

A Chronicle of the Reform: Catholic Music in the 20th Century

By Msgr. Richard J. Schuler



Citation: *Cum Angelis Canere: Essays on Sacred Music and Pastoral Liturgy in Honour of Richard J. Schuler*. Robert A. Skeris, ed., St. Paul MN: Catholic Church Music Associates, 1990, Appendix—6, pp. 349-419. Originally published in *Sacred Music* in seven parts.

This study on the history of church music in the United States during the 20th century is an attempt to recount the events that led up to the present state of the art in our times. It covers the span from the *motu proprio Tra le sollicitudini*, of Saint Pius X, through the encyclical *Musicae sacra disciplina* of Pope Pius XII and the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council and the documents that followed upon it. In knowing the course of development, musicians today may build on the accomplishments of the past and so fulfill the directives of the Church.

Part 1: Tra le sollicitudini

The *motu proprio*, *Tra le sollicitudini*, issued by Pope Pius X, November 22, 1903, shortly after he ascended the papal throne, marks the official beginning of the reform of the liturgy that has been so much a part of the life of the Church in this century. The liturgical reform began as a reform of church music. The *motu proprio* was a major document issued for the universal Church. Prior to that time there had been some regulations promulgated by the Holy Father for his Diocese of Rome, and these instructions were imitated in other dioceses by the local bishops. But Pope Pius' *motu proprio* of 1903 inaugurated a movement that would culminate in the action of the Second Vatican Council, which was the first ecumenical council to turn its attention to questions of church music so extensively, and in so doing, place the capstone on the reforms begun nearly a century before.

The *motu proprio* itself was the outcome of several decades of activity and study that had centered chiefly in Germany and France. Two movements flourished along separate but similar paths with the reform of liturgical music as their primary objective. One was the Caecilian movement in the German-speaking lands, centered on Regensburg in Bavaria. The other grew up around the Benedictine monastery at Solesmes in France. Roots of both movements can be traced to the romanticism of the nineteenth century with its interest in the culture of the middle ages including the revival of medieval music. Musicological research and interest in the discipline of history grew up in those years also. Efforts to study and perform Gregorian chant occupied both scholars and practical musicians, leading to the re-publication of the Medicean edition of 1614 (*Gradualein* 1871 and 1873, and *Antiphonalein* 1878) by the German firm of Pustet. Several volumes of chant were issued from the abbey of Solesmes too. An agreement with the Holy See granting Pustet exclusive rights for the sale of the chant books of the Church delayed the publication of the Solesmes editions which finally were adopted as the official texts and printed as the Vatican Edition in the first decade of the twentieth century.

Closely associated with the church music revival in Regensburg were Karl Proske, Franz X. Haberl and Franz X. Witt, founder of the Cecilian Society at Bamberg in 1868. Its journal, *Musica Sacra*, and the famous school of church music in Regensburg became the means of spreading their ideas throughout the German-speaking lands and even into Italy and the United States. Even the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music, founded in Rome in 1911, and Italian musicians such as Licinio Refice, Raffaele Casimiri and Lorenzo Perosi had connections with the Caecilian activity at Regensburg. In the United States the Caecilian ideals were promoted by John B. Singenberger who came to this country at the invitation of Archbishop John Martin Henni of Milwaukee and in 1873 founded the American Society of Saint Caecilia with its publication *Caecilia*.

While the Caecilians were interested in polyphonic music as well as Gregorian chant, the studies of the monks of Solesmes concentrated on chant under the direction of their abbot, Prosper Gueranger, who assigned Dom Paul Jausion and later Dom Joseph Pothier to the task of

reconstructing the ancient melodies from manuscripts that were coming to light through interest in the monuments of the middle ages. Their work ultimately resulted in the Vatican Edition. Connected with its publication was the controversy stirred up between the proponents of the Medicean edition and the new Vatican books, repercussions of which were heard even in the United States and left their imprint, causing a decline in the Caecilian movement. Chant congresses which promoted the singing of the ancient melodies by vast congregations were promoted especially in France. In the United States, the Gregorian congress organized by Justine B. Ward at New York in 1920 was a great impetus in spreading the authentic melodies. It was attended by representatives from Solesmes and musicians from all parts of the world.

Although the Caecilian movement was active for nearly thirty years in the United States, particularly among German-speaking Catholics, the real catalyst for reform of church music in the United States came in 1903 with Pope Pius' *motu proprio*. Action did not begin immediately, but as the Caecilian movement ran into difficulties because of the suppression of the Regensburg Medicean edition of the chant, other efforts developed to carry out the papal instructions. Just before the beginning of World War I, in June 1913, a meeting was held in Baltimore to organize a society that would implement the directives of the *motu proprio*. Father J.M. Petter of Saint Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, New York, with Monsignor Leo P. Manzetti of Saint Mary's Seminary in Baltimore and Nicola A. Montani of Philadelphia invited others to join them, and in the summer of 1914, a larger group of musicians met in Cliff Haven on Lake Champlain to draft the constitution of the Society of Saint Gregory of America. Their publication, *The Catholic Chormaster*, appeared in 1915 with Montani as editor.

Important in the reform were the Catholic music publishing houses. In 1906, McLaughlin and Reilly was established in Boston, joining the older J. Fischer and Bro. of Dayton, Ohio, M.L. Nemmers Co. of Milwaukee and Pustet of Regensburg and Cincinnati. Their cooperation in bringing the compositions of the Caecilians of Europe and this country into print together with smaller editions of chants useful for parishes and schools provided the tools for choirmasters, teachers and pastors.

With the introduction of these materials it was hoped that the secular, cheap and sentimental music that was so prevalent in American churches would be eliminated. The chief thrust of the *motu proprio* was to demand a holiness and an artistic quality for all music used in the liturgy. The style held up as the best example of such sanctity and art was Gregorian chant. The polyphony of the Roman School of the sixteenth century as well as other polyphonists of the Renaissance period came second, and suitable compositions of modern writers that fulfilled the threefold requirement of sanctity, artistry and universality could also be allowed. The reformers were particularly concerned to eradicate music that came from the operatic literature, folk tunes, ballads and art songs. As in the application of any general principles to specific cases, judgments sometimes were not well-founded, and the interpretation of the *motu proprio* by some whose vision was too narrow often eliminated the good along with the bad and substituted music of no value.

The First World War had a great effect on church music in the United States. The roots of the Caecilian Society were German, and during the war German culture in every aspect suffered from propaganda and prejudice. This contributed in a degree to the demise of the local Caecilian societies throughout the Midwest. By the same token, things French became very popular, and with that spirit in the land, the Solesmes chants found ready acceptance. A new era opened for the United States which brought in many European influences, not least a revival of interest in the liturgy with new ideas coming from Belgian, French, German and Austrian centres. Abbeys such as Maria Laach, Beuron, Maredsous, Mont-César and Klosterneuburg were visited by Americans who brought back the research and new liturgical thinking being done abroad. In this country, Saint John's Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, through the work of Dom Virgil Michel, became the center for a liturgical movement, that published *Orate Fratres* (later *Worship*) to spread information and promote a renewed interest in the liturgy as the source of true spiritual life. Dom Gregory Huegle of Conception Abbey in Missouri and Dom Ermin Vitry, both of whom became editors of *Caecilia*, promoted Gregorian chant as part of the larger liturgical revival. The publication of *The Saint Gregory Hymnal and Catholic Choirbook* in 1921 under the editorship of Nicola A. Montani marked a milestone in the reforms in both the United States and Canada. The *White List* published by the Society of Saint Gregory, attempted to establish suitable repertory both by suggesting and prohibiting certain compositions, although its restrictive stance and too narrow standards reflected the poorer aspects of the Caecilian movement and led ultimately to its rejection. It did, however, accomplish a considerable amount by giving the clergy and musicians some definitive criteria for action on a practical level, while the theoretical aspects were promoted by the liturgical movement. Another publication that did much to improve architectural standards as well as artistic taste in vestments, chalices and other appurtenances of the church was *Liturgical Arts*, published by Maurice Lavanoux.

The reform was pushed forward by periodicals, new musical literature, congresses and various forms of legislation both universal and local. But the need for schools to train musicians was apparent very early. The Caecilians in Europe had their school in Regensburg. The Holy See established an international institute in Rome for students from all countries. The Institut Catholique in Paris did its part to prepare students according to the principles of Solesmes. In the United States, the Catholic Normal School in Milwaukee served the American Society of Saint Caecilia and prepared many musicians to serve in the Midwest as teachers in the parochial schools and choirmasters in the parish churches. But the Solesmes chant also demanded a school for its study and the training of teachers to carry the new theories across the country. Such an institute was founded at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart in New York through the work of Mrs. Justine Ward and Mother Georgia Stevens who opened the Pius X School of Liturgical Music in 1916. It trained Sisters from many communities across the country who returned to train novices, who in turn took up the task of teaching Gregorian chant to the thousands of children in the growing parochial school system. Through the twenties and thirties, Gregorian chant became the music of the younger generations and in time as they entered monasteries, seminaries and convents, the chant there improved and flourished. By 1940, the

implementation of the directives of the *motu proprio* on chant was well underway in the United States, but a restrictive, narrow reading of the document could be detected and this would ultimately lead to a negative force that deprived the movement of the freedom needed for any artistic development.

Part of the restrictive, legalistic attitude that grew during the years following World War I can be attributed to the efforts to dispose of poor and often offensive compositions that cluttered the repertory of most choirs. Unfortunately, along with the poor and secular and cheap, much that was good music, especially music of the classical period, was replaced by compositions judged to be safe and acceptable, but which were often insipid and characterless, music that was so innocuous that it could be said to be “seen but not heard.” The supremacy of the text was so over-emphasized that melody and harmony were sometimes only tolerated and were thought to be most acceptable when they were hardly noticed. Repetition of the text was judged to be wrong, thus excluding much great music of the past from liturgical performance. A misunderstanding of the polyphony of the sixteenth century, including the work of Palestrina, deified the Roman School of composers, although their works were only rarely performed: but in fostering that style efforts to imitate it produced music of doubtful worth. Since the *motu proprio* had given chant a primacy of place among styles of music suitable for liturgical use, some thought that to imitate chant would produce the best contemporary music. But imitation and restriction have never produced true art, and so the period between the wars in this country saw the creation of a great bulk of mediocre music as well as the great progress that occurred in chant study and performance.

Parochial schools, seminaries, novitiates and abbeys were the scene of the greatest chant activity. Singing by even large congregations developed. The *Liber usualis*, not an official book but a very *useful* one, served as the regular text for Mass, vespers and other parts of the liturgy, and it gradually, replaced the old Regensburg books that were still occasionally found, especially in German parishes. Unfortunately, the chant did not find as ready an acceptance in the parish choirs, many of which found it difficult to give up old repertory and to master the new theories of chant. A rigid insistence on the rhythmic theories of Solesmes in all performances of chant was a restrictive element, since most choirmasters had not been trained in it and thus were reluctant to try to teach it. Graduates of the Piux X School taught only the theories of Dom André Mocquereau and Dom Joseph Gajard to their students. These were very French in their approach to the Latin language, and often conflict developed in teaching the chant, especially among groups of German or other ethnic backgrounds. The chant became too precious and difficult to perform because of the theories of interpretation. Too often choirs imitated rather than learned the chants. School children in the Midwest sometimes sounded like members of a French choir instead of the children of immigrants from eastern Europe. Parish choirs found it too difficult to achieve the special effects demanded by the experts, and the result, unfortunately, was a reluctance to use chant, especially in parochial choirs and in congregations. The chant was intended to be the song of the people, but unfortunately it became an art form whose rendition was beyond the abilities of all except the specially trained.

The years following World War I saw also the establishment of departments of music in many Catholic colleges that were prospering in nearly every state. The women's colleges quite regularly promoted chant, because Pius X School trained nuns, and only later on allowed registration of male students. As a result, most men's colleges had very insignificant church music courses. This was caused also by the large number of colleges under Jesuit administration where courses in music were not usual. Seminaries did very little at first, since priests themselves were not trained to teach music. But little by little seminary officials recognized the need of professional study for teachers of music, and as the Roman directives continued to insist on the training of seminarians in chant and music, such training was given to promising candidates who in time became the professors of music in seminaries, replacing many who had held the position, often without much training.

In 1943, even though the country and the world were at war, modest observances of the publication of the *motu proprio* were held in several parts of the United States. The question was always asked, "How much progress has been made in implementing the decrees of the Holy See?" Usually one could say that considerable work had been done. Seminary music courses had been established; departments of music that gave training in church music existed; religious orders of Sisters had prepared their members to teach the chant in the parochial schools; societies of church musicians continued to publish their journals; several firms made materials available for study and performance; many dioceses had issued regulations based on the Roman decrees; guilds of organists and choir-masters had been founded (Rochester in 1920, Newark in 1933, Saint Louis in 1933, Paterson in 1938, Saint Paul in 1939, Chicago in 1940, and San Francisco in 1941); many parishes had good choirs and dedicated musicians worked hard to carry out the reforms.

If there was one single difficulty that surfaced as the main problem in this country in implementing fully the orders of the Church, it would be the lack of professional training of those who were trying to fulfill the decrees. This was caused chiefly by the lack of professional schools of music that taught anything about Catholic church music and the reluctance of church authorities to put adequate finances into the liturgical music programs. A few key positions were occupied by musicians trained in Europe, but the main body of choirmasters and organists lacked the training they needed to carry out what the Church was asking. As a result the idea that one could be a "liturgical musician" without truly being a musician arose and did great damage by narrowing the scope of the reform and restricting the development of the musical art both in composition and in performance. A legalism and a false reading of the directives from Rome caused a restriction that kept the flowering of music in the liturgy from becoming a reality in every way.

Part II: Musicae sacrae disciplina

The nation went to war in December, 1941. Europe had already been embroiled in the conflict

for two years. All things suffer in such global conflict, but the arts are particularly devastated and not least of them, church music. Parish and cathedral choirs lost their male singers. Directors, composers and organists were called up to the various armed services. Only seminaries, abbeys and novitiates were able to maintain their regular programs since the law allowed for the exemption of the clergy from military conscription. A great deal of adaptation took place in most parishes as children's choirs and women's groups replaced the traditional adult mixed choirs. Congregational singing increased and the Gregorian melodies were found to be most useful as part-music became impossible because of the lack of tenors and basses.

The war years, 1939 to 1945, were years of great isolation for those who remained at home. Communication with Europe was cut off for the most part. Study abroad was not possible; new compositions and new publications were not available, not merely for lack of the possibility of importing them but because nothing was forthcoming from European countries engaged in total war. If the years between the First and Second World Wars are thought of as a period of isolation when the United States turned in upon itself, the actual years of the Second World War proved to be much more isolated and restricted. Nonetheless, the work of teaching the chant to the school children, seminarians and novices continued. The church music journals were published throughout the war. Parishes continued their regular services, and congregational singing, especially at the very popular novenas, spread and developed.

With peace in 1945, the men returned and choral organizations were reorganized. Interest in church music grew as returning soldiers told of what they had heard in the great cathedrals and churches in Europe. Prisoners of war told of the important role singing and especially sacred music played in their lives during captivity. European publishing houses, anxious to increase their markets and acquire some of the coveted American dollars, began to advertise their catalogs in the United States and open agencies to sell their publications in this country. Omer Westendorf of Cincinnati had observed the church music of several European capitals while in the armed service. On returning home he set up his World Library of Sacred Music to introduce to American choirmasters and organists the music he had experienced in Europe, particularly in The Netherlands. He brought to this country the compositions of renaissance musicians in the Annie Bank editions, along with German, French, Belgian and Italian publishers' catalogs. With these new compositions came also various editions of Gregorian chant, some of which did not have the rhythmic markings of the Solesmes monks. The *Graduale Romanum* and the *Antiphonale Romanum* in the Vatican Polyglott Press printings, chant editions from Schwann-Verlag of Düsseldorf, from Dessain at Mechelen in Belgium and other church music houses came to be known along with the more familiar *Liber Usualis* which until the war had been the exclusive volume for singing chant in this country. It came as a revelation to many that the Vatican Edition itself did not have the editorial markings of the Solesmes rhythmic theories, and in fact many countries did not use them.

One of the greatest effects of the war and the anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish policies of the Nazi regimes in Europe was the influx into the United States of many important musicologists,

especially from Germany. English joined German as a major language in the expanding discipline of musicology. Scholars from abroad took their places in American universities and began the training of young Americans in the history of music. Research which blossomed into performances left its mark on many Catholic church music organizations as interest in the compositions of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance grew. Programs for concerts as well as for worship often contained newly discovered and transcribed works from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. What the *motu proprio* of Pius X had praised so highly now became a possibility for practical use in this country. Opportunities for serious music study opened up for many young priests, Sisters and lay people in American universities as newly established chairs of musicology increased.

Enrollment in seminaries increased dramatically with the end of the war, and the teaching of chant and church music improved according to the directives from Rome. The position of professor of music was to be found in most major seminaries and regular courses in the theory and practice of liturgical singing were given. Among those occupying seminary music positions in the late Forties and Fifties were: Monsignor Richard B. Curtin in New York; Fr. Benedict Ehmann in Rochester; Fr. Francis V. Strahan in Boston; Fr. John Selner, S.S., in Baltimore; Monsignor Joseph Kush in Chicago; Fr. Robert J. Stahl, S.M., in New Orleans; Fr. Francis A. Missia in Saint Paul; Fr. Elmer F. Pfeil in Milwaukee; Fr. John P. Cremins in Los Angeles; and Fr. Andrew A. Forster, S.S. in San Francisco. Programs in minor seminaries were improving, especially with the putting of emphasis on note reading and chant theory.

New developments in church music composition abroad reached this country shortly after the war. Noteworthy were the works of Netherlands composers: Hermann Strategier, Hendrik Andriessen, Jan Nieland; German composers: Theodor Pröpper, Heinrich Lemacher, Hermann Schroeder, Johann Nepomuk David, Georg Trexier; Belgian composers Flor Peeters, Jules Van Nuffel; French composers: Jean Langlais, Olivier Messiaen, Maurice Duruflé; and Austrian composers: Ernst Tittel, Joseph Lechthaler, Herman and Joseph Kronsteiner and Anton Heiller. That new contemporary techniques of composition could be used in church music, involving dissonance, free rhythm and modal writing, was a surprise to many. The use of instruments in addition to the organ had not been common in the United States and usually required the permission of the local bishop, a remnant of the rigidity introduced by the misreading of Pius X's *motu proprio*. An interest in the new music was fostered through workshops in various parts of the country along with the journals, *Caecilia* and *The Catholic Choirmaster*, and many diocesan courses for organists and choirmasters.

In the Diocese of Pittsburgh, Fr. Carlo Rossini set up a system for training and evaluating church musicians. Guilds in many dioceses organized study courses that led to approbation and certification following testing for proficiency and knowledge of church music legislation. The Gregorian Institute of America under Clifford Bennett provided visiting faculties for sessions set up in various parts of the country, as well as a correspondence course through which church musicians in rural and remote areas could study privately and have their work corrected and

evaluated, even making it possible to obtain a degree. The Archdiocese of Milwaukee under the direction of Fr. Elmer F. Pfeil and Sister Theophane, O.S.F., organized workshops that attracted students from all parts of the country, and at Boys Town, Nebraska, under the direction of Monsignor Francis P. Schmitt, workshops for church musicians were held each August beginning in 1953 and continuing through the 60's.

The Boys Town events were a significant development of the post-war years, attracting faculty members of international reputation and students from all parts of the country. With a library of highest quality and facilities not equalled elsewhere, the workshops at Boys Town had a wide influence. Among those associated with the yearly events were Fr. Francis A. Brunner C.Ss.R., Monsignor Richard J. Schuler, Dom Ermin Vitry, O.S.B., Marie Pierik, Flor Peeters, Anton Heiller, Jean Langlais, Paul Koch, Louise Cuyler, James Welch and Roger Wagner.

An outgrowth of the Boys Town workshops was the transfer of *Caecilia* to the revitalized Society of Saint Caecilia. With the cooperation of Arthur Reilly of the McLaughlin and Reilly music publishing firm which had underwritten the magazine for many years, Monsignor Schmitt assumed the editorship of the journal which began then to reflect the policies and theories of the Boys Town associates. Interest in chant without the Solesmes rhythmic theories grew at Boys Town along with the introduction of contemporary compositions from this country and Europe. In a sense the First World War had seen the decline in the Society of Saint Caecilia and the growth of the Society of Saint Gregory as the Solesmes editions replaced the Regensburg Medicaean books of chant. So did the Second World War and its aftermath witness a decline in the Society of Saint Gregory and its *White List* while the Society of Saint Caecilia revived with the introduction of new materials and ideas. Ultimately the two societies would combine.

In 1951, Pope Pius XII beatified Pope Pius X, and in 1954, he declared him to be a saint of the Church. These events were widely celebrated by church musicians and gave a great impulse to efforts to implement the *motu proprio* of Pius X. But the most important event of the entire post-war period was the publication of the encyclical, *Musicae sacrae disciplina*, by Pope Pius XII, December 25, 1955. The first time a pope turned his attention in a major encyclical to questions of liturgical music, this document came in a logical and planned line of development that began with Pope Pius X's *motu proprio* of 1903 and was prepared for by the encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, of 1947. In adding yet another stone to the edifice of reform, Pius XII did not sound the negative note of excising decay that many thought they found in the *motu proprio* of Pius X. It is true that what is sensual and unchaste, illicit and extravagant and irreverent must be eliminated. But now the Holy See wished us rather to cultivate the great, the beautiful and the artistic. The valuable research of musicologists had opened the treasures of the past and new compositions of spiritual and artistic merit had appeared to adorn the liturgy. The developments of the fifty years since *Tra le sollecitudini* of Pius X were extensive and fruitful. All that is good and worthy, all that is true art and in conformity with the liturgical action could be employed as musical handmaiden of sacred liturgy Pius XII wrote that music had progressed "from the simple and natural Gregorian modes, which are quite perfect in their kind, to great and even magnificent

works of art which not only human voices, but also the organ and other musical instruments embellish, adorn and amplify almost endlessly.”

Musicae sacrae disciplina brought a new freedom for the art of music that had been fettered, especially in the United States, by puritanical and rigid interpretations of Roman legislation. Music and all art needs freedom to flourish, even when its limitations as the handmaiden of the liturgy are clearly known and accepted by the artists. While the Church can clearly indicate what role music plays in worship, it is not legislation that produces art. Pope Pius XII discusses extensively the requirements for a true liturgical music: a God-given talent, properly trained, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit who in a certain sense shares with the composer His role of creation. The theology of sacred music is beautifully developed in the encyclical which gave church musicians a sense of approbation for the success achieved in the first phase of the reform of liturgical music as well as a challenge to continue the work in a more constructive manner. Gregorian chant was reaffirmed as the music of the Church *par excellence* the new researches in medieval and renaissance music were commended and approved for use; and new writing was encouraged with clear instructions given for composers and performers.

The encyclical was a great surprise to the church musicians of the United States, an almost totally unexpected Christmas present, since it came for the feast of the Nativity. The Holy Father encouraged choirs; he urged the professional training of those charged with the training of others, particularly seminary students; he permitted the use of other instruments in addition to the pipe organ; he ordered the congregations to participate in the liturgy through singing so they would not be “present at the Holy Sacrifice merely as dumb and inactive spectators.” He commended the various musical societies and urged formation of diocesan commissions for music and art. Everything that had been stated before by his predecessors was confirmed and a new dimension of freedom and progress was added.

On September 3, 1958, the feast of Saint Pius X, the Sacred Congregation of Rites made specific the more general directions of the encyclical with the instruction, *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia*. It was based solidly on the *motu proprio*, *Tra le sollecitudini* of Pius X, the apostolic constitution, *Divini cultus* of Pius XI, the encyclical, *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII, and the encyclical, *Musicae sacrae disciplina*. It stated clearly a well organized code of church music legislation. In 118 paragraphs the church musician had his pattern for action. It set the direction for the continuing reform, protected the art of sacred music and determined its relationship with the liturgical action, both in general norms and in specific actions. It remains today the basis for much of the conciliar and postconciliar directives, and just as truly, many of the abuses afflicting the Church today were condemned and prohibited by the instruction which preceded the Vatican Council by ten years. Anyone truly wishing to understand such conciliar directives as *actuosa participatio populi* must read the 1958 instruction where participation of the faithful is clearly spelled out. Use of instruments, questions of radio and television broadcasts, remuneration of professional musicians, establishment of schools of music and diocesan commissions are explained. 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.

In those areas of the United States where serious efforts had been made to implement the reforms of Saint Pius X, the new encyclical and the instruction came as confirmation of work accomplished and direction for future activity. Where nothing had been done about the *motu proprio*, either nothing was done about the encyclical or the task of initiating the reform, fifty years late, had to be begun. But the 1950's saw continuing progress musically in the reform. Guilds of organists and choirmasters were organized in many more dioceses with courses of instruction scheduled, festivals for parish choirs arranged, efforts made to give church musicians a fair remuneration, and diocesan legislation echoing the papal decrees promulgated. The National Catholic Music Educators Association (NCMEA), while primarily organized for teachers of classroom music, turned its attention to church music. In Minnesota, the NCMEA sponsored annual state-wide festivals for boys choirs. Seminary professors in the Midwest met under the auspices of NCMEA to plan courses for both major and minor seminary music programs. National conventions of most Catholic societies were planned with good liturgical music. National Liturgical Weeks were scheduled to promote interest among clergy and laity in the new liturgical reforms. There was a conscious effort in most parts of the land to carry out the wishes of the Holy Father in *Musicae sacrae disciplina*.

In Saint Louis, Mario Salvador had his choir of boys at the cathedral; in New Orleans, Elise Cambon specialized in renaissance polyphony; Monsignor Charles N. Meter directed the choirboys at Holy Name Cathedral in Chicago, James Welch's chorale sang at Saint Philip Neri in the Bronx, and Father Joseph R. Foley, C.S.P., carried on the traditions of Father Finn's Paulist Choir. Richard Keys Biggs composed and directed at Blessed Sacrament Church in Hollywood and Roger Wagner gained international acclaim with his chorale and his performances of Catholic music. Monsignor Francis P. Schmitt in addition to his national tours conducted his Boys Town choir each Sunday at the solemn Mass, presenting a repertory of wide variety. In Saint Paul, Monsignor Richard J. Schuler organized the Twin Cities Catholic Chorale in addition to his Nativity Choir. Paul Koch worked at the cathedral in Pittsburgh and Theodore Marier founded his choir school in Boston. In Dallas, Father Ralph S. March, S.O. Cist., organized and directed the Dallas Catholic Choir, and in Saint Paul, Richard Proulx conducted the Holy Childhood Schola Cantorum, founded by Father John Buchanan. Monsignor Robert F. Hayburn worked in San Francisco; C. Alexander Peloquin, in Providence; Frank Campbell-Watson in New York City and Philip G. Kreckel in Rochester. The pages of *Caecilia* and *The Catholic Choirmaster* record their programs and many others.

In Europe in the years following World War II, musicians felt the need for international consultation and discussion among themselves. As a part of the Holy Year of 1950, the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome, under the direction of Monsignor Iginio Angles, set up a series of conferences on sacred music which came to be the First International Congress of Church Music. Later ones were held in Vienna in 1954, Paris in 1957, Cologne in 1961,

Chicago-Milwaukee in 1966, Salzburg in 1974, Cologne-Bonn in 1980. The leadership of the Pontifical Institute was felt in these international gatherings with the papal directives forming the basis of discussion and the resolutions adopted. Action at the 1961 Cologne congress led to the establishment of the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* by Pope Paul VI in 1963, with the responsibility of organizing succeeding international gatherings, the first of which was held in Chicago and Milwaukee under the auspices of the newly organized Church Music Association of America.

In late summer of 1964, at the close of the twelfth annual liturgical music workshop, members of the Society of Saint Gregory of America and the American Society of Saint Cecilia and other interested church musicians met at Boys Town in Nebraska, at the invitation of Monsignor Francis P. Schmitt, to consider the possibilities of uniting the two organizations into a single society for church musicians in the United States. In the friendly hospitality of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home and its president, Monsignor Nicholas J. Wegner, the procedures for forming the Church Music Association of America moved along smoothly, and the new society was born.

Representation at the meeting was truly nation-wide and well divided among clerical and lay persons. Among those present were the members of the board of directors of the Society of St. Gregory: Monsignor Richard B. Curtin, Reverend Benedict Ehmann, Reverend Joseph F. Mytych, Reverend Cletus Madsen, Reverend Joseph R. Foley, C.S.P., J. Vincent Higginson and Ralph Jusko. Representing the Society of Saint Cecilia were Monsignor Francis P. Schmitt, Reverend Richard J. Schuler, Reverend Francis A. Brunner, C.Ss.R., Sister M. Theophane, O.S.F., Archabbot Rembert Weakland, O.S.B., Paul Koch, Alexander Pelouquin, Lavern Wagner, Roger Wagner, James Welch, James Keenan, Frank Szynskie, Norbert Letter and Mrs. Winifred Flanagan. Reverend Elmer Pfeil was a member of both boards. Monsignor Curtin, who represented Father John Selner, S.S., president of the Society of Saint Gregory, and Monsignor Schmitt acted as co-chairmen of the meetings.

A provisional constitution was drafted and officers were chosen for one year. Archabott Weakland was named president; Father Madsen, vice-president; Father Schuler, secretary; and Frank Szynskie, treasurer. Various committees and a board of directors were selected. Two resolutions, submitted by Father Brunner, Father Robert A. Skeris and Father Schuler, were adopted by the new Society: 1) We pledge ourselves to maintain the highest artistic standards in church music; 2) we pledge ourselves to preserve the treasury of sacred music, especially Gregorian chant, at the same time encouraging composers to write artistically fine music, especially for more active participation of the people.

At subsequent meetings a permanent constitution was drafted, submitted to the membership and adopted. *The Catholic Chormaster*, begun in 1915 and published through fifty volumes by the Society of Saint Gregory, merged with *Caecilia*, then in its ninety fourth volume and published by the Society of Saint Cecilia. The journal of the new Church Music Association

of America, continuing the volume numbers of *Caecilia*, was named *Sacred Music*. Coadjutor Archabbot Rembert Weakland, O.S.B., became editor.

The calling of the Second Vatican Council and the publication of its first document, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, marked the closing of one era and the opening of another. So did the founding of the Church Music Association of America signal the end of the age when church music was fostered and regulated by the two American societies, St. Gregory and St. Cecilia. The new society inaugurated the conciliar and post-conciliar period with all the challenges and problems that it brought to the church musician in the on-going task of reform. In 1964, the future still looked bright and the challenge of the conciliar decrees attracted the American church musicians. The foundations had been laid over the past sixty years, and now the crowning stones were to be put in place. Little did anyone know what lay ahead.

PART III: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*

On December 4, 1963, the first document to be issued by the Second Vatican Council was officially promulgated. With the title *Sacrosanctum concilium*, it was the constitution on the sacred liturgy. Its sixth chapter was dedicated to sacred music, the first time an ecumenical council had turned its attention so extensively to the subject of music in liturgy. It was the capstone placed on all the official pronouncements made over the past sixty years by Roman authority in the on-going reform of church music, begun by Pope Pius X with his *motu proprio* of 1903.

For church musicians around the world, two principal challenges stood out in the council's document: the permission for the use of the vernacular in certain parts of the liturgy; and the continuing insistence on *actuosa participatio populi*, an idea clearly enunciated by Pope Pius X and often repeated through the intervening years, especially in the instruction of 1958. Both challenges were welcomed with joy and in anticipation of the rich possibilities that the vernacular languages and the singing of the people promised for new compositions and in revitalized performance practices. A sense of freedom for artistic development with new avenues of expression was clearly foreseen by those who commented on the conciliar constitution. Truly, *Sacrosanctum concilium* was a *magna carta* for the church musician, re-enforcing the historical developments of liturgical music from the Gregorian chant to modern works, openly allowing all styles of sacred music as long as they were appropriate to the occasion, encouraging and even demanding new works, both in the vernacular and in Latin, both for choirs and for congregations, permitting the use of various instruments but ensuring the honored position of the pipe organ.

The sections of the constitution that dealt with sacred music had been studied and debated by the pre-conciliar committees and, once the council opened, developed further by the conciliar committee. As early as 1960, Monsignor Iginio Angles, rector of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome, was appointed a member of the preparatory commission on sacred liturgy. Others among the consultors to the preparatory commission were Father Eugene Cardine

of Solesmes Abbey; Father Frederick McManus of the Catholic University in Washington; Father Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., editor of *Worship*; Monsignor Johannes Wagner of the liturgical institute in Trier, Germany; and Canon George A. Martimort of the liturgical center in France. Secretary of the commission was Father Annibale Bugnini, C.M., of the Lateran University in Rome. Records of the discussions and proposals of this commission may someday be the subject of considerable study, together with the deliberations of the conciliar committees and the interventions of the fathers of the council during their meetings in Saint Peter's Basilica. The exact intentions of the fathers will be known only through the careful study of their deliberations, since the published conciliar documents themselves are only the distillation of many hours of study, discussion and argument. An interesting proposal, for example, to permit the vernacular languages in all spoken liturgy, while retaining Latin for the solemn, sung Masses and offices, would have allowed for the free exchange of musical compositions among the nations, giving the countries without a strong musical establishment opportunities to use music from other lands, and at the same time strengthening the universality of the Church through such exchange. But the proposal unfortunately was not approved for the final draft, and thus much of the difficulty provoked by the sudden introduction of vernacular singing into the solemn liturgy resulted.

With the announcement of the appointment of the conciliar commissions in 1962, Archbishop Paul Hallinan of Atlanta, Georgia, was the sole American listed on the liturgy commission. Among the *periti* or consultants were Monsignor Angles, Father Bugnini, Father Frederick McManus, Monsignor Johannes Overath, Monsignor Fiorenzo Romita, Canon Martimort and Monsignor Johannes Wagner. Re-organization of the schema developed by the pre-conciliar commission changed the decrees on sacred music into the sixth chapter which was finally approved as we have it today. The records of the meetings of the members of the commission on sacred liturgy, together with the suggestions of *periti* and the final discussion of the document in Saint Peter's, form the foundation for future study of what was exactly the intention of those who gave us *Sacrosanctum concilium*. Several things concerning sacred music were crystal clear: Gregorian chant is the special music of the Church and must be given primacy of place; the long tradition of sacred music in all styles must be fostered and used; the purpose of music in the liturgy remains the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful; the reforms begun by Pius X must continue and grow, especially the active participation of the people. The council clearly re-affirmed the musical traditions of the Church and at the same time gave ample challenge to musicians to continue and enlarge their work in the service of God's worship.

It was with the council's directives in mind that the Fifth International Church Music Congress, under the sponsorship of the newly organized *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* and with the Church Music Association of America as host, met in Chicago and Milwaukee, August 21 through 28, 1966. Father Richard J. Schuler was chairman of the event, together with Father Elmer F. Pfeil and Father Robert A. Skeris. This was the first international meeting of church musicians since the close of the Second Vatican Council, December 8, 1965.

Present were world-renowned musicians and scholars from fifteen nations on five continents.¹ Proceedings were divided into study days at Rosary College in Chicago and a public congress in Milwaukee for which special music was composed and performed specifically to fulfill the intentions of the conciliar reforms. The purpose of the assembly was to begin the work asked for by the council, and the musicians eagerly came to Milwaukee in great numbers from all parts of the country to learn and to put into practice what were the wishes of the council. There had never been in this country before, nor has there been since, so distinguished a gathering of nationally and internationally famous church musicians. Many had themselves been the *periti* responsible for drafting the constitution on the sacred liturgy.

However, all was not harmonious when the Fifth International Congress opened its study days in Chicago. Father C.J. McNaspy, S.J., who was himself never present at any part of the congress, wrote in *America* about “secret meetings,” “planned exclusion of important liturgists,” and “reactionary attitudes in liturgical thinking.”² Others joined in this vein, including persons belonging to a group called *Universa Laus* organized under Father Joseph Gelineau, S.J. Archabbot Rembert Weakland, O.S.B., who was president of the Church Music Association of America, the host of the congress, was unfortunately very outspoken in his criticisms, saying that the congress was “negative and restrictive.” He too was present only for the last day of the Chicago sessions and was apparently unaware of the procedures established long before, governing the discussions during the study days. He and others wished to introduce many subjects to the floor for discussion that were not a part of the announced theme, which was *actuosa participatio populi* and its relation to sacred music. This theme had been approved by the Holy See as the only subject matter for discussion. In an interview with the Milwaukee press, the archabbot alluded to the congress as a kind of legislative body with the task of acting for the universal Church in order to exclude modern music and, among other things, dancing. The congress, of course, had no legislative authority, nor had its organizers thought of it as having such a role. Nevertheless, a small group tried to subvert the work of the congress.³ This group was responsible for the false criticism of the congress printed and reprinted in the American press after the close of the meeting. This was the beginning of efforts that have continued over the past twenty years to undermine the intentions of the council fathers and the work of the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae*, founded by Pope Paul VI for the express purpose of implementing the directives of the Vatican Council in matters of liturgical music. Those who were unhappy with the role given to sacred music in the sixth chapter of the constitution on the sacred liturgy have never ceased to oppose what the Church has ordered for sacred music in its

¹ For a list of participants and speakers at the Chicago sessions, see *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II* (Rome: Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae, 1969) p. 197-201.

² For a longer treatment of criticism of the congress, see *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II*, p. 283-288.

³ On August 24, 1966, a meeting of Americans was held at Rosary College during the congress. At it Archabbot Weakland complained about the congress, saying that those present were being brainwashed by papers which were filled with recurring incompetency and lack of artistic direction. He accused the praesidium of the *Consociatio* of employing undemocratic procedures, saying that he stood for liberty, pluralism and humanism since the Church in America has its own physiognomy.

liturgy.⁴ They have by their actions set church music back to a state far worse than when Pope St. Pius X began the work of reform in 1903. They have promoted their own ideas of what music and liturgy should be, but these fail to correspond to the decrees of the council or the documents that followed after the close of the council. A careful analysis of the legislation given for the universal Church and the reality as it is presently promoted in the United States exposes a considerable divergence between the two.

Far from being the spring-board from which a great development in church music would be launched, the Fifth International Church Music Congress marks the end of progress in the reform begun in the time of Pius X and continuing until 1966. At the congress, new compositions, employing the vernacular and engaging the congregation as well as choral and instrumental forces, written in contemporary idiom and demonstrating that the art of music could indeed be employed for the glory of God and the edification of the faithful, filled four days of liturgical worship. Papers prepared by experts on the theological basis for liturgical music and the use of art in worship showed how necessary both the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and adequate training in the musical art are to create music that is worthy of its exalted purpose in the liturgy. That the quality of music for church would in a few years be lowered to the banality and profanity of some liturgical developments was beyond the imagination of most of those who participated in the events in Chicago and Milwaukee in the late summer of 1966.⁵

It became clear that the problem was a theological one, not a musical one. Those who analyzed the decrees of the Vatican Council on sacred music could see that the musicians were capable of doing what was asked. They could provide what was ordered, but the problems lay in the theology of worship, indeed in the very fundamental concepts of the sacraments, the priesthood and the Church itself. It was apparent to those who had a Catholic sense of history that the Church was in the last throes of the heresy of Modernism, the malady that Pius X called the “synthesis of all heresies.” It is interesting that the pope who in 1903 launched the liturgical renewal was the same pope who undertook to exterminate Modernism. He drove it underground, but it resurfaced with the Second Vatican Council, and with the speed characteristic of the communications of our day, it spread throughout the world, transported to every continent by

⁴ A meeting was sponsored in Kansas City, Missouri, November 29 to December, 1966, by the American Liturgical Conference. Opposition to the sixth chapter of the constitution on the sacred liturgy was voiced by Archabbot Weak; and who said that “false liturgical orientation gave birth to what we call the treasury of sacred music, and false judgments perpetuated it.” Those “false judgments” seem to have been made by the fathers of the council who ordered that the treasury of sacred music be preserved and fostered. At the same meeting, Theodore Marier, president of the Church Music Association of America, was unable to get an indication from the assembled liturgists that they accepted the constitution, including the sixth chapter.

⁵ For an account of the maneuvering that went on to impose the liturgical “reforms” on the Church in the United States, see Gaiy K. Potter “The Liturgy Club,” *Triumph*, Vol. 3 (May 1968), p. 10-14, 37. For similar activity in the area of liturgical music, see Richard J. Schuler, “Who Killed Sacred Music?” *Triumph*, Vol. 4 (March 1969), p. 21-23.

many of the participants in the council who became infected. Since liturgy expresses belief, the importance of using it to diffuse errors is clear. Most Catholics know their Church and their faith chiefly through the Sunday Mass. When their worship is turned about, so will their very religion follow. When liturgy becomes entertainment, secularized and profaned, then its role as the expression of Catholic dogma is weakened and even lost for those who look to it for their spiritual sustenance, the “primary source of Catholic life,” as Pope Pius X called it.⁶

The resurgence of Modernism or Neo-modernism was well organized all over the world. It spread with incredible velocity and efficiency. Indeed, there are those who think that an international conspiracy was operating.⁷ An agency called the International Center of Information and Documentation concerning the Conciliar Church (IDOC) promoted the tenets of Neo-modernism and functioned on an international level with associates in every country. All areas of Catholic life came under its scrutiny, and the names of those working under its direction included some of the best known scholars, religious and clergy of this country.⁸ Their aim was the same in liturgy, catechetics, religious life, education, the press, social action and even church music. What was happening was not without direction and purpose. To counter required equal if not greater organization, and such was not at hand. The results of the greatly advertised “changes” introduced into the post-conciliar Church by the modernist camp can be seen in the catastrophe we have witnessed in the closed schools, defections from the clergy, decayed religious life, fewer converts, a substantial drop in attendance at Sunday Mass, theologians who defy the Magisterium, fewer vocations to the priesthood, and the banality, profanity and ineptitude of what is now promoted as liturgical music.

Who is responsible? In the field of liturgical music, those who voiced their opposition to the conciliar directives at the congress in Chicago and Milwaukee were associated with the National Liturgical Conference, *Universa Laus*, the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy and the Music Advisory Board organized under that committee. The activities of these groups in the years following the Fifth International Church Music Congress provide the answers to many of the questions asked by Catholics who wonder what has become of their musical heritage, what has happened to deprive them of the sacred worship of God that the liturgy should be. They wonder, in a word, why the clear orders of the Second Vatican Council on the reform of sacred music, set out in the sixth chapter of the constitution on the sacred liturgy, have not been heeded and implemented in the United States.

⁶ . “We must give up the idea that liturgical celebrations, in the performance of their music, ought to rival the standards of the concert hall, the radio, the theater, and the achievements of professional composers and performers. Their art is too equivocal in spirit, too different in plan, too heterogeneous in its productions to be directly allied to the requirements of a worship celebrated in spirit and in truth.” (Collegetown, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1964), p. 141.

⁷ Even Pope Paul VI spoke of the attack of Satan on the Church, saying that the smoke of hell could be detected.

⁸ For a list of those from various nations including the United States, see “Dossier on IDOC,” *Approaches*, No. 10-11 (January 1968), p.30-95. Among those listed for liturgical action in the United States are Rev. Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., Rev. Frederick McManus and Jack Mannion. Cf. John Leo, “The Catholic Establishment,” *The Critic*, (December 1966-January 1967).

PART IV: *Musicam sacram*

With the close of the Second Vatican Council in December of 1965, church musicians began the work of implementing the decrees on music promulgated in the Constitution on the sacred liturgy. The first international effort was organized by the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* and the Church Music Association of America. The congress held in Chicago and Milwaukee, August 21 to 28, 1966, undertook to implement the two major challenges given musicians by the council fathers: *actuosa participatio populi* and the permission for an extended use of the vernacular languages. Pope Paul VI had erected the *Consociatio* in his chirograph of November 22, 1963, *Nobile subsidium liturgiae*, giving it the express mission of implementing the decrees of the council and furthering international meetings and discussions of development in sacred music. With a roster of scholars, composers and practicing musicians of international reputation, the *Consociatio* had the potential to solve the problems presented by the introduction of the vernacular languages, the more extensive involvement of the congregation in singing, the employment of modern techniques of composition, the use of various instruments and the need for maintaining a truly sacred character in all music used in divine worship.

However, opposition to the *Consociatio* and its efforts was manifest very early. On an international level, *Universa Laus*, an organization led by Father Joseph Gelineau, S.J., openly worked against the *Consociatio* and its leaders. On the American scene, the American Liturgical Conference was the chief opponent. It worked through groups within the Church Music Association of America led by Archabbot Rembert G. Weakland, O.S.B., and through persons associated with the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy which was directed by Father Frederick R. McManus. The editor of *Worship*, Father Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., also played a leading role along with other journalists in fostering the tenets of *Universa Laus*. In time, the Music Advisory Board, set up under the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, became a tool for these groups in their efforts to oppose the *Consociatio* and its program to implement the decrees of the council on sacred music. The common denominator of the struggle was soon seen to be the conflict between the liturgists and the church musicians. The battle was fought in Europe and in the United States.

Universa Laus had its origin at an assembly of liturgists and musicians that met in Lugano, Switzerland, April 20 to 22, 1966, with the encouragement of Abbot Raimund Tschudy of Einsiedeln and Bishop A. Jelmini, president of the Swiss conference of bishops. Previous sessions of a similar kind had been held in Cresus in 1962, at Essen in 1963, at Taizé in 1964, and at Freiburg in Switzerland in 1965. The announced purpose of the gatherings was to study chant and music in their place in liturgical celebrations. At the Freiburg meeting nearly three hundred participants came from thirty-two countries, and at Lugano a selected group of seventy came from sixteen countries including America and Australia. Historical, liturgical, pastoral and technical studies were presented by Helmut Hucke, H. Leeb, Bernard Huijbers, Luigi Agustoni, G. Stefani, Lucian Deiss, Joseph Gelineau, and Abbot Raimund.

Favorable comments on the activities of *Universa Laus* were printed in *Musik und Altar*, published in Freiburg in Breisgau, in *De Linie* from Holland, in *Herder Korrespondenz*, and in *Notitiae*, the organ of the newly created Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy. An article in *Notitiae* noted the Holy Father's reply to a letter sent to the Vatican by the assembly at Lugano.

...the association has received the praise and the felicitations of the Secretary of State: "The Sovereign Pontiff has accepted with benevolence the letter addressed to him by both of you, Don Luigi Agustoni and Erhard Quack, informing him of the results of the assembly of Lugano, and also of the foundation of an international group for the study of chant and music in the liturgy, under the name of *Universa Laus*. This initiative has appeared opportune to His Holiness in this special period in which the development of the various directions in the department of liturgical chant and music has led to so many delicate problems. Therefore he has been pleased to invoke God's blessing on the newborn association and sends to the three chairmen and to all the members the apostolic blessing asked for.

This letter was sent on May 11 by Monsignor Angelo deli' Acqua, *substitutus*, to Father Joseph Gelineau, S. J., who together with Dr. Erhard Quack and Don Luigi Agustoni form the praesidium of the new association.⁹

When it became clear that *Universa Laus* was promoting opposition to the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae*, which had been officially erected by Pope Paul VI, another letter was issued by Monsignor dell' Acqua, July 16, 1966, addressed to Monsignor Johannes Overath, president of the *Consociatio*, and to Father Joseph Gelineau, a director of *Universa Laus*.

As you are aware, there was established with the pontifical chirograph, *Nobile subsidium liturgiae*, of November 22, 1963, the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae*, which is the only international association of sacred music approved by the Holy See; moreover, any eventual duplication is useless and harmful.¹⁰

Another letter concerning *Universa Laus* from the Secretariate of State, dated July 29, 1966, was addressed to Monsignor Overath saying that the Holy Father is of the opinion "that the matter involves a superfluous duplication (*inutile duplicato*), and this group should either place itself under the *Consociatio* or dissolve itself." Much of the conflict surfaced in Chicago and Milwaukee during the Fifth International Church Music Congress.

⁹ *Notitiae*, Vol.11(1966), p. 198-199.

¹⁰ Secretariate of State, Dispatch N. 74270. Printed in *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, Anno III, N. 2-3 (Summer-Autumn 1966), p. 29.

While the battle raged around the official status of the two groups and what kind of approbation could be obtained from the Holy See, the real conflict lay in the place of sacred music in the liturgy and the implementing of the directives of the council. The position of *Universa Laus* was clearly stated in Father Gelineau's *Voices and Instrument in Christian Worship*,¹¹ a volume that received strong criticisms in many languages.¹² The position of the *Consociatio* was clearly outlined in the papers delivered at the Chicago-Milwaukee congress.¹³ The final clash would occur over the publication of the 1967 instruction, *Musicam sacram*, issued jointly by the Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Monsignor Iginio Angles said of the preparation of the instruction:

As you know we had to fight many a battle over this instruction, as the liturgists did not want to hear about the true value of good church music in the liturgy. They tried to destroy everything that belonged to the old Roman rite. The Holy Father showed much personal interest in this instruction. Sometimes he accepted an article composed by the liturgists, through we were against it. But in spite of this, the fundamental principles of church music were preserved.¹⁴

In the United States, during the 1966 congress and following it, the battle developed along lines similar to those in Europe. The Church Music Association was affiliated with the *Consociatio* and (with the exception of its president, Archabbot Weakland) stood in support of the principles outlined by the papal international association. On the opposite side, supporting *Universa Laus*, were the liturgists as represented by the Liturgical Conference and many members of the official bodies set up by the American bishops and dominated by Father Frederick McManus. These were the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy and its Music Advisory Board.

Father McManus was in close relationship with Father Annibale Bugnini, secretary of the Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy in Rome. Together with Father Johannes Wagner of Trier and Canon George A. Martimort of Paris, they promoted the liturgical innovations that were so devastating to church music both in Europe and in America. The resistance of the church musicians to the activities of these liturgists and even efforts at discussions about the disagreements were characterized by Father Bugnini, speaking at an Italian liturgical convention on January 4, 1968, as "four years of musical polemics."¹⁵ Controversy was noted even in Rome between the Congregation of Rites, long the authority in liturgical and

¹¹ Joseph Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1964.

¹² Cf. *Response*, Vol. VII, No. 2 (1965), p. 104-107 (Reprinted in *Sacred Music*, Vol. 92, No. 3 (Autumn 1965), p. 83-88; *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, Vol. III, No. 1 (Spring 1966), p. 14-20.

¹³ Johannes Overath, ed., *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II*. Rome: *Consociatio internationalis Musicae Sacrae*, 1969. (English edition available from Church Music Association of America, 548 Lafond Avenue, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55103.)

¹⁴ Quoted from a personal letter sent to the author.

¹⁵ Cf. *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II* p. 17 (footnote).

musical matters for the universal Church, and the newly established Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy, of which Father Bugnini was secretary.

As Father Bugnini used the Consilium, so in the United States the liturgical revolution against the Roman rite and its treasury of sacred music was led by Archabbot Weakland as chairman of the Music Advisory Board of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy. He and Father McManus achieved the ends set forth by *Universa Laus* through the official American agencies organized to fulfill the directives of the council. Since Father McManus was a part of the Consilium and also the International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL), he was the key man in introducing into the United States all the plans of *Universa Laus*.¹⁶ He worked through the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, the Liturgical Conference, *Worship* and the Music Advisory Board.

The Music Advisory Board was set up in 1965 to assist the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy in musical matters. It had been the proposal of the Church Music Association of America that, as in England and in Germany, such advice be sought from the existing national association of musicians instead of organizing still another group, but the suggestion was not taken. With the introduction of the vernacular into the sung liturgy, questions of chants for both priest and people had to be solved. Other problems concerning the education of church musicians for the vernacular changes, professional training for church musicians and teachers of church music, new hymnals, the position of the pipe organ in new churches and many other matters were to be brought to the attention of the experts appointed to the board.

According to Archbishop Paul Hallinan, secretary of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, the new board was to be made up of "musicians, music critics and authorities in pastoral liturgy."¹⁷ He further stated that the bishops were seeking advice about a broad statement on the principles of sacred music, the selection of a musical setting for the Our Father, and help for seminaries. Members appointed to the board in 1965 were: J. Robert Carroll, Monsignor Richard B. Curtin, Louise Cuyler, Rev. Francis J. Guentner, S.J., Paul Hume, Theodore Marier, C. Alexander Peloquin, Rev. Richard J. Schuler, Robert Snow, Rev. Eugene Walsh, S.S., and Archabbot Rembert C. Weakland, O.S.B. The first meeting was in Detroit, Michigan, May 4 and 5, 1965. Archabbot Weakland was elected chairman and Father Schuler, secretary. Father McManus announced that he was the liaison with the bishops and spoke about sacred music in the new liturgical legislation. Archbishop Dearden, chairman of the bishops' committee, and other members of that committee welcomed the members. Although it was not as yet obvious, the stage was now set to accomplish in sacred music what the Liturgical Conference had achieved in the renovation of the rites and ceremonies. The plans of *Universa Laus* could now be implemented despite the wishes of the *Consociatio* or the Church Music Association of America. In fact, some members of those organizations would even be involved in carrying out the work. In a word, the Music Advisory Board was intended to become a rubber stamp in the United

¹⁶ Cf. Gary K. Potter, "The Liturgy Club," *Triumph*, May 1968, p., 10- 14f.

¹⁷ Unpublished minutes of the meeting.

States for the proposals from *Universa Laus* as presented to it by Father McManus. The Benedictines, Father Godfrey Diekmann and Abbot Rembert Weakland, were cooperators, one as editor of the liturgy magazine, *Worship*, the other as chairman of the Music Advisory Board. A few musicians on the board fought against the introduction of the plans of *Universa Laus*, but they were out-numbered and were eventually replaced on the board by more cooperative advisors.¹⁸

Typical and perhaps most interesting of the innovations engineered through the Music Advisory Board by Father McManus, Father Diekmann and Father Weakland was the “hootenanny Mass.” The scenario began in April 1965, when Father Diekmann delivered an address entitled “Liturgical Renewal and the Student Mass” at the convention of the National Catholic Educational Association in New York. In his speech, he called for the use of the “hootenanny Mass” as a means of worship for high school students. This was the kickoff of a determined campaign on the part of the Liturgical Conference to establish the use of profane music in the liturgy celebrated in the United States. *Universa Laus* had already begun a similar effort in Europe.¹⁹ In September 1965, the Catholic press began to carry reports of the use of hootenanny music by those in charge of college and high school student worship. In February 1966, the Music Advisory Board was called to meet in Chicago, with an agenda that included a proposal for the use of guitars and so-called “folk music” in the liturgy. It was clear at the meeting that both Fr. McManus and Archabbot Weakland were most anxious to obtain the board’s approval. The Archabbot told of the success of such “experiments” at his college in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, where, during Mass, the students had enthusiastically sung, “He’s got the Archabbot in the palm of His hand.” 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 already had left. But once the rubber stamp had been applied, the intensity of the debate and the narrow margin of the vote were immediately forgotten. The Music Advisory Board had fulfilled its function; it had been used.

The press took over. American newspapers, both secular and ecclesiastical, announced that the American bishops had approved of the use of guitars, folk music and the hootenanny Mass. Despite repeated statements from the Holy See prohibiting the use of secular music and words in the liturgy, the movement continued to be promoted in the United States and in

¹⁸ At its meeting, December 1 and 2, 1966, in Kansas City, Missouri, under the leadership of Archbishop Hallinan and Father McManus, the following were retired from the Music Advisory Board: Monsignor Curtin, Fr. Schuler, Fr. McNaspy, Louise Cuyler, Alexander Peloquin and Paul Hume. In their places the Archbishop appointed Rev. Paul Byron, Rev. John Cannon and Rev. Robert Ledogar. Also added were Dennis Fitzpatrick, Haldan Tompkins and Richard Felciano.

¹⁹ At the Chicago congress, the Ailgemeiner Caecilien -Verband of the German-speaking nations had introduced a resolution against such profane music which had already begun to appear in Europe (See *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II*, p. 182-185); news reports from Europe, including the city of Rome, report the use of beat music, youth combos and folk music; the reaction from the Vatican was also reported calling for an end to such abuses (*Minneapolis Star*, January 4, 1967) with Father Bugnini himself explaining that “everything profane and worldly must be excluded from church services.”

Europe.²⁰ Deception played a part, since American priests were allowed to think that the decision of the Music Advisory Board was an order from the bishops themselves. In reality, an advisory board has no legislative authority, nor does a committee of bishops have such authority. Decisions on liturgical matters need the approval of the entire body of bishops after a committee has received the report of its advisors and submitted its own recommendations to the full body.²¹ The hootenanny Mass never came to the full body of bishops; it did not have to. The intended effect had been achieved through the announcement of the action of the Music Advisory Board and the publicity given to it by the national press. It was not honest, and further, it was against the expressed wishes and legislation of the Church.²²

There are other examples of the introduction of the ideas of *Universa Laus* and the progressive liturgists that involved confusion and even deceit. The gullibility of the American clergy and their willingness to obey was used. A confusion was fostered in the minds of priests between the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy and the Liturgical Conference, which indeed had interlocking directorates. As anticipated, most American priests failed to distinguish between the releases that came from them, taking the proclamations of both as being the will of their bishops. Meanwhile, the official directives of the post-conciliar commissions in Rome rarely reached most American priests. They knew only the commentaries on them provided by the liturgists both nationally and on the diocesan level. As a result, the altars of most American churches were turned *versus populum*; choirs were disbanded; Gregorian chant was prohibited; Latin was forbidden for celebration of the Mass in many dioceses; church furniture and statuary were discarded. These innovations which distressed untold numbers of Catholics were thought to be the orders of the Second Vatican Council. Rather, they were the results of a conspiracy whose foundations and intentions have yet to be completely discovered and revealed.

The Church is clear in what is its liturgical reform. The documents for an on-going work, begun by Pius X and slowly developed through several pontificates, reached their fullness in the council and the later instructions that undertook to implement the will of the council fathers. Formulating the specific details of the liturgical renewal fell to the pontificate of Pope Paul VI. In the area of sacred music, the most significant document was the instruction of March 15, 1967, *Musicam sacram*.²³

The text of the instruction was bitterly fought over, and both sides, liturgists and musicians, ultimately came away with less than they were expecting. Monsignor Angles and

²⁰ Cf. *Declaratio Sacrae Rituum Congregationis et Consilii ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra liturgia, Notitiae*, Vol. III (1967), p. 37-38. The text of Father Bugnini's meeting with journalist clarifies the official declaration. It is appended on p. 39-46. Some discrepancy appears in that what Fr. McManus is promoting in the United States is apparently contradicted by Fr. Bugnini in Rome.

²¹ Cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. LX, N. 6 (June 28, 1968), p. 361.

²² For a more extensive discussion of the hootenanny Mass, see Richard J. Schuler, "Who Killed Sacred Music," *Triumph*, March 1969, p. 21-23.

²³ Cf. *Sacred Music*, Vol. 94, No. 1 (Spring 1967), p. 7-21. The Latin text can be found in *Musicae Sacre Ministerium*, Vol. W (Special number 1967), p. 116, and in *Notitiae*, Vol. III (March 1967), p. 87-108.

Monsignor Overath presented the scholarly and practical positions of the church musicians in face of pressure for experimentation and triviality that would lead to the destruction of art, reverence and the treasury of sacred music, the heritage of the Roman Church through fifteen centuries. Their chief opponent was Father Bugnini. Pope Paul VI himself took an active part in determining the final draft.²⁴ In the final analysis, the church musicians were satisfied at having saved the Church's musical heritage and were ready to carry out the requirements of the instruction, but what was ordered by the authority of the Church has not yet been achieved, chiefly because the liturgists wanted even further innovations. They were not ready to have the liturgy determined by an instruction; they were not yet finished with their experimentation and innovation. Even another instruction of September 5, 1970, has not succeeded in putting an end to innovations and so-called experimenting, now rechristened "creativity."²⁵

Musicam sacram clearly presumes the use of the ancient form of the *Missa Romana cantata* (*Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus Benedictus, gnus Dei*) in its thousand-year development musically, and gives detailed directions for using it involving the participation of the congregation. But that traditional structure, the Ordinary and Proper parts of the Mass, has ceased to be a vital entity to contemporary liturgists. Further, *Musicam sacram* clearly states that the distinction between solemn, sung and read Masses is to be retained; but the liturgists from the beginning have refused to accept that order. Again, *Musicam sacram* has a detailed listing of the various degrees of participation by singing, but the liturgists have never observed the order of priority established by the instruction. Also, the "treasury of sacred music," mentioned in the constitution on the sacred liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, is carefully guarded and its use commanded, including the polyphonic settings of the ordinary of the Mass produced over the past six centuries by the greatest composers of every age; but the liturgists have all but eliminated this heritage as a reality in worship.

Not the least important point made by *Musicam sacram* is found in its very title, "sacred music." This reaffirms the statement of the council that the purpose of church music is the "glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful." Some were trying to assert that all things are sacred, and thus all music was suitable for the liturgy. They were in fact saying that nothing is "sacred," and the result was a desacralization. The instruction reaffirms the on-going tradition that begins with the patristic age.²⁶ Pope Paul VI himself spoke several times on the subject of

²⁴ It is said that Pope Paul, in his own hand, wrote that he saw no reason why a polyphonic *Sanctus* could not be sung, thus correcting the false claim of the liturgists who wished to make that hymn into an acclamation always to be sung by the congregation. The Pope preserved the integrity of the *Missa Romana cantata*.

²⁵ Cf. Robert A. Skeris, "The Third Instruction," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 98, No. 1 (Spring 1971), p. 3-8. The Latin text of the instruction may be found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, LXII (1970), p. 692-704. Several criticisms have been made of the English translation that was widely circulated in this country. For an assessment of the implementation of the instruction, see Richard J. Schuler, "1967 Instruction — Ten Years Later," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 104, No. 3, p. 3-12.

²⁶ The problem of the "sacred" is basic to the entire liturgical reform; violation of the "sacred" has been the chief scandal for most people. For literature on this subject, see "Pope Paul on Sacred Music," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 96, No. 2 (Summer 1969), p. 3-6; John Buchanan, "The Subject is Worship," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (Fall 1969), p. 3-

sacred music. On April 15, 1971, he addressed a thousand religious dedicated to the work of liturgical music at a national convention of the Italian Society of Saint Cecilia held in Rome, repeating the admonition that “all is not valid; all is not licit; all is not good.” The secular, the cheap, the inferior and the inartistic “are not meant to cross the threshold of God’s temple.”²⁷

Musicam sacram, in its nine chapters and preface, lays down general norms about sacred music, directives about musical personnel, orders about the Mass, the divine office and other rites; it treats of the use of Latin and the vernacular; it promotes congregational singing and fosters the creation of new music; it gives instruction about the use of instruments, directives for composers and for establishing music commissions. The always present question of a sound education for performing musicians and composers is emphasized along with the musical training of those preparing for the priesthood. Appreciation of what is “sacred” and what is “beautiful” in music demands long and well-directed study.

What had been the principal problem preventing the reforms of Pius X from being fully implemented in the United States - inadequate musical and liturgical formation - now was compounded as total amateurs invaded the areas of composition and performance, contrary to the directives of *Musicam sacram* and against the warnings of professional church musicians. Encouraged by liturgists who lacked musical learning, many amateurs began to sing, play and compose under the false idea that they were fulfilling the commands of the council for active participation. They were, in fact, breaking the rules of the highest authority in the Church. Texts to be sung in church are to be taken from the Holy Scriptures or liturgical sources,²⁸ but all kinds of secular ballads and songs have become commonplace. A *sensus ecclesiae* should determine the fittingness of musical forms and techniques for use in divine worship, but without proper training such a sense is not present or operative, even with all the good will and good intentions of many amateurs. What Pope Paul VI called “liturgical taste, sensitiveness, study and education,” were demanded to carry out the directives of the 1967 instruction. Since they have been lacking in most of those who have assumed the church music positions in this country, the instruction, *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.

PART V: The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations

11; Richard J. Schuler, “Humanism and the Sacred,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (Winter 1969), p. 3-6; Richard J. Schuler, “Pope Paul on Sacred Music,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer 1971), p. 3-5; James Hitchcock, “The Decline of the Sacred,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 100, No. 4 (Winter -1973), p. 3-9; Deryck Hanshall, “Resacralization,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 103, No. 4 (Winter 1976), p. 3-12; Richard J. Schuler, “Sacred Music and Contemplation,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 106, No. 1 (Spring 1979), p. 23- 26; Richard J. Schuler, “The Sacred,” *Sacred Music*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (Fall 1980), p. 21-27

²⁷ Cf. *Sacred Music*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer 1971), p. 3-5.

²⁸ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Art. 121

The enormous task of implementing in the practical order the wishes of the council fathers as expressed in the constitution on the sacred liturgy occupied the attention of the Roman authorities for nearly ten years. Two official bodies were involved in the process, the Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Difficulties between the two groups were many, but they were eventually solved by the establishment of the Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship to replace the old Congregation of Rites and the reorganization of the Consilium as a special commission dedicated to completing the liturgical reform.²⁹ Many conflicts of personalities and problems between the liturgists and the musicians continued to trouble the work of implementing the reforms called for by the council.

For church musicians the most important events of the decade following the close of the council were the publication of the new liturgical books as well as the various instructions and decrees of the Consilium and the Congregation of Rites and later, the new Congregation of Divine Worship. Fundamental to the entire reform was the new order of the Mass which was finalized with the appearance of the *Missale Romanum* in 1969. Controversy over the introduction to the 1969 edition led to the issuing of another “*Institutio generalis Missalis Romani*” in 1970. The Latin text of the missal remains the basis for all vernacular sacramentaries that have been published throughout the world.³⁰

The new order of the Mass brought new texts for which musical settings were wanting, particularly the responsorial psalms. The rearrangement of introits and communions, different from the old order, as well as the three-year cycle of scripture readings, presented some difficulties at first. The new calendar impinged more closely on the church musician, because of the suppression of some feasts and a revised positioning of others. A new system of classification of liturgical celebrations according to importance brought a new vocabulary with “*memorials*,” “*solemnities*,” “*ordinary time*,” etc. The old octaves were gone for the most part, and the familiar sequences were no longer obligatory.

Publication of a new *Graduale Romanum* followed shortly. Based on scholarly research and sound methodology, the chants for the Mass were made available in an edition prepared by the monks of Solesmes.³¹ According to the principles enunciated in the preface to the volume, only authentic chants were included, eliminating many pieces that had cluttered the earlier 1908 edition. New feasts introduced into the calendar with texts lacking in authentic chant settings would have to be provided with music written in the idiom of our day, since Gregorian chant is no longer the style of contemporary composition and the process of producing an ersatz chant has been discredited. Music for newly introduced responsorial psalms would have to be newly composed. The challenge of the council fathers to musicians was seen to be an on-going one.

²⁹ Cf. *Notitiae*, 195-196 (October-November 1982), p.466.

³⁰ This writer once was asked by a priest if the Latin *Missale Romanum* that he was unfamiliar with was a translation into Latin from the English missal. It demonstrates how the Latin missal was kept from the American priests.

³¹ See *Sacred Music*, Vol. 102, No. 4 (Winter 1975), p. 31-35; Vol. 103, No. 3 (Fall 1976), p. 3-6.

The new missal contains eighty-seven different preface texts. To provide musical settings for use at the altar, the monks provided sample tones, as well as musical notation for the singing of the four Eucharistic prayers, and the various introductory rites in this most useful volume.³² Together with the *Graduale Romanum* and the *Missale Romanum*, the *Ordo Missae in cantu* provided the clergy and the musicians with all the books needed to celebrate the sung liturgy in Latin.

An effort to introduce a simpler chant for the Mass produced a *Graduale simplex*, which was a failure from the beginning. It neither pleased the progressive liturgists who wanted only the vernacular, nor the musicians who pointed out that it was a mutilation of Gregorian chant as well as a misunderstanding of the relationship between text and musical setting with reference to form. They objected to the use of antiphon melodies from the office as settings for texts of the Mass. An effort at an English vernacular version proved to be even a greater disaster.

The revision of the office and the ritual had less impact on the ordinary church musician, although it caused grave changes in monastic communities.³³ No new official books in Latin with musical notation have been forthcoming as yet for the universal Church for the singing of the hours, although attempts to set the vernacular texts can be found. The official *Liturgia horarum* has no musical settings

While the Holy See published the official revised liturgical books in the Latin language and spread them around the world, in the United States these books remained almost totally unknown, and in fact, in some dioceses, their use was prohibited by local legislation that forbade the use of Latin.³⁴ To a great degree, the American clergy still do not know the *Missale Romanum*, the new *Graduale Romanum* or the *Ordo Missae in cantu*. They continue to co-relate the use of Latin with the old rite and the vernacular with the reformed rite. When asked to sing a Mass in Latin, they frequently resort to the old editions which are no longer in use. The confusion spread in the sixties concerning the use of Latin still continues.

Thus, with the virtual demise of Latin and with it the repertory of Gregorian chant and polyphonic music, church musicians turned their efforts to music for the new vernacular liturgy. Among the early problems was the instability of the translations, which were changed a number of times during the period of experimentation which produced many temporary versions. Choirs

³² See Sacred Music, Vol. 103, No. 4 (Winter 1976), p. 19-28; Vol. 104, No. 1 (Spring 1977), p. 21-25.

³³ In 1966, Pope Paul VI warned religious communities bound to the singing of the office that, "if this language, noble, universal and admirable for its spiritual vigor, if the Gregorian chant that comes from the depths of the human soul - if these two things be remodeled, then the choir will become like an extinguished candle which no longer illuminates or attracts the attention of the minds of men. The Church introduced the vernacular among the faithful for pastoral reasons; but she looks to you to preserve the ancient beauty, gravity and dignity of the divine office in both language and chant." Quoted in the Wanderer, Oct. 6, 1966.

³⁴ For a partial list of dioceses in the United States with regulations against the use of Latin, see Johannes Overath, ed. Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II, Rome 1969, p. 22-23.

were discouraged by the assertion that there was no longer a place for them, and they regretted the loss of familiar repertory. New music was not quickly forthcoming, although publishers rushed to sell compositions, many the work of total amateurs. It soon became apparent that the congregations that were expected to sing psalms and responsories and lengthy antiphons and parts of the Mass, were only capable of mastering a few hymns and not much more. The vernacular liturgy did not generate a “nest of singing birds” in the United States, and with choirs disorganized, the combo of a few instruments with various types of so-called folk-music became the musical ensemble in many churches. The organ was replaced by the guitar, the choir by the vocal combo, the professional musician by the amateur, the sacred by the secular. The hoped-for flowering of the privilege of the vernacular did not mature. Rather the speed of the disintegration of all that had been worked for during the years since Pius X amazed serious musicians. The decay was incredible.

In asking the question why, musically speaking, the reforms of the council were not a success, one must always arrive at the same answer: the wishes of the council fathers were not carried out. The council documents are clear; the instructions that followed are detailed and understandable; the official liturgical books leave no doubt about their use. But why have they not been put into effect in the United States? An important reason lies in the issuing of a document by the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, prepared by the Music Advisory Board and entitled “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations.”³⁵ While claiming to be an American interpretation of the Roman instruction, *Musicam sacram*, this statement is based on principles quite contrary to the expression of liturgical theology continuing though the past one hundred years. It is confused and even erroneous in doctrinal, musical and legal aspects. One wonders why the Roman instruction was not allowed to stand on its own and why an American statement was necessary at all, unless perhaps to prevent the Roman directions from becoming known and implemented in the United States.

Three years before the appearance of “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations,” Pope Paul VI issued his encyclical on the Holy Eucharist, *Mysterium Fidei*, September 3, 1965. Strangely, the American document has no reference to the encyclical even though its chief concern is with the Mass. In fact, it contains several statements quite contrary to the clear teaching of the encyclical. Pope Paul wrote in *Mysterium Fidei*:

Having safeguarded the integrity of the faith, it is necessary to safeguard also its proper mode of expression, lest by the careless use of words, we occasion (God forbid) the rise of false opinions regarding faith in the most sublime of mysteries. St. Augustine gives a stern warning about this in his consideration of the . way of speaking employed by the philosophers and of that which must be used by Christians. “The philosophers,” he says, “who use words loosely and in matters very difficult to understand have no great fear of offending a religious audience. We religious, however, have the obligation of speaking

³⁵ Newsletter of Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy. Vol. 4, No. 1-2 (January-February 1968).

according to a definite norm lest the license of our words give rise to an impious opinion about the matters which are signified by these words.”

The norm, therefore, of speaking which the Church after centuries of toil and under the protection of the Holy Spirit has established and confirmed by the authority of councils, and which has become more than once the watchword and standard of correct belief is to be religiously preserved and let no one at his own good pleasure or under the pretext of new science presume to change it... We are not to tolerate anyone who on his own authority wishes to modify the formulae in which the Council of Trent sets forth the mystery of the Eucharist for our belief.³⁶

In the light of the words of Pope Paul, the statement of the Music Advisory Board seems to be wanting in clarity and even to be expressing false opinions. One might wonder why an advisory board in the area of music should put out a theological statement at all, and especially this paragraph:

The eucharistic prayer is the praise and thanksgiving pronounced over the bread and wine which are to be shared in the communion meal. It is an acknowledgment of the Church’s faith and discipleship transforming the gifts to be eaten into the Body which Jesus gave and the Blood which he poured out for the life of the world, so that the sharing of the meal commits the Christian to sharing in the mission of Jesus. As a statement of the universal Church’s faith, it is proclaimed by the president alone. As a statement of the faith of the local assembly it is affirmed and ratified by all those present through acclamations like the great Amen.³⁷

The authors of “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations” use the word “transform” to describe the effect of the words of consecration and avoid the word “transubstantiation” as commanded by Pope Paul. They employ the term “meal” twice in a short paragraph, and the term “sacrifice” is not found once in the entire document of over six pages, while in *Mysterium Fidei* Pope Paul uses it repeatedly and has occasion only once to employ the word “meal.” The term “president” is used instead of “priest.” The document clearly was intended to be an expression of theological ideas quite different from those taught by Pope Paul, including such questions as the purpose of prayer, the distinction between the hierarchical priesthood and the common universal priesthood, the nature of Christ’s presence in the Holy Eucharist and His presence among us, and the very purpose of the Mass itself. In a variety of issues, the document of the Music Advisory Board offends against the clear teaching of the encyclical. What is obvious from such a comparison is that the theological convictions of the progressive liturgists and the thinking of the *Universa Laus* group are closely associated with doctrinal deviations that the council fathers voted to reject but which surfaced after the council not only in theological writings but in such practical applications as these published for musicians.

³⁶ Paragraph 23,24.

³⁷ IV,B, 1,A

But “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations” is not confused only in doctrinal matters. It fails in musical questions to conform to directives from the Holy See. *Musicam sacram* says: “The distinction between solemn, sung and read Mass, sanctioned by the instruction of 1958, is to be retained.”³⁸

But the Music Advisory Board says: “While it is possible to make technical distinctions in the forms of Mass...there is little distinction to be made between the solemn, sung and recited Mass.”³⁹ *Musicam sacram* uses the long-standing terminology of “ordinary” and “proper” parts of the Mass; but the Music Advisory Board says that “the customary distinction between the ordinary and proper parts of the Mass with regard to musical settings and distribution of roles is irrelevant.”⁴⁰ The Music Advisory Board says that “the musical settings of the past are usually not helpful models for composing truly contemporary pieces.”⁴¹ But *Musicam sacram* says:

Musicians will enter on this new work with the desire to continue that tradition which has given the Church a truly abundant heritage. Let them examine the works of the past, their style 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.⁴²

The chief error to be found in the American document, however, is concerned with the very purpose of sacred music, and this error lies at the root of most of the problems that have arisen since the issuing of the unfortunate statement. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy repeats the centuries-old position of the Church: “The purpose of sacred music is the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful.”⁴³ But the Music Advisory Board says:

Music, more than any other resource, makes a celebration of the liturgy an attractive human experience. Music in worship is a functional sign. It has a ministerial role. It must always serve the expression of faith. It affords a quality of joy and enthusiasm to the community’s statement of faith that cannot be gained in any other way. In so doing, it imparts a sense of unity to the congregation.⁴⁴

With the purpose of sacred music reduced to the “creating of a truly human experience,” one can easily explain the secularization of wedding music, the introduction of various combos, show-tunes, folk-music, ballads and much of the newly composed religious pieces that lack all artistic

³⁸ Paragraph 28.

³⁹ II, B, 1.

⁴⁰ II, B, 3.

⁴¹ II, B, 3.

⁴² Paragraph 59.

⁴³ Article 112

⁴⁴ III; III, B.

merit. The criterion has become “We like it.” The requirements of sanctity and good art have been replaced. Music is no longer *pars integrans*, as the council fathers called it, but it has become entertainment at worship.

The Music Advisory Board’s document teaches that there are now four principal classes of texts: readings, acciamations, psalms and hymns, and prayers. This comes directly from “Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship” by Father Joseph Gelineau.⁴⁵

Because these theories were imposed on the church musicians of the United States, the various instructions of the Holy See failed to get a hearing. The liturgists refused to accept the sixth chapter of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy as well as the instruction, *Musicam sacram*, and in their place they promoted the tenets of *Universa Laus* as expressed in “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations.”

One may ask how such a body as the Music Advisory Board could impose its opinions on the musicians and clergy of the United States. What was their legal foundation? The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy says: “It is desirable that the competent ecclesiastical authority, mentioned in article 22, set up a liturgical commission, to be assisted by experts in liturgical sciences, sacred music, art and pastoral practice.”⁴⁶ Advisory boards were set up in other areas besides music. Their capacity was seen as exclusively advisory to the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy.

The Bishops’ Committee finds its purpose and description in a document from the Holy See, an instruction for the proper implementation of the constitution on the sacred liturgy, dated September 26, 1964:

The territorial authority may, as circumstances suggest, entrust the following to this commission:

- a) studies and experiments to be promoted in accordance with the norm of article 40, 1 and 2 of the constitution;
- b) practical initiatives to be undertaken for the entire territory, by which the liturgy and the application of the constitution of the liturgy may be encouraged;
- c) studies and the preparation of aids which become necessary in virtue of the decrees of the plenary body of bishops;
- d) the office of regulating the pastoral-liturgical action in the entire nation, supervising the application of the decrees of the plenary body, and reporting concerning all these matters to the body;
- e) consultations to be undertaken frequently and common initiatives to be promoted with associations in the same region which are concerned with scripture, catechetics, pastoral

⁴⁵ Joseph Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship*, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1964.

⁴⁶ Article 44.

care, music and sacred art, and with every kind of religious association of the laity.⁴⁷

The question arises concerning the fact of how many of these functions have been entrusted to the committee by the territorial authority. But presuming that all of them have been so entrusted, it still remains a fact that in each of the cases enumerated in the instruction from the Holy See, the committee is concerned only with studies and experiments, with regulating what the plenary body has already decreed, with preparation of aids and consulting learned societies and individuals, and with practical initiatives to promote the constitution on the sacred liturgy. Committees are normally set up by a plenary body and are responsible to that body that has created them; they report their findings to that body which then, having received or not received the report, may or may not determine to take action on the subject in question. Thus the “legislative” authority in liturgy in this country as a whole remains the “territorial authority,” the plenary body of bishops, subject always to the Holy See.⁴⁸

An interesting note appeared in the Newsletter of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy when “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations” was issued:

The following statement was drawn up after study by the Music Advisory Board and was submitted to the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy. The Bishops’ Committee has approved the statement, adopted it as its own, and recommends it for consideration by all.⁴⁹

The question is obviously just what authoritative value does this document possess, and therefore, what respect and even obedience does it demand? Can it be construed as the basis for local diocesan legislation on musical matters, as has in fact so often been done?

The answer must be that it has no legal binding force, since it is merely the opinion of a board that is only advisory to a committee that in itself has no legislative authority but is constituted to report to the full body that empowered it, an act that doubtfully was ever done at all. In addition, when the opinions of an advisory board are found to be in contradiction to authoritative Roman instructions, then they clearly must be rejected.⁵⁰ But, in fact, they were not, and “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations” became the basis for, great activity in most dioceses where many musicians in good faith accepted the, propaganda delivered to them by *Universa Laus*, acting through the Music Advisory Board.

Two national meetings were arranged in order to launch “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations,” one in Kansas City, Missouri, December 1 and 2, 1966, when the

⁴⁷ Paragraph 45.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (June 28, 1969). No bishops’ conference can delegate any of its legislative authority to any of its committees.

⁴⁹ Vol. 104. No. 1-2 (January-February 1968).

⁵⁰ See Richard J. Schuler, “By Whose Authority?” *The Wanderer*, April 4, 1968, p.3

Music Advisory Board met, reorganized itself to be free of members who would likely oppose the projected statement, and then appointed a committee to write the desired document. Members of the committee were Fathers Eugene Walsh, S.S., and Robert Ledogar, M.M., and Dennis Fitzpatrick. The other major meeting was in Chicago, Illinois, November 20 to 23, 1968, jointly attended by members of diocesan music and liturgy commissions from across the nation. Under the watchful eye of Father Frederick McManus, papers were given by Rev. Joseph M. Champlin, Rev. Robert Ledogar, M.M., Rev. Eugene Walsh, S.S., Rev. Neil McEleney, C.S.P., Bishop John J. Dougherty, Rev. Gary Toilner and Rev. William A. Bauman. Statements made and left unchallenged included these:

“Without faith, there can be no sacrament; community faith is necessary; it exists in the community before it exists in the individual.” “The faith of those present accomplishes the marvelous change called transubstantiation.” “The primary sign of the Eucharist are (sic) people gathering together, not the bread and wine or words.”

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. But the true colors of those who were manipulating the reforms of music and liturgy in the United States became crystal clear in Chicago. The practical application of the principles set forth in the document was presented at the Mass celebrated by Rev. J. Paul Byron at Old Saint Mary’s Church, November 21, at which the folk-music of Phil Ochs and Pete Seeger was performed.⁵¹ Present at most of the sessions and the Masses were many members of the hierarchy, members of the Bishops’ Committee on Liturgy, none of whom raised any objections to the statements made or the music performed.⁵²

With the document now enjoying an “official” position, taken by some to be even legislative and authoritative and equal if not surpassing Roman legislation, the disintegration of church music across the country began in earnest. “Beat” music, so called folk-music, combos, jazz and rock groups, country Western and ballads became the accepted music for parish liturgies, weddings, graduations and even ordination. The Catholic and the secular press have recorded the aberrations.⁵³ With the introduction of profane and trivial compositions and performances, good music became ever more disused, as choirs were disbanded and even prohibited. Seminaries, novitiates and colleges led the way, and little official effort was

⁵¹ The official program of the meeting prints the texts for Oh, Had I a Golden Thread by Pete Seeger; When I’ve Gone by Phil Ochs; and This Little Light of Mine.

⁵² Members of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy were Most Rev. Leo C. Byrne, Coadjutor Archbishop of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, Most Rev. John L. Morkovsky, Most Rev. James W. Malone, Most Rev. Francis J. Furey, Most Rev. Aloysius J. Wycislo and Most Rev. John J. Dougherty.

⁵³ Some of the “top ten” of the liturgical hits in the late sixties were: Michael, Row the Boat; Blowing in the Wind; Gypsy Rover; and Kum-bay-a. Often these had newly composed works whose literary worth was worse than liturgical value of the melodies. Others were totally secular in both words and music, e.g., Hush Little Baby; There is a Ship; Try to Remember; This Land is Your Land, etc.

expanded to curtail it.⁵⁴ In some dioceses the bishops did speak up forcefully against abuses.⁵⁵ Writers in Catholic periodicals generally backed the revolution, but others expressed caution and concern.⁵⁶ As music for “special groups,” originally intended for college and high school students, came to mean music for elementary pupils too, so that they could participate more fully, some liturgists promoted the writing of music by grade school children for performance at their Masses. “Living Worship,” a publication of the Liturgical Conference, assured church musicians that the piano had at least four advantages over the organ as a liturgical instrument, and that ukeleles are amazingly simple for young children to learn to play.⁵⁷ In a more learned idiom, “Worship” published an explanation of the entire reform: “The hootenanny Mass can give explicit eucharistic and christological specification to youth’s intense involvement in the movements for racial justice, for control of nuclear weapons, for the recognition of personal dignity.”⁵⁸

With the very purpose of sacred music undermined, the repertory of centuries set aside, the language of the Church even outlawed, choirs disbanded and a rash of secular compositions and ensembles put in the place of a thousand-year tradition, there is little wonder that church musicians were baffled and disheartened. The hope and development promised by the council fathers had not materialized in this country, chiefly because what came from Rome never reached the United States.

PART VI: Music in Catholic Worship

The seventies were a decade of unrest for the whole world. In the United States the effects of the cultural revolution that began in China and spread through Europe caused protests and strikes on college campuses that echoed down into high schools and other educational institutions generally. The protests associated with the war in Viet Nam involved nuns and priests in activity not formerly a part of the religious life. The concept of authority in the Church was challenged in every area: education, liturgy, catechetics, religious vows, the role of the laity. Much of the ferment was justified by the activists in their own minds as being an expression of the “spirit of Vatican II.” The progressivists pushed far beyond the intentions of the council fathers in an effort to establish a church that reflected their own specifications rather than the directives that came out of the council and the Curia. Since few among the laity and even among the clergy actually had ever read the writings of the council fathers or the papal and curial

⁵⁴ For example, in a letter to this writer, dated March 31, 1966, Archbishop Hallinan of Atlanta, Georgia, said: “I am sympathetic to the adaptation of popular music in church to include the use of folk songs. I would not want the bishops’ commission to take a strong stand against such folk music. Rather, I prefer the free development of it, with of course, proper care and exercise of caution at all times.”

⁵⁵ For example, Archbishop Cousins in Milwaukee and Bishop Gorman in Dallas both spoke out against the abuses.

⁵⁶ Cf. Michael D. Cordovana, “Perspective of Change,” *Musart*, September-October 1967, p. 10-11, 41; Robert F. Hayburn, “Music for Special Groups,” *Musart*, September- October 1967, p. 16, 33-38.

⁵⁷ William Flanders, “Music for Children’s Liturgies —Practical Excerpts from a New Book,” *Living Worship*, Vol. 6 No. 7, September 1970.

⁵⁸ Patrick Regan, “The Change Behind the Changes,” *Worship*, Vol. 40, No. 1, January 1966.

documents that followed on the close of the council, most of the activity that was promoted so feverishly in the seventies, supposedly to implement the council's directives, was based on opinions rather than on facts, on newspaper accounts of interviews with the statements by *periti*. Church music was among the first areas to suffer devastation under the attacks of the reformers.

On an international level, the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* continued its efforts to implement the decrees of the council in accord with the commission given to it by its founder, Pope Paul VI. It organized and sponsored the Sixth International Church Music Congress, held in Salzburg, Austria, in August of 1974.⁵⁹ Special efforts were made there in the practical order to foster new compositions. New works in a variety of languages, many from areas under Communist domination, were presented along with Gregorian chant and music from all periods of the Church's treasury of polyphony. Before and after the congress, several symposia were organized by the *Consociatio* in various areas of music that were opened up for study as a result of conciliar statements. In Rome, in 1975, ethnomusicologists from all the continents met to consider the place of native music in missionary lands as ordered by the council.⁶⁰ In 1972, the subject of music for cathedral churches was studied in Salzburg,⁶¹ and in 1977, at Boizano in the South Tirol, questions confronting composers for the revised liturgy were discussed.⁶² An international house for the study of hymnology, ethnomusicology and Gregorian chant was established at Maria Laach in West Germany in 1977 with the purpose of aiding musicians and bishops from all parts of the world in carrying out the music reforms of Vatican II.

The *Consociatio* published a volume of chants common to all peoples, the *Liber Cantualis*,⁶³ containing a basic repertory to be sung by all Catholic congregations, and four years earlier, in 1974, Pope Paul VI sent a booklet of chants, entitled *Jubilare Deo*,⁶⁴ to all the bishops of the world as his special Easter gift to them and their people. Despite constant opposition to its work from the progressivists who wished to impose a "spirit of the council" in place of the decrees of the council, the work of the *Consociatio*, coupled with the academic activity of the

⁵⁹ Johannes Overath, ed. *C'onservare et Promovere: VI. Internationaler Kongress für Kirchenmusik. Salzburg, 26. August bis 2. September 1974*. Rome: Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae, 1975. American participation in the congress included the presence of two choirs, the Dallas Catholic Choir, directed by Father Ralph S. March, and the Twin Cities Catholic Chorale, directed by Monsignor Richard J. Schuler; new compositions commissioned for the occasion by American composers, Noel Goemanne and Paul Manz; and lectures presented by William Peter Mahrt and Monsignor Schuler.

⁶⁰ Kuckertz — J. Overath, eds. *Musica Indigena: Musikethnologisches Symposium, Rom, vom 14. bis 22. November 1975*. Rome: Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae, 1976. See also R. J. Schuler, "Native Music for the Missions," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 102, No. 4 (Winter 1975), p. 27-30.

⁶¹ Johannes Overath, ed. *Magna Gloria Domini, Die liturgische Musik in den Kathedralen, Abteikirchen und Ecclesiae minores nach dem Vaticanum II: Symposion der Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae, vom 4. bis 8. April 1972 in Salzburg*. Rome: Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae, 1972.

⁶² Johannes Overath, ed. *Confitemini Domino: Internationales Komponisten-Symposion, Boizano dal 13 al 17 aprile 1977*. Maria Laach: Haus der Kirchenmusik, 1977.

⁶³ *Liber Cantualis*. Sablé-sur-Sarthe (France): Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, 1978.

⁶⁴ *Jubilare Deo*.

Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome, advanced clearly if somewhat slowly.

During the first part of the decade, the officers of the *Consociatio*, appointed by papal letter, were: Jacques Chailley of France, president; Monsignor Johannes Overath of Germany and Monsignor Richard J. Schuler of the United States, vice-presidents; Canon Renè B. Lenaerts of Belgium, Joseph Lennards of The Netherlands, Monsignor Fiorenzo Romita of Italy, Rev. Jean-Pierre Schmit of Luxemburg and Monsignor Ferdinand Haberl of Germany were consultants. During the second half of the decade, the praesidium of the *Consociatio* was: Monsignor Johannes Overath, president; Monsignor Richard J. Schuler and Canon Renè B. Lenaerts, vice-presidents; Joseph Lennards, Monsignor Jean-Pierre Schmit, Rev. Gerard Mizgalski of Poland and Edouard Souberbielle of France, consultants. Rev. Robert A. Skeris was appointed consultant after the death of Mons. Mizgalski.

In the United States, the Church Music Association of America continued its efforts to carry out the wishes of the council. Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts, April 1-3, 1970, church musicians from all parts of the United States considered the challenges presented to them by the reform, but the influence of the progressivists was very apparent at the meeting, both in discussions and in practical demonstrations.⁶⁵ The previous national convention at Detroit, Michigan, April 16- 19, 1968, had been a financial disaster because racial tensions in the city had kept many from attending.⁶⁶ The Boston meeting did much to help recoup the monetary losses incurred in Detroit, but a clear direction for the Association in the turmoil of the liturgical and musical reforms was not forthcoming. Later meetings of the association in Saint Paul, Minnesota, in December 1973,⁶⁷ and in Pueblo, Colorado, January 31 to February 2, 1975,⁶⁸ were poorly attended and of little significance. Cost of travel and lodging and adverse economic conditions prohibited many musicians from attending national conventions at great distances from their homes. The meeting in Saint Paul marked the centenary of the establishment of the Society of Saint Cecilia of America and the founding of the journal *Caecilia*. The event was observed with pontifical Mass at the Church of Saint Agnes, a blessing from the Holy Father and the presentation of medals from the Allgemeiner Cäcilien-Verband für die Länder deutscher Sprache. After Pueblo, the Church Music Association of America has confined its activity to the publication of its quarterly journal, *Sacred Music*.

Officers of the association during the seventies were: 1970-72: Roger Wagner, president; Noel Goemanne, vice-president; Rev. Robert A. Skeris, general secretary; Frank D. Synskie, treasurer; Robert I. Blanchard, Rev. Ralph S. March, Theodore Marier, John McManemin, Rev. Elmer F. Pfeil, Paul Salamunovich, Rev. Richard J. Schuler and James Welch, directors. 1972-74: Roger Wagner, president; Rev. Robert A. Skeris, vice-president; Monsignor Richard J.

⁶⁵ See *Sacred Music*, Vol. 96, No. I (Spring 1970), p. 42-43, for Father Ralph S. March's comments on the convention.

⁶⁶ f. Theodore Marier, "National Convention in Detroit," *Sacred Music*, Vol. 95, No. I (Spring 1968), p. 3-4.

⁶⁷ See *Sacred Music*, Vol. 101, No. 1 (Spring 1974), p. 41-42.

⁶⁸ See *Sacred Music*, Vol. 102, No. 1 (Spring 1975), p. 35-36

Schuler, general secretary; Sister Miriam Joseph, C.S.J., treasurer; Mrs. Richard K. Biggs, Arthur F. Edwards, Rev. Ralph S. March, John McManemin, Rev. Elmer F. Pfeil and Paul Salamunovich, directors. 1974-76: Gerhard Track, president; Rev. Robert A. Skeris, vice-president; Monsignor Richard J. Schuler, general secretary; Mrs. Richard H. Dres, Treasurer; Mrs. Richard K. Biggs, Arthur F. Edwards, Rev. Ralph S. March, John McManemin, Noel Goemanne, Mrs. Donald G. Vellek, directors. 1977-80: Monsignor Richard J. Schuler, president; Gerhard Track, vice-president; Virginia A. Schubert, general secretary; B. Allen Young, treasurer; Mrs. Richard K. Biggs, Rev. Ralph S. March, Mrs. Donald G. Vellek, William P. Mahrt and Rev. Robert A. Skeris, directors.

During the seventies, many ecclesiastical organizations ceased functioning, chiefly because of financial troubles caused by inflation in the economy, but also because a clear direction and purpose could not be maintained. Pressure from the progressivist element was too strong. Among the societies that disappeared was the National Catholic Music Educators Association, publishers of *Musart*. The NCMEA was primarily interested in classroom music teaching, but the music of the liturgy always had an important place in Catholic schools. Thus, considerable effort was directed toward Gregorian chant, formation of boys choirs, state-wide festival Masses and the liturgical formation of students in addition to the usual work of music educators. When Catholic schools and most religious orders of Sisters experienced the turmoil of the seventies and many failed and closed, the teachers' associations also suffered. NCMEA ceased publication of its magazine in the middle of the decade.⁶⁹

While strictly speaking it is not the successor organization to NCMEA, the National Association of Pastoral Musicians was organized after the demise of the music teachers' society. Its publication, *Pastoral Music*, began in 1976, with Rev. Virgil C. Funk as publisher. The society has the approval of the American bishops, and its journal reflects the position of the music advisors to the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy as well as the National Liturgical Conference, the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, and ultimately, *Universa Laus Pastoral Music* publishes current developments in liturgical innovations and musical fads. References to folk-music, combos, dancing, banners and theological trends dominate its pages, and yet a decade after its beginning, it is already becoming passé, tied to the ideas of the sixties and seventies. The true liturgical reforms of the council, as announced by the Holy See, are not clearly set forth in the pages of *Pastoral Music*, although they are slowly beginning to appear on the American scene despite the fads and trendy positions proposed by the Association of Pastoral Musicians. Its conventions and workshops are scheduled in a wide variety of places across the country. They have attracted large numbers of church musicians who truly seek help in bringing to their parishes the reforms sought by the Church, but the number who have found answers to their problems is beginning to dwindle. Basic in the stance of the Association of Pastoral Musicians is a confusion over the nature of the "sacred."⁷⁰ Until the requirements as given by the

⁶⁹ Published from 1948 to 1976.

⁷⁰ *Pastoral Music*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (April-May 1983), contains several articles on the question of sacred and secular music.

Church in its instructions on music in the liturgy are accepted, viz., holiness and goodness of form, nothing positive toward implementing the wishes of the council will be achieved by the activities of this group. Liturgical music must be sacred and it must be art. So many of the suggested innovations are lacking in one or both of these requirements.

The seventies proved to be the decade of the *piccolomini*, the little men. Church music became the domain of the “do-it-yourself” composer and performer. In the name of *actuosa participatio*, guitar players, various combos, folk-singers and even grade school children undertook to write and perform music for church, providing both texts and notes. That such ineptitude and ignorance, albeit sincere, could have taken hold of a serious and sacred sector of life, the worship of God, can only be explained by reference to the direction given from the central authority in the country. The phenomenon was witnessed in all parts of the country; it came from a common source. That source was the Music Advisory Board of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy. The group acted chiefly through the documents issued in its name: “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations;”⁷¹ and “Music in Catholic Worship,” which was released in 1972.

On September 5, 1970, the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship published its third instruction on the orderly implementation of the constitution on the sacred liturgy of the Second Vatican Council.⁷² Entitled *Liturgicae instaurationes*, it put an end to experimentation in liturgical matters and called for the careful fulfillment of the instructions given by the council and the curial documents that followed. The decrees contained in *Musicam sacram* of 1967 are repeated, and abuses are ordered to be eliminated. Only a passing reference to this significant document from Rome occurs in “Music in Catholic Worship.” Just as with *Musicam sacram*, this Roman instruction was ignored in the United States, and the abuses continued to grow. There is little wonder that the laity objected to many innovations made in the name of the council and the reform, because their very right to have the liturgical reform carried out properly and orderly was being violated. The instruction of 1972 clearly stated that “the priest should keep in mind that, by imposing his own personal restoration of sacred rites, he is offending the rights of the faithful and is introducing individualism and idiosyncrasy into celebrations which belong to the whole Church.”⁷³ The true nature of the liturgical reform was once again clarified:

The effectiveness of liturgical actions does not consist in the continual search for newer rites or simpler forms, but in an ever deeper insight into the word of God and the mystery which is celebrated. The priest will assure the presence of God and His mystery in the celebration by following the rites of the Church rather than his own preferences.⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Newsletter of Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy*. Vol. 4, No. 1-2 January-February 1968). See Part V of “Chronicle of the Reform” for a treatment of this document, pages 3 73/85. above.

⁷² See *Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1982, p. 159-167.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, para. 1.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*

The third instruction repeats the statement of *Musicam sacram* which says that “the Church does not exclude any kind of sacred music from the liturgy.”⁷⁵ It says further that “not every type of music, song or instrument is equally capable of stimulating prayer or expressing the mystery of Christ.” True sacred music must have the qualities of holiness and good form, as the Church has been repeating at least since the days of Pope Pius X. Interestingly, “Music in Catholic Worship” omits the word “sacred” in its treatment of this subject, even when it quotes *Musicam sacram* in the Newsletter of the Bishops’ Committee: “In modern times the Church has consistently recognized and freely admitted the use of various styles of () music as an aid to liturgical worship.”⁷⁶ The fact is, that the word “sacred” and the very notion of sacredness is usually absent in the American documents, despite frequent use in the Roman ones. The issue of the “sacred” continues to be a basic difficulty between the American and Roman statements. If one eliminates the quality of holiness, then “many styles of contemporary composition”⁷⁷ can be employed, and if the quality of good form is overlooked, then “music in folk idiom (can) find acceptance in eucharistic celebrations.”⁷⁸ But these actions go contrary to the clear Roman instructions.

As was the case with “The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations,” so the most unfortunate part of “Music in Catholic Worship” is its theology. Why a document on music needs such theological reflections is not clear, unless a new theology is being taught, something until now unknown to the Catholic musician. In the chapter entitled “The Theology of Celebration,” we read such nebulous statements as these:⁷⁹

We are Christians because through the Christian community we have met Jesus Christ, heard his word in invitation, and responded to him in faith. We gather at Mass that we may hear and express our faith again in this assembly and, by expressing it, renew and deepen it. We come together to deepen our awareness of, and commitment to, the action of his Spirit in the whole of our lives at every moment We come together to acknowledge the love of God poured out among us in the work of the Spirit, to stand in awe and praise.⁸⁰

Catholic truth is not based on feelings. The divine life in a baptized person redeemed by the sacrifice of Christ is a deeper reality than that expressed in “The Theology of Celebration.” The purpose of the Mass for the Catholic is inadequately expressed in the words quoted above. Such

⁷⁵ *Musicam sacram*, No. 9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 4.

⁷⁷ “Music in Catholic Worship,” Revised edition. Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, 1983. No. 28.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Compare these statements with *Liturgicae instaurationes*, the third instruction, No. 1, which says: “Liturgical reform is not at all synonymous with so-called desacralization and is not intended as an occasion for what is called secularization. Thus the liturgy must keep a dignified and sacred character.”

⁸⁰ “Music in Catholic Worship,” No. 1, 2.

watered-down statements cannot be the basis for liturgy or for music that forms an integral part of liturgy. The taint of a false ecumenism with its roots in Modernism can be detected in this statement on celebration. It is only a partial truth and not a good or adequately complete expression of Catholic faith. Where is there in it any reference to transubstantiation, or the consecration, or the real presence of Jesus, all essential to a Catholic understanding of the Mass? Truly, the Mass is more than a mere prayer, more than even the greatest prayer.

“Music in Catholic Worship” is the work of liturgists, not of church musicians. It was drawn up by a committee of the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions. In the seventies, a new class of “expert” emerged.⁸¹ Despite limited theological study, historical knowledge and artistic achievement, the liturgist acquired command of parish worship, including virtual control of the clergy, musicians and the laity in their separate roles. Selection of music, scheduling of cantors and lectors, decisions on vestments, decorations, ceremonial movement and even the hours of choir practice came under the jurisdiction of a new type of bureaucrat. Trained at Notre Dame University and at Catholic University in Washington, the first liturgists were able to find employment and command significant salaries, and thus many other schools and colleges added courses to train liturgists. With “creativity” as a basic principle of action, the liturgist is constantly seeking the innovative despite the warning of the Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship which insists that “the effectiveness of liturgical action does not consist in the continual search for newer rites or simpler forms.”⁸² Most of the difficulties between liturgists and church musicians arise precisely because of this problem. Musicians need time to develop repertory, and once repertory is built, opportunity to use it frequently is necessary. The very construction of the Roman liturgical books assures this repetition with the recurring cycles of the liturgical texts and the Gregorian melodies. Thus the musician asks only for the right to carry out the liturgy according to the directions of the Roman books. Indeed, the third instruction of 1970 says: “One should not add any rite which is not contained in the liturgical books.”⁸³

Thus, by the end of the decade, fifteen years after the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, the state of church music in the United States had so deteriorated that serious observers began to question what had gone wrong with the reform. The *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* conducted a survey of musicians in all parts of the world seeking to ascertain if current practices in liturgical music actually corresponded to the requirements of the conciliar decrees and the post conciliar instructions.⁸⁴ It asked if there was greater *actuosa participatio* now than before, if Latin and Gregorian chant were truly being fostered as the council had directed, if church music was being taught in seminaries and novitiates, if congregational singing was improving, if the organ was being given its legitimate role in

⁸¹ Cf. Editorial statement, “The Liturgist,” *Sacred Music*; Vol. 108, No. 3 (Fall 1981), p. 19-21

⁸² *Liturgicae instaurationes*, No. 1.

⁸³ *Ibid*

⁸⁴ The questions made reference to particular articles of the constitution on the sacred liturgy, the instruction *Musicae sacram* of 1967, and the *Institutio generalis* of the *Ordo Missae*. Cf. *Sacred Music*, Vol. 104, No. 4, p. 5-12.

liturgical services. For each question, the proper quotation from the official documents was given. The survey proved that far from a new springtime for church music, the hoped-for reform had come to ruin, and even the achievements of the past seventy-five years since the *motu proprio* of Pope Pius X had been for the most part lost. A new beginning would have to be made, based on a renewed understanding of the “sacred” and a re-established system of education in liturgical music at all levels from grade schools through seminaries and novitiates. By the beginning of the eighties, it was becoming clear that the next generation would have to correct what had been wrought in the sixties and seventies if it wished to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council and continue the reform originally begun by Saint Pius X.

Part VII: Documents on the Liturgy

By the end of the seventies, the condition of church music in the United States had so far deteriorated that the very purposes of the reform set in motion by Pope Pius X eighty years before had all but disappeared. Just what the Church intended as reform, and how it was to be accomplished was so confused in the minds of church musicians that aberrations worse than the abuses decried by Pius X were even being promoted as reforms.

To catalog the abuses would take volumes. When the nadir was thought to have been reached, the next day produced even greater and more unfortunate disorders. The problems were based in a disregard for the two elements required of church music, qualities clearly called for by Pius X and by every document issued since, including the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy from the Second Vatican Council: holiness and goodness of form. Church music must be sacred and it must be true art. In nearly everything that in recent years was promoted by publishers, performing groups, musical congresses and conventions, one or both of these essential qualities was lacking. With the basic requirements wanting, the incidental and peripheral innovations had no foundation, and utter confusion resulted. Educated musicians and many Catholics with a *sensus ecclesiae* asked openly what had happened. Could it be that what we have experienced in the past twenty years is what the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in a general council, intended the worship of God to become?

The answer was hard to arrive at, because the vast number of documents, papal, conciliar and curial, that had come forth since the opening of the Second Vatican Council lay beyond the grasp of most musicians and clergy. Even those who had attempted to become acquainted with every decree were not sure that they had really seen them all. No orderly compilation of the documents of the reform had as yet appeared. Monsignor Robert F. Hayburn had collected the historical documents on church music, but his work was concluded with the Second Vatican Council.⁸⁵ Need for an orderly collection, that showed the intentions of the law givers, the direction of the reform, and the purpose behind the art of music as a part of liturgy was finally met by the publication of a monumental work, *Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979, Conciliar*,

⁸⁵ *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music, 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D.* Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1979.

*Papal and Curial Texts.*⁸⁶

In studying this volume the first idea that strikes the reader is the order and plan behind the on-going decrees from the Holy See and the conciliar bodies. The goal of reform was clear and the means of attaining the goal were likewise fully laid out. The purpose of sacred music is given: the glory of God and the edification of the faithful, not the creation of a truly human situation, as the Bishops' Advisory Board on Music stated.⁸⁷ Music for use in church must be sacred, a requirement that is called for again and again in the Roman documents, but hardly ever in statements from Americans. Music for the liturgy must be true art, a judgment that belongs to well-trained professional church musicians, despite the abundance of well-meaning but uneducated amateurs in composition, performance and criticism of church music in this country. In reality, what the documents of the council, the Pope and his Curia spelled out in the past twenty years does not differ significantly from the original directives given by Pope Pius X. In a way they are a kind of capstone placed on the top of a structure that has long been building. Now the view of the whole is apparent and those who have strayed from the plan can return to the clearly outlined goal.

Not all the reform has been contained in decrees and documents. More important from a practical standpoint has been the publication of new liturgical books. In these newly revised and edited volumes what has been ordered for liturgical use in the universal Church is definitely set down. While all the liturgical books issued since the council are important, at least remotely, to the church musician, those that are specifically musical are of the utmost concern. Those that have been published and are available for use in the Latin liturgy are:

- *Graduate Romanum* (1974). Contains the proper of the time, common of the saints, proper of the saints, ritual Masses, Masses for various occasions, votive Masses, the liturgy of the Dead and the ordinary of the Mass.
- *Graduale simplex* (1975). Intended for use in small churches, it contains simplified settings for the texts of the Mass.
- *Jubilare Deo* (reprinted 1974). A collection of chants for Mass and other occasions.
- *Lectioarium* (1970-72). In three volumes, the readings in Latin for the whole church year in all cycles, together with the responsorial psalm and verse before the gospel (without musical settings).
- *Liturgia horarum* (1980). In four volumes, the divine office (without musical settings).

⁸⁶ Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1983.

⁸⁷ "The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations." III; 111, B. Published in *Newsletter of Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy*, Vol. 4, No. 1-2 January-February 1968).

- *Missale Romanum* (revised edition, 1975). Originally published in 1969, this is the *Novus Ordo Missae* of Pope Paul VI, containing what is needed by the priest at the altar and the chair. Some musical indications are given.
- *Missale Romanum cum lectionibus ad usum fidelium* (1977). In four volumes, all the prayers and readings for the whole year for use as a hand missal for the faithful. Musical settings include some chants for the Mass.
- *Ordo Missae in cantu*. The priest's chants at the chair and the altar, including the opening prayers, various intonations, all the prefaces, the four Eucharistic prayers, concluding chants. Notation is provided for all the texts.
- *Pontificale Romanum and Rituale Romanum*. Still in preparation, containing rites performed by bishops and by priests. There will be musical notation

From these books that have appeared in an *editio typica* from the Libreria Editrice Vaticana, the official publishing house of the Holy See, all the various vernacular translations have been made. But the Latin originals have been printed for use not simply as sources of translations.⁸⁸ When the council ordered that the Gregorian chant books be revised and extended, it was the intention of the fathers that the chant should be sung within the Latin liturgy. They were not merely promoting musicological research; they were directing the faithful to the means of Catholic worship in song. Other books are in progress, including the musical settings of vespers and an updated *Liber usualis*, containing the most commonly used chants for Mass and vespers. The revision is the work of the monks of Solesmes, and their publications in the past decade include not only the official chant books, but they have also issued research volumes indicating their musicological methods.⁸⁹

With the publication of the official books and decrees emanating from Rome and from the Abbey of Solesmes, the long process of implementing the wishes of the council fathers for a liturgical reform takes shape and gains momentum throughout the world. Unfortunately in the United States it has scarcely begun, chiefly because an anti-Latin propaganda was so effective among both clergy and laity that the use of Latin is still thought to be forbidden. The official liturgical books in Latin have hardly been seen in this country even in the seminaries, contrary to explicit legislation ordering candidates for the priesthood to be trained in Gregorian chant and Latin, and other rules commanding that the liturgy celebrated in seminaries be done in Latin as the usual procedure. As long as a disobedience to these commands persists in the seminaries, the

⁸⁸ Fr. Frederick R. McManus, while head of the secretariate of the American bishops' committee on the liturgy, stated that "it may be that in some areas retention (of Latin) will simply mean employing the Latin texts as the basis for translations into the vernacular, at least in the case of those parts of the Roman rite which are themselves original, such as the collects." *Worship*, Vol. 38, No. 6, p. 351.

⁸⁹ Cf. *Graduale triplex* Eugene Cardine, *Première année de Chant grégorien: Sémiologie grégorienne; Graduel neumé: Offertoires neumés*.

liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council will not be accomplished in the United States. Without the solid foundation of the Latin liturgy, the aberrations found in so many vernacular celebrations will continue and increase.

From June 19 to 22, 1983, an international Gregorian chant symposium was held in Washington, D.C., sponsored jointly by the Catholic University of America, the Dom Mocquereau Foundation, the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome and the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae*. Over five hundred participants came from all over the world to study, sing and learn about Gregorian chant.⁹⁰ The significance of this gathering lies in the demonstration that Gregorian chant is alive and prospering in some parts of the world in accord with the Church's wishes, and secondly, that in the United States, for the most part, the wishes of the Church have been ignored.

In contrast with the chant symposium the several meetings of the Association of Pastoral Musicians show how far astray the reform has gone in the United States. In Saint Louis, Missouri, after the closing Mass of the convention in the cathedral, the archbishop found it necessary to apologize to the people for the liturgy carried on by the delegates.⁹¹ *Pastoral Music, Aim, Worship, and Modern Liturgy* continue to record the theorizing and the practical applications of the theories that propose to be the implementation of the Church's reform of the liturgy. But a younger generation is arising of priests and people who see the discrepancy between what is being promoted in this country and what the official directives have indicated. They see that what is still being promoted by various publishers, performing groups and national organizations of liturgists and musicians does not correspond to the reality of the present. Rather these groups are passé, tied to the ideas of the sixties when experimentation was widespread. Now that the experiments, for the most part, have been shown to be unfortunate and useless, they continue to hold to them while the Church prepares to implement its well planned reform according to its documents. Only when we are freed of the errors and unfounded innovations of the present liturgical establishment will progress be made in the United States and the reform again be allowed to continue.

Certain distinctions must be learned in this country about music for worship. They are clearly indicated in the documents.⁹² First, the difference between music intended as liturgical music and that intended as *religious* music must be established. When composing for the very words of the Mass or the hours, one is creating music which is itself *pars integrans*, an integral part of the liturgy itself. Whether the texts are Latin or the vernacular, the music must always be in a sacred

⁹⁰ For accounts of the meeting, see Paul LeVoir, "The international Gregorian Chant Symposium" in *Sacred Music*, Vol. 110, No. 2 (Summer 1983), p. 17-21; Christopher M. Schaefer, "International Symposium on Gregorian Chant" in *The American Organist*, Vol. 17, No. 10 (October 1983), p. 40-42; Msgr. Francis Schmitt, "International Symposium on Gregorian Chant" in *The American Organist* (Vol. 17, No. 10 (October 1983), p. 42-43.

⁹¹ *St. Louis Review*, April 29, 1983, p. 4.

⁹² Cf. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy; *Musicae sacrae*, instruction on music in the liturgy, March 5, 1967, Par. 4a, b.

style and truly and seriously artistic, worthy of the exalted purpose for which it is intended. It can, indeed, be simple and within the scope of lesser performers, but it must always be holy and of good form. The council itself calls for just that, both in Latin and in the vernacular tongues. The treasures of the past will supply the bulk of such repertory for many years to come, but new composition must surely be encouraged and used.

Secondly, *religious* music, as distinguished from *liturgical* music, truly has a place both within the liturgy and in paraliturgical and extra-liturgical services, as well as in gatherings apart from formal worship. Through the centuries the Church has encouraged such pious activity. The medieval world was filled with compositions in both Latin and the vernacular that were religious and prayerful. Some, indeed, found their way into the liturgy as hymns and sequences. Others remained always as non-liturgical compositions.

We can further distinguish within this *religious* music pieces that might well be used at Masses in which the liturgical texts themselves are not sung.⁹³ Hymns constitute the largest body of such music. They must, of course, have sacred texts and they must be composed according to the proper rules of hymn-writing. Since by their very nature they fall within the capabilities of the entire congregation, they are most useful for the promotion of *actuosa participatio populi*. A great body of such music exists, especially from the 16th century, but 19th century hymns and some from our own time may likewise be suitably employed.

Other *religious* music, especially what is known today as folk songs, or pieces in ballad style, music reminiscent of country or western songs but set to texts of a religious nature, has no place in services within the church, either liturgical or non-liturgical. The texts are not taken from the sacred scriptures or from liturgical books as the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy orders.⁹⁴ The music is not in a serious artistic style. Rather these pieces, good in themselves, are best used in gatherings outside the church, meetings of youth groups, excellent for singing as part of entertainment.

There are also those great religious works, such as oratorios and cantatas, written on texts from the Bible or on sacred poems, set with melodies of great beauty and harmony of great value, some with orchestration and both choral and solo sections. Again, these are not intended for liturgical use, but rather for occasions when performances of this genre of religious music can bring the minds and hearts of the audiences to the contemplation of holy things.

In a word, as there exist both secular and sacred compositions, so within the category of sacred one must further distinguish between liturgical and religious works. And often one must

⁹³ *Musicam sacram*, Para. 32.

⁹⁴ Para. 121. Pope Paul VI spoke to a thousand religious women participating in a convention of the Italian Society of St. Cecilia, April 15, 1971, about a true sense of what is sacred and therefore fitting for the liturgy. For a commentary on his words, see Richard J. Schuler, "Pope Paul on Sacred Music" in *Sacred Music*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer 1971), p. 3-5.

further refine the distinction “religious” by determining what is suitable for use within the house of God and what belongs in activity that is good and worthwhile in itself, but not directly a part of God’s worship. It is in the confusion of these forms and styles that many of today’s problems in church music in the United States lie. Most contemporary guitar ensembles, campus ministry combos, folk-singers and religious ballad singers, often very skilled and professional, are not aware of the distinction in forms that must determine the use of all religious music. Frequently criticism is misunderstood when objection is made to the kind of religious music employed in some liturgical services. Ignorance of what the Church wishes for the liturgy and what the Church approves for non-liturgical services, and what it admits and even blesses for activities outside the house of God is widespread.

With composition for liturgical texts at a low ebb, many choirs are resorting to Protestant anthems. Unfortunately the texts are not from the Catholic liturgy, and in singing general religious anthems the richness of the ever-changing liturgical texts of the Roman rite is lost. One Sunday becomes as every other, and feast and ferial, solemnity and memorial, all become the same. The riches of the Roman rite are ignored. The same can happen when hymns replace the texts of the day, even though the hymns themselves may often be varied. The poverty of liturgical celebration experienced in the eighties is caused chiefly by the abandoning of the liturgical texts of the *Missale* or the *Graduale* in favor of general anthems or hymns.⁹⁵ The true reform intended by the Church lies in the full use of all the liturgical books, the implementation of the directives contained in the post-conciliar documents, and above all, a clear understanding of what divine worship is, particularly its essential characteristics of holiness and goodness of form. Music as an integral part of divine worship must share in and clearly exemplify those same qualities.

In conclusion, having traced the liturgical reform from its inception in the work of the second half of the 19th century, through the pontificates of several popes, the high point of the council and the decline that followed, what can one expect will be the course of that reform in the eighties and nineties of this century? One cannot know the future and frequently guesses about it are totally wrong. But by observing present trends one may arrive at probable results.

First, a new expression of Catholic truth in a new theological language is coming from the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II. Signs of a new flowering, the result of the council, are beginning to be apparent, even though many theologians continue to hold to the errors of modernism that surfaced just after the council. But they are living in the past, shackled to the sixties. As a new

⁹⁵ “What must be sung is the Mass, its ordinary and proper, not ‘something,’ no matter how consistent, that is imposed on the Mass. Because the liturgical service is one, it has only one countenance, one motif, one voice, the voice of the Church. To continue to replace the texts of the Mass being celebrated with motets that are reverent and devout, yet out of keeping with the Mass of the day... amounts to continuing an unacceptable ambiguity: it is to cheat the people. Liturgical song involves not mere melody, but words, text, thought, and the sentiments that the poetry and music contain. Thus texts must be those of the Mass, not others, and singing means singing the Mass, not just singing during Mass.” *Notitiae*, Vol. 5 (1969), p. 406.

wind is blowing in theological expression, so in liturgy and church music. So also in the religious life, in catechetics and canon law. The work of implementing the decrees of the council, freed of the dross of those who wished to have their own way, is at last taking hold.

In church music, the renewal can be seen especially in eastern Europe, in Poland, Croatia and in Germany. In the United States such activity has not yet begun, chiefly because the musical establishment is in the hands of those who are living in the past, holding to ideas that have long-since been discarded abroad. The errors foisted on the church musicians of this country twenty years ago are still being peddled by official and semi-official organizations and periodicals.

What must be taken as the basis for putting the reform back on the track in this country? Simply, a full and impartial acceptance of all directives, conciliar, papal and curial.⁹⁶ That means the use of Latin as well as the vernacular, the fostering of choirs as well as congregational singing, the acceptance of the distinction between sung and spoken liturgy, the creation of new serious music as well as the use of the great works of the past. Above all it means that the distinction between sacred and profane must be held to, along with the admission that a professional judgment must be made on the artistic merit of musical composition. In a word, the reform must be put in the hands of educated, professional musicians who are dedicated to carrying out the wishes of the Church as expressed in the documents. The same malaise that afflicted this country when the reforms of Pope Pius X were promulgated still persists. It is still a question of education, an understanding of what the Church wants and a willingness and an expertise to carry it forward.

⁹⁶ These are all readily available in *Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1983.