. According to the *Coetus*, the rubric was the same as had been recently approved by unanimous vote of the Pan-African Catechetical Conference at their recent meeting in Katigondo.¹⁰¹ The *Coetus* marshaled historical evidence on behalf of the proposed position, noting that the tradition of the East

¹⁰¹ S-112 Relatio, 51: "Secundum vota plurium, recenter adhuc a Conferentia panafricana Catechetarum in Katigondo unanimiter expressa, introduximus rubricam secundum quam 'episcopus vel, absente episcopo, sed de eius consensu, presbyter celebrans' confirmationem administrat. Quae rubrica certo certius adhuc ab iis approbanda erit, quibus pro competentia res huius generis reservatur."

was more consistent with the intent of initiation – that the sacraments be unified, and that baptism lead to confirmation, which culminated in the celebration of the Eucharist – a pattern desired in *SC*.¹⁰² This move, argued the *Coetus*, would be pastorally beneficial in the case of adults, who would otherwise have to wait an extended period between receiving the two sacraments.¹⁰³ And further, in terms of the historical development of the administration of Confirmation, presbyters had already been granted the faculties to confirm, particularly in mission countries.¹⁰⁴ Thus, the precedent was set to restore a pastorally beneficial and historically and theologically preferred practice. The text also allowed for the pastoral possibility that, should the number of neophytes be large, the Bishop could be assisted by other priests.¹⁰⁵ The celebrant was to extend his hands over the neophytes and pray the introductory prayer from OC, “*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui regenerare dignatus...*” after which he would pray the litany of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the concluding prayer, “*Adimple eos Spiritu timoris tui...*” No alterations were made to these texts. When these prayers had been completed, S-112 indicated that the neophytes, accompanied by their sponsors, were to approach the celebrant, who would

¹⁰² S-112 Relatio, 52: “Antiquissima traditio, a Patribus Ecclesiae iterum iterumque fidelibus inculcata et in Oriente christiano fideliter tradita, secundum quam confirmatio et eucharistia semper immediate sequebantur baptismum, ita ut unitas initiationis christianae appareret.”

S-112 Relatio, 55: “Optima concordia cum desiderio explicite ipsius Concilii in Constitutione de sacra Liturgia (art. 71) expresso: ‘Confirmationis sacramenti intima connexio cum tota initiatione christiana clarius eluceat’.”

¹⁰³ S-112 Relatio, 53: “Maxima utilitas pastoralis pro adultis, pro quibus secui duo prima sacramenta initiationis longo spatio temporis separantur.”

¹⁰⁴ S-112 Relatio, 54: “Evolutio recens disciplinae confirmationis, secundum quam saepe saepius presbyteri ad confirmationem administrandam delegantur. Quod fere semper – secundum facultates decennales – fit in Missionibus, ita ut nil fere novi introduceretur, si cuivis presbytero adultos baptizanti haec delegatio conferretur.”

¹⁰⁵ S-112 93.

confirm them, one by one. No mention was made about the posture of the neophytes, who, in OC, were to be kneeling. Similarly, no mention was made about the division by gender, which, in OC, required that males be confirmed first, then females. Finally, no mention was made regarding the celebrant asking the name of the neophyte, as had occurred in OC, since the celebrant was expected to have known their names at this point in the rite. The formula for Confirmation was the same in S-112 as it was in OC, and the rubric, while phrased slightly differently, pointed to the same ritual action: placing his right hand on the head of the neophyte, he was to sign their forehead in the sign of a cross with Chrism, using his thumb. The concluding action in OC, the ritual slap, was omitted in S-112, as were the post-Confirmation rubrics directed towards cleaning the celebrant's hands.

Following the description of Confirmation in S-112, the document concluded its treatment of the Vigil with the rubric from Le Saulchoir regarding communion under both species for the neophytes. Here, however, it added a rubric indicating that the celebrant could briefly address the neophytes immediately before communion, exhorting them "to ponder the great mystery, which is the culmination of Christian initiation."¹⁰⁶

The final period, the *Tempus mystagogicae* remained unchanged and undeveloped. The entire description of this period, as first found in NR-C, indicated that mystagogy was to occur on the Sundays after Easter, within the context of newly

¹⁰⁶ S-112 100: "Immediate ante communion celebrans communionem celebrans potest breviter neophytos monere de pondere tanti mysterii, quod est culmen initiationis christianae."

composed votive masses for the neophytes, based on the model of the Ambrosian Missal.¹⁰⁷ This rubric was unaltered throughout these drafts of the rite.

5.6: Conclusions

With the creation of S-112, the *Coetus* had a document that could be submitted to the *Consilium* for their deliberations and approval. A fitting summary of the work up to this point can be found in a survey of the introductory material of the *Relatio* to the *Consilium* accompanying S-112. In this brief text, several trends can be identified: a clear reliance on and preference for texts from Roman liturgical history; the incorporation of suitable texts from non-Roman liturgical sources; the incorporation of Scripture into texts; faithfulness to the Roman liturgical structure; an emphasis on the paschal nature of initiation; and a sensitivity to pastoral circumstances.

The work of the *Coetus* demonstrated, in the first place, an overall sensitivity to the Roman liturgical tradition. In doing so, they embraced the obligation imposed on them in SC 62, to clarify the purpose of the sacraments by adapting them and removing those additions that distorted their clarity.¹⁰⁸ The *Coetus* found a helpful guide for their own work in the directive given to those responsible for treating the Eucharistic liturgy, and, in turn, embraced that principle as their own:

... the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance; elements that, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated or were added with but little advantage are now to be discarded; other elements that have suffered

¹⁰⁷ “Observationes A.G. Martimort in *schematata Coetus* XXII, De Ordine baptismi adultorum prosequuntur” 7: Martimort argued that importing or composing new texts for the neophytes was unnecessary, as they already existed within the Roman Rite – the texts for the Octave of Easter.

¹⁰⁸ SC 62: “With the passage of time, however, certain features have crept into the rites of the sacraments and sacramentals that have made their nature and purpose less clear to the people of today; hence some changes have become necessary as adaptations to the needs of our own times.”

injury through accident of history are now, as may seem useful or necessary, to be restored to the vigor they had in the tradition of the Fathers.¹⁰⁹

S-112 clearly reflects this endeavor in the frequent usage of texts from the Gelasian Sacramentary, which was widely accepted as having been compiled around the 8th century in France.¹¹⁰ Jungmann argued that “the material added in France can in general be easily separated from the rest. The Roman material remaining is dated about the sixth century.”¹¹¹ This text contained the earliest versions of many of the prayers contained within OBA, and the *Coetus* restored many of the texts in S-112 to the way in which they appeared in the source text. In particular, the signation of the forehead at S-112 7, the use of the *Memento Domine* and *Hanc igitur* for the scrutiny masses at S-112 55, and the prayer before the *redditio symboli* at S-112 81, S-112 81. Further, prayers from the Gelasian Sacramentary were incorporated with only one or two changes for the concluding prayer for the signation of the senses at S-112 8, the concluding prayer for the rite of election at S-112 47, the concluding prayer for the exorcisms at S-112 53, 59, and 66, and the prayer of exorcism at S-112 58.

The *Coetus* also attempted to incorporate many prayer texts from other, non-Roman sources, in ways that did not detract from the Roman liturgical style. In particular, many of the minor exorcisms and blessings during the period of the catechumenate were drawn from Eastern liturgical sources, and were adapted to fit in

¹⁰⁹ SC 50. This paragraph explicitly deals with the Order of Mass.

¹¹⁰ See Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, O.S.B., *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli* (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56)(*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, Series Maior Fontes IV (Rome: Herder, 1960), XXXV: “Für die Zeit der Niederschrift bewegen sich die Meinungen der besten Kenner um die Datierung WILMARTS (1945): Saec VIII (paululum ante medium) – Paucis annis ante 750 – fortasse etiam saec [sic] VIII.”

¹¹¹ Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy*, 236.

with the rest of the texts. Further, the Ambrosian Rite would provide the text for the initial interrogation of the candidates in S-112 2, as well as the idea for masses for the neophytes, named at S-112 101. While this method has been criticized as being false ecumenism,¹¹² the assumption that the varied liturgical rites were divergences in a monolinear trajectory and the commensurate emphasis on liturgical similarity rather than difference renders this euchological borrowing defensible. While some liturgical traditions might have been performing the rites somewhat differently, they were pointing to the same core, which was widely recognized as being discernable. Indeed, the directives given in *SC* imply this very thing: “With the passage of time, however, certain features have crept into the rites of the sacraments and sacramentals that have made their nature and purpose less clear to the people of today.” The growth of liturgies was clearly a process of addition and accretion to a common center. *SC* 62 had given the mandate that “the treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly, so that a richer share in God’s word may be provided for the faithful” (51). The premise on which this statement is based is clear: God’s word is consistent. Did not the same rationale apply to the prayer texts of the varied Christian traditions? Just as the fundamental nature of Christ’s passion is not ascertained only through focus on the account of John, but requires focus on the rest of the canon, including the Synoptic Gospels, so too could the fundamental nature of Christian initiation and the Paschal Mystery not be understood simply through focus on Roman heritage alone, but through the many different liturgical traditions. The difficulty,

¹¹² See, for example, Gerard Austin, *Anointing with the Spirit – The Rite of Confirmation: The use of Oil and Chrism* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1985), 46: “On first view its [the Byzantine formula for Chrismation] adoption appears to be a laudable ecumenical gesture, but a closer look reveals what some would call a false ecumenism, because the formula has been removed from its total context. As borrowed and used by the new rite, the formula lacks the epicletic prayers that accompany it and give it meaning in the Byzantine context.”

however, which was not raised, let alone addressed, was whether or not selecting texts from different liturgical traditions and then quilting them into a Roman structure was a genuinely honest endeavor.¹¹³ This question would be left for later scholars of the liturgy.

Based on *SC*'s instruction that Scripture be opened more fully to the faithful the *Coetus* sought to increase the possible connections between the rites and God's Word. Most noticeably, not a single celebration was intended to be celebrated without being in the context of a celebration of the Word. Scripture was to be proclaimed and preached upon in each of the stages (S-112 12, 41 49, 56, 62, 86, 101), and it was also to accompany the celebrations within the period of the catechumenate (S-112 18, 30), the *traditiones* (S-112 71, 75), and the rites of immediate preparation (S-112 79). Specific recommendations for readings were incorporated into the rite for the celebration of the rite for making catechumens, the scrutinies, the *traditiones*, and the rites of immediate preparation. The *Coetus* had also made the recommendation to the group responsible for the lectionary regarding using texts from the Acts of the Apostles during the masses for the Sundays of Easter, so that Mystagogy could be rooted in a presentation of the nature of Christian living.¹¹⁴ Furthermore, the *Coetus* incorporated more scriptural allusions and references into the prayer texts. The prayer for the exorcism in the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum* (S-112 4) demonstrates this trend, as does the renunciation of

¹¹³ Of course, one does not need to look any further than the Roman liturgical tradition itself to see proof of this pattern. According to Cyrille Vogel, William Storey, and Niels Rasmussen, "The Latin liturgy which came into being [between 590 and 1085]... and which continued to be the liturgy of the West for centuries to come, was not a purely Roman one; as a result of its long and turbulent history, it is better characterized as Romano-Frankish or even as Romano-Germanic." See *Medieval Liturgy*, 61.

¹¹⁴ "Protocollum junii 3-6 1965", 44: "Pro hoc tempore sex missae creanda sunt cum tertia lectione ex Actibus Apostolorum facultativa."

false cults (S-112 5), several of the formulae for anointing the senses (S-112 8), four of the minor exorcisms (S-112 26, 27, 28, 29), the prayers of exorcism for the Scrutinies (S-112 51, 58, 64), the prayer for the blessing of the font (S-112 86), and the formulae for the presentation of a white robe (S-112 96) and a lighted candle (S-112 97).

The manner in which scriptural allusion was contained within the texts of S-112 reveals yet another general characteristic of the revised rite. Only the four minor exorcisms and the exorcism during the first stage were entirely new creations; the rest of the scriptural allusions were added to pre-existing texts. The *Coetus* thus attempted to fulfill the dictates of SC 23: "... there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing." The vast majority of the elements in the OCGD were based directly on OBA, thereby testifying to the desired organic growth of the rite. Even the rite of election, which was not present in OBA, could be seen as organic development, based on the testimony of such Patristic authors as Ambrose, Augustine, and Egeria. The most obviously clear additions to the rite, the giving of a new name and the presentation of a holy medal, were elements that were understood to be culturally valuable, pointing to the central truth of the rites of the catechumenate and initiation. They communicated new personhood and membership in a community.

The Paschal context of the proposed rite was highlighted in two significant ways. Most obviously, the chronological setting of the rite emphasized the connection between initiation and Easter: the period of intense preparation was to begin on the First Sunday of Lent, initiation was to be celebrated during the Paschal Vigil, and the Period of

Mystagogy was to occur within the Easter Season. In this way the baptismal character of Lent, as expressed in *SC* 109, could be ritually developed within communities:

Lent is to be marked by two themes, the baptismal and the penitential. By recalling or preparing for baptism and by repentance, this season disposes the faithful, as they more diligently listen to the word of God and devote themselves to prayer, to celebrate the Paschal Mystery. The baptismal and penitential aspects of Lent are to be given greater prominence in both the liturgy and liturgical catechesis.

Further, the Relationship between the paschal mystery and salvation, as expressed in *SC* 106, could be highlighted:

... Christ's faithful must gather together so that, by hearing the word of God and taking part in the eucharist, they may call to mind the passion, the resurrection, and the glorification of the Lord Jesus and may thank God, who 'has begotten them again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 Peter 1:3)

The calendrical structure of the OCGD clearly allowed these connections to be made. Accordingly, virtually every prayer that was amended was altered with a Paschal context in mind. Some of the more notable alterations include the texts for the exorcisms at the scrutinies (S-112 51, 58, 64), prayer for the blessing of the font (S-112 86), the baptismal profession of faith (S-112 90), and the texts for the presentation of a white robe (S-112 96) and a lighted candle (S-112 97).

One final particular strength of the OCGD was the degree to which pastoral sensitivity was not merely permitted, but encouraged. Unlike OBA, S-112 offered numerous opportunities for local adaptation to the structure of the rite (see Table 5.26 below). The structure itself was variable; of the fifteen elements of the first stage, six could be omitted: the exorcism (S-112 4), the renunciation of false cults and adherence to Christ (S-112 5), the signation of the senses (S-112 8), the gesture of welcome (S-112 11), the giving of the Gospels (S-112 13), and the celebration the Eucharist.

Furthermore, only three of the fifteen elements were given a fixed form: the catechesis (S-112 3), the imposition of hands (S-112 6), and the introduction into the church (S-112 10). All of the others allowed for some degree of variability. In the greeting (S-112 1) a double option for the color of liturgical vestments was noted: if mass was to follow, the vestments should use those colors; otherwise they should be a festive color, as determined regionally. More significantly, the entire text of the greeting was left to the celebrant, with only the concluding formula being fixed. The introductory song was also variable. The introductory dialogue, or the interrogation of the candidates, (S-112 2) was provided in two different forms, which would be specified by the local Conferences of Bishops, and could be administered either individually or corporately, should there be a significantly large number of catechumens.¹¹⁵ The exorcism (S-112 4), the celebration of which was optional, allowed for the celebrant to use a regionally acceptable posture in administering the prayer. Also, the rite here allowed for a variable mode of celebration, should the numbers of candidates be sufficiently large. The renunciation of false cults and the Adhesion to Christ (S-112 5) could be omitted, and, if used, the text provided was only by means of a guideline. The rite intended that localized texts be written and used. The signation of the forehead (S-112 7) allowed for the possibility of omitting physical contact, and it also provided for the possibility that the number of candidates might be large. The signation of the senses (S-112 8) could be omitted entirely or in part, and provision was once again allowed for a large number of catechumens. The giving of a Christian name (S-112 9) was optional, and allowance was made that this element could

¹¹⁵ Regular allowance would be made for instances when “a very large number are to be baptized together,” according to the directives of *SC* 68.

be celebrated at different locations throughout the entire process of initiation. The gesture of welcome (S-112 11) was deemed optional, and the rubric suggested two non-exclusive gestures; the local Conferences of Bishops could determine if another gesture might be more appropriate. The Conferences were also responsible for crafting any accompanying texts. The rite also indicated that the gesture of welcome could be celebrated either before or after the introduction into the Church. In describing the Celebration of the Word (S-112 12), the rite allowed the celebrant to explain the significance of the Word in the life of the Church from the chair, the ambo, or the chancel. At the conclusion of the homily, the rite allowed for the possibility of presenting the catechumens with a book of the Gospels (S-112 13): the only description of the manner in which this element was to proceed was “reverentially” (“*ac reverenter distribui*”). The litany of intercession over the elect (S-112 14), not itself an optional element, allowed for the use of varied texts, after which the catechumens would be formally dismissed. Allowance was given here that the catechumens might, should circumstances require it, simply move to the side instead of leaving the worship space. The final element described in the rite was the celebration of the Eucharist, which was named as being another optional element. Thus, in the first stage alone, twenty-six different options were permitted, which could be utilized according to pastoral requirements. This degree of pastoral sensitivity continued throughout the rite.

S-112 was, by no means, a perfect document. The *Coetus* identified four particular weaknesses in the OCGD: the description of the period of Mystagogy, the lack of pastoral *Praenotanda*, the absence of instructive texts within the rite, and the form of the Latin. The first three issues were problems that simply required more time to fix.

TABLE 5.26
VARIABILITY IN THE RITE
IN THE RITE FOR MAKING CATECHUMENS
IN S-112

Element	Requisite	Variability
Greeting	Yes	Color of vestments; speech of welcome, song
Introductory Dialogue	Yes	Two forms of dialogue; numbers
Catechesis	Yes	
Exorcism	Optional	Celebrant's posture; numbers
Renunciation of False Cults and Adhesion to Christ	Optional	Text
Imposition of Hands	Yes	
Signation of the forehead	Yes	Physical contact; Numbers
Signation of the senses	Optional	Senses; Numbers
Imposition of a Christian Name	Optional	Location
Introduction into the Church	Yes	
Gesture of Welcome	Optional	Gesture; Text; Location
Celebration of the Word	Yes	Location for Explanation
Giving of the Gospels	Optional	
Litany of Intercession	Yes	Text
Dismissal of Catechumens	Yes	Place to where they were dismissed
Celebration of the Eucharist	Optional	

The description of the period of Mystagogy did not yet, for example, make reference to any existing mass or lectionary texts, as this project was dependant upon the work of other *Coetus*. The *Coetus* had intended the *Praenotanda*, described in SC 63b,¹¹⁶ to emerge out of the period of experimentation, thereby drawing upon the wisdom found in practical experience. Certainly, some rubrical direction was present in the text, but, as the *Consilium* had approved earlier, the *Coetus* was desirous of allowing the rite to speak

¹¹⁶ "... But those who draw up these rituals or particular collections of rites must not leave out the prefatory instructions for the individual rites in the Roman Ritual, whether the instructions are pastoral and rubrical or have some special social bearing."

for itself.¹¹⁷ Similarly, the instructive texts within the rite were to be based on the pastoral experience gleaned through the period of experimentation.¹¹⁸ By far the largest issue, however, was the use of Latin in the rite. Both Botte¹¹⁹ and Martimort¹²⁰ had independently critiqued the Latin texts rather severely in their reviews of the OCGD, and their point was not lost on the *Coetus*. They admitted to the *Consilium* that they had not been able to perfect the Latin phrasing, and that they would welcome the services of a Latinist, who might revise the language of the rite in preparation for the experimentation phase, where the rite would be translated into the vernacular.¹²¹ Indeed, the next draft of the rite, S-147, would display countless linguistic modifications. S-112 was submitted to the *Consilium* on October 4, 1965, and would come before that group at their Sixth General Meeting, on October 18-19.

¹¹⁷ S-112 Relatio, 8: “Deficit primum caput, i.e. Praenotanda pastoralia seu instructiones, de quibus exarandis Constitutio loquitur in art. 63b. Hoc ex eo provenit, quod mandatum a Vobis accepimus progrediendi ad ipsum ritum cum textibus exarandum (Quaesitum 23 relationis mensis aprilis). Insuper fatendum est rem esse tanti momenti pastoralis, ut conveniat eam non absolvere nisi post experimentum factum et sub luce experientiarum pastoralium, quas experimenta afferent. Elementa perplura interim iam collegimus.”

¹¹⁸ S-112 Relatio, 10: “Obvium est ritui quando secundum vota vestra ad experimentum transibit, specialia monita praemittentur ad usum eorum, qui experimenta dirigent.”

¹¹⁹ “Louvain 20-7-1965,” 1: “Je ne sais pas qui a rédigé ces textes, mais on dirait qu’il n’y a personne au *Coetus* qui connaisse le latin, pour laisser passer – dans les rubriques heureusement – des monstres tels que responsabilitas, responsabilis. Quant aux corrections qui ont été faites aux prières elles-mêmes, elles trahissent une incompréhension du texte. Avant de changer, il faudrait savoir exactement ce que cela veut dire, et il semble que personne ne s’en soit soulié.”

¹²⁰ “Observationes ab A.G. Martimort,” 1: “Prima quidem et generalior observatio mea erit, latinum sermonem esse sedulo revisendum, quippe qui sit saepe mendis inquinatus, tempus enim mihi deert, ut singulatio sive orationis sive rubricas emendare nitagam.”

¹²¹ S-112 Relatio, 7: “Deficit prae omnibus perfectio latinitatis, quae talem actantum ritum deceret. Angustia temporis non permisit, quod latinitas ritus adhuc ante hanc Vestram sessionem perpoliretur; sed iam statutum est hoc factum iri a latinista Consilii post approbationem pro experimento (si fiet), antequam ritus iis tradatur, quibus experimentum committetur.”

CHAPTER SIX

REVISIONS, CORRECTIONS, AND PAPAL PRESENTATION

In the eight months between October, 1965, and June, 1966, some of the most important work on the experimental OCGD would be accomplished, not just by the *Coetus*, but also by their supervisors, the *Consilium*. S-112 would be presented to the *Consilium* for its corrections and approval on October 18-19, after which the subcommittee would meet to propose some very specific solutions to the issues raised in the meeting of the *Consilium*. Nearly one month later, on November 14-15, *Coetus* XXII and XXIII would meet together for some final revisions to this work, which, in its revised and edited format, S-125,¹ would be submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Rites on February 18, 1966. Based on their corrections and suggestions, a completed second *schemata* of the rite, S-147,² could be presented to Pope Paul VI in March, in order that he approve its use for experimentation over the next two years.

¹ *Schemata* 125, *De Rituali* 6, “Rituale Romanum Titulus I: De initiatione christiana; Sectio I: De initiatione christiana adultorum,” ND DRi-6 (125).

² *Schemata* 147, *De Rituali* 9, “Rituale Romanum Titulus I: De initiatione christiana; Sectio I: De initiatione christiana adultorum,” ND DRi-9 (147).

6.1: Presentation to the Consilium, October 18-19, 1965, and Corrections

The Sixth General Meeting of the *Consilium* lasted from October 18-26, November 22-26, and December 1, 1965. Of particular concern for the OCGD are the meetings held on October 18 and 19, when the first *schemata*, S-112, was presented to the *Consilium* for its discussion.³ The October 18 session concerned the whole of the rite up until Confirmation; at the October 19 meeting the *Consilium* discussed Confirmation and the manner in which experimentation was to occur.⁴ Fischer, as the Relator for

³ Bugnini provides a description of the entire meeting in *ROL*, 150-153. He described how the presentation of the *schemata*, S-112, occupied the Consilium for the entire first day and a portion of the second. See 151: “The order of the presentations and discussions was as follows: October 18: adult baptism; 19 adult baptism, *Ordo Missae*, Office; 20...”

Bugnini elaborated on the proceedings concerning adult initiation in the Chapter specifically dedicated to that work. However, Bugnini indicated two different, yet similar dates. On page 151 he lists October 18-19, and on page 584-5 he describes a meeting with remarkably similar content as occurring on November 18 (these same dates are also provided in the original Italian publication). There would appear to be three possibilities: these two dates refer to two different meetings; the single meeting occurred on the earlier date; or the single meeting occurred on the later date. Bugnini describes the November 19 meeting as containing “a masterly presentation from Professor B. Fischer,” and in describing the nature of the discussions, he notes that one of the Fathers of the Consilium, responding to the traditions, “said: ‘They already know the gospel and the creed!’ The Relator [Fischer] replied: ‘It is one thing to know them, another to receive them officially from the Church in a celebration in the presence of the community’ ” (586). In the record of the Consilium meeting from October 18-19, this same concern and response is provided. It would therefore seem that the “masterly presentation” is the one described in the Consilium minutes, which occurred on October 18-19. Alongside this textual evidence, Bugnini’s listing for the dates of the meeting suggests that the Consilium was not in session on November 19. Furthermore, given the way in which the Consilium and the Coetus worked, one would expect to find some new correspondence following a November 18 meeting. This is not, however, the case. The texts from this period include S-112 (written on October 2 and October 4), Fischer’s summary of the Consilium proceedings of October 18-19 (written on November 9), minutes from a meeting of the Coetus for corrections to S-112 (dated November 14-15), and S-125, the revised *schemata* (dated October 18-19, though the date appears to indicate the authority for the text, rather than the date of composition). The next dated item is a list of corrections to S-125 from Bugnini, dated February 18, 1966.

⁴ “Protocollum privatum de iis, quae in sessionibus Consilii dierum 18 et 19 oct. acta sunt circa schematata de initiatione christiana necnon de iis, quae post has sessiones in dicto schematata adhuc mutata sunt” in C.N.P.L. 1.C.7: “Autour de la Plenaria du 4 Oct. 65.” The file is mislabeled in C.N.P.L., clearly evidenced by the fact that October 18 was the first date of the Plenary, or General Session. See *ROL*, 139.

Discussion of the Concilium proceedings must proceed with some degree of delicacy. An atmosphere of secrecy is readily noticeable surrounding their deliberations. Bugnini notes that the members of the Consilium were exhorted to “be very prudent in letting others know of the work. Some *schematas* still needed revisions, others required experimentation, and all had to be submitted to the supreme authority in the Church. All sorts of expectations were harbored, both by those who were anxiously awaiting the reform of the rites and by those who feared such a reform. Revelation of what was

Coetus XXII, was present at the *Consilium* meeting, along with Seumois, the secretary.⁵ Seumois, however, was unable to be present on the second day, and so, Lengeling filled in as secretary.⁶ Following the meeting of the *Consilium*, the subcommittee assembled in the village of Nemi, about twenty miles outside of Rome, on October 21, where they made some of the changes desired by the *Consilium*. More corrections to the rite were made at a meeting of the entire *Coetus* at the Benedictine monastery of St. Priscilla in Montefiolo, on November 14-15,⁷ which led directly to the composition of the next draft of the rite, DRi-6, S-125.

6.1.1: General Issues

Broadly speaking, two overriding concerns about the OCGD were expressed by the *Consilium*. It was thought to be far too long, and it was recognized as possessing bad Latin style. On the first issue, Bugnini has noted that “the Fathers of the *Consilium* had

being done in the *Consilium* could give rise to untimely hopes or provoke hostile reactions” (155). More specifically, the reports of the *Consilium* proceedings contained within the C.N.P.L. are marked as being private, and for the use of the *Coetus* members for their own work. The rationale behind this secrecy was necessary, at that time, for limiting the spread of rumor.

Bugnini notes, however, that the secrecy was not absolute – “It was impossible, however, that people in Rome should fail to notice so large a gathering and avoid indulging in conjectures, sometimes very odd, as to its business. For this reason it was decided to publish some information of the work of the general meetings” (155). Furthermore, in treating the General Meetings, Bugnini readily reported the content of the discussions (see *ROL*, 585). The secrecy that Bugnini did maintain, however, was in relation to the identity of those members of the *Consilium* who engaged in debate. Only rarely in the discussion of adult initiation did Bugnini mention any of the Bishops by name. Since the original purpose of the secrecy is no longer valid - there is no question regarding the final decisions of the *Consilium* surrounding liturgical reform – this study will adopt the same position as Bugnini, which is unquestionably conservative. The content of the discussion, which is rather apparent from the revisions resulting from it, will be described, but the names of those members of the *Consilium* who raised their points will be omitted. Since Bugnini was content to distinguish between the points raised by the *Consilium* and the responses by the Relator (Fischer) this study will employ the same method here as well.

⁵ *ROL*, 585-586.

⁶ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 1.

⁷ *ROL*, 599.

the impression that the rite was overly complicated.”⁸ The only comment that emerges from the minutes of the *Consilium* meeting in this regard was made very early in the deliberations. By the time the rite of election was being discussed, Fischer had already presented fifteen pages of text – the entire rite comprised thirty-three pages. And so, when Fischer turned to the second stage, which was not a revision, but an addition to the rite, the immediate response was that the stage was an unwarranted accretion. Fischer responded to this concern by pointing to the pastoral benefits emerging from its use in France up until this point.⁹ This appeared to satisfy some of the members of the *Consilium*, but Bugnini notes that it was also “explained that there would indeed be a simpler rite, as called for by the liturgical Constitution itself, although this would have to be considered not the norm but rather an exception for special cases.”¹⁰ Nevertheless, the *Consilium* still looked for opportunities to streamline the rite when possible, especially when it appeared to them that elements might be doubled – such as the litany over the elect and the general intercessions, and the post-baptismal anointing and confirmation.

The second issue that concerned the *Consilium* was the form of the Latin that appeared in S-112. One member of the *Consilium* proposed, for example, that the rite simply be resubmitted to that body when the linguistic issues had been resolved, but this proposal was rejected.¹¹ Another member pointed out the obvious error, where a

⁸ *ROL*, 587.

⁹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 7: “Experimenta hucusque praesertim in Gallia habita illustraverunt magnum pondus pastorale ritus per gradus dispositi.”

¹⁰ *ROL*, 587.

¹¹ It was rejected, in part, because the experimental rite would be distributed and used entirely in the vernacular. The *Consilium* was satisfied with knowing that the Latin text would be revised, even though that translation would not appear before them for approval.

question was asked using the plural voice and the response was given in the singular. This issue was resolved when it became known that the text would be revised for style by a Latinist before being sent out for experimental use.

In all, there were two different sorts of occasions during which revision of the text might occur: content-based revisions, emerging out of theological, pastoral, or practical rationale; and stylistic revisions, emerging from the lack of satisfaction with the Latin text. The revisions occurred during four different occasions between the examination of S-112 and the crafting of S-125: the meeting of the *Consilium*, the meeting of the subcommittee, the meeting of the *Coetus*, and the work with the Latinist. Most of the revisions dealing with issues of content can be ascribed to the first three meetings, while most of the revisions dealing with language and style can be attributed to work with the Latinist. This distinction is not, however, thoroughly clear-cut.

The *Consilium*, in particular, occasionally made linguistic corrections, as they found the Latin of S-112 to be lacking.¹² Subsequent revisions that they suggested were made with the knowledge that the text would be revised stylistically, but they did, nonetheless, propose some revisions directly.¹³ A brief comparison of parallel elements in S-112 and S-125 demonstrates the concerns of the *Consilium*, as these revisions reveal

“Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 2: “Agitur praecipue delatinitate rubricarum, quapropter non est necessarium denuo Consilio submittere textum revisum. Etenim, textus rituum fere semper desumpti sunt ex fontibus antiquae traditionis. De cetero, latinitas non tanti ponderis est, cum linguae vernaculae in usu erunt pro universo ritu.”

¹² “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 2: In particular, one member of the *Consilium*, argued that the Latin should be “Christian and not Ciceronian.” Certainly, the incorporation of some older liturgical texts would suggest a certain linguistic archaeologism. However, given the critiques of both Botte and Martimort, the question was not simply one of modern or antiquated style.

¹³ For example, the *Consilium* directly sought the addition of the text “Unusquisque vestrum assentiatne” at 3.

countless corrections, including word order, verb tenses and forms, and pronouns. The introductory catechesis (3),¹⁴ for example, contains eight textual alterations. Only one of these was an outright change – “*si igitur*” replaced “*qui*.” Of the remaining seven, five were changes of person in the verb (including a change suggested directly by the *Consilium*, in which the question was posed in the plural, and the response was given in the singular),¹⁵ one was an inversion of word order (“*hoc etiam*” to “*etiam hoc*”), and one was a change of person (“*suam*” to “*vestram*”).

Needless to say, focus on the stylistic alterations in this phase would be tedious, at best. Consequently, the only linguistic changes that will be expressly noted are those that affect the content of the text, some of which were the result of the work of the Latinist. For example, no alterations were proposed to the litanic intercessions over the catechumens towards the conclusion of the rite for making Catechumens (14) in the description of the *Consilium*, subcommittee, or *Coetus* meetings. The revision of the fourth petition, however, modifies the description of baptism as that “regenerating bath which cleanses by the remission of sins” to be, simply, a “regenerating bath.” While it is certainly possible that such an alteration was an official request, no record of that decision was made in the very thorough notes on the meetings. The other significant point surrounding the work of the Latinist is that some texts assumed directly from other sources were stylistically modified. For example, the portion of the prayer for the laying on of hands in the rite for making Catechumens (6) that was taken directly from OBA,

¹⁴ Because the paragraph numbering remained constant during this period, only the paragraph number will be used to identify the element in question. For example, S-112 1 will be notated, simply, as 1.

¹⁵ “*Protocollum privatum*, 18-21 oct.,” 5.

which was itself taken from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, was slightly altered, though not in a perceptibly meaningful way. The original phrase from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, “*omnem caecitatem cordis ab eis expelle*,” was, in S-125, rendered “*omnem ab eis cordis caecitatem expelle*.” Perhaps this older liturgical Latin was an example of the “Ciceronian” Latin reviled by some of the *Consilium*. Nonetheless, because the linguistic and stylistic changes that resulted from the work of the Latinist are both plentiful and of little consequence for the content of the rite, only those linguistic changes that have substantial bearing on the rite will be discussed.

The following treatment will treat the substantial changes and discussion that emerged out of the four different settings: the October 18-19 meeting of the *Consilium*; the October 21 meeting of the subcommittee; the November 14-15 meeting of the *Coetus*; and the revisions of the Latinist in creating S-125. For the sake of clarity, these will be presented according to the ritual structure, rather than the order in which the changes were made.

6.1.2: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

Overall the *Consilium* desired very few changes in the first stage of the rite. This first stage, however, would be the stage in which they sought the greatest degree of alteration. First, during the introductory dialogue (2), the *Consilium* sought the addition of an option present in OBA1962 that the celebrant might call the name of the candidate, to which they would respond “present” (“*adsum*”).¹⁶ Second, as noted immediately above, *Consilium* detected a difficulty in the question to the candidates following the

¹⁶ “*Protocollum privatum*, 18-21 oct.,” 4, 31.

statement of catechesis (3). As phrased in S-112, the celebrant asked all of the candidates, using the second-person plural, whether they agreed to the contents of the catechesis, and they were to respond in the singular. The intent, however, was that the candidates would respond individually – otherwise, the first person plural rather than the first person singular would have been utilized. One member of the *Consilium* suggested an alternate formula, in which the celebrant instructed the candidates in the midst of the question to respond one by one. Both of these two suggestions were accepted by the *Consilium* and included in the next draft of the rite.¹⁷ The third proposed alteration involved the exorcism (4), for which the celebrant would optimally pray the prayer with his right hand on the candidate's head. One member of the *Consilium* proposed that the element be omitted altogether. It was pointed out to him, however, that not only the exsufflation was optional, but so too was the posture that the celebrant might adopt.¹⁸ The revised text further allowed that the exorcism could be enacted without any ritual gesture at all, and, in cases where there were a substantial number of candidates, the exsufflation could be omitted, while the prayer was still recited.¹⁹

During the optional renunciation of false cults (5), the subcommittee made its first alteration, and it decided to amend the direction of the final statement to include the sponsors and the community of the faithful more actively. Formerly, the text mirrored Joshua 24:22 more directly: "You are your own witnesses that you have chosen to serve Christ the Lord." The subcommittee decided, however, to direct this admonition to the

¹⁷ "Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.," 3, 32.

¹⁸ "Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.," 4.

¹⁹ "Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.," 33.

sponsors and the gathered community – “You are witnesses that these candidates have chosen to serve Christ the Lord” – to which they would reply, as had the candidates in the version before this, “We are witnesses.”²⁰

A second change made by the subcommittee attempted to streamline the signation of the forehead (7) in cases where the other senses were also to be signed (8). The formula for the signation of the forehead present in S-112 made reference to accepting the cross on the forehead and in the heart, but the optional formula for the signation of the chest made reference to the heart. When the latter signation was to occur, the subcommittee indicated that the phrase “*tam in fronte quam in corde*” should be omitted from the original text, to avoid unnecessary duplication.²¹ For the sake of clarity, the subcommittee decided to include a cross to indicate the moment at which the signation was to occur. For the signation of the forehead it was to occur after the statement “accept the sign of the cross,” and for the signation of the senses, it was to occur after mention of the sense that was being signed. The only variation to this pattern was for the signation of the whole body – the cross was inserted in the midst of naming the Trinity, rather than after the word “body.”²²

The final alteration made by the subcommittee to the first stage was in reference to the celebration of the Word (12). Rather than indicating that the books of Scripture were to be processed with “solemnity,” the subcommittee preferred the phrase “with

²⁰ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 34.

²¹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 35: “Recte enim observatum est in forma illa pleniore minus gratam duplicationem oriri, si et in signatione frontis et in signatione pectoris mentio fit cordis.”

²² “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 7, 8.

dignity.”²³ Perhaps they recognized that a procession of the book that included enthroning the book and incensing it would connote some degree of solemnity, but that dignity was a separate disposition.

The *Consilium* raised an issue later in their deliberations which had an impact on the shape of the rite for making Catechumens. When treating the rite of election, the question was raised about the duplication of litanies: one for the catechumens and one for general intercessions. Fischer’s response to this question was particularly interesting, and helps explain a later pastoral allowance. Fischer argued that there were not two litanies in the rite, but only one, which was “interrupted by the dismissal of the catechumens.”²⁴ In S-112 the intercessions for the catechumens and the general intercessions are only separated by the dismissal of the catechumens; the Creed is to follow the intercessions. This is the same order that has been retained in the current version of the rite.

6.1.3: The Time of the Catechumenate

The *Consilium* addressed no issues during the period of the catechumenate, nor did the *Coetus*. Only three notable changes were made by the subcommittee. The first was for the purpose of ritual clarification, indicating that any of the formulae offered might be used.²⁵ The other two changes were textual. In the minor exorcism derived from the *Testamentum Domini* (23) the verb was changed from “*elegisti*” to “*vocasti*,” acknowledging that the subjects of the exorcism were not yet “elect,” but were still

²³ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 37.

²⁴ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 8: “Circa duplicationem litaniarum: non est duplicatio: habetur unica litania, aliaquatenus interrupta per dimissionem catechumenorum.”

²⁵ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 38: “In n. 21: clarius rubrica ita redacta est: Nihil impedit, quominus formulae infrascriptae in diversis occasionibus pluries adhibeantur.”

catechumens: thus, being “called” was more appropriate than being “elected.” And in the minor exorcism taken from the Byzantine and Coptic rites (24), the limitation of greed to being exclusively “monetary” was removed.

6.1.4: The Second Stage: Election

Only two substantial changes were proposed for the second stage. The first change made to the rite of election was rubrical. S-112 had indicated that the rite should occur on the first Sunday of Lent, or, if necessary, in the preceding week. Martimort, a Consultor,²⁶ suggested that the subcommittee further limit the anticipation of this stage, by proposing that if it was to be celebrated in the week before the first Sunday of Lent, it was to remain a Lenten celebration: it could not be celebrated “before Ash Wednesday.”²⁷ The only change was proposed by the *Consilium* was to revise a phrase in the text for the presentation of the candidates (42) that had been recently altered by the *Coetus* at Clervaux. While the French proposal had articulated that the catechumens expressed “a desire... to receive Baptism and Eucharist in the joy of Easter,” S-112 described their desire “to be admitted to participate in the mystery of initiation.” One member of the *Consilium* proposed that this phrase was too obscure, and instead proposed “to enter into the Church.” This alteration was ultimately rejected, and the text remained as it had been.

²⁶ Bernard Botte, in *From Silence to Participation*, provides a brief and colorful description of the way in which the *Consilium* meetings were held. All Consultors, such as Martimort, had the right to attend the sessions. While they could not vote, they could lend their opinions and insights to the matters at hand (126).

²⁷ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 42: In n. 41: monete Can. Martimort in lin. 6a post verbum ‘praecedentum’ introducta est equens parenthesis: (sed non ante Fer. IV Cinerum), ne extra limites Quadragesimae missa tam eminenter quadragesimalis celebretur.”

6.1.5: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones

Three questions about the third stage were raised by the *Consilium*. The first question concerned the spirituality of the Lenten season. One member of the *Consilium* argued that the celebration of the scrutinies on the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent would detract from “the natural penitential flavor of the Lenten season” with so much attention being paid to baptism. Fischer responded that penitence and initiation were intimately linked by pointing to the theology of Romans 6: “No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life.”²⁸ The role of the celebrant was to explain this natural connection in the homily.²⁹ A second question sprang from this concern about preserving the nature of Lent, but directed towards the existence of scrutiny masses. A member of the *Consilium* asked where such masses might be found, to which Fischer responded that they were already present in the Roman Missal, but on weekdays. S-112 proposed that these be returned to their original locations on the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent. The third question concerning this stage was in reference to the *traditiones*. As Bugnini has noted, one member of the *Consilium* questioned the veracity of the *Coetus*’ apparent assertion that some type of *disciplina arcani* continued to exist in the Church. Fischer responded that the intent was not to pretend that it existed, but to

²⁸ Romans 6:13 (NRSV).

²⁹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 11: “Quaestio pariter movetur... de indole paenitentiali temporis Quadragesimalis: cavendum est, ne minuatur eo, quod indoles baptismalis confertur dominicis. Relator: In homiliis, sacerdos inculcare debet sensum poenitentialem intime coniunctum cum sensum baptismali: cum Christo commoriendum est, ut cum Ipso vivamus.”

recognize that there is a difference between knowing a text and “receiving [it] officially from the Church in a celebration in the presence of the community.”³⁰

The only significant linguistic alteration in S-125 that can be spoken of was, to a large degree, reversed in the subsequent version of the rite, S-147. In the first half of the prayer of exorcism for the first scrutiny (51), the description of “God providing, through his servant, Moses, drinkable water from the rock in the desert” was shortened to describe “God providing, through his servant Moses, water from the rock.”

6.1.6: The Fourth Stage: The Rites of Immediate Preparation

Neither the *Consilium*, nor the subcommittee, nor the *Coetus* proposed any revisions to the fourth stage of the rite. While some small stylistic revisions did occur during this phase of the work, none of these were of any substantial consequence. The only alteration worthy of any mention at all was an erroneous one: the revised *Ephphatha* (80) mistakenly substituted “*eos*” for “*os*” in describing where the elect were to be signed. This oversight was corrected in the next draft, and once again the elect were to be signed on the mouth.

6.1.7: The Sacraments of Initiation

The *Consilium* made many points on the celebration of the sacraments of initiation which resulted in changes to the rite, many of which were points that the *Coetus* had discussed among themselves leading up to S-112. The issues of concern were the

³⁰ *ROL*, 586. Also, “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 10: “Difficultas movetur circa sensum traditionis Symboli, cum iam non existat disciplina arcani. Relator: Praevisum est quod haec traditio fieri possit durante ipso catechumenatu. Attamen etiam traditio symboli momento consueto, i.e. intra ultimam Quadragesimam, suum sensum retinet, quia ritualiter prae oculis ponitur factum quod electi symbolum recipiunt ex parte Ecclesiae.”

renunciation, the pre-baptismal anointing, the post-baptismal anointing, the presentation with a white robe, the presentation of a lighted candle, and the presbyteral administration of Confirmation. Discussion on the first stages of the rite had taken so long, however, that the *Consilium* had to treat their discussion on the celebration of the sacraments in two phases. Everything in this stage up until Confirmation was able to be discussed on October 18, but the *Consilium* had to adjourn before turning to Confirmation, and resume their deliberations on October 19.

6.1.7.1: October 18, 1965

The first element in the rite that elicited questions was the renunciation of Satan (88). In particular, one member of the *Consilium* inquired about the difficulty of the alternate invocation, “and all of his angels,” presumably wondering about the overwhelmingly singular association of the term with messengers from heaven, and not simply messengers. Fischer reassured him that the issue would be clarified with the translators, so that the proper sense of “angels” would be maintained in the versions sent out for experimental purposes.³¹

Another member of the *Consilium* noted that the formula for the pre-baptismal anointing (89), which could be omitted, according to the decision of the local Conferences of Bishops, would be tedious, should there be a large number of elect to be baptized. Fischer indicated that the subsequent revision of the rite would include an

³¹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,”16.

option that if the numbers were, indeed, large, the celebrant could speak the formula once only.³²

When discussion moved to the post-baptismal anointing (95), one member of the *Consilium* proposed that the anointing be removed completely from the rite, in order that the Roman practice might be better aligned with the practice in the East. The clear understanding here was that the post-baptismal anointing and the anointing at Confirmation were equivalent. Both Fischer and Martimort explained the debates that had already occurred, describing how the position proposed in S-112 was the best possible option. The text was permitted to stand. Nonetheless, during the discussion on the post-baptismal anointing that took place at the meeting of the *Coetus*, they agreed to address the question of the double-anointing directly, by means of a questionnaire directed towards the “difficult questions,” which would be sent out during the period of experimentation.³³

A change to the rubric for clothing the neophyte in a white garment (96) was effected during the meeting of the subcommittee. Martimort’s suggestion, originally made in response to NR-C, was given greater weight. No longer could the color of the garment be simply changed to another color to express festivity; the rubric entered into S-125 directed that other colors were not permitted except in cases of pastoral necessity.³⁴

³² “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 15: “[Is] monet de taedio quod eluctabiliter generatur ex repetitione formulae, quando numerosiores sunt baptizandi. Relator: De hoc problemate providebimus in rubrica: liceat formulam semel pro omnibus recitare.”

“Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 44 contains the rubric inserted at paragraph 89 of the rite.

³³ “Coetus 22: 14-15 Novembre 1965” in C.N.P.L. 1.C.vii: “Autour de la Plenaria du 4 oct 65:” “Envoyer 1 questionnaire sur les questions difficiles après un certain temps d’expérience.”

³⁴ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 45: “Monente Can. Martimort ea quae in parenthesi de eventuali admissione alius coloris dicuntur, aliter stylizata sunt, ut magis appareat non sine vera necessitate

The Scriptural witness was too significant. The white robe also symbolized the eschatological reality of the sacrament; solely expressing joy was insufficient.

The text for the presentation of a lighted candle (97) underwent two changes, both of which restored the text more closely to its form in OBA, all the while keeping the additions made in S-112. These two suggestions arose within the *Consilium* meeting. The first restoration referred to the phrase “*servate Dei mandata.*” While it is not clear why the text was removed in the first place, the subcommittee argued that its restoration was necessary for theological reasons. As the formula was phrased in S-112, the neophyte was instructed “to accept, therefore, this lighted candle, so that you might come with the Lord... and live forever.” However, the gift of eternal life was not given because one accepted a lighted candle; it was given because one co-operated with God’s grace by living a life in the light of Christ, most particularly through following Christ’s instruction to love others. The legalism that might have been understood through the use of language of commandment was not a necessary connection – but it was required to adequately express the Roman Catholic position on grace and salvation.³⁵ The second text that was restored was the phrase, “*ad nuptias,*” which had been deemed to obscure a reference by the *Coetus* because even the baptized tended not to understand the reference. The initial point of the *Coetus* remained, that many simply would not understand this reference, and so, when the possibility of reintroducing the phrase into the text was raised

ab usu devianum esse, qui in more loquendi ipsius Sacrae Scripturae radicatus est. Rubrica cognita sic sonat: ...vestem albam; alius color non adhibeatur, nisi rationes pastorales id vere postulent.”

³⁵ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 46: “... reintroducta sunt verba SERVATE DEI MANDATA, et quidem his ex rationibus: 1) ne suspicio oriatur falsi ‘centi-legalismi’ qui non concordaret cum iis, quae ipe Dominus in IVE evangelio passim de mandatis suis proclamat; 2) ne particula UT sensum amittat, quam in formula completa habuit. Neophyti Domino occurrere poterunt, non quia lumina acceperunt, sed quia mandata servaverunt.”

by a member of the *Consilium*, Fischer responded that the subcommittee would further ponder the issue. The decision reached by the subcommittee was to reintroduce the phrase parenthetically into the text, so that it could be used wherever it might be beneficial, but could be omitted whenever it might be obscure.³⁶

6.1.7.2: October 19, 1965

The single most important topic of discussion during the portion of the *Consilium*'s deliberations on October 19 dealing with adult initiation was that of Confirmation. As proposed in S-112, Confirmation was to be administered to the neophytes either by the bishop or by a priest acting with the bishop's consent. This certainly was a significant matter for the Roman Rite, since this practice had only recently been approved, specifically for use in Africa. The debate within the *Consilium* was extensive, ranging from the very specific³⁷ to the more broadly theological, including the role of the bishop as ordinary minister of confirmation and the pastoral readiness of the neophytes.³⁸ In order to preserve against the presbyter becoming seen as the ordinary

³⁶ "Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.," 13: "Dur suppressa est speciosa allusio ad nuptias? Relator: Fideles ordinarie non intelligunt; mirantur quod, baptismo peracto, immediate de nuptiis sermo habetur. Attamen rem denuo investigabimus et ponderabimus."

47: "Juxta propositum, de quo supra sub n. 13, in eadem linea in fine addita est parenthesis, quae sic sonat: UT CUM DOMINUS VERENIT (AD NUPTIAS) POSSITIS OCCURRERE EI. In fine numeri haec addita est rubrica ad explicandam parenthesim: 'Verba in parenthesi posita in versionibus popularibus omittis possunt, quandocumque timendum sit, ne minus bene intelligantur.' Quae solutio certe indolem 'compromissi' praesefert; sed motivum biblicum reapse venerabile ita saltem pro quibusdam servatur, pro his nempe, qui propter adiuncta, in quibus vivunt, difficultates in intelligenda tali allusione non timent."

³⁷ One member of the *Consilium* noted that the triple signation with the cross contained in S-112 had recently been abolished, and the gesture was now only a single signation with the cross. "Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.," 20: "[Is] monet triplicem cruce signationem in formula confirmationis iam abolitam esse in recenti Instructione (n. 67). Relator: Est error a parte nostra ex oblivione ortus et statim reparandus."

³⁸ *ROL*, 586: "A further objection had to do with the celebrating priest being able to administer all three sacraments. Granting the priest the faculty to confirm would, it was said, strip the bishop of his prerogative as 'ordinary minister' of this sacrament. One accomplished jurist said: 'At least let it be clear

minister of the sacrament, some members of the *Consilium* proposed that all of the neophytes might come together for a single celebration of Confirmation along with the children who were to receive the sacrament, at which a single bishop would preside – they envisioned this celebration as being the penultimate stage in the rite of adult initiation.³⁹ Other members disagreed, arguing that preserving the integrity of the sacraments of initiation as described in S-112 was of fundamental importance in the case of adults, since they “stood in need of special grace, which flowed from confirmation.”⁴⁰ To these arguments Fischer responded by restating the limitations contained within the proposed rubric; presbyteral confirmation was only possible in the case of adult baptism, when the bishop was not present, and when the bishop had given his consent. Otherwise, it was not to occur. Martimort added the observation that confirmation required the use of chrism, which had to be consecrated by the bishop. Therefore, even in cases where the bishop was not the minister of confirmation, the allusion to the bishop was present.⁴¹ The allusion might, however, need to be more fully developed.

that the permission to confirm is given by the bishop as ordinary minister and not by the law.’ Others thought it better to postpone confirmation for pastoral reasons, namely, to ensure a further study and understanding of the faith. This problem was to crop up again. But the group did not yield, for it wanted to ensure the unity of the three sacraments and to have the catechumen experience a complete Christian initiation; the group did, of course, leave open the possibility of acting differently in individual cases.”

³⁹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 22: “[Ei] rationes pastorales contra talem delegationem adducunt: timent, ne acceleret processum versus statum, in quo sacerdos esset minister ordinarius confirmationis, dolerent, si episcopus tantum pueros confirmaret et occasionem perderet post aliquot annos novum in neophytos exercendi influxum; confirmationem a solo episcopo censent esse conferendam ut quasi ultimus gradus sit in processu initiationis christianae.”

⁴⁰ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 23: “[Ei] fatentur se his rationibus consentire non posse. Maximi momenti esse unitatem initiationis; neophytos adultos statim indigere gratiis specialibus, quae ex confirmatione fluunt; confirmationem adutorum inter pueros semper minus placuisse; periculum non adesse, quia agi de facultate.”

⁴¹ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 24: “Can. Martimort observat, debere inveniri formam, qua delegatio sacerdotis confirmantis etiam in ritu aliquomodo exprimatur, ut confirmandi specialem partem videant, quam secundum antiquissimam traditionem occidentalem in hoc sacramento conferendo semper

As discussion on the issue was winding down, and the question was about to be called, a canonical issue was raised about the bishop granting the authority to confirm: this faculty could only be given by a bishop who was responding to a difficult situation. Thus, the question that was being posed in S-112 was insufficient, as it did not recognize the particularity of the situation. The question was, therefore, amended. Rather than asking the *Consilium* to allow presbyters who baptized adults to be given the faculty to confirm when the bishop was absent and had given his consent, the new question inserted a clause concerning pastoral need. Could the faculty to confirm be given to a priest who had administered baptism to adults, in the absence of the bishop, but with his pastoral judgment?⁴² Of the thirty-two members of the *Consilium* present on October 19,⁴³ thirty voted in favor of the motion, and two members voted against it.⁴⁴

6.1.8: The Process of Experimentation

The final portion of the proposed rite for adult initiation to be considered at the meeting of the *Consilium* was the way in which experimentation was to take place. The description of the phase of experimentation, contained in the *Relatio* of S-112 was

habet episcopus. Ex eadem ratione confirmationem in Ecclesia latina conferre non licet nisi sacro chrismate ab episcopo consecrato; sed haec allusio ad episcopum in unquam confirmatione requisita nimis tenuis est, ut etiam a minus cultis percipiatur.”

⁴² “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 25: “Placetne Patribus, ut – consentientibus iis, ad quos haec res pertinet – neophyti adulti absente episcopo ac de eius iudicio pastoralis et delegatione confirmantur a presbytero, qui baptismum administravit.”

⁴³ According to Bugnini, there were forty-four voting members of the *Consilium* on October 19, 1965, including the President of the Consilium, Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro. See *ROL*, 942-944.

⁴⁴ S-125 99: “Quae rubrica a Consilio die 19.10.1965 approbata est (placet 30, non placet 2), sub condicione tamen consensus eorum, ad quos haec res spectat.”

relatively brief.⁴⁵ It indicated that experimentation should take place in many diverse settings, so that the different options might be more fully utilized. Not only would the rite be sent to a variety of different countries, but, as suggested by one member of the *Consilium*, it should also be sent to urban centers along with rural centers.⁴⁶ Indeed, the success of the experimentation depended on diversity. In order to assist the experimental centers, especially given the absence at this point of any *Praenotanda*, the *Coetus* decided to craft an appendix to the experimental rite. This text was intended to comprise two sections: a two or three page general presentation, which included some description of translation issues; and a fifteen to twenty page explanation of the pastoral aspects of the rite.⁴⁷

The precise chronology of events following the November 14-15 meeting of the *Coetus* to the middle of February is unclear. At some point the Latinist revised S-112 along with its modifications emerging from the meetings of the *Consilium*, the subcommittee, and the *Coetus*. The fruit of this work, however, S-125, represents the corrected version of the OCGD that was approved by the *Consilium*.

6.2: Corrections, February-March, 1966

Before experimentation could begin, the S-125 had to be approved by the Congregation of Rites. Only then would it be sent to Pope Paul VI for final approval.

⁴⁵ S-112 Relatio, 57-58.

⁴⁶ “Protocollum privatum, 18-21 oct.,” 3: “Opportunum erit experimenta peragere, non solum in regionibus ruralibus, sed etiam in urbibus; propter magnas quae intercedunt discrepantias.” The member who made this comment came from a country in which there was a vast degree of difference, in virtually every way, between those who lived in the country and the city.

⁴⁷ This text would become the Appendix described by Bugnini in *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 586.

While it is unclear as to when the rite was sent to the Congregation, they examined it from February 14 to 16, 1966, and Bugnini sent their corrections and suggestions to Fischer and Gy two days later, on February 18, 1966.⁴⁸ In his letter to them, Bugnini indicated that an audience with the Pope was scheduled for March 16, at which time the rite was to be presented to him.⁴⁹

Bugnini indicated twenty-four corrections to the rite, some of which were superficial, some of which were somewhat more substantial. Most of these changes were suggested for the first stage and the celebration of the sacraments. Some alterations for

⁴⁸ Bugnini notes that “the second schemata, which made some improvements on the first, was discussed with the Fathers and consultors of the Consilium and then presented to the Holy Father by Cardinal Lercaro at an audience on March 18, 1966” (*ROL*, 585). No mention of a second meeting with the Consilium is contained anywhere in the files of the C.N.P.L., and Bugnini lists the Sixth General meeting of the Consilium as ending on December 1, 1965, with the Seventh General meeting not beginning until October 6, 1966. Bugnini’s text might allow the possibility that the revisions were presented to the Consilium towards the end of the Sixth General meeting, though that seems highly unlikely. First, the description of the Consilium meeting makes no mention of a second presentation to that body, while it details the days in which meetings took place. Second, the description of the Consilium proceedings indicates that a member of the Consilium sought a revision from Fischer after the initial presentation and vote, and was informed that the Coetus would examine that issue after the period of experimentation, thereby indicating that the text was not to come before the Consilium again. Third, in the passage where Bugnini allows for the possibility of a re-presentation of the text to the Consilium, he also notes that the text was approved, which seems to have occurred on October 19. Fourth, if a re-presentation did take place, then few changes were made to the text beyond the corrections made on October 18-19. Fifth, in response to the question surrounding the poor use of Latin in the text, the Consilium was informed that they would not need to see the text again. If there was to be another presentation to the Consilium within a short time-frame, such a statement might not have been necessary.

What, then, is to be made of Bugnini’s statement that a second presentation of the schemata to the Consilium took place before the presentation to the Pope? Perhaps the answer is found by looking to the Congregation of Rites, who also needed to give their approval to texts before they were sent out for experimentation (71). First, no mention of the meeting with the Congregation of Rites is made in *ROL*, yet such a meeting clearly occurred, as is evidenced by letter from Bugnini outlining their decisions. Second, the meeting of the Congregation fits the time-frame for the revision of the document, and accords better with the corrections that were made. Third, Bugnini, as secretary for the Congregation, would have present at the meeting of the Congregation.

All together, the evidence appears to suggest the possibility that Bugnini’s reference to the second presentation to the Consilium was, in actuality, a presentation to the Congregation. Should, however, this not have been the case, and there was a second presentation of the schemata to the Consilium, no details about the meeting have been located, and, in any event, any alterations to the text were miniscule.

⁴⁹ “Bugnini to Fischer and Gy, February 18, 1966,” Prot. N. 666/66, in C.N.P.L. 1.C.vii: “Autour de la Plenaria du 4 oct. 65.” The presentation would not occur on this originally appointed day, however, but rather two days later, on March 18.

the *Traditiones* and the scrutinies were proposed. The only changes to the period of the catechumenate were stylistic.⁵⁰ Occasionally the concerns originally voiced by the *Consilium* would be echoed by the Congregation. As in the previous section, only the alterations of any significant substance will be noted.

6.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

The Congregation proposed seven changes to the first stage of the rite. First, they proposed a short-lived amendment regarding the manner in which the presider was to be dressed. The corrections appear to imply that it might be improper for the deacon to wear a cope, and, as a consequence, S-147 1 contained the instruction that a dalmatic might also be worn.⁵¹ This alteration would, nonetheless, be removed in the next *schemata*.

More substantially, the Congregation suggested inverting the two options for the initial dialogue (2). S-125 had listed the amended Ambrosian text first, placing the text from OBA second. The change gave priority to the Roman form over the more ancient but more recently added text. The unfortunate oversight that occurred with this move, which was, nonetheless, corrected in the next draft of the rite, was that the rubric inserted by the *Consilium*, that the celebrant be allowed to question the candidates collectively, was buried in the midst of the alternate formula.

A third change was to the optional signation of the senses (8). The rubric in S-125 left no room for omitting any individual signation: either all of them were performed, or none was. The Congregation was concerned for proper decorum: should the celebrant,

⁵⁰ Bugnini suggested dividing formula 26, a newly composed blessing over the catechumens, into four paragraphs, instead of leaving it as a single paragraph. This suggestion was accepted, and was thereafter applied to all of the formulae for blessing.

⁵¹ “Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966,” 2: “Ad 1.: ... diaconus: cum pluviali?”

for example, sign a female candidate's breast?⁵² The solution was to insert the instruction that the signations could be omitted either wholly or in part, according to the judgment of the local Conference of Bishops. The rubric still did not address the specific situation that the Congregation had raised, in that it did not distinguish between genders. Thus, while omissions could be made for cultural reasons on the whole (touching this particular sense is considered offensive for both male and female), omissions could not officially be made for reasons of gender impropriety.

The next amendment suggested by the Congregation was made in order to avoid complexity. At the introduction into the Church (10), the text in S-125 indicated that the candidate was being welcomed into "the home of the Church" – the "*domum ecclesiae*." Bugnini suggested that this terminology, and presumably the distinction between the Church as Body of Christ and the place where the Body of Christ assembled, would not be readily grasped.⁵³ This change was enacted in S-147, although it is not immediately clear why the stated intent was desirable. It is true that the dual nature of Church is complex, but too frequently the word "Church" is used to apply to the building, instead of the people, particularly at the parish level. The choice of "*domum ecclesiae*" appears to have addressed this problem quite well, implying that the place called church is dependant on the people, who are Church. Suppressing this distinction allows the underdeveloped interpretation to continue. Furthermore, the choice of "*domum ecclesiae*" would also help clarify matters for those with a more developed understanding

⁵² "Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966," 2: "Ad (8): celebrans procedit ad signationem diversorum sensuum: etiam pro mulieribus? In pectore? In scapulis?"

⁵³ "Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966," 2: "Ad 10: dicatur: introductio in ecclesiam. Nam 'domus ecclesiae' est complexus totius presbyterii."

of ecclesiology. The thing into which the candidates are entering is not the Body of Christ, but only the place where the Body of Christ assembles. As such, the candidates are not becoming full members of the Christian community, as the amended text in S-147 might communicate. This alteration would, likewise, be addressed in the next *schemata*.

The Congregation next proposed the addition of a formula for the presentation of the Gospels (13). S-125 had indicated that if this was to happen, the celebrant was to present them reverently. They suggested providing a short phrase that might be used, such as found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, *Ordo XI*, or the *Hadrian Sacramentary*.⁵⁴ None of these formulae were deemed appropriate by the *Coetus*, presumably because they focused on explaining the significance of the Gospels in rather lengthy format. The content of these formulae had already been intended to occur in two different places: the preceding introduction to the liturgy of the Word (12), where the celebrant “briefly explains the dignity of the Word of God which is proclaimed and heard in the Church;” and during the homily. They nonetheless incorporated the instruction to provide some text, and so, to avoid duplication (or triplication), a newly composed and simple instruction, “Child of God, accept the Gospel of Jesus Christ,” was inserted into S-147.

The Congregation’s final suggestion for the alteration of the structure of the first stage was to the shape of the Eucharistic liturgy, should it follow the dismissal of the catechumens (17). Echoing a question raised during the meeting of the *Consilium*, the Congregation indicated that after the dismissal of the catechumens, the liturgy should continue with the Creed and the offertory. Mention of the general intercessions was to be

⁵⁴ “Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966,” 2: “Ad (13): “porrectio evangeliorum: quare eam non comitari aliqua etiam parva formula: ex gr. Gelas. 34; Ordo XI; Hadrian. 82.”

omitted, they argued, presumably because they had already occurred in the litany of intercession over the catechumens. However, as Fischer had explained during the meeting of the *Consilium*, the single litany of intercession, begun over the catechumens, was not concluded by the dismissal of the catechumens; rather, this dismissal simply interrupted the litany, which should be continued and concluded following their dismissal. The *Coetus* understood prayer for the whole world, and not just for the catechumens, to be the culmination of the liturgy of word, as this was an expression of the priesthood of the faithful.⁵⁵ To limit the intercessions to prayer for the catechumens alone was to rob the faithful of their priestly ministry. This change, also suggested for the rite of election (47) and the three scrutinies (55, 61, 68), was not accepted in any of the proposed locations.

6.2.2: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones

The Congregation made three suggestions regarding the scrutinies, one structural, and two textual. Their first suggestion, likely mirroring one of the concerns expressed by the *Consilium*, concerned with the length of the rite as a whole. In an effort to streamline some of the elements in the rites, the Congregation proposed that the *Coetus* examine the possibility of transferring the first scrutiny to Wednesday of the third week of Lent, and celebrate it alongside the *traditio* of the Lord's Prayer (48). This proposition would mean one less gathering of the elect, their sponsors, the faithful, and clergy, since the scrutiny and *traditio* would be merged. This suggestion was rejected outright.

⁵⁵ Molin, "Questions que pose la participation des catéchumènes à la liturgie de la parole de la messe" in C.N.P.L. 1.C.viii: "Notes du travail (datées ou non)."

The Congregation's two other suggestions involved changes to two prayers for the third scrutiny. The first revision was to the first intercession (63), where they proposed eliminating mention of Christ's "death." Instead of petitioning that the elect "might be made worthy, who will be buried in Christ's death through baptism and rise with him," the alternate petition described them as "through baptism, being buried with Christ." This suggestion was incorporated into S-147. The second revision was to the first portion of prayer of exorcism (64). The Congregation proposed removing the phrase "*aeternam*" from the description of grace. No rationale was provided for this suggestion, and it was not acted upon. The portion of the prayer which would have been affected by the Congregation's alteration remained just as it had in OBA.

The Congregation proposed two changes to the texts accompanying the *traditio symboli* (69). First, they noted that the Latin text of the deacon's instruction for the elect to come forward sounded awkward: "*Accedant... accepturi.*" In S-147 the verb was changed to "receive," and explicit mention of the Church was added: "Come forward elect, to receive the Creed from the Church." The second alteration that they suggested was to the celebrant's subsequent text. They argued that the proposed text, with its emphasis on the "word of the new covenant" was better suited to use at the presentation of the Gospels.⁵⁶ The Congregation did not suggest a new text, but in S-147 a revised and abbreviated version of a text from the Gelasian Sacramentary was included (see Table 6.1 below).⁵⁷ This prayer instructed the elect to hear and believe the words of

⁵⁶ "Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966," 2: "Ad 72: .. Nunc audite verba de novo foedere? Pro symbolo haec expressio non bene videtur quadrare. Melius esset pro traditione evangeliorum."

⁵⁷ See *DOBL* 221.

6.2.3: The Sacraments of Initiation

The Congregation's final suggestions all pertained to the celebration of the sacraments themselves. Their first proposal was pastoral in nature, relating to the pre-baptismal anointing on the chest, or on the hands where dictated by pastoral necessity (89). They suggested that a woman's gender provided sufficient grounds for anointing the hands instead of the breast.⁵⁸ This proposal was incorporated into the rite. A second addition, also for pastoral purposes, suggested that if baptism was to be done by immersion (91), then both male and female candidates should remain "decently clothed."⁵⁹ A less direct version of this instruction was incorporated into S-147: decency should be preserved. The third recommendation made by the Congregation was that the rubric from OBA1962 for the post-baptismal anointing might be incorporated into the new *schemata*. The clear difficulty in doing this was the reason why the anointing was to be deemed optional. In OBA1962 the post-baptismal anointing could be omitted for grave pastoral reasons. In S-125 the anointing was to be omitted whenever confirmation was to be administered in the same celebration. If confirmation was not to be celebrated, then the anointing simply could not be eliminated, no matter the reason. The rubric from OBA1962 failed to address these changed circumstances. The fourth, and only other suggestion worthy of note, was an alteration to the rubric surrounding the administration of confirmation (99). The sense of the rubric remained the same: the bishop was to confirm, but in his absence a priest could be delegated to administer the sacrament. The

⁵⁸ "Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966," 2: "Ad 89: Nonne dicendum esset quod pro mulieribus haec unctio semper in manibus facienda esset."

⁵⁹ "Bugnini, Feb. 18, 1966," 2: "Ad 91: ponatur rubrica, ubi dicatur quod in baptismo per immersionem sive mulieres sive viri debent decenter vestiti remanere."

Congregation's proposal sought to underscore the importance of the Bishop. The rubric in S-125, "*Episcopus vel, absente episcopo...*" was changed to read "*Praestat ut confirmatio ab episcopo impertiatur; attamen absent episcopo...*" This text highlighted that the proper minister of confirmation remained the bishop, and thus, helped address some of the concerns also raised by the *Consilium*.

Of the Congregation's twenty-four different corrections, twenty were incorporated into the *schemata* to be presented to the Pope. The three most significant corrections that were not effected were the elimination of the general intercessions for the world following the dismissal of the catechumens or elect, the resistance to combine the first scrutiny with the *traditio* of the Lord's Prayer into a single celebration, to be celebrated on Wednesday of the third week of Lent, and the decision not to use the post-baptismal anointing rubric from OBA1962.⁶⁰ The other twenty were deemed helpful to some degree or another. There is no clearly overriding theme surrounding the Congregation's concerns, but three trends can be identified. First, the Congregation appeared to be concerned about the length of the rite; two of the suggestions that were rejected clearly revolved around this issue, namely, their treatment of the first scrutiny, and their desire to omit the general intercessions. Second, the revised rubric surrounding confirmation clarified the importance of the bishop in the sacrament, thereby pointing to the intent to emphasize that the bishop remained the ordinary minister of confirmation. In these two ways, the Congregation echoed the concerns voiced by the *Consilium*. Their third broad trend, however, was that of maintaining a proper sense of decorum in the

⁶⁰ The fourth suggestion that was not accepted was the use of the word "eternal" in the exorcism for the third scrutiny.

rites. By stating their preference that women not be signed on the breast, and that both men and women be properly clothed when being baptized by immersion, the Congregation articulated, in some small way, a desire to maintain the sobriety of the Roman Rite. In all, the decisions of the Congregation helped to create a version of the rite that could be accepted for the purpose of experimentation.

6.3: Conclusions

Having been approved by the *Consilium* and the Congregation of Rites, the second *schemata* of the rite for adult initiation, S-147, was formally presented to Pope Paul VI by Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, President of the *Consilium*, on March 18, 1966. Papal approval was necessary to proceed to the next phase of the work, the period of experimentation.⁶¹ This approval was given on June 20, 1966.⁶² Shortly thereafter, the rite would be sent to various sites for use during the next two years. These centers were to send their comments on the experimental rite to Cellier, who would compile a report on their impressions for the *Coetus*.

Virtually all of the changes witnessed throughout the meetings during this eight month time period generated little in the way of wholesale change. The alterations that were made were mostly for the purpose of clarifying and streamlining. On the whole, the

⁶¹ As Bugnini noted, appended to the ritual was a three-part document, treating “Pastoral Guidelines for Experiments,” Practical Guidelines for the Translation of the Rite,” and “Directives for Drawing Up a Report on the Experiments.” Each of these three sections will be treated, to the extent that they are necessary, in the following chapter, which details the period of experimentation.

⁶² *ROL*, 154. In between Paul VI being presented with the *schemata* and his approving it, some discussion ensued between the Secretariat of State and the *Consilium*, regarding the relationship of infant baptism to adult initiation, as well as the length of the rite of adult initiation. Both of these questions had been addressed by the *Coetus* and by the *Consilium* before, and so, there is no need to represent these arguments. See *ROL*, 586-587.

vision embraced by the *Coetus* was sanctioned, and would be given the chance to succeed at the parish level.

CHAPTER SEVEN

EXPERIMENTATION, OBSERVATIONS, AND REVISION

On June 20, 1966, Pope Paul VI approved S-147 for the purpose of experimentation. Bugnini details that the rite was sent out to “about fifty catechumenal centers in Japan, Mali, Togo, the Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Rwanda, Congo, Zaire, Belgium, Canada, France, and the United States.”¹ The centers were asked to provide their reflections on the use of the rite. These responses would be gathered during the summer of 1967, at which point Cellier, Ligier, Seumois, Molin gathered together to review the submissions.² From this session, four further questions on some specific points were developed, and would be sent to the catechumenal centers for further reflection.³ All reports of the experiments were to be returned to Cellier, who had since

¹ *ROL*, 587. The official declaration of experimentation was contained in Prot. N 3122/66, dated November 11, 1966, in C.N.P.L. 1.D.ii: “Expérimentation,” but it is not clear when notification was sent to the experimental sites. Presuming that notification was sent to all of the sites at the same time, November 11, 1966 is the clear *terminus post quem*, while the *terminus ante quem* is provided by in the report from Rwanda (Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations de l’Ordo Baptismi Adultorum faites dans le diocèse de Butare (Rwanda) – janvier-mars 1967” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.iii): the Bishop of Butare received his notification on December 13, 1966 (1).

² “Fischer to Bugnini, August 7, 1966” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.ii. In this letter, Fischer named the subcommittee, though he did not specify when or where they were to meet. Fischer also indicated that all future communications surrounding the rite of adult initiation would best be transmitted directly to Cellier. Cellier would be officially named a Relator for adult initiation by November 6, 1968.

³ These four questions were contained in a letter from Cellier, dated November 20, 1968. An unaddressed version of this letter, “A ceux qui ont envoyé au Consilium de Liturgie un rapport d’expérimentation sur le rituel du baptême des adultes,” can be found in C.N.P.L. 1.D.iv: “Relance des expérimentateurs.”

been named the Relator for adult initiation, by December 20, 1968. These reports would be assessed at a meeting of the *Coetus* from December 30, 1968 to January 4, 1969 at Vanves, just outside of Paris, and the summary report, along with a large number of revised texts for the rite, would be sent back to the experimental centers to elicit their reactions.⁴ A second document would be sent to the experimenters on February 7. This text, S-337,⁵ would focus exclusively on the prayers of exorcism for each of the Scrutinies. The reports were to be reviewed and discussed at a meeting at St-Genesius-Rode, a town located five miles north-west of Waterloo, Belgium, on March 3-8. The next draft of the rite, released on June 21, S-334, would reflect these changes.

7.1: Experimental Method

In *The Reform of the Liturgy*, Bugnini indicates that the text was sent to “nearly fifty” different experimental centers within twelve countries. While there is no reason to doubt this claim, the extant records present a more limited picture in terms of verifiable numbers.⁶ Only thirty-nine different locations can be definitively attested as having

⁴ The work on the rite continued during the period of experimentation, focusing primarily on the *Ordo admissionis valide iam baptizatorum in plenam communionem ecclesiae catholicae*. Between July 11, 1967 and April 29, 1968 the *Coetus* crafted DRi-22, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 28bis, each of which concerned the rite of reception for the already baptized. For a full description see Sieverding, “*Ordo admissionis*,” 217-265.

⁵ *Schemata* 337, *De Rituali* 34, “De exorcismis Ritualis Baptismi adultorum,” February 7, 1969. ND DRi-34 (337).

⁶ This number was determined from two distinct sources, both of which are contained in C.N.P.L. 1.D: “1966-69, Expérimentation du Rituel.” First, C.N.P.L. 1.D.iii: “Premières comptes rendus d’expérimentation” and C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: “Deuxième vague de comptes rendus d’expérimentation” contain reports of the experimentation both from individual parishes, as well as centralized reports from national or diocesan offices. Second, C.N.P.L. 1.D.iv: “Relance des expérimentateurs” contains a list of contacts, to whom the letter of November 20, 1968 was sent. This list names contacts in all fourteen countries, but only treats individual parishes in Japan. Thus, for Rwanda, Seumois is the only contact, yet Seumois’ report indicates that seven parishes were contacted; for the United States, Frederick McManus is listed as the only contact, yet the report from the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy describes experimentation in five parishes. The matter is complicated by the fact that not all of the contacts listed in the letter have reports

received the rite, although Bugnini's claim regarding the number of countries was increased from twelve to fourteen, which represented four continents: Africa, Asia, Europe, and North America.⁷ According to the extant list, nearly half of the clearly discernable sites selected were in Africa: one in North Africa⁸ (Algeria),⁹ five in West Africa (one in Ghana,¹⁰ the Ivory Coast,¹¹ Mali,¹² and Togo,¹³ and two in Upper Volta –

associated with them, such as Algeria and Ghana. Only twenty-eight respondents can be conclusively identified. From these two sources, however, thirty-nine separate centers can be definitively discerned, although this in no way rules out the possibility that more than thirty-nine parishes participated in the experimentation. In conclusion, the most that can be claimed with absolute certainty is that at least thirty-nine centers in fourteen countries were contacted, of which at least twenty-eight responded, even if that response was to indicate that the experimental rite had not been utilized, as in two Rwandan parishes and one parish from the United States.

Bugnini's claim that the rite was sent to almost fifty centers in twelve countries most likely represents a conflation of two different sets of experimenters. The number of centers may well be accurate in terms of the actual sending out of the rite. The number of countries, however, represents those who submitted reports on the experimentation.

⁷ There is a slight difficulty in correlating the reports that were submitted to the list of participating parishes. The obvious difficulty is that the list of contacts is somewhat limited, in that it most often lists a national contact. Rwanda, France, and the United States, for example, contributed half of the verifiable locations, though, in each of these cases, only the national contact was listed. Further, not all of the listed centers submitted reports, some reports were submitted anonymously, referring not even to the country of origin. Given that in their own summary of the reports, the *Coetus* lists some reports that are not readily identifiable in the archives, the reasonable possibility exists that not all of the reports are contained within the archive. Most significantly, the method of reporting varied from report to report. While the Japanese parishes submitted individualized reports, the national reports from Rwanda, the United States, and Canada enumerated the number of participating parishes, the French reports were submitted by Diocesan centers, only one of which gave any indication as to the number of parishes that participated in the experimentation within their Diocese. While only a floor of parishes can be established from the reports, the ceiling value relies on Bugnini's testimony as being "nearly fifty"; the number of experimental centers was between thirty-nine and forty-nine. On a final note, it must be stated that the reports themselves vary in the degree of detail: the Rwandan report constitutes nineteen pages, while some reports are a single page or less.

⁸ On the list of letter recipients, the contact in Alexandria, Egypt, is scratched through. No report from Egypt can be discerned, and it may be that Alexandrian experimentation was desired, but did not occur. In any case, Egypt has not been counted among the thirty-nine centers.

⁹ No report can be definitively assigned to Algeria, and the country does not appear in either Bugnini's list or the *Coetus'* list. Gaston-Marie Jacquier, then the Auxiliary Bishop of Alger, was the national contact. Algeria has not been counted among the thirty-nine centers.

¹⁰ No report can be definitively assigned to Ghana, and Ghana is not mentioned by either Bugnini or the *Coetus* in their lists. The national contact was Peter Proeku Dery, then the Bishop of Wa. Ghana has not been counted among the thirty-nine centers.

now Burkina Faso¹⁴), and twelve in East-Central Africa (five in the Congo,¹⁵ and seven in Rwanda¹⁶). Europe was the next most-represented continent, with at least eleven parishes: at least nine in France,¹⁷ and at least two in Belgium.¹⁸ North America provided

¹¹ No report can be definitively assigned to the Ivory Coast, though this report is mentioned by Bugnini and the *Coetus*, in their summary of the experimentation. The national contact was André-Pierre Duirat, then the Bishop of Bouaké. The report is either one of the anonymous reports, or is not contained in the C.N.P.L. archives.

¹² No report can be definitively assigned to Mali, though Bugnini and the *Coetus* both mention this center in their summary of the experimentation. The national contact was Father Laridan, a White Father, then stationed in Bamako.

¹³ The national contact for Togo was a Franciscan, Barthélemy Hanrion, then the Bishop of Dapango. He entrusted the experimentation to another Franciscan, Father Pierre Reinhard. Reinhard's report was sent to Cellier on December 9, 1968.

¹⁴ No report can be definitively assigned to Burkina Faso, though this report is mentioned by both Bugnini and the *Coetus*, in their summary of the experimentation. The national contact was the White Father, Adrien Laur, who was to report on the experimentation in the dioceses of Ouagadougou and Nouna.

¹⁵ No report can be definitively assigned to the Congo, though this report is mentioned by both Bugnini and the *Coetus*, in their summary of the experimentation. The national contact was *Coetus* member, Boniface Luykx. Four other experimenters were listed for this country: Monseigneur Moke (unspecified location), Father van Meerhaege (Ngiri-Ngiri), Father Bulke (Camp Cito), and Father Bragard (Yolo).

¹⁶ The report from Rwanda is, by far, the most detailed of the reports in the archives, likely because they were compiled by Seumois, who was responsible for overseeing this experimentation. There were seven sites selected for experimentation, though experimentation only occurred in five of them: Cyanika, Gihindamuyaga, Nyanza, Nyumba, and Save. The names of each of the priests responsible in the various locations are not contained in the report.

¹⁷ The French experimentation was overseen by the National Commission on the Catechumenate, through Father Bernard Guillard in Paris. Separate reports were filed from the various Dioceses in which the rite was used: Father André Leducq from Amiens, Father Michel Mille from Arras, Father Roger Rondeau from Luçon, Father Henri Viatgé from Montauban, Father Daudet from Nîmes, and Father Dumont for three communities from Strasbourg. An anonymous report was also filed from Lille. For each of these Dioceses, excepting Strasbourg, it is unclear how many separate parishes contributed to the experimentation. Thus, for the purpose of counting the number of sites, given that each report provides some data from experimentation, the most that can be said about these Diocesan reports is that they were gathered from at least one parish. This lack of detail may well mean that Bugnini's claim of nearly fifty experimental centers is more accurate.

¹⁸ Rabau oversaw the experimentation in Belgium, and only one report can be definitively ascribed to this country, from the diocese of Malines-Brussels. It is an anonymous report, written from the Office of the Catechumenate in Waterloo. The text mentions that "the celebration of baptism was done in the parishes or communities of election of the catechumens," indicating more than a single center. No other indication as to number of centers is contained in the reports.

a clearly discernable number of six centers of experimentation: five in the United States,¹⁹ and one in Canada.²⁰ Only five Asian parishes were selected, all of which were Japanese, and all of which were in relatively close proximity to Tokyo.²¹ With the exception of the United States, there was a common link among all of these experimental centers; French could be used as the language of correspondence: the European centers were France and Belgium; the Canadian center was in Quebec; and the centers selected in the African countries and in Japan were staffed by French or Belgian missionaries. This unquestionably made collation of the reports far simpler than if multiple languages had been used. This task was further simplified in that the centers in the United States submitted one centralized national report.

To each experimental center the Latin text of the rite was sent, along with instructions that the rite was to be utilized in the vernacular. It also appears that a French translation was sent to the centers (excluding, presumably, those centers in the United

¹⁹ One centralized report was submitted from the United States, which contained insights from five experimental centers as well as the comments of the liturgical commission of an unnamed missionary order. No parish names are supplied, but descriptions are provided: 1) a Paulist Information Center in a large eastern city, which specialized in adult religious education; 2) a small rural parish next to a College campus in the South; 3) the cathedral of a large mid-Western city, where adult religious education was a major component of parish work; 4) a rural parish in Pennsylvania; and 5) a rural parish in Texas. McManus was named as the national contact.

²⁰ Experimentation in Canada was limited to the Cathedral in Montréal, Marie-Reine-du-Monde. The contact was Father Clément Farly, a priest of the Diocese of Nicolet, who was then the director of Liturgy for the French sector of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. Farly's bishop, Joseph Albert Martin was a member of the *Consilium*. See, for example, Gilles Routhier, "The Canadian Bishops and Vatican II's Work on the Liturgy" in *Celebrate!* 42.4 (2003), 11-14.

²¹ Bishop Nagae of Urawa, a member of the *Consilium*, was designated as the national contact for the Japanese experimentation. He selected five sites. Three sites were within his diocese, and the other two were in the neighboring diocese and city of Tokyo. Reports from both Tokyo sites were sent to the *Coetus* from Father Michel Christiaens at the Parish of Matsubara, and Father Marcel Le Dorze at Ste-Bernadette. A third Japanese report was sent to the *Coetus* from Fr. Corvaisier at the Urawa Cathedral. It is unknown as to whether or not the two remaining sites submitted reports of their experimentation, if they experimented at all.

States), so that the experimenters might translate the text into their own particular vernacular.²² Not only would this cut down on the work of the *Coetus* in crafting these texts, thereby allowing the rite to be distributed more rapidly, but it would allow for a far easier and greater dissemination of the rite; the *Coetus* did not have to translate the rite into Japanese or a multiplicity of African languages, for example, but these diverse regions could, nonetheless, be utilized in the experimentation. Diversity was vital to the experimental process, since the rite was conceived in such a way as to be culturally viable and hospitable. Sending the rite to a variety of different locales would allow for many options to be utilized in numerous cultural contexts, such as the degree to which the region was already Christianized, the degree of literacy in the society, and the number of individuals entering the Church (see Table 7.1 below).²³ These figures represent centers giving specific numbers of neophytes, and indicate totals from Easter 1968, except for Rwanda, which is Easter 1967.

It is difficult to determine with certainty the manner in which reporting was done.²⁴ The reports contained in the C.N.P.L. archives comment on a particular year – either 1967 or 1968 – and only one report is available for most centers. The third Appendix to S-147, “*Suggestiones circa Relationes de experimentis*,” contained a list of

²² The December 12, 1968 report from Marcel Le Dorze, in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v, makes reference to “the French text.” Presumably, an English translation was made for the centers in the United States.

²³ Obviously, data is only supplied for those centers that provided it in the first place. Data that is not represented includes centers that reported not celebrating the rite, or centers where they listed numbers as being “too numerous,” or descriptions to that effect.

²⁴ Some reports contained in the C.N.P.L. are from 1967 and some are from 1968. Some of the 1968 reports, such as those from Montauban, Tokyo (Christiaens), Tokyo (Le Dorze), and Togo refer to prior reports. Some reports, such as that submitted from Waterloo and the United States are incomplete. Furthermore, some reports named by the *Coetus* are simply unaccounted for. There were, unquestionably, other reports or portions of reports that are unavailable, which are likely either filed in some other location or have been lost.

TABLE 7.1
NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS INITIATED
DURING THE PERIOD OF EXPERIMENTATION
IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CENTERS

Country	Centers Reporting	Full Initiation	Confirmation and Eucharist	Celebration at Vigil	Celebration during Easter Octave
Canada	1	4	3	7	0
France	3	10	0	10	0
Japan	1	17	0	17	0
Rwanda	5	1153	0	427	516
United States	4	10	18	28	0

issues for reflection and comment, which helped, somewhat, to guide discussion.²⁵ In 1967, the first wave of reports was collected. The reports contained within the C.N.P.L. archives represent four sources: two exceptionally brief reports were given (less than one hundred words each) from one of the Japanese centers and from Togo; a more extensive two page report was received from Belgium; and a thoroughly detailed report was submitted by Seumoio for Rwanda.²⁶ These two more detailed reports followed, generally, the order established by the third Appendix. The second wave of reports was received in 1968. The C.N.P.L. archives contain only two detailed reports from 1968,

²⁵ Generally speaking, the guide asked the experimenters to give brief general notes describing the way in which experimentation had taken place (a description of the catechumens, the participation of the community, and the method of catechesis), and commentary on points of success and difficulty. The guide also sought specific details on elements of the rite, including rationale for the elimination of any particular elements. Twenty-eight points of reflection, divided according to the stages of the rite, were enumerated in the guide. These ranged from detail-oriented questions such as “Who was the presiding minister of the rite for making Catechumens?” and “How were the sponsors chosen? What did they do before and after the rite for making Catechumens?” to questions on reception of the rite, such as “How did the liturgical dismissals feel?”, “How did the structure of the scrutinies feel? What suggestions would you make?,” and “How did the whole celebration of the sacraments of initiation feel?”

²⁶ In C.N.P.L. 1.D.iii.

from Canada and the United States.²⁷ Most of the reports found within the C.N.P.L. archives are from the final wave and accord with the four questions sent by Cellier to the experimenters in November, 1968.²⁸ In this letter, Cellier reminded the experimenters of the spiritual significance of each stage (urging them to consult the first Appendix for their responses), and posed questions surrounding other possibilities for adaptation, the helpfulness of the first Appendix, the prayer formulae, and the minor exorcisms. Reports were received from Amiens, Arras, Lille, Luçon, Montauban, Nîmes, Strasbourg, Tokyo (Christiaens), Tokyo (Le Dorze), Togo, and Urawa, as well as from three anonymous sources. From all three waves of reports Cellier would compile a summary presentation, which would help the *Coetus* navigate discussion of the experimentation when they met at Vanves at the end of 1968.

Given that the rite was sent in Latin and French (or, perhaps English) to the various centers, but was to be used in the vernacular, the first two of three Appendices to S-147 were attached to the rite to aid in the process of experimentation. The first, “*Normae pastorales ad usum illorum qui experimenta moderantur*” gave an overall summary of the shape of the rite, and clarified the theological rationale underlying the entire rite as well as particular elements within each stage.²⁹ Three principles were espoused here, which were longstanding concerns of the *Coetus* from their first meetings.

²⁷ The report from the United States contained within the C.N.P.L. archives is incomplete, and is obviously missing several pages.

²⁸ “Cellier, A ceux qui ont envoyé au Consilium de Liturgie un rapport d’expérimentation sur le rituel du baptême des adultes,” November 20, 1968, in C.N.P.L. 1.D.iv. Cellier requested that these reports be returned to him by December 20, 1968.

²⁹ The more particular points of emphasis demonstrated no clear divergence from the points of discussion raised during the previous sessions of the *Coetus*. It will contribute little towards a better understanding of the shape of the rite to further dwell on them here.

First, the purpose of the rite was the reunification of the three sacraments of initiation in their proper order. Second, the rite sought to correspond to the spiritual development of the one seeking initiation. In this regard the *Coetus* suggested a three-fold pattern of spiritual development that was mirrored, on the one hand, in the rites themselves, and on the other hand, beyond the rites to the whole of life. In the period of evangelization, the individual came to faith in Christ, a transition that was marked by the rite for making Catechumens. From the period of the catechumenate the catechumen proceeded to the sacraments of initiation, or the “*Ordo ad fidelem faciendum*.” Then, having been received into the Church, during the period of Mystagogy, the new Christian expressed their faith ritually through living a Christian life and participating in the sacraments.³⁰ Third, the *Coetus* highlighted the paschal context of initiation, and the corresponding need for a baptismal focus during the season of Lent.

The second Appendix, “*Indicationes practicae quoad versionem et catechesim*,” dealt exclusively with issues of translation and catechesis. This Appendix was divided into two parts. The first was concerned with terms that were more uniquely “initiatory,” such as *candidati*, *pompae*, *scrutinia*, and *exorcizo*. These terms and concepts were defined and clarified, so that when being translated into the vernacular, the proper theological, biblical, liturgical, and pastoral senses of the term could be maintained.³¹

³⁰ S-147 Appendix I, 2: “(1) Evangelizatio... Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum; 2) Catechumenatus... Sacramenta initiationis (ad fidelem faciendum); Mystagogia... Vita christiana cum suis sacramentis.”

³¹ S-147, Appendix II, 3: “Ad num. 87: Angeli satanae: (cf. Apoc. XII, 9): ‘draco ille qui vocatur diabolus et satanas... proiectus est in terram *et angeli eius*’). Secundum S. Scripturam intelliguntur spiritus Deo adversi. In casibus, de quibus agitur in rubrica, intelliguntur tum *spirituales potestates*, quibus falsi cultus dedicantur, tum *homines* qui quasi eorum suppositi considerari possunt, quatenus falsis cultibus praesunt, nempe incantatores, magi et alii huius generis (lingua gallica: sorciers, magiciens, féticheurs).”

The second part of the Appendix treated scriptural and liturgical references in the new rite, giving an index of scriptural citations and allusions, as well as the occasions where texts from OBA were being revised or incorporated. By means of this index, the *Coetus* hoped to provide a good foundation for translating the rite into the local languages, so that the intended meaning of the texts was maintained.³²

7.2: Experimentation and Responses

In describing the responses to experimentation, Bugnini argued that they mostly addressed four areas of concern: the general structure of the rite, relevance, prayers, and the role of the laity, particularly catechists, sponsors, and the community of the faithful.³³ This assessment is, for the most part, accurate; these were, by and large, the principal areas of concern and comment. But Bugnini's presentation can, on occasion, be elaborated upon and clarified. The use of specific examples and suggestions from the reports will, in the first place, illustrate more clearly the nature of the concerns articulated by Bugnini. What will often be apparent, however, is that the suggested unanimity of opinion present in Bugnini's analysis was not always present: specific critiques of some experimenters were occasions for praise by others. Furthermore, by looking at the reports, several especially valuable reflections and insights can be recognized as meriting

³² This understanding of translation is consistent with the aims of the *Consilium*, that translations be "dynamically equivalent." See Gilbert W. Ost diek, OFM, "Overview of *Comme le Prévoit: On the Translation of Liturgical Texts for Celebration With a Congregation, To Speak as a Christian Community, and Criteria For the Evaluation of Inclusive Language Translations*" in *The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource with Commentary and Cumulative Index*, Volume Two (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1999), 228-230.

The sources cited in this Appendix have been laid out thoroughly in the discussions surrounding prior meetings of the *Coetus*, particularly relating to the meetings at Clervaux and Galloro.

³³ *ROL*, 588.

specific mention. What will become clear, however, is that the experimental rite, though by no means perfect,³⁴ was, indeed, a viable model of pastoral versatility, as demanded by SC.³⁵

7.2.1: The General Structure of the Rite

The overall perception of the weight of the general structure of the rite by the experimenters was a sense of unease, although for different reasons. In some places the rite was deemed under-developed. In other places the rite was seen as being too full. There was, by no means, a consensus on which stages of the rite needed less and which needed more, but there was, almost universally, the sense that some increased degree of balance was necessary. As Bugnini notes, “all the reports praised the approach taken by the rites;”³⁶ approach, or theory, however, is different from actual practice and ritual realization.

Bugnini noted that some of the experimenters related how S-147 did not deal with “the period of evangelization, sympathetic welcome, and initial contacts,”³⁷ an omission

³⁴ “Report of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, on the Experimental Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults: The Order of the Catechumenate Arranged in Stages” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 3: “The concluding remarks from one pastor well summarizes this point: ‘We suggest that future programs leave far more room for freedom to experiment and that more effort be made to account for the variety of local situations rather than hope for a fixed rite to cover them all. And finally, we suggest that the period of time for experimentation be quite long, since this program indicates that we are still far from arriving at a satisfactory rite’.”

³⁵ SC 63b: “...These rituals are to be adapted, even in regard to the language employed, to the needs of different regions. Once they have been reviewed by the Apostolic See, they are to be used in the regions for which they were prepared...”

SC 65: “...it is lawful in missions to allow, besides what is part of Christian tradition, those initiation elements in use among individual peoples, to the extent that such elements are compatible with the Christian rite of initiation.”

³⁶ ROL, 587. Not a single report rejected the reunification of the sacraments of initiation – though some, particularly the report from the NCCB, sought an increased emphasis on Confirmation in the rite.

³⁷ ROL, 588.

that was, in fact, recognized by the *Coetus* in the Pastoral Norms appendix. Nonetheless, according to Bugnini, some of the experimenters correctly argued that these facets of the structure were fundamental, and suggested that they “might be marked by some kind of rite.”³⁸ Writing from Tokyo, Christiaens provided the only concrete proposal contained within the C.N.P.L. archives that addressed the issue, by using a revised first stage as an “Entry to the Pre-catechumenate.” This ceremony would not require, he suggested, eliciting an explicit statement of faith in Christ – thereby corresponding to the early stage of faith development of the pre-catechumen – but would afford the opportunity to mark this important period with a liturgical celebration. The entry into the catechumenate might, instead, be marked around Christmas, using the first portion of the Rite of Election. The Inscription of Names, he proposed, would thus constitute the whole of the Rite of Election, and would be celebrated at the beginning of Lent.³⁹ This proposal was largely in response to the Japanese catechumenal reality, that the pre-catechumenal period was a rather extensive one, during which the pre-catechumen came to know the Church without making any explicit proclamation of faith in Christ. On the other hand, the period of the catechumenate was relatively brief, since, by the time a person was prepared to enter the catechumenate, their faith was already significantly developed

³⁸ *ROL*, 588.

³⁹ Christiaens, “December 14, 1968,” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 1: “Toutefois dans mon premier rapport j’ai proposé une modification du rite de l’Entrée du Catéchuménat. Sur ce point je n’ai pas changé d’avis. Je proposais la solution suivante: Élargir les possibilités de la cérémonie de l’Entrée, c.a.d. ne pas exiger une foi explicite au Christ... en faire une sorte de cérémonie d’Entrée au Précatéchuménat. J’ai encore proposé de diviser la cérémonie de l’Élection en deux cérémonies: Une première cérémonie serait alors la cérémonie d’Entrée au Catéchuménat proprement dite (p.e. Noël). Au commencement du Carême viendrait alors l’inscription des noms” (Ellipses present in text).

because of extended contact with the Church.⁴⁰ Development of the period of the pre-catechumenate would certainly have been a valuable addition in such contexts. Otherwise, however, the pre-catechumenate, which was not discussed in any detail in S-147, appears to have been largely ignored by the experimenters.⁴¹

In the same way, as Bugnini noted, the experimenters were very much at a loss when faced with the prospect of Mystagogy. The descriptions of Mystagogy within S-147 were sparse, indicating only that it was intended to strengthen the neophyte in faith, and help to explain the process that they had just undergone.⁴² Some experimenters noted that entering into this period was liturgically difficult, especially since the texts for the masses for the neophytes had not yet been written. The summary of the reports contains the indication that some centers compensated for the lack of direction during the period of Mystagogy by going so far as to detach Confirmation from the Vigil, celebrating it during the Easter Season (not surprisingly, the *Coetus* firmly rejected this

⁴⁰ “Compte Rendu de l’Expérimentation du Nouveau Rituel Baptismal des Adultes” in C.N.P.L. I.D.v: 3: “Dette requête est plus pressante dans les pays où le précatéchuménat couvre une période assez longue. Il s’agit de pays, comme le Japon, où les non baptisés se forment en fréquentant longtemps ‘la mission’ pour en savoir davantage sur l’Église, mais sans se déterminer à un acte de foi explicite au Christ. Dans ces circonstances, le temps du catéchuménat est relativement bref, car lorsqu’une personne remplit les conditions prévues pour l’admission au catéchuménat, elle a aussi trouvé une solution à la majeure partie de ses problèmes.”

⁴¹ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,”13: Seumois wondered, however, whether the blessings and exorcisms for the period of the catechumenate might be celebrated during the pre-catechumenate instead.

⁴² S-147 Appendix I, 9-10: “Ut primi neophytorum in vita sacramentali gressus rectiores et firmiores fiant, requiritur ut ardentius adiuventur a sacerdote, a fidelium communitate, praesertim ab eorum patrinis. Curandum ergo est ut neophyti et patrini et amici eorum ac familiares saepius invitentur ad illa missarum sollemnia, in quibus mystagogica catechesis apta eis et specialiter exponatur. In genere, mystagogiae tempus coincidere deberet cum tempore Paschali. Quousque autem fiat Romani Missalis instauratio, in quo speratur tempori huic ‘missas mystagogicas’ assignatas fore, provideant pastores ut ad catechesim praeparandam argumenta et animum desumant ex missis hodiernae hebdomadae Paschalis et e prima Petri epistola.”

approach as misunderstanding the theology of Confirmation).⁴³ Nonetheless, Mystagogy was attempted, with varying degrees of success, at some of the experimental centers. Seumois noted that each of the five Rwandan centers met for Mystagogy, and though each followed a different schedule, in each of the five the neophytes participated in the celebration of the Eucharist daily during the week of Easter: one parish met daily during the Octave of Easter; another parish met twice weekly throughout the Easter Season; two parishes met once weekly until Trinity Sunday; and the final parish met twice during three months.⁴⁴ In Canada the neophytes were invited once to participate in the Eucharist after Easter, but, they argued, while the neophytes would occasionally gather together, “it was not possible to enter into Mystagogy throughout the year, since there was no established catechumenate upon which to rely.”⁴⁵ The response from the United States was, to some degree, consistent with the Canadian position: “the continuing catechesis needs to be faced more realistically. Few of the neophytes will attend daily Mass during Easter week, and some of them will be moving or traveling soon after baptism. Some of these difficulties are insoluble, but solutions offered should contain great flexibility.”⁴⁶ What is clear in these three national examples is that there was a need for flexibility in

⁴³ “Compte Rendu,” 3: “Les rapporteurs regrettent que le rituel ne prévoit aucune célébration pour ce temps, alors qu’ils jugent nécessaire de marquer par un rite la reprise spirituelle qu’ils exigent des néophytes au terme du temps de la mystagogie ou de leur première année de baptisé. Dans certains diocèses, pour compenser cette absence, on détache la confirmation du baptême, et on fait jouer à la première le rôle que nous venons de dire. Mais est-ce bien le sens de la confirmation?”

⁴⁴ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 19: “On souhaite vivement que soient fournis les formulaires de messes des dimanches après Pâques pour la mystagogie.”

⁴⁵ “Canada – secteur français”: Remarques concernant le nouveau rituel de l’initiation chrétienne des adultes” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 6: “Après Pâque, les nouveaux baptisés, leur parrains et les catéchètes ont été invités une fois à participer ensemble à l’Eucharistie. Il n’a pas été possible de faire davantage cette année, car le catéchuménat n’en est qu’à ses débuts.”

⁴⁶ NCCB, 2.

structure in different cultures. A more robust period was possible within the African context, while, for many possible reasons relating, perhaps, both to neophytes and pastors, the North American response was less welcoming of this period. Nonetheless, given the importance of the period, an open-ended approach that would allow for these possibilities was necessary. For the most part, however, perhaps stemming in part from their clear lack of formal structure in the rite, Mystagogy was not treated in the majority of the reports contained within the C.N.P.L. archive, suggesting that the period did not play a substantial role in the experimentation. Just as the pre-catechumenate before it, the underwhelming treatment of the period of Mystagogy in the reports appears to be the direct result of the absence of any degree of detail devoted to the elements in the rite.

The third division of the rite that received somewhat similar treatment in both the rite and by the experimenters was the period of the catechumenate. As Bugnini noted, this period, “which in some places lasted for years, was felt to be somewhat thin in content.”⁴⁷ Though S-147 provided many different texts, the liturgical rites, indeed, rather thin, comprised only minor exorcisms, blessings, and dismissals. The reports from Canada, Belgium, Strasbourg, Togo, and Rwanda, explicitly stated that these rites were not celebrated. The Canadian report simply noted that they had not been celebrated, while the Belgian report described their rationale: there was no clear liturgical rite into which these might fit.⁴⁸ The report from Strasbourg indicated no reason for not

⁴⁷ *ROL*, 588.

⁴⁸ “Diocèse Malines-Bruxelles, Réponse partielle concernant el Rituel du baptême des adultes en vue de la prochaine réunion du Coetus” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.iii: 3: “Nous n’avons pas utilisé les exorcismes mineurs, parce qu’il n’y a pas encore de liturgie proprement catéchuménale en dehors des célébrations étapes du baptême.” It must be noted here that the stages reported by the Belgian experimenters were very much an experiment: 1) Election; 2) *traditio* of the Creed; 3) *traditio* of the Lord’s Prayer, *redditio* of the Creed, final preparation with one scrutiny; and 4) initiation.

celebrating them, but did admit that had they been celebrated they would have been helpful in catechizing about the place of sin in conversion. The priest responsible for experimentation in Togo described the difficulty in translating the texts of the minor exorcisms into the vernacular. As a consequence, they did not use the minor exorcisms there. No mention of the blessings was made in this report. Their absence in the Rwandan rite was, similarly, pastorally understandable. The priests responsible for experimentation were simply unable to work with these rites as they were busy with their other responsibilities, as well as preparing for the Lenten experimentation.⁴⁹ Conversely, only two Japanese centers described using the rites for the period of the catechumenate. Both of these priests described their effect as being extraordinarily beneficial.⁵⁰ Clearly, more use was made of the liturgical elements for the period of the catechumenate than the precatechumenate or mystagogy, though these were still omitted in many centers.

The opposite problem of stages being too dense was noted for the rite for making Catechumens, the rite of election, and the period of intense preparation. The reports are filled with countless examples of these stages being omitted, trimmed, or fused together. So, for example, the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum*, described as “too heavy, too

⁴⁹ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 13: “Aucune expérimentation n’a été faite, faute de temps, toute l’attention des prêtres expérimentateurs ayant porté sur les rites quadragésimaux.”

⁵⁰ Christiaens, 2: “J’ai beaucoup utilisé les exorcismes mineurs. J’en suis très satisfait et j’ai remarqué qu’ils font beaucoup d’impression. Je conçois la cérémonie comme suit: 1) Lecture de la bible en relation avec la leçon du jour; 2) Prière personnelle ou récitation de prières; 3) un exorcisme mineur et une bénédiction.”

See also the report from Father Corvaisier in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 9: “J’ai utilisé les exorcismes mineurs et les bénédictions comme prière à la fin des réunions d’études. Je rédige en ce moment quelques schémas de liturgie catéchuménales et j’y introduis ces prières.”

ritualistic” by one experimenter,⁵¹ was omitted in Canada and Belgium, the rite of election, discussion of which was noticeably absent in most of the reports, was shortened in Togo, and elsewhere, at least one scrutiny was omitted in Lille, Nimes, Belgium, and Togo. Furthermore, many of the centers that complained that the rite was too heavy often combined celebrations, so as to minimize the number of gatherings required in the rite. In Belgium, for example, the only scrutiny that was celebrated was performed in the context of the rite of election,⁵² and in Canada the *traditiones* were celebrated on Sunday along with the scrutinies, since it was deemed “impossible to reconvene during the week... five meetings during Lent was sufficient.”⁵³ One of the most frequently recurring criticisms, that the rite was simply too long, was expressed in the report from the United States:

An excessive repetition of ceremonies. Modern day society makes many demands on people. It is unreasonable and impractical to have them come for so many services... The exorcisms and scrutinies need to be simplified, revised, and even dropped. So too the immediate preparation rite should be eliminated or at least incorporated into another stage.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Mille, “Arras 31-12-68” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: “Adaptations surtout pour l’Entrée au Catéchuménat. Le Rituel n’est pas possible avec la plupart des catéchumènes entrant au Catéchuménat. Il est déjà trop fort, trop ‘ritualiste’.”

⁵² “Diocèse Malines-Bruxelles,” 1: “Première étape – Election: 1) Inscription du nom; 2) Promulgation officielle du Carême; 3) Un scrutin.”

⁵³ “Canada – secteur français,” 5: “Les traditions on été faites le dimanche, avec les scrutins, parce qu’il était impossible de réunir en semaine les catéchumènes, empêchés par leur travail ou par la distance. De plus, il nous a semblé que cinq réunions préparatoires au cours du carême constituaient un nombre suffisant.”

For their part, the *Coetus* noted that the rite called for a maximum of seven liturgical gatherings during the six weeks of Lent.

⁵⁴ NCCB 1-2.

The concern that the rite needed to be simplified was also explicitly stated in reports from Belgium, Canada, France (Amiens, Arras, Lille, Montauban, and Nimes), Togo, and Japan (Corvaisier). Corvaisier included a particularly biting critique of the complicated shape: “Nous ne sommes pas une secte; nous sommes la grande Église catholique; nos cérémonies d’initiation de doivent pas être compliquées.”

Added to this concern was the fear that a highly structured rite would reduce initiation to a series of liturgical steps rather than a process of conversion. See Luçon in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 1: “Celle-ci m’a parus

The perception that some of these stages were too dense was not, however, universal. The Rwandan report made no such assessment, even though they were forced to deal with the constraints of time in a way that the other centers did not. At one Rwandan location, for example, because of the large number of elect, the *Ephphatha* rite alone lasted twenty-five minutes and the profession of faith and baptism took forty-five minutes. Seumois noted that on average, the celebration of the Vigil lasted three and a half hours. And yet, when given the opportunity to save some time and have the neophytes change their clothes after their baptism, Seumois argued that it was better for them to stay and witness the entire celebration.⁵⁵ In Seumois' assessment, the rites were clear and simple, and therefore, well understood and effective.⁵⁶ Also implicitly rejecting the critique that the rites were too long, Christiaens indicated that, out of the perspective of his Japanese parish experience, he wished that each Lenten Sunday had its own

trop absolue et catégorique dans sa perspective et dans son expression. J'aurais envie de faire des réserves sur l'option du nouveau rituel quant à la place de la liturgie dans la formation catéchuménale. Bien sûr, je crois à l'importance de la liturgie dans cette formation; mais je crains qu'on réduise l'initiation à la liturgie et à la prière aux seules célébrations catéchuménales; je crains qu'on donne l'impression de privilégier les rites; je crains qu'on tombe dans un liturgisme d'esthètes, coupé de la vie, et dont les catéchumènes ne verront pas la signification (ils s'y soumettront parce qu'il le faut!)."

The irony in the comments from Luçon, however, is that the experimental evidence demonstrated that when left with complete freedom to experiment, such as in the pre-catechumenate and mystagogy, most pastors ignored the rite completely. The evidence appears to suggest that the more "highly structured" the rite, the more likely it was to be used, even in modified form. The period of experimentation highlighted that both pastoral freedom *and* structured liturgical rites were vital to the process of conversion and initiation.

⁵⁵ Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 8-9, 16-18.

⁵⁶ Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 5: "La clarté et la simplicité des rites mettent les baptizandi en présence du sérieux de l'engagement qu'ils prennent; ils touchent du doigt l'action du Christ à travers son Église; leur part active équivaut vraiment à une réponse personnelle à Dieu."

scrutiny.⁵⁷ Thus, while the majority of respondents to the proposed rite indicated that the rite was too long, there was not universal accord on this issue.⁵⁸

7.2.2: Relevance of the Rite

Bugnini briefly described the category of responses treating the relevance of the OCGD as comprising the views that

there were some rites not adapted to the modern mentality (for example, the scrutinies, presentations, and exorcisms) or overly involved (such as the rite of introduction to the catechumenate) or artificial (the rite of election) or not practicable nowadays (the dismissal of the catechumens after the liturgy of the Word).⁵⁹

Each of these positions was, unquestionably, present in the reports of experimentation, even though the *Coetus* had either anticipated or responded to these concerns before the experimental rite was distributed. But by looking at particular elements, it becomes clear that the assessments described by Bugnini were not universally held, and that what was deemed relevant is conditioned by culture. In some cases, what was irrelevant to some was critical to others, and in other cases, what was problematic for some was harmless for others. During the rite for making Catechumens, for example, the exorcism by exsufflation was excluded in Canada because it did not make sense culturally, but was well-received in Rwanda, because of similar usage in pagan rites.⁶⁰ Also during that

⁵⁷ Christiaens, 2: “J’aimerais mieux un scrutin pour chaque Dimanche du Carême.”

⁵⁸ To some degree, the rite was prepared for this critique, in that it was composed with an eye towards flexibility. As Bugnini noted on page 588 of *ROL*, the *Coetus* treated the overall structure of the rite to be essential, but allowed for a great degree of flexibility within the structure.

⁵⁹ *ROL*, 588.

⁶⁰ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 12: “L’exsufflation a été pratiquée et très bien comprise, car c’est un rite utilisé dans le paganisme traditionnel à nos régions.”

stage, the optional rite of welcome was practiced differently in the various centers. While Le Dorze, a Japanese missionary, wished that more concrete options (such as a crucifix, a holy card, or a sort of commemorative document) had been provided in the rite so that less creative pastors would be encouraged to use the element,⁶¹ the imposition of salt and the giving of a holy medal were the most popular options utilized. Both Seumois and Christiaens stated that giving the medal would be a more significant ritual in their centers, while the report from Nimes indicated that the loss of the imposition of salt was lamentable.⁶² Furthermore, oral cultures tended to avoid presenting the catechumens with a Bible, while literate cultures generally preferred this option.⁶³ The Canadian report stated that the celebrant also gave the elect written copies of the Creed and Lord's Prayer during the celebration of the *traditiones*.⁶⁴ Other reports, such as the one from Lille, rejected the *traditiones*, since the elect already knew them.⁶⁵ Seumois noted that

"Canada – secteur français," 3: "Dans notre pays, il serait préférable d'omettre l'exorcisme et l'exsufflation. Le geste de souffler en direction du visage d'une autre personne est inadmissible dans la mentalité actuelle."

⁶¹ Le Dorze, 1: "Mettre un choix plus grand; penser aux gens qui manquent d'imagination."

⁶² Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 12: "On a remis la médaille, selon la coutume. Cependant on souhaite une croix spéciale, qui serait le signe distinctif des catéchumènes; on pourrait profiter de l'occasion pour les inciter à orner leur maison d'une croix."

Catéchuménat de Nimes, "Réponses en Références à la lettre circulaire du 22/11/68," 1: "Quelques uns parmi nous regrettent la disparition du sel, et trouvent que son symbolisme est facile à percevoir puisque dans l'usage quotidien, le sel donne saveur et purifie."

⁶³ Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 12: "Pas fait, parce que c'est une civilisation orale."

Christiaens, for example, treated this presentation as primarily functional: "Seulement j'ai omis la présentation de la bible pour la seule raison que les catéchumènes sont déjà en possession d'une bible" (1).

⁶⁴ "Canada – secteur français," 5: "Au cours de la tradition, le célébrant a remis à chaque catéchumène le texte écrit du Pater et du Credo."

⁶⁵ "Lille-Centre: A Propos du Rituel de Baptême des Adultes: Réflexion de quelques membres de l'Équipe liturgique de Lille-Centre à propos de ce Rituel. Ce travail n'engage que cette seule équipe, non les autres Communautés périphériques de Lille" in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 4: "La Tradition correspond-elle à la

the elimination of saliva from the *Ephphatha* rite was seen as unfortunate in Rwanda, because of the role of saliva in pagan initiation.⁶⁶ On the other hand, the Canadian report described the *Ephphatha* rite as strange – “touching the ears and mouth of an adult is bizarre” – and other European sources saw it as “magical.”⁶⁷ During the Vigil, in Togo, the Christological portion of the profession of faith was expanded to include reference to Christ’s descent into Hell, in order to highlight the difference between Christianity and traditional African ancestor veneration.⁶⁸ No other centers reported altering the profession of faith. In both Belgium and France there was a near universal refusal to present the neophyte with a white robe, because this gesture was deemed to have no resonance for modern sensibilities.⁶⁹ Outside of Europe, however, little discussion of the white robe is evidenced.

mentalité et la culture modernes? La plupart des catéchumènes savent le ‘Notre Père’ ou l’ont entendu au cours d’un mariage ou d’un enterrement (sans parler des Messes à la Radio ou à la T.V.). Il en est parfois de même pour le Credo. Ces proclamations ont-elles à reprendre la forme de celles du IV^e siècle?”

⁶⁶ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 16: “Des chrétiens ont manifesté leur étonnement à propos de la suppression de la salive. De fait, la salive joue un rôle très important dans les initiations païenne.”

⁶⁷ “Canada – secteur français,” 5: “Le rite de l’ephphatha apparaît étrange: toucher les oreilles et la bouche d’un adulte est un geste assez bizarre. Il ne suffit pas de reprendre tels quels des rites anciens, mais il apparaît nécessaire ici d’inventer autre chose.”

⁶⁸ “Diocèse de Dapango – Togo – Réponses du Père Pierre Reinhard,” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 2: “Formule de profession de foi: Nous remplaçons ‘a été enseveli,’ par ‘est mort, est descendu aux enfers,’ à cause de l’importance catéchétique du dogme de la Descente aux enfers en Afrique, où le culte des ancêtres est primordial.”

⁶⁹ “Compte Rendu,” 4: “Au sujet des rites, il faut signaler la très vive sensibilité des rapporteurs pour que l’on ne garde que des rites dont le sens est perdu par l’homme moderne. De là, le refus en Europe de l’imposition du vêtement blanc à un catéchumène adulte, surtout lorsqu’il s’agit d’un homme.”

Lille, 1: “Nous nous posons la question d’opportunité du ‘Vêtement blanc,’ actuellement, pour les hommes surtout (la remise de la cape ayant provoqué des moqueries ouvertes de la part des invités des Catéchumènes). Nous conseillons volontiers aux catéchumènes-hommes de porter une chemise ou un pull blanc, et soulignons cette couleur après le baptême.”

Most specifically however, the exorcisms were criticized because of their irrelevance to the lives of modern Christians.⁷⁰ Most of the experimenters simply did not understand the purpose of the exorcisms, and thus, could not see their effectiveness. The pastoral suggestions surrounding this element, provided in the first Appendix, appeared to have fallen aside fruitlessly; these experimenters were unable or unwilling to understand them as being instructive regarding the conflict between the two ways of living, between the reign of God and evil, the conflict between the spirit and the flesh, and between sin and virtue.⁷¹ Not surprisingly, in this context these experimenters did not regard the omission of exorcisms as any loss to the structure of the rite or to the development of the catechumens' faith. The rite was seen to be too long in the first

⁷⁰ NCCB 2: "The exorcisms and scrutinies need to be simplified, revised, and even dropped."

"Canada – secteur français," 4: "Dans les scrutins, il y aurait sûrement une autre façon d'amener les catéchumènes à prendre conscience de leur situation de pécheurs : en faisant appel à leur expérience personnelle, et surtout par le Parole de Dieu, car c'est elle qui révèle à l'homme sa situation de pécheur. Au lieu de s'adresser au démon, que l'exorcisme soit une prière adressée à Dieu pour qu'il donne aux catéchumènes de se convertir totalement et d'être protégés des sollicitations du mal."

Lille, 4: "Nous souhaitons normalement un seul scrutin et profondément modifié (contenu et vocabulaire)."

Togo, 5: "Nous n'avons pratiquement pas utilisés les exorcismes mineurs. Il serait d'ailleurs mieux de les appeler plus simplement 'prières.' Nous ne les avons pas utilisés parce que cela ne nous a pas semblé nécessaire; et lorsque cela aurait pu être utile, nous n'avons pas immédiatement ces prières sous la main. D'autre part la traduction en Moba de ces textes présente une remarquable série de difficultés."

Anonymous, "Reflexions sur le Rituel," in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 2: "Exorcismes mineur: Nous ne les avons jamais utilisés, ne sachant pas très bien comment les situer."

⁷¹ S-147 Appendix I, 4: "Propterea exorcismi minores non sunt imprecatorii, sed deprecatorii et educativi. Ad modum Evangeliorum et Patrum, ponunt ante oculos catechumenorum themata 'duarum viarum' (Matt 7:14-15), 'benedictionum Regni caelorum' et 'maledictionum' (Luke 6:20-27), pugnae inter carnem et spiritum (Rom. 7:18-25; Gal. 5:16-26), peccatorum et virtutum. Inde catechumeni intelligere possunt, pugnam spiritualem quam sustinent revera esse pugnam, qua Christus diabolo adversatur. Modo autem positivo ac praesertim discipulorum Christi exmpolo, ostenditur spes et pretium vocationis christianae, ut magna catechumeni pro Christo et Ecclesia aggredi possint. Denique tandem peti tur a Deo ut divina sua virtute et protectione eos liberet a peccato et a pravis cupiditatibus atque eos perducatur ad finem ad quem eos creavit et vocavit."

S-147 Appendix I, 6: "Scrutinia sunt actio qua Deus, mediante Ecclesiae liturgia, mentes et corda catechumenorum intime penetrat ad ea probanda et purificanda. At electi ipsi, pro sua parte, divinae operationi collaborare debent sincera sui cognitione, seria animi discussione ac paenitentia vera, quibus intime ac profunde sui peccati sensum invenient et agnoscent. Quapropter pastores et catechistae et patrini eos adjuvare debent ad conscientiam excutiendam et ad sensus paenitentiae imo in corde excitandos ac fovendos."

place, and the irrelevant exorcisms that were repeated so frequently in the rite were often omitted. Nevertheless, in the instances where the exorcisms were used, most notably in some of the Japanese centers, they were well received. The summary of the reports describes this situation well: “The minor exorcisms were thoroughly appreciated wherever they were used... But the embarrassment of many experimenters when confronted with these rites must be noted, the result of which was that they did not use them.”⁷² Given the negative response of the experimenters to the exorcisms in general, and the scrutinies in particular, the *Coetus* recognized that more work on these elements were necessary. They were justifiably convinced, however, that the principal stumbling block in the celebration of the exorcisms was one of pre-conception. As the Japanese testimony suggested, if the experimenters could put aside their worries about the rites in general, they could work effectively. The responsibility of the *Coetus*, therefore, was to provide a format that would help pastors overcome their hesitation, by making the exorcisms more recognizably connected to the contemporary situation. During the meeting at Vanves, the responsibility for revising the prayers for the exorcisms would be given to Ligier, who would present them in S-337.

7.2.3: Prayer Texts

Bugnini described an interrelated series of general concerns surrounding the prayer texts, writing that “the exhortations and prayers sometimes used negative ideas to express conversion to God and the progressive purification of the catechumens. More

⁷² “Compte Rendu,” 1: “Les exorcismes mineurs ont été appréciés partout où ils furent utilisés. Ils permettent d’affermir la démarche des catéchumènes entre leur entrée dans le catéchuménat et l’inscription des noms à ce titre, ils comblent un vide. Toutefois il faut noter l’embarras de nombreux expérimentateurs en face de ces rites, dont ils n’ont pas su tirer parti. De telles difficultés semblent réclamer que l’on insiste, tant dans les ‘Règles pastorales’ que dans le rituel lui-même, sur le sens et l’usage de ces rites.”

effective texts were requested, as well as more extensive possibilities of adaptation and selection.”⁷³ Four issues can be isolated here: the tone of some texts; the usefulness of some texts; the cultural limitations of some texts; and the paucity of textual choices in some instances. The reports indicate that all of these concerns are motivated and linked by pastoral concerns.

7.2.3.1: Negativity in the Texts

The sense that some of the prayer texts were too negative in tone was rather prevalent in the reports, particularly those reports from Europe and North America. Many of these experimenters took issue with what they perceived as a false dichotomy in the texts between being converted and not being converted. The Belgian report provides a helpful summary of the sense of many of these experimenters, when it argued that even without clear recognition of it, the catechumens already lived in the Spirit of Christian faith, and that the portrayal of their prior lives as being in darkness in comparison to their conversion as being in the light was a false dichotomy. There was no clear moment at which the catechumen suddenly came to faith where none had existed before – not only their conversion but also their life leading up to their conversion pointed to the action of God, whether or not the catechumens recognized it as such.⁷⁴ Similar sentiments were expressed in the report from Lille, which wondered whether catechumens were really

⁷³ *ROL*, 588.

⁷⁴ “Diocèse Malines-Bruxelles, Catéchuménat des Adultes, Service à la Liturgie: Réponse partielle concernant le Rituel du baptême des adultes en vue de la prochaine réunion du Coetus,” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.iii: 2: “L’ensemble des prières semblent également ignorer que déjà le catéchumène vivait sans le savoir à certains moments dans l’Esprit de la foi chrétienne. Leur vie antérieure est trop uniquement présentée comme n’ayant été que ténèbres alors qu’elle était déjà un acheminement vers Dieu avec ses ombres et ses lumières.”

subjects of the Devil? Do not all the baptized have the same sorts of conflicts, they wondered.⁷⁵ The Canadian report provided the most thorough treatment of texts that should be considered particularly offensive, citing three specific examples. First, it proposed that the text for the laying on of hands in the rite for making Catechumens, (6) was too harsh. Instead of asking God to “drive out all blindness of heart from the candidate, and break Satan’s bonds,” the report suggested inserting a more positive petition that God enlighten them and free them from all sin. This would avoid the negative implication that the candidates were, actually, blind of heart and enslaved by Satan: they had decided to become Christian – how blind could they be?⁷⁶ The Canadian report criticized the introduction to the dialogue with the sponsors during the rite of Election (43) in similar fashion, arguing that it suggested the possibility of a “disagreeable investigation.” Logically, the report insisted, this was not the case, since the investigation had already taken place – those present had already been deemed ready to become catechumens. The negativity here was unnecessary and misleading.⁷⁷ The dismissal of the elect (47) in the same stage was also a matter of concern. The prayer from OBA, “*Deus, qui humani generis...*” contained a negative portrayal of human nature: “... in order that, as children of promise, they might find joy in having become by

⁷⁵ Lille, 2: “Des catéchumènes ont déjà une attitude et une vie évangéliques: à quel “Maître” doivent-ils alors renoncer? Et nous, baptisés, n’avons-nous pas la même lutte à poursuivre?”

⁷⁶ “Canada – secteur français,” 3: “La formule ‘omnem ab eis cordis caecitatem expelle: disrumpe omnes laqueos Satanae’ risque d’être injuste et injurieuse pour beaucoup de catéchumènes. Puisqu’ils font la démarche de se convertir, leur aveuglement ne doit pas être si grand. Au lieu d’une formule négative, pourquoi ne pas employer une tournure positive et demander plutôt que Dieu les éclaire et les libère toujours davantage?”

⁷⁷ “Canada – secteur français,” 4: “Ne vaudrait-il pas mieux supprimer la première phrase qui risque d’apparaître comme une enquête désagréable pour les catéchumènes. D’ailleurs, cela ne correspond pas à la réalité. L’examen a déjà eu lieu et ne sont présents que ceux qui on été jugés prêts.”

grace what they could have become by nature.” The report suggested that one could highlight the role of grace without defining the limitations of human nature, and proposed substituting the phrase “that life which You alone can give them.”⁷⁸

The *Coetus* acknowledged these claims in recognizing the faith in Christ did not appear without some sort of growth. Furthermore, alluding to the theory of anonymous Christianity, which had already influenced the choice and revision of some ritual texts in the rite, the *Coetus* admitted that salvation might even be possible without the use of the sacraments.⁷⁹ As a consequence, revisions would attempt to take this reality more fully into account.

7.2.3.2: Usefulness of the Texts

The second general issue surrounding the texts in the rite was in regard to their usefulness, particularly concerning content and form. Many experimenters found the texts to rely too heavily on archaic or esoteric terminology.⁸⁰ Despite appending a translation guide to the experimental rite, terms such as election, exorcism, scrutiny,⁸¹

⁷⁸ “Canada – secteur français,” 4: “Ce texte... reflète aussi une conception pessimiste de l’homme: ‘Quod non potuerunt assequi per naturam’. On peut exulter la surnature sans qu’il soit nécessaire d’abaisser la nature. Il suffisait de dire: ‘cette vie que toi seul peux leur donner’.”

⁷⁹ “Compte Rendu,” 2: “De nos jours, on a conscience que la conversion d’un non croyant à la foi en Jésus-Christ ne part jamais de rien, et que, dans certains cas, le salut est possible sans l’entrée effective dans l’économie sacramentelle. Quelques rapporteurs ont tiré de ces vérités une conclusion induite. Ils n’ont pas vu que la conversion à la foi explicite en Jésus-Christ dans l’Église apporte du nouveau aux non baptisés de bonne foi qui vivent déjà de la justice et qui servent leurs frères.”

⁸⁰ “Canada – secteur français,” 7: “Toutefois, certains rites et certains textes paraissent archaïques et gagneraient à être davantage adaptés à la mentalité et au langage contemporains.”

⁸¹ “Compte Rendu,” 5: “Le vocabulaire des formules du nouveau rituel est contesté par l’ensemble des rapporteurs et n’a satisfait personne. On lui reproche son archaïsme, qui le rend plus ou moins inadéquat à l’homme moderne. Les rapports souhaitent que l’on s’efforce de trouver de nouvelles dénominations pour désigner l’élection, les exorcismes, les scrutins, etc. La critique du vocabulaire des oraisons se situe à un double niveau : tantôt on dénonce l’emploi d’un langage inusité, dont les images ne répondant plus à la sensibilité de nos contemporains. On reproche aussi à ces formules de ne pas

and mystagogy⁸² were deemed difficult to render in the vernacular, and were found to have little meaning in the experimental centers.⁸³ Many texts were also described as being too complex or dense to allow for active participation. For example, the summary catechesis during the rite for making Catechumens was criticized for this reason, particularly in cultures that were not largely Christianized, such as Africa and Japan.⁸⁴ The report from Amiens illustrates the overall concern: the broader biblical culture, presupposed in particular words and expressions within the rite, is not readily available to the non-baptized.⁸⁵

correspondre à la situation présente des catéchumènes. Écrites pour les païens de l'antiquité, qui devaient renoncer à leurs idoles pour embrasser la foi chrétienne, elles donnent l'impression à l'homme d'aujourd'hui qu'il n'y avait rien de valable en lui avant sa conversion. Les usagers du rituel demandent que les oraisons présentent la conversion comme un dépassement de soi-même par le haut, dans une plus grande fidélité à prévenant de Dieu, par le passage d'une économie de salut à une autre."

Even Seumois related the difficulty of translating "scrutiny" into the vernacular. See Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 14: "Certaines difficultés pour l'exacte intelligence de cette action liturgique sont nées d'une traduction défectueuse du mot 'scrutin'."

⁸² NCCB 2: "The term 'mystagogia' has little meaning for Americans."

⁸³ "Canada – secteur français," 2: "Que les traducteurs n'arrivent pas à traduire en langage contemporain les termes techniques anciens comme: catéchuménat, catéchumène, catéchète, élu, élection, tradition, scrutin, candidat, exorcisme, chrême, reddition, mystagogie, etc., illustre bien la difficulté. Cette accumulation de termes exotiques finit par constituer un écran."

Lille, 2: "Le vocabulaire n'est pas assez proche de celui des hommes d'aujourd'hui. La plupart des textes on dû être modifiés dans nos liturgies pour 'passer' en milieu ouvrier (Oraisons, Exorcismes surtout). Ces textes modifiés vous parviendront bientôt."

Corvaisier, 9: "J'évite seulement de parler d' 'exorcisme' ou de 'bénédiction'. Je dis seulement 'Prières de l'Église pour les catéchumènes'. Là aussi, il faudrait distinguer le titre donné à la section, titre simple, accessible à tous, et le vocabulaire technique qui resterait en latin (si on tient à le conserver); De toute façon, dans ce genre de vocabulaire, il y a un danger latent de magie (je suppose d'ailleurs que les exorcismes doivent être un héritage du paganisme, simplifier le vocabulaire, c'est aller je pense dans le sens de la christianisation des rites)."

⁸⁴ Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 12: "Cette catéchèse n'a pas paru très claire. A la réflexion, ce défaut est venu de la traduction. Pour le fond, elle est excellente."

Le Dorze, 1: "Résumé de catéchèse: celui de l'ancien rituel romain est encore le meilleur."

⁸⁵ Amiens, 2: "Enfin, la question du langage semble à revoir... Pour des nouveaux chrétiens non encore initiés, certains mots, certaines expressions qui demandent une grande culture biblique ne peuvent être compris."

The nearly universal critique of the experimenters was that some of the texts were too complex to be effective. But comprehension was not the sole area that caused these texts to be judged unhelpful. Just as when describing some of the rituals, the charge of artificiality was raised against some texts. As is readily noticeable from their commentary, this judgment was partially due to the use of archaic terms that had little relevance to the modern catechumen. As the report from Amiens stated, the texts must mirror the lives of the faithful,⁸⁶ which clearly implied modernizing the rite: the report from Lille noted that the rite occasionally resembled a museum.⁸⁷ Furthermore, while the word often used to describe them was “formalized,” the content of this critique was actually that they were, in the words of one experimenter, so staged that they were reminiscent of “children’s theater.”⁸⁸ Multiple reports urged, for example, that dialogues be rewritten so that, beyond giving their names, the answers to the questions would be yes.⁸⁹ This would help make the rites more authentic, or, at the very least, less forced.

⁸⁶ Amiens, 2: “Il est important que la liturgie soit en lien avec la vie. Surtout lorsqu’il s’agit de catéchumènes venant de milieu simple, ayant un travail dur (travail d’usine, travail en équipe, etc...), il est important que les rites et le langage d’une liturgie soient simples aussi, surtout au moment où ils ne sont qu’au, début de leur initiation.”

⁸⁷ Lille: “Le Rituel des adultes est riche de siècles d’Histoire, mais un peu lourd de cette richesse (il ressemble quelquefois à une musée)!”

⁸⁸ Le Dorze, 2: “Le Dialogue (43) est entièrement à revoir; il fait dialogue de théâtre d’enfants.”

⁸⁹ “Canada – secteur français,” 2: “Ne serait-il préférable de déritualiser ce dialogue et de le rendre plus spontané? On pourrait poser les questions de façon que les catéchumènes puissent répondre d’eux-mêmes, sans avoir à lire ou à réciter par cœur une formule imposée. Ainsi, au lieu de dire: ‘N., que voulez-vous?’ on pourrait demander: ‘N., voulez-vous devenir chrétien?’ Le catéchumène peut alors répondre de façon spontanée.”

Amiens, 1: “Il semblerait préférable que le prêtre, dans sa question oriente la réponse du catéchumène, par exemple en disant: ‘Est-ce bien pour devenir chrétien, pour connaître le christ que vous êtes venu ici?’... question reprenant les expressions du Rituel, et que le catéchumène réponde simplement: ‘c’est bien cela’.”

Nîmes, 1: “Nous avons refait une 4e formule... À la critique nous préférons laisser le Catéchumène répondre ce qu’il veut. Cela suppose qu’il a été préparé, et a totalement épousé le sens du rite.”

A final point, raised only within the African context, presumably because of the far larger numbers of catechumens, pertained to the length of some formulae. Seumois pointed, in particular, to the individual profession of faith, which, in one location, took twenty minutes, and to the formula for the post-baptismal anointing, which was simply too long to be repeated so frequently.⁹⁰ In such circumstances, Seumois argued that the existing texts did not benefit the overall celebration of the rite.

With few exceptions – namely the structure of the dialogues and the repetition of certain texts for large groups of individuals – the *Coetus* had addressed many of the concerns that arose surrounding the relevance of the text. The failure of the texts to be seen as relevant should not, therefore, be seen as the fault of the rite itself. Lengthy pastoral guidelines had been provided, including apparatus for translating and catechizing. As the summary of the report indicated, “the experimentation revealed... a certain lack of formation among the experimenters.”⁹¹ This unquestionably affected the experimentation itself.⁹² The overriding concern, however, was a more theoretical one.

⁹⁰ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 18: “On signale la difficulté pour faire répondre au singulier. Ici se pose le problème de la profession personnelle. L’équipe liturgique de Save (40 personnes, la plupart des laïcs) a insisté beaucoup pour que la triple profession de foi se fasse individuellement ; le clergé l’a admis, mais ce rite seul a pris 20 minutes (80 baptizandi, alors que 5 prêtres concélébrants posaient des questions, chacun 16 fois).”

18: “Une rubrique devrait spécifier comment se comporter lorsque les néophytes sont très nombreux: la formule est beaucoup trop longue que pour être répétée 20 fois et, à fortiori, 100 fois. Que le célébrant récite la formule entière (au micro) sur le premier qui se présente; pour les autres, qu’il puisse employer une formule simplifiée, par ex. ‘que Dieu te consacre avec le chrême du Salut’.”

⁹¹ “Compte Rendu,” 1: “Pour autant, le nouveau rituel n’a pas été admis par ses usagers en tout points, car son expérimentation a révélé, à la fois, ses défauts et un certain manque de formation chez quelques utilisateurs.”

⁹² Undoubtedly, the fact that many European and North American centers celebrated the rites with only limited distinction between those seeking baptism and those already baptized seeking full communion points to this fundamental misconception as to the purpose of the rites. The experimenters who commented that the texts contained within the rite were not intended for those who had been baptized were absolutely correct – but yet, many of these same experimenters failed to grasp the rather obvious implication that the rite should, therefore, not be used for the already baptized. An editorial comment in the report from the

The *Coetus* was utilizing a mystagogical approach, in which “performance of a sacred action, and in particular the celebration of the sacraments of initiation [preceded] oral or written explanation of the mystery hidden in the scriptures and celebrated in the liturgy.”⁹³ In this model, understanding was to follow upon practice. Certainly, the rites were to be revised so as to be comprehended, but the question as to when comprehension was to be realized was left open-ended. Thus, the model of liturgical catechesis presented in the experimental rite was one in which the one becoming Christian was asked to trust that the community and the rites would lead them safely to their destination. On the other hand, this method was not appreciated by many of the experimenters, who apparently relied on a more populist type of approach, a sort of “meet them where they are at” catechesis. Rather than bringing the neophyte to a full understanding of what had been done, many of the reports demonstrate a predilection to only do what the catechumens could understand. The clear weakness in this latter method is that it presumes the catechumen to be capable of full comprehension, regardless of the degree to which their faith is developed. The Canadian report indicated that the prayer over the elect at 73 was too dense: “Almighty and ever-living God, you make your Church your children forever: increase the strength and intellect of our elect,

United States clearly identifies this problem: “The observation apparently confuses the rite of baptism with the rite for the reception of a baptized person into full communion with the Church, which is being separately prepared” (6).

⁹³ R. Bonnert, *Les commentaries byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle*, Archives de l’Orient chrétien 9 (Paris, 1966), 29, cited in Enrico Mazza, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age*, Matthew J. O’Connell, tr. (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1989), 1.

so that, renewed in the font of baptism, they might become your adopted children.”⁹⁴ This subject material is rather basic baptismal theology. The suggestion that it should be dropped because the elect would not yet be able to comprehend it proposes, essentially, that the prayers of the liturgy should be “dumbed-down.” Such an approach will inevitably stunt future theological growth, by excising any texts that might not be understood. In such a model, catechesis has no role and growth is not given an opportunity to occur, since everything spoken within the liturgy is already understood. For liturgical texts to “meet” a catechumen “where they are at” means that liturgical texts are to express a faith that is only beginning to grow. If the arguments surrounding the Relationship between the law of prayer and the law of belief are to be taken seriously, then liturgical texts must afford faith room to develop.

7.2.3.3: Adaptability of the Texts

The third point of general concern surrounding the texts in the rite was the degree to which they could be adapted for local usage. While some experimenters called for an extraordinarily increased degree of adaptability, including the number of stages, gestures, and formulae,⁹⁵ some reports provided more specific requests. One particular area of concern is the previously mentioned point surrounding the length of texts that were

⁹⁴ “Canada – secteur français,” 5: “L’oraison ‘omnipotens sempiternus Deus’ utilise des formules denses, mais qui ne sont guère expressives aujourd’hui: ‘qui Ecclesiam tuam nova semper prole fecundas’ ... ‘adoptionis tuae filiis aggregentur.’ Ce vocabulaire aurait besoin d’être rajeuni et adapté.”

⁹⁵ The testimony of virtually all of the experimenters points to this conclusion. As noted above, experimenters routinely omitted entire stages, as well as elements within stages; experimenters also frequently amended or improvised texts. Through their actions, the various experimenters implicitly argued that the rite should embody the adaptability that their actions modeled.

repeated in the rite, such as the formula for the *Ephphatha*.⁹⁶ Secondly, issues of translation were relevant, but the particular issue was not the quite the same the previously described concern about translating unfamiliar words and technical terminology into the vernacular.⁹⁷ Rather, when faced with difficult content, several reports, including the one from Montauban, noted the tendency of the celebrant to try and clarify the material by adapting the existing texts.⁹⁸ Seumois described a similar tendency on the part of the celebrants. Pastors found themselves explaining texts often, in order to foster the interior disposition demanded by the rite.⁹⁹ In this sense, the rite appeared to have failed in one of the goals set out for it in *SC*: to make “the nature and purpose” of the rites more clear.¹⁰⁰ In light of this apparent weakness, several experimenters expressed the desire for far less structured prayer texts, which might be better described as prayer guides. The report from Montauban suggested that the rite should incorporate tools for improvising formulae where appropriate – no specific exceptions were suggested, though presumably texts such as the baptismal formula might

⁹⁶ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 16: “On a appliqué la rubrique de la fin: emploi de la formule complète pour le premier élu. Cependant, pour les suivants, il peut paraître ridicule – si pas magique – de répéter sans cesse ‘ephpheta.’ Les célébrants ont dit: ‘Ephpheta, c.à.d. ouvrez-vous’ comme dans l’évangile. Il serait bon de corriger le rituel dans ce sens.”

⁹⁷ The general difficulty was noted by several experimenters, but only a few concrete examples were provided. The Canadian report contained dissatisfaction that one line in the prayer for the *redditio symboli*, “ut ad dignitatem (pristinam), quam (originali transgressione) perdiderant” translated to “avoir perdu sa dignité” (5). See also Corvaisier (1) and Le Dorze (1) below, footnote 104.

⁹⁸ H. Viatgé, “Response au questionnaire du 22-11-68, Catéchuménat Montauban” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 1: “On remarque que chaque prêtre a la tentation d’inventer sa formule.”

⁹⁹ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 13: “Les pasteurs ont veillé à introduire régulièrement des interventions du commentateur, de manière à guider les fidèles dans l’intelligence des rites. Sans ces interventions, ils seraient incapables de s’unir intérieurement à l’action liturgique. Il serait bon que les rubriques mentionnent le commentateur (pas seulement pour le rite de l’inscription du nom, mais pour chaque étape baptismale).”

¹⁰⁰ *SC* 62.

be considered a set formula.¹⁰¹ Along these same lines, one report from Japan indicated that the best solution to the problem would be that the rite should indicate the content of the prayers, but not the form of the prayers themselves, and an anonymous report extended this principle to include attitudes and gestures.¹⁰² In doing so, the theological intent from the Church would be preserved, and, through the work of local liturgists, the genius of the culture in question would be brought more fully into dialogue with the Church's teaching.¹⁰³ Practically, in the absence of officially approved vernacular translations, this would also minimize the possibility of inaccurate translations, such as one critiqued by several Japanese experimenters: the Latin phrase "Table of the Word" would have been rendered "kitchen" in Japanese.¹⁰⁴ Admittedly, this problem was largely due to the manner in which the experimental rite was distributed, and the reliance upon relatively hasty translations into a variety of different languages from the Latin original and the French translation. Nonetheless, the proposed solution of specifying content was slightly different from providing better translations, since less structured texts would provide more flexible tools to the local communities in their realization of the

¹⁰¹ Montauban, 2: "Formules trop difficiles – difficultés qui peuvent surtout aux expressions utilisées (N'ayant pas le rituel sous la main, il est difficile de donner des exemples. Je parle surtout à position de ce que nous avons fait...). Je ne propose pas des nouvelles formules, mais des schémas précis et simples avec des indications pour 'fabriquer' vous mêmes des formules bien adaptées, sauf pour quelques formules-charnières."

¹⁰² "Reflexions sur le Rituel" 3: "On pourrait proposer attitudes et gestes, actuellement utilisés et significatifs, laissant à chacun le soin de ce qui conviendra le mieux à la communauté locale."

¹⁰³ Christiaens, 1: "Je suis d'avis que pour un pays comme le Japon, ce serait mieux de préciser seulement le contenu des textes: c.a.d. les idées qu'il faudrait absolument retrouver dans ces prières, et pour le reste donner libre cours aux Liturgistes Japonais de compose des textes, qui conviennent à leur façon de penser et qui sont enracinés dans leur culture."

¹⁰⁴ Two Japanese reports expressed dissatisfaction with the phrase in the text for the Introduction into the Church (10), "in mensa verbi Dei." According to Corvaisier, the words "the table of the Word," when translated into Japanese, became "kitchen" (Corvaisier, 1; Le Dorze, 1).

rite: it is safe to say that the pastoral needs of a community in the center of Dublin are different from the needs of a community in rural Mississippi, despite the fact that both communities speak English. This was an issue that the *Coetus* would more thoroughly deal with in the subsequent versions of the rite.

7.2.3.4: Textual Options

The fourth general area of concern surrounding the texts of the rite expressed in the reports was a desire for more printed options. While some of the experimenters desired textual templates upon which to base their own orations, other experimenters recognized, along the lines of Justin Martyr,¹⁰⁵ that presiders were not equally creatively gifted.¹⁰⁶ Consequently, there were several requests for an increased selection of options, both textual and ritual, so that the rite might better correspond to the lives of the catechumens. Some of the Japanese experimenters, for example, called for different options for calling out the names of the candidates during the rite for making Catechumens. The Canadian report requested an alternate formula, for use in cases where the sense of sin and evil had replaced the sense of the Devil.¹⁰⁷ More broadly speaking, one of the Japanese reports called for increased number of scriptural selections

¹⁰⁵ Justin Martyr, in *St. Justin Martyr: The First and Second Apologies*, Ancient Christian Writers, 56, tr. and ed., Leslie William Barnard (New York: Paulist Press, 1997), 67: "... and the Ruler likewise offers up prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability..."

¹⁰⁶ While not related to the shape of Christian Initiation, the issues surrounding the eucharological improvisation are well documented in Allan Bouley, O.S.B., *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, 21 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981).

¹⁰⁷ "Canada – secteur français," 2: "Nous croyons que la renonciation devrait être formulée autrement: qu'on demande aux catéchumènes de renoncer au péché et au mal. Cela correspondrait davantage à leurs sentiments véritables. Encore ici, avant de répondre ce qui textuellement ce qui se faisait dans l'antiquité, il faudrait se demander quelle signification ces mot ont pour nos contemporains."

within the rite.¹⁰⁸ Several suggestions were also proffered in the various reports regarding non-textual adaptations that could be included within the rite. As noted above, the request came from Japan that more symbols of welcome might be specifically enumerated, to assist those pastors whose imagination was somewhat lacking. A request made from Montauban regarding the laying of hands was echoed in one of the anonymous reports. These reports suggested that hands be placed upon the shoulder, rather than the head, as this was a “universally significant” gesture.¹⁰⁹ The report from the United States indicated that allowing the option for anointing the right arm instead of the breast would be a positive addition: “Anointing on the breast does not necessarily convey the notion of strengthening in our culture. To anoint the right arm or the hands might be more effective.”¹¹⁰ Finally, one of the Japanese reports indicated that instead of celebrating the Eucharist after the dismissal of the catechumens, some other options might be included, which might involve all of the community more fully, such as an Agape.¹¹¹ By means of suggestions such as these, the experimenters indicated their

¹⁰⁸ Le Dorze, 1: “Mettre un choix plus grand de lectures; penser aux gens qui manquent d’imagination.”

¹⁰⁹ Montauban, 1: “Imposition des Mains: sur chacun en particulier – il serait peut-être mieux de poser le main sur l’épaule du catéchumène... c’est une geste connu et ‘significatif’ pour tout le monde.”

Anonymous, “Rituel du baptême des Adultes” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.v: 1: “Imposition de la Main: faut-il la maintenir sur la tête (sur l’épaule dans certains cas serait plus opportun).”

¹¹⁰ NCCB, 2.

¹¹¹ Corviasier positively reported that his community had a tea party after the dismissal of the catechumens: “Je n’ai pas eu de problème de renvoi, car il n’y a pas eu de liturgie eucharistique (Bien que ce fût un dimanche, cette liturgie a remplacé la messe du soir). La liturgie eucharistique était remplacée par un tea-party” (1). See also 6: “Dans les régions où le renvoi n’est pas possible, il est souhaitable que la cérémonie d’entrée au catéchuménat ne soit pas suivie de la liturgie eucharistique. Il serait préférable de la faire suivre par une réunion amicale (agapè).”

desire that the ritual not simply be more open-ended, but that it should be malleable, providing concrete suggestions for celebration:

Some liturgical rite, extremely versatile and easily adaptable to these many different situations, is needed. Or, better, several different rites suitable for the specific persons mentioned should be designed. Yet even with such alternatives, the rites should remain open and flexible since the conditions under which they will be employed vary greatly from place to place.¹¹²

The *Coetus* would address the issue of an increased number of textual options, including a greater number model texts from which the celebrant could use “these or similar words” in the subsequent versions of the rite.

7.2.4: Role of the Laity

Bugnini summarized a group of responses treating the role of the Catechists, indicating that the experimenters believed that the catechists should “have a larger role, even in the liturgical part proper, since they are the ones who in many cases bear most of the burden of catechumenal instruction.”¹¹³ While this sentiment was certainly expressed, the concern was actually much larger than just involving the Catechists. It extended also to the sponsors and the community of the faithful.

Discussion of the role of the catechists, at least insofar as the reports contained within the C.N.P.L. came, mostly, from the Rwandan reports. Seumoïs described, in one case, how at one center, during the rite for making Catechumens, the final laying on of hands was done by the catechists. This, he pointed out, could find its historical

¹¹² NCCB, 3.

¹¹³ *ROL*, 588.

antecedent in *Apostolic Tradition* 19, where the teacher lays hands on the catechumens.¹¹⁴ Similarly, Seumois reported that in two parishes, during the rite of Election, the elect came forward to either the priest or the catechist to receive the laying on of hands.¹¹⁵ The only other explicit mention of the catechist in the Rwandan report was during the inscription of names. Seumois suggested that the rubric allowing the already signed book to be presented to the celebrant by the deacon might instead be presented by the catechist.¹¹⁶

The sponsors were the second category of lay-faithful to be addressed in the reports, though this treatment too was rather brief. While the reports that detailed the initial catechesis made mention of special training sessions for the sponsors, the only addition sought in any report was from Lille. This report suggested that the sponsors might be given an increased role to play during the celebration of baptism itself, perhaps through serving as lectors or reading petitions.¹¹⁷ Of course, this solution would only be feasible in situations with very few neophytes, and thus, few sponsors. Otherwise,

¹¹⁴ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 12: “À Save, cette imposition des mains s’est faite par les catéchistes, comme le prévoit Hypolite de Rome pour les ‘doctores’ (qui étaient laïcs comme nos catéchistes). Ce fut très bien et a surtout le grand avantage de donner une part plus active aux catéchistes, un peu négligée dans le nouveau rite. On souhaite que la rubrique soit corrigée dans ce sens.”

Apostolic Tradition 19: “Quand le docteur, après la prière, a imposé la main sur les catéchumènes, il priera et les renverra. Que celui qui enseigne soit clerc ou laïc, il fera ainsi.”

Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips note that “all the versions agree that the ‘teacher’ who is to lay hands on and dismiss the catechumens after prayer may be either a cleric or a layperson” (102).

¹¹⁵ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 14: “Dans deux paroisses, on a pratiqué l’‘accedant ad manus’ soit auprès du prêtre, soit auprès des catéchistes. Rite très significatif, dont la possibilité devrait être mentionnée dans les rubriques. La formule du renvoi devrait être prononcée, non pas par le célébrant, mais par le catéchiste (à défaut de diacre).”

¹¹⁶ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 14: “Dans la rubrique, après la mention du diacre, mettre entre parenthèse: (ou le catéchiste).”

¹¹⁷ Lille, 4: “On cherche à rendre les parrains plus participant au baptême: certaines Lectures ou Prière des Fidèles ne pourraient-elles leur être confiées.”

however, the only comments on the liturgical participation of the sponsors came from Seumois, who reported that the increased role given them over the previous revisions of the rite were very beneficial. He indicated that the sponsors were thoroughly satisfied and energized by their participation in the rites.¹¹⁸

The third group for whom a greater degree of participation in the rite was desired was the assembly of the faithful themselves. While comments about the role of the faithful in the rite were given in only three of the reports, one might reasonably assess that the total absence of commentary about the role of the faithful in the rest of the reports indicates the lack of concern for the faithful in the rite. In the Rwandan report, Seumois lamented the absence of any description of the faithful during both the rite of Election and during the Scrutinies.¹¹⁹ More significant, perhaps, is the assessment from Strasbourg. The faithful, after being named, for example, in the entrance into the catechumenate, were given little to do, except to be present. The Strasbourg report wondered whether they might be given some sort of response, other than just during the intercessions. “It was vital to engage the faithful,” the report argued, “if the Church is, indeed, to be ‘Mother Church,’ and if the faithful are to be anything except passive and curious bystanders.”¹²⁰ Most importantly, if the rite is to speak of the action of the

¹¹⁸ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 5: “Il faut reconnaître l’influence immense que les rites ont exercé sur la conception du parrainage. Le rôle des parrains a été, en effet, très bien revalorisé dans les rites, et ceci d’une manière qui correspond à la culture locale (en rapport avec la parrainage dans les initiations païennes). Ils en ont manifesté leur contentement et leur satisfaction au point que l’on peut dire que cette innovation dans les rites répond à leur attente et à leurs aspirations. Ils ont été vraiment conscients de leur rôle et l’ont rempli avec ferveur.”

¹¹⁹ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations” 13: “On déplore aussi que les rubriques n’indiquent pas quelles attitudes doit adopter l’assemblée.” 14: “La Rubrique (49, 56, 62) devrait indiquer l’attitude de l’assemblée.”

¹²⁰ Strasbourg, 3-4: “Ne pourrait-on pas marquer plus nettement le rôle de toute la communauté, y compris sur le plan des rites (p.e. une intervention de tous dans le genre ‘Nous en sommes témoins’ de

Church, then it must be made clear that it is the Church that is acting, and not simply a priest – otherwise, the rite would risk becoming entirely too clerical.¹²¹ This sentiment was echoed in the Canadian report, which described the participation of the assembly as being “superficial.”¹²² In many cases, not only was the role of the assembly not specifically considered, but it was often truncated. The summary report described how the reports unanimously remarked that the assembly’s general intercessions were a structural duplication of the assembly’s litany of intercession over the catechumens. The *Coetus* noted, however, the inability of these experimenters to detect the difference between the prayers of the Church for the world and for the catechumens. This was especially frustrating to the *Coetus*, given the concerns that had been expressed regarding the desire for an increased role for the assembly.¹²³ This critique was significant,

l’entrée en catéchuménat; mais de toute façon par la prière des fidèles, si heureusement réintégrée dans les différentes célébration). Peut être ajouter une suggestions : ‘Que les pasteurs qui célèbrent un baptême dans leur communauté paroissiale n’omettent point de faire prendre conscience à cette communauté de sa responsabilité vis-à-vis des futures baptisés, de leur rôle d’intercesseurs pour porter leur frères fraternelle.’ Et pourquoi ne pas citer le beau passage de ‘Presbytorium Ordinis’ n. 6 ‘Par la charité, la prière, l’exemple, les efforts de pénitence, la communauté ecclésiale exerce encore une véritable maternité pour conduire les âmes au Christ.’ Cette recommandation paraît nécessaire, si l’on se rend compte que souvent les communautés paroissiales où se célèbrent des baptêmes, ou des scrutins pendant le carême, n’ont pas compris leur rôle d’ ‘Église maternelle,’ mais ne sont que des assistants passifs et curieux, d’un rite qui ne les engage pas. ”

¹²¹ Strasbourg, 3: “A propos de l’appel décisif on parle de ‘l’action de l’Église.’ Mais cette action semble encore décrite de façon trop cléricale ; et même si on dit que ‘la communauté des fidèles doit remplir son rôle,’ on restreint ce rôle très rapidement à la réponse des parrains.”

¹²² “Canada – secteur français,” 1: “Le rite de l’élection, les scrutins et l’initiation sacramentaire ont été... accomplis au cours de la messe dans l’église cathédrale. Les fidèles présents à cette messe ont donc été témoins de ces rites et ont été invités à prier avec et pour les catéchumènes. Les fidèles ont été aussi invités à rencontrer les catéchumènes après la messe, dans un local près de l’église. Cette participation est cependant restée superficielle, à cause de peu de vie communautaire et de l’anonymat d’une grande paroisse urbaine.”

¹²³ “Compte Rendu,” 1: “Au sujet de la simplification du rituel, les rapports font unanimement remarquer que la prière universelle des fidèles paraît faire double emploi avec la prière de la même assemblée pour les catéchumènes. Dans la pratique, la répétition de ces deux prières a paru tellement insupportable que leur distinction n’a pas été respectée. ”

however, since it had also been raised by the *Consilium*. Coupling what some experimenters saw as a paucity of opportunities for active participation, along with the previously mentioned concern surrounding the archaic nature of prayer texts, the concern for the ability of the faithful to participate in the rites was well-noted by the *Coetus*. They would treat all of these issues in the next revisions to the rite, which were begun during their meeting just outside of Paris, at the Benedictine mission house in Vanves, France, from December 30, 1968 to January 4, 1969.

7.3: Revisions, Vanves, December 30, 1968-January 4, 1969

The work relating to the rites of adult initiation that was to be undertaken at Vanves was three-fold. After first reviewing the results of the period of experimentation, the *Coetus* would then address questions of structure and text through the revision of the rite. Finally, drawing on the pastoral norms from the first appendix to the experimental rite the *Coetus* would set about composing a draft of the *Praenotanda* for the rite.¹²⁴ While the first two components of the agenda were, indeed, addressed and accomplished, the draft *Praenotanda* would not actually be written during this meeting. The proposals concerning structure and text would, however, be compiled into a unified document, The Appendix to S-147. This was then sent to the experimenters for their review. The document was divided into two sections: “General Structure and Principal Elements” and “New and Edited Texts.” The first section treated issues of structure and theory, while the second section contained the proposed revisions. Upon reviewing the new document,

¹²⁴ The schedule for this meeting is contained in two different letters from Cellier to the *Coetus*. The first, less specific, version is found in a letter dated November 6, 1968 in the unnamed folder, C.N.P.L. 2.A.i. The second letter was dated November 18, 1968, and is located in the same folder. Both letters indicate that the *Coetus* would also work on the rite of infant initiation, as well as on the rite of baptism for infants 7-9 years old.

the experimenters would lend their pastoral expertise to the *Coetus*, offering commentary on the new proposals, in order to assist in preparing for the next meeting of the *Coetus* at St-Genesius-Rode, March 3-8, 1969.¹²⁵

7.3.1: General Issues

In assessing the reports of experimentation, the *Coetus* had been, overall, concerned with the degree of adaptation undertaken in the various centers. The structure of the rite had clearly indicated three different levels of elements: those that were obligatory in the rite; those that could be inserted or dispensed with at the discretion of the local Councils of Bishops; and those that could be inserted or dispensed with according to local usage. Found amidst each of these three levels were elements that could be adapted by either the local Conferences of Bishops or the local community. The experimenters, however, exercised a greater degree of latitude than was permitted in the rite, ranging from the restructuring of entire stages – such as the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum* in some Japanese locales – to the suppression of individual elements – like the post-baptismal white vestment throughout much of Europe. Consequently, in an effort to safeguard the intended structure, the *Coetus* decided that the rite must be more explicit in naming places where additions, subtractions, and adaptations could be made. Further, following the advice of some of the reports, they indicated that the rite might include more concrete ritual suggestions, or models, that might inspire local practice. As a final

¹²⁵ The report from Vanves was composed in French and distributed to the experimenters in both French and in English, in order to facilitate their response. The experimenters were asked to submit their responses between February 15 and 25, 1969 in order that Cellier might compile a report, and present the findings to the *Coetus* at St-Genesius-Rode. The French version of the text sent to the experimenters is found in the University of Notre Dame archives, appended to S-147. It is labeled *Schematata* 147, *Adnexum* I, “Session du Coetus XXII (Vanves, France) (30-X-68/4-I-69) sur les expériences du Rituel du Baptême des adultes” ND DRi-9a(147).

directive, the *Coetus* indicated that more alternate textual options would be provided in the new rite, and the formula “in these or similar words” would be used more frequently.¹²⁶

Several of the reports, particularly those from Japan and Africa, had indicated that a rite for entry into the pre-catechumenate would be a valuable addition. The *Coetus* responded to this suggestion by proposing some broad guidelines that would allow local communities to craft their own celebration, based on a forthcoming model, which could best respond to local traditions and community life. Indeed, the *Coetus* noted, this “human factor” was primary: any such ritual of welcome should rely on local gestures of welcome and hospitality in order to introduce the seeker to the heart of the community.”¹²⁷ Nonetheless, as an act of the Church, the celebration of welcome should also be presided over by the leader of the community, and include Christological prayer, blessing. While these must, necessarily, be within the power of comprehension of the seekers, even at such an early stage of their faith, the *Coetus* was insistent that the structure of the service clearly indicate that the community itself was explicitly Christian, and not simply one that subscribed to Christian moral values.¹²⁸ This was a clear response to one of the Japanese reports, which argued that “the rite of entry into the catechumenate supposed that evangelization had already been achieved: the proclamation

¹²⁶ S-147 adnexum I, 3.

¹²⁷ S-147 adnexum I 3: “Ce rite comportera d’abord un élément d’accueil humain où l’on suivra les traditions locales de la vie sociale et de l’hospitalité. Il s’agit en effet d’introduire le sympathisant à l’intérieur d’une communauté qu’il veut connaître telle qu’elle est.”

¹²⁸ S-147 adnexum I 4: “On pourra toutefois aller au-delà ou rester en deçà de ce principe, en fonction du contexte local et des cas individuels. Bien que les valeurs pré-chrétiennes doivent être respectées, on ne se contentera pas de s’y appuyer; le sympathisant cherche une vraie communauté chrétienne: on pourra donc faire fond sur le Christ et déjà parler de Lui.”

of the living God and his Son, Jesus Christ.”¹²⁹ The *Coetus*’ response recognized that while seekers may well have been “anonymous Christians,” any rite of welcome must make it clear that the seekers would be naming Christ and leaving their anonymity behind. To present the Church without mentioning Christ respected neither Christianity nor the original culture.

One of the possible solutions offered by the experimenters seeking a rite of welcome to the pre-catechumenate proposed celebrating the rite for making Catechumens at the same time as the rite of election. This, they argued, respected the extensive formation given to the pre-catechumen, and recognized that those in the pre-catechumenate who opted to continue in their journey of faith, were, in a very basic sense, choosing baptism also.¹³⁰ The *Coetus* rejected the suggestion that these two rites could be celebrated at the same time, but, granting the point of these experimenters, allowed that the celebration of entry into the catechumenate could be celebrated, perhaps, in January or February, and thereby in closer proximity to the rite of election at the beginning of Lent. As a second possibility, the *Coetus* offered that one might include some principal elements of the rite of entry into the rite of election, without simply joining the two celebrations into one. It is not clear in this second option whether two

¹²⁹ Corvaisier, 6: “Le rite d’entrée au catéchuménat suppose déjà achevée l’évangélisation: annonce du Dieu vivant et de son Fils Jésus-Christ.”

Christiaens, 1: “Élargir les possibilités de la cérémonie de l’Entrée, c.a.d. ne pas exiger une foi explicite au Christ.”

¹³⁰ Corvaisier, 6 “La période allant de la cérémonie d’entrée au catéchuménat à l’ouverture du Carême est normalement une période longue. Pourtant, bien que ce ne soit pas l’idéal, il peut y avoir des cas où une personne, (ou un groupe de personnes) quoique n’ayant pas participé à la cérémonie d’entrée au catéchuménat, soient déjà suffisamment avancés dans la préparation doctrinale et spirituelle au baptême. Dans ce cas, la distance séparant la cérémonie d’entrée et le baptême sera plus courte. On évitera cependant que la cérémonie d’entrée fasse double emploi avec le rite du premier dimanche de Carême. Pour cela, il semble que sauf cas vraiment exceptionnels, ceux qui reçoivent le baptême à Pâques doivent avoir fait ‘l’entrée au catéchuménat’ au plus tard au cours de l’Avent.”

separate celebrations were still intended, or whether the rite of entry was to be eliminated when some of its elements were moved.

7.3.2: Structural and Textual Proposals

The first section of The Appendix to S-147 was concerned not only with general issues relating to the experimentation, but also treated theoretical issues concerning specific rites and elements. The latter material will be best treated in conjunction with the content of the second section, which contained new and revised texts for the rite. In examining the theoretical alongside the practical, the concerns of the *Coetus* will be more readily apparent.¹³¹

7.3.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

The *Coetus'* work on the first stage of the OCGD occurred mostly on January 2, with some further revisions being accomplished on January 4. Only in cases where changes were made on January 4 will the date be noted.

The introductory admonition (1) was altered in two ways. First, the *Coetus* added an indication that the candidates were to be greeted in a friendly manner, thereby giving real significance to the joy and gladness of heart with which the Church greeted them. The likely intention here was to render the rite in a less forced or superficial manner, as many of the experimenters had noted. Second, on January 4 the *Coetus* indicated that the text provided in the rite for the invitation to the candidates and their sponsors to come

¹³¹ The texts in S-344 emerge directly out of these discussions. While, for chronological reasons, it will be unnecessarily confusing to present this recension of the rite within the main body of the text, any additional discussion of the particulars will be contained in the footnotes. Towards this end, the partial rough draft of the rite that emerged following St-Genesius-Rode [hereafter SGR] will occasionally be helpful in tracking any significant changes. This text, entitled "Caput II: Ordo Catechumenatus per Gradus Dispositus" is found in C.N.P.L. 2.C.

forward should instead become a rubric indicating the manner in which the priest should issue the invitation. The inclusion of more texts designed to be determined within local communities was one way in which the *Coetus* attempted to allow the rite to connect with the local cultures.

In the introductory dialogue (2), the *Coetus* again responded to the calls of the experimenters for greater diversity of texts and for cultural adaptability. Instead of requiring the local Conferences of Bishops to choose one of the two formulae proposed in the rite, the *Coetus* added a third form of the dialogue, and indicated that these three were models for the creation of locally specific texts. The third form, based to some degree on Cellier's proposal from Le Saulchoir, had the celebrant asking the candidate "Why have you come here?," to which the candidate was to respond, "In order to accept baptism." The celebrant continued, "Why do you seek baptism from the Church of God?," to which the candidate could respond "In order to follow Christ and to receive life from Him."¹³² Recognizing that a multiplicity of answers to the questions was possible in this form, as well as the other two, the *Coetus* added the instruction that other answers were possible. The strength, particularly of the third model, was that the second question did not, necessarily, depend on a precise answer to the first question, unlike the example from the OBA. In this older option, the first question of the celebrant, "What do you seek from the Church of God?," required the candidate to make the theological answer of "Faith" in order to lead to the next question, "What does faith offer you?" The problem was, however, that the first question was so general that the very practical answers of

¹³² S-147 adnexum I 9: "Cel: Ad quid huc venisti? Cand: Ut baptismum accipiam. Cel: Cyur petis ab Ecclesia Dei baptismum? Cand: Ut sequar Christum et ab eo vitam recipiam."

“Membership,” or “Baptism” would also be reasonable (and, perhaps, more likely) responses; the second question thus appeared to be random. Alternatively, in the third option, the first question was formulated to generate a response that was more practical than theological. The candidate clearly understood that baptism lay at the end of the process of initiation, and could, thus, be expected to provide that answer. And yet, even in cases where the candidate might not respond “properly,” the second question would not seem out of place. The response to the second question in the third option was, certainly, more open-ended. At the end of the dialogue, however, this is more fitting, since the celebrant was not required to respond specifically to the candidate’s own response. Instead, the celebrant offered the summary catechesis, which would generally draw on some of the answers that had just been given.

The *Coetus* made only one change to the summary catechesis (3), altering the formulation of the dual commands to “love your God with all your heart, and your neighbors as yourself.” Instead of introducing this idea with the statement that “The whole law depends on these two commands,” as had been contained in OBA 5, the revision integrated the commands more cleanly into the catechesis, also providing a Christological focus for the commands: “Therefore, love the Lord and your neighbor, just as Christ has commanded us.”¹³³

The formula for the exorcism by exsufflation was also simplified by the *Coetus*. The prior deprecatory formula, which had quoted 2 Thessalonians 2:8, was seen as being too confusing: “The Lord expels you, devil, by the breath of his mouth; depart, since His

¹³³ S-147 adnexum I 9: “Vers la fin de l’allocution, remplacer: ‘Tota enim... ipsum’ par: ‘Et ideo Dominum et proximum vestrum diligatis sicut Christus nobis mandavit’.”

reign is coming.” Instead they provided a shorter formula, in which the scriptural quotation was amended: “By the breath of your mouth, Lord, expel the evil spirits: Command them to depart, for your reign is coming.” The new formula maintained the understanding that it was Christ, and not the celebrant, who was performing the exorcism. However, the revision minimized the degree to which the celebrant was acting on Christ’s already established authority, and instead, allowed for the possible understanding that the celebrant was able to direct Christ’s actions. In so doing, the formula was a hybrid of the imperative and deprecatory patterns: the minister did not expel the demon on his own, but the minister did not actually petition Christ’s action. And so, while the formula avoided the problem of promoting an understanding that the priest, himself, could control evil spirits, apparently, the idea that the priest could control Christ was not so difficult to accept.

In treating the renunciation of false cults (5), the *Coetus* made the technical alteration that the renunciation by the candidate and subsequent affirmation of support by the sponsors were to take place for each separate false belief that was being rejected. The renunciation had already been applied separately, but The Appendix to S-147 indicated that the affirmation was to occur separately also. On January 4 a further change was made to the element. A new text was added to the affirmation by the sponsors and the community, which highlighted the role of the community in the candidate’s journey of faith.¹³⁴ This was a clear attempt to expand the role of the community, as had been requested in numerous reports of experimentation.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ S-147 adnexum I 10: “Celebrans concludit hunc dialogum dicens: Ainsi notre communauté, dans la joie de l’accueil et d’un nouvel effort de vie chrétienne authentique, sera apte à soutenir ces catéchumènes dans leur démarche.”

Responding to the criticisms of negativity in the texts, the prayer for the laying on of hands (6) was amended slightly. Instead of petitioning that God “remove all blindness of heart” from the candidates, and “break all of Satan’s snares, which had previously bound them,” the revised text asked that God “illumine their hearts and liberate them from all of Satan’s snares that would impede their progress.”¹³⁶ Furthermore, a newly-composed second possible formula for the element was added. This text was oriented towards praise of God for having called the candidates to conversion and to the Church, and it sought God’s protection over them as they progressed towards Baptism.¹³⁷ These changes to the imposition of hands would help eliminate some of the negativity from the prayers of the rite.

A proposed change to the signation of the forehead (7) was made in the name of rendering the texts more understandable. Some of the experimenters had complained

SGR 5bis: “Tunc celebrans concluditur dicens his vel similibus verbis: Par cette remise au Christ et cette charité, vous voilà déjà unis à l’Église, vous voilà déjà de la famille (maison) du Christ. Et toute la communauté des fidèles devra vous entourer de son amour et de sa sollicitude. Vos igitur sponsores qui praesentatis hos candidatos...”

¹³⁵ The affirmation would be moved ahead of the exorcism and renunciation of false cults during the meeting at St-Genesius-Rode. Thus, instead of the ritual order being summary catechesis, exorcism by exsufflation, renunciation of false cults, affirmation by sponsors and community, imposition of hands, the order in SGR would be summary catechesis, affirmation by sponsors and community, exorcism by exsufflation, renunciation of false cults, and imposition of hands. While no discussion of this change is contained in the notes of the meetings at the C.N.P.L., it is possible that the rationale is ecclesiological. The embrace of the Church can be understood to sanction the act of the celebrant.

¹³⁶ S-147 adnexum I 10: “Modifier ainsi la sixième ligne: (quas) ad rudimenta... dignatus es: Illumina corda eorum, ut iam liberentur ab omnibus laqueos Satanae, quibus impediuntur gressus eorum.”

¹³⁷ S-147 adnexum I 10: “Formula altera (pro impositione manus): Celebrans dicit manibus iunctis: Oremus. Gratias tibi agimus, clementissime Pater, pro his famulis tuis qui iam gratia tua multipliciter praeveniente, quaesierunt te, et quos hodie nobis adunare voluisti ut iam sint de familia tua. Tunc extendit manus et prosequitur: Manus tua potentissima protegat iter eorum, ut in dies magis adhaerentes Christo et abrenuntiantes omnibus adversariis eius, inspirante Spiritu tuo per regenerationis lavacrum plenam Ecclesiae tuae communionem consequi valeant. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Omnes: Amen.”

about the accompanying text here, originally from the OBA, arguing that it was too complex for candidates: “N., receive the sign of the cross on your forehead and in your heart; observe the heavenly commandments, and live so that you might be permitted to be known as God’s temple.” The proposed alteration safeguarded much of the content, but was far simpler: “N., receive the sign of the cross on your forehead and in your heart; learn to know Christ and serve Him.” Following the revised text and the signation the *Coetus* responded to the critique that the rite afforded too few opportunities for the catechists and sponsors to be involved by allowing that the catechists or sponsors could sign the catechumens after the initial signation by the priest. This allowance was provisional, however, and could be used only if the signation of the various senses was not celebrated. While no rationale was provided here, presumably the intent was to avoid repeating elements unduly.

The signation of the senses (8) underwent some degree of change. The language of the individual signation statements was changed to correspond more readily to the text accompanying the signation of the forehead. Rather than stating “I sign you...,” wherein the verb focused on the action of the celebrant, the verb in the new texts would be directed towards the action of the catechumen: “Receive the sign of the cross.” The older form was retained as a secondary text, largely due to its presence in OBA. Furthermore, catechists were added to the list of those entitled to sign the senses while the celebrant made the invocation.¹³⁸ On January 4, the *Coetus* inserted an optional acclamation to Christ after the signations, referring, implicitly, back to the cross with which the

¹³⁸ S-147 adnexum I 11: “Signationes fieri possunt a pluribus sacerdotibus vel diaconis vel a catechistis vel a sponsoribus, dum celebrans formulas pronuntiat sequenti modo: in auribus: Accipite signum Christi in auribus, et audiatis...”

catechumens had been signed: “Christ conquers!” or “Glory to you, Lord!”¹³⁹ The element was to be concluded with a prayer, and here the *Coetus* responded to the desire for an expanded number of texts, making the allowance for another textual option. The new prayer, which asked God to grant strength to the catechumens to live the way of the cross was added on January 4.¹⁴⁰

The directions regarding the giving of a Christian name were not modified at Vanves. At this point in the rite the *Coetus* opted to insert the direction that any of the auxiliary rites might be celebrated before the introduction into the Church. The content of this rubric remained largely constant. Responding to the desire for more concrete options in the rite,¹⁴¹ the *Coetus* added the possibility of giving a cross, or some other type of symbolic act to the list. Perhaps unwittingly, for it was added back in the next draft of the Rite, approval of the Conferences of Bishops was omitted from the new rubric.¹⁴²

Textual options for the Introduction into the Church (11) were expanded, particularly through the composition of a new text that tried to explicate the previously deleted reference to the “house of the Church” (*domum ecclesiae*). Thus, the exhortation

¹³⁹ S-147 adnexum I 11: “Signationes concluduntur, pro opportunitate, cum acclamatione ad Christum, v.g. Christus vincit, vel Gloria tibi, Domine.”

¹⁴⁰ S-147 adnexum I 11: “Omnipotens Deus, per crucem et resurrectionem Filii tui populum tuum ex omnibus gentibus in familiam coadunasti. Praesta quaesumus, ut hi familui tui, quos manus nostrae cruce signaverunt, sequentes vestigia Christi tui vivendo exprimant et mundo demonstrent crucis salvificam virtutem.”

¹⁴¹ Le Dorze, 1: “Mettre un choix plus grand; penser aux gens qui manquent d’imagination. Remise possible d’un évangile, un crucifix, une image pieuse, ou une sorte d’attestation d’entrée dans l’Église comme catéchumène.”

¹⁴² S-147 adnexum I 12: “Si quae consuetudines aptae videantur, quibus exprimatur receptio in communitatem, v.g. porrectio salis vel alius actus symbolicus aut etiam traditio crucis vel numismatis sacri, ante vel post ingressum in ecclesiam inseri possunt.”

that the Church was “the house of God: come with us to hear His word” was proposed as an option. The choices for the element were greatly expanded, however, both with the added instruction that the given prayer texts were models, and that celebrants could use “these or similar words,”¹⁴³ and the directive that other songs beside Psalm 33(34) could be used to accompany the procession.

The *Coetus* turned then to the Celebration of the Word, inverting and expanding the order of the components of the element. In S-147 the element began with the procession of Scripture, moved to the celebrant’s exposition on the dignity of proclaiming the Word in the assembly, and concluded with the reading of Scripture. Instead, the new order began with the celebrant’s exposition and then moved to the procession, which led directly to the proclamation of scripture itself. The homily was to follow. The list of readings was, likewise, changed in the revision: the Old Testament reading, Genesis 12:1-8, was retained as a possibility; a Responsorial Psalm, such as Psalm 32(33), was added; and the proposed Gospel reading, John 1:35-39 was expanded to become John 1:35-42.¹⁴⁴ The optional giving of the Gospels (13) was further developed, to allow the giving of a cross in addition to the giving of the book, had it not already taken place during the Auxiliary Rites. This was the last element of the first stage that was treated on January 2.

¹⁴³ S-147 adnexum I 12: “His peractis, celebrans dicit his vel similibus verbis... N., N., iam estis de domo Dei; venite nobiscum audire verbum eius.”

¹⁴⁴ S-147 adnexum I 12: “Cum catechumeni ad suas sedes pervenerint, celebrans aut ad sedem aut im ambone aut ad cancellos, eos breviter alloquitur, exponens dignitatem verbi Dei quod in Ecclesia annuntiatur et auditur. Tunc liber Sacrarum Scripturarum cum dignitate in processione deferatur, inthronizetur et pro opportunitate incensetur. Sequitur sacra verbi Dei celebratio. Seligantur una vel plures lectiones novis catechumenis aptiores, v.g. Gen. 12:1-8 (vocatio Abrahae) et Io. 1:35-42 (vocatio Apostolorum), cum psalmo 32[33] vel alio cantu responsoriali.”

On January 4, the *Coetus* examined the Litany of Intercession over the Catechumens (14). The introductory prayer was named as needing to be reworked, according to the concerns of the experimenters, so that it might give some emphasis to the positive steps already taken by the catechumens. The proposed shape along which the prayer might be reformed asked that the community “pray for our brothers, these catechumens, who after a long wait have taken their place among us, which God has reserved for them.”¹⁴⁵ Mention of seeking God’s mercy on behalf of the catechumens was stricken from the prayer. Furthermore, the intentions themselves were reworked in terms of style and content. In the first petition, the *Coetus* restored the verb “*revelare*” from the source text of the petition, *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII, 6, and added a phrase to suggest the catechumen’s progressive growth in faith. The content of the second, third, and fourth intercessions was retained, but the Latin was changed slightly in all three. The fifth intercession from S-147 was replaced with a new composition, asking that the charity of the gathered community would serve as an aid to the catechumen’s development.¹⁴⁶

Responding to the request for more prayer options, the *Coetus* expanded the number of possible prayers of dismissal over the catechumens (15), by indicating that any of the dismissal prayers from the second stage of the rite might also be used. Further, they amended the conclusion of the given dismissal to include mention of “living a

¹⁴⁵ S-147 adnexum I 12: “Refaire la monition, pour qu’elle exprime la valeur de la démarche faite; quelque chose comme: Oremus pro fratribus nostris catechumenis, qui après une longue attente ont pris parmi nous la place que Dieu leur réservait...”

¹⁴⁶ S-147 adnexum I 13: “Ut caritas nostra illis sit une aide véritable dans leur cheminement.”

fruitful life,” as a prelude to receiving the promise of eternal life.¹⁴⁷ Following the prayer the *Coetus* added mention of an address by the celebrant, who could “briefly tell the catechumens of the community’s joy that they had been called towards Baptism, and to invite them to live the Word that they had received.”¹⁴⁸ Having been dismissed, the *Coetus* indicated that the catechumens should meet to share reflections on their experience, while the faithful celebrated the Eucharist, omitting, if desired, the Creed and the General Intercessions.¹⁴⁹ The meeting of the catechumens was described in the report from Canada, where “each scrutiny was followed by a meeting where the catechumens could talk amongst themselves and with the catechumenal leader. Generally, these discussions pertained to the Gospel and the homily of the mass that day.”¹⁵⁰ Rendering the General Intercessions (17) optional, however, was a concession. During the meeting with the *Consilium*, the *Coetus* had argued that the Litany over the Catechumens and the General Intercessions, despite their similar form, were distinct elements serving two different purposes, and should both, therefore, be present in the rite. This distinction, lost on the *Consilium*, was also lost on the experimenters as a whole. The *Coetus* therefore

¹⁴⁷ S-147 adnexusum I 13: “lavacrum, ut in communione cum fidelibus tuis vitam degentem fructuosam, promissionum tuarum aeterna bona consequantur.”

¹⁴⁸ S-147 adnexusum I 13: “Postea catechumeni dimittuntur. Le célébrant eos alloquitur; il peut leur dire breviter la joie de la communauté qui les a accueillis et les inviter à vivre de la Parole reçue.” To this was added in SGR 15bis: “Et il peut achever en disant: Cel: Catechumeni, ite in pace et Dominus maneat vobiscum. Cat: Deo gratias.”

¹⁴⁹ S-147 adnexusum I 13: “Catechumenis dimissis, de more fideles baptizati eucharistiam celebrant. Pendant ce temps, les catéchumènes, avec le soutien de quelques personnes compétentes, partagent fraternellement leur joie et leur expérience... Post dimissionem catechumenorum, si eucharistia sequitur, omitti possunt Credo et oratio communis pro universalis Ecclesiae necessitatibus.”

¹⁵⁰ “Canada – secteur français,” 1: Pendant le carême, chaque scrutin était suivi d’une réunion où les catéchumènes pouvaient dialoguer entre eux et avec le responsable du catéchuménat. Ces dialogues portaient en général de l’évangile et de l’homélie de la messe de ce jour.”

allowed the latter litany to be omitted for the purpose of expediency.¹⁵¹ At this point in the deliberations, however, no attempt was made to preserve the content of the General Intercessions.

7.3.2.2: The Second Stage: Election

No changes to the prayers for the time of the Catechumenate were proposed at Vanves, and so, the *Coetus* proceeded to a presentation of the second stage, Election. This stage, and an alternate proposal to the Dialogue with the Sponsors by Seumois, appears to have been discussed on January 2.¹⁵² The primary difficulty observed in the reports of experimentation by the *Coetus* was that of comprehension. Few of the experimenters seemed to understand what the rite was trying to accomplish, which ultimately meant that the rite appeared artificial.¹⁵³ The *Coetus* recognized the difficulty

¹⁵¹ “Compte Rendu,” 3: “Au sujet de la simplification du rituel, les rapports font unanimement remarquer que la prière universelle des fidèles paraît faire double emploi avec la prière de la même assemblée pour les catéchumènes. Dans la pratique, la répétition de ces deux prières a paru tellement insupportable que leur distinction n’a pas été respectée. Pour autant, surtout dans les cas où l’on renvoie effectivement les catéchumènes avant l’eucharistie, on ne saurait assimiler purement et simplement la prière pour les catéchumènes avec la prière universelle des fidèles.”

¹⁵² Both of these proposals would be included in S-344, along with the instruction that the *Coetus* was considering both, but would choose one for inclusion. Seumois’ proposal was written with missionary territories more fully in mind, while the version originally contained in S-147 had been written by Cellier for use in the Diocese of Lyons.

¹⁵³ The *Coetus* pointed out that the suggestion that the rite of election be moved to the beginning of the catechumenate as a whole represented a misconception as to the purpose of the rite. Seumois’ report for Rwanda indicated that the local experimenters did not understand the importance of the name “election,” and that the faithful were, generally, lost in the rite: “Les pasteurs ont veillé à introduire régulièrement des interventions du commentateur, de manière à guider les fidèles dans l’intelligence des rites. Sans ces interventions, ils seraient incapables de s’unir intérieurement à l’action liturgique” (13). Christiaens’ Japanese report even proposed dividing the rite into two portions, with election constituting the actual entry into the catechumenate.

The harshest critiques of the rite as a whole came from Japan, where Christiaens, Le Dorze, and the anonymous report all voiced their displeasure with the artificiality of the rite. Le Dorze, 1-2: “Je dis non à tous les noms barbares de cette cérémonie: de grâce, simplifiez le langage... le dialogue est entièrement à revoir; il fait dialogue de théâtre d’enfants.” This sentiment was admitted by the *Coetus* in S-147 adnexum I 14: “Le rite a paru artificiel: dramatisation extérieure d’un jeu déjà fait, aboutissant à des questions, dont les réponses sont déjà connues et données.”

here, and proposed the modification of the introductory rubric (41), so as to better guide pastors in the realization of the rite. This text would be composed by Cellier on January 6, and would be inserted into the next draft of the rite, albeit in modified form, in ten separate paragraphs.¹⁵⁴ In it the theology of the rite was confirmed: the church confirmed that these catechumens had been elected by God, and the elect confirmed their desire to be initiated by giving their names to the Church.¹⁵⁵ The *Coetus* did, however, indicate in The Appendix to S-147 that the rite of Election “was to be preceded by a meeting for those responsible for the catechumenate (the director of the catechumenate, missionaries, priests, catechists, sponsors, etc.), during which they would discuss the fitness of the catechumens to stand as elect before God.”¹⁵⁶ Such a discussion would, hopefully, help clarify the purpose of the rite itself, so that those responsible for the catechumens might better convey its importance to their charges.

The *Coetus* proposed only two alterations to the Presentation of the Catechumens (42). The sample text for the initial presentation was to be retained, as was the response

¹⁵⁴ S-344: 70-79.

¹⁵⁵ “Secundus Gradus: Electio” in C.N.P.L. 2.B.1, 1: “Ipse ritus electionis rationem habet signi: per actionem communitatis localis [...] hierarchiae exstructae, de idoneitate candidatorum iudicium ferentis, manifestatur mysterium divinae electionis; cum vere nomen suum dent, catechumeni firmam et definitivam suam voluntatem significant ut initientur.”

Divine election was clarified in several places during the revision of this stage, notably during the celebrant’s dialogue with the sponsors and at the inscription of names. S-147 adnexum I 15: “Tout à la fin, en toute hypothèse pastorale, on propose que le célébrant par une intervention conclusive, fasse apparaître le sens religieux de la décision d’Église. A travers son jugement c’est Dieu lui-même, qui proclame les catéchumènes dignes de s’approcher de lui et, par conséquent, de lui apporter une nouvelle réponse.” S-147 adnexum I 16: “Un complément est nécessaire, en toute hypothèse, à la fin du rite... En effet, avant de donner rendez-vous aux catéchumènes pour les prochains mystères de Pâques, il faut leur découvrir que, à travers cette inscription visible accomplie devant la communauté, c’est le Christ lui-même qui, continuant sur eux son appel, les inscrit et amène à Lui.”

¹⁵⁶ S-147 adnexum I 14: “On dira que ce rite aura été précédé d’une session des responsables du catéchuménat (Directeur du catéchuménat, missionnaire, prêtres, catéchistes, parrains, etc.), pendant laquelle on aura discuté devant Dieu de l’idoneité des catéchumènes.”

of the celebrant. Greater flexibility was written in to the rubric describing the possible manner of presentation. Smaller groups of catechumens could celebrate the rite as presented in the text, whereby each individual name was called. In larger groups, however, the *Coetus* proposed that the calling of names might have already taken place, in smaller group settings; when the actual rite of election was celebrated, then, a communal presentation of the candidates could suffice.¹⁵⁷ The final speech of presentation, “*Post maturam...*,” was to be eliminated.

The *Coetus* then turned their attention to the Dialogue with the sponsors (43), focusing particularly on possibilities for diversity. In particular, Seumoïs put forward two options, which were dependant upon the role that the celebrant had played in the formation of the catechumens, most notably in the newly called for meeting before election. The option in cases where the celebrant had not taken part in the meeting preserved the intended sense of the rite, and was, thus, placed first in the text. Here, the bishop or priest, using essentially the same questions from the experimental rite, was to inquire about the readiness of the catechumens for election. Should the celebrant have taken part in that previous meeting, then he was already aware of the readiness of those about to become elect; questioning the sponsors would thus be superfluous. Instead, the celebrant could simply relate the decisions about the catechumen’s fitness for election to

¹⁵⁷ S-147 adnexum I 15: “Dans les groupes nombreux, en pays de mission, l’appel nominal (singulos nominatum vocat) pourra être réalisé préalablement dans les églises ou chapelles succursales. Par contre, dans la célébration commune faite au centre, on pourra se contenter d’une présentation commune, faite par groupe sur présentation de chacun d’eux par les catéchistes.”

those gathered.¹⁵⁸ While a text would, eventually, be composed for this purpose,¹⁵⁹ the manner in which this was to be done was not mentioned in the Appendix to S-147.

In treating the Dialogue with the Candidates (44), the *Coetus* reaffirmed their commitment to the substance of the text given in the experimental rite, but offered the option that the celebrant might use other words to express the intended content. The celebrant's speech before asking the candidates if they did, indeed, seek baptism would be somewhat expanded in the next draft of the rite; at the time of composing The Appendix to S-147, however, this work had yet to be done.¹⁶⁰ The *Coetus* considered this dialogue to be intrinsic to the Inscription of Names (45), and thus, merged the two together into a single paragraph number to highlight the intimate connection. As in the case of the dialogue with the sponsors, the *Coetus* wished to allow for a great deal of flexibility. Consequently, they noted that the celebrant could write the names of the candidates; in other cases, the catechumens might write their names (particularly when the writing took place outside of the rite of election), and that written document could be given to the celebrant.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ S-147 adnexus I 15: "Si au contraire, comme c'est souvent le cas en pays de mission, le prêtre ou missionnaire chargé du catéchuménat a participé à la réunion préalable, dans laquelle ils ont fait l'enquête, il n'y a plus de raison de mentionner un interrogatoire qui lui paraîtra aussi factice qu'aux catéchistes et peut-être aussi aux parrains. Dès lors, au lieu de dire, 'Ecclesia sancta... certior fieri nunc exoptat'... il fera savoir à tous la décision prise : il la communiquera donc à la communauté, aux catéchumènes eux-mêmes."

¹⁵⁹ S-344, DRi-35, "Rituale Romanum I: De Initiatione Christiana," June 21, 1969. ND DRi-35 (344), 81§1b.

¹⁶⁰ S-344 82.

¹⁶¹ S-147 adnexus I 16: "Dans certains cas, comme le spécifie le Rituel, c'est le célébrant qui écrit lui-même le nom du catéchumène. Dans d'autres cas, en pays de mission, ce sera le catéchumène lui-même qui viendra s'inscrire. Ce qui pourra encore se faire de façon bien différentes: inscription individuelle à l'église succursale, présentation par groupe à l'église paroissiale, présentation d'une carte au célébrant, etc..."

The final element addressed in the second stage was the Litany of Intercession over the Elect (46). While no specific textual alterations were made at Vanves, the *Coetus* did clearly state their intentions regarding these prayers. The introductory prayer, which had simply instructed the assembly to “Pray for the elect and ask God’s mercy upon them,”¹⁶² was to be expanded “to situate the catechumens within the community.”¹⁶³ Therefore, the focus of the petitions would not be the elect themselves, but rather the journey of the elect and the community together towards Easter. Admittedly, this would allow some mention of specific members of the community – the elect, catechists, sponsors, and catechumens – but the overall emphasis on the entire community would be central. It would only be at St-Genesius-Rode that these intercessions would take clear shape.¹⁶⁴

7.3.2.3: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones

The experimenters voiced a great degree of criticism concerning the Scrutinies, most specifically because they were “not adapted to the modern mentality.”¹⁶⁵ In a

¹⁶² S-147, 46: “Oremus pro his electis et imploremus super eos (eas) Dei et Domini nostri misericordiam.”

¹⁶³ S-147 adnexum I 16: “Les mots d’introduction de cette prière situeront les catéchumènes dans la communauté, en route vers Pâques, afin qu’elle les prenne en charge: on mentionnera donc parrains, familles, catéchistes, prêtres, communauté entière pour recommander à tous les nouveaux élus.”

¹⁶⁴ The petitions of S-147 and S-344 are completely distinct. The former petitions had been drawn from Celestine and Chrysostom; the latter appear to have no precedent in classic liturgical texts. SGR 45 indicates that they were prepared by Molin, and are dated March 7, 1969.

¹⁶⁵ *ROL* 588. The comment from the USCCB report indicates a sentiment shared by numerous experimenters: “The exorcisms and scrutinies need to be simplified, revised, and even dropped” (2). The report from Canada is far more extensive in its criticism: “Dans les scrutins, il y aurait sûrement une autre façon d’amener les catéchumènes à prendre conscience de leur situation de pécheurs: en faisant appel à leur expérience personnelle, et surtout par la Parole de Dieu, car c’est elle qui révèle à l’homme sa situation de pécheur. Au lieu de s’adresser au démon, que l’exorcisme soit une prière adressée à Dieu pour qu’il donne aux catéchumènes de se convertir totalement et d’être protégés des sollicitations du mal. Écrits dans cette ligne de pensée, les scrutins correspondraient tout autant à la définition donnée dans l’introduction au

further attempt, therefore, to describe the Scrutinies in a way that would be understandable, the *Coetus* proposed including a pastoral rubric before each of the scrutinies, to clarify the sense of the rite.¹⁶⁶ Responding, in particular, to concerns about terminology, the *Coetus* noted that they would seek an alternate term to replace “Scrutiny,” in order to better draw out the proper sense of the ritual.¹⁶⁷ By and large, however, there was too much work involved in amending these texts to work on the element while at Vanves, and so, instead, a draft of the revised scrutinies, crafted by Ligier, would be published as S-337 on February 7, 1969. In the meantime, however, the *Coetus* presented a revised text for the Silent Prayer (49, 56, 62) that began the scrutiny, as well as articulating some principles for crafting the Litany over the Elect (50, 57, 63) the exorcisms (51, 58, 64), and the Prayer over the Elect (53, 59, 66).

The text for the Silent Prayer, which included both rubrics and the spoken introduction to pray, was the same for each of the three scrutinies. The revised description of the element provided a great deal of detail, thereby helping to orient the element more fittingly. The description from the experimental rite simply indicated that the elect and the sponsors were to stand in front of the assembly, and the celebrant was to instruct the elect to kneel and pray. To this, the *Coetus* added a rubric that the celebrant was to invite the assembly to pray, once the elect, sponsors, and catechists were standing

rituel: ‘actio qua Deus, mediante Ecclesiae liturgia, purificanda.’ D’ailleurs les textes qui ont retenu davantage l’attention des catéchumènes ne sont pas les exorcismes, mais les évangiles et les homélies: cela est significatif. Par ailleurs, les lectures de l’Ancien Testament ont paru les dépasser” (4).

¹⁶⁶ S-147 adnexum I 22: “On propose qu’avant chaque scrutin une rubrique pastorale en précise le sens.”

¹⁶⁷ S-147 adnexum I 22: “Revenant au nom donné aux ‘scrutins,’ on estime que ceux-ci doivent – quoi qu’il soit de leur nom – garder leur spécificité. On souhaite que l’on puisse arriver à trouver un nom satisfaisant; mais on estime qu’il ne doit pas être précisé prématurément.”

before them. The prayer of the assembly concerned the elect: that they might be given “the liberty belonging to the children of God, through a sense of sin and repentance.”¹⁶⁸

At this point the celebrant would instruct the elect to assume a gesture of the spirit of repentance - kneeling, bowing their heads, or prostrating themselves – and the elect would pray in silence, as in the earlier version of the rite.

Following the period of silent prayer the Litany of Intercession over the Elect was to be prayed. The *Coetus* only pointed towards the eventual content of these texts, and they indicated that each of the Litanies, rather than being drawn from the ancient liturgical sources, would adhere to a common pattern attempting to relate the intercessions more to the lived experience of the elect. Through clear allusion to the appointed Gospel readings for the scrutinies, the intercessions would affirm that the journey of the elect towards Christ had been ongoing, and had been discernable thus far through their past works. They would take account of the family life of the elect, and they would pray for a fuller understanding of the sense of sin, particularly as a barrier to coming to Christ, and that they might be welcomed into the Church, which loved and understood them.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ S-147 adnexusum I 19: “In fine homiliae, electi se disponunt coram celebrante cum patrinis (et matrinis) suis. Celebrans, a catechistis pro opportunitate circumdatus, et communitatem invitat ut pro catechumenis in silentio exorent et catechumenos ipsos ut a Christo Domino plenam filiorum Dei libertatem cum sensu peccati et paenitentiae impetrent.”

¹⁶⁹ S-147 adnexusum I 20: “Pour cette litanie on a réuni les directives et intentions suivantes: les allusions aux thèmes des 3 évangiles (Samaritaine, Aveugle-né, Lazare) resteront discrètes; rappeler que depuis longtemps déjà les catéchumènes sont en route à la recherche du Christ; rappeler leurs bonnes oeuvres passées, qui trouveront leur accomplissement; tenir compte de leur condition: foyers, familles, enfants; demander qu’ils acquièrent le sens du péché, de leur péché qui est pour eux un obstacle dans la recherche du Christ; qu’ils soient accueillis avec compréhension et amour par la communauté et intégrés par elle.”

The *Coetus* then turned to providing both general and specific indications about the content of the prayers of exorcism. Just as with the prayers of intercession, the exorcism texts would no longer be taken directly from the historical sources, including OBA, but would, rather, take forms that were more accessible to the contemporary mindset.¹⁷⁰ Elements such as the formalized invocation of God and direct address of the demon were both explicitly eliminated because they hindered accessibility.¹⁷¹ So too, as noted extensively in the reports of experimentation, the language used in the exorcisms was a clear impediment to rendering the element in a comprehensible fashion.¹⁷² Consequently, in order to promote accessibility, the exorcisms were to be rewritten according to the following guidelines. The first prayer of the exorcism would develop the particular theme that had been articulated in the Gospel reading for each scrutiny (living water, the light of Christ, and resurrection to new life, respectively), and would be

¹⁷⁰ Fischer, himself, described the approach to the exorcisms in “Baptismal Exorcism in the Catholic Baptismal Rites after Vatican II,” *Studia Liturgica* 10/1 (1974), 48-55: “What has taken place is purely and simply an adaptation necessitated by the theological understanding of the situations and relationships referred to in these texts, for that understanding has grown organically since the texts themselves first saw the light. A developed theology of original sin has made possible a sharper distinction than was possible in the early centuries between demonic possession and the status of belonging to the realm of Satan’s dominion – a status which is to be predicated of infants without any suggestion of personal guilt. From this vantage-point, it would seem mandatory to surrender the formula of a direct scolding of the Devil, for all its unique and undeniable majesty. Such an utterance cannot but suggest the presence *here* – and practically speaking, that means in this candidate for baptism, in this truly ‘innocent’ infant – of the Devil, who has to give way so that the Holy Spirit can enter. When one thinks of a congregation of twentieth-century Christians assembled for a baptism, one is obliged to dismiss such an antiquated theology of original sin – now held by no theologian – as totally irrelevant.

Simply on these grounds, and not for the sake of watering down Christianity, ‘imprecatory’ exorcism has been replaced by ‘deprecatory’ exorcism – a type of exorcism not unknown even to the ancient Church, especially in the East. We no longer speak to the Devil (considered as being present); we speak with God about the Devil (still seriously considered as present)” (53).

¹⁷¹ S-147 adnexum I 20: “On abandonnera le type d’invocation ‘Deus Abraham, Isaac et Iacob...’ peu accessible et critiquée... On abandonnera le type ancien, qui interpelle directement le démon: l’exorcisme sera déprécatif (bien que distinct des exorcismes mineurs).”

¹⁷² Explicit criticism of the scrutinies was contained in the reports from Rwanda, Togo, Lille, Montauban, Nimes, Strasbourg, Malines-Bruxelles, Canada, and the United States.

addressed to the Father, who had sent the Son both to the Samaritan woman, the man born blind, and to Lazarus in the Gospel readings, and to the catechumens.¹⁷³ The second prayer, concerning the actual expulsion of demons, would be specifically directed towards Christ himself, who had cast out demons during his historical ministry, and who “by the paschal mystery of his death and resurrection has conquered sin and evil, and the author of both, the devil.”¹⁷⁴ While this change was well-suited to modern sensibilities, it was a clear departure from traditional Roman prayer forms. The exorcisms in OBA had been imperative – on the authority of Christ the celebrant, himself *in persona Christi*, commanded the demon to leave. Now, however, the exorcisms would be deprecatory – the celebrant would petition Christ to act again as he had done in the past.¹⁷⁵ Alongside the focus on Christ instead of sin, the new texts would also emphasize the reality that the catechumens were in the midst of a journey, and not simply sinners.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ S-147 adnexusum I 20: “On se contentera du thème évangélique, précisé dans les trois évangiles: Samaritaine (eau vive), aveugle-né (lumière du Christ), Lazare (résurrection, vie nouvelle). L’oraison est adressée au Père, qui envoie son Christ à la Samaritaine (aveugle-né, Lazare) et aux catéchumènes, pour les libérer et leur porter la vie.”

¹⁷⁴ S-147 adnexusum I 20: “L’oraison sera adressée au Christ, qui par son mystère pascal de mort et de résurrection est vainqueur du mal, du péché et de son principe, le démon.”

¹⁷⁵ While the move to deprecatory formulations of the exorcism is imminently understandable, the result was that the traditional Roman imperative formulation had now disappeared completely from the rite. Previously the *Coetus* had considered including both deprecatory and imperative formulae for the exorcisms of both the scrutinies and the catechumenate. Since that time, however, only deprecatory formulae were appointed during the catechumenate; and now only deprecatory formulae were to be used for the scrutinies. By this gradual process the imperative form disappeared from the OICA.

¹⁷⁶ S-147 adnexusum I 20: “L’oraison saisira le catéchumène dans sa démarche vers le Christ.” This theme was incorporated as a result of the claim that the texts were too negative in their presentation of the lives of the catechumens and elect. See, for example, “Diocèse Malines-Bruxelles,” 2: “L’ensemble des prières semblent également ignorer que déjà le catéchumène vivait sans le savoir à certains moments dans l’Esprit de la foi chrétienne. Leur vie antérieure est trop uniquement présentée comme n’ayant été que ténèbres alors qu’elle était déjà un acheminement vers dieu avec ses ombres et ses lumières.”

Having presented a general approach to rewriting the texts for the exorcisms, the *Coetus* next presented the themes for each of the exorcisms, based on the Gospel reading for the particular scrutinies. The description for the first exorcism focused on the way in which evil and sin affects individuals. The Samaritan woman was indeed afflicted by the devil, argued the *Coetus* – the same devil that afflicts humans today. The devil had caused her to accept her sinfulness uncritically, because ultimately, the Samaritan woman did not recognize that she was in a state of sin until Christ expelled the demon and revealed her true condition to her.¹⁷⁷ In this sense, the first exorcism was intended to utilize the power of Christ to overcome the demon of ignorance, and open the minds of the elect to perceive that they were, indeed, sinful. In taking this first step, Christ, the living water, could be recognized as true strength against human weakness. The description of the theme of the second scrutiny pointed to a certain spiritual progression. No longer focused on the individual, the theme of the man born blind revolved around the sin of society, namely in the rejection of the man by the religious authorities and the indifference of his family. Christ expels these social demons by giving the man born

¹⁷⁷ S-147 adnexum I 20-21: “La Samaritaine est à la recherche de l’eau vive: elle en a soif et la demande; elle sait qu’il faut adorer en esprit et en vérité; elle attend même le Christ. Mais elle n’a pas idée qu’elle soit en état de péché. Il faut que le Christ le lui révèle. Bref il faut que cet obstacle soit révélé et ensuite levé. C’est seulement après qu’elle pourra progresser dans sa démarche vers le Christ, au point de se faire apôtre. Ainsi Satan apparaît en creux comme le ‘dieu de ce monde qui aveugle les hommes pour les empêcher de reconnaître la gloire du Christ’ (2 Cor. 4:3-4 et déjà 3:15-16). Et l’obstacle intérieur est d’abord le péché personnel.”

A sample text for this exorcism was written on January 4. It was not, however, included in the Appendix: “Deus, qui Filium tuum in mundum misisti, ut intimae cogitationes hominum revelarentur (Lc 2:35), per ipsum quaerentis te mulieris Samaritanae cor aperuisti, ut peccata sua agnosceret. Immuta mirabilia pro his (Eccl. 26:6) qui sitiennes nunc ad aquam vivam accedunt, ut per agnitionem peccatorum suorum liberati, Christum tuum Salvatorem corde et ore confiteantur. *Oratio exorcismi*: Dominus Iesus Christus propria vobis peccata revelat potestatemque affert effugendi fallacitatem et mendacium, a Satana vos liberans, ut sincere corde peccata agnoscentes, misericordiam eius et caritatem fide vestra inveniat.”

blind the strength to stand up against the sin of the world.¹⁷⁸ Here, Christ, the true light, continues his work in the elect, bringing them to the realization that the *status quo* of the world is sinful; becoming Christian necessarily entails standing with Christ against the demons of empty power and empty promise. The theme of the third scrutiny is the sinfulness of death itself and the hopelessness that it inspires. By being exorcised from the demon of death, the elect were made more ready to accept death in baptism, which, paradoxically, would prepare them to receive the fullness of life. In this way the *Coetus* understood this scrutiny to point clearly to baptism, just as the resurrection of Lazarus prefigured the resurrection of Christ.¹⁷⁹ This scrutiny is, therefore, a foreshadowing of the entire paschal mystery for the lives of the elect. The demons exorcised in each of the scrutinies are, indeed, real.

The final element of the scrutinies discussed in the Appendix to S-147 was the Prayer over the elect. In the experimental rite this prayer, an adaptation of OBA 28, was the same for each scrutiny. Despite critique from experimenters, the *Coetus* reaffirmed this choice, insisting that the prayer was to be retained without further amendment. They allowed, however, that a second prayer would be composed which might focus more on the journey that still lay ahead of the elect. The new prayer would ask God's protection

¹⁷⁸ S-147 adnexum I 21: "L'obstacle rencontré par cet homme, qui finira par proclamer sa foi au Christ l'adorer, n'est pas le péché personnel ni celui de ses parents: le Christ le déclare publiquement. C'est l'opposition incrédule de la synagogue qui l'excommuniera et l'indifférence de sa famille. Le mal et l'action du démon se situent donc ici au plan social: péché du monde, dont chacun est prisonnier et complice et avec lequel il doit avoir le courage de rompre, pour entrer dans l'Église et gagner le Christ. Ainsi le catéchumène, en route vers la profession de foi baptismale, doit être libéré par le Christ de sa solidarité avec le monde."

¹⁷⁹ L'obstacle à la rencontre du Christ est ici le mal dans sa dimension ultime et radicale: la mort allant jusqu'à la corruption, coupant tout espoir d'accéder à la plénitude de la vie. – Rapport mort – péché – Satan. – Le Christ est vie et résurrection. – Le baptême, en faisant passer par la mort et la résurrection du Christ, fera passer à la vie. Cet exorcisme devient ainsi figuratif du baptême, comme la résurrection de Lazare annonça la résurrection du Christ."

upon the elect, and point to baptism as the moment at which God's face could be seen clearly, and at which they would join the church, itself a sign of God's blessing upon the world, while they nonetheless continued their journey of faith.¹⁸⁰

7.3.2.4: Miscellaneous Issues

The summary of changes to S-147 was completed by a brief fourth section in which four elements were discussed: the prayer for the *redditio symboli*, the introduction to Baptism, the renunciation of Satan, and the pre-baptismal anointing. For the *redditio symboli* (81) the *Coetus* indicated that instead of using the first prayer for the first Scrutiny from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, a new prayer would be crafted. The older text had asked that God “bestow upon these elect right hearts and wise minds as they come to confess your praise: so that man's ancient dignity, which once by sin they had lost, by your grace may be restored in them.”¹⁸¹ The new text would present a more optimistic view of humanity, and would petition God that “these about to be baptized, who have been nourished by your Word, and whose heart you will open, might be increasingly attentive to live in accordance with the faith they are going to profess.”¹⁸² Turning to the introduction to Baptism (86), the *Coetus* directed that the text included in the rite should be an example of what the celebrant might say. This text, they noted, would be revised

¹⁸⁰ S-147 adnexum I 21-22: “Dieu les a conduits et gardés, pour leur faire rencontrer son Christ. Le baptême vers lequel ils marchent, sacrement de l'illumination, fera rayonner leur vie: “nos revelata facie gloriam Domini... a claritate in claritatem...” progrès dans l'esprit des béatitudes. Ainsi ils rayonneront sur la communauté où ils vont entrer. Et de là, sur le monde, dont ils seront la bénédiction. Ainsi leur vie trouvera-t-elle sa plénitude de sens.”

¹⁸¹ *DOBL* 213.

¹⁸² S-147 adnexum I 22: “Oratio ad reddendum symbolum À refaire dans ce sens: Permits, Seigneur que ces futurs baptisés, nourris de ton message et dont tu viens d'ouvrir le coeur, soient plus attentifs encore à vivre en correspondance avec la foi qu'ils vont proclamer.”

so that it could be used equally well during the baptism of infants. Regarding the Renunciation of Satan (87, 88) the *Coetus* indicated that the element could be done collectively, given the experimental evidence from Rwanda.¹⁸³ Furthermore, the *Coetus* opted to allow that the interrogation could be maintained as a rejection of three separate elements or that it could be unified into a single renunciation.¹⁸⁴ Finally, concerning the Pre-Baptismal Anointing (89), the *Coetus* proposed that it might instead be celebrated during one of the scrutinies. The difficulty with the location of the pre-baptismal anointing had been suggested by Seumois in his report of experimentation. He proposed that the theme of strengthening did make clear sense so close to the end of the journey towards baptism. Instead, if the anointing were to be found within the period of the catechumenate, it could “give the strength necessary for conversion, spiritual combat, and perseverance to the catechumen when it was most needed.”¹⁸⁵ The *Coetus* clearly saw this possibility as being a viable one, but they rejected Seumois’ original suggestion as to the location of this anointing, choosing instead to locate it during one of the Scrutinies.

¹⁸³ Seumois, in the “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations” indicated that the renunciations had been performed collectively. This is certainly understandable, given that at one particular Rwandan location, the *Ephphatha* alone had taken twenty-five minutes, and, at the same parish, individual professions of faith and baptism had lasted for forty-five minutes.

¹⁸⁴ S-147 adnexum I 22: “Indiquer que la renonciation peut être collective et qu’alors elle est unique.”

SRG 87: “Consecratione fontis peracta, celebrans interrogat simul omnes: Abrenuntiatia Satanae et omnibus operibus et seductionibus eius? Electi: Abrenuntio.

SRG 88: “Altera formula: Celebrans simul omnes interrogat: Abrenuntiatia Satanae? Electi: Abrenuntio. Cel: Et omnibus operibus eius? Electi: Abrenuntio. Cel: Et omnibus pompis eius? Electi: Abrenuntio.”

¹⁸⁵ Seumois, “Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 18: “On trouve que cette onction n’a pas beaucoup de sens à ce moment, d’autant plus que le symbolisme naturel, propre à la région, porte davantage sur la beauté que sur la force ou la lutte. Mais au lieu de l’omettre, comme le suggère la dernière rubrique, on souhaite qu’elle puisse être administrée pendant le temps du catéchuménat. Elle aurait alors tout son sens, pour conférer au catéchumène la force dont il a besoin pour sa conversion, son combat spirituel et sa persévérance.”

Nonetheless, the themes of conversion, spiritual combat, and perseverance are certainly contained in the Scrutinies themselves. And so, given the thematic consistency, as well as the presumption that the Scrutinies were more likely to be celebrated publicly than any of the rites for the period of the catechumenate, the choice to allow the anointing to be celebrated during the Scrutinies is a defensible choice.

7.4: Revision of the Scrutinies, February 7, 1969

The experimenters were instructed to respond to these new proposals by February 25, 1969, so that the *Coetus* could review the submissions before their next meeting. In the meantime, however, new prayers of exorcism for each of the three scrutinies were composed and sent to the experimenters as S-337. There is no documentation extant in the C.N.P.L. archives surrounding the manner of composition of these texts. It is unclear whether an individual member of the *Coetus* was given the responsibility for composing these texts, or whether the whole group, or a part thereof, met to write collectively.¹⁸⁶ The texts were sent out, however, on February 7, 1969, and, as with report on

¹⁸⁶ It seems, at least, possible that these texts were likely written by Ligier. In a letter from Ligier to Cellier, dated July 2, 1969, and contained in C.N.P.L. 2.E: “Douvres-la-Délivran,” Ligier made mention of a proposal that tried to respond to the direction established at Vanves: “En février, si j’ai présenté un projet pour les exorcismes des scrutins, vous en savez la raison. Je vous la rappelle. Le bien-aimé P. Béraudy, après avoir planché avec le P. Brunner deux heures entières n’avaient écrit que quatre lignes, qu’il m’a fallu encore aligner en ordre sur la machine. Nous n’avions rien: J’ai donc proposé un texte qui répondît au programme établi à Vanves. Ce projet, c’est clair, ne satisfait pas à la majorité du *Coetus*.” This comment alone establishes little except that Ligier was responsible for crafting some version of the exorcisms. However, in an earlier letter from Cellier to the members of the *Coetus*, dated June 5, 1969, also contained in C.N.P.L. 2.E., “Project L” is one of four sets of exorcism submissions (the others are Projects A, B, and C). S-34 is clearly based. The letter from Ligier to Cellier also contains the admission that “Project L” was composed by Ligier: “Les fiches du P. Stenzel, qui sont négatives par rapport à mon projet, restent courtoises: elles ne vont pas au-delà de ses remarques habituelles à l’égard de mes textes. Il a en effet parfaitement conscience que ces textes sont de ma fabrication (*‘gravamen, quod semper habui erga productiones ‘L’, etiam hic non evacuatur’*).” Despite lacking conclusive evidence linking Ligier to the exorcisms in S-34, it seems, at the very least, to be a likely possibility that these texts were his creations.

experimentation, response was requested from the experimenters in time for the meeting at St-Genesius-Rode, on March 3-8, 1969.

Consistent with the stated intention for the prayers of exorcism, the first part of the exorcism was directed towards the Father, and would introduce the theme of the exorcism as found in the Gospel pericope for the day (see Table 7.2 below). In the first exorcism the demon that was to be cast out was the demon of ignorance to the state of sin. Consequently, the exorcism asks that God release the elect from false faith in themselves, and to liberate them from deceptive power, so that they might come to know Christ. In the second exorcism the theme of social sin was found to be pre-eminent. Thus, the exorcism requested that God save the elect from the sin of the world, and that they be released from the blindness of faithlessness, and that like the blind man, cast out by society, they might have faith in Christ. Finally, the theme of the third exorcism was the demon of death. The prayer asked God to release the elect from the reign of the devil, which was death itself, and hearing the voice of Christ, might, like Lazarus, emerge from death to praise God.

The second portion of the exorcism was to be directed to Christ, a logical and necessary extension of the principle contained in the imperative exorcisms from S-147. Even in the use of imperative formulae, the exorcist's authority rested on the person of Christ, who had, himself, expelled demons during his earthly ministry, and who had conquered the demons through his death and resurrection. The deprecatory form maintained the theological foundation of the exorcism – Christ is the actor. Since the imperative form was understood to be incongruent with a modern mentality, the choice of a deprecatory form ensured that the theological intent of the exorcism would not be

TABLE 7.2
PRAYERS OF EXORCISM TO THE FATHER
IN THE REVISED SCRUTINIES

<p>Primus Exorcismus 51. Immensae caritatis et potentiae Pater, qui Filium tuum Iesum nobis obviam Magistrum et Salvatorem misisti, praesta ut hi catechumeni, qui aquam vivam haurire satagunt, verbo Christi ad semetipsos, sicut Samaritana mulier, revocati, propriis se fateantur peccatis praepeditos et vulneribus maculatos. Ne eos permittas, quaesumus, in seipsis mendaci fiducia confisos, ab adversa potestate decipi, sed a spiritu nequitiae potenter libera, ut sua mala agnoscentes, interius mundari viamque Christi aggredi mereantur.</p>	<p>Secundus Exorcismus 58. Luminum supernorum Pater, qui Verbum tuum inter tenebras illuscere voluisti, ut ad te accedant qui veritatis amore flagrant: hos Ecclesiae catechumenos respice et adiuva. A peccato mundi huius, pro tua benignitate, salventur; incredulorum contagione et adversariorum timore ne deficient. Potenti manu tua ab auctore mendacii, qui mentes inficelium obcaecat, libera eos et custodi. Ne formident a sociis amicisque reiici, sed sicut ille caecus, derelictus et a synagoga separatus, confiteri non dubitavit, ipsa etiam in Christum tuum credere audeant, et ab Evangelio illuminati, populo tuo aggregari mereantur.</p>	<p>Tertius Exorcismus 64. Aeternae vitae auctor et restitutor, Pater, qui creasti nos ut in perpetuum vivamus et Filium tuum misisti ut vitam in ipso accipiamus hoc catechumenos illumina, ut videant consilii tui benignitatem. Mortem, longe a tua caritate pergrinam, intellegant expeccato, despectis vitae mandatis, in omnes pertransire. Peccatum confiteantur mortis esse stimulum, mortem agnoscant peccati stipendium, Christum glorificent peccati et mortis triumphatorem. Tu ergo, amator hominum, Pater, hos famulos a sequelis peccati et vinculis absolve. Salva eos a diabolo, qui de mortis imperio regnum sibi usurpare voluit. Et vocem Filii tui audiens, erige eos, sicut Lazarum, in vitam, ut Ecclesia tibi gratias agat.</p>
--	---	---

trivialized simply because of an archaic appearance. Furthermore, the second portion of the prayer for exorcism was to point towards the journey of the elect that had already taken place, while also strengthening the elect for the rest of their journey towards Christ (see Table 7.3 below). Thus, for the first exorcism, the prayer pointed towards Christ as the end of the journey of faith, and indicated that through their admission of sin they would be healed by God, since Christ had already proven himself victorious over the sin of self-reliance. In the second exorcism the prayer addressed social sin, and asked that

the elect be released from the demon that only permitted seeing the cross as the world saw it – as a scandal. Instead, they should embrace the Word of God, which proclaimed the cross as the source of liberation. The third exorcism pointed towards the triumph over death, naming Christ as the author of life through his cross and resurrection; through his intercession the elect would be released from the power of death, so that they might live with Christ in heaven.

S-337 treated only the prayers of exorcism. The content of the Litanies of Intercession over the elect thus remained yet to be composed, since the *Coetus* had agreed in The Appendix to S-147 that new prayers should be composed. These would be left until the next meeting of the *Coetus* at St-Genesius-Rode.

7.5: St-Genesius-Rode, March 3-8, 1969

The portion of the meeting at St-Genesius-Rode concerning adult initiation had two points of principal focus. First, the *Coetus* examined several elements in specific detail. This work centered on the exorcisms, although the litany of intercessions over the elect during the rite of election, and a third form for the pre-baptismal renunciation of Satan were also considered. Second, the *Coetus* collated the most recent changes with the alterations proposed at Vanves into a partial rough draft of the rite. This text would essentially become the next official draft of the rite, S-344. Overall, however, work was hampered by the absence of both Fischer and Stenzel from the meeting, causing Cellier to later admit to Fischer that the issue of the exorcisms had been left unresolved.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁷ “Cellier to Fischer, March 10, 1969” in C.N.P.L. 2.C: “Notre session s’est bien passée, mais le Coetus XXII, privé les 2 premières journées de la présence du Père Stenzel malade et de la vôtre, n’a sûrement pas accompli un travail de même qualité que d’habitude. Nous avons dû laisser en suspens la

TABLE 7.3
PRAYERS OF EXORCISM TO THE SON
IN THE REVISED SCRUTINIES

<p>51. Domine Iesu, Deus nobiscum factus, tu es fons ad quem isti sitiunt et Magister quem exquirunt. In te, qui es mitis et humilis corde, faciem Dei videre et se agnoscere cupiunt. Coram te, qui sanctus pro peccatis mortuus est, innocentiam suam propugnare nequeunt. Sua fidenter aperiunt corda, sordes confitentur, onera deponunt, vulnera detegunt ignota. Tu ergo eos a propriis impedimentis amanter libera: aegros restaura, debiles adiuva, sitientes pota, omnibus pacem tuam largire. Nomine sancto tuo intercede et salva. Malignis hodie spiritibus et diabolo, quem resurgendo vicisti, impera, ut regnum Dei adveniat et isti pede iam libera progredi ad te mereantur.</p>	<p>58. Domine Iesu, gloria Dei mundum illuminans, tu es testis fidelis lapisque reprobatus caput Ecclesiae factus. Ad te accedunt isti, qui, diligentes mundum quem salvasti, illum tamen formidant, qui te damnavit. A te veritatem rogantes exspectant, cum solus verba vitae aeternae habeas. Da eis hodie elatam fidem, quae, scandalum crucis superans, mundum vincit et instaurat. Oculis aperi, pusillanimes robora, quaerentes dirige, dubios collustra, fluctuantes erige, vexatos adiuva, omnes in Ecclesia aedifica. Virtute nominis tui, in quo solo data est salus, interveni hodie et libera. Confunde principis incredulitatis mendacium. Fuga tenebras: innova inter nos verba tua et signa. Tuum etiam Spiritum demitte, qui mundum arguat, ut isti, liberati fide et confirmati, te profiteantur Deum et adorent.</p>	<p>64. Domine Iesu, in cruce et resurrectione tua mors et vita osculatae sunt et nunc, apud Patrem regnans, in aeternum vivis. Supplices nos respice, qui usque ad tui adventum inter vitae et mortis vices exspectamus, hisque catechumenis providus attende. Ipsorum erit, te auxiliante, vitae et mortis sensum detegere et in mundo laborare, ut tua in omnibus plenitudo appareat. Da ut probe videant, recte iudicent, in fide decernant et prospiciant. Praesta ut malis renuntient, adversa superent. Fac ut secundum Evangelium vivant morique admittant. Suam in terris auctoritatem fides extendat. Tu proinde, in virtute tui nominis, cui omnia subduntur, intercede hodie et impera. Diabolum reprime perditionisque potestates. Et antequam auferas morti potentiam, ubique tuum effundas Spiritum, ut homines vitam in te abundantius habeant.</p>
---	---	--

7.5.1: Exorcisms

Five sets of texts for the exorcisms were presented to the *Coetus* at St-Genesius-Rode: one set was a slightly edited version of the prayers contained in S-337; three sets

question des exorcismes. Le Père Ligier nous a apporté le dernier état de ses travaux dont vous devinez la complexité. Nous avons commencé à discuter le premier texte sans aboutir à beaucoup de résultats

written by Ligier with the help of his colleague from the Pontifical Gregorian University, Jean Galot, S.J.; and one set submitted by the Japanese experimenters.¹⁸⁸ Each of these new sets retained the dual structure of the prayers in S-337, with the first portion addressed to the Father, and the second portion addressed to the Son. Stylistically speaking, the new texts from Ligier and Galot were similar to the prior versions. The focused on God's saving actions in the world through Christ's paschal mystery, and then implored Christ to expel the demon from the elect, in similar fashion as he had cast out demons during his historical ministry. The proposal from Japan was, however, considerably different.

The texts from Japan (see Table 7.4 below) were prefaced by a presentation of the principles used in composing them. Noting their opposition to the thematic progression of the scrutinies from individual sin to societal sin to fear of death, the Japanese experimenters instead proposed that the scrutinies should present the struggle against sin from three different angles.¹⁸⁹ The content of each scrutiny, they argued, should be determined by both of the lectionary texts for each scrutiny (not simply the Gospel pericopes)¹⁹⁰ as well as by the modern sensibilities regarding sin.¹⁹¹ Thus, terminology

¹⁸⁸ "Cellier to Fischer, March 10, 1969": "A celui-ci se sont ajoutés quelques exemplaires apportés par le Père Ligier et réalisés par le Père Galot... Celui-ci nous a fourni 3 séries de 3. Enfin, nos amis japonais nous ont envoyé aussi un texte."

The four versions of the exorcisms are attached to a letter from Cellier to the members of *Coetus* XXII and XXIII, written on June 5, 1969, and contained in C.N.P.L. 2.E: "Douvres-la-Délivran".

¹⁸⁹ "Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon" in C.N.P.L. 2.E, 1: "On renonce à établir une stricte progression d'un scrutin à l'autre. On aborde seulement le problème de la lutte contre le péché sous différents angles, en projetant à chaque fois une lumière différente."

¹⁹⁰ The current lectionary system of three readings was not in place during the period of experimentation. The three reading system, at least as it was applied to the third, fourth and fifth Sundays of Lent, would not take shape until late 1968. In a letter from Cellier to the *Coetus* responsible for the Lectionary, *Coetus* XI, "Remarques sur le projet de lectionnaire, 7 décembre 1968," in C.N.P.L. 1.D.i:

would be biblical as well as contemporary.¹⁹² For the first scrutiny, the Japanese experimenters determined that the first reading, Numbers 20:1a, 2-8, allowed for the comparison of the elect with Israel wandering through the desert. Just as Israel was thirsty and God gave them water from the rock, so would the elect be given the water of baptism to quench their thirst in Jesus, the living water (John 4). The comparison of the elect to Israel also provided the possibility for illustrating the temptation of sin. Like Israel, the elect should persevere, and strive to correct their faults.¹⁹³ In the second scrutiny, the Japanese experimenters saw Ezekiel 36:25-28 as pointing towards justice and charity as the result of God's purification: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you... I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances" (36:25, 27). The man born blind in John 9 represented the baptismal purification foreshadowed in Ezekiel. If, therefore, justice and charity were gifts of God, then the scrutiny should address the ways in which people have failed to live according to

"Controverses sur les lectures des messes rituelles," he expresses surprise at some of the choices, and lobbies for some degree of change.

¹⁹¹ "Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon," 1: "Le contenu des prières est déterminé par le contenu des lectures (pas seulement l'évangile) et par la psychologie du pécheur moyen: on essaye de se représenter sous quelle forme concrète se pose sur lui le problème du péché."

¹⁹² "Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon," 1: "Le vocabulaire est biblique, mais on tient compte de la sensibilité moderne et on évite les expressions trop difficiles à comprendre (ou à traduire)."

¹⁹³ "Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon," 1: "La 1^{ère} lecture compare les catéchumènes au peuple de Dieu s'avancant dans le désert. Ce peuple a soif ; Dieu lui donne de l'eau. La 2^{ème} lecture montre Jésus promettant l'eau qui jaillit en vie éternelle. On insistera sur les tentations et l'entraînement au péché (dangers que rencontre le peuple de Dieu dans sa marche). On insistera aussi sur la nécessité de persévérer. En rapport avec les tentations, on peut parler des défauts à corriger. Éviter l'expression 's'esclavage du péché,' le mot 'esclavage' est plus ou moins bien compris (parler de 'délivrance')."

God's intent.¹⁹⁴ The third scrutiny clearly emphasized resurrection, through both the reading from Ezekiel (37:12-14) and the story of the raising of Lazarus (John 11). The Japanese experimenters viewed the death spoken of in these passages as being primarily spiritual – in light of faith, death is sin. Therefore death to, or the renunciation of, sin indicates an acceptance of life. They found the expression “baptized into the death of Christ” to be too obscure, and instead, preferred to emphasize being saved by Christ's death.¹⁹⁵ Following these principles, the Japanese experimenters were able to craft texts that would be amenable to the elect of a modern age.

While taking a more contemporary frame of mind into account, the Japanese compositions were also able to respect the traditional Roman structure of prayer, as contained in the Roman Canon. Unlike Eastern Eucharistic Prayers, the Roman structure allowed for the insertion of material particular to specific feasts and celebrations, such as the *communicantes* and the *hanc igitur*, and on a larger scale, the prefaces. The Japanese proposal used fixed portions of text throughout the prayers of exorcism, thereby underscoring the commonality between the prayers. The foundational structure began

¹⁹⁴ “Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon,” 2: “La 1^{ère} lecture parle d'abord de la pratique de la justice et de la charité, puis de la purification. La 2^{ème} lecture parle de la guérison de l'aveugle-né (il est illuminé). On insistera sur la prise de conscience du péché (nombreux sont les catéchumènes et les chrétiens qui ont une conscience déficiente du péché). On parlera du don de la purification et de l'illumination. On emploiera de préférence les mots: lumière, ténèbres, égarement (dans le ténèbres), illumination. On évitera le mot cécité, aveuglement; pour certains catéchumènes, il semble difficile à comprendre; le mot ‘aveugle’ fait penser immédiatement aux vrais aveugles et on passe difficilement au sens moral (on évitera aussi des mots genre ‘maladie de l'âme’).”

¹⁹⁵ “Projet Proposé Par Les Expérimentateurs du Japon,” 1: “Les 2 lectures parlent de résurrection. On insistera sur les conséquences du péché, vues dans la lumière de la foi : c'est une mort. On orientera les catéchumènes vers la ‘renonciation au péché’, qui est une attitude ferme et générale vis-à-vis du péché (on y renonce). Le mot ‘mourir’ est employé par la bible dans 2 sortes de textes : 1. Le péché mène à la mort ; 2. Il faut mourir au péché. Pour la clarté, dans la courte cérémonie scrutin-exorcisme, il serait bon de choisir un seul sens et de trouver d'autres morts pour exprimer l'autre idée. Ici, on choisit ‘le péché mène à la mort,’ et on remplace l'expression ‘mourir au péché’ par ‘renoncer au péché’, et ‘renoncer à vivre dans le péché’ ; on dira encore ‘sauvés par la mort de Jésus’ au lieu de ‘baptisés dans sa mort’.”

TABLE 7.4
PROPOSED PRAYERS OF EXORCISM
FOR THE SCRUTINIES
BY THE JAPANESE EXPERIMENTERS

First Scrutiny	Second Scrutiny	Third Scrutiny
<p><i>Seigneur notre Dieu, tu as conduit et protégé ton peuple à travers les périls du désert. A ce peuple qui mourrait de soif, tu as donné par la main de Moïse l'eau du rocher.</i></p> <p><i>Écoute la prière que nous faisons pour ces candidats au baptême. Aide-les à persévérer dans la voie du bien. Protège-les dans les tentations, tant celles qui viennent du monde que celles qui viennent de la faiblesse de leur coeur.</i></p> <p><i>Conduis-les jusqu'au baptême, afin qu'ils reçoivent de ton Fils Jésus l'eau jaillissante en vie éternelle.</i></p> <p><i>Seigneur Jésus, qui par le mystère de ta croix et de ta résurrection a vaincu le péché et la mort, délivre de l'esprit du mal ces candidats au baptême, afin qu'ils ne soient plus entraînés au péché.</i></p> <p><i>Que l'Esprit Saint vienne en leur coeur et leur donne la force de corriger leurs défauts. Qu'il les fasse progresser dans le bien, et parvenir aux dons du salut.</i></p>	<p><i>Seigneur notre Dieu, tu pardonnes à ceux qui se repentent et tu purifies leur coeur.</i></p> <p><i>Écoute la prière que nous faisons pour ces candidats au baptême. Aide-les à reconnaître les fautes qu'ils ont commises et à regretter tout ce par quoi ils t'ont offensé. Donne-leur un coeur pur, assoiffé de justice, capable de t'aimer et d'aimer les autres.</i></p> <p><i>Conduis-les jusqu'à la fontaine du baptême, afin que le Christ ouvre les yeux de leur coeur et les illumine de sa Lumière.</i></p> <p><i>Seigneur Jésus, qui par le mystère de ta croix et de ta résurrection a vaincu le péché et la mort, délivre de l'esprit du mal ces candidats au baptême, afin qu'ils ne s'égarent pas dans les ténèbres.</i></p> <p><i>Que l'Esprit Saint vienne en leur coeur, qu'il les aide à mieux distinguer le bien du mal et à vivre en fils de lumière.</i></p>	<p><i>Seigneur notre Dieu, tu veux sauver tous les hommes, tu veux les arracher à la mort que leur péché a mérité, et les faire vivre avec toi.</i></p> <p><i>Écoute la prière que nous faisons pour ces candidats au baptême.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Donne-leur la force de renoncer au péché, afin qu'ils deviennent tes fils par le don de la nouvelle naissance.</i></p> <p><i>Conduis-les jusqu'au baptême, afin que sauvés par la mort de ton fils Jésus, ils soient admis à participer à sa résurrection.</i></p> <p><i>Seigneur Jésus, qui par le mystère de ta croix et de ta résurrection a vaincu le péché et la mort, délivre de l'esprit du mal ces candidats au baptême, afin qu'ils ne soient pas entraînés sur le chemin de la mort.</i></p> <p><i>Que l'Esprit Saint vienne en leur coeur, afin que renonçant à vivre dans le péché, ils puissent vivre dans l'amour de Dieu et participer à sa gloire.</i></p>

Material in italics is common to all three texts.

with an address to “the Lord, our God,” which transitioned into a contextual naming of a way in which God had saved, relative to the scrutiny being celebrated. Then the structure moved to a specific petition – “listen to the prayers we now make for these candidates for baptism” – which was also related to the themes contained in the day’s scripture passages. The opening portion of the exorcism ended with the petition that God “lead them towards baptism” in which Christ would act for their salvation by some means related to the pericopes. The transition towards emphasis on Christ’s action led directly to the second portion of the exorcism during which Christ was asked to expel the demon “through the mystery of his cross and resurrection.” Following another brief reference to the scriptural texts for the day, the exorcism concluded with an invocation of the Holy Spirit into the heart of each of the elect. Ultimately, this approach had the pastoral advantage of signaling a ritual unity at the same time as it highlighted the different ways in which God’s salvation was bestowed upon humanity.

Each of new sets discussed by the *Coetus* retained the dual structure contained in S-337: the first portion was addressed to the Father and the second portion was directed towards Christ. Perhaps acknowledging the rejection of this thematic progression contained in the Japanese proposal, the newer compositions modified this trend, and instead, emphasized the impact of sin on the individual. This is most evident in the prayers for the second exorcism, notably, in the first portion. The text in S-337 petitioned that God save the elect “from the sin of this world.”¹⁹⁶ The three new texts from Ligier and Galot instead petitioned that God save the elect “from the deadly power of the evil

¹⁹⁶ S-337, 58: “... A peccato mundi huius, pro tua benignitate, salventur...”

spirit so that they might rise to new life in Christ,”¹⁹⁷ “from the deep penetration of the demon, in order that they might actively and consciously reject sin,”¹⁹⁸ and “from the darkness of the evil spirit, from blindness of thought and an obscured heart, by leading them to the brightness of God through the light of Baptism.”¹⁹⁹ The critique of the Japanese experimenters had been noted – the clear place of sin as it affected the life of the community was minimized in each of these new texts, and the personal impact of sin on the life of an individual was heightened.

The choice of a prayer at this point in the rite was a complicated decision. The difficulty in finding a single text that would adequately respond to all pastoral situations lead the *Coetus* to the decision to provide multiple texts for the exorcisms, although this decision would not be enacted until S-352.²⁰⁰ Celebrants might thus be able to respond to their own particular circumstances as pastorally as possible.²⁰¹ All of the texts proposed in S-344 would be the edited versions of the prayers presented in S-337.

¹⁹⁷ “Rituel du baptême des adultes, 5.6.69” in C.N.P.L. 2.E, 7”: “...libera, quaesumus, how catechumenos a mortifera potentia maligni spiritus ut novam vitam Christi resurgentis accipere et dilatare valeant.”

¹⁹⁸ Rituel du baptême des adultes, 5.6.69, 11: “...salva, quaesumus, hos catechumenos ab intimo influxu daemonis, ut peccati horrorem in corde concipiant et servant...”

¹⁹⁹ Rituel du baptême des adultes, 5.6.69, 17: “...duc, quaesumus, ad illius diei claritatem quos ad lucem baptismi vocasti; libera eos a nocte spiritus maligni, a mentis caecitate et a cordis obscuracione...”

²⁰⁰ In *Schemata* 352, *De Rituali* 36, “De Christiana Adulorum Initiatione quorum textus post experimenta recogniti et locupletati sunt,” September 29, 1969, ND DRi-36 (352), three versions of each prayer would be included. The total number of prayers of exorcism discussed at St-Genesius-Rode was thirty (five sets of two prayers for each of the three scrutinies). Of the twenty-four crafted by either Ligier or Galot, twenty would be contained in S-352.

²⁰¹ “Cellier to Fischer, March 10, 1969”: “Nous avons décidé de proposer plusieurs textes au choix dans le rituel afin de répondre aux diverses situations. Il y aurait les textes du Père Ligier améliorés et les meilleurs des autres textes.”

7.5.2: Intercessions over the Elect

Responding to the inability of many to perceive the difference between these litanies and the general intercessions, the *Coetus* allowed for the omission of the general intercessions, providing instead the allowance that petitions for the Church and the world could be added to the former litanies. The prayers for the catechumens, which had already been rewritten at Vanves, typically maintained the same content while being edited largely in terms of the manner in which the catechumens were described. The litany over the elect, however, was altered rather dramatically. The petitions in the experimental rite focused on strengthening the elect and healing them of their weaknesses. The newly proposed intercessions instead highlighted the role that other members of the Christian community would play in supporting the elect (see Table 7.5 below). The new intercessions, prepared by Molin, demonstrate little reliance on the prior draft of the rite.²⁰² While one could validly argue that the intercession concerning the strengthening of the elect against the devil and secular temptation is aligned to the new petition that the elect be introduced into Christ's victory through the cross by the work of their catechists, the point of commonality between these two is the paschal mystery itself. Direct comparisons in order to establish provenance between one version and the other are of limited value.

²⁰² Unlike the litany over the catechumens, edited in Latin, the new petitions were composed in French. Given the manner of work at Le Saulchoir, it is likely that the new intercessions were entirely new creations instead of an edition of the former.

TABLE 7.5
INTERCESSIONS OVER THE ELECT
AS PROPOSED BY MOLIN

S-147	Molin's Proposal
Ut electis ad regenerationis sacramenta perductis aulam misericordiae caelestis reserare dignetur, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour que ces catéchumènes accomplissent généreusement les dernières étapes de leur conversion, prions le Seigneur.
Ut eos (eas) contra insidias diaboli et tentationes saeculi roborare dignetur, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour leur catéchistes, afin qu'ils les introduisent pleinement dans le mystère du Christ victorieux par la croix, prions le Seigneur.
Ut eos (eas) in fide confirmet semperque conservet, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour leurs parrains, afin qu'ils les entraînent dans la vie de foi et de charité, prions le Seigneur.
Ut gratiae suae et sacris Ecclesiae institutionibus eorum corda aperire dignetur, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour leurs familles, afin qu'elles comprennent leur démarche, et le permettent de la bien réaliser, prions le Seigneur.
Ut eos (eas) in Spiritu Sancto edoceat fraternitatem diligere, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour tous les chrétiens, afin qu'ils sachent sortir vainqueurs des tentations de l'égoïsme sans cesse renaissant, prions le Seigneur.
Ut luce sua eos (eas) illuminet et in suam veritatem, propitius introducat, Dominum deprecamur.	Pour tous ceux qui hésitent encore à se donner au Christ, afin qu'ils nous rejoignent un jour, prions le Seigneur.

7.5.3: Renunciation of Satan

In response to logistical problems during the period of experimentation, the *Coetus* had allowed two time-saving mechanisms to be built into the renunciation of Satan: all of the elect could be questioned together and the triple renunciation could be

combined into a single renunciation.²⁰³ A potentially lengthy element of relatively minor significance in the rite was, thus, given ritual brevity.²⁰⁴

Duration, however, was not the sole concern of many experimenters. Rather, concerns about textual relevance and about the negativity of many of the texts could be applied to this element. Thus, at St-Genesius-Rode, a third possible formulation of the renunciation was added, which asked whether the elect rejected sin in order to live in the freedom of God's children, whether they rejected the seduction of evil and being dominated by sin, and whether they rejected Satan, the author and origin of sin.²⁰⁵

7.5.4: Post-Baptismal Structure

SGR contained a significant alteration in the pattern of the sacraments of initiation (see Table 7.6 below). The *Coetus* had already determined that the post-baptismal anointing was to be omitted whenever Confirmation immediately followed baptism, thereby likening the two post anointings with Chrism. The ritual structure in S-147, however, placed Confirmation after the post-baptismal presentations of a white garment and a lit candle, and after the optional explanation of the newly taken Christian name. The similitude of the two anointings was strengthened in SGR in two ways. First,

²⁰³ Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 17: "En appliquant la rubrique 93, les pasteurs ont fait faire collectivement les renonciations. Cette manière à des inconvénients (moins personnelles) et ils se demandent si la renonciation personnelle ne pourrait pas être placée auparavant, par exemple durant les rites immédiatement préparatoires. Le profit pastoral serait beaucoup plus grand, et on allègerait la veillée pascale."

²⁰⁴ At the Rwandan parish of Gihindamuyaga there were fifty-four neophytes baptized at the Vigil. That number was more than doubled at Cyanika, where one hundred twenty-four were baptized at the Vigil. See Seumois, "Rapport sur Les Expérimentations," 2.

²⁰⁵ SGR 88 bis: "Celebrans simul omnes interrogat: Abrenuntiat peccato, ut in libertate filiorum Dei vivatis? Electi: Abrenuntio. Cel: Abrenuntiat seductionibus iniquitatis, ne peccatum vobis dominetur? Electi: Abrenuntio. Cel: Abrenuntiat Satanae, qui est auctor et princeps peccati?"

Confirmation was placed directly after the description of the post-baptismal anointing – the instruction to omit the post-baptismal anointing whenever Confirmation was to follow was still included. Thus, in SGR, only following the laying on of hands and anointing of Confirmation was the neophyte presented with a white garment (now an optional element according to the Conferences of Bishops) and a lit candle. Second, the Confirmation formula in SGR, based on the work of *Coetus XX*, was the initial Latin translation of the Byzantine formula for chrismation: “*Accipe signaculum Spiritus Sancti, qui tibi datur.*”²⁰⁶ The explanation of the Christian name was removed from this structure. The allowance that the presentation of a white garment could be optional according to the local Conferences of Bishops was in response to the concerns many European experimenters. The disappearance of the explanation of the Christian name was not commented upon in any of the notes contained in the C.N.P.L. archives.

TABLE 7.6
POST-BAPTISMAL STRUCTURE
IN THE REVISIONS AT ST-GENESIUS-RODE

S-147 Baptism Optional anointing with Chrism Clothing with a white garment Presentation with a lit candle Optional explanation of the Christian name Confirmation Liturgy of the Eucharist	SGR Baptism Optional anointing with Chrism Confirmation Optional clothing with a white garment Presentation with a lit candle Liturgy of the Eucharist
---	--

²⁰⁶ *ROL*, 625. For another presentation of the choice and development of the formula, see Botte, *From Silence to Participation*, 159-160.

7.5.5: Textual Compilation

The second stage of the labor at St-Genesius-Rode involved compiling the changes to the rite from both St-Genesius-Rode and Vanves. The resulting text is an undated rough partial draft of the rite.²⁰⁷ Containing only the first and second stages along with a description of the celebration of the sacraments themselves, this text realized the alterations made in response to the period of experimentation and contained the new intercessions. It did not, however, contain any revised scrutinies, since, as Cellier had admitted to Fischer, the *Coetus* had only begun discussing these texts.²⁰⁸ This draft also contained indications of introductory material for the first stage, which was largely based on the Appendix to S-147. The next official draft of the rite, S-344, would reflect this work, and was dated June 21, 1969.

7.6: S-344, DRi-35, June 21, 1969

The next official draft of the rite contained all of the changes to the rite up until this point. The structure of the rite reflected the discussions of the *Coetus* through the meeting at St-Genesius-Rode, and the only alterations to the work from that point did not relate to the content of the rite itself.²⁰⁹ Rather, in S-344 the *Coetus* faithfully introduced

²⁰⁷ “Caput II: Ordo Catechumenatus per Gradus Dispositus” in C.N.P.L. 2.C.

²⁰⁸ “Cellier to Fischer, March 10, 1969”: “Nous avons dû laisser en suspens la question des exorcismes. Le Père Ligier nous a apporté le dernier état de ses travaux dont vous devines la complexité. Nous avons commencé à discuter le premier texte sans aboutir à beaucoup de résultats!”

²⁰⁹ The decisions of the group responsible for the Lectionary were incorporated into S-344, even though these choices had not been specifically discussed by the *Coetus*. The discussions between Cellier and *Coetus* XII in November and December, 1968, are contained in “Controverses sur les lectures des messes rituelles,” in C.N.P.L. 1.D.i.

specific directions for each stage based entirely on their past deliberations,²¹⁰ incorporated Latin translations of the recently added French texts, and edited the Latin where deemed necessary. The overwhelming majority of the changes contained in S-344 do not, therefore, require much further discussion, as they are not innovations. There are, however, some new alterations to the text that merit description.²¹¹

7.6.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

The four changes that appear in the first stage of the rite within S-344 from were all by means of addition to the rite. First, the form for the anointing of the senses from S-147, which had been altered at Vanves, was re-inserted into the rite as an alternate formulation (18).²¹² This allowed the formula that had been present in OBA 11 to continue to find a place within the rites, although it ceded pride of place to the newer revision. Second, for the prayer ending the anointing of the senses (19), another optional text was appended. The source of this text is uncertain. Third, a new possibility was added to the options for introducing the catechumens into the Church (22). The alternate formula proposed at Vanves was placed first, and a new invitation based on John 14:3-4, instructing the catechumens to “come to the place prepared for you in order to hear God’s

²¹⁰ “Ligier to Coetus XXII and XXIII, June 30, 1969” in C.N.P.L. 2.C: “Elaborata est sane, adhibitibus multis anterioribus documentis, v.g.: iterum legi Praenotanda RR., Ordinis Baptismi adultorum per gradus catechumenatus dispositi (1963), *Schematata* P. Molin, *Schematata* Trevirensis; deinde Adnexa, praeparata in monasterio Montefiolo; prae oculis denique habui Praenotanda generalia, nunc publiciuris facta, et Praenotanda Baptismi parvulorum.”

²¹¹ It is unclear when, or if, these changes were made by the entire group, by a smaller group, or by an individual.

²¹² The paragraph numbers refer to S-344.

Word with us,” was placed second.²¹³ The original formula, based on OBA 29, was placed third. Finally, the *traditio symboli*, typically located in the week after the first scrutiny, although allowed within the period of the catechumenate, was permitted to be celebrated within this first stage.²¹⁴

7.6.2: The Time of the Catechumenate

Within the time of the catechumenate there is only one notable alteration to the rite that appears to arrive unannounced: the classification of “transitory rites” (*ritus transitus*) (64-69). It had been allowed as early as in the first draft of the rite that the *traditio symboli* could take place during the period of the catechumenate, but in an effort to clarify that if it was indeed to be anticipated it should only take place towards the end of the period of the catechumenate, it was classified as being transitory. The content of the *traditio* was unaltered.²¹⁵

The *traditio symboli* was not, however, the only transitory rite described in S-344. Instead, two other elements were named in this section. First, the *traditio orationis Dominicae*, which had only been permitted to occur after the third scrutiny, “since the

²¹³ S-344, 22: “N., N., accedite ad loca vobis praeparata ut nobiscum verbum eius audiat.”

John 14:3-4: “In my Father’s house there are many dwelling places. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, so that where I am, there you may be also” (NRSV).

²¹⁴ S-344, 122: “Traditio Symboli: Fit infra hebdomadam post primum scrutinium. Pro opportunitate autem in tempore catechumenatus celebrari potest sive una cum ordine ad faciendum catechumenum (nn 7-29), sive postea ad modum ritus transitus (cf nn 64-66).”

²¹⁵ In his report of experimentation, Seumois indicated that the anticipation of the *traditio symboli* was well-received in Rwanda, “car la tradition du Credo pourrait répondre au degré d’avancement dans la foi des catéchumènes et à leur situation spirituelle. De plus, vu le grand nombre des baptizandi, nous devons tâcher d’alléger le plus possible le rituel quadragésimal” (“Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 13). “La solution d’anticiper la tradition du Credo avant l’élection semble répondre à nos situations pastorales. Cependant il n’a pas été possible de faire l’expérimentation sous cette forme” (“Rapport sur Les Expérimentations,” 15).

Lord's Prayer is the prayer of the baptized,"²¹⁶ was to be permitted at the end of the period of the catechumenate. This was a puzzling addition, since it directly contradicted the theology of the rite that had been expressed up until this point in the discussions.²¹⁷ Second, S-344 includes the possibility of anticipating the pre-baptismal anointing (67-69) in these transitional rites. This allowance was made largely in response to Seumo's concern that this anointing, which emphasized being strengthened for spiritual battle with the devil, would be better located early in the rite, such as during the period of the catechumenate. The new text simply proposed that the anointing should take place following a celebration of the liturgy of the Word, and could be celebrated communally or, if necessary, individually. If this option was exercised, S-344 directed that it should not occur later in the rite, either in the rites of immediate preparation or during the celebration of baptism itself.

7.6.3: The Second Stage: Election

In the second stage, Election, one text was significantly altered beyond the proposed revisions in the Appendix to S-147, and three new texts were added. The model text for the taking of the names for election (82) was expanded, presumably to allow for the greater flexibility desired by the experimenters (see Table 7.6 below). The

²¹⁶ S-147, 74: "Traditio orationis Dominicae fit infra hebdomadam, quae tertium scrutinium sequitur. Quam traditionem anticipare ante Dominicam V Quadragesimae non licet, quia oratio Dominica est oratio baptizatorum."

²¹⁷ No record of the discussion on this matter can be found in the C.N.P.L. archives. One might speculate that this allowance emerged out of a desire to make the rite more flexible as well as out of a response to the European and North American experimental experience, where many of those not baptized nonetheless had some degree of faith formation. The report of experimentation from the U.S.C.C.B. challenged that "the rite under experimentation... is not well suited for those not baptized, but with considerable Christian training" (2). Could it be, in such circumstances, that the Lord's Prayer was so familiar to many catechumens that intentionally disallowing them from praying it was pastorally insensitive?

new formulation added the entire Christian community to the list of those who may have spoken well of the catechumens, and it elaborated upon the place of Christ in the nature of the Church, into which the catechumens were freely choosing to enter. Celebrants were given the option to choose between using the printed text or similar words; thus the given text needed to be more fully instructive so that it could serve as an appropriate model.

TABLE 7.7
ADMONITION FOR ELECTION
IN S-344

<p>S-147 45</p> <p>Nunc vos alloquor, catechumeni dilecti. Patrini (et matrinae)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">de</p> <p>vestra dispositione testimonium praeberunt. Rogo vos ut propositum vestrum libere reveletis.</p>	<p>S-147 adnexum I 18</p> <p>Nunc vos alloquor, catechumeni dilecti. Patrini et catechistae</p> <p style="text-align: right;">de</p> <p>vestra dispositione bonum testimonium praeberunt. Rogo vos ut propositum vestrum libere reveletis.</p>	<p>S-344 82</p> <p>Nunc vos, catechumeni dilecti alloquor. Patrini et catechistae (necnon tota communitas) bonum de vobis testimonium reddiderunt.</p> <p>Quo suffragio confisa et Spiritu Sancto illuminata, Ecclesia vos ac sacramenta Paschalia nomine Christi advocat (Qui audit Ecclesiam, ut scitis, Christum audit; et Ecclesiae respondet. Nunc igitur vestrum est, qui a tanto tempore vocem Christi audivisit, responsum ipsi reddere, revelando voluntatem vestram).</p> <p>Vultis (desideratis) sacramentis Christi initiari Baptismo, Confirmatione et Eucharistia?</p>
<p>Desideratisne initiatorum mysteriis baptismatis, confirmationis et eucharistiae?</p>	<p>Desideratisne initiatorum mysteriis baptismatis, confirmationis et eucharistiae?</p>	

In a similar fashion, S-344 contained a sample statement of conclusion to the Inscription of names (82). This new text, “*Mysteriis divinis pleni sunt gressus eorum...*,”

replaced the rubric from prior versions, which had indicated that the celebrant was to “express the religious sense of the completed action: the visible writing of the names, done before the community, signified that Christ himself had written their names in the book of life, and that they were moving towards him.”²¹⁸ The newly composed text was, simply, a sample formulation.

Two new texts were inserted into the rite of election in S-344. The first was an alternate concluding prayer (84) to the originally prescribed text, based on OBA 11. The new formula, “*Domine, Deus et Pater noster...*,” appears to be an attempt to present the content of the former prayer in a new, more contemporary light, thereby avoiding the claim that the catechumens would “receive by grace what the could not attain through their nature”²¹⁹ Instead, it asked that through divine adoption, the elect would be led to the eternal joy with God promised by Christ, and realized through baptism. The second new text was a greatly expanded dismissal (85). Instead of the simple “Elect of God, go in peace; May the Lord be with you,” a new text that could serve as a theological model for the celebrant’s similar words was inserted. This new text reminded the elect that they were to receive intense formation through the season of Lent, and that they would be unified to the Christian community, through the light of Christ, at the Vigil.

²¹⁸ S-147 adnexum I 19: “Deinde celebrans exprimit sensum religiosum actionis peractae: nominum inscriptione visibili, coram communitate facta, significatur Christum ipsum eorum nomina in libro Vitae consignare ut eos ad Se adducat.”

²¹⁹ S-344, 84: “...quod non potuerunt assequi assequi per naturam, gaudeant se recepisse per gratiam.”

7.6.4: The Third Stage: Scrutinies and Traditiones

There were few amendments to the third stage. Since the scrutinies had been so thoroughly examined in the recent past, no actual changes to the plan from St-Genesius-Rode were required. The only significant differences were that new litanies of intercession over the elect for each scrutiny were composed in accordance with the principals established in the Appendix to S-147, and that the prayers for each exorcism were the revised versions of those appearing in S-337, otherwise referred to as “Project L.”

7.6.5: The Fourth Stage: The Rites of Immediate Preparation

The only alteration to the fourth stage, the Rites of Immediate Preparation, was the inclusion of the possibility of celebrating the pre-baptismal anointing (144). In the Appendix to S-147 the *Coetus* had indicated that the anointing would occur during one of the scrutinies.²²⁰ This proposal was not enacted in S-344, however, and two other locations for the anointing were proposed. First, the anointing could be restored to the immediate context of baptism. Second, it could occur within the rites of immediate preparation, where it would occur before the *redditio symboli*; in this scenario the *Ephphatha* could be omitted. To celebrate the anointing in either of these two locations presumed that one had not already celebrated it during the period of the catechumenate.

²²⁰ S-147 adnexum I 22: “Enlever le 89 de cet endroit (Unctio) pour le placer à l’un des scrutins.” This statement clearly indicated that, at this point in the discussion, the pre-baptismal anointing was to be removed from the immediate context of baptism altogether. The anointing mentioned in the Appendix to S-147 in connection with the period of the catechumenate appears to have been, at that point, a separate consideration. It was only in S-344 that the catechumenal anointing was explicitly linked to the pre-baptismal anointing.

7.6.6: The Sacraments of Initiation

In treating the celebration of the sacraments at the Vigil,²²¹ S-344 contained three additions. First, the introduction to Baptism (150), scheduled for revision in the Appendix to S-147, was rewritten, in order to better correspond both to adult and infant initiation. The text contained in S-344 was a translation of the French text inserted in SGR. Second, allowance was made for an acclamation by the assembly following baptism (155, 156). Sample texts would eventually be added, but none were contained in this draft. This would mirror the rite of infant initiation. Third, a sample instruction before Confirmation (159) was composed. This was likely inserted in an attempt to respond to the criticism of some experimenters that Confirmation did not stand out clearly enough within the rite.²²² The instruction instructed those gathered about the place of Confirmation in the life of the Church, and about the priesthood of all of the baptized, who would soon be anointed as were the Apostles at Pentecost. The instruction also indicated that the Bishop who confirmed them stood in the line of the Apostles, or, in cases where the sacrament was administered by a priest, that the priest received his authority to confirm from the Bishop. This addition clearly referred back to the

²²¹ S-344 did include directions for celebrating adult initiation outside of the Vigil at number 147. These had not been included in the previous versions of the rite, although the possibility had certainly been considered.

²²² Le Dorze, 3: “Confirmation passe totalement inaperçue entre les deux grands sacrements du Baptême et de l’Eucharistie. Pour la remettre en valeur; préparer une admonition qui soit dans le texte du rituel; imposer un chant, avant ou après cette admonition.”

NCCB, 2: “Confirmation does not stand out enough in the present rite. Some minor revision – a pause, a change in location, appropriate words – needs to be inserted which will accomplish this.”

discussion of the *Consilium*, who desired that the role of the Bishop in the rite be highlighted and respected.²²³

7.7: Conclusions

From the time that the *Coetus* first received reports of experimentation until the composition of S-344, the rite, which retained its general structure for the most part, underwent a great deal of textual alteration. The impact of the period of experimentation cannot be understated. Four general trends can be noted. First, the rite became more supple. Ritual options increased in an effort to allow it to respond more thoroughly in pastoral situations. The number of texts was increased, and a great number of these texts were marked as models for local adaptation. Second, the structure of the rites and the texts themselves were further adapted to better address modern sensibilities and better fit within a wide variety of local cultures. Third, the issue of negativity in prayer texts was addressed – often by adding alternate options, often by editing the text in question – in order to more fully proclaim that those seeking initiation were on a journey of faith, one in which they became closer to God through the process of conversion itself. And fourth, the rites were expanded to allow for greater participation of the catechists, the sponsors, and the community.

In putting forward these changes the *Coetus* sought to address the concerns expressed in the responses to experimentation. In doing so, spurred by the experimenters,

²²³ The rite of Confirmation was taken from the work of *Coetus XX*, the group assigned to the Roman Pontifical. For a brief history of the work of this group see *ROL* 613-625, and Botte, *From Silence to Participation*, 153-161.

the *Coetus* moved to a more complete appreciation the principles of reform espoused in SC 21:

... For the liturgy is made up of immutable elements, divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change. These not only may but ought to be changed with the passage of time if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy or have become pointless. In this reform both texts and rites should be so drawn up that they express more clearly the holy things they signify and that the Christian people, as far as possible, are able to understand them with ease and to take part in the rites fully, actively, and as befits a community.

Two basic points are espoused here: accretions have distorted the purpose of the liturgy; and some elements have lost their significance. The operative mindset of the *Coetus* had been oriented towards the larger picture, towards the structure of the rite itself, and both principles are clearly evidenced in the reform of the rite. So, for example, regarding the first principle, the *Coetus* understood the passage of time having essentially, allowed for the doubling of the post-baptismal anointing via the separation of Confirmation from Baptism. They corrected the problem by eliminating the anointing immediately after baptism in cases where Confirmation was to be administered. In terms of the second, the distribution of salt had lost its significance in contemporary society, and so, had been relegated to being an optional element.

Furthermore, what clearly emerged beginning at Vanves, was a new approach to the ancient liturgical sources, rooted in a more complete appreciation of the implications of SC 21. This is most clearly evidenced by the Scrutinies. Experimentation had made clear, however, that fixing the shape of the rite, while vital, was, itself, insufficient. Textual changes beyond the surface alterations that had already been made needed to be embraced. Consider, for example, the texts for the Scrutinies in S-147; they were, largely, taken from other sources. Thus, in the First Scrutiny the text of the intercessions

was adapted from *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII, 6, the prayer of exorcism was adapted from OBA 17 and 21, and the final prayer over the elect was taken from OBA 28. In the Appendix to S-147 and S-337, the intercessions and prayers of exorcism were completely rewritten, and, while the final prayer over the elect was retained unchanged, directives were established for the creation of an alternate text. The addition of intercessions and the further editing of the prayers of exorcism in S-344 completed this work. These changes suggest that the *Coetus* more completely embraced the reality that relevant rituals, like the Scrutinies, could be rendered irrelevant by the texts employed therein. The principle of SC 21 was thus extended to apply to the texts also.

Upon examining the official drafts of the rite existing before experimentation it is clear that the changes were minimal. However, comparing S-147 with S-344 demonstrates a great degree of wholesale change, which corresponds directly to the observations of the experimenters. One should, therefore, say that the composition of S-344 was, thus, not simply the work of the *Coetus*. It was also very much a multi-national effort of priests, practitioners, and catechumens engaged in hands-on work with the rite itself.

CHAPTER EIGHT

FINALIZING THE RITE

Following upon the completion of S-344, the *Coetus* was to meet again for another full review of the OCGD on July 15-21, 1969, at Douvres-la-Délivran in Normandy and Arromanches, and on September 10-14, 1969, in Luxembourg. The fruits of these sessions would be S-352. This text would be studied by the Relators on November 5 and would be presented by Ligier to the *Consilium*, now operating under the recently created Congregation for Divine Worship, at their twelfth General Meeting on November 13. With the approval of the *Consilium* the OCGD was prepared for publication, and over the next year, was checked and studied repeatedly by *Coetus* members and the Congregations for Divine Worship, the Sacraments, the Doctrine of the Faith, and the Evangelization of Peoples. Once the responses from these Congregations had been received, they were studied by a committee from the *Consilium* on April 30, 1971, and a joint meeting between the four previously named dicasteries was held on June 7. Two weeks later, on June 23, the Congregation for Divine Worship sent the corrected texts to the other Congregations for their approval, and on November 14, the texts were sent to the Pope for his approval. The OCGD was approved by Paul VI on

November 30, and on January 6, 1972, the *Ordo initiaionis Christianae adultorum* was published by the Congregation for Divine Worship.¹

For most of these later meetings there is little available documentation available, largely because the *Coetus* itself was not involved. Throughout the process, however, there was at least some discussion with the Congregation for Divine Worship back and forth with the *Coetus* – largely with Cellier and Ligier – and amidst the *Coetus* members themselves.

8.1: Douvres-la-Délivran and Arromanches, July 15-21, 1969

The portion of the meeting at Douvres-la-Délivran and Arromanches² concerning the rites of adult initiation focused on two separate tasks: discussing the *Praenotanda*, and examining the prayers for the scrutinies distributed at St-Genesius-Rode.³ The ultimate purpose of the meeting was to prepare a final version of the rite to present to the *Consilium*. A draft of the newly composed *Praenotanda* was sent to the *Coetus* members

¹ The outline of dates is based on Bugnini's account. See *ROL*, 185-188, 589-591.

² Bugnini names both of these locations as being the sites for the meeting in *ROL*, 589. This data is confirmed in the *Relatio* accompanying S-352, 3. There is, however, no mention of Arromanches anywhere in the handwritten documentation contained in the C.N.P.L. archives. The records of the proceedings simply refer to Douvres-la-Délivran, and the letter from Cellier to *Coetus* XXII and XXIII (in C.N.P.L. 2.E) gives only the address for the Pensionnat de la Vierge Fidèle in Douvres-la-Délivran, as well as the train schedule for Caen. It is, therefore, possible that the *Coetus* moved to Arromanches unexpectedly. Because, however, it is impossible to determine what work was accomplished in which site, this study will simply make mention of Douvres-la-Délivran, while recognizing all the while that some of the decisions reached may well have occurred at Arromanches instead.

³ "Cellier to Coetus XXII-XXIII, June 5, 1969:" "Mise au point du rite et spécialement des exorcismes (Prière à chacun d'étudier les documents ci-joints distribués à Bruxelles... Élaboration des Praenotanda. Le Père Ligier pourra faire sans doute, malgré son lourd travail, un texte de base."

"Groupe de Travail sur le Rituel Baptismal, June 14, 1969" in C.N.P.L. 2.E, 1: "Étude du projet du rite d'entrée en Catéchuménat élaboré par le Coetus 22 lors de la session de Bruxelles."

on June 30, 1969.⁴ Until this point, the *Praenotanda*, which were to provide “pastoral and rubrical” directives,⁵ had not been appended to the rite. Thus, this particular portion of the work was critical for the development of the OCGD.

8.1.1: Praenotanda

The draft *Praenotanda* were composed by Ligier and were based on numerous previous documents: OBA; OBA1962; Molin’s proposal in preparation for the Cologne meeting; the Trier *Instructiones*; the revisions following the 1965 meeting with the *Consilium*; the General Introduction to Christian Initiation; and the *Praenotanda* for Infant Baptism.⁶ The two latter sources, both the work of *Coetus* XXII and XXIII, had recently been approved for publication by the Congregation for Divine Worship on May 15, 1969.⁷ Furthermore, the text incorporated quotations from *SC*, *Ad gentes*, and the Code of Canon Law. The sixty-one paragraphs of the new document were contained in fourteen typed pages, and were divided into six sections, not including a three paragraph

⁴ The “Draft Praenotanda” (in C.N.P.L. 2.D: “Avril-Juin 69...”) are actually dated “in Commemoratione Sancti Pauli 1969.” The feast of St. Paul, originally celebrated on June 29, had been separated in the eighth century from the feast of St. Peter for logistical reasons, and celebrated one day later, on June 30 (see Adolf Adam, *The Liturgical Year: Its History and Its Meaning After the Reform of the Liturgy*. Collegeville: A Pueblo Book by the Liturgical Press, 1990, 235-237). The reunification of the feasts of Sts. Peter and Paul had only been accomplished weeks before the drafting of the *Praenotanda*, on May 9, 1969 (see *ROL*, 314). It is, therefore understandable that Ligier would have used the calendar with which he was far more familiar. The cover letter, however, is dated June 30, 1969. For the text of the *Praenotanda*, see Appendix A.

⁵ *SC*, 63b: “...But those who draw up these rituals or particular collections of rites must not leave out the prefatory instructions for the individual rites in the Roman Ritual, whether the instructions are pastoral and rubrical or have some special social bearing.”

⁶ “Ligier to Coetus XXII-XXIII, June 30, 1969” in C.N.P.L. 2.D: “Elaborata est sane, adhibitis multis anterioribus documentis, v.g.: iterum legi Praenotanda RR., Ordinis Baptismi adutorum per gradus catechumenatus dispositi (1963), Schema P. Molin, Schema Trevirense; deinde Adnexa, praeparata in monasterio Montefiolo; prae oculis oculis denique habui Praenotanda generalia, nunc publiciiuris facta, et Praenotanda Baptismi parvulorum.”

⁷ See *ROL*, 601-602.

introduction: The structure of Christian Initiation (thirty-one paragraphs); On Ministries and Offices (six paragraphs); On the Time for Initiation (eleven paragraphs); On the Place for Initiation (four paragraphs); On Adaptations Permitted to Conferences of Bishops and Bishops (three paragraphs); and On Adaptations Permitted to the Minister (three paragraphs). The first section was by far the most detailed. Following one paragraph of general introduction, the subdivisions matched the temporal division of the rite: the Pre-catechumenate (three paragraphs), the Catechumenate (eight paragraphs), the period of Purification and Enlightenment (six paragraphs), the Sacraments of Initiation [fourteen paragraphs, including a general introduction (one paragraph) the Rites of Immediate Preparation (two paragraphs), Baptism (four paragraphs), Confirmation (two paragraphs), and Eucharist (one paragraphs)], and Mystagogy (three paragraphs). This was the only subdivided section of the *Praenotanda*.

Ligier admitted to the *Coetus* members that the draft text contained two obvious weaknesses. There was a great degree of overlap between the introductory *Praenotanda* for the rite and the *Praenotanda* for the particular stages. Also, there were some occasions for discrepancy between the directives of the *Praenotanda* and other rites that would be affected by it – notably marriage.⁸ Ligier asked for specific help in sorting out these issues, as well as commentary on the wording of the *Praenotanda* and the order in

⁸ “Ligier to Coetus XXII-XXIII, June 30, 1969:” “Attamen adumbratio ista, prout nunc legitur, se praebet in multis valde imperfecta: 1. Quae veniunt, v.g. ‘De structura initiationis christianae’ non raro idem dicunt et quidem fusius quam in Praenotandis particularibus ipsius Ritualis novi. Necessarium erit ideo seligere locum aptiorem et modum dicendi opportuniorem. 2. Nonnullae affirmationes iterum ponderandae sunt, quia non semper ad veritatem et perfectionem sufficienter deductae: v.g. quod dicitur de matrimonio catechumenorum; necnon particularia de structura Ordinis initiationis intra Missam dominicalem (paragraphus desumpta fere ad verbum ex Ordine Baptismi parvulorum).”

which they occurred.⁹ With few exceptions the content of the document gave written expression to the concerns and considerations of the *Coetus* that had been expressed until this point in the deliberations. The revised version of the *Praenotanda* exhibits very few changes of substance to the vision of adult initiation laid out in the draft.¹⁰ The changes that do occur can be classified as deletions, alterations, or additions.

There are very few items in the draft *Praenotanda* that were removed in the revised version, and only three of any substantive note. First, the revised version eliminated Ligier's explanation of why the post-baptismal anointing was to be omitted in cases where Confirmation was administered. Ligier named the post-baptismal anointing as equivalent to chrismation in the East, and implied that chrismation was equivalent to Confirmation: "The post-baptismal rites are shortened, the anointing with chrism by the priest having been omitted, when Baptism and Confirmation are united, just as in the tradition of the East, where we continue to see a unified celebration of the two sacraments."¹¹ The revision simply excised the rationale from the paragraph. No discussion surrounding this choice is extant in the C.N.P.L. archives. Second, Ligier had included the suggestion that a non-religious celebration for the end of the period of Mystagogy might be celebrated on Pentecost Sunday, presuming that Confirmation had

⁹ "Ligier to Coetus XXII-XXIII, June 30, 1969:" "Propterea auxilium vestrum fraternum exspectatur. Afferatis propositiones positivas sive quoad textus, sive quoad locum et structuram. Etenim, dum responsiones mere 'criticae' quamvis utiles, animum frangunt eorum qui horas et integros dies ad opus commune triverunt, solutiones positivae et constructivae ab omnibus semper admittuntur. Apud omnes gentes, in regione veri et boni, criterium 'evidentiae' semper recte praevaluit."

¹⁰ "Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969" in C.N.P.L. 2.E: "Douvres-la-Délivrande." See Appendix II for the comparative *Praenotanda*.

¹¹ "Draft *Praenotanda*," 30: "Propterea ritus complementares Baptismi, omitta chrismatione postbaptismali a presbytero facta, remittendi sunt post collatam Confirmationem et perficiantur ad modum conclusionis, uti mos est in liturgiis orientalibus, quae continuam celebrationem Baptismi et Confirmationis ad nos usque servaverunt."

not been delayed until that day.¹² Again, no rationale was provided for its elimination, although it seems reasonable to think that mention of a non-liturgical celebration might not be appropriate within the *Praenotanda*. Third, Ligier had included a paragraph outlining different adaptations to the Liturgy of the Word that could be made whenever adult initiation was celebrated outside of the Vigil.¹³ Admittedly, this paragraph was more of an enumeration of what should happen than elements that the celebrant might adapt. Perhaps expectedly, then, this paragraph disappeared from the revised version.

There were only three substantive alterations to the draft *Praenotanda*, one concerning the location for initiation, one involving the time, and one dealing with a Bishop's authority to dispense with a scrutiny in his diocese. In paragraph 53 of the draft version, Ligier had indicated that the optimal place for the sacraments of initiation was the cathedral church, or in some other major church. While the *Coetus* had been revising the rite the specification of any particular location had been left untouched. The preference for the term "celebrant" instead of bishop or priest underscores this lack of precision. Consequently, during the period of experimentation, many of the rites of election had, indeed, taken place in local parishes, while others had taken place in the cathedral parish. But even if Ligier was not actually advocating that initiation would take

¹² "Draft Praenotanda," 51: "In Dominica Pentecostis, etiamsi neophyti Confirmationem hac die non recipiant, instauretur aliqua celebratio, additis etiam profanis festivitibus, ad claudendum tempus mystagogiae et iter spirituale neophytorum."

¹³ "Draft Praenotanda," 59: "Si forte initiatio adultorum extra Vigiliam paschalem in Missa dominicali habeatur, celebratio hoc modo ordinatur: 1: In liturgia verbi: a) Lectiones sumuntur e Missa dominicae, aut, si speciales rationes adsunt, ex iis quae in Ordine Baptismi proponuntur; b) Homilia e textu sacro fiat: rationem autem habeat initiationis celebrandae; c) Symbolum non dicitur, eo quod eius locum tenet confessio fidei, quae ab universa communitate fit ante Baptismum; d) Oratio universalis ex iis quae habentur in Ordine Baptismi sumitur. In fine autem additur deprecatio pro Ecclesia universali et necessitatibus mundi. 2: Celebratio sacramentorum prosequitur inde a benedictione fontis."

place in the cathedral rather than in the parish, naming the cathedral as the optimal location is an indication of the centrality of the bishop and cathedral for the life of the Church. Nonetheless, the revised version named the parish as being the best location for the celebration of initiation, or if necessary, some other location. In an effort to acknowledge the centrality of the bishop, the revised paragraph directed that the Bishop was the best celebrant, whether in the cathedral church or in some other location. This paragraph concluded by noting that the participation of the community should be the guiding principle in making the decision surrounding location.

The second point that was altered from the draft *Praenotanda* was the time at which the sacraments were to be administered if not at the Vigil itself. Mirroring developments stemming from Tertullian,¹⁴ Ligier had indicated that if initiation could not be celebrated at Easter, then the next best day was Pentecost Sunday, or on any other Sunday, since Sunday was the day on which the paschal mystery was called to mind. The revision eliminated the day of Pentecost as a specific possibility, naming instead, the octave of Easter as the next best time outside of the Vigil. Otherwise, the sacraments should be celebrated on a Sunday.¹⁵

¹⁴ Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 19: “The Passover provides the day of most solemnity for baptism for then was accomplished our Lord’s passion, and into it we are baptized... After that, Pentecost is a most auspicious period for arranging baptisms, for during it our Lord’s resurrection was several times made known among the disciples, and the grace of the Holy Spirit first given... For all that, every day is a Lord’s day...” Quoted in *DOBL*, 10.

Admittedly, naming the day of Pentecost as second in significance for baptism, rather than the season of the fifty days itself, is a development from Tertullian. Ligier’s claim is likely influenced by Duchesne. *CW* 293: “It was at Easter, in fact, that baptism was ordinarily administered, and that, too, from the earliest times. The vigil of Easter Sunday was devoted to this ceremony... The last day for this purpose, that of Pentecost, as much on account of its being the last as for its own special solemnity, came soon to be regarded as a second baptismal festival.”

¹⁵ Compare “Draft *Praenotanda*” 47 with “*Recognitio Schematis* 344, August 6, 1969” 55 and 59.

The third alteration in the revision indicated that a scrutiny could only be omitted in cases of grave necessity with the necessary approval of the Bishop. Ligier's original paragraph preserved the decision of the *Coetus* found in S-344: no scrutiny could be omitted. While no record of the discussion on this point is extant in the C.N.P.L. archive, Cellier himself provided a rationale in his written evaluation of the draft *Praenotanda*:

At paragraph 44 it says that none of the scrutinies may be omitted. I find this position too harsh. The text must underline their importance and their complementarity; but it must be more flexible. A genuine problem is revealed by experimentation – the rhythm of the steps in Lent is seen as too heavy.¹⁶

It is reasonable to think that this position, a concession to pastoral necessity, guided the alteration. The way in which the paragraph was rephrased clearly indicates the importance of the scrutinies while allowing for some modification should circumstances dictate such a necessity.

There were numerous additions made to the draft of the *Praenotanda*. Some additions provided further references for points contained in the draft. These did not change the meaning of the draft, but merely supported it. For example, in describing one of the ways in which catechumens grew in faith during the period of the catechumenate,¹⁷ Ligier's original claim that the catechumens were helped by the example and support of their sponsors and the entire community to turn towards God more easily in prayer, to testify to their faith, to wait for Christ, to hear divine inspiration in all of their activities,

¹⁶ Cellier, "Quelques remarques du responsable du Catéchuménat du diocèse de Lyon à propos du nouveau projet de rituel du baptême des adultes" in C.N.P.L. 2.E, 2: "Au no. 44, il est dit qu'aucun des scrutins ne doit être omis. Je trouve cette position trop dure. Tout en soulignant leur importance et leur complémentarité, il faudrait être plus souple. Il y a un réel problème en ce qui concerne le rythme des étapes tout au long du Carême. Il se révèle très lourd à l'expérience."

¹⁷ Ligier's draft *Praenotanda* contained three ways – the revision added the fourth way of evangelization, through inserting a quotation from *Ad gentes* 14.

and to love their neighbor by renouncing their own desires, the *Coetus* added a quotation from *Ad gentes* 14.¹⁸ The “Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity”¹⁹ was the document added most frequently, with five insertions by means of both direct and indirect quotations. *Lumen gentium* and *Presbyterorum ordinis* were each quoted once.²⁰

Some additions clarified points made in the draft making the original description more specific. So, for example, in the first draft the paragraph which details that various versions of the rite exist (Draft Praenotanda 3), in order to facilitate diverse pastoral circumstances, lists the normative version as being the full rite, and adds that a simple form and a brief form exist also. The next draft specifies that the simple form is only to be used when necessary, and the brief form is to be reserved for cases where death is impending. No point of clarification inserted in the revision went contrary to the decisions of the *Coetus* up until this point. So, for example, the subsection treating the precatechumenate was expanded to include explicit mention of evangelization in the title, and an extra paragraph describing how evangelization aided in the conversion process,

¹⁸ “Draft Praenotanda,” 14b: “In exercitio christianae vitae familiariter versantur. Exemplo et subsidio sponsorum totiusque communitatis in statu missionis erectae, assuescent ad Deum facilius orandum, fidem testificandam, Christi expectationem in omnibus servandam, supernam inspirationem in operibus audiendam et ad caritatem proximi usque ad abrenuntiationem sui operandam.” See also OICA 19.2, and *The Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See*, Study Edition, Prepared by International Commission on English in the Liturgy and Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1988) (hereafter, RCIA) 75.2.

¹⁹ Compare “Draft Praenotanda” 5, 10, 11, 14 and 18 with “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969” 10, 16, 17, 20, and 22. Notes on the session from July 15 (“Douvres 15/7/69” in C.N.P.L. 2.E.) indicate that evangelization was the first weakness noted by the *Coetus*.

²⁰ For *Lumen gentium* compare “Draft Praenotanda” 35 with “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969” 41. For *Presbyterorum ordinis* compare “Draft Praenotanda” 39 with “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969” 45.

specifically by helping foster the desire for Christ through baptism.²¹ And in the section dealing with the role of sponsor, the revision included mention that the sponsors were delegated by the local community and approved by the priest.²²

Finally, the revised text occasionally expanded the draft version of the *Praenotanda*. Thus the general introduction to the first section, *De structura initiationis adultorum*, expanded from one paragraph to five. The original had noted that the process of initiation united the work of the Church, the action of the Holy Spirit, and the growth of the candidates together. It then named the stages and times of the process of initiation. The revision, however, elaborated upon the growth and conversion of the candidate through the power of the Holy Spirit in one paragraph, and then moved on to linking that with the ritual action of the Church. The next paragraph described the stages of the rite – doors through which the candidates passed, or steps that the candidates ascended on their journey²³ – and pointed towards the intended spiritual growth marked by each of the three steps: entry into the catechumenate, election, and initiation. Then the revision treated the times of the rite, those extended periods in between the steps, in which the candidates prepared for the next phase of their spiritual journey. This paragraph pointed briefly to the purpose of each of the four times: evangelization in the pre-catechumenate; the period

²¹ “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969,” 11: “Ex evangelizatione cum auxilio Dei peracta oriuntur fides et conversio initialis, qui bus quisque se percipit a peccato revocatum et mysterio dilectionis divinae apertum. Integrum praecatechumenatus tempus dedicatur incremento huius fide et conversionis ita ut maturescat vera voluntas Christum sequendi et baptismum petendi.”

²² “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969,” 43: “Patrinus... a communitate christiana loci delegatus et a sacerdote approbatus.”

²³ “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969,” 6: “De gradibus – In hac via, praeter tempora/investigationis et maturationis, sunt gradus seu gressus, per quos catechumenus progrediens veluti portam transit vel gradum ascendit.”

of the catechumenate; the time of intense preparation; and the period of Mystagogy. This presentation of the times and steps of the rite would later be compiled into a chart by Seumois, based upon the chart originally composed at Trier in 1965 (see Table 8.1 below).²⁴ While the chart would not be made available to the *Coetus* until well after this meeting, it represents the state of thinking of the group on progression through the periods and steps of the catechumenate at that time. Finally, the revised version of the *Praenotanda* provided a description of the paschal context which underlay the OCGD. In doing this, the revised version attempted to provide a more theological perspective on the initiatory process.

The largest single alteration to the draft *Praenotanda* was the portion concerning the celebration of adult baptism. This draft text contained four paragraphs, based on the order of the ritual. The first of these paragraphs treated the blessing of the water, describing how it recalled creation and the entire mystery of salvation; through the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the proclamation of the paschal mystery, the water instilled regeneration and participation in Christ's death and resurrection, thereby leading to eternal life. The second and third paragraphs considered the renunciation of Satan and the profession of faith, describing how, together with the pre-baptismal anointing, the elect were strengthened to turn from sin and accept the offer of salvation by embracing the faith of the Church as their own. The fourth paragraph described baptism as the moment in which the elect signified and realized their participation in Christ's death and resurrection. Above all, however, this draft pointed to the ritual itself, outlining the steps

²⁴ Seumois sent the revised chart to Cellier, who made some minor additions. It can be found in the midst of the revised *Praenotanda* in C.N.P.L. 2.F: "Correspondance: P. Seumois." For the original chart,

TABLE 8.1

STAGES OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION IN THE REVISED OCGD

<i>Iter Fidei</i>	Fides in Christum	Conversio Globalis ad Christum	Experientia vitae Populi Dei	Decisio definitiva (conversio baptismalis)	Ultima Praeparatio Spiritualis	Regeneratio et aggregatio Populo Dei	Intellectus mysteriorum
<i>Gradus et Tempora</i>	Tempus precatechumenatus	I Gradus: Ordo ad catechumenos faciendos	Tempus catechumenatus	II Gradus: Electio seu inscriptio nominis	Tempus purificationis et Illuminationis	III Gradus: Celebratio ipsorum sacramentorum initiationis	Tempus mystagogiae
<i>Functio Ecclesiae</i>	Evangelizatio	Acceptatio	Initiatio	Electio	Illuminatio	Celebratio sacramentorum	Mystagogia
<i>Partes Hierarchiae</i>	Testimonium vitae, praesertim caritatis; Dialogus salutis, propositio kerignatis	Investigatio de motivis conversionis; Admissio in	Catechesis praebaptismalis	Investigatio de probatione catechumenali - Electio	Catechesis – Celebrationes scrutiniorum et traditum	Celebratio sacramentorum	Catechesis mystagogica
<i>Catechumenorum</i>	Praeambula fidei, fides initialis	Dedicatio globalis (remise de soi à l'Eglise)	Obedientia fidei operosa	Inscriptio	Oboedientia fidei operosa sensus poenitentiae – desiderium Christi Salvatoris	Protestatio fidei et actiosa participatio	Gustus mysteriorum
<i>Communitatis</i>	Testimonium vitae, praesentia caritatis, dialogus salutis, propositio kerignatis	Participatio actiosa ecclesiolae	Testimonium vitae et caritatis, Dialogus salutis, Praeces fidelium, Catechesis	Participatio actiosa communitatis christianae localis	Participatio actiosa communitatis in renovatione paschali	Participatio actiosa communitatis localis	Participatio actiosa
<i>Sponsoris vel Patris</i>	Idem	Praesentatio a sponsore		Parini testimonium dant de idoneitate; promittunt assistentiam spiritualem	Delegati a communitate ut electis auxilium spirituale afferent; <i>Pars activa in ritibus</i>	Pars activa in ritibus	Guides et consellers
<i>Ritus Normativi</i>		Ritus ad catechumenos faciendos	Exorcismi minores et benedictiones; Celebrationes Verbi, praesertim in Missa	Inscriptio nominis, seu electio	Missae scrutiniorum, Traditiones – Ritus immediate praeparatorii	Baptismus, Confirmatio, Eucharistia	Missae pro neophytis
<i>Ad iudicium Conferentiae Episcopalis</i>	Exorcismi minores et benedictiones		Ritus transitionis: Traditiones, Ephphetha, Redditio Symboli, Unctio olei catechumenorum				

that were to be followed. Consequently, the decision was made to move paragraphs 25-27 of Ligier's text to the particular *Praenotanda* embedded within the rite.

In its place the *Coetus* inserted four paragraphs that were about the ritual shape, and about the paschal theology of baptism.²⁵ Paragraph 28 treating baptism would be retained in place. The revised text, which would be adopted almost wholesale into the published version of the rite, included an overall introduction to the celebration of baptism, highlighting the baptismal act, and orienting the pre-baptismal rites towards it. Then it moved to a less concretely ritualized description of the elements. Like the expansion of the overview to the progression of the initiatory process, the revised text was more theological in content than the draft version.

The only statement that appears relatively unannounced in the revised text was a firm rejection of "anonymous Christianity:" "Adults are not saved unless they come forward of their own accord and with the will to accept God's gift through their own belief."²⁶ No explanation for this theological shift is contained within any of the notations from the meeting. One might suspect, however, that this was intended to stand against an uninformed acceptance of the theory at the parish level. One report of experimentation had indicated that professing a faith in Christ was not a necessary requirement for entry into the catechumenate, but was something that could be delayed until later in the initiation process.²⁷ The response of the *Coetus* had been, justifiably,

²⁵ Thus, Ligier's paragraph 25 dealing with the blessing of water became paragraph 210, and a new paragraph was inserted where the original text had been – now paragraph 30.

²⁶ RCIA 211, cf. OICA 30. "Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969," 31: "Adulti enim non salvantur nisi, sponte sua accedentes, donum Dei credendo velint accipere."

²⁷ Le Dorze, 1: "Je proposais la solution suivante: Élargir les possibilités de la cérémonie de l'Entrée, c.a.d. ne pas exiger une foi explicite au Christ..."

rather negative towards this suggestion; it appeared to take the principle of anonymous Christianity and extend it where it was not intended to go – namely, that one might actively profess to be a Christian without professing a belief in Christ. Perhaps this addition was made in order to safeguard the process of initiation against such misinterpretation about the place of Christ in salvation.

8.1.2: Scrutinies

Five complete sets of exorcisms had been distributed at St-Genesius-Rode, including a revised version of the prayers from S-337, three versions composed by Ligier and Galot, and one submission from the Japanese experimenters. At that meeting the *Coetus* had only been able to agree that a variety of texts should be offered, but they were not able to settle on any particular choices. At the Douvres-la-Délivran meeting, however, the *Coetus* was able to come to some decision about which texts should be included in the final draft of the rite (see Table 8.2 below). The texts are classified according to the scrutiny (1, 2, or 3), the set to which they belong (L=Ligier, A, B, or C),²⁸ and the person to whom the prayer is addressed (F=Father, S=Son).²⁹ Along with the one set of prayers included within the main body of the rite, the *Coetus* decided to include two sets of options for each scrutiny in the chapter of alternate texts which would follow the rite. Thus, they selected nine sets of prayers for the scrutinies. Ultimately, the decision of the *Coetus* was to leave the revised versions of Ligier's prayers intact within in the rite. In selecting the alternate prayers, the *Coetus* occasionally chose complete

²⁸ Since none of the prayers from the Japanese collection were included, the “J” set has not been included in the table.

²⁹ Thus, 1LF indicates the portion of the exorcism composed by Ligier for the first exorcism that is directed to the Father.

sets, occasionally wove prayers from distinct sets together, and, in two instances, fused prayers intended for different scrutinies together. Almost certainly some of the motivation here was an attempt to respond to the Japanese critique, which rejected the thematic progression within the scrutinies from individual sin to communal sin, to the necessity of baptism.

In only one case, apart from the prayers in the “L” set, was a Father-Son combination utilized without amendment – the first option for the first scrutiny (385). Here the prayers of exorcism for the first scrutiny from the “A” collection were included (see Table 8.3 below). The texts are generally similar, although the revision presents Jesus and the elect in different ways. Jesus’ yoke is described as gentle, and it is his merciful wisdom that leads to conversion rather than his power. Jesus is thereby rendered more approachable and compassionate. Regarding humanity, the revision adds in specific mention of divine adoption through initiation, and the elect are not brought to a specific “true worship” but to a more broad “true faith.” These alterations point to a more optimistic view of humanity in general, and lessen the degree of possible offence that might be taken by others, particularly in mission territories. The revision thus has responded to the overall criticism of negativity in the texts by presenting a more positive view of Christ and humanity.

TABLE 8.2
PRAYERS OF EXORCISM

IN S-352

Key:
*=alternate text
?=possible source text

Text	S-337	S-344	S-352 (171, 178, 185, 385, 386, 390, 391, 395, 396)
1LF	51 (1)	100 (1)	171 (1)
1LS	51 (1)	100 (1)	171 (1)
2LF	58 (2)	108 (2)	178 (2)
2LS	58 (2)	108 (2)	178 (2)
3LF? ³⁰	64 (3)	116 (3)	185 (3)
3LS?	64 (3)	116 (3)	185 (3)
1AF			385 (1*)
1AS			385 (1*)
2AF			395 (3*)
2AS			390 (2*)
3AF			390 (2*)
3AS			395 (3*)
1BF			386 (1*)?
1BS			386 (1*)
2BF			391 (2*)?
2BS			391 (2*)
3BF			396 (3*)
3BS			
1CF			386 (1*)?
1CS			
2CF			
2CS			
3CF			
3CS			

³⁰ The Ligier texts for the third exorcism were missing from the collection in the C.N.P.L. archives. Given the pattern of textual inclusion in S-337 and S-344 when compared to set “L,” it seems reasonable to presume that the missing page contained the prayers found at S-344 116.

TABLE 8.3
FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS
FOR THE FIRST SCRUTINY
IN S-352

<p>1AF Pater misericordiae, qui Samaritanae efficaciter misertus es et paterna sollicitudine motus, omnibus peccatoribus per Filium tuum Jesum miram salutem praeuisti, peculiari dilectione hos respice, qui filii tui per baptismum fieri cupiunt</p> <p>solve eos a peccati servitute et a duro iugo Satanae transfer eos ad Iesu iugum; Protege eos in omnibus periculis ut, a Christo Salvatore incessanter adiuti tibi in pace et gaudio fideliter serviant, ac semper gratias agere valeant.</p> <p>1AS Domine Iesu, qui miro potentia tua magnam peccatricem convertisti ita ut deinceps spiritu ac veritate Patrem adoraret, eadem potentia nunc libera a pernicioso Satanae artificiis et seductionibus eos qui fonti aquae vivae appropinquant; per Spiritus Sanctam converte eorum animam ut vero cultu Patrem agnoscant et genuinam fidem, amore inspiratam et roboratam, excolant.</p>	<p>S-352, 385 Misericordiarum Pater, qui per Filium tuum benignus Samaritanae misertus es et eadem paterna sollicitudine permotus, omnibus peccatoribus salutem obtulisti, eximia dilectione tua hos electos respice, qui</p> <p>adoptionem filiorum per sacramenta accipere exoptant: solve eos a peccati servitute et a gravi iugo Satanae ut suave Iesu iugum suscipiant. Protege eos in omnibus periculis ut, tibi in pace et gaudio fideliter servientes, tibi etiam gratias in perpetuum agere valeant.</p> <p>Domine Iesu, qui miro misericordiae tuae consilio magnam peccatricem convertisti ut in spiritu deinceps et in veritate Patrem adoraret, nunc a pernicioso Satanae artificiis potenter libera hos electos, qui ad fontem aquae vivae propinquant. Corda eorum in virtute Spiritus Sancti converte ut</p> <p>in genuina fide, quae per caritatem operatur, Patrem tuum agnoscant.</p>
--	--

The second option for the first scrutiny (386) used the prayers from set B as a base model, but composed a new opening section, drawing only generally from the first portion of the prayer for the first scrutiny from sets B and C (see Table 8.4 below). In the opening prayer addressed to the Father, the prayer included in S-352 drew on the ascription in 1BF to God as the living water, rendering it more explicitly baptismally as the “living font.” Then, alluding to 1CF, the new text indicated that Jesus was sent to the Samaritan woman who lacked dignity because of her slavery to sin. To her, Jesus revealed the true gift of God, the living water which would quench humanity’s spiritual thirst and lead to eternal life. Then, however, the new text moved away from an explicitly exorcistic petition, that the elect be liberated from the power of Satan. Instead a more optimistic petition was inserted: that the elect might come to their Savior, so that their spiritual thirst might be quenched. The prayer addressed to the Son was altered, as above, in order to present a more positive portrait of humanity. Rather than simply being saved from the demons, the new prayer indicated that the elect was being directed towards the living water. Furthermore, the implication that love of sin dwelled within the heart of the elect was excised from the revised text.

TABLE 8.4
SECOND ALTERNATE TEXTS
FOR THE FIRST SCRUTINY
IN S-352

<p>1BF Pater aquae vivae, qui ad mysteriosam fontem Samaritanam attraxisti, ut in ea, a servitute peccati soluta, aqua viva, verum donum Dei, in vitam aeternam salire posset, subtrahe, quaesumus, imperio mali et Satanae quos ad baptismi fontem vocas, ut vita tua divina, per Iesum Filium tuum data, in iis libere et abundanter salire possit.</p> <p>1BS Domine Iesu, qui, a Patre missus ad omnes homines salvandos, Samaritanam a via mali olim avertisti et ad credendum in te vocasti ut per hanc fidem sanctitatis viam inveniatur, salva, quaesumus, hos catechumenos ab intimo influxu daemonis, ut peccati horrorem in corde concipiant et servant; da eis Spiritum sanctitatis ut, fide ardenti et firma moti, tibi in aeternum adhaereant.</p>	<p>1CF Pater infinitae sanctitatis, qui Filium tuum ad Samaritanam misisti ut eam a peccati servitute liberaret et ad superiorem vitam vocaret in vera libertate filiorum Dei, concede his ad baptismum candidatis ut, per actionem redemptricem Iesu Salvatoris, a malo et a spiritu mali liberentur atque ad supremam libertatem vitae filialis in tuo regno accedant.</p>	<p>S-352, 386 Deus, qui ipse es fons vitae, Filium tuum Iesum obviam mulieri Samaritanae mittere dignatus es, ut se revelaret largitorem aquae vivae, quae sitim cordis humani exstinguat: fac ut electi tui, qui huc convenerunt, et ipsi inveniant Iesum Salvatorem; aufer a cordibus eorum omnia quae novae vitae adversantur.</p> <p>Domine Iesu, qui a Patre missus ad omnes salvandos homines, Samaritanam a via iniquitatis avertisti et ad credendum in te vocasti ut per fidem viam salutis inveniret: salva, quaesumus, a virtute daemonis, hos electos ad aquas sitientes, ut a peccato semper abhorreant, da eis Spiritum sanctitatis ut, fide ardenti et firma moti, tibi in aeternum adhaereant.</p>
--	--	--

Finding a suitable set of exorcistic prayers for the second scrutiny posed a challenge to the *Coetus*. As part of its critique of the thematic progression for the scrutinies, the Japanese proposal had specifically rejected the emphasis on social sin. Finding this theme in the second scrutiny appeared, at best, forced. Consequently, for the first alternate text for the second scrutiny (390), the *Coetus* used a prayer to the Father

intended for the third scrutiny as a base model for a new text (see Table 8.5 below). In the thematic progression of the scrutinies, the theme for the third scrutiny had been one of overcoming the fear of death itself, and of approaching baptism freed from the blindness of human perception: death was not the end – it only appeared to be for those who saw without the eyes of faith. The introductory prayer, therefore, did not mention blindness, but only being led into the light, as was Lazarus led from his tomb. The only substantive alterations to the text involve a more direct mention of the death and resurrection of Christ instead of the night of Calvary, a substitution of human community for human family, and a removal of the implication that the hearts and minds of the elect were presently in darkness. The first alteration suggests an attempt to make the language of the prayer more readily understandable, and the second two alterations point to the general trend of presenting humanity and the elect more optimistically. The majority of the alterations to the second portion of the prayer were stylistic. Otherwise, the alteration of spirit of error and denial to the infection of error points to the same two trends witnessed in the alterations to the first portion of the prayer. Having mentioned the Holy Spirit, reference to error and denial as a spirit might have been confusing to some. Furthermore, rendering error as a spirit would be more compatible with contemporary minds than as a spirit, and at least to some degree, denial had been overcome by these elect, who had ceased denying Christ.

TABLE 8.5

FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS

FOR THE SECOND SCRUTINY

IN S-352

<p>3AF</p> <p>Pater, omnium tenebrarum triumphator, qui in nocte Calvarii per Filium tuum cruci affixum mendacii et odii tenebras defecisti et per Filium tuum gloriosum veritatis et amoris lucem in totam communitatem humanam effudisti, concede, quaesumus, ut quos ad filiationem tuam vocasti, a tenebris ad claritatem transire possint et ab omni potestate principis tenebrarum liberentur; fac ut Christus, lumen nundi, eorum mentes et corda illuminet.</p> <p>2AS</p> <p>Domine Iesu, qui ipse in baptismo tuo Spiritum Sanctum a caelis apertis accepisti ut per eum pauperes evangelizares et caecis visum restitueres: effunde hunc Spiritum in eos, qui baptismo tuo baptizari cupiunt, ita ut a spiritu erroris, dubii, negationis et incredulitatis semper praeserventur et recta fide ducti te oculis sanatis et elevatis contemplari valeant.</p>	<p>S-352, 390</p> <p>Deus lumen indeficiens et pater luminum, qui per Christi tui mortem et resurrectionem tenebras mendacii et odii exturbasti et lucem veritatis et amoris in familiam humanam effudisti: concede, quaesumus, ut electi tui, quos inter filios adoptionis vocasti, a tenebris ad claritatem transire valeant et, ab omni potestate principis tenebrarum liberati, filii lucis indesinenter maneant.</p> <p>Domine Iesu, qui ipse baptizatus de caelis apertis accepisti Spiritum Sanctum ut in eo pauperes evangelizares et caecis visum restitueres: hunc Spiritum effunde in eos, qui sacramenta tua cupiunt, ut a contagione erroris, dubii et incredulitatis praeservati rectaque fide ducti oculis sanatis et erectis te contemplari valeant.</p>
--	--

The second set of alternate prayers for the second scrutiny was largely based on the set of prayers for that scrutiny from project B (see Table 8.6 below). The portion directed to the Father in S-352 is related to project B primarily by way of allusion; the portion directed to the Son is clearly derivative of the proposal text. The opening portion of the exorcism makes an implicit connection between the man born blind and the elect, but softens the comparison of the model text. In the earlier prayer God is petitioned to free the elect from their blindness – their own inability to see. In the revised version God is petitioned to free them from deceptions or “false values.”³¹ Clearly the metaphoric blindness is a result of original sin, and is thus, something imposed on humanity because of the sin of Adam. In this sense, the revision helps clarify that the sin from which the elect should be freed is something imposed on them, namely, society’s values. But by specifying that the blindness is external to the individual the revision relieves the individual of responsibility for participating in those deceptions. In doing so, the presentation of humanity in the revised text is elevated from the presentation in the model. In a similar way, in the second portion of the prayer the revision eliminates the implication that the elect are in need of a sincere disposition, even though that disposition is necessarily affected by the blindness of society’s values.

³¹ RCIA 168a: “Free these elect from the false values that surround and blind them.”

TABLE 8.6
SECOND ALTERNATE TEXTS
FOR THE SECOND SCRUTINY
IN S-352

<p>2BF Pater, fons omnis illuminationis, qui non ad unum sed ad omnes caecos natos, Filium tuum misisti iisque novos oculos ad te videndum praebuisti, libera, per potentiam salvatricem Christi, ab omni caecitate et a spiritu caecitatis quos ab baptismum nunc attrahis; fidei oculos in eis aperi, ut veritatem a te revelatam percipiant et vultum tuum paternum in Iesu vultum discernant.</p> <p>2BS Domine Iesu, lux vera, quae omnem hominem illuminas et regnum tenebrarum evellis, libera, per Spiritum veritatis, omnes qui sub iugo diaboli, mandacis et patris mendacii, patiuntur in iis, quos ad baptismum selegisti, suscita dispositionem sinceræ adhaesionis vero et bono, ut, luminis tui gaudio fruenter, sicut caecus ad visum olim restitutus, fidei testes firmi et impavidi evadant.</p>	<p>S-352, 391 Clementissime Pater, qui caeco nato dedisti ut in Filium tum crederet et per hanc fidem ad regnum luminis tui accederet: fac ut electi et electae tuae, hic praesentes, liberentur a fallaciis, quibus circumventi obcaecantur, eisque concede ut firmiter in veritate radicati, filii lucis efficiantur et in perpetuum remaneant.</p> <p>Domine Iesu, lux vera, quae omnem illuminas hominem et regnum tenebrarum evertis, libera, per Spiritum veritatis, omnes qui sub iugo patris mendacii vexantur: et in iis, quos ad sacramenta tua elegisti, suscita bonam voluntatem, ut, luminis tui gaudio fruenter, sicut caecus ad claritatem olim restitutus, fidei testes firmi et impavidi evadant.</p>
--	--

The first set of alternate prayers for the third scrutiny placed two prayers from different sets alongside each other. While the first set of alternate prayers for the first scrutiny had linked 3AF with 2AS, the set for the third scrutiny linked the remaining prayers from those projects: 2AF with 3AS (see Table 8.7 below). Surprisingly, in the seemingly misplaced first portion of the prayer, no content was altered. The changes that do occur are stylistic, mostly involving the substitution of one synonym for another. The second portion of the prayer, however, despite being initially composed for the third scrutiny, is altered more significantly. Specific mention of Lazarus is incorporated into the revised version; this essentially shifts the point of emphasis from the miraculous

resurrection of Christ to Christ's resurrection of Lazarus. The abundant life promised to those who are baptized is thus not directly connected to baptism into Christ's death, and thereby related to divine adoption. The revision does not present resurrection as something that the one being baptized actively participates in, but rather, as something that is done to the one being baptized. Furthermore, by shifting the focus from Christ's death, in which all who are baptized participate, to the resurrection of Lazarus, the prayer can lead to an increased focus on the individual, rather than on the community of the baptized. The other significant revision in this prayer echoes this shift in focus. In the model, the final petition was inherently communal – life with all of those who share in Christ's victory. In the revised text, however, mention of the community is dropped, and petition is made for individuals to live with Christ. This shift in focus may not have been intentional. Indeed, the life of the Church and participation in the life of the community was a significant point of emphasis throughout the process of revising the rite. The motive behind this shift may simply have been the desire to make explicit reference to the Gospel pericope within the prayers. Regardless of intention, however, the unfortunate replacement of communal by individual can be perceived in these prayers.

TABLE 8.7
FIRST ALTERNATE TEXTS
FOR THE THIRD SCRUTINY
IN S-352

<p>2AF Pater vitae aeternae, tu Deus es non mortuorum sed vivorum, qui Filium tuum vitae nuntium misisti ut nos mortis subtraheres et ad resurrectionem adduceres, libera, quaesumus, hos catechumenos a mortifera potentia maligni spiritus, ut novam vitam Christi resurgentis accipere et dilatare valeant.</p> <p>3AS Domine Iesu, qui per resurrectionum miracula te bonum pastorem praebuisti ad abundantioram vitam effundendam,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">libera a fonte mortis eos qui fontem vitae in baptismo quaerunt; spiritu pravitatis eos subtrahe et per Spiritum Sanctum vivificantem communica iis vitam fidei, spei et amoris, ut tecum omnes beatitudinem victoriae tuae participant.</p>	<p>S-352, 395 Pater vitae aeternae, qui Deus es non mortuorum sed vivorum, Filium tuum vitae praeconem misisti ut homines, de mortis regno ereptos, ad resurrectionem adduceres: hos electos libera, quaesumus, a mortifera spiritus maligni potestate, ut novam Christi resuscitati vitam accipere et testificari valeant.</p> <p>Domine Iesu, qui</p> <p>Lazarum a mortuis suscitans, praesignasti te venisse ut homines vitam haberent et abundantius acciperent: libera a morte eos qui vitam sacramentis tuis expetunt, solve eos a spiritu pravitatis eisque communica per Spiritum tuum vivificantem fidem, spem et caritatem ut tecum semper viventes gloriam resurrectionis tuae participant.</p>
--	--

The opening prayer in the second set of alternate prayers for the third scrutiny is based on the text for that scrutiny from project B (see Table 8.8 below). The second prayer appears to have been a new composition. In the first portion, the naming of the devil as Satan was removed, thus making it more similar to the other alternate texts, none of which mentioned Satan by name.³² While the rationale for this change is not contained

³² OICA maintains naming only “the devil.” The ICEL translation of this text, however, at RCIA 175b reinserts “Satan” despite the Latin original.

within the notes of the meeting, a later article by Fischer indicates that it relates back to the expanded sense of the diabolical that emerged out of the work of Heinrich Schlier.³³ By not naming Satan directly, one could more easily talk about the evil spirits that were still very much at work in a modern world. Here, this change was an attempt to rescue the text from a perceived cultural irrelevance. The only other alteration of any significance was the substitution of the petition that God lead the elect to eschatological glory with a petition that God lead the elect to proclaim God's glory to the world. The second portion of the prayer asked Christ to release the elect from the power of death, and lead them to a share in the resurrection of Christ through baptism. This petition was predicated upon Christ's initial action of liberating Lazarus from death and his own paschal mystery.³⁴

Having, thus, revised the *Praenotanda* and selected the texts to provide greater flexibility during the scrutinies, the *Coetus* concluded their session. They decided to review the revised *Praenotanda* and approve this version, which Cellier hoped could be

³³ Fischer, "Baptismal Exorcism in the Catholic Baptismal Rites after Vatican II," 49-50, 53: "Particularly suspicious... is the fact that the address to the Devil that was once integral to the liturgy both for adults and infants alike, the so-called 'scolding of the Devil,' has in the new rites been carefully side-stepped. One cannot avoid the impression that liturgical reform has set out to allow for the views of those theologians who see a personal Devil as a theologoumenon that has to be demythologized... A closer examination will soon show that these alterations in no way represent an equivocal abolition of baptismal exorcism. What has taken place is purely and simply an adaptation necessitated by the theological understanding of the situations and relationships referred to in these texts, for that understanding has grown organically since the texts themselves first saw the light. A developed theology of original sin has made possible a sharper distinction than was possible in the early centuries between demonic possession and the status of belonging to the realm of Satan's dominion – a status which is to be predicated of infants without any suggestion of personal guilt. From this vantage-point, it would seem mandatory to surrender the formula of a direct scolding of the Devil, for all its unique and undeniable majesty. Such an utterance cannot but suggest the presence *here* – and practically speaking, that means in this candidate for baptism, in this truly 'innocent' infant – of the Devil, who has to give way so that the Holy Spirit can enter. When one thinks of a congregation of twentieth-century Christians assembled for a baptism, one is obliged to dismiss such an antiquated theology of original sin – now held by no theologian, as totally irrelevant."

³⁴ This set of prayers appears at OICA 387, RCIA 175b.

<p>3BF</p> <p>Pater, omnis vitae fons suprema, qui in homine viventi gloriam tuam quaeris et in mortuorum resurrectione omnipotentiam tuam revelas, imperio mortis hos subtrahere velis qui per Baptismum ad vitam accedere cupiunt: libera eos a Satanae tyranni servitute, quae per peccatum mortem inducit et mundum creationis tuae corrumpit; Filii tui dilectionis potestati eos subiice ut resurrectionis virtutem ab eo accipiant et ad gloriam tuam novum mundum et novam vitae divinae civitatem in Christo et per Christum aedificent.</p>	<p>S-352, 396</p> <p>Pater, omnis vitae fons, qui in homine viventi gloriam tuam quaeris et in resurrectione mortuorum omnipotentiam tuam revelas, hos electos a mortis imperio eripere digneris, qui per Baptismum ad vitam accedere cupiunt: libera eos a diaboli servitute, qui per peccatum mortem induxit et mundum, quem bonum creasti, corrumpere satagit. Subice eos potestati Filii dilectionis tui, ut resurrectionis virtutem ab eo accipiant et gloriam tuam coram hominibus testificentur.</p>
---	---

³⁵ “Cellier to Bugnini, July 23, 1969” in C.N.P.L. 2.G.i: “Luxembourg, 9-14-1969: Correspondance,” 1: “Le projet du *Praenotanda* rédigé par le Père Ligier a été intégralement revu. Un nouveau texte, que nous espérons définitif quant au fond, va être mis au point ces jours-ci par le Père Ligier, et sera approuvé par le Coetus en septembre.”

³⁷ “Cellier to Braga, July 24, 1969” in C.N.P.L. 2.G.i: “Nous avons mis au point en Normandie les Praenotanda du rituel du baptême des adultes et le rite pro pluribus. Le Père Ligier doit intégrer toutes les remarques dans le projet qu’il avait préparé, mais il s’est refusé à tout allègement. Nous n’avons absolument pas pu travailler la latinité. Il nous serait très précieux d’avoir votre collaboration pour mettre

8.2: Luxembourg, September 10-15, 1969

The final meeting of *Coetus* XXII and XXIII relating to the rites of adult initiation before the presentation of rite to the *Consilium* was held at the Great Seminary of Luxembourg.³⁸ At this meeting they would review both the *Praenotanda* and the rite itself. The decisions emerging out of this meeting would be compiled into the final draft of the rite, S-352, on September 16. The accompanying *Relatio* to the *Consilium* would be composed by Cellier and Ligier between September 29 and October 1.³⁹

8.2.1: Praenotanda

The principal focus at Luxembourg concerning the *Praenotanda* was editing the existing texts into an acceptable form, so that they could be included in S-352. The vast majority of the work was editorial as the principal alterations had occurred during the previous session. There were but three significant alterations, for which no rationale is provided in the archives of the C.N.P.L. The first of these was the removal of the direction that the catechumens should attend the liturgy of Good Friday, as part of their immediate preparation, in order to enter more fully with the entire community into meditation on the Paschal Mystery.⁴⁰ A second addition concerned the description of the post-baptismal rites: both Confirmation and the post-baptismal anointing were to be

au point tout cela, et il serait sans doute plus utile pour vous de voir avec nous tous les éléments qui interviennent dans une rédaction fort complexe.”

³⁸ “Relatio, S-352, DRi-36, September 29, 1969,” 3.

³⁹ The date at the head of the *Relatio* for S-352 is September 29, 1969. The date at the end of the *Relatio* is October 1.

⁴⁰ “Recognitio Schematis 344, August 6, 1969,” 27a: “Electi invitentur ut liturgiae feriae 6ae partem habeant, ut una cum communitate de passione Redemptoris meditantes, in mysterium paschale spiritualiter ingrediantur.”

understood as signifying the royal priesthood of the baptized; the white garment symbolized the neophytes new Christian dignity; and the lit candle indicated the vocation of all the baptized to walk in the light of Christ.⁴¹ Third, a significant addition was made in the section detailing ministries and offices: laypersons who baptized a person in danger of death could, if possible, also give communion to that person.⁴²

8.2.2: Revisions to the Rite

Many small changes to the texts of the OCGD were made at Luxembourg, although only a few had any substantive value. In this sense, as in the revision of the *Praenotanda*, the work was quite clearly editorial and largely focused on repairing any difficulties and making the rite more usable. Towards this end, the *Coetus* chose to remove the many textual options from within the main body of the rite, placing them instead in an appendix of alternate texts. This work was accomplished on September 10 and 11.

8.2.2.1: The First Stage: The Rite for Making Catechumens

The first alteration to the first stage at Luxembourg was a change in the response of the candidates to the summary catechesis (76).⁴³ Instead of saying “I do agree,” the candidates were asked whether they “approved” of the faith that had been described to

⁴¹ S-352, 35: “... Christmatis autem unctio postbaptismalis, quando celebratur, significat sacerdotium regale baptizatorum eorumque in populi Dei consortium ascriptio. Vestis candida est symbolum novae ipsorum dignitatis. Cereus vero accensus illustrat eorum vocationem ambulandi tanquam filii lucis.”

⁴² S-352, 48: “Laicus, qui infirmum in periculo mortis baptizat, ius habet ei, pro posse, communionem porrigendi.”

⁴³ Paragraph numbers refer to the location of each element in S-352.

them. The subsequent address to the sponsors and the gathered community (77) was shortened when the introductory material added at Vanves was removed. Even though the option to include similar words was noted, the text became, once again, a brief question to all of the gathered faithful as to whether or not they would help the candidates find and follow Christ. In so doing, the textual material that would help celebrants craft their own formula was excised from the rite.

The *Coetus* made two changes to the prayer accompanying the laying on of hands (82). They inserted the optional prayer, newly composed at Vanves, into the primary position, and removed the former text, which had been a moderately revised version of OBA 12. This change appears to have been made out of a desire to further minimize negativity within the rite. Second, and of far greater significance, they retained the portion of the prayer spoken with hands joined, and excised the second portion of the prayer, which accompanied the laying on of hands. The only explanation for this alteration was contained within an earlier review of the first stage, in which this portion of the prayer was criticized, since it reinforced “the image of the hand of God which protects, which upholds the idea of a protector God intervening in the course of the events of our world here-below to remove obstacles.” At the time, the group felt that this text undermined the preferable sense of God accompanying the candidate on their journey towards baptism, in spite of the obstacles they would inevitably face.⁴⁴ It is therefore surprising that in eliminating the prayer for the laying on of hands, the act itself

⁴⁴ “Compte rendu de la Rencontre du 14/6/69” in C.N.P.L. 2.E, 3: “Par contre, la formule 6 bis a été critiquée. L’image de la main de Dieu qui protège, qui entretient l’idée d’un Dieu protecteur intervenant dans la trame des événements de notre monde d’ici-bas pour en lever les obstacles. L’imposition des mains signifie plutôt que Dieu est présent au catéchumène pour lui donner de marcher librement vers le baptême, en dépit des obstacles qui se dressent sur sa route.”

was also eliminated. No mention of the laying on of hands, that moment at which the candidates became catechumens, endured in the first stage of the rite.

To the signing of the forehead (83), the *Coetus* added a spoken invitation to the catechumens, directing them to come forward with their sponsors. This addition was a helpful one, since prior versions of the rite did not contain any indication as to when or how those to be signed were to come forward, but only that they were to be signed. The additional directive to those catechumens who had renounced a false cult was, at this point, removed from the structure of individual signations. Allowance for the insertion of renunciation language was to be included in the new spoken invitation to a group of candidates (84) as well as to the formula for signing them all with the cross. The texts for the signing of the senses (85) were retained as they had previously appeared with only one exception. The formula accompanying the signing of the lips was changed, so that the catechumen was not to speak the word of God, but was to respond to it. The signing of the senses could be concluded with the singing of an acclamation (86). Of the two prior suggestions, however, “Christ is victorious” was removed, leaving only “Glory to you, Lord.”

The description of the optional giving of a new name (87) was extended at Luxembourg with the addition that the name did not need to be a traditional Christian name. Instead, allowance was made that a culturally familiar name that did not conflict with Christian beliefs might also be given. This decision helped render Christianity within a more global context – Christianity was not foreign to any culture.

Following the introduction into the Church (89), the rite proceeded to the celebration of the Word (91), the giving of the Gospels (92), and the litany of intercession

over the catechumens (93). A notation was made on the working draft from Luxembourg that these prayers were to be amended, but no alterations were made at this point. At some point in the next few weeks, however, the invitation and the litany were reworked. The invitation to prayer was given a more communal emphasis, highlighting that the catechumens were on a path to full participation in the life of the community. Full participation, of course, was demonstrated not simply by receiving the Eucharist, but by sharing in the priestly work of the Church, offering the Eucharistic prayer to God in union with the celebrant. Priesthood was also demonstrated by offering prayers for the world, as expressed in the intercessions prayed at this point in the rite. Thus, the clear mention of full participation in the introductory text to the litany both highlighted the community's function as priest, and pointed towards the duties that would accompany initiation. The content of the petitions was, for the most part, retained, but some changes which point towards baptismal priesthood are evident. The first intercession expanded mention of the catechumens being led to Gospel of Christ, to being led to Christ himself, thereby pointing more fully to initiation. The second asked that they embrace the will of God, rather than that they be filled by it. A newly composed third petition was inserted, asking for the support of the Christian community towards the catechumens, and the fourth petition was rephrased to point to the community's life, which should be a visible and active sign of God's love and charity.

The concluding prayer (94) and the dismissal of the catechumens (95) were retained as in S-344. The rubric concerning the celebration of the Eucharist (96) that was to follow, however, was altered slightly, so as to emphasize the preference for continuing with the General Intercessions. Rather than simply stating that the intercessions and the

Creed could be omitted, the new rubric indicated that the celebration continued with the intercessions. Only later did it mention that they could be omitted, if necessary. The clear hope in doing so, consistent with the aim of the *Coetus* even before the first meeting with the *Consilium*, was that the Church would exercise its priestly ministry by interceding for the world.

8.2.2.2: The Time of the Catechumenate

The alterations to this period of the catechumenate occurred within the particular *Praenotanda*, rather than within any of the prayer texts. In general the changes gave greater theological precision to the time period, while at the same time, they made the period more ritually flexible.

The length of the period (97) was given less specificity at Luxembourg. Instead of describing a period which could last between two to three years, S-352 instructed that it should last for many years.⁴⁵ The content of the period, however, was given greater specificity (98). Not founded solely on communicating the paschal mystery through catechesis oriented to the liturgical year, now the catechumens were also to be formed in Roman Catholic doctrine. This addition was in clear accord with *Ad gentes* 14: “the catechumenate... is not a mere exposition of dogmatic truths and norms of morality, but a period of formation in the whole Christian life.”⁴⁶ A new addition to these directions was

⁴⁵ Unfortunately, the notation about the duration of the catechumenate, while retained in OICA, was not included in the ICEL translation of the rite.

⁴⁶ In Austin Flannery, O.P., general editor. *Vatican Council II: Volume I – The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing Company, 1996), 828.

given in the instruction that the entire community should be given the opportunity to participate in the rites (104).⁴⁷

The description of the celebrations of the Word that were to occur during the period of the catechumenate was amplified in S-352 (105). The teachings the catechumens were to be instructed in involved the proper morality of the New Testament, the forgiveness of injury and insult, a sense of sin and repentance, and the proper place of the Christian in the world. The catechumens were to be formed by different manners of prayer, have the signs, actions, and seasons of the liturgy explained to them, and be prepared to enter wholly into the worship life of the Church. Finally the catechumens were to be taught about the nature of Sunday, the central paschal feast (106), through celebrations of the Word which would occur on that day, and their gradual participation in the liturgy of the Word celebrated in the midst of the community's eucharistic liturgy. No description of a structure for the celebrations of the Word that were to occur outside of the context of Sunday mass was contained in S-352.

The description of the minor exorcisms contained within S-352 was only altered slightly. In the prior draft of the rite the celebrant of the rite had been specified as being a priest or deacon. The rite expanded at Luxembourg to allow that a catechist, officially deputed by the Bishop, could also pray the minor exorcisms (108). The location in which

⁴⁷ The translation of this paragraph into English at RCIA 80 describes the community in a manner inconsistent with the original intent of the *Coetus*. The translation indicates that "provision should also be made for the entire community involved in the formation of the catechumens – priests, deacons, catechists, sponsors, godparents, friends, and neighbors – to participate in some of the celebrations belonging to the catechumenate, including any of the optional 'rites of passage.'" Here the "entire community" indicates those leading the catechumenal process and an immediate circle of friends. The Latin text, S-352 104, OICA 105, suggests, instead, that the entire community is the Church, which naturally includes those named members. The French notation in the draft, "Caput II, Luxembourg, 10-11 Septembre 1969" in C.N.P.L. 2.G.ii: "Caput II," appears to support the more open position: "Souhait de rassembler t^{te} [toute] la c^{te} [communauté] avec les c^{nes} [catéchumènes]."

the minor exorcisms could be celebrated was, likewise, expanded in S-352 (109). Now these could occur either in a Church, or in a chapel or in a place where the catechumens might ordinarily meet (“*domo catechumenatus*”). The texts of the minor exorcisms remained relatively constant. Alterations were, for the most part, oriented towards facilitating better Latin. Some changes, however, were somewhat more substantive. Thus, in one prayer (117), the catechumens were named as “servants” instead of “creatures,” in another (118), the celebrant petitioned that Christ “examine” rather than “scrutinize” the hearts of the catechumens, and in a third (120), the “call” of the Gospel became the “words” of the Gospel. Three new prayers were introduced into the rite (123-125), which were likely new compositions.⁴⁸

No substantive changes were proposed for the rites or prayers of blessing, although some of the texts were expanded, such as the prayer originating in the *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII, 8 (127) and the prayer adapted from the Ethiopic baptismal liturgy (134). Then, in describing the transitional rites, now renamed “Rites during the Catechumenate”⁴⁹ S-352 contained the new addition that both of the *traditiones* that might be celebrated could be concluded with the *Ephphatha*. If, however, the *redditio* of the Creed was also to be anticipated, the *Ephphatha* should accompany the *redditio* and not the *traditiones*. The final element contained within this section of the rite was the description of the anointing of the catechumens (138-139). A ritual structure was

⁴⁸ Source text references for each of the other minor exorcisms were appended in S-352. These three prayers have no reference notes. While it is, of course, possible that they are based on some other historical model, the trend by this point in the reform of the rite had been to compose new texts.

⁴⁹ The title “rites within the catechumenate” is somewhat unhelpful – it has been dropped in RCIA – since the entire stage relates to the period of the catechumenate and its rites. Furthermore, the particular *Praenotanda* still refer to the transitory rites at 126.

provided in S-352. Following the celebration of the Word, the anointing was to be accompanied either by one of the formulae of minor exorcism or by the formula for the pre-baptismal anointing. The rite was concluded with one of the blessings appointed for the period of the catechumenate.

8.2.2.3: The Second Stage: Election or Inscription of Names

Little about the basic description of the rite of Election was substantially altered in S-352, although the formulation of the particular *Praenotanda* demonstrates many stylistic alterations. There were, however, some new additions to the description of this stage. A notation was added that the sponsors were to be approved by the parish community, and that the rite marked the point at which the sponsors publicly manifested their ministry (143). Also, allowance was given that should the rite not occur on the first Sunday of Lent, the readings for the mass of the day were given priority. If they were found unfitting, the readings for the first Sunday of Lent, or any other appropriate readings could be used (148).

There were several alterations to the rite, making it shorter and less didactic. Within the rite itself, two proposals of the dialogue of election (151) had been included, one from Cellier and one from Seumois. S-352 contained only the proposition from Seumois, though no rationale for this choice was provided within the archives of the C.N.P.L. This proposal had included two pastoral possibilities, emerging out of the participation of the celebrant having participated or not participated in the deliberations about election. Each option in this proposal was amended in a similar fashion. First, the introductory remarks by the celebrant were now marked as being a model text. The text itself was not amended. Second, the sponsors were no longer instructed to place their

hands on the shoulder of their candidate; as a consequence, the celebrant's direction to the sponsors to do so was removed, as was the celebrant's transitional comment to signal to the sponsors that they were to respond to the questions he would put to them. The instruction to answer had already been contained in the spoken introduction.

The dialogue with the candidates (153) was shortened in S-352, when a lengthier reference to Christ's identity with the Church ("whoever hears and consults the Church hears Christ; when the Church responds, Christ responds") was eliminated, and a shorter allusion included instead ("in the name of Christ the Church accepts their judgment"). Also, given that the rubrics included the instruction that these or similar words could be spoken here, the printed variant to the question was excised, leaving only the more recently added "do you want" instead of "do you desire." Upon receiving the response of the candidates, the celebrant's response was significantly shortened with the elimination of the more explanatory content. Now, simply, the celebrant instructed the candidates to "offer their names."

The way in which the names were to be given was altered rather significantly. The *Coetus* had been rather firm in their commitment to the names being written in the book by the celebrant or the sponsors, since the catechumens lacked sufficient standing within the Church to offer their own names for consideration. The action of calling the candidates to election belonged to the Church, not the decision of the catechumens themselves. In S-352, however, the first two options for the inscription were that the candidates wrote their name, or gave it orally. In this change, about which no record of

discussion is extant in the C.N.P.L. archives, a fundamental change in the nature of election is clearly communicated.⁵⁰

S-344 had included a newly composed conclusion to the rite of inscription (154). The Christological first portion of this text was deleted, and the ecclesiological second portion was appended to the instruction that the elect were now approved for initiation at the Vigil. This statement was followed by a brief instruction to the sponsors. Having completed their first official ministerial function, the sponsors were reminded of their role as guides and models in the lives of the elect. It was at this point that the sponsors were invited to place their hand on the shoulder of their elect, or to make some other gesture communicating their ministry to the elect. The song inserted in S-344 was removed.

The litany of intercession over the elect (155) was retained in large part from Molin's proposal, which had first appeared in S-344. The single largest alteration was found in the petition for the local community, where mention of the season of Lent was added to qualify the period when they were to persevere in prayer and grow in charity. S-352 also contained a new set of petitions, crafted by the Japanese experimenters,⁵¹ which was included in the Appendix (378). While the individual prayers were more concise in the Japanese submission than the prayers crafted by Molin, they were more numerous. Molin's set contained seven invocations; the Japanese had written thirteen. Molin's texts

⁵⁰ The experimental report from Canada contained precisely this suggestion. "Canada – secteur français," 4: "Puisque chaque adulte sait écrire, ne serait-il pas plus simple que chaque catéchumène inscrive lui-même son nom? Le catéchumène serait plus actif et cela éviterait au célébrant d'avoir à écrire des noms dont il ignore l'orthographe."

⁵¹ "Caput II, Luxembourg, 10-11 Septembre 1969," 37: "Formula orationis communis post electionis (petita ab experimentatoribus Iaponiae)."

were well-suited to allow for the elimination of the General Intercessions, since they addressed subjects beyond the elect. But because the Japanese proposal only contained prayers concerning the elect, this set could not serve carry the burden of both litanies in cases where the General Intercessions were to be eliminated.

The concluding prayer for the rite of Election in S-352 includes a curious omission (S-344, 84). The prayer “*Deus, qui humani generis...*” did not appear in the revised rite. Clearly an oversight, the prayer was re-inserted, without comment, into the first proofs of the rite.⁵² The recently composed alternate text would not, however, reappear within the rite.

In keeping with the general trend of the revisions to the rite of election, the dismissal of the elect (157) was considerably shortened. This text, which served primarily as a model, was rewritten to focus more explicitly on the elect returning for the scrutinies, rather than pointing towards the Vigil. Following the dismissal of the elect the gathered community was to celebrate the Eucharist (158). The rubric here, however, did not reflect the altered rubric describing the way in which the Eucharist was to proceed in the first stage. Here, instead of highlighting the importance of the General Intercessions, the rubric was left untouched, so that the only mention of these intercessions and the Creed was the clarification that these could be omitted.⁵³

⁵² The first and second proofs are contained in C.N.P.L. 3.

⁵³ This reference was changed to reflect the importance of both litanies in OICA 151.

8.2.2.4: The Time of Purification and Enlightenment

In S-352 the progression of stages and periods of the rites of initiation finally reached expression in the satisfactory form developed in the draft *Praenotanda*. The period of purification and enlightenment was to include what had most previously been described as being the fourth and fifth stages: the scrutinies, the *traditiones*, and the rites of immediate preparation.

8.2.2.4.1: The Scrutinies

The scrutinies, having been worked upon so rigorously since the beginning of the year, were only amended in relatively minor fashion. Much of the previous work was permitted to remain untouched, but as usual, the scrutinies provided opportunities for some degree of correction. Many small alterations were made to the particular *Praenotanda*. The most important, however, was the elimination of material relating to the thematic progression of the scrutinies (S-344 95-96, 104, 112); a clear description of all of the scrutinies as releasing the elect from sin and the influence of the devil in order to assist the elect on their journey towards Christ was included instead (163). Furthermore, rather than a progression in awareness of sin, the themes of the scrutinies were to be understood as a progression about the ways in which Christ saved: he is living water, he is light, and he is the resurrection and the life (164). While the concluding sentence in S-352 164 remained the same as in S-344 91 – from the first to the final scrutiny the elect should progress in their perception of sin and their desire for

salvation⁵⁴ – the thrust of the claim had clearly shifted. In the earlier versions of the scrutinies the emphasis of the progression was on the nature of sin. In the final version the emphasis of the progression was on the nature of salvation.

The structure of the scrutinies was altered in four ways. First, at the beginning of the scrutiny during the prayer in silence (169), the option to have the sponsors stand before the celebrant with the elect was removed: the proper place of the sponsor was beside their elect, who were either to bow their heads or kneel – not prostrate themselves. Second, the concluding prayer over the elect – “*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*” (S-344 101, 109, 117) or its alternate, “*Pater sancte et clementissime...*” – was excised from the scrutinies, as was the corresponding laying on of hands over the group of elect. Third, to compensate for the elimination of the laying on of hands after the exorcism, the revised scrutiny inverted the celebrant’s hand gestures during the exorcism and inserted the optional laying on of hands in silence in between the two portions of the prayer of exorcism (see Table 8.9 below). The fundamental gesture, the laying on of hands, was thus maintained, while at the same time, the rite was simplified. The unfortunate loss, however, was the prayer “*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*” This text, revised from OBA 28, had been designated early on by the *Coetus* as the preeminent prayer immediately preceding dismissal, and would be accompanied by what they understood to be a classic gesture of the catechumenate, the laying on of hands. Throughout the revision of the rite the text had gradually receded from use, first being reserved only for the scrutinies, then being listed as one of two possible texts for the conclusion of the

⁵⁴ S-352 164: “A primo usque ad ultimum scrutinium progressus fieri oportet in cognitione peccati et desiderio salutis.”

scrutinies, and now, being removed from the scrutinies altogether. Fourth, provision was made for the singing of an appropriate song immediately before the dismissal of the elect.

The scrutinies were also altered textually at Luxembourg. Most of these changes were concerned primarily with style, such as the change of divine address in the exorcism for the first scrutiny (171), and the dismissals for the first two scrutinies (172, 179). The intercessions over the elect in each of the scrutinies, however, were revised more thoroughly. Some were edited for clarity⁵⁵ and style⁵⁶ to promote the underlying themes of the Gospel. Furthermore, new intercessions were added that better alluded to the

TABLE 8.9
STRUCTURE OF THE SCRUTINIES
IN S-352

<p>S-344</p> <p>Prayer in silence (elect: head bowed, kneeling, or prostrate)</p> <p>Litany over the elect (sponsors: hand on shoulder of elect, or extended over them)</p> <p>Exorcism-Father (celebrant: hands outstretched over the elect)</p> <p>Exorcism-Son (celebrant: hands together)</p> <p>Optional Laying on of hands</p> <p>Prayer over the elect (celebrant: hands outstretched over the elect)</p> <p>Dismissal</p>	<p>S-352</p> <p>Prayer in silence (elect: head bowed or kneeling)</p> <p>Litany over the elect (sponsors: hand on shoulder of elect)</p> <p>Exorcism-Father (celebrant: hands together)</p> <p>Optional Laying on of hands</p> <p>Exorcism-Son (celebrant: hands outstretched over the elect)</p> <p>Optional Song</p> <p>Dismissal</p>
---	---

⁵⁵ In the first scrutiny, these include the first, seventh, and eighth petitions. In the second scrutiny, these include the first, fifth, and eighth petitions. In the third scrutiny, these include the first, fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth petitions.

⁵⁶ In the first scrutiny, these include the fifth, sixth, and ninth petitions. In the second scrutiny, these include the second, third, and sixth petitions. In the third scrutiny, these include the second and seventh petitions.

Gospel readings.⁵⁷ Of the twenty-five intercessions included within the rite, only one was an unedited petition from the previous rite. Of the six portions of the prayers of exorcism, all were edited to a small degree, for clarity, style, and length – none of the prayers were expanded.

Along with these texts, S-352 included alternate choices. The alternate selections for the petitions were based on a recent submission by Seumois, sent to Cellier on July 31, 1969 (see Table 8.10 below). By Seumois' own admission, his submissions were not intended to supplant the intercessions from S-344, but rather, were to be offered as alternate texts.⁵⁸ In their origin, these petitions took the Gospel readings for each scrutiny as a primary referent, instead of the thematic progression of the scrutinies. As seen in the first petitions for both the second and third scrutinies, however, the revision that was incorporated into S-352 preferred less direct allusion to the scriptural texts. Indeed, few of Seumois' compositions would be incorporated with only minor stylistic emendation,⁵⁹ but his general approach would be embraced. The resulting set of petitions is one that focuses more on the elect than on the nature of sin.

The prayers of exorcism had been thoroughly discussed during the previous meeting. They were thus retained in S-352 as agreed upon at Douvres-la-Délivran.

⁵⁷ In the first scrutiny, these include the second, third, and fourth petitions. In the second scrutiny, these include the fourth and seventh petitions. No entirely new petitions were crafted for the third scrutiny.

⁵⁸ "Seumois to Cellier, 31/7/69" in C.N.P.L. 2.F, 2: "P.S. Je joins les textes des litanies pour les scrutins, qu'on m'a demandé de composer. Elles ne suppriment pas les intentions actuelles, mais devaient être offertes au choix."

⁵⁹ Only five of the twenty-two petitions offered by Seumois appear to have been adopted with only minor stylistic change. In the first scrutiny, these include the third, fourth, fifth, and seventh petitions. In the third scrutiny, this includes the third petition.

TABLE 8.10
ALTERNATE INTERCESSIONS FOR THE SCRUTINIES
IN S-352

<p>Seumoiois</p> <p>First Scrutiny</p> <p>Ut donum Dei scientes, aquam vivam qua non sitient in aeternum toto corde appetant...</p> <p>Ut mulierem samaritanam imitati, propria delicta agnoscere et suis peccatis purgari valeant ita ut fructus verae poenitentiae producant...</p> <p><i>Ut donum Dei scientes, aquam vivam qua non sitient in aeternum toto corde appetant...</i></p> <p>Ut Christum Prophetam et Messiam agnoscentes, sicut et Samaritana et ipsi omne malum quodcumque fecerint videant et respuant...</p> <p>Ut a Christo, animo contrito et corde volenti, aquam promissam impetrent quae fiet in eis fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam...</p> <p>Ut Spiritu Sancto illuminati, inter veros adoratores, qui adorent Patrem in Spiritu et Veritate, adnumerari digentur...</p> <p>Ut donum Dei super omnia extollentes, Dei mirabilia amicis et concivibus annuntiare valeant...</p> <p>Ut nobis omnibus, Christum consecutis, eibus noster sit ut faciamus voluntatem Patris et opus eius perficiamus...</p>	<p>S-352</p> <p>384</p> <p>Ut electi nostri, sicut Samaritana mulier, vitam suam coram Christo recolant et propria peccata agnoscent...</p> <p>Ut a spiritu diffidentiae, qui a via Christi gressus hominum abducit, liberentur...</p> <p>Ut donum Dei expectantes, aquam vivam, in vitam aeternam salientem, toto corde exoptent...</p> <p>Ut, Filium Dei suscipientes magistrum, veri adoratores Dei Patris in spiritu et veritate evadant...</p> <p>Ut mirabilem Christi occursum experti, amicis etiam et concivibus laetum eius nuntium perferant...</p> <p>Ut omnes terrae pauperes et verbo Dei egentes ad Evangelium Christi accedere valeant...</p> <p>Ut nos omnes a Christo edoceamur et, voluntatem Patris diligentes, opus eius amanter perficiamus...</p>
<p>Second Scrutiny</p> <p>Ut in natatoria Siloe (quod interpretatur Missus) properantes, ab omni peccati corde mundentur...</p> <p>Ut, apertis a Christo oculis suis, Eum ut Messiam perfectius cognoscant et observantes mandata, vestigia Eius fidelius premant...</p> <p>Ut, ad exemplum caeci nati, superatis impedimentis contradictionibusque eorum qui in Christum non credunt, fidem suam inconfusibilem servant...</p> <p>Ut pressurae peccati mundi conscii et in novitate vitae ambulantes, incolumes reddantur luce Christi quem Pater misit ut tollet peccatum mundi et salvetur mundus per ipsum...</p> <p>Ut illis nunc occurrente Christo Salvatori et illuminante, fidem suam constanter profiteantur in Filium Dei...</p>	<p>389</p> <p>Ut, fugatis umbris, Deus in cordibus electorum nostrorum ipse illucescat...</p> <p>Ut ipse eos ad Christum suum, lumen huius mundi factum, adducat...</p> <p>Ut electi nostri, corda sua aperientes, illum confiteantur principem luminis et testem divinae veritatis...</p> <p>Ut ab illo sanati ab incredulitate huius mundi servantur...</p> <p>Ut ab illo salvati, qui tollit peccatum mundi, ab huius peccati contagione et pressura liberentur...</p> <p>Ut a Spiritu Sancto illuminati, Evangelium salutis, indesinenter profiteantur ceterisque tradant...</p>

TABLE 8.10

continued

<p>Seumois</p> <p>Ut, dissipatis mentis tenebris, cum Christo convivificati per sacramenta Ecclesiae, exemplo vitae et testimonio verbi lux mundi in Christo efficiantur...</p> <p>Ut in omnibus nobis, fonte baptismali regeneratis et Sancto unctis, opera Dei manifestantur...</p>	<p>S-352</p> <p>Ut nos omnes, morum exemplo nostrorum, lux mundi et ipsi in Christo inveniamur...</p> <p>Ut omnes terrae habitatores verum Deum, creatorem omnium agnoscant, qui nobis hominibus spiritum et vitam largitur...</p>
<p>Third Scrutiny</p> <p>Ut his electis, quos diligit Christus eadem caritate qua Lazarum infirmum amavit, donum Vitae aeternae e resurrectione Christi profluentis tribuere dignetur...</p> <p>Ut his electis, suam fidem profitentibus in Christum qui est Resurrectio et Vita, per sacramenta paschalia regenerantur et vita aeterna donentur...</p> <p>Ut, dissolutis per suam paenitentiam peccati vinculis, per baptismum conformes Christo reddantur ita ut, mortui peccato Deo semper vivant...</p> <p>Ut promissum Spiritum Sanctum sacramento confirmationis accipientes, fructum Resurrectionis Christi plene participent...</p> <p>Ut pabulum panis eucharistici proxime gustaturi, Christo consecrentur qui est Resurrectio et Vita...</p> <p>Ut per mortem et resurrectionem Christi liberati a peccato, fructum suum habeant in sanctificationem finem vera vitam aeternam...</p> <p>Ut in novitate vitae nos omnes ambulantes, mundo Christum manifestemus...</p> <p>Ut super inenarrabili dono resurrectionis nobis a Christo elargito, in gratiarum actione semper maneamus...</p>	<p>394</p> <p>Ut his electis fides donentur, qua Christum resurrectionem et vitam esse fateantur...</p> <p>Ut a peccatis liberati fructum habeant in sanctificationem et vitam aeternam...</p> <p>Ut solutis per paenitentiam vinculis peccati, Christo conformes per Baptismum evadant et, peccato mortui, Deo semper vivant...</p> <p>Ut vivificantis Spiritus spem habentes, ad renovationem vitae strenue se disponant...</p> <p>Ut per cibum eucharisticum, quem proxime gustabunt, ipso auctore vitae et resurrectionis socientur...</p> <p>Ut omnes terrae habitatores, Christum invenientes, in ipso promissiones vitae aeternae agnoscant...</p>

8.2.2.4.2: The Traditiones

Structurally, the *traditiones* were altered very little at Luxembourg. Textually, however, there was a considerable degree of expansion. Only one significant change was made regarding the structure of the *traditiones* in S-352. Allowance was given for the presentation of the creed (193) to be done by the celebrant alone or with the community, thereby better highlighting one of the concerns of the *Coetus*, expressed at Le Saulchoir

in 1965, that the responsibility for handing on the faith to the elect rested with the entire community, not simply its ordained minister.⁶⁰ More noticeably in the rite, however, S-352 displayed an increased number of textual options. During the *traditio symboli*, alternate texts were added in the introduction to the presentation of the creed itself (193) and the prayers over the elect (194). No source for the alternate texts provided at the introduction or the first portion of the prayer of the elect are mentioned, and these appear to be new compositions. Further expanding the textual options at these locations, S-352 contains the instruction that these texts could be spoken in “these or similar words.” A significant change occurred regarding the concluding portion of the prayer over the elect, which immediately preceded the dismissal of the elect. The prayer text “*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*,” having been eliminated from the scrutinies at this same meeting, was re-inserted into this rite, as originally called for at Trier in 1964. This text was given pride of place, and the text formerly appearing in its place was moved to the Appendix.

8.2.2.4.3: The Rites of Immediate Preparation

Little was altered in the Rites of Immediate Preparation. The original pericope of the curing of the deaf man in Mark 7:31-37, read in advance of the *redditio symboli* and *Ephphatha*, was supplemented by the additional options of Matthew 16:13-17 and John 6:35, 63-71 (203). These choices were oriented towards the *redditio*: the text from Matthew was the dialogue between Jesus and Peter, where Peter acknowledges Jesus as “Messiah, the Son of the living God;” the text from John pointed towards the Eucharist with reference to Jesus being the bread of life, and Peter’s rhetorical question, “Lord, to

⁶⁰ The Lord’s Prayer, however, was still to be handed on by the celebrant alone, as an extension of his being *in persona Christi*.

whom can we go? You have the words of eternal life.”⁶¹ Any of these three were deemed acceptable, although S-352 contained the instruction that the text from Mark was only to be used if the *Ephphatha* was actually celebrated.

The only altered text during the *redditio symboli* was the prayer before the *redditio* (205) originally taken from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.⁶² It was replaced by a prayer that appears to have been newly written. The new text contained a more positive understanding of the elect: rather than seeking wisdom for the elect, asked for strength.

Only one change was noted during the *Ephphatha* (209). Responding to the desire for a shorter formula, in cases where there were many elect to be signed, the formula that could be used after the full formula had been used once was, simply, *Ephphatha*. In S-352, however, the shortened formula became “*Ephphatha*, which is be opened.”

S-352 contained a significantly expanded ritual for the giving of a new name (210). The previous draft contained only the brief formula, “N., you are now to be called N.” In the revision, however, this formula was to be preceded by an appropriate song, a reading, and a brief explanation of the reading that highlighted the function of a new name in describing one’s Relationship with God.⁶³ Afterwards, for those who had not been given new names, the celebrant could then offer explanations of the Christian significance of the given names of the elect.

⁶¹ Matthew 16:16 (NAB). John 6:68 (NAB).

⁶² Gelasian Sacramentary XXVI, 193. See also *DOBL* 213.

⁶³ DR-36 210 contains four suggestions: Genesis 17:1-7, Isaiah 62:1-5, Revelation 3:11-13, and Matthew 16:13-18.

The final rite during the immediate preparation was the optional anticipation of the pre-baptismal anointing. The accompanying prayer was reshaped to better reflect the original in OBA while also reflecting concerns about communicating proper authority in the ritual. Avoiding a first person singular construction and subsequent emphasis on the minister, the new text instead focused on salvation offered through and in Christ.

8.2.2.5: The Third Stage: The Celebration of the Sacraments

The structure and texts of the celebration of the sacraments remained rather constant in S-352. Most of the changes that occurred were stylistic or for the purpose of clarification or simplification, and only one structural alteration was made.

In S-344, the invitation to prayer (221) was to occur after the litany of the saints; in S-352 the order of these two elements was inverted. Thus, the prayer to which the gathered assembly was invited also involved the prayer of the communion of saints. Likely with some of the African celebrations in mind, allowance was made that if the number of elect was of sufficient number, they might begin to approach the font during the singing of the litany.

Following the pre-baptismal anointing (224), amended here in the same way that it had been within the rites of immediate preparation, was the profession of faith (225). The only alteration here was to the response of the elect to the third invocation. Rather than replying “I believe” (“*credo*”), the proper response was to be “Amen.”⁶⁴ After Baptism (226-228) was administered, the rite turned to Confirmation. S-352 included an

⁶⁴ The English translation wisely uses “I do” as the response to all three invocations. There is nothing in the final invocation that suggests a different response, and the substitution here is surprising. No rationale for the change appears in the C.N.P.L. archives.

edited version of the invitation to Confirmation (231), preserving the content of the former in more eloquent language, and then described the laying on of hands, where each neophyte was to kneel in front of the celebrant separately, returning to their places after the ritual action. S-352 included the pastoral allowance that if there were a large number of neophytes to be confirmed, the individual laying on of hands could be omitted. In both cases, the laying on of hands was concluded with the invocation of the Spirit over the neophytes by the celebrant with hands outstretched. This text included the naming of the gifts of the Spirit. In the previous version of the rite, the neophytes were to respond “Amen” to the various gifts of the Spirit; in the revised version, no interjections into the list of the Spirit’s gifts were indicated, and only a final “Amen” was to be spoken. This was followed by the anointing (233).⁶⁵ The suggestion that a song might be sung during the anointing was removed from S-352, thus indicating that the spoken formula might be heard by the community. The rite then directed that the clothing with a white garment was to follow Confirmation.

In cases where Confirmation was not to be celebrated, the post-baptismal anointing with chrism (234) was to immediately follow the celebration of baptism. This rite was unaltered from S-344, and the structure of the giving of a white garment (235) was, similarly, unchanged. The only difference in the latter element in the final draft was that the faculty to render it as optional was given to the local celebrant, rather than the Conferences of Bishops. The only alteration in the giving of a lit candle (236) was a

⁶⁵ Interestingly, the name of the element was changed from “Anointing of Confirmation” to, simply, “Anointing.” While no rationale for this change is provided, one might suspect that it emerged out of a desire to eliminate the divide between the post-baptismal anointing and the anointing of Confirmation. In any case, the rubrics at this point do refer to the recently baptized as “*Confirmandi*.”

change in the verb within the formula: rather than instructing the sponsors to “come forward” (“*accedunt*”) in order to give the light of Christ to the neophyte, they were to “accept” (“*accipite*”) it for the same purpose.

Upon the conclusion of the post-baptismal ceremonies, the Eucharist (237-239) was to be celebrated, beginning with the General Intercessions (239). Participation in this priestly duty would, thus, be the first ecclesial act of the new Christians. As such, the intercessions could be understood as providing a lens through which the entire Christian life should be viewed. Initiation was not about seeking salvation for one’s own self, but seeking it for the world. The celebration of the Eucharist would proceed as normal, until immediately before communion. The location of the celebrant’s instruction on the Eucharist, already noted as preceding communion, was to immediately precede the invitation to communion, “This is the Lamb of God” (“*Ecce Agnus Dei...*”). S-352 took the existing indication that the neophytes, sponsors, the neophytes parents and spouse, and catechists were to receive from the cup (238), and extended it to include the entire community.

8.2.2.6: The Time of Mystagogy

Since the period of Mystagogy (240-243) was only sparsely described in previous versions of the rite, there was little to change in S-352. Some minor alterations did, however, occur. Mystagogy, which had been described as lasting until Pentecost Sunday, was now described as ending around that day (241). The allowance in S-344 that the close of Mystagogy could also occur on the Sunday before or after Pentecost was removed from S-352. Thus, the close of the period was described in a way that was both more fixed by the day of Pentecost being the sole chronological reference, as well as

more vague because ending “around” Pentecost could be interpreted in a diversity of manners. In any case, the final addition to the period of Mystagogy in S-352 did not actually fall within the period itself: the neophytes were exhorted to gather together on the anniversary of their initiation to give thanks to God, to share their experiences, and to reestablish their commitment to the Christian life into which they had been fully initiated (243).

8.2.3: Final Preparations

Having completed a final draft of the rite, the *Coetus* began to make their final preparations for presentation of the rite to the twelfth General Meeting of the *Consilium*, set to occur between November 10 and 14, 1969, and a preliminary presentation to any interested relators in the week before the General Meeting.⁶⁶ The text of the rite, S-352, is dated September 16, 1969, and the accompanying *Relatio*, which would guide the presentation itself, was completed on October 1. The former document is unsigned, while the latter document bears the names of both Cellier as Relator for adult initiation, and Ligier, as Secretary. Included in the presentation is an undated note concerning the proper minister of Confirmation, bearing the names of Fischer, the Relator for *Coetus* XXII and Seumois, the Secretary.

⁶⁶ Bugnini offers potentially conflicting evidence on the meeting of the Relators. In *ROL* 186 he notes that the meeting of the relators occurred between November 4 and 8; in *ROL* 589 he locates the date as being either November 3 or November 4: “It was studied on November 13, 1969, after a careful presentation by assistant secretary L. Ligier. Ten days earlier it had already been studied at the meeting of the relators.” In any case, the notes on a version of S-352 contained in C.N.P.L. 3 details that the study of the document before the relators took place on November 5.

8.3: Presentation to the Relators and the Consilium, November 5-14, 1969

The first presentation of the completed draft of the rite at Rome was to the group of interested relators.⁶⁷ This meeting occurred on November 4 to 8,⁶⁸ and the presentation of S-352 took place on the second day, November 5. The presentation to the fathers of the *Consilium* at the General meeting occurred on November 13. Bugnini notes that “the general vote on the schema was very positive” and that “the observations focused mainly on the details.”⁶⁹

The *Relatio* which guided the presentation to both Relators and *Consilium* is comprised of seventy-three paragraphs, including seventeen questions for the *Consilium*. After a paragraph of introduction, the *Relatio* is divided into three parts. The first eleven paragraphs concern the *Praenotanda*, and are descriptive of the process by which they had been composed⁷⁰ and their organizational structure.⁷¹ The next thirty-two paragraphs detail the process of experimentation and concerns about the OCGD arising out of the process (nineteen paragraphs). Most specifically, this section also included the resulting

⁶⁷ ROL 140: “During the week preceding a general meeting, there was a meeting of the relators, who studied the same material as a ‘court of first instance,’ with a view to presenting their conclusions to the Fathers later on.” For a more vivid description, see Botte, *From Silence to Participation*, 125-127.

⁶⁸ ROL 186.

⁶⁹ ROL 589.

⁷⁰ Two paragraphs are dedicated to an enumeration of the places and times that the *Coetus* had met to prepare the rite: one paragraph treats pre-experimentation locales, and the other names the post-experimentation centers.

⁷¹ The *Praenotanda*, as have been discussed above, were both of a doctrinal and pastoral nature, and were contained both in the form of the General *Praenotanda* at the beginning of the rite, and in the form of Particular *Praenotanda*, which were interspersed into appropriate locations in the rite itself.

alterations to the rite (thirteen paragraphs).⁷² The final twenty-nine paragraphs discuss the altered versions of the rite, including the simple rite, the brief rite, initiation of those baptized but un-catechized, and children of catechetical age.

Several questions about the rite were raised throughout the deliberations, though as Bugnini has noted, these were on minor points and details.⁷³ During the meeting of the relators, for example, Martimort suggested that the *Praenotanda* further develop material relating to regional diversity. During this same meeting, Canon André Rose of Belgium

⁷² The list of these changes is contained in *Relatio* S-352, 30, 32, 34, 36, 39, and 42. Generally these included the clarification of rubrics and the expansion of textual options. Specifically, in the *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum* these are the elimination of the imposition of hands after the signation, increasing the participation of the sponsors through the interrogation and signation, increasing the participation of the catechist through the signation, and increasing the participation of the assembly through acclamations. In the period of the catechumenate the changes included particular *Praenotanda* which described the various rites, and the transitory rites of the *traditiones* and pre-baptismal anointing. During the stage of election the changes included rephrasing the celebrant's instructions in order to make the rite clearer, making the rite more flexible in a variety of different situations, and increasing opportunities for the preparation of the community. In the period of purification and enlightenment these changes included the reconfiguration of the period to include the rites of immediate preparation, the possibility of anticipating the *traditiones*, and the reworking of the scrutinies, which included using the deprecatory form instead of the imperative. In the stage of the celebration of the sacraments the texts were brought into alignment with the rite of infant baptism and the rite of Confirmation. Finally, in the period of Mystagogy, the *Praenotanda* were expanded, and mention of an official conclusion and an anniversary celebration were included.

⁷³ *ROL* 589: "The observations made focused mainly on the details. It was asked that a correction be made in no. 76 (of the printed text), which seemed to suppose that the catechumen already had an adult faith. Bishop Nagae, who gave expression to Japanese sensibilities, insisted, as he had already done at the first presentation of the schema, that the anointings and, more generally, everything requiring a direct contact of the celebrant and the catechumen or baptizand be made optional. Another point that elicited renewed calls was confirmation. Some Fathers wanted this to be always administered by a bishop."

In a letter dated January 2, 1970, Ligier indicated to Cellier that he had crafted a new summary catechesis in the first stage (S-352, 76), and it had been approved by Bishop Nagae. Ligier added the he had also written a third summary catechesis, which "emphasized the progression of faith during the catechumenate, and which would assist in the interpretation of the Apostles Creed" ("Mgr. Nagae a reçu le nouveau texte qu'il demandait pour le rite d'entrée en catéchuménat: il l'a approuvé. Dans l'intervalle j'en ai fait un 3°, qui met en valeur le progrès de la foi durant le catéchuménat et qui est rédigé en fonction de la problématique de l'interprétations du Symbole des apôtres." See "Ligier to Cellier, January 2, 1970" in C.N.P.L. 3.E: "ICA: Notes-modis, Sch. 352, documents Sept. 69-Jan.72"). There is no clear indication as to which of the two new texts appearing in the OICA at either 76 (RCIA 52A) or 370 (RCIA 52B) was composed with Nagae in mind. Based, however, on the order in which the texts appear in Ligier's letter to Cellier (Ligier names Nagae's text first and his newer composition second), it is possible that the text written with Nagae's concerns in mind is the one presently located at OICA 370. The original summary catechesis was retained in the Appendix at OICA 370 (RCIA 52C).

argued for the imperative form of exorcism, noting that Christ addressed the demons directly in the Gospels. Ligier's response here was to point out the obvious difference between one who is possessed by a demon and one who is a sinner, and to indicate that the scrutinies were for the latter category of person. Questions were raised during the *Consilium* proceedings as to whether or not individual Bishops should have the authority to determine the number of scrutinies performed,⁷⁴ whether the *traditiones* could be optional, as well as the issues concerning physical contact and the presumption of faith in the texts. At a more general level, Bugnini notes that a suggestion emerging from the meeting of the consultors was "to reduce the number of some optional texts, especially presidential prayers, in order to avoid monotony and an appearance of inflatedness."⁷⁵

The voting of the *Consilium* on each of the questions resulted in the approval of all the questions that were put before them. The sole question that was not asked, even though it appeared in the *Relatio*, was whether or not the *Consilium* approved the inclusion of the overall *Praenotanda* for Christian initiation.⁷⁶ Of the ten remaining

⁷⁴ The authority to omit one scrutiny had already been given to individual Bishops. As a result of this concern, however, allowance was made that a second scrutiny could be omitted in extraordinary circumstances. See OICA 52 (RCIA 20).

⁷⁵ *ROL* 589. No rationale for the elimination of any particular texts is extant. What follows, however, is a list of those texts in S-352 that were removed from the rite: During the *Ritus ad catechumenos faciendos*, two forms of the introductory dialogue (368, 369), the older alternate form for signing the senses (371), the second alternate prayer concluding the signing of the senses (373), the first two options for the introduction into the Church (89), and the original litany over the catechumens (93). Within the period of purification and illumination, one set of exorcism prayers from each scrutiny was removed (386, 178, and 185), of which the exorcisms from the second and third scrutiny had appeared as the primary texts in S-352.

⁷⁶ *Relatio* S-352, 11: "Quaesitum I: Placente patribus, ratione habita observationum auditarum, Praenotanda communia de ordine initiationis adultorum?" A marginal marking in a copy of *Relatio* in C.N.P.L. 3 indicates that the question was not asked. Perhaps it was not asked because this text had been approved already, as it had been published in the OBP in 1969. Perhaps, however, the reason it was not asked foreshadowed the concerns about the text that would eventually be voiced at a joint meeting between the Congregations for Divine Worship, the Sacraments, the Doctrine of the Faith, and the Evangelization of Peoples. See *ROL* 590.

questions pertaining to the standard rite of initiation for adults, eight were approved unanimously. These questions asked whether or not a layperson who baptized an adult in danger of death might then give the dying neophyte communion, whether or not the pre-baptismal anointing might be anticipated within the period of the catechumenate, and whether or not the fathers approved the *Ritu ad faciendos catechumenos*, the period of the catechumenate and its rites, the rite of election, the amended scrutinies, the *traditiones* and rites of immediate preparation, the structure of baptism itself, and the period of Mystagogy. Only two questions received any dissension. The second question posed to the *Consilium* concerned giving catechists the right, with the consent of the local Bishop, to perform the minor exorcisms and blessings in the period of the catechumenate. No discussion on the matter is recorded, but the motion narrowly passed: twelve votes for, eight votes against, four abstentions, and twelve votes for with reservations.⁷⁷

The other question on which there was some discussion was that of Confirmation. A presentation concerning the previous discussions on the matter was appended to the *Relatio*, highlighting the connection of “confirmation” to baptism in the East and in Christian liturgical history, the pastoral benefits of celebrating the two in close proximity, the officially accepted connection between the two sacraments in *SC*, the approval of this union by the *Consilium* in 1966, and the great pastoral success evidenced in the period of experimentation, particularly in missionary contexts. At least one member of the *Consilium* expressed concern about the relationship of the Bishop to confirmation in general, and, more specifically, about the contact between the Bishop and neophytes

⁷⁷ The source of these concerns is not clear, and the rubric contained in S-352 appears, altered only slightly, in OICA. The single largest difference between the two is that the officially approved text designates the catechists as being “qualified” (“*digno et apto*”). See S-352 108, OICA 109, and RCIA 91.

confirmed by a priest. In spite of such concerns, the question of allowing a priest to confirm those being baptized as adults was passed with twenty-nine votes for, two votes against, and two votes indicating that the rubric should be modified so that this would only occur in necessary cases.

By all counts, the reception of S-352 by the *Consilium* had been exceedingly positive – only two matters were not approved unanimously, and the most contentious issue was on a relatively minor point. Having, thus, received approval from the *Consilium*, the text would be left with Ligier, the secretary, to be corrected and amended over the next few months, and would begin, what Bugnini named as a “lengthy journey of examination by the agencies of the Roman Curia.”⁷⁸

8.4: Final Amendments, December 1969-August 1971

The final process of editing the rite was begun by Ligier following the November meeting. He sent the revised texts to the *Consilium* through Bugnini and Braga on December 13, and on December 26 Bugnini sent corrections made largely by Anselmo Lentini, O.S.B., a consultant for the *Consilium* back to Ligier. Ligier verified the corrections and returned the text to Braga, who would “tidy up”⁷⁹ the text, in order “to achieve a more logical and handy arrangement of the abundant material.”⁸⁰ The result of

⁷⁸ *ROL*, 589. This process involved back and forth amendments from a variety of different individuals and parties, of which few can be reliably attributed. Of course, whenever proper acknowledgement can be made, it will be.

⁷⁹ “Ligier to Cellier, January 2, 1970,” 2: “Pour le moment, en effet, le P. Braga va faire la toilette finale pour passer notre texte le plus tôt possible à l’Imprimerie Vaticane, c’est-à-dire dès que l’ ‘Annuario Pontificio’ sera sorti, donc vers les ‘épreuves,’ qui seront également communiquées aux dicastères intéressés. Je n’ai, pour le moment, aucune indication sur la date éventuelle des épreuves.”

⁸⁰ *ROL*, 589.

this work was a rite in which only the principal texts would appear in the immediate context of the rite, and the optional texts would be moved to a separate chapter.

Apart from the addition of two alternate texts for the summary catechesis in the first stage, only one significant alteration was made to the text approved by the *Consilium*. S-352 contained a rubric allowing that the marriage of an elect could be convalidated at an appropriate time: the couple could give their consent after the neophyte had been given a white garment, and the nuptial blessing could be administered in its usual place as the embolism to the Lord's Prayer. While it is not entirely clear if the convalidation was expected to occur during the Paschal Vigil – indeed, no mention of the Vigil is contained in this particular rubric – this provision, nonetheless, caused some canonical concern. Ligier consulted Raimondo Bidagor, S.J., a canonist, who advised that the issue of convalidation be omitted within the context of the rite, as the rite could offer nothing except a liturgical solution. Ligier reported that Bidagor indicated that such a directive overlooked the diversity of possible situations, in which any number of impediments, each requiring specific dispensation, might occur.⁸¹ Consequently, he indicated that the paragraph might simply disappear. This, however, raised the practical concern of having to renumber much of the rite for its submission to the printers, and thus revisit the entire proofreading process. As a result, Ligier suggested replacing the

⁸¹ “Ligier to Cellier, January 2, 1970,” 1: “Avant de remettre le texte à la Pro Cultu divino, j’ai proposé au canoniste de la révision du Code, le P. Bidagor, le problème posé par notre n. 216 [maintenant, n. 220] et relevé par notre P. Ritzer (dans la schedula, où il nous rappelait l’enseignement de son professeur de Droit Canon). De son côté, le P. Bidagor estime que ce paragraphe engendrerait des difficultés canoniques et qu’il est inopportun. Selon notre texte, la ‘convalidatio’ semble n’avoir de solution que liturgique, alors qu’elle implique la présence d’empêchements dont il faut obtenir dispense de l’autorité compétente. D’autre part, ce sont des difficultés qui n’ont pas à être mises en public au cours d’une célébration. Les cas, de plus, sont divers. De même aussi leurs solutions. La ‘sanatio in radice’ en est une, et elle n’a rien à voir avec la liturgie... Il préfère donc qu’on ne pose pas la question et que le paragraphe disparaisse, ce qui était aussi le jugement du P. Ritzer.”

convalidation rubric with one describing the celebration of adult initiation outside of the context of the Vigil.⁸² He gave Cellier a choice, however, and provided an alternate rubric which touched on the question of marriage, simply suggesting that at some point after being admitted to the sacraments, the pastor might work towards bringing the marriage into conformity with the Church.⁸³ Ligier's recommendation was approved by Cellier, and S-352 216 was replaced by OICA 209.

The rite was then to be submitted to the Vatican printer between January 10 and 15, 1970. According to Ligier, printer's proofs would then be sent to Cellier and Ligier as well as to any of the interested dicasteries, notably the Congregations for the Doctrine of the Faith, Sacraments, and Evangelization of Peoples. Describing the subsequent period as "a lengthy journey of examination by the agencies of the Roman Curia,"⁸⁴ Bugnini relates that texts were sent to these Congregations on October 30, 1970.⁸⁵ It is

⁸² "Ligier to Cellier, January 2, 1970," 1: "Par conséquent, en remettant tout à l'heure notre texte, j'ai averti les PP. Bugnini et Braga du problème et de l'opinion du P. Bidagor. Le P. Bugnini maintenant s'en remet au P. Braga; quant à celui-ci, il pense que, si les canonistes font difficulté, il vaut mieux se taire. Mais il reste une difficulté pratique: comment boucher le trou? Ni moi – ni Braga – ne voulons changer encore une fois la numération et vérifier tous les renvois! J'ai donc proposé deux textes de remplissage, que vous trouverez ci-joints. L'un, songeant l'aspect pascal de la célébration. L'autre, touchant au problème matrimonial, se contente de rappeler aux pasteurs qu'il existe, en termes volontairement généraux. Le P. Braga et moi préférez le second, soyez assez bon pour me le faire savoir le plus tôt possible."

⁸³ "Ligier to Cellier, January 2, 1970," 4: "Antequam accedatur ad celebrationem sacramentorum, ne praetermittatur attendere, si casus ferat, condicioni matrimoniali electorum, ut occurrentibus difficultatibus, si adsint, tempestive solutio congrua procuretur."

⁸⁴ *ROL* 589. Documentation surrounding this last stage of discussion on the rite in the C.N.P.L. archives is minimal. Any evidence from this body will, of course, be noted. Otherwise, however, the chronology and narrative contained here is thoroughly reliant upon *ROL*, *passim*.

⁸⁵ That the proofs were sent to these dicasteries on October 14, 1970, means, clearly, that Bugnini is not referring to the first proofs, of which there appear to have been at least three or four.

Only two versions are contained within the C.N.P.L. archives in 3. However, a set of corrections, "Remarques sur les épreuves de Ordo initiationis christianae adultorum, September 18, 1970" in 3.C. refer to a version of the proofs not contained within the archive. This unsigned set of suggestions notes, for example, that the exorcisms at 116, 117, 119, 120, and 121, as well as the blessings at 130, 131, 133, 134, and 135 had been suppressed. These occur in both proofs held at the C.N.P.L.

unclear, however, when the first proofs were created or sent, although the second proofs are known to be in existence by June 4, 1970.⁸⁶ Cellier would not examine these until September. This may have been the same version of the text that Bugnini reports was sent to the three Congregations, or, perhaps, the version named by Bugnini was a third version which reflected Cellier's corrections.

Responses from the three Congregations were received between November 1970 and April 1971.⁸⁷ The various responses were studied by a committee of the *Consilium*, consisting of Ligier, Luigi Agustoni, Pierre Jounel, Bartolomeo Belluco O.F.M., and Gottardo Pasqualetti on April 30, and a meeting of representatives from each of the dicasteries was held on June 7. Bugnini notes that he and Pasqualetti represented the Congregation for Divine Worship, Antonio Magnoni and an individual named Sutter represented the Congregation of the Sacraments, and Gabriel Roschini represented the Congregation for Divine Worship along with Lécuyer, who also represented the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples together with Seumois.⁸⁸ Bugnini summarizes that

“the Congregation of the Sacraments limited itself to a minute comparison of the new *Ordo* with the prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law... [and] in the final analysis, the Congregation of the Sacraments was satisfied with the inclusion, at

⁸⁶ “Cellier to Ligier, June 4, 1970” in C.N.P.L. 3.C: “Remarques sur les épreuves (1970-1971)”: “Le Père Jounel m’a rapporté de Rome les deuxièmes épreuves du Rituel du baptême des adultes.”

⁸⁷ Bugnini indicates that the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples responded on November 5, 1970, the Congregation for Divine worship responded on February 22, 1971, and the Congregation for the Sacraments responded on April 20, 1971. *ROL* 589.

⁸⁸ *ROL* 590 simply contains the name “Sutter,” as does the Italian version on page 575. This is the only reference to him in the text.

the points it indicated, of such phrases as ‘*non obstante*,’ ‘*abrogato in hoc casu*,’ and ‘*derogato can... CJC*.’⁸⁹

Bugnini further notes five specific requests that emerged out of the joint meeting, including, first, the omission of the *Praenotanda* for Christian Initiation from the OICA, as they “were regarded as displaying god knows what doctrinal defects... the corrections finally required were minimal,”⁹⁰ and, second, the addition of a paragraph concerning conditional baptism into the *Praenotanda* of the rite in the Appendix, the *Ordo admissionis valide iam baptizatorum in plenam communionem ecclesiae catholicae*.⁹¹ The third alteration was an addition to the structure of the overall rite; a notation in the *Praenotanda* to Christian Initiation that a non-Catholic could act as a witness, but not as a godparent at paragraph 10.⁹² This change was not made within the texts specifically describing the OICA. The rationale behind the description of the celebration of confirmation is well-documented by Bugnini:

Once the possibility was accepted that the celebrating priest might administer all three sacraments, a complex casuistry developed that was due in part to the variety of situations envisaged in the *schema* itself: confirmation and first communion of baptized persons who had neglected or lost their faith; Christian initiation of children of catechetical age; etc. It was requested that in these cases, too, the priest might administer confirmation. Then the question arose: Can he also confirm other baptized Christians who may be present?

⁸⁹ *ROL* 590. See, for example, the rubric for the giving of a new name at OICA 88. An addition was made here to indicate that the giving of a new name was in accordance with Canon 761 of the Code of Canon Law, advising pastors that it was their responsibility to see that all those being baptized were given a Christian name.

⁹⁰ *ROL* 590.

⁹¹ *ROL* 591. See also Sieverding, *Ordo admissionis*, 263-264.

⁹² *ROL* 591 contains an obvious error, arguing the opposite position: “... the specification that a Catholic cannot act as a godparent but can only be allowed as a witness.” Unfortunately, the error is not a misprint in the English translation, but rather, represents a faithful translation of the Italian text: “... la precisazione che un cattolico non può fare da padrino, ma solo essere ammesso come teste” (576). These texts should simply indicate that the subject here should be a non-Catholic, rather than a Catholic.

The Congregation of the Sacraments was in favor of allowing a priest who celebrates baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist for an *adult* to confirm also any other adults present who had been baptized in childhood. It did not allow without qualification that the celebrant might do the same at the Christian initiation of a child. The SCDW, on the other hand, was more in favor of the second case because among the children sharing a common catechetical formation there could be some preparing for all three sacraments and others preparing only for confirmation and first communion.

The problem was resolved by allowing the priest to confer confirmation only as part of the sacramental action of Christian initiation for an adult or for a child that had reached the age of reason, to the exclusion of everyone else.⁹³

This was accomplished in the addition of an extra paragraph in the *Praenotanda* (OICA 46), which clarified both that when baptism was celebrated for one who had achieved catechetical age, the priest was also to celebrate Confirmation. The fifth request was “the revision of some texts, especially of the *Praenotanda*, with a view to clarifying some expressions or making them more precise.”⁹⁴ The majority of these revisions preserve the sense of the former texts,⁹⁵ and there was only one deletion of significance. The *Praenotanda* in the first proof included authorization for the laity to administer both baptism and communion if the individual was in immediate danger of death (S-352, 48). This paragraph simply disappeared from the General *Praenotanda*, and was, instead, included in the Particular *Praenotanda* of the brief rite for adults in danger of death (OICA 278-280).

Within the rite itself, there were two key alterations above and beyond editorial changes which require mention: the *traditio* of the Lord’s Prayer and the location of

⁹³ *ROL* 590.

⁹⁴ *ROL* 590.

⁹⁵ For example, the paragraph of the *Praenotanda* treating the status of the catechumens once they had passed the first stage, was expanded to include the phrase “... quos iam ut suos dilectione curaue complectitur Mater Ecclesia...” highlighting the concern and affection of Mother Church for her catechumens.

Confirmation in the sequence of initiation. The first of these appears to have been a solution to a problem pointed out to Bugnini by Cellier in a set of corrections dated November, 1971.⁹⁶ In the original structure, the *traditio* was to occur after a celebration of the Word, which included a reading from the Old Testament, a Responsorial Psalm, a reading from the Epistles, a Gospel reading (which combined the accounts of the Lord's Prayer being taught in both Luke and Matthew), and a homily. Following the homily, the celebrant would instruct those who were to have the prayer handed over to them to come forward, where they would, once again, hear the Lord's Prayer. In the published OICA, however, the celebrant's instruction to come forward to receive the prayer was moved to before the proclamation of the Gospel, which was likewise altered. Instead of weaving Luke and Matthew together here, the Gospel pericope would only be the account contained in Matthew. The reading of the Gospel would, thus, be the *traditio* itself. The homily would occur in its normal place.

The second significant change concerned the location of Confirmation within the celebration of the rites of initiation. The post-baptismal structure had been amended at St-Genesius-Rode, so that following baptism the neophyte would be anointed with chrism, whether that anointing was the traditional post-baptismal anointing or whether it was the anointing associated with Confirmation. The next element in the sequence would be clothing the neophyte in a white garment. During this final period, allowance had been made that if Baptism was celebrated by immersion, or for some other reason,

⁹⁶ "Remarques sur les épreuves de l'Ordo Initiationis Christianae Adultorum, November 1971" in C.N.P.L. 3.B, "Remarques sur les épreuves de nov. 1971," 2: "Numéro 190, avant-dernier § : On a rajouté ici une conjonction de deux péripécies évangéliques qui font double emploi avec le numéro 191. Ceci doit être supprimé. Il est impossible de lire un évangile pour lui-même et d'en reprendre immédiatement après, dans le rite, les termes." While this text is unsigned, it is attached to a letter, "Bugnini to Cellier, November 13, 1971" where Bugnini indicates that he has received the corrections through Pierre Jounel.

Confirmation could be moved after the presentation with a white garment and a lit candle. Presumably, this would facilitate the comfort of the neophytes, who would not be wet while waiting for a white garment. In the final proof, however, the pastoral location for Confirmation became the normative one. Confirmation would not be as fully integrated into the Baptismal action as it had been just before; conversely, it would not be treated, simply, as a sacramental post-baptismal anointing, but would stand somewhat apart.

Once the proofs had been amended and corrected, they were sent, once again, to the Congregations for Divine Worship, for the Sacraments, for the Doctrine of the Faith, and for the Evangelization of Peoples. Bugnini notes that approval was given to these texts in July and August, 1971: Evangelization of Peoples, July 6, Sacraments, July 9; and Doctrine of the Faith, August 31.

8.5: Conclusions

According to Bugnini, the final proofs of the *Ordo initiationis christianae adultorum* were submitted to Paul VI on November 14, 1971, and he gave approval to them on November 30. The rite was published on January 6, 1972, the Solemnity of the Epiphany, and was accompanied by a press release, authored by Cellier.⁹⁷ In this text Cellier described the rite as centering on preparation for initiation, rather than initiation itself:

The new rite... sets out the different ways in which the Church prepares an unbaptised adult to receive Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. The preparation consists of a period called the catechumenate, which will normally

⁹⁷ “Communiqué de Presse” in C.N.P.L. 3.A.i. Included in this folder is an English translation of the same document, simply entitled “Press Release.”

last several years. During this period, the catechumen... shares in the life of the Christian community, receives suitable instruction (catechesis), and takes part in liturgical ceremonies expressing the action of God in a man's life. The new rite is based on a period of preparation for Baptism (catechumenate), found in the early Church, which it adapts to contemporary needs, and the different situations which arise from a rich variety of traditions and cultures.⁹⁸

At the same time as the catechumenate was focused on the spiritual progression of the catechumen, it also helped form the community into which the catechumen was being initiated:

It is a sign of a Church ready to welcome those who turn to her in search of God, and the tenor of this period of instruction brings out the need for holiness of life and sincerity of faith as the basic requirements for all the Christian community. It is also a sign of a church aware that everything comes to it from God, and therefore, which puts at the centre of its Christian initiation those sacramental services through which God expresses his love for those he wishes to make his children.⁹⁹

At Cellier's suggestion, Molin was requested to write a brief commentary on the new rite for *Notitiae*.¹⁰⁰ He provided a helpful summary of the contents of the document, treating the emphasis on the process of initiation rather than the sacraments of initiation, the broad outlines of the work of the *Coetus*, a somewhat more detailed outline of the periods and stages of the new rite, and the adaptability of the rite to particular circumstances. Molin concluded that the new rite was,

of all the sections of the Roman Ritual now available, ...certainly the most important, and not only because of the number of pages. It shows us how and

⁹⁸ "Press Release" 1.

⁹⁹ "Press Release" 2.

¹⁰⁰ "Cellier to Bugnini, January 28, 1972" in C.N.P.L. 3.A: "En signant cette lettre, il me vient une idée pour les *Notitiae*. Le Père Jean-Baptiste Molin, membre du *Coetus* 22, serait tout à fait capable, après avoir parlé avec moi, de faire quelque chose d'intéressant. Il a le temps de le faire. Il m'est facile de lui demander si vous le souhaitez." Jean-Baptiste Molin, FMC, "Le Nouveau Rituel de l'Initiation Chrétienne des Adultes," *Notitiae* 8 (1972), 87-95.

why the Church, missionary by vocation, can pay specific attention to the birth of new children of God, entrusted to it by God himself.¹⁰¹

With the publication of the *Ordo initiationis christianae adultorum* and these articles, the work of the *Coetus* was completed. The real work, however, was only to begin, as these new, adaptable, texts were realized within local parish communities across the world.

¹⁰¹ “Le Nouveau Rituel,” 95: “De toutes les sections déjà parues du nouveau Rituel romain, l’*Ordo initiationis christianae adultorum* est, certes, la plus importante, et non seulement par le nombre des pages. Il nous montre comment et combien l’Église, missionnaire par vocation, doit prendre un soin particulier de la naissance des nouveaux enfants que Dieu lui donne.”

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSIONS

There are multiple ways in which one might assess the success of the OCGD as the paradigmatic rite of the OICA and its impact on the life of the Church. Indeed, many scholars, pastors, and practitioners have already done so in a broad diversity of ways. It is necessary to point to some of the particular advancements, especially as they are readily evidenced in the workings of *Coetus XXII*, but, as this present study is concerned with the history and process of revising the rite, a far more fitting conclusion involves revisiting the ways in which the rite was put together. In looking at the process, exemplified through the evolution of the scrutinies, a methodological shift in the work becomes apparent, which mirrors a principal development in sacramental theology at that time: the transition from treating the sacraments of initiation as what Peter Fink describes “as ‘objective realities,’ quasi-scientific objects, which could be observed and analyzed from without” to treating the rite of adult initiation as a “phenomenological and experiential model of ‘human encounter’.”¹ Enlightened by the evidence afforded in the period of experimentation, conclusions about contemporary pastoral practice can, thus, be drawn from the nature of the work of revising the rite of adult initiation.

¹ Peter E. Fink, SJ, “Sacraments” in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter E. Fink, SJ (Collegeville: A Michael Glazier Book by the Liturgical Press, 1990), 1108-1109.

9.1: General Assessment

9.1.1: Advancements in the OICA

According to Aidan Kavanagh, the OICA was the

most mature outcome of the postconciliar subcommission's work. Its intent was to be a preparation not merely for the final sacramental *rites* of initiation (baptism-confirmation-eucharist), but for a *life of faith* in which asceticism, good works, and sacramental engagement could blend in a robust whole rather than languish as mere options, supine before the idiosyncrasies of personal taste and piety.²

Given the degree to which the revised rite for adult initiation has implications for the entire life of the post-conciliar Church, it has been the subject of countless studies, both academic and pastoral, emphasizing what the rites mean, and how they might most effectively be realized. Fischer himself provided one of the most concise studies of the impact of the new rite, highlighting nine now well-known points of importance within the rite: five “rediscoveries” and four “new additions.”³ First, he argued, the OICGD reunited the three sacraments of initiation, Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist, in their proper order, and presents them as the culmination of an entire process of initiation.⁴ Second, initiation is given a decidedly paschal character: not only are the rites intended to be celebrated at the Paschal Vigil, but the texts themselves demonstrate a

² Aidan Kavanagh, *Shape of Baptism*, 105.

³ Balthasar Fischer, “Die Struktur des Ordo Initiationis Christianae Adultorum von 1972: Wiederentdecktes und Neueingeführtes” in *Redemptionis Mysterium: Studien zur Osterfeier und zur christlichen Initiation*, Albert Gerhards and Andreas Heinz, eds. (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh), 1992, 225-234.

⁴ OICA 2 (RCIA 2): “This rite includes not simply the celebration of the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and eucharist, but also all the rites belonging to the catechumenate...”

clear emphasis on the Paschal Mystery.⁵ Third, the catechumenate has an essential ecclesial character: the catechumen becomes a Christian in the midst of the community of the baptized.⁶ Fourth, the catechumenate has an essential liturgical character: every period and stage of the catechumenate is marked by particular rite.⁷ Fifth, the process of initiation was concluded by mystagogical catechesis.⁸ All of these rediscoveries were considered to be hallmarks of the process of Christian initiation by Louis Duchsense.⁹ The first of the new additions to the rite, according to Fischer, is its flexibility. Not only are elements within the rites optional, but so too is the manner in which they might be performed, both in action and speech. For example, in the signing of the forehead and senses in the first stage of the rite (83-87; RCIA 54-56), the introductory text could

⁵ OICA 8 (RCIA 8): “The whole initiation must bear a markedly paschal character, since the initiation of Christians is the first sacramental sharing in Christ’s dying and rising and since, in addition, the period of purification and enlightenment ordinarily coincides with Lent and the period of postbaptismal catechesis or mystagogy with the Easter season. All the resources of Lent should be brought to bear as a more intense preparation of the elect and the Easter Vigil should be regarded as the proper time for the sacraments of initiation. Because of pastoral needs, however, the sacraments may be celebrated at other times.”

⁶ OICA 18 (RCIA 47): “From this time on the Church embraces the catechumens as its own with a mother’s love and concern. Joined to the Church, the catechumens are now part of the household of Christ, since the Church nourishes them with the word of God and sustains them by means of liturgical celebrations. The catechumens should be eager, then, to take part in celebrations of the word of God and to receive blessings and other sacramentals. When two catechumens marry or when a catechumen marries an unbaptized person, the appropriate rite is to be used. One who dies during the catechumenate receives a Christian burial.”

⁷ “Die Struktur” 228: “Die Alte Kirche hatte eine sehr einfache Weise, den Bewerber um die Eingliederung sowohl die geistliche wie die ekklesiale Dimension ihres Weges zum Bewußtsein zu bringen. Sie begleitete diesen Weg mit liturgischen Feiern, und ihre Wiederentdeckung hat dem Katechumenat ein völlig neues Gesicht gegeben.”

⁸ OICA 37 (RCIA 244): “The third step of Christian initiation, the celebration of the sacraments, is followed by the final period, the period of postbaptismal catechesis or mystagogy. This is a time for the community and the neophytes together to grow in deepening their grasp of the paschal mystery and in making it part of their lives through meditation on the Gospel, sharing in the eucharist, and doing the works of charity. To strengthen the neophytes as they begin to walk in newness of life, the community of the faithful, their godparents, and their parish priests (pastors) should give them thoughtful and friendly help.”

⁹ CW, 292-316.

follow the given formula or other similar words, the candidates could be signed on the forehead or in front of the forehead, and the signing of each of the senses was optional. Furthermore, within this single element, textual options were also given for cases in which there were a large number of candidates. Second, the OICA provided for a variety of different circumstances of initiation by including a simple rite, a brief rite, a rite for those baptized but uncatechized, a rite for children of catechetical age, and a rite for those seeking full communion with the Church. Third, the rite included the new element of the giving of a Christian name which would help communicate new life in Christ, particularly in those cultures where names and name-changes bore great significance.¹⁰ And fourth, the rite permitted and promoted the administration of Confirmation by the celebrant, whether he was Bishop or priest.¹¹

These points of significance are clearly emphasized as intended consequences of the structural revision of the rite of adult initiation. Not only were these highlighted in *SC*¹² and the initial stages of the *Coetus*' work,¹³ but they also found support in some of

¹⁰ "Die Struktur" 232: "Aus der richtigen Erkenntnis, daß der früher mit der Taufe verbindlich gegebene Namenswechsel mit Übernahme eines europäischen Namens eine regelrechte Entwurzelung des Neugetauften aus seinem kulturellen Milieu bedeuten konnte, hat man die Frage des Taufnamens in unserem Ordo neu geregelt."

¹¹ OICA 228 (RCIA 232): "If the bishop has conferred baptism, he should now also confer confirmation. If the bishop is not present, the priest who conferred baptism is authorized to confirm."

¹² See SC 64-70. Here is found support for the variety of ritual forms, adaptability, and the unity of the sacraments of initiation. See also SC 27 on the preference for communal celebrations.

¹³ S-30 highlights the use of liturgical rites throughout the process of initiation, prebyteral administration of confirmation. During the first meeting of the *Coetus* at Galloro in September, 1964, the questionnaire composed by Cellier provided a structure for discussion: it highlighted the integrity of the initiation process, the Paschal significance of initiation, the ecclesial character of the catechumenate, and the liturgical character of the catechumenate. Discussion would confirm the significance of Mystagogy, and would introduce the giving of a new Christian name.

the pre-Conciliar studies of the *Coetus* members.¹⁴ In this sense, the *Coetus* was quite clear that each of these points should emerge through the process of revision. Indeed, on these points, while discussions about degree – particularly on the issue of flexibility – did occasionally occur, there was never any hesitation throughout the entire project about their fundamental significance.

9.1.2: The Role of History

While the place of each of the previously named advancements within the structural revision of the rite of adult initiation is abundantly clear, the primary interest of this study has not been exploring their nature or their presence. Rather, the intent has been to fill a notable *lacuna* in the dialogue surrounding the rite of adult initiation; the focus has been the process by which the revised rite, and thus, the advancements, came into existence. It is, essentially, oriented towards history – that portion of the theological enterprise upon which the current situation rests.¹⁵ As the rite clearly expresses, the Body of Christ and its individual members in all of their stages of membership are on a journey

¹⁴ See, for example, Stenzel, *Die Taufe*, Seumois, *L'Adaptation Dans Le Culte*, Lécuyer, “Théologie de l’initiation chrétienne chez les Pères,” and Lécuyer, “San Juan Crisóstomo y la Confirmación.”

¹⁵ Robert F. Taft, S.J., “Introduction” in *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997), 14: “Theology must be reflection on the whole of that reality, the whole of tradition, not on just its present manifestation. One of the great contemporary illusions is that one can construct a liturgical theology without a profound knowledge of the liturgical tradition... We study the history of the liturgical tradition for the same reason that a psychiatrist seeks to uncover the childhood traumas of patients: not to understand their childhood, their past, but their present adult personality that was formed by those childhood experiences and can be understood only in relation to them... Christian liturgy is a given, an object, an already existing reality like English literature. One discovers what English literature is only by reading Chaucer and Shakespeare and Eliot and Shaw and the contemporaries. So too with the liturgy. If we want to know what Christmas and Chrismation, Eucharist and Easter mean, we shall not get far by studying anthropology or game-theory, or by asking ourselves what we *think* they mean. We must plunge into the enormous stream of liturgical and patristic evidence and wade through it piece by piece, age by age, ever alert to pick up shifts in the current as each generation reaches for its own understanding of what it is we are about.”

of faith; those involved in realizing the rite of adult initiation in the Church will therefore be well served by locating their bearings. In discerning the place from which the Church has come, a more complete understanding of how it has arrived at its present location will be possible. This in turn allows for more clarity in assessing how the journey which lies ahead might proceed. Consequently, pastoral decisions made with the intention of addressing the Church and those seeking entrance into it using a “where they are at” methodology can operate within a framework informed by the anamnestic intent of the rite itself.

9.2: The Process of Revision

The work of *Coetus* XXII on revising the rite of adult initiation began on September 10, 1964, and was brought to a close on January 6, 1972. During the course of almost seven and a half years, over fourteen different meetings were held and nine *schemata*, including five complete drafts of the rite, were produced. Throughout this work, the *Coetus* was continually revisiting the rite, in its various states of revision, in order to make the text more theologically precise and more readily usable in pastoral settings. Broadly speaking, the progression of the work can be described in two separate phases. The early phase moved from general principles, to ritual structure, to ritual texts. The later stage involved revisions following the period of experimentation. These changes were also concerned, primarily, with ritual texts.

9.2.1: General Principles

S-30, dated September 10, 1964, provided an outline for the work of the *Coetus*, elaborating on the directions contained in *SC*. It contained, in very broad strokes, the outlines of the rite, and included mention of local adaptations and presbyteral

confirmation. It further detailed the different versions of the rite that should be drawn up: the solemn rite, the simple rite, a rite for those in danger of death, and a rite for bringing those already baptized into full communion with the Church. Given the general nature of the *schema*, the treatment of the scrutinies was exceptionally concise: prayers and exorcisms were to be used during the rite, and would help stimulate the spiritual progression of the catechumen.¹⁶ No specifics about the scrutinies in particular were given. Overall, this text, although brief, would be foundational in directing the work of the *Coetus*.

On September 15, 1964, the *Coetus* gathered for two days at Galloro, Italy, where they discussed S-30, a preparatory questionnaire on adult initiation, and an earlier proposal for the shape of adult initiation crafted by Josef Jungmann. The fruits of this meeting concerned the broad outlines of the rite: the reunification and proper ordering of the sacraments of initiation and their celebration at the Paschal Vigil; the promotion of symbols that were “immediately intelligible” and those that were explicitly scriptural (flowing water, a lit candle, and a white garment); the suppression of unnecessarily repeated elements and outdated or obscure elements (separate ritual texts for men and women and the blessing and distribution of salt); the active participation of sponsors; and the introduction of new elements (the giving of a Christian name, the *traditiones*). At Galloro a four-stage structure of initiation was developed, which would extend the process of initiation over time: admission to the catechumenate (interrogation of sponsors and candidate, and optional giving of salt); instruction (minor exorcisms, blessings, and

¹⁶ S-30, 23c: “Series orationum et exorcismorum eo modo sint ordinatae, ut progressus catechumeni ad baptismum excitetur et clarius in dies appareat.”

optional giving of salt); immediate preparation (election, scrutinies with *traditiones*, *redditio symboli* and optional renunciation); and initiation (with profession of faith) and mystagogy. Initiation was to be concluded with mystagogy, which at Galloro was not considered as a stage in and of itself. The treatment of the scrutinies at Galloro was brief. The *Coetus* determined that they should be celebrated on the third and fourth Sundays of Lent, as well as on the fifth Sunday, Passion Sunday, in accordance with the ancient liturgical practice.¹⁷ Debate began at this meeting concerning the proper style of the exorcisms: imperative or deprecatory. The final task at Galloro was amending S-30, notably in the addition of questions for the *Consilium* fathers.

9.2.2: Ritual Structure

The subcommittee on baptism, Fischer, Stenzel, Seumois, and Cellier, gathered at Trier on November 3, 1964 for a two-day meeting. The primary work at this meeting was to be the elaboration of the structure devised at Galloro. From the spare outline of Galloro, the subcommittee crafted a more detailed ritual shape: the first stage, containing three elements at Galloro, was enlarged to include twelve elements; the second stage was expanded by the optional insertion of the *traditiones* of the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and the Gospels alongside the minor exorcisms; within the third stage the *redditio symboli* became one of three rites of immediate preparation alongside the *Ephphatha* and the

¹⁷ Gelasian Sacramentary, Book I, XXVI-XXVIII and *DOBL* 213-215. See also Antoine Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316): Sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titres romains au viie siècle* (Tournai: Desclée, 1958), 230-233, Antoine Chavasse, "Le carême romain et les scrutins prébaptismaux avant le IXe siècle," *Recherches de science religieuse* 35 (1948), 325-381, and Antoine Chavasse, "La discipline romaine des sept scrutins prébaptismaux," *Recherches de science religieuse* 48 (1960), 227-240.

optional giving of a Christian name; and the fourth stage was divided into two stages, thus separating the sacraments of initiation from mystagogy.

At Trier the place of the scrutinies within the rite was described with more precision. The scrutinies were intended to be viewed as natural outgrowths of the exorcisms performed throughout the period of the catechumenate; they were to be differentiated from the minor exorcisms by being celebrated within the context of a ritual mass: the first two scrutinies would be celebrated in place of the ordinarily celebrated Masses for the third and fourth Sundays of Lent; the third would utilize the texts for Passion Sunday, which were properly baptismal. The group also determined that the scrutinies should occur after the homily, so that they might respond to Scripture more fully. The scrutinies would begin with silent prayer, and would be followed by the community's litany of intercession over the elect. This led directly to the exorcism of both men and women together, and the signation of the elect by their sponsors. The optional celebration of the *traditiones* of the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Gospels, respectively, might be celebrated within the scrutinies; the preference, however, was that they should have been celebrated during the second stage. The conclusion of the scrutinies was the liturgical dismissal, comprised of the prayer "*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*" and a laying on of hands by the celebrant. Significant here was the suppression of the elect's recitation of the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of each of the exorcisms in OBA 16, 18, and 20 for men and 22, 24, and 26 for women. The elect, of course, should not be expected to pray the Lord's Prayer within the liturgical assembly during each of the scrutinies if the *traditio* of it was not expected to occur (optionally) until the end of the third scrutiny: how could they give back what they had not yet

received? Nonetheless, the ritual element of prayer by the elect formerly occupied by the recitation of the Lord's Prayer was retained in the silent prayer of the elect.

A meeting of select members of *Coetus* XXII and XXIII at Cologne, on December 28-31, 1964, was primarily concerned with the general outline of the *Rituale*. Nevertheless, the rather particular question of whether catechumens should participate in the intercessions of the Church or not, as well as some minor alterations to the shape of the rite. There were no discussions concerning the scrutinies at Cologne.

The subcommittee on baptism reconvened in Trier on February 15-18, 1965. With the addition of Molin to the subcommittee, the group sought first to review the section on initiation in the *Rituale*, and second to prepare a submission to the *Consilium* treating the shape of the rite of adult initiation. The resulting document, S-77, discussed by the *Consilium* on April 26, 1965, maintained the division of the rite into five stages. The document provided both a theological rationale for each of the stations – as the stages of initiation were now named – as well as a general description of the content of the stages. The order of the elements had been reviewed during the second Trier meeting, and the content of the rite described in S-77 was heavily reliant upon the two prior versions of the Rite, OBA and OBA1962. The sense of how the revision of the rite might occur in this first presentation to the *Consilium* is somewhat similar to the revision in 1962: here the existing rite was simply divided into stages; the only addition to its predecessor was an opening versicle for each of the seven stages. The rite envisioned in S-77 involved the addition of some new elements, the suppression of some old elements, and a substantial reorganization of those remaining. The texts of the older rites were largely to be retained; in cases where they were to be amended, specific rationale for each

decision was provided. Alongside the general trend of retaining as much as was possible from OBA and OBA1962, S-77 revealed that some texts found outside of the Roman Rite would be necessary, particularly in describing the minor exorcisms and blessings. In the description of the second station, the *Coetus* simply proposed that a variety of different texts, selected from other liturgical sources, would be given, so that pastors could respond effectively to the needs of those in the catechumenate. These prayers would eventually be chosen from a collection of texts prepared by Ligier following the meeting with the *Consilium*. The texts in the collection would all be drawn from ancient liturgical sources.

Discussion on the scrutinies at Trier and in S-77 developed the previous structure and content largely by way of clarification. The subcommittee acknowledged that it might be necessary to omit one or two of the scrutinies, but the shape of the scrutinies themselves should not be truncated, likely in order to minimize the appearance of formalism. Further options were given to separate the *traditiones* from the structure of the scrutinies.

9.2.3: Ritual Texts

With a basic structure for the rite having been approved by the *Consilium*, the *Coetus* set to work on fleshing out the structure with particular texts. This initial work began at Le Saulchoir on June 3-6, 1965 by the subcommittee, expanded by the additions of Lengeling and Ligier. This work, as well as the labor from the later that month at the Abbey of Clervaux in Luxembourg, was intended to lead to the creation of a submission to the *Consilium*, S-112, for the purpose of being approved for experimentation. With some alterations, the *Consilium* approved the text, on October 19, 1965, and the corrected draft, S-125, was submitted to the Congregation for the Rites for its approval. After some

changes, mostly dealing with items of ritual and textual clarity, though some that addressed the concern of the *Consilium* regarding the length of the rite, a new *Schemata*, S-147 was drawn up and submitted to the Pope on March 18, 1966. On June 20 of that same year Paul VI approved the *schema* for the purpose of experimentation.

Textually speaking, the experimental rite demonstrated a general preference for taking whatever could be taken from OBA and OBA1962, and, where applicable, restoring these texts as found in earlier liturgical sources. If, for some reason, these were deemed inappropriate, texts were chosen from other ancient sources and other liturgical traditions, and edited to fit within the general sense of the Roman rite. If these texts were generally suitable, they might occasionally be modified with the addition of allusions to scripture or paschal imagery. If no suitable formula could be culled from these sources, a new text could be composed. All of the ritual texts were subject to an investigation on the degree to which they could be considered pastorally appropriate, and occasionally, texts were either amended with such concern in mind. This progression underscored a fundamental preference for texts emerging out of the liturgical tradition, but at the same time, reflected a concern for those who would be using the texts.

The scrutinies contained in S-112, S-125, and S-147 reflect this process of choosing and editing texts from the tradition in a manner concerned for their use in contemporary assemblies. Thus, the intercessions contained in the litany which were, largely, drawn from the catecheses of John Chrysostom and from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, were not inserted wholesale, but were edited in order to highlight the penitential and the paschal aspects of initiation. Similarly, the prayers of exorcism reflected the liturgical tradition. The difficulty, however, was in reconciling prayers of

exorcism from the early Church with modern mentality concerning demons and possession. One proposal drew upon the texts contained in the prior versions of the rite (OBA 17, 23, and 19, respectively). A second proposal provided newly composed texts that rendered the historical intent of the scrutinies within a contemporary framework. These texts were to demonstrate a progression of sin, and thus, to achieve the liberation of the elect from sin:¹⁸ the elect were to recognize their own sinfulness; they were to understand the importance of penitence; and they were to be made more open to the promise of eternal life. A second related issue discussed at Le Saulchoir was that of the address of the scrutinies, and whether addressing demons directly as in the ancient texts would be a fruitful choice in the restored rite, as this option appeared to endorse not only the presence of the demon within the elect, but the exorcist's seemingly magical ability to cause the demon to retreat. A decision was reached to provide both imperative and deprecatory versions of the prayers of exorcism for each scrutiny, and to decide which version was preferable following upon the period of experimentation.

By the meeting at Clervaux, however, the *Coetus* had opted to prefer the use of texts from the liturgical sources to the creation of new texts. The continuing issue concerned presenting the traditional imperative texts in a manner consistent with contemporary belief. The texts found in S-112 were all based on prayers of exorcism from OBA, but were edited to point more clearly to Scripture in general and the Gospel pericopes for each scrutiny in particular. Furthermore, whenever possible, the prayers

¹⁸ Mario Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, Vol. IV (Milan: Editrice Ancora, 1950-1953), 55, cited in Dujarier, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 115-116: "The purpose of the scrutinies was not then, at least in the beginning, to verify the degree of his religious instruction or of his spiritual progress, but to *scrutinize* himself (that is, to penetrate his own heart and to be assured that the mysterious action of God is working there) so as to be free of all domination by an impure spirit, with the understanding, of course, that this progressive liberation is the fruit of faith."

were restored to the form in which they were found in their earliest recension, notably the *Gelasian Sacramentary*. By S-112, the *traditiones* had been separated from the scrutinies, as the union of these two elements would be too theologically rich for the elect – both elements would, therefore, suffer. The scrutinies that appeared in S-147 reflected only minor alterations from both S-112 and S-125.

9.2.4: Revisions from Experimentation

Experimentation had been performed over two years in a relatively wide variety of locales on four continents. While there were some concerns about ritual balance, the reports by the experimenters revealed a near universal concern that the rite should be far more intimately connected to the contemporary situation of the Church than on restoring historical texts to the rite. These concerns can be classified according to the relevance of particular rites and texts were culturally relevant and useful. The work of the *Coetus* at Vanves from December 30, 1968 to January 4, 1969, in the creation of new prayers of exorcism in S-337, and at the meeting at St-Genesius-Rode on March 3-8, 1969, all reflected a desire to respond to the concerns of the pastors.

In the reports of experimentation, the scrutinies were often criticized because they smacked of “archaeologism:” these elements did not respect modern sensibilities about time; the texts and vocabulary did not speak to a contemporary mentality; and the perception of demonic possession no longer applied in the way it once did. While the *Coetus* was hesitant to allow for the truncation or elimination of any of the scrutinies, they were willing to thoroughly revisit these elements, in order to allow them to have their desired effect upon the elect. Specifically, they added pastoral rubrics before the celebration of the scrutinies, they rewrote the texts of the intercessions to better comment

upon the faith journey of the elect, and they composed a new alternate prayer concluding the scrutiny. Most significantly, they revised the form and content of the exorcisms, eliminating direct address of the devil, and restructuring the prayers so that the first portion of the exorcism would develop a progression of themes corresponding both with the spiritual journey of the elect and with the fixed Gospel pericopes for each scrutiny. In order to achieve this, new texts for the exorcism were composed. While these precise texts would undergo a great deal of revision, and multiple new versions for each prayer would be composed, the general principles proposed in response to the period of experimentation would remain, generally, consistent. Ultimately, three versions of each exorcism would be contained within the rite, thereby better allowing local pastors to respond to their particular situations more effectively. The next draft of the rite that was prepared, S-344, reflected the modifications made in response to experimentation. Overall, it introduced few new changes; the majority of these were additional textual options.

The rite was finalized over the course of two years, during which it was reviewed twice by the *Coetus*, once at Douvres-la-Délivran on July 15-21, 1969, and once in Luxembourg on September 10-14, 1969. In these meetings the primary focus was dedicated to the composition of the *Praenotanda* and reviewing the texts in light of the principles established at Vanves. Particularly at Luxembourg the Latin of the rite would be studied and given more precision and clarity. The treatment of the texts for the scrutinies at Douvres-la-Délivran attempted, in general, to respond to the critiques voiced during the phase of experimentation regarding negativity in the rite and attempted to express a more optimistic view of humanity. This sort of editing continued at

Luxembourg, where the existing texts were reshaped so that they might focus more explicitly on the nature of salvation, rather than on the nature of sin. Correspondingly, new sets of intercessions that referred to the salvation that was expressed in the Gospel pericopes were added as an optional resource. The structure of the scrutinies was modified at Luxembourg, presumably in the interest of streamlining the rite: the laying on of hands was inserted into the exorcism, and the accompanying prayer, “*Aeternam ac iustissimam pietatem...*” was, thus, removed.

The final draft of the rite, S-352, was studied by the Relators of the *Consilium* on November 5, 1969 and by the *Consilium* itself on November 13, 1969. It was overwhelmingly approved and thereafter began its final journey through the Congregations for Divine Worship, the Sacraments, the Doctrine of the Faith, and the Evangelization of Peoples as well as by *Coetus* members during 1970 and early 1971. The content of the rite was not substantially altered, except by means of clarifying some portions of the *Praenotanda* and the description of Confirmation. The final text of the OICA, submitted to the Pope on November 14, 1971 and approved on November 30, is, unquestionably, a collaborative project between scholars, pastors, the hierarchy, and the Church as a whole. The rite, based as it was in liturgical history, is nonetheless one which looks forward, embracing and welcoming the challenges of a living Church.¹⁹ What Dominic Serra has argued about the scrutinies in particular is equally true for the entire rite: it is

¹⁹ Balthasar Fischer, “The Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults: Rediscovery and New Beginnings,” *Worship* 64 (1990), 102: “Our commission was well aware of the reproach of archaeologism which hung over our efforts to restore the catechumenate. But more and more we discovered that what the early Christians established in regard to the catechumenate was fundamentally a timeless pattern.”

a “traditional” reform in the fullest sense because it is not the mere reinstatement of an ancient practice but a new formulation by which the ancient form is given new life and adapted to its new setting. Nothing could be less “traditional” than to dust off old and disused rites and to put them in a contemporary context in which they will appear irrelevant and misunderstood only to atrophy and die a second time. Concern for liturgical tradition has more in common with horticulture than with taxidermy. The tradition of the scrutinies lives once again because the ageless wisdom of its supple form is now adapted to the new soil and climate of the present age.²⁰

If nothing else, the history of the revision of the OICA, particularly in the second phase of their work, points to this very same liturgical vitality.

9.3: Shifts in Sacramental Theology

The charge of “archaeologism,” or as Serra has suggested, “taxidermy,” was occasionally filed against *Coetus XXII* in the first phase of their work,²¹ and it clearly relates to the way in which the *Coetus* approached the prescription of SC 23: “That sound tradition may be retained and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy to be revised.” The challenge to be both faithful to tradition *and* to be open to progress is a difficult one; study of the past experience of the Church must be balanced with future expectation for the Church. There was, without question, an earnest desire to discover how the two demands might be engaged, and how one might balance the experience of the past with expectations for the future. The restoration of ancient rites and texts in the OICA clearly emphasizes the importance of the tradition. At the same time, the criteria guiding the

²⁰ Dominic E. Serra, “New Observations About the Scrutinies of the Elect in the Early Roman Practice,” *Worship* 80 (2006), 511.

²¹ *ROL*, 586, 588.

restoration of those rites and texts, and the great allowance for variability within their celebration emphasizes the forward-thinking mentality of the *Coetus*.

In essence, the issue involved in addressing both of the principles of tradition and progress is one of priority: one must, necessarily, start from one of the two, and proceed afterwards to addressing the concerns of the other. One might, then, say that the early stages of the work up to the point of experimentation is best described as one in which questions about the rite were viewed primarily through the lens of tradition, as it could best respond to “the needs of our own times.”²² This work left an indelible mark on the rite, particularly in terms of ritual structure. But in the second phase, assisted with the data received during the period of experimentation, the priority was reversed. Based upon testimony of the rite being realized within diverse pastoral settings, the rite was reviewed through the lens of contemporary need. Living communities, rather than common traditions increasingly became primary sources for the rite, which was, nevertheless, still based in tradition. Increasingly, pastors at every level of the Church were given the responsibility to utilize the tradition effectively within their own communities. Importantly, however, at no time in the work of the *Coetus* was either tradition or pastoral necessity ignored, for each was continually brought to bear on the other at every point along the way.

Despite the fact that the issue of priority remained present throughout the process of their work, a greater degree of balance between the two principles was gradually learned through study and conversation. The requisite connection between the two was

²² SC 62.

developed in a sort of creative tension, which allowed the tradition the opportunity to adapt “to the new soil and climate of the present age.”²³

A large part of what made this work so difficult was a relatively recent, yet fundamental shift in the conception of liturgy and sacraments. In 1960, Edward Schillibeeckx’s book, *Christus, Sacrament van de Godsontmoeting* (*Christ the, Sacrament of the Encounter With God*)²⁴ provided sacramental theology with its “first major step away from scholastic methodology... [and] introduced a paradigm shift, a new hermeneutical lens through which to view faith and the sacramental tradition of the church... replacing the ‘object model’ of scholastic reflection with the more phenomenological and experiential model of ‘human encounter’.”²⁵ Schillibeeckx argued that “religion is above all a saving dialogue between man and the living God,”²⁶ and that

God’s ultimate purpose was to call a faithful people into life... In the dialogue between God and man, so often breaking down, there was found at last a perfect human respondent; in the same person there was achieved the perfection both of the divine invitation and of the human response in faith from the man who by his resurrection is the Christ. The Covenant, sealed in his blood, found definitive success in his person. In him grace became fully visible; he is the embodiment of the grace of final victory, who appeared in person to the Apostles.²⁷

Thus, to come into contact with Jesus is to come into contact with God himself, and “because the saving acts of the man Jesus are performed by a divine person, they have a divine power to save; but because this divine power to save appears to us in visible form,

²³ Serra, “New Observations,” 511.

²⁴ Edward Schillibeeckx, O.P., *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter With God* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1963).

²⁵ Fink, 1109.

²⁶ Schillibeeckx, 3.

²⁷ Schillibeeckx, 13.

the saving activity of Jesus is *sacramental*.”²⁸ If one, therefore, is to accept that the Church is the mystical Body of Christ, Schillibeeckx argued, “the earthly Church is the visible realization of this saving reality in history,”²⁹ and thus when one comes into contact with the Church, one comes into contact with Christ himself. Therefore, the seven sacraments of the Church, those divinely instituted ecclesial acts which transmit grace, are “primarily and fundamentally a personal act of Christ himself, which reaches and involves us in the form of an institutional act performed by a person in the Church who, in virtue of a sacramental character, is empowered to do so by Christ himself: an act *ex officio*.”³⁰ In short, when one encounters the Church through the sacraments, one comes into contact with the Body of Christ doing those things that Christ himself did: the sacraments “are the visible and tangible embodiment of the heavenly saving action of Christ. They are this saving action itself in its availability to us; a personal act of the Lord in earthly visibility and open availability.”³¹ One therefore encounters Christ, and, *de facto*, one encounters God. Or, as Philip Kennedy has summarized, “to encounter the Church is to encounter a sacrament of Christ who in turn is a sacrament of an encounter with God.”³²

Schillibeeckx’s sacramental theology was echoed in some of the principal documents of the Second Vatican Council. *Lumen gentium*, for example, explains that

²⁸ Schillibeeckx, 15.

²⁹ Schillibeeckx, 47.

³⁰ Schillibeeckx, 53.

³¹ Schillibeeckx, 44.

³² Philip Kennedy, O.P., *Schillebeeckx*, Outstanding Christian Thinkers series, ed. Brian Davies, OP (Collegeville: A Michael Glazier Book by the Liturgical Press, 1993), 62.

“the Church, in Christ, is in the nature of sacrament – a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all.”³³ More significantly for the worship life of the Church, “the rhetorical shift which Schillebeeckx effected in sacramental theology found a complement in the language employed... [in] the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.”³⁴ Not only can Schillebeeckx’s sacramental theology be discerned in the portion of *SC* dedicated to the “Nature of the Liturgy and Its Importance in the Life of the Church,”³⁵ but it is also evidenced throughout the various norms proposed in the chapter on “Promotion of Liturgical instruction and Active Participation.”³⁶

What is critical in Schillebeeckx’s discussion involves the pastoral implications surrounding the manner in which those participating in the sacraments encounter God. As Susan Wood has pointed out, “the idea of the Church as sacrament is closely related to the image of the body of Christ. From a biblical perspective, the body is that which makes a person present and active.”³⁷ Sacraments are, therefore, events in which the Church communicates the reality of Christ’s presence in an immediate, dialogical, fashion. Communication, however, requires the active participation of both sender and recipient, and therefore, presuming comprehension on the part of the sender, requires that the message being communicated is comprehensible to the one receiving it. Therefore, as a prelude to describing the unity of the Church inherent in the image of the

³³ *Lumen gentium*, 1.

³⁴ Daly, 1109.

³⁵ *SC* 5-13. See especially *SC* 5-9.

³⁶ *SC* 14-40.

³⁷ Susan K. Wood, S.C.L., *Sacramental Orders*, Lex Orandi series, ed. John D. Laurance (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 20.

Body of Christ, Paul emphasized the requirement of cultural particularity as it relates to ministry:

For though I am free with respect to all, I have made myself a slave to all, so that I might win more of them. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though I myself am not under the law) so that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (though I am not free from God's law but am under Christ's law) so that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, so that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings.³⁸

This, it would seem, is the same principle underscoring *SC*'s insistence on both the "substantial unity" of the Roman Rite,³⁹ but not on "rigid uniformity."⁴⁰ The Constitution recognizes, as Bugnini clarifies, that

social, religious, cultic, and cultural conditions, and indeed the entire psychological climate, have changed radically in our day. The peoples in the developing countries who are opening themselves to the light of the gospel feel an urgent need not to abandon the many things that are the authentic expression of the national soul and constitute their cultural patrimony, even if one that is at times in a pristine state, still bound up with deeply rooted usages and customs.⁴¹

In both 1 Corinthians and *SC* there is a fixed point of contact, best described as sacramental, which is Christ himself, through his embodiment in the Church. And for all three, the fixed point of contact is rendered within cultural contexts. Karl Rahner pointed towards precisely the same dynamic in articulating that the Church, "the primary

³⁸ 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 (NRSV).

³⁹ *SC* 38.

⁴⁰ *SC* 37.

⁴¹ *ROL*, 42-43.

sacrament of the grace of God,”⁴² administers the sacraments, in which “the grace of God constitutes itself actively present in the sacraments by creating their expression, their historical tangibility in space and time, which is its own symbol.”⁴³ Properly speaking, therefore, the essence of sacramentality, indeed, the very essence of liturgy and of gospel, lies in the attempt to be culturally and historically relevant. As Robert Taft has noted, “the liturgy is the ongoing *Sitz im Leben* of Christ’s saving pattern in every age, and what we do in the liturgy is exactly what the New Testament itself did with Christ: it applied him and what he was and is to the present.”⁴⁴

This new method of sacramental theology is realized within the OICA in two ways. First, the purpose of each element within the historical rites was examined as thoroughly as the limits of scholarship would allow, and those portions of the elements which distorted, concealed, or obscured their fundamental purpose were, justifiably, suppressed. Admittedly, there was loss when this happened. The shift from imperative to deprecatory exorcism, an innovation within the Roman pattern, caused a certain degree of rupture with the past, and, one might argue, de-emphasizes the sacramental role of the presbyter. Fischer himself noted, however, that retaining the traditional formula would have ignored the “sharper distinction than was possible in the early centuries between demonic possession and the status of belonging to the realm of Satan’s dominion,” and risked being dismissed “as totally irrelevant” by “a congregation of twentieth-century

⁴² Karl Rahner, S.J., “The Theology of the Symbol” in *Theological Investigations* Vol. IV, tr. Kevin Smyth (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1966), 241.

⁴³ Rahner, 242.

⁴⁴ Robert F. Taft, S.J., “Toward a Theology of the Christian Feast” in *Beyond East and West*, 21.

Christians assembled for a baptism.”⁴⁵ Serra has correctly observed that the scrutinies in the OICA represent “very careful restorations of the tradition, not duplications of its historic forms.”⁴⁶

Second, flexibility and adaptation was built into the rite. Not counting repeated formulae, such as the pre-baptismal anointing, amended texts for multiple catechumens, minor exorcisms and blessings, and only counting texts for one scrutiny, there are fifty-four introductions, admonitions, prayers, groups of dialogue, and acclamations in the paradigmatic OICA. Of these texts, twenty-five include the qualifying directive, “in these or similar words,” and eight have fixed options within the text. The majority of the formulae that are fixed and have no alternate are located within the celebration of the sacraments (nine). This indicates a great opportunity for celebrants to allow the rites to speak clearly and directly to the communities that they, presumably, know.

9.4: Implications for Pastoral Practice

While it is difficult to construct a profile of each of the pastors responsible for carrying out experimentation in 1967 and 1968 – especially since some of the experimenters remain anonymous – there are two significant points of commonality shared by them all. First, all of the named experimenters had been raised within the confines of traditional Western Catholicism, be that within Europe or North America. Second, each one of them was formed by liturgical practice emphasizing, to varying degrees, the post-Enlightenment concern for conveyance of grace through sacramental

⁴⁵ Fischer, “Baptismal Exorcism,” 53.

⁴⁶ Serra, “New Observations,” 526.

validity.⁴⁷ Recognizing that their individual styles of ministry and their approach to the rites would differ somewhat, particularly when some became missionaries, little else can be said about their mutual commonality. When examining the reports, however, two general types of approach to the experiments can be perceived, which are clearly relatable to pastoral circumstances. Those ministering in countries where Western Catholicism was well established tended to exercise their ministry in a fashion most compatible with the objective model of sacramentality. Those engaged in mission work tended to embrace the phenomenological model described by Schillebeeckx. James White has described the transition to the latter from the former as placing

much emphasis on the sign value of sacraments so that, as in all human actions, they communicate to the fullest. This aspect gives a new dynamic quality to the sacraments as sign acts and places quality of celebration as a major category alongside of validity. The obsession with what is the least one can do to have a valid sacrament has been replaced with a concern as to how a sacrament can signify grace as effectively as possible.⁴⁸

Experimenters in traditionally Christian lands did not, necessarily, have to appeal to anything beyond the older, traditional, standards of sacramental validity because in these countries Catholicism was well-established – those who came to the Roman Catholic Church were choosing one Christian denomination from among many others. On the other hand, the experimenters in mission territories, particularly the White Fathers in Africa, were far better equipped to approach the new ritual dynamic; since 1878 they had been using a catechumenate that, while following the structure of the *Rituale*, was clearly

⁴⁷ See, for example, James F. White, *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989), 31: “During [the Era of the Enlightenment] Roman Catholic sacramental theology became almost obsessively concerned with the concept of validity (basically, what is the least that can be done still to have a valid sacrament) and became increasingly resistant to change.”

⁴⁸ James F. White, *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today* (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), 99.

influenced by the Patristic catechumenate.⁴⁹ The spirit of Schillebeeckx's work had been, to some degree, anticipated in their version of the catechumenate, insofar as the missionaries recognized that the rites had to appeal to would-be converts – the catechumenate could not simply rely on sacramental validity in order to be practically effective. The reception of the experimental rite in the various centers points clearly to these two broad approaches to liturgical performance. In the European and North American centers, experimentation tended, overall, to be limited to eliminating elements of the experimental rite that were not perceived to be central (regardless of the instructions given in the rite itself). Great attention was also paid to the issue of time, both in terms of the number and the length of gatherings. Experimentation, in these centers, is best understood in minimalistic terms. Conversely, the African and Japanese centers were, by far, the most receptive to the rite, since they were best equipped to deal with the method established in SC 11:

Pastors must therefore realize that when the liturgy is celebrated something more is required than the mere observance of the laws governing valid and lawful celebration; it is also their duty to ensure that the faithful take part fully aware of what they are doing, actively engaged in the rite, and enriched by its effects.

Experimentation here tended to demonstrate a willingness to try previously unknown rites (especially major and minor exorcisms) in an attempt to communicate their theology to an assembly that was not steeped in the same multi-generational cradle-Catholicism found throughout the West. Further, a different sensibility of time was active. Rather than simply performing rites for the sake of the performance, attempts were made to make the rites meaningful, and to take the necessary time to perform them well. While

⁴⁹ See Paul Turner, *The Hallelujah Highway: A History of the Catechumenate* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2000), 144-145.

many of these experimenters were still able to make suggestions about improving on the shape of the rite, they were largely accepting of the way in which it was to be enacted. It was certainly not about these that the *Coetus* observed that “the period of experimentation revealed... a certain lack of formation in many experimenters.”⁵⁰

Thirty-five years later, however, lack of formation should no longer pose the same problem that it did for the experimenters who were seeing the rite for the first time. Pastors have had ample opportunity to study the rite, and will hopefully have noticed the degree to which ritual elements and texts are declared optional in the OICA. At first glance, this suggests the mere possibility of flexibility: a celebrant is equally free to choose between that which is contained in the rite or liturgical creativity. Such an understanding, however, belies the attitude of liturgical minimalism criticized by the *Coetus* in reviewing the reports of experimentation. It is, unquestionably at odds with the theological vision proclaimed in the restored OICA. As Mark Searle pointed out twenty-five years ago, “The directives were obeyed, but the theological principles were not much grappled with by clergy or people.”⁵¹ The rite proclaims the sacramental model of encounter and, thus, calls all of its ministers forth to be evangelists: “in the various circumstances of daily life... all the followers of Christ have the obligation of spreading the faith according to their abilities.”⁵² This applies no less to celebrants, who have the specific “responsibility of attending to the pastoral and personal care of the

⁵⁰ “Compte Rendu,” 1: “Le nouveau rituel n’a pas été admis par ses usagers en tout points, car son expérimentation a révélé, à la fois, ses défauts et un certain manque de formation chez quelques utilisateurs.”

⁵¹ Mark Searle, “Reflections on Liturgical Reform,” in *Worship* 56 (1982), 416.

⁵² OICA 41 (RCIA 9).

catechumens... they are to be diligent in the correct celebration and adaptation of the rites throughout the entire course of Christian initiation,”⁵³ and therefore, “should make full and intelligent use of the freedom given to them either in *Christian Initiation*, General Introduction, or in the rubrics of the rite itself.”⁵⁴ In commenting on the celebration of the Eucharist, Searle pointed to the fundamental problem:

The... lack of authentic faith comes across in the inability of most priests to recognize what is required of them in their new role as presidents of the liturgical assembly and leaders of prayer. They either resort to gimmicks and pseudo-intimacy or withdraw into “saying Mass.” At the present time, only a minority of priests show themselves capable of performing the liturgical roles for which they were ordained.⁵⁵

To do less and to simply employ the model texts as written is to abrogate ministerial responsibility; it is to actively attempt to hinder the conversion sought in the restored rites. Only when those involved in the realization of the rites embrace the priestly ministry of service demanded of the baptized will the OCIA become the vessel through which all seeking conversion will come to encounter Christ.

Sixteen years after the promulgation of the OICA, Fischer claimed that

the introduction of a well-guided catechumenate into the life of a parish changes the whole community’s ecclesiology, its sense of church. Without any formal indoctrination, people are helped to overcome their consumer mentality; they come to understand the church is *Mater Ecclesia*, Mother Church... Lay men and women rediscover that they themselves, together with their ordained ministers constitute the Church... Wherever [the OICA] has been properly implemented and understood, the faithful know well that they are the Church.⁵⁶

⁵³ OICA 45 (RCIA 13).

⁵⁴ OICA 67 (RCIA 35).

⁵⁵ Searle, “Reflections,” 422-423.

⁵⁶ Fischer, “Rediscovery,” 104.

This was the vision of the Council, this was the vision of the *Consilium*, this was the vision of the *Coetus*, and this is the vision in the rite. May it become the vision of the Church.