Publications of the
CATHOLIC CHVRCH MVSIC ASSOCIATES

in cooperation with the
Church Music Association of America
MusicaSacra.com

MVSICAE · SACRAE · MELETEMATA

edited

on behalf of the
Church Music Association of America

by

Catholic Church Music Associates

Volume 5

THE BUGNINI-LITURGY AND THE REFORM OF THE REFORM

THE BUGNINI-LITURGY AND THE REFORM OF THE REFORM

by
LÁSZLÓ DOBSZAY

Front Royal VA
2003

EMINENTISSIMO VIRO
PATRI VENERABILI ET MAGISTRO

JOSEPHO
S. R. E. CARDINALI RATZINGER

HOC OPUSCULUM
MAXIMAE AESTIMATIONIS
AC REVERENTIAE SIGNUM
D.D.

AUCTOR

The author kindly requests that persons or periodicals publishing a review on his book
send a copy or the bibliographical data to the following address:
László Dobszay, H-1014 Budapest, Táncsics M. u. 7. Hungary. E-mail: laszlod@zti.hu

Contents

Introduction

The growing displeasure with the "new liturgy" introduced *after* (and not *by*) the Second Vatican Council is characterized by two ideas.

1) A large part of the objections was raised on account of theological failures or distortions in the new liturgical texts, rubrics or practice.

2) The alternative advised is the 1962 Missale Romanum as the source of the traditional Roman liturgy.

It is rare, however, to meet a communication (publication?) analyzing the new liturgy *as a liturgy*, i.e. according to the proper nature of this special field of religious life. It is, perhaps, because it was mostly theologically well-educated Catholics who tried to find a justification for their instinctive aversion, and not those who were familiar with the details of liturgical affairs.

The theological objections might prove strained but even if everything were right with the theology, the liturgical problems would still remain.

The problem with the second approach is that an absolutism of change is opposed by an absolutism of constancy. Supporters take the 1962 Missal as if it were identical with the Tridentine rite, and as if the Tridentine rite were identical with the traditional Roman liturgy. (We discuss this question in the sixth chapter of this volume.)

Concerning the first point: I admit that the quality of the liturgy reflects the quality of the theology, discipline, morality and spirituality, and also reacts on them. But now we wish to ponder the liturgy as a liturgy.

Concerning the second point: one should not conceal the fact that the Roman liturgy has changed in an organic way and with small modifications over the past centuries. The traditional Roman liturgy can be found in what is *common* in spite of the *changes* on the surface. I agree that we have to return to the traditional Roman liturgy and not be content with the removal of some "excesses" of the Neo-Roman rite. The true "Reform of the Reform" is the reform of the traditional Roman liturgy in the sense intended by the Council: organic changes in the measure of previous organic reforms in history, in accordance with the real necessities of the Church (and not with the creative will of commissions).

But do we know what kind of changes and what measures can be introduced justifiably without demolishing the identity of the Roman rite? I wish to scrutinize these questions in the following studies.

The following studies[1] contain critical reflections on the Novus Ordo. We start with a seemingly unessential theme, the position of hymns in the Office. It is, however, suitable to make clear some basic aspects. The second study concerns the very center of the liturgy: the Holy Week. The Divine Office is a much more important element in this affair than many regard; it stands in the focus of the third chapter. The proper chant of the Mass is connected with the organism of the liturgical year, and the fifth section on the pericopes and calendar completes this theme.

Three more tracts (published elsewhere) have been appended to the series. The first addresses the friends of the Tridentine Movement, and its intention is to convince them that the long-term alternative of the Novus Ordo is not simply the restoration of the 1962 Missal. The last two treatises are about music, but some remarkable theological and pastoral issues are also discussed in them.

* * *

By way of introduction, let me draw the lines immediately so as to separate myself from certain views on the one hand, and on the other to exclude some other topics, albeit important, from discussion:

1. The critical approach to the "Bugnini Liturgy"[2] presented here reflects neither disobedience toward higher church authority nor a practical opposition to liturgical regulations. In everyday life, I am ready to accommodate myself to the currently valid liturgical prescriptions even though as an expert dealing with the liturgy, I consider them wrong or unsuccessful in many respects. Thus, my remarks are made in a spirit of service and not of contestation.

1 Since some of them have been published separately, certain thematic repetitions could not be entirely avoided.

2 My expression 'Bugnini Liturgy' was earlier criticized by saying that the new liturgy was elaborated by commissions and not a single person, and was introduced under the authority of the Pope and the Curial Office concerned. These readers do not seem to have noticed the essentially provocative nature of the title. The name was naturally not meant to attribute this liturgy to one person, but had to do with the *contents*: It symbolized that the new liturgy is not a recent form of the Roman rite, nor another stage of an organic development, but a hastily created, voluntarist invention, in which individual ideas and ambitions played a decisive, dominant role. This has remained so as regards the *content* even if it had received *legal* approbation.

2. The reason why I think that the Bugnini liturgy is unsuccessful for the most part is not because it has introduced innovations and thus is a reform-liturgy, but because it has introduced defective reforms and has thereby caused damage. There is no doubt that a liturgical reform was necessary, but it is not so clear that *this* liturgical reform was needed. Consequently, I decline to accept the grouping of opinions into "progressive" and "conservative" categories, as well as the attempt to seek the main cause of the present troubles in these "progressive" and "conservative" extremes. I am convinced that the scholar may undertake the awkward task of examining both the old and the new elements in the liturgy, each according to its own specific truth, as long as he is willing to observe the regulations of the Church in daily practice.

3. The liturgy has its own particular laws and truth, and what is more, its own immanent laws and truth, and not only legal statutes. When in the following pages the Bugnini liturgy is criticized, it will be done from the standpoint of this particular "liturgical truth" and not from a theological point of view, in spite of the fact that at certain points (e.g., the rites of the sacraments) the liturgical solution suggests a problematic dogmatic attitude. The liturgy seems to have no measure apart from the *lex credendi*; everything can be imagined and verified by means of speculation. Yet the liturgy is one of the most important repositories of holy TRADITION, the dynamic handing-down of the wisdom of the Church even in its stylized state. Its dogmatic contents are constituted, in addition to the normative system of dogma, by the sum of spiritual, socio-psychological, aesthetic, cultural, emotional, historical and pedagogical factors which preserve at the same time the role of the liturgy connected with the other spheres of religion but not identical with them. Theological speculation may warrant the harmony between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*; liturgical legislation can protect the values of liturgy against arbitrariness; and yet for grasping the specific truth and validity of the liturgy, theological speculation proves inadequate and the law insufficient. To touch this sacred sphere, utmost tact is required, since our reasoning is in much the same way secondary to reality as any speculation about life is to the fullness of life.

4. Tradition plays such an important role in liturgy because, among other things, it provides the most essential point of departure. The Constitution on the sacred liturgy made a clear statement in this respect: it allowed for the introduction of innovations, but only on condition that they meet

two requirements. One is that the new forms should spring organically from the existing ones; the other is that only innovations yielding real and genuine profit to the Church are to be introduced. Unfortunately the Constitution itself contradicts these two requirements in certain respects, and in subsequent years the regulations fell into serious contradiction with the Constitution on these two points, and in so many other areas as well. It is, therefore, all the more problematic if Rome, which acts as a guarantee of the regulations, wishes to reduce the whole matter to a question of obedience. In this case her own commission could also be called upon to account for obedience to more universal and comprehensive laws. What makes the claim of obedience psychologically difficult is that an arbitrary construction – based to a large extent on individual initiatives and opposed to the centuries-old customs of the Church –, now claims the reverence due to the usage of the Church, a procedure which though perhaps valid legally, is yet contestable from the point of view of contents.

5. In the following discussion, Tradition will not be identified with the Tridentine liturgy. In fact, the Tridentine liturgy is but one – and not the most successful one – of the branches of the Roman liturgy; one which existed in many variants, side by side in remarkable orderliness. Thus our point of departure will not be the Tridentine but the Roman liturgy as it appears in the variety of forms found in various localities, religious orders and historical periods. Once we know this tremendously rich system of variants, and even in spite of this knowledge, we can scarcely include the Bugnini liturgy in the category of the Roman liturgy, since it is arbitrary to such an extent that we can neither regard it as something developing organically from the older liturgies, nor can we claim that its innovations were called into life by the "real and genuine" spiritual interests of the Church.

6. In practice, the introduction of the Bugnini liturgy went hand in hand with the change-over to the use of the vernacular. These two changes are not "liturgical reforms" in the same sense, because the latter brought about changes in the manner of the transmission of the liturgy, whereas the former affected the contents of the liturgy. Although the change-over to the vernacular is not lacking in difficulties, it is not treated in these articles.

7. The liturgical reform has given rise to a certain conception about the liturgy in public opinion – primarily among the clergy – which manifests itself in beliefs, judgments, the celebration of the liturgy, in teachings, and in practical endeavors. An analysis of this new mentality and its effect on the

whole spirituality of the clergy, ought to be carried out before all else. However, this and similar theoretical issues are passed over in silence or mentioned only briefly in these studies.

* * *

I cannot begin to treat this subject, however, without first expressing my deepest gratitude to Rev. Prof. Robert A. Skeris, the President of the Church Music Association of America, who gave me continuous and unwavering support, shared his inspiring thoughts with me, and corrected some of the chapters in this book both as regards content and language.

I would also like to thank Judit Fehér PhD and Ervin János Alacsi theologian, for proof-reading and perfecting the script with their numerous suggestions.

But I render special thanks, most of all, to His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger for granting me permission to dedicate this book to him.

1. Hymns of the Hours

In connection with the hymns of the Hours, the Constitution on the sacred liturgy provided for two changes: to enlarge the repertory, and to "restore the old forms," that is, to eliminate the unfortunate outcome of the 17th-century aggiornamento (cf. § 93).

The Bugnini breviary has fulfilled, or perhaps "over-fulfilled," the first task. It is in fact not so certain that by multiplying the number of hymns, a definite profit has been realized in every respect. Overwhelming as the wealth of the surviving hymns of the Roman liturgy may be, in reality each local church only made use of some 80 to 100 items; their adequate repetition, and the deliberate balance between variety and constancy resulted in a kind of familiarity: it followed from the repetitions of melodies and texts that anyone saying the Office could be familiar with each hymn separately and could even know them by heart in many instances. This personal familiarity with the hymns is endangered by the exaggerated number of hymns (amounting to some 300 in the new hymnal, many of them recent compositions). As much as I find the prospective enlargement of the repertory justified (though not to the same extent in every part of the breviary) I can hardly escape the impression that in this case a subcommittee used the opportunities for creativity with zealous and exaggerated ambition.[3]

For the most part, the reconstruction of the texts has been carried out successfully. The worst failure for which one might blame the compilers of the new hymnal is that in other instances they themselves found reasons for "emendations" so that we cannot claim to have authentic texts at our disposal this time, either. In my opinion, these modifications are for the most part unjustified. To mention only two examples: the last two verses of St. Ambrose's famous hymn for Easter (*Hic est dies verus Dei*) have been omitted, thus eliminating the textual unit which forms the climax of the whole poem and which opens up eschatological perspectives at the end of

3 Would it not be a more satisfactory solution for the Church to submit a medium-sized "common hymnal" (consisting, let us say, of 60 to 80 hymns) together with a rich selection from the "treasury of hymns" out of which the individual local churches could make up their own hymnals by selecting some 60 to 80 additional pieces, each according to its own capabilities, and also including some hymns from their own local liturgical tradition?

the hymn by linking the resurrection of Christ and man. This truncation represents a loss poetically as well. Another example is the rewriting of the hymns for Lent by omitting all references to *jejunium*. In reality, Lent has been a primary period of bodily fasting up to the present day. The hymns give evidence of the ancient liturgical asceticism of the Church and thus it may well be that "they are right" as opposed to the recent trend. Finally, early ecclesiastical authors unanimously assert that the *jejunium* must be understood in a more comprehensive sense than mere bodily fasting (*jejunium magnum et generale*) and in this meaning it has remained timely to this day.

The greatest change has taken place in an area which has not been specified by any provision of the Constitution, namely in the position of the hymn within the Hour. The rule which was followed without exception by hundreds of liturgies of dioceses and religious orders, and by the most varied branches of the Office of the Roman liturgy, had already been reflected in the *Rule of St. Benedict*, which provides the earliest existing detailed account of the Roman Office, namely that the hymn is to be sung before the canticle (though separated from it by a versicle) in the three Hours (Lauds, Vespers, Compline) which conclude with a canticle from the Gospel (*Magnificat, Benedictus, Nunc dimittis*); otherwise it is sung at the beginning of the Hour.[4]

The Bugnini breviary has now "made order" in that it placed the hymn at the beginning of each Hour.

He who has never experienced the ancient system, and in particular he who does not take the sung choral Office as his basic experience or norm, may easily claim that it is only a minor difference, not worthy of mention. But anyone who has had sufficient opportunity to experience Lauds or Ves-

4 We all know that it took centuries until the hymns were introduced into the Roman liturgy. In the Office of the monastic orders they were accepted immediately, and evidence of their early diocesan use is also available. On the other hand, Rome refused to incorporate them into her own practice as late as the turn of the 11th or 12th centuries (see the so-called Old Roman antiphonals), and the last three days of Holy Week have preserved up to the present the more ancient construction, without hymns. But wherever they were introduced, the principle enunciated above was followed without exception. The various Office systems show only one significant and one less significant difference: about half of the European churches did not sing a hymn at Matins since they felt that the invitatory was sufficient for introducing this extensive Hour. Apart from that, the sequence of the three items constituting the central part of the Hour (chapter, responsory, hymn) varied at Compline (and occasionally also at Lauds) in some churches.

pers in actual liturgical celebration will know how immensely the traditional structure contributed to the effectiveness of the Hour, which was guided by liturgical sensitivity to the exigencies of real life, and not by a mechanical system. This order, which was animated by the spirit of prayer and can only be understood and judged in its life-functions, came into existence through the concatenation of logical, theological, psychological and artistic forces.

The high point of these three Hours was the canticle from the Gospels, whose dignity derived from its position in the New Testament, but whose text originated in the world of the psalms. Apart from the antiphon, it is exactly the uplifting force of the hymns which assisted the community in singing these words in their full brilliance, at the climax of the celebration. From the midpoint of the Hours, i.e., from the *capitulum* onwards there emerges a "block" (consisting of chapter, responsory hymn and canticle) equivalent to the "block" of psalmody in time and significance but, in contrast to the smooth course of the psalmody, characterized by a steadily increasing intensity. In opposition to the first section of the Hour which is primarily accommodated to the Old Testament (and only in its application, to the New Testament), the second section reveals the consummation in the New Testament more directly.

The liturgical truth of this structure is even more transparent in the Vespers of the feasts. This Hour commences with the tranquillity of the psalms which contain antiphons enough to attune the hearts to the feast and to lend intellectual-musical emphasis to the psalmody. The chapter takes only one sentence from the Scriptures and calls attention to it through its very conciseness (as well as through the related visual elements). After this sentence, a climax is reached: the responsory (in fact, prolixum!) raises us out of the world of the psalmody. The hymn which follows, lends wings to the Hour in every respect: its five to eight verses provide an excellent framework within which the Church speaks in direct terms about the feast, and not merely through the words of the Bible. The form and the poetic mode of expression differentiate this unit from the rest of the liturgy in a characteristic way. The versicle separating the hymn from the canticle seems to be well-nigh a composed rest, but it represents as much a momentary relaxation, as does the "letting back" before the climax of the great musical compositions. The emotional and thought content accumulated in the hymn then breaks forth in the canticle, which though always textually identical, is always interpreted anew under the influence of the hymn.

In themselves, the contents of the canticle are rather general in comparison with those of the hymn, which assumes here almost the function of the introductory tropes, thereby lending particular stress to the most important thing: the one continuous praise of the Lord. The antiphon of the canticle is not sufficient to fulfill this function; it is, however, adequate for maintaining the notion of the feast and linking it with the canticle. Let us recall too that following the accumulation of these poetic and festive thoughts in the verses of the hymn, the fire of the evening burnt offering is being brought in during the singing of its last verse of praise, and the versicle is being sung while the priest imposes incense upon the glowing embers so that its smoke and scent should also render visibly present the canticle's general praise of the Lord as the climax of the Hour.

It is evident that this construction of the Hour is basically dynamic and that its progressive structure varies completely from that of the little Hours. Only a dull rationalism could take pleasure in reducing all the Hours to the same pattern. The argument in favor of the introduction of the Bugnini breviary, which alleges that the hymn must indicate the part of the day and the feast at the beginning of the Hour, is not convincing either. Every person singing the Office will know whether it is sunset or dawn, while the thought of the feast is sufficiently expressed by the antiphons. The fact that this thought is first expressed more enigmatically, deduced from the psalm, and then more and more explicitly, reflects the spirituality of the Hour. Even if we accept this speculative argument, we would still feel that the evacuation of the middle section of the Hour and the loss of its characteristic spiritual and psychological structure are too high a price to pay for the alleged practical advantages.

The compilers of the Bugnini liturgy must also have felt that by shifting the hymn to the beginning, the inner equilibrium of the Hour has been disturbed and its middle section has been impoverished. This may account for the inclusion of the pseudo-psalms at the end of the psalmody which are taken from the epistles of the apostles or from the Book of Revelation. One cannot exclude the possibility that biblical scholars, suspecting ancient Christian songs in some of them, are right after all. But should they be songs, then they must rather be included in the second or third categories of Saint Paul's "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5:19), let us say perhaps as early forerunners of songs like the *Phos Hilaron*, or the independent genres of the Orthodox liturgy and the extensive Latin antiphons,

rather than being considered New Testament counterparts of the psalms, built on the principle of *parallelismus membrorum*. This is why their psalm-like arrangement in the new breviary appears to be so unnatural.

This lack of sensitivity to the structure of the Hours is evident not only in changing the position of the hymns but also in another innovation of the Bugnini liturgy: the fusion of Lauds and Vespers with the Mass. In the history of liturgy, three examples of this combination are known: the attachment of Lauds to the midnight Mass of Christmas, the addition of Vespers at the end of Mass on Holy Thursday, and the shortened Vespers (or Lauds, respectively) sung at the conclusion of the Easter Vigil Mass. All three go back to a unique situation and find their explanation therein. Besides, none of them disturbs the integrity of the Office and the Mass; the Hour is sung as a whole between the communion and the postcommunion, i.e., at the end of the Mass. According to the Bugnini liturgy, the hymn and the psalms are to be sung before the Mass, whereas the canticle from the Gospel comes after the communion, which means that the Hour has practically been broken down into its constituent parts; its psalms mean an unjustified prolongation of the beginning of the Mass, the mixing of two liturgical cycles, each of which requires a different attitude. Cut off from the psalmody and the rest of the Hour, the canticle functions as a simple song of thanksgiving. This solution is to be considered particularly dangerous if it is not the exception but the rule, as in some parishes, monasteries and seminaries, etc. He who experiences the Hours in this form day by day cannot form a proper notion of their proportions and the logic of their structure. I feel no desire to listen to a symphony by Beethoven between the second and third movements of a Mozart symphony, not even by way of exception, and much less to see it established as general performance practice.

The life-like structure expressing the character of the Hours has fallen victim to the enforcement of a principle contrived at the office-desk. The structure that had been followed by 500 Office rites through 1500 years of liturgical history has been rejected, indeed prohibited (!) by the 501st Office. Do the votes of 500 count so little against 1? Can this inconsiderate procedure claim our inner loyalty and affection beyond external compliance? The *adinventiones suae*, defying the overwhelming majority, are audacity; if, however, they are aimed at eliminating the majority, an impudence; and if for achieving this my obedience to the Church is required, then, violence.

The Constitution on the sacred liturgy states that no innovations should be introduced unless the genuine and actual benefit of the Church demand them (Art. 23). Is there anyone who can prove that upsetting the ancient structure of Lauds, Vespers and Compline has brought notable spiritual advantages to the Church in the past twenty years?

2. The Holy Week

In the previous chapter I put forward some principles which I summarize now as follows: 1. The expert in liturgy is entitled to criticize the liturgical "reforms" if, in practice, he observes obediently the regulations in force of the Church, including those rules which he cannot accept in his capacity as an expert. 2. We have to reject the attitude which ranks the criticism of the reforms as the manifestation of conservativism since it may be simply the criticism of certain single components of the reform. 3. The Liturgy has its own inner laws beyond the purely theological and juridical speculation. The various individual solutions must be measured against these liturgical laws, too. 4. The laws can only be established by studying the liturgical traditions and not by applying a speculative method. By liturgical tradition I mean the sum of the whole past of a given liturgy (in our case of the Roman rite), not only the customs of the last 100 years. 5. The Bugnini liturgy is contrary to this tradition in many respects, not only to the Tridentine rite but to the whole of the Roman liturgy. The Bugnini liturgy is an arbitrary patchwork which does not meet the requirements of the Liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council according to which all accidental innovations must spring organically from tradition and yield genuine spiritual benefit. 6. In this series the question of the language of the liturgy will not be discussed since it touches upon the problem of the transmission of the liturgical contents, and not upon its essence. 7. Similarly, the theological, spiritual, pastoral and psychological implications of the liturgical reforms will be disregarded.

1.

In the preamble let me raise a more general question, the relationship of the Bugnini liturgy to the liturgy of the Roman rite and to the Tridentine rite.

The reform made sporadic references to the ancient Roman liturgy, its starting point was, however, the Tridentine rite. It was the Tridentine liturgy that the reform corrected and modified, combined with other elements (in most cases with its own innovations), or simply rejected as an unacceptable pattern, and replaced by new inventions. The innovations were pre-

sented to the public as the next step of the organic liturgical evolution set off by the requirements of our age. This argumentation showed the Tridentine rite as a reform liturgy, too, expressing the requirements of its own age, and took for granted that such a "zeitbedingt" liturgy had to be modified after a period of 400 years. It would follow from this train of thoughts that to oppose the new liturgy meant a sinful adherence to a 400-year-old, out-of-date evolutional phase and, moreover, that this kind of conservativism was a sin against the Holy Spirit and the hallmark of disobedience against the Pope. (This view has been not modified by the fact that some years ago Pope John Paul II permitted – on certain conditions – the celebration of the liturgy of the Mass according to the Tridentine rite. This permission was regarded as a tactical compromise with conservative groups.)

What is the real place of the Tridentine rite within the overall tradition of the Roman liturgy?

Anyone who wishes to speak about the Tridentine rite must first clarify what meaning he exactly attributes to this term. Essentially the Trident rite is not an original and independent liturgy but a variant of the centuries-old Roman liturgy. Compared with this centuries-old tradition the first points that strike the eye are where the Tridentinum seems to be independent and different from everything else. In this case it will be declared to be a new branch of the Roman liturgy created 400 years ago. On the other hand, if you compare the Trident rite with liturgies other than the Roman one (e.g. with 17th–18th century "reformed" liturgies or with their spiritual offspring, the Bugnini liturgy) you will find that there are no important differences between the Tridentine usage and the main stream of the at least 1500-year-old Roman liturgy. In this respect the Tridentine rite represents the ancient Roman liturgy itself and not a 400-year-old custom.

Evidence on the liturgy of the first Christian centuries is sparse, and certainly not enough to justify any practical arrangement of the liturgy. Authentic sources survive sporadically from the 6th century onwards and in complete form from the 8th–9th centuries on. The liturgical arrangement as it is recorded in the 8th- to 10th-century sources could be traced back with careful consideration to the end of the 5th century at the latest. (Just think of the structural identity of the Office in the 9th–10th-century liturgical books on the one hand and in the Rule of St. Benedict on the other.) The main features of this liturgical usage were the same as those of the Roman church as followed – with slight differences – by the dioceses, provinces,

religious orders up to 1970. There was no universal Roman liturgy that showed deviations depending on the location and the times of its use, in fact, these variants represented in their integrity the common essence of the Roman liturgy. The differences of the individual liturgies are historically extremely interesting and the details very clear if we examine them closely. However, the moment we look at them from the perspective of our time, they appear to constitute a uniform, characteristic liturgical family separated not only from the rite of the Eastern churches but from the liturgy of the other Latin rites (e.g. Mozarabic, Ambrosian, etc.), too. Unity and difference within this "Roman" liturgy (or liturgies) is not accidental, and the number and importance of the common features are greater than that of differences.

A relatively late variant of this common Roman liturgy was the rite of the Papal Court, the Romana Curia. This "Curial" liturgy was the starting point of the Council of Trent (more accurately, of the reforms after the Council), hence this "Curial" liturgy determined indirectly the liturgical practice of the 17th to 20th centuries, too. The Tridentine reform did not aim at creating a new, up-to-date liturgy. All it wanted to achieve was to prune off the wild shoots of the late Middle Ages, of humanism and Reformation. It meant to be a reform in the original sense of the word: the restoration of the "pure" forms of the Roman rite. The Trident rite is therefore a special form compared to the liturgy of Paris, Cologne, Prague or to that of the Dominicans, Premonstratensians. The Tridentine reform slightly impoverished the Roman liturgy and mutilated its integrity by disregarding these traditions. (It must be acknowledged, however, that it happened in spite of the original intentions since the norm of Trent was established to replace the 16th-century "modern" reform liturgies, and not the traditions having survived "from time immemorial.")

These drawbacks, nevertheless, can only be discovered if we compare the Tridentinum with eminent representatives of the Roman liturgy. Compared with other rites outside the sphere of the Roman liturgy or with the Bugnini liturgy, the Tridentinum proves to be a member of the Roman liturgy. In this respect the Tridentine rite is identical with the centuries-old Roman liturgy, being one of its branches itself, while the Bugnini liturgy does not belong to the great family of the Roman liturgy.

In my opinion this distinction was neglected by no means innocently or by negligence. It was done with a purposeful manipulation. The reason why the Bugnini liturgy was introduced as if it differed not from the Roman tra-

dition, but only from the Tridentine rite was to create the misleading impression that all we had to depart from was a 400-year-old "Baroque" tradition. In fact, viewed in the light of the essence of the liturgy, breaking with the Tridentine rite entailed a break with the entire Roman tradition up to that point. If the Roman liturgy is identical with the liturgical order documented from the earliest sources up to the year of 1970, then the Tridentine rite is definitely a member of this tradition, while the Bugnini liturgy is not.

It is, of course, possible to say that the Roman liturgy was bad or outdated. In this case the person doing so should proclaim his standpoint openly and assume responsibility for it. Yet he should not give the impression that anybody who adheres to the Roman liturgy in its Tridentine form or to any other variant – as opposed to the Bugnini liturgy – is the slave of a 400-year-old "Baroque" liturgy. All this seems to be a *sermo durus*. But those who had the opportunity to turn the pages of the liturgical books of earlier centuries and learn which Introit, Oration or Gospel belonged to a given day, could without any difficulty "feel at home" in any liturgical book (in spite of some differences) and have the experience of following the path of one and the same tradition. (It has always been an astonishing discovery for my students to recognize the essential identity between the oldest books published by Hesbert in the Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex, on the one hand, and a Graduale Romanum printed in 1930, on the other.) If thereafter the reader takes into his hands the liturgical books of the Bugnini reform, he finds himself in a completely different edifice, in an alien world – even if he succeeds in finding certain elements of the Roman rite in a capricious arrangement.)

And now let us return to a paragraph of my previous chapter. *Dato non concesso*, it was necessary to experiment with a new liturgical order, to create a new rite for the real and demonstrable spiritual benefit of the Church. Nevertheless, it is likewise impossible to justify the attitude which combined this *experiment* with the extirpation of the Roman liturgy – constant in its essence from the earliest documents on. Had they shown a minimal level of fairness and reverence, they would have set forth the new liturgy simply as a "proposal" at the side of the existing liturgical tradition. If the complete unification of the Roman liturgy seemed to be the most urgent task of our days which was carried out with an historically unprecedented severity, and if this aspiration expected a real obedience beyond the laws rooted in the hearts, the moral justification of such a disposal could not have been

a *new* construction invented on office desks or at conference tables, but solely the Roman rite, the unbroken tradition represented in any form.

This does not mean that in my opinion the Roman liturgy ought to be celebrated according to the Tridentine rite and without any changes. I do not deny that a reform of the Roman liturgy was topical at the end of the 20th century. Neither do I claim that a reform should have been based on the Tridentine rite by all means. Yet in reality it should have started from the Tridentine rite as a *status quo* and a liturgical order worth honoring, yielding much fruit in the life of the Church even in our century, a cult deeply rooted in the hearts and connected with the piety of the people. But the Tridentine rite is no more than one and perhaps not the most perfect form of the Roman liturgy. In a true "reform" the medieval traditions of the dioceses and the orders, the relics of the Old Roman rite and, of course, certain requirements of our age should have been taken into consideration. All this could have been achieved without abandoning the domain of the "Roman liturgy."

To sum up: By turning against the Tridentine rite the Bugnini liturgy turned in fact against the whole Roman liturgical tradition. The Bugnini liturgy cannot be placed in the same category with the family of the Roman liturgy consisting of various partial traditions, homogeneous in essence and nicely varied in detail. It fits more comfortably into the set of short-lived renaissance, Neo-Gallican, "aufklärist" reform liturgies from the 16th to the 18th and 19th centuries. This group of reform liturgies is the same which provoked the resistance of the great personalities of the 19th–20th century liturgical movement and which prompted them to evolve their own theology and liturgical practice. It is a tragic fact that the liturgical movement was defeated at the point when it "gained the victory."

2.

The Holy Week is one of the most important elements of our liturgy. It is the center of the whole year and its condition influences the whole liturgical life considerably. It is an exceptional period not only as regards its contents but also in its liturgical forms, worthy of the contents. In establishing the rite of the Holy Week some inner laws of the liturgy played a part in

addition to the contents. They included the effort to protect the liturgy of special periods, before all else the Holy Week, and to preserve within them the most ancient liturgical customs partly because of piety, and partly because they were connected with the contents of the week in the mind of Christians (cp. "Lex Baumstark").

It should be noted that the Roman rite has no other period in the year that preserved so many elements taken over from the customs of the church in Jerusalem as this one. The visualizing force of some liturgical actions (e.g. the rites of Palm Sunday) or the remnants of the veneration of the holy places and relics (e.g. on Good Friday) spread from Jerusalem throughout the whole Church to ensure that nobody is excluded from direct (as it were, physical) contact with the holy secrets. It may have resulted from the fact that the Roman liturgy does not rest satisfied with words but expresses itself in visible symbols and dramatic actions in an exceptionally powerful way during these holy days. By going beyond the sphere of words, a theological perspective manifests itself at the same time which holds that the liturgy is more than a didactic, exhortative or meditative remembrance: it is an action of mystery where, under the veil of an outward act, the facts of our redemption come true in the present. There is also a pastoral benefit to this structure of the Holy Week liturgy which consists in that the whole assembled community may be directly influenced by the liturgical event (regardless of age, education and social environment).

In this respect the Ritus Curiae, and consequently, the Tridentine rite represented a certain decline. Both the conditions and the pastoral stimuli for a colorful realization of such a "depicting" liturgy were absent from the life of the priests of the papal Offices. Evidences of this impoverishment, of the elimination of some powerful dramatic moments are e.g. the reduced form of the Palm Sunday procession, the remnants of the Mandatum and the veneration of altars on Maundy Thursday, the reduction of the procession before the adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, the omission of the closing rites of the Officium Tenebrarum.

The starting point for the reforms of the Bugnini liturgy was this impoverished Tridentine rite. The innovations brought further impoverishments (partly as a norm and partly through their *ad libitum* proposals), giving more and more concessions to liturgical minimalism. On the other hand, the Bugnini liturgy eliminated the special features of the Holy Week and, by adapting the rubrics valid during the whole year, it "standardized" the rites

of the Holy Week (particularly in the Office). These statements will be elucidated by means of examples below. Particulars cannot be discussed in greater length for lack of space but the examination of some important features will suffice to demonstrate the whole procedure.

3.

On PALM SUNDAY the celebration of the high Mass begins with the blessing of fronds and the procession. In the Middle Ages the procession preceded the high Mass on each Sunday. The Palm Sunday procession was a special, expanded form of the regular Sunday procession recalling and representing the events of the day. By doing so the universal Church followed the custom of the faithful of Jerusalem who wandered all over the places of the one-time events and celebrated the memory of Christ's entry into the Holy Town. The station of benediction and the procession are two equally important parts of the rite. Nevertheless, because of the inserted dramatic moments and the role of the children who represented the group of *pueri Hebraeorum* the procession became the principal motive of the liturgical action. The climax of the procession is when the children spread their garments in front of Christ (represented by the processional Cross), when they put the palm branches onto His path and finally, before entering the church, as if it were at the gate of Jerusalem, they pay homage to *Rex Christe Redemptor.* Thus these dramatic moments turned the procession into a chain of events and determined at the same time the exact place of the various chants during procession (*Pueri Hebraeorum vestimenta...*, *Pueri Hebraeorum tollentes ramos...*, *Gloria laus et honor...*, *Scriptum est percutiam...*, *Ingressus Dominus*).

In the Tridentine rite the emphasis shifted to the blessing and so the procession became an unstructured wandering in which the chant had to rest contented with the role of accompaniment and background music. It is therefore small wonder that a great many chants were omitted at that time already and what remained was either left out later or replaced by supplementary material. Only the entry into the church was stressed by chanting the *Gloria laus* and by a small symbolic gesture (a knock on the church gate with the Cross). At the same time, the Tridentine rite gave a long ritual

frame to the benediction (similar to the rite of the Mass), with lengthy readings, prayers, Preface and Sanctus.

The Bugnini liturgy went further in simplification. The benediction was shortened and the procession was retained in its nude form with a minimum of chant material, yet with a permission to substitute it practically by any song. The rubrics introduced further alternative forms which allowed, as it were, the complete abolition of the whole procession (at the very worst the solemn entrance of the priest).

Nevertheless, the re-introduction of the traditional structure of processions and their visual elements (or, at least, the offer of its potential restoration) would be beneficial from a pastoral point of view in our days when the procession cannot leave the church in most places. When scarcity of space only allows the priest, the assistance and the children to participate in the procession, the actions performed before the very eyes of the faithful sitting in the pews would greatly help them enter fully into the spirit of the opening of the Holy Week.

During the procession the role of chants is very important, their message cannot be replaced by anything else. One should not have suggested their substitution but the establishment of closer links between the chant and the action so that the functional meaning of the chants be strengthened. (In the realm of authentic folk customs the more songs were associated with definite points of the custom itself the greater was the chance of their survival.)

Several other details have to be necessarily omitted, yet I want to call attention to two additional factors. An important element of the traditional Roman liturgy both with respect to content and psychological effect is the transition, or rather the change, between the procession and the Mass. The procession is a liturgical action with its own meaning, more than a mere preparation for the Mass! So it was quite logical that the celebrant led the procession in a long vestment (pluvial) and, after having recited the magnificent closing rogation of the procession, changed the vestment adequate for the procession into the chasuble of a priest celebrating the sacrifice. So there remained some time for the choir to sing the proper introduction of the Mass (Introit *Domine ne longe*). This transition is reasonable first, because of the difference of contents and emotional implications between the two celebrations (see the chants, readings and prayers of the Mass!) and second, because of the technical requirements. To stop the move of the

procession, to re-arrange the participants, to transform the assistance – all this could be performed more decently if the Introit and the incensation of the altar allowed sufficient time, more decently than if the procession flowed into the Mass prayer and the readings.

The two chants that had separated the readings – from the earliest choirbooks up to 1970 – were the Gradual *Tenuisti* and the Tract *Deus, Deus meus*. The Bugnini liturgy replaced the beautiful Gradual by another chant, and what is more and quite absurd, the new Graduale Romanum prescribes first the Tract and then a Gradual. (By doing so the authors apparently wish to create a closer link between the chants and the pericopes. I will dwell upon this problem in the fourth chapter of this book.)

4.

The Officium Tenebrarum (i.e. the Matins with the Lauds on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday) must be regarded as an organic part of the Holy Week liturgy. This Office is a precious heritage of the Roman rite (both with regard to contents and form) and we ought to attempt to make it, in one form or another, an essential constituent of even the liturgy of parish churches.

The special features of the Officium Tenebrarum (such as the omission of the invitatory, the hymns, the introductory and closing supplications, the closing of psalm without the doxology) are all relics of an older state of liturgy which the participants do not perceive as historical curiosities but as exceptional forms of an exceptional season: as signs of deep emotion and restriction, as the removal of ordinary ornament on these extraordinary days. In the sphere of customs their function is identical with that of the removal of flowers from the altar and the silence of the organ in another sphere.

The arrangement of the Office on Thursday, Friday and Saturday was practically the same in each liturgical usage starting from the ancient ones to the phase preceding the introduction of the Liturgia Horarum (i.e. until the transitory rearrangement of the Breviarium Romanum). It is remarkable that concerning the Office of Holy Week the monastic branch of the Roman liturgy, which differs structurally from the diocesan rite, fully agrees

with the other members of the Roman rite, and so the Officium Monasticum renounces here the "Benedictine" character for the sake of the common heritage of the Roman Office.

An important part of the Officium Tenebrarum is the set of readings taken from the Lamentations of Prophet Jeremiah. The local traditions differ in the selection of texts but they are all concordant with each other in adapting the Lamentations. The reading of the Lamentations in the liturgy connects the death of Jesus to reminiscences about the fall of mankind, original sin, the tragic fate of Israel and Jerusalem. By doing so the rite renders palpable the connection of the Passion with the history of Salvation as a whole just as the Canon of the Roman Mass does when Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech are mentioned. This is done, however, not by giving a didactic explanation but, according to the style of the liturgy, through a "concealed sermon," in the language of symbols, images, substitutions and identifications.

A precious part of the Officium Tenebrarum is the Litany which finishes the Lauds. It can be found in almost every ancient liturgy and has survived in some of the religious orders until quite recently. The text, the dramatic effect of the "cast," some supporting elements, the artistic insertion of the Gradual *Christus factus est* make it a worthy conclusion to the celebration. Its name in the rite of the Hungarian churches was "Kyrie Puerorum" since each section of the Litany opened with the Kyrie chant of small children (or, in other places, with the chant of the youngest member of the convent or monastery).

The Curial and, consequently, the Tridentine rite preserved the ancient Office almost unchanged and removed only the Litany – befitting communities full of real liturgical life but alien to the clerks of the papal court. It replaced this dramatic part by the simple recitation of Psalm 50 and the chant of *Christus factus est.*

The Bugnini liturgy lacks this subtlety of emotion and reverence. It was unable to accept that the structure of the Officium Tenebrarum should be different from other days in the year. Invitatories, hymns were created or selected to eliminate the "disorder" of the Office of Holy Week. The Laments were omitted since they did not seem to be closely related to the "theme of day." (Parenthetically: through the unwarranted interference of liturgical commentaries, the liturgy became overwhelmed by an exaggerated interest in "themes" which then became one of the main stimuli of the re-

form.) The restauration of the Litany Kyrie Puerorum was, of course, out of the question, in spite of the fact that it could be easily identified with the darling of the Bugnini liturgy, the *Preces*.

In the Bugnini liturgy in the place of the Officium Tenebrarum we can find a meticulously elaborated, ordinary daily Office. Some antiphons and responsories selected from the Roman rite appear here and there, yet the Office itself – preserved thus far in every tradition as the fundamental heritage of the Roman liturgy – was eliminated after a life of at least 1500 years.

5.

The "theme" of the liturgy on MAUNDAY THURSDAY is not the institution of the Eucharist but the whole Paschal Mystery, similarly to Good Friday or Easter Sunday. The classics of liturgical doctrine explained repeatedly that during these holy days our Passover celebration always recalled the memory of Christ's Paschal mystery in its integrity. On a given day some aspects may gain prevalence above the others but always as part of the whole, in close connection with it. Even when viewed separately, the specific content of Maundy Thursday can be regarded as multi-layered combining various elements of the Last Supper, the Lord's Last Sermon, his apprehension and interrogation (chronologically the first events of his Passion). The feelings vibrating in the soul of the Church correspond to the two sayings of the Lord: "With desire I have desired..." – and "Father, if you will..." The reason why in the Middle Ages the Church felt the need to create the Feast of Corpus Domini is because she realized that Maundy Thursday was *not* the feast of the institution of the Eucharist. Maundy Thursday is a day of the celebration of the Paschal Mystery, a day of the celebration of the Passion, a day of presenting the Redemption through mysteries – and in this context and among other motives only – the remembrance of the institution of the Eucharist.

This complexity manifests itself within the Mass, too. The Introit (*Nos autem gloriari*), the Gradual (*Christus factus est*) and the Offertory (*Dextera Domini*) refer to the fundamental element of the celebration, i.e. the whole Paschal Mystery. The Gospel recalls the washing of the disciples' feet, the original oration puts the motive of Judas's betrayal into the context of the Holy Week as a whole.

This statement will prove to be even more valid in view of the fact that the liturgy of Maundy Thursday was not confined to the celebration of the Mass. In the animate medieval liturgy the Mass was followed by a tremendous complexity of rites designated *Mandatum* (see: "Maundy" Thursday). In this rite the washing of feet, the cultic reading of the Last Sermon, the ritual meal (agape), the pious veneration of the altars were all combined to a homogenous sequence of events of dramatic nature. The whole was accompanied by a completely matching set of texts and chants. Besides, we have to mention the ceremony of the "Reconciliation of Penitents" taking place in the morning of this day. It had survived in some religious orders as a rite of purification up to the recent past closing down the Lenten period and preparing the souls directly for Easter. (It is remarkable that some religious orders stressed the unity of this set of rites by taking out the Office and the Mass from the Antiphonaries and Graduals and including them into the Processional as parts of a coherent action.)

The Trident rite may already be blamed for initiating a process which impoverished this liturgically complex and rich day. It turned the ceremony of washing the feet into a separate celebration confined to cathedrals. The veneration of the altars was simplified to a mere divestment of altars accompanied by a murmured psalm. The symbolic agape and all the other elements of the Mandatum were naturally omitted and the "Reconciliation of Penitents" was simply forgotten. The innovation of the reform of Pope Pius XII was to split the Mass into two, making a morning Mass with the benediction of chrism for the cathedrals and an evening Mass with the memory of the Last Supper for all churches. This was the first ordo which suggested that the ceremony of the washing of feet should be included into the Mass (after the Gospel), leaving the rites otherwise unchanged.

Reformers after the Second Vatican Council could have come to the conclusion that their task was to restore the rich liturgy of the Holy Week, marking those simplifications which the small parish churches could carry out with the least possible loss. Instead, recent reforms took the average-size parish church for a point of departure and made its supposed potentials to norm. Based on theoretical considerations, the evening Mass on Maunday Thursday was made the beginning of the triduum sacrum and thus both the Officium Tenebrarum of this day and the morning Mass with the benediction of the chrism were excluded. The Institution of the Eucharist was proposed as the principal message of the Mass, and so the meaning

of the oration and the Gradual *Christus factus est* became obsolete (the latter was replaced by a per annum text with eucharistic content). The possibility of including the foot-washing ceremony after the Gospel was retained; the denudation of the altar after the Mass is still more insignificant in this liturgy than it had been earlier.

Upon reading the description of the earliest witnesses of the Holy Week (e.g. the Jerusalem account of the pilgrim Aetheria) and comparing these memories with the practice of the Eastern Church as well as with the ancient documents of the Latin Church, it becomes clear that originally the Christians celebrated these holy days with a coherent sequence of rites, with a liturgy stretching throughout almost the whole day. The rite of Maundy Thursday according to the Bugnini liturgy is practically identical with the normalized form of the daily Mass, and all further demands are to be met by locally constructed devotions.

The possible arguments to defend these changes are that a "pastoral liturgy" should contain no more than what is executable by the faithful of an average-sized community. This is certainly an essential difference in attitude. In the earlier liturgy it was always the whole Church that celebrated and invited the individual communities and individual faithful to take part in the celebration according to their own circumstances, yet to the greatest extent possible. The Church manifests itself in those parts of the rite as well in which the given community as a whole cannot participate. (In the last analysis two ecclesiological views seem to be at conflict here. The "modern" notion identifies the Church with the edifice built of its members. The classic view of Catholic theology holds that the Church is the city descending from heaven or, in other words: the temple into which the faithful are incorporated.)

In my opinion the task of the reforms should have been to restore the complex order of the Maundy Thursday celebration beginning with the Office of the day and incorporating the rite of purification ("Reconciliatio Paenitentium") closing down the Lenten period; the cathedral Mass with the benediction of the chrism; then the solemn evening Mass; and finally the Mandatum (adapted to present-day conditions but preserving its essence). This ordo represents, of course, an ideal which cannot be realized everywhere in its integrity. But it is good to see it together, to regard this complex as the starting point of the celebration of particular churches while the rubrics for adaptations could refer to legitimate differences of

various church types. But the number of participants should not be the sole criterion in these churches either! The fidelity which leads members of a however small community to celebrate the holy mysteries in the fullest possible way, united with the whole Church and representing their community before God, is honorable indeed, and is to the benefit of the whole Church. As a reward for their fidelity, they will probably see the increase of their small flock sooner or later.

6.

Nor was at one time (according to the consuetudo of medieval churches) the ordo of Good Friday lacking in liturgical ceremonies covering the entire day. For lack of space only the central celebration will now be commented on, i.e. the *Missa praesanctificatorum*. Its main parts were and are still identical in every branch of the Roman liturgy: readings with the Passion, solemn prayers, the adoration of the Cross, and finally the distribution of the praesanctificatorum, i.e. Holy Communion. We experience, however, essential changes in the reformed ordo if we examine the details.

Let us begin with the two readings. For centuries the first reading had been the prophecy of Hosea about the three days of death and resuscitation, while in the second a section from Exodus about the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was read. Attached to the first reading was one of the most important chants of the Christian liturgies, i.e. the canticle *Domine audivi*, whereas the second reading was followed by Psalm 139 of the persecuted Messiah. Both were sung in tract form which bears evidence of the ancientness of the custom on the one hand, and suits excellently the mood of the exceptional liturgical situation, on the other. In fact, this is not the moment when the responsorial chant of the faithful is by all means necessary and desirable. These texts – the words of the Church as she falls on her knees stunned by God's powerful deed in the first tract, and the complaint of the Body of Christ united with its suffering Head in the second – can well-nigh dumbfound the community listening with attention to the words performed by a solo singer or a small choir.

These readings and tracts can be found unchanged in every liturgical book of the Roman rite (the Tridentine rite included), differences appear only in the rituals of the non-Roman churches (Beneventan, Milanese).

The new reform, however, did not find them suitable. The prophecy of Isaiah about the suffering Messiah was transferred from Holy Wednesday to the first place here and, as the second reading, the theological discourse on suffering from the Epistle to the Hebrews can be heard. Both are important and fitting to the day. There is, however, the impression that the change went together with a certain loss, too. The pericope about the sacrifice of the Lamb was taken over to the Mass on Maundy Thursday so as to emphasize the relationship between the Sacred Meal of the New Testament and the Cena Agni of the Old Testament. In my opinion the long text of Isaiah with its almost lyrical tone was at a better place in the period preceding and preparing the holy days. The pericope about the killing of the Lamb collated the Pascha of the two Testaments and by doing so it represented the "nunc" of Good Friday as a meeting point of the great mysteries of the *oeconomia salutis*. I think Maundy Thursday could have been left with one reading and the Gospel according to the ferial order, for then the text on the Lamb could have remained in its theologically justified place on Friday. If we compare the text of Isaiah with the prophecy of Hosea, we will find that the latter – instead of depicting the sufferings in detail – calls our attention to the objectivity of the divine deed manifested in the Paschal Mystery. It seems, however, that we may not count on the understanding of this paragraph these days and so the reading of Isaiah remains the more practical solution.

In my eyes the elimination of the tract from Habakkuk is of even greater loss. In the Christian antiquity this text expressed the amazement of the Church not only on Good Friday (when God manifested himself "in medio duorum animalium" in justice and pity ("in ira misericordiae memor"); but also on other days proclaiming God's magnificent deeds (e.g. in the Christmas Office or the liturgy of the Easter Vigil of the Beneventan church, etc.). "Lord, I have seen your work and I am disturbed..." In the present rite we sing a less characteristic tract after the first reading and a gradual after the second reading (again in a quite absurd sequence as regards chant tradition!).

The place of the solemn prayers has been retained by the Bugnini liturgy as well, whereas the text is substantially rewritten. This new text would deserve a separate study. At any rate, the inserted new elements are conspicuous among the classic phrases by virtue of their style and loquacity.

The culmination of the Good Friday liturgy is the adoration of the Cross. Its origins go back to the customs of the church of Jerusalem. Standing on the mount of Golgotha and venerating the relics of the Holy Cross, the Christians of the Holy City could feel as if taking part in the events of the Passion and Salvation, while sharing in their graces. This astonished feeling of *hic et nunc* must fill the church of even the smallest village in these moments.

In the majority of the liturgical books from before the Tridentine rite there was a dramatically constructed rite, monumental in its simplicity, that preceded the rite of the elevation and adoration of the Cross. Not only preceded but prepared it as well: the events before the rite of adoration gave rise to the community's spiritual attitude necessary for adoration. When the Holy Cross entered the church three stops ("stationes") interrupted the procession. The priest carrying the Cross recited the words of our Savior: "My people, what have I committed against you? and with what have I harmed you? answer me!" It means that the Impropria were originally not songs accompanying the adoration but in the voice of the singer the Savior himself began to speak and he addressed seemingly the people of Israel, in reality the whole of mankind, the whole Church and the community present in the church. The words of accusation were not intended to condemn them but to speak to their hearts, as the Lord himself did: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem ... how often would I have gathered thy children together..." And here we have to think of the psalm verse: "Hodie, si vocem ejus audieritis, nolite obdurare corda vestra!" To this complaint the soul's answer must be complete readiness. Therefore, it is a tempus loquendi for the whole of mankind, for the whole Church, for the two "orbis," East and West, to answer each time: "Hagios ho Theos – Sanctus Deus." And in our days the local community may join in using the vernacular: "Holy is the Lord!" After the three stations, the Cross arrives at the High Altar where the celebrant elevates it singing "Ecce lignum crucis – Behold, this is the wood of the Cross," and the procession of the adoration can start.

The Tridentine liturgy was insensitive to the powerful energy of this rite just as it was insensitive to so many dramatic elements of the liturgy. The Cross was introduced in silence, and the Improperia became a background-music for the adoration. Having lost their specific function, the chants

shared in the fate of the other "accompanying" chants in that they were eliminated or replaced in most churches.

Here again the Bugnini liturgy took the Tridentine rite as its point of departure and not the entire Roman tradition. Its approach to the problems was again to find proposals for further simplification. It draw the final conclusions from the fate of "background chants": some pieces are listed, but they can be replaced by anything else (by any "cantus aptus," – and nobody knows what the "aptus" means in these cases). By doing so, the reform legitimized the process of devalorization which afflicted the chants accompanying the adoration of the Cross in most churches anyway. In general, it can be said that the chants no more carry any definite liturgical message in the new liturgy. Not only did it not occur to them to restore some of those valuable parts omitted by the Tridentinum (e.g. the earlier widespread and beautiful antiphon *Dum fabricator mundi*, the sacerdotal prayers to be said silently during the adoration of the community, the lack of which today indicates a functional hiatus), but even the chants retained by the Tridentine use (e.g. the hymn *Crux fidelis*) received an *ad libitum* character. All this does not matter so much in practice because the procession of adoration is discarded in many churches as something that cannot be realized, and the adoration of the Cross is performed in agreement with the "accelerated tempo of the life of modern man." Nobody thought of how beneficial the dramatic force of the preparatory rite could be in exactly those churches where the whole community cannot take part in the procession. It would provide time and incentive for the people to be involved in this important event, at least spiritually.

In connection with the rite of Holy Communion, let me mention that ancient chant books contain items abounding in profound thoughts and emotions to accompany the procession taking the Host to the altar. (Such is e.g. the hymn *Laudes omnipotes ferimus* which speaks about the unity of the Eucharist and the sacrifice on the cross.) The mystery of the Eucharist as the *memoria passionis* was pointed out in the ancient custom by the priest's elevation of the Host with the intonation: "This is the Body which is given for you," and the choir went on singing the Communion *Hoc corpus*. The new rubrics give instead the usual rite of the Mass with slight abbreviations.

7.

The new arrangement of the EASTER VIGIL is one of the greatest mistakes of the liturgical reform. It shows clearly how weak the theoretical and speculative indications of an arbitrary fabric are compared to the lively order molded by organic development and tradition. A basic principle of the doctrinarian liturgy producers carried through relentlessly during the whole reform process was that the administration of the sacraments and all the exceptional rites have to be inserted into the Mass after the Gospel. They wanted to document thereby the relation of the sacraments to the Eucharist. One could demonstrate how the rigidity of this idea ruined both the logic of the rite of sacraments and the unity of the Mass and, furthermore, what kind of theological distortion lies behind this change of form. But there is even more at stake here. The Easter Vigil is a comprehensive series of rites of dramatic construction built on several different elements of form and content. At the same time it is a very delicate phase in the celebration of the mystery, and the imposition of the above mentioned schematic principle meant a serious interference which resulted in the disturbance of its inner balance.

Today the celebration starts with the blessing of the fire and the Easter candle followed by the *Exsultet* and two to seven readings from the Old Testament. After them the priest intones the *Gloria* (quite unexpectedly, with a sudden change) and then the regular rite of the Mass follows. The Epistle, the *Alleluia reddita*, and the Gospel resemble steps which lead organically to the culmination of the Eucharistic action. Yet instead of ascending we suddenly step back and start reciting the Litany, then celebrate the prolix rite of the blessing of the baptismal font, the administration of baptism, the renewal of baptismal vows. Only after these can we return to the oratio fidelium (the reformers' favorite which appears here as the duplication of the Litany), and finally we arrive at the sacrificial action of the Mass. Anyone who had the chance of entering fully into the spirit of the earlier forms of the Vigil (or at least the form ordered by Pope Pius XII) has to undergo a series of disappointments and breaks, suffer the marred sequence of actions of the most holy liturgy of the Vigil year by year.

The reformers ought to have admitted the fact that certain celebrations and feasts may have their own logic of content and form and, as a result, their own emotional, psychological and dramatic implications, and that

these "exceptions" are useful not only in respect to the representation of liturgical ideas but they are of pastoral benefit as well. Unification, the emergence of stereotypical forms is not the highest asset to the liturgy. In defining the arrangement of the Easter Vigil the principle forced through in the rite of Sacraments cannot be a conclusive argument.

In the Roman liturgy the Vigil had two principal structural forms as documented in and known from the most ancient sources. Each is logical in its own kind. One of them survived in the Beneventan rite (so it cannot be called "Roman") where after a beautiful introductory antiphon (*Ad vesperum demorabitur fletus...*) the celebration starts with the readings. For the people prepared by the readings the ceremony of the birth of light and the benediction of the Paschal candle symbolized the moment of resurrection. Their own resurrection was celebrated then in the mystery of Baptism, and thus the community buried and risen in Christ could strengthen its unity with its Head in the Eucharist.

The second main type was universally accepted with minor variations in the whole Roman liturgy. Here the rite began with the benediction of the fire, outside the church. The consecration of the Paschal candle took place in the frame of the Exsultet after entering the church. This first climax was followed by a period of calm meditation when the catechumens and the faithful were taught by the "prefigurative" readings of the Old Testament. Then the rite became livelier again: the community went over to the baptismal church singing the Litany. After the baptismal font was "fecundated" and God's children were born out of the sacred womb (i.e. the womb of *mater Ecclesia*), the community returned to the main church singing a Litany again. By going to and coming back from the baptistery both in the physical and spiritual sense of the word, we follow the customs of *mater omnium ecclesiarum*, i.e. the customs of the Lateran church. The liturgy of the Resurrection itself is over now, the mystery is completed with the Eucharist, and the Mass is closed down with an abbreviated form of the thanksgiving Vespers or Lauds.

The rhythm of the whole sequence of rites is masterly balanced and straight in its progression. The transition to the Mass is guaranteed by the Litany which closes the baptismal rite, and so we arrive at the Glory in a natural way. (In some medieval churches the celebrant was invited with a trope to sing the intonation of the Gloria and so the introduction was still accentuated.) The sequence of oration, Epistle and Alleluia emphasized in

many churches by a threefold intonation, and a fine trope ("Jam Domnus optatas reddit Laudes...") in others, speeds up the tempo. The risen Lord manifested himself to his disciples first in the Gospel then by way of the sacrament and let his members share in the meal.

As written repeatedly before, it is astonishingly audacious to upset a clear liturgical order chiseled by tradition. If somebody anathematizes this ordo for the sake of his own invention, it is near impudence. And it is particularly so if it is qualified as disobedience or unecclesiastical behavior when somebody regards the original order of the Roman liturgy to be clearer, more dignified and worthier to the feast.

There are problems not only as regards the structure but also with respect to the details of the ceremony of the Vigil. Limited space does not permit the analysis of the various individual texts here but some elements can be mentioned.

The rite originally began with the blessing of the fire outside the building. (In many churches the procession was accompanied, and the events commented by, chanting the ancient hymn of Prudentius *Inventor rutili dux bone luminis.*) After the blessing of the fire there followed the blessing of the candle already inside the church while the Exsultet was being recited. As shown by its form (*Praefatio*), the Exsultet was originally more than a mere verbal action (*praeconium paschale*, i.e. the announcement of Easter). It was the frame and the means for the *consecration* and offering of the candle. This fact has its cultic and pastoral implications. The consecration of the candle is not a mere introduction to, or preparatory blessing before, the rite itself. The words of the Exsultet help us to see in the candle the symbol of the risen Savior as well as the symbol of the Church offering herself to God. From a practical and pastoral point of view, the rite of the blessing or consecration of the candle is more impressive if it is connected with the Exsultet. In this case the words and actions, the signs seen and heard are combined, they accentuate and complement each other. On ancient Exsultet rolls we can observe the candle being depicted as high as a tower and the deacon standing beside it with a long stick in his hands to raise the fire to the candle while singing the Exsultet. Thus the consecration of the candle happened in the main apse of the church in a well visible manner. The symbol of the candle and its consecration were explained by the Exsultet itself. The long text of the Exsultet was easier to follow if visual elements and events made it livelier. The Exsultet was simplified into a *praeco-*

nium without any action as early as the reforms of Pius XII. It is no wonder that the Bugnini reform had only one thing to do: to abbreviate it.

The Roman rite gave more alternatives regarding the number and selection of the Old Testament readings. This fact entitles the people of our time to rearrangement. For the number of readings two systems are known. One is the remnant of the ancient whole-night vigils and requires twelve readings. The other, more general usage ordered four readings in proportion with the long, complex celebration. As to the content, both systems emphasized two readings of fundamental importance. The first is the reading about the Creation of the world, which stressed one of the main ideas of the liturgy, namely the interrelation between Creating and Re-Creating. The other was the description of the Exodus. In the four-reading system two further readings were added to them: the prophecy about the time of the Messiah and the admonition to the chosen people: they should now live worthily to what God has done to them.

The liturgical reform defined the number of readings in seven, making only two of them obligatory. The pericope of the Exodus cannot be omitted, otherwise the priest has the right to choose. (In our experience the priests usually choose the shortest possible readings, hence they omit the reading about the Creation; besides, they strive to achieve "variety" from year to year.)

In my opinion this night is not the liturgical moment in which "variety" should be sought. It is better to determine the best selection and associate it with the day so that it can aid the deeper involvement of the congregation in the mystery. Stability has more to offer to the faithful. When the great day returns again the next year, it brings back to memory everything that belongs to this day. Possibly, the selection of the traditional readings may not be the best one. Nevertheless, the disorder of our time can be justified neither by the content of the liturgy nor with its supposed pastoral benefit.

The shorter, four-reading system given by tradition could be upheld. Of course, for somebody who does not regard this group of readings as an autonomous part of the vigil (which has its analogies in the old custom of vigils, the arrangement of the Beneventan rite, and also the separate celebrations with readings alone in the Eastern churches) but simply as an extension of the present part of Mass readings, even two lections appear to be too much. According to this concept, the Exsultet is no more than a substi-

tute for the Introit after which it would be enough to recite the oration and the reading about the Exodus, and then the Mass could continue in its usual course.

The Vigil, however, is not an exceptional form of the Mass but an autonomous rite built up according to its own logic, different from any other celebration. The Old Testament readings with their "prefigurative" meaning are meant to help the catechumens and all the faithful who will receive the renewed grace of Baptism. They all have to understand better from these words what the mystery is that they share in and, I think, four readings is the minimum requirement for such an effect. In my opinion these readings should by necessity be always the same. The selection must be well weighed so that they clarify the complex meaning of Baptism from different angles. I cannot see why it is pastorally more effective if a priest picks a reading following his own whims. I think the reading about the Creation ought to be an obligatory first pericope and the Exodus the second. In the third place perhaps a more appropriate pericope could be selected instead of the prophecy of Isaiah (e.g. the paragraph from Ezekiel). The last reading ought to be the admonition of Moses. As an appendix, a series of further readings could be added for those who wish to prolong the Vigil.

We have seen that the Litany within the Vigil of the Roman liturgy did not interrupt the dynamism of the Mass (as the new order does, as if going back from the Gospel to the Kyrie). The Litany put the rite in motion after the community had calmed down in the meditative atmosphere of the readings. Regarding its content, the Litany is not a *Litania omium sanctorum:* it is the sole liturgical Litany of the Church, an authentic and solemn form of the *oratio fidelium.* This Litany had a relatively free form which could easily adapt itself to the liturgical context. In this case it was not an extension or transformation of the list of saints that one ought to have aimed at, but the wording of the prayers belonging to the Vigil, before all else, to the baptismal rites. With a delicate sense for proportions it can be determined what the ideal length of the Litany is, short enough not to break the unity of the celebration and long enough to prepare proportionally the baptismal rite.

The blessing of the font was a key text of our liturgy. This Preface is again an "effective" (and not a declarative) word, and it was accompanied by appropriate actions. I think the real solution was not to abbreviate it, but rather its text should have been used as the basis of catechetical instruc-

tions, so that the faithful could listen to it fully, consciously from year to year and could understand better and better what has happened to them in Baptism. This Preface makes clear that Baptism is more than an act of joining the followers of Christ, it is more than making an act of faith. It is substantially a supernatural *event* taking effect ex opere operato. The generative power of Christ's redemptive act fecundates the womb of Mother Church (which was expressed without prudery in the fine language of symbols by the candle being let down into the baptismal font), and the font becomes the place of a mystical birth now and at every Baptism. It is hard to understand why the importance of the font (one of the cultic places of the church) and the dignity of parish churches ("baptismal church" in the old terminology) had to be neglected, and why the whole blessing of the font had to become an empty ceremony in recent times when the common font is not used and the water is blessed for each administration of Baptism not as an exception but as a norm.

The Vigil liturgy of the Roman rite was not an extended variant of the Mass. It consisted of well-rounded sections making up a perfectly structured unity. Whoever had the chance to take part in it, keeps the memory of the unforgettable moment when the series of rites turned – with a well perceptible change – into the rite of the Mass. The rite started in the darkness of the tomb, and the nearer it got to the highlight of the celebration, the more the inner direction of the whole rite became expressed in outward forms. At the beginning of the rite the celebrant was not dressed in white garments and the altar was without the usual ornaments. He who entered the church found himself in the silence of Good Friday. It was the Church reborn in Baptism that later adorned its edifice: the flowers were placed onto the altar before the beginning of the Mass only, and then the priest put on the white chasuble for the Mass. The reform may have intended to assist the faithful in taking the whole Vigil more seriously, yet as a result, the inner divisions of the rite became somehow blurred. I am of the opinion that the indifference of the new liturgy to the signs of changes shows a lack of taste and it was harmful to the liturgy of the Vigil.

The length and content of the celebration needs a closing proportionate with, and worthy of, the whole. This might be the reason why the custom survives up to the present day that a short Vespers (or Lauds in the last decades) stood in the place of the Communion chant. This extension of the rite was probably an extra burden for some priests. But if the new order al-

lows us to sing *anything* during the Communion what argument can be raised against the chanting of Psalm 150 and the Benedictus (or Magnificat) with the antiphon *Et valde mane*? It would be helpful if the liturgical books contained these parts at least *ad libitum* because experience shows that the pedantic clergy frequently thinks: what is omitted from the books is also prohibited.

8.

In churches where the community wants to celebrate the liturgy in its full richness, the triduum is concluded with solemn Vespers and not with the high Mass of Sunday. The introduction to the Liturgia Horarum makes allusion to the baptismal thanksgiving Vespers that most readers probably do not even understand: "where known it may be retained" (paragraph 213.) This short sentence hints at one of the most admired rites of the Roman church (called "gloriosum officium" by Amalarius) contained in the earliest Roman "ordinaries," the "Old-Roman" sources, and in almost all of the liturgical books of medieval dioceses. After the Tridentine reform, there were only a few religious orders that kept it. Therefore, obscure hints like the one in the Liturgia Horarum are hardly worth anything. It would have been a great achievement if the reform had tried to restore this Vespers in its full splendor. It would have been more appropriate since the content of the Vespers is concordant with the theology of the Second Vatican Council. The solution would have been to propose both a full and a simple form of the Vesperae Baptismales (preserving its substance in both forms), to give a chance for its realization in cathedrals, cloisters and even in churches of the smallest villages. In order to be able to do so, one ought to comprehend that through the mutually supportive devices of words, sounds, chants, motions, actions and symbols the rites teach more to the people about the dignity of Baptism and its relationship to Christ's death and resurrection than endless homilies, frequently interposed sacerdotal sermonizing, and the celebrant's "creativity." *Sacris erudiri*... It is sad that the "spiritual benefit," i.e. the only motive the Liturgical Constitution indicated as justification for the innovations, never inspired the bureaucrats of the reform to offer the Church something *more*.

* * *

To sum up: we have seen that the Bugnini liturgy tried to adapt the Tridentine rite (the branch of liturgy belonging to the Roman rite but having somewhat impoverished forms) to the supposed conditions and requirements of our age, or rather to the categories living in the minds of the reformers. By doing so it conflicted with the frequently mentioned pastoral benefit, too. In Hungary we managed to include some elements of the Roman heritage into the new Catholic Hymnal and, what is more, the full earlier "ordo" (adapted to present-day conditions) was allowed to be restored in one church with ecclesiastical approbation *ad experimentum*. According to the unanimous reaction of the participants the effect of the rites was fascinating, and they surpassed even the Tridentine rite reformed by Pope Pius XII, not to mention the dry reformed liturgy.

3. The Divine Office

In the most splendid periods of the liturgy Christian communities afforded the same reverence and attention to the Office as to the Mass. The Eucharist undoubtedly surpasses any other service as to its ontological meaning and effects in the order of divine grace. But the potentials of the Office are greater with respect to its psychological and catechetical influence.

A. Lessons from the History of the Roman Office

1. The roots

Although the Office has its roots in the Old Testament and the religious customs of the whole of mankind, what we call Office in the strict sense of the word was born no earlier than the 3th–4th centuries, when earlier elements of Christian piety were integrated into a logical structure. The consideration of these constituents helps us to understand better the problems about the Office today.

The first constituent was the *continuous praying of psalms.* It was "continuous" in two respects: a) it was a permanent and unceasing sacrifice of praise; and b) its essential feature was to pray them in the numerical order of the Psalter. The Psalter in its Christian understanding (which is more than a purely scientific explanation and goes back to Christ himself) became the most important, we might even say, the *only* prayer-book of Christianity. The psalms were prayed privately on different occasions by lay men and clergy, and the Psalter functioned as the "libretto" of chant during the services. Altthough psalms could certainly be specially selected to consecrate particular feasts and seasons, yet the continuous psalmody has the added distinct capacity of encompassing the totality of Christian life with its manifold motives and experiences that are not infrequently at variance with each other. When the Psalter is prayed in its order, the faithful accept the holy words from the very hand of God, without picking and choosing, in the order determined by God's will manifesting itself through the twists and turns of human history. The "kathisma" in the Office of the Eastern Churches or the continuous psalmody of the Ambrosian Office demonstrate the univer-

sality and spiritual meaning of this practice. The difference between the rites was the length of the period within which the entire Psalter had to be prayed through. In the Roman rite the entire Psalter had to be prayed fully in *one* week. St. Benedict regarded one week as optimal: it is a period of suitable length without the burden of a "full Psalter each day" as it was the custom with the severe desert Fathers. At the same time, the regimen of a weekly Psalter was deemed sufficient to defend monks from sinking into laxity.

The second component of the Office is the *observance of the holy Hours* of the day. For man, confined by time and subjected to its inevitable erosion, the set hours of a day, the observation of fixed hours is really a healing. Since the time when man first turned to God, morning and evening have always been regarded as most compelling, as it were, obligatory hours for prayer. There is nothing else that makes us more conscious of the frailty of our existence and dependence on our Creator than the birth and fall of the daylight. These hours were the hinges of the liturgical day for the Old Testament as well. Its observance might vary according to different conditions and the zeal of individuals, but the Church as a whole keeps with a common obligation at least the preparatory vigils before greater feasts and – according to an old tradition – the vigils in memory of the dead.

The third component came from the desire to keep the rule of "ceaseless praying" ("sine intermissione orate" 1 Thess. 5:17.) also during the course of daily work. When we turn to God periodically, even if for a short time, we raise all our actions and our entire life into the sphere of God's power. "To pray ceaselessly equals with keeping the fixed hours" – as the masters of the first centuries taught.

The Office Hours celebrated with the participation of the lay people differed from the continuous psalmody in three respects:

i. Instead of praying the entire Psalter, certain psalms were selected to fit the occasion, and they remained more or less stable. Such psalms are e.g. 50, 62, 148-150, and the canticle *Benedicite* for the morning, or psalm 118 for the daytime; psalm 140 was regarded as the best for sunset; psalms 4, 90 and 133 for the night. The essence of the Hour was to recite these selected psalms.

ii. While the continuous psalmody was regarded as the task chiefly of individual devotees or monastic communities, the Office of the Hours was celebrated regularly together with the people. An old Christian writing says that he who is absent from the morning and evening prayers, not only harms himself, but also truncates the Body of Christ.

iii. The presence of the congregation inspired the inclusion of blessings, orations, processions with lights, incense, and the solemn rites performed by the clergy (dialogues, sermons, invocations).

Scholarly literature designates this service "Cathedral Office." To avoid misunderstanding we will refer to it with the "modern" term Folk Office or Parish Office.

The Office, in the broad sense of the word, was prayed by the Christian Church from the dawn of her existence. Paul and Silas sang psalms in the prison in full voice so that other people could hear it (Acts 16:25). The Office, in the strict sense of the word, was born when the constituents above have been integrated and the continuous psalmody has been built organically into the regular "Folk Office." This historical process was affected by the foundation of urban monasticism: the monks moved into the cities and became catalysts of the "pastoral" liturgy, and consequently, of the Parish Office. Simultaneously, once the persecutions stopped, the parish churches were provided with priests, deacons, acolytes, lectors, psalmists, and so became able to sing the full Office day by day, and to pray it not only with the people (*cum populo*), but also for the people (*pro populo*).

The coalescence of the components proved very successful. The continuous psalmody provided a stable order and tranquility to the Office, and it also corresponded to the obligation of the periodic recitation of the full Psalter. The "Parish Office" offered a stable framework to composition, made it possible to recite the outstanding psalms more frequently, added influential elements and rituals to the psalmody, and increased its beauty along with its efficacy. This well-balanced, we may say, classic arrangement of the Office was achieved in the 4th and 5th centuries, was uniform over the entire Christian world in its essential motives, while the actual solutions differed according to the great ecclesiastical provinces.

2. *The formation of the Roman Office*

Perhaps the most mature construction in the realm of Office varieties is the proper Office of Rome. Its elements were ready by the 4th, or at the latest, by the 5th century. When St. Benedict of Nursia gave an Office to his monks (beginning of 6th century), he had no more to do than to adapt the Roman Office to the living conditions of the monastery. This 4th–5th-century form of the Roman Office has been augmented during the subsequent centuries, and it eventually gave birth to a great family of various related Offices, while in essence it remained unchanged up until the 20th century. What is meant by the term "Roman Office" is this 1500-year old structure, yet not any *one* individual form of it (like the Tridentine Office), but the totality expressed in the rites of dioceses and religious orders. In this sense it can be said that the Roman Office – originated in the 4th or 5th century – was deadly wounded around 1900, and ceased to exist in 1970.

We are now going to describe briefly the essential features of this Roman Office.[5]

2.1. The "natural" character of the Roman Office is a result of an organic development that did not conceal the traces of historically diverse components or the different roots of the Hours, in spite of the necessary unification. Lauds and Vespers, the Vigil and the group of daytime Little Hours sensibly differ in length, structure and atmosphere.

The Vigil consists of the alternation of longer psalmody and reading in accordance with the longer night watch and its contemplative character. The Hour is preceded by the invitatory, which does not belong to the beginning of the astronomical day, rather it is a proportionate introduction of the longer Hour and, at the same time, the overture of the liturgical day started by the Vigil.

Lauds and Vespers are the most "liturgical" Hours: their dominating element is praise; the ceremonial elements of the ancient "Folk office" survived mostly in these two Hours. Their perfect construction with a steady build-up from the Old Testament psalms through the reading of the Bible up to the hymn, the New Testament canticle and the collect is not only composed with a perfect dramatic and psychological sense, but it also expresses the theological idea of man's salvation proceeding from prophecy to

5 The description refers primarily to its "secular" form (used in dioceses).

fulfillment, from Creation (psalms) through Redemption (hymn, canticle) to Sanctification (collect).

The structure of the Little Hours corresponds to their function. The psalms are short and always the same so that they can be prayed without a book with only a short stop in our daily activity. St. Benedict went one step further when he adapted them still more to the life of his monks (which stands closer to the life of a working man today, than the life of a clerical society does). Terce, Sext, None with their short and stable texts are easy to pray within four or five minutes. They constitute the "most modern" element of the ancient Roman Office ("modern" here simply means fitting to the lifestyle of contemporary men).

Compline, a blessing of nightly rest, is also short and unchanged. Its form corresponds to the natural need to calm down the soul at the close of the day, and spur the praying man on to sleep. (One can feel its spiritual significance much better in a Benedictine monastery, where the community each day recites by heart in the dark church Psalms 4, 90, 133.)

The different character of the Hours is also manifest in the different placement of the hymn: in the "quiet" Hours (Vigil, Little Hours), the hymn starts the celebration, while in the "dynamic" Hours it stands before the canticle.[6]

In sum, the first heritage of the Roman Office is the preservation of the different characters of the Hours, according to their origin and distinctive structure.

2.2. The specific character of the Hours depends mostly on the most constitutive element of the Office, i.e. the distribution of psalms. The Roman Office combined the two principles of distribution in a masterful way:

Selected psalms (psalm sections) are to be prayed in the Little Hours, each day the same: the "divisiones" of Psalm 118, i.e. of the psalm that places all human activity permanently under the dominance of God's Law. St. Benedict replaced this psalm on weekdays by nine "gradual" psalms (119–127), which express the basic motives of Christian life in great variety and in texts shorter than the sections of psalm 118. (While in the original form of the Roman Office each of the Little Hours contained $3 \times 16 = 48$ psalm verses, the Benedictine series gives 24 verses in Terce, 18 in Sext and 20 in None.) The psalms of Prime and Compline do not vary.

6 See more on this subject in Chapter 1.

Three of the psalms in Lauds are unchanged, while two psalms change according to the given day of the week. The unchanged psalms go back to a very ancient, as it were, obligatory practice: psalm 50 (on feasts: 92), the morning twin-psalms 62 + 66, and the typical "Lauds" psalms, 148 + 149 + 150 connected. (The connection of these three comes from the Old Testament and they also refer to the Resurrection.) In between two of the unchanging psalms two others are inserted: the "proper psalm" of the day in the second place (99, 5, 42, 64, 89, 142, 91 beginning with Sunday; each of them referring to the light and morning!); and the proper canticle of the day in the fourth place. According to St. Benedict's testimony, the selection of the canticles is part of an old Roman tradition.

The continuous psalmody dominates the Vigil and Vespers: psalms 1–108 are assigned to the night Hour and 109–147 to Vespers. (The psalms selected for the other Hours are skipped over in the continuous psalmody.)

Night Vigil	Lauds	Prime	Little Hours	Vespers	Compline
1–108	50, X, 62 + 66, X, 148-150	117, 118/I–II	T: 118/III–V, S: 118/VI–VIII, N: 118/IX–XI	109–147	4, (30/1–6), 90,133

NB. X means that the particular psalm/canticle of Lauds changes day by day.

NB. The 11 (double-) sections marked in psalm 118 contain 16 verses.

NB. In St. Benedict's system Psalm 118 is divided into 22 single sections (8 verses each). Sections 1–4 are prayed at Prime, the rest three by three in the Little Hours of Sunday and Monday. From Tuesday until Saturday the nine gradual psalms are recited each day: Terce: 119–121, Sext: 122–124, None: 125–127.

NB. The Benedictine (monastic) Compline leaves out verses 1–6 of psalm 30.

In sum: the second heritage of the Roman Office is a reasonable combination of the two ancient systems, and as a result, a clear, practical, and meaningful distribution of the psalms which is easy to keep in mind.

2.3. In the distribution of the psalms and also in other parts of the Office the traditional numerical arrangement prevails (it sometimes received a mystical explanation). It is easy to recognize a proportionate relationship between the structure of the Hour and the number of its psalms (3 psalms in the Little Hours, 5 psalms in Lauds and Vespers, 12 psalms in the Vigil). As patristic writers already observed, the number of nocturnal psalms equals the sum of the psalms in the four daytime Hours. The Vigil of Sun-

day and the feasts is regulated by another principle; the smooth alternation of psalmody and readings is characterized by the number three. It has three parts (nocturns), each with 3 psalms (with their own antiphons), and 3 readings (with their own responsories). Each nocturn is provided with readings of different types (biblical, patristic or hagiographic and homiletic). The reading of each nocturn is in turn divided into three by responsories; thus the attention is prevented from drifting even during the relatively longer texts.

In sum: the third heritage of the Roman Office is a tranquil and harmonic numerical order (in contrast, e.g. with the irregular number of psalms in the Ambrosian Office), related to the structure of the given Hour.

It is true: the total duration of the psalmody is regulated by the number of the psalms recited, and not by their length. As a result, the time needed for reciting the daily portion of psalms became different. To eliminate this anomaly the Roman monastic Office divided the longer psalms into two.

2.4. The Rule of St. Benedict bears witness to the fact that readings from the Bible and from the Church Fathers were part of the Night Office. In early times the selection was left to the head of the local community, only the orthodoxy of the writer had to be examined carefully. As time went on, the "pericopes" became regulated by customary lists and later by lectionaries.

The matter was different with the biblical readings. In the second phase of development not only the appropriate readings of the feasts but also the continuous reading of Holy Scripture (*scriptura occurrens*) became fixed. The books of the Torah had to be read from Septuagesima Sunday on, then the book of Jeremiah (in Passiontide). In Eastertide readings from the New Testament (except the Gospels and St. Paul's letters) interrupted the succession. After Pentecost they took up the series with the books of Kings, of Wisdom (August), Job, Tobias, Judith, Ester (September), and the Macchabees (October). In November the Prophets followed and in Advent Isaiah. After Epiphany the series was closed by St. Pauls's letters. The *scriptura occurrens* did not mean reading the full books; in the selection of passages some freedom was granted to local decisions.

In sum: The fourth heritage of the Roman Office is the principle ruling the distribution of Office readings during the year. The arrangment of the readings influenced, in turn, the composition of some chant items (responsories, antiphons).

2.5. We know from St. Benedict's Rule that the great feasts had their proper psalms, antiphons and responsories. It can likewise be taken for granted that the *per annum* part of the year also possessed a fixed repertory of antiphons and responsories. The collection that contained this repertory was later called antiphonary or 'antiphonarium officii.'

With some simplification the antiphonary can be divided into three layers:

To the first belong the antiphons and responsories of the weekly Psalter and of the great ancient feasts. Their texts are mostly taken from the psalms (or the life story of the saint celebrated). They constitute a homogeneous group with respect to music, and they can with great probability be dated back to the first centuries of the Roman Office. This group was preserved during the following centuries, although the use of the psalmic responsories was pushed back to a limited period of the year (from Epiphany to Septuagesima). The repertory and its liturgical arrangement is practically a common feature of all the churches of the Roman rite.

The second layer is the fruit of the full development of the liturgical year. To this category belong the prophetic antiphons and responsories of Advent, the non-psalmic items of the great feasts, the antiphons to the Lenten Gospels. The last addition might be the "great antiphons" of Sundays taking their text from the daily Gospel. The majority of these pieces might originate in the period between the 6th and 9th centuries. They are a little lengthier than the pieces of the first period, but they all follow the old chant style. This repertory is also a common property of the Western Church, though differences can be found among the local churches in respect to its selection and distribution.

The third layer consists of additions during the 9th to 15th centuries. The growing number of the feasts of saints inspired new and new antiphons and responsories. Their acceptance is uneven and constitutes considerable differences between the local traditions.

In sum: the fifth heritage of the Roman Office is the Roman Antiphonary, first of all, in its first and second layers.

The Roman Office is essentially one and the same with all the families of *Christian rites.* Such common features are, e.g. the use of psalms, the characteristics of the Hours, the combination of the continuous and selected psalmody, the liturgical genres of the Office (antiphon, responsory), and the assignment of some eminent psalms.

Within this framework the Roman Office belongs to the family of *Latin liturgies*. Again we find common points between them, e.g. the inclusion of the Magnificat at Vespers, the selection of Old Testament canticles, etc.

Narrowing the circle we arrive at the *Roman Office*, which is an individual local branch of this common tradition, perhaps the most outstanding specimen of the great local liturgies.

When during the Great Migration Rome extended her missions to the newly settled populations, the missionaries took their liturgical books and liturgical experience with them into these new local churches, and everywhere they started singing the Office accordingly. The expansion of the Roman rite in Europe reached even the old territories of Christianity, and consequently most of the local liturgies disappeared (except the Ambrosian rite). The Office of Rome became *the Office of the entire Western Christendom.*

3. The Roman Office in the Middle Ages

The structure of the Roman Office remained untouched in every important aspect from the 4th or 5th until the beginning of the 20th century. The repertory grew, the number of antiphons and responsories became multiplied during the centuries: If we count with an old repertory that contained the *per annum* antiphons and the responsories taken from the Psalter, the psalmic pieces of some great solemnities and the common of saints, then the size can be estimated to be no more than 4–5 hundred antiphons and 2–3 hundred responsories in St Benedict's time. In contrast, the content of an average medieval antiphonary includes two thousand antiphons and one thousand responsories or more. New and new items, later whole cycles ("*historiae*") were composed to embellish the new feasts, to solemnize the cult of saints celebrated only by a common Office earlier.

The more ancient a piece is, the more it figures as part of the *common* Roman heritage of Europe. The younger items appear as *local* additions to the basic antiphonary, always inspired of course by the age old tradition. Both layers have their own value, though their prestige is of different rank.

As I have mentioned the common heritage did not exclude the formation of new offices by the local churches and the appearance of varieties characteristic of the local use. These varieties resulted in no change as regards the structure of the Hours and distribution of psalms; legal differences touched upon the distribution and practical use of the antiphonary,

completed with some additions. They provided the diocesan Offices with a special "color," and whoever celebrated the Office in the choir, probably felt himself quite at home both in the Roman rite as a whole (transmitted to him through his proper church), and in the "domestic" tradition worthy of special respect and emotional adherence.

A number of religious orders used the Benedictine variant of the Roman Liturgy, with more or less local rearrangements and additions. On the other hand, orders founded later as associations of the secular clergy adapted the Office of their settlement (e.g. the Augustine canons), or of the place of their foundation (e.g. the Dominicans), and both became regarded as their proper Office, the expression of their identity. If the saying is true: "*chorus facit monachum*" (= the common Office makes the monk), we may complete it: "*hic chorus facit hunc monachum*" (= the order's own Office forms the self-identity of the monk).

Within this multiplicity a special role was kept in store for the "Curial Office", i.e. the form prayed by the clergy of the Papal Offices. This derived from an Old Italian branch of the Roman Office, and had been slightly simplified according to the demand of the members of the Curia. The elements linked specifically to the liturgy of cathedrals and parish churches were here omitted as unnecessary for a priest without pastoral duties. A version of the "Officium Romanæ Curiæ" became also the proper Office of the Franciscans.

The most important change that influenced the place of the Office in the life of the Church was the gradual spreading of the so-called "private Office." Though the congregation in the Parish churches had stopped singing the Office regularly as early as the second half of the first millenium, nevertheless, they participated at least passively in the Vesperal Office of Sundays and feasts. Insofar as the priests are concerned, at least in principle, the Office remained the official act of praise sung in common, practically however, more and more priests fulfilled their obligation regularly by the mute reading of their "breviary." This change did not influence the Office itself. The dialogues, responsorial forms, genres connected with singing survived even in the read Office, and no Office text was produced without melody. Yet step by step the private reading of the Breviary became the norm. The service with its dramatic structure, singing performance, and lay participation was transformed into a meditation and a prayer for feeding

the priests' spirituality. At the end of the Middle Ages the notated books gave place to the unnotated (printed) Breviaries.

4. Reform liturgies and Trident

Toward the end of the Middle Ages, the Office was heaving with appendices and new items, and so its reform seemed to be a pressing necessity. The intentions pointed into two opposite directions.

Some wished to modernize it opening free entrance to "reasonable" proposals and ideas inspired by the spirit of "Humanism." This tendency represented an overt departure from the Roman tradition. One of the experiments gained wide acceptance: a new breviary published under the name of cardinal Quignonez made the Office more "rational." It ousted a great part of the traditional repertory, made the Hours quite uniform (with three psalms in each), and removed the chanted genres. The result was a short, "geometrically" arranged breviary, destined for reading. Since this breviary shortened the portion of the priests' daily prayer considerably, it gained rapid and wide acceptance.

The other proposal was to "purify" the Office from the "ballasts" and restore it in the spirit of tradition. This trend found a good argument partly in the results of the "humanistic" reforms, partly in the liturgical innovations of Protestantism, which made clear (in a negative way) how closely the cult is connected with the *depositum fidei* (the preservation of the purity of faith).

The Tridentine Council rejected the reform Offices (the Quignonez breviary included). Those who were obliged to pray the Office could either return to their traditional local (-Roman) rite, or take over the new Roman-Tridentine liturgical books planned to be prepare subsequently.

The new breviary published with the authority of St. Pius V was a slightly modified version of the Officium Romanae Curiae which was the supposed "authentic" form of the Roman tradition. The medieval additions and the legacy of the Carolingian or Post-Carolingian times (accepted earlier in great parts of Europe) were to a great extent omitted, and the Tridentine Breviary (like its predecessor, the Curial one) also ousted the "pastoral" elements taken over from the tradition of ancient Roman basilicas.

When speaking of the Tridentine rite, we have to avoid, in my opinion, two misleading views. The Tridentine rite cannot be recommended as the

only way to return to the authentic Roman liturgy. The Roman rite was rich in different traditions, and they all represented the same "Roman" rite. So Rome is not equal with Trident.

But, on the other hand, Trident was not something basically different from the traditional Roman liturgy, it was not a 16th-century innovation. The Tridentine liturgy was identical in all essential elements with the Roman tradition – already a 1000 or more years old at the emergence of the Tridentine rite.

The first error is much less harmful, but both come from the same misinformation or (in the second case) a purposeful and tendentious falsification.

The Tridentine Breviary was not declared obligatory: the local rites representing at least 200 years of tradition could be maintained in the future. In spite of this "right of long-standing tradition" they were abandoned almost everywhere, and the Tridentine Office gained universal acceptance.

The wave of reforms finally abated and only unessential changes were introduced during the subsequent three centuries. Nevertheless, the "rationalistic" reform-endeavors did not cease in the period. In France almost each diocese had its own Neo-Gallican Office, though their destructive influence (severely attacked 150 years ago by Dom Prosper Guèranger) remained confined to a narrow sphere.

The process – started in the Middle Ages – of making the normal form of the Office (prayed in chorus) an exception and the exceptional form (private breviary of the priest) a norm, continued in this period. The consequences badly influenced even the most recent events. The singing of the Office survived though part of the daily service of some monasteries and cathedrals; Vespers celebrated along with the congregation continued to exist in some regions (the peasant population of Hungarian villages sang Vespers in Latin or in Hungarian until the end of the 20th century!); and the liturgical movement sought to re-introduce lay people to singing Vespers (of course, in Latin). For the clergy the Office remained something to be read, an obligation of the priestly life; in a good case, daily food for the soul, in a bad case, the *onus diei*, the burden of the day.

This attitude at the beginning of the 20th century led to the dissolution of the centuries old structure of the Roman Office. The demand became stronger and stronger to diminish the obligations of the priests overburdened by pastoral work. Since the custom of praying the whole Psalter

weakly remained in effect, the basic principle of psalm distribution (the combination of selected psalms and the *psalmodia currens*), the most powerful factor of the Roman Office had to be given up. A great advantage (in the eyes of the reformers: a great disadvantage) of the old system was the daily repetition of *some* psalms. This repetition was the remnant of the ancient "Folk office" and was justified by theological, practical, psychological and spiritual arguments. The new Roman Breviary published under the reign of St. Pius X put over half of the 12 nocturnal psalms into the Little Hours, and replaced the stable psalms of Lauds by others, changing them on a daily basis. So the pensum of the Vigil was considerably diminished. The longer psalms were divided, the daily portions became more or less equal. The number of psalms (psalm sections) in the Vigil became invariably nine (even on weekdays), instead of the traditional twelve. The new distribution diminished the daily burden without giving up the principle of the "entire Psalter each week" But it was a victory of questionable value.

The first loss was that the order of the antiphons was disturbed: many new antiphons were needed because of the new place of psalms and psalm divisions. The new texts (many times worded in a style different from the old ones) required new melodies.

The old system of selected psalms expired. The daytime Hours got different psalms for each day and these Hours became nearly as long as Vespers. The Little Hours lost their original character and meaning. Lauds was deprived of its stable psalmody based on good theological and historical grounds. Practically 35 psalms entered in a puzzling order to this Hour. Compline also lost its stability and the close contact between its psalms and the night time.

The practice of *psalmodia currens*, the continuous psalmody also came to an end. About half of the "nocturnal psalms" 1–108 disappeared from the Vigil, went over to an "empty" Hour of the same or another day. As regards the number of psalms, the Vigil became the same on weekdays and feasts with the single difference in the number of readings.

The greatest damage was the change that the new Breviary effected in the minds of the priests. Those generations that grew up on this Breviary have lost their sense of the life-inspired order of the Office. They forgot what a Little Hour was for, or what they should have thought about it was contradictory to what they actually prayed. The emotional relationship of the soul to individual psalms, which was the result of an association

between the given text and the Hour in which it was prayed, was now all but gone with the displacement of the psalms.

This was also the first time in the long history of the Church when the clergy was left with the impression that one can "freely" dispose of 1500 years of Roman tradition (all the more so when the psalm texts were radically changed in the "Psalterium Pianum"). And so the clergy became, as it were, prepared for the rejection of the Roman liturgy as a whole.

B. The Liturgia Horarum and its Critics

The reforms of St. Pius X considerably diminished the "burden of the day." But for the clergy this was not enough. They found the one or one-and-a-half hour that the daily Office demanded too long. The main point of the further reforms requested from Vatican II was again a radical shortening of the Office. Another aim was a kind of "rationalization" in the spirit of Quignonez and the Neo-Gallican reform breviaries. A lot of other (sometimes right, otherwise wanton) changes completed the package of new reforms. Having the Liturgia Horarum in hand, one is frequently inclined to ask what is the "true spiritual benefit" of a particular modification, given the fact that the Constitution on the Liturgy defined this benefit as the main criterion of any legitimate change.

The Council dealt with the Office mainly from a theological, spiritual and disciplinary point of view, but some principles for its reorganization were also laid down. A new Latin version of the psalms was wanted (practically, a return from the Pianum to the Vulgate), and similarly a restoration of the hymns (return from the "modernized" version of the 17th century to the original medieval texts). The Constitution abolished Prime, conceded to make only one of the daytime Little Hours obligatory; stipulated that the Psalter be distributed within a longer (undefined) period instead of its weekly recitation. The realization was left to a Committee to be set up.

The Committee under the leadership of Msg. Bugnini (practically following his will, or, if the reports are true, a will from outside the Church) did not *reform* the Roman Office, but created a *new* breviary. It was sent to the bishops' conferences to solicit their opinion. This was, in fact, no more than a formality. No time was left for a thorough analysis; the clergy was

unprepared for a well-founded response; and, the Committee was resolute to carry the changes through whatever reply would come from "outside."

I summarize the most important innovations and add some remarks. The solution of the problems will be discussed in the third chapter.

1. The character of the Hours

The Vigil Office (or: "Matins") was transformed into an "Hour of Reading" with three psalms and two long lectios. This Hour can be read at any time of the day.

The structure of Lauds and Vespers has been changed: the hymn was placed at the beginning, the number of psalms was reduced to three, the last psalm of Vespers was replaced by a NT canticle. At the close of these Hours the oratio (collecta) is preceded by invocations modeled after the "oratio fidelium."

Prime has been abolished. The other Little Hours were replaced by one single Hour (Hora Media), which can be said at any time of the day. In the time of the two other Little Hours some psalms are proposed for prayer *ad libitum.*

Compline starts with the hymn and has only one psalm.

The Invitatory was moved over from the Vigil to the Hour prayed first on the calendar day.

There is no difference between the structure of the Office on Sundays, feasts or weekdays.

The daily portion of psalms (respectively psalm divisions) is reduced from 40 to 11.

The difference between the Hours became blurred. Each Hour consists of three psalms. The former lengthier, contemplative psalmody of the Vigil, the solemn psalms of Lauds and Vespers, the short psalms of the Little Hours (well suited to the rhythm of daily activity) has been equalized in accordance with new rule of prayer: more or less the same portion each day and for each Hour.

The disposition of the Hours became uniform: they all start with the hymn; only the inclusion of the canticle (and of two long readings in the "Hour of Reading") sets the Minor and Major Hours apart.

This dull uniformity derives not from the inherent structure of the Office but from the mentality of the producers who composed a book of pri-

vate readings and prayers rather than a vivid and dramatic choir-Office. Perhaps they did not even have any personal experience of the characteristic differences between the Hours made evident by their proper effect and construction. The organic and characteristic differences of the old Office gave a well-shaped arch to the single Hours as well as to the whole day, while the new order simply multiplied the Hours.

The Vigil has been transformed into an "Hour of Reading" which can be read in any time of the day. The aim was purely practical: this way the priest can read this Hour whenever he finds place in his daily schedule for it. Thus an essential element of liturgical spirituality has been ousted. The theology and mystical meaning of the Vigil had frequently been the subject of contemplation and exposition for the spiritual Masters. No doubt, its observance demanded some self-denial from the participants but they were fairly compensated by the special spiritual blessings of this particular time of the day. The length of the Vigil – the lengthier psalmody with its contemplative atmosphere and the quiet reading in the silence of evening or night – corresponded well to this spirit. The "Hour of Reading" is based not on the tradition of Christian prayer, but on the modern techniques of time-saving.

The Invitatory likewise became the victim of misunderstanding. The genuine motive of this responsorial psalm is not the commencement of our daytime, but rather it is a solemn overture to the *liturgical* day, even if it is prayed the evening before or at night.[7]

For the construction of the "Hora Media" the starting point was the Breviary of St. Pius X and not the original structure of the Roman Office. This Breviary transformed the Little Hours into lengthier services and thus effaced the very function of the Little Hours by the use of changing psalms. While it was easy to pray the authentic "Little" Hours in the course of the day, and they were in complete harmony with the spiritual intention of these Hours (they regularly interrupted the day's profane activity with prayers and consecrated these "holy times"), it was precisely the "modern" Breviary that made them "burdensome." The Liturgia Horarum should have returned to the original idea, the practice of *horae minores* instead of reducing

7 It is not contradictory to this view that the Invitatory starts Matins even on days having first Vespers. First Vespers was not part of the original structure of the Roman Office, but an addition to the daily liturgy, part of the preparation (vigil-day) rather than of the solemnity.

the three Hours to one. In actual fact, it created another *hora major* (or to use a more suitable name: *hora* of medium size), and annihilated the spirituality of the *horae minores.*

Another misunderstanding stands behind the abolition of Prime. It was falsely stated that the Roman Office duplicates the morning prayer (Lauds – Prime). The character, function, content of these two Hours is totally different. Lauds greets the day of the history of salvation, a new day of the Cosmos, of Creation and the rise of Easter anew every day. Prime on the other hand (concluded by the praxis-oriented "officium capituli") sanctified the working day of the laboring man. Or we can say, the importance of Lauds lies in its dogmatic and communal nature, while Prime affects the moral and private sphere.

2. The new distribution of psalms

The blurring of the Hour's character is the consequence of the diminution of daily psalmody and of the new distribution of psalms.

The reform at the beginning of the 20th century gave up in great part the 1500-year-old system, as well as the basic principles of distribution. Two generations of priests had grown up without any personal experience of the Roman psalmic order, and, their majority simply did not know about its existence. The Liturgia Horarum – with a more radical resolution – went much further down the path opened 70 years before.

According to the new distribution the Psalter is to be prayed through over a period of four weeks. If one multiplies the number 11 (the daily portion of psalms) by 28 days, gets 308, a little more than double of the whole Psalter. The apparent conflict does not come from the repetition of some psalms, but the extensive practice of dividing psalms into sections.

With negligible exceptions, none of the psalms returns during the four-week period. In other words: the use of selected "stable" psalms (dating back to the ancient Folk office) has been abandoned. But the other principle, the continuous psalmody (*psalmodia currens*) has also been rejected. An essential feature of the old practice survived in the reform of St. Pius X: Psalms 109–144 were assigned to Vespers and thus at least traces of the continuous psalmody could be detected, although scattered among the Matins and Little Hours. The basic norm of distribution in the Liturgia Hora-

rum is the equal length of psalm portions, and the psalms/divisions have been assigned in a random (dis)order among the 112 Hours of 28 days (with only a few points of structural consideration). It could not be otherwise. It is impossible to attribute proper "content" to the psalm selection of 28 days and the large number of Hours within it. The liturgy has some psychological laws, too; such is e.g. the measure of cyclic change that the human mind is able to follow and embrace; a 28 times 5 period is surely beyond perceptibility.

The old system represented an ideal equilibrium: the stability of the Little Hour fitted to the conditions of the working day; the stable psalms of Lauds expressed day by day the main motives of the Hour (psalm 50: penitence at the beginning of the day; psalm 62: awaking to God; psalm 148-149-150: solemn praise of God who created and redeemed us). One psalm of Lauds (with reference to light and morning) and the canticle changed according to the day of the week coordinated with a natural-biblical period of time (the week), a cyclic return within the grasp of the human mind. The rest of the Psalter was not forced into hardly comprehensible intellectual schemes, but was allowed to follow its own biblical sequence.

The insertion of NT canticles in Vespers is an innovation of the Liturgia Horarum. Its motivation might have been the analogy with the OT canticles of Lauds, and this idea was backed by the view of some scholars who suspect in some passages of the NT the traces of an old Christian hymnody. This hypothesis is not generally accepted, and, in fact, paragraphs from St. Paul's letters or from the Apocalypse sound rather strange when transformed into a psalm. Moreover, this innovation has infringed upon the logic of the Hour, the ascent from the OT psalms (understood, of course, in their Christian interpretation) through the hymn to the Magnificat.

The new distribution of psalms resulted in a loss and contributed significantly to the change of character within the Hours. The association between the given Hour and its proper psalms was clear and natural in the Roman Office: the stable psalms identified some Hours, while the continuous psalmody was linked to the Vigil and Vespers forming two groups (i.e. psalms 1–108 and 109–147). This order now disappeared without being replaced by another. If the multifaceted upheaval of the psalmic order within the Liturgia Horarum follows any motive, this motive is a secret, unrevealed for those who pray it.

I do not know what the "true spiritual benefit" could possibly be which motivated the new distribution. The only intention we may recognize was the reduction of the number of psalms and their arrangement into equal portions.

3. The repertory of the antiphons

The rearrangement of the psalms made the Antiphonale Romanum unusable. A great many new antiphons had to be created, and many of the existing ones were omitted or transposed to a new place.

In the traditional Roman system not all psalms received a separate antiphon. The psalms of the Little Hours were e.g. sung under one antiphon (*antiphona sola*); the psalms of the weekday Vigils were kept together in pairs. Some rites frequently used "antiphona sola" for the nocturns and/or first Vespers. This practice reasonably reduced the repertory, and it also affected the character of the Hours. The *antiphona sola* in the Little Hours corresponded to the brevity and simple structure of these Hours, while the solemnity of the *horae majores* was emphasized by separate antiphons for each psalm. In other cases, it was just the "antiphona sola" position of an item that gave stress to its importance.[8] The use of the "antiphona sola" has been eliminated from the Liturgia Horarum.

Other changes were caused by the new system of Gospel-pericopes in the Sunday Masses. A number of Benedictus and Magnificat antiphons take their text from the daily Gospel. In consequence of the new system many antiphons had to be transposed to another day, and the situation is further complicated by the three-year Gospel-cycle. If the three *antiphonae majores* (of the Benedictus and the two Magnificats) would be taken from the Gospel, we need three times three antiphons for the three years. The solution of the Liturgia Horarum is rather strange: the *antiphona major* of first Vespers fits in with the Gospel of cycle A, of Lauds with cycle B, and the one for second Vespers with cycle C. So two of the three antiphons "miss the mark" each year.

The authors of the Liturgia Horarum created a great number of new antiphons. They defined new texts for many days and feasts, neither better

8 The practice of the *antiphona sola* might help the congregation in the Parish Office in our days, too, since only one piece is to be learnt and the whole series of psalms can be sung in the same mode.

nor worse but different from the Roman Antiphonary. A great number of the antiphons of the Antiphonale Romanum remained unused, while many new pieces appeared without any melody assigned. This means that the Antiphonale Romanum cannot be adapted. One may pick up pieces from its repertory but it must be mixed with a whole bundle of new texts.

The three layers of the old Antiphonale Romanum (i.e. the ancient core material, the primary additions, and the medieval additions) were more or less separated liturgically, and each liturgical section (the Psalter, de tempore, commune, old saints of the sanctorale, medieval Offices of saints) was provided with a set of antiphons rather homogeneous in style. Now the elements are different in style, age and origin and mixed throughout each section.

The new antiphons are *texts* singled out from the Bible by liturgical experts. And this observation leads to the most critical remark:

The Roman Office was the product of a service, celebrated in choir, shaped and polished by living practice. Its antiphons were *chants*, joint productions of theological reflection, liturgical tradition and musical inspiration. The typological character of ancient antiphons reflects a vivid and realistic singing practice.

In contrast, the Liturgia Horarum is a book to be read, constructed at an office desk. The "chants" are not chants in reality, they have been construed in the same way. *The Liturgia Horarum is the first Office Book in the life of the Church without melodies. Consequently, the Liturgia Horarum is not a proper tool for the restoration of liturgical life, rather it furthers the decadence of recent centuries and fosters the process by which the Office, earlier sung in common, is turned into a private spiritual reading for priests.*

Thirty years went by since its promulgation and the promised notated Roman Antiphonary has still not been produced. The music experts had to realize that the melodies cannot be adapted to the texts of the Liturgia Horarum, and only two possibilities exist: to compose new melodies for hundreds of new texts or to select antiphons from the old Antiphonary with the consequence that the "libretto" of the Office (Liturgia Horarum) and the sung variants will be totally different. This is something quite new and bizarre in the two-thousand-year old history of the liturgy. Now anyone may ask the question: which one is the Office of the Roman Church, the book to be read or the stuff we sing?

In the process of practical implementation most have simply neglected this crucial question and decided to rest satisfied with deplorable "solutions" such as: the people use the Liber Usualis for the sung Office, or local composers fabricate compositions to vernacular texts, or – in most cases – the Office is not sung at all.

4. The responsories

Responsorial chant is the most ancient way of performing the psalms, it even precedes the antiphonal psalmody. The word "responsory" refers to the answer of the congregation to the psalmist, i.e. the refrain giving occasion to the congregation to join in the psalmody. Later, when members of the community became familiar with entire psalms, the antiphonal chant became dominant and the responsorial psalmody was restricted to one genre (the Invitatory), while a new genre was developed from the old way of performance: the responsory placed after readings with only one or a few verses.

The expression "responsory" signifies that the congregation makes a response to the psalmist and not that the responsory is a sort of reflection on the thoughts explained in the reading. This genre was originally a kind of psalm-singing without any link to the lectio. After it found a new place following the reading, it was motivated by a more psychological than intellectual demand: to make way for an emotional response after the verbal communication, to create an opportunity for quiet contemplation after the intellectual activity.

In fact, the meaning of the responsory text was only loosely or not at all connected with the message of the reading. In the beginning, a collection of psalmic responsories was used, and the items were arranged in a purely numerical order. The Roman Office maintained this ancient repertory during the post-Epiphany weeks: after each reading a selected psalm is sung as the responsory. These pieces are arranged according to the days of the week. This is probably the form of Office referred to by St. Benedict. Later the responsories might be related to the feast, the season or the *scriptura occurrens* (the particular Book of Sacred Scripture read in a given month) *as a whole*, but not even then to the individual readings. The responsories taken from the scriptura occurrens displaced the old psalmic responsories in the greater part of the year, and their function was to deepen the impact of the as-

signed biblical reading. The responsory helped the community to keep contact with the given Book of Sacred Scripture. A clear sign of it is that the responsories "de Regibus," "de Sapentia," "de Job" etc, were sung during the given month even after readings taken from other (non-biblical) books (e.g. in the 2nd and 3rd nocturn).

It was only in the 20th century that scholars of liturgy began to suppose a close connection between the readings and the subsequent responsories. Ironically, just when this thesis was finally refuted by historical studies, pragmatic liturgists proposed to realize the fictitious past in the future by creating responsories corresponding to each reading. Since two readings on the 365 days of the year amount to more then 700 readings and themes, hundreds of new texts had to be construed, lacking any liturgical or musical precedence.

And so the fate of this genre has been sealed. The new responsories can be read or recited, but they do not become 'responsories' in a liturgical-musical sense. The melismatic style of the true responsories is far from the authors of today's liturgy, and it is rather hard to adapt the long texts to the models of short recitative responsories.

Only two paths remain open: one either stops singing the responsory, or replaces the responsories of the Liturgia Horarum with the traditional repertory. Unfortunately, the latter has now lost its point of reference. The responsories of the *scriptura occurrens* were coordinated with the distribution of the Bible over the year. The assignment of Moses' books for the period starting with Septuagesima; Acts, Apocalypse and the "Catholic letters" for Eastertide; Kings for the post-Pentecostal weeks, Kings and the books of Wisdom for August; Job, Tobiah, Judith, Esther for September; the Machabees for November; the Prophets for November; Isaiah for December; and Paul's letters for post-Epiphany defined the place of many responsories. The Liturgia Horarum abolished this order of biblical readings and assigned 2- or 3-week periods for one textual unit, jumping here and there among the OT and NT books. Since the authors aimed at establishing a very close link between the given reading and the responsory, the patristic readings also received newly composed responsories. It is rare that an appropriate piece could be found in the traditional repertory.

5. Is the Liturgia Horarum part of the Roman Liturgy?

Leaving many details aside we now turn to the question: what is the place of the Liturgia Horarum within the family of Roman Office rites?

As we have seen, the Liturgia Horarum departed from the Roman Office in all essential points: it abolished the characteristic structure of the Hours; modified the distribution of psalms, moreover, gave up its principles; transformed the repertory and arrangement of the antiphonary to such an extent that the two can be hardly identified. In contrast to the Roman Office, its norm is not the common celebration in choir, but the private reading of the Breviary. If the Roman Office of recent centuries can be likened to a libretto of an opera without its music, the Liturgia Horarum is an opera destined from the outset to exist without music, without public performance, i.e. it is only a story to read.

As we remember the Office of great medieval churches were different from each other in such a way that they had to provide proper books for themselves, and later let their own breviary be printed one after the other. Moreover, they all differed from the "Old Roman" antiphonary, as the Tridentine Breviary universally accepted during the recent four centuries also differed considerably from all the previous ones. These variations granted individual characteristics to the different Offices of dioceses and religious orders, and so the participants rightly felt that the given Office was their own.

But if we compare them, the differences appear unessential. The structure of the Hours, the distribution of psalms, the repertory and assignment of the antiphonary were essentially the same everywhere, and the differences only concerned certain additions and points not disturbing the main features. We could say that all of what they have in common (i.e. 80 % or more of their material) is THE Roman rite. In other words: the Roman rite is represented in the universality of the particular rites. The Tridentine Office is also a member of this family, without any difference in the essential features, even if it can be considered a somewhat "puritanical" version compared to its relatives. The Roman rite when regarded closely is alive in local traditions; looking from a little farther, it appears as one and the same liturgy; always and everywhere the same in the Western church from the 4th or 5th century (or earlier), in spite of the organic development and natural modifications.

This continuity excludes two false ideas. One, that the liturgy must always be adapted to the spirit of the historical ages. The thesis is valid for details: e.g. the devotion of the Middle Ages is reflected in the Marian Office and the daily Officium Defunctorum. But the Office as a whole expresses the *lasting* elements of faith and cult.

The other false idea is that the Tridentine Office is a relatively recent form expressing the spirituality of the 16th century, and as such now outdated. It is far from me to attrinute an absolute reputation to the Tridentine Office. It is not the only and perhaps not even the best representative of the Roman rite. But it IS a member of the Roman rite and differs only in minor details from the tradition already alive for a 1000 years at the time when the Tridentine version was promulgated.

The Liturgia Horarum took over elements from the Roman Office, similarly to someone erecting a new building by using the bricks from a demolished house. But it is not the same building. The structure, material and spirit of the Liturgia Horarum stands so far from the Roman Office (in the sense examined above), that it cannot be called a new version of it, a new member of the same family. The Liturgia Horarum is "Roman" only in one sense: it was promulgated by Rome and approved by the pope. In other words: although the Liturgia Horarum *legally speaking* is the authorized Office of the Roman Church (as of today), it does not belong to the Roman Office as regards its content.

Where can we look if we try to search for its relatives? How can we categorize it? I think its proper place is in the group of the short-lived reform-breviaries of the 16th–18th centuries. The principle of abbreviation and "rationalization," the uniformity of the Hours, the artificial composition – instead of the organic development required by the Council –, the dominance of private decision-making and creativity disregarding the continuous common use, its basic character as a book of readings: all this and a host of other concrete features link the Liturgia Horarum to that family.

The history of the Roman Office came to an end in 1970 – or, at least, today it certainly seems so.

C. No other way?

Could another way be found? Was not this construction a necessity or requirement of our age? Could we not say that the editors simply recognized the "signs of times"?

Until now nobody has managed to compile a list of the elements of the Roman Office that were up-to-date in 500, in 1000, in 1500 or 1890, but suddenly became outdated by 1960. No doubt, the Roman (practically: Tridentine) Office needed corrections. I mention two examples: The permission to people uneducated in Latin to pray the Office in the vernacular is surely a benefit for them. It could also be admitted that different groups in the Church praying the Office under different conditions needed Offices of somewhat different size and structure.

I do not believe, however, that these difficulties could not have been solved without destroying the whole edifice of the Roman Office. The two directives of the Council, i.e. to implement changes only if they "earn real spiritual benefit" and to "produce new forms organically outgrown from the old ones" could be fulfilled simultaneously.

It is not my task to propose solutions, nor am I authorized to advise people responsible for the matter, but I cannot reasonably argue for the possibility of keeping the essence of the old Office while adapting it to the requirements of our times if I give no examples of such a healthy compromise.

I. The Office and the Consuetudo

A given Office (e.g. Milanese, Byzantine, Roman) is a historically formed and modeled unit, regulated by its inner proportions and interrelationships. Changes in time and space or certain varieties do not destroy its integrity. But it has its inner laws, and once these were disregarded, the structure became unbalanced, and the essence and spirit of the whole was done away with. In this case it cannot be labeled by its earlier name, since it became something other. The history of these Offices bears witness to development, extension, modification, and addition without compromising identity, and such reasonable changes can also be accomplished in our days. New Offices may also be construed, as was the case with the reform Offices of

the renaissance and baroque periods, but if doing so, one must admit frankly that his product is a new construction, the value of which has to be measured accordingly.

The history of the liturgy offers numerous examples of praying the *same* Office differently in different communities, following not some kind of personal inspiration or capricious improvisation, but the authoritative guidelines and "consuetudo" of the community. For example: the Office of the Byzantine church preserved its identity in spite of the historical changes (mainly: growth), and there can be no doubt about what the Byzantine Office is. But this does not mean that the Byzantine Office is said in its entirety by every community, or even by all priests. Just because there are various ways of praying the Office, different conditions require (and justify) no radical changes in the structure of the whole. Some monasteries sing the whole Office daily in the name of, and on behalf of, all their brothers following the same venerable tradition. Other communities, monasteries and parish churches sing some Hours. There are permitted ways of slightly shortening the longer Hours. This is possible precisely because the Office itself stands virtually untouched behind the daily and locally adapted practice.

The 20th-century problems of the Roman Office could have been overcome by accepting the duality between the Rite and the Consuetudo. The Roman Office could have been improved in some small details – without touching its essence –, provided that the different ways of how single communities and persons should adapt it to the individual conditions of their life were clearly defined. We admit that the conditions are quite different in the case of a monastery, a cathedral or collegiate chapter (whose first task is to present the praise of the whole Church to God and to maintain the fullness of the cult), a religious order *in vita activa*, a parish church located in a big city or a congregation living in diaspora; and it is again different with communities of nuns or spiritual confraternities founded just for praying the Office. The living conditions of a young seminarian, an active pastor, a retired priest, a priest teaching in a university, etc. are all rather different. The Office may assume a kind of regularity in the life of a layman, but the obligations, daily schedule, extraordinary events, as well as personal inspiration all have their role in defining one's disposition for praying the psalmody.

One solution could be the construction of a "mini-Office" suited even for the busiest person or community. This Office could be declared the "official" one, obligatory for everybody. But another way can also be followed: the Church may uphold the complete Office as the official liturgy of the Church as a whole (and prayed by the Church as a whole), while individual persons and communities would follow the rules of their *consuetudo* concerning what portion of it they actually pray. Of course, it would result in irreverence against the liturgy, and cause great harm for the faithful if everybody followed his own will in this respect. Rules would have to be established on four different levels:

1. It is the responsibility of the legitimate ecclesiastical authority to define the basic principles for individual types of communities and persons concerning the minimal obligations, essential elements of the Hour, etc. A universal rule may be, e.g. that Lauds is considered valid if at least three of its five psalms are prayed. Or: a priest must pray the full Psalter in every four weeks as a minimum. Or: all communities of religious orders *in vita activa* must pray at least Lauds and/or Vespers *in choir* every day.

2. The second level is linked to the local authorities, the chapter of the diocese or the superior of a religious order. Being familiar with the specific conditions, this authority would define the general rules of how the actual communities should adapt the full Office to their life.

3. The third level is the given liturgical community. A well-ordered liturgy needs the stability of customs based on authoritative decisions, and recorded in a local "Consuetudinary book" (as it was the practice for centuries). In this case a kind of *institutio liturgica* would be composed from the system of general, seasonal and exceptional orders.

4. The fourth level is that of the individual person (e.g. a priest praying the Office privately) who shapes and permanently reshapes his praying practice following the general rules and the order of his daily schedule.

If it were done so, the Church would appear – in spite of the differences, and, perhaps, precisely because of the differences – an "acies bene ordinata," a great association for divine praise, where everybody takes part in the same liturgy in accordance with his own capabilities, completes the activity of others, and possesses the acquired common spiritual goods.

2. Folk office, choir office, private office

The Office has, of course, only one form, at least, in principle: the one sung in the choir of a secular or monastic community.

The Office in choir has two kinds: i) the "parish Office," i.e. the regular Office prayed by the clergy and the people, and ii) the "canonical" Office, i.e. the great Office of stable ecclesiastical communities prayed in the name of, and on behalf of, the whole Church.

The "parish" Office is the successor of the Folk office, one of the most ancient forms of Christian liturgy. It may be shorter and structurally simpler than the full form. Its "ordinary" elements may predominate the changing elements, e.g. it contains one formula for the Advent Vespers instead of daily changes. (Some say that Vatican II planned to edit such a "Folk office," but it failed to come about, either due to the shortage of time, or on account of leaving the task to the local churches.) Lauds and Vespers are the main Hours of the parish Office, but the Vigil Office may once again resume its original function by becoming part of the preparation for great solemnities. The parish Office should be the main form also for the parish priests. It would be tolerable that a priest participating in the parish Office is only obliged to read some psalms and readings of the Vigil Office.

The "canonical Office" represents the full form of the sung Office; the main reason of the existence of chapters and monasteries is to have communities in the Church praying the Office diligently and regularly in a solemn way. Since this is the "normative" form of it (in principle), all priests and monks might be obliged to pray periodically the whole or at least a large part of the Office in this community. These church communities have the great honor of keeping and absorbing the Office heritage to a greater extent than their brothers in the active life are able to do. The general and local rules may fix the measures for full/partial fulfillment.

Though the private Office remains the most frequent form of praying the Office, it must be regarded as an exception. That means that he who prays the breviary privately, should be present from time to time with a regular frequency in choir, to draw inspiration from the spirit of the common service for his privately read (or sung!) Office.

Perhaps it is not necessary that every priest pray the full Office each day. But it would be still worse if the Office itself would be cut to the capacities of the individual priests. Beyond the rules of the "necessary minimum,"

priests should be prepared to be able and even to desire to pray the largest possible portion of the Office, even privately.

Whatever part of the Office is prayed by the individual communities and persons, the full Office may remain untouched, as the prayer of the whole Church, who shares her treasure with all her children.

3. Which Office?

We have spoken above of a full-size Office. But which one?

I consider it a rather natural supposition that the Roman Church should return to the Roman Office. When priests, monks or laymen of today enter the practice of common praise, they must feel that they are joining a tradition of one and a half thousand years, and are not forced to accept a liturgy hardly thirty years old, constructed by a small group of aloof officials.

But as I have already tried to explain, the Roman Office is not a formula spelled out from the first letter to the last. It is rather a "virtual reality," manifesting itself in the proper Offices of different dioceses and religious orders. The idea of a uniform Office did not appear until the Council of Trent. Moreover, Trident itself accepted all traditional Offices, though this will of the Council was neglected during the subsequent decades. The old rites lived on even after the Council for decades, and the medieval orders adhered to their own Office as a liturgy determining and shaping their monastic identity.

During the Vatican Council we could hear many nice words about the "regina... in vistitu deaurato, ccircumdata varietate", the queen dressed in a legitimate diversity, i.e. the Church displaying her inner richness in a number of different rites. Toward the end of the Council one could even hear happy news about the imminent restoration of traditional local liturgies for special occasions. It is rather strange that the final result was a uniformity imposed in a ruthless dictatorial manner unparalleled in Church history. Simultaneously (as a reprisal?) a furor of local arbitrariness was unleashed. Anyone who loves the centuries old Office of the Church is now regarded disobedient, while monasteries fabricating offices for themselves are not blamed...

I think that dioceses and religious orders could be encouraged to return (not without legal decisions and proper approval) to their own Offices, which are but variants of one and the same Office. On the other hand, the

individual innovations should be restricted to the level of "consuetudo" mentioned above, i.e. the definition of the way in which the common Office is adapted.

There is no reason to be afraid of this legitimate diversity of Offices. All of them represent the same Roman liturgy, their repertory is common in great part, and the differences among them are not so significant that they should cause scandal or prevent guests from joining in. In a paradoxical way, the stable rules for the local Offices can more easily expel arbitrariness than the cold uniformity of the Liturgia Horarum.

Among the representatives of the Roman Office, the Tridentine form would also be eligible. Moreover, it would be entirely appropriate, if the Old Roman form of the Office would also be restored in communites suitable for that task.

To avoid any accusation of "Antiquarian" tendencies, I must add a second qualification. The restoration of the traditional Offices might go along with the needed modifications. Some of these adjustments may concern all of them, others may remain within the field of the given Office. There are (or there may be) inconveniences in the Roman rite that can be avoided without any harm to the integrity of the rite. If the essential elements remain saved, one may request some more effective changes in order to help the rite to display its living power more clearly. Here the matter of language must be discussed. While working with unwavering determination for the rights and better conditions of a liturgy celebrated in Latin, we admit that the essence of a rite is not altogether dependent on the language (provided that the translation is perfectly exact).

Friends of the Tridentine liturgy aspire for its total restoration. They do not seem to realize that this claim hinders its rebirth and acceptance. The papal instruction allowing the Tridentine Mass linked the permission to the condition that it must be celebrated in Latin and nothing should be changed in it. But the Tridentine Mass – if some small elements are modified and celebrated either in Latin or in the vernacular according to the circumstances – could become a rival of the Bugnini-Mass. Or is it just what must be avoided?

In sum: the restitution of the Roman Office (with the necessary "modernization" and the legal approval of its traditional variants) would result in a synthesis of traditionalism and modernity, unity and variety, organic de-

velopment and tactful intervention – in full harmony with the history of liturgy.

What about the Liturgia Horarum? I am scandalized time and again seeing that a liturgy constructed only recently is not simply managed on the same level with the centuries-old tradition of the Church, but as a newcomer, it simply swept off its antecedent. The Bugnini-Office was quickly imposed on the praying Church, and simultaneously the venerable Roman Office with all its values of a slow and organic evolution has been discharged. I dislike the Liturgia Horarum. But since it already exists, perhaps it should not be prohibited (as the Council of Trent prohibited the "reform" breviary of Quignonez). Some (first of all those recently founded communities that are imbued with a slight flavor of Aufklärism) who like it may keep it as a proper Office of a little eccentric type. Then its fate can be left to the future and its coexistence with the Roman Office.

4. The distribution of the psalms

The key point of the structure of the Office is the distribution of psalms. The distribution determines the clear outlines of the Hours, moreover, the spirituality of the whole Office. The relationship between the Office and prayer in general is greatly influenced by the double principle of distribution. The restoration of the Roman Office necessitates first of all the restoration and necessary renovation of the distribution of psalms.

The first element of psalm distribution was the use of some constant, selected psalms. Their order was logical, it worked well over the centuries, and it corresponds to the needs of the human psyche. This order is the first to be restored.

The basic principle for the PRIME, TERCE, SEXT and NONE is the use of constant and short psalms. The Roman Office offered two systems for that. The older one was to pray the full psalm 118 in sections of 3 times 16 verses (if we assign numbers to the 8-verse sections, 1–4 in Prime, 5–10 in Terce, 11–16 in Sext, 17–22 in None; on Sundays the sections 118/1–4 were followed by the Paschal psalm 117). The other system is of St. Benedict who divided psalm 118 into short 8-verse divisions (corresponding to the alphabetic structure of the Hebrew psalm) and alloted these sections

to Sunday and Monday (Sunday: 1–4; 5–7; 8–10; 11–13; Monday from Terce: 14–16; 17–19; 20–22). From Tuesday on he assigned the "gradual" psalms from 119–127. In St. Benedict's system there are three series, approximately of the same length, with 18-24 verses for each Hour. The three series are equally perfect and they can be combined. We may follow St. Benedict's arrangement, but it is better to distribute the short units of psalm 118 to two Sundays in the following way:

Prime: psalm 117 on Sundays and 118/1–4 on weekdays (see below);
Terce – Sext – None on Sunday I: 118/5–7; 118/8–10; 118/11–13.
Terce – Sext – None on Sunday II: 118/14–16; 118/17–19; 118/20–22.
Terce – Sext – None on weekdays: 119–121; 122–124; 125–127.

If the Little Hours are set in this way, there is no need for a Hora Media. Everyone should be exhorted to pray the Little Hours in their proper time. If the daily hustle and bustle permits no time, it can simply be omitted or replaced by a Pater Noster (according to the *pia traditio* of the first Christians). Those who pray the Hour by heart, may fulfill it with the hymn, three short psalms, and the collect or a Pater Noster. Such an Hour requires 3 or 4 minutes. Psalm 118 will probably be prayed from a book, but the gradual psalms can be said without one. In private use freedom can be granted to alternate the three series, provided that none of them is neglected. The proper parts (antiphon, capitulum, responsory, versicle, collecta) of the Little Hours have to be recorded in the Office book, but in case of necessity they can be omitted or replaced by the per annum texts.

Prime seems to pose more problems, not due to liturgical reasons (it does not duplicate the morning prayer!), but rather on practical grounds. The man of our day wakes up late and runs to work finding no time for Prime. But it is exactly the working man who gains special blessings for his daily work by the praying of Prime. A short Prime (with a hymn, a short psalm and an invocation) does not require more than 2-3 minutes, and can even be attached to Lauds.

Communities could pray Prime at least twice a week: on Sundays with the Paschal psalm 117 before Mass, and on Mondays offering the whole of one's weekly work to God (1–4. short sections of psalm 118). Sections 1–4 of the psalm could also be distributed to single weekdays.

The psalm selection of LAUDS goes back to the most ancient Office traditions:

I. Psalm 50, and on Sundays, feasts and in Eastertide: 92;
II. daily psalms: 99, 5, 42, 64, 89, 142, 91;
III. 62 + 66;
IV. daily canticle;
V. 148–150

They represent a complete psychological journey (from penitence through longing after God to praise) and have practical benefits. The 5-psalm form gives due emphasis to the first "corner-point" of the day. The daily psalms lead through the week, a period still comprehensible to the mind. The canticles of the single days are, as witnessed by St. Benedict, of old Roman origin.

Rules of adaptation may help in some difficulties. The joint psalms 62 + 66, and 148 + 149 + 150 slightly prolong Lauds. Though in St. Benedict's Office psalms 62 + 66 are replaced on weekdays by a changing one, the original assignment is a central element of the Hour from very early times and fits well to its spirit. A daily alternation of the two psalms (62, 66) could be, however, conceded. Similarly the concatenation of the Lauds-psalms belongs to the oldest tradition (derived perhaps from the Old Testament liturgy). They should be edited in this form, at least for Sunday, but with the concession to select only one of them on weekdays (Monday, Thursday: 148, Tuesday, Friday: 149, Wednesday, Saturday: 150).

This solution preserves the genuine structure of Lauds; the number of psalms surpasses that of the Little Hours, and it takes (similarly to Vespers) about 15 minutes reading, or 25 minutes singing. But rules of adaptation may go further allowing Lauds to be prayed with 3 psalms: one of the first three psalms should be selected, and the local consuetudinary may define the due alternation of the three.

It is only the long Saturday canticle that implies a problem. The Liturgia Horarum abbreviated this canticle into one third of its original size, but he who reads through the full canticle carefully will observe that the full message of the text is only unfolded in the long form. (Some verses, however, could be omitted.) A possible solution is the omission of psalms 50 and 62 on Saturday and the division of the canticle in three:

I. Psalm 91; II–IV: canticle/1–3; V: psalm 150.

The shortened form of the canticle given by the Liturgia Horarum can be used in the 3-psalm structure.

The result of this arrangement is the same length for each psalm(section) and for each day.

There is no good reason why the psalms of COMPLINE should be changed. The Roman form (4, 30/verses 1–6, 90, 133) can be kept in the full Office, while the rules of adaptation may allow the alternation of two possible combinations (4, 30/verses 1–6, 133 or the single psalm 90).

The steady, selected set of psalms above is not a heavy burden, and yet their stability makes their use easier. This distribution is justified not only by tradition but by psychological and liturgical reasons.

All the other psalms were and should be included in the continuous psalmody. The traditional "point of division" in their sequence is between psalms 108 and 109 (both in the Roman and Ambrosian Office!).

Psalms 109–147 are to be prayed at VESPERS except those prayed during the other Hours (117–127, 133, 142) just as it is in St. Benedict's Office. Instead of the 7 times 5 psalms of the "cursus saecularis," only 26 psalms remained for seven days, and if the longer psalms are divided (psalms 113, 135, 138 in three, 134, 143 and 144 in two divisions) we arrive at a portion not onerous, proportionate to the importance of the Hour and approximately equal with the 5 psalms of Lauds. The rules of adaption (or in case of laymen: private decision) may concede to lessen the number of psalms to three; the full portion is prayed in this case over two weeks.[9]

9 The arrangement above refers to the secular cursus of the Roman Office. The monastic Office should be left untouched, with the concession in some monasteries to pray the psalms of the first Nocturn in Week One and those of the second Nocturn in Week Two. Lauds and Vespers could also be abbreviated (if needed) similarly to the description above. Only the psalms of Prime (1–19) are problematic if this Hour is omitted. In this case the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday Prime-psalms could be prayed in Terce, Sext, None of Saturday Week One, while the Thursday, Friday, Saturday psalms in the same Hours on Saturday Week Two. The Prime of Sunday, however, along with the "officium capituli" should remain as it is, to bless the work of the whole week and also to keep up the memory of the Hour. And so nothing is changed in comparison to St. Benedict's Office, only the rules of adaptation create slight variations in different types of monasteries.

The best time for the continuous psalmody is the nocturnal Vigil, the Hour of longer and quiet prayer. The psalms here need no "thematic" arrangement (except, of course, the feasts), rather they maintain us in a "general" prayerful atmosphere. What we have to do here is to go on systematically in the Psalter. The speed, however, of proceeding might be different, according to the life conditions of communities or private persons. The practical solution would be to divide the Psalter into small "chapters" of three psalms/psalm-divisions (skipping over the pieces prayed in other Hours). Sunday might perhaps be the single exception by having a series of its own, selected from the most ancient series of Sunday-psalms (e.g. 1, 2, 3–8, 12, 18–19, 20, 23).

These ternary sets of psalms could be managed as units and the number of such sets to be prayed in a Vigil should be defined by special rules and "consuetudinaries." The character of the Hour demands a portion longer than the one for Lauds and Vespers. This portion might be either the traditional 12 (consisting, however of shorter sections than earlier!), or 6 or even 3 (as in the Liturgia Horarum). Accordingly, we pray 4, 2 or 1 ternary sets, and arriving at the end of the Psalter we start it all over again. In this respect no absolute uniformity is necessary in the Church. We simply join the process at the point where the psalmody happens to be. Moreover, if in private recitation one day has to be left out, we can proceed from the point where we stopped two days earlier. It is obvious, that this flexibility has to be balanced by good rules for avoiding the danger of laxity.

What was outlined here is a system more traditional but, at the same time, more innovative compared to the bureaucratic parsimony of the Liturgia Horarum. The *full* Roman Office is given into the hands of the faithful. No matter how large a portion is actually prayed following the rules: the whole, undiminished Office is proposed. On the other hand, the differences in life-conditions are not neglected by egalitarianism on the lowest level. All the essential and structural values of the Roman Office are preserved without overburdening the person who prays it. This "full" Roman Office invites the faithful to take part in it to the greatest possible extent, at the rate, as their strength and devotion allows.

5. The character of the Hours

The distribution of psalms shapes the character of the Hours: by restoring the Roman system the mechanic uniformity of the Hours is eliminated and their proper structure, character and "mood" are restored. There are, however, other details that one could take into consideration in order to preserve the character of the Hours.

Matins gets its "vigil" quality not from the texts to be prayed but rather from its length. The nightly rest, the more abundant contemplation of God and "opera eius," the eschatological expectation of final salvation: all this provides an experience and spiritual condition indispensable for a Christian and Christianity in general. The Vigil is the best time for longer prayers for a practical reason: a part of the evening or night, of our nightly rest is then offered to God, to more profound prayer and contemplation.

It is a loss to take away the Vigil-character from this Hour. It might be that someone is unable to pray it in its due time. Perhaps not everybody will and should pray this Hour each day. It can sometimes be permitted to transfer the Hour to another part of the day. But this is an exception or concession, and it counts as if the Hour were prayed at night. No doubt, the relatively recent name of "Matutinum" (a consequence of a historical "slip") is not the best for this Hour, but neither is the "Hour of Readings." The lengthier psalmody is a constituent just as important for the Hour as the readings. It would be best to call it again "Vigil" with a reference to its biblical foundation and the spirituality of the Hour.

I think that the Invitatory should be left in its place, at the beginning of the Vigil, the beginning of the *liturgical* day. I have already made my arguments. Now I add that there is a proportionality between the use of the Invitatory and the structure and size of the Vigil. The importance of this introduction was so much respected by many medieval churches that they did not insert a hymn at all in this Hour!

For centuries Lauds began in many churches by a short versicle ("versus ad Laudes" or "versiculus sacerdotalis"). In the middle of the half-dark church, the community is called to pray by the voice of the celebrant, reciting the leading thought of Lauds.

Some wished to argue for the transposition of the hymn to the beginning of Lauds and Vespers by appealing to the Ambrosian usage. The truth is that in Milan the hymn is near the end of Lauds while Vespers has no

hymn at all. There is, however, a solemn Lucernarium before Vespers, and this celebration contains among other chants the hymn of St. Ambrose *Deus Creator omnium.* This kind of celebration preceding Vespers was asked for by many (and has been introduced in the Anglican Evensong). In Rome there is no trace of such a Lucernarium, and it would be problematic to insert it in the Hour without disturbing its proportions and structure. But nothing can be said against a solemn entrance and lighting of candles accompanied by a proper chant.

6. The Antiphonary

A great many new antiphons and responsories (or speaking more properly: antiphonal and responsory texts) have been created for the Liturgia Horarum. Nevertheless, if the Roman Antiphonary presented any difficulties, it was rather its repertory of massive size. The numerous ecclesiastical communities flourishing in the Middle Ages sang the Office day by day. They demanded proper chants for great number of feasts, and they were able to learn the hundreds of new chants. In recent centuries, however, the Church and the communities felt it less and less obligatory to sing the Office decently, and the lack of regularity and skill rendered the participants unable to sing the whole repertory. Even if the Office was prayed in common, a large part of it was simply recited and not sung. By the 20th century the situation deteriorated to the point that 95% of the clergy has no experience at all of the Office in choir.

After the Second Council Vatican the desire of praying the Office in community (and with the participation of the congregation) grew strong among some enthusiastic people, but learning/teaching the antiphonary is almost hopeless due to the lack of experience. The enlarged antiphonary brings no help; on the contrary, it causes even more trouble.

The real need today is: i) to preserve the treasury of liturgical chants already in existence as well as we can, and ii) to adjust the liturgical practice to the more adverse circumstances by the use of a simpler and abridged repertory. In other words: the everyday practice has to return to the "minimal" Antiphonary of the 5th–6th centuries. The return is advised also by musical reasons: while the ancient repertory adapted a small set of melodies to hundreds of words, the development of the subsequent centuries resulted in the proliferation of thousands of individual melodies.

This dilemma could be solved only if the antiphonary is divided into layers. A relatively small portion built on melodic "types" offers, if well selected, good material for the entire liturgical year. (This set could also be translated into the vernacular by the use of the same musical language.) If need be, some of this ground repertory could be replaced by more complicated or more individual melodies taken from a rich "additional" antiphonary.

How big is the "minimum" needed for a ground repertory? We need the antiphons taken from the psalms themselves (for the per annum period), 5-6 simple antiphons for each solemnity, each season and also for the commune sanctorum. It makes no more than about 200 pieces to be sung on 15-20 tunes (if they are well selected), and this is sufficient to sing through the whole liturgical year. About one thousand pieces are enough to enlarge this repertory with the proper antiphons of the whole temporale (each day of Advent, Lent, etc.). This amount can be surpassed only in communities learning and singing the Office intensively. The Church at all times needs communities of that kind, always have, and always will!

Concerning the responsories we might return to the basic set of psalmic responsories with the addition of some for solemnities. This basic repertory is again built on melodic "types," and the return of similar melodies makes the learning much easier. Knowing these melodic types, the basic repertory could be enlarged, and communities well trained in reading music (including the schola) could take possession of the whole.

This way the whole Roman Antiphonary could survive in its original state, yet the basic rules of partial adaptation make the task realistic. In contrast, I regard it unrealistic, to provide melodies for hundreds of new texts. *The Liturgia Horarum cannot be transformed into a new Antiphonary.*

The "concessions" concerning the repertory and liturgical assignment are interrelated. If the repertory is diminished it needs its own assignment. Fortunately, the history of liturgy presents good models for this task, too.

As mentioned above, we have examples of performing the psalms "sub unica antiphona." This custom can be regarded as a concession for musically weak communities: one of the antiphons can be selected and repeated after each psalm. A consuetudinary may define e.g. a medium-sized Advent set adding the rules of adaptation. The learning process can be helped by the observation that although some old sources assign proper antiphons to each Hour, yet some antiphons return in different functions (e.g. the

Vigil antiphons for Sunday are selected from the weekday canticle antiphons in the Old Roman Office).

This selection makes, of course, the textual repertory somehow poor. The extension of the medieval practice of "versus ad repetendum" may help: The psalms are accompanied by one single melodic antiphon, but the text of the omitted antiphon is recited before the return of the "antiphona sola."

Moreover: we have more and more historical arguments for the solo performance of antiphons in the past. A community that consists of very few trained members but has a good musician could enrich its Office by solo antiphons; its emotional influence might be equal with the piece sung in common.

By these examples I wanted to emphasize that what we need now is not a new antiphonary but the rediscovery of the Roman Antiphonary. It can be adapted to contemporary conditions without having to make arbitrary decisions.

The translation into vernacular is an altogether different question; now I only remark that the task is basically no different from what we discussed above.

Appendix

For outsiders all this seems unimportant and the petty game of experts. In this respect I regard as "outsiders" a great part of Christians and even priests. For most of them it is all the same. "One has to pray what is ordered by Rome... Only the spirit is essential... Christianity must not be ritualized." A friend of mine, a priest and professor of theology, explained that the Office must be abolished, and it would be enough to impose on priests the obligation of private prayer and spiritual reading for half an hour each day. Well, Beethoven's Seventh Symphony is, of course, no more than a given number of a, b, c-sharp etc. notes...

I do not consider liturgical scholars "insiders" either, though when a decision is to be made some knowledge in liturgical matters is undoubtedly desirable. The true "insider" is the one who lives the liturgy, who is implanted into the permanency of the Church's liturgical life. One who has learned by his own experience how much the Office, its form, conscious and unconscious impressions gathered from the Office can contribute to his spirituality; how greatly he is educated day by day by taking part in the

Office. Let us remember: "Chorus facit monachum" – and not only monachum. The "insider" may experience that the words spoken in the Office convey the great tradition of the Catholic faith itself; he observes that the 'how' of the Office, the radiation of its actual order may influence our approach to faith and salvation. He detects the difference between turning spontaneously to God and joining the Church at prayer. This kind of Christian wants to be sure that he is not following the innovations of some people merely out of a sense of obedience. The mature experience of the praying Church comes to him from the anonymity of Great Times, and it is a special honor to join this flow, to adapt our heart and mind to the words given onto our lips. Following St. Benedict's rule so forgotten today: "ut mens concordet voci" – the mind should follow what is expressed by voice.

4. The Chants of the Proprium Missae versus "Alius Cantus Aptus"

1.

What arrangement of the Mass chants emerges before the eyes of an unbiased reader of the Liturgical Constitution promulgated by the Second Vatican Council? If we disregard what happened *after* the Synod, and concentrate our attention upon the text of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, this is the picture we get:

The Mass is celebrated in most cases in Latin (Art. 36), although *some* parts (lections, bidding prayer: Art. 54) *some*times (when and where it seems useful) can be said in the vernacular (Art. 36/2). The faithful are able to chant the responses, the acclamations, and the Ordinary in Latin (Art. 54, cf. Kyriale Simplex). Gregorian chant has pride of place in liturgical singing (Art. 116). The chants of the Proper are sung by a choir or schola (Art. 114), in larger churches from the *Graduale Romanum*, and in smaller ones from the *Graduale Simplex* (Art. 117); but the congregation, too, may join in the Chant (Art. 114), singing psalms and antiphons (Art. 30). Chant is complemented by sacred polyphony taken from the heritage of sacred music, or from a repertory of new compositions. These take their texts chiefly from the Holy Scriptures or the liturgical books (Art. 121), correspond at all points with the spirit of the liturgy (Art. 116), and are characterized by the hallmarks of true ecclesiastical thinking (Art. 121) and true art (Art. 112). Careful instruction must prepare the laity to take their part in liturgical singing, and so each part is sung by the very person concerned (Art. 28, 114), and yet in the way required by the nature of the given part (Art. 112). Congregational religious hymns are also accepted during various devotions, as well as in liturgical celebrations "in keeping with rubrical norms and requirements." However, in consequence of all these stipulations the meaning of 'congregational hymnody' has been changed: people sing not only vernacular hymns but also many parts that are integral components of the liturgy. Hence it seems right to distinguish the *cantus populi* (the chanting of the people) from *cantus popularis* (popular religious songs). The first of

these is plainly the task of present and future; it is the great task of the liturgical renewal in the field of congregational chant.

The Liturgical Constitution of 1964 was followed in 1967 by the Instruction *Musicam Sacram*, whose intention was to apply the general principles to daily practice. This Instruction, in fact, describes essentially the same ideal set forth in the conciliar document. It retained the rules concerning language, but in view of the increasing demands for the vernacular, it interpreted those norms more broadly. The Instruction emphasized the recitations of the celebrant, ministers and lectors; it recognized the choir and the schola; it made clear the fact that the very nature of the liturgy is sufficient justification for assigning some parts only to the schola while the faithful listen attentively, and that this practice does not contradict *actuosa participatio.* The 1967 Instruction reaffirmed the privileges of Gregorian chant in the liturgy. With regard to the congregation, the document again underlined that the dialogues, acclamations, psalms, antiphons, refrains and hymns must enjoy priority, while also acknowledging the usefulness (though secondary in importance) of the *cantus popularis.* Finally, *Musicam Sacram* confirmed the norms enforcing the quality of sacred music, and the need for it to be worthy of the celebration and of holy places, whilst banishing from the Church *expressis verbis* all instruments associated with a secular atmosphere. Unfortunately, however, the document lacks detailed definitions. For instance: how is one to decide what is "worthy of the dignity of the liturgy"? What is considered to be in accordance with the "holiness of churches"? What kind of music should be rejected as unworthy, artistically inferior or "secular"? In other words, little direction is given as to how one should judge in concrete cases. History, of course, testifies that norms of this kind can scarcely be defined exactly, but even so, principles of a somewhat more detailed nature, along with corresponding guarantees, would surely have prevented the abuses that followed.

2.

The "*anthrax* in the envelope" was paragraph 32 of the 1967 Instruction. It says:

> In some places there exists the lawful practice, occasionally confirmed by indult, of substituting other songs for the Introit, Offertory and Com-

> munion chants in the *Graduale Romanum*. At the discretion of the competent territorial authority this practice may be retained, on condition that the songs substituted fit in with those parts of the Mass, the feast, or the liturgical season. The texts of such songs must also have the approval of the same territorial authority. (DOL 4153)

In plain language, this means that under certain conditions, other songs can be sung in place of the *Proprium Missae* or Mass Propers. The Instruction still seems to make a distinction by referring to these "other songs" as "substitutions." But what is the exact meaning of "these songs ... must be in keeping with the parts of the Mass" (Art. 36)? "Compatibility with the nature of the liturgical service" and of any given part, as a regulative factor for all music, is a recurrent theme of the Instruction. In these paragraphs of *Musicam Sacram* "the nature of the liturgical part" (Art. 9, 34 etc.) is a criterion not only for the content but also for the form. For instance, its antiphonal structure is an essential characteristic of the Introit, it is not simply something to be read in order to begin the Mass. We recognize the Introit primarily by its antiphonal structure, and this being the case, we would naturally think that any substitution for the Introit should also be antiphonal, "according to the nature of the liturgical part." But the Instruction is not clear about the mind of the Consilium. The second condition, namely, the necessary approval of the territorial authority, is likewise ambiguous. What exactly is to be approved: the religious song itself, or its quality as a substitute for the Introit? This implies a great difference! Thousands of old chant books and hymnals were approved with respect to their theological content (faith and morals): the *nihil obstat* is displayed prominently in each one of them. Does that mean that the songs published in such books can be introduced into liturgical use, for example, to substitute the Introit?

The General Introduction to the new Missal went a step further by saying that the Proper chant (Introit, Offertory, Communion) may be a piece from the *Graduale Romanum* or the Simple Gradual, – "*vel alius cantus aptus*," – or anything else that is appropriate. This sounds rather like the hoary joke about the *causa bibendi*, the rightful reasons for drinking: *dies natalis, infirmitas corporis, adventus hospitis, vel alia causa* – a birthday, bodily weakness, arrival of a guest, – or any other reason.

One feels compelled to ask: what need have we of arguments at all, if "any other" reason suffices as justification? Why bother with the *Graduale Romanum* or *Simplex*? Why make any effort toward liturgical and musical

education, if any "alius cantus aptus" is good enough to replace the Introit? In other words the *Graduale Romanum* is no longer the norm. People have always sung "something" at this point in the service, and they will continue to do so. The crucial difference is that what was previously regarded as a 'substitution' for the liturgical chant, will now be regarded as equivalent to that chant, indeed as if it were just another liturgical chant. The goal of the reform was never simply to sing "something" during the Mass, but to sing the Mass itself. And now, as an effect of the permission for any "cantus aptus," the Graduale has *de facto* disappeared.

The fact is that this rule of unlimited substitution has practically swept away the Proper of the Mass. Moreover, it also effectively removed the *norms* that the Council had established for liturgical music in general. In recent times, not a single territorial authority in the world has interfered in what is sung at Mass – save that sometimes they protested against the use of *traditional* ecclesiastical chant... If any such territorial authority actually tried to intervene, there would be no canons to which they could appeal. Had there been any such canon, they would have possessed mere legal power but no actual competence entitling them to take a stand on questions such as: what is secular?, what is worthy of the liturgy?, what is and what is not in keeping with the parts of the Mass? And finally, if they actually did take a stand, no one took notice of it. The fact is that in the universal Church today, it is only the caprice of the local priest, cantor or lay committee of the parish council (each changing from time to time, from person to person, from place to place) which determines what will be sung as the Introit of, for example, the Sixteenth Sunday of Ordinary Time.

Experience reminds us that there is still another consequence. At the very moment when the choice of chants is left in the hands of local personnel instead of the Church Universal, the standard of measurement changes from objective norms to so-called "pastoral needs," which is but a euphemism for the real or imaginary taste of those present at the liturgy. Thus all demands upon, and norms governing, *musica sacra* become illusory. No song can be rejected because it is unworthy of the liturgy, for the counter-argument is always at hand: "Our people like it"; "This congregation favors it"; "The song is fitting for this age group," and so on and on.

We have thus far spoken about the moral and musical disintegration of Catholic liturgical chant, a matter of no little importance if we recall the majestic words with which *Musicam Sacram* explains that the sacred music

of our own day should not be unworthy of the past (Par. 59). Now, however, we shall analyze the question from a liturgical point of view.

3.

The concession *alius cantus aptus*, in fact, does not touch upon music alone: together with the music it also adversely affects the liturgical text itself. The General Introduction of the Missal does not speak about the *tune* of the Introit in any musical setting, but about a concession to allow the singing of basically anything in place of it. While the conciliar Liturgical Constitution prescribed that composers set texts from the Bible or the liturgical books, the Missal imprinted with the name of that same Council seems to be quite indifferent toward the texts of the chants to be performed during the holiest and most canonical celebration in all of Catholic worship.

We can express this as follows: henceforth the Church entrusts no liturgical message to the chant. To state it differently: henceforth chant does not have a role in the self-explanation of the liturgy. More rudely put: the chant is no longer an integral part of the liturgy. The past Council, of course, said the exact opposite: the music *qui verbis inhaeret necessarium vel integralem liturgiae sollemnis partem efficit* (SC 112); the music which inheres in the words is an integral part of the solemn liturgy. With permission for the unregulated "cantus aptus," chant ceased to inhere in the words (since these words can be anything), and ceased to be an integral part of the liturgy (since it does not carry the message of the liturgy determined by the Church).

As we know, the Roman liturgy took ninety percent of its Proper chants from the Bible, at least two-thirds of these from the Psalms. The gradual decline can be described in a (fictitious) series of steps:

- At first, both Gregorian and Byzantine chant sang the psalm on a tune appropriate to both the textual structure and the liturgical situation.
- The psalmody cites the liturgical text exactly, but the musical setting does not correspond perfectly to the form of the words (e.g., mensural rhythms, music directed by harmonies, or polyphonic arrangement).
- The psalm is chanted in strophic psalm paraphrases, in the style of choral psalms or "Geneva" psalmody. Such paraphrases frequently deviate

from the direct meaning of the words, and still more from the form connected so closely to the content; moreover, many things are added to the psalms. But the identity of the psalm remains discernible, and the verses are regulated by the sequence of ideas in the psalm. The Proper chants replaced by such stanzas can still be recognized.

- Finally, the Mass Propers are simply replaced by strophic congregational hymns inherited chiefly from the Baroque or Romantic era. Plainly, this change produces no benefit in terms of liturgical singing, and the disappearance of the liturgical words, which at least the priest had prayed earlier, is a serious loss. Such songs are far from both the content of the liturgical text and the "nature of the liturgical part": all liturgical singing is completely homogenized following the schemes of recent poetical forms, which are alien to the character of responses and antiphons mentioned in the Liturgcal Constitution and the Instruction *Musicam sacram*, as well as to free biblical prose. (Some hymns of this type simply violated all legal boundaries and replaced even the Ordinary of the Mass with Baroque-Romantic "Mass-songs," thus also sabotaging the musical realization of the liturgical renewal.)

In other countries, musicians attempted to create a new repertory of refrains to be sung by the congregation. These compositions to texts from the Bible or the liturgical books, fulfilled the desire for singing in alternation, in cooperation with the schola or cantor and congregation. Three objections, however, must be examined.

- The majority of the tunes themselves are forced and unnatural compositions. (The musical reasons can be analyzed.)
- In most cases the texts are independent of the extant Proper chants, and they convey the message of the composer instead of the liturgy.
- The chief problem is that most of these compositions are rarely used, not merely because of their unattractive music but rather because of man's innate desire to spare himself any pointless and unnecessary labor. Why work so hard to teach new melodies and new methods of singing, if the well-known strophic songs are of equal rank with the liturgical chanting?

New strophic hymns have also been composed. In some instances, fine textual elements (such as hymns of the Eastern churches, for example, or

selections from classical Christian writers) have found a place in these newer hymns. But most of them remain pale and diluted copies of Baroque-Romantic religious lyrics set to music, which are but variations on 19th-century triadic clichés. From a liturgical perspective they share the same deficiencies we observed in the case of the inherited repertory of *cantiones*.

As the decline continues its downward trend, there follows the cheap musical material adapted under the pretext of "folk traditions" (which in actual fact are known very little, or only superficially). I explain in the last chapter of this book that the melodies in the actual "folk tradition" consist chiefly of secular musical material or – in the best cases – paraliturgical popular repertory. The number of surviving ethno-musicological remains or "relics" which meet the standards governing liturgical use, is insignificant. But deep and careful analysis of such musical data can indeed call our attention to certain "universal" musical factors, attitudes and archaic forms, which can also be instructive for church music.

Finally, the principle of *alius cantus aptus* has opened the door to light or beat music, which at first was used only as a means of religious propaganda (similar to the usage of some sects), and then gradually penetrated into the liturgy itself. It should have been clear to everyone that we are dealing with secular music here, something far beneath the level of *verae artis formas* (SC 112), and with texts theologically cheap (if not heterodox) and independent of the message of the liturgy. The only argument brought forth by its advocates, is its attractiveness to some groups of young people. But if the majestic principles of the Conciliar Constitution and the post-conciliar Instruction (both of which call for a music worthy of the sacred precincts of the chuch, worthy of the heritage of the past, etc.) did not, even in this instance, supply motives for the prohibition of secular music, then we are quite right in saying that the ringing phrases of ecclesiastical documents have no regulative force and indeed, no meaning at all. I have yet to hear any protest by ecclesiastical authorities against this destruction of sacred music, this abandonment of the musical dimensions of the liturgical renewal.

And yet one reads glowing reports about how good and warm-fuzzy even the very highest prelates feel today at hearing the juvenile music which resounds in the Masses of young people! Such is the real value of the vague "principles" which do not go beyond *quaedam sanctissima verba*, venerable but absolutely ineffective verbiage. This is the ultimate logical consequence of

article 32 in *Musicam sacram*, and of those four small innocent words in the Missale Romanum: "vel alius cantus aptus."

I do not claim that it would be easy or unproblematic to re-implant the Proper chants of the Roman Mass into the mainstream of liturgical practice in the Church today. We shall return to this question in the final paragraphs of this study, where we shall discuss in greater detail the question of religious congregational singing. But first, we turn our attention to the tradition of the chants of the Roman Mass, and once we understand its essence and its qualities, we can consider the tasks of the present. Our study will proceed in two steps: first, an analysis of the contents of the *Graduale Romanum*, and secondly its functional and historical reality.[10]

4.

The ancient religions (Judaism, for example, or Eastern and Western Christianity, Buddhism, Mohammedanism) each have their own sacred book as the basis for their ritual. Indeed, they have no "church music": instead they chant the holy words in a liturgical context. As the eminent scholar Ewald Jammers puts it,

> The essence of Christian liturgical chant is the monophonic, unaccompanied vocal performance of God's word... Man does not 'compose' music to God's word, instead, he pronounces it. But at worship he does so by speaking not in the language of the everyday, the language of the marketplace, but rather in a solemn singing voice. And yet, this 'pronouncing' does not and cannot add anything to God's word... human utterance is elevated and transformed in the cult to become as it were the mouth of the self-revealing Deity, of Revelation proclaimed, of the incarnated Word, and to become in the common prayer, the spokesman of the Church.

The Roman Church adhered to the biblical word more consistently than any other rite. For a long time, she was reluctant to receive even the hymns of St. Ambrose. This attitude was surely grounded not only in reverence toward Sacred Scripture but also in the vigilant defense against here-

10 In this chapter, the terms *Graduale Romanum* or *Antiphonarium Missae* refer not to the *melodies* but to the liturgical texts arranged according to the annual cycle of the liturgical year, the *anni circulus*.

sies. Can we possibly say that today this danger is non-existent? Have we no reason to fear a deformation in the content of the liturgy, or an intrusion of one-sided and deficient doctrines through the predominance of man-made words?

In the Roman rite, however, the chanting of the Holy Book means more than merely singing a paragraph from the Bible. The majority of the texts chosen for liturgical chant entered the liturgy as a result of three or four centuries of theological reflection. The material selected for chanting in the liturgy is a particular manifestation of authentic Christian theology. The connection between a text chosen for chanting, and a given solemnity or liturgical season, is based upon the contemplation and interpretation of generations of Church Fathers. Feasts were interpreted by the explanation of biblical verses and, *vice versa*, the explanation of the biblical verses took place in the liturgical context of feasts.

For instance, when Psalm 2 was adopted in the Christmas liturgy, its background was a deep understanding of Christmas; the mystery found its appropriate expression in Psalm 2. On the other hand, the precondition of such an adaptation was the Christological understanding of Psalm 2, which included its connection with the mystery of the Nativity. The context of the Christmas feast is deficient without the inclusion of Psalm 2, and the interpretation of Psalm 2 is deficient without the dogmatic content concerning the Second Divine Person. Psalm 2 (the Introit and Alleluia verse of the Midnight Mass) is closely related to St. Paul's Letter to the Hebrews (Epistle of the Third Mass of Christmas Day) and to St. John's Prologue (the Gospel of the Third Mass).

Anyone who is familiar with the liturgy of the praying Church is aware of the importance of Psalms 18, 24, 79, and 84 in the spiritual message of the Advent season, an importance not inferior to that of the lections and prayers. These psalms, as they occur and recur, pray *into* the mind precisely *that* content of the Advent season, as well as its mystery, which is given by the praying Church – and not by individuals. The responsorial psalm is one element in this process, but not a self-sufficient one. The singer and the listener are influenced in a different way by the main verses chosen from the psalm and performed in a melodious way, than by a longer section of the psalm.

Therefore, he who removes the Proper chants from the Mass of the day or the season (e.g., Advent or Lent), mutilates the liturgy and diminishes the

content of the feast, by depriving the praying Church of an excellent means of fully understanding the feast being celebrated. It is totally false to suppose that the full content of a given liturgical celebration can be adequately conveyed by readings and prayers alone, while the chanted texts are omitted. What these biblical texts transmit cannot be replaced or even approximated by poetic songs and hymns, as precious as they may be. And even if such texts would remain close to the biblical words, they remain *human* words, taken out of the biblical (i.e. inspired) context. I dare say that whoever removes the proper chants, mutilates and diminishes the theology as well, which lives not only in manuals and textbooks, but also in the spirituality of the praying Church, the *Ecclesia orans.*

It is also remarkable that the Scriptural texts are introduced not at the level of private devotional reading, but within the cultic community and at fixed points within the liturgy. Earlier meditative explanations of the liturgy probably exaggerated the conscious planning of every single word and sentence within the liturgical fabric. But on the level of principles they were right: the texts were included within the liturgy because of their content, which had been the object of theological reflection. Their meaning, however, was frequently enriched and their efficiency augmented when they were situated within a given liturgical environment. One example will suffice to document this point.

> The first Sunday of Advent takes the text of its Communion chant from Psalm 84, *Dominus dabit benignitatem, et terra nostra dabit fructum suum...* The Lord Himself will give His benefits; and our land shall yield its increase. The psalm speaks of the Messianic age when the earth answers the heavenly blessing with abundant fruits of virtues: "Fidelity shall spring out of the earth, and justice shall look down from heaven." Taken in itself, the psalm describes a series of events: grace radiates down from on high; the 'earth' – meaning man – brings forth many kinds of just deeds. In fact this prophecy is fulfilled in one Person, in God made Man, Who is in one Person both the justice descending from heaven and the One Man Who possesses fidelity. He is peace; in Him is salvation near indeed to those who fear Him; He is the glory dwelling in our land (*habitavit in nobis*), kindness and Truth meet in Him, Justice and Peace shall kiss in Him. God not only gave His grace, but He Himself became, in the Second Divine Person, grace and the source of grace for us. But at the same time He is the blessed fruit of the earth, the *fructus*. What *fructus*? "Fructus ventris

> tui." The womb of Mary is the soil that bore this blessed fruit, the human nature of Christ. Hence the genealogy is an integral part of the liturgy: the genes, the seeds of Him Who descends and takes flesh in Mary's womb descended from Adam and were transmitted from generation to generation. God gave His grace (*caeli rorabant desuper*) and our earth bore its fruit (*aperivit terra et germinavit Salvatorem*): the God-Man. We sing this chant during the Communion, the time when God gives His grace to us, and if we receive Him as Mary did, then the humus of our own soul will bear its fruit... the life of God's children.

The question remains: is there an "alius cantus" that is "aptus" to include and express this mystery in one sentence, with such heavenly sensitivity and unaffectedness?

But we may proceed farther. The Proper chants are imbued with a special kind of poetical power, which is lacking in strophic poetry, even in its most wonderful hymns. The chants of the Proper announce the great truths of Christian doctrine and liturgical theology, in most instances without direct didactic persuasion, and without decorating the teaching with lyrical ornaments. They are "poetical" by speaking with the vocabulary of the Bible, i.e. with *adapted* words. In a certain sense they resemble *similes*, chiefly when they quote from the Old Testament. The theological truths are transmitted, and yet – concealed in their intimacy. Simple words and images are, as it were, dropped into the mind of the listener, where they come to light; figurative speech becomes reality in prayerful silence.

An authoritative expert in aesthetics has explained that the essence of great poetry is an enigmatic oscillation between layers of meaning, and between the temporal "reference points" (that is past, present and future) in a poem. This same oscillation is present in the liturgy not as an outcome of creative will, but in virtue of Divine Providence: the same Poet, God Himself, pronounced the Old Testament, uttered the Good News, and fulfilled (still fulfills) both in the sanctified life of the Church. When we sing a Proprium chant, we always think (or at least we feel or sense) more than is actually delivered by voice and lips. We surmise the fulfillment itself in the words, and therefore they are the words of the heavenly liturgy. This tactful, discreet poetry is hardly attainable by the plain language of ecclesiastical poetry.

I offer another example. Most of our Paschal chants speak of Easter in approximately this fashion: Christ is truly risen; the women and the apostles found the empty tomb; Christ is victorious, He has conquered Satan; He gave us the hope of resurrection. All this is very true, of course. But the Easter Introit sings: "I arose, and am still with thee, alleluja: Thou hast laid Thine hand upon me, alleluja: Thy knowledge is become wonderful, alleluja, alleluja." These are words from Psalm 138 which contemplates with enthusiasm God's omnipotence, and this enthusiasm is expressed in the psalm: "Thou knowest my down-sitting, and mine up-rising." The singer is with God during the night, and again when he awakes in the morning: "forthwith I am with you." Plainly, the singer of the Old Testament speaks with a double meaning: he speaks of God's presence in the life of man; God sees all our actions, "thou hast foreseen all my ways." But with the same words the psalmist says that he is with God both in good fortune and in bad, i.e. day and night, sitting down and rising up.

This truth was realized to an eminent degree in the life of Christ Himself. God was with Him quite as much when Christ said, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" as when He said on Easter morn, "I arose, and am still with thee." As the Easter morning High Mass commences, we do not blow up the joyful trumpet singing Christ's Resurrection, but instead the voice of Christ Himself sounds forth out of a deep silence through our lips to the Father: "I am still with thee"... Thou hast laid Thine omnipotent hand upon me and raised me. Thy knowledge is become wonderful in mine eyes, that knowledge which guides and guards the paths of all men, but in a quite exceptional sense the path of mine, of Your Son. This knowledge is not something that takes note of events after they have occurred. Thy knowledge is not the result, but the cause of events. Christ is united most intimately with the Father. And although He has "power to lay down His life, and power to take it up again," still He does not now say, "I am risen by my divine power," but rather He whispers to the Father, in the intimacy of the Trinity's innermost life: "I am still with Thee, Thou hast laid Thine hand upon me."

Since baptized Christians, ever since the Easter Vigil, grow together with Christ in the likeness of His death and resurrection, both the individual Christian and the Church as *persona publica* may say the same thing to the Father: "I am risen, and after the long night of sins I am again with Thee, because Thou hast laid Thy healing, forgiving, vivifying, resurrecting hand upon me." When the Church intones the Introit on Easter morning, she is so profoundly one with Christ that she does not speak to Him in the third person, but rather the Head with the Body united to it, speaks in unison to the Father through our lips.

With this in mind, I ask once more: where is the "alius cantus" that is able to speak with such strength, such theological profundity, such poetic intimacy, but also with such simplicity, of the Paschal mystery? With what majesty does the celebration of Easter rise up out of the silent depths of this personal (and mystical) dialogue! And how powerful the pedagogical effect of this poetry which teaches us to regard our religion primarily as a very personal union with God, and not merely as adherence to a group of people, as it were, to a party or some "community." We learn to seek this inner truth without despising the external form that delivers the inner meaning. It is enough to read (or better: to sing) the daily Introit chants of the Easter octave to see how the Mystery, with its many dimensions, unfolds in the Church's chant.

Neither can we disregard the *form* of the texts. The Introit of the Ascension begins thus: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" Whom do we hear speaking in this chant? It is the speech of God, of course, and then of the Church – but in the words of the angels. This is a *chant of representation.* And we have already seen Christ speaking in the Easter Introit, "I am risen and am still with thee..." This, too, is the language of representation. The Introit of the second Sunday in Advent proclaims, "People of Zion, behold the Lord shall come to save the nations..." And who is speaking here? It is the Church as herald of the Good News who begins to speak in this chant. It is a *chant of announcement.* Or the words of the Introit for the third Sunday in Lent, beginning "Mine eyes are ever looking unto the Lord; for He shall pluck my feet out of the net..." Who is speaking now? God puts these words on the lips of the whole Church and the souls who make up the Church. This is a *chant of imploring...*

All these examples have one thing in common. Someone *speaks* in them. Now, when we listen to a strophic hymn, this precise effect of *locutio directa* is diminished, in fact disappears completely. When we sing even the finest hymns, we feel they are the compositions of a poet – it is the poet who speaks in these chants. And that difference is a consequence of the *form.* There, the flow of thoughts, the length and linkage of phrases, the selection of words is defined and determined by the poetic form, by its rhythmic structure and rhyme. The strophic poem is *artefactum,* an artificial construct, an artistic opus. And when the result is not of the highest quality either as regards its theological or poetical dimension, then we sense even more viv-

idly that the necessities of the poem direct the thought, rather than *vice versa.* One does not need at all to despise sung poetry in hymns, even those of extra-liturgical origin in order to recognize that hymns can never be such speech-like texts as one finds in free biblical prose.

Since the chants of the Mass proper, with but few exceptions, are based upon biblical texts, they are, again with but few exceptions, manifestations of a "spiritual speech" rather than "poems." Finding their own pleasant articulation, they proceed with the naturalness of speech; the singer can take it on his lips as speech delivered in a special way. This is what Ewald Jammers meant when he affirmed that "Man does not 'compose' music to God's word; instead, he pronounces it. And he does so at worship by speaking not in the language of the everyday, the language of the marketplace, but rather in a solemn singing voice." Psychologically, the prose form always approximates speech more closely; when pronouncing a text of this kind, we feel more easily that we are *praying.* This is not to say that prayers in strophic form cannot be uttered with a prayerful mentality. But even then, there always remains something that reminds us: we are speaking "in quotation marks." "I lift up my soul to Thee, O God..." Here, the form suggests that an individual person (or a collective person such as the Church) is telling his Lord: "I lift up my soul to Thee." Compared to this directness, strophic speech in most cases sounds like the repetition of a poem... or a song.

Finally, it behooves us to recall that the Proper chants of the Mass are linked to the liturgical seasons and times, not just in a general fashion, but quite specifically, by virtue of their content. The oldest choir-books of the Roman liturgy eloquently testify that the overwhelming majority of these chants belonged to fixed days, and these assignments remained untouched up until 1968. The same texts were written in the Missals, and if they were not sung, then the priest prayed them. In doing so, the Church clearly expressed her desire that each chant stand in a fixed position, which simply means that on this day, at this liturgical position, *this* is the chant, and not any other.[11]

11 It is quite remarkable, however, that this connection between a Proper chant and a given part of the liturgy does not involve explicit mention of the start of Mass in the Introit, for example, or explicit reference to the act of offering in the Offertory chant, or to the reception of the Sacrament in the Communio. The reality is rather that certain thoughts

Exactly when and how this "properization" of the Mass chants was achieved is an altogether different question. At this point, we are not interested in this question, nor in deciding whether or not the numerous speculations are true concerning the justification of the given position of a chant and its interrelationships with other parts of the daily liturgy through historical facts or spiritual reflections, We simply accept the fact that in the minds, hearts and memories of faithful Catholics there gradually emerged, over a period of 1200 years or more, a network of associations between the experience of a particular liturgical day and the chants "proper" to that day. Such associations were truly "catholic," in other words universal within the Latin liturgy. All felt a part of it, anyone at will referred to it: the Sundays were named after their Introits (e.g. *Laetare, Gaudete, Quasimodo*); people dated their private letters by referring to the same chant; composers created music not to *texts*, but to the Offertory or the Introit of a given day. For a Christian who lived in and with the liturgy of the praying Church, this order of chants coalesced with the full liturgy of the day, and it contributed to the high degree of constancy in the Mass Propers (as opposed to the frequent variations in the Divine Office). So it is by no means an accident that certain chant forms were excluded from this uniformity. In spite of the unchanging stability of Introits, Graduals, Offertories and Communions, the Alleluja and the Sequence presented a wide field of opportunity for the creative forces of various geographic regions (tropes, sacred polyphony).

This universality and continuity in space and time bore rich fruit, and brought great blessings. Over and above the psychological associations, such universality nurtured a feeling of stability and promoted the reverence of which a long tradition is worthy. It radiated, and thus taught, discipline; it made palpable a kind of "impersonal anonymity" which cannot be achieved simply by concealing the authors' names. My university students were always shocked to open Dom Hesbert's *Antiphonarium Missarum Sextuplex* or the 11th-century Gradual of the Roman basilica of St. Cecilia, only to find there, on the same days, the same Proper chants than the ones printed in the *Liber Usualis* of 1950. And without any coaching from me, their first question after the initial surprise was, "Then why should we sing different ones instead of these?" Why, indeed...?

and emotions are evoked in the mind of the participant through these chants connected with the given liturgical event.

The last Council offered an opportunity to make these blessings of the Propers available for the entire "People of God," transcending the relatively restricted circles of those familiar with Latin, or the users of bilingual missals. The fateful paragraph 32 of the 1967 Instruction, however, deprived the Church of these blessings. The Instruction (and indeed the "Missal of 2001") pretends that we actually do have Propers for the Mass[12] – whereas everyone knows that today the Mass Propers are sung perhaps at one Mass in ten thousand. In the real world of today, the *mundus hujus temporis*, the content of the Proper chants is not what the Church desires to communicate through them, but instead what people attribute to that content in many tens of thousands of churches in many tens of thousands of ways.

In sum, there is today no defined liturgical content authoritatively attached to the Proper chants by the Church. Which is to say that chant – excepting the Ordinary and the interlectionary chants in the best case – *plays no part in carrying the content of liturgy.* The Proper chants have ceased to be an integral part of the liturgy.

5.

If we wish to understand the present situation and our tasks within it, we should not neglect to draw the main lines of the historical process which led to the present state of affairs, since all the elements of this description will be helpful in considering the possibilities of today and tomorrow.

12 On March 16, 2002 the Congregation for Divine Worship sent a letter with detailed observations on a proposed translation of the Roman Missal submitted by a number of episcopal conferences. Section IV, paragraph N of these observations says, with all desirable clarity: "Since it is already permissible, as specified by the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, to use other sung texts in place of the antiphons given in the Missal, the Conference may wish to publish separately a set of such texts, and perhaps some of the antiphons prepared for the present project may eventually qualify for inclusion in such a publication. The Congregation would not be opposed to such a measure provided that the texts chosen be doctrinally sound. However, in the case of texts from Sacred Scripture, it is the sacred text itself that should determine the qualities of the music to which it is to be set, rather than vice-versa." This principle does not seem to have been followed consistently in the antiphons given in the part of the project that the translators have labeled the 'Antiphonal.' The antiphons to be printed in the Missal should appear within the Mass formularies, as in the current *editio typica.*

As far as its formal aspect is concerned, the Catholic Mass in Late Antiquity was an almost uninterrupted dialogue in cantillation between the celebrant, the deacon, the lector and the assembly. This form was "ordinary" in the broad sense, and what we today call the Ordinary of the Mass was part of it. For example, the Kyrie was a litany refrain, the Sanctus an exclamatory response to the Preface, the Agnus a litany section, the Gloria a series of acclamations. The Ordinarium Missae in this narrow sense was an element within a larger series of cantillations, itself a cantillation that sounded similar (without being identical note for note) to the so-called "Missa Primitiva" or "Missa Mundi" we know today as Mass XVI and XVIII in the Liber Usualis. The 1967 Instruction on Musica Sacra is therefore perfectly correct in giving preference to the responses, acclamations and Ordinary of the Mass among the "parts which pertain to the faithful" (*partes quae ad christifideles spectant*).

According to our present-day knowledge, the most ancient item of the Proper was the psalm lection which was not a "chant" as we understand that term today, but part of the Liturgy of the Word, itself also a reading, recited by a lector. In contrast to other lections, this reading could be more ornate, depending upon the capabilities of a "psalmista" with better musical training. Though its tone was defined by tradition, its actual realization in practice was the result of the individual improvisation of the lector-psalmist. Today one can still hear chanting analogous in many respects within orthodox Jewish communities where the cantillation may be simpler or – by extending the scale and inserting melismatic elements – more ornate, indeed sometimes even passionate, according to the singer's talent. The Gregorian Tract (Ambrosian: *Cantus*) is in all probability the descendant of this solo psalmody.

From the 4th century there is evidence indicating that the congregation could also join in the psalmody by chanting a refrain. For instance, in his *Confessions* (IX,12) St Augustine relates how, at the death of his mother Monica, after the first shock of loss was mitigated, his friend Evodius took up the psalter and intoned Psalm 100 "with the whole house making the responses": *Misericordiam et justitiam cantabo tibi, Domine;* Mercy and judgement I will sing to Thee, O Lord. Such responsorial psalmody was an integral part of the Divine Office, and frequently introduces Augustine's sermons on the psalms. But the sources are unclear as to whether or not this kind of psalm-singing was actually part of the Mass. Some think that the Psalm in the

Mass remained a solo chant for a longer period of time, and was immediately succeeded by the Gradual chant of the Roman Mass.

According to historical progression, the next element might be the Communion. In the earliest stages it was not truly a "proper" chant because the selection of psalms (e.g. Psalm 33, 148 etc) was, analogously to the *kononikon* of the Byzantine liturgy, enough to cover the whole year. This psalm, too, was a solo piece, and the links between the Office Responsory and the old Communion repertory suggest the existence of a stock of melismatic solo psalmody common in the ancient Mass and Office liturgies but not yet divided into clear-cut genres.

It is also worth noting that historically, the chant after the Scripture reading had no direct thematic link with the foregoing lection. It was rather an independent psalm, connected with the reading only indirectly, through the general theme of the liturgical season. Indeed, the name "responsory/responsorial" did not mean that the chant is somehow "responding" to the reading, but rather referred to its inner structure. The idea of coordinating lection and ("responsorial") psalm emerged first in the 20th-century commentaries, which the post-conciliar liturgical books attempted to realize in practice.

During the next period of the Roman liturgy's history, the period of the *scholae*, the "psalmist" (psalmista) remained the qualified performer of the Proper chants. The *scholae* were founded primarily to serve the liturgical life of the well-endowed great basilicas, while in the smaller towns or village communities the older and simpler usage was retained, namely leaving all the elaborate chants to the soloist.

The emergence of the Introit and Offertory chants is already associated with the *scholae*. The daily liturgical practice of the major basilicas required the presence of more than one psalmist, so that they could take turns singing the "professional's" chant individually, and later in common or in alternation according to the musico-liturgical customs. Such groups may have acted as *scholae* even before the institution itself was formally established and properly named. Group singing in the *schola* led to the elimination of improvised elements, the fixation of melodies, and the creation of a kind of canon of selected sacred texts, at least for smaller areas. The raw material of their chanting naturally consisted of the formulae inherited from the earlier solo chanting. But in the very moment when this set of formulae was applied to fixed words, more and more individual pieces came into exis-

tence. The creation of individual pieces was not only necessary but also possible in the context of choral singing: the existence of the *scholae* as the *collegium* of professional singers, and the mutual control which it implied, established the conditions for memorizing a growing repertory within the parameters of the oral culture.

As far as the texts of the Proper chants are concerned, the earlier "free choice on the basis of traditions" has gradually changed into the concept of *repertory*, based upon the theological reflection referred to earlier, i.e. the background of Christian liturgical interpretation of the psalms. The first stage in stabilizing a fixed repertory was not the equivalent of some sort of a Roman Mass Antiphonary. Lists of selected psalm sections or verses could have been fixed first, then distributed according to liturgical genres of chant, and assigned to specific feasts or within particular seasons. The process could have been completed with the achievement of lists or registers simply arranged in the numerical sequence of psalms, for instance a register *per annum*, traces of which can be found in the Lenten Communions as well as the post-Pentecost Introits and Offertories of the *Graduale Romanum*.

At some point in the 7th century, the collected set of liturgical Proper chants was arranged and completed in a way that linked each of them to a precisely defined day of the liturgical year. Recent research points to the probability that this arrangement was made gradually, proceeding from one type of chant to another. Although there existed no master plan to coordinate all the Proper chants of a given day, tradition sanctioned their cohesion. Thus the "properization" was completed, and the result was an admirable structure. Its value was guaranteed on the most fundamental level by the quality of the individual texts, i.e. their biblical origin; on the second level by the theological interpretation defining their approximate liturgical position; and on the third level by their order arising from the arrangement within the annual cycle, the system of *anni circulus*. This, of course, also applies conversely: the biblical words and their theological-liturgical interpretation have immensely enriched the liturgical year. This arrangement *per anni circulum* helped to fix the structure of the calendar; it made the individual days more characteristic, well distinguished and memorable. The Roman Fifth Instruction of March 28, 2001 ("Liturgiam authenticam") frequently refers to the "identity" of the Roman liturgy as something to be preserved. Certainly, the *Graduale Romanum* arranged *per anni circulum* is (was?) indeed a preeminent part of this identity!

Before we proceed, two lessons should be drawn from what has been said thus far.

First, the music of the Proper chants was not an emotional or "feeling"-element of the liturgy. Rather, in its proper way, it has a part to play in the communication system of the liturgy. Second, the congregation did not take part in the performance of the Proper chants, since they pertained to the semi-professional or professional singers. This fact does not at all point to any lack or deficiency in *actuosa participatio*, but rather is the manifestation in practice of a basic principle of liturgy: the distribution of roles. The skeleton framework of the rite was presented in the ongoing cantillation and dialogue; the delivery of lections was the task of lectors, the singing of psalms was chiefly the task of the psalmist(s) or the *schola*.

* * *

This situation changed as the Roman liturgy spread throughout the whole of Western Christendom. The Roman rite propagated by the missionaries included not only the priest's Sacramentary but the *Antiphonarium Missae* as well. The *agenda* were not determined by local conditions but by an objective liturgical *ordo*, and the new local churches had to "grow up" to this task. The manner of celebration could be a little different, but its essence was fixed by a canon. Medieval Europe was able to create and support the corporative bodies and institutions, which guaranteed the basic unity of the Proper chants while allowing for legitimate variations within that unity. An essential element of the medieval school system was the teaching of music, and so the "chorus," which existed in the great cathedrals as well as in the smallest village churches, assured the chanting of the Propers making them resound all over the *orbis catholicus*. In this context, the term "chorus" of course does not mean a modern choir, but rather the entire liturgical corporative body: in cathedrals and larger churches the chapter, priests, clerics, schoolboys and their instructors; in the village church perhaps no more than the priest, a teacher and three or four lads. At various times and in different places one finds divergences in the distribution of chants amongst soloist(s), selected schoolboys or the whole choir. However, the basic repertory of sung texts and melodies was essentially the same across the entire area of the Roman rite. The medieval choir extended the ideal of the *schola* to the community of all literate persons. An historical precedent for such

efforts in recent centuries would have been to incorporate, by an extension of Christian schooling, increasing numbers of layfolk as members of this "extended schola."

In the Middle Ages, scientific education reached only a narrow segment of the population, though it was not restricted to the clergy. A fuller participation of the faithful in the "communication system" of the liturgy was also limited by linguistic boundaries. As a consequence, the *schola* gradually assumed the role of the congregation in the basic stratum of liturgical chants, that is to say, in the cantillation of responses and Mass Ordinary. Eventually, the Mass Ordinary itself became a cycle of schola chants, approximating the musical style of Proper pieces. And with the exception of the lections, the orations and other recitations, the structure of the different types of Mass chants began to amalgamate.

Though it is fashionable today to profess that one is scandalized by these changes, from a theological point of view they are in no sense an abuse. Sane principles solidly support the belief that the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered not by those present, but always by the universal Church. When Holy Mass is celebrated or, so to say, realized and actualized in its right order, the Church acts for the benefit of the entire community, every member of which partakes of its blessings through the channels of grace. The content of the liturgy is what the Church says and does in it; the participants join in the *actio praecellenter sacra* according to their own way and capacity.

Originally viewed, as liturgical texts delivered in a special way, the liturgical chants of the Proper gradually changed into *compositions* on liturgical texts. In a further logical development, the musical setting itself (at least on some days and in some types of chants) adapted the musical language of the time, in other words the contemporaneous style of polyphonic art music.

These developments were also influenced by the multiplication of Masses, which did not come about for pastoral reasons, viz. to offer the faithful more occasions to choose when they wished to attend Mass. The fact is that in addition to, and outside of, the High Mass the faithful wished to commemorate the Blessed Virgin or their patron saint or their dear departed, and so during the late Middle Ages an increasing number of Masses was celebrated at side altars in honor of individual saints etc., according to the intentions of the donors. In most cases singers were also provided for those Masses, and they were paid by the "foundations" of donors. In the

absence of such singers, however, the celebrant himself read (some think that at an earlier stage, he sang) all the chants of the Mass.

* * *

After the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church retained this principle: the chants of the Proper are an integral part of the Mass, hence should be sung in Latin (as Gregorian chant or a polyphonic setting), or at least recited by the celebrant. But by this time, as a consequence of historical processes, the system of institutions that formerly maintained and supported the continuity of chanting, had collapsed. In some churches there remained choirs (*capellae*) executing the pale and "boring" Gregorian Propers as a ritual obligation between the performance of two splendid movements of a polyphonic Ordinary. Some monasteries were also able to maintain the regular singing of the Proper chants. In the majority of Masses, however, it was left to the celebrant to read the texts in silence whilst the congregation nurtured its own religious feelings and passed the time by singing the pious hymns created as a result of Protestant influence. The mere reading of the Proper chants shriveled the texts into brief "logia," bits of connective tissue between the "important" parts of the service. No wonder, then, that for many the Proper chants became an obligatory but very subordinate, non-essential part of the liturgy, incapable of offering much spiritual sustenance even to the priest celebrant.

Problems of this nature were but of marginal interest to the religious movements of the 17th and 18th centuries, and only the liturgical renewal of the 19th century (Dom Guéranger, Bishop J. M. Sailer) offered any chance for the a reversal of the decline. The best efforts at reform, however, encountered serious obstacles, and the results were rather narrowly circumscribed. But their real significance lay in the "appeal" they voiced: to look for and work toward a better future. The apostles of liturgical renewal urged the establishment of choirs in many churches, with appropriate musical formation to enable them to sing the chant, including the Proper chants (largely to Gregorian tunes) according to the rules of the Church. What was missing, unfortunately, was the supporting system of institutions, which would guarantee the universal and uninterrupted achievement of this goal –, independently of personal and individual zeal.

Along with the other texts, the Proper chants were also transmitted to the faithful in the bilingual missals whose influence was enormous. For many Catholics the missal became their most important spiritual nourishment, more important perhaps than even the Bible, because once drawn into the rhythm of the Church's life, they received God's word and the Church's prayer within the vivid context of the liturgy under the protecting wings of liturgical observation. Such persons also became attached to the Proper chants as to sacred texts... but only as texts. (While singing, a text extends in space and time, and thus touches not only the intellect, but other spheres of the heart and soul as well). The liturgical renewal greatly enriched and supported both priests and layfolk by publishing explanations of the liturgy. Drawn from good sources, these commentaries transcended the moral sermonizing of Baroque and Enlightenment schoolbooks, and did not fail to include the chants of the Proper, interpreting them in the spirit of the liturgy. It is regrettable that these commentaries did not reach the entire larger community of the faithful, and even more regrettable that they did not permeate the great majority of the clergy either.

Complete success was not achieved because of three failures or deficiencies: 1) The liturgical renewal remained more of an exhortation and a pious desire than a concrete program energetically taken up and vigorously executed by the entire institution of the Church. 2) No mechanism was developed for combining the true preservation of Latin with the linguistic communication of the liturgy to persons unfamiliar with Latin. 3) There was no bold creative action to find ways of presenting music to people of the age, unable to perform universally the Proper chants in their full form.

Vatican II was predestined to accept and pass on the noble legacy of the century-old liturgical renewal and to solve the problems that had emerged. Though the principles of the Council's Liturgical Constitution promised the *restoration* of liturgical singing, events after the Council in fact led to the *disappearance* of liturgical singing.

6.

Before we begin to examine the possibilities in actual practice today, we shall summarize, as clearly as we can, what has been said thus far.

What are the *Proprium* or "Proper" chants of the Roman liturgy? They are sacred texts chosen chiefly from the Bible, sung in a liturgical context (i.e. performed as appropriate to the individual moments or actions of the Mass) on the various days of the (Church) year.

Why were changes introduced after the Council? In the case of the Proprium chants, we may surmise that aims like the following were involved: a) to draw the entire congregation into the singing; b) to offer ordinary or conventional texts in place of the biblical verses which require a higher degree of liturgical formation and knowledge from the faithful, and yet they are also c) in the vulgar tongue, on simple tunes; d) and to abrogate or dissolve the fixed position of a given chant, i.e. its connection with a given day and a given part of the liturgy; e) so as to permit the use of a repertory pleasing to various ethnic, social or age groups.[13]

The reader himself can judge which of these objectives harmonizes with heritage of the Roman liturgy or with the conciliar Liturgical Constitution. In any case, the goals listed above are very useful in indicating the difficulties faced by anyone who wishes to propose a solution.

The question can be divided into three component factors: A. performer (Who sings?), B. performed (What is sung?), and C. performance (How is it sung?).

A. Neither history, nor the nature of the liturgy, nor the norms of the Church or of the Council, nor even the postconciliar regulations vindicate the need for having the Proprium sung by the entire congregation. The Church fulfills her prophetic function in the Proprium chants, and it is absurd that the entire congregation should "prophesy" to the entire congrega-

13 As I see it, the only reason for some of the changes was, unfortunately: change for its own sake, change itself. For example, the new Missal gives on one day the text of the chanted Proper piece, and on another day a different text (without tune) which is neither better nor worse than the one from the *Graduale*. I cannot recall that anyone has ever demonstrated the spiritual benefit (cf. SC 23!) of this peculiar choice. It was quite sufficient, however, to loosen the link with the sung Proper, thus diminishing the inner coherence of the liturgy and consequently also its external discipline.

tion. General congregational participation is a good thing – but only if the content, the message of the liturgy is not sacrificed on the altar of "active participation," for that would mean that the Greater is being sacrificed for the sake of the Lesser in importance.

We have already noted that the historical succession of groups that chanted the Propers might be this: psalmist – schola – "cappella musicale." It is the mediaeval model (choir) that comes closest to transforming the Proper chants into the chant of the full assembly (while admitting that some chants remain the competence of small groups or individuals, as they were in the Middle Ages). In other words, the level of musical literacy today permits the congregation to be a "chorus," a liturgical corporate body. But even so, that is not necessary. The Introit, the Offertory or the Communio (sometimes also the Gradual, Alleluja and Sequence) should be performed by well-prepared singers. Alternatively, those pieces (or sections of them) can be divided amongst the singers and the congregation.

Who are exactly these "well-prepared singers"? The Instruction "Musicam Sacram" of 1967 lists three: the large choir (*cappella musicale*), the schola, and the cantor (psalmist). This series represents three steps or stages back into history – or, if you want, three increasingly broad areas of possible realization. A large choir or *cappella* established in a cathedral or *ecclesia major* (a "greater church") – as the Instruction requires! – should be obliged to sing the full Proper. There are many more parish churches where a *schola* – consisting of, let us say, ten or twelve chanters – can be organized, whose primary task would be precisely the chanting of the Proprium Missae. The Instruction advises and admonishes that – even where a large choir or a schola is functioning –, there is a need for a cantor or *psalmist* who can perform some parts alone, who leads the singing of the congregation, or who alternates with it in *all* the Masses.

The best thing the Church can do in this area is to impose *obligatory* regulations and demand the allocation of appropriate budgetary resources (as was the customary during past centuries) so as to assure the presence of cantors or singing groups in each church, at the greatest possible number of Masses.

The proper location of these singers is between the sanctuary and the nave, in an area suitably furnished and arranged so that they can carry out their function and direct the chant of the congregation. Since the responses and parts of the Ordinary are sung by the people, the chief task of these

"well-prepared singers" is to chant the Proper, alone or in alternation with the people, supporting their chants, as conditions require.

If the presence of a cantor is assured, and their training and formation is successful, then the problem is already half-solved. If we have loyal and competent singers over a few decades, who take their place in each parish church, every day (or at least every Sunday) in all the Masses, then a new liturgical tradition would surely emerge organically from the old one – and that in an unexpectedly brief period of time!

B. The Proprium Missae Romanae *is* the Proper of the Roman Mass! Here, the first and most urgent task is to abolish *instanter* the *alius cantus aptus*. Until this path of 'escape' is open, all efforts will be vain and fruitless, indeed still-born. If substitution is permitted at all, it must be by way of exception only, under strictly defined rules (which differentiate according to the peculiar characteristics of the various Proper parts)... and the permission should specify the acceptable types of substitutes.

Such strictness is not meant to imply or require that henceforth only the tunes of the *Graduale Romanum* should be sung. (We shall discuss the melodies below, under the heading "how.") We have already noted how the Roman Proprium Missae developed in two or three formative stages, each of which possessed special advantages. The *first* period was the *ad hoc* selection of psalms. There is little reason and less need to return today to that period. The *second* stage, with *sets* of recurrent Proper chants set to melodies varying from week to week, would be useful in parishes unable to master *all* the chants of the entire church year. Two examples of this device can be mentioned: the *Dominicale* in the Ambrosian *Antiphonarium Missae*, and the new Roman *Graduale Simplex*. The Ambrosian *Dominicale* presents a dozen Introits, Offertories etc. in one series for the season *per annum*, which are used cyclically by turns.[14]

The composition of the *Graduale Simplex* was not motivated by liturgical considerations, but by musical ones. According to SC 117, *Expedit quoque ut paretur editio simpliciores modos continens, in usum minorum ecclesarum.* The book aided the ritual practice of such "smaller churches" in two ways. First, it offered a chant repertory selected from the syllabic Office antiphons based

14 The Old-Roman Gradual also retains elements of this system when it presents a modest number of Allelujas which are used several times.

largely on recurring (and hence easily mastered) model-melodies with multiple texts, in place of the ornate individual melodies created for the use of the Roman scholae. Secondly, the book contains *sets* of chants for free distribution within a given season, in place of the chants that changed each week.

I believe it is unfair to criticize the *Graduale Simplex* for ignoring and indeed confounding the musical differences between Mass and Divine Office. These "simpler melodies" were not intended to displace the "great melodies" from churches where the singers are capable of chanting them. Instead, the idea was to help churches where otherwise, in the absence of such *simpliciores modos* there would not be any liturgical singing at all. Furthermore, it is not only the elaborated pieces of the trained scholae that bear a high value. Simple tunes can do so as well, in their proper environment, with their monumental liturgical and musical beauty, which is evident chiefly when they are sung by large groups of people.

The greatest difficulties were buried elsewhere. The *Graduale Simplex*, of course, is bound to Latin. And when the Latin tongue was excluded from the practice of the great majority of Catholic Masses, then the *Graduale Simplex*, which had been produced with such a great effort, lost its function, and became superfluous. It was the consequence of being bound to the Latin texts that Dom Cardine, the architect of the *Graduale Simplex*, made his choices only from the Office antiphons, since no one wished to create new "Gregorian" melodies. And thus the *Graduale Simplex* lost its link with the "canonical" texts of the *Graduale Romanum.*

However, once the language changes to the vulgar tongue, the adaptation of "authentic" chant melodies is no longer necessary. So the *Graduale Simplex* may be regarded from two aspects: either as a repertory for use at Latin Masses, or as a model for vernacular liturgical chant, in which case nothing prevents the creation – following the principles and methods of the *Graduale Simplex* – of easier versions of the "original and authentic" Proper chants, for congregational use.

And so, from the theological, liturgical and historical considerations presented up to this point, we may sum up the matter in this proposition: once the practice of *alius cantus aptus* has been eliminated, the Roman liturgy will need a "canonized" series of Proper chants which should be sung at all Masses. (The "how" is discussed in the following paragraph.)

Such a "canon," however, may contain two systems or series: a) a strict order of Proprium chants arranged according to days and genres, identical with the 1200-year old traditional system; b) a second, simplified ("simplex") order of Proper chants assigned to feasts and seasons according to the principle of "sets" of chants. The two systems should not be completely independent of each other: if the simple series (largely in the vernacular) should not be set to fixed Gregorian tunes, the various texts of the "strict" Proprium may also be combined with simple melodies and may serve as a "seasonal" Proper. Moreover, the most important section of a longer piece could function as an "easy" refrain, shifting the remainder over into the verses. A possible canon of "simpler" Introits for Lent, for instance, might be *Invocabit, Reminiscere, Nos autem* – supplemented by others depending upon circumstances.[15]

Substitution, in the strict sense of the term, is not contemplated, but other possibilities will be proposed below. Moreover, the official "canon" itself may contain alternatives (for instance the historical *Rorate/Memento* pair as Introit on IV Advent), and some space may be allotted to the local traditions, chiefly in the Sanctorale.

In any case, it is possible to conceive a specifically enumerated Proper which maintains the identity of the Roman rite, is suitable for universal use, and "canonic" enough to be regarded as an integral part of the liturgy, while being flexible enough to permit realization in practice if the necessary effort is appropriately made. Confusion, arbitrariness and corruption of taste would be eliminated in such a case.

C. In the post-Tridentine period there were two possibilities for performing the proper chants: to have them either chanted by professional singers (in Gregorian tunes, or occasionally polyphonic settings), or read silently by the celebrant at the altar. Today, when the heightened awareness of

15 In the new Hungarian Catholic church hymnal (*Éneklő Egyház* = The Church in Her Chants) there are 46 Introits for the whole year (28 for the Temporale, 18 for the Sanctorale, Commune and Votive Masses). The texts are taken from the Graduale Romanum, with some abbreviations in a few exceptional cases (e.g. *Exsurge, quare obdormis, Domine? exsurge, et ne repellas in finem: quare faciem tuam avertis? adjuva nos, et libera nos*). The majority of these texts are sung to one of a "set" of 12 antiphon melodies. The collection is supplemented by the "Book of Introits," which contains all the Introits of the Temporale, in most cases set to the same model tunes.

the inner nature of the liturgy and the needs of the present situation are considered, it is plain that more possibilities are required. Whether or not a "canonized" Proper will actually be able to survive, depends chiefly upon the available ways of performing it.

a) The manner of performance which most closely approximates the ancient living tradition is of course the chanting of the Proprium from the *Graduale Romanum* by trained singers (or, if the standard of musical literacy permits, by a well-trained congregation). Although the 1967 Instruction *Musicam sacram* par. 33 recommends that according to conditions (*quantum fieri potest*) the congregation join in chanting the Propers to the extent possible, at least in the form of easier refrains, this is not prescribed by liturgical law, and as we know, the Proprium did not originally belong among the "parts which pertain to the faithful." Hence we should retain the words of the Instruction: such congregational participation is desirable – *quantum fieri potest.*

b) The wish of the 1967 Instruction (par. 31/32) is that, if possible, the Proper chants should be sung on the tunes of the *editio typica* in the *Graduale Romanum.* Though I concur on this point, I believe that the restrictions should be mitigated and limited only for instances when it involves some widely-known pieces like the Christmas Introit *Puer natus est nobis.* Otherwise, today we have a far greater appreciation for the local traditions of plainchant, whose revival is a noble goal.

The Central European or so-called pentatonic dialect of Gregorian chant is much easier than the Italo-French diatonic dialect, and its broader use may contribute to the wider extension of Gregorian practice.

In the spirit of the last Council, the door is now also open to new compositions on the Proper texts, on the condition that they harmonize with the nature of the words and of the liturgy.

c) Recent research has shown that it was premature to conclude that Gregorian music is so closely linked to the Latin texts that its melodies cannot be adapted to vernacular translations. Plainchant is not an "opus-music" the way that the art music of the 18th and 19th century is. With taste, talent and knowledge of style, the melodies can be adjusted to the recipient language without harm to the music. Where experts are able to translate pieces from the Proprium along with their melodies (as was the case, for instance, in Hungary, or with the Anglicans who possess some nicely made adaptations), then their use is preferable, even in combination with the Latin ver-

sion. Moreover, new vernacular compositions may also emerge, chiefly if they embody the free form and rhythm of the text. (The musical language of the 17th to 19th centuries is rather alien to the text as well as to the liturgical function.) The final result of such a process will probably approximate Gregorian chant.

d) The "full settings" of Proprium chants are typically performed by the schola or the large chorus (*cappella*). The 1967 Instruction also envisions the situation in which a solo psalmist (cantor) takes over the role of the schola. I recall a visit to Venice nearly forty years ago, during which I happened to attend a weekday morning Mass in a Venetian parish church. The entire Proper was sung by a soloist from a pulpit in the sanctuary. It was a great experience for me, indeed (if I may say so), one of the most beautiful Masses I ever attended.

e) The chanting of the full proper is not incompatible with the desire of involving the congregation. For example, the most important phrase of the text can be excerpted and then inserted as a refrain at an appropriate point of the fully chanted piece performed by a psalmist or schola. Or a melodic refrain, which remains unchanged over a longer period of time (for example through the entire Advent season), may respond to the message transmitted by the professional singer.

f) Thus far we have discussed the performance of proper chants by a psalmist or a schola, alternating (or not) with congregational chanting. A greater degree of active congregational participation might be achieved in either of the following two ways.

First, the same pieces (texts) could be chanted on easier tunes. That would involve three steps: using simpler, less ornate melodies; abbreviating the lengthier texts; choosing model melodies that are easier to combine with different texts.

The second way to achieve this goal is to substitute seasonal antiphons for the daily Proper chants. In other words, use the "second series of the canon" mentioned earlier, sung either in Latin or the vernacular. The best melodies for this purpose are the recurrent model-melodies such as those one finds in the *Graduale Simplex*, though one should not exclude rearrangements of Gregorian tunes or new "chant-like" compositions based upon Gregorian music. The *Graduale Simplex* in Latin and/or in the vernacular can serve the needs, at a lower level, of congregations or psalmists and scholae with less training. It can also be used in the simpler "little

Masses" of a well-provided parish church. All of these levels permit "full-quality" realizations of the Proper. What follows, are only substitutions.

g) Where even the tunes of the *Graduale Simplex* seem too difficult, cantillation formulae can be provided for the Proper chants, perhaps after the fashion of Carlo Rossini or Edmunds Tozer, for example. Four or five such "tones" suitable for delivery of texts which vary in length, and able to be combined with a psalm-melody, can, in small communities, announce the content of the text with appropriate solemnity. Old Gregorian schemes, which hardly find a place in today's "new liturgy" can also be used in this role.[16] It is not at all too difficult to select suitable tones from the historical patrimony of Gregorian and Ambrosian music. Nor is it a great problem to adjust to the peculiarities of various languages. And new tones might also be composed.

h) Is there any place in such a system for strophic congregational hymns? Not if full musico-liturgical validity is the goal. In cases of real necessity, however, and under appropriate conditions a congregational hymn *might* be taken as an *element* in a combined Proper chant, whereby (for instance) after the cantor or another person delivered the official Proper text on one of the appointed tones, the congregation joins in a well-selected hymn.

And which congregational hymns might fulfill this function? In order of increasing distance from the ideal form, such hymns might be 1) a strophic paraphrase of the Proprium chant itself; 2) an appropriate section of a strophic psalm-paraphrase such as e.g. chorale-psalms or the "Geneva" psalms;[17] 3) translations of liturgical hymns; 4) other congregational hymns evaluated and ranked according to their liturgical content.

In this context we are not speaking of a general approval of the songs by the local Ordinary, but approval with specification of use. The possible liturgical location of each individual hymn should be evaluated carefully, and each day should be assigned its own list of possible hymns, after the fashion of some of the early Lutheran service orders. And this ultimately

16 To take but one example: the text of the Mass Introit could be chanted in the tone of the *capitulum* or Little Chapter in the Divine Office, followed by the psalm in mode 2, psalm tone intoned by a cantor, a minister or a server with a good voice, or as a last resort by the celebrant.

17 In Hungary we possess a full series of versified Psalms created in the 16th century for the use of Protestant communities.

leads to the notion of "*hymn-pericopes*," of course with two or three alternatives for each point.

If the complementary use of strophic congregational hymnody were appropriately regulated, and if such hymns were artfully combined with the recitation of the official Proper chant, then the authenticity of the Proprium Missae would be recovered while giving some freedom to good decisions. Eventually, some type of a Gradual-Cantional could publish with local authorization the liturgical assignments of the unison congregational hymns while ensuring their connection with the official texts and recitation tones.

i) Finally, there is the (mere) "reading" of the Proper. In cases where nothing at all is chanted (*missa lecta*), the celebrant is obliged to read these texts. But that is insufficient: such reading should also be obligatory when something other than the Proper chant is sung. And the drawbacks involved in mere reading must likewise be eliminated. First of these is the all-too-short duration of a "read" Proper: it flies by in a matter of seconds. Then there is the fact that the acoustic realization of such reading does not even remotely call to mind "singing." And thirdly, mere reading reduces the Propers to the level of private prayers of the priest that are lost in the torrent of other texts said by the celebrant.

In the antiphonal pieces one should retain the alternation with the psalm. And the Offertory ought to retain its admirable verses. (It was a great loss to the Roman liturgy when these verses were omitted in the 13th century.) The antiphon or response ought to be read together by the celebrant, cantor, lector, ministers and even the congregation, while the psalm (or verse) is performed by any of the participants. If possible, the reading of chant texts could be done *recto tono* so as to prolong their duration and approximate more closely to singing. One might even countenance organ accompaniment for such a flat recitation in order to distinguish it from the other orations and recited texts.

The solution outlined above, is perhaps a radical cure for present-day maladies. The suggestion of several possible devices or procedures offers concrete assistance for actual practice, though their number is limited and they are arranged in a hierarchical order so as to exclude completely the liberty of choice. This proposal allows room for decisions at the local level (language areas, diocese, parish) for various occasions (types of Masses), but

this permission is counterbalanced by norms for preserving the identity of the Roman liturgy. The message of the liturgy entrusted to the chanter, is defined but legitimate variations are arranged in concentric circles according to their relationship to the canon. Finally, this proposal safeguards the predominance of Gregorian chant, which is allowed to function as an ideal model for vernacular adaptations and new compositions without becoming a rigid pattern or form which must be followed blindly.

7

Although this study deals with the Proper chants, I may be permitted to append two paragraphs, dealing with the Ordinary chants and the use of popular songs, respectively.

A. The 1967 Instruction *Musicam sacram* and the General Introduction to the new Roman Missal both delineate very clearly the importance of the chants of the Ordinarium Missae and the apposite liturgical norms. The problem here is channeling our efforts in the right direction in order to realize these norms in practice.

a) In opposition to the abuses appearing here and there, it is necessary to repeat verbatim that the texts of the Ordinary must *not* be replaced by anything else! It is permissible, however, to add tropes to the Kyrie. It seems necessary to offer frequent reminders that the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo (sung, if at all possible!), Sanctus and Agnus should normally be chanted in accord with the ancient tradition, with congregational participation.

b) It must be stressed yet again that the parts of the Mass ordinary are not insertions in the Mass, but belong to the same stratum of the Ordo Missae as the texts and the cantillations of the celebrant and ministers. In order to stress this fact, and to promote the necessary degree of unity in the universal Church, the use of the genuine (and originally, sole) Ordinary, the so-called "Missa Mundi" or "Missa Primitiva" should be made obligatory for all churches (while allowing, of course, the use of other compositions as well). Since the style of this Ordinary harmonizes with the characteristics of music found among all peoples, its simple inflections could be adjusted to the vernacular languages, too, which means that use of the

"Missa Mundi" includes both the Latin and vernacular renditions. This "universal" Ordinary should, like the tone for the *Pater noster*, be included in the Missale Romanum – and the local churches ought to prefer these melodies in practice.

c) Some suggestions may be offered for new settings of the Ordinary, primarily for those created in the vernacular for congregational use. These should avoid, if at all possible, forcing free prose texts into the rhythmical patterns and measures of recent European musical styles, and strive rather to preserve the pneumatic inspiration of those texts. Furthermore, the age and prayerful character of the Ordinary is somewhat contrary to the style of triadic music, which creates fewer problems in polyphonic works, but is frequently vexing in unison congregational settings, where modally inspired tunes composed within moderate ranges can accommodate much more readily the textual and liturgico-functional peculiarities.

B. Earlier, we distinguished the functional notion of *cantus populi* from the historical notion of *cantus popularis* (unison hymn or *cantio, cantiuncula*). As we have seen, a broad field is open to the *cantus populi*, even within the parameters of liturgical chant in the strict sense of that term. Both pastors and musicians should tirelessly promote and encourage the development of such *cantus populi.*

The text of the conciliar Liturgical Constitution is not entirely unambiguous. SC 118 seems to speak of *cantus popularis*, but then the argument is taken from what concerns the *cantus populi*: "Religious singing by the people (*cantus popularis religiosus*) is to be skillfully fostered, so that in devotions and sacred exercises, as also during liturgical services (*in piis sacrisque exercitiis et in ipsis liturgicis actionibus*) the voices of the faithful may ring out according to the norms and requirements of the rubrics." In any case, this provision clearly indicates the chief function of the *cantus popularis*, namely at popular devotions. And then the Constitution gives permission for congregational hymns to enter the liturgical celebrations – but without defining either the place or the extent of their use. I can recall only one other liturgical regulation which suggests an awareness of the qualitative differences within the sphere of *cantus popularis*: the Liturgia Horarum permits local authorities to substitute at the sung Office, other hymns in place of those published in the Breviary, on condition that they are not some "cantiunculae" or profane ditties. Beyond this, the experts at Rome apparently fail to take into account

both the great and significant religious, theological, literary and artistic differences within the *cantus popularis*, and the consequences of those differences. Paragraph 4 of the 1967 Instruction "*Musicam sacram*" distinguishes between the liturgical and "simple pious" types of congregational hymns. And the same document lists chants of the congregation in this order; first the acclamations and responses, then the antiphons and psalms, responsorial refrains and finally the (liturgical) hymns and canticles. I have discussed this important topic in another study, and at present we are dealing with only one aspect of this complex question, namely: is there a place for the non-biblical strophic folk hymn (the *cantio*) in the "ideal" system of Mass chants outlined above? I believe that if the framework of the Mass chants is maintained in the strictly liturgical pieces which are essentially the same throughout the universal Church, then the non-liturgical hymns which differ from country to country, may figure as insertions or additions to the celebration, just as was the case with the conductus, carols etc. in the Middle Ages.

At which points in the Mass could one insert such hymns without disturbing the liturgical equilibrium? In many countries it is a pious tradition to have the people gather *before Mass begins* and sing hymns in preparation for the sacred action. It is also customary in many lands that a brief but meaningful hymn be sung *between the Gospel and the sermon.* (I note in passing that this custom also preserves the original and primary function of the mediaeval congregational hymn, which was to frame the sermon.) Where the *Offertory* is carried out with appropriate solemnity (procession, incensation) there is sufficient time to add a congregational hymn to the sung or recited Offertory chant. Furthermore, the *hymn at the Elevation* also goes back to the Middle Ages: the people express their faith in the Real Presence and adore Christ present on the altar while the celebrant interrupts the *Canon Missae.* (Today, this hymn may function as a trope, so to speak, to the acclamation *Mortem tuam...*) The *distribution of Holy Communion and subsequent thanksgiving* again allows time for hymns after the Communion chant. And a good congregational hymn is practically indispensable *at the end of Mass.*

These opportunities would allow for at least two or three, or as many as five or six congregational hymns. In addition, they could join under certain conditions in the Proper chants of "little Masses" at the parish level, as well, which I believe would be quite satisfactory. But if even more opportunities were allotted to congregational hymns (most of which were created in the

16th to 19th centuries) they would be counterproductive by failing to assert the right of liturgical singing and ultimately frustrating the musical realization of the liturgical reform.

Our goal can be formulated in a paraphrase of the famous dictum of St. Pius X: "Do not merely sing during Mass, but rather sing the Mass." (Notitiae 5 [1969] 406).

5. The Readings of the Mass and the Calendar

1.

"Sunday of the Pharisee and the Publican", "Sunday of the Prodigal Son", "Sunday of the Paralyzed Man", "Sunday of the Samaritan Woman" – the liturgical books of the Byzantine church name many days this way: the daily Gospel pericope is, as it were, the center of the day's texts, the sun that spreads its rays over the whole day, as well as on its stichiras and kontakions .

The same is also true of the Latin church. One could read the explanation of the Gospel in the third Nocturn of Sunday Matins (the Benedictines recited the entire Gospel at the end of Matins). The words of the Gospel frequently framed the day's liturgy, providing sentences for the Benedictus and Magnificat antiphons. Weekdays in Lent were honored by proper Gospel texts associated with the thoughts of the period and sometimes also with the selection of the *statio* church. Some old calendars named particular Sundays after the Gospels. But the central role of the Gospel lived on in the hearts of the faithful, who closely followed the liturgical process even when such names were not used. The well-known words or images of the Gospel belonged not only to the solemn seasons, but also to ordinary Sundays. Individual Gospel texts were even associated with the cycle of the natural year: the recurrence of a given section belonged to our experience of summer, fall or winter. The system of the Gospels acted as a compass, a point of orientation for the year as a whole. They "furnished" time and made its passage familiar. The year also helped people to lodge selected sections of the Gospels deeper in their memory. When a Gospel pericope recurred with annual regularity, and when it was embedded in the living structure of the liturgy, it was able to influence more intensively the minds of people and communities.

It would be unwise to underestimate the significance of habituation, associations and their emotional power in people's contact with that which is holy. But the issue is of much greater significance. Whatever the meaning of readings and Gospels in the early Mass might have been, they developed quite an outstanding role in the mature Roman liturgy. As the great teachers

of the liturgy frequently explained, *the Gospel is not simply a reading of the Bible or its teaching: it becomes an image of mystery in the Eucharistic environment*, closely connected with the given part of the liturgical year and with the mystery of the Holy Mass. Its function is more than just to learn the Gospel: Christ's presence in the Gospel is a prediction of his Eucharistic presence and its effects. A miracle when read as the Gospel may report a historical event, but it also tells us what Christ is to do with us in this Mass. The reading of the Gospel at Mass is a "prefiguration" of the sacrament, and a preparation for receiving it. (This is also the "clue" for a good homily.)

Just as the accompanying ceremonies (processions, standing up, candles, incense, turning to face the North) represent welcome external means of promoting the full unfolding of the Gospel, so the liturgical place of the pericope in the year helps people and communities to grasp and retain it with their minds and hearts. The permanence of biblical texts is more important than their high number. A given pericope affects us more if it regularly recurs in its classical formulation, supported by associated elements (e.g. antiphons taken from it) and explanations.

Recollection transcends the limitations and finite lives of individuals. The Roman community read the same pericopes, with only negligible changes, for over 1200 years; the "great memory" of generations stored and elaborated these sections of the Gospel according to their liturgical place. Meditations and spiritual explanations are merely external manifestations of the process of inner assimilation by which the Church took this treasure into its possession and kept it there. Moreover, these pericopes also survived in the "Old-Church systems" of Anglican and Lutheran (and early Calvinist) worship.

2.

The Liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council declared – without detailed directives – that the treasure house of the Bible should be opened more abundantly in Mass readings, and that all important and essential parts of the Scriptures should be read during the masses within a certain (undefined) period of years (§ 51). This sentence can be implemented in a variety ways, however. How many years make a cycle? Should all elements of the year (seasons, Sundays, weekdays) be included in this alternation?

Which are the "important and essential parts," and what is the criterion for a part to be considered important? The published lectionary merely offered one possible interpretation. Since this is not a doctrinal question, we may proceed to ask: is it sure that the Council judged the agenda correctly at this point? Was it not influenced by principles contrary to the Roman tradition? Were the advantages and disadvantages carefully weighed before the one-year system of pericopes was abolished? Does the number of "important and essential parts" necessitate the introduction of a cycle of just three years (no more and no less)? Was there no way to preserve the values of the traditional pericope system and develop it simultaneously, according to the will of the Council? These are the questions we wish to address here, mostly with respect to the Gospel pericopes.

First, however, we have to make an essential distinction. The Bible and the Gospels are holy to the very last letter. The very last "and" uttered by the Savior has meaning and conveys grace, simply because it was He who said it. Nobody has the right to select or omit the words of the Bible according to their perspective or taste. The Bible demands reverence and pious devotion, and it is only in its entirety that it has consecrating power. But another question is whether all parts of the Bible are equally suitable for becoming a pericope (in the sense defined above) – able to pervade, organize and characterize the liturgical day. When we discuss the choice of pericopes, it is not the biblical text that is criticized, and no distinction is made between the status of the various holy texts as part of Divine Revelation and doctrine. All we say is that one text is not as suitable to be a pericope as another. One section might be too abstract; another can only be properly understood in its full context (together with a following paragraph to be read the following Sunday). There can be commands or recommendations worthy of the deepest consideration, yet they can lack the striking effect needed for a pericope. Different descriptions of the same events may express the *liturgical* meaning on different levels of perfection.

Let us not forget that the holy Mass is not the only – not even the best – occasion to broaden our knowledge of the Bible. For example, the Divine Office is more suitable to reading texts for their own sake and meditating on them. Moreover, the best place to learn the Bible is not the temple – figuratively speaking – but the synagogue, "the House of Doctrine." Readings of the Mass are no substitute for sermons explaining the Bible, catechisms, and private reading of Holy Scripture (and, similarly, these activities

are not a replacement for bible reading in a liturgico-sacramental context). It is not right to reinterpret the *liturgical* reading of the Gospel in such a way as to sacrifice its highly significant function as part of a *liturgy*.

With full reverence to the holy texts, we now compare the old and new systems of pericopes according to their liturgical meaning. Later I also try to reach a sane compromise between the two attitudes.

3.

In the Roman tradition, the first Sunday in Advent had *two* possible Gospel texts. Today we are perhaps shocked by the more accepted pericope of the medieval Church: a majestic image at the head of the liturgy. It was the Entry into Jerusalem (and in the Lutheran and Anglican communities it remains so even today). Naturally, this choice follows a mystical way of thinking rather than a rationalistic approach: Advent is the Lord's Entry to his people who greet him with a Hosannah of self-devotion. – The other pericope (known from the Tridentine Mass) was about the Last Judgement (Luke 21:25–33) emphasizing our expectation of Christ's second coming. – In the present system the latter is read in year C, while the pericope of year B is short and less energetic; that of year A, with its reference to Noah's time, has a more explanatory than representative character.

The Gospels of the second to fourth Sundays in the traditional Mass were three distinctive scenes from the evangelic preparation by St. John the Baptist. Among other texts on the same theme, these three excel by their remarkable descriptions. One may also find a logical (if not historical) progression: John's disciples visit Jesus (John asks questions), the messengers of the Pharisees visit John (John's confession), John's mission and preaching (with reference in the introduction to the historicity of Jesus' birth).

In the present system we find a new arrangement of pericopes on the second and third Sundays; over the years, the former Gospels of the second and third Sundays went over to the third Sunday; the text formerly for the fourth Sunday is now on the second Sunday. The two new pericopes for the second Sunday are John's preaching (by Matthew, with a detailed paragraph of reproaches), and a shorter variant about the same (by Mark). The new text of the third Sunday (by Luke) is essentially about the same topic,

but adds the inquiry of the publicans and soldiers: it is a typical weekday pericope.

With the Ember Days vanishing from the calendar, the Marian Gospels were transferred to the fourth Sunday. We hear the paragraph about Joseph in one year, the description of the Annunciation in the next, and that of the Visitation in the third. Are they, in fact, *alternatives* to one another? If this theme is to be placed on a Sunday, the Annunciation (in its relationship to Christmas) dominates over the two others.

In short: the four Advent Sundays do not in fact possess twelve distinctive, truly characteristic sections. New variations on the theme of St. John the Baptist brought nothing in the way of real benefit, while the best formulated pericopes have become obscure as a result of their infrequent recurrence.

The Gospels of the three Christmas Masses remain unchanged throughout the three years and are identical to the traditional ones. There was simply no other section that could be used to transform the system into a three-year cycle. The same is true of the Gospel of the first of January, where all that has changed is that the story starts a little earlier, either to include the name of Mary, or simply to absorb the "scandal" of Circumcision into the longer text. The Gospel of Epiphany is also the same each year.

More problematic is the Feast of the Holy Family, in terms of its place both in the calendar and in the Gospels. In the first year, the story of the escape is read; in the second, the Gospel of Purification; in the third year, the scene with the twelve-year-old Jesus. In a year where December 26 falls on a Sunday, it may happen that Jesus appears in his twelfth year on the day following his Nativity! Neither does the Gospel of Purification "open more richly the treasury of the Holy Scripture for us," since the same Gospel will sound again one month later, on its own day. (In the old system the ritual of Presentation was read on February 2, while the Gospel on the Sunday within the Octave of Christmas was the *prophecy* of Simeon and Anna on the Blessed Mother and her Son.)

The three descriptions of Christ's Baptism *as pericopes* are not of equal rank: Mark and Luke are very short, and missing essential elements. (This deficiency is compensated for by John's declaration, already read in Advent). In the old system another pericope was recited on this day from John's Gospel in which the Baptist remembers the scene of the Baptism and introduces Jesus: "See, he is the Lamb of God."

The new Lectionarium permits the pericopes of year A to be read on Sundays in Lent every year. This would be a good solution, but I do not know of this proposal being adhered to anywhere. The system of Lenten pericopes has changed radically. The traditional Gospels of the third to fifth Sundays disappeared because they were replaced by the Gospels of the old "scrutinium" days. The themes of the first and second Sundays have remained as before, but are read from a different Gospel every year. Not a fortunate thought. On the second Sunday they are only variations on similar (though not identical) texts that have the effect of weakening the impression in the mind without adding any spiritual benefit. On the first Sunday, however, the rotation leads to a loss of content. In year A we hear the traditional text from Matthew, the full narration of both elements (fasting and temptation). In year B, Mark is so laconic that he does not even describe the temptation. In year C, Luke adds nothing to Matthew, he merely exchanges the position of the second and third temptations. The introduction of Mark's description shows that the creators were more interested in biblical studies than in the liturgy. The essence of the old pericope was not only the very fact of temptation but also its objects: those related to the three main Cardinal Sins (lust, vainglory and gluttony, cf. 1 John 2: 16). It is precisely to defeat these that the Church takes up its three weapons of Lent: fasting, prayer and charity. This is the meaning of the "secundum Matthaeum" Gospel at the start of Lent.

The great scenes of the third to fifth Sundays are the stories of the Samaritana, the healing of the blind man, the resurrection of Lazarus, and the prodigal Son (the last of these, however, occurs again on the 24th Sunday of the same year). Though the scene with the adulterous woman is one of the most beautiful parts of the Gospels, it is not necessarily a Sunday pericope, and still less so is the "expulsion from the temple" (despite of the reference to Easter near the end). In addition, Jesus' three sermons took place on these Sundays – the brass serpent, the grain of corn and the tower falling onto some people. All three are instructive, but their significance is not, perhaps, proportional to the importance of these Sundays. Of the traditional pericopes, two concerning the debate with the Jews are omitted (third Sunday: struggle between the Strong, i.e. Satan, and the Stronger, i.e. Christ; fifth Sunday: "Before Abraham came into being..."). The Gospel of the Feeding of the Five Thousand has also been left out, despite the fact that this was an example of a Sunday with a unified program. This Sunday

showed the catechumens the image of their Mother, the Heavenly Jerusalem (Epistle, chants; cf. the statio at the basilica of the *Holy Cross in Jerusalem*), her goods (milk, according to the introit), and her most precious treasure, the celestial Bread, the holy Eucharist to be received by the faithful at the same Mass.

What we have seen again is that the Lectionarium does not offer fifteen truly characteristic Gospel pericopes for the three-year cycle. Probably a single series of well-considered "classic" choices would represent a better program, one that is easier to follow and more suitable for encompassing the whole of Lent and for organizing other elements of enrichment. Such a one-year system could be the new year A (which focuses on the great "scrutinium" Gospels formerly read on weekdays); but no serious objection would be raised against the traditional series, either.

In years B and C, St. Matthew's Passion on Palm Sunday is replaced by that of Sts. Mark and Luke. There is hardly any element in the latter two, however, that would be capable of adding anything of importance to St. Matthew's text. The alternation comes more from a rigorous schoolmaster-like mind than from finding real spiritual benefit (Lit. Const. § 23). This alternation only results in confusing singers and making it highly difficult to sing the Passion in small churches in a fitting way.

In the traditional system, the Gospel of the Holy Women was read from St. Matthew at the Easter Vigil Mass and from St. Mark on Easter Sunday. They are now to be found in the Vigil Mass of years A and B. St. Luke's text in year C (on the apostles who did not believe the women) is, in my opinion, edifying in itself, but less suitable for the liturgical moment. The Sunday Gospel in the new system is the Visit of Peter and John at the Holy Sepulcher, which sounds highly appropriate. I think the image of the empty sepulcher with the two Apostles gives a "morning freshness" to the day that transmits the primary experience of Easter to the congregation, even those attending the evening Mass.

I consider it a very bad idea to include the story about the bribery of soldiers on Easter Monday in all three years. Previously one of the kindest and most attractive moments of Easter was the association between the liturgy of the second day and the Emmaus event. Indeed, this moment was an emotional "call" for many of us to attend a Mass that is not obligatory. And what is the benefit of moving this Gospel from this day? The Emmaus

story is read on the third Sunday (!) in year A, on the Sunday evening Mass in year C, and is simply excluded from the solemn days in year B.

On the second Sunday we have a "one-year system," since here the traditional Gospel remained in each of the three years. On the third Sunday we again hear Jesus' evening appearance in year B (now the less detailed description by St. Luke), and the appearance at Lake Tiberius in year C.

I have never found a justification for the Gospel of the Good Shepherd being moved to a week later. Was it perhaps intended to balance the actual disappearance of the Octave of Easter by the Resurrection scenes of the third Sunday? On the fourth Sunday, three succeeding paragraphs of the Shepherd parable are read from St. John in all three years (with a very short paragraph remaining for year C). I think a well-selected (perhaps somewhat longer) part recurring every year would be more effective; for example, the traditional John 10:11–18 is a well-balanced and rounded pericope.

The reading of Christ's Last Sermon already began on the fourth Sunday. The reading of this Sermon is an old tradition, but one not without problems. It is a difficult, long text, not easy to follow and appreciate at the first hearing. The old practice offered help by reading it in full length on Maundy Thursday (after the Mass) and some distinctive sections on the fourth to seventh Sundays after Easter. The atmosphere on Maundy Thursday was favorable: the faithful allotted more time to devotion and might, in this uniquely dramatic situation, listen to the Lord's last words with heightened attention. The sections assigned to the Easter Sundays followed a logic that pointed to the consequences of the Paschale mysterium: first the "Modicum" section (Jn 16:16–22; omitted under the present system); then the promise of the mission of the Holy Spirit (16:5–14), Christ's admonition to pray and expect the second Advent (16:23–30), and finally the future of the Church (15:26–27; 16:1–4). There is no question that we should frequently read all parts of the Sermon. But I am not sure that many of the thoughts distributed among the nine pericopes of three years are more effective than four eminent sections recurring each year.

At the Gospel of Ascension, a mechanical approach again overcame the liturgical one. The traditional pericope (Mk 16:14–20) presented both important elements: the command of mission and Baptism, and the event of the ascension (now it is read in year B). The pericope in year A (St. Matthew) leaves the ascension out; year C (St. Luke) omits the command of Baptism.

Pentecost now has a new Gospel, the same in each year: Christ's appearance to the Apostles on Easter evening. The reason for the choice might be to remember the emission of the Holy Spirit in an Easter context. But the descent of the Holy Spirit *then* and later at Pentecost are two different things (if it were not so the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the same Apostles fifty days later would simply be superfluous). The old Gospel was about the promise of the Spirit's coming and was better related to the second (Pentecostal) emission.

Of the three pericopes of Trinity Sunday only that of year B speaks of the baptismal mission: this is the only sentence where Christ gives the names of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in a single formula. In the Gospel of year A the Holy Spirit is not mentioned; the Gospel in year C is less distinct. (If one wishes to take a part from the last Sermon, Jn 16:15–16 is the most condensed declaration of the Holy Trinity.)

With regard to Corpus Christi as a dogmatic solemnity, St. John's text in year A is more appropriate than the pericopes of the two other years. The Gospels of the Mass of the Sacred Heart in years A and C are touching, but only indirectly linked to the feast. Mystical interpretation traditionally links the Gospel of year B to the veneration of the Sacred Heart; it is a powerful image with deep theological associations, often painted on the walls of churches: the most appropriate for presenting this cult to the faithful.

What can we say about the *per annum* Gospels? It is clear that the Gospels include numerous parts that are remarkable, moving, and suitable for reading in the community. Nevertheless, there are problems that emerge here too.

The first is precisely this abundance. Does the total of 99 Gospel sections not exceed the amount that individual souls, communities, and the universal Church are able to absorb liturgically?

The second question is whether all selected sections are really suitable to be mystical images that encompass the whole Sunday.

The third: is it in harmony with the spirit of the Roman liturgy that the *lectio continua* be forced precisely in the Mass? The lectio continua represents a kind of "biographical" attitude. The old system was not interested in such an attitude (except, of course, during the Christmas and Easter seasons); it grasped individual moments of the Savior's life not in their historical-biographical quality but as *mysteria.*

The fourth problem is that in spite of the richness, repetitions cannot be avoided; these recurrent sections emerge, however, on different Sundays in different years because of the lectio continua.

The fifth problem is the predominance of sermons, parables and dialogues. I hope it is not the sign of a trend, but it is certainly true that the proportion of sermons to miracles in the per annum Gospels is as follows: year A, 10 vs. 90 %; year B, 31 vs. 69 %; year C, 16 vs. 84 %; in the three years together: 19 vs. 81 %. In contrast, the rate in the old Roman system was 41 vs. 59 %! If we consider this assignment purely from its pastoral dimension, we find that impressive, remarkable texts are frequently replaced by others that are more difficult to follow and are not of primary significance in terms of actual use (no matter how important they might otherwise be, and how worthy of the highest attention in catechesis).

The traditional Roman liturgy was right in making a distinction between the post-Epiphany and post-Pentecostal (or post-Trinity) periods. The first section began with two excellent Gospel pericopes, that of the twelve-year-old Jesus, and that of the Wedding feast at Cana (the latter the beginning of Jesus' public activity, and also a liturgico-mystical interpretation of it). This is followed by two outstanding miracles, manifestations of Christ's divine nature, thus completing the notion of Epiphany. The Cana scene now only figures in year C. In the other years, the beginnings of Jesus' public activity are recounted on these Sundays: John's testimony (the earlier Gospel of the eighth day of Epiphany), the vocation of the first Apostles, and Jesus' first appearance in the synagogues of Nazareth and Capharnaum. The descriptions of three miracles are read in year B, one in year C. One possible conception would see it as a logical (though in its three-year distribution a little chaotic) arrangement.

After this introduction, the new system spreads the parts of the Sermon on the Mount in year A over a period of six Sundays; in year C it does the same over three Sundays. The sermon about the eight beatitudes is read on the fourth Sunday in year A, and on the sixth Sunday in year C (in a shortened form complemented by the "woes"). The Gospels of the seventh Sunday in year A and C are narrations of the same event by two different evangelists. Repetitions can also be found on the following Sundays, for example: the sending of the disciples, Christ's admonitions to them, and their return in a detailed narration (year A, eleventh to fourteenth Sundays; year B, fourteenth to sixteenth Sundays; year C, thirteenth to fourteenth Sun-

days). Peter's confession is on the 21st Sunday in year A, on the 24th Sunday in year B, and on the twelfth Sunday in year C. The Feeding of the Five Thousand is told on the eighteenth Sunday (year A) and sixteenth Sunday (year B). The words of the Commandments can be heard in short form from St. Matthew in year A (30th Sunday) and in a longer form from St. Mark in year B (31st Sunday). Their place is defined by the lectio continua, and these variations have not in fact increased the number of sections that are read.

There are sections that contain remarkable divine instruction but which are not strong enough or sound just strange as Sunday pericopes. Examples in year A include the pericopes on Sunday 13 (the denial of our relatives), 22 (Christ's suffering predicted), 26 (on the two sons); in year B, Sunday 8 (the fasting of wedding guests), 14 ("who is this?"), 16 ("let us rest a little while"), 22 (on the tradition of the Pharisees), 25 ("who is the greater among us?"), 26 ("don't forbid them the exorcism"), 27 (the indissolubility of marriage), 29 (the debate between James and John), 32 ("beware of the Pharisees", the two pennies of the poor woman); in year C, 8 ("mote and beam"), 13 ("Will you that we command fire to come down from heaven?"), 19 ("I am not a judge among you"), 19 ("gather treasures where there is no moth"), 20 ("I brought fire and disagreement"), 23 (the builder of tower, starter of war), 27 (the strength of the faith; the modest servant), 29 (the unjust judge), 32 ("of whom will she be wife on the day of resurrection?"). Again: all these are wonderful parts of the Gospels, but this does not mean that they are all equally suitable as Sunday pericopes.

On the feast of Christ the King, the Lectionarium hesitates, as it were, as to what the message of the day is. In year A the Gospel is about the Last Judgement, in year C about the thief at Christ's right hand (I suppose because of the "reign" mentioned in this part). The key text with Jesus' open statement is read only in year B.

The Gospels of December 8 and 26, February 2, March 19 and 25, May 31 (a little too long), June 29, August 15, September 8, November 1 are the same each year.

The experiences above can be summarized as follows: it is possible to go through the three synoptic Gospels with a lectio semi-continua during a three-year period. In this case, however, the quality of the texts as pericopes can end up not being on the same level. Often the same themes may

emerge on different Sundays in different years. Rather than encountering powerful images, miracles or typical parables, we follow an arid sequence of texts. The "lectio continua" situation is reminiscent of a private reading of the Bible, when we settle at the Master's feet and listen to His words.

On feast days and during festival periods the choice of texts is sometimes forced, departing from the most clear-cut form solely for the sake of variety. On the other hand, it turns out that there are not enough suitable pericopes for three years, and the change did not in fact always open the Bible's treasure-house more abundantly. The same events are told on *different* Sundays as the lectio continua requires. The "continua" is not, however, perceptible to the listener: he is not holding the given book of the Bible in his hand, and he listens to the pericopes not as a series, but as descriptions of separate sermons and events. The advantage of this "variety" is outweighed by its disadvantage, because of the confused shape of the liturgical year, the dissolution of associations, and the impossibility of perceiving some kind of *order*.

The creators did not consider the capacity of the human psyche: the maximal size of a cyclic human memory extends to one year, which is "humanized" by the path of the Sun and the cycle of the seasons. A system of pericopes adapted to this human framework can rely on the capacity of the mind. A three-year order is not perceived as a form of unity or order, simply as a random way of reading the Scriptures at whichever page it happens to be opened. If someone lives to an average human age and listens to the same Gospel text on the same day on sixty or seventy occasions throughout his life, he will surely retain it in his mind. This effect is less intense if he listens to it with three-year gaps; it cannot have such a deep impression, and the influence is more superficial. I fear that most pericopes are retained in the memory not even until the end of the Mass. The question is not the number of Gospel sections during particular years, but the way they fit into the liturgy, and, as a consequence, their power to catch the imagination. Fewer but recurrent pericopes, fixed in an associative system, are better suited for that.

One can become familiar with the rich treasury of Gospel texts in other and more efficient ways, for example, when we read and study the Gospel for its own sake with full concentration on the words themselves. The liturgy, on the other hand, is not a classroom for biblical studies. A good example for learning the Bible is the Capharnaum scene where the Savior

takes the scroll, reads it aloud, and explains it. Such a form of Bible reading is urgently needed in the Church. But the problem is not solved by inserting Bible lessons in the Mass.

There are some more consequences of the three-year cycle. Because of the new principle of selecting the graduals (see below), the repertory of the interlectionary chants has increased immensely; this system has severed the connection between the pericope and other elements of the liturgy (e.g. with the canticle antiphons), and the three-year cycle requires a bigger collection (almost an anthology) of books (lectionaries).

4.

Though the focus of this study is the Gospel-pericope, let us take a look at the other elements of the "Liturgia Verbi."

The Epistle is, of course, a less characteristic component of the liturgical day. There are, however, some pericopes that are eminent precisely because of their content or their assignment. While they add much to the richness of the day, in the mind of the Church and the faithful it is the liturgical day that has highlighted these texts.

This is true, above all, of the Epistle of the first Sunday in Advent ("It is time to awake from our sleep"), which became the basis for the remarkable Advent antiphons by chance. It is also true, of course, of the "Gaudete" Epistle on the third Sunday of Advent. Lovers of the Roman liturgy had good reason to adhere to the Epistle of the three Christmas and the Epiphany Masses. The Epistles of the recent Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima Sundays (the runners in the stadium; Paul's affliction, the Praise of Charity) added much to the profile of these Sundays.

Like the first Advent Sunday, the fine Lenten "program" of 2 Corinthians 6 is one of the main texts of the year. The Roman liturgy rightly assigned it to the first Sunday of Lent (and not Ash Wednesday). The liturgical rubric makes clear that the official opening of Lent is this Sunday, when the *full* assembly gathers to commence the solemn season. The Epistle of the fourth Sunday (on the two women and the two Jerusalems) suited the content of this day perfectly. For the readings of Holy Week see chapter

two above. The third Sunday in Easter seemed unthinkable without the paragraph from Peter's first epistle.

The Epistles for Easter Sunday, Ascension and Pentecost are hardly a matter for debate, but the selections for Trinity Sunday and the Sacred Heart of Jesus were also perfect. We no longer think of the Epistles for per annum Sundays as unique texts.

The Old Testament reading, introduced for all Sundays and solemnities in the post-conciliar reform, is a conspicuous feature of the new liturgy. For a long time, experts in history thought that a Mass with three readings was the original norm, and the remnants of this system are the Old Testament readings on some days in the Tridentine Mass. The reformed Lectionary is a product of this particular phase of liturgical research. More recent studies have given rise to serious doubts about this hypothesis. In the ordinary Mass of Christian Antiquity there were probably two readings; three (or more) readings were an exception found only on certain days. One reason for this might have been Masses with extended vigils (Ember Saturdays, Easter Vigil); there were also other days that were honored by this means (Christmas, the scrutinium days of Lent). The new system of three readings is not a restoration of the old form of the Mass (cf. Liturgical Constitution, at the end of § 50), but it has allowed more space for biblical readings.

If this is so, the thematic coordination between Old Testament readings and the Gospels is a twentieth century invention. Its origins are found not in the ancient liturgy, but rather in the old traditions of considering and explaining the two Testaments in their mutual relationship with one another.

I have tried to explain in the study on Proper Chants that the thematic coordination between a reading and the subsequent *psalmus responsorius* is based on mere speculation; it is a construction that cannot be traced back to any tradition. This would not be a problem if the principle did not make the structure of the proper chants excessively burdensome. The three-year psalm repertory, linked to the high number of readings, has resulted in a huge body of texts.

Its appropriate musical rendition was obviously an impossible task. Naturally, no better method could be found than the recitation of both the psalm and its refrain with the tones of antiphonal psalmody. The musical equalization of the two is alien both to the traditions of liturgical music and

to appropriate analogies from the history of music. Some old models for responsorial psalmody can be found in the responsorium breve, the invitatory, as well as some chants restored in the Graduale Simplex. However, these models are not in use anywhere because it was impossible to compose, teach and distribute several hundred refrain melodies. So simple recitation remained, or more frequently, plain reading without a chant.

I have explained elsewhere that the misunderstanding is rooted in the incorrect interpretation of the word "responsorial." The responsorial psalm has its response within itself. It only provided an answer to the reading in the sense that it balanced the recitation of a long text with a melodious and meditative element. Such a notion, however, as if the reading were God's voice and the psalm the community's answer to it, is false from the outset. The dialogical structure of the liturgy pervades all its elements. To listen to the reading is prayer, and the responsory is no less the word of God.

The musical realization of the liturgical reform would have been much easier if such a scholastic demand had not been imposed on it. The responsorial psalm is the part of the Mass where the whole community can first and best enter into the singing of proper chants. If people could do it in a well-conceived one-year cycle, this change would contribute much to the development of musical practice (and also help the community to keep track of where within the liturgical cycle they actually are).

5.

Can we draw any conclusions concerning the "reform of the reform" from all these remarks? The best point of departure is to be faithful to the identity of the Roman liturgy without neglecting the reality of past and present historical changes. What, then, are the possible changes that promise real spiritual profit, and are justified by the history of the liturgy (Lit. Const. §§ 21 and 23)?

The Sunday Gospel pericopes. In the case of the key part of the temporale (the half year from Advent to Pentecost), I think that the three-year system did not prove worthwhile. Bearing in mind the confusion it causes in the structure of the liturgical year, its limited benefits come at too high a price. The best, I think, would be a return to the one-year system.

Of the parts concerning St. John the Baptist, the best were selected for the Roman rite (second to fourth Sundays of Advent). The new pericopes brought variety but not essential enrichment; they may, of course, work well on weekdays. If the fourth Sunday really has a need for a Mariological Gospel, it is the Annunciation, as a close preparation for Christmas, which is the most eminent. (On the other hand, the Annunciation lives vividly in the minds of the community, and the chants, religious folk hymns and Rorate Masses commemorate it splendidly.) It is not so easy to make a decision concerning the first Sunday: both traditional pericopes are equally suitable.

The other Gospel pericopes of the Christmas season are identical every year, and also identical to the old tradition. It is only the feast of the Holy Family that is worthy of consideration, depending on its final place in the calendar (see paragraph 6 below).

If Christ's Baptism keeps its place on the Sunday after Epiphany, the most appropriate pericope would be the fullest description of the event (Matthew 3:13–17), or the account given in St. John's Gospel. I think that on the two following Sundays the story of the twelve-year-old Jesus and the Wedding feast at Cana should be kept in each year. Afterwards the vocation of the first Apostles and the scene in the synagogue at Capharnaum could be used to introduce Jesus' public activity, and the remaining Sundays retained for the old "Epiphanic" miracles.

Because of the importance of Quadragesima, the one-year system should be restored in this period, though there are one or two more good pericopes than are necessary. There is no sense in alternating the Gospels of Sundays 1 and 2: it is the one that describes the event most perfectly that should be read, and this is St. Matthew's account. It would be good for the whole of Lent if significant texts were to emerge on Sundays 3 to 5. If the debate scenes in the Roman tradition seem less appropriate for the third and fifth Sundays, they could be replaced by two of the catechumenal pericopes, the Samaritana on the third Sunday, and resurrection of Lazarus on the fifth (as it is presented in year A under the new system). I am inclined to keep the kind and appropriate pericope of the Feeding of the Five Thousand on the fourth Sunday, but the Gospel of the Blind Man is also fine. What would be transferred (back) to the weekdays in this case? One might object to the deowngrading of the parable of the Prodigal Son and the story of the Adulterous Woman (both previously read on Saturdays, which is not a bad place for them); although the stable Gospels on the Sundays (also per-

mitted in the Lectionary) do provide compensation. The three other Gospels to be transferred from Sunday (parts of Jesus' sermons) are typical weekday pericopes. On Palm Sunday, Matthew's Passion should be restored (in its abbreviated form): singers would be thankful for this stability, while the lack of the few peculiar elements in the other two passions would not cause much trouble.

Of the Easter Vigil Gospels (concerning the three Marys), the variants by Sts. Matthew and Mark are of equal rank. The change on Easter Sunday from St. Mark to Jn 20:1–9 is an acceptable one, but the Emmaus scene should by all means be restored to Monday. The Gospel of the second Sunday is given; I would be happy if the Gospel of the Good Shepherd could be moved back to the third Sunday. In this case there is time enough on Sundays 4 to 7 to read Jesus' Last Sermon; either more parts, each every three years, or fewer well-selected pericopes, with yearly regularity.

As we have seen, the Gospel pericopes of Ascension are liturgically not of equal rank. The version of St. Mark (read traditionally) is the fullest one. I regard the Pentecost Gospel with the promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit to be better than the one read now (which is a duplication of the Gospel on the second Sunday of Easter). The old pericopes of Trinity, Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart (now read in one of the three years) are also better than the current ones which change annually.

As we have seen, the *number* of pericopes on per annum Sundays does not justify the three-year cycle. There are three plausible solutions: a) the restoration of the old system of pericopes; b) to offer a new one-year system by adapting the most characteristic parts of the new Lectionary; c) to add a second series to the traditional system as an alternative for every other year. A two-year system offers adequate space for more texts, but could still be followed by the partial and universal community.

In the case of the *Epistles* a more frequent alternation is justified, especially if some important and characteristic part keeps its place fixed. Perhaps the old Epistles of the period from Advent to Pentecost could be retained (with some revision), and the writings of the Apostles, in a two-year arrangement, in the other half year. If the texts of the post-Pentecostal Gospels are also arranged in a two-year system, the two readings could alternate together from year to year.

As regards the *Old Testament readings*, the first question is whether or not it is justified to have three readings each Sunday. The post-conciliar liturgy was often accused of a "semi-Protestant" prolongation of the Liturgy of the Word and the neglect of the sacrificial act. The omission of the long Old Testament readings would shorten the first part of the Mass.

While on weekdays we have plenty of time to read the Old Testament, the demand that the most important sections be read to a great number of the faithful on the Sundays is a fair one, as is the requirement that there be a connection between the "prefigurative" Old Testament texts and the daily liturgy. One possible solution would be to reassign the OT texts for the weekdays in the per annum season and read them as "prophecies" in the first half-year of the great mysteries: the nine well-selected paragraphs from Isaiah on the four Advent Sundays, on the Vigil of Christmas, at the three Christmas Masses and at Epiphany. Then the most important "prefigurations" of the history of salvation (Fall of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, wandering in the desert, Jeremiah) could be given a place on the six Sundays of Lent.

In the case of the *interlectionary chants* I suggest a radical return to the previous state: they should be fixed in a one-year cycle as part of the Proper Chant. If they are sung as responsorial psalmody and not in melismatic tunes, more psalm verses could be appointed; some small revision of their distribution could also be acceptable. The apparent loss arising from dissolving the artificial thematic link between reading and psalm is abundantly compensated by their stability: people could impress in their minds these sixty psalmic texts that recur annually; they could better understand and better love them, and moreover a good musical and technical arrangement would bring real progress in liturgical life.

The principle of selected pericopes is not so relevant for *weekdays*. But let us remember that the repetition of the Sunday pericopes during the week adds much to their deeper reception. I think this kind of "liturgical pedagogy" should be maintained to this day. In early medieval Missals we encounter the practice of providing proper readings for the ancient liturgical weekdays, i.e. Wednesday and Friday. It would be a good solution to have two Epistle-Gospel pairs each week. The three pericopes (Sunday included), together with those on Saints' days, seem to be enough for one

week. The arguments on behalf of the one-year system are not relevant for weekdays: the present two-year system could survive (in combination, perhaps, with the Wednesday-Friday method).

I think the solution described here is a sensible middle way. It embraces the right needs, but does not adhere to any doctrinarian principle. It is a synthesis of biblical, liturgical and psychological aspects, and preserves the identity of the Roman rite, both in its principles and, at key points, by its material. The question is not "what can be changed," but rather, what is appropriate for developing the Roman liturgy with regard to certain spiritual benefits and objective facts. The change does not exceed the extent to which the Roman liturgy changed itself during its earlier history in any case. In other words: it follows the will of the Council. "In order to preserve a healthy tradition, but also to open up the possibility of proper progress, thorough theological, historical and pastoral research must precede any revision of any part of the liturgy. No innovation should be introduced, except that which is required for the true and real benefit of the Church. But even in this case, one should be careful that the new forms originate organically from the existent ones." (Lit. Const. § 23.)

6.

Our interest is now the liturgical calendar less for its own sake than as a system that determines the distribution and meaning of pericopes and chants. The transformation of the calendar touches not only upon the (not insignificant) "technical" dimension of the liturgy (when and how much time is retained for something; the quality of connections between days or seasons), but also its traditional order and theological meaning. The new regulations after Vatican II brought more changes to the sanctorale than to the temporale. The following paragraphs, however, will focus on the latter, sometimes criticizing or questioning their quality.

The first change in the structure of the year was the abolition of the Ember Days. In recent centuries, the faithful observed these days primarily because of the obligation to fast. But the celebration of quarter-years goes back to ancient times, and fasting was only one element of this institution.

The precedent is given in the Old Testament; and the sermons of Pope St. Leo the Great bear witness to their excellence among the customs of the Roman Church. These were three days of thanksgiving, propitiation and alms, which "are brought to our attention by tradition, confirmed by common usage, and which our religious conscience cannot neglect, and neither can our piety omit" – as the great Pope formulated. These days served as the sanctification of our secular life, reminded us to give thanks for all we had received in the last months, to ask God's forgiveness through prayer and fasting for all our transgressions, and to offer the poor what we had saved by abstinence. Maybe it is difficult to keep the old forms of fasting, but this is no argument for abolishing them; rather it suggests that its deep original meaning be revived.

The new calendar practically omitted the vigils (including the one at Christmas); all that remained was a Mass on the evening before (which lost its importance as a result of the anticipated festal Mass). The number of vigils was perhaps too high, but I do not believe that a purging preparation for greater solemnities is necessarily obsolete. The octaves with the repetition of the solemn Mass might also have been too frequent. The calendar left only two octaves untouched (in practice only one, that of Easter). The true meaning of the octave is not, however, to repeat the liturgy of the day, but to give more time to assimilate the content of the feast: this meaning could have been preserved by liturgical means.

In my opinion, one great failure of the reform was the shift of the solemnity of Epiphany and Ascension to Sunday (ad libitum). It was with good reason that the dates of these two feasts were fixed: the first was decided by a very old and universal (also ecumenical) tradition, the second by the decision and deed of the Lord himself. By being moved, they became simply the "theme" of two Sundays, and caused confusions in the calendar. Was it not too big a concession to secularism to allow the date of two great solemnities to be set according to the position of civil holidays? Is it too much to expect from the faithful, from those "initiated in the Paschale Mysterium," from those "living in Christ," those "devoted to God," to attend Mass twice in a year after their day's work (knowing that if they are unable to do so, they are automatically exempted from this obligation anyway)? Is it right that Catholics in different countries celebrate these great festivals on different days?

I also regret the new position of the feast of the Holy Family. This feast (which bears the hallmark of modern "action-celebrities") disturbs the order of three old solemnities (December 26-27-28, probably older than Christmas itself). In given years, moral teaching on the virtues of family life may take place on the second day of Christmas, while the feast of St. Stephen or St. John or the holy Innocents are simply omitted in that year. Moreover, these feasts are never celebrated on a Sunday, when the whole community would be present. The image of the Holy Family in Nazareth is no worse than that in Betlehem; indeed, it serves the moral aims of the feast better. I think the Sunday after Epiphany was a better place for the proper message and proper Gospel of the feast. But if they wanted to bring it closer to Christmas, the Sunday between December 30 and January 5 is also a good date (with the Gospel of the Escape to Egypt), provided this day does not have to be kept in reserve as a result of juggling the date of Epiphany.

The other reason for moving the day of the Holy Family was the new feast of Christ's Baptism. Earlier this was not an independent feast, but one of the mysteria of Epiphany recalled on the octave of Epiphany. The new system detached it from the high feast and made it an independent baptismal one. It is now less a dogmatical-mystical feast belonging to Christmas and more a "biographical" feast of Christ before He starts His public activity. If it became a "theme" of a certain day, the five Sundays could be arranged in order, beginning with the twelve-year-old Jesus in the temple (the Holy Family), then Christ's Baptism, the Wedding feast at Cana, the vocation of the first apostles, and the scene in the synagogue of Capharnaum. This series would make concessions to the "chronological-biographical" approach of today, would not confuse the subsequent stages, and not even disturb the age-old feasts from Christmas to Epiphany.

The liturgical commentaries (books and sermons) praised the pre-Lenten Sundays as masterpieces of the Church and the sign of its spiritual sensibility. They praised the wonderful gradual progression from the pre-Lenten period, through Lent and Passiontide to Holy Week and the Triduum Sacrum. It was said that the high solemnities of Christmas calm down during the post-Epiphany Sundays, before we are led in the pre-Lenten weeks to realize our need for salvation, and so we are prepared to accept the observance of Lent. As I see it, obedience in the minds of many

today means the acceptance of a liturgical institution with full understanding and enthusiasm one day, and the full rejection of it on the next...

The positions of Ash Wednesday and Lent have remained untouched (though the contents of the Sundays have been modified). Passion-tide, however, has become one week shorter and the Dominica Passionis is now simply the fifth Sunday of Lent. As the triduum sacrum is an exceptional period, the *Tempus Passionis* is shortened practically to three days. Consequently, the rubrics, texts and symbols that separated these two weeks within Lent, and turned our attention directly to the suffering Lord, have lost their validity. (For the Holy Week, see my study in this series.)

I have already discussed the change in the character of the third and fourth Sundays of Easter in the section on pericopes. I note in passing that the Gospel on the Good Shepherd in the traditional liturgy did not turn this day into "Good Shepherd Sunday," but simply added a new motive to the mystery of Easter. In general, the classic liturgy was artistic and human enough not to take pleasure in some kind of thematic "slogan-liturgy"; this custom is more akin to the spirit of the activist and will-centered centuries.

The (ad libitum) move of Ascension is even more offensive than that of Epiphany, since the very day of Ascension is now without so much as a commemoration. Since the octave of Pentecost (the days for joyful meditation on the mysteries received at the solemnity) has been omitted, the days after Ascension have been imbued with a preparatory meaning (in the sense of modern "novenas"), offering asylum to some of the fine texts of the octave.

The new calendar influenced the per annum season at two points. It counts these Sundays as a continuous series. There is no doubt that the movable position of Easter previously caused confusion, since the readings and prayers of three or four Sundays (but not their chants) could be found at the end either of the post-Epiphany or the post-Trinity period. Despite this, as a whole, the two sections differed greatly. The post-Epiphany Sundays were reflections of Epiphany and celebrated the manifestation of God's appearance. The period after Pentecost (Trinity), however, is the image of the "short" time ("modicum"), which seems so long to us: the image of the historical time of the Church, already redeemed, but wandering toward its eternal home, awaiting the second Advent. These Sundays manifest the joys, emotions and problems of the faithful, whom Christ did not want to take out of the world, but rather to safeguard them from it. The two pe-

riods of the per annum season cannot be mixed. If earlier it was the "wandering Sundays" that caused a problem, now it is much more Sundays 6 to 10 jumping back and forth over a space of four months, appearing in one year as the last "Abklang" of Epiphany, and in the next as the direct continuation of the Easter season. One only has to read through the texts of these Sundays to see their unsuitability for this double role.

The second change is the transfer of the Sunday of Christ the King. The new position represents an emphatic end to the series of Sundays. But the reason for the change was more theological, perhaps, than technical. The feast of Christ the King emerged as a "program celebration" of modern times, a protest against modernism and secularization. It confirmed that Christ must reign both in society and in everyday life. So the new feast was logically placed near All Saints' Day, *within* the series of per annum Sundays. Moving it over to the last Sunday of the year emphasizes the eschatological nature of this Kingdom. Christ's reign here on Earth is invisible, and will be manifest in the future, at the end of time. It is possible that this shift of meaning was reasonable; I would prefer not to take a stand on this question.

7.

Two historical processes determined the formation of the *Sanctorale.* The number of feasts for the saints was relatively low in the rite Rome bequeathed to the newly formed local churches. The saints represented the various *types* of Christian sanctity, and gave a Roman flavor to the local church's calendar. The development of local churches and the transposition of relics augmented the list of names after the seventh and eighth centuries. Newer and newer reforms were required for this to be decreased, with a new wave of growth following each reform.

The basic layer of the medieval calendars was composed of Roman heritage and some other universally accepted feasts. In addition to this, every calendar was a *local* calendar: there are hardly two manuscripts with identical lists of saints. Regions, countries, dioceses, religious orders all had their specially venerated saints; the composition of the calendar was, nevertheless, the product of individual ecclesiastical institutions. The Roman rite had no "universal" calendar until the post-Tridentine reforms.

In this regard, the calendar after Vatican II is essentially Tridentine in character: it permits the retention of some local saints, but assigns an abundant list for universal adoration. The new calendar contains the most significant saints, but omits many earlier names. On the other hand in order to document the universality of sanctity it introduced a lot of new names from different eras, countries and continents. The large number of "local" saints appeared as a consequence of a new kind of "principle of representation."

In many cases the date of the feast itself changed, either to venerate the Saints on the day of their death (Natalitia), or to remove the feasts from the privileged sections of the temporale (last week of Advent, Lent).

Many readers are likely to take issue with the following opinion (and I am less certain in this respect than I was on other points): the reform could have been more radical while remaining more forgiving. The list of universally celebrated feasts could be shorter. The calendar is incapable of representing the huge crowd of saints. The old principle could be restored, therefore: only the most important saints of the Roman Church should belong to the basic catalogue (the biblical names and the proper saints, mostly martyrs, of Rome). On the other hand, local churches would be offered a much broader canvas for completing this catalogue (warning them, however, to take the traditions of their region, and not only their national saints, into account). Directives and an extensive martyrology could help their selection.

In most cases there is little sense in debating the change of dates. It would be better to retain some dates, however, which are deeply rooted in the ecclesiastical or even civil traditions of great regions (e.g. Elizabeth, Thomas, Gregory). It is not a good idea to lose the support that civil customs can give to the ecclesiastical feast; we cannot expect civil society to change these dates in line with the Church's new decrees. Neither is the new date of Visitation in May better than the generally accepted one in July.

8.

There is another aspect to the order of feasts, which has escaped the attention of many: the rank of the feasts.

The rituals made a careful record (albeit using different terminology) of the quite distinct rank of feasts. In the new calendar this order has been reduced to three grades: solemnity, feast and commemoration. (The category "memoria ad libitum" is not a rank in and of itself since it only refers to whether or not the observance of the memorial day is obligatory.) Modern rubricists have dealt with the ranking order mainly from the viewpoint of precedence when two feasts coincide or succeed one another (occurrentia, concurrentia). More is at stake here, however (as we shall explain), and this means that the three grades are insufficient. The "solemnitas" corresponds to the "duplex primae classis" in the Tridentine terminology, the "festum" to the "duplex secundae classis," but also covers some earlier feasts of minor rank. In the category of "memoria." four earlier grades are mixed (not to mention the even more differentiated systems of some religious orders). The consequence is that the new calendar cannot reflect the real priority of saints, and is unable to give precedence to the saints of universal importance over the great number of others. At least one more grade (the earlier "duplex maius") would be needed to distinguish the great Church Fathers, Founders, etc., appropriately. This intermediary grade could also facilitate a more differentiated treatment of the days now ranked in the "festum" category.

The Council and the subsequent regulations neglected to give a new impetus to the practice of festivities. In addition to admonitions, rules and directives it would have been necessary to enliven the actual practice of festal *observation*. This is where the ranking order of the days would really have a role to play.

The ranking of feasts reflects the faith, conscience, indeed the very emotions of the Church. If it is perceptible to the priests and the faithful, then the feasts fascinate them and implant the benefits of solemnities in their minds and emotions. If the difference between the solemnitas, festum, memoria majus, memoria simplex could actually be experienced in the life of the Church, this practice would continuously instruct both priests and laymen on a "liturgical order" (*ad analogiam* "hierarchy of dogmas").

How can the practice of this loving care be fostered?

The first question is how the Church itself celebrates its own feasts. The liturgy is not the worship of individuals, not of communities, but of the whole Church. It would achieve its full worth even if only the celebrants, ministers and a few faithful were present. The desire for a great

number of participants is not to make the celebration more holy but to let people share in all graces of worship! Consequently, norms should be established as to which parts of the liturgy should be celebrated in a cathedral, a parish church, a smaller church, and how, according to the rank of feast (convent Mass, missa cantata, public Office, etc.).

As a second step, the Church would turn to her children with commands and advice, asking them to observe the feasts in accordance with their rank. What is wrong with associating the category of "obligatory" with the rank of solemnity, and the category of "advised" with the rank of a feast? (At the same time, some of the solemnities could be reduced to the rank of a feast, and some feasts to the rank of memoria maius). To the faithful, "obligatory" means not only the moral burden (from which they are in any case exempted, if appropriate), but also the guarantee of celebration of the given day with the community in its fullness. We can automatically distinguish the (higher-ranking) feasts by making them "advised," as the feasts of lower rank and memoriae maius by "announcing" them with explanatory admonitions.

The third means of influencing the spirit of celebration is through ceremonial rules that work as the rules of the "game." In better centuries, the primary meaning of "rank" was to regulate the size and quality of assistance, the number of burning candles on the altar, the size of the choir, the kind of music, the selection of vestments, the number of bells, etc. The fulfillment of these demands required financial guarantees, of course. I do not know why the Church is so "spiritual" in these matters, when it is otherwise not at all neutral with respect to material goods. If today's situation does not allow the introduction of a strict system, a flexible norm (applicable in a variety of different circumstances) would be able to salvage our celebration from its present poor state.

Such regulation "from outside" is, of course, no more than an "appeal." It may degenerate into empty ritualism if not associated with theological, spiritual and liturgical instruction and meditation. But the history of the Church testifies that there is little ground for such fears. A reduction of rites always led to a similar laziness in spirituality, while liturgical observance creates an inner discipline that also maintains spirituality in a healthy condition.

6. The Tridentine Movement and the Reform of the Reform

In the wake of the great changes in Catholic worship wrought after the last Council, not a small number of Catholics, priests and layfolk, expressed – frequently in an active way – their resentment and protest against the innovations. At first, the resistance seemed to be led chiefly by older people who, although they had advanced rational arguments, often gave the impression of being motivated by emotional attachments and instinctive reaction. This spontaneous resistance assumed organized form in Archbishop Lefèbvre's movement. In many respects it possessed the seeds of truth, but when conjoined with doctrinal and disciplinary factors, (and when the resistance won the support, in fact, of rightist political and social forces) a sincere discussion of liturgical problems became, so to speak, impossible, and led almost inevitably to secession.

However, there was also a positive outcome of the Lefèbvre secession. Pope John Paul II approved, under certain conditions, the celebration of the "Tridentine" Mass according to the 1962 Roman Missal, founded a papal Commission to manage the problem *(Ecclesia Dei),* and in some of his statements he acknowledged the value and rationale for the existence of the traditional form of liturgy.

All of these papal initiatives placed the Tridentine movement on a new basis. Its followers can celebrate this liturgy without defying Rome amidst a situation when priests educated during the time of the Council and now reaching the age customary for bishops, treat them in the same "conservative" and dictatorial spirit as the previous generation did with the "innovators." And so the wheel has turned: the "progressives" gave birth to a new "conservativism" and vice versa.

But the more favorable treatment by Rome is not the only new feature of this second period. Of equal significance, it seems to me, are the following new aspects of the second stage in the struggle for the "Tridentine" Mass. The first of these is that the number of priests and communities who prefer the 'old' liturgy has grown rapidly. Whereas in the first period such efforts were exerted chiefly by a very small group, today we find a respect-

able number of communities in Europe and America celebrating this liturgy occasionally or regularly.

The second aspect is that today it is not senior citizens who stand in the forefront but the middle-aged and younger generations who have no recollection of the pre-conciliar forms of worship, since they were very young or not even alive in the sixties.

The third aspect: the movement has found its organized structures and its own voice; it has its publications, Internet homepages, and the like.

The fourth aspect is the start of honest intellectual work treating the dogmatic, liturgical, pastoral, sociological and psychological components of the theme, and so now the positions are based upon strict and many-sided argumentation instead of mere nostalgia.

The fifth point is that today the movement works within the post-conciliar context. It places less emphasis upon "condemning" the Council and/or the post-conciliar liturgy (or if it does, the question is treated chiefly from a strictly liturgical point of view), rather it is focused mainly upon defending the values of the Tridentine Mass and its right to exist. A clear sign of this approach is that a good many "Tridentine" people and communities recognize or even occasionally celebrate the Novus Ordo, while personally preferring the pre-conciliar rite.

This improved situation, however, should only be regarded as transitional. It is necessary to launch the third stage that will bring about a reassuring and long-term solution to the problem. The precondition for this is an expansion of the 'theoretical' (in fact, far too practical) work, a synthesis of the results, and a clearer definition of terms and tasks. The situation has not changed in one regard: the followers of the "Tridentine" Mass have attempted 'dialogue' with each other, with church authorities and with the 'other side' amidst a total confusion of notions. Even the basic terms are not clarified: what is the "traditional Roman liturgy"? What is the "Tridentine" rite? What is the "Novus Ordo"?

This chapter focuses directly upon these basic questions and by doing so, arrives at some rather clear practical conclusions.

I.

What is the "traditional Roman liturgy"?

If the reply to this query is to be based upon facts instead of suppositions, then the testimony of the liturgical sources themselves cannot be ignored. Though liturgiology has no right to force itself upon the living liturgy, still, honest statements cannot be formulated in contradiction with the facts of liturgical history.

Though it may be appealing to romantic natures, it is not exactly legitimate to suggest that everything contained in the liturgical books of the 8th–9th centuries is a mirror image of the usages in the "early Church." Much earlier sources testify the presence of various important elements of the liturgy: the "Sursum corda" dialogue or the Sanctus (in the third-century layer of the 'Apostolic Constitutions'); observance of the daily Hours of prayer (Terce, Sext, None in the writings of Tertullian); the existence of responsorial psalmody (e.g. in St. Augustine's Psalm commentaries). These bits of important information do not mean that the liturgy in the third century was little more than the Sursum corda and Sanctus (for instance). They mean simply that the sources at our disposal are very sparse and fragmentary, hence frustratingly silent about what was actually done in worship services. Thus anyone who wishes to make generalizations about the Roman liturgy as a whole, must perforce take "Roman liturgy" to mean that which has survived in the full liturgical books of the 8th–9th centuries and on into our own times. All else is speculation and hypothesis – not 'facts' – when it comes to "early Christian liturgy."

The Roman Liturgy emerges in the sources not in its entirety, as a completed whole, an *opus perfectum,* but only as the succession of its elements. It is not so much the development of liturgy that is reflected in these sources; what we have to deal with is the insufficiency of the source material. It is a rather audacious or romantic attitude to refer to "the liturgy of the time of the Apostles or Martyrs," since the very small number of sources from these periods imposes a serious limit on the level of knowledge we can possibly attain about this early stage of the liturgy. Some elements already appear in the third century sources; some chance references can be found in the sermons of the Church Fathers; a richer source of information is the Rule of Saint Benedict. However, liturgical books including

actual texts and ceremonies are not available from this early age. The little we know must be gathered through the analysis of sources that date from subsequent centuries, and by their careful comparison with the early quotations.

In contrast to this disappointing picture, when we take up the earliest surviving books used in actual liturgical practice, we find that all the essential elements and structures known from the Middle Ages and valid up to 1970, are present in them. (Of course, I speak now only of the Roman rite and not of other branches of the Western liturgy which have almost completely disappeared with the passage of time.)

This statement should be understood differently as regards the different elements of the liturgy, the different seasons and days of the liturgical year, and the composition, material and arrangement of the celebration itself. While the priest's prayers and the readings, for instance, are known in different arrangements from the (partly overlapping) collections of the 7th and 8th centuries, the repertory of Mass chants (edited by Hesbert) obligatory until very recent times is about 90 percent the same as in the earliest sources.

The liturgy reflected in the "essentially identical" source material became still more homogenous by the regulation of the Roman rite and its diffusion through all of Europe. The distribution of the pericopes, the sacramentary, the chant books and even more the structure of the main components of the liturgy all exhibit great similarity when charted in hundreds of mediaeval ritual books. In the process of regulation, new contextual values and potentialities evolved: cross-references, associations, confluence of elements all enriched and stabilized the celebration of the sacred rites.

This does not mean, however, a literal identity. The pre-conciliar rites of some religious orders allow us to perceive to a greater or lesser degree the inner variety of the Roman liturgy. The Benedictines, Cistercians, Dominicans and Norbertines preserved the liturgy of their own orders even until recent times, up to the Council and some even beyond. These liturgical families preserve great values for the whole Church, and a special personal attractiveness for those living in the given communities. But in the Middle Ages, variety within unity was not limited to the religious orders. The guardians of continuity were first of all the cathedrals. In a paradoxical way, they guaranteed both conformity to the unity of the Roman liturgy and the variety of the local rites. The liturgy of the cathedral was the norm for the parish churches of the diocese.

The geographical (or rather, institutional) differences caused no confusion for two reasons. On the one hand, both the categories of *ubi* and *quomodo* were adequately regulated. By that we mean that the liturgical areas *where* or *in which* unity was to be maintained (with the local traditions duly observed) were governed by a 'hierarchy' of elements supported by dogmatic and liturgical considerations. On the other hand, it was the Chapter (or the convent or the superior of the religious order) that safeguarded both the continuity and the legal changes or development, and this guarantee against any kind of arbitrariness was not at all less efficient than the activity of a far distant Curial congregation would have been.

If, knowing all this, we again ask the question what the "traditional Roman liturgy" is, the answer will be as follows: it is the liturgical practice of Rome continuously living and organically developing from the 4th century at the latest (if its basic features are meant) and fixed in the 8th–9th centuries; which preserved its identity during diffusion both geographical (in cathedrals) and institutional (in orders), as also amid the local and temporal variations regulated by the liturgical hierarchy. Or more briefly put: the Roman rite is that which emerges in the uniformity of the organic temporal and coherent spatial variety of its daughter-liturgies. The description of its content, the separation of common, general, and differing specific elements can only be achieved by analyzing the rite in its entirety, a task which exceeds the limits of this chapter. The definition given above could not avoid, of course, some superficiality, but for our purposes it is valid and sufficient.

What is the 'Tridentine liturgy"?

The correct reply to this question seems to be a simple matter: it is the rite codified in the liturgical books promulgated under the authority of St. Pius V and Clement VIII as a response to the mandate of the Council of Trent. But this definition must be somewhat nuanced with regard to the past and future of the Tridentine books.

First of all, the 1962 *Missale Romanum* is not identical with the Tridentine Missal. The books containing the different parts of the liturgy were published over a lengthy period after the Council, and they reflect in different ways the wishes of the Sacred Synod. For now it will suffice to refer, for example, to the catastrophic 17th-century re-arrangement of the Hymnal

and the re-wording of the hymn texts, or to the anomalies surrounding the edition of the Gradual. The material published in these books has been augmented during the 17th to the 19th centuries, and in the meantime that material underwent minor unessential changes, sometimes in opposition to the will of the Council. New and decisive changes were made once more at the beginning of the 20th century, chiefly in the structure of the Divine Office. It is sad but true that the re-arrangement of the order of psalmody basically destroyed the system of the Roman Office and erased its most traditional elements from the experience of two or three generations of priests. Another change was the introduction of the Pius XII Psalter in the fifties, again injuring the liturgical continuity at a sensitive point, just as the re-arrangement of Holy Week did not lack points of dubious value. Finally, the Tridentine Liturgy was modified by some innovations under Bd. John XXIII and Paul VI. This is not to say that there were not a number of fruitful, organic and justified changes among those just mentioned. But the liturgy valid in 1962 can in no way be regarded as "Tridentine" without the necessary clarifications.

A more important question is the relation of the "Tridentine" liturgy to its predecessors. The historical context of its emergence is: flourishing local liturgies, the destructive liturgical movements of the Renaissance, and the confusion caused by the Protestant Revolt. In this situation, the Council of Trent had to restore order and – at least according to its desire – return to the pristine Roman tradition as was clearly explained in the introduction to the Missal. The restoration or return had two components: the approval of all cathedral or monastic liturgies that had existed from time immemorial while removing some of their excesses; and secondly the proposal of a new exemplary Roman rite, originally only intended for those who did not possess a venerable, ancient, and basically Roman cathedral liturgy.

The basis of the "Tridentine" liturgy was the rite of the Roman Curia. This *Ritus Curiae Romanae* evolved at the turn of the 11th–12th century on the basis of old Italian and Roman traditions. In comparison with the other cathedral rites, it was a somewhat simplified variant of the same common order. The motivation for simplicity was twofold: limiting the increase of the Frankish-Roman liturgy (e.g., indifference toward the Offices of new saints, slowing the growth of trope and sequence repertory); and the separation of priests working in the Curial bureaucracy from the elevated public sung liturgy of cathedrals and parishes.

And thus many rich elements of the Holy Week liturgy, for example, fell victim to the Curial reform.

To sum up: the "Tridentine" liturgy belongs to the family of the Roman liturgy. All its essential features are identical with that liturgy. In other words, it is one of the many variants of the Roman liturgy – *the "Tridentine" liturgy is Roman liturgy!* In this sense, the "Tridentine" liturgy exists not only since the 16th, but since the 8th or 9th, or in some sense since the 4th century. But the Roman liturgy is not identical with the "Tridentine" liturgy: it is more than that. Those who follow the "Tridentine" liturgy, celebrate the Roman liturgy. But the Roman liturgy also lived in other, and in certain respects perhaps more perfect, forms.

Is the confusion of terminology in contemporary discourse the outcome of neglect or lack of knowledge? Instead, I think it is a conscious and malevolent deception. When the choice is described in terms of the dichotomy: "conciliar liturgy – 'Tridentine' liturgy," an impression is created that the matter concerns the opposition of two liturgical forms which are equally "zeitbedingt" or time-bound. The logic of this mentality is that the "Tridentine" rite is the liturgy of the Renaissance and Baroque periods, which perhaps worked well for the past 300 years, but today the needs of a new age and of modern man must be met with the new Vatican II liturgy. Accordingly, he who favors the "Tridentine" liturgy over the "conciliar" one desires to perpetuate the formalities of bygone times, and thus endangers the renewal of the Church.

But if, on the contrary, the "Tridentine" liturgy in its essence is nothing other than the ancient Roman liturgy itself, it cannot be written off as Renaissance or Baroque or "zeitbedingt." And then, the truth is that the recent innovations overrode not some 300-year-old custom, but in fact broke with the entire tradition of the Roman Church insofar as it is recognizable for us.

The point can perhaps be better understood if we attempt to clarify the nature of the "conciliar" liturgy as well.

What is "neo-Roman" liturgy?

It is incorrect to define the Roman liturgy as the mere sum of various local and monastic rites. Other liturgies existed outside this stream of tradition. One thinks first of all of the tradition of ancient ecclesiastical centers

like Milan, Gaul, Spain and others. And there existed other systems created on the basis of the Roman liturgy but farther removed from it.

Such are e.g. the innovative systems created under the influence of Renaissance reflections. Some of these systems remained at the level of conceptual experiments; some, however, have been realized, and even received ecclesiastical approval. One of these is the Quignonez Breviary, abolished *expressis verbis,* after several decades of use, by the Council of Trent, or more correctly, by the Breviary of St. Pius V.

Such also are the Neo-Gallican liturgies of the 17th–18th centuries. They almost superseded the "Tridentine" rite in France, and by provoking reaction they had a part in the process of liturgical renewal in the Church Universal. They represented opposite poles from which the French Church had to return to Rome; at the same time, these rites and the bishops supporting them represented the greatest obstacle to such a return. Abbot Guéranger fought a heroic battle to replace the Neo-Gallican liturgies with the Roman rite, and he was regarded as the enemy of the Church in France.

The Novus Ordo imposed after the close of the Second Vatican Council fits into the long line of similar reform-liturgies. It adopts a respectable number of their concrete devices, and is akin to them in its approach and indeed, its philosophy. The "reform-liturgies" of the past four centuries resemble each other in the following main points:

a) they emerged not as the result of organic development and small changes during the course of subsequent centuries, but from a stormy, one-time modification;

b) they are not structures which originated during the normal process of Church life, but are constructions created by "experts," the inventions of one person or of a group;

c) though they accept certain elements and details from the liturgical tradition, their structure, material and arrangement is something newly invented, deviating to a great extent from tradition without any concrete precedents.

In what sense, then, can the "Neo-Roman" liturgy be regarded as a Roman one? There is no doubt that it is "Roman" in two respects. Firstly, the majority of the Roman Catholic Church today celebrates her liturgy according to this Ordo. Secondly, it was produced within the juridical framework of the Roman Church, and it enjoys her official approval.

However, the conclusion is quite different if we test the Novus Ordo from the *viewpoint of its content.* In this respect, it does not belong to the ancient and long-lived Roman liturgy, but represents another type. We can recognize some elements taken over from the Roman Liturgy. They are more numerous in the *Ordo Missae,* less so in the *Proprium Missae,* still less in the rites of Holy Week and of the sacraments, and very few in the Divine Office. With regard to the whole, in essence it is a new construction. The term "new liturgy" is frequently used in common parlance even though it has been officially rejected. Notwithstanding the official objections, a detailed analysis of its content fully justifies the expression.

Without being overly critical, the three features listed above are plainly applicable in the case of the Novus Ordo. First, flatly contradicting Art. 23 of the Liturgical Constitution, the new liturgy did not come into existence through organic development and so it did not sum up or incorporate the changes that were warranted by the passage of time. In fact it is the product of a rather hasty, haphazard process: the *compositum* created over centuries by the cooperation of generations of Church Fathers, popes, bishops, theologians, and the everyday actors of worship was put aside, and the whole liturgy was to be re-invented by the work of ten years. Second, the new liturgy is a personal product: the work of one single ambitious man and the comission acting under his strict direction. An effective debate was excluded, and approval was received under the pressure (and by the not always entirely innocent maneuvers) of this person and group. Third, in spite of the elements and details taken over from the Roman liturgy, *the construction as a whole* remains outside the stream of tradition previously called "Roman rite."

The post-conciliar liturgy is the official liturgy of the Roman Church today and we have to accept it and follow it obediently. In the juridical sense it is the Roman liturgy. But since it is difficult to call it Roman in terms of its content, in order to avoid any confusion we shall hereafter refer to it as "Neo-Roman."

Such is the context in which we have to make a judgment about the "Tridentine Mass movement," and indeed, about any so-called "reform of the reform."

II.

The "truth" of the Liturgy

I am reluctant to depict the Roman and Neo-Roman liturgies as antagonists battling each other with a resolution to "mutually assured destruction." The "traditional Roman liturgy" received a limited right of existence by papal decree, and some new Vatican statements nourish hopes of expanding these rights. Its use is linked to the condition that people who favor it will not question the validity of the Neo-Roman rite. Here, my only aim is to investigate the circumstances and needs in respect to the Roman rite, and thus we may leave the fate of the Neo-Roman rite to the future course of history.

But we cannot move ahead in practical matters without clarifying the system of norms for measuring events and solutions. And so we arrive at the question of the "truth of the liturgy," which must be analyzed carefully on more than one level.

The first and most important factor is what we call the SACRAMENTAL TRUTH of the liturgy. The liturgy may fulfill its task in a more or less perfect way, but in order to fulfill this task, it must first realize what it is ordered to. In the case of Holy Mass this "sacramental truth" is guaranteed if an ordained priest, keeping the matter and form of the sacrament, does what the Church intends. In this respect the faithful can take heart: no doubt is attached to the sacramental truth and validity of the Mass celebrated either according to the Roman or the Neo-Roman rite. The same is true of the other sacraments, and the aim of the Office is likewise achieved regardless of which rite is used.

According to the well-known principle of *Lex credendi legem statuat supplicandi,* the liturgy must be in accord with DOCTRINAL TRUTH, while at the same time it is also a *witness* to sacred Tradition. At first, critics of the new Missal made attempts to appeal to this particular principle. In fact, in the face of their criticism the General Introduction of the Missal had to be reworded when it became evident that it is at the very least liable to misunderstanding as regards the essence and sacrificial nature of the Mass.

But we would restrict the "doctrinal truth" of the liturgy to a very narrow sense if we merely continued searching for dogmatically unfortunate expressions. The positive side of the matter is that the liturgy has to unfold

the *whole* of Catholic doctrine, and represent it in good proportions. It should be in close harmony with the Catholic, i.e., the universal character of the liturgy, as also with the spiritual "aura" of the *depositum fidei.* Going further, it is quite justified to demand that the Roman liturgy reveal this faith not in the partial presentation of theological or spiritual "schools" current in the last eight or ten centuries, but in the synoptic view and with the appropriate terminology of the early Christian centuries. Moreover, the liturgy can reveal or conceal doctrinal truths not only in word but also in symbol, through proportion, emphasis – and deficit. To take one example: in the earlier manner of administering the sacraments, when each sacrament had its proper structure, its own series of events, with proper symbolic and effective actions (like the tasting of salt, the rite of Ephpheta, or the exorcism at Baptism), the dramatic nature of the sacrament clearly manifested: something *happens* in the sacrament in virtue of divine power, *ex opere operato.* But when all sacraments are pressed into one uniform structure within the Liturgy of the Word accompanied by a great deal of didactical and exhortatory words, then the symbolic actions are reduced and another view of the sacrament becomes predominant, namely the one which emphasizes the intellectual-moral (i.e., human) side of the sacrament.

The third point is the JURIDICAL TRUTH, i.e. the discipline of sacramental practice. Since this matter has been discussed already, we remark only that in ideal circumstances the juridical or *legal approval supports the essential meaning* of the truth, providing it with authority and general validity which guarantees its place in the Church while defending against arbitrariness. It does not, however, compensate for what is imperfect in its content.

The fourth point is the PASTORAL TRUTH of the liturgy. Here serious misunderstandings may arise. The liturgy is not first and foremost the worship of the congregation (priests and faithful) assembled *hic and nunc,* but that of the universal Church, who, as it were, engraves her image of God, her understanding of being redeemed, her own sacramental consciousness and spirituality in the forms of the liturgy. True, certain expressions might be changed, but eighty percent of what is said and done in the liturgy is independent of the passing of time, not dependent upon historical periods, social levels, gender and age groups. If on the basis of an appeal to pastoral intentions, the liturgy is subjected to the religious ideas and tastes of historical periods, social strata, gender and age groups, then the continuous transmission of the Church's faith and life might be interrupted, at least in the

most important and most effective (i.e., cultic) form of this transmission. The liturgy fulfills its goal not only, and indeed not primarily, by speaking to concrete communities, but *simply by existing.* Its effect continues also in an invisible way (as during the period of the Latin liturgy in the souls of people unfamiliar with Latin), not only by its sacramental power, but also by the devotion, style, and discipline radiating from it, through the words of theologians, preachers and catechists, through spiritual literature settling down on the "bedrock" of the Church's common sense and furnishing hungry souls with the authentic nourishment of faith and life. Hence a genuine pastoral liturgy is not a liturgy forced into the service of short-term aims and of "pastoral intentions," but a more or less fruitful and effective pastoral activity for transmitting the content and practice of the liturgy in the sphere of the faithful.

Though it is the most difficult to formulate, the fifth point is the most vital factor, and this is the LITURGICAL TRUTH of the liturgy. The liturgy is a special form of sign language, an individual manifestation of the faith having its own laws, proportion, style, logic and structure. This *sui generis* system links on one level all authentic liturgical manifestations of mankind; on another level all the Christian rites. Every individual rite has its own inner laws, preserved even during the changes. If the rite lacks these laws it becomes a fiction. If a house is not constructed firmly, it will eventually collapse. But if the liturgical truth is diminished or attenuated, no visible trouble will result right away, since the liturgy is falsely assumed to be the sum of human conventions. It is commonplace, however, that in a society serious disorder will follow if the commonly accepted norms of behavior become regarded as mere conventions that can be changed at will. The spiritual unity of such a society disintegrates when its former principle of order changes to fiction. Similarly, the violation of liturgical truth will sooner or later grievously harm the common sense and spirituality of the Church, as well as the religious behavior of her priests and faithful. Sad to say, this thesis has been proven right by the events that followed Vatican II. As Cardinal Ratzinger put it: "The cause of the Church's inner crisis is the disintegration of her liturgy."

Just what is this "liturgical truth"? The matter resembles St. Augustine's relationship to time: "If you do not ask me about it, I know it clearly, but when you ask me, I suddenly do not know." I offer an absurd example of this. Let us imagine that someone comes up with the following idea: the

Gospel is the Word of the Living Christ Who is present among the congregation. Hence it is more logical if first of all Christ appears among us (through the Transubstantiation), and then afterwards speaks to us (in the Gospel). We all sense the falsity of this conclusion, and the absurdity of the idea. But on the level of speculation it is difficult to offer a rebuttal. If the Gospel were transferred to a position following the words of the Last Supper, no dogmatic truth would be offended. But the whole *liturgical* truth of the Mass would have collapsed.

Since this "liturgical truth" is the aggregate of a great number of components, effects, proportions, which can hardly be described in most cases, the human mind is unable to construct it. This truth is something more vibrantly alive than the dogmatic, juridical or pastoral truth. As the human mind and body cannot be produced by construction, since they are the marvelous result of conception, birth and growth, so too the liturgical truth can only be inherited, nursed and transmitted. We may change it in approximately the same measure as we can change our own bodies. This is the TRADITIONAL TRUTH of the liturgy.

We can know how, why and when certain individual elements of the liturgy were introduced. Its totality, however, comes (or should come) to us from a world of anonymity, from the immemorial ancient traditions of the Church.

The merits of the "Tridentine" movement

The decrees approving the use of the "Tridentine" Mass referred at first to the fulfillment of spiritual needs amongst priests and faithful. In more recent statements there appears also the thought of preserving the traditional liturgical values of the Roman Church.

I think the partial permission to use the 1962 Roman Missal cannot solve the problems but rather prepares a path toward the solution. I regard this movement as a transitional phenomenon with its own merits and anticipated fruits. But we must speak of its shortcomings as well.

1. The first advantage of celebrating the "Tridentine" Mass is that the ancient Roman liturgy, or at least part of it, can survive in this form: it can be shown and offered as a possibility to the faithful. Thus the "Tridentine" Mass also offers the possibility of discussing the Novus Ordo and its effects on the basis of experiences gained within the context of the "Tridentine" Mass.

2. It is even more important that the "Tridentine" Mass does or is at least able to maintain the correct approach to the liturgy. The most harmful consequence of the Novus Ordo was that the thinking of many priests (and their followers) about the liturgy has been radically changed. The liturgy in the practice of many priests is not a holy, divine action, an *actio praecellenter sacra,* performed by the priest as the servant of the Church according to the order given by the Church, not something which enlivens, preserves and transmits certain objective values... No, it is rather an event organized by the priest (often by a specific group from the congregation), and its value can be measured by its effect on the given members of the congregation. No doubt, the liturgy had or might have effects on the mind and psyche in the Ordo Antiquus, too. But it did so not by reason of a direct intention, but through an invisible formative power whose content is defined not by the celebrant or a liturgical committee but by the fixed liturgical norms. In the long run the "Tridentine" Mass can become an asylum or refuge and a catalyst for the spirit of respect and discipline, of devotion and discretion, of stylization and maturity in the Church – even for the followers of the Novus Ordo! – in an age of neglect and arbitrariness, of agitation and manipulation, of naturalism, improvisation and informality.

3. The Tridentine movement may also help to make the liturgy the summit and source of the Church's life, as the last Council phrased it in complete fidelity to Catholic tradition, (SC 10: *culmen simul et fons).* But what more often than not happens in the *ecclesia in mundo hujus temporis* is practically the exact opposite. How many Catholics today are preoccupied with social responsibility and activity, or external appearances, or the internal mobilization of crowds in the style of some sects – all to be achieved, of course, by the arbitrary use of the liturgy! According to the traditional approach of Holy Mother Church, however, there are three primary means of redemption in the life of the Church: the truths of Revelation grasped in faith, God's mercy and grace received in the sacraments, and personal devotion manifested in the ascetic struggle to live a moral life. Each of these factors is more or less hidden from the eyes of the world, concealed in the womb of the Church community (sancta *mater* ecclesia!) and in the hearts of the faithful as part of the profound interior relationship between the individual soul, the Church as the Bride of Christ, and our God the Father. All else is but the consequence or outward manifestation of this faith, these sacra-

ments, that moral life: fraternal charity, the obligations of our state in life as regulated by the cardinal virtue of justice, the external actions which flow from these virtues. And do we not find an apt symbol of this hierarchy of elements in the Church as *domus Dei?* In the innermost sanctuary dwell faith, sacraments, morals: the faithful in the nave participate in these goods of the sanctuary; and outside the church edifice lies the world in which the faithful live their lives and work their jobs – while the sanctuary itself remains untouched – *culmen simul et fons.* In this sense the Tridentine movement and its reverence toward dogma and the *divine* Offices of the *ecclesia orans,* can help to maintain and safeguard this hierarchy of elements in the life of the Church and individual souls.

4. The Tridentine movement may maintain in the Church a responsible way of thinking about liturgy, and transmit the dogmatic and liturgical principles, which have formed and educated many generations in the correct approach to the liturgy.

5. The Tridentine movement preserves, activates, connects and allows certain spiritual forces and personalities to work in the Church, and this perhaps will prove to be extremely helpful as the Church strives to escape from the present crisis. Such forces not only promote the conservation of high values; the involvement of the middle and younger generations gives hope that the establishment of appropriate organizations will raise from an atmosphere of isolation and depression all those who can pray and work for this future. And then, in to its service on behalf of a better future, the Tridentine movement can also play a symbolic role: after the heated and mixed emotions (such as e.g. anxiety, outrage, hatefulness, orthodoxy, nostalgia, true religious experiences, rightist political tendencies) are properly dealt with, distinguished and rightly ordered, the movement can offer the Church a helpful reserve for nurturing and assimilating faith, for nourishing an intimate religious life. In this case the Tridentine movement will truly be a place to gather and educate not regressive forces of reaction, but rather persons and communities that promote and assist a true renewal.

But in order to solve the problem, the Tridentine movement should transcend its present aims. In the following paragraphs I shall try to list its shortcomings in order to locate the main areas in which advances might be made.

Ideally, each of the points that follow should be accompanied by ample explanations, the clarification and justification of certain statements by way of numerous examples chosen from different parts of the Liturgy. But since such exemplification far exceeds the limits of space and time at my disposal, I must perforce fulfill my obligation to the reader with brief summary statements, referring to other parts of this book.

1. Pope John Paul II permitted the public celebration of the traditional Mass according to the 1962 Missal. We know, however, that this Missal is not identical with the "Tridentine" liturgy. Some of the changes introduced during the intervening decades and centuries are reasonable, others are less fortunate. To mention only one example: according to the "Tridentine" rite and the earlier Roman rubrics, the Paschal candle is set up in the church, and it is consecrated by the Exsultet (*Consecratio cerei*). The change made fifty years ago moved the blessing of the candle to an area outside the church, and it is then brought into the church by procession. (The Paschal candle, as we see it depicted on the old Exsultet rolls, was a huge column of light that could be lit only by the deacon climbing several steps to reach it.) With the change, the Exsultet, formerly a Preface producing a sacramental, was turned into a "Praeconium" or announcement of Easter. I do not believe that the fate of the Roman liturgy depends on this or any similar detail, but there is no doubt that this modification adversely affected the theological and liturgical content of the ceremony.

2. We have already noted that the "Tridentine" liturgy is not identical with the Roman rite, rather it is only one representative of it. Its outward *appearance* reflects the private liturgy of the Curia Romana and consequently, when compared with the medieval cathedral liturgy which originates in the celebrations of the ancient Roman basilicas, it proves to be poorer in many respects. If the reform of the "Tridentine" liturgy was desired after the last Vatican Council, it would have been preferable to go back to this richer Roman heritage at many points. Such a course of action could also re-open a path to certain values of the medieval liturgical development which were extirpated during the Tridentine reforms. To mention again but one example: fortunately the "Tridentine" Missal preserved the Sequences of Easter, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and of the Requiem Mass, yet a set of beautiful

and doctrinally rich Sequences for solemnities of equal importance (Nativity, Epiphany, Ascension, Marian feasts) was rejected.

3. The Council of Trent did not prohibit the peaceful survival of the long-lived and precious local variants of the Roman rite. In spite of this, dioceses and religious orders abandoned, one after the other, their valuable liturgical heritage, motivated perhaps by a ultramontanist tendency in the Counter-Reformation era. Since the need for healthy pluralism in the sense of a well-ordered variety of rites, and the preservation of individual traditions were emphasized time and again in the sessions of Vatican II (e.g. Sacrosanctum Concilium 38), one could reasonably entertain the hope that after the Council these particular values would peacefully coexist within the essential unity of the Church. We know of religious orders and dioceses where initiatives were launched for reestablishing their proper traditions. And in fact, one had every reason to expect that if pagan peoples have the right to bring their traditions into the liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium 37), then the same rights would also be conceded to communities with long centuries of Christian history and culture. But in reality a very strange situation emerged: on one hand, the Bugnini commission (established to implement the will of the Council) was successful in attaining a dictatorial uniformity never known in the Church before, on the other hand, the practical result of the "reforms" could best be described as a scene of the greatest confusion, a disorder ensuing from the arbitrary decisions of individual priests. The "Tridentine" rite is a good counterpoint to both the confused diversity and the dictatorship of the Novus Ordo. But it cannot blind us to the fact that the rightful varieties and traditions of the dioceses and religious orders that formerly existed within the unity of the Roman liturgy, have not recovered their juridical existence.

4. The Tridentine movement and the papal concessions seem to focus mainly on the celebration of the Mass, and there is very little discussion about the problems relating to other important areas of the liturgical life. The Roman liturgy or in particular its "Tridentine" form, suffered much greater loss as regards the Office and the administration of the Sacraments. The Council was quite right when it urged Catholics to make at least parts of the "priestly" Breviary into the prayer of the whole Church in accordance with the pristine practice of previous periods. If the arguments on behalf of the "Tridentine" *Mass* can be taken seriously, they are even more

cogent for the maintenance of the "Tridentine" or Roman Office, and that not only in private recitation by the clergy, but in public celebration as well.

5. At the same time, the protagonists of the Tridentine liturgy should admit the fact that the current edition of the *Liturgia Horarum* is but the final denouncement in the drama of abolishing the Roman Office. It is painful to admit but the principles of the Roman Office were first violated by the reforms of St. Pius X. Moreover, the two events are related: the clergy that accepted the *Liturgia Horarum* had no personal experience of the Roman Office for at least three generations, and precisely for that reason was unable to recognize and understand the essential features of this Office; indeed of the Office in general. Going farther: even the unblemished "Tridentine" Office used before the reforms of St. Pius X was but one variant of the Roman Office. The Roman Office itself lost a great many of its values already as a result of the "Tridentine" reforms, and the task of an intelligent reform would have been to restore them on the basis of sound and sensible considerations, instead of giving up the Roman Office even in its "Tridentine" form.

6. Thus far we have scrutinized the 1962 form of the "Tridentine" liturgy and its permitted use as related to its past. This did not reflect an archeological or antiquarian approach, but rather an effort to preserve and restore the liturgical values. This is not to say that a reform of the liturgy was inappropriate at the time of the last Council. And yet I do not wish to exclude the possibility that a true fidelity to the Roman Office demanded reforms going even farther than did the Council's reforms. I fear that if we confine ourselves exclusively to fighting for the use of the unchanged 1962 Missal, the results would only contribute to the satisfaction of a narrow, standoffish circle, while the life of the Church as a whole would simply go on without deriving much useful benefit.

The conciliar reforms surely contain legitimate points warranted by the Church's life and by the liturgy itself, and no adherent of the "Tridentine" liturgy can be insensible to them. The essential difference is that the adherents of the "traditional Roman liturgy" would have preferred, or would now promote, a *reform* in the true sense of the word without producing a completely new liturgy. The Council's will was that "there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing" (SC 23). Applying this princi-

ple to the traditional Roman liturgy, we ought to think of a reform that aims at increasing its efficacy instead of altering the liturgy itself. In what follows, I wish to point out only a few possible features of such a reform.

7. Though I despise slogans of this kind, it cannot be denied that the admirable richness of the Roman liturgy was the function of a clerical celebration. The problem is not sociological but purely practical. The well-developed Roman liturgy was celebrated by the bishop surrounded by priests, lower ranking clerics, lectors, psalmists, etc. The available personnel made it possible to celebrate the liturgy in its entirety day after day; schools and theologians labored to understand it, to assimilate it, and to apply it to the spiritual life. Financial resources were at hand to keep the whole system alive and maintain it without interruption. This liturgical "network" was very important, efficient, and its beneficial effects also reached the congregation both directly and indirectly. As these conditions began to diminish, the very celebration of the *Opus Dei* began to shrink as well. Supplementary partial solutions were offered in order to maintain the spiritual values of the liturgy, but these proved insufficient to sustain its radiant solemnity or to manifest its true inner nature. The final stage of this evolution is the "Tridentine" silent Low Mass and the priest's personal obligation to the private reading of the Breviary.

I will demonstrate this process of erosion by one single case. A decisive element of the daily liturgy is the Introit, a chant identical in the earliest sources, which *even* if it was *not* originally coordinated with the other parts of the Mass, gradually became inseparable from the daily liturgy.

Nothing prevented the chanting of the Introit since a solo psalmist, a "choir", i.e. a well-trained ensemble of clerics and school-boys, or later, paid musicians, were provided for that purpose. When such singers were not present for at least some of the Masses, the Introit was transformed into the silent prayer of the priest, whilst the congregation in some parts of Europe sang vernacular hymns not directly related to the liturgy. Where parish choirs existed, only a few of them were able to sing week after week the proper Introit of the Mass on its Gregorian melody. True, the singers could perhaps be taught to sing the words of the liturgy on simpler tunes, even if not a different one for each Sunday of the year. This, however, was not permitted. And so the chanting of the Introit ceased, except at the High Mass of some larger churches. Thus the memory of the Introit was maintained until the 1962/65 Council only in the prayer of the priest quietly recited

while the congregation occupied itself with the singing of vernacular hymns. The damage was somewhat mitigated by the use of bilingual or vernacular congregational Missals, transmitting the spiritual message of the Introit; the liturgical *chant*, however, was omitted. The postconciliar rubrics offered three remedies: a) the Introit remained in principle a part of the Proper; b) but in actual practice it is most often replaced by *alius cantus aptus,* "some other appropriate song" (during which the Introit itself is not even prayed by the priest anymore); c) and the mere reading of the Introit – as a kind of pious epigraph – in Masses without any singing. A true reform must and can find a solution to this situation, the more so since literacy today is not restricted to the clergy.[18]

8. *Pars pro toto,* this example also serves to demonstrate another problem. Taking for granted that the Introit is meant to be chanted and only in ex-

18 In the oldest Missals and in the most ancient Graduals (up to 1970) we find the series of Introits to be identical in ninety percent of cases. It is true that the Mass Propers were created independently of the other elements in a given daily formulary; the 20th century meditations or reflections on the "theme" of a given Sunday, for example, with comparable prayers, pericope and chants, is historically incorrect. (In the 7th–9th centuries the order of pericopes varied somewhat; in many points the Chants follow the numerical order of the psalms – which of course excludes any thematic "selection.") The decisive factor in the selection was not so much the individual day and the other parts of its formulary such as the readings and prayers; rather, it was the liturgical *season* whose influence predominated. However, in spite of this the prayers, readings, and chants of a given day co-existed over the course of centuries and (as the history of religious culture in western Christendom shows) in the mind of the Church and of the individual faithful they became very strongly linked to the particular day and the other elements of its liturgy. We may refer to this as the "psychological or associative coherence" of the parts of a day's liturgy, and it produced rich fruits both intellectually and emotionally. How frequently it happens that a given Introit becomes attached in our minds and memory to a certain Sunday after Pentecost (for instance) and to its Gospel, collect, etc. This "context" is of high liturgical value, and it should be preserved. But on the other hand, if such an Introit is merely read by the priest (and in the best of cases also by the congregation using its missalettes), then the Introit is in fact *changed:* it is no longer a *chant*, but simply one of the *readings*. Hence there would seem to be three tasks here: 1) to maintain the given Introit sung to its Gregorian melody whenever possible; 2) to create a series of Introits, worthy of the liturgical heritage but capable of being chanted by a schola or the congregation even in the smallest country parish church (Cf. e.g., *Graduale Simplex*); 3) to invent a combination that recalls the "proper" Introit of the day while allowing the schola and congregation to sing a seasonal Introit on a fine but simple tone, instead of singing *alius cantus aptus*. Or, more correctly: to create a series of liturgical *alius*. (For the details see Chapter 4 of this book.)

traordinary cases be read, the first question is: given today's conditions what are the *obstacles* to the regular chanting of the Roman (or "Tridentine") Introit? The answer is twofold: the first obstacle is the fact that except for the priest, the Mass is celebrated with the assistance of volunteers. In most places this is also true of the singers, and even more true if the liturgical chant is based only upon the actual diminishing memory and knowledge of the congregation. The remedy, of an organizational rather than liturgical nature, would be to establish a system to recruit liturgical assistants from amongst the layfolk, not as haphazard volunteers, but for a *regular* and obligatory service. The ancient traditional organization of chapters (*capitula*) could be revived and adapted to the contemporary situation, in a more modest form, even at the smallest parish church. This would be very much a "reform" achievement. The second obstacle is that as far as the singers are concerned, only professionals are able to learn the Introit and other items of the Proper for every week, or every day. Congregations are surely unable to do that. The last Council tried to provide a more limited collection of liturgical chants for the smaller churches (*Graduale Simplex*). But how can the full set of Introits of the Roman liturgy then survive? The combination of a seasonal and a daily Introit is a musical task, just as it is a musical task to place easier liturgical tunes alongside the Gregorian ones. If we examine the musical questions, it is clear that we need variant solutions for one and the same liturgy, possibilities which can be selected according to the conditions. "Variant," I say, but not "anything appropriate"! The fixed order of the "Tridentine" liturgy has great value as a powerful stabilizing factor. But how can this advantage be combined with a kind of flexibility that preserves rather than renounces the liturgical heritage? The question is discussed in Chapter 4; for now, it suffices to stress that a Roman liturgy reformed in the good sense of the word, should offer solutions for choice *within its sphere,* and not 'in general' ("anything appropriate").

9. At this point it will be useful to return to the example of the Office. The last ("Pastoral") Council regarded the praying of the Roman Office – even after the reduction of St. Pius X – as too burdensome. Therefore the post-conciliar Commission constructed a new Office, adapted to the lowest standard. Quite the contrary, the Eastern Church preserves her traditional Office unchanged in its entirety, though it is, celebrated in this fullness only by some monasteries, while the parish churches pray parts of the Office, arranged according to customary practice. The principal Hours are retained,

but there are also obligatory and optional parts within an Hour; "We omit this or that part," reports one of the faithful.

A similar distinction can also be *observed* in the West. The Roman liturgy is the liturgy of the Church, and yet in its full traditional form, contained in the *editio typica,* it is celebrated in certain cathedrals, in many monasteries, and in some assigned churches. These celebrations should be carried out according to certain well-regulated concessions or reductions according to the circumstances. In *one* place the full Office is prayed, in another only some Hours, or they sing the Vigils (Matins) on fixed solemnities of the year, or Lauds are celebrated with three psalms instead of five, or a priest with pastoral commitments prays only one Sunday Nocturn of the three, or seasonal items are sung instead of those from the day's liturgy, etc. If all this occurs not out of arbitrariness or because of laziness, but according to general rules adapted by the individual churches or persons with ecclesiastical approval, then the integrity of the Roman liturgy can be preserved. Participation in its entirety demands effort, but it should be a realistic obligation even under varying conditions. The rite of the universal Church lives in a regulated way in the customs of *this* Church.

10. This kind of genuine reform of the Ordo Antiquus is justified by the survival of the Roman tradition. But it is justified also by recalling that this is the only chance for long-term survival today alongside the Novus Ordo. And in this context we cannot omit discussing the question of language.

III

Rite and language

In the papal *Motu proprio,* the use of the "Tridentine" rite is linked to the *lingua Latina.* The use of the vernacular is bound up with the introduction of the Novus Ordo, and though the original Indult rightly prohibited any admixture of old and new rites, some have suggested using the new vernacular lectionary within the "Tridentine" Mass. Thus Cardinal Mayer, in a 1991 letter to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington DC, proposed this as a pastoral option, *ad libitum.* It is not the "new" lectionary that is significant here but the "vernacular lectionary" in a Mass celebrated in Latin according to the "Tridentine" usage.

We cannot postulate, of course, the identity of a rite with a particular language. The Eastern Church offers good examples of change in language whereby a rite is transmitted unharmed to the recipient nation. This fact urges us to analyze the question carefully.

The chief argument in favor of the use of Latin was its universal character. This argumentation is substantial, although taken in itself it does not necessitate the *exclusive* use of Latin.

It cannot be denied that the religious history of mankind clearly testifies to the use of sacral languages, which are often not understandable to all participants, which include and contain while to a certain extent also conceal the mystery of the cult, and which therefore rely upon mystagogy to open up its meaning for the initiated, the *mystes*.

In my opinion the strongest argument in favor of Latin derives from the demand for the accurate and integral preservation of the liturgical content. During the countless translations into the vernacular one can hardly avoid distortion, or at least a change of meaning and style.[19]

The Latin is a witness to, and a reservoir of, the full meaning, the total liturgical theology which is neither the opposite of, nor identical with, doctrinal theology. We can return again and again to this treasury of original meaning, terminology and manner of thinking, and we may use it also as a corrective of the distortions made during the course of time. I wish to add two points to these considerations. First, the point here is not only logical accuracy, but also the use of language in a sacred atmosphere evoking a sys-

19 "The fundamental problem here is the same difficulty that arises in every confrontation between 'vernacular' and 'sacred' liturgical language. The majority of people instinctively feel that the vernacular is the proper language of private, mental prayer and not primarily the language of liturgical prayer, which is distinguished from mental prayer precisely by the fact that it is external, sensible and communitarian. The Divine Liturgy goes beyond internal acts and issues forth into the external world, and the more perfectly internal unity (*participatio actuosa interna!*) is given a unified external expression, the more perfect is the liturgical form involved. To say that the understanding of a liturgical formula is more important than the formula itself, is like saying that the understanding of an idea is more important than the idea – when in fact the importance of understanding depends on the importance of the content of the given idea. At stake is the *sacrifera sacralitas* of a cultic language, which for us is the *Lingua latina* as historically connatural with the *religio catholica*: Latin has adapted itself in many ways to the requirements of the Christian religion, and in the course of history has been perfectly molded along the Church's lines." I owe thanks to Rev. Prof. R. Skeris for this commentary.

tem of associations, a cultic style, a "sacred" language. Second, it is not enough if this perfect form can be found in the liturgical books. Each historical period, each place and community, each person has to encounter it, and so the full Latin liturgy must be kept alive in its proper function, as the language of liturgical celebration.

The Latin liturgical language also has a pedagogical effect. The Latin word symbolizes and inspires the presence of objective validity. The substance of the liturgy exists above and independently of ourselves; it has a canonic power – we serve and assimilate, but we do not command it. The introduction of the vulgar tongue transformed first of all the mentality of the clergy: from this point onward, priests began to regard liturgy as an article of consumption, as a means. If the Latin had remained, the clergy would not have succumbed to temptation and would have been incapable of "dominating" the liturgy, of sitting in judgment upon it and submitting it to their whimsical improvising during the liturgy. This psychological effect is true not only for the texts but also, by metastasis, for all the parts and indeed for the whole of the liturgy. The language, the vocabulary, the linguistic discipline of the Latin could also have helped maintain purity and accuracy of diction amongst preachers and theologians. It would be helpful if the obligation to learn Latin could preserve the intellectual capacities and the theological discipline of the clergy.

When the "Tridentine" movement adheres to the Latin Mass, it adheres to something that is more than the language of celebration. Latin should be present in the Church in its full strength, and that not only in cathedrals and at international gatherings, but also in each parish church, in the seminaries, in the communities of laymen, in the religious culture of all persons: priests, monks, ecclesiastical ministers and individual faithful. In an age of general literacy when learning languages has become universal, it is false to say (more so than any time before) that one cannot learn and keep in everyday use a modicum of ecclesiastical Latin. The use of Latin could conjoin both individuals and communities, by links visible and unseen, with orthodox Catholicism. Let us recall the example of the traditional Jewish communities: Hebrew is the symbol and the means of adherence to religion, to the Torah, and to the nation. Jewish children learn to read and cantillate the Scripture in Hebrew from an early age, and thus are introduced into the religious life of the community.

But on the other hand, it cannot be denied that for very many today, to say or sing the *entire* material of the liturgy exclusively in Latin, has become very problematic. In the last century it became even for many a priest rather a symbol of obedience and devotion, than a real source of liturgical spirituality. The liturgical reforms, too, would have probably been different, if the consciousness of the clergy had in fact been imbued with the liturgical texts. The bilingual Missals helped many people over the difficulties, but in spite of its numerous undeniable blessings and *fruits*, the bilingual Missals could transmit the liturgical message only indirectly to those unfamiliar with Latin. It was not the liturgy itself that spoke to the people, but the Missal which told them what the liturgy is about.

There are parts of the liturgy where this "indirectness" causes no difficulty. But there are other places where the difficulties are barely surmountable. Vatican II proposed a well-balanced canon which was, however, never taken into consideration by the engineers of the reform. "Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites. But since the use of the mother tongue... may frequently be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This extension will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants" (Sacrosanctum Concilium 36). The Constitution speaks here about the vernacular with regard to the people and not the priests. Concerning the Mass, it enumerates the parts which concern the people, but desires that the faithful should be able to say or to sing also in Latin all parts which pertain to them. As far as the priests are concerned, "In accordance with the centuries-old tradition of the Latin rite, clerics are to retain the Latin language in the Divine Office." (By way of exception the Council envisions the possibility of vernacular translations for those who encounter *serious* difficulty in using Latin (SC art. 101/1).

The conjunction of the Latin language and the "Tridentine" Mass was a fortunate decision because after the introduction of the Novus Ordo contravened the linguistic principles of the Liturgy Constitution it was left to the "traditional Mass" to fulfill the primary wish of the Council ("the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites"). But it is not easy to see why the traditional Roman liturgy should renounce a well-considered and balanced use of the vernacular, at least in certain circumstances in certain places, and in certain parts of the liturgy. Such decisions must however be made with much more prudence than they were in the case of

the Novus Ordo, in order to avoid walking the path of least resistance which leads to the gradual displacement of Latin.

Any attempt to summarize this matter in a balanced way would include points such as these:

1. History testifies to the existence of a sacred language, just as it attests to changes in the liturgical language. The Eastern churches, for example, were able to preserve their Liturgy in great vigor while using vernacular tongues. Since it is plain that today's intellectual and religious environment is not propitious to the precondition of 'fidelity' in the process of translation, we must think long and hard about the postulata, the munimina and the subsidia of authentic and congenial translations, following the lead of the Holy See's *Instructio Quinta "De Usu Linguarum Popularium in Libris Liturgiae Romanae Edendis"* (March 28, 2001).

2. If in the minds of believers and of churchmen there is once established the equation "Latin = Ordo Antiquus, Vernacular = Ordo Novus," then there is no chance at all for the traditional rite to be widely accepted, and it will remain the private hobby of some few groups. Good translations of the content of the Roman rite are much more important than any eventual reproach for insensitivity – but only on condition that the use of Latin is simultaneously safeguarded, in the sense of Vatican II and the wise provisions of e.g., SC 36 and 54, which should be followed in preference to what occurred after the Council.

3. Analysis of the various elements of the Liturgy allows us to differentiate the varying degrees of difficulties in linguistic accuracy. a) Most difficult (or impossible?) is an equivalent translation of the Sacramentary (Eucharistic Prayer, Prefaces, Orations). If these are kept in Latin, and good translations are made available for the congregation, then the essence of this dogmatically most sensitive part of the Liturgy will be safeguarded. b) A much easier task is the translation of the Bible based upon sensible principles, meaning that the chants and lections can be translated when and where necessary, without harm to the liturgical content. One need not think in terms of the chants and readings being delivered in the mother tongue at *all* Masses. A correct and balanced proportion can be found. c) The Mass Ordinary presents a twofold aspect. On the one hand, it is easy to translate and to provide appropriate melodies. On the other hand, since these texts

remain unchanged, they are easy to learn also in Latin. The best solution in the case of the Ordinary may perhaps be a regular alternation of Latin and the vernacular.

4. Since the Divine Office consists almost exclusively of biblical texts, it could be translated without difficulty, provided that this be done with intellectual honesty. But here, another factor must be taken into account, namely, that the clergy will come to feel at home with the Latin chiefly by regularly praying the Office in that language.

All these points are intended as suggestions for serious discussion.

What might all this mean in practice?

1. One should insist on the clergy learning Latin well and using it regularly. We have reached a point where many a priest is incapable of correctly pronouncing a Latin text. Lack of practice causes serious problems with correct pronunciation and accentuation. Formation of candidates for the priesthood must include introduction to the liturgical texts in Latin (with the support of the vernacular), not only in their ritual aspects but in spiritual and dogmatic terms as well.

2. One should insist on the weekly frequency of a full Latin Mass (where possible, *Missa Solemnis*) in the worship order of each community. This would make the traditional Mass permanently present in real life, and at the same time give to the clergy the proficiency in Latin which they need as theologians, priests and liturgists. Moreover, this system offers the faithful a chance if they wish to celebrate the Mass in Latin according to the will of Rome and their own needs and wishes.

3. An exact and worthy translation of the full liturgy is urgently needed. The majority of translations from the Novus Ordo was inspired by an incorrect relationship to the Liturgy, and enshrines this flawed concept. And of course most of them can be sternly criticized on the basis of the best contemporary principles governing the art of translation. A translation is meant to serve. Its task is not to speak to the reader or the listener in great lines something similar to the original, but rather to reproduce, in the new language and in the fullest possible measure, the content of the original with all its complexities, its coherence and its nuances. The grammatical structure of the text must be accurate, using a logically consequent and

theologically elaborated terminology. The structure of the text must also be faithfully represented according to the possibilities presented by the new language, since the logical links are also parts of the thought. The style calls for cultic elevation and stylization, even by means of a modest archaisation. These characteristics help to assure that the translation will not be worth less than the Latin. Most of the new liturgical translations began from false axioms and they bear witness to serious deficiencies in treating both Latin and the vernacular. The interpretation of liturgical Latin is much too complex for being left to the local staff of many countries. The best experts should establish the authentic *interpretation* to be summed up in the local translations. As we know from the research of Christine Mohrmann, for example, or the studies published in Odo Casel's *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* the texts of Christian Antiquity cannot be understood in terms of the later patterns of subsequent devotional Latin. Since only a tiny minority of translators is familiar with this literature, the meaning to be passed on to the faithful must be transmitted to those translators. Many of the presuppositions that influenced the translations are, in the light of a true knowledge of the vernaculars, simply fictions. For example, the German and English texts of our own day are teeming with passive structures, while the liturgical translations reject them as terrible Latinisms. While the newspapers use compound sentences without any trouble, the translations destroy the logic of the Latin orations by breaking them up into short phrases. It is a trendy slogan to adjust the thoughts of the liturgy to the level of contemporary man by using the language of the market place, while linguistics has splendidly proven the existence and importance of linguistic layers. The producers of the new texts aim to avoid Latinisms, though vernacular languages have always been able to be enriched by the influence of other languages, (just as many languages today are by English) to the (at least stylistic) benefit of the recipient language. The texts are simplified for the sake of pastoral efficiency, and the result is a banal, tedious devotional collection, which scarcely impresses the substantial, sometimes astonishing but always noteworthy message of the original text upon the minds of the faithful. There is no reason to be fearful of producing "slavish" translations – the translation has to serve.

4. After good translations of the traditional Roman liturgy are produced, all the books should be published in *bilingual* format so that the Latin stands beside the vernacular as a symbol, as a guarantee and as a call for use.

5. The simple fact of translation has not made the liturgy better understood. It was not the language that hindered people's understanding, but the intricate thoughts of the liturgy. The key to liturgical understanding is liturgical catechesis, which is not just a presentation of thoughts loosely related to the liturgy, but a pathway to the thoughts and ideas of the liturgy itself through fixed words, sentences, texts and signs. In this respect, too, the liturgy follows the order of Incarnation: to arrive through the visible at the invisible, through the body (here: the body of the language) to the spirit.

6. Once all these conditions are verified, we may begin to reflect upon the parts of the liturgy which can be read, recited or sung by the given community in the vernacular or in Latin. It would make good sense, for example, to retain (at least frequently) Latin for a substantial part of the "Tridentine" Mass from the Praefatio to the Agnus Dei. In other Masses, only the readings might be spoken in the vernacular. We also have some good examples of combining two languages. During the Holy Week liturgies at Old Rome, many pieces were sung first in Greek, then in Latin. Similarly, also today, after the congregation has sung the Introit in the vernacular on a relatively simple tune, the well-trained singer(s) could chant the same in Latin Gregorian.

It certainly would be good to have major clerics pray the Breviary, or at least a greater part of it, in Latin (from a bilingual Breviary as a help), while allowing them to read the Patristic sermons in translation. The parish or congregational Office (whose regular celebration in every church is another important but sadly neglected task!) could be sung in the vernacular, with encouragement to maintain Latin for certain elements such as the Magnificat or the antiphons.

7. To avoid confusion, the use of both Latin and the vernacular should be determined clearly in advance, thus offering to individuals and communities a choice among possible alternatives. Again, the close connection between rite and language is the result of historical factors. The potential benefits of the mother tongue should not be excluded in principle from a "traditional Roman liturgy" which desires to preserve the rights of Latin. But we must honestly admit that today, thirty years after the introduction of the Novus Ordo, a majority of Catholics would probably reject a Mass always celebrated entirely in Latin. On the other hand, six or eight Latin "Tridentine" Masses would only be an 'aesthetic experience' in comparison

to the effect of 50 or 60 Masses in the vernacular *secundum Novum Ordinem.* If the supporters of the "Tridentine" Mass think that the Ordo Antiquus represents in its whole yearly cycle a value that must be preserved, then they should find a solution, which both maintains the role of Latin and utilizes the strength of the vernacular as a vehicle for the message of the liturgy.

IV.

What should the short-term solutions be?

The Novus Ordo will remain the dominant rite of the Roman Catholic Church during the years to come, and we owe respect and obedience to it. Besides, we have the right given by papal decrees to celebrate the "Tridentine" liturgy with regular frequency. In order to increase its effectiveness, I think we have to aim for the following goals.

1. The celebrations according to the "Tridentine" rite should be maintained, stabilized and held regularly, but not in a "secondary" form as was earlier the case with the *missa lecta,* but possibly as the primary form of celebration, the *missa solemnis.* Continuing these efforts, the sphere of its use could be expanded. A necessary and logical further step would be to obtain approval for complementing the "Tridentine" Mass with the regular and public "Tridentine" Office.

2. Every effort should be made to promote the "full, conscious and active participation" of the faithful (SC Art. 14) in the "Tridentine" rite, too. To this end "a more explicitly liturgical catechesis should also be given" (SC Art. 35/3) and the ministers, lectors and singers should also "be deeply imbued with the spirit of the liturgy" (SC Art. 29). Aiming at a worthy celebration, one must foster and gather everywhere a well-trained and educated group of assistants, and thus avoid transforming the liturgy into the priest's *missa privata* – in the presence of the faithful. We need well-made bilingual altar and hand Missals with correct and artistically valuable translations. Written and spoken forms of instruction, meditation and information should allow the content of the liturgy to penetrate the catechism, spirituality, religious literature and indeed the whole life of the Church.

3. Theoretical work should be encouraged to reveal the content of the liturgy on the level of theology, history, spirituality, and pastoral activity.

In arguing both on behalf of the "Tridentine" liturgy and criticizing the Novus Ordo, combative or propagandistic elements should be eschewed. However, research built upon objective facts and analysis, reported in an appropriate tone and published in the right sphere, should not be excluded. A principal subject for analysis might be a multifaceted investigation of individual parts and themes of the liturgy which could promote the extension of the "Tridentine" into the Roman liturgy on the basis of solid and reliable arguments.

4. The "Tridentine" movement has to preserve and defend above all its communion with the Church and with Rome, as well as fraternal charity toward those using the Novus Ordo. This would be much easier if an authentic organ were assigned within the Curia to promote, patronize, and guide the life and development of the "Tridentine" rite. It could be either the *Commissio Ecclesia Dei* or a member of the Congregation *de Culto Divino* who would be appointed to deal with these questions not only in their disciplinary but also their strictly liturgical aspects. It is also desirable to have a bishop as patron or "protector" of the Tridentine rite within the episcopal conference in all lands where its use is requested.

What should the middle-term solutions be?

Points 3 and 4 above appear to be important not only for the present moment, but also with reference to the challenges which face us in the near future. We should be prepared to make changes: organic changes that, remaining within the Roman ("Tridentine") tradition, are yet necessary for improving the liturgy and making it more effective in the future.

1. Careful analysis can generate serious proposals, e.g. for providing greater opportunity to incorporate Roman traditions – which are more universal than the "Tridentine" one is; or for making the liturgical forms more worthy; or to vivify them by a wise accommodation to the demands of the day or to different situations. These kinds of changes could be prepared by experts who know and love the traditional Roman rite, and are familiar with the procedure of obtaining official juridical approval.

2. In the event that current efforts to maintain the "Tridentine" rite would lead to a more extensive use of the Roman rite, we foresee a situation in which rites coexist within the Catholic Church. Other considerations lead to the same conclusion. For example, those communities of the Epis-

copal Church which desire communion with Rome would probably preserve the right to maintain their tradition which is based upon the Salisbury rite (or Sarum use), as transformed during the centuries of separation, but in some respects is of at least the same value as is the Roman liturgy today. Though during the past 400 years we have grown accustomed to total conformity in the liturgy, the coexistence of rites is by no means unknown in the Church. Unity is harmed not by the coexistence of clearly named, defined and controlled rites, but by confusion and individualization within the illusion of unity. The Roman and Ambrosian rites coexisted over centuries within the Catholic Church; even the Roman rite existed with local variations up to the 16th century. One and the same community may use more than one rite: an example is the Byzantine liturgy with its orders linked to the names of St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom etc., or the Episcopal Church today with clear differentiation of the A or B order in given services.

3. If the Ordo Antiquus and Novus will coexist with equal rights, then individual churches congregations and priests must be prepared to use *both.* If this is impossible – the differences between the two are surely greater than in the Byzantine examples mentioned earlier –, the Ordo Antiquus needs some organization to provide liturgical instruction, books, and a control mechanism. If all this can be realized quietly, without any struggle and under the direction of Rome; if unity is preserved in doctrine and discipline, and if a precondition of any approval be the acceptance of the other rite, then one need not fear any danger of schism.

The long-term future?

A longer time is required to discern what God wanted with all these developments. It is perhaps possible that the coexistence of an ancient tradition and a recent construction may be useful for the Church.

Another possibility, however, is that each rite influences the other, and that they will draw closer over time. Many today speak about the need for a "reform of the reform." In other words, they believe a revision is needed, to see whether the Novus Ordo went too far with innovations. Is it not necessary to return in many things to traditional texts and customs, that is, to "romanize" to some extent the Bugnini liturgy?

Above, we discussed the opposite attitude as well: it would be foolish to regard the 1962 form of the "Tridentine" rite as a state of affairs which

permits absolutely no change. If changes will appear needful, some of them will approximate, or be identical with, certain features of the Novus Ordo. Moreover, we must reckon with changes required by the future, either for practical reasons (such as how to achieve the fuller celebration of the liturgy under the conditions of the 21st century, or the opposite: how to preserve it when facing a shortage of priests), or because of the appearance of new feasts, new saints to be celebrated, etc. Both rites will have to deal with exigencies like these and their reaction will perhaps be the same.

When we peer into the future with our human eyes – and can we ever do otherwise? – we may see a unified liturgy once again, a liturgy unified at least in its essentials, but one which also allows for well-ordered variants which are juridically and theologically irreproachable as was the case in the Middle Ages. It may just be the case once again, for the Lord has promised: *Intellectum tibi dabo, et instruam te in via hac, qua gradieris; firmabo super te oculos meos.* I will form thee, and teach thee in the way wherein thou shalt go; and I will guide thee with mine eye (Ps 31:8).

7. High Church – Low Church: the Split of Catholic Church Music

I.

The Second Vatican Council used very nice words to describe church music in Chapter Six of its Liturgical Constitution.

> The musical tradition of the universal Church is a treasure of immeasurable value... Sacred music increases in holiness to the degree that it is intimately linked with liturgical action. This Sacred Council maintains the norms and precepts of ecclesiastical tradition and discipline. Great importance is to be attached to the teaching and practice of music in seminaries... and also in other Catholic institutions and schools. Gregorian chant should be given pride of place in liturgical services. Composers, filled with the Christian spirit, should feel that their vocation is to cultivate sacred music and increase its store of treasures. Let them produce compositions which have the qualities proper to genuine sacred music... The texts intended to be sung ... should be drawn chiefly from Holy Writ and from liturgical sources.

The Constitution outlined a view of church music in which Gregorian chant (as most suitable for the liturgy), polyphonic music of artistic quality, and religious hymns of the congregation are balanced with each other and "give a more noble form to the liturgical action"; a church music in harmony with the ecclesiastical traditions having "the spirit of the liturgical action", "the spirit of the liturgy" as its highest norm; church music under the care of diligent bishops, and priests receiving a solid musical education.

In actual fact, however, church music fell into such a deep crises after the Council as never before in its history. In a great part of the Church over the world, church music is not cultivated but neglected; musical rubbish prevailed; sacred music fell in many places into the hands of unedu cated dilettantes; its fate and daily practice depends upon decisions of priests who stand in this matter (too) very far from the true spirit of the Council. The "treasure of immeasurable value" is dissipated; in many churches the

most frivolous music resounds without a single word of warning from the hierarchy; and the music which predominates can be called anything but "the expression of true art." The responsibility for this decline lies firstly with the ambiguous instructions of the post-conciliar committees, secondly with the church authorities who neglected to fulfill the will of the Council, thirdly with the clergy and in fourth place with the church musicians themselves.

Before entering into details, I mention briefly that in my opinion the matter of church music is not a question of music. Good church music exudes into pastoral practice, spirituality, church discipline, morals and even theology. Bad church music likewise affects all this but in a destructive manner. And vice versa: behind the lapse of church music, liturgical lapses lie hidden; behind the liturgical lapses an incorrect image of the Church, and in the last analysis, implicitly heretical views. It ought to have been the task of theologians familiar with church music or church musicians with expertise in theology to express clearly the deeper roots of the theology of worship and of its music in order to expel the suspicion of being cultural aristocrats and defenders of purely aesthetic values.

The diagnosis that follows is not true for every country, every diocese, or every parish church – at least, not to the same extent. But I very much regret to say that these symptoms are far from being rare exceptions.

II.

1. The first problem is *the neglected state of church music.* The new ideal of the liturgy is a verbose celebration, and now the role of music is not to play an organic part in it, but rather to serve as an emotional addition. After the Council, music has been totally expelled from the liturgy in many places, the musician dismissed, and the church contented with the activity of amateur groups and their amateur leaders. A consequence of this degradation in attitude is a decline in financial resources. In one of the largest and most respectable dioceses in Italy only one single professional musician is in charge. Valuable old pipe organs are out of use, in poor condition or perished because trashy electroniums or guitar ensembles replaced them. Church authori-

ties are simply uninterested in the state of church music and fail to consider honestly the tasks of forming the faithful and the challenges of pastoral practice. Nothing has happened by way of promoting the musical culture of priests, and another important wish of the Council has been equally ignored: "that composers and singers, especially boys must be given a genuine liturgical training... liturgical instruction of servers, readers, commentators and singers to imbue them deeply with the spirit of the liturgy." The root cause is the underestimation of the role of music in the liturgy and religion in general. Today the Church finds herself "at home" in the movements, activities and appearances of secular society, and values music only in the measure it can be utilized in this context. Music in this view has no value of its own, no value in building bridges between the Christian soul and God, between the Church and her Divine Head.

What Guardini wrote about the liturgy as a whole, namely that it has *meaning* and not *aim or purpose*, should also be true for its music to some extent. In this life there are things whose purpose we learn, and then we work with them according to their own nature. The pianist, for instance, knows that Bach's music contributes to the spiritual good of mankind; but the moment he sits down at the piano, he concentrates upon fingering and touch. The Council pointed to the place and role of music in the liturgy and Church life. And so the duty of church music is to fill this place by enjoying a certain independence. But it is not allowed to do that...

2. The second problem is the consequence of an *anthropocentric view of the liturgy*. The liturgy was traditionally understood as the permanent priestly activity of holy Church: she conducts the highest matters of salvation before God's throne and at the same time, it is her intimate communication with her divine Bridegroom. The greatest honor for the faithful is to join this divine work (*opus Dei*) as a member of the Mystical Body, and while the believer strives to live his life hidden in Christ and the Church, while he thus "loses" his life, he in fact finds it, The liturgy is not something we create but an objective reality we share in, a precious patrimony we inherit. What happens in the Mass is relatively true for all parts of the liturgy: it is not we but God Who is doing His work in it, and we ourselves become divine when we receive Holy Communion. So the reality we celebrate becomes our own. With respect to the prayers and chants, this truth is expressed by St. Benedict's classic saying: "*mens concordet voci*": the mind should

be concordant with the voice. It is not the soul who speaks in the voice, but it is the Church and the Holy Spirit. The harmony between soul and voice comes not from expressing the soul by the voice but from adapting the soul to the sounds that the Church and the Holy Spirit put upon our lips.

The Liturgical Constitution of the Council says nothing contradictory to this traditional view. And yet, according to the post-conciliar approach it was precisely the modern man, man *hic et nunc*, who became the focus of interest and the norm of the liturgy. Consequently the liturgy and its chant are supposed to express the religious experience of the individuals and communities. The result is: "*vox concordat menti*", i.e. the voice is concordant to the state of the mind. The regrettable outcome of this approach is that the liturgy is unable to elevate and raise up heavenwards the individual and communities: they express themselves and so they remain where they are.

This liturgical approach also influenced the church music. A great part of the clergy can accept music only as the chant of the assembly. The demand of *actuosa participatio* is taken in a sense that excludes the possibility of silent and attentive listening to the chant of singers or choir. Consequently, in many places the choirs have disbanded and the musicians have fled their posts.

To anyone who reads the Constitution it is clear that this fate was *not* intended by the Council. Par. 28 says that "each person should perform his role by doing solely and totally what the nature of things and liturgical norms require of him." Even in the new Missal of Paul VI we find the names of items belonging to the *schola*. Things are even clearer if we examine the *natura rei*, the nature of things: the liturgy is a dramatic event and the assembly participates "actively" in the ritual by performing the parts proper to them. The Council judged it opportune to stress the *actuosa participatio* because the role of the assembly had been taken over by others during the course of centuries. But this does not mean that now the assembly has to take over the role of others!

Another consequence of the anthropocentric view is that the assembly does not in fact sing what *should* be sung "according to the nature of things," but rather what it *can* sing, or what the priest or the local music leader judges acceptable or pastorally justified. The role of the assembly would be:

- first, to sing (and never to say) the responses and the Ordinary (which was itself originally a special kind of response), and

- second, to sing the Divine Office. (We know that the Office was performed by the assembly in the 4th or 5th century, and even in our own days the Office in some Eastern churches is not the task of the priests but of the laymen.)

The people can join, of course, in the Proper chants as well, although history shows that these parts properly belonged to the psalmist or the group of psalmists. Large mixed choirs have been introduced into churches quite recently; in the beginning, however, the "professional" singer was the sole psalmist, and out of the group of psalmists was the schola formed at a later stage of development. Also, between the 11th and the 18th centuries the polyphonic pieces were performed by a group of 6 to 8 singers.

After the Council, when in many churches the chant was given over entirely to the congregations, very little has been done for bringing them up to their double role: to sing what is genuinely their own part, and to sing in some way the parts that earlier belonged to the professional singers. As a result, in current practice active participation does not mean that the congregation sings the liturgy, but it sings something during the liturgy, in other words, replaces the chants of the liturgy by ready-made or recently composed strophic songs. Do we remember the words of the Council? "The texts intended to be sung... should be drawn chiefly from Holy Writ and from liturgical sources." What people actually sing has nothing to do with the text written in the Missal or other liturgical books. Much of the congregational repertory is badly made music: insignificant or quite horrible settings of words, which remain mostly on the same low theological and poetical level. When the Missal allows us to substitute appropriate chants for the Proprium, it requires that these chants must be of the same content as the official liturgical pieces. Nothing of this requirement has been fulfilled. The real intention of the Council has been negated by a presumed aim.

In the 19th century the congregation sang its own folk ("congregational") hymns, while the priest at the altar whispered the text of the liturgical chants. The fathers of the liturgical reform wanted people to sing the Mass instead of singing during the Mass. Now the congregation sings the same as earlier or even worse, and it is declared "liturgical" while the message of the original chant totally disappeared.

3. The third problem with the new situation is *the lack of norm* in the matter of liturgical chant.

Earlier the chant was regulated by three principles:

- The first was the *text*, the Proper of the given Mass or Office that had been created under the influence of the liturgical explanations and theological reflections of Church Fathers. The text-material guaranteed a *universality* and a universal norm for the chant; and not the ideas of individuals but the message of the praying Church defined what the chant is about.
- The second regulating principle was the *order* of celebration. The Lord's Prayer needs a different kind of melody than the *Gloria in excelsis*, the Communion, or the Offertory does, that is, a melodic form in harmony with the *natura rei*. The liturgico-musical genres did include liturgical features and a noble ritualism (in the correct sense of this word), and so they defined in some way also the norm of *holiness*. The later polyphonic settings already blurred, to some degree, this distinction of genres. The 'tone' of polyphonic pieces depended upon the emotions inspired by the words and not on the liturgical genres. But today, rarely if at all, are the songs sung by the people defined by a liturgical moment.
- The third element was the requirement of an absolute *artistic quality*. Musical works can embody or achieve artistic quality on different levels of difficulty. It is not necessarily the case that musical quality always requires technical difficulties. No doubt, recent developments in music produced more and more complex material, and simple but good-quality music can more easily be found today in early repertories than in contemporary music of eminent value. But the composers are not to be blamed for that: it is a historical necessity. However, there is a great deal of good music for any technical level of performers.

When church music lost its norms, one single principle took over their place: whether it appeals to the people (or rather: whether the leaders suppose it will appeal to them). The new principle could not but lead to the invasion of more and more inferior fashions into the Church, finding justification in each case in "taste." Moreover, the sort of human being who is now considered the measure of music is not a man destined for greatness and called to spiritual qualities; no, he is the marketable man, *homo œconomi-*

cus, subjected to any manipulation. I think that nobody gave serious thought to the shortsighted nature of this principle with respect to pastoral tasks, either. How can the Church ask to be accepted in her teaching if she makes her liturgical action relativistic? How can she avoid creating the impression that if the liturgy and church music can be adapted to different tastes, then also matters of faith and morals could now be submitted to the opinion of individuals or to the different social and psychological requirements of our age?

- This appeal to "different tastes" forgets how people (especially children and youth) entering the church are open and thirsty for all the good they will learn there. "When the Chruch offers her own genuine goods with motherly tenderness, people naturally accept them because they come from the Church they love and respect. Eventually the goods thus absorbed and appropriated become highly formative of their opinions, tastes, preferences, customs, and in fact, their entire life." As we read in St. Augustine's Office: "*Cibus sum grandium, cresce et manducabis me, nec tu me mutabis in te, sicut cibum carnis tuae, sed tu mutaberis in me*": I am the food of adults; grow up and eat me; it is not you who will change me into yourself, as is true of bodily food, but you will be changed into me. This is valid for liturgy and church music, as well as for teachings of faith and morals. When we say: "The people like this" we regard them as unable to develop, as animals rather than human beings, and we simply neglect our duties in helping them towards a true *human* existence, – indeed, in this case, to truly *Christian* existence.

III.

The response of church musicians to this kind of apostasy in the Church was first of all protest. However, as soon as they found it hopelessly impossible to change matters, they shifted their tactics and chose what I consider a bad course. And here lies the responsibility of church musicians in the crisis.

What they ought to have undertaken, by way of accepting the challenge, was hard intellectual work and almost superhuman courage. Church musicians ought to have learned again the theology (the *theologia perennis* and not

the *nouvelle théologie*) of worship and its music, and the liturgy, along with the history of church music, so as to be able to diagnose the deepest causes of the malady and to find the means of alleviation. They ought to have formed a firm league in the defense of values, and I mean "defense" not in a rigidly conservative way, but rather a creative way. It might be that even this struggle would have ended in defeat, but a future generation could perhaps have built on this spiritual foundation.

Instead, the church musicians withdrew themselves into the narrow, restricted area left to them. One or two Masses were left to them to enjoy, to conduct a choir or orchestra, to perform the favored Palestrina or Mozart pieces (or their own compositions...). They can organize festivals, church concerts, conferences, Gregorian workshops and Masses. This gives the illusion of rescuing the "treasure of immeasurable value" bequeathed to the universal Church, even if only within the confined limits of this ghetto existence.

The path of the history is clear: during the first centuries of Christianity there was no "church music," but only liturgy performed in singing. In the course of time, two byways were opened: the first is artistic church music (starting as early as the 7th–8th century), the second is the folk hymn which appears in the 10th–11th century). At first the use of both was limited and they remained in close proximity to the liturgy. As their autonomous life developed, they moved away from the liturgy: art music toward compositions inspired by religious sentiments, the vernacular folk hymn toward popular genres. Although the church musicians of today have some control over the folk hymn through the hymnals, in fact they left the church music of weekdays and normal Sundays to its own fate. They failed to protest resolutely as a group against the corruption of liturgical music, and to search for the path of a real renewal in the spirit of the liturgy. They regarded the rescue of ecclesiastical art music as their main task and found satisfaction in the artistic production of solemn Masses and concerts.

Thus church music has been broken into two, reflecting the disruption of the Church herself into a low and high Church. The high-church music is in this case the sphere of Gregorian and polyphonic Masses. The low-church music is the multitude of Masses celebrated with popular *cantiuncu-lae*, ditties, and amateur pop music compositions. Somewhere between the two we find a "traditional" low-church music: congregational hymns lead by

organ mixed with rather poor Ordinary compositions. Adding up the percentages: high-church music is in one or two percent of the Masses and churches, low-church music in all the other ninety-eight percent.

IV.

Is there any solution at all? Is it not the case that church music was imbued for over a thousand years by an idea untenable in our own age, and church musician cannot do more than to keep the *memory* of these one-time values in "Museum Masses"?

The question is not quite unwarranted. It seems clear that an 18th-century orchestral Mass composition is inseparably linked with such a special form of celebration and religious mentality that today it can only be recalled in exceptional cases. It is enough to think of how much longer a polyphonic Gloria or Agnus is, than the time allowed for it in a Mass today. An Offertory of Palestrina exactly fits the time of an offertorial rite if the celebration is done at a dignified pace with suitable care, complete with incensation – but this exceeds the one or two minutes in which the Offertory is commonly executed today. Of course, musicians can ask politely: is the ceremonial action of the "offertory" worth only a minute or two? The question then becomes not merely whether the liturgy today is suitable for preserving the treasures of church music; but also whether the liturgy today is suitable to its own dignity?

And yet the task is not simply to fight for the restoration of a liturgy more hospitable to church music. It is the original balance of the liturgy which must be recovered, along with the organic relationship of the three kinds of noble church music mentioned earlier. Of course, this question involves not only musical technicalities, but also spiritual and financial dimensions. But let us speak briefly about actual practice.

No other music corresponds so perfectly to the inner structure and dramatic form of the liturgy as Gregorian chant (or possibly a new setting of the liturgical texts patterned after it). Only such music offers appropriate language for the dialogues, the alternating chant of the celebrant, singer and congregation. Only this medium is able to adapt itself to the characteristics

of the liturgical parts; allows the liturgical words themselves to be sung (instead of substitutions), while faithfully preserving the peculiarities of the words instead of compelling the biblical prose into a network of alien measures, bars and rhythms. If Gregorian chant, or similar vernacular chant, appeared at the structural points of the service, the will of the Council would also be fulfilled, and the *cantus Gregorianus* would in fact reclaim its "pride of place."

But some points of misunderstanding call for clarification.

First, when it comes to Gregorian chant I am not thinking of a general use of the *Graduale Romanum*. The long Gregorian melodies could surely not be sung for each Mass by the choir or by the congregation alone. The Gregorian repertory includes, however, layers that differ greatly according to their manner of expression, style and difficulty. These differences make it easier to find a solution applicable to the conditions and circumstances of different services. In Christian Antiquity congregational chant included the Ordinary (evolved from the recitative style, as can be seen in the so-called Missa Mundi or Missa Primitiva) and the psalm refrains, whereas the more elaborated pieces were left to solo singers. This means that we have already encountered at least two types of musical language. The recitatives, melodic responses, short antiphons and hymns belonged to the congregational repertory, and the melismatic pieces or individual compositions belonged to the soloist(s), later to the schola. In the most ancient musical material a given text is not linked definitely to a single given melody. Some basic melodies might be applied to a number of texts, and this fact made it much easier to learn the tunes. That being the case, even the smallest parish church could find a simple repertory of liturgical chant to be learnt without insurmountable difficulties. Proceeding from this stage upwards, one arrives without any gaps at the level of a full Gregorian Mass in monasteries, cathedrals, large parish churches ("*ecclesiae majores*") or groups of intellectuals.

The second misunderstanding is that Gregorian chant is bound to the Latin language. We could discuss this theme for hours, presenting one example after another – but for now it suffices to say that Gregorian pieces lived (unchanged or with slight modification) in different languages during the historical past. In fact, some of these repertories are still in use today, even outside the realm of Catholic liturgy. (For example, I personally conducted Gregorian pieces sung in English as found in Anglican collections,

and these concerts were very successful.) Bad experiments do not discredit the possibility of adaptation, but rather underscore the need for respectable work and adequate talent in this field. In earlier times, the melody was regarded more as an elastic musical thought to be adapted to the text, rather than an invariable *opus perfectum.* Similarly, in the case of vernacular chant the task is not to force the text under the single notes of a stable melody, but to perform the text using a given melodic type.

The third misunderstanding is to think that the problem is already solved by publishing some devotional Latin pieces in the congregational hymnals. Some church musicians regard it as a great success to include the *Adoro te devote*, *Salve Regina*, *Ave verum corpus* or other "hits" in the hymnal. These insertions have nothing to do with the solution of the main problem. The task is solved if the main parts of the Mass, the Introit, Communion etc. included can be sung in the proper musical language of the liturgy. This task can be accomplished in musical terms, and it can also be accomplished in the pastoral sense provided that one is really determined to bring it about. It is essential, however, that the task be regarded as important as it really is; the chant has to be included in the regular course of catechism and other forms of instructions, and in addition, a psalmist (or schola) should be positioned in each case at the head of the congregation.

Once such a firm ground has been established, the polyphonic music and the vernacular hymns will also find their place. There are points within the Mass where either of them works well without any break in the liturgy, although not without a distinction. The first rank belongs to those settings that take their words from liturgical texts or are their paraphrase. Then come pieces borrowed from the repertory of the day or season (e.g. translations of the hymn, polyphonic settings of a liturgical text). In the third place are pieces equally worthy in content and music to strictly liturgical material. There can be no fourth grade, for the church musician must reject what is below this standard on the grounds of his professional conscience and moral obligation.

It is better, if the three components (liturgical monophony, polyphony, congregational hymn) are combined at *each* Mass in a stable hierarchical order. Such a stable structure is illustrated by the following plan adapted in some 100-150 parish churches in Hungary (3-5 % of all) for the past three decades:

before the Mass: and introductory folk hymn

Introit: Proper of the day in vernacular with congregational participation, on simple antiphonal melodies; occasionally closed by the Latin version from the Graduale

Kyrie: three simple Gregorian melodies in alternation during the year

Gloria: Liber Usualis XV in Hungarian

Psalmus responsorius: one-year cycle (textually from the *Ordo Cantus Missae*) on the tone of a "short responsory"

Alleluia: refrain by the congregation from the collection of 8-10 melodies; the verse is a melismatic piece from the Graduale Romanum; or recitation in polyphonic setting)

before the homily: a short congregational hymn that expresses succinctly the thoughts of the day or season

Offertory: motet or folk hymn

Sanctus: always the same, from Mass XVIII in Hungarian or in Latin

Agnus: from Mass XVIII in Hungarian or in Latin; on other days Ambrosian recitative Agnus

Communio: Proper of the day or season in vernacular, with the participation of the congregation, on simple antiphonal melodies; occasionally closed by the Latin version from the Graduale; followed by congregational hymn

Thanksgiving: polyphonic piece

at the end: a congregational hymn

In this scheme all elements are in a fixed place as demanded "by the nature of things," i.e. by the liturgy itself. *Except for the Offertory, the full Proper is performed.* The congregation has a part in almost every item, except for one or two. The soloist or the schola has a distinctive part in five or six items. Four or five traditional congregational hymns and two or three polyphonic pieces are included. This structure can be realized under the leadership of one single psalmist (in which case the motets are replaced by a solo psalm or a congregational hymn or an organ piece). But it can be realized with a schola or a small choir prepared by a one-hour rehearsal.

The proportion of professional art music can of course be higher if the conditions and provision of the church permit. Sometimes one item of the Ordinary (in exceptional cases, all of it) can be performed in a polyphonic setting, with parts of the Proper sung from the Graduale. As a *non plus ultra*, in some places we can arrive at the full Latin Gregorian Mass or High Mass with the combination of Gregorian and polyphonic pieces. This causes *no division* in the liturgical usage because the same system is realized

in all Masses of all churches, the difference being only on the level of musical realization. The *same* Mass is sung in this or that setting, and gradual steps or degrees lead from the vernacular to Latin, as well as from simple antiphons to great pieces. In its own sphere each realization can be equally perfect.

Such a system will only be complete, however, if the Divine Office is also chanted. The introduction of the regular Office is a key question not only for the sake of liturgical integrity but also to offer the best school of liturgical singing to the choirs and congregations.

Redefined tasks may also require changes in personal along with financial provisions. It is fine if the church has a large choir with a well-paid conductor. But it is fundamentally more important to have a music director who keeps his eyes on the full musical life of the church and governs everything. He needs for each single Mass and Hour of the Office a well-prepared psalmist or a group of psalmists. A true liturgical music program cannot be directed from the organ bench, though the organist is an important helper and colleague of the "archicantor" (taking this title in its original meaning!). Perhaps the whole system of training church musicians has to be changed accordingly.

As far as financial provisions are concerned, the stable salaried positions should be completed with resources for paying the psalmists who lead the Mass and help the music director in teaching the children, young people and congregation from case to case. I have attempted a calculation: according to the conditions in Hungary, a fund or foundation of approximately 100.000 dollars could guarantee until the end of time (!) the perfect music for *all* services (!) of a parish church, daily Lauds and Vespers included!

It is much more difficult to lay the spiritual foundations. Such liturgical music needs a deep theological foundation, absorbed more and more intimately. The return to chant based on biblical and liturgical texts will be fruitful only if the liturgical meaning of the words is fully understood by both the singers and congregation. Moreover, it is not enough to understand them: they must penetrate the spiritual and mystical sphere of the individual souls, as well as catechesis, preaching, and church life outside the liturgy. The sung words and tunes built into the memory of communities and individuals will deeply influence their way of thinking. Such church

music will be able to contribute to the re-sacralization of our view of the Church. In other words, church music will not be able to fulfill its task, if its position is separated from the other activities of the Church. The ideal relationship is that the life of the praying Church governs church music. But the direction is sometimes reversed: church music may influence the Church's life. Remember that the renewal of the liturgy in the 19th century began with the Gregorian reform of Solesmes!

In order to carry out the program I have discussed here, church musicians will have need of the four "cardinal virtues."

- They need stability in principles rejecting any compromise on the most important points.
- They need continued learning and workshop activity in order to be able to realize the great principles in the smallest of details.
- They need collaboration, for today there is no chance of surmounting the crisis except by a unanimous stance and common strategy concerning the main points.
- And finally they need a great deal of individual and common prayer, because they themselves may plant and water, but God alone gives the growth.

Quod Deus bene vertat!

8. Church Music at the Crossroads (Experiences in Hungary)[20]

Two paths

As the Byzantine Church spread to regions inhabited by pagans, new branches of its rite sprang up in the new languages. This process involved not only the texts of the celebrant, but also the chant which began to be sung in the new languages without any speculation about the linguistic character or difficulties caused by different prosodic conditions. As an obvious procedure the *same* chant was sung, changing only the language. This process is so natural that I myself once met a cantor who sang *ex abrupto* in Serbian from the Bulgarian ritual or vice versa, as necessity required.

When the Hussites or Luther and his followers decided to change the language of the service, they could have gone down the same path. But rather another path was opened, namely, the replacement of liturgical chants with new examples. At *first* these were more or less related to the chant, but *later* they became poems with only a slight reminiscence of liturgical or biblical texts, and *finally* they evolved into fully independent congregational hymns inspired by subjective religious experiences.

The divergence of these two paths took place in connection with changes in the history of literature, liturgy and music. Byzantine chant consists of artistic prose enunciated in an idiomatic musical language, while literature in the age of the early Protestant movements was dominated by strophic verse, the "poem," and the music by melodious, syllabic, metrical singing. Strangely, Protestantism while advocating "sola scriptura" proved insensitive to the wording and musical form proper to the Bible taking instead the late medieval trope and cantio as a starting point for its chant. A genuine reform, the longed-for return to "origins" would have meant basing the singing of the congregations on the prose text of the Bible by adapting idiomatic musical material. However, the Reformation simply continued the development of the late Middle Ages in liturgical chant (as in many other matters), instead of returning to the primordial Christian traditions. In this matter, too, it was a child of its time.

20 The example of church music in Hungary is discussed here for the sake of making general conclusions.

But there is a more deeply rooted motivation for the divergence that is of a liturgico-theological nature. The music of the great liturgies of Antiquity is simply the way the text, as defined by the liturgy, was performed. It was not an optional insertion in the liturgy, and its content was ordained in full by the liturgy. So chant, just like the readings and prayers, was a bearer of the liturgical message. In Eastern Christianity, liturgy and liturgical chant has the task of transmitting the faith itself – most efficiently from the perspective of the congregation. To replace the liturgy and chant was equal to replacing the faith or, at least, of curtailing the faith it conveys; the very beliefs confirmed in the sacred words of the rite. The transmission of the faith must not be weakened. The change to a new language was no more than a change of means, the content still had to be transmitted in its integrity. It was not intended as the "expression of new religious experiments" or the manifestation of the soul of new nations. The "what" – that is above languages and nations – was perfectly defined, the change was only in the "how."

By contrast, Western chant was given a new function at the end of the Middle Ages. It had to gather and coordinate people, express and invoke private and communal piety, give voice to the affections, or simply provide a background to the liturgy and fill gaps in its procedure. The new approach appears clearly in the idea of "dialogue": God speaks to the congregation in readings and the sermon, and the congregation answers in singing – differently, of course, according to cultures, languages, historical ages, social strata (or in our time, according to gender, generations, conditions, etc.). By contrast, the old approach regarded the service as a dialogue in every respect: God addresses man in the Word, but man listens to His Word as something already received in the soul, something that is answered by listening to it. And conversely, chant communicates not only the thoughts and feelings of the congregation but it is itself a revelation that combines the divine Word and human resonance. In the liturgy Christ is acting among us, He is Revelation to us, and Prayer for us in every moment of our life. We stand before God in Him, who is Prophet and High Priest in one Person. One view is theocentric and christocentric, and emphasizes the objective, the other is anthropocentric and focuses on the subjective. St. Benedict provided the formula for the old ecclesiastical view: *mens concordet voci*. Let us take the words (and chants) on our lips as they are given us by the Church, and form our mind according to the words while singing them. The *new*

approach can be summarized in a paraphrase of St. Benedict's sentence: *vox concordat menti*, i. e. let us sing what we feel.

As history proves, the two ways should not exclude each other. While taking one of them as a starting point, the other acts as a modifying factor. We express the feelings of the people, while carefully avoiding any conflict with the faith; or: we deal with the objective content of the liturgy, but with regard to human conditions.

After Vatican II, when a "translation" of the liturgy seemed to be necessary again, the Church and church musicians found themselves at a crossroads. The Constitution spoke for the first – we may say, the "orthodox" – way. The chant is a mediator of concrete liturgical content. Beside the Latin that should be preserved, it would generate – combined with new ritual languages – new branches of the old musical family. A natural way, suggested by good examples, would be to begin singing the words of the liturgy and give time for assimilating the musical idioms to the character of the different languages. Instead, people became entrenched in the false question of the possibility or impossibility of adapting Gregorian melodies to the prosody of the new languages. The creation of a musical language and repertory for the rite demands, of course, knowledge and musical invention; but an acceptable liturgical music is more than the result of paperwork by scholars and ambitious composers.

The keyword in the post-cociliar documents became: *vel alius cantus aptus*. By the use of this concession the liturgy turned in practice to the second way: replacing the liturgical items by various musical pieces. This led to three consequences:

1. Phrases interpreting the term "aptus" proved to be empty formulas unable to be used as norms for actually assessing chant material. The few objective norms given in the Constitution (such as: the text of chants should be taken mainly from the Bible and the rite; Gregorian chant should take pride of place in the liturgy; it should be introduced in small parish churches, too; only items approved by the bishops' conference should be sung; chant must consist of noble artistic material, etc.) lost increasingly their regulating strength.

2. Chant at the moment does not participate in preserving and conveying concrete liturgical content and has become an element of 'mood' in the liturgy. Its unity with the celebration, its part in the dramatic structure of

the liturgy has been abandoned, and it plays the role of mere 'insertion' (the only exception, perhaps, being the interlectionary chants).

3. Chant is assessed now according to its capacity to express the feelings of the community. In this connection, a totally unauthentic interpretation of "folk music" has spread (discussed below). Chant is regarded as a means of "inculturation," an expression of the different mentalities of different nations. Music as promoting the catholicity of the church, or to express a kind of universality as a bridge *connecting* gender, generations, social strata is out of the question and has been forgotten in practice. This attitude stems, in the last analysis, from a false anthropology that prefers the differences among people to their community, and takes man as an unchangeable entity, regardless of the use of learning and training (the "second nature" of man in a former view).

Liturgical music – if taken in the original sense of the word – has been relegated either to the liturgical museum of "Gregorian" festivals, courses, and workshops, or to the "New Age" and "World Music" sections of CD stores.

The first step

The Hungarian church, one of the first churches to do so, decided to follow the second path. The bishops' conference asked Rome (with an appeal to "ancient Hungarian tradition") to recognize the pre-conciliar hymnal (Szent vagy Uram = Thou art holy, o Lord; SzVU in the following) as a liturgical collection, and the petition obtained approval. The decisive motive of the petition was not, in fact, a liturgical and anthropological concern in any sense of the term, but simply *inertia* justified by false arguments.

We will discuss later the question of 'ancient Hungarian' tradition. Now it is enough to say that the practice thus obtaining approval was a typical example of the Central European baroque heritage, exactly what was *opposed* by the 19th–20th-century liturgical movement. The apostles of the liturgy censored the usage of singing non-liturgical songs while the priest says quietly the most majestic liturgical chant texts. They suggested that people should be introduced to the liturgy spoken quietly so far by the priest. In the new situation these hymns became legitimized, while at the same time the priest ceased to recall the message conveyed in the original chant texts.

This was a victorious attack against liturgical reform – under the flag of liturgical reform. Ironically, the approved collection itself was totally

unsuited for its intended role. At the time of its composition (in the 1920s) this book was a collection of the typical standard of Central European churches. Though there existed both better and worse examples of this style, the genre itself was all the same. An excessive regard for the volume in Hungary gave it a *nimbus* taken for granted by the uninformed clergy. It was declared to be the definitive collection of the pristine songs of a nation endowed with exceptional qualities, springing up from ancient roots, conforming to the ideals of liturgical chanting better than any other. Furthermore, in 1960 it was claimed that this hymnal was a forerunner of the liturgical reform of the Council.

The book indisputably has its own merits: it played a great role in combating the rather corrupt practice of many congregations inherited from the 19th century. This being so, an honest examination in the sixties would have revealed that it cannot fulfill expectations after the Council. The necessity of such an examination – which should have been done before asking for its approval – did not occur to anybody. It was not the music that received the required approbation, but the book as a whole, as a result of a formal process without any investigation.

What objections could be made after 1960 against a book produced in 1930? Let us start with the question of "ancient Hungarian tradition."

The book is a typical Central European collection. The bulk of the material is part of an international repertory. We find in it some (but not enough) medieval cantios (*Dies est laetitiae, In dulci jubilo*); a few good examples of 16th–17th-century Hungarian congregational songs; imported 17th-century tunes from Bohemia and Germany; cantios in the devotional style of the early baroque period lacking a truly congregational character. The largest category consists of tunes created or imported from the end of the 18th century until the mid-19th century, productions in the late German chorale style. Not a single piece of the rich treasury of religious folk chants, collected already by 1930 (and thoroughly processed by 1960) found its way into the collections.

Only a small part of the valuable set of medieval and 16th-century pieces took root in real practice, and their transmission became still more problematic later in the given political situation. After 1960 a process of counter-selection began: a few dozen of the 300 items were kept in use, exactly those that had been adopted for the sake of compromise. The eternal fate

of compromises was fulfilled: what was accepted as a compromise survived, and the *reason* for it was forgotten.

Another shortcoming of the book was that only the *melodies* of the relatively valuable items were included, and they were given new, sentimental or neo-romantic texts. The biblical style and objective of the old repertory was replaced either by the patterns of 18th–19th-century devotional lyrics, or the eclectic and affected poetry of 1900.

But the most serious problem was the theological and liturgical content of the book. It represented exactly the kind of subjective devotional spirituality that the liturgical reform was supposed to amend. The psalmodic inspiration was missing, almost no liturgical hymns were included, and the great dogmatic themes, terms and expressions of the liturgy remained neglected. The hymns sung during Advent were mainly about the Annunciation, during Christmas about the shepherds; during Lent they expressed sorrow about the Passion. The great bulk of "Mass songs" are versifications of the "Mass devotions" of 19th-century prayer-books (with "we go in, we go out, we begin, we finish" type introductory and closing hymns, meditations upon the first word of the Gloria, Sanctus, etc.). There are many hymns about the Holy Virgin, mostly in the 19th-century spirit of her devotion. We find practically no chants about saints; the "thematic songs" (praise, confidence, reliance on God) were ousted by lyrical complaints. If ever there existed a songbook *in*adequate for replacing liturgical chants, this collection was surely it.

This songbook is the official hymnal of the Catholic Church of Hungary even today, and the hierarchy, a great majority of the lower clergy – and daily practice, supports its use.

Good conditions

If anywhere, certainly in Hungary another path could have been followed. Kodály's inspiration created a new and in some respects exceptional musical situation in Hungary:

1. The most important point is Kodály's vision of the essence of music, of the relationship between man and music, music and morals, music and the church, music and school. It is a vision sharp as a diamond allowing no compromise. This heritage could perhaps act as a defense against the confusion about musical values, a confusion that has defeated even the Church.

I shall confine myself here to two quotations from Kodály, also relevant to church music:

"Bad taste is a spiritual illness that burns out of the soul all susceptibility." "Good music has an impact on general human education, because a sense of responsibility and moral maturity radiates from it. Bad music lacks these and its destructive effect may reach a point where it cripples faith in the moral law."

2. Kodály's personality, views and research elicited a great development in the field of ethnomusicology, but also influenced general thinking about music, scholarship, pedagogy, and aroused a great international response. Kodály also influenced a wide sphere of musical life through his collections and analyses, and this influence also affected church music.

3. His inspiration penetrated the whole of musicology and gave impetus to chant research, too. Szabolcsi, a former student of Kodály, added Gregorian chant to the context of general music history and studied also its ethnomusicological aspects. In the Folk Music Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences the Cistercian priest Benjamin Rajeczky founded a highly admired workshop for chant research.

4. Kodály as a scholar, thinker and composer, innovator in musical pedagogy had ideas also concerning the reform of church music. He gave an example of how to pull together fields frequently separated. Musicology may influence practical musical life; musical pedagogy receives incentives from scholarship, scholarship and pedagogy may have contact with composition and performance. This does not mean that scientific studies should be limited by pedagogical or artistic considerations, or that teaching should adopt immediately theoretical or historical theses, or that composers should be servants of ideological programs. Talented people knowledgeable in more than one field may offer their experiences to found an inclusive vision of many branches of music life. It is still more important, however, to work at the unity of musical life as a whole, avoiding both the isolation of fields and the domination of one field over others.

If there is a field of musical life where this principle is true, it is surely church music. The ultimate motive of this unity is of a spiritual nature. Its starting point and measuring norm is the liturgy. Musicology cannot be neglected in church music affairs, not so that it can overrule them, but so as to provide authentic information for some decisions. Pastoral aspects cannot be fostered by repudiating artistic quality: musicology can demonstrate that

they are not opposites. At the same time, church music is a kind of pedagogy, elevating people when bringing them into the liturgy and liturgical music.

The unity and mutual influence of different fields has been more or less attained in Hungary, at last potentially, except in church music, where a smooth cooperation between musicians and clergy is exceptional.

Folk music and Church music

What does folk music tell us about church music? What impact might folk music research and its consideration – the work of three generations – have on the musical life of the Church? Here I list only some points that seem important, leaving the reader to draw his or her own conclusions.

1. Field collections when they began a hundred years ago encountered poor-quality popular music on the surface and an almost forgotten valuable musical heritage underneath, coexisting in the same social stratum. The former was earlier ranked equally with Hungarian folk music. Thus it became clear that the notion of folk music must be clarified by making a distinction according to different aspects. The sociological aspect might be different from the cultural one and so the appraisal of folk music might be different regarding different criteria. It may be that something has its own sociological, scientific or historical interest while lacking cultural or aesthetic value; on the other hand, less "popular" layers of music may be worthy not only of study, but also of support, dissemination and practical use.

2. Folk music makes clear the importance of a third category, i.e. *functional value*. Folk customs use different kinds of musical phenomena that are valid only in a given situation. E.g. the music of "magic customs" differs greatly from the material for performing epic texts; songs of children's games differ from ballads. People themselves are conscious of the link between style and function. They distinguish, even in terminology, secular music-making from ritual chanting. Many tunes may be used and have special cultural value in their own sphere, without being good for another function. (Let us remember that Liszt and later St. Pius X appreciated *and* expelled from churches even the good "theatrical music" of the time because of functional considerations.)

3. While the romantic age inclined to regard folk music as a timeless expression of the people's soul, comparative research has discovered its his-

toricity. Folk music, previously thought to be "spontaneous," is the product of a historical process; the outcome of essential changes over time, of mutual influences between art and folk music, and of cultural exchanges between nations. Looking at folk music with these eyes, it appears not as a single unit, but as a compound phenomenon that can be differentiated into layers and styles by appropriate studies.

4. Among its historical layers, one emerges as having special importance. Some musical *universalia* and classic forms of musical 'behavior' that flourished during the age of oral culture were preserved in folk music. Among these are elementary but highly stylized musical forms and expressions common to very large groups of mankind, and also the elaborated but not too sophisticated ones of ancient Eurasia, originating from the same age as Christianity itself. Folk music includes such "primary" phenomena (e.g. different kinds of recitation) and also documents their functional properties by their use in folk customs. Folk music also demonstrates the equal rank but functional difference of *logogenous* and *melogenous* musical material (at their extremes: recitation and melismatic singing), and documents the musical meaning of tonal restrictions (systems of narrow range, conjunct melodies). This classic culture is completed by a psychic element: the balance and mutuality of a stylized expression, discipline, self-restriction on the one hand, and a deep emotionality on the other. Perhaps this is the same thing that some scholars call the "pneumatic character" of liturgical music. We may rightly suppose that this elementary but elaborate and stylized music of a pneumatic character, immaculate musicality and rational functionality is related to the basic music of the liturgy.

Comparative studies proceed further and find concrete melodic models common to the two fields. In these cases it is not that folksongs were adopted by church music, or ecclesiastical tunes by folk music, but that their common roots are documented. As Kodály formulated it: Gregorian music could not have been so strange to the ears of pagan Hungarians in the time of King St. Stephen (around 1000) as it had earlier been supposed.

5. And here we find an answer to the question of pastoral practice: simplicity and high quality are not opposites. It is true, their paths separated later in history when high quality became inseparable from a more sophisticated musical material. The nearer we approach our own time it becomes more increasingly true that something is either popular *or* valuable. But this is not absolutely true for history as a whole. The farther we turn back to the

Urformen, the two 'opposite' qualities are the more conjunct. A children's song of three notes is a perfect "opus" in its simplicity and no evolution will invalidate it. The "evolution" of professional activity progresses towards increasingly complex qualities, and broad social strata can absorb its products only by learning. I think the conclusions for church music are clear.

6. Folk music permits us to understand the importance and function of orality. Though church music exists today as written music, its past (e.g. the past of Gregorian chant) is misunderstood if the characteristics of oral music are forgotten. Moreover, anyone who deals with music mainly as existing on paper loses his real sense for it.

7. A very important teaching of folk music is about the relationships between type and the individual piece within the ancient musical styles. There the "opus" is not an individual creation, not the finished composition of a musical personality. As an Eastern rite Church represents a *canon* realized differently in different places but remaining always the same, so the perfect "creation" in the classic periods of folk music and liturgy are the given *types* of a musical expression that produced ever new individual pieces while joined to new texts, performed again and again by different persons in different environments. Consequently, styles and idioms can be reborn when combined with new languages.

8. Finally, folk music research donated another gift to the Hungarian church: tens of thousands of religious folksong recordings. Kodály himself collected hundreds of folk hymns and this amount has been multiplied in the field collections of the sixties and seventies. The collection has grown not only in its quantity. Classification and analyses documented in the archives of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences have helped a lot in the stylistic, historical, sociological and aesthetic understanding of this treasury.

Though Hungarian folk music includes a highly esteemed ancient melodic tradition, the repertoire of secular folksong has only a few meeting points with the religious hymns. Religious folksong is an isolated repertory within folk music. This repertory is a compound collection and contains both tunes of real value and ephemeral tunes of only folkloristic interest. We cannot simply declare this whole to be the expression of the people's religious experience. Behind the good texts one finds theologically well-trained authors and many melodies are of international origin.

What makes them "Hungarian," is not so much the "what" but the "how." Characteristically "Hungarian" is the manner and taste manifested in the assimilation, variation and performance of the tunes. This is the point where religious hymns have features in common with the performance of secular folksongs. As Kodály emphasized, what we see in the music of the 16th–17th century songbooks is misleading; authentic performance survived in the memory of the people. The melodic inspiration, fashions of ornamentation, the lively *parlando* that transforms the marked rhythms and makes the song into prayer: all these are documented in the field collections published on disc and in books.

Gregorian chant and church music

The ethnomusicological methods and aspects of Kodály's and Szabolcsi's activities influenced the work of chant research not by forcing chant into the category of folk music, but by revealing some generalities of ancient oral cultures.

During the last thirty years the full material of Hungarian chant sources has been transcribed, analyzed and compared; the repertory of antiphons has been published arranged by musical classification in the series Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi; four medieval manuscripts have been edited in transcription or facsimile; dozens of sources have been catalogued by computer; a great number of articles and conference papers have discussed the problems of the Gregorian tradition. As an artistic reflection of the scholarly activity, more than 40 records have been made by the Schola Hungarica. Gregorian chant has been introduced in a systematic way into teaching from the elementary level up to higher education. Here follow some issues that are relevant to the theme of the present paper:

1. In retrospect Gregorian music, seen from the aspect of post-Solesmes times, seems to be a petrified repertory with an inseparable connection between a row of notes and syllables. If, however, we consider its birth and origins, it is rather a style, a kind of generative technique, a system of idioms that acquired ever-new shapes when encountering different words and liturgical situations. If this is so, the liturgy after the Council can be regarded as a possible new "meeting point" between the style and a set of new texts. The question is not how to write syllables under the notes of a canonized

melody (with a result unsatisfactory to many people), but how to enunciate the new texts in this musical language.

2. The different aspects might be caused by different experiences: it was the Gradual that formed the knowledge of many people in the Church; research in Hungary has focused mainly on the rich vocabulary of recitation and on the repertory of the Antiphonaries. As we know the Antiphonary stands nearer to the primary living conditions of the chant. The Graduale is the outcome of a radical turn to professionalism, to the activity of *scholae*, and consequently, to "individual" creation, thus it presents less the language than a repertory. The Antiphonary is just the opposite. Similarly to the psalm tones that can be combined with any psalm text, the ancient stock of antiphon and responsory melodies offer a flexible vocabulary reshaped again and again according to the different texts.

3. The Gregorian movement in Hungary (research and performance practice) arrived at experiences that discovered the vividness of chant.

One experience is given by analysis of *genres*. A general "Gregorian" music read note by note might sound very pious, but might be so boring that chant loses all its magnetism. The proprieties and functional meaning of genres include clear differences among musical "events"; musical behavior in performance can make the piece very effective at the given point of celebration.

The same is true for thinking in types and idioms. Gregorian chant is then considered not as a row of single notes but as melodic words, sentences, a series of well-known formulas. Viewed as such, the ritual function of the chant and its capacity for delivering a text is not weakened, but its artistic qualities are better emphasized, offering liberty for imagination, liturgical inspiration, and even, to some extent, for the sensation of 'something happening', as required in art. The devotional character of Gregorian chant excludes extravagance but it does not allow boredom.

4. Anyone who works frequently with the medieval sources of Roman liturgy experiences a sense of prevailing unity *and* variety. Historically, it is equally false to think either in terms of a totally uniform liturgy/music, or to regard them as a collection of arbitrary varieties. Both uniformity and variety fit into a hierarchical order. Roman liturgy and its chant are *essentially* uniform from the first surviving rituals on. Symbolically speaking: there is no Mass chant-book that begins otherwise than by the introit *Ad te levavi.*

But this uniformity was achieved not by the regulations of the Curia Romana. Its contents were transmitted as the traditions of individual dioceses or religious orders. Varieties and differences were given their proper place, regulated by right order according to the ranking of liturgical elements, arranged following the levels of archdioceses, dioceses and local churches, and, in small details, by personal decisions. These varieties were not a matter of caprice but were based on the decisions of communities responsible for the liturgy. The proportion of local varieties was less in the Mass than in the Office, less in the temporale than in the sanctorale, less in arrangement than in repertory, etc. This means that the system made possible both the uniformity of the Roman liturgy and the existence of local varieties, and helped create a feeling of identity and familiarity.

5. This being so, it is true that the Roman liturgy and the Cantus Romanus are one and the same from the beginning up to 1970, but it appears in legitimate and well-ordered varieties, according to space and time. As Dom Prosper Guéranger stated: the Roman liturgy manifested itself in the sum of its variants. The Roman liturgy "developed" over the centuries through slow and organic changes. Regarding it as a whole, it was not "Zeitbedingt," i.e. bound to a particular time: the Church lived with it in very different societies and cultures over more than a thousand years.

6. Research has revealed the properties and qualities of the Hungarian liturgical and chant traditions. If the right is given to African tribes to include their pagan traditions in the liturgy, I think the same should also be given to the rite of a thousand year-old Christian Church, based on a much older Roman tradition.

Turning to practice

As mentioned above, the Church in Hungary as a whole (like other parts of the Latin Church) disregarded the possibility of creating liturgical music in Hungarian; singing in churches became after the Council simply a set of insertions.

In the late sixties some scholars, musicians, church musicians and a few priests founded a study group to work on a church music reform that would be concordant with the spirit of the Council. They worked (hidden from the glance of the State authorities) within the framework of the music section of the Hungarian Catechetical Committee. When the church policy of

the State became more liberal and the Bishops' Conference established a committee for the preparation of a new edition of the old hymnal SzVU, Benjamin Rajeczky (and other members of the study group) were invited into it. The plan was initially no more than to make small alterations to the SzVU, but the need for a new chant-book (with inclusion of what is good in the old one) became more and more urgent. The new hymnal approved by the Bishops' Conference as an "alternative" songbook for Catholics was published in 1986 under the title "Éneklő Egyház" (= The Church Singing, ÉE).

The study group was aware from the outset that the Mass and the Office are of equal importance for the integrity of liturgical life. Accordingly work was begun (in the context of the St. Augustine Liturgical Movement) on publishing a Hungarian Office with chants based partly on the ancient traditions of the Roman and Hungarian Church, and partly on the Liturgia Horarum. The volumes of this Office have been published from the late eighties on.

In logical order the first point to be clarified was how a balance between the three elements of church music (ritual music in the strict sense of the word, strophic hymns for the congregation, polyphonic art music) can be achieved. A simple "co-existence" of the three, i.e. of occasional "Gregorian Masses," "Polyphonic masses for tourists," and regular cantio-Masses did not seem satisfactory, nor was a capricious mixture of the three judged agreeable.

Latin churches (and similarly the Eastern churches, or the Jewish and Buddhist rites) had no "ecclesiastical" music. Ecclesiastical music was simply the liturgy itself performed by chant. It sprang from the womb of the rite, and so music and rite existed in an organic unity. The essential components of it were the dialogues between the celebrant/assistants/solo-singers and the congregation, and the more individual and artistic psalm-intoning by the solo singer (psaltes, cantor). There was no conflict between the two components. Their place was defined by the liturgy and the two psychological attitudes of the faithful (participation, attentive listening) alternated in a worthy and foreseen order. The liturgy of the Eastern churches has preserved this "pure" state almost untouched until today.

When the *scholae* took over the role of the psalmist this part of liturgical music was transformed into a group production that had to be prepared

and rehearsed in advance. Though this choral singing found a larger place in the Mass than earlier, the various types of chanting existed still in an organic unity with the liturgy. New artistic developments appeared first in the new offices, tropes, and sequences, and later *some* liturgical items started to be occasionally performed in two or three parts. Polyphonic church music initiated a growing professionalism and development of technique (of composition and performance). Time and again the Church protested against the "'extremities" of polyphonic music, but in fact, it gradually came to stand on its own feet. Though music itself had broken down functionally from the unity of the liturgy, the contact was still preserved for a while: tropes and discant parts were joined to the liturgical items, canonized chants preserved their privilege in the elaborate polyphonic music as a cantus firmus, or at least, as sacred texts. A new stage began at the turn of the 16th–17th centuries. The demand to *express* the text (instead of delivering and enunciating it in a high quality musical language) penetrated sacred music from modern opera compositions. The liturgical placement of the individual texts was more frequently neglected and composers selected texts for their works at will. The pieces themselves used the musical language of the time (or in the case of "seconda prattica" of the recent past) making no difference between liturgical genres. Also pieces composed to liturgical texts were performed on other feasts or on liturgical occasions different from the one originally intended. "Liturgical music" was transformed into "church music."

Both tendencies continued during the following centuries. The desire for *representation* (instead of enunciation) led to the expression of affections and moods; the free choice of texts and frequent performance of favorite texts resulted in the non-functionality of the church music repertory. Finally, music became an expression of the composer's religious feelings, faith and devotion, and just as liturgical music had changed into church music, so now "church music" changed into "religious music." Artistic expectations remained, but the result was obviously "insertion-music," with only a slight reminiscence of its origins.

Another process – parallel with the former – started around the year 1000. While Latin remained predominant in the liturgy, the new Christian population of Europe needed some sort of church hymns in the vernacular. Vernacular hymns in the Middle Ages had no liturgical function and were connected to the liturgy like tropes, at best. Their appropriate field lay out-

side the liturgy: preaching, processions, pilgrimages, devotions. Accordingly, they were free from any liturgical obligations. Under the influence of the Protestant movement the cantio, the new congregational hymn penetrated liturgical services. The text of the liturgical chant had to be recited by the priest, while the song was sung along with it. But exactly for this reason, the liturgy imposed no norms and gave no text to the cantio; it was enough if it referred superficially to the basic liturgical ideas. The congregational hymn became, just like art music, a "free" element of the liturgy, an insertion. It had no liturgical restrictions, and the choice of hymn depended on the organist. If art music deflected from liturgical music (culturally) *upwards*, towards musical professionalism, cantio hymns did the same *downwards*. Lacking any objective norm, the path was defined by the taste, pleasure and fashions of individuals or communities. Being free of liturgical responsibility the way led irresistibly downward, both as regards the spiritual-theological message and poetical-musical quality.

From the liturgical aspect both deviations were a loss, though the gain in other respects cannot be denied. In art music a fine repertory of masterworks was born (from Dufay and Palestrina to Mozart, Stravinsky or Kodály), while congregational hymns trained people in singing, and inspired religious feelings and memories.

If neither separation nor an inorganic mixture of the three elements is acceptable, a *new order* must be found joining the three in a stable and organic system. Within the Office the cantio has no traditional role and the dominance of liturgical music (even with the active participation of the congregation) can be achieved in this field more easily. In some churches and on some occasions also polyphonic settings and alternatim performance can find their place in this context. At the other end of the spectrum, popular devotions offer plenty of opportunities for cantios, even for long cantios with all their verses (omitted in the Mass). Gregorian chants or polyphonic pieces can also be inserted in devotions.

In the case of the Mass the strict dramaturgical structure and the time limits of successive events make the situation more difficult. The proposition elaborated by the study group is a well-arranged, musical order of the Mass true to the nature of the liturgy that assigns a more or less stable placement for liturgical chant and insertions (both cantios and polyphony). Not only a balance of these elements can be achieved in each Mass (with

the predominance of liturgical chant, of course), but also a new kind of functionality and dramatic effect can contribute to its pastoral, pedagogic and artistic qualities. There is no space here to describe this order in detail, only to declare that such boundaries are absolutely necessary for new music worthy of the new liturgy. There is no liturgy without constraints and no music lacking these constraints can function as liturgical music.

The musical language of liturgical chant

The rights of the Latin or (linguistically) mixed liturgy are declared in the constitution of the Council. Our question is now what principles and possible methods are there when the birth of new ritual music in the vernacular is at stake.

1. The words of vernacular liturgical chant should be taken from the liturgical sources (first of all, from the Bible; cf. SC 121.), using the sacred words themselves instead of their paraphrases.

2. The texts are to be enunciated in music and in a liturgical context, i.e. following the nature of the different liturgical genres.

3. The chant should be integrated into the dramatic structure of the liturgy. The congregation should sing what belongs to them, in a right relationship with the chant of other participants (SC 28–29.). The genuine character of the liturgy does not exclude liturgical solo (and choral) singing. As history demonstrates, the congregation should partake, first of all, in singing the responses and the ordinary; than come the responses of the psalmody, and finally the Proper chants (originally assigned to the psalmist or the schola).

4. With some caution, we may hint also to the nature of the music itself. It works better if it corresponds to the *prose* structure of the liturgical text: unmeasured *parlando* singing better serves the text than the metrical-rhythmic structures of the last three or four centuries. We may perhaps say that a narrow pitch-range melodic core, extended by moving out of this center, serves extremely well the requirements of congregational singing in the context of the liturgy. It can be added – with less certitude – that modal melodies favor the congregational style and the concentration on words, while the triadic music of the 16th to 19th centuries corresponds better to the independence of music and *bel canto* (what Stravinsky in the extreme

case of Mozart's church music called "sinful sweetness"). These expectations concern only the central core of liturgical music, while both melismatic singing (which delivers the text at a slower pace and is more ornamented) and polyphony have their own rules.

How can this kind of liturgical music be produced? We encounter four methods in modern practice.

a) Many compositions (mostly ordinaries) attempt to force the liturgical text into schemes alien to its nature, taken from past reminiscences. The result is in most cases quite deplorable.

b) Sometimes motives taken from medieval (modal) and 20th century music are combined as a proposal for a new liturgical language. The melodies frequently follow so closely the text that they are, as it were, a scoring of the speech melody. This way seems to be viable, though sometimes we feel that the music sounds dry and "made on paper." The melodies are often too short (to make it easier to learn many new items) and cannot develop a musical thought. Another question is whether church life in our century can concede space to the reshaping or crystallizing of the melodies during their common use, as was done in former times.

c) Artificial melodies composed in Gregorian style stand close to liturgical traditions and to a speech-like music. Their merits are obvious, since the repertory serves well the words and yet awakes Gregorian reminiscences. But the keen adjustment of tunes to words may itself cause difficulties. Each prose text being different, diverse melodies are needed, and if no melodic types are used, the material to be learnt grows considerably. So only a stable congregation with music-reading members is able to acquire them.

There is also a common feature of the three ways. Even if a 20th century composer were talented enough (which is not always the case), the question remains whether with his individual tone of voice he is able to create the "communal" musical language required as a background for liturgical music.

d) What is then the situation with the self-evident thought of singing the new texts to Gregorian melodies as ideal bearers of the text, instead of imitating it? There are two reasonable arguments against this solution. It is frequently objected that Gregorian melodies are so intimately linked with the Latin words that they cannot be combined with the prosody of modern languages. And the second question: how can Gregorian melodies be combined with a translation very different from the originals in length and

structure? Or should the text be modified to fit the music (which seems to be harmful for the sacred words)?

a) The "prosodic" objection is based on a false theory, not justified by the music itself. The musical phrases should, undoubtedly, correspond to the text units. But musical history documents very different kinds of correspondence between word and tune. Their connection depends on the stylistic and functional features (e.g. genres) of the music, too. A note-by-note coordination of the two exists only in the minds of pedantic schoolmasters.

b) The rigorous prosodic view does not take account of the relative independence of music and text. Neither does it take account of the difference between performed music and music on paper. Many of the prosodic "failures" that offend the eye do not harm the ear when it is actually performed. Performance simply overrides without hesitation points that seem to be problematic. Moreover, a kind of counteraction between text and melody is often pleasant when one hears or sings the piece.

c) This prosodic view disregards the testimony of folk music and the history of Gregorian chant, where it is documented that monophonic music is more amenable to being transformed according to new conditions than is elaborate art music. In the process of transformation new variants of the given music style can arise, like a new member of a stylistic family. Gregorian chant in a new language may depart somewhat from its Latin version, but it may also become simply a new version of it.

d) We have to take account also of the well-documented fact that during the process of reception new languages can impose their characteristics onto the received music without losing the qualities of the original repertory.

e) If Gregorian music is more than a collection of canonized melodies, the task is not simply to attempt to attach the syllables of a translation to the notes of the Graduale Triplex (and when it fails, to declare the task insoluble). Typological thinking becomes here a *punctum saliens*. A great number of new melodies have been produced also in Latin when a new text was sung to the melody of a musical type. The same method can be adopted in the new situation, generating new variants via new texts.

And so we have answered also the second question. The melodies of the Mass Proprium originated in the practice of choirs (scholae), and each

text had its own melody. Choirs, or congregations trained in music reading must be able to sing these tunes. But if types are chosen for each genre that are suitable for being learned and for bearing many texts, the congregation becomes able to retain the outlines of a few melodies by ear, and to sing many various texts to them.

The new hymnal

The hymnal Éneklő Egyház (= The Church Singing) includes a short catechesis, liturgical commentaries, selected Offices, devotions, and a large collection of prayers (taken mostly from Christian Antiquity). It attempts to solve the musical task in the following way:

370 congregational hymns (cantios) are included, some of them only as a compromise (with regard to their popularity or the wishes of members of the committee). Thematically the material became balanced: the liturgical meaning of the feasts gained prevalence; thematic songs of psalmodic inspiration are included, the repertory of saints elaborated. Apart from the hymns retained from the earlier Hymnal, good medieval and 16th–17th-century examples have been introduced, with slightly modernized and abbreviated texts. A rich collection of liturgical hymns has been included in fine 20th century translations. The new or restored songs have improved the ratio of biblical and dogmatic texts. Though "Mass-hymns" had to be retained, a selection of thematic examples has made it possible to have a more appropriate selection for replacing the Proper items. Valuable ancient melodies – given earlier in a rather dry transcription of 17th century printed songbooks – have now been published in versions taken from field recordings, which may help them to become accepted.

Only a few ordinaries are included and the poor compositions of recent times have been excluded. It is reasonable to return to the original state of affairs, when the ordinary items of the Mass were sung to stable melodies; so the "Missa mundi" (in Latin and Hungarian) with a few alternative melodies seemed to be enough to satisfy the desire for variety.

The collection of cantios is better than in any earlier Hymnal. But what opened a new path in the true spirit of the Council is the "Graduale Simplex" for the order of the church year. Introits and communios for solemnities and feasts are given in Hungarian, and a rich collection for the seasons (5 for Advent, 5 for Lent, 7 for ordinary time) and for the common of

saints. Moreover a one-year cycle for the interlectionary psalms and a splendidly restored order for Holy Week – the old traditional Hungarian rite – is added. The texts of 45 introits and 34 communios are linked to not more than 13 melodies, and suggestions help beginners to sing the whole year to a still more restricted number of melodies. This means that the principle of "melodic types" has been amply used in this process. The collection is extended by 12 "parish" Vespers, Lauds, Terce, and Compline, with similar musical material.

As mentioned above, shortly after the publication of the new hymnal a series of sung Offices was launched (7 volumes so far). Its organization is, however, the theme of a separate paper.

* * *

The new hymnal (1984) appeared finally not as a compulsory but as an alternative book besides the previous one. It did not receive strong support on the part of the hierarchy and so the majority of communities took the easier way out and retained the old one. However, where devoted church musicians (sometimes also priests) supported the new Hymnal, it has been introduced with complete success, in small villages as well as in cities, country towns and suburbs. It has only failed to succeed where it has not been introduced... Where the methods suggested have been used, it has encountered no trouble in being learned and liked. It has also been demonstrated that congregations living among the simplest conditions can be taught liturgical chanting. The introduction of liturgical chant did not lead to the decline of folk hymns or polyphonic music, much to the contrary: they found their proper place and proper role, and now flourish in the new context.

A true and long-lasting success would need, of course, a better environment. Firstly, a better environment, a healthier climate with respect to the universal Church. All who regard the new book as unwelcome find good arguments in the confusion and lack of norms everywhere.

Secondly, a better environment within the country. If someone visits different churches and finds entirely differing liturgical and musical conditions, he will feel less confident in what he is doing. Even if a priest dedicates a good amount of time and effort to improving the liturgical situation at his parish, he is likely to be moved to another parish at one point of his career, and as a consequence, all his achievements are in danger of being

abandoned by a new priest in favor of other ideas. In this situation, communities cannot mature to the desired level of liturgical culture (as e.g. the faithful do in the Greek rite who acquire from childhood a high-level liturgical culture unimaginable for a foreigner).

We also need a better atmosphere of general church life in which catechesis, preaching, and spirituality would be connected with the liturgical Hymnal, used as a kind of Common Prayer Book.

* * *

A colleague of mine said recently – with some exaggeration – that everything is possible if we have a vision of the right treatment of matters. To which I add that this is so if the vision is in concord with the truth of matters, in this case, the will of God and the genuine traditions of the Church.

A Word to the Reader

Every honest observer of the present state of Holy Church will find it difficult to gainsay the signs of confusion and "disintegration" (Card. Ratzinger) which are so often evident today. The counterpart of disintegration in theology, in discipline and in morals is the disintegration in liturgy, which perhaps is where the entire process began. Nonetheless, we delude ourselves if we imagine that what we see is simply the consequence of disobedience towards the Church's rules. There are cases in which provisions made by Church authorities are themselves, at least in part, responsible for the situation.

An historical analogy may be found in the years around 1520 or 1530. Symptoms of secularization (not only of the society, but of the Church's own life) and various influences upon religious and liturgical life itself – alienation from the Church, latent heresies, desire for and movement toward a reformation – all these were widely prevalent in that long-gone age as well as in our own time. There emerged, even with ecclesiastical approval, liturgical rites that severed the thread of traditions. It was an era that desperately yearned for the Council of Trent. Is it possible that we, too, stand before another Trent? Or that we have to return to the point where we missed the way, and to prepare a right reform of the traditional liturgy as was intended by Sacrosanctum Concilium?

Is it not too audacious for a layman to criticize the liturgical usage of Holy Mother Church? Is it not presumptuous of him to offer proposals? Indeed, – but one who possesses some degree of competence (and I hope I did not miss the mark in presenting and interpreting liturgical facts) is perhaps permitted to offer his services in bringing about a change for the better.

But, my friends, what can we do here and now, if we are anxious about the present state of affairs and motivated not by disobedience but by *zelus domus tuae*?

We should strive to persevere in adverse times. We should strive for solutions that are, within the parameters of the law, the closest to the best liturgical traditions of the Church. We should strive for a better future by learning, thinking, weighing ideas and facts, and above all by praying, so that

when the day of true reform dawns, we will not confront the problems in ill-prepared haste.

But only the "official" Church may *act.* What we do may later appear useful; but it bears fruit only after the Church embraces it and makes it her own. As the *Exsultet* says: what the diligence of the bees has gathered, it transformed into the material of the precious candle by the work of the Mother-Queen; only she can offer it as a pleasing evening sacrifice to the Lord. May God grant us, my friends, that Holy Mother Church may present all our efforts to Him by the hands of His ministers, the work of bees... *per ministrorum manus de operibus apum sacrosancta reddat Ecclesia.*