

## Review: Weber's Proper of the Mass

by Horst Buchholz

In Susan Benofy's February 2015 article "What Must be Sung is the Mass: Resources for Singing the Proper of the Mass" she noted that Father Samuel Weber's *Propers of the Mass* book was forthcoming. It is now available from Ignatius Press ([ignatius.com/Products/PMSS-H/the-proper-of-the-mass-for-sundays-and-solemnities.aspx](http://ignatius.com/Products/PMSS-H/the-proper-of-the-mass-for-sundays-and-solemnities.aspx)).

The Proper of the Mass for Sundays and Solemnities

Hardback, 1292 pages, \$34.95

Following is a review from Adoremus music consultant Horst Buchholz:

Historians and scholars have taught us that Pope Gregory the Great was most likely not the author of any of the chant that is named after him. Nevertheless, the image of Gregory dictating chant to a servant while a dove symbolizing the Holy Spirit is singing into his ear is powerful and unforgettable. This beautiful image also comes to my mind

when reading and singing through Father Samuel Weber's English Gradual, *The Proper of the Mass*, published by Ignatius Press. This most impressive compilation fills more than 1000 pages and includes English chant for Introit, Offertory, and Communion throughout the Church year.

In recent years several composers have crafted antiphons and verses in the vernacular for the Propers for English-speaking congregations. These collections have filled a tremendous void for those who would like to use those appointed texts yet do not want to sing too much Latin in an otherwise all-English Mass.

I have often wondered how many parishes faithfully recite those antiphons at weekday spoken Masses but regularly fall back to hymns and songs on Sundays. Of the collections from which to choose, one must give special praise to Father Weber's compilation in the English Gradual. Not only does he understand the patrimony of the original Latin chant perfectly well,

but he also has an unequalled feeling for the rhythm and accent structure of the English language.

The English Gradual was written over a period of several years and offers multiple options for each antiphon. The first setting is the most elaborate version closely



based on the Latin chant from the *Graduale Romanum*. While the original melodies are still clearly recognizable, flow and grammar of the English text give the chant its final shape. The second setting is a simplified version of the Gre-

gorian antiphon, still in the same mode and following the basic outline of the Gregorian model. These antiphons are followed by a number of verses in a somewhat solemn Gregorian psalm tone. The third setting of the antiphon is in an embellished psalm tone, with a syllabic alternative antiphon, while the fourth setting is the simplest, reminiscent of the psalm tones in the *Mundelein Psalter* by the same author. There is yet another set of verses in the same simple psalm tone of the fourth antiphon setting.

While the settings in the Gradual are intended to be sung by a schola, from the more advanced to the less experienced, the antiphons could also be sung by a cantor alone; in particular, Antiphons III and IV might even be used as refrains for the assembly with

a schola or cantor chanting the verses. This great wealth of options, combined with a supreme command of the text and the Gregorian modes, makes this new Gradual most valuable for any church, from the smallest parish to

the cathedral.

At some point I was only moderately enthusiastic about English chant and thought that, if at all, it should be written in modern notation. However, I have experienced that the four-line notation is really easy for anyone to learn, providing much greater flexibility than modern notation in selecting the appropriate pitch for your singers.

I highly recommend this new English Gradual to anyone who wants to sing the proper antiphons on a regular basis and is looking for very accessible, yet most beautiful chant in the vernacular. We cannot thank Father Weber enough for all his hard work, a true labor of love and dedication to liturgy and the Church. I am most confident that this new Gradual will become a standard work and hope it will find a home in many parishes.

Dr. Horst Buchholz is Director of Sacred Music at the Cathedral and the Archdiocese of St. Louis and vice-president of the Church Music Association of America.

## Footnotes for a Hermeneutic of Continuity: Sacrosanctum Concilium's Vanishing Citations

by Susan J. Benofy

Editor's note: The works cited within this article are designated with brackets, rather than superscript footnote numbers. The chart on page 10 supplements this article.

ON OCTOBER 22, 1962, during the first session of the Second Vatican Council, the presentation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* began. First the document was read and explained paragraph by paragraph, then the full document was discussed. According to historian John W. O'Malley, SJ:

Cardinal Frings of Cologne led off from the presidents' table. His opening words: "The schema before us is like the last will and testament of Pius XII, who, following in the footsteps of Saint Pius X, boldly began a renewal of the sacred liturgy." Frings thus sounded what would be a leitmotif of the majority: the council was carrying forward work that had already begun. ([1])

In the fifty years since the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC), however, the idea that the Council was a continuation of work already begun was obscured by numerous commentaries that treated SC as a departure from the past, the beginning of a "new" liturgy for the "new" post-Vatican II Church. O'Malley's account indicates that the Council Fathers interpreted SC according to what Pope Benedict XVI called the "hermeneutic of reform in continuity." If today's readers are to interpret it in the same way we must re-discover SC's connection to the reform of the earlier twentieth-century popes. And to do this it would help to understand a little-known editorial decision that may have contributed to the loss of this connection.

According to Father O'Malley the text of SC that was presented to the Council in October 1962

had 105 sections, running without the notes to about 25 pages of ordinary print. The notes to the text covered a wide vari-

ety of sources but with a generous sprinkling from the encyclical *Mediator Dei*. ([1], p. 131)

Yet when the definitive text of SC was promulgated on December 4, 1963, there were only 42 footnotes, citing just four categories of sources: 23 cite Scripture, 6 the Fathers of the Church, 9 liturgical books, and 4 the Council of Trent. The "generous sprinkling" of citations of *Mediator Dei* had vanished.

To see when and why they were removed we need to look in more detail at the procedure followed by the Council in approving SC (see [2] and [3]). The bishops submitted hundreds of amendments during the discussion of the draft SC presented at the first session of the Council. Chapter I was revised to accommodate the amendments, and a definitive vote was taken on this chapter during this session.

Between sessions the Council's liturgical commission incorporated the rest of the bishops' suggestions into the document, and the new draft was discussed during the Council's second session. One chapter at a time was considered. First each paragraph was voted on, and then the chapter as a whole was put to a vote. Bishops could vote to approve the text, to reject it, or to approve on condition that it was amended in a specific way. These final amendments were incorporated into yet another draft, which was presented for the definitive vote on the document as a whole on November 22, 1963. Finally this vote was ratified December 4, 1963 in a public session. This last version thus became the official Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy promulgated by Pope Paul VI.

The successive Latin drafts of SC, including the footnotes, are collected and printed side by side in reference [2]. It is clear that footnotes (numbering about 115) from a wide variety of sources are still present in the draft presented at the beginning of the second session of the Council,

and approved in the detailed section by section vote. But all the footnotes that cited sources other than Scripture, Fathers of the Church, liturgical books, or the Council of Trent were removed in the transition from this to the final version, reducing the number of footnotes to only 42. Why?

Pierre Marie Gy, OP, who was a member of the Conciliar liturgical commission, explains the commission's concern about developing the proper style for SC:

According to the tradition of the Council of Trent and even of Vatican I, it should be biblical and patristic, and should maintain a certain distance from theological disputes. But should one not, at the same time, take account of the doctrinal style of encyclicals, which are more concerned with theological precisions and are somewhat removed from biblical theology? The question was all the more relevant since Pius XII had devoted considerable attention to the liturgy, in the encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, and elsewhere. Should the conciliar constitution be a solemn prolongation of the Pope's teaching? Could it conceivably abstract from it?

Little by little a delicate solution emerged, a solution that seems to have pleased the Council Fathers and to have inspired even the theological commission in its revision of schemas. It was decided that the style of the Constitution would be that traditionally adopted in Councils; it would be wholly biblical, except where canonical precision was necessary. Thus it is that the opening pages, on the history of salvation, are closer to biblical theology than to the style of *Mediator Dei*. However, at the same time, the Constitution relies considerably on the great encyclical of Pius XII, and time and again it uses its very terminology, without quotation marks or reference. Only in the case of biblical, liturgical and patristic quotations are references given. ([4], p. 70)

Note that Gy does not say that the Council Fathers requested the footnotes be dropped, or that the content changed in a way to make them irrelevant. It was, he

says, simply a matter of the proper style.

In fact, it was not only *Mediator Dei* (MD) that was cited in earlier drafts of SC. There are also numerous citations of Pope Pius X's motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* (TLS) of 1903, Pope Pius XI's Apostolic Constitution *Divini cultus* (DC) of 1928, Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (MSD) of 1955, and the 1958 Instruction from the Congregation of Rites, *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia* (1958I), which gathered together provisions on liturgy and music from these earlier documents. However, none of these documents is cited in the definitive text.

As the short history above shows, during their debate and the detailed section-by-section votes on SC the Council Fathers were working from a text whose large number of citations to earlier documents made clear the continuity of SC's provisions with the early 20<sup>th</sup>-century liturgical reform. Only on November 22 and December 4, 1963 were they considering a text without these citations.

The decision to drop citations to earlier documents that Gy described, however justified it may have been, removed these indicators of continuity from the definitive version of SC. The passages cited in the deleted footnotes, for example, often show that an emphasis in the earlier documents was lost in the much briefer treatment of a subject in SC. This is particularly evident in Chapter VI on Sacred Music. Twenty-three citations of earlier documents were deleted from the ten paragraphs of this chapter in the final revision. The cited passages repeatedly emphasize that music in the liturgy must be truly sacred and explain in some detail why this must be so. Moreover, specific sections of earlier documents were cited repeatedly in SC, suggesting that certain ideas of the earlier reform are particularly important for a reform in continuity, even though they may be treated only briefly in the text of SC.

Readers of SC who are not familiar

# Citations of Five Vatican Liturgy Documents Removed During the Final Revision of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*

The list includes citations to the following documents:

## *Tra le sollecitudini* (TLS)

published in *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903-1904)

Italian vatican.va/archive/ass/documents/ASS-36-1903-4-ocr.pdf

English adoremus.org/TraLeSollecitudini.html

## *Divini cultus* (DC)

published in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 21 (1929)

Latin vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-21-1929-ocr.pdf

English adoremus.org/DiviniCultus.html

## *Mediator Dei* (MD)

published in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947)

Latin vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-39-1947-ocr.pdf

English adoremus.org/MediatorDei.html

## *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (MSD)

published in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* AAS 48 (1956)

Latin vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-48-1956-ocr.pdf

English adoremus.org/MusicaeSacrae1955.html

## *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia* (1958I)

published in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 50 (1958)

Latin vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-50-1958-ocr.pdf

English adoremus.org/1958Intro-sac-mus.html

### Chapter I

SC §	Note #	Doc.	AAS page	English Translation §
§7	(10)	DC	33	1st 2 paragraphs
	(16)	MD	522, 528, 573	§§2-3; 19-20; 141-144
	(17)	MD	529	§21-22
	(18)	MD	528-529	§§19-22
§13	(32)	MD	583-587	§§170-183
	§14	DC	39-40	§§ VII-XI
MD		552, 555, 559, 560	§§80-81; 88-92; 102-104; 105-106	
TLS		330	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph of Intro	
§19	(40)	1958I	659-660	§§104-108
§20	(41)	1958I	652-653	§§74-79
§21	(42)	MD	541-542	§§49-51
§22	(43)	MD	544	§§58-59
	(44)	MD	594	§§205-208
§23	(45)	MD	541-542	§§49-51
§27	(48)	MD	557	§§96-98
	1958I	633	§2	
§29	(49)	1958I	656	§93
§35	(51)	MD	580	§§164-165
§45	(58)	MD	562	§§110-113
		1958I	663	§118
§46	(59)	TLS	338	§24
		MD	561-562	§§107-113
	(60)	1958I	663	§118

### Chapter II

§48	(3)	DC	40	§§X-XI
		MD	555	§§88-92
§52	(11)	MD	529	§§21-22
§55	(15)	1958I	638	§22c

### Chapter III

No citations of these documents

### Chapter IV

§83	(1)	MD	573	§§141-144
§84	(2)	MD	573	§§141-144
§100	(9)	MD	575	§§148-150
		1958I	645	§45

### Chapter V

No citations of these documents

### Chapter VI

SC §	Note #	Doc.	AAS page	English Translation §
§112	(2)	TLS	not specified	not specified
	(3)	MSD	12	§§29-32
§114	(4)	MD	589	§§191-192
		MSD	18-19	§§53-60
		1958I	646	§§48-49
§115	(6)	TLS	338	§25
		DC	36-37, 40	Last 3 par of Intro and §§ I-IV; §§ X-XI
§116	(8)	MD	589	§§191-192
		MSD	23	§§72-76
		1958I	662	§§115-117
		TLS	338	§27
§118	(10)	DC	38	§§V-VI
		1958I	658, 662	§§98, 114
		TLS	332	§3
§119	(11)	1958I	636	§16
		MSD	8	§§14-17
§120	(12)	MD	590	§§193-195
		MSD	20-21	§§61-68
§121	(13)	1958I	636, 647	§§15, 54
		MSD	22	15 is what is printed, but possibly 51 (p. 647) is meant since it deals with hymns.
§122	(14)	MSD	22	§§69-70
§123	(12)	MSD	19	§§57-59
§124	(13)	MSD	11-14	§§25-40
§125	(14)	MSD	20	§§61-63

### Chapter VII

§122	(1)	MD	591	§§196-198
		MSD	11	§§25-28
§123	(2)	MD	590-591	§§193-196
§124	(4)	MD	591	§§196-198
§126	(5)	1958I	663	§118
§127	(6)	MD	591	§§196-198

with the liturgical teachings of earlier twentieth-century popes and are not led by footnotes to the documents that explain them will almost certainly see SC as a document with no connection to the recent past. They are thus unable to see SC as the Council Fathers did — as the continuation of reform begun by Saint Pius X.

As an aid to such readers, citations that were deleted from the draft of SC in the final revision are listed in the chart above. The list is organized by paragraph numbers of SC (which were not altered in the final revision). Citations for DC, MD, and MSD appeared in the earlier draft of SC as page

references to the *Acta Apostolicae Sedes*, in which the official Latin versions of these documents are published. Sections in the Latin versions are not numbered, so the list gives paragraph numbers from the English translations as well. TLS and 1958I do have section numbers in the Latin and this is the form of the original citations, but the list also includes the page references for the Latin (Italian for TLS) versions.

An annotated version of SC with full text of any cited passages inserted after each paragraph makes the task of consulting these passages more convenient, but is too long to print here.

However, an annotated version is available as part of the online edition of this issue of *AB* on the Adoremus website at [adoremus.org/AdoremusSpring2015.pdf](http://adoremus.org/AdoremusSpring2015.pdf).

### Works Cited

- John W. O'Malley, SJ, *What Happened at Vatican II?* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2008), p. 131.
- Concilii Vaticani II Synopsis in Ordinem Redigens Schemata cum Relationibus necnon Patrum Orationes atque Animadversiones-Constitutio de Sacra Liturgia: Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vatican, 2003)
- Cassian Folsom, OSB, "The Hermeneutics

of *Sacrosanctum concilium*: Development of a Method and Its Application," *Antiphon* 8:1 (2003) pp. 2-9.

- Pierre Marie Gy, OP, "The Constitution in the Making" in *Doctrine and Life*, vol. 14 #1 (January 1964) pp. 65-74.