

here takes place in the lower voice, where a series of eighth notes are divided into tonal sets of three before the singers end the first section in an octave, as if to test the pitch. The lower voice begins again, this time up a sixth and the upper voice enters a third above. Some difficult passages follow until rhythmic unity is achieved on the third part but on different words. Another settling down takes place before the final section, and here we have breath and rhythm training before a unison ending.

A duet like "Fulgebunt" can be sung fast or slow but whichever one chooses, the singers must be prepared for the last section, which in this case is the most challenging. Singers can spend hours working through lines that chase each other around and about and back again. The same is true of a spectacular little motet written to celebrate Mary: "Sicut rosa," with a structure that seems to replicate the full flowering of a sweet rose.

The best way to approach these is to find the pitches without the aid of instruments. This way the singers become accustomed to finding pitches within rather than outside of themselves. For this reason, these are ideally sung with two people, not two sections, when the challenge is the greatest but also the potential for learning is at its most intense.

If two singers end up mastering 6 to 8 of these in the course of months, it is not a stretch to say that they will have overcome many of the difficulties that confront singers who are encountering polyphonic music for the first time. They will begin to feel the required inner pulse of the music, to hear pitch without the aid of instruments, and to develop the confidence to enter without the aid of an external cue.

If nothing else, these pieces help singers overcome a sense of shyness about pitch and rhythm, and familiarize singers with the style and approach of the golden age. They reduce polyphony to its very essence in a way that makes it comprehensible and approachable by amateurs. They also provide compelling evidence that Orlando Lasso was a friend to singers, then and now. ♪

Proprium Missae: Unity, Variety, and Rupture in the Roman Rite

by László Dobszay



any criticisms of the post-conciliar liturgy touch upon the theological implications of the *Ordo Missae*, but such criticisms are frequently rather questionable. In fact, however, the chief difficulty concerns the liturgy as *liturgy*, and so those problems remain even if the new Order of Mass is theologically faultless.

The Roman Rite is more than the *Ordo Missae*. And though the Roman rite is historically linked to the Latin tongue, that Rite itself is more than the language of the liturgy. Recall the fact that the Eastern liturgies were translated repeatedly, whilst the rites themselves changed much less frequently over the centuries than did the Roman rite!

Also included in the Roman Rite are the many texts of the *Proprium Missae*. In addition, the Roman Rite is the order of the pericopes, the collection of prayers and orations and their distribution, the structure of the Divine Office (today in ruins), and the texts for celebrating the

László Dobszay teaches at the Liszt Ferenc Academy of Music in Budapest, Hungary, and directs the Scholar Hungarica. He is the author of *Reform of the Reform*. laszlod@zti.hu.

sacraments. Furthermore, the Roman Rite is also the Mass antiphoner (*graduale*) and the office Antiphoner (*Antiphonale*). (I wish to stress this last aspect too, since lovers of the traditional liturgy are almost always silent about the recent destruction of the office, which after all ought to be an integral, indeed an eminent part of the liturgy, without which there can be scarcely any liturgical education, any liturgical life, any liturgical renewal, any pastoral-liturgical activity.

Today, however, I shall confine my remarks to the chants of the *proprium*, to their special features, and to some general conclusions. But we must begin with a brief historical survey of the Mass chants before we arrive at the conclusions, some of which will exceed the narrow limits of the assigned topic.

I invite your attention to the tables at the end of this article which list a few selected days and their proper Mass chants from sources of varying dates. The “equals” sign in the table (=) means that the given item is identical with the corresponding piece in the so-called Tridentine rite as indicated at the beginning of each line. Pieces which differ are marked with only a reference letter; the full text can be read in the footnote. A question mark (?) means the source offers no clear assignment. The first column following the incipit quotes the antiphoner of the Old Lateran (Roman) Use, followed by the most ancient (and some later) Gregorian Mass antiphoners. The last column points to the *Ordo cantus Missae* and the Missal of Paul VI. The letter-codes identifying the various sources are explained above the table. The *Graduale simplex* was not taken into consideration because its chants are basically different from this system.

What can we see in the table at the end of this article?

1. First, the *continuity* of the Roman Mass chant tradition from the earliest sources up to the twentieth century emerges very clearly from these data. The Old Roman source testifies that the chants sung at Rome before the rite was transmitted to the Franks, was identical to that found in the Tridentine Mass. It is surely possible to trace this tradition back at least into the 7th century, which is only a *terminus post quem non*. The identical nature of the two is convincing not only with respect to quantity but also in *quality*, since it covers all the cardinal points of the liturgy. And the *differences* confirm this essential sameness, whilst only adding nuances to the picture.

Namely:

2. In the offertories we observe the presence or absence of the *verses*, which in spite of their rich significance unfortunately disappeared from the Roman liturgy during the XIIth and XIIIth centuries, approximately. A genuine reform should have exerted itself to restore them. Some of the ancient sources also included a so-called “versus ad repetendum” to the introit and communion psalm, which wonderfully illuminate the selection of that psalm on the given day. In other cases the difference results from omission of a verse in some Alleluias. Double verses occasionally appear in the ancient Roman liturgy which was simplified in the curial rite and consequently in the Tridentine Missal as well. Thus, for instance, the amputation of the verse “Epulemur” from the Easter Sunday Alleluia seriously mutilated the full meaning of the chant.

3. Some of the items in the table are in boldface, meaning that one or more sources differ considerably from the Missal of St. Pius V. It will be instructive to examine them more closely. Though in the recent reform the interlectionary chants remained the only obligatory Mass chants, we can see that the tradition is not uniform at precisely these points. In the various individual usages the selection of the Alleluia is anything but arbitrary, but the Roman Rite as a whole is not quite uniform in this respect. As some of the ancient liturgical books put it: “Alleluia quale volueris,” which, of course does not mean that these items were left to the creative will of individuals, but rather permitted the worshipping community to select the chant from an already established collection. Closer inspection of these cases reveals, for example, that the Old Roman rite used only two Alleluias for all of Advent, alternating from week to week. The Gregorian sources place these two Alleluias on the first and third Sundays (reversing the

order of the Old Roman rite) and added new pieces for the second and fourth Sundays. And it is precisely on these two Sundays that we can discern ambiguity between the sources.

Furthermore, the Old Roman rite had a limited set of Alleluias (*Dominus regnavit, Adorabo ad templum, Venite exsultemus*, etc.) which were used both on great solemnities and on ordinary Sundays. The Gregorian sources assigned these few Old Roman Alleluias to the feasts, and created a series of new Alleluias for the period *per annum*, arranged in an orderly linear sequence. Owing to some differences at the beginning and end of this series, and also because of a few insertions, the individual chants may shift position by a week or two depending upon the *consuetudo* of the particular local usage. (See the two examples at the end of the table.) There are a few differences also in the case of the other interlectionary chant, in the graduals of the Sundays after Pentecost.

4. The difference between the Old Roman and the Gregorian sources on the Fourth Sunday of Advent has another cause. In the Old Roman rite, because of the long vigil service on Ember Saturday, this day was specified “*Dominica vacat.*” When the custom of the lengthy vigil on this day died out, it was necessary to compose a proper for the Sunday which had become “free,” and so one was assembled from the chants of other days. In some communities the Mass of the Ember Wednesday was repeated on the following Sunday, and this is how the *Rorate* became the introit of the Fourth Sunday of Advent. In transalpine regions, however, a new chant was provided for that day, and thus one of the most beautiful pieces was created: the introit *Memento nostri* (whose melody is new, though the text was chosen on the basis of a traditional interpretation which dates back to St. Augustine).

To summarize: the repertory and distribution of the proper chants *per anni circulum*—what we may call chant pericopes—is an integral part of the Roman rite. The system as a whole was common throughout the *universal* Roman rite, accepted everywhere and at every epoch from the earliest documented beginnings until the final decades—even if some few pieces were fixed in their place by the tradition of a *local* church institution such as a diocese or a religious order.

In other words, the chant was not merely an accompaniment but an important component of the liturgy, indeed, of the *daily* liturgy. The chants had their function in delivering the contents of the liturgy. In other words: to the liturgy of a given day there *belong* the chant texts, no less than the prayers and lections, and therefore omission of the daily chanted texts mutilates and truncates the message of the liturgy.

This statement, however, calls for refinement. Many 20th century commentators on the liturgy often tended to analyze all the items of a given Mass as transmitting a homogeneous intellectual message. Thus they would explain how an introit fits with the Gospel of the day, how the gradual is linked to the epistle, and so forth. As the years went by, such endeavors appeared false and harmful. They are *false*, because the cycle of the individual liturgical genres was composed separately over the course of the year, and the fixed series of texts often shifted away from one another. And the attempts are *harmful* because this approach inspired the liturgical tinkers and preachers to construct rational “themes” for each day, simply regarding the Mass, (in good Enlightenment fashion) as an illustration of catechetical or moral lessons.

Since the traditional liturgy did *not* fulfill such expectations, the “experts” arrogated the right to fabricate a new liturgy which was more “consistent” in this respect. A striking example of such untraditional, contrived harmonization in the Neo-Roman rite is the three-year system of responsorial psalms. The false interpretation holds that lection and psalm together form some sort of a dialogue: first God speaks to man and then man replies to God according to the ideas or “trends” elicited by the lection. The truth of the matter is simply that in each of its genres, the liturgy is a “dialogue”: *all* of the moments are God’s gift to the church, and they all include simultaneously the response of the church. God teaches also in the gradual chant; and the church hearkens also to the lection in a continuous reflexivity and with a prayerful spirit.

II

But, really: how can one say that the proper chants are “part” of the daily liturgy? What does it mean to claim that those proprium chants are a decisive element of the Roman rite which cannot be omitted? There are three dimensions or principles which justify the thesis.

1. It is a peculiarity of the *Ritus Romanus* that most of its chants have texts taken from Holy Writ. Though to us this seems self-evident, the liturgical usage of the Eastern Church makes it clear that this is a special characteristic of the church in the West, and of Rome in particular. This practice became possible because the apostles interpreted not only the words of the Lord in the Gospels, but also the entire Scriptures including the Psalter, and this *interpretatio Christiana* was enriched by the theological reflexion of the Church Fathers during the succeeding centuries. Many of the faithful became familiar with the biblical commentaries of Origen, Augustine, Ambrose or John Chrysostom. But this type of interpretation really became the common property of the church in and through the liturgy.

The church as a living community comprehended the Bible when it was prayed in chant day by day. It was this understanding of the Sacred Page which inspired the church to sing a given passage, but at the same time the *adoption* of that passage clarified the meaning of it. Thus, for instance, Psalm 2 and the solemnity of Christmas mutually interpret each other.

2. The Christological reading of the Bible in general has become more accurate and refined by dint of theological reflection when many verses of Scripture were linked with specific mysteries and consequently with specific liturgical occasions. It was not at all as though someone searched out an appropriate text to be sung on a given Advent Sunday. Prior to being chosen, the particular Biblical *locus* was already associated with the mystery of the specifically distinct seasons. In this case, “season” seems more important than individual “day.” Psalms 24, 79, and 84 recur again and again in the Masses and offices of Advent; therefore they should not be understood chiefly in the context of the day (and its other chants and lections), but rather in the larger framework of general Advent references. And then it becomes clear why *Excita* or *Ostende* (which recur at so many points of the Advent office) are entirely appropriate texts to serve as an Alleluia verse, even though they are assigned differently to Sundays in the Old Roman and Gregorian systems.

Permit me to illustrate the relationship between the patristic interpretation and the liturgical use by one cogent example, the introit of Easter Sunday.

Many a man of our time is perhaps unmoved by the enigmatic psalm verse of this introit: *Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum*. Perhaps he would be more easily stirred by the triumphal sounds of a late mediaeval *cantio* or a Lutheran chorale that begins: “Christ ist erstanden . . . des sollen wir alle froh sein!” But instead, let us consider St. Augustine’s Explanation of Psalm 138. It is difficult to summarize this text in a few sentences, but I can at least hint at its Paschal meaning.

Augustine’s sermon begins with an admonition to search out in the words of the Prophet the same truth proclaimed in the Gospel, since the *sacrificium vespertinum* of Christ on the cross rent the curtain of the Temple, revealing its secrets. In Psalm 138 Christ addresses the Father as his “Lord” because here he speaks to the Father as someone less: “which being in the shape of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: and took on him the shape of a servant” (Phil 2:6). It is *this* Christ who says to the Father: “I arise, and am still with thee.” And further: “Thou hast searched me out, and known me”—not as though the Father had not known him before, but because the Father’s knowledge is powerfully active: it *makes* what he *knows*. “Thou knowest my down-sitting, and mine up-rising.” When a man takes a seat, he lowers himself, “humiliates” himself. The Saviour “sat down” in his sacred Passion and “rose up” on Easter morning because the Father “has laid his hand” upon Christ.

When Christ, the new Adam lay down and slept (Ps 3:5) there emerged from his side (*ex corde scisso*) the new Eve, the church (*nascitur Ecclesia*) and they become two in one flesh. Consequently the “sitting down and rising up” of the Head is also the Passion and Resurrection of the Body. Thus the Head and the Body say together to the Father, “I arose, and am still with thee: thou hast laid thine hand upon me: thy knowledge is become wonderful.”

And so we see that the Easter introit not only *announces* Christ’s Resurrection (“Christ ist erstanden”), but also joins together the voice of the Risen One with the voice of the church. Together they speak to the Father in that unparalleled intimacy in which only the Son of Man might address the Father by means of his divinity.

When the church achieved the deeper understanding of the full mystery of Holy Scripture, when the “secrets of the Temple” had been revealed, then also the mouth of the church could open to chant praise to God with the appropriate words at the right time, proclaiming but also addressing him. Hence it belongs to the integrity of worship, to the fullness of the cult, to include at the apposite points of liturgical time the chanting of appropriate, well-understood texts.

When the Church achieved the deeper understanding of the full mystery of Holy Scripture, then also the mouth of the Church could open to chant praise to God with the appropriate words.

3. From the foregoing observations one might, of course, conclude that it would suffice to present a list or collection of biblical texts along with a scheme for distributing them over the appropriate seasons of the year. Close study of these chants has documented the fact that there was a historical period in which the church contented herself with *seasonal collections*, which is to say, with the principle of “sets.” This means that the festal periods had their own *proprium* chant repertoires, whilst during “ordinary” time (*tempus per annum*) the singers worked their way through a store of selected chants arranged in numerical order.

Traces of this “set principle” can still be found in the pre-1970 missals, the Lenten communions for example, or the fact that the introits, Alleluias and offertories of the first sixteen Sundays after Pentecost follow each other in successive numerical order of the psalms. Even clearer is the arrangement in the Ambrosian Mass Antiphoner where even today, “ordinary” time is provided for by a 12-item set of *propria dominicalia*.

However, one more dimension of the *proprium* chants remains to be considered: it is the psychological one. As early as the 6th–7th centuries the church found it appropriate and desirable to distribute the sets of chants which had been collected, assigning them to the individual days of the year. In fact, there is a scholar who defends the supposition that this arrangement and distribution of the proper chants was the real beginning of the linear arrangement of the church year itself.

In any case, a similar phenomenon can be observed when we study the other components of the Mass. For instance, analysis of the sermons of St. Gregory the Great reveals that in his time each day had a fixed gospel, in the majority of cases identical to those we know from our preconiciliar missals. The transition from the principle of “sets” to the principle of *proprium* chants in the strict sense, brought great benefits. Among them were the cessation of an improvisatory style of liturgical chanting; introduction of a quiet and peaceful order into the liturgical celebration; formation of a barrier against arbitrariness; effective promotion of unity at the precise moment when the liturgy of Rome became the liturgy of half a continent; opportunity for singers and ministers to prepare themselves both technically and spiritually for the liturgy of the day because they could repeat at regular intervals the same chants on the same day every year.

And so, as the annual sequence of orations and lections became fixed in the Sacramentary and the Lectionary, there arose also a bond of *association* amongst all the items prayed and chanted on a particular day. But that does not contradict what has just been explained, because this bond or link is not a premeditated, speculatively calculated coordination of the proprium chants, but rather a bond whose nature is spiritual and emotional. One became accustomed to, and grew to like, the fact that in the Mass whose gospel recounts the miraculous raising of the widow's son of Naim, the introit *Protector noster* is regularly chanted. Here, there is something more than mere routine: the fixed constellation produced a great many spiritual and psychological fruits.

In the mature form of the Roman rite, the order of proprium chants is the result of three principles or factors completed by a fourth, a musical principle. The first factor is the tradition of the *interpretatio Christiana*; second is its manifestation in the *principle of sets*; the third factor is the transformation of the repertory into a cycle *per anni circulum*. And the fourth musical component may be termed the principle of *genre*, the fixation of musical expression linked to individual liturgical moments and types of events. This principle of Gregorian musical forms explains why an introit cannot be replaced by a gradual and vice versa, even if their texts be identical.

And what of the changes which followed the last Ecumenical Council? How are they related to the continuous tradition of the proprium chants in the Roman rite? How did they affect it? Very little, at first sight; scarcely more than the non-essential changes wrought during earlier centuries. The new *Ordo Cantus Missae*, which determined the order of Mass chants as well as its implementation in the new *Graduale Romanum* of 1974, is similar to the *Ordo Antiquus* in many places, in spite of the re-location of a good many chants as a consequence of changes in the church calendar. The influence of the new three-year cycle of lections upon the arrangement of the chants led to the predominance of what we have seen to be a false concept (namely the idea of complete coordination within each daily liturgy) over the traditional order.

And the changes in the new *Missale Romanum* are even more numerous. Although the texts of the gradual also appear in the missal over a great part of the year, there are two conspicuous differences.

The *first* difference is the remarkable number of instances where the assignment in the missal differs from that in the *Ordo Cantus Missae*. Up until now, the antiphoner fixed the text and melody of the chant, and the missal quoted the texts from the choir book, after the fashion of a libretto or "text"-book. This is the first time in the long history of the Ritus Romanus that choir book and altar missal do not overlap or coincide. The separation of the two Mass books is not (yet) as lethal as it is in the case of the Divine Office, but it tends in that direction.

The *second* novelty is the selection of new texts for the introits and communions of some Masses. New texts also emerged, of course, in past centuries, chiefly for new feasts instituted over the years. But here, old and traditional Mass texts have been replaced, thereby changing the contents of the liturgy at "cardinal" points.¹

Two other radical innovations should be mentioned. The offertory has been eliminated from the new missal, and the interlectionary chants transferred into the lectionary where a new three-year system, with totally new texts to be chanted, has been constructed, thereby causing many problems which unfortunately I cannot discuss at this time.

Another choir book published after the last Council under the title of *Graduale simplex* and purporting to follow the intentions of the Sacred Synod (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* no. 117) attempted to adapt the principle of sets to modern times—but in doing so, completely severed all ties to the centuries-old Mass antiphoner.

¹[The status of these texts in the missal is addressed in Christoph Tietze, "Graduale or Missale: The Confusion Resolved," *Sacred Music*, 133, no. 4 (Winter 2006), 4-13. Ed.]

The real subversion, however, was not found in these publications, but in three seemingly innocent little words of the *General Instruction to the Roman Missal*. In my recent book I called those words “the anthrax in the envelope.” In addition to chanting the proprium texts from the *Graduale Romanum* or the *Graduale simplex*, today, according to the GIRM paragraphs 48, 74, and 87 one may substitute *alius cantus congruus* or *aptus*. Since the plain fact is that today, ninety-nine of every one hundred Masses throughout the world are celebrated without the participation of a schola capable of chanting the Roman Gradual, and since the Simple Gradual has practically nowhere been effectively introduced, *alius cantus aptus* has prevailed over the proper chants of the Roman Mass.

There is no norm regulating or specifying what should be regarded as *congruus* or *aptus*, and consequently the Roman proprium chants fell victim to the “reform.” This means in plain terms that the church today has nothing to say through the chant in the Mass: that the chant effectively has no part at all in forming the liturgy and delivering its message. In other words, the proper chants ceased to be part of the liturgy after the Council. Today, the majestic phrases of the Liturgy Constitution sound almost ironic: “. . . as sacred melody united to the words, it forms a necessary or integral part of the solemn liturgy” . . . “sacred music increases in holiness to the degree that it is intimately linked with liturgical action” . . . “this sacred Council, keeping to the norms and precepts of ecclesiastical tradition and discipline.” . . . “The treasury of sacred music is to be preserved and fostered with very great care.” “The Church acknowledges Gregorian chant as proper to the Roman liturgy: therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services.”

If anything, even less valid today are the warnings of the celebrated *Motu proprio* of St. Pius X: “Nothing then should be allowed in the sacred precincts that could disturb or lessen the piety and devotion of the faithful, . . . nothing especially that could offend against the dignity and holiness of the sacred rites, and that would therefore be unworthy of the house of prayer, or of the majesty of Almighty God. . . . Since the text to be sung and the order in which it is to be sung are already determined for every liturgical service, it is not lawful to change either the words or their order, nor to substitute another text, nor to leave anything out, either entirely or in part” (*Motu proprio* Intro; II/8).

Chant ceased to be *pars integrans* of the liturgy. And the grievous damage is not repaired if *alius cantus congruus* is to become a juridically accepted part of the liturgy. Those three short words opened the pathway for the many kinds of *canciunculae*, pious but liturgically inappropriate “volkish” songs, as well as light music and pop tunes, poems foreign to the church’s textual tradition. One may criticize the 1974 *Graduale Romanum*, but the catastrophe was the General Instruction to the Roman Missal (and of course the Instruction “*Musicam Sacram*.” no. 32) since they opened the floodgates—to ground zero.

What motivated such laxity (for want of a more drastic word)? No doubt there were motives whose mention would be indecent, of which one must be ashamed. But one should also suppose a kind of good will, as is the case with the “reform” as a whole. One may surmise that there were two basic aspirations, more or less correct, which led to the concession of *alius cantus aptus*.

First, in the great majority of parish churches there is no qualified cantor or group of singers who could perform the chants of the Roman Gradual (or even the Simple Gradual) in its entirety, week after week, Mass by Mass. What then is to happen in the great number of Masses celebrated in spite of the lack of such cantors? One of the great temptations of our own day is that lovers of the liturgy and its *musica sacra* attend the Mass with the best music they can find, and ignore all the others. And so the liturgy has frequently been fractured and split into a “high” church music and “low” church music.

And second, there was the fateful call to extend “actual participation” to the chant, including the proper chants. It is dashing, but supremely witless to lift our eyes to the heavens and

invoke the sonorous phrases about *musica sacra* whilst offering no proposals for satisfying the every-day needs of those thousands of daily Masses, no satisfaction for the rightful desires of the faithful at prayer.

In order to propose a suitable course of action, an accurate diagnosis is required, an understanding of how we arrived at the present state of affairs. In other words, we cannot avoid a brief summary of the historical process.

III

In the earliest centuries the proper chants of the Mass consisted of but two pieces: the Interlectionary chant(s) and the *communio*, both performed by the *psaltes*, the trained solo singer. The role of the congregation was to join in the responses, the ordinary as a special kind of response, and the repeated refrains of the responsorial psalmody. On the basis of the ancient reports and descriptions, confirmed by the surviving practice of the Eastern Church, we can conclude that in the earliest times the true field of *participatio actuosa externa* for the layfolk, was the Divine Office.

This situation changed in a fundamental way when the *scholae* were founded. In the very beginning, these were little more than a gathering, a “workshop” of the psalm-singers which made possible their occasional singing as a group. We do not know when and where such gatherings of singers emerged, but it was surely no earlier than the late 4th or early 5th century, and then only in some of the larger churches. Today it is generally believed that as a regular institution, the Roman schola was founded in the 6th or 7th century.

One should not imagine that there was a schola in every parish church: at first, only two or three papal basilicas possessed the infrastructure and the financial resources required for the support of such an active ordinary institution. In the parish churches at Rome, the so-called *tituli*, musical practice remained in the hands of the precentors. The papal schola, as a body of selected young people who lived the *vita communis* and learned the liturgy and its chant as a vocation, flourished amidst exceptionally favorable conditions which made it possible to develop a new and more demanding style of Mass proprium chants. Although melismatic chanting, too, had flourished earlier (one thinks of the improvised tract or *communio* of the solo singers), yet it was the *individuality* of the tunes which demanded such great skill and diligence.

The new pieces were not mere adaptations of standard musical models; in the new situation each text had its own tune, and mastery of these involved an enormous task for the memory, particularly in an age when notation had not yet developed. These singers did not chant only once a month, and they could not decide for themselves which items of the Mass would be performed on a given day. They were required to sing by heart each of the four or five proprium chants of the particular Mass, and even a new piece week after week—or even every day, as for instance in Lent.

It is not surprising that those who from early childhood grow up in such a school, later choose the service of the liturgy as their life-long vocation. And in this sense it may be said that the chanting at Mass in the Roman basilicas was of a “clerical” nature from the 6th or 7th century onward. The only way to transmit these chants to a wider environment was through the visits of the papal schola to the various parish churches, where they would chant the entire liturgy on the stationary days. Otherwise, the precentor or *psaltes* remained the chief executant of the chant in the many local churches.

It was the evangelizing efforts of the missionaries from the 7th century onwards which spread the liturgy of Rome throughout the European continent. In the monasteries and cathedrals the abbots and bishops imitated Rome by establishing their own *scholae* which trained professional singing masters and a cadre of good singers. The prelates did not fail to urge the

entire liturgical community to join in chanting at least some pieces. The best institution to implement this ideal, of course, was the cathedral or monastic school, where the lads could be systematically prepared to chant the liturgy.

The collapse of the institutions in the Protestant revolution, lack of material resources, radical change in the educational system, widespread, secularization—converged to destroy the basis of regular liturgical chanting.

The typical liturgical choir consisted of priests, young men and boys, up to an hundred or more in the cathedrals, twenty or thirty in the cities, or only two or three in the smaller town or village churches. All the singers together, or

in smaller groups, performed the obligatory chants of each day, and this took three or four hours of the day, in addition to an hour or two of preparation. Maintaining such a system on a level which assured its functioning, required *stable* institutions, with great material and intellectual background. Which is to say, that large estates, endowments and strict regulations assured the regularity of liturgical singing in each ecclesiastical centre, over decades and centuries.

In their turn, these institutions promoted further development of *musica sacra* over many years during which Gregorian chants were embellished or completed with polyphony, and later supplanted by polyphonic masterworks. Since the liturgy regulated the texts, such pieces remained lawful even if the texts were not delivered on their Gregorian tunes. During this period of history, congregational participation was at a minimum, if it existed at all.

In the middle of the 16th century this vibrant liturgical life came to an abrupt end. The collapse of the institutions in the Protestant revolution, lack of material resources (or their re-direction to new purposes), the radical change in the educational system, widespread secularization—all these factors converged to destroy the basis of regular liturgical chanting. Actual liturgical praxis was sharply divided: in some wealthier churches groups of professional musicians graced the High Mass with exquisite art music (often of a character increasingly alien to worship), and also the *cantus gregorianus* became the domain of experts. On the other side of the great divide, in a great majority of Masses the text of the liturgical chant became a prayer read by the celebrant: silence in the sanctuary became the norm. The few monasteries and religious houses which preserved in practice a remnant of the regular proprium chants were but small and insignificant islets in the great stream of the church's life.

Permit me to summarize the situation in a more pointed fashion. The *cantilena Romana* had developed and grown into an enormous liturgical and spiritual treasury. But that treasure was not shared in equal degrees by the entire church. As a sung reality it resonated in the praxis of some monasteries and cathedrals and their scholae, though the mediaeval institutions like the system of schools (with their strong staff and reliable financial support) had made a good beginning on the process of making chant the possession of all the faithful. But after the 16th century, liturgical chant became a *hortus conclusus* for congregations as well as choirs in most churches, for it remained present in the Mass only as a prayer, surrounded by other texts and covered over by non-liturgical music.

During the course of the last century, as a growing number of layfolk achieved a relatively higher educational and cultural level, there emerged a new opportunity for improving the *status quo*. Fostering literacy, comprehension and music-making would have greatly aided endeavors to transform a great number of the communities into some type of liturgical bodies.

Which is to say, the mediaeval “liturgical choir” could have been broadened and enlarged so as to include the educated layfolk and eventually, by gradual steps, the full congregation.¹ To achieve that, the common elements of church life such as catechesis, preaching, singing classes in the church-run schools, activity of the choirs and indeed most institutional aspects of church life should have been adapted to the great purpose.

It would have required a definite focus for pastoral activity, the training and employment of suitable leaders, promulgation of diocesan statutes and the establishment of apposite foundations and endowments in order to elevate the regular chanting of the Divine Liturgy from the level of short-lived individual initiatives to its rightful place as *pars integrans* of a flourishing religious life—which, I may add, also includes involving popular participation in the Divine Office.

For a great many Roman Catholics, highly profitable “participation aids” such as “missalettes” have become an intermediary transmitting the message of at least the text of many proprium chants. Because of the (false!) isolation into which Latin has been forced, however, the texts of the proprium chants lacked their directness and immediacy of contact. No “missalette” can compensate for the loss of the *chanted* proprium. Though the text as the voice of the praying church was precious for many people, the church as it really exists was only listening indirectly to this voice. The proper chants of the Mass can communicate the full value of their message only as *chanted* texts; the *read* or recited propers have a diminished function in the liturgy. That is to say, in practice the proper chants have *de facto* been dropped out of the liturgy, even before they were abolished, in reality, after the last Council.

It was precisely in this situation that the “reforms” of the Second Vatican Council appeared. Well-founded criticism of the *Novus Ordo Missae* and the new orientation which results, depend upon a view or approach which adheres to the tradition but at the same time is not blind in one eye to the desires which the *Novus Ordo* ardently sought but could not achieve. The myopic engineers of the “reform” over-simplified the problem: “Why bother about the tradition of the Roman Church if we can let the people sing what they want, and can?” For them, that was the beginning of “inculturation.” But is it still possible to correct that aberrant idea?

IV

One possibility would be simply to allow the present state of affairs to continue, which is to say: organize magnificent Gregorian days, courses, and conventions; solemn Masses with majestic chant performed by professional singers—and then to extend pious wishes with a blessing for all the other churches and all of their Masses.

But is it even possible to resolve the contradiction between preserving the inherited Roman repertory and obstacles of its regular use? Finding a resolution requires that we think over the situation carefully and formulate purposeful provisions leading to a true liturgical reform, one which extends also to the field of chant and includes both the musical material and the institutional background. Temporal constraints permit me to discuss only the first aspect, and I would like to do so in five theses.

Thesis 1 = The formula *alius cantus aptus* as a substitution for the Roman Gradual or the Simple Gradual must be abolished.

Thesis 2 = The highest degree of vocal participation in the Mass proper is of course chanting the full proprium in its Gregorian tunes. One could accept certain minor corrections and alternative options to the Missal of Trent, for instance the restitution of the offertory and

¹One may note in passing that it was precisely this noble goal which motivated Justine Bayard Ward to devise her ingenious method of musical formation, in the spirit of St. Pius X.

communio verses; the use of double introit *Rorate* and *Memento* for the Fourth Sunday of Advent, etc.

The Missale must contain the same text printed in the choir books. Official authoritative instructions should be issued, to regulate matters such as these: where and when is the chanting of the full proper obligatory? what kind of simpler forms are permitted? when and where? how can and *should* individual churches provide a *psaltes*/cantor or a schola for the parish Masses? how can it be guaranteed that the faithful actually receive the message of the proper chants through authentic translations? what tools or aids can be offered to the clergy in order to insure an obligatory systematic introduction to the understanding of these texts in the framework of local catechesis, preaching, and spiritual reading?

Thesis 3 = Although the most splendid sonic vesture of the proper texts is contained in the *Graduale Romanum* which "should be given pride of place in liturgical services," it is also in conformity with church tradition that those texts may also resound in other worthy settings such as the polyphonic elaboration of the texts, or alternatim compositions combining polyphony with Gregorian chant. On the other hand, collections of less difficult musical settings can also be approved which enable choirs with less training (or even the entire congregation) to chant the canonical texts, i.e. the texts contained in the *graduale* and not some other substitute.

The best of these will be settings which adapt melodic models to different texts (like the ancient antiphons of the Roman Office) so as to render the liturgical chant more widely accessible. And on occasion the chanting of antiphons might even be simplified somewhat by introducing some less accentuated motives in the text into the verses. The question of liturgical and musical norms must be relegated to another forum.

Thesis 4 = To churches or for Masses which are less well provided with good chanters, or are just beginning the process of introducing liturgical chant, permission might be given to return to the old "set principle," which is to say using a collection of set pieces for an entire season, analogous to the Simple Gradual but based upon the traditional gradual. In such cases the celebrant, the ministers, and/or the congregation should, after chanting that "set" piece, pray the introit (or offertory, etc.) proper to the day.

In an "emergency situation" like that, the introit *Ad te levavi*, for instance, could be sung throughout Advent, followed by recitation of the proper introit of the day. I would call this form a "regulated use of sets" because it allows the necessary freedom to the local community without sacrificing the liturgical canon.

Thesis 5 = The "regulated use of sets" is a step above the lowest level which could be adopted chiefly in weekday Masses or at Masses with a small congregation. It involves congregational recitation of the antiphons, with the verse read out by a lector or server (facing the altar and not the congregation). If these texts were recited *recto tono* on one pitch (or even with a soft organ accompaniment), worshippers might be reminded that the text is properly a chant. Indeed, before or after the text of (for example) the introit, a well known hymn which is appropriate to the liturgical day could also be sung. But the catalogue of hymns allowed for the use of a specific type of community should be accurately fixed and officially approved.

I have eschewed a comprehensive discussion of the "language problem." In my opinion, if the vernacular is useful anywhere, it is precisely for the proprium chants (cf. *Sacrosanctum concilium* 36.2). However, this option should, I believe, be combined with the rules governing a regular (and suggested) use of the Latin tongue.

For such complementary use of the mother tongue I propose four tools. 1) Specified types of churches are obliged to celebrate the Mass, according to a fixed schedule, with Latin propers. 2) Latin and vernacular in combination, e.g. the soloist/cantor chants the Latin Gregorian melody of the introit at the beginning of the Mass, after which the congregation repeats it in

their mother tongue on a simple tune, as a “sung translation,” so to speak. 3) A third possibility is to follow a custom used already in the “Tridentine” rite: the congregation or a small schola sings the proper chant in the vernacular whilst the priest as the “mouthpiece” of the church prays the required Latin text. 4) The fourth tool is the use of bilingual choir books or notated Missals, thus permitting the faithful to see the original Latin (read by the celebrant) whilst the same text is chanted in the vernacular.

Restraints of time do not permit me to discuss at this point the musical style of vernacular proprium chants. What is of primary importance, either in reciting or chanting, is to use a worthy translation which renders the meaning quite precisely whilst preserving the traditional biblical-liturgical style of the particular native tongue. The best way of doing this would be a slight and tactful modernization of the old translations. I never cease to wonder why it has not occurred to post-conciliar English-speaking Catholics to use the Anglican-use gradual with the English versions of the chants.²

A differentiated praxis such as I have just outlined, would ensure preservation of the full Roman chant repertory whilst also permitting those chants to resound even in the poorest and simplest circumstances. Each level uses the same texts; the same thoughts are pronounced, but differently, depending upon the local circumstances. These forms resemble an ascending staircase: those who stand on the lowest step and are still unable to climb higher, celebrate the same liturgy as those standing higher—and they can see before their eyes (and ears!) the steps to which their community can rise.

To adapt the well-known saying of St. Pius X: they are not singing something during the Mass, but singing the Mass itself. It would be mistaken to regard this gradation as a degradation of the full Latin Gregorian proprium chanted by the schola! Let the classic chant remain in its majestic state; but let us consider also the ordinary Masses in parish churches today—and appreciate the opportunity for improvement offered by these “tools.”

Permit me to offer a concluding observation. I fear that my suggestions may have set off a two-front war. For the partisans of the *Novus Ordo*, my adherence to the tradition might be cause for reproach; and for the friends of the Tridentine movement the practical measures I have suggested, may seem too opportunistic. I think, though, that the “Tridentine” rite will remain a source of joy only for a few, and hence have little impact upon the general usage of the church because of this isolated position—unless we recognise that whilst maintaining its identity, the traditional Roman rite could—and did!—live, change, and develop over the centuries.

The question is: what does this “change” mean? If it is not to demolish the Roman rite but to make it more vigorous and alive, then the change is justified not only by the Liturgy Constitution of the last Vatican Council, but by the *tradition itself*. “Remain the same, by the force of change!”—that should have been the true motive of the post-conciliar “reform.” What I am calling for is not a compromise or an admixture of *novus* and *antiquus*, but rather a way to surmount their conflict. We must return to the rite of 1962, not in order to call a halt at that point, but in order to locate the true reform of which we have been cheated.

In this respect, I think that what has been said about the chant might offer a model for restoration of other elements of the Roman liturgy such as the lections, the sacramentary, the office, the kalendar, etc. I consider this to be the best and most accurate meaning of the formula: reform of the reform. ❧

²Online at <http://anglicanhistory.org/music/gradual/gradual.pdf>.

OR=Old Roman; R = Rhenau (8-9. s.), MB = Mont Blandin (8-9. s.), Co = Compiègne (9. s.), Cor = Corbie (9-10. s.), S = Senlis (9. s.), L = Laon 239 (9-10. s.), Ch = Chartres 520 (13-14. s.), Be = Benevento 34 (11-12. s.), Bo = Bologna (11. s.), Kl = Klosterneuburg, Graz 807 (12. s.), Le = (Leipzig, 14. s.), Str = Strigonomium (Esztergom, 14. s.), OCM = Ordo Cantus Missae (1972), MP = Missale Romanum auctoritate Pauli Pp. VI Promulgatum (1971)

Dies	Missale Romanum Pii V.	OR	R	MB	Co	Cor	S	L	Ch	Be	Bo	Kl	Le	Str	OCM	MP
ADY. Dom 1																
Introitus	Ad te levavi	=	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	= ¹	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Universi qui te	=	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Ostende nobis	E ²	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Offert.	Ad te (Domine) levavi	= ³	=	= ^v	?	=	= ^v	= ^v	=	= ^v	= ^v	= ^v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Dominus dabit	= ⁴	=	=	?	= ^p	= ^p	= ^p	=	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=
Dom 2																
Introitus	Populus Sion	= ⁵	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	= ⁶	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Ex Sion species	=	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Lactatus sum	O ⁷	=	=	?	=	= ⁸	=	= ^{+S}	= ^{+S}	= ^{+S} / V ⁹	= ^{+S}	= ^{+S}	R ¹⁰	=	=
Offert.	Deus tu conversus ¹¹	= ^v ¹²	=	= ^v	?	=	= ^v	= ^v	=	= ^v	= ^v	= ^v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Jerusalem surge	= ¹³	=	= ^p	?	= ^p ¹⁴	= ^p	= ^p	=	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=
Dom 3																
Introitus	Gaudete in Domino	= ¹⁵	=	=	= ^v	=	=	=	= E ¹⁶	=	= ¹⁷	=	=	= F ¹⁸	=	= ¹⁹
Graduale	Qui sedes Domine	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Excita Domine	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Offert.	Benedixisti Domine	= ^v ²⁰	=	= ^v	= ^v	=	= ^v	= ^v	=	= ^v	=	= ^v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Dicite pusillanimes	=	=	= ^p	= ^v ²¹	=	= ²²	=	=	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=	= ^p	=

¹V. Qui non vis mortem. V. Scimus quia non reliquis.

²Exulta

³V1: Dirige me in veritate. V2: Respice in me

⁴Ps. 84. V. Veritas

⁵V. Excita

⁶V. Consolamini consolamini

⁷Alleluia *Ostende*

⁸V2. Stantes erant

⁹Alleluia *Virtutes caeli*

¹⁰Alleluia *Rex noster adveniet Christus*

¹¹vel: Domine tu convertens

¹²V1. Benedixisti. V2. Misericordia et veritas.

(B: V3 Veritas de terra). O: Benedixisti. 2. Redemisti.

³. Misericordia

¹³. psalmus ut supra"

¹⁴Ps. 147

¹⁵V. Ostende nobis

¹⁶Gaudete. V) *Et pax Dei*

¹⁷V. Et pax Dei. V. Laetetur angelica turba

¹⁸V. *Et pax Dei*

¹⁹. textus abbreviatus

²⁰V1. Operuisti omnia. V2. Ostende nobis Domine

²¹Ps. 84. V. Ostende nobis

²²V. Deus manifeste veniet

Dies	MR	OR	R	MB	Co	Cor	S	L	Ch	Be	Bo	Kl	Le	Str	OCM	MP
Qu.T. 14																
Introitus	Rorate. Ps. Caeli	= v ¹	=	=	= v	=	=	=	=	=	= v ²	=	=	=	M ³	Ve ⁴
Grad. 1	Tollite portas	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	F ⁵	—
Grad. 2	Prope est Dominus	?	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—	—
Offert.	Confortamini et jam	= v ⁶	=	= v	=	=	=	= v	—	= v	= v	= v	=	=	Au ⁷	—
vel Off.	—	—	—	Ave ⁸	—	Ave	Ave v	Ave	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Comm.	Ecce Virgo concipiet	=	=	=	= v ⁹	= v ¹⁰	=	= p	=	=	= v	=	= p	=	Ve ¹¹	E ¹²
Qu.T. 16																
Introitus	Prope es tu	= v ¹³	?	=	= ¹⁴	=	=	=	=	=	= v ¹⁵	=	=	=	Ve ¹⁶	E ¹⁷
Graduale	Ostende nobis	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	A ¹⁸	—
Offert.	Deus tu conversus	Ad ¹⁹	?	=	= v ²⁰	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	Au ²¹	—
Comm.	Ecce Dominus veniet	=	?	=	= v ²³	= v ²⁴	=	= p	=	=	= p	=	= p	=	Ex ²²	—
Qu T. S.															Ex ²⁵	S ²⁶
Introitus	Veni et ostende	= v ²⁷	=	=	= v ²⁸	=	= v	=	=	=	= v ²⁹	=	=	=	M ³⁰	=
Grad. 1	A summo caelo	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	Ex ³¹	—
Grad. 2	In sole posuit	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—	—
Grad. 3	Dñe Deus virtutum	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—	—
Grad. 4	Excita Domine	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—	—

23 V. In sole posuit

24 V. Caeli laetentur

25 Intra. Memento nostri

26 Intra. Veniet Dominus et non tardabit

27 Grad. In sole posuit

28 V1. Tunc aperientur oculi. V2. Audite itaque

29 Audi Israel

30 Offert. Ave Maria. VI. Quomodo in me. V2. Ideoque quod

nascitur.

31 Ps. 18. V. In sole posuit (= Bo)

32 V. Exsultavit ut gigas

33 Comm. Veni Domine

34 Comm. Ecce Dominus noster

35 Ps. 118. V. Beati qui scrutantur

36 Ps. 118. V. Tu mandasti

37 V. Bene est prophetatum

38 Intra. Veni Domine

39 Intra. Ecce Dominus venit

40 Grad. A summo caelo

41 Ad te Domine levavi

42 sicut in Dominica II

43 Off. Audi Israel. V. Israel si me.

44 Offert. Exsulta satis

45 Ps. 118. V. Tu mandasti

46 V. A solis ortu

47 Comm. Exsultavit ut gigas

48 Comm. Salvatorem expectantius

49 Ps. 79. V. Excita

50 Ps. 79. V. Excita

51 V. Quousque expectavimus

52 Intra. Memento nostri

53 Grad. Excita

54 Hy. Omnia opera Domini

55 V1. Loquetur pacem. V2. Quia convenio/venio

56 Off. Exsulta satis

57 Ps. 18. V. In sole posuit

58 Ps. 18. V. Nec est qui se abscondat

59 Comm. Exsultavit ut gigas

60 Comm. Ecce venio cito

Dies	MIR	OR	R	MB	Co	Cor	S	L	Ch	Be	Bo	KI	Le	Str	OCM	MP
Dom 4																
Introitus	Rorate Ps. Caeli	— ¹	V ²	—	M ³	—	=	—	M	M	= / M	M	M	M	=	=
Graduale	Prope est	—	A ⁴	—	—	—	=	—	T ⁵	—	—	—	—	—	=	—
Alleluia	Veni Domine et noli	—	?	—	—	—	=	—	—	= / A ⁶	F / L ⁷	= / P ⁸	=	= / P	=	—
Offert.	Ave Maria gratia	—	E ⁹	—	= v ¹⁰	—	= v	—	C ¹¹	= v	= v	= v	=	=	=	—
Comm.	Ecece Virgo	—	=	—	=	—	=	—	=	=	=	=	= p	=	= p	=
NATIV.																
DOM.																
Missa 1																
Introitus	Dominus dixit ad me	= v ¹²	=	=	=	=	= v ¹³	=	=	=	= ¹⁴	=	=	=	=	= / G ¹⁵
Graduale	Tecum principium	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—
Alleluia	Dominus dixit ad me	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	= / N ¹⁶	=	=	—
Offert.	Laetentur caeli	= v ¹⁷	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= v	= v	= v!	=	=	—
Comm.	In splendoribus	= p ¹⁸	=	= v ¹⁹	= v	= p	= v	= p	=	=	= p	=	= p	=	= p	V ²⁰
Missa 2																
Introitus	Lux fulgebit	= v ²¹	=	=	= v	=	=	=	=	=	= v ²²	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Benedictus qui	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—
Alleluia	Dominus regnavit	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	—
Offert.	Deus firmavit	= v ²⁴	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= v	= v	= v!	=	=	—
Comm.	Exsulta filia Sion	=	=	=	=	=	= v ²⁵	= p	=	=	= p	=	= p	=	= p	—
Missa 3																
Introitus	Puer natus est	= v ²⁶	=	=	= v	=	= v	=	=	= ²⁷	= v ²⁸	=	=	=	=	=

61 Dominica vacat

62 Intr. *Veni et ostende* (= Qu. Temp. Sabb.)63 Intr. *Memento nostri Domine*. Ps. Peccavimus cum patribus64 Gr. *A summo caelo*65 Grad. *Tollite portas*66 Alleluia alia: *Ave Maria*67 Alleluia *Festina ne tardaveris*, vel: *Levate capita*68 vel All. *Prophetiae sancti praedixerunt*

69 Off. Exsulta satis (= Qu. Temp. Sabb.)

70 V1. Quomodo fiet. V2. Ideoque et quod nascetur

71 Offert. *Confortamini*

72 Ps. 2. V. Postula

73 Ps. 2. V. Astiterunt

74 V. Cum dilexisset me

75 vel Intr. *Gaudemus omnes*76 vel All. *Natus est nobis hodie*

77 V1. Cantate Domino canticum (BS). V2. Confessio et pulchritudo (B). V3. Cantate Domino benedicite (S)

78 Ps. 109.

79 Ps. 109. V. Tecum principium

80 Comm. *Verbum caro factum est*

81 Ps. 92. V. Parata sedes tua

82 Ante saecula natus

83 melodia propria

84 V1. Dominus regnavit. V2. Mirabilis in altis/excelsis

85 Ps. 147. V. Quoniam confortavit

86 Ps. 95. V. Notum fecit

87 Tropi!

88 V. Multiplicabitur ejus imperium

89 Alleluia *Verbum caro*. Vel: *Natus est nobis*

90 V1. Magnus et metuendus. V2. Misericordia et veritas.

V3. Tu humiliasti.

91 Ps. 97

92 Ps. 97. V. Recordatus est

Dies	MR	OR	R	MB	Co	Cor	S	L	Ch	Be	Bo	Kl	Le	Str	OCM	MP
D2 p. Ep.																
Introitus	Omnis terra	In ¹	=	=	=	=	= v ²	?	=	=	= v ³	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Misit Dominus		=	=	=	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Laudate Dominum omnes angeli	Ad ⁴	=	=	=	=	=	?	Do ⁵	O ⁶	=	Do	Do	=	=	=
Offert.	Jubilare Deo universa	Ju ⁷	=	= v ⁸	= v	=	= =	?	=	= v	= v	=	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Dicit Dominus implete	Mi ⁹	=	=	= p ¹⁰	=	= v ¹¹	?	=	=	= v ¹²	=	= p	=	L ¹³	P/N ¹⁴
D. Palm.																
Introitus	Domine ne longe	= v ¹⁵	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	= v ¹⁷	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Tenuisti manum		=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	D ¹⁸	=
Tractus	Deus Deus meus	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	Ch ¹⁹	=
Offert.	Impropertium	= v ²⁰	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= vc	=	= v	=	= v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Pater si non potest	=	=	=	= p ²¹	= p ²²	=	= v ²³	=	=	= v ²⁵	=	= p	=	= p	=
15 Cena																
Introitus	Nos autem gloriamur	= v ²⁶	= p ²⁷	= p	= p	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Christus factus est	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	O ²⁸	=
Offert.	Dextera Domini	= v ²⁹	=	= v	= v	=	= v	= v	=	=	=	= v	=	=	U ³⁰	=
Comm.	Dñs Jesus postquam	=	=	=	= v ³¹	= p	= p	= p	=	=	= p	=	= p	=	H ³²	H

93. Intr. *In excelso throno* (Omnis terra: D1 p. Ep.)

94. Ps. 65. V. Dicite Deo

95. V. Tibi laus Deus noster

96. Alleluia *Adorabo ad templum*

97. Alleluia *Dominus regnavit exultet*

98. Alleluia *Omnis terra!*

99. Offert. *Jubilare Deo omnis* (Jubilare Deo universa: D1 p. Ep.)

100. V1. Reddam tibi. V2. Locutum est os meum.

101. Comm. *Mirabantur omnes*

102. Ps. 65.

103. Ps. 65. V. Qui convertit mare

104. V. Manifestavit gloriam suam

105. Comm. *Laetabitur* Ps. 96.

106. Comm. *Parasti in conspectu. Vcl: Nos cognovimus*

107. V. Libera me

108. V. Diviserunt

109. V. Sciens autem Jesus omnia

110. Tract! *Deus Deus meus*

111. Grad! *Christus factus est*

112. V1. Salvum me fac Deus. V2. Adversum me exercebantur.

V3. Ego vero orationem

113. Ps. 21

114. Ps. 115

115. V. Et hymno dicto

116. V. Verumtamen non sicut

117. Cumque consummassent omnia

118. Ps. 67. V. Sicut deficit

119. Ps. 95 (R, B, Co, S)

120. Grad. *Oculi omnium*

121. V1. In tribulatione. V2. Impulsus.

122. Hymn. *Ubi caritas*

123. Ps. 118. V. Tu mandasti

124. Comm. *Hoc corpus. ps. 22.*

125. V. Ecce tu Domine (B: Tu cognovisti. Co, S: Intellexisti)

126. Vel Intr. *Surrexit Dominus tere*

127. V2. *Epulemur*

128. V2. Notus in Judaea. V2. Et factus est in pace.

V3. Ibi confregit.

129. Ps. 138. V. Et omnes vias

Dies	MR	OR	R	MB	Co	Cor	S	L	Ch	Be	Bo	KI	Le	Str	OCM	MP
D 17 Pe																
Introitus	Justus es Domine	= v ¹	=	=	?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Beata gens	T ²	B ³	T/B	#	U ⁴	U	=	=	U	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Domine exaudi	L ⁵	L	?	#	?	D ⁵	Q ⁷	P ⁸	=	P	DI ⁷	Di	P	=	=
Offert.	Oravi Deum meum	=	=	= ¹⁰	#	=	= v ¹¹	= v	=	= v	= v	= v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Vovete et reddite	=	=	=	#	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	QuE ¹²
D 20 Pe																
Introitus	Omnia quae fecisti	= v ¹³	=	=	#	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Graduale	Oculi omnium	=	E ¹⁴	= /E	#	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Alleluia	Paratum cor	Q ¹⁵	A ¹⁶	?	#	?	?	De ¹⁷	Qui ¹⁸	N ¹⁹	De/M ²⁰	Qui	Qui	De	=	=
Offert.	Super flumina	= v ²¹	=	= v ²²	#	=	= v ²³	= v ²⁴	=	= v	= v	= v	=	=	=	=
Comm.	Memento verbi tui	=	=	=	#	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	= /E ²⁵

- 130 Ps. 117. V. Dextera Domini
 131 Ps. 117. V. Justifica
 132 Grad. *Timebunt gentes*
 133 Grad. *Bonum est confidere*
 134 Grad. *Utam petii*
 135 All. *Laudate nomen Domini*
 136 Alleluia *Deus iudex justus*
 137 Alleluia *Qui timent Dominum*
 138 Alleluia *Paratum cor meum*
 139 Alleluia *Dilexi quantiam*

- 140 B: V1. *Audivi vocem dicentem. V2. Ecce me loquente.*
 141 S, L, Be, Bo, Klo: V1. *Adhuc me loquentem.*
 142 Comm. *Quemadmodum desiderat. Vel: Ego sum lux*
 143 V. *Sicut audivimus*
 144 Grad. *Eripe me Domine*
 145 Alleluia *Quantiam confirmata*
 146 Alleluia *Adorabo ad templum*
 147 Alleluia *Dextera Dei fecit*
 148 Alleluia *Qui confidunt (cum tropo)*
- 149 Alleluia *Non nobis Domine*
 150 Alleluia *Domine Deus salutaris. Vel: Magnus Dominus*
 151 V1 In salicibus. V2 Hymnum cantate.
 V3 Si oblitus fuero. V4 Memento Domine
 152 V1. Si oblitus fuero. V2. Memento Domine
 153 S, Be, Bo, Klo: V1. In salicibus. V2. Si oblitus fuero.
 V3. Memento Domine
 154 V1. In salicibus. V2. Si oblitus fuero
 155 Vel Comm. *In hoc cognovimus*