The Expressive and Formative Roles of Music: A Search for Balance in Liturgical Reform

Edward Schaefer

In recent times the Church has recognized the expressive power of music in the liturgy in unprecedented ways. In particular, a dramatic—and dramatically new—flexibility with regard to the use of various instruments, musical styles and especially music that expresses local cultures[1] has ushered in an era of musical expression in the liturgy with a breadth never before seen. However, Holy Mother Church is also attuned to music's formative power. Through music not only is God glorified, but we are also sanctified.[2] While perhaps not as explicit as her statements about music's expressiveness, and perhaps even somewhat masked by the Church's focus on other musical issues, such as vocal participation, certainly the assertion that music assists in our sanctification is more than implicit about music's ability to form us.

Ostensibly, there is a dynamic tension between these two roles of music. Can music express a faith and simultaneously form that same faith more deeply? In recent admonitions that music for the liturgy "should be drawn chiefly from the Sacred Scripture and from liturgical sources,"[3] the Church shows a certain subtle sensitivity to this tension. However, the issue is deeper than a simple matter of text selection. Too, it is an issue that is by no means new. The Reforms of John XXII, the Council of Trent, Benedict XIV, and Pius X, in addition to those of the Second Vatican Council, all reflect efforts by the Church to balance the need for contemporary musical expression with the responsibility of using music that will truly "sanctify the faithful." While the secular scientific world has only recently begun to document music's ability to form the intellect—the so-called "Mozart Effect"[4] –it would seem that the collective wisdom of the Church has understood this formative ability, at least in the spiritual realm, for centuries.

Even so, while there is a growing body of scientific research regarding the formative power of music on the intellect, there is, on the other hand, little scientific work being done regarding its formative power on the spirit.[5] In a world that is increasingly scientific, technological and clinical and less philosophical, theoretical, and abstract, perhaps this lacuna in the research has been at least partially responsible for an emphasis shift in both ecclesiastical writing and in liturgical practice, for just as the Church's recent writings have been more emphatic about music's expressive role than about its formative one, so too has the recent liturgical life of the Church emphasized the expressive nature of music, at times without adequate regard for its formative nature.

Just what is the proper balance between expression and formation in our music, and how do we achieve it? If, indeed, the Church has struggled with this issue for centuries, can we dare to assume that we can "solve" the problem? If history tells us anything, it is that we will likely not find an eternally perfect balance between these two poles. However, we can use our knowledge of history to help us understand common principles that the Church has used over time in addressing this issue. We can then apply these principles in proposing some directions for the future.

In the course of this presentation, we propose to clarify the nature of the problem by explicating some of the differences and common elements of music as expressive and music as formative; to elucidate the struggles that the Church has faced through her history in balancing these two dynamics; to summarize the principles she has used in her balancing efforts; to examine the current situation in the context of these principles; and, finally, to offer some suggestions, based on these same principles, for the next phase in our ongoing liturgical renewal.

Music as Expressive and Formative

At the risk of oversimplification, expression concerns what we are; formation concerns what we aspire to be. Expression concerns the revealing of our essence, formation the shaping of that essence. However, the two are not unrelated. They are, in fact, intricately interwoven, one into the other. Liturgical

expression looks at what is at the center of our being, humbly reveals it in the presence of our almighty Creator and joyfully proclaims it in the reception of His merciful love. Liturgical formation looks at what is at the center of our being, lays it at the feet of our almighty Creator, that is, expresses it, in faith and hope that He will reshape to His own image and likeness any part of it that we have misshapen. Expression, that is, the revealing of ourselves before God, is part of the process of formation.

Music integrates both the expressive and the formative. It has the power to express who we are, and the ability to shape us into something beyond our present state. From ancient times we have both understood this dualistic nature of music and tried to find ways to describe and understand it. Too, we have always viewed this dual nature as an ordered one. The formative aspect of music has always been regarded, at some level, as the higher nature of music or as the ultimate goal for its use.

Plato tells us, "God has produced in man the natural inclination to produce harmony and rhythm, not at random, but ultimately in imitation of spiritual harmony."[6] Is not imitation a method of formation? Thus, as we produce—express—harmony and rhythm, we form ourselves in the mold of spiritual harmony.

Aristotle acknowledges music's profound ability to express human emotion and thus attributes to music three roles: education, purification, and intellectual enjoyment, relaxation and recreation.[7] However, he further clarifies that while music's expressive powers make it ideally suited to enjoyment, relaxation and recreation, they also render it critical to education and purification, that is, processes that will form us into something above and beyond our present state.

Augustine observes that "music is a principle whereby man can know, analogously, the harmony of God's government."[8] Similarly to Plato, Augustine reminds us that it is in the making of musical harmony that we come to understand God's harmony.

Plotinus is most pointed in lifting the formative power of music to the higher position. He observes that music's "ulterior purpose is to bear the listener beyond nature, to the highest beauty, whereby the soul, being beautified, becomes like God."[9]

More recently, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Pope Pius X places this dual, but ordered, nature of music into a liturgical context: "Sacred music, being an integral part of the liturgy, is directed to the general object of the liturgy, namely the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful. It helps to increase the beauty and splendor of the ceremonies of the Church, and since its chief duty is to clothe the liturgical text, which is presented to the understanding of the faithful, with suitable melody, its object is to make the text more efficacious, so that the faithful through this means may be more roused to devotion, and better disposed to gather to themselves the fruits of grace which come from the celebration of the sacred mysteries."[10] In the liturgy, it is through musical expression that we are led to the formative powers contained in the celebration of the sacred mysteries.

Nevertheless, while it is relatively easy to theorize about an ordered, dual nature of music in the liturgy, it is far more difficult to put that theory into practice. The music that effectively expresses who we are, may not, in fact, be music that will move us to anything beyond that reality. Too, harmonies that open to one person a glimpse of God's harmony, may close that vision to another. C. J. McNaspy attributes at least part of this second dilemma to cultural differences. He notes that "after much experience and the findings of anthropology and missiology, it now seems clear that cultural context has a great deal to do with one's response to music."[11] That is to say, our ability to be formed by music is in part dependent upon how we have been formed!

Ostensibly, there is an intrinsic tension between these two musical poles.

Balancing The Roles of Music in the Church

This tension between bringing music to the liturgy that expresses who we are and using music in the liturgy that will help us become who we are called to be is a struggle that has permeated the Church's existence. To demonstrate this, we will look at the reforms attempted in the Church's music at five different points in time: the reforms of John XXII (1324-1325); the Council of Trent (1562-1563);[12] the reforms of Benedict XIV (1749); the reforms of Pius X (1903); the reforms of Vatican II and the postconciliar period (1963-present).

These five attempts by the Church to effect reforms in her music, give us a legislative perspective that spans about 650 years. While this covers only

about 1/3 of the Church's history, it is roughly 2/3 of the time during which chant was not the only music that existed for the liturgy. In addition, the reforms of John XXII address processes that were, in fact, a kind of culmination of several centuries of development, and the reforms of Vatican II are still current. Thus, an examination of these five attempts at reform essentially enables us to gain an overview of how the Church has addressed issues regarding her music during most of the existence of polyphonic music.

We will outline these five events chronologically and summarize their common elements afterward.

The Reforms of John XXII

By the mid-twelfth century, after about 100 years of development of independent polyphonic music—that is, polyphonic music that was more than *organum* improvised to fairly strict guidelines—concern was expressed by more than one writer about the negative effect this new music was having on the devotion [formation] of the faithful. For example, John of Salisbury (1120-1180), bishop of Chartres, concludes after a graphic description of certain practices of singers of this new music that, "When this goes to excess it is more fitted to excite lust than devotion."[13]

St. Aelred (1109-1166), Cistercian abbot of Rielvaux Abbey in Yorkshire, also expresses concern that musical improprieties of the day are leading the faithful away from rather than toward God.

> …and you would think they had come not to prayer, but to a spectacle, not to an oratory, but to a theatre. There is no fear for that fearful Majesty in Whose presence they stand; no reverence for the mystic Crib at which they minister; where Christ is mystically wrapped in swaddling clothes; where heavens are opened, where angels are assisting; where earth and heaven are joined together, and men associated with blessed spirits.
>
> Thus what the holy Fathers instituted, that the weak might be excited to piety, is made to serve unlawful pleasure; for sound is not to be preferred to sense, but sound combined with sense, so as to be a help to greater fervor.[14]

These concerns came to a climax in the fourteenth century—a time we call the *Ars Nova* or *New Art*—when new harmonic practices, new notation systems and an evolved sense of creativity had resulted in some rather amazing and amazingly complex music. For example, Elias Salamon, a monk and theorist, writes about the poor manner of the singing of chant as a result of this new music:

> What is more lamentable is that, as concerns plain chant, they make little of it, by taking it for granted at times that there is a legitimate method of elaborating plain chant, which, as a matter of fact, completely transcends the true science of plain chant. Let them know this for sure, that they are neither looking for the things which are ours, and which can be seen, nor looking for the things of God, nor for what properly pertains to the art of music, because they do not know anything about it, but rather they introduce novelties, howling their *miau minau* into the air, in order to attract those who will hear; and what is perhaps worse, that more frequently, the offering of money might be larger, and then be turned to illicit purposes by being kept in their own purses.[15]

The criticisms of polyphonic music—or at least its abuse—by these writers, show us that "dissatisfaction aroused in the clergy by the contrapuntal [polyphonic] writing of many composers would seem to have reached a climax in the early fourteenth century. When remonstrances and admonitions had already been attempted in vain, a grave step was taken by Pope John XXII (1316-1334), ruling at Avignon."[16] Pope John issued a bull, *De vita et honestate clericorum,* addressing the musical abuses of the day and articulating both proscriptions and prescriptions for reform. Here we quote a portion of it:

> But certain exponents of a new school, who think only of the laws of measured time, are composing new melodies of their own creation with a new system of notes, and these they prefer to the ancient, traditional music; the melodies of the Church are sung in semibreves and minims and with gracenotes of repercussion. By some, their melodies are broken up by *hocheti* or robbed of their virility by *discanti* (two parts), *tripla* (three parts),

motectus, with a dangerous element produced by certain parts sung on texts in the vernacular; all these abuses have brought into disrepute the basic melodies of the Antiphonal and Gradual; these composers, knowing nothing of the true foundation upon which they must build, are ignorant of the Modes, incapable of distinguishing between them. and cause great confusion. The mere number of the notes in these compositions, conceal from us the plain-chant melody, with its simple, well-regulated rises and falls which indicate the character of the Mode. These musicians run without pausing, they intoxicate the ear without satisfying it, they dramatize the text with gestures and, instead of promoting devotion, they prevent it by creating a sensuous and innocent atmosphere.

Consequently We and Our Brethren (the cardinals) have realized for a long time that this state of things required correction. And now We are prepared to take effective action to prohibit, cast out, and banish such things from the Church of God.

Therefore, after consultation with these same brethren, We prohibit absolutely, for the future that anyone should do such things, or others of like nature, during the Divine Office or during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. ….

However, We do not intend to forbid the occasional use - principally on solemn feasts at Mass and at Divine Office - of certain consonant intervals superposed upon the simple ecclesiastical chant, provided these harmonies are in the spirit and character of the melodies themselves, as, for instance, the consonance of the octave, the fifth, the fourth, and others of this nature; but always on condition that the melodies themselves remain intact in the pure integrity of their form, and that no innovation take place against true musical discipline; for such consonances are pleasing to the ear and arouse devotion, and they prevent torpor among those who sing in honor of God.

Made and promulgated at Avignon in the Ninth Year of Our Pontificate. (1324-1325).[17]

Hayburn summarizes the significance of this document and also comments on its possible impact on the direction of musical development in the fourteenth century:

> The significance of this document for the musical practice of that time can be seen in its toleration of the use of polyphony in the services of the Church. It is true that this was not a general permission, but it did allow the use of the new art on the greater feasts of the Church and at both the Mass and the Divine Office. However, a condition was laid down, namely, that the chant must have priority and be employed as in the past.[18]

It must also be acknowledged that while these reforms were certainly implemented in various places,[19] their implementation was by no means thorough. Even in the Papal Court at Avignon, the music of the *Ars Nova* was widely sung within a generation after the bull.[20]

Reforms of the Council of Trent

Two hundred years later, things had not improved. In particular, in the sixteenth century, the Madrigal, a kind of light-hearted secular song, often about amorous matters, had become extremely popular, and its techniques were invading liturgical music. The Council of Trent actually considered banning all polyphonic (harmonized) music from the liturgy. Cardinal Giovanni Morone, the president of the council—and therefore the person who determined the agenda of the council—and others, advocated banning polyphony altogether. Cardinal Morone had already done so, temporarily, in his own cathedral in Modena in 1538. It was only through the quiet intervention of Ferdinand I, the Emperor of Spain, that polyphony was saved in the Church. However, the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent, September 17, 1562, did address several abuses in the liturgy, including music:

> *Decree Concerning Things to be Observed and Avoided in the Celebration of Mass*:
> They shall also banish from the churches all such music which, whether by the organ or in the singing, contains things that are lascivious

or impure; likewise all worldly conduct, vain and profane conversations, wandering around, noise and clamor, so that the house of God my be seen to be and may be truly called a house of prayer.[21]

The council was concerned that music of the liturgy help draw the faithful to prayer rather than away from it. Certainly, in conjunction with other mandates of the council this concern can be seen as a desire that the expression of music not overwhelm or interfere with its formative capacity. Rather, its expressive elements should be directed toward enhancing the formative potential. For example, in the report of the general session of September 10, 1562 we see:

> The sacred mysteries should be performed with the greatest veneration, with both internal affection towards God, and with external worship that is both fitting and decorous, so that others may be filled with devotion and moved towards religion....The whole plan of singing in musical modes should be constituted not to give empty pleasure to the ear, but in such a way that the words may be clearly understood by all, and thus the hearts of the listeners be drawn to the desire of heavenly harmonies, in the contemplation of the joys of the blessed.[22]

Of course, it is one thing to say what should not be done in church. It is quite another to say what really should be done. After the Council of Trent, it remained for the Church to set forth guidelines that would foster not just the avoidance of inappropriate music, but the development and use of especially suitable music. On April 28, 1565 there was a meeting in the home of Cardinal Vitelli during which certain Mass settings were tested for intelligibility and also during which it is claimed that the music of Giovanni da Palestrina was chosen as the preeminent model for polyphonic music in the Church.[23] While the veracity of this particular story cannot be fully confirmed, it is certainly true that it is the music of Palestrina that has been upheld as the preeminent model of harmonized music ever since.[24]

However, even if we might argue that Palestrina's music has a sense of reserve about it that is appropriately "non-worldly" for the liturgy or that it has a sense of élan that is organically related to that of chant, we must also acknowledge that his music incorporates many of the thoughts of his own day about music. It is clearly more "modern" than the music of the *Ars Nova*. Thus, similarly to the reforms of John XXII, the reforms of the Council of Trent, while continuing to uphold the primacy of chant,[25] do not condemn the use of contemporary music. They are more directed toward guiding the selection and/or composition of contemporary music toward music that will be as formative as it is expressive.

The Reforms of Benedict XIV

Another leap of almost 200 years, and we find ourselves in the eighteenth century—a difficult time for the Church. The Enlightenment brought a veritable tidal wave of challenges to the Church, none of which she seemed to face particularly well. Her influence diminished dramatically as witnessed by the politically forced suppression of the Jesuits in 1763 and the French Revolution in 1789. In addition, to make matters worse, the music of the Church had taken an equally "evil" turn. Operatic music had invaded the liturgy.

In 1749 Pope Benedict XIV banned trumpets, timpani, horns and solo singing by castrati. He also contended that "chant,… if executed in God's churches according to the rules and with decorum, is more willingly listened to by devout men, and more rightly preferred to chant called figurative [that is, to harmonized music]."[26]

His ban was generally ignored on ceremonial occasions, but it did eventually have some effect. Musical settings of the Mass were shortened so that once again they served the liturgy rather than the liturgy functioning as a kind of stage for them. Nonetheless, while these reforms retained for chant its place of pride, they did not eliminate new music from the liturgy, nor was that their intention.

Reforms of Pius X

The French Revolution (1789) threw Europe into a state of upheaval that lasted over two decades. In 1814, however, "the Congress of Vienna {1814-15)," as Bokenkotter notes,

> …brought a general peace to Europe after nearly thirty years of war - a peace that lasted a hundred years. It disavowed the Revolution, restored the old order, put the Bourbons back on the throne of France, and perched Napoleon on a rock two thousand watery miles away. It also restored the Pope as the absolute monarch of the Papal States. But it could not undo the work of the Revolution—the magnitude of social and political transformation was too extensive. France and the rest of Europe could never return permanently to a hierarchical society, held together by an alliance of throne and altar, where status was determined by birth and where monarchs ruled by divine right.[27]

The struggles of the Church to address these profound social and political transformations, in addition to changes brought about by technological and scientific advances, are what characterize the relationship between the Church and society for the remainder of the nineteenth century. There was a tremendous tension between "new" thinking and the traditional positions of the Church in all these areas.

Too, the tensions that existed between "old" and "new" thinking were certainly not exclusive to the Church and society's progressives. These tensions were reflected in the musical world as well. On the one hand, certain music of the period reflected society's new emphasis on the individual. The music is highly individualistic, rejecting more traditional notions of structure and form. The music also reflects the technological advances of the century. For example, the piano becomes a completely modernized instrument, with a power and brilliance—brought about by nineteenth-century technology—that allows it to solo with the enormous orchestral forces that were now employed. In addition, just as society becomes more and more complex, so does the harmonic language of music.

On the other hand, other music of the period shows an unmistakable alliance to earlier times, when things seemed simpler and more ordered. There was a Romantic idealization of the past that sparked an interest in the music of past eras that was far stronger than any previous interest in the music of earlier times. The music that develops in the shadow of this idealization of the past assiduously adheres to older models of form and structure and a more conservative harmonic language. Certain composers consciously copy older compositional styles, while "updating" them with more current harmonies, albeit conservatively so. Witness, for example, the preludes of Frédéric Chopin, which are modeled on the concept of the Well-Tempered Clavier of J. S. Bach and the organ preludes and choral motets of Johannes Brahms, which are consciously modeled respectively on the preludes of Bach's *Orgelbüchlein,* and the choral motets of Bach.

This nineteenth-century fascination with the music of earlier times and musical conservatism was, in the Church, the ethos of a movement known as the Cecilian movement. Anthony Ruff notes:

> There was a turn to Gregorian chant and classical polyphony. Old music was unearthed and performed, sometimes for the first time in centuries. Above and beyond the ever-developing tradition of the *stile antico,* a historical style from the past was now discovered and exalted as the model for newly composed sacred music. Not only were the Cecilians influenced by the rapidly growing musical historical consciousness of the nineteenth century, they also contributed to its further development. To the Romantic fascination with the past they added a theological imperative to return to an earlier historical era in order to discover music truly sacred.[28]

It was this same imperative that guided Dom Prosper Guéranger and his monks at the newly reopened monastery at Solesmes, as they began a scientifically grounded research project in an attempt to find and restore to the liturgy the archetypal chant.

It was also in this context that Guiseppe Cardinal Sarto ascended to the chair of St. Peter in 1903, assumed the named Pius, took the motto "To Restore All Things in Christ," and shortly thereafter, on the feast of St. Cecilia of the same year, issued his first papal document, the *motu proprio, "Tra le sollecitudini."* This document was, in fact, the culmination of fifteen years of development, being built on reforms undertaken by the pope while he had been bishop of Mantua and patriarch of Venice. Indeed, the document echoes many of the reforms

undertaken by the Holy Father during these earlier appointments. The portions of the document most germane to the present study follow:

I. General Principles

1.Sacred music, being an integral part of the liturgy, is directed to the general object of this liturgy, namely, the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful. It helps to increase the beauty and splendor of the ceremonies of the Church, and since its chief duty is to clothe the liturgical text, which is presented to the understanding of the faithful, with suitable melody, its object is to make that text more efficacious, so that the faithful through this means may be the more roused to devotion, and better disposed to gather to themselves the fruits of grace which come from the celebration of the sacred mysteries.

2.Sacred music must therefore eminently possess the qualities which belong to liturgical rites, especially holiness and beauty, from which its other characteristic, universality, will follow spontaneously.

It must be holy, and therefore avoid everything that is secular, both in itself and in the way in which it is performed.

It must really be an art, since in no other way can it have on the mind of those who hear it that effect which the Church desires in using in her liturgy the art of sound.

But it must also be universal in this sense, namely, that although each country may use in its ecclesiastical music whatever special forms may belong to its own national style, these forms must be subject to the proper nature of sacred music, so that it may never produce a bad impression on the mind of any stranger who may hear it.

II. Various Kinds of Sacred Music

3.These qualities are fond most perfectly in Gregorian chant, which is therefore the proper chant of the Roman Church, the only chant which she has inherited from the ancient Fathers, which she has jealously kept for so many centuries in her liturgical books, which she offers to the faithful as her own music, which she insists on being used exclusively in some parts of her liturgy, and which, lastly, has been so happily restored to its original perfection and purity in recent study.

For these reasons Gregorian chant has always been looked upon as the highest model of Church music, and we may with good reason establish as a general rule that the more a musical composition for us in church is like Gregorian chant in its movement, its inspiration, and it feeling, so much the more is it right and liturgical, and the more it differs from this highest model so much the less is it worthy of the house of God.

Wherefore this ancient Gregorian chant should be largely restored in divine worship, and it should be understood that a service of the Church loses nothing of its solemnity when it is accompanied by no other music than Gregorian chant.

Especially should this chant be restored to the use of the people, so that they may take a more active part in the offices, as they did in former times.

4.The qualities described above are also found to a high degree in music of the classical school, especially in that of the Roman school, which reached its greatest perfection in the sixteenth century under Pierluigi da Palestrina, and which even afterwards went on producing excellent liturgical compositions. The music of the classical school agrees very well with the highest model of all sacred music, namely Gregorian chant, and therefore it deserves, together with Gregorian chant, to be used in the more solemn offices of the Church, as, for instance, in those of the Papal Chapel. This music, too, should be largely restored, especially in the greater basilicas, in cathedrals, and in seminaries and other institutions where the necessary means of performing it are not wanting.

5.The Church has always recognised [sic] and encouraged all progress in the arts, and has always admitted to the service of her

> functions whatever is good and beautiful in their development during different centuries, as long as they do not offend against the laws of her liturgy. Hence more modern music may also be allowed in churches, since it has produced compositions good and serious and dignified enough to be worthy of liturgical use.
>
> Nevertheless, since modern music has become chiefly a secular art, greater care must be taken, when admitting it, that nothing profane be allowed, nothing that is reminiscent of theatrical pieces, nothing based as to its form on the style of secular compositions.[29]

Pius X is unequivocal in retaining chant as the music most suited, and therefore "proper," to the Roman Church. He also welcomes into the liturgy the use of polyphonic music, especially the music of Palestrina and his contemporaries, but also more modern compositions. However, the value of all polyphonic music, old or new, and therefore its appropriateness for the liturgy, is determined by how closely it emulates the qualities of chant, that is, the music most perfect for the Roman liturgy.

The logic in *Tra le sollecitudini* is both consistent and thorough, and the articulation of that logic renders the document perhaps the most eloquently expressed by any Pontiff on the subject of music. Even so, there is little in it that in one form or another does not appear in earlier mandates regarding liturgical music, save for one most notable exception: the notion that Gregorian chant need not be solely the domain of professionals. Although this idea is never contradicted by earlier reforms, the cultural norms of past centuries simply never raised it to consideration. The music of the liturgy had for centuries been sung by choirs. This concept of putting Gregorian chant into the mouths, so to speak, of the laity is perhaps the most significant contribution of Pius X's reform, and it gave a tremendous impetus to the already forming chant renewal of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The founding of the Schola Cantorum in Paris in 1894, the papal approbation given by Pius X to the scholarly work of the monks of Solesmes, the establishment of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in 1910, the many varied efforts of Justine Baylor Ward in the United States,[30] and a 1920 sacred music congress in New York during which 3500 children trained in the Ward Method of music instruction sang Mass VIII for a liturgy are but a few indications of this revival and the strength that Pius X's reforms gave to it.[31]

Vatican II and the Postconciliar Period

Nevertheless, a scant half century after *Tra le sollecitudini*—that is, shortly after the end of World War II—the approaches that Pius X, his predecessors in the First Vatican Council, and his immediate successors Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII had taken in addressing the challenges of the modern world seemed inadequate for the tremendous economic, social, scientific, technological and even musical changes that had occurred in just a few generations. A Second Vatican Council was called by John XXIII to examine the Church's ever-continuing efforts to adapt the methods of her changeless mission to changing times.

From a musical perspective Vatican II strongly reinforced the work of Pius X, including Pius X's giving chant the "pride of place"[32] in the liturgy, his mandate that the "treasury of sacred music...be preserved and fostered with great care,"[33] his inclusion of "other kinds of sacred music,"[34] and his desire for greater participation in the liturgy by the faithful.[35] However, it also expanded Pius X's work, allowing for more latitude in the musical practices of the Church than at any previous time in history. The principle of active participation, that is, vocally as well as internally, was given a certain kind of primacy in the both the general norms for liturgical practice[36] and the specific mandates created to implement those norms.[37] This led to permission for use of vernacular language in the liturgy,[38] tolerance for more popular forms of music,[39] including music indigenous to various cultures,[40] greater flexibility with regard to the use of instruments,[41] permission for the substitution of other texts for the Proper of the Mass,[42] acceptance of the use of non-scriptural and non-liturgical texts for these substitutions and at other points in the Mass,[43] and a general freedom and flexibility in the rite never before allowed.[44]

As a result, the effect of these reforms has been radically different from those of the reforms of Pius X and virtually all of his predecessors. The

unprecedented latitude given in the reforms of Vatican II and the postconciliar period has yielded unprecedented musical changes in the liturgical life of the Church. Today for the most part only vernacular language is used in the liturgy and its music; popular music dominates, and the "treasury of sacred music,"[45] –mostly with Latin texts—has virtually disappeared; the organ is more and more a rarity at Mass; use of the Proper texts of the Mass has been all but abandoned, having been displaced by the singing of hymns and songs from a wide variety of sources, even hymn writers of the Protestant Reformation, and a virtually endless stream of local practices, both musical and non-musical, that are incorporated regularly into the liturgy. In practice, the *Novus Ordo*, as the revised Mass of Paul VI is called, has, indeed, become a *new rite*, hardly recognizable as a vestige of the pre-conciliar Mass of Pius V, especially with regard to its music. Even so, there is a continuity of thought that can be seen between the reforms of Vatican II and of virtually all the reforms undertaken throughout the Church's long history of attempts to guide the music for her liturgy.

Summary of Principles

Throughout this nearly 650 years of legislation and centuries more of practice, the Church has held fast to three principles regarding her music.

First, there is the principle of tradition and what Vatican II has termed as "organic growth."[46] In every era, as we attempt to address musical issues, there is an appeal to preserve traditions and also an acquiescence to more contemporary musical forms, so long as these forms are kept within certain prescribed boundaries. These boundaries are described in various ways, but generally they are fixed, even if sometimes in a manner difficult to quantify, around qualities deemed to be inherent in music that has proven itself to be worthy for liturgical use through a certain longevity. Music that has not withstood the test of time to validate its worthiness for the liturgy is somewhat suspect, and perhaps rightfully so when it is to accompany us as heaven is opened and we are lifted, through the saving grace of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, to stand in the presence of God and angels.[47] However, it is not condemned so long as it takes on those characteristics that have been deemed appropriate for music that is to assume this awesome task.

Second, the musical form that has been upheld as *the* exemplar throughout the entire history of the Church is chant. This demands more than a casual observation. Why has the Church—throughout her existence—given a persistent insistence of the importance—the primacy—of chant in her liturgies? Is it simply part of the Church's historical preference for things traditional, or is it perhaps reflective of a deeper wisdom that deserves to be explored and embraced?

The music that we call Gregorian Chant is actually the result of a long evolutionary process. It's "final"[48] form, concretized by the invention of notation systems to transcribe it in the ninth and tenth centuries, was the result of a confluence of older Gallican and Roman chants effected by the efforts of Pepin the Short and his son Charlemagne to unify the liturgy in their kingdom as a means of unifying the kingdom politically. However, the constitutive elements of this music were themselves the result of long evolutionary processes. We can see in Gregorian chant earlier layers of pentatonic music, a music that is common to early cultures throughout the world, and roots that consist of a series of ancient cantillation formulas. In fact, there are several other extant bodies of chant, Old Roman, Beneventan, Milanese, and Hispanic, that predate the Gregorian and often show these characteristics in more pristine states. These ancient cantillation formulas are the earliest identifiable music of the Church. Even so, they themselves were the result of an evolution from an older process of cantillation, an oratorical process that we might describe today as something between speaking and singing, with signs to direct certain kinds of inflections appearing in Masorete manuscripts as old as perhaps 1000 BC.

We might be tempted here to conclude that the value placed on chant by the Church is an historical one. It is both a repertoire and a way of "cantillating" or singing prayer that has primordial roots and, therefore, because of our emphasis on tradition, it must be preserved. Certainly, there would be an element of truth in such as assertion.

However, the value is deeper then a simple historical association between chant and the liturgy. Chant is intrinsically and inextricably linked to the process of prayer we call the liturgy. Not only were

the liturgy and chant born of the same lineage, but the two also developed together symbiotically. In truth, one cannot exist in its fullest sense without the other.

On the one hand, when the Mass is clothed in its most natural garment, the ordered "harmony and rhythm" of chant, to use Plato's terminology figuratively, it most imitates the "spiritual harmony" of the heavenly liturgy.[49] On the other hand, chant is a musical idiom that is uniquely bound to liturgy, for musical as well as the historical reasons just outlined. It exists only within the context of the liturgy: its texts are uniquely liturgical, and its melodies are intimately bound to its texts. They do not exist in their own right, but only as vehicles for the Word.[50] No other music has these qualities. No other music can adorn the liturgy as chant can, that is, completely void of the slightest association with anything else. It is *the* music that is truly "integral" to the liturgy.[51]

Jungmann refers to the sung Mass, i.e., the *Missa cantata*—which he observes as recently as during the 1940's as "the predominant face of parish services in most dioceses"[52]—as the "unbroken continuation of the presbyter Mass of Christian antiquity."[53] That is to say, from the earliest times of Christian public worship until just prior to Vatican II, a sung liturgy, with chant as an integral—if not the sole—component, was the preeminent form of our liturgical prayer.[54]

Admittedly, the *Missa cantata* is not our only form of liturgical prayer. There is also the "read" or low Mass, that is, the *Missa lecta*, whose roots can be traced to the private Mass, evidenced as early as at least the sixth century, and perhaps to its predecessor, the Domestic Mass of apostolic times. Too, it must be acknowledged that over time and for various reasons,[55] the *Missa lecta* has become the "ground form"[56] for public worship, to use Jungmann's terminology. Even so, as this process has unfolded, we have continuously attempted to retain certain characteristics of our liturgical prayer that can only be achieved in the *Missa cantata.* For example, witness the various methods of accompanying the low Mass that developed during the centuries, such as so called Organ Masses or even vernacular hymns.[57] Even in the twentieth century we see the Dialogue Mass, in which responses—sometimes recited, sometimes sung—and hymns were added to the *Missa lecta* in order to recapture, again as Jungmann puts it, "some of the simple beauty of the *Missa cantata.*"[58]

Thus, when the Church uplifts chant to a place of primacy in the liturgy, it is, indeed, for reasons more profound than a nostalgia for things historical. It is a recognition and affirmation of the fullness that is achieved in the liturgy when it is prayed in this way.

Third, there is the principle of quality with regard to music for the liturgy. In all of the Church's struggles with appropriate music for the liturgy, that is, for the way we pray, the discussions, until very recently,[59] have always centered around music that we have come to respect as being among the finest contributions to Western culture, that is, what we must call music that is truly art.

To be sure, the struggle with popular music, or its characteristics tainting the liturgy, has plagued the Church since long before the present. To mention but a few examples, witness the *Officium Festi Fatuorum* and *Missa Asini* (*Office of the Feast of Fools* and *Mass of the Ass*) attributed to Pierre de Corbeil (d. ca. 1222) in the thirteenth century, the madrigal-like music about which the Council of Trent admonished musicians in the sixteenth century, the attempts of Pope Benedict XIV to rid eighteenth-century liturgical music of its operatic elements, and the famous *Black List of Disapproved Music* produced by the Society of St. Gregory in 1922, which condemned such pieces as the "Sextet from 'Lucia di Lammermoor,'[the] Quartet from 'Rigoletto,' [and] arias from 'Tannhäuser,' 'Lohengrin,' [and] 'Othello,'"[60] ostensibly because they were being used in the liturgy.

It would also be naive to think that after the development of polyphony, every small parish church sang only the works of the great masters. Nevertheless, it would seem that until the present, there were in every era commonly accepted norms or models that were of the highest artistic levels. We have already noted in papal documents through the centuries the primacy given to chant, that is, the consummate music of the Carolingian era. We can also note other examples century after century: the manuscripts of Victoria that found their way into various parishes throughout the Hapsburg empire, as seminarians in the German College in Rome, where Victoria taught, took them as models of the best music of the day; the works of Palestrina that were sung by choirs and emulated by virtually every serious composer of liturgical music from the end of the sixteenth century well into the twentieth; and the myriad of collections and adaptations of the finest

motets of the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries that appeared in Catholic parochial schools and parish choir lofts,[61] as companions, of course, to the *Liber Usualis*[62] or other books of chant[63] from shortly after the *motu proprio* of Pius X until Vatican II. The liturgy, in principle and, to the extent possible, in practice was the place where the first fruits were offered.[64]

We can, then, summarize these three common principles to which the Church has adhered from century to century as she has navigated the waters of change in her music as follows:

1. Even though musical change is perhaps inevitable, new music should always embrace and exhibit long established core values for the Church's music;
2. These long established values, even if somewhat difficult to quantify, are most perfectly embodied in Gregorian chant, Gregorian chant being defined both explicitly as a specific body of Medieval monophonic music and implicitly as a way of praying the liturgy;
3. Any music employed in the service of the liturgy should be music of the highest artistic quality.

These principles do not exclude the consideration of others, such as the emphasis on vocal participation that has dominated liturgical thought since Vatican II, or the liturgical and pastoral principles for judging the worthiness of music proposed in *Music in Catholic Worship*, or an ongoing discussion about appropriate styles and forms of contemporary music to mention but a few examples. However, the three principles just summarized have been a consistent guide throughout our history of attempts to balance the expressive and the formative poles of music. They have played a consistent role in defining how we express who we are and how we form ourselves into whom we are called to be. Unless we are prepared to break all ties with the way we have expressed ourselves and formed ourselves for the better part of two millennia, these principles must be at the basis of any serious considerations regarding the future.

However, prior to such consideration it is necessary to evaluate our present situation, again in light of these principles, so that we might see where our future efforts are most needed.

The Present Situation in Light of These Principles

Earlier we noted some of the significant and unprecedented changes in liturgical music following Vatican II. How have these changes fared with respect to observing the historical principles that have guided the Church? How have they fared in terms of using these principles to balance the expressive and formative qualities of music? If the truth be acknowledged, not very well.

Vatican II did attempt to apply these principles, by requiring "that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing,"[65] by acknowledging "Gregorian chant as proper to the Roman liturgy" and "giving it a place of pride in liturgical practices,"[66] and by encouraging not only preservation and fostering with great care "the treasure of sacred music,"[67] but also the production of new "compositions which have the qualities proper to genuine sacred music."[68] However, the council's fundamental philosophy of music for the liturgy does not adequately balance both the expressive and formative natures of music, preferring to emphasize music's expressive elements more emphatically than its formative ones. For example, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* begins its explicit discussion of music by stating that "sacred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is the more closely connected with the liturgical action, whether it adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites."[69] While these qualities are not exclusive of formative aspects, particularly with regard to the idea of "fostering unity," they are much more easily perceived as relating to music's expressive nature, especially when the notion of adding "delight to prayer"—somewhat akin to the Aristotelian notion of music as "intellectual enjoyment, relaxation and recreation"[70] – is the first quality attributed to music by the council. The idea that music's purpose is "the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful"—sanctification being ostensibly related to Aristotle's idea of purification or Plato's concept of being formed in the image of the heavenly harmonies[71]—is subordinated to the following paragraph. This is a dramatic contrast to the *motu proprio* of Pius X, in which

music's purpose is stated in the first sentence and unequivocally used as the basis the entire document.

This somewhat subliminal, and undoubtedly unintentional, subordination of music's formative role to its expressive one, along with the council's emphasis on "active participation" throughout the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* has led to an implementation process that has all but abandoned the historical principles that have been used to balance music's dual role. For example, with regard to the first principle, while it is not too difficult to see our acceptance of, even embracing of, the inevitability of musical change, it is conversely not too easy to see in most of our present music any "organic growth" of the new from the old, in order to insure its own assimilation and embracing of time-honored values for our music. There has been a veritable revolution in the music of the Church, and the typical music for our liturgies has little or nothing to do with the music of our past.

Further, it is not too difficult to understand why our music today is so disconnected with the music of our past. There is—isolated exceptions acknowledged—virtually no application of either the second or third principles, that is, there is little or no chant, or chanting, and little or no music of substantive quality.

While there does seem to be a small resurgence of interest in chant, it is nothing compared to the renewal in this country during the first half of the twentieth century. Too, there are very few musicians trained in the chant. In addition, sung liturgies are an extreme rarity, and our attempts at the integration of music into the liturgy have resulted in a common schema in which an arbitrary hierarchy of importance[72] is assigned to various elements of the Mass and they are set to music, paradoxically either because of the importance assigned to them, such as the processional songs,[73] or because by singing them they are supposed to "highlight" the importance of something else, such as the acclamations that are supposed to highlight the Gospel, Eucharistic Prayer, and Lord's Prayer.[74] We have become comfortable with a liturgy that is punctuated by a series of musical interludes, but which is, itself, not particularly musical.

Also—and again with the exception of unusual churches here and there—truly artistic music is not only generally absent from our liturgies, it is quite normally purposefully rejected as inappropriate in the context of contemporary liturgical thought. While superficially such a claim may have some merit, it also begs the question, "What are we saying about ourselves—both expressively and formatively—when we contend that our liturgy, our public prayer life, has no place for artistic music?

This lack of adequate regard for the historical principles that have guided musical choices in the liturgy has created a fairly dramatic imbalance in our liturgical music. It is a music that rejects Tradition as a key element of our faith, and that dismisses the formative capacities of chant, the sung liturgy and artistic music. Our current music, with its strong emphasis on the popular, is highly expressive of who we are as individuals at this point in time and in very specific locales, but not particularly focused toward connecting us with anything beyond the immediate and the immediately local or into forming us into anything more. While we might take some consolation in the fact that the state of liturgical music will never be perfect, we must also acknowledge that the present situation could be improved dramatically without endangering our right to this consolation.

Suggestions for the Future

If, then, the situation is ripe for improvement, just what is to be done? How might we better apply our understanding about the expressive and formative natures of music, our history, and the collective wisdom of the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to make some reasoned suggestions for the future that may help to reestablish a state of equilibrium between the poles of expression and formation in our music?

In as much as the current imbalance is weighted in favor of music's expressive elements, as we explore our options for the future, we must give more consideration to the formative value of our music, even as we strive to prevent a simple shifting of the imbalance from one pole to the other. *Lex orandi, lex credendi:* the way we pray will determine what we believe. It will form us.

If, then, we look at this issue from the perspective of refocusing our efforts on formation, what can we do? First and foremost, we, that is, those of us in leadership positions, must start with ourselves. We must reform ourselves.

There is a common term today, that of "Cafeteria Catholics," that is used to refer to people who like to pick and choose the Church's teachings that they will follow, much like they can pick and choose what food they would like to eat in a cafeteria. Many of us—perhaps inadvertently—have become "Cafeteria musicians, liturgists, pastors, etc." In our efforts to be sensitive to the pastoral needs of those whom we serve, we have adopted habits of following certain liturgical mandates of the Church while disregarding others. From a formative perspective, the relationship between this kind of approach to our liturgy and the cafeteria-style approach to living a Catholic life should be obvious. If we model a casual approach to the liturgy, that moment when earth and we as part of it are joined to heaven, then we should not be surprised when our parishioners adopt a casual approach to their living their daily lives.

We must reform ourselves by submitting our wills to the will of the Church, in trust that her wisdom will lead us to a deeper understanding of the will of God and in faith that by submitting ourselves wholly and without reservation to a higher authority we will learn to give ourselves wholly and without reservation to God's authority. We must imitate the Lord—and thus be reformed into his image—as he says, "I have come not to do My own will, but the will of Him who sent Me."[75] It is fundamental that we recommit ourselves to a holistic embracing of the Church's mandates regarding the music for the liturgy.[76]

Thus, and secondly, as the Church for her entire history has placed primacy on chant as "the music proper to the Roman liturgy," we must trust in a deeper wisdom of this mandate and commit ourselves to rediscovering the sung Mass and to restoring chant to its rightful place in our liturgical prayer. We cannot overestimate the formative power of this music and this way of praying the liturgy. Maurice Tillie reminds us that through history "the liturgy...was the sure means to pass on the Christian doctrine in its fullness, and consequently, Gregorian [chant, as the music proper to the liturgy] became a powerful means to express and to pass on the faith of the Church."[77] He also remarks that because of this, "All the reformers who have tried to mitigate the faith or to suppress dogmas have always begun by suppressing traditional songs in general and the Gregorian chants in particular."[78]

If we commit ourselves to this challenge of chant restoration, there are several tools available today that can facilitate the process,[79] and thus, on a technical level, the task is not unachievable. The difficulty is more likely to be encountered on a cultural level. Reestablishing the *Missa cantata* as the parochial norm will not be easy in a culture that has fully embraced the *Missa lecta* as the standard for its public worship. However, even if a full scale return to the *Missa cantata* as normative may be unrealistic as a first step, we must at least reestablish it as the preeminent means of liturgical prayer, the model, if you will, toward which we strive. If our liturgical reforms are ever to claim a true sense of authenticity, they must be based on the historical model for public worship, of which the *Missa cantata* is a direct descendent, rather than the historical model for private worship, from which we have received the *Missa lecta*.[80]

Third, we must rededicate ourselves to bringing our best musical offerings to the altar. Again, on a technical level using higher quality music for our liturgies would be fairly simple to accomplish. The renewed use of chant itself would already raise dramatically the quality of the liturgy's music, and there are simple chants that could be utilized in small parishes to complement the more complex chants that require more sophisticated singers. Too, there are many examples of simple, but elegant works from the polyphonic tradition, in addition to many beautiful works from a hymn tradition of the Church that is all but ignored. It is not because bringing higher quality music to the liturgy is impossible that will make such a task difficult. It is, again, more likely to be cultural resistance to better music that will be the greater challenge. We have for the better part of the last two generations encouraged and even inculcated principles of relativism with regard to musical judgment that declare there are no qualitative absolutes. As difficult as it will be to do, the current doctrines that claim all musical styles are qualitatively equal must be exposed for the rationalization of poor quality and often egocentric music that they are. While we will certainly never be able to equal the quality of God's gift to us, we must never allow that truth to prevent us from giving Him our best.

Fourth and finally, we must not give up hope. In the same way that Christ admonished Judas that "the poor will be with you always,"[81] so too will we always

be plagued with less than perfect music for our most perfect prayer, the liturgy. The Church in all her collective wisdom and with all her divine guidance has not yet developed a perfect solution to this continuous problem.

At the same time, the Church has always persisted in the effort of striving toward perfection. The battle to overcome our imperfections is a noble and necessary one, and we must not abdicate. Our very willingness to engage in the struggle is in itself one step toward accomplishing the goal. It is in itself part of the process of formation that we seek.

Notes:

1 See Vatican Council II, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (*Sacrosanctum concilium,* December 4, 1963 [hereafter SC]) no. 119; for related examples, see *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1994) nos. 1201, 1674.

2 See SC, no. 112.

3 SC, nos. 118, 121.

4 See (among many) Don Campbell, *The Mozart Effect for Children: Awakening Your Child's Mind, Health, and Creativity with Music* (New York: Harper Collins, 2000).

5 It should be acknowledged that much of the research does address the formative influence of music on health and well-being, in addition to its influence on intellectual development. See ibid, for example. However, the notion of music specifically influencing spiritual development is generally absent from the research literature.

6 Plato, *Ion,* 534D, E; quoted in F. C. Lehner, "Music (Philosophy)," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (16 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) 10.89-91.

7 Aristotle, *Politics* (trans. B. Jowett; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885) 256-257.

8 Augustine, *Epistulae* 166.5.13; quoted in F. C. Lehner, "Music (Philosophy)."

9 Plotinus, *Enneads* 1.6.6; quoted in F. C. Lehner, "Music (Philosophy)."

10 Pius X, Motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* (November 22, 1903) I.1; trans. Robert F. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music, 95A.D. to 1977A.D.* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1979) 223-224.

11 C. J. McNaspy, "Music, Sacred," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (16 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) 10.97-99.

12 The dates here refer to the dates during which musical reform was addressed by the council rather than the dates of the council itself, which met from 1545-1563.

13 John of Salisbury, *De nugis curialiam*; quoted in Hayburn, *Papal Legislation*, 18.

14 Aelred of Rielvaux, *Speculum charitatis* 2.23; quoted in Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 19.

15 Elias Salamon, *Scientia artis musicae* (1274); quoted in Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 18.

16 Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 20.

17 *Corpus juris canonici, ed. a. 1582 cum glossa (in aedibus populi Romani, isuus Gregorii XIII)* (Leipzig: Ed. Aem. Friedberg, 1879-1881) 1:1245-1457; trans. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 20-21.

18 Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 21.

19 See ibid., 22.

20 Antoine Guerber, "Missa Magna"; notes in *Missa Magna: Messe à la Chapelle Papale d'Avignon, XIVe Siècle*, trans. Elizabeth Guill. Performed by Diabolus in Musica, Antoine Guerber, director (Paris: Studio SM, 1999). CD recording #SM D2819.

21 *Concilium Tridentium*, vol 8: *Actorum pars quinta,* 963, lines 12-16; trans. H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1950) 151.

22 F. Romita, *Jus musicae liturgicae* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1947) 59; trans. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 27.

23 See Lewis Lockwood, *Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina: Pope Marcellus Mass, An Authoritative Score, Backgrounds and Sources, History and Analysis, Views and Comments* (New York: Norton, 1975).

24 See ibid., 28-29. Lockwood cites a 1607 letter written by Agostino Agazzari as the "earliest known claim that the *Pope Marcellus Mass* [of Palestrina] was instrumental in saving sacred music from banishment from use in Catholic churches."

25 While primacy was not given to chant in any formal statement of the Council, it is a reasonable deduction given the serious discussions regarding, and near banishment of, polyphony from the Church during the Council.

26 Pope Benedict XIV, Encyclical. *Annus Qui.* Trans., *The Liturgy* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1962) 46-78; quoted in Hayburn, *Papal Legislation,* 95.

27 Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1977) 269.

28 Anthony Ruff, "Integration and Inconsistencies: The *Thesaurus Musicae Sacrae* in the Reformed Roman Eucharistic Liturgy" (S.T.D. diss., *Institut für Liturgiewissenschaft, Christliche Kunst und Hymnologie* of the *Karl-Franzens-Universität*, Graz, 1998) 45.

29 Pius X, *Tra le sollecitudini;* trans. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation* 223-231.

30 For a few examples, note the development of the chant-centered Ward music method for Catholic parochial school students, the establishment of a chair in sacred music at Manhattanville College, the opening of the Pius X School of Liturgical Music in 1918, and financial support for the first recordings done by the monks of Solesmes.

31 See Ruff, “Integration and Inconsistencies,” 21-67, for a more detailed discussion of the Cecilian movement and the work of the monks of Solesmes in the context of the reforms of Pius X.

32 SC, no. 116.

33 SC, no. 114.

34 SC, no. 116.

35 SC, nos. 114 and 121.

36 SC, nos. 28, 30, 114, 121.

37 Congregation of Sacred Rites, *Musicam sacram* (March 5, 1967 [hereafter MS]) nos. 15, 9, 20.

38 SC, nos. 101, 63, 54; MS no. 47.

39 SC, no. 121; MS, nos. 4, 9, 61.

40 SC, no. 119; MS, no. 61.

41 MS, nos. 62, 63, 65.

42 MS, no. 37.

43 SC, no. 121.

44 MS, no. 36.

45 SC, no. 114.

46 SC, no. 23.

47 See Saint Benedict, *The Rule for Monasteries,* trans. Leonard J. Doyle (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1948), Chapter 19; and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, “'In the Presence of the Angels I Will Sing Your Praise'; The Regnsburg Tradition and the Reform of the Liturgy,” in idem, *A New Song for the Lord: Faith in Christ and Liturgy Today,* trans. Martha Matesich (New York: Crossroads Publishing, 1997) 128-146.

48 The word “final” here refers to the general concretization of the repertoire when it was subjected to the process of notation. It does not, however, imply that there were no more changes to the chant afterward.

49 See Plato, *Ion*, quoted in Lehner, “Music (Philosophy).”

50 The hymn repertoire may be the one possible exception to this norm in that the hymn melodies have a certain sense of independence that is not found in the rest of the repertoire. Even so, the melodies of the hymns are still intimately tied to the singing of liturgical texts and not to any other function.

51 Subjectively, one might also add that no other music has the same ability to “foster unity” (SC*,* 112) in the assembled faithful as much as does a monophonic melody, that is, music that in itself unifies its totality in a single voice as it both proclaims the Word of God and simultaneously transports us, to use the imagery of Plotinus, “beyond nature, to the highest beauty, whereby our souls, being beautified, become like God” (Lehner, “Music [Philosophy]” 90).

52 Joseph Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development,* rev. and abridged ed.; trans. Francis Brunner (Westminster Maryland: Christian Classics, 1959) 155.

53 Ibid.

54 The term “integral” with regard to music in the liturgy was used by Pius X in *Tra le sollecitudini,* (Part 3, par. I:1) and echoed by Vatican II (SC 112), by the bishops of the United States in the document *Music in Catholic Worship* (par. 23) and by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) in its *Pastoral Notes on the Order of Mass* (fifteenth draft, par. 40—the final version has not yet been published.) Even if, influenced by several centuries of experiencing the low Mass as normative, our contemporary understanding of the word “integral” is incomplete, as evidenced by our somewhat paradoxical efforts to apply it to a spoken liturgy, it is a recognition—at a deep level—of the fullness of our prayer in the *Missa cantata*; that is, in the liturgy in which music is truly integral, in the liturgy that is intrinsically and inextricably tied to chant.

55 See Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 165-167.

56 Ibid., 166.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 *Sacrosanctum concilium* certainly affirms the need for music of the highest quality in the liturgy (no. 121). However, the flexibility given in *Musicam sacram* that “No kind of sacred music is prohibited from liturgical actions by the Church as long as it corresponds to the spirit of the liturgical celebration itself and the nature of its individual parts,[7] and does not hinder the active participation of the people[8]” (no. 9), along with the adoption in *Music in Catholic Worship* (Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1972) of a threefold criteria for judging the value in which liturgical and pastoral judgments are given equal weight to the quality of the music (nos. 25-41) has resulted in a practice in which the quality of the music is, in truth, relegated to a position of less importance than other factors in determining its value for liturgical use. See also *The Snowbird Statement on Catholic Liturgical Music* (Salt Lake City: The Madeleine Institute, 1995) no. 6.

60 Nicolas Slonimsky, *Music Since 1900,* 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1938) 532.

61 For two of many examples, see James A. Reilly, ed., *Thirty-four Liturgical Motets for Three Equal Voices by Ancient and Modern Composers* (Boston: McLaughlin & Reilly, 1944); Carlo Rossini, ed., *Canticum Novum: Collection of 115 Motets and Hymns and an Easy Mass for Two Equal Voices* (New York: J. Fischer & Bro., 1935).

62 *Liber Usualis* (Tournai: Desclée, 1908).

63 For example, see *Kyriale* (New York: J. Fischer & Bro., 1927); *Chants of the Church: Selected Gregorian Chants* (Chicago: Gregorian Institute of America, 1953); *Parish Kyriale* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1961).

64 It is rather amazing to contrast the kinds of musical comparisons that are made today between popular and art music as a result of the threefold criteria promulgated in *Music in Catholic Worship,* with the debates that were generated in Germany regarding the compatibility of Gregorian chant and the music of Mozart, that is, the finest music of the ninth and eighteenth centuries respectively, as a result of the directives of Pius X in *Tra le sollecitudini.*

65 SC, no. 23.

66 SC, no. 116.

67SC, no. 114.

68 SC, 121. Given the earlier reference in *Sacrosanctum concilium* to the work of previous pontiffs, and especially that of Pius X (no. 112), these "qualities proper to sacred music," while not explicitly defined in *Sacrosanctum concilium* clearly assume a relationship to the qualities outlined by Pius X in *Tra le sollecitudini.*

69 SC, 112.

70 See Aristotle, *Politics.*

71 See Plato's *Ion,* quoted in Lehner, "Music (Philosophy)."

72 *Music in Catholic Worship* assigns relative importance to various parts of the Mass and, in accordance with their relative importance of these parts, establishes a hierarchy for parts of the Mass that should be sung. This hierarchy is unique to *Music in Catholic Worship. Musicam Sacram* (no. 7), and subsequently the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (no. 19), do recommend that "in selecting the parts which are to be sung, one should start with those that are by their nature of greater importance." However, the same paragraph in *Musicam Sacram* goes on to clarify what is meant by "greater importance." The term is used to refer to "those [parts] which are to be sung by the priest or by the ministers, with the people replying, or those which are to be sung by the priest and people together." That is to say, the word "importance" here does not imply a structural hierarchy. Rather it establishes one that is both based on ease of learning and intended to facilitate "active participation." This is confirmed in the "degrees" that are established in *Musicam Sacram* (no. 29) which specify those parts of the Mass that should be sung first, second and third. These "degrees" are completely unrelated in both concept and specifics to the hierarchy of items to be sung that is outlined in *Music in Catholic Worship.*

73 *Music in Catholic Worship,* 60-62.

74 *Music in Catholic Worship*, 53.

75 John 6.38.

76 It is acknowledged that for a number of reasons, among them some seeming contradictions in the mandates themselves, this is a task much easier said than done.

77 "La liturgie...est-elle apparue comme le moyen sûr de transmettre la doctrine chrétienne dans son intégralité, et par conséquent, le grégorien lui-même est devenu un vecteur pouvent exprimer et transmettre la foi de l'Église." Maurice Tillie, *Le Chant Grégorien Redécouverte* (Nantes, France: Association Grégorienne de Nantes, 1997) 19.

78 "Tous les réformateurs qui ont cherché à édulcorer la foi ou à supprimer les dogmas ont toujours commencé par supprimer les chant traditionnels en général et le chant grégorien en particulier." Ibid. Tillie refers to an example cited by W. Bäumker, *Das Katholische Kirchenlied* (Friebourg-en-Brisgau, 1891).

79 For example, see *Graduale Romanum* (Solesmes: Abbaye St.-Pierre de Solesmes, 1974); *Graduale Triplex* (Solesmes: Abbaye St.-Pierre de Solesmes, 1979); *Graduale Simplex, editio typica altera* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1975); Paul Ford, *By Flowing Waters* (Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1999); Edward Schaefer, ed. *Missa Cantata: A Notated Sacramentary* (Spokane, WA: Priory Press, 2001); Edward Schaefer, ed. *Congregational Booklets to Accompany Missa Cantata* (Spokane, WA: Priory Press, 2001); Edward Schaefer, ed. *A Notated Lectionary for Sundays and Feasts* (Spokane, WA: Priory Press, in preparation). In addition, the new *editio typica tertia* of the *Missale Romanum* (Vatican City: Typis Vaticanis, 2002), while perhaps not a widely useful aid in the United States, is most encouraging nonetheless. The Order of Mass is presented with the text of the priest notated throughout the body of the book, rather than in an appendix. This is a clear effort by the Vatican both to facilitate the celebration of the *Missa Cantata* and to signal its importance in the liturgical life of the Church.

80 See Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 165-167.

81 John 12.8.