

# Buried Treasure

## *Sacred Music and the Twentieth Century Liturgical Reform*

by Susan Benofy

*It is an undisputed fact that nearly every twentieth-century pope — and an ecumenical council — called for the revival of Gregorian Chant in the Church's living liturgy. Yet, after more than a hundred years, we seem no closer to achieving this goal than when Pope Pius X urged that this buried treasure be recovered.*

*Why didn't it happen? Although the secular world has recently shown renewed interest in and appreciation for classic Catholic music, can Catholics today hope to recover and "re-inculturate" the Church's heritage of sacred music?*

*Susan Benofy, research editor of the Adoremus Bulletin, offers insight into the history of this long effort in a series of essays that we first published in 2001. We have collected all of the essays together here in one document in response to reader requests.*

— Editor

---

### Part I

(published March 2001)

#### **Sacred Music in the Twentieth Century Reform of the Liturgy**

**T**he musical tradition of the universal Church is a treasure of inestimable value, greater even than that of any other art. The main reason for this pre-eminence is that, as a combination of sacred music and words, it forms a necessary or integral part of the solemn liturgy.

Second Vatican Council,  
Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,  
*Sacrosanctum Concilium* §112

AS THE TWENTIETH CENTURY BEGAN, the music proper to the Roman Rite, Gregorian chant and the classical polyphony that is based on it — a “treasure of inestimable value” — was

for all practical purposes buried.

Musical settings of the Mass in chant or classical polyphony were rarely performed in parishes. Much of the music was in manuscript form in libraries or museums, written in ancient notation, although serious attempts to understand the notation and edit the manuscripts had begun in the nineteenth century.

All of the twentieth-century popes wrote on the subject of sacred music, and encouraged the revival of the chant, its publication in new editions, and the widespread teaching of chant so that Catholics could actually sing it.

Further progress was made on the revival of chant during the first half of the century. Institutes and schools trained teachers and promoted chant, and chant was introduced into religious houses, colleges and schools, and some parishes. Yet, despite the extensive liturgical reform after Vatican II, the “treasure of inestimable value” is almost never experienced as “an integral part” of the liturgy.

It is rare to hear chant in Catholic churches, and it is rarely taught in Catholic institutions. Catholics who are familiar with the chant and polyphonic repertoire are more likely to have gained this familiarity from listening to recordings than to have experienced this music as “an integral part of the solemn liturgy.”

Parishioners or choir directors who express an interest in introducing such music into Sunday liturgies are often told it is inappropriate for the “post-Vatican II Church.”

But is the sort of music heard at the average American parish what the Second Vatican Council intended? How is “sacred music” different from any other kind? What does music intend to accomplish in worship? Is it, after all, just a matter of taste? What does it really matter what we sing at Mass?

The liturgical reform that led to the Second Vatican Council's first published document, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, can provide historical perspective on the matter of Church music.

The story really begins more than a century ago.

**In the beginning...**

**Pope Pius X — *Tra le Sollecitudini***

Pope St. Pius X initiated the twentieth-century reform of the liturgy with his decree *Tra le Sollecitudini* (“among the cares”) in 1903.

The pope was concerned with engaging the people's true and full participation in the Church's worship; and to this end he issued this legislation for sacred music in the liturgy.

He states his objective right at the beginning:

Among the cares of the pastoral office ... a leading one is without question that of maintaining and promoting the decorum of the House of God in which the august mysteries of religion are celebrated ... we do not touch separately on the abuses in this matter which may arise. Today our attention is directed to one of the most common of them, one of the most difficult to eradicate, and the existence of which is sometimes to be deplored in places where everything else is deserving of the highest praise.... Such is the abuse affecting sacred chant and music.

Filled as we are with a most ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit flourish in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before anything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for no other object than that of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable font, which is the *active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church*. And it is vain to hope that the blessing of heaven will descend abundantly upon us, when our homage to the Most High, instead of ascending in the odor of sweetness, puts into the hand of the Lord the scourges wherewith of old the Divine Redeemer drove the unworthy profaners from the Temple.

— *Tra le Sollecitudini*, Introduction  
(emphasis added)

In this document, the pope detailed principles that constituted a “juridical code of sacred music” with the force of law.

Sacred music, said Pope Saint Pius X, is to have “the qualities proper to liturgy, and in particular sanctity and goodness of form, which will spontaneously produce the final quality of universality.” It must, therefore be “holy” with nothing profane (non-sacred) in its content or presentation:

It must be true art, for otherwise it will be impossible for it to exercise on the minds of those who listen to it that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining in admitting into her liturgy the art of musical sounds. (TLS, §2)

*Tra le Sollecitudini* holds up Gregorian chant as the supreme model of sacred music, that which the Church “directly proposes to the faithful as her own”:

Special efforts are to be made to restore the use of the Gregorian Chant by the people, so that the faithful may again take a more active part in the ecclesiastical offices, as was the case in ancient times. (TLS, §3)

The pope said that polyphony, especially that of Palestrina and others of the sixteenth century, agreed “admirably with Gregorian chant” and, therefore, had a rightful place in the liturgy. More modern music was also permitted, provided it avoided all suggestions of the profane.

Thus, in the earliest document of the liturgical reform, sacred music, especially Gregorian chant, is presented as a fundamental element in the “active participation” of the people in the liturgy.

This emphasis on revitalization of liturgical chant for the purpose of invigorating and deepening people's worship continued in other documents of Pope Pius X and of later popes.

### **Pope Pius XI — *Divini Cultus***

Pope Pius XI issued *Divini Cultus* (DC), an Apostolic Constitution on Divine Worship, in December 1928. Like his predecessor, he emphasized the connection between re-invigorated Catholic worship and sacred music:

In order that the faithful may more actively participate in divine worship, let them be made once more to sing the Gregorian Chant, so far as it belongs to them to take part in it. It is most important that when the faithful assist at the sacred ceremonies ... they should not be merely detached and silent spectators, but filled with a deep sense of the beauty of the liturgy, they should sing alternately with the clergy or choir, as it is prescribed. (DC, §IX)

### **Pope Pius XII — *Mediator Dei and Musicae Sacrae Disciplina***

Pope Pius XII issued two encyclicals dealing with the liturgy and participation by the people. The first, *Mediator Dei* (MD, November 1947), clearly continues the program of liturgical reform set out by his predecessors. The pope stresses that the liturgy is external worship but is also, and primarily, interior worship.

The pope devoted an entire section to the “participation of the faithful in the Eucharistic sacrifice,” and explained that the people offer the sacrifice *with* the priest, though they do not have priestly power. They do this, he makes clear, by *joining their prayer* to that of the celebrant, and by offering themselves. (§§85-99)

In the section on music, the pope exhorts the bishops to see that the norms regarding music are observed. He reiterates the statements of his predecessors that Gregorian chant is the music “the Roman Church considers as her own,” and says that it is “proposed to the faithful as belonging to them also.” (§191) He recommends that the people sing the chants of the Mass, and quotes directly from *Divini Cultus* (§IX).

Pope Pius XII gave additional directives on sacred music in his encyclical *Musicae Sacrae Disciplina* (MSD), issued in 1955. MSD encouraged the restoration of chant and studies on polyphony, and repeated the remarks of Pope Pius X on the need for holiness and true art in sacred music.

He took note of popular religious singing and permitted hymns in the vernacular to be sung at “low Masses.”<sup>2</sup> Vernacular musical texts, however, were not permitted at the sung “high Mass” because of a requirement that all liturgical texts be sung in Latin.

Nevertheless at Masses that are not sung solemnly these hymns can be a powerful aid in keeping the faithful from attending the Holy Sacrifice like dumb and idle spectators. They can help to make the faithful accompany the sacred services both mentally and vocally and to join their own piety to the prayers of the priest. (MSD §64)

## Further instruction — *Sacred Music and the Liturgy*

*Sacred Music and the Liturgy*, a 1958 Instruction issued by the Congregation of Rites (now the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, CDW), summarizes and systematizes these papal teachings.

The Instruction is a legislative document that gives detailed regulations for the use of music in the liturgy.

It included the teaching of *Mediator Dei* on participation of the people, and recommended various “stages” through which the people’s participation should advance in both sung and read Masses.

In the first stage, people would sing the simple responses such as Amen and *et cum spiritu tuo*. In the second stage, all would chant parts of the Ordinary of the Mass,<sup>3</sup> or at least the simpler parts such as the *Kyrie*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*. Ideally, the people would also sing the *Gloria* and *Credo*, but if they found it too difficult these could be chanted by the choir.

In reference to both of these stages, the Instruction said that the faithful throughout the world should be taught to chant the simpler responses and a simple setting of the ordinary chants. The Instruction specified that:

care must be taken that the following easier Gregorian melodies be learned by all the faithful throughout the world: the *Kyrie Eleison*, *Sanctus-Benedictus* and *Agnus Dei* according to no. 16 of the Roman Gradual; the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* together with the *Ite missa est-Deo gratias* according to no. 15; and the *Credo* according to nos. 1 and 3. (§25b)

In a third stage, the entire congregation would chant the Proper of the Mass.<sup>4</sup> This was urged particularly in seminaries and religious communities, but apparently was not considered practical for ordinary parish congregations.

Monsignor Richard Schuler, who was active in liturgical reform both before and after the Council, discussed the 1958 Instruction in his series of articles on the history of Church music in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, “Chronicles of Reform.” He says this document remains the basis for most postconciliar legislation on music:

and just as truly, many of the abuses afflicting the Church today were condemned and prohibited by the Instruction which preceded the Vatican Council.... What the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council as well as the various instructions that followed after the council had to say on sacred music could be found almost in detail in the 1958 Instruction.<sup>5</sup>

## Pioneers in the revival of chant

The planned reform of the liturgy was complex, and progress in the revival of chant was slow.

Since the early work of Dom Prosper Guéranger in the 1840s, the Benedictine monks of Solesmes in France had been working to restore original melodies to the music for Mass. Manuscripts of polyphonic music were also being edited. Musicians, of course, had to learn the music in order to teach it. This was demanding work.

Considering that the first half of the twentieth century saw two World Wars and the Depression, it is not altogether surprising that liturgical music was not given high priority in the allocation of available resources.

In spite of all the difficulties, however, significant progress was made in the introduction of Gregorian chant. Societies and schools were established to make it happen.<sup>6</sup> Choir directors and pastors sometimes had a great effect on their parishes.

One of the best known institutions for teaching chant was the Pius X School of Liturgical Music, founded in 1916 by Mrs. Justine Ward and Mother Georgia Stevens, RSCJ, at the College of the Sacred Heart in Manhattanville, New York.

Mrs. Ward, a convert to Catholicism who had studied the techniques of the monks of Solesmes, developed a method for teaching chant, and incorporated it in a series of textbooks for children. These books taught sight reading of both modern musical notation and the neumes in which chant is written.

Mother Stevens, also a convert, was a musician interested in improving the music at Manhattanville. Impressed by a demonstration of Ward’s method, she joined with Ward to begin a summer school for liturgical music at Manhattanville, eventually called the Pius X School of Liturgical Music.

Andre Mocquereau, OSB, the choirmaster at Solesmes, served at times as faculty at the school. By 1925, more than 13,000 teachers had studied Mrs. Ward’s method of teaching chant.<sup>7</sup> Other programs grew out of this.

## Enter GIA and Dorothy Day

With Mother Stevens’s encouragement, Clifford Bennett began the Catholic Choirmasters Correspondence Course and offered courses in chant in various regions of the country.<sup>8</sup> Later this became the Gregorian Institute of America (now known as GIA). The Gregorian Institute also developed a popular series of children’s textbooks, *To God through Music*.

Groups whose primary emphasis was on social action also promoted liturgical reform and Gregorian chant. Dorothy Day, of the Catholic Worker Community in New York, wanted to form a chant choir to help poor parishes learn to sing Gregorian chant, and enlisted the help of Mother Stevens. The Catholic Worker asked for a teacher or student from the Pius X School to train the group in chant:

That may seem a rather far cry from the work of the Catholic Worker, at first glance; but I’m sure I don’t need to point out to you the fact that the entire Catholic social teaching is based, fundamentally, on liturgical doctrine. The group wishes to be able to open their evening meetings ... with sung Compline. And they are especially anxious to learn a few of the simpler Gregorian Masses, in order to be able to offer their services free to poor parishes.<sup>9</sup>

## Hellriegel and Holy Cross

Congregations in a few ordinary parishes began to sing the Mass in Gregorian chant. One of the best known was Holy Cross in Saint Louis. Its pastor, Monsignor Martin B. Hellriegel, was a leader in the liturgical movement in the United

States and one of the founders of the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres* (later called *Worship*).

Monsignor Hellriegel arrived as a new pastor at Holy Cross in June 1940, finding little music and practically no chant sung at its Masses. He began by teaching the parishioners hymns in English to be sung at non-liturgical services and before and after Mass.

For his first Easter in the parish, Monsignor Hellriegel hoped to have the people chant Mass I, *Lux et Origo*, a setting designated “For Paschal Time” in the *Kyriale*.<sup>10</sup>

At the beginning of Lent, he organized a special Easter preparation for the school children. They met with the pastor in the church for a half-hour three days a week during Lent. Monsignor Hellriegel explained to them: “The Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent are the greater Lenten days when the people of old fasted more strictly.” The children, who did not fast, would use these days to learn the Easter Mass.

Monsignor Hellriegel had recordings of the monks of Solemnus chanting this Mass, which he played for the children. He writes,

They were quite enthusiastic. We supplied them with *Kyriales*. During the first week of Lent they merely listened to the monks, following the music in their booklets. During the second week I permitted them to hum along, but very quietly. During the third they hummed again, but with more rhythm. During the fourth they sang, but lightly. During the fifth they sang with more expression, and during the sixth they did it “without the monks.” Easter morning they sang the *Lux et Origo* Mass without books.<sup>11</sup>

The adults were impressed, and many of them wanted to learn to sing the Mass. By Pentecost that year, the Mass was chanted by children and adults together.

Within a few years, parishioners at Holy Cross were chanting half-a-dozen Masses, and several choirs were formed. Monsignor Hellriegel stressed that the choir and director must be exemplary Christians, that the services must be well prepared, and that the music must be for the glory of God:

The best we can give to our God is not good enough. *Sancta sancte!* Holy things must be done in a holy way!<sup>12</sup>

Although Holy Cross was not the only example of such a program, parishes that regularly sang chant were definitely a minority. In most parishes where chant was sung it was sung by the choir at the Sunday High Mass.

### Other early achievements

Though music was the primary focus of Pope Pius X’s foundational document on the reform of the liturgy and of the other papal documents cited here, the liturgical reform of first half of the twentieth century was not confined to music.

By the 1950s, personal Missals containing vernacular translations with the Latin text of the Mass were used by many lay people. By mid-century, also, the so-called dialogue Mass, where the entire congregation recited the responses to the priest,

was coming into use.

Much scholarly work on the history and theology of the liturgy had been accomplished during this period. Although much of this activity took place in Europe, there were scholars and centers of liturgical study in America. The Benedictine Abbey of St. John in Collegeville, Minnesota, was among the most active. Dom Virgil Michel of St. John’s was a major leader in the liturgical movement and the first editor of *Orate Fratres*, an influential liturgical journal still published at St. John’s, though its name was changed to *Worship* in the early 1950s. The Abbey’s Liturgical Press issued a series called the Popular Liturgical Library to educate people about the liturgy, and published a short version of the Breviary in English for lay people.

Much good work was being done, but the early liturgical reform was not free from problems. Pope Pius XII’s warnings in *Mediator Dei* against erroneous practices have a familiar ring today.

For example, he said that there were those who “assert that the people are possessed of a true priestly power, while the priest only acts in virtue of an office committed to him by the community. Wherefore they look on the Eucharistic Sacrifice as a ‘concelebration.’” (MD §83)

He observed that there were even those who “go so far as to hold that the people must confirm and ratify the Sacrifice if it is to have its proper force and value.” (MD §95)

The pope cautioned against those “who are bent on the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately.... The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They too owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit.” (MD §61) He saw an “exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism” in those who “wish the altar restored to its primitive table-form; want black excluded as a color for the liturgical vestments; forbid the use of sacred images and statues in churches; order the crucifix so designed that the Divine Redeemer’s Body shows no trace of His cruel sufferings; [or] disdain and reject polyphonic music or singing in parts, even where it conforms to the regulations issued by the Holy See.” (MD §62)

Pope Pius XII had by no means rejected the idea of liturgical reform, however. As early as 1946 he had asked the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites to begin a study of the general reform of the liturgy. In May 1948 the pope appointed a commission for liturgical reform to be headed by the Prefect of the Congregation of Rites.

Though it was in existence for only twelve years, the commission’s accomplishments were considerable. Its first major achievement was the restoration of the Easter Vigil in 1951. This was followed in 1955 by the reform of the rest of the Holy Week ceremonies by *Maxima Redemptionis*, a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The liturgical commission also published new editions of the Breviary and the Roman Pontifical and a new, simplified Code of Rubrics.

On both the popular and official levels, a reform of the liturgy was already in progress on that famous day in January 1959 when Pope John XXIII announced that there would be a

second Ecumenical Council at the Vatican.

Thus the liturgical commission appointed by Pius XII was dissolved and a new one formed — the preparatory commission on liturgy for the Council.

The reform of the sacred liturgy was about to enter a new phase.

### Notes — Part I

<sup>1</sup> Issued November 22, 1903 as a *motu proprio*, which means literally “own accord.” It is a simple decree of the pope.

<sup>2</sup> In the terminology common before Vatican II, Low Mass referred to one in which all liturgical texts were spoken, in contrast to a High Mass, in which specified liturgical texts — including the Proper, the Ordinary, the Preface, and dialogues between priest and people — were all sung.

<sup>3</sup> “Ordinary” means the parts of the Mass that do not change.

<sup>4</sup> “Propers” are the parts of the Mass that change daily: for example, the prayers for feasts.

<sup>5</sup> “Chronicles of Reform” originally appeared as a series of articles in six consecutive issues of *Sacred Music*: Parts I - IV in the four issues of 1982 (vol. 109) and Parts V and VI in the first two issues of 1983 (vol. 110). They were later republished as “A Chronicle of the Reform” in *Cum Angelis Canere* (Saint Paul, MN: Catholic Church Music Associates, 1990), pp. 362-363. Available online at: [musicas-acra.com/books/cum\\_angelis\\_canere.pdf](http://musicas-acra.com/books/cum_angelis_canere.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> See “A Chronicle of the Reform” for a detailed discussion of the papal documents and the role of various musical societies and schools in the reform of liturgical music in the twentieth century.

<sup>7</sup> See Keith F. Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America: 1926-1955* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), pp. 269-273.

<sup>8</sup> The Gregorian Institute of America is now known simply as GIA. GIA currently publishes hymnals, including *Worship, Gather, and Ritual Songs*.

<sup>9</sup> Letter of 5 June 1935, Dorothy Day, Catholic Worker Collection (W-6), Marquette University Archives, Milwaukee, WI. Quoted in Pecklers, p. 276, footnote #195.

<sup>10</sup> The *Kyriale* is a book of chants for the Ordinary of the Mass, or the unchangeable parts; the *Graduale* is the chants for the Proper, or changeable parts, of the Mass.

<sup>11</sup> Monsignor Martin B. Hellriegel, “Monsignor Hellriegel’s Music Program” in *Caecilia* 83 (January-February, 1956) pp. 73-74. Quoted passages on p. 73. Italics in original. [See also *Adoremus Bulletin*, Nov. 2000, p. 3, “Active Participation in Chant”, a reprint of Monsignor Hellriegel’s article in *Caecilia*.]

<sup>12</sup> Hellriegel, p. 74.

## Part II

(published April 2001)

### Sacred Music in the Twentieth Century Liturgical Reform

THE FIRST SESSION OF the Second Vatican Council began on October 11, 1962. The first official document issued by the Council was the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. The decisive vote on the Constitution was taken on the sixtieth anniversary of Pope Pius X’s *Tra le Sollecitudini* (TLS), November 22, 1963.

It is not surprising to see many of the concerns of the pre-conciliar liturgical documents reflected in the Constitution.

All popes from Pius X on stressed the active participation of the faithful in the liturgy; and the Constitution on Sacred Liturgy did not break from this tradition. It even used the same Latin term, *participatio actuosa*, as other documents had. Echoing the language of Popes Pius XI and XII, it says the people are not to be at Mass as “strangers or silent spectators” (§48). *Sacrosanctum Concilium* specifies that this participation should be expressed in “acclamations, responses, psalms, antiphons, hymns, as well as by actions, gestures and bodily attitudes. And at the proper time a reverent silence should be observed” (§30). Although it permitted the use of vernacular languages, it also insisted that Latin was to be maintained in the Roman Rite: “Nevertheless, care must be taken to ensure that the faithful may also be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them” (§54).

The entire sixth chapter of the Constitution was devoted to sacred music. The first paragraph of Chapter VI stresses in general terms the importance of sacred music in the liturgy, calling it a “treasure of inestimable value.” Before proceeding to specific provisions it says:

Accordingly, the Sacred Council, keeping to the norms and precepts of ecclesiastical tradition and discipline and having regard to the purpose of sacred music, which is the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful, decrees as follows... (§112)

#### Norms and precepts on music

The “norms and precepts” mentioned here are primarily those developed over the previous sixty years and contained in TLS and the 1958 Instruction.

The Constitution specified that the “treasury of sacred music is to be preserved and cultivated with great care” (§114), that Gregorian chant is “specially suited to the Roman liturgy [and] should be given pride of place” (§116), that polyphony should not be excluded, that the current work on a typical edition<sup>1</sup> of Gregorian chant should be completed (§117), and that the “pipe organ is to be held in high esteem” (§120), though

other instruments may be used.

None of these provisions differs from those developed in the series of liturgical documents from TLS to the 1958 Instruction. Yet the experience of most Catholics in the immediate post-conciliar period was of a radical and sudden change in the music at Mass. Organs, choirs and Latin hymns were replaced almost overnight with “folk groups” singing their own compositions.

### Implementation and experts

Chapter VI did include provisions that differed from those in previous documents. It urged that the musical traditions of the people (particularly those in mission lands) be incorporated into the liturgy. Authorization for introducing vernacular languages into parts of the liturgy also affected the music. The Constitution on the Liturgy did not give detailed directives about how its provisions were to be put into practice. Those who were placed in charge of the implementation of the reform interpreted the document and specified how it was to be followed.

The magnitude and rapidity of the changes that occurred in the aftermath of the Council were difficult for most Catholics to understand. Even the bishops’ conferences seemed bewildered about how to exercise their newly granted authority over the liturgy — specifically, overseeing translation of the texts and implementation of all the new rites. Most American bishops had not taken a great interest in the liturgical movement before the Council. Thus, during and after the Council, they relied greatly on the opinions of various liturgical experts.

Bishop Robert Tracy of Baton Rouge, in an account of his experiences at the Vatican Council, recalls that most “non-specialist” bishops at the Council attended lectures given by experts daily. Even Archbishop Paul Hallinan of Atlanta, he writes, “was less than an expert liturgist when he was elected the only member of the US hierarchy to sit on the Council commission on the Liturgy.”<sup>22</sup>

Those who took such an avid interest in the experts’ lectures may have been more influenced by the opinions they heard than by what the Council actually said. For their part, the experts believed that the bishops were in need of their instruction. One expert writing to another said: “Hallinan is very good indeed; I only wish it were not a case of getting him a Berlitz-type education in the liturgy while we operate.”<sup>23</sup>

Many of these experts were appointed to the Consilium (commission) for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy, a body created to determine the details of implementation of liturgical reform. Also, some experts staffed the US Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy (BCL) and diocesan offices of worship, which were created or expanded at this time.

In some cases the opinions of the experts were tainted with the same kind of errors that Pope Pius XII had condemned in *Mediator Dei*. Notably, the experts were eager to restore what they believed were the liturgical practices of the first Christian centuries (e.g., use of the vernacular) while rejecting later developments, (e.g. polyphony and Gregorian chant). But the

liturgical experts’ opinions had predated the Council, as we have seen. Some experts conveniently saw the Council documents as requiring the implementation of their own favored theories concerning the liturgy.

### International music organizations — differing views, different roles

Not all experts, of course, had identical views; but some seemed to have more influence on post-conciliar liturgical reform than others.

Two international organizations were founded during and after the Council, representing markedly different views on how the musical provisions of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy should be implemented.

The first, the Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae (CIMS), was established by Pope Paul VI on November 22, 1963, the Feast of Saint Cecilia, patroness of music — the very day that the Council approved the Constitution on the Liturgy. CIMS developed out of a series of conferences on sacred music held in Europe starting in the Holy Year 1950, sponsored by the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music. The chirograph *Nobile subsidium Liturgiae*, establishing the Consociatio, said that the new organization was to be an “international institute which would be able to make known [to the Holy See] the needs of sacred music, and which would be able to assist in putting the decisions of the supreme ecclesiastical authority relating to sacred music into practice.”<sup>24</sup>

Pope Paul VI himself appointed officers for the CIMS on March 7, 1964. In addition, the Holy Father appointed as consultants to the Consilium the president of the CIMS, Monsignor Johannes Overath, and its honorary president, Monsignor Higinio Anglès, who was president of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome. Monsignor Fiorenzo Romita, president of the International Federation Pueri Cantores, was also appointed a consultant. The Federation was an organization of boys’ choirs and an institutional member of CIMS. According to Monsignor Overath, however, these men were “not in fact numbered among the working committees entrusted with the various musical problems before the Consilium.” They were not informed in advance of important developments related to music, such as the plans for the *Graduale Simplex*, nor were they invited to be part of the group that met to determine the final version of the Instruction on Sacred Music in 1967.<sup>25</sup>

In the US, a group of church musicians<sup>26</sup> met in 1964 at Boys Town, Nebraska, to form a new organization, the Church Music Association of America (CMAA).<sup>27</sup> The CMAA, which became an affiliate of CIMS, pledged to uphold the highest artistic standards, preserve the treasury of sacred music, and encourage composers to write artistic music for the more active participation of the people.

In August 1966, CIMS organized the first international meeting of church musicians after the close of the Council — the Fifth International Church Music Congress was held in Chicago and Milwaukee, and hosted by CMAA.

The program for this meeting, approved by the Holy See, dealt with sacred music in light of the Constitution on the Liturgy and focused particularly on *actuosa participatio populi*, the active participation of the people.

Shortly before this Congress began, another international organization for the study of liturgical music was formed. Known as *Universa Laus* (Universal Praise), this predominantly European group was officially inaugurated at Lugano, Switzerland in April 1966.

Like CIMS, *Universa Laus* was an outgrowth of work begun years before the Council. When the Council was announced, a group of liturgists and musicologists formed a group to offer assistance to those who were preparing the *schema* (draft) on the liturgy to be presented to the Council Fathers.

### ***Universa Laus* and Father Gelineau**

The most familiar name among the founders of *Universa Laus* is that of Father Joseph Gelineau, SJ. Gelineau composed the so-called Gelineau Psalms, musical settings that were published in 1953 to be used with the French text of the psalms from the Jerusalem Bible. The English text of the Grail Psalter was later set to the same tunes. These musical settings of the psalms became quite popular shortly before the Council and continued to be used after the new Rite of Mass was promulgated.

Besides the psalm settings, Father Gelineau produced works on the use of music in the liturgy, the most influential of which was published in English in 1964 as *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*.<sup>8</sup> The book, written prior to the Council, had first appeared in 1962 in French, and was based on ideas in a series of articles Father Gelineau had published in a French journal of liturgical music between 1958 and 1961.<sup>9</sup>

In a note added to the English translation Father Gelineau says that the conclusions expressed in the book:

have by no means been weakened; on the contrary, they acquire added strength in the light of the Council's teaching.... The author has not felt any need to modify his text in any way, but has thought it worthwhile to add, in the footnotes, references to articles of the Constitution [on Sacred Liturgy] which vindicate or strengthen the views he has expressed or are helpful in rendering them more specific.<sup>10</sup>

While Gelineau says that the Council did not influence his ideas on liturgical music, his ideas on liturgical music (along with those of *Universa Laus*) had a very strong influence on how the Council's reform of liturgical music was implemented.

Gelineau was a member of the three-man Praesidium (presidential committee) that governed *Universa Laus*. The other two members were Father Luigi Agustoni, a Swiss parish priest and a Gregorianist associated with the Institute of Sacred Music in Milan; and Doctor Erhard Quack, diocesan director of sacred music and music director of the cathedral of Speyer,

Germany.

After a series of meetings beginning in 1962, *Universa Laus* published a study on the role of music in the liturgy, *Le Chant liturgique après Vatican II* (Liturgical Chant after Vatican II). The book appeared in 1965 in five languages. One commentator tells us:

From this era dates the faithful friendship for *Universa Laus* of Monsignor Annabile Bugnini, who was unstinting in his encouragement and support of the group's work.<sup>11</sup>

Monsignor (later Archbishop) Bugnini was Secretary of the Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy from 1964 to 1969, and Secretary of the Congregation for Divine Worship from 1969 to 1975.<sup>12</sup> He was extremely influential in the post-conciliar reform of the liturgy. Bugnini's history of this reform, *The Reform of the Liturgy: 1948-1975*, is instructive both for its details of the membership and workings of the individual study groups of the Consilium and for its insight into his own views on the liturgical reform.<sup>13</sup> The book confirms that he favored the opinions of *Universa Laus*, and reveals his negative attitude toward musicians holding more traditional views.

The roles of the Consilium consultants associated with the two international music associations, CIMS and *Universa Laus*, differed significantly, both in terms of the study groups to which they were assigned, and in terms of Bugnini's opinions of their ideas and methods. Fathers Gelineau and Agustoni, of the *Universa Laus* Praesidium and advisors to the Consilium, were far more influential in the development of norms for liturgy than were the two members associated with CIMS, Monsignors Anglès and Overath.

Their influence was not confined to music. Both Agustoni and Gelineau were members of the important Group 10, responsible for revising the Order of Mass. In 1965 two Masses were said for a select group to demonstrate what the reformed rite would be like. Agustoni was music director of the first Mass (in Italian) and Gelineau for the second (in French).

Gelineau was also a member of committees writing new Eucharistic Prayers, including those for Masses with children, and was a speaker at an international congress on translation, sponsored by the Consilium. Those who supported traditional sacred music, however, were involved in none of these projects.

### **Post-conciliar revisions**

The revision of the rites and the use of some vernacular following the Council made it necessary both to update the norms for sacred music and to make some revisions in the repertoire of chant. The Consilium undertook both projects.

The first resulted in the instruction *Musica Sacram*. The second involved the revision of the chant books and the publication of a collection of simpler chants that the Council had requested. (SC §117) Two study groups were assigned these projects.

Group 14 was in charge of the study of singing in the Mass, and is the group originally charged with writing the first *schema* (draft) for the post-Conciliar instruction on sacred music that eventually became *Musicam Sacram*. None of the leaders of either the CIMS or Universal Laus was appointed to Group 14 (Helmut Hucke, who gave a paper at the Universal Laus meeting in Lugano, was a member of this group).

Group 25 was charged with revising the Gregorian Chant books and assembling the collection of simpler melodies. Father Agustoni of Universal Laus was secretary of this group.

A third study group, Group 33, was also designated to deal with questions of music and liturgy. Monsignor Overath was appointed to this committee. According to Bugnini, this group “had a supervisory role.”<sup>14</sup> But despite the detailed discussion of the controversies surrounding some of the musical projects of the Consilium, there are no details of the work of Group 33. In fact, since it is never mentioned again, is difficult to see what its “supervisory role” might have been.

### Developing the “Simple Gradual”

Group 25’s project of producing an edition of simpler chant melodies, the *Graduale Simplex* (Simple Gradual), was extremely controversial.

The chant for the Mass of the Roman Rite is contained primarily in two books, the *Kyriale* and the *Graduale Romanum*.

The *Kyriale* is a collection of music for the sung parts of the Mass (the Ordinary), the text of which is unchangeable: the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*. The *Kyriale* contains 18 musical settings of the ordinary.

When the earlier popes’ documents spoke of the participation of the people in the singing of the Mass, they recommended singing the Ordinary. The Council’s recommendation of a collection of simpler melodies resulted in the *Kyriale Simplex*, an abridged *Kyriale* containing only five or six Mass settings and two or three *Credos*. A few simple settings from non-Roman Latin rites, such as the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Rites, were also included.

The other set of sung portions of the Mass is known as the Proper. The text of these parts is variable, each Sunday or feast having a set of texts proper to it with corresponding melodies. Included in the Proper are the *Introit*, *Gradual*, *Alleluia* (replaced by the Tract during Lent), *Offertory*, and *Communion*.

The chant settings of the various Propers for Mass are collected in the *Graduale Romanum* (Roman Gradual). For centuries these parts of the Mass were sung by the *schola* or choir and were generally more elaborate musically than the settings for the Ordinary. Many consider the Propers to be the most beautiful in the entire chant repertoire. (Recordings of Gregorian chant generally include several selections from the *Graduale*.) The contents of the *Graduale* are more extensive and generally more elaborate than the *Kyriale*, so any selection process would be more difficult. However, there is no reason to believe the Council’s desire for a collection of the simpler melodies from the *Graduale* could not have been accomplished. This would

have produced an abridged *Graduale*, containing the simplest settings, thus making it easier for smaller churches and inexperienced choirs to use the authentic chant repertoire at least part of the time.

Group 25 chose a very different procedure for compiling the *Graduale Simplex*.

Instead of setting the texts of the Proper of the Mass for the various Sundays and feasts, as in the *Graduale Romanum*, the Simple Gradual gives a few sets of chants for each liturgical season to be used repeatedly throughout a season. In this arrangement there is no longer a set of proper texts for each Sunday. Thus the texts used would not necessarily correspond to those in the *Graduale Romanum*, which has different texts for each Sunday and feast.

Even when the texts are preserved, however, the melodies traditionally associated with these texts at Mass have disappeared. Instead, melodies from manuscripts and other parts of the chant repertoire (such as the Divine Office) were used, because the committee judged that to ensure the participation of the people “there is an absolute need for simpler melodies” for which “the more complex melodies in the *Graduale Romanum* could not be the source.”<sup>15</sup>

This seems to imply that no simpler melodies can be found in the *Graduale Romanum* itself. However, the same introduction earlier recommended that smaller churches using the Simple Gradual should also use selections from the *Graduale Romanum* “especially the easier ones or those more familiar through long usage among certain peoples.”<sup>16</sup> Yet it was a collection of precisely these simpler and more familiar melodies that the Council apparently asked for.

The *Graduale Simplex*, then, is not simply a short collection of the simplest melodies taken from the *Graduale Romanum* thus serving as an introduction to its repertoire for choirs. It is an entirely different book intended for congregational participation.

On what principles was this book produced? One principle seems to be a somewhat exaggerated view of the need for vocal participation by the people — the idea that people cannot participate in the Mass unless they audibly intervene in some way. This is reinforced by a view of the history of liturgy that concludes that from the earliest times singing at Mass was done by the people and a soloist, and that this singing consisted mostly of complete Psalms with antiphons. These views were promoted by Universal Laus and advocated in the works of Joseph Gelineau.

The form of the musical settings in the *Graduale Simplex* corresponds to the form of singing for the liturgy advocated by Father Gelineau in *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*. Therein he states:

In spite of all the vicissitudes it has undergone in the course of the centuries, the *responsorial form* remains in Christian worship as the *most traditional and the best way* of including the entire assembly in the singing of psalms.<sup>17</sup> (emphasis added.)

Gelineau also objects to the length of the Mass antiphons. He believes these were developed from a form that was originally responsorial psalmody in which the people participated. He contends that over the course of time the psalm verses were suppressed and the responses lengthened; their music became more elaborate, and was consequently sung by a choir, not by the people. The resulting antiphons, he believes, became the Gregorian Propers. In Gelineau's view, this development is decidedly negative. He states that it "has not always exerted a favorable influence on the evolution of the rites"<sup>18</sup> and often "took place at the price of radical transformation."<sup>19</sup>

Gelineau's theories about the history of the liturgy are not accepted by all historians,<sup>20</sup> and were emphatically rejected by leaders of CIMS. Monsignor Anglès, in an article in the CIMS journal, contends: "from a historical viewpoint it is impossible to maintain that the *Proprium Missae* belonged to the people."<sup>21</sup> He indicates that the people never sang the Introit, Offertory, or Tract, and contributed only a simple refrain for Communion. If the liturgical reform nevertheless thinks it desirable that the congregation join in singing the proper, says Anglès,

it would be absurd to insist on its singing the various parts in the single form of chant with responsions, i.e., always providing a short refrain to the voice of the soloist. There exist other, and less monotonous ways in which the congregation may partake in church singing.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, Monsignor Overath stresses that the Proper was not sung by the congregation, and that simple responses were necessary in the early centuries only because the people had no books and could not read. He adds:

Active listening also belongs to *actuosa participatio*. Very often we say: "All praying is, after all, listening to the will of God!" Let us make room for such listening within the Church service. I believe I am allowed to say that more listening is what our devotion needs.<sup>23</sup>

It is by now clear that the *Simple Gradual* expressed the reform desired by those who shared the ideas of *Universa Laus*, and opposed the ideas of the more traditional CIMS.

### **"Simple Gradual" approved**

The *Graduale Simplex* was the part of Group 25's work that had the hardest time gaining approval. It was approved by the Consilium in April 1965 and was submitted at that time to the Congregation of Rites, who wished to see the page proofs before approving it. (Oddly, Bugnini praises the work of the members of this group in part because their presentations were "often modest ... and hardly intelligible even to the members of the Consilium."<sup>24</sup> One wonders if the members who voted on this book knew what they were approving.)

There was some question about which office of the Curia would publish the book, and whether it would even be an official liturgical book. It was proposed that the book be issued by some agency that was less official than the Congregation

for Rites so that "it will always be possible to correct it, revise it, or even, should it prove less useful, abandon it."<sup>25</sup> Ultimately the Congregation of Rites would issue the *Graduale Simplex*. The decree (dated September 1, 1967) said that it could be used "unless some future legislation determines otherwise."<sup>26</sup>

During the two years that elapsed between the Consilium's approval of the Simple Gradual and its publication, Bugnini says, "serious reservations" were voiced about its nature. The Consilium responded to three main objections and to the "difficulties and fears that were felt."

1. "The musical forms of the Gregorian chants used in the Roman Mass would be destroyed." The Consilium insisted that this was not true, since the new book was not intended to replace any of the existing official chant books, but would be used in addition to these.
2. "New forms [e.g. responsorial] would be introduced that are not adapted to the faithful and not in conformity with the art of the Church and with the liturgical renewal." The Consilium argued that none of the melodies was new, all of them being taken from the existing chant books; and that "[t]he manner of singing in which one or more cantors alternate with the congregation, which sings a refrain verse, is the oldest and most traditional in the Church."<sup>27</sup>
3. "The text of the Roman Mass would be changed" (the introit, gradual, tract, alleluia, offertory, and communion verses would be changed, and in some cases changed completely). The Consilium answered: "This is a logical consequence of the entire approach to the problem," the "fundamental criterion" of providing a simple set of songs to be used throughout an entire liturgical season. If authentic Gregorian melodies were to be used, the texts must be altered. The Simple Gradual texts maintained the "concepts that inspire a season," rather than being "bound to a text."<sup>28</sup>

The *Graduale Simplex* was finally published by the Congregation of Rites in September 1967 — with a note approved by the pope requiring that the term "psalmist" be replaced by "cantor."

### **Simple Gradual led to "diversity and adaptation"**

The Simple Gradual "opened the door to greater diversity and adaptation," according to Monsignor Frederick McManus, a *peritus* (expert) at the Council, member of the Consilium, and first director of the Secretariat of the US Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy. He saw the change in the Propers of the Mass as an intended, even desirable, consequence of its devel-

opment.

Speaking to a meeting in Kansas City in December 1966, before the Simple Gradual was published, he stated:

The significance of the Simple Gradual, a direct fruit of Chapter VI [of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*], does not lie in the Latin texts and accompanying melodies. It lies rather in the principle: *the first alternative to the proper chants of the Roman Gradual* is officially provided, and the door *thus opened to greater diversity and adaptation*.<sup>29</sup> (emphasis added)

(Monsignor McManus was also a founder of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy [ICEL], which composed the English texts of the antiphons used in the *Simple Gradual*).

The aim of the Simple Gradual was not to supply chants for every Sunday and feast, but “to provide a set that can be useful for a liturgical season, with permission to use it several times during the same period.”<sup>30</sup> This is a departure from the traditional practice in the Roman Gradual of having a Proper particular to each Sunday and feast.

During the process of approval, several questions were raised by an official identified by Bugnini only as “the reviser from the Secretariat of State.” For example, the Constitution on the Liturgy §117 had asked for a book of simpler chants for use in small churches. The Consilium proposed to call the publication “Simple Gradual for the Use of Small Churches and Small Groups.” The reviser for the Secretariat of State removed the phrase “and Small Groups” on the grounds that it was not in §117 and that its removal would “help to prevent abuses leading to the practical elimination of the Roman Gradual.”<sup>31</sup> Bugnini insists that the Simple Gradual would be useful in more general situations:

The way things were going was so obvious that the Simple Gradual was used at Masses of the Council in Saint Peter’s Basilica, which is certainly not a “small church,” nor were the assembled Fathers a “small group.”<sup>32</sup>

This comment implies that the Simple Gradual was used at the Council because of the Council fathers’ enthusiasm for it, but in fact the decision to use it was made by a committee appointed by Bugnini that prepared a booklet to be used for Council liturgies. One of the committee members was Father Luigi Agustoni of *Universa Laus*, secretary of the Consilium study group that was working on the Simple Gradual.<sup>33</sup>

This illustrates a familiar (and highly effective) technique used by those who pushed for radical implementation of the reform. A practice, often one that had been explicitly rejected for general use, would be requested for “pastoral” reasons for a particular situation. Once permission was granted, liturgists would employ the innovation in other situations. Then its “widespread use” becomes an argument for general approval.

So the scenario for radical and sudden change in the music at Mass was set.

First, the antiphons from the Simple Gradual were translated into vernacular languages.

Next, new musical settings for the vernacular versions of the antiphons were required, it was argued, because of the different stress patterns and the reduced number of syllables in English as compared with the Latin version.

The ICEL translation of the antiphons was ready in 1968 and an English edition of a musical setting of the Simple Gradual was published in England in 1969.<sup>34</sup> In addition to musical settings of the antiphons, psalm texts are given (from the 1963 Grail Psalter), marked for the use of three different sets of psalm tones.<sup>35</sup>

The musical settings of the antiphons differ from those in the Latin edition, and no claim is made that these are authentic Gregorian melodies. The explanatory material in the English edition of the Simple Gradual stresses that the *texts* are officially promulgated by the Congregation of Rites, and emphasizes these do not change every Sunday, but by seasons. As to the music, the notes observed:

On the other hand, you may be unimpressed by the music you find here. “Where has our heritage of sacred music gone to?” you may ask. This book does not pretend to satisfy a highly skilled and resourceful choir... The Simple Gradual, like its Latin original, is “for the use of smaller churches,” in accordance with the wish expressed in the Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy (art. 117).<sup>36</sup>

Simply put, the “heritage of sacred music” is not to be found in the Simple Gradual. Article 117 of the liturgy Constitution had asked for an edition of the simpler Gregorian chants. The English Simple Gradual makes no pretense to be such a collection.

Thus, in the *Graduale Simplex*, the texts of the Proper of the Mass were changed, and their variety reduced, on the grounds that this was the only way to enable the people to sing “authentic chant melodies.”

Yet the English Simple Gradual, with its newly composed music, did not fulfill this purpose.

What it *did* do was to establish a principle that other texts could be substituted for the official Proper. The Simple Gradual itself was rarely used, but the principle of substituting new texts, which Monsignor Frederick McManus saw as its primary significance, was used to replace the Proper with other songs.

The final result, then, of a process ostensibly intended to preserve authentic music at the sacrifice of authentic texts, led to most Masses using neither authentic music nor traditional texts for the chants of the Proper of the Mass. The principle of “seasonal options” intended for smaller churches became an ideal norm for all churches.

### **The Instruction *Musicam Sacram***

The Constitution on the Liturgy had dealt with music only in general terms (in Chapter VI), and the first post-conciliar instruction on the liturgical reform, *Inter oecumenici*, did not mention music at all. Some people interpreted the absence of directions to use polyphonic music or Gregorian chant as mean-

ing that this music was no longer to be used in the liturgy. So the Consilium proposed a special instruction on music.

The resulting document, *Musicam Sacram*, is the only post-conciliar Vatican instruction devoted entirely to the subject of sacred music. The process of writing it was long and contentious, according to Bugnini's account, and twelve *schemata* (draft proposals) were issued between February 1965 and February 1967. The final document was published in March 1967 — just six months before the Simple Gradual.

The drafting of *Musicam Sacram* was entrusted to the Consilium Study Group 14. Consultors who examined the first draft found it weak and wanted “the instruction to codify the entire current discipline on sacred music as it related to the liturgical constitution.”<sup>37</sup>

A second, much longer, draft followed in April. This 74-paragraph version was written by Canon A.G. Martimort, a sacramental theologian. A larger group of consultors reviewed this draft and found it generally acceptable. A third draft was written, incorporating their comments.

Up to this point no musicians had been members of the drafting committee or included among the consultors. (In Bugnini's usage, a “musician” is not simply one trained in music, but one who has *traditional ideas* about sacred music and is concerned about preserving the treasury of sacred music.)

This unsatisfactory situation impelled Monsignor Anglès (with the agreement of the academic senate of the Pontifical Academy of Music) to write a memorandum to the Holy Father on May 25, 1965, and another on June 7. The latter asked “the Holy See to intervene and prevent the practical introduction of many abuses.”<sup>38</sup>

Bugnini calls the Anglès memo an attack “against the entire liturgical reform.”<sup>39</sup> But he says that the Secretariat of State saw the memo as raising a “serious and urgent question,” and recommended that the Consilium study it and inform the Secretariat “with all due haste of [its] thinking and activity in this area.”<sup>40</sup>

After this exchange, Bugnini judged that “the time had come to bring the musicians into the committee that was to put the finishing touches on the text that the liturgists had drawn up.”<sup>41</sup> A new committee was formed that, according to Bugnini, “was made up of forty-three experts, half of them liturgists and half of them musicians.”<sup>42</sup>

But the “finishing touches” extended to several more drafts of the instruction.

From Bugnini's account it appears that a new committee of experts was formed for each successive *schema*. Musicians frequently represented less than half of the committee. For example, the committee for the fifth *schema* had twelve members, among whom were two “musicians of the Roman school” and two “Gregorianists,” one of whom was Agustoni of *Universa Laus*. Other members were described as canon lawyers, theologians, pastoral experts, and rubricists.

In his account of the development of further drafts of the

instruction on music (he refers to this as its “way of the cross”<sup>43</sup>), Bugnini usually presents the musicians as obstructionist. He charges that their suggestions for revision “reflected bygone ideas of sacred music,” took concert performances as their ideal, and ignored “new problems raised for sacred song by pastoral liturgics.”<sup>44</sup>

Bugnini presents the liturgists, on the other hand, as invariably “pastoral” in their views. He contrasts the views of the two sides on the meaning of active participation:

Here precisely is where the views of the two sides diverged: in the view of the liturgists the people must truly *sing* in order to participate actively as desired by the liturgical Constitution; in the view of musicians, however, even listening to good devout, and edifying music ... promotes “active” participation.

These and other observations betrayed a mentality that could not come to grips with new pastoral needs.<sup>45</sup>

Bugnini claims that some of the musicians' recommendations were incorporated,

but the Consilium did not intend to yield on certain basic points, since they embodied the basic principles on which the liturgical reform was founded.<sup>46</sup>

Given this attitude, it is not surprising to find that *Musicam Sacram* incorporates some attempts at compromise of dramatically divergent views.

In the end, “traditional” statements included were sometimes worded so as to permit a “progressive” interpretation. The musicians, for example, asked repeatedly for inclusion of some reference to the retention of Latin in the Roman Rite (SC §36a) and to the preservation of the treasury of sacred music. (SC §114)

The final text did mention the retention of Latin, but it also promoted the vernacular; and it said that in order to follow these norms “one will therefore employ that form of participation which best matches the capability of each congregation.” (MS §47)

(No one seemed to notice that congregations whose “capability” in Latin was superior to their capability in their native language would be extremely rare.)

### Preserving the treasury

*Musicam Sacram* deals with the preservation of the treasury of sacred music in the following way:

In sung liturgical services celebrated in Latin:

a) Gregorian chant, as proper to the Roman liturgy, should be given pride of place, other things being equal. Its melodies, contained in the “typical” editions, should be used, to the extent that this is possible....

c) Other musical settings, written for one or more voices, be they taken from the traditional heritage or from new works, should be held in honor, encouraged and used as the occasion demands. (MS §50)

The opening phrase confining these provisions to liturgies “celebrated in Latin,” Bugnini interprets to mean that

When, therefore, the Constitution allowed the introduction of the vernaculars, it necessarily anticipated that the preservation of this “treasure of sacred music” would be dependent *solely on celebrations in Latin*....

In this part of the text, the instruction intends to make it clear that just as there are *two forms of celebration, one in Latin, the other in the vernacular*, in accordance with the norms established by competent authority, so the use of the *musical repertory that is connected with the Latin text is for celebrations in Latin*, although it is possible to use some parts of it even in celebrations in the vernacular.<sup>47</sup> (emphasis added)

There is nothing in the Constitution on the Liturgy, however, to indicate that the Council Fathers envisioned anything like “two forms of celebration.” They did not envision an entirely vernacular liturgy.

Paragraph 36 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* says that Latin is to be preserved, but that since the vernacular may be beneficial “a wider use may be made of it, especially in readings, directives and in some prayers and chants.”

But it is not at all obvious, either, that *Musicam Sacram* §50 fully reflects Bugnini’s view.

He states that the Council “makes it clear that the principles set down for use of the vernacular refer to all celebrations, whether with or without singing,” thus, he says, “It follows from this that it would be contrary to the Constitution to decree or even to hint that sung celebrations, especially of the Mass, should be in Latin.”

He asks rhetorically, “How can clerics be trained for the vernacular liturgy that will occupy most of their ministry if they experience only celebrations in Latin? Singing is something that requires long practice, beginning in youth.”<sup>48</sup>

Thus we can see how the “two forms of celebration” implicit in *Musicam Sacram* §50 became a springboard to further “reforms” in liturgical music.

This had been foreshadowed in a paragraph of the fifth *schema* which allowed for the replacement of the chants of the Mass with other songs approved by the episcopal conference. Indults (permission) allowing this practice had been in effect for a long time, particularly in German-speaking countries that had an existing repertoire of such approved songs. Since these indults were already in effect and limited to certain countries, some of the experts saw no need to include mention of them in a document for the universal Church. According to Bugnini, this paragraph merely confirmed the existing indults and it was retained.

The majority, however, saw the pastoral advantage of having other songs besides the psalms for the Proper of the Mass. The paragraph ... would subsequently play a very important role, because the episcopal conferences would appeal to it as a basis for asking the same indult for their regions.<sup>49</sup>

The paragraph did not merely confirm existing indults, but highlighted the possibility of such indults, thus encouraging other conferences to ask for them — especially if their expert

advisors (e.g., Frederick McManus to the US bishops) were enthusiastic about additional options. Introducing other songs to replace the Gregorian chants of the Mass, of course, would work against the preservation of the treasury of sacred music.

The debate continued through ten drafts of the document. When the tenth *schema* was submitted, Pope Paul VI

... felt an obligation to get a better insight into the divergent points of view. He therefore asked the musicians to draw up a single text that would include their variants and to provide justification for their differences with the liturgists.<sup>50</sup>

The Holy Father then read both texts, comparing them and noting his own comments and questions in the margins. He finally sent his annotated text to the Consilium in November 1966, with instructions to revise it according to his marginal notes. The Consilium then produced Schema 11.

Bugnini states that despite criticism of this draft, “the Pope stood by the balanced and carefully worded text of the Consilium.”<sup>51</sup> Finally the twelfth *schema* was accepted and issued on March 5, 1967, as the Instruction *Musicam Sacram*.

### Effects of *Musicam Sacram*

The final version encouraged the formation of choirs and the preservation of the heritage of sacred music, specifying that settings of the Ordinary of the Mass written for several voices could be sung by the choir, provided that the congregation was not excluded entirely from the singing.<sup>52</sup>

It maintained the distinction of solemn, sung and read Masses. For the sung Mass it specified degrees of participation “so that it may become easier to make the celebration of Mass more beautiful by singing, according to the capabilities of each congregation.”<sup>53</sup>

It suggested that some compositions of sacred music in Latin could be used in vernacular Masses: “there is nothing to prevent different parts in one and the same celebration from being sung in different languages.”<sup>54</sup>

Teaching of music at all levels was emphasized, in order to “preserve the heritage of sacred music and genuinely promote the new forms of sacred singing.... Above all the study and practice of Gregorian chant is to be promoted because, with its special characteristics, it is a basis of great importance for the development of sacred music.”<sup>55</sup>

Despite this emphasis, however, few Catholics have experienced a Mass celebrated according to these instructions. Few Catholics who came of age since the Council learned even the simplest Gregorian chants or experienced a polyphonic sung Mass.

According to Monsignor Richard Schuler, “*Musicam Sacram* was never truly put into effect. It was obscured by a document prepared by the Music Advisory Board of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, entitled ‘The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations,’ which has done untold harm.”<sup>56</sup>

Ironically, an instruction whose aim was to dispel confusion and to help preserve the Church’s treasury of sacred music was

ignored or interpreted in such a way as to permit this treasure to be buried ever more deeply.

## Notes — Part II

<sup>1</sup> A typical edition (*editio typica*) is the normative or authorized edition approved by the Holy See.

<sup>2</sup> Most Rev. Robert Tracy, *American Bishop at the Vatican Council* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966) p. 57. Archbishop Hallinan was elected Chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy and was instrumental in the founding of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy shortly after the Council.

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Frederick McManus to Godfrey Diekmann, Nov. 1, 1962. Quoted in Kathleen Hughes, RSCJ, *The Monk's Tale* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991) p. 206. McManus and Diekmann were in the small group that founded ICEL and permanent members of its Advisory Committee for decades.

<sup>4</sup> English translation quoted in *Sacred Music and Liturgical Reform after Vatican II: Proceedings of the Fifth International Church Music Congress*, Johannes Overath, editor (Rome: CIMS, 1969) p. 32. Available online at [musicasacra.com/pdf/smlr.pdf](http://musicasacra.com/pdf/smlr.pdf) [later referenced as Congress Proceedings].

<sup>5</sup> Congress Proceedings, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> These musicians were mostly members of the Society of Saint Gregory of America or of the American Society of Saint Cecilia.

<sup>7</sup> CMAA publishes the quarterly journal *Sacred Music*.

<sup>8</sup> The Reverend Joseph Gelineau, SJ, *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship: Principles, Laws, Applications* translated by The Reverend Clifford Howell, SJ (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1964).

<sup>9</sup> “*Les rôles dans l’assemblée qui chante*” (6 articles) *Église qui chante* 1958-1959 and “*Fonction et signification des principaux chants de la liturgie*” (9 articles), *Église qui chante* 1959-1961.

<sup>10</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 10.

<sup>11</sup> See Claude Duchesneau and Michel Veuthey, *Music and Liturgy: The Universa Laus Document and Commentary* translated by Paul Inwood (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1992), pp. 1-2.

<sup>12</sup> Prior to the Council he had been Secretary of the commission for liturgical restoration appointed by Pope Pius XII, Secretary of the preparatory commission for the liturgy before the Council, and a peritus for the Conciliar commission on the liturgy during the Council. From 1976 to 1982 he was Apostolic Pro-Nuncio in Iran.

<sup>13</sup> Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, translated by Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990). See especially “Part IX: Sacred Music and the Liturgy” pp. 885-917.

<sup>14</sup> Bugnini, p. 890.

<sup>15</sup> The Simple Gradual Introduction §§5-6. *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979* (DOL) (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1982) ##4261-4262.

<sup>16</sup> The Simple Gradual Introduction §2. DOL #4258.

<sup>17</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 101. (emphasis added)

<sup>18</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 68.

<sup>19</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 87.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, Peter Wagner, *Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies Part I*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, translated by Agnes Orme and E.G.P. Wyatt (London: Plainsong & Medieval Music Society, 1901).

<sup>21</sup> Monsignor Higinì Anglès, “Commentary by Msgr. Higinì Anglès,” *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium* Vol VI (1967) pp. 35-44. Quoted pas-

sage on p. 35.

<sup>22</sup> Anglès, p. 36.

<sup>23</sup> Monsignor Johannes Overath, “Church Music in the Light of the Constitution on the Liturgy,” *Sacred Music* Spring 1965, pp. 3-11. Quoted passage on pp. 3-4.

<sup>24</sup> Bugnini, p. 892.

<sup>25</sup> Letter of Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, President of the Consilium, to the Vatican Secretariat of State, June 23, 1966. Quoted in Bugnini, p. 892.

<sup>26</sup> Quoted in Bugnini, p. 896. Thus it did not have the status of an official liturgical book when it was issued; however, a new edition, published in 1974, was designated the “second typical edition.”

<sup>27</sup> Bugnini, p. 894.

<sup>28</sup> Bugnini, p. 894. See also p. 121, where Bugnini says that publication of the *Graduale Simplex* “was certainly another step toward a new form of celebration” since the text “offered a selection of texts for each chant in the Proper, created Commons for the seasons, and revived the responsorial psalm — innovations very useful for participation.”

<sup>29</sup> Frederick R. McManus, “Sacred Music in the Teaching of the Church” in *Crisis in Church Music? Proceedings of a Meeting on church music conducted by the Liturgical Conference, Inc., and the Church Music Association of America* (Washington, DC: The Liturgical Conference, 1967) p. 20.

<sup>30</sup> Bugnini, p. 895.

<sup>31</sup> Quoted in Bugnini, p. 896.

<sup>32</sup> Bugnini, p. 895, footnote 22.

<sup>33</sup> See Bugnini, pp. 810-811.

<sup>34</sup> *The Simple Gradual for Sundays and Holy Days*: revised edition. Edited by John Ainslie (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1970).

<sup>35</sup> The tones given are by Lawrence Bevenot, OSB, Gregory Murry, OSB and Joseph Gelineau.

<sup>36</sup> *The Simple Gradual*, Editor’s Foreword, p. iv.

<sup>37</sup> Bugnini, p. 899.

<sup>38</sup> Bugnini, p. 900.

<sup>39</sup> Bugnini, p. 900.-

<sup>40</sup> See Bugnini, p. 900, footnote 2.

<sup>41</sup> Bugnini, p. 900.

<sup>42</sup> Bugnini, p. 901. All 43 members are listed on this page. See note 4.

<sup>43</sup> Bugnini, p. 900.

<sup>44</sup> Bugnini, p. 902.

<sup>45</sup> Bugnini, p. 904.

<sup>46</sup> Bugnini, p. 905.

<sup>47</sup> Bugnini, p. 907.

<sup>48</sup> Bugnini, p. 906, 907.

<sup>49</sup> Bugnini, p. 903.

<sup>50</sup> Bugnini, p. 909.

<sup>51</sup> Bugnini, p. 910.

<sup>52</sup> *Musicam Sacram* §34.

<sup>53</sup> *Musicam Sacram* §28.

<sup>54</sup> *Musicam Sacram* §51.

<sup>55</sup> *Musicam Sacram* §52.

<sup>56</sup> Monsignor Richard Schuler, “A Chronicle of the Reform” in *Cum Angeles Canere*, p. 383.

## Part III

(published May 2001)

### The US Interprets Vatican Norms for Sacred Music

THE CONSTITUTION ON THE LITURGY gave permission for using vernacular languages in the liturgy, but this use was limited. Paragraph 36 says:

1. Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.
2. But since the use of the mother tongue whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its use may be extended. This will apply in the first place to the readings and instructions and to some prayers and chants according to the regulations on this matter to be laid down for each case in subsequent chapters.

Paragraph 54 of the Constitution adds:

With art. 36 of this Constitution as the norm, in Masses celebrated with the people a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue. This is to apply in the first place to the readings and “the universal prayer,” but also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts belonging to the people. Nevertheless steps should be taken enabling the faithful to say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass belonging to them.

Because of the close connection of sacred music to the text of the liturgy, change in language would have a profound effect on liturgical music. Bishops’ conferences that desired greater use of the vernacular were instructed by paragraph 54 to follow the provisions of paragraph 40 on “more radical adaptation” in introducing it. Evidently the Council Fathers envisioned a limited use of the vernacular in certain parts of the Mass, and perhaps only at certain times or for certain congregations. Very quickly, however, permission was given to have the entire Mass in the vernacular. This remained a permission. The Council never required, and in fact never intended, that Latin be replaced entirely in all Masses by other languages.

Most Catholics at the time, however, had the impression that Latin had been replaced, even forbidden. Although the Council did not forbid Latin, some diocesan worship offices in the United States did. As early as March 1, 1964, the Baltimore archdiocese issued directives that the “introduction of the vernacular into sung Masses is to be completed” by the First Sunday of Advent 1965. From that time on in Baltimore, all parts of the Mass permitted in the vernacular were to be performed in the vernacular. The Baltimore decree permitted Latin hymns by the choir, but emphasized: “This does not mean, however, that those Ordinary or Proper parts of the Mass which must be performed according to the rubrics can be in Latin.” Other dioceses, including Chicago, Kansas City, San Diego, and Colum-

bus, issued similar regulations.<sup>1</sup>

Such regulations left a musical vacuum. Before the Council all music for the liturgy had been in Latin. It had been, in fact, forbidden to sing liturgical texts in vernacular translation during the liturgy. (Hymns permitted during Low Mass could not be direct translations of liturgical texts.) Even if there had been English versions of the Ordinary and Proper of the Mass, the changes in the Latin text and, even more, the new translations would have meant that this repertoire would have been unusable without revision. Singing the Ordinary and Proper of the Mass in dioceses in which English was required for all parts of the liturgy, then, would require that new English translations be set to new music. Moreover, congregations, who were now expected to do the singing, would have to learn all of this new music in a very short time. Consequently, the singing of the actual texts of the Mass itself, the Ordinary and Proper, would almost completely disappear.

#### Latin vanishes

The elimination of Latin by decree of individual worship offices was defended by Monsignor Frederick McManus (director of the bishops’ liturgy secretariat). In his 1987 book *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal*, McManus contends that, though the people mostly preferred the vernacular (according to “later surveys”), the clergy did not want the change.

Thus, what was a concession became overnight a requirement.... From a pastoral viewpoint, however, it is certain that a mere permission to use the vernacular in a given diocese would have resulted in the most diverse practices — and, in days before parish councils and worship committees, would have deprived a very large percentage of the Catholic people of the fruits of the Council’s first decision. Such fears and, most likely, the bishops’ desire for uniform practice within dioceses more than explain the diocesan decisions.<sup>2</sup>

The practice established in most parishes was the “four-hymn” Mass, the singing of mostly new hymns and songs in English. Usually these were Entrance, Offertory, Communion, and Recessional hymns. This pattern, ironically, originated in the Holy See’s 1958 Instruction on music, which was intended to allow for some sung participation by the people in Low Masses recited in Latin. Thus forbidding the singing of the Proper and Ordinary in Latin meant not that the Mass texts were sung in English — they were not sung at all.

Hymnals issued shortly after the Council also show this extreme emphasis on English. The 1964 *People’s Mass Book*<sup>3</sup> retains Latin words alongside the English for some of the most familiar Latin hymns (*Tantum Ergo*, *Salve Regina*, *Adoro Te*, etc.), but the only two settings of the Ordinary of the Mass have only English words.

Two years later the Liturgical Conference published *The Book of Catholic Worship*,<sup>4</sup> from which all vestiges of Latin had been removed. Latin titles such as *Pange Lingua* are not even given as aids in identifying familiar hymns, which are listed only with unfamiliar English words and titles. Settings of the Ord-

nary of the Mass are all in English, and even the ancient titles have disappeared, replaced with “Lord Have Mercy,” “Glory to God,” “Holy, Holy, Holy,” etc.

### The “folk Mass” appears

*Musicam Sacram* (MS), issued by the Holy See in 1967, clearly advocated that the people sing the traditional Latin repertoire. Expressly included in the term “sacred music” are Gregorian chant and “the several styles of polyphony, both ancient and modern.” (MS §4) It also contains a provision that some of the repertoire composed in Latin could be used in celebrations in the vernacular. (MS §51)

Yet these provisions had no perceptible effect on diocesan regulations such as those mentioned above, apparently because those in charge of implementing the liturgical reform were often strong advocates of the vernacular as a means of making the liturgy intelligible to everyone.

Implementation of *Musicam Sacram* in the US was the responsibility of the bishops, who relied on the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy (BCL). This committee was assisted by a staff secretariat, headed from 1965 to 1975 by Father (later Monsignor) Frederick McManus.

### The Music Advisory Board

A Music Advisory Board was formed in 1965 to assist the BCL. At its first meeting in Detroit in May 1965, Benedictine Archabbot Rembert Weakland (later Archbishop of Milwaukee) was elected chairman and (then) Father Richard Schuler, Secretary. McManus was the official liaison with the bishops.

At its February 1966 meeting, the Music Advisory Board was presented with a proposal for the use of guitars and folk music in the liturgy. Monsignor Schuler gives an account of the meeting:

It was clear at the meeting that both Father McManus and Archabbot Weakland were most anxious to obtain the board’s approval.... Vigorous debate considerably altered the original proposal, and a much modified statement about “music for special groups” was finally approved by a majority of one, late in the day when many members had already left.<sup>5</sup>

The “Music for Special Groups” statement (which consisted of only three paragraphs) observed that “different groupings of the faithful assembled in worship respond to different styles of musical expression,” and said that in services specifically for high school or college-age young people “the choice of music which is meaningful to persons of this age level should be considered valid and purposeful.” It specified that such music should not be used at ordinary parish Masses and that

the liturgical texts should be respected. The incorporation of incongruous melodies and texts, adapted from popular ballads, should be avoided.<sup>6</sup>

While the “special groups” statement did not mention either guitars or folk music explicitly, neither did it offer any rec-

ommendations for those groups who responded especially to Gregorian Chant, Palestrina, or Mozart. “Folk” music played on guitars was the sort of music assumed to be “meaningful” to youth. Thus, this statement was publicized as official approval, even encouragement, of what was at first called the “hootenanny Mass.” Later these were more generally called “folk” or “guitar” Masses.

The preference for such music was by no means universal among people of this age group. Father Francis P. Schmitt, director of music at Boys Town, Nebraska, commented at a meeting on liturgical music in Kansas City in December 1966:

We have no right, I think, to rob our wards of disciplines which are fundamental in favor of what we imagine might please them. For I do not think that it is the young people who are clamoring for the hootenanny Mass, at least not until they have been exposed to the idea by some arrested adult personality who thinks that he or she will save the young masses for the liturgy ... if they are given something that involves no effort on the child’s part at all. It looks suspiciously to me like trying to buy the young, and dirt cheap at that. Well, you don’t buy them, and you don’t fool them. All the time they’re telling each other what a simple dope you are, and how you’re the one that’s being fooled.<sup>7</sup>

Father Schmitt directed the choir at Boys Town, whose resident members were often inner city youth who might be called “troubled” or “disadvantaged.” He comments that he thinks it “cowardly” to justify folk Masses on the basis of a provision in the Constitution on the Liturgy applying to mission countries:

And what is a more derelict mission territory than the inner core of our cities, and all that. I have been dealing with the outcasts of the inner core all my life and they are quite capable of and content to sing everything from Gregorian to de Monte Hindemith for three or four months of Sundays without ever repeating a musical setting of the text. I wouldn’t ask them if they wanted to do a hootenanny Mass because they would laugh me off the campus.<sup>8</sup>

Father Schmitt’s opinion (that adults, rather than teens, are the real enthusiasts for the hootenanny Mass) is confirmed by several surprising sources. At this same meeting, for example, liturgical composer Dennis Fitzpatrick presented the “far left” position. Fitzpatrick advocated the abolition of the restriction of such Masses to youthful congregations, and said that at many such services adults already outnumbered teens.<sup>9</sup>

Ray Repp, the composer of the first widely used “folk” Mass, the *Mass for Young Americans*, confirms Fitzpatrick’s observation. Repp recounted his experiences at a suburban parish, where he was invited on several occasions to lead music at Mass. On the first occasion “a charming silver-haired woman” came up to him after Mass and said she thought his music was wonderful and that it would certainly bring young people back to church. Several weeks later, at the same parish, “several silver-haired people” said the same thing. Shortly afterward Repp was again invited to the same parish.

I’ll never forget the impression I had when first walking out to

begin the singing. The church was filled, not with teen-agers, but with smiling, silvered-haired seniors.

...

Contrary to the common opinion that “guitar” or “folk” music in church is youth-oriented, my experience is that almost never have young teens joined in enthusiastically...<sup>10</sup>

In fact, when he was invited to a junior high school to lead music, “the usual response was rolling eyes and other gestures I’d rather not discuss here.”<sup>11</sup> Repp, however, denies that the problem is with the music itself, suggesting rather that it is the fact that we don’t treat youth as “real people.” His views go beyond the style of music used at the liturgy. He contends that people are confused about what worship is.

Unfortunately, many of our worship rites continue to emphasize a preincarnational dualism.... Communion rails, steps, or sanctuaries still separate people from the “holy of holies,” and male dominance of worship still suggests inequality and a divine preference.<sup>12</sup>

A spirit of “inclusiveness,” Repp believes, would eliminate problems of youth participation, and singing would be spontaneous and natural. Music must be “inclusive” no matter what its quality, Repp says. “Music that focuses on a God separate from the people is idolatrous at best.”<sup>13</sup>

Though we may consider the “folk” Mass to be uniquely American, neither the use of popular forms of entertainment music at Mass nor the divergence of opinion was confined to the US. At the 1966 meeting of the CIMS, Professor Jacques Chailley of the University of Paris related the following incident:

After an experimental Mass in jazz style, a radio journalist interrogated several of the faithful on the way out of church. Contrary to what one would have perhaps expected, the adults were often a little undecided, but inclined to be persuaded in favor of the Mass. On the other hand, the young people almost all showed their disapproval. For us, they said, this music is a living thing, and possesses a well-defined meaning; if it is introduced into the church, then you must bring in with it everything that it connotes. Otherwise it would make no sense. We haven’t arrived yet at the state of going to Communion in a bar, have we?<sup>14</sup>

Perhaps liturgists who want to introduce “meaningful” music into liturgies for youth would do well to first inquire closely into exactly what meaning the music actually conveys to young people.

The BCL issued the statement of the Music Advisory Board on special groups in April 1966. The full body of bishops never voted on it. Many bishops may not even have seen it before its publication. Despite this, the statement was treated in the press as a statement of the American bishops, and most people had the impression that the bishops’ conference, if not the Vatican itself, had approved “folk Masses.”

Despite the explicit restrictions of this document, the “hoo-tenanny Mass” was used for ordinary parish Masses and often included secular “pop” melodies, sometimes even with the orig-

inal words. The music thus introduced brought with it its own atmosphere — an informality radically different from people’s lifelong experience of reverence and mystery at Mass.

Even before the new official Missal was issued, this combination of music and the atmosphere it produced may have done even more than alteration in language or in the rites themselves to convince the average Catholic that the Council had made radical changes in the Mass.

### “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations”

In December 1966 the Music Advisory Board met again to consider yet another document on liturgical music. At this meeting several of the original members of the board were retired, and new members appointed. Monsignor Schuler, who was one of those retired, suggests this move was designed to make the committee “free of members who would likely oppose the projected statement.”<sup>15</sup>

A committee of three was appointed to write the new document: Father Eugene Walsh, SS; Father Robert Ledogar, MM; and Dennis Fitzpatrick. The last two were newly appointed to the Music Board. (Mr. Fitzpatrick, recall, was the “far left” speaker at the 1966 Kansas City conference, and an advocate of the extension of the use folk Masses to regular parish congregations.) Father Walsh, director of music and liturgical education at Saint Mary’s Seminary in Baltimore, is reputed to have been the principal author of *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* (PMEC).

At a later meeting the draft document was considered. Monsignor Schuler tells us:

With only a few objections, which were quickly disposed of, the document, “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations,” was considered approved, although it had scarcely been considered by the assembly and little or no discussion was permitted or encouraged.<sup>16</sup>

Like its predecessor “Music for Special Groups,” the new document was issued by the BCL without consulting the full body of bishops. This 1967 document, which was essentially the work of three men — none of them bishops — with little input from anyone else, came to be regarded as official legislation of the bishops’ conference. In fact, Monsignor Frederick McManus later said of *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations*:

Probably no statement of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy has had the impact of this one, either in its original version or as revised and expanded in 1972.<sup>17</sup>

Since it was issued only months after the Holy See’s document, PMEC should have been an implementation of *Musicam Sacram* for the US, but its recommendations sometimes actually contradict the Roman instruction.

### Principles of PMEC

PMEC has four major sections. Each of the first three begin with a statement printed in capital letters, serving as the main

principles of that section:

### **I. The Theology of Celebration**

GOOD CELEBRATIONS FOSTER AND NOURISH FAITH. POOR CELEBRATIONS WEAKEN AND DESTROY FAITH. (p. 96)

### **II. The Principle of Pastoral Celebration**

THE PRIMARY GOAL OF ALL CELEBRATION IS TO MAKE A HUMANLY ATTRACTIVE EXPERIENCE. (p. 97)

### **III. The Place of Music in the Celebration**

MUSIC, MORE THAN ANY OTHER RESOURCE, MAKES A CELEBRATION OF THE LITURGY AN ATTRACTIVE HUMAN EXPERIENCE. (p. 99)

These principles differ radically from the principles of sacred music enunciated in the Holy See's documents — from *Tra le sollecitudini* to *Musicam Sacram*. They correspond much more closely to views expressed elsewhere by Father Walsh, who refers to “the old and outmoded concept of ‘sacred music’”:

The glorious inheritance of church music — chant, polyphony, baroque — is entirely choir and instrument oriented. As such it is not suited to a worship that focuses on the celebrating community as the center of worship, a worship that sees the role of music primarily as service to the celebrating community rather than as service to the text.<sup>18</sup>

#### **Out with the “outmoded”**

Clearly there was a radical shift in the BCL's new statement — with sweeping implications. The earlier documents all defined the purpose of sacred music as first, the glory of God, and second, the sanctification of men. It is not surprising, then, that the application of the “community-centered” principles of P MEC resulted in a very different set of recommendations for music in the liturgy — and its conclusions directly contradict *Musicam Sacram*.

“Humanly attractive celebration” is the focus of Section II of P MEC. It says that the “signs of sacramental celebration are vehicles of communication”:

The celebration of any liturgical action, then, is to be governed by the need for the action to be clear, convincing, and humanly attractive; the degree of solemnity suitable for the occasion; the nature of the congregation; the resources that are available. (p. 98)

Thus it states,

Under this principle, there is *little distinction to be made between the solemn, sung, and recited Mass*. (p. 98, paragraph II B1 - emphasis added.)

But erasing the distinction between sung and recited Masses flatly contradicts provisions of *Musicam Sacram*. Ironically, P MEC justifies this by a citation from that very document. P MEC (§II B1) quotes a portion of MS §28: “for the sung Mass (*Missa Cantata*), different degrees of participation

are put forward here for reasons of pastoral usefulness.” But the same paragraph earlier made it clear that,

The *distinction between solemn, sung and read Mass*, sanctioned by the Instruction of 1958 (n. 3), is retained, according to the traditional liturgical laws at present in force. (MS §28 - emphasis added.)

Then MS describes “different degrees of participation” possible for the *sung* Mass, and provides detailed specifications for the use of these three degrees.

These principles are ignored — and often contradicted — by P MEC. According to MS §28, the three “degrees” are arranged so that the first may be used alone but “the second and third, wholly or partially, may never be used without the first”; then it specifies the parts of the Mass that belong to each of the three degrees.

The “first degree of participation,” *Musicam Sacram* (§7) says, includes the most important parts, “especially those which are to be *sung by the priest or by the ministers, with the people replying, or those which are to be sung by the priest and people together*.”

It lists all the items of the first degree: those items that should *always be sung* whenever there is any singing at Mass. These are: the greeting of the priest and the people's reply, the opening prayer, the Gospel acclamation, the prayer over the offerings, the preface dialogue, preface and *Sanctus*; the doxology of the Canon; the Lord's Prayer; the *Pax Domini*; the prayer after Communion; the formulas of dismissal. (Many of these items are to be sung by the priest, and the people have short responses.)

Other parts of the Mass may be gradually added to those that are sung “according as they are *proper to the people alone* or to the choir alone.” (MS §7, emphasis added)

The second degree, then, includes those parts “proper to the people” — that is, the remaining sections of the Ordinary of the Mass (*Kyrie, Gloria, Agnus Dei, Credo*) and the Prayer of the Faithful. (MS §30)

The third degree includes those parts of the Mass “*proper to the choir only*” — that is, most of the Proper of the Mass: Entrance, Offertory, Communion, and song after the first reading (i.e., the Responsorial Psalm). The readings from Scripture may also be chanted in sung Masses of the third degree if this seems desirable. (MS §31)

The “three degrees” of a *sung* Mass in *Musicam Sacram* correspond closely to the three stages of the peoples' participation outlined in the 1958 Instruction on music. (See the discussion of the 1958 Instruction in Part I. This and other major documents on music are available on the Adoremus web site, adoremus.org, Church Documents section.)

#### **“Humanly attractive experience” vs. heritage of Catholic music**

In addition to eliminating the distinction between sung and recited Masses, P MEC draws yet another conclusion from its

“humanly attractive experience” principle:

Under this principle, each single song must be understood in terms of its own specific nature and function. Therefore, the customary *distinction between the Ordinary and Proper parts* of the Mass with regard to musical settings and distribution of roles is irrelevant. For this reason, the *musical settings of the past are usually not helpful models for composing truly contemporary pieces*. (p. 98, Section II, paragraph II B3 - emphasis added.)

Again, ironically, *Musicam Sacram* (§6) is cited to justify this extraordinary conclusion of P MEC, which collapses the entire musical structure of the Mass as it had been known for centuries: the Ordinary (for every Mass) and the Propers (for feasts and seasons); and breezily trashes the treasury of sacred music — dismissed even as “helpful models” for new music.

*Musicam Sacram* (§6), in fact, repeats the requirement of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy that each participant in the liturgy do all and only that which pertains to him. It continues:

This also demands that the *meaning and proper nature of each part* and of each song be carefully observed. To attain this, those parts especially should be sung which by their very nature require to be sung, using the kind and form of music which is proper to their character. (MS §6)

Neither does MS §6 reject the music of the past as a model for new compositions.

The kinds of sacred music listed in MS explicitly includes “Gregorian chant, sacred polyphony in its various forms both ancient and modern.” (§4b)

In addition to referring in several places to the Proper and Ordinary and their musical settings, MS provides that settings of the Ordinary for several voices may be sung by the choir alone “according to the customary norms.” (§34)

It suggests that parts of the Latin repertoire of sacred music written in earlier centuries could be used even in liturgies celebrated in the vernacular (§51), and,

Above all, the study and practice of *Gregorian chant is to be promoted*, because, with its special characteristics, it is a *basis of great importance for the development of sacred music*. (§52 - emphasis added.)

As to models for new compositions, *Musicam Sacram* specifies that:

Musicians will enter on this new work with the *desire to continue that tradition* which has furnished the Church, in her divine worship, with a truly abundant heritage. Let them *examine the works of the past*, their types and characteristics, but let them also pay careful attention to the new laws and requirements of the liturgy, so that “new forms may in some way grow organically from forms that already exist,” and the new work will form a new part in the musical heritage of the Church, not unworthy of its past. (§59, emphasis added.)

Any logical process that could leap from the proposition in MS §6 to the conclusion P MEC §II B3 would require a bridge

like: “The settings of Ordinary and Proper of the Mass written in past centuries rarely correspond to the meaning and proper nature of each song.”

Of course, nothing of the sort is found in *Musicam Sacram* or in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. On the contrary, both hold the sacred music of the past in great esteem, recommend its continued use and stress the “organic” growth of the new from the old forms. But radical rethinking was clearly crucial to those who crafted P MEC.

### Three “judgments” key in P MEC

The role music has in making the liturgy “an attractive human experience” is stressed in Part III of P MEC, where it gives criteria used to judge whether a particular piece of music is appropriate to use in a liturgical rite. (Sec. C) These criteria are based on three judgments: the *musical*, the *liturgical*, and the *pastoral*.

Monsignor McManus, commenting later on P MEC, emphasizes these key judgments:

Still, another telling feature of the statement, which required and received later elaboration, is its practical description of the three-fold judgment to be made in the selection of music: musical, liturgical, pastoral. These interdependent considerations can resolve most of the conflicts between the pastoral and the musical emphases if they are thoughtfully applied. It is one of the statement’s major contributions, deserving even greater stress.<sup>19</sup>

The first, or *musical judgment*, decides whether the music is good technically and aesthetically. However, though P MEC says this judgment is “basic and primary,” it is not conclusive. No criteria are given for judging what “good music” is, and there are no references to any of the official documents on sacred music.

In the second, *liturgical judgment*, says P MEC, the “nature of the liturgy itself” will determine the type of music, who will sing it, and what parts should be given preference in deciding what is to be sung. There is no reference to the “three degrees of participation” outlined in MS. Instead, P MEC lists three items that must be considered.

The first concerns *requirements imposed by the text*. The document does not consider the *meaning* of the text, but says that music is appropriate if it corresponds to the *class* of text.

Four principle classes of texts are listed: readings, acclamations, psalms and hymns, and prayers. Though various texts are listed in each category, nothing is said about what musical requirement each class of text imposes, except that the “Holy, Holy” has the character of “an acclamation by all present.”

Another item under the “liturgical judgment” heading is the *differentiation of roles*. Here the celebrant is mentioned and it is said that special attention must be given to the role of the cantor. There is a separate section on the role of the cantor. The role of the choir is not mentioned.

### The “pastoral judgment”

The third, *pastoral judgment*, is related to the particular context of any given Mass. The music, P MEC says, must allow the congregation “to express their faith in this place, in this age, in this culture.” As an example it suggests that though a musician may judge Gregorian chant to be good music this “says nothing about whether and how it is to be used in this celebration.” (P MEC II C 3)

This seems to imply that a “judgment” about chant must resolve two conflicting views: one committed to musical excellence and the other to pastoral concern. The fact that the Church judges Gregorian chant to be the music proper to the Roman rite, *suitable for expressing her faith*, is ignored. Though this high estimate of Gregorian chant played a large part in the reform of the liturgy until (and including) the Council, it does not influence the threefold judgment of P MEC. Both P MEC itself and Monsignor McManus’s comment seem to assume an inherent conflict between *musical* and *pastoral* considerations, and that the “threefold judgment” must be employed to resolve it.

There is nothing in MS to suggest that a threefold judgment is necessary for selecting music for Mass. It says this:

In selecting the kind of sacred music to be used, whether it be for the choir or for the people, the capacities of those who are to sing the music must be taken into account. (MS §9)

This seems to be merely a practical consideration. The music should be something that the singers can perform well.

Again, we find that principles of P MEC are used to set criteria that contradict specific provisions of the Constitution on the Liturgy or *Musicam Sacram*.

In “Application of the Principles of Celebration to the Eucharist,” P MEC gives specific recommendations for singing various parts of the Mass. The recommendations, not surprisingly, do not correspond either to the *rubrics* for a solemn Mass or to the *degrees of participation* outlined in MS for a sung Mass. According to P MEC:

The best places to sing are at the “Holy Holy Holy,” the Amen at the conclusion of the eucharistic prayer, the communion song, the responsorial psalm following the lessons (P MEC Section IV, first paragraph).

Of these only the *Sanctus* and the Great Amen are included in the “first degree” to be sung in MS. The Communion hymn and responsorial psalm belong to the “third degree.”

Moreover, MS emphasizes that the parts of the Mass that are a *dialogue between the priest and people* should be sung. But P MEC never mentions these parts. Although the Lord’s Prayer belongs to the “first degree” in MS, it is merely listed as one of the “other places to sing” in P MEC.

### “All else is secondary”?

A peculiar feature of P MEC is a description of the various sections of the Mass, specifying for each what the authors consider its most important parts. The list for each section ends

with the remark: “All else is secondary.”

In the entrance rite, the “secondary” elements include the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*, which, according to P MEC, are often better spoken than sung to avoid making the entrance rite “top-heavy.” It also considers the Creed and the Prayer of the Faithful to be “secondary” parts of the Liturgy of the Word.

The *Credo* should be recited, rather than sung, according to P MEC, and for the Offertory, “The celebrant’s role and all prayers except the prayer over the gifts are secondary in the rite.” (P MEC IV B1 3c)

In the Communion rite, the priest’s prayers and the Lamb of God are both called secondary in P MEC.

According to P MEC’s recommendations, four of the five prayers that make up the Ordinary of the Mass — the basis of all musical settings of the Mass used for centuries — are reduced to “secondary” elements, generally to be recited, even when other elements are sung. The sung Propers of the Mass are replaced by whatever songs are chosen by whoever plans the parish liturgy.

Although little direction is given by P MEC as to what is required in the choice of such songs, the exception is the Communion hymn, which should “foster an experience of unity.” P MEC directs:

- The ideal communion song is the short refrain sung by the people alternated with the cantor or choir. The song can be learned easily and quickly. The people are not burdened with books, papers, etc. For the same reason, the metric hymn is the least effective communion song.
- The communion song can be any song that is fitting for the feast or the season; it can speak of the community aspects of the Eucharist. Most benediction hymns, by reason of their concentration on adoration, are not suitable. (P MEC IV B2 c3)

Nothing in the Constitution on the Liturgy or in *Musicam Sacram* justifies either relegating parts of the Mass to “secondary” status or these requirements for the Communion hymn. No source is cited for these innovations either, though the preference for short refrains for the people with verses by a cantor is Father Joseph Gelineau’s preferred method of liturgical singing.<sup>20</sup>

Given its radical break with tradition, history, and recent official Church documents, it is not surprising that P MEC received “a less than calm and serene reception”<sup>21</sup> when it was issued in 1967. Questions were raised about its canonical status and its binding force.

Monsignor McManus contends, however, that this was not a substantive issue:

With great care, the committee had insisted in 1967 that the statement [P MEC] eschewed any “set or rigid pattern,” merely intending to “offer criteria” in the form of “recommendations and attempts at guidance”.... The same language was employed ... in the 1972 edition. This was done each time precisely because the statements draw their strength from the reasoned presentation and the force of their exposition.<sup>22</sup>

One might expect to read “the force of their *arguments*.”

However, PMEC does not present arguments, but rather a series of quite forceful *statements*, evidently intended to be understood as requirements and not mere “guidance.” Monsignor McManus tellingly admits that, despite the disclaimer about setting norms, “the text [of PMEC] is somewhat apodictic in setting forth criteria”:

One instance is the succession of theses in capital letters; another is the repeated declaration in pointing out the principal elements of some part of the eucharistic rite, “All else is secondary.” This tone is explained almost as an attention getting device, a desire to say as forcefully as possible what had, in fact, been overlooked by the professional church musicians.<sup>23</sup>

Apparently the Constitution on the Liturgy and *Musicam Sacram* “overlooked” the very same points because neither PMEC’s theses printed in capital letters nor the division of the prayers of the Mass into “primary” and “secondary” categories can be found therein.

Despite disclaimers, the language of *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* was that of rules, not guidance or recommendations. This is also the way it was presented in the press and in the parishes.

The pattern PMEC initiated is, in fact, what is found in most parishes today — essentially the four-hymn pattern that the Holy See’s 1958 Instruction recommended only for “indirect” participation of the people in a Latin Low Mass. The *Sanctus*, Acclamation, and Amen of the Eucharistic Prayer are now often sung, however, as is the *Agnus Dei*. (The opinions of liturgists change — the “breaking of the bread,” no longer considered “secondary,” is now strongly emphasized.)

The pattern established by PMEC for the music at Mass is not that of a sung Mass according to the norms of *Musicam Sacram*, but of a recited Mass with some parts sung.

Why were the provisions of *Musicam Sacram* not followed by the bishops during the reform of the liturgy following the Council? And what liturgical theories led their Music Advisory Board to enshrine the contrary principles of *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* in the parishes of America? For complex reasons, these theories have dominated not only the development of music, but virtually every other aspect of Catholic worship ever since.

### Notes — Part III

<sup>1</sup> See The Rt. Rev. Johannes Overath “Introduction” in *Congress Proceedings*; pp. 22-23 for quotations from several diocesan documents.

<sup>2</sup> *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal*, edited with an introduction and commentaries by Msgr. Frederick R. McManus (Washington, DC: Secretariat Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1987), p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> *People’s Mass Book*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Cincinnati: World Library of Sacred Music, 1964).

<sup>4</sup> *The Book of Catholic Worship* (Washington, DC: The Liturgical Conference, 1966). The editorial board included very influential liturgists: Msgr. Frederick McManus; Godfrey Diekmann, OSB; and Gabe Huck,

then director of Liturgy Training Publications of the Archdiocese of Chicago. It also included Fr. Eugene Walsh, SS (who served on the Music Advisory Committee for the BCL); and Fr. Robert Hovda, the principle author of the BCL’s controversial 1978 document *Environment and Art in Catholic Worship*.

<sup>5</sup> Msgr. Richard J. Schuler, “A Chronicle of the Reform” in *Cum Angelis Canere* ed. Robert Skeris, (St. Paul, MN: Catholic Church Music Associates, 1990) p. 379.

<sup>6</sup> The complete text of “The Use of Music for Special Groups” can be found in *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal, Statements of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy*, p. 44.

<sup>7</sup> Francis P. Schmitt, “Leaning Right?” in *Crisis in Church Music?* Proceedings of a meeting conducted by the Liturgical Conference, Inc., and the Church Music Association of America (Washington, DC: The Liturgical Conference, 1967), p. 60.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Dennis Fitzpatrick, “From the Far Left” in *Crisis in Church Music?* (p. 88).

<sup>10</sup> Ray Repp, “Maybe We Shouldn’t Be Singing in Church”, in *Pastoral Music*, Vol 14, #5 (June-July 1990), pp. 46.

<sup>11</sup> Repp, p. 47.

<sup>12</sup> Repp, p. 48.

<sup>13</sup> Repp, p. 49.

<sup>14</sup> Jacques Chailley, “Disputed Statements” in *Congress Proceedings*, p. 176.

<sup>15</sup> Schuler, p. 394. See also p. 383, note 10 for a list of members retired and their replacements.

<sup>16</sup> Schuler, p. 394.

<sup>17</sup> McManus, *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal* p. 92. Full text of *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* is found on pp. 96-104. The revision of PMEC he mentions was issued as a statement of the BCL entitled *Music in Catholic Worship*.

<sup>18</sup> Eugene A. Walsh, SS, *Practical Suggestion for Celebrating Sunday Mass* (Glendale, AZ: Pastoral Arts Associates, 1978) pp. 62-63. See also his *The Theology of Celebration* (Glendale, AZ: Pastoral Arts Associates, 1977) which stresses laws of communication and a “new” theology of the sacraments, which he calls “radical.”

<sup>19</sup> McManus, *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal*, p. 95.

<sup>20</sup> See the discussion of the ideas of Father Joseph Gelineau in Part II of *Buried Treasure*.

<sup>21</sup> McManus, p. 93.

<sup>22</sup> McManus, p. 93; phrases in quotation marks are from the introduction to PMEC, see p. 96.

<sup>23</sup> McManus, p. 95.

## Part IV

(published July-August 2001)

### The Nature of Catholic Music for Mass — Functional vs. Sacred

**T**he *Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* (PMEC), a 1967 statement of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, advocated the evaluation of music considered for liturgical use by three sets of criteria: musical, liturgical, and pastoral.

This so-called “threefold judgment” was “one of the statement’s major contributions,” according to Monsignor Frederick McManus, then-director of the Liturgy Secretariat — the staff of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy (BCL).<sup>1</sup>

Although Monsignor McManus implies this was an idea original to the writers of PMEAC, a very similar set of criteria was given by Jesuit Father Joseph Gelineau in his 1962 book *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*:

When it is known what conditions each sung item has to fulfill within Christian worship then — but only then — it becomes possible to judge whether any particular musical work is or is not fitted for use in divine service. The criteria which derive from the functional role of singing in the liturgical action, and which must be applied to particular works or general categories of music, may be reduced to four.

1) The *canonical* criterion, according to which a melody is obligatory, recommended, permitted, tolerated, or excluded.

2) The *ritual* criterion, according to which a melody must conform to the person or persons appointed to sing it, to the literary text and its specific form, and to the musical genre which results from this.

3) The *pastoral* criterion, according to which a melody must correspond to the living musical idiom and religious sentiment of the community which is at worship.

4) The *esthetic* criterion, according to which its musical performance is judged to be beautiful, artistic and a worthy sign of the sacred.<sup>2</sup>

Note that Father Gelineau specifies that these criteria derive from the “functional role of singing.” The “canonical” judgment refers mainly to the fact that certain melodies were officially assigned to Latin texts that were to be sung in the High Mass — i.e., parts of the Mass, such as the Preface and the Lord’s Prayer were to be sung in Latin to specific melodies given in the Missal.

The 1967 Vatican document *Musicam Sacram* had specified that for vernacular texts “new melodies to be used by the priests and ministers must be approved by the competent territorial authority” (MS 57). This requirement seems to have been almost entirely ignored, however, by PMEAC’s writers, as is Father Gelineau’s “canonical criterion.”

Father Gelineau’s “esthetic criterion” becomes the “musi-

cal judgment” in PMEAC. Unlike PMEAC, Gelineau does mention the sacred aspect of the music, although in his view this aspect is in the *performance* rather than in the text or the music itself. The word “sacred” appears nowhere in PMEAC. Both lists assign essentially the same meaning to the term “pastoral.”

What PMEAC calls the “liturgical” judgment Father Gelineau calls “ritual” judgment, but the definitions are almost identical.

#### “Ritual” vs. “sacred” music

The use of the word “ritual” is worth noting. It is the word preferred today by *Universa Laus* (UL), the group of liturgical musicians that Gelineau helped to found (see Part II). Others who advocate a functional approach to liturgical music adopt it as well. In fact, a recent study emphasizes the change in terminology as characteristic of the change in the twentieth-century understanding of music for Catholic worship. This 1997 study, by liturgist and composer Father J. Michael Joncas, is called “From Sacred Song to Ritual Music.”

“Music in Christian Celebration,” the 1980 document of *Universa Laus* that explained its basic principles, said:

Common expressions such as “sacred music,” “religious music,” or “church music” have broad and rather nebulous meanings which do not necessarily relate to the liturgy at all. Even the expression “liturgical music” (in the United States “musical liturgy”) may not be precise enough to denote the unique relationship between liturgy and music that we are talking about here. Throughout the remainder of this document, therefore, we shall use the expression “(Christian) ritual music.”

We understand “ritual music” to mean any vocal or instrumental practice which, in the context of celebration, diverges from the usual forms of the spoken word on the one hand and ordinary sounds on the other.<sup>3</sup>

It is hard to imagine a definition more broad and nebulous than this.

The advocates of “ritual music” enthusiastically promote the “threefold judgment” outlined in PMEAC, which stresses a liturgical or ritual *function*, eliminating all reference to the *sacred*, to the *sacred* nature of Catholic “ritual.” Thus there is no basis for distinguishing sacred from secular music. This is admitted by advocates of “ritual” music.

The largest organization of Catholic church musicians in the US is the National Association of Pastoral Musicians (NPM), founded in 1976. It apparently has no official affiliation with *Universa Laus*, but it shares UL’s basic approach. Father Virgil Funk, a priest of the diocese of Richmond, and founder and first president of the NPM, compared the positions of the organizations *Consociatio Musicae Sacrae* (CIMS) and *Universa Laus* in his 1998 article “Secular Music in the Liturgy: Are there any Rules?”<sup>4</sup>

CIMS uses the term *musica sacra*, to describe worship music. The opposite of sacred music is secular or profane music.... So, for CIMS, the use of secular music is a fundamental violation of the very definition of what worship music is, namely sacred.<sup>5</sup>

Universa Laus, on the other hand, avoided the term sacred (which had been used in all the documents on music of the Holy See, the Second Vatican Council, and the official documents implementing it), coining the new term “Christian ritual music.” As Father Funk describes it, the key distinction between “sacred” and “ritual” is that the latter term is limited to the function of the music, without regard for the music’s intrinsic capacity for expressing religious attitudes and beliefs:

While it is not possible to draw all the comparisons between sacred music and Christian ritual music, for our purposes it is essential to notice how the shift in language results in a shift in understanding of the music from the culture. The opposite of ritual music is non-ritual music, music which does not have a ritual function or does not function in a ritual manner or context. Therefore, for UL, secular music is neither excluded or included as liturgical music; *all music is judged by whether it functions as ritual music.*<sup>6</sup>

### Sacred music “deforms” liturgy

We have seen that P MEC says that the judgment that Gregorian chant is good music “says nothing about whether and *how it is to be used* in this celebration” (P MEC III C 3 — emphasis added). If we combine this with opinions, such as Father Funk’s, that secular music can serve a ritual function in the liturgy, it is not surprising that the music at Mass in a typical parish is often of a secular style. It is this combination that also leads musicians to declare that traditional Catholic sacred music is actually *unsuitable* for use in the (reformed) liturgy. This conclusion is not original to P MEC, however.

Consider Father Gelineau’s evaluation of the liturgical appropriateness of polyphonic Masses:

Something more than mere material respect for the text and literary forms is required. The singing, in its form, must also fulfill the *ritual function* for which it is composed. The great polyphonic or symphonic compositions have not always been satisfactory from this point of view. In particular the works classified as “Masses,” which treat the five parts of the Ordinary as five movements of a single cyclic composition, raise a question to which we must return later. In style and inspiration a Palestrinian “Mass” is instinct with the sacred character, and this music, as Pius XI said, is “moulded by Christian wisdom”; but its musical forms, inspired by the liturgical and musical fashions of the sixteenth century, correspond rather imperfectly with the authentic ritual functions of the Mass chants. As the great symphonic compositions of later date, such as the *Missa solemnis* of Beethoven, they are rightly preserved today as achievements of religious music to be sung only apart from the liturgy, because their use at the actual celebration of Mass completely deforms the normal course of the ritual action.<sup>7</sup>

This quote, from Father Gelineau’s *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*, gives the same extremely negative evaluation of the heritage of sacred music as does P MEC (II B3). Again, it is evident that his evaluation of polyphonic musical settings of the Mass is based on their alleged failure to fulfill a proper “ritual function.” Note that while *Musicam Sacram* (MS) speaks of a song’s “*meaning and proper nature*,” P MEC speaks

of its “specific nature and *function*” (emphasis added.) Note that this shift to evaluating music in terms of its function supplies the “bridge” between MS §6 and P MEC §II B3 that we noted was missing on p. 18.

### Law of functionalism

Father Gelineau states that certain “functional laws” must be observed in judging the appropriateness of musical compositions for the liturgy. These functional laws are not derived from any liturgical documents of the Holy See; in fact, they sometimes lead to recommendations that are directly contrary to official norms. Father Gelineau insists that one must start with the rites themselves and study how they are celebrated:

One must first know what the Church intends as regards each item designed to be sung as part of her ritual, even when her written law specifies no details.<sup>8</sup>

But where does one find the Church’s intention if not in her written laws? Father Gelineau finds this in what he contends was the liturgical practice of the earliest Christian centuries. But documentary evidence for the music used in the liturgy during this period is very sparse. Even the melodies used are a matter of conjecture, since an exact musical notation was not developed until about the eleventh century. This does not deter Father Gelineau, however. He repeatedly states that the early Christians sang simple refrains to the verses of Psalms sung by a psalmist (cantor) who improvised elaborate melodies.

### Historical reconstruction

Other historians agree that such a method was probably followed for the chanting of the psalm between the readings and for the Communion chant. However Father Gelineau implies that this format was characteristic of the Introit and Offertory as well, and that the forms of these chants as they appear in official chant books resulted from a “radical transformation”<sup>9</sup> of earlier forms. The new forms, he insists, were developed by trained singers in choirs whose role “has progressively invaded the rites to the detriment of the people’s part in them.”<sup>10</sup>

Other historians give a different account of the history of the Introit. Monsignor Higinì Anglès, president of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome, asserts that

The Introit, as an antiphonic chant in the Mass, was introduced to Rome between 431 and the first half of the VI century. The congregation never took part in it.<sup>11</sup>

In a frequently cited history of Gregorian chant, Professor Peter Wagner concurs. He says that the earliest evidence of the existence of the Introit is in a *Liber Pontificalis* of Pope Celestine I (5<sup>th</sup> century) and concludes:

The introduction by Pope Celestine I of antiphonal chanting for the Introit of the Mass presupposes a choir of instructed singers.<sup>12</sup>

He does not see this as an “invasion,” but as a normal response to a changing situation. He points out that singing in the early centuries, when the Church was persecuted, was probably

limited out of necessity.

However, this did not always remain the case: as soon as circumstances allowed, the musical art was admitted into the sanctuary. The century which created the great basilicas also inaugurated an artistic development of the liturgical chant.<sup>13</sup>

In fact he sees the development of artistic chant as natural:

Apart from everything else, it would have been very strange if the Church, after her liberation and while enjoying the protection of the secular power, had not outgrown the simpler forms of chant which had only been a necessity as long as she was obliged to be content with a hidden existence. Church music could not stop at this point, when all the other arts prepared to offer the best that they had to the God of the Christians.<sup>14</sup>

Gelineau, in his discussion of the Introit, asserts:

By its nature this psalmody is the concern of the whole assembly: verses to be recited by a psalmist and refrain to be sung by all.<sup>15</sup>

Yet he asks a number of questions in a footnote: whether the original form of the Introit had a short refrain for the people or a long one for the choir, whether it was sung alternately by two choirs, or even whether the Introit was originally a psalm. He concludes: "We cannot answer any of these questions with certainty."<sup>16</sup> Gelineau rejects the known form of the Introit as a "radical transformation" of the original form, yet by his own account, its original form is not known. His opinions about the nature of the Introit appear to be based largely on his own preference for the form he himself used in setting the psalms to music in the 1950s.

The dangers of this kind of reconstruction of history were pointed out by another liturgical scholar, Oratorian Father Louis Bouyer. Father Bouyer, a theologian, had also done historical research in the liturgy, and he believed a reformation of the liturgy must be based on the internal nature of the liturgy. He did not think, however, that this could be achieved by resorting to reconstructing the liturgy of early periods:

For no reconstructions of the past — however excellent the period one chooses to try to bring to life — can be achieved without a large admixture of the products of one's own fancy; and such reconstructions are likely to raise more problems than they can solve.<sup>17</sup>

### Functionalism in postconciliar practice

Indeed, we have more than thirty years' experience of the problems raised by Gelineau's "reconstruction" of the pristine Roman Rite. The "functional laws" promoted by Gelineau and *Universa Laus* seem to be the primary influence on the development of the *Graduale Simplex* and documents such as PMEC. Their application often led to recommendations (frequently interpreted as rules) that not only specify details not contained in the law, but which in many cases *contradict* specifications that *are* in the written documents.

Much of the treasury of sacred music was rejected on the grounds that it did not satisfy these functionalist laws.

This functionalist approach often led to the use of music for Mass chosen by a "liturgy planner" in place of the authorized sung texts of the Mass. The songs chosen were frequently secular songs or secular-style works newly composed for folk Masses. Thus, in practice, a musical pattern contrary to the directives of the Constitution on the Liturgy and *Musicam Sacram* was established for the "new" liturgy — even before the actual revised rite of Mass was published in 1969.

The replacement of the traditional texts and music was greatly advanced by official diocesan decrees requiring the use of only English in the Mass, and by the general perception that the Council mandated replacing Latin with the vernacular.

This approach to worship music was promoted by agencies of the bishops' conference, many unofficial liturgical groups, and, especially, publishers, who had a financial interest in promoting constantly changing new music. The advocates of functionalism, however, attribute its triumph to other factors.

### Acoustics and the "cultural ear"

Father Virgil Funk analyzes the change in the character of music at Mass since the Council in terms of the acoustics of the sort of modern churches often built since (and even before) the Council. These "draw sanctuary and assembly space together." To make spoken words more intelligible, they employ sound systems and "modern acoustical techniques that deaden reverberation with acoustical tile and carpets." This makes it possible for a preacher "to create a sense of intimacy with the assembly" but the assembly's song is weakened since they cannot hear themselves sing.<sup>18</sup>

According to Funk, in the ten or fifteen years after the Council it became clear that in this environment

the overtones of Gregorian chant and the extended chords of traditional polyphony did not have the desired effect on the assembly's ears. It is my opinion that the people who chose to build such worship centers did so not because they were trying to exclude musical environments supportive of chant and polyphony, but because they were trying to draw the presider and assembly closer ... or reflect a perceived new theology of incarnation. It can be argued, however, that chant and the musical treasury are not in the cultural ear of the typical American assembly as they are in a German assembly. American musicians discovered this musical truth through pastoral practice.<sup>19</sup>

Father Funk seems to suggest here that musicians actually tried to introduce chant and polyphony at Mass in the years after the Council, but their efforts failed.

Even if his views about the unsuitable acoustics and the defective "cultural ear" of American Catholics were true, this explanation for the disappearance of chant does not persuade. In fact, the number of parishes that had maintained chant and polyphony for ten years following the Council is minuscule. Any parish that did maintain this music — despite the negative attitude toward Latin and the downgrading of the sung parts of the Mass in such documents as PMEC — would hardly be

likely to drop it because of acoustics. Furthermore, traditional music fared no better in the thousands of Gothic or Romanesque-style churches that presumably had excellent acoustics for singing chant and polyphonic music.

Father Funk's "historical reconstruction" of postconciliar developments in music is inconsistent with his own observation, a few paragraphs later, that popular secular music was already used in worship during the 1960s. It also suggests that the abandonment of chant was a peculiarly American phenomenon, which it was not.

Even in Germany, where Father Funk contends that Gregorian chant *is* in the "cultural ear," its replacement by other styles of music was common enough by 1965 to concern Cardinal Joseph Frings of Cologne.

The cardinal, noting the disappearance of Gregorian chant and polyphony in many parishes, issued a decree urging their continued use. He noted that the requirements for sacred music given by Pope Pius X were still mandatory, and added:

Spirituals and similar songs, including popular hit tunes, jazz and the like ... do not fulfill the requirements laid down for liturgical music, and hence are not suitable for use at Holy Mass.<sup>20</sup>

The situation was similar in France, where two associations concerned with sacred music published a statement noting that Gregorian chant and polyphony were being abandoned:

Even more, in those places where it would be possible to preserve these treasures, pressure has been brought to bear on those in charge to abandon them, in spite of the fact that many of the faithful, even the more humble, are attached to them.<sup>21</sup>

Despite the preference for chant in the French "cultural ear," then, choirs were disbanded and organists dismissed. The statement also says:

It seems that a vandalism, which would never consider the demolition of a cathedral or other religious art treasures, is attacking indiscriminately the masterpieces of sacred music.<sup>22</sup>

This last statement points to a connection between the functionalist approach to music and modernist architecture, which goes deeper than acoustics. Ten years after P MEC was issued, a "companion document," *Environment and Art in Catholic Worship*, would apply the same functionalist approach to sacred art and architecture.

### **"Functional" environment and art**

Shortly after P MEC was written, the Music Advisory Board ceased to exist. A new organization was formed in 1969, the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions (FDLC). This group, whose members are officials of diocesan worship offices, is officially recognized by the BCL, and two of its officers are *ex officio* advisors to the committee. A music committee of this group revised P MEC, and their revision was issued in 1972 as "Music in Catholic Worship" (MCW). Like P MEC, this is a statement of the BCL only, and was not presented for a vote of the entire conference. As was the case with P MEC, MCW is

usually presented as if its provisions were liturgical law, though it is only a committee statement. MCW retains the threefold judgment and P MEC's assertions that all but a few specified parts of the Mass are "secondary." A new edition of this document, revised mainly for "inclusive" language, was issued in 1983.

The FDLC was also instrumental in the writing of "Environment and Art in Catholic Worship" (EACW), the document on liturgical art and architecture that shares the functionalist philosophy of its companion music documents. Like the documents on music, it was a statement of the BCL only, not voted on by the entire conference.

Like P MEC, EACW expresses negative views about the art of the past: "Many local churches must use spaces designed and built in a former period, spaces which may now be unsuitable for the liturgy." (EACW §43)

EACW insists that the church must be designed taking into account the community's "self-image," but there is no insistence that modern churches correspond to a cultural preference of the community: "A good architect will possess ... sufficient integrity not to allow the community's design taste or preference to limit the freedom necessary for a creative design." (EACW §47)

The documents reveal striking parallels:

P MEC stresses the *ritual function* of music; and EACW says that appropriate liturgical art "must clearly serve (and not interrupt) *ritual action* which has its own structure." (EACW §21)

P MEC was used to discourage traditional liturgical music; and EACW was invoked to enforce a modernist, functionalist architecture in new churches, and to require radical renovation of older ones. These renovations often resulted in the very sort of vandalism that the French musicians quoted above thought would never be tolerated.

But such "vandalism" follows necessarily from UL's views of the nature of the liturgy, which they claim is that of Vatican II. The commentary published with the 1980 UL statement of its principles contrasts two approaches to liturgy.

If there is a preoccupation with worship to be rendered to God, priority will be given to everything that favors this particular dimension: "stretched out" architecture; very high churches; remote and hidden altars ... ministers turning their backs to the people; minimal or even non-existent interpersonal relationships. In this context, an unreal ethereal kind of music is naturally preferred ... the text may not be understandable ... but ... in this way the image of a majestic, remote, and inaccessible God is projected.

On the contrary, if one's first thought is of the assembly, if theology sensitizes Christians to the presence of God in the midst of God's gathered people and to the fact that God comes among us, then the results will certainly be very different, and in several different areas: churches centered around the altar ... the presiding celebrant turned toward the assembly and looking at the gathered people in order to speak to them in their own tongue and to enable them to see ritual gestures; insistence on relationships within the group.... And quite naturally this conception of liturgy will use dialogue forms, communal singing, unison music, and unanimous acclamations....

In reacting against the excesses inherited from previous centuries, Vatican II has resolutely turned us toward the second option. This theological concept of a God present in his people is properly Christian, whereas the first image — the remote God — can be found in any religion.<sup>23</sup>

### From Broadway to the sanctuary

The functionalist approach is destructive to traditional music and art because it is essentially a secularizing approach. Some considered the use of popular music at Mass to be functional, while traditional chant and polyphony, as well as statues and other art work, were considered unsuitable “distractions.” Funk insists, however, that the popular secular music of the 1960s used in worship shortly after the Council was also “unacceptable to the cultural ear of the worshippers.” Though specific songs were dropped, the style was not:

As a result of what we learned soon after the Council, a second group of composers began to develop music that was heavily influenced by the secular culture but whose popular musical “codes” were more subtly hidden from the cultural ear by arrangement, harmony, or performance technique. When a composer was able to create music that the assembly did not recognize as blatantly drawn from the secular culture, but was nevertheless music that charmed its cultural ear, the assembly began to sing such music readily and with enthusiasm.

...  
In the United States, a group of composers has attempted to use musical techniques drawn from the popular culture, e.g., Broadway, but these composers mask the secular codes in such a way that their sources are not recognizable by the listener.<sup>24</sup>

A footnote to this passage names Father J. Michael Joncas, Marty Haugen, and Christopher Walker as composers who have stated “that they deliberately encode their music with contemporary codes from Broadway show tunes.”<sup>25</sup>

Ironically, many musicians who produce music “coded to Broadway” for use in the Mass also reject chant or sacred polyphony, arguing that these musical forms are based on an entertainment model of liturgy. In their view only a trained choir can “perform” polyphony and the more elaborate chants, thus excluding the people’s participation.

Father Funk believes that if secular music *functions* within the liturgy as ritual music, it ceases to be secular and *becomes* ritual music:

Likewise, if music such as chant and music from the sacred treasury can function as ritual music, then they are no longer sacred music but ritual music.<sup>26</sup>

This last statement turns the idea of sacred music on its head, since its corollary is that the only part of the treasury of sacred music that, in Funk’s terms, can really be called sacred is that which is *unsuitable* for use in the liturgy.

### The Roman Rite: “It is gone.”

Another characteristic of functionalism is a rigid emphasis on the use of the vernacular, on the grounds of intelligibility.

In the opinion of the dominant school of liturgists, even the simplest texts, such as the *Kyrie* or *Agnus Dei*, had to be sung or said in English. Such an emphasis led to the replacement of most official texts with substitutes.

The resulting change in texts and music led to the perception that there was a great gulf between the “Old Mass” and the new. Not only ordinary worshippers had this impression. Prominent liturgists concurred. Father Gelineau, whose *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship* strongly influenced details of the change in liturgical music, wrote in 1978:

Let’s make no mistake: translating does not mean saying the same thing in equivalent words. It changes the form.... If the form changes, the rite changes. If one element changes the total meaning changes. Think back, if you remember it, to the Latin sung High Mass with Gregorian chant. Compare it with the modern Post-Vatican II Mass. It is not only the words, but also the tunes and even certain actions that are different. In fact it is a different liturgy of the Mass. We must say it plainly: the Roman rite as we knew it exists no more. It is gone.<sup>27</sup>

Gelineau’s 1962 book outlined “functional laws,” which, in his view, summarized what the Church intended as music suited to the nature of the Roman Rite.

Father Gelineau apparently wished to recapture a pristine rite unencumbered by what he saw as musical accretions and “art for art’s sake.” However, when his own prescriptions were followed after the Council, he perceives in the result not a *re-capturing*, but an *abandonment* of the Roman Rite. When provisions contrary to those of the Council are put into effect, clearly the result will be contrary to the Council’s intentions. Instead of organic growth and true renewal, they produce merely a new set of accretions, obscuring the Roman Rite.

The abandonment of the Roman Rite was by no means the intention of the Council. Recent documents issued by the Holy See make this very clear.

The revised edition of the General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM) reemphasizes several traditional practices. The Fifth Instruction for the Right Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, *Liturgiam authenticam*, decrees that “the greatest care is to be taken to maintain the identity and unitary expression of the Roman Rite” and “envisions ... a new era of liturgical renewal ... which safeguards also the faith and the unity of the whole Church of God.” Both the GIRM and *Liturgiam authenticam* contain sections on music.

These documents will undoubtedly influence the development of Catholic music in the “new era.”

### Notes — Part IV

<sup>1</sup> Msgr. Frederick McManus, *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal* (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1987), p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Gelineau, SJ. *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship: Principles, Laws, Applications* translated by the Rev. Clifford Howell, SJ. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1964), p. 192.

## Part V

(published September 2001)

### Conclusion

**S**weeping changes in the music sung at Mass occurred with alarming speed in the years immediately following the Second Vatican Council.

Even before the final revised texts for Mass became official in 1969, the functionalist (or utilitarian) view — that the liturgy must conform to the contemporary culture in order to “speak to” worshippers in their own idiom — effectively supplanted decades of efforts to restore the patrimony of Catholic music. Thus Gregorian chant and polyphonic choral music, recovered in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and actively promoted by the liturgical movement, nearly all 20<sup>th</sup>-century popes, and the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy, vanished almost overnight.

#### General Instruction of the Roman Missal - 1969

The rubrics (or directions) for celebrating the new Order of Mass were contained in the General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM) published in 1969. The GIRM also provided for adaptations by the national conferences of bishops so that variations in local customs and traditions could be maintained. These included postures and gestures, materials for ceremonial vessels, vestments and furnishings, and musical styles, instruments and texts.

The GIRM’s directions concerning the sung parts of the Mass, like the Constitution on the Liturgy and the 1967 document *Musicam Sacram* (MS), more closely resembled practices advocated by the earlier 20<sup>th</sup>-century popes than what had actually developed in Church music immediately following the Council.

The levels of importance of sung music at Mass found in *Musicam Sacram*<sup>1</sup> appeared in GIRM §19. These directives said that the most important parts to sing are those sung by the priest or ministers with the people responding, or those sung by the priest and people together. The GIRM mentioned singing for all parts of what had been known as the Proper (texts that change with the day or feast) and the Ordinary (unchanging texts) of the Mass. It urged that the faithful should know how to chant at least parts of the Ordinary in Latin, especially the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer.

In contrast to the pre-conciliar practice, the GIRM permitted substitutes for the prescribed text of the Proper of the Mass if it was to be sung. For example,

The entrance song is sung alternately either by the choir and the congregation or by the cantor and the congregation; or it is sung entirely by the congregation or by the choir alone. The antiphon and Psalm of the *Graduale Romanum* or the Simple Gradual may be used, or another song that is suited to this part of the Mass, the day, or the seasons and that has a text approved by the Conference of bishops (GIRM §26 — emphasis added).

<sup>3</sup> §§1.3-1.4 of the 1980 *Universa Laus* document “Music in Christian Celebration.” The original document was written in French and published in the French liturgical journal *Maison Dieu* 145 (1981), pp. 7-23. An English translation and commentary was published as Claude Duchesneau and Michel Veuthey *Music and Liturgy: The Universa Laus Document and Commentary*, translated by Paul Inwood (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1992). Quoted passage on pp. 15-16.

<sup>4</sup> Fr. Virgil C. Funk, “Secular Music in the Liturgy: Are There Any Rules?” in *Studia Liturgica* 28 (1998), pp. 177-93.

<sup>5</sup> Funk, *Studia Liturgica* 28, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup> Funk, *Studia Liturgica* 28, p. 181. (emphasis added)

<sup>7</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 110

<sup>8</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 11.

<sup>9</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 87.

<sup>10</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments* and *Instruments*, p. 88.

<sup>11</sup> Monsignor Higini Anglès, commentary in *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, Vol. IV, p. 35.

<sup>12</sup> Peter Wagner, Ph.D., *Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies: Part I Origin and development of the forms of the Liturgical Chant up to the end of the Middle Ages*. Translated by Agnes Orme and E.G.P. Wyatt (London: The Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society, 1901), p. 7.

<sup>13</sup> Wagner, p. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Wagner, p. 26.

<sup>15</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 168.

<sup>16</sup> Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments*, p. 168, footnote 357.

<sup>17</sup> Louis Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955), p. 12.

<sup>18</sup> Funk, “Secular Music in the Liturgy: Are There Any Rules?” in *Finding Voice to Give God Praise: Essays in the Many Languages of the Liturgy*, edited by Kathleen Hughes, RSCJ (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), p. 46.

<sup>19</sup> Funk, in *Finding Voice to Give God Praise*, p. 47.

<sup>20</sup> An English translation of Cardinal Fring’s June 24, 1965 decree appears in *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium Special Edition*, 1965, pp. 11-12.

<sup>21</sup> “Association for Choirs and French Liturgical Organists statement sent to the French hierarchy” in *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium* Vol. IV, No. 1 (Spring 1967) p. 11.

<sup>22</sup> *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium* (Spring 1967), p. 10.

<sup>23</sup> *Music and Liturgy: The Universa Laus Document and Commentary* by Claude Duchesneau and Michel Veuthey, translated by Paul Inwood (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1992), pp. 54-55.

<sup>24</sup> Funk, in *Finding Voice to Give God Praise*, p. 48.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57, note 33.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>27</sup> Joseph Gelineau, *The Liturgy Today and Tomorrow* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), p. 11.

The GIRM uses almost identical wording about the Offertory (§50) and Communion (§56i) songs.

Even before the Council an entrance hymn was sometimes sung at low Mass, although it did not eliminate the *Introit*, which would still be recited. But according to GIRM §26, an “entrance song” replaces the *Introit*, so that this hymn becomes, in effect, part of the Proper of Mass. It also suggests that whatever is sung as part of the Proper of the Mass will have specific prescribed texts: if not from the *Graduale Romanum* (Gregorian settings of Latin texts) or the *Simple Gradual*, then one approved by the bishops’ conference.

This is not the first reference in a liturgical document to substitutes for the texts of the Proper. *Musicam Sacram* had said:

The custom legitimately in use in certain places and widely confirmed by indults, of substituting other songs for the songs given in the *Graduale* for the Entrance, Offertory and Communion, can be retained according to the judgment of the competent territorial authority, as long as songs of this sort are in keeping with the parts of the Mass, with the feast or with the liturgical season. *It is for the same territorial authority to approve the texts of these songs.* (MS §32 — emphasis added)

### American Adaptations to GIRM

In November 1967 the US bishops’ conference expressly proposed substituting other hymns or sacred songs for the *Introit*, Offertory, and Communion chants. The Holy See’s approval, however, was deferred because: “A decision for the universal Church is being awaited, given the discussion of this matter in the Synod of Bishops”<sup>2</sup> held a few weeks earlier.

It is not clear that this proposal was specifically approved, but one of the items the US Conference voted for the following year seems essentially equivalent to it. These 1968 “action items” included acceptance of a translation of the Simple Gradual,<sup>3</sup> in addition to approval of:

other collections of Psalms and antiphons in English ... as supplements to the *Simple Gradual*, for liturgical use in the dioceses of the United States, including Psalms arranged in responsorial form, metrical and similar versions of Psalms, provided they are used in accordance with the principles of the Simple Gradual and are selected in harmony with the liturgical season, feast, or occasion.<sup>4</sup>

The next year, the conference approved the first set of American Adaptations to the GIRM. The *BCL* [Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy] *Newsletter* reported that at the November 1969 meeting the National Conference of Catholic Bishops:

made various decisions concerning liturgical matters which had been specified in the new liturgical rites as within the competence of episcopal conferences. Other decisions not reported here, have been submitted to the Holy See for its action, and the approval of English translations also awaits confirmation from the Holy See. (*BCL Newsletter*, December 1969, p. 207)

This account lists proposals that were announced at the end

of the November 1969 meeting, but it is not clear whether these proposals were submitted to the Holy See for approval, or only the “other decisions not reported here.”

Several of the bishops’ 1969 proposals concern musical parts of the Mass, specifically, “criteria for the approbation of substitute texts for the processional chants, in accord with no. 26, 50, 56 of the General Instruction.” For example,

The entrance rite should create an *atmosphere* of celebration. .It serves the *function* of putting the assembly in the proper *frame of mind* for listening to the word of God. It helps people to *become conscious of themselves* as a worshipping community. The choice of texts for the entrance song should not conflict with these purposes.<sup>5</sup> (emphasis added)

The purpose of the entrance song had already been given in GIRM §25:

The purpose of this song is to open the celebration, intensify the unity of the gathered people, lead their thoughts to the mystery of the season or feast, and accompany the procession of priest and ministers.

What was the objective of adding different criteria in the “American Adaptation” of GIRM §26?

### Functionalism and flexibility

While GIRM §25 gives straightforward liturgical purposes for the entrance song, the American Adaptation speaks of “function,” introducing the nebulous goals of creating atmosphere, inducing a “frame of mind” and self-consciousness in the gathering.

The Adaptation of GIRM §26 is a functionalist reinterpretation of the purpose of the entrance song in GIRM §25. It is taken verbatim from the 1967 document of the Music Advisory Board of the BCL, *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* (PMEC).<sup>6</sup>

The official adaptations in the GIRM Appendix for the Dioceses of the United States combined the 1968 and 1969 proposals. “Other collections” of antiphons and songs were permitted (1968 proposal), but no texts were approved. The only guide for choosing alternates was the vague functionalist criteria in the description of the *Introit* (1969), and that alternates were to be “used in accordance with the Principles of the *Simple Gradual*.” (1968)

But what are these principles?

The Simple Gradual was intended to provide simple, authentic chant settings for the Proper antiphons of the Mass.<sup>7</sup> The original version used Latin texts. When the texts were translated into English, however, new music was composed to suit the texts. Thus the original purpose of making chant accessible was subverted.

Commenting on the *Simple Gradual* even before it was published, Monsignor Frederick McManus, director of the BCL secretariat, said that its primary significance was that “the first alternative to the proper chants of the Roman gradual is officially provided, and *the door thus opened to greater diver-*

sity and adaptation”<sup>8</sup> (emphasis added.) He views the “principles of the *Simple Gradual*” as allowing almost any alternative to chant.

In 1969, Monsignor McManus, writing in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, interpreted the GIRM as even more permissive. He said of GIRM §26:

The most important development in the *Introit* is the canonization of what has already become common practice, namely, the substitution of a popular hymn or other sacred song for the assigned *Introit* antiphon and Psalm of the Roman Missal as well as for the other processional chants....

The reference in the revised order to “other song” opens the door as wide as may be and creates the first of many instances where priests, consulting with others, are responsible for sound choices of texts suited for Mass.<sup>9</sup>

Elsewhere in the same commentary Monsignor McManus explains why he thinks such alternatives are important. The “present rigidity of the Roman liturgy,” he says, must be overcome:

The real official inflexibility lies in the texts themselves, in the official language, in the demand that, with few exceptions like the prayer of the faithful, an appointed text be adhered to.<sup>10</sup>

What texts, then, are suitable alternatives? McManus urged the study of P MEC for guidance in choosing music for the Mass, observing pointedly that “it is hard to recommend” *Musicam Sacram*.

Monsignor McManus had been a *peritus* (expert) on liturgy at the Council, a founding member of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) and director of the US bishops’ liturgy secretariat from its founding in 1965 until 1975. He was a prime influence on compiling the American Adaptations proposed for the GIRM as well as for interpreting and implementing them.

Given his views about the “rigidity” of the texts of the Roman Rite, the result is not surprising. In practice, virtually any song could replace the prescribed texts of the Proper. The music texts were never scrutinized by the bishops’ conference or by any other authoritative body.

The prescribed texts in the approved liturgical books were abandoned. Musicians could compose almost anything in any style and hear it at Mass the next Sunday — or as soon as it was published in a disposable “missalette.” As a consequence, much of what has become “Catholic music” is both theologically and musically dubious (or worse).

Arguably, more than four decades of singing words like “we come to tell our story” and “you and I are the Bread of Life” contributed greatly to the loss of understanding — revealed in several surveys — of the Real Presence and of the Mass as a Sacrifice. The loss of hymns with texts expressing sound Catholic theology undoubtedly compounded this effect. The American Adaptation to GIRM §56i, on the Communion song, states quite bluntly that:

Most Benediction hymns, by reason of their concentration on ado-

ration rather than on Communion, are not acceptable, as indicated in the Instruction on music in the liturgy, no. 36.

The Instruction is *Musicam Sacram*. But MS §36 does not say that hymns expressing adoration are unsuitable as Communion hymns. It says only that *other songs may sometimes be substituted* for the Proper chants at the entrance, Offertory and Communion:

It is not sufficient, however, that these songs be *merely* “Eucharistic” — they must be in keeping with the parts of the Mass, with the feast, or with the liturgical season (MS §36 - emphasis added.)

It does not say that hymns may *not* be Eucharistic, only that this is not the sole criteria for selection.

The restriction in the American Adaptation, then, does not come from *Musicam Sacram* at all, but from P MEC (section IV b 2c 3).

The psalm between the readings (the Responsorial Psalm or Gradual) is treated differently from the processional chants. For this, GIRM §36 specifies that a cantor sing the verses of the psalm, while the people listen. “As a rule” the people sing the response. It further specifies:

The Psalm when sung may be either the Psalm assigned in the Lectionary or the gradual from the *Graduale Romanum* or the responsorial Psalm or the Psalm with *Alleluia* as the response from the *Simple Gradual* in the form they have in those books.

No provision is made here for substitute texts. Nevertheless, the US bishops’ conference added an Adaptation for GIRM §36 as well, which allowed the use of other collections of psalms and antiphons in English as supplements to the *Simple Gradual*. In practice, this provision led to the use of songs “based on” a psalm — often very loosely.

One translation of the psalms approved for liturgical use in the US is the 1963 version of the “Grail Psalter.” An “inclusive language” revision of the original version was proposed to the bishops in 1983, but it failed to get the requisite two-thirds vote.

In his commentary on the rejection of revised Grail Psalter, however, Monsignor McManus said that, even if it could not be *read* during the liturgy, it could still be used:

the new version may well be used at the Eucharistic celebration as a substitute for the appointed texts of the entrance and communion processions — along with hymns and various responsorial songs, which are rather freely chosen.<sup>11</sup>

He said that if the Responsorial Psalm is sung, other collections of Psalms may be used, and that this is “a qualification clearly satisfied by the Grail Psalter in revised as well as unrevised versions.”<sup>12</sup>

Thus, according to McManus, at that time arguably the most influential liturgist in the world, even texts specifically rejected for use in the Liturgy may in fact be used in the Liturgy. As long as the words are sung, anything goes.

### Missing chant — the pope ignored

Though substitutes for the Proper are allowed, neither the 1969 GIRM nor the American Adaptations mention alternatives to the chants for the Ordinary of the Mass. While liturgists generally emphasized that the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* should be sung (in English) they discouraged singing the *Kyrie*, the *Gloria*, and the *Credo*. (The opening rite of Mass that includes both the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* was referred to as “our cluttered vestibule.”)

Latin, considered hopelessly irrelevant by those who directed the liturgical reform following the Council, disappeared almost instantly.

As a result, few Catholics would be able to fulfill the Council’s intent that “the faithful are able to say or chant together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.” (SC §54)

Pope Paul VI was so concerned about this deficiency that in 1974 he sent to every bishop in the world a copy of *Jubilate Deo*, a booklet of the simplest settings of Gregorian chants of the Mass. The booklet was accompanied by the following request:

Would you therefore, in collaboration with the competent diocesan and national agencies for the liturgy, sacred music and catechetics, decide on the best ways of teaching the faithful the Latin chants of *Jubilate Deo* and of having them sing them, and also of promoting the preservation and execution of Gregorian chant in the communities mentioned above. You will thus be performing a new service for the Church in the domain of liturgical renewal.<sup>13</sup>

Despite this explicit request from the Holy Father to the bishops, these chants are still unknown to most Catholics. Influential liturgists evidently hoped this “buried treasure” of sacred music would stay buried.

### ICEL — more revisions proposed

The International Commission on English in the Liturgy’s controversial 1994 revision of the Roman Missal (Sacramentary) proposed radical restructuring of the entrance rites and other changes that would further diminish the importance of the ancient chants of the Ordinary of the Mass.

Most liturgists did not conceal their desire to eliminate the chants of the Ordinary of the Mass entirely. For example, Father Edward Foley, OFM Cap., and Sister Mary McGann, RSCJ, declared:

Currently, Mass settings usually include such standard elements as the “Lord, have mercy,” the “Glory to God” and in some cases even a lengthy creed. This continuation of the medieval practice of composing an “ordinary of the Mass” needs to come to an end.<sup>14</sup>

### New Missal and GIRM 2000

The Holy See does not share this view. Although most of ICEL’s proposals were eventually approved by the member conferences and submitted to the Vatican in 1998, they were

rejected by the Holy See in 2002. See [adoremus.org/CDW-ICELtrans.html](http://adoremus.org/CDW-ICELtrans.html) for a detailed explanation on the Holy See’s objections. Recent Vatican documents still favor historic Church music and traditional practices.

The revised General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM), released during the Jubilee Year (July 2000), and forming part of the new Roman Missal, changes very little from the original 1969 edition of the GIRM.

In its sections on music, the GIRM 2000 retains provisions reminiscent of the 1903 *Motu Proprio* of Saint Pius X. For example, §41 prescribes:

The main place should be given, all things being equal, to Gregorian chant, as being proper to the Roman Liturgy. Other kinds of sacred music, in particular polyphony, are in no way excluded, provided that they correspond to the spirit of the liturgical action and that they foster the participation of all the faithful.

Since the faithful from different countries come together ever more frequently, it is desirable that they know how to sing together at least some parts of the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin, especially the Profession of Faith and the Lord’s Prayer, according to the simpler settings.

The *Kyrie* must be said or sung in *all* Masses, unless it is explicitly incorporated into the penitential rite. (§52) The *Gloria* is prescribed for all Sundays outside Advent and Lent, for solemnities and feasts, as well as other solemn celebrations; furthermore, “the text of this hymn is not to be replaced by any other.” (§53)

In the section on the choice of the entrance song is a reference to Pope John Paul II’s 1998 encyclical on the liturgy, *Dies Domini* §50, which says, in part:

It is important to devote attention to the songs used by the assembly, since singing is a particularly apt way to express a joyful heart, accentuating the solemnity of the celebration and fostering the sense of a common faith and a shared love. Care must be taken to ensure the quality, both of the texts and of the melodies, so that what is proposed today as new and creative will conform to liturgical requirements and be worthy of the Church’s tradition which, in the field of sacred music, boasts a priceless heritage.

### New instruction for implementation of the Council’s liturgy constitution

A major document, released in May 2001, *Liturgiam authenticam*, the “Fifth Instruction for the Correct Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council,” deals primarily with translation of the Latin texts of the liturgy into vernacular languages. It is also concerned with liturgical music. For example, it suggests:

Consideration should also be given to including in the vernacular editions at least some texts in the Latin language, especially those from the priceless treasury of Gregorian chant, which the Church recognizes as proper to the Roman liturgy, and which, all other things being equal, is to be given pride of place in liturgical celebrations. Such chant, indeed, has great power to lift the human spirit to heavenly realities. (*Liturgiam authenticam*, §28)

In the years following the Council, the justification for substituting texts for parts of the Mass that are sung — even paraphrasing them — was that this freedom was needed in order to set texts to music. Because of this free-wheeling approach, many official texts of the Mass were rarely heard.

*Liturgiam authenticam* makes it very clear that, although texts should be translated so as to facilitate their being set to music:

Still, in preparing the musical accompaniment, full account must be taken of the *authority of the text itself*... Whether it be a question of the texts of Sacred Scripture or of those taken from the liturgy and already duly confirmed, *paraphrases are not to be substituted* with the intention of making them more easily set to music, nor may hymns considered generically equivalent be employed in their place. (*Liturgiam authenticam*, §60 — emphasis added)

... Hymns and canticles contained in the modern *editiones typicae* constitute a minimal part of the historic treasury of the Latin Church, and it is especially advantageous that they be preserved in the printed vernacular editions.... The texts for singing that are composed originally in the vernacular language would best be drawn from Sacred Scripture or from the liturgical patrimony. (*Liturgiam authenticam*, §61)

One provision, though a departure from recent practice, seems to be a further clarification of GIRM 2000 §390 as it applies to texts for the processional chants:

Sung texts and liturgical hymns have a particular importance and efficacy. Especially on Sunday, the “Day of the Lord,” the singing of the faithful gathered for the celebration of Holy Mass, no less than the prayers, the readings and the homily, express in an authentic way the message of the Liturgy while fostering a sense of common faith and communion in charity. If they are used widely by the faithful, they should remain relatively fixed so that confusion among the people may be avoided. Within five years from the publication of this Instruction, the Conferences of Bishops, necessarily in collaboration with the national and diocesan Commissions and with other experts, shall provide for the publication of a directory or repertory of texts intended for liturgical singing. This document shall be transmitted for the necessary *recognitio* to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. (*Liturgiam authenticam*, §108)

Any “repertory of texts intended for liturgical singing” would presumably include all that are meant to replace the prescribed texts for Proper of the Mass. If all such texts must go through the same approval process as the other liturgical texts, it would insure that all the sung texts will also follow the translation norms of *Liturgiam authenticam*. It would eliminate “inclusivising” hymns and improvising changes, and would ensure that sacred words will be restored to sacred music. This will confirm that music is a truly integral part of the liturgy — and that, since the liturgy is the prayer of the Church, all our liturgical prayers, both recited and sung, must express the faith of the Church.

## American Adaptations 2001

Adaptations to GIRM 2000 were discussed and voted upon at the American bishops’ June 2001 meeting. Those for the musical portions of the Mass are an improvement over the 1969-75 Adaptations, principally because of what has been removed. For example, the section on the *Introit*, or Opening Song in the final form after receiving *recognitio*, says:

This chant is sung alternately by the choir and the people or similarly by a cantor and the people, or entirely by the people, or by the choir alone. In the Dioceses of the United States of America, there are four options for the Entrance Chant: (1) the antiphon from the Missal or the antiphon with its Psalm from the Graduale Romanum, as set to music there or in another setting; (2) the antiphon and Psalm of the Graduale Simplex for the liturgical time; (3) a chant from another collection of Psalms and antiphons, approved by the Conference of Bishops or the Diocesan Bishop, including Psalms arranged in responsorial or metrical forms; (4) another liturgical chant that is suited to the sacred action, the day, or the time of year, similarly approved by the Conference of Bishops or the Diocesan Bishop.

The redefinition of the purpose of this part of the Mass, contained in the 1969 Adaptations, has disappeared. Wording for the other processional chants is similar. The “unsuitability” of adoration texts for the Communion hymn has been removed.

Neither GIRM 2000 nor *Liturgiam authenticam* seems to require review of musical settings of substitutes for the Proper. Only the texts are mentioned. Texts in a traditional style and employing sacral vocabulary lend themselves more readily to a sacred style of music, however. A set of texts that remain “relatively fixed” would allow for the gradual development (or restoration) of a repertoire of sacred music in a variety of styles. This is, after all, how the treasury of sacred music developed in the first place. Texts remained fixed for centuries, but each age contributed its own musical settings.

In November 2006 the USCCB approved a “Directory for Music and the Liturgy” as its response to LA §108. Rather than a list of approved texts the US bishops compiled a set of criteria for evaluation of texts (as they had done in 1969). They left the decision about the suitability of specific texts to the bishop of the place where a particular hymnal is published. As of this writing (March 2013) the Directory has not received the required *recognitio*.

## Art, beauty, and truth

Much of the argument about liturgical music after the Council seems to be caused by the conflict between two very different views of the meaning of the Second Vatican Council and its Constitution on the Liturgy, of the role of music in the Liturgy, and the related question of the meaning of “active participation” (*actuosa participatio*) of the people at Mass.

One view holds that in order for participation in the Mass to be “active,” the people must sing at least part of all the music of the liturgy. This narrow view of “active participation” has led to the suppression of most great Church music. Since most

Gregorian chant and polyphonic music was deemed too difficult for people to sing, its use for Mass was decried as art for art's sake, depriving the people of their right to participate in the liturgy.

It has now become a truism that much contemporary Catholic music is far more difficult for most people to sing than traditional hymnody. Yet the fact that Catholics don't sing it is dismissed as rejection of Vatican II. With no sense of irony, a choir singing the ancient chants of the Church from a choir loft is derided as "performing" for a passive audience, while a contemporary ensemble occupying the center of attention (and often of the Sanctuary) is praised for "enabling" the sung prayer of the community.

An early and influential defense of the functionalist interpretation of the Council's intention for liturgical music was offered in 1966 by Archabbot Rembert Weakland, OSB, then chairman of the Music Advisory Board of the Liturgy Committee. He said that "the treasury of music we are asked to preserve ... were the products of a relationship between liturgy and music that is hard to reconcile with the basic premises of the Constitution itself."<sup>15</sup> He insists "there is no music of a liturgical golden age to which we can turn, because the treasures we have are the product of ages that do not represent an ideal of theological thinking in relationship to liturgy."<sup>16</sup>

This applies to Gregorian chant, despite what the Council said, because, according to the archabbot, "the period when Gregorian chant reached its apogee, although filled with intense Christian faith, is no liturgical model for our days."<sup>17</sup>

Such a view, however, is "hard to reconcile" with the Council's premise that the liturgy is the "font and summit" of the Catholic faith. How could an age that had an inadequate theology of liturgy (and, presumably, a faulty liturgical practice flowing from it) have been "filled with intense Christian faith"? Might this strong faith have been fostered by a particularly *excellent* theory and practice of liturgy — that might also have led to great works of liturgical art, such as Gregorian chant?

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI) saw such a connection:

As a matter of fact, one cannot speak of liturgy without talking about the music of worship. Where liturgy deteriorates, the *musica sacra* also deteriorates, and where liturgy is correctly understood and lived, there good Church music also grows.<sup>18</sup>

The view that the liturgy has no place for art for its own sake is often interpreted to mean simply that the liturgy has no need for transcendent beauty. This is an error. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* treats sacred art mainly in the section on liturgy; but there is an important comment in the chapter on the eighth commandment, §§2500-2503:

Sacred art is true and beautiful when its form corresponds to its particular vocation: evoking and glorifying, in faith and adoration, the transcendent mystery of God — the surpassing invisible beauty of truth and love visible in Christ.... This spiritual beauty of God is reflected in the most holy Virgin Mother of God, the

angels, and saints. Genuine sacred art draws man to adoration, to prayer, and to the love of God, Creator and Savior, the Holy One and Sanctifier.

It is this vocation of sacred music that is overlooked by advocates of "ritual music," so preoccupied with the supposed *function* of individual parts of the liturgy that they ignore the fundamental *purpose* of sacred music. The Catechism strongly recalls the view of Pope Saint Pius X, who said in *Tra le Sollecitudini* that the purpose of sacred music was "the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful." (TLS §1)<sup>19</sup>

It has been more than a century since Pope Saint Pius X's encyclical on the reform of sacred music. During that time there have been other papal documents on the subject, the early liturgical movement, and most important, the Second Vatican Council and the liturgical reform that followed. But has the state of sacred music actually improved since the time of Saint Pius X?

The cultural status of the treasury of sacred music itself has certainly improved. During the past century, the monks of Solesmes have restored books of Gregorian chant, and many new editions of the sacred polyphony of the sixteenth century have been published.

Recordings of both are now widely available — and appreciated by many thousands, young and old, Catholic and non-Catholic. One recording of Gregorian chant even reached the top of the pop charts in the 1990s — to the surprise of everyone and the amazement of Catholic music publishers. Chant, sacred polyphony and Mass settings are frequent features on the programs of major symphony orchestras and choruses. New secular *scholae* are formed regularly, "early music" societies abound, and Protestant choirs offer concert performances of historic Catholic music.

So the treasure that remained buried at the beginning of the century has been unearthed, refurbished and beautifully displayed — but not in ordinary Catholic parishes.

In the Italy of Pope Saint Pius X's day, operatic-style performances impeded the sense of transcendence — of the sacred — in the music at Mass. The combination of show tunes, pop, pseudo-folk, rock, and even cocktail-lounge-style music that pervades our Masses today is hardly an improvement.

For Saint Pius X, the popes who followed him, and the liturgical movement they inspired and fostered, the point of the recovery of this treasure was to restore it to its proper setting — to the Mass, and to Catholics everywhere. Though their efforts brought forth some briefly brilliant fruits through the labors of Father Virgil Michel, Monsignor Martin Hellrigel, Justine Ward, and others, their careful plantings, which promised to be nurtured by the Council, were soon uprooted by the inhospitable liturgical winds that followed.

Gregorian chant has not been restored to the Catholic people — yet. And it is still rare to hear the great works of polyphony in the liturgical setting for which they were com-

posed. But interest in chant and polyphony is growing, especially among younger Catholics. And musicians are now using the latest digital technology to make this ancient music available in new forms to parishes throughout the world.

As the Catechism of the Catholic Church reminds us, the Church needs beauty for the sake of truth. The truths of the Catholic faith — set to beautiful music by all those throughout the ages whose work was inspired by that truth — have made the sacred music of the Roman rite “a treasure of inestimable value” — as the Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy affirmed.<sup>20</sup>

The Council fathers, like the popes both before them and since, intended to praise this treasure, not to bury it.

In 2000 Pope John Paul II, himself a father of the Second Vatican Council, told a Vatican conference on the implementation of Vatican II:

[T]he genuine intention of the Council Fathers must not be lost: indeed, it must be recovered by overcoming biased and partial interpretations.... To interpret the Council on the supposition that it marks a break with the past, when in reality it stands in continuity with the faith of all times, is a definite mistake.<sup>21</sup>

Pope John Paul II finds this continuity also in the Church’s liturgy and sacred music. He stressed this in his address to the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in January 2001.<sup>22</sup> The institute, founded by Saint Pius X, was the most important result of his 1903 directive on Church music, *Tra le Sollecitudini*.

In his address to the musicians, Pope John Paul II spoke of the Second Vatican Council as “continuing the rich liturgical tradition of previous centuries.” The Council, he said, affirmed the necessity of beauty:

The criterion that must inspire every composition and performance of songs and sacred music is the beauty that invites prayer.... “Singing in the liturgy” must flow from “*sentire cum Ecclesia*”.<sup>23</sup> Only in this way do union with God and artistic ability blend in a happy synthesis in which the two elements — song and praise — pervade the entire liturgy.

Far from rejecting the heritage of Catholic music, the Holy Father believed it must be recovered, revitalized. In order to recover this great treasure of the Church, he told the musicians,

You, teachers and students, are asked to make the most of your artistic gifts, maintaining and furthering the study and practice of music and song in the forms and with the instruments privileged by the Second Vatican Council: Gregorian chant, sacred polyphony and the organ. Only in this way will liturgical music worthily fulfill its function during the celebration of the sacraments and, especially, of Holy Mass.

Amen. Let us begin.

## Notes — Part V

<sup>1</sup> See “Buried Treasure” Part II (*AB* April 2001) for a more detailed discussion of *Musicam Sacram*, an Instruction on music for Mass dated March 5, 1967, issued by the Sacred Congregation for Rites (now the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacra-

ments). Copies of MS and many other documents mentioned in this series are available on the Adoremus website: [adoremus.org](http://adoremus.org).

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy *Newsletter*, March 1968 (p. 123). Page numbers for all citations from the *BCL Newsletter* refer to the compilation *35 Years of the BCL Newsletter 1965-2000* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> The translation was provided by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy.

<sup>4</sup> *BCL Newsletter*, February 1969 (p. 167). Page numbers for all citations from the *BCL Newsletter* refer to the compilation *35 Years of the BCL Newsletter 1965-2000* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> *BCL Newsletter*, December 1969 (p. 207).

<sup>6</sup> For a detailed discussion of this document see “Buried Treasure” Part III (*AB* May 2001). “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations” was issued by the BCL in 1967, a few months after *Musicam Sacram*.

<sup>7</sup> See “Buried Treasure” Part II (*AB* April 2001).

<sup>8</sup> Msgr. Frederick McManus, “Sacred Music in the Teaching of the Church” in *Crisis in Church Music?* (Washington, DC: The Liturgical Conference, 1967) p. 20.

<sup>9</sup> McManus, “The New Order of Mass” in *American Ecclesiastical Review* vol. 161. Part I: September 1969, pp. 192-203; Part II: December 1969, pp. 396-409. (Later referenced as: McManus, AER.)

<sup>10</sup> McManus, AER, p. 400.

<sup>11</sup> *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal*, edited with an introduction and commentaries by Frederick R. McManus (Washington, DC: Secretariat Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, NCCB, 1987) p. 248.

<sup>12</sup> McManus, *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal*, p. 248. Ten years later, another proposal to approve the Grail Psalter (Inclusive Language Version) for liturgical use in the dioceses of the United States again failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote of the bishops. An “inclusive language” version of the Psalter and Canticles produced by ICEL in 1994 was forbidden for use in the liturgy by the Holy See in 1996, and its imprimatur was removed in 1998. Because it was still being used for liturgy in some communities, in early 2000 the Congregation for Divine Worship ordered it withdrawn from distribution.

<sup>13</sup> Pope Paul VI, *Voluntati Obsequens*, April 14, 1974.

<sup>14</sup> Edward Foley and Mary McGann, *Music and the Eucharistic Prayer; American Essays in Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1988) p. 47. Father Foley teaches liturgy at the Chicago Theological Union; Sister Mary McGann served on the editorial board for the ICEL Psalter.

<sup>15</sup> Rembert Weakland, OSB, “Music as Art in Liturgy,” an address to a meeting on Church music in Kansas City on November 29, 1966, *Worship* 41 (1967), p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Weakland, p. 6.

<sup>17</sup> Weakland, p. 9.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *A New Song for the Lord: Faith in Christ and Liturgy Today*, Translated by Martha M. Matisich. (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1996) p. 137.

<sup>19</sup> *Tra le sollecitudini* is available on the Adoremus web site ([adoremus.org](http://adoremus.org)), Church Documents section.

<sup>20</sup> *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, §112.

<sup>21</sup> “Vatican II Was Spirit’s Gift to the Church,” Address of Pope John Paul II to a Vatican conference on the implementation of Vatican II, February 27, 2000. *L’Osservatore Romano* (English Edition) March 8, 2000, p. 4.

<sup>22</sup> “Sacred Music Is Integral Part of Liturgy,” address of January 19, 2001, to professors and students of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music for the celebration of the Institute’s 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary. *L’Osser-*

*vatore Romano* February 7, 2001. The complete address is available on the Adoremus website ([adoremus.org](http://adoremus.org)), Church Documents section. All the following quotations are from this address.  
<sup>23</sup> *trans.* feeling or experiencing with the Church.