

Rt. Reverend Johannes Overath

President of CIMS

INTRODUCTION

In Cologne, in 1961, at the Fourth International Church Music Congress, it was suggested that the next international meeting be held in London. Meanwhile, on November 22, 1963, with the chirograph, *Nobile subsidium liturgiae*, His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, established the Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae. One of the tasks entrusted to the newly organized society was that of arranging for international meetings of church musicians, continuing the series of congresses begun in Rome in the Holy Year, 1950, with subsequent assemblies in Vienna in 1954, Paris in 1957, and Cologne in 1961.

The Holy Father named the first officers of CIMS on March 7, 1964, and they immediately made contact with a committee of the English hierarchy according to the proposal made at Cologne to hold the next congress in London. After many conferences the conclusion was reached that "the time for an international church music congress in London is not yet ripe," as His Excellency, Bishop Charles Grant, chairman of the committee appointed by the hierarchy of England and Wales, wrote on November 5, 1964.

Since the first four congresses had taken place in Europe, and since the proposal had been expressed that an English-speaking country be the location of the next meeting, this course of action now suggested itself to the officers of CIMS, *viz.*, to discuss the possibility of holding an international meeting in the United States. Therefore, in the spring of 1965, many discussions and conferences took place between the officers of CIMS and leading church musicians in the United States, especially with the Rt. Rev. Coadjutor Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland, O.S.B., president of the newly organized Church Music Association of America, together with his colleagues in that society.

Chicago and Milwaukee were proposed as sites for the Congress: Chicago

for the days of study from August 21 to 25, and the neighboring city, Milwaukee, for the public congress from August 25 to 28, 1966. The suggested theme for both the more scientific, professional sessions as well as for the more practical, popular conferences of the first meeting of church musicians after the close of the Second Vatican Council was the consideration of church music in the light of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, promulgated on December 4, 1963, and the Instruction of September 26, 1964, in order to ascertain the task of sacred music in the liturgy and in the other apostolates of the Church. In accord with the documents of the Council, the Congress would treat not only the need for the preservation of the *patrimonium ecclesiae*, which is common to all nations, but it would likewise consider the possibilities for liturgical singing in various vernacular languages in the sense of *actuosa participatio populi* and in accord with the laws and the very nature of the musical art and the several languages.

Experiments, made here and there, without the solid foundation of true scientific and artistic knowledge, have given rise to a situation which — *proh dolor!* — contradicts both the great musical tradition of the Roman Church as well as the very dignity of the liturgy, without fulfilling the pastoral goal of *actuosa participatio populi*. This condition, deplorable in many places, is the result of many causes, but not least among them is a one-sided tendency to use the vernacular in the liturgy. The moderate, but meaningful path of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy has already been abandoned in many places without necessary consideration being given to what are the limits as well as the possibilities of congregational singing. To point to specific examples is superfluous.

In view of these difficulties which faced the universal Church, it seemed hardly fitting to organize a congress emphasizing great presentations of church music compositions. Rather, it was thought better to invite genuine experts in church music, in musicology and in performance and composition, to study and discuss the questions raised by the Council together with the tasks placed on the church musicians by the Council. Personal invitations were sent by CIMS for the days of study, held at Rosary College in Chicago from August 21 to 25, 1966.

Thus the Fifth International Church Music Congress of 1966 opened with Catholic musicologists from the universities of Europe, America and the Orient present, along with many well-known Catholic composers and performers. As members of CIMS, they demonstrated a vital interest in the current situation in sacred music and a sincere concern for preserving its precious heritage and solving its new problems. Several non-Catholic musicologists and artists also cooperated in the work.

In a letter, dated July 26, 1965, Cardinal Cicognani, papal Secretary of State, gave the approval of the Holy See for the Congress, scheduled for Chicago and Milwaukee, and at the same time the Apostolic Delegate in Washington informed the American bishops of this fact.

August 21 to 25, 1966, were days of study at Rosary College in Chicago to which all members of CIMS were invited. With the close of these study sessions, the Congress moved to Milwaukee for four days of public events from August 25 to 28. This part of the Congress was conducted in conjunction with the Church Music Association of America (CMAA). His Excellency, the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, Archbishop of Milwaukee, expressed his pleasure that Milwaukee was chosen as the convention city and assured the delegates of the city's reputation for friendliness and the promise of a happy remembrance of Milwaukee. The invitation to the Milwaukee convention prompted a great response among those interested in sacred music in the United States. At the formal opening event in the Milwaukee Auditorium over seven thousand persons were present, and the other Masses, lectures and concerts all taxed the capacities of the churches and halls where they were held.

In retrospect, CIMS has every reason to be grateful to His Eminence, John Cardinal Cody, Archbishop of Chicago, and to His Excellency, Archbishop Cousins of Milwaukee, for their wonderful kindness and cooperation. To the Sisters of Rosary College for their gracious hospitality special thanks are due. And to all those who cooperated in planning and carrying out the Congress — priests, Sisters, choirmasters, organists and singers — to all, CIMS is very grateful. By no means least, thanks must be expressed to all the committees that worked so tirelessly to organize the Congress.

I

Before undertaking here a treatment of the actual subject matter of the Congress, it is necessary to review the whole of the recent liturgical reform both from the point of view of the facts and from the viewpoint of canon law. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy still remains the legally established foundation, within the framework of canon law, for all liturgical reform. Therefore, the exclusive prerogative of the Holy See in all liturgical matters remains secure, and every liturgical change, according to the Constitution, whether undertaken by a single bishop or by a conference of bishops, must first be submitted to the Holy See for approval.¹

¹ Hans Barion, "Das zweite Vatikan Konzil," *Der Staat* (Berlin, February 1964), Vol. 3, p. 2, 225. A recent decision of the Central Commission for Coordinating Post-Conciliar Work and Interpreting the Decrees of the Council is of interest here: "Dubium. Utrum

While the Council was still in session the Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was established. Along with other post-conciliar commissions it has the task given it by the Council "to put its (the Council's) decrees into effect as soon as possible." A German canonist, Hans Barion, surveying the situation in the entire Church, has discussed the Consilium and its method of organization, its objective and structural peculiarity. He has noted that the post-conciliar complex of new administrative bodies in a certain sense is anti-curial.² Thus the Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy appears to be a body opposed to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, even though the two are connected by a common leadership. After the retirement of Cardinal Larraona as Prefect of the Congregation of Rites and at the same time the retirement of Cardinal Lercaro as President of the Consilium, Benno Cardinal Gut was appointed chairman of both groups. Earlier the secretary of the Consilium had also been named sub-secretary of the Congregation of Rites. While the appointment of a single cardinal to serve as head of both these organizations seems to lessen somewhat the contrast of curial and anti-curial forces, it is, nevertheless, just this conflict that compels the Pope to exercise a continual personal intervention in the disagreements, because in important liturgical questions it should be the thinking and the will of the universal Church that decides the issue, and not merely small sections of the Church or objectively insufficient viewpoints or even one-sided pressure groups.

At this point it is the question of the structure of the Consilium and the appointment of its consultors to which we must turn. The question is whether these men demonstrate in their professional viewpoints an outlook geared toward the good of the universal Church, or whether there is not rather a concentration here of certain vested interests that in their efforts for

potestas legislativa quae, ad normam Decreti Ss. Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II *Christus Dominus*, n. 38, § 4, intra certos limites tribuitur Conferentii Episcoporum, delegari possit Commissionibus episcopalibus quae ab ipsis Conferentiis constituuntur. Commissio Centralis coordinandis post Concilium laboribus et Concilii Decretis interpretandis, re mature perpensa in Coetu, die 24 mensis maii 1966 habito, respondendum censuit: Negative. Ssmus. Dominus Noster Paulus Pp. VI in audientia die 10 iunii 1966 infrascripto impertita hanc decisionem ratam habuit et adprobavit. Hamletus I. Card. Cicognani a publicis Ecclesiae negotiis." *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, An. LX, N. 6 (June 28, 1968), p. 361.

² Hans Barion, *op. cit.* (March 1966), Vol. 5, p. 350. In this connection one should note the attitude of the Holy Father in his address to the Consilium on October 13, 1966, when he said: "It is the obligation of the old and venerable Congregation of Rites to defend the present forms and to establish the new forms as definite and binding directives. In this experimental phase of the renewal, which is being introduced and tested in various regions within the Church, it is the obligation of the Consilium to be watchful, to correct deviations which might arise here and there, to put a stop to things which are begun without permission and on private initiative that might disturb the good order of public prayer and lead to errors in doctrine . . ." *Notitiae* (Vatican City, 1966), Vol. II, p. 300.

liturgical reform are minded to go far beyond the instructions of the Council. Undoubtedly, professional competence has not always been the clear basis of their selection, and anyone who compares the opinions expressed by the bishops in the Basilica of St. Peter with the directives issued by the members of the Consilium cannot escape the impression that a certain selectivity has been at work in their pronouncements. This sufficiently explains the one-sided liturgical practices evident since the Council.

Church musicians, of course, are interested in what factual presentation was made of sacred music, its schools and associations in the Consilium by those who are professionally competent. It should come as no surprise that among the episcopal members of the Consilium not a single authentic professional musician is to be found, even though in the Basilica of St. Peter during the Council professionally competent voices on the subject of sacred music were to be heard among the Fathers themselves. The consultors of the Consilium were named for the very purpose of providing professional knowledge to the Consilium, which was then sub-divided into committees with specific tasks. However, the president of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome, the president of CIMS, and the president of the International Federation of *Pueri Cantores*, all of whom were named consultors by the Holy Father, are not in fact numbered among the working committees entrusted with the various musical problems before the Consilium. These officers of these international church music organizations did not learn the smallest detail concerning the preparation of the first instruction of September 26, 1964, until the very day of its publication, not to mention the preparation of the *Graduale simplex*. Further, they were not once invited to attend the meeting of the "small group of liturgists and musicians" who, as the secretary, Reverend Annibale Bugnini, wrote on October 20, 1965, were entrusted with preparation of the final redaction of the Instruction on Sacred Music.³ Thus there arose from the obligations of their positions as officers of international church music organizations the duty to convoke in a study congress internationally prominent musicologists and composers and their schools to consider the problems of church music inherited from the liturgical reforms. In particular, such a congress would have to consider the matter of professionally representative, constructive proposals to aid an organic development in liturgical music. These proposals would then be presented directly to the Holy Father himself. Without the study days in Chicago, the leading

³ On September 4, 1964, the president of CIMS, who only a few months previously had been personally named to that office by the Holy Father, after his appointment as consultor to the Consilium, wrote to the Reverend Annibale Bugnini, secretary of the Consilium, expressing his willingness to promote fruitful cooperation between the Consilium and CIMS, but unfortunately in vain.

Catholic university professors, musicologists, composers and conductors would not have been heard from at all in the current questions of liturgical reform and church music. This is especially true since the competent representatives of professional musicians were excluded from working on certain projects in the Consilium. The question is why did not the Consilium make use of these international church music organizations in order to clarify and solve the problems that faced it. An even more interesting question is why the Consilium did not make use of the many professional resources, both clerical and lay, to be found in CIMS, which was established during the Council.

In point of fact, such a role was mentioned in the chirograph, *Nobile subsidium liturgiae*, of November 22, 1963, which canonically erected CIMS and commissioned it to function as *consulta supremae auctoritatis*.⁴ On October 13, 1966, the Holy Father in an address to the Consilium alluded to this undertaking:

*Existunt vero nonnullae quaestiones magni ponderis . . . et quae postulant, ut peculiari cum diligentia considerentur, etiam a Nobis. Ex quibus una musicam sacram respicit, quae studia movet multorum, sive eorum, qui Liturgiae sunt periti, sive eorum, qui musicam colunt. Haec quaestio ampla indiget lucubratione, quae sine dubio in posterum quoque fiet, prout hinc experientia pastoralis, illinc ingenium musicorum mutua ratione se attingere pergent, quod exoptamus ut benevole et fructuose agatur. Instructio, qua eiusmodi rationi inter Liturgiam et musicam intercedenti consuletur, faciliorem reddet eam concordiam et restituet — ita fore confidimus — novam quasi sociam operam, quam duae voces sublimes spiritu humani sibi invicem praebeant: oratio et ars. Conventus de Musica sacra nuper Chicagiae celebratus hanc spem Nostram confirmat. Hic autem in memoriam revocare cupimus ea, quae Constitutio universalis Synodi Sacrosanctum concilium hac de re statuit, honorem dans et Liturgiae et musicae (n. 39, 44, 112, 114, 115, 116, 120, 121) . . .*⁵

⁴ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, An. LVI (1964), p. 231–234. The document establishing CIMS can also be found both in Latin and in English in *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, English Edition (Rome, 1964), N. 1, p. 1–6.

⁵ *Notitiae* (Vatican City, 1966), Vol. II, p. 301–302. A translation of the Latin: "Indeed several questions of great weight present themselves and demand consideration with special care, even by Us. One of these is sacred music which occupies the studies of many experts, both those learned in liturgy and those who are musicians. This problem needs full consideration. Without doubt, ultimately, as pastoral experience and musical genius both turn to it with mutual study, a solution will be found in fruitful and friendly cooperation. Instruction is the means for fostering and facilitating agreement between liturgy and music, and We hope it will re-establish a closer collaboration between those two sublime voices of the human spirit — prayer and art. The congress of sacred music recently held in Chicago confirms Us in this hope. Here, however, we wish to remind you what the Constitution, *Sacrosanctum concilium*, of the ecumenical Council, has stated on this question, giving honor both to liturgy and to music. Cf. Articles 39, 44, 112, 114, 115, 116, 120, 121."

Quite often in the course of this address the Holy Father alluded to the necessity of cooperation between the liturgists and the musicians in order that the historical forces present within the development of the liturgy be recognized and above all in order that an organic liturgical reform might be made possible. Unfortunately, one cannot resist the impression that in the present reform of the liturgy all too often the contribution of musical scholarship is regarded as annoying, and then even it is often pushed aside altogether. Indeed this has been carried to the extent that attempts have been made to depreciate the very place of music in the liturgy. Theories have been advanced with the help of false historical notions; other theories have been based on the exclusive consideration of the "ministerial" role of music which reduces it in practice to a mere marginal position and totally ignores the *pars integralis* that music is in the liturgy.⁶

A word must be said concerning the interpretation of the texts of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and the other conciliar documents.⁷ The connection between the text to be explained and the prevailing intention of the particular law-giver before the law was issued must remain the authoritative principle for interpretation. This must be done in accordance with the canon law.⁸ In a word, it is the intention of the Fathers of the Council that must be considered in any interpretation. Further, one is not entitled to pass over the various clashes of opinion to be found in the documents drafted by the competent commissions working during the Council, nor can one fail to note the disputations conducted in the Basilica of St. Peter before the voting took place on each of the texts that was under consideration.

But when, on the contrary, those in high places in the Consilium established as a principle for implementing the Constitution that "it is not the *letter* but rather the *spirit* of the Constitution that is important," then more and more in the liturgical practices of the post-conciliar period deviations from the true intentions of the Fathers of the Council have understandably appeared. The shimmering words of that slogan remind the church musician of much new music that was said to have been written "in the spirit of Gregorian chant," when in reality most of it could not even be called music.⁹

⁶ Cf. Johannes Overath, "Liturgie und Kirchenmusik im Sinne der Konstitution des II. Vatikanischen Konzils über die hl. Liturgie," *Musica Sacra CVO* (Cologne, 1964), Vol. 84, p. 194.

⁷ Cf. Hans Barion, *op. cit.* (March 1965), Vol. 4, p. 358.

⁸ Canon 18 of the *Codex juris canonici* states: *Leges ecclesiasticae intelligendae sunt secundum propriam verborum significationem in textu et contextu consideratam; quae si dubia et obscura manserit, ad locos Codicis parallelos, si qui sint, ad legis finem ac circumstantias et ad mentem legislatoris est recurrendum.*

⁹ Many appeal to the so-called "spirit of the Council" in other questions too. "Whoever follows the public discussions on the question of the participation of the laity in the mission of the Church, keeping his eyes on the prescriptions of the Council, will cer-

In the face of this situation, it became the duty of CIMS and all its members throughout the world to promote the homogeneous development throughout the Church of an attitude toward music and the liturgy which would accord fully with the decrees of the Council.¹⁰

At this point it must be repeated that the will of the Second Vatican Council on the subject of sacred music is not to be found exclusively in Chapter VI of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. It must be sought also in several other articles of that constitution which speak only indirectly of music but which have great bearing on the subject. They are Articles 23, 31, 36, 40, 44, 46, 54, 91, and 123.¹¹

In the meantime such a host of publications on the reforms in the liturgy following the Council has appeared that it is frankly impossible to give an exhaustive review of them. It is understandable that we have witnessed this enormous mass of publications because various directives for implementing the conciliar decrees have appeared since 1964, coming on the one hand from the Consilium or from the Sacred Congregation of Rites or other congregations in Rome, and on the other hand from the various episcopal conferences throughout the world. In this avalanche of liturgical guidelines there is in the publications of ecclesiastical authorities an easily recognizable trend toward confusion in questions of liturgical reform. Consequently, even after promulgation by competent authority, many decrees find a mixed reception. The Instruction on Liturgical Formation in Seminaries of December 25, 1965,¹² for example, was scarcely even noticed, even though it had been examined by the Consilium and the Congregation of Rites and had received the approval of the Holy Father, who ordered its publication. How, then, is a church musician in a seminary to act when papal directives are in practice completely hushed up? In view of the crisis of authority which is noticeable in many other areas besides liturgy, is it surprising that a deplorable arbitrariness in liturgical practice continues to gain ground?

One will search in vain through the conciliar documents for a justification of many of the changes that have come about in recent years.¹³ Nevertheless,

tainly wonder where these various movements are leading. Under the guise of an appeal to the spirit of the Council, which some people tailor to fit their own measurements, tendencies are advancing which disturb the very foundations of the Church's structure." K. Mörsdorf, *Scheuermann-Festschrift*, 1968.

¹⁰ Cf. Johannes Overath, "Message from the President of CIMS to the Special Meeting in Rome, October 12-14, 1967," *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, English Edition (Rome, 1968), Vol. V, N. 2, p. 20.

¹¹ Cf. Johannes Overath, "Liturgie und Kirchenmusik im Sinne der Konstitution des II. Vatikanischen Konzils über die hl. Liturgie," *Musica Sacra CVO* (Cologne, 1964), Vol. 84, p. 192.

¹² Hermann Kronsteiner, *Kirchenmusik Heute* (Vienna, 1967), p. 61 f.

¹³ For example, the table altar (*altare versus populum*) has been introduced into many

there remains a duty to learn what is the clear position of the Church in liturgical and church music questions. That will be expressed by the highest ecclesiastical authority which is the general council united with the pope.

II

The point of decisive significance for church music, quite naturally, is precisely the question of the use of the vernacular languages in the liturgy. Its purpose is to make possible a more intelligent participation of the faithful in the liturgical action. During the discussions on Article 36 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in the Basilica of St. Peter, eighty Fathers addressed themselves to the general prescription of that article alone. But on that question and also in the discussions on Articles 54, 63, 101, and 113, the opinions voiced by the Fathers of the Council were very diverse. An extreme solution to the question of the use of the vernacular, which in the days since the Council has come to be the rule in many places, so that even the Canon of the Mass is now included, contradicts the will of the Council. Such a practice which we now see would have been unacceptable to the majority of the Fathers of the Council.¹⁴

In this matter too, alongside the arguments *pro* and *con* expressed by the Fathers, a study of the *Relationes*, which were made before the voting in the Basilica of St. Peter, proves most illuminating and in fact indispensable for the interpretation of the texts of the conciliar documents.

In his remarks on the fundamental Article 36, Bishop C. J. Calewaert of Ghent proposed a kind of middle course on the question of the vernacular which "could perhaps secure the assent of all the Fathers." According to this view the Latin language holds first place, while a certain leeway is conceded to the vernacular. At this point the wish was expressed that pilgrims assembled together from many lands should be able to pray together in common,

dioceses at all costs and under the guise of a false appeal to the Council and contrary to all valid historical, theological, psychological and artistic grounds. Cf. Joseph A. Jungmann, "Der neue Altar," *Der Seelsorger* (Freiburg, 1968), Vol. 38, N. 6, p. 374-381. In the United States, in addition to the promotion and even ordering of the table altar, numerous examples of legislation in other matters on the diocesan level that have no basis in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy can be cited. Frequently such local regulations are said to be founded on statements of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, or the Music Advisory Board, or even on private publications of such unofficial societies as the American Liturgical Conference. Needless to say, these bodies do not possess legislative power. For additional comment on this problem, cf. Richard J. Schuler, "Implementation or Deterioration," *The Wanderer* (Saint Paul, November 30, 1967), Vol. 100, No. 48, p. 4; Richard J. Schuler, "By Whose Authority," *The Wanderer* (Saint Paul, April 4, 1968), Vol. 101, No. 14, p. 2; Richard J. Schuler, "Who Killed Sacred Music," *Triumph* (Washington, March 1969), Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 21-23.

¹⁴ Cf. E. J. Lengeling, *Die Konstitution des II. Vatik. Konzils über d. hl. Liturgie* (Münster, 1964), p. 83.

and an admonition concerning this need was requested for the chapter dealing with the Mass. The Bishop of Ghent had already described in his address on October 26, 1962, the deep religious impression that the celebration of the Pontifical Mass by the Papal Legate at the close of the Eucharistic Congress in Munich in 1960 had left behind, as many thousands of worshippers sang the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin Gregorian chant. This was quite a contrast, the bishop pointed out, with another celebration of the Mass with German songs and prayers all of which were quite incomprehensible to the many foreigners present. In passing, he also made the proposal that the use of the Latin language be preserved for the short responses and the parts of the Ordinary in general, as a symbol of unity among the faithful of all lands and as an effective psychological factor.¹⁵ He emphasized the inner connection between Gregorian chant and the Latin tongue.

A number of the Fathers of the Council spoke for the preservation of the Latin language when the people speak or sing the Ordinary of the Mass. The impact of their words can be seen in Article 54, paragraph 2. The words of Cardinal Feltin of Paris deserve particular mention. He took a middle course and went on record for a special position to be given the *Missa solemnis*, "in order that the musical treasures of the Christian tradition may be preserved," and in order that the possibility of communal celebration by people from various countries might perdure.

While more than ten cardinals and twenty bishops spoke on behalf of the preservation of Latin in the liturgy, Cardinal Feltin was the sole isolated voice that referred to the possibility of an irreparable loss of the whole musical art in the liturgy. He pointed out that because that art is so closely interwoven with the Latin language, an eruption of the vernacular could sweep it away. What becomes clear from all this is how few recognize the pastoral dimension of the marvel of sacred music which has itself sprung from the liturgical action. It becomes clear how little sacred music is thought of in the context of the contemporary interest in the care of souls even in

¹⁵ In 1964, at the thirty-second general meeting in Brixen of the Allgemeiner Cäcilien Verband (ACV), Prof. Hermann Kronsteiner, chairman of the division of church music of the Academy of Music in Vienna, said: "A request should be sent to the bishops conferences in the German speaking dioceses of Germany, Austria, Switzerland and South Tirol, asking that the dialogue responses of the Mass continue to be spoken and sung in Latin at every Mass for the following reasons: 1) translation of these short responses into German creates many difficulties both linguistic and musical; 2) in any case, the Latin responses must still be learned by the faithful since the celebration of Mass in Latin, together with a minimum of at least one Latin Ordinary in chant, is required both after the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy as it was required before its promulgation; 3) it is relatively easy to achieve an understanding of these Latin responses; 4) the Latin responses create an important bond of unity through the Mass among various peoples." Cf. *Musica Sacra (CVO)* (Cologne, 1964), Vol. 84, p. 213.

those lands which can still boast of a high musical culture, both within and without the Church.¹⁶

The Benedictine abbots of Solesmes and Beuron spoke without ambiguity on behalf of the preservation of Gregorian chant and with good reason. They did not, however, exclude a moderate use of the mother tongues in the liturgy. On October 26, 1962, the Rt. Reverend Benedict Reetz, O.S.B., Arch-abbot of Beuron, presented sixteen points for consideration.¹⁷ The ninth point in particular on the subject of Gregorian chant was in part a premonition, but it has already been confirmed by subsequent developments.

If one searches in the documents of the Council, among the many voices speaking on the subject of the liturgical language and so frequently citing the *via media*, one must conclude that the majority of the Fathers spoke on behalf of the primary position of Latin and for a use of the vernacular only in those sections which are directed to the people. This fact has clearly found expression in Article 36.

It is perhaps not amiss here to consider from which cultural regions and from which dioceses the bishops came who held extreme opinions in the matter of the use of the vernacular. Europe, together with its culturally related lands, possesses a mature Christian musical culture, the core of which is the Roman Mass in the Latin language, now unfortunately in danger of extinction. In countries with an old pagan culture or in those lands just now emerging from colonialism, the pastoral situation with respect to the liturgy is quite a different thing. In these places a Christian culture must begin for the first time to grow and develop organically.

On November 13, 1962, Bishop Hermann Volk of Mainz announced in the Basilica of St. Peter that the "faithful must no longer be hindered from singing the liturgical texts in their native tongue (He meant the Proper and Ordinary of the Mass.) . . . otherwise they will be reduced to the status of illiterates in the worship of the Church . . . but no one can object that there is a dearth of worthy melodies for them . . . because they surely will become available after a period of time once the ecumenical Council permits the liturgical song in the vernacular." The old, traditional German *lieder-*

¹⁶ Pope Pius X rated the pastoral value of Gregorian chant and polyphony so highly that he dedicated his first papal letter, the *Motu proprio, Inter Pastoralis officii sollicitudines*, Nov. 22, 1903, entirely to the subject of sacred music. In the same sense, cf. M. Bernards, "Zu Bischof Simars Leitgedanken und Massnahmen am Vorabend der Pianischen Neuordnung. Kirchenmusikalische Reform aus dogmatischer Besinnung und pastoraler Sorge," *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* (Cologne, 1966), Vol. 50, p. 181 f.

¹⁷ These same thoughts are to be found expressed in other articles. Cf. Benedict Reetz, "The Moderate Use of the Vernacular in the Liturgy," *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, English Edition (Rome, 1965), Vol. II, N. 1-2, p. 7-12; *Münchener Klerusblatt* (Munich, May 1, 1964), N. 11.

hochamt had long been permitted in German dioceses, and after the competent episcopal conference has given its permission the texts of the Proper and the Ordinary of the Mass may actually be sung in the vernacular. But Bishop Volk, according to his own words, was not concerned with hymns but rather with providing melodies for the congregation to sing the liturgical Mass texts.

From the purely musical point of view, a fitting response to the remarks of the Bishop of Mainz can be found in the writing of a non-Catholic musicologist, who in a sense stands above the inter-cameral disputes about the vernacular. In touching on the subject of vernacular musical settings of prose texts and the relationship between music and speech, his researches in history bring him to these conclusions:

The vernacular found . . . its entrée into the Church . . . not in the garb of prose . . . but rather in the costume of verse. . . . assuming that the ecclesiastical community is to sing . . . German liturgical texts, it becomes incumbent upon one to make use of hymns. The musical interpretation of German prose texts takes on a personality which is consciously concerned with expressing the content of the text in musical terms. Thus there remain only two possibilities for the musical exploitation of the German language in the liturgy: the sung hymn and spoken prose. These are the only two forms which have developed in the Evangelical Church.¹⁸

Bishop Volk in the same speech to the Fathers of the Council assumed that a contribution "toward greater understanding among Christians" could be achieved by his proposals, "because the Protestants make use of the singing of the congregation as an essential element of the liturgy itself." But the songs sung by the Protestants are in fact hymns, which the speaker had already relegated explicitly to a secondary place in favor of having the congregation sing the prose texts of the liturgy. What did not succeed in the case of the Protestants of the sixteenth century, *viz.*, the creation of a tradition of congregational singing of prose texts, is supposed today somehow to work for us, and then indeed to be able to be accomplished not just in the German tongue but in the languages of all peoples, according to this opinion expounded by the Bishop of Mainz.

In viewing our liturgical practices today, it would be more correct to speak of a *rapprochement* with the liturgy of Protestantism in the sixteenth century.¹⁹ In this connection, the Protestant historian of music, Hans Joachim Moser, says:

¹⁸ Thrasybulos G. Georgiades, *Musik und Sprache* (Berlin, 1954), p. 53. The same may be said of English.

¹⁹ Rudolf Graber, "Zur nach konziliaren Situation der Kirche, Vortrag in der Akademie 'Kontakte der Kontinente,'" *Die zweite Reformation* (Abensberg, n. d.), p. 10 f.

Two fundamental guiding principles distinguished Luther's new order of church music with respect to Catholicism in particular. The first is the concept of the universal priesthood (Cf. I Peter 2:9; Apoc. 1:6). In accord with this idea the community as a massed choir becomes the actual agent of the divine service and the most active factor in the praise, the prayer, the singing and the adoration. In this connection an old high German gloss has found a very late but splendid confirmation; it read "*Orae = helfan singon,*" i.e., to pray is to help sing. From this follows the second guiding principle: the national language of the people is the chief carrier of ecclesiastical singing since the vernacular alone assures for all the participants in the divine service the full understanding of God's word. Once one decides to sing in German, the melody of speech and the musical melodic formulae must coincide quite organically. For this reason Luther with his sensitive musician's ear dismissed as mere aping the efforts in some small localities to subordinate the German text to the Latin styles of singing . . .

With this new evaluation of congregational singing, the people's hymns which were only tolerated up until this time now rose to the heights of being the dominant element with liturgical preeminence. The Latin motet and the Latin High Mass, however, continued to be accepted quite generally right down to the time of Bach. As a result of this, Latin continued to play its role in the linguistic education of the choristers. The beautiful thought of the Pentecostal "Praise Him in all tongues" remained true.²⁰

The voice of another expert from Switzerland testifies to the situation at present with reference to congregational singing in Protestant churches:

Today more than ever before the Church should take its stand in the world. Indeed it must do this with confidence and joy. But the Church must not be of this world, if it will remain true to the divine mission to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. The Church must be open to the world but must not equate itself with the world. The more hectic the outward mode of living becomes, so much the more do men need the Church as the place of quiet and of final rest. In the Church eternity reaches down into time, and all that the Church says and does, most especially in divine services, must remain transparent, because its being is founded in the super-terrestrial. In church music, we have in the service of praise and of prayer neglected the latter aspect of transparency for the super-terrestrial. Indeed, we have forgotten it. One might well imagine that the church music of the future together with future hymns may have to go out in search of this again. They will have to try to strike a note that is related to the soaring clarity and eloquent silence of Gregorian chant and thereby lead us anew to adoration. We have already noted that the Reformation hymn was the new song of that era. This was true precisely because it left the all too super-terrestrial, meditative and other-worldly sound and descended to the earthly which was the final consequence of taking seriously the Incarnation of the Divine Word. We have, however, all too long and too one-sidedly

²⁰ H. J. Moser, *Die evangelische Kirchenmusik in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1953), p. 322.

become fixed in this optimistic activity which has been joined with the pharisaical noise of confessional prayer. Now at last we have to search for a wholesome completion in the transcending of secularization.²¹

If in spite of the clear, historical tradition of the Lutheran Church and the musical problems that confront that body today, someone may still try to seek for a solution to the problem of singing prose texts in the vernacular by turning to a kind of vernacular Gregorian chant, then he might well consider the study prepared by Johannes Hatzfeld.²² As early as 1953, Hatzfeld, who was a recognized authority on congregational song in the Catholic Church, prepared a memorandum for the German episcopal conference meeting in Fulda on the subject of various experiments in this area. He spoke out unequivocally against them.²³ In addition, there are other studies in the matter.²⁴

III

Any further analysis of the proposals made in the Basilica of St. Peter on the subject of sacred music will have to be reserved for more thorough examination at a later date. Surely, then, statements which cannot be taken seriously by professional scholars must be shown for what they are. With all due

²¹ W. Tappolet, *In neuen Zungen* (Zürich, 1963), p. 168.

²² Cf. Hubert Jedin, "Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenkrise," *Anzeiger für die katholische Geistlichkeit* (1968), Vol. 77, p. 535 f. On p. 537, the author comes to the following conclusions among others: "It is only with the greatest reluctance that I speak about the liturgical crisis . . . I fear that it will not be long until one will not be able to find a Latin missal in many places, until our children no longer know what a *Gloria* or a *Credo* is, and until one must go into the concert hall to hear the immortal creations of our church music. Catholic worship is both mystery and proclamation. As mystery it is impenetrable by our understanding, and must remain so. Translations of texts into the vernacular can do nothing to change this."

²³ Johannes Overath and Johannes Hatzfeld, *Ein Wort zum deutschen Choral* (Düsseldorf, 1954), p. 244.

²⁴ For a listing of the literature published in German on the problem of adapting the Gregorian chant to the German language, *vide* Joseph Haas, "Gestalt und Aufgabe," *Der Allgemeiner Cäcilien Verband* (Cologne, 1961), p. 81. Despite the scholarly suggestions of the experts, in missals published in Latin and German in 1965, by order of the Fulda Conference and the conference of Swiss bishops, no attention was given to their advice. Similarly in English, articles have appeared on the subject of chant adapted to the vernacular. Cf. Eugene Cardine, "A Propos of a 'Translation' of Gregorian Chant," *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, English Edition (Rome, 1965), Vol. II, N. 1-2, p. 19-22; Urbanus Bomm, "Address Delivered during the Congress on Sacred Music held at Bressanone, May 1964," *Musicae Sacrae Ministerium*, English Edition (Rome, 1964), Vol. I, N. 2, p. 5-9; G. Wallace Woodworth, "Latin and the Vernacular: A Parallel," *Sacred Music* (Boys Town, Nebraska, 1967), Vol. 94, No. 3, p. 8-9. As in Germany, the new missals published in the United States with English texts have incorporated "adaptations" of Gregorian melodies for the singing of the vernacular texts of the prefaces, *Pater noster*, etc.

reverence for the pastoral concern of these Fathers of the Council, it is still good to recall what Dr. Johannes Baptista Hilber, founder of the Swiss school of church music, said in pointing out that sacred music must both be taught and learned as an independent discipline with laws of its own. "It is a matter of the greatest moment," he said, "to achieve the right viewpoint and the valid evaluation in the midst of confusing polemics and the pseudo-modern dilettantism of our day."²⁵ This admonition today is only beginning to show its force.

In listening to the various speeches on the question of sacred music in the Basilica of St. Peter, one could not always escape the impression that a decided disdain for polyphony could be detected in some of them. Indeed, the whole order of liturgical music including the melodic structure of Gregorian chant from time to time became the subject of professionally untenable suggestions. This clearly demonstrates that the more that control over the sphere of liturgical music is conceded to individual bishops or to episcopal conferences, so much the more must respect for professional scholarship be maintained. How often, indeed, are the learned observations of leading musicologists and composers simply pushed aside today with all manner of experiment or in fact even dismissed as being "fruitless polemic!" But such indiscriminating judgments made against the well-founded objections from church musicians will never solve the pressing problems that face us today.²⁶

Sometimes the assertion is heard that "those who resist the modern iconoclasm are really fretting about unessential things, because the indispensable reality must be the mystery of Holy Mass and the Eucharist." Dietrich von Hildebrand has exposed this transparent argument which could promote iconoclasm:

It is indeed not essential that the Church in which Holy Mass is celebrated and in which the faithful receive Holy Communion be beautiful. Only the words through which transubstantiation is accomplished are essential. If this is what is referred to, then one can have no objection. But if by "unessential" is meant "insignificant," if it is meant that such things as the beauty of the Church, the Liturgy, and the music are "trivial," then this accusation is very wrong, for there is a profound re-

²⁵ Joseph Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 92 f.

²⁶ Rev. Annibale Bugnini, secretary of the Consilium, speaking at an Italian liturgical convention on January 4, 1968, described the first four years of the Consilium's history as "four years of musical polemics." He deplored the lack of positive initiative on the part of the musicians. Had he been referring to certain polemics in the Italian newspapers, it would then have been the duty of the Italian church musicians who knew this situation to respond and take a stand. But this statement was exported from Italy and applied to those church musicians who up until now had refrained from any polemics, because they still believed in the weight and the worth of their professional arguments.

lation between the essence of something and its adequate expression. This is especially true of Holy Mass.²⁷

Who is there that has not at some time experienced himself that a part of the very soul of the liturgy is missing when music truly worthy of the sacred action is lacking? It is true that the recited liturgy possesses grandeur and holiness, but even the most unmusical man will notice that it is quite a different thing when an *Alleluia*, a *Gloria* or a *Credo* is sung instead of spoken. Indeed only the truly inspired Christian is able to sing as St. Francis did in his *Canticle of the Sun*. He had "known" the content of his hymn for a long time, but something ineffable was required to stir him up in order that he could express what was within him in such a form that it would have the power to communicate his "inexpressible inspiration" to all that would hear it. Mere "manufactured" music does not possess this divine, scintillating spark, even if it has been commissioned by the highest authority. For this reason, the Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, in his address to the Italian diocesan commissions for liturgy and sacred art, in 1967, said:

The Church needs saints . . . but she also needs artists, competent and good artists; both the saint and the artist are witnesses of the living spirit of Christ. Our commission and our wishes are directed to you to give the Church new artists who will push forward and reveal the holiness of the Church.

IV

Finally, the question of the use of the vernacular in the liturgy must be judged by the canonists according to the will of the Second Vatican Council. Prof. Georg May says:

Article 36, #1 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy formulates the principle: "Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites." This sentence has imposed a command to preserve the Latin language. In contrast to the translation produced under the auspices of the German bishops, it must be observed that the official text of the document employs the subjunctive *servetur* and therefore expresses a command, not merely a recommendation. The Latin language must be preserved. In the future the Latin rites will continue to be moulded by the Latin language. The word *usus* clearly commands the actual employment of the Latin language and not simply the possibility of its being used. . . .²⁸

²⁷ Dietrich von Hildebrand, *The Trojan Horse in the City of God* (Chicago, 1967), p. 197.

²⁸ On the contrary, the head of the secretariate of the American Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy has 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

The principle imposed by Article 36, #1, of the Constitution, commanding the preservation of the use of Latin, is to be considered the ruling, fundamental principle in explaining the legislation of the Council pertaining to the vernacular. Every interpretation which violates this principle errs against the sense of the Constitution and the will of the Fathers of the Council. The use of the vernacular is allowed in the liturgy *in addition to* the Latin. The primacy of the Latin may not be assaulted in the process.

Article 36, #2, of the Constitution permits the use of the mother tongue in certain parts of the liturgy. The use of the vernacular is not prescribed nor is it urgently recommended. It is simply permitted. Therefore the command to preserve the use of Latin stands in clear contrast to the permission to use the vernacular. The priority of Latin is unequivocally maintained . . .

Article 36, #2, of the Constitution gives examples indicating in which section of the liturgy especially (and therefore not exclusively) the use of the vernacular is of value: lessons, admonitions (Cf. Article 35, #3), many, but not all orations, and chants. By giving these examples the Council has made clear that it is not its intention to allow an exclusive use of the vernacular in the liturgy . . .

Whether and in what respect to use the vernacular in the sense of Articles 36, #2, 54, 63, 101 and 113 does not rest with the individual priest or layman nor even within the discretion of an individual bishop. It belongs rather only to that authority which is competent in ecclesiastical matters for a particular territory (Articles 39, 36, #2, and 22, #2). But even the decision of the episcopal conference does not possess the force of law of itself, but it stands in need of review and confirmation by the Apostolic See (*Actis ab Apostolica Sede probatis seu confirmatis*). If confirmation of a decision has been granted to the competent territorial authority, then the bishop in his diocese has the right, but not however the duty, to permit the use of the vernacular according to the limit conceded . . .²⁹

Of special interest to the church musician is the use of the vernacular in the *Missa cantata*. Articles 54, 113, 114 and 116 are to be cited in this matter.

Article 54 of the Constitution provides a special norm for the general law expressed in Article 36. Article 54 applies the universal prescription that the use of the vernacular is limited to Masses celebrated with the people (*in Missis cum populo celebratis*). The use of Latin in the celebration of Masses offered with the people is

collects." Frederick R. McManus, "The Constitution on Liturgy Commentary," *Worship* (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1964), Vol. 38, No. 6, p. 351. A study of some of the activities of Fr. McManus in the area of liturgical renewal can be found in these articles: Gary Potter, "The Liturgy Club," *Triumph* (Washington, May 1968), Vol. 3, No. 5, p. 10-14; Ronald D. Lambert, "The New Missal: Experiment in Heresy," *Triumph* (Washington, March 1968), Vol. 3, No. 3, p. 17-24; Ronald D. Lambert, "The Threat to the Mass," *Triumph* (Washington, January 1969), Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 20-24.

²⁹ G. May, "Umfang und Grenzen des Gebrauchs der Landessprache in der Liturgie nach der Gesetzgebung des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils," *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* (Vienna, 1967), Heft 1, p. 16-94.

to be maintained. Exceptions are permitted only by appeal to special legislation. First, last and always, the celebration of Masses in Latin with the people is not only permitted, but is in fact commanded. After all, when no Masses are offered with the people in Latin, then the preservation of the Latin tongue in Masses celebrated with the people can no longer be a matter of serious consideration. A certain leeway (*congruus locus*) can be allotted to the vernacular in Masses celebrated with the people, and the Council makes very clear what that leeway to be allowed is (*tribui possit*). Its wish is to allow for the possibility of appropriate room for the mother tongue. The use of the vernacular is never commanded. But the possibility of its use is desired.

An appropriate leeway (*congruus locus*) means that the degree of use of the vernacular is to be measured by the various arguments *pro* and *con*. Here lies the qualification from the very beginning that the use of the vernacular is not to be boundless or unchecked. An overwhelming use of the vernacular would not be in keeping with the weight of the various arguments advanced on behalf of the preservation of Latin. There is no obligation upon the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority to permit the use of the vernacular even in limited measure for Masses celebrated with the people. If the competent episcopal conferences are convinced that no need exists for a greater use of the vernacular, then no priest may assume to himself the freedom to use it in greater measure on his own authority. Only the action of the competent episcopal authority puts in force the right of the individual priest to proceed in such a manner.

As a conclusion drawn from the principle set forth in Article 36, #1, of the Constitution, Article 54, #2, orders that care is to be taken so that the faithful may be able to say or sing together those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them. Sufficient compliance with this command can be maintained only if the faithful have sufficient opportunity to attend Masses in which Latin is recited and sung. Since the faithful, except for a dwindling minority, attend Mass only on Sundays and holydays, Article 54, #2, therefore imposes the obligation of a regular celebration of the Sunday service in the Latin language. Further, since the faithful in general usually attend Mass on Sundays and holydays at the same hour, the necessity arises to provide divine services in which they can pray and sing in Latin those parts which belong to them at all the usual hours for divine service. Thus, for example, it does not suffice only to provide regularly a Latin High Mass; there should also be occasions for those attending the early, late, evening or children's Masses to join in offering the Holy Sacrifice in Latin . . .

Article 54, #3, of the Constitution refers to Article 40 to cover the use of the vernacular in addition to what is provided for by Article 54, #1, which deals with the permission for its use in Masses celebrated with the people. The following points are to be observed for a wider introduction of the mother tongue: 1) a more intensified use of the vernacular must be justified by a pressing need; 2) proposals for such innovations are to be presented to the Apostolic See and permission must be granted by the Apostolic See; 3) when such permission is obtained, preliminary

experiments for a limited, stated time may be begun by the appropriate communities; 4) in the formation of liturgical decrees, experts from the appropriate disciplines must be consulted.

One can scarcely call it the middle path to say that “the entire celebration of Mass for the faithful is possible in the vernacular as long as one bases it on the conditions given in Article 40.” On the contrary, the door has been opened to extreme shifts into the vernacular and the total elimination of the Latin tongue in Masses celebrated with the people. This is the consequence of the elasticity of the formulation of Article 54, #3, when the limiting provisions of Article 36, #1, and Article 54, #2, are disregarded . . .³⁰

Professor G. May comes to the following conclusion concerning the directives of the German bishops on the various forms of celebrating Mass:

The fifth chapter, Articles 57–78, of the directives of the German bishops on the various forms of celebrating Mass do not favor the use of Latin. What is presented will lead in most places to the suppression of Latin under the conditions that prevail in Germany. The forms of celebration set forth in the directives cannot lay claim to be the best possible way of following the unambiguous command of the conciliar legislation demanding the retaining of the Latin language in the liturgy. Still less do these directives preserve the dominance of Latin, and thus they do not agree with the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in this matter . . .³¹

The use of these additional permissions to employ the vernacular in Masses celebrated with the people is left to the pastoral responsibility and the conscientious discretion of the clergy. Therefore the clergy is bound to observe the spirit and the letter of the Constitution. Because the majority of men much prefer to follow the easiest and most comfortable way, it was easily foreseen that straightway scarcely any divine services would make use of the Latin any longer. This premonition has been vindicated in full measure. The permission for the use of the vernacular is now almost universally understood as a command for its exclusive use. Only here and there, and in greater measure in the *diaspora* than in the predominantly Catholic

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 46 f.

³¹ The German bishops, assembled at Fulda, addressed a letter to the clergy on September 30, 1966, on the subject of divine worship, which says that the use of the vernacular at Mass is not intended “to exclude in any way” the Latin language. Cf. *Amtsblatt* (Mainz, 1966), p. 209. Hence both the Latin and the German Mass “are to be promoted” according to the forms described in Articles 59–70 of the guidelines, which were later completed in a supplement. However, the “varieties of pastoral conditions” are not adequately expressed in a “general schematic determination of the frequency of the individual forms.” It must be emphasized in the sense of the Council that the faithful are to be able to sing and pray even in Latin the parts of the Mass that pertain to them. “In fact, the children should also learn these songs.” The Ordinary in Latin should continue to be promoted where it is customary. Similarly, Latin chants used outside the Mass should also be retained. The German High Mass in its old form can continue to be promoted. In cases of pastoral necessity, the celebration of Mass in the Latin language may be announced in the parish bulletin with the hours of service.

regions, do perspicacious and courageous pastors try to satisfy the commands of the Council to preserve the Latin language in the liturgy. They are exposed to censure by their colleagues, but the German bishops have in the meantime extended them a measure of support in their letter of September 30, 1966 . . .

Article 113, #2, of the Constitution deals with the language of liturgical celebrations carried out festively with song at which sacred ministers take part and the people actively participate. In this article reference is made to the general norms of Article 36 and to the special norms of Article 54 for the Mass, Article 63 for the sacraments, and Article 101 for the Divine Office. What has been said above concerning the spoken Mass is true also in corresponding measure of the sung Mass. This means, first and foremost, that Latin must be preserved and its predominance not violated. Article 114, #1, is in full agreement with this, when it states that "the treasury of church music is to be preserved and fostered (*foveatur*) with great care." In first place, this treasury includes the Gregorian chant, and in second place, the other forms of church music, and before all else, polyphony. Article 116, #1, declares that the Church considers Gregorian chant as the song proper to the Roman liturgy, and therefore it ought to have the first place in liturgical actions, all conditions being equal.³²

In the United States over-emphasis on the vernacular is also widespread. While not all dioceses have published regulations on the subject of the liturgical languages, some have put into stated form directions that are at variance with the conciliar decrees. These examples, to mention only a few, may be cited to demonstrate what can be found across the entire nation:

For the Archdiocese of Baltimore, in the *Directory for Worship*, published with the *imprimatur* of Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, March 1, 1964, the following rules are given:

No. 161. As of the First Sunday of Advent in 1965, the introduction of the vernacular into the sung Mass is to be completed in this archdiocese.

No. 162. All parts of the Mass where the vernacular is permitted should be performed in the vernacular.

No. 163. Latin songs may be sung by the choir where participation will not be hindered in any way. This does not mean, however, that those Ordinary or Proper parts of the Mass which must be performed according to the rubrics can be in Latin.

No. 180. If the funeral Mass is a sung Mass, the Ordinary must now be in the vernacular. After the first Sunday of Advent, 1965, the Proper must also be in the vernacular.

In the Archdiocese of Chicago, the *Pastoral Directory on the Mass*, newly revised edition of 1966, which has the *imprimatur* of John Cardinal Cody, gives the following direction on the use of Latin in sung Masses:

³² G. May, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

No. 701 (footnote). All sung Masses are to be in the vernacular except on special occasions when Latin is permitted to preserve the rich tradition of Gregorian chant and polyphonic music which is wedded to the Latin language. Care should be taken that the use of this music is meaningful to the particular worshipping community. The special occasion would be left to the discretion of the pastor in cooperation with the musical director.

No. 836. In places where there is a large influx of tourists, especially from foreign lands, it may be helpful to schedule a Mass in Latin. This Mass would be arranged in a specific church according to an established and publicized time-table. If there is such need, permission is to be obtained in writing from the Ordinary.

Special directives on the Liturgy for the Archdiocese of Chicago, mandatory as of June 9, 1966:

No. 3. The vernacular is to be used at all public Masses to the extent permitted by law.

In the Diocese of Columbus, Ohio, directives concerning the Mass were issued in a letter from the chancellor, which was given at the direction of Bishop John J. Carberry, September 17, 1965: "All scheduled Masses should be in the vernacular and provide for the active participation of the faithful attending."

In the *Outline for the English High Mass* issued for the Diocese of Kansas City-Saint Joseph, Missouri, November 29, 1964, the exclusive use of the vernacular is presumed in such statements as this:

Beginning Sunday, November 29, 1964, the people's parts of the High Mass may be sung in English as they are said at Low Mass. This includes the Proper and the Ordinary of the Mass. Because of the extremely short notice the following directives are given: 1. Through the Christmas season, pastors may choose between Latin or English at High Mass as they feel will be pastorally most effective with materials available . . .

The legislation on church music for the Diocese of San Diego, California, for January, 1966, states: "The Ordinary and Proper of the Mass should be sung in English, but Latin motets may be used (*e.g.*, at the Offertory, Communion or as a recessional after Mass)."

On the other hand, such sees as Washington, Milwaukee, Saint Paul-Minneapolis and Boston have made it clear in legislative directives that in conformity with conciliar decrees the use of the vernacular is a permission and not an obligation, while Latin retains its official position *de jure* if not *de facto*.

In the meantime, changes in liturgical practices have gone far beyond the clear prescriptions of the Council. There can no longer be any thought of a *via media* in the question of language as the will of the Council was stated,

since even the canon of the Mass has now been universally permitted in the vernacular.³³

Even if one presumes that the introduction of the vernacular has produced a more intelligent participation by the faithful in the liturgy, one cannot pass over the very sobering evidence that up until now the intended "intensification of the spiritual life of the faithful" through liturgical reform has not been achieved. Indeed, in spite of all the liturgical efforts, and perhaps even because of them, a recession in church attendance must be recorded. Through many shattering experiences in the post-conciliar Church, what was in any case a small enough degree of piety has been swiftly lessened.³⁴

What one sees disappearing from artistic liturgical values in the field of sacred music cannot unfortunately be measured in statistics. But the professionally active church musician and his choir are well aware of what this is.

V

Quite apart from all well-founded criticism of post-conciliar liturgical practices, one must gratefully hold fast to the fact that the Second Vatican Council took an explicit position in detail on the subject of church music. No preceding council did a similar thing. What is said of sacred music may be applied in much wider measure to the action of the Council on the subject of liturgy, whose integrating element sacred music is. The Council was open to new developments, in particular in those lands that possessed a mature, native, musical culture and tradition. The Council was ready to accept "all forms of true art," but it emphasized in the introduction to the chapter on sacred music "the preservation of the norms and precepts of ecclesiastical tradition and discipline" (Art. 112).

By this tradition is meant not only the corpus of church music, the Gregorian chant, polyphony, vernacular songs and liturgical organ music, but their theological and liturgical foundations as well. The answer to the question "What is sacred music?" lives in this ecclesiastical tradition. There has always been a theocentric Christian experience in music which has stood in contrast to all anthropocentric concepts. A tradition, constantly revived and therefore ever living in music, is necessary if a new order is to come to light.

³³ Cf. Hubert Jedin, *op. cit.*, p. 535. The Protestant phenomenologist, theologian and scholar, R. Otto, in his book, *Das Heilige* (Breslau, 1923, 10th Ed.), has described the unique function of the "cultic silence" in the canon of the Roman Mass, "the sacramental high-point of the liturgical action" (p. 314). In the book, *Epirrhosis-Festgabe für Carl Schmitt* (Berlin, 1968), Hans Barion raises basic objections to the spread of the vernacular Mass and above all the canon (p. 19).

³⁴ Cf. Georg May's comments in *Erasmus, speculum scientiarum* (February 25, 1968), p. 82.

A patrimony is needed to bring into being new music with true spirituality. Richard Seewald has said:

Without doubt it is necessary to prune the wildly luxurious growth, but in an age in which everything tends toward dissolution in every form and pattern, accompanied by the enthusiastic applause of our contemporaries, it seems to us that the far shrewder term is *conservare* instead of reform in the sense of refashioning. But the position to be defended is almost hopeless!³⁵

Hans Ur von Balthasar has pointed out that in the Apocalypse everything is not dissolved in the experience so often invoked today. Rather experience and form are indissolubly joined.

The Fifth International Church Music Congress was never focused either in its themes or in its programs exclusively on the preservation of the musical patrimony. This is true both of the study days in Chicago and in the public sessions in Milwaukee. Rather, the Congress took up with equal zeal the musical foundations for *actuosa participatio populi* in theory and in experiment, as the program clearly shows. In reality, the exclusive subject for discussion and study in Chicago was the key words of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *actuosa participatio populi*, together with its musical consequences.

The fact is that the Fourth International Church Music Congress in Cologne, in 1961, had already undertaken to demonstrate the active participation of the people in six different forms of offering High Mass. In addition to the Gregorian chant, compositions of the past as well as those in a contemporary idiom were used.

Wherever choirs or parishes have adopted the various forms demonstrated by that congress, the Latin High Mass even today continues to hold first place among the different ways permitted for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. This is quite in accord with the spirit and the directives of the Vatican Council. Church musicians are thankful to Pope Paul VI for protecting the polyphonic settings in Latin of the Ordinary of the Mass. In the Instruction of March 5, 1967, Art. 34, it is expressly stated that the parts of the Ordinary, "if they are sung to musical settings written for several voices, may be performed by the choir according to the customary norms." In fact, the polyphonic settings of the Ordinary are sharply contrasted with other forms of the High Mass, since the following paragraph begins with the words, *in aliis casibus* — "in other cases." Church musicians are likewise grateful for the unequivocal opening words of the Instruction — *Sacred* music.

A Latin High Mass, celebrated according to present liturgical prescriptions, is even today in its form and movement, in its Gregorian or polyphonic

³⁵ Richard Seewald, *Der Mann von gegenüber* (Munich, 1963), p. 215.

expressiveness, a true school of reverence and veneration, a source of devotion and thanksgiving, and foundation for a spirit of joy and readiness for service. This celebration is far distant from a purely aesthetical event, and it is just as far removed from a falsely understood democratization.³⁶ To be sure, an actual communal experience advances belief in the divine mystery of the Church and the Holy Eucharist. In return, the solemn celebration of the liturgy with music and ritual sprung from its very spirit serves this faith.

When mention is made here of High Mass, it is not those caricatures of the High Mass that is meant. These indeed continue in many areas in spite of all the reforms of liturgy and church music begun by the provincial councils of the nineteenth century and continued with the work of St. Pius X. These so-called High Masses omit the proper parts, often interrupt the *Gloria* and the *Credo*, and truncate other parts, but employ large symphonic ensembles. They neglect the Gregorian chant and do little to perfect its performance if they sing it at all.

Blame for these liturgical and musical aberrations in the Latin High Mass cannot be placed only on the church musician, unless he does not deserve to be called a musician. The pastor of the parish is in any event responsible for the celebration of the liturgy and the music and ceremonies that accompany it.

At the Fifth International Church Music Congress the Latin High Mass with active participation by the people was given its honored place; side by side with it stood the High Mass celebrated in the vernacular with the congregation taking its active role.³⁷ It scarcely needs to be pointed out that lively criticism and debate resulted from discussion of the newly composed works in the vernacular for choir and congregation. Only the future will show what fruits have been produced by the stimulus that the Congress provided.

In order to make the most of the short time available for the study sessions in Chicago, the subjects to be considered were prepared in advance by an international circle of specialists. These texts were mailed in various translations to about sixty experts, among them twenty Americans, well before the opening of the Congress. Thus everyone had opportunity to study the pre-

³⁶ One is reminded of the views of Abbot Ildefons Herwegen, OSB, of Maria Laach, on the connection between art and liturgy in *Alte Quellen neuer Kraft* (Düsseldorf, 1920), p. 26 f, 46, 148 f.

³⁷ Among others, Professor Hermann Schroeder of Cologne was commissioned by the American Congress committee to compose *The Mass in honor of Saint Cecilia*, an English Ordinary for mixed choir and congregation. Cf. p. 206. It was premiered on August 25, 1966, in Saint John's Cathedral, Milwaukee, at the solemn Pontifical Mass which opened the Congress. Under the direction of Roger Wagner and with the enthusiastic participation of the faithful it constituted an unforgettable experience.

pared papers and take a position on them by proposing alterations that should be made in their content or wording. Apparently the work of the specialists was so good and their preparations so well accepted by the experts to whom the drafts were sent that only a few remarks were proposed as emendations. These texts, together with the submitted suggestions, are contained in this volume of proceedings of the Congress. In addition, the contributions submitted by the various national groups and institutes for church music within CIMS are likewise published in this volume. Because of the time factor in Chicago, only a few of these texts were able to be debated. They do, however, throw light on the problems that confront church musicians today.

SACRED MUSIC
AND
LITURGY REFORM
AFTER VATICAN II

Proceedings of the
Fifth International Church Music Congress
Chicago-Milwaukee, August 21-28, 1966

Johannes Overath, *editor*

CONSOCIATIO INTERNATIONALIS MUSICAE SACRAE
Rome, 1969