

CAECILIA

A Review of Catholic Church Music



A LETTER TO HANS KÜNG

VOLUME 90, NO. 3

AUTUMN, 1963

Twelfth Annual
**Liturgical
Music Workshop**

AUGUST 16th through 28th, 1964

BOYS TOWN, NEBRASKA

FLOR PEETERS

Inquire

Music Department
Boys Town, Nebraska

CAECILIA

Published four times a year, Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter.

Second-Class Postage Paid at Omaha, Nebraska

Subscription Price—\$3.00 per year

All articles for publication must be in the hands of the editor, 3558
Cass St., Omaha 31, Nebraska, 30 days before month of publication.

Business Manager: Norbert Letter

Change of address should be sent to the circulation manager:
Paul Sing, 3558 Cass St., Omaha 31, Nebraska

Postmaster: Form 3579 to Caecilia, 3558 Cass St., Omaha 31, Nebr.

CAECILIA

A Review of Catholic Church Music

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorials	99
Project 90 (I)	106
Project 90 (II)	107
Project 90 (III)	119
Review	
Books	128
Organ Music	131
Records	133
News Litter	137

VOLUME 90, NO. 3

AUTUMN, 1963

CAECILIA

A Quarterly Review devoted to the liturgical music apostolate.

Published with ecclesiastical approval by the Society of Saint Caecilia in Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter. Established in 1874 by John B. Singenberger, K.C.S.G., K.C.S.S. (1849-1924).

Editor Very Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Schmitt

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Francis A. Brunner, C.Ss.R.
Louise Cuyler
David Greenwood
Paul Koch
Paul Manz
C. Alexander Peloquin

Elmer Pfeil
Richard Schuler
Lavern Wagner
Roger Wagner
Abbot Rembert Weakland, O.S.B.
James Welch

CAECILIA ASSOCIATES

Dr. Caspar Koch, Pittsburgh, Pa.	The Hon. Arthur Reilly, Boston, Mass.
Sr. Alphonse Marie, C.P.P.S., O'Fallon, Mo.	Eugene Leahy, Notre Dame, Ind.
Alfred Bichsel, Rochester, N.Y.	Emmanuel Leemans, Boys Town, Nebr.
Cornelius Bouman, Nijmegen, Holland	Edward Malone, O.S.B., Elkhorn, Nebr.
Martin Bush, Omaha, Nebr.	Dom Gregory Murray, Downside Abbey, England
George Carthage, St. Cloud, Minn.	Flor Peeters, Mechelen, Belgium
Sr. Casimir, O.P., Omaha, Nebr.	Rev. Fred Reece, Stuart, Ia.
Rev. Charles Dreisoerner, San Antonio, Tex.	Myron Roberts, Lincoln, Nebr.
Rev. Laurence Feininger, Trento, Italy	Sr. Rosalie, O.P., Hastings, Nebr.
Winifred Flanagan, Omaha, Nebr.	George Schaefer, Omaha, Nebr.
Terence Gahagan, London, England	Dom Ireneo Segarra, Montserrat, Spain
Rev. Ferdinand Haberl, Regensburg, Germany	Eugene Selhorst, Rochester, N. Y.
Anton Heiller, Vienna, Austria	Frank Szynskie, Boys Town, Nebr.
Paul Hume, Washington, D.C.	Sr. Theophane, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisc.
Ralph Jusko, Cincinnati, O.	Irvin Udulutch, O.F.M., Marathon, Wisc.
Aloysius Knoll, O.F.M. Cap., Herman, Pa.	Omer Westendorf, Cincinnati, O.
Ernst C. Krohn, St. Louis, Mo.	Rev. Russell Woollen, Washington, D.C.
Jean Langlais, Paris, France	John Yonkman, Ft. Wayne, Ind.

Managing Editor Norbert T. Letter
Library Ferenc Denes
Circulation Paul Sing

Subscription Price: \$3.00; Additional Single Copy 75¢

Editorial and Business Address: 3558 Cass St., Omaha 31, Nebraska

EDITORIALS

A LETTER TO HANS KÜNG

I presume that you, Father Küng, would be the first to admit that *The Mass of the Future* (Sign, Sept., 1963) involves far too much schematic pigeonholing to be entirely accurate. Still, even in so short an article one sees little reason for so many superficial observations. I trust that calling attention to these will not be construed as detrimental to the things you say which demand hearty concurrence.

First of all, this matter of tradition. You aver, and perhaps correctly, that far too many people identify it with "what happened in our younger days." But then you proceed, throughout your article, to identify tradition only with what happens to suit your case. That is, there is no legitimate tradition except that which held when the Mass was "simple and flexible." Beyond that, as we shall see, you do violence to the very tradition which you purport to uphold. This brings up the whole matter of "romantic" reconstruction. Any reconstruction is going to be romantic if you want to make romantic a dirty word. In reconstructing the liturgy, even to a vital contemporary form, I fear one cannot avoid being "romantic"—whether you are talking about Gueranger, Parsch, the Council, or Küng.

Secondly, I would suggest that not a few liturgical scholars would disagree with the following simple assertions:

- a) that even in the "simple and flexible" period the language of the liturgy was the *vernacular* of the period.
- b) that the obvious reason why silent prayers were added to the Mass was that the people no longer understood Latin. It may have been one reason.
- c) that the bishop was dressed in the clothes of a Roman citizen, and stood at a table facing the people. The matter of facing the people may have held in most of the Roman Basilicas, but only there; and in any case, the celebrant took that position because he wanted to face the east, not especially in order to face the congregation. Furthermore, he was so surrounded by clergy, and the people off in the transepts, that nobody saw very much anyhow; and it was only after the oblation that he went to the altar. The ancient service was no kind of preprandial cocktail party. It was already highly formalized, as were the Jewish ritual elements which form the background of the Christian Eucharist.

- d) that "Lift up your hearts" is a correct translation—it is decidedly "our." The whole matter of your insertion of a translation of Hippolytus is problematical. It is so far from certain that it represents the Roman tradition that it should not be made the basis of a popularization.
- e) that the faithful *took* the consecrated bread in their open hands. They received it, perhaps on top of an underlying communion cloth.
- f) It is true that the essential outlines of the early Mass were fixed. It is not exactly true to say that each priest or bishop used his one discretion in shaping the liturgy. Such improvisation as there was was kept within lines quite as fixed, both textually and musically, as the "essential" outlines.
- g) that "it would have struck the early Christians as completely absurd to be present at a meal without eating, or to receive the Eucharist either before Mass or before the Eucharistic Prayer was over." Whenever the consecrated was taken home, as sometimes surely happened, there was only a question of consuming the species of bread.
- h) that the matter of concelebration in the early Church is to be taken for granted. As late as the era of St. Francis there was surely one community sacrifice, regardless of the number of priest-friars present. But there is no certain evidence that even in the early Church this practice constituted a sacramental concelebration. The likelihood is that the priests were just standing at their proper places around the altar, assisting at the sacrifice. The sacramental concelebration which we are accustomed to during the Rite or Ordination is a quite late medieval introduction. It will be interesting to see whether the Council expands or contracts the concept of concelebration brought into the Instruction of 1958.
- i) under the caption "long and complicated," that a whole set of ceremonies was borrowed from the Roman-Byzantine Court Ceremonial. This is a favorite charge of reformist-popularizers. The fact is that the borrowing was relatively insignificant. To aver that this borrowing included heathen practices—genuflections, bowing, kissing, incense, and candles—borders on the silly. Such practices are preeminently biblical. It may be true that some of them coincided with heathen practices and that the early

Christians therefore temporarily eschewed them. But the minute they no longer lived in fear of a *communicatio* with the pagan milieu, they promptly adopted, and quite properly, the Jewish tradition which included these precise practices. In this connection, I cannot help but think of Chesterton's monumental common sense chapter on "The World St. Francis Found," or his saying: "Water itself has been washed. Fire itself has been purified as by fire . . . Man has stripped from his soul the last rag of nature-worship, and can return to nature."

- j) that the solemnizations of the liturgy which accompanied the borrowing from court ceremonial resulted in a more artistic form of chant that replaced the earlier, more simple singing of the people. This is something more than bordering on the silly. One need only refer to the half-century old studies of Peter Wagner, or to the current works of Willi Apel and Eric Werner.
- k) under the caption, "far away and silent," that the priest no longer faced the people, but a wall. He didn't face a wall. He faced a magnificent altar—what had been, biblically, the Holy of Holies; what is regarded in Eastern rites even today as a symbol of St. Paul's Letter to the Hebrews, where one, taken from among men, is delegated to take forward the burden of human kind. He faced the magnificent Advent concept of the Oriens. If I am not mistaken, there is still some legislation, or at least a hallowed tradition, governing the geographic location of the sanctuary.

In all of these matters I am mindful of the fact that you, Father Küng, have previously expressed some concern about Catholic preoccupation with Thomism. Despite strong Thomistic training, this writer has never been able honestly to identify himself as a Thomist. He has rather been a Bonaventuran, and, I suppose, an Augustinian. Nonetheless, his routine studies in Criteriology fill him with dismay at the utter lack of critical apparatus in the going discussions on liturgical reform.

Thirdly, the business about a deep gulf emerging between the priest and the people. Suppose one did grant that, liturgically speaking, a kind of symbolic gulf had developed. One would still question most seriously whether this had anything to do with the *de facto* social gulf, either before or after the Reformation. I am glad that you do not lay the European exodus from Sunday Mass

entirely at the feet of the form of the Mass. Latterly, the scant attention paid to documents like *Rerum Novarum* was certainly a far more basic cause of that exodus. That, almost alone, as Pope Leo said, was the great scandal. Even now, one questions whether "it is basically a question of overcoming the thousand-year-old gulf between the people and the priest at the altar." Is it not possible to be properly concerned over what seems to many of us to be a patent fact that despite the acceptance of the minimal reforms espoused by St. Pius X—say the widespread practice in this country of frequent communion—we emerge with a less abiding piety than that of our fathers and grandfathers, who were perhaps half Jansenistic?

Finally, since I am chiefly involved in the matter of a singing worship, I am obliged to say that it was the last pigeonhole, "the Mass of the Future," which prompted the writing of these few notes. What do you mean by a renewal of the method of singing psalms? I hope you do not refer to the contraptions of Gelineau. An Anglican Rector recently told me: "We have been three hundreds years trying to get rid of that sort of thing." (And allow me to aver that the genius of Gregorian psalmody is one thing that is adaptable to the vernacular.) I hope that you do not refer to the current practice—an *ersatz* revival—which has everyone singing the psalms; for the ancient practice called for a soloist for the psalmody. One need have no special quarrel with your plea for "a more sparing use of incense." But this is bound to jar many of our liturgical dust-throwers. It is not especially uncommon to observe, in churches of high liturgical repute, a meaningless processional reconstruction which may well include some of the better Gelineau psalms. When the procession enters the church, alas, one can scarcely see the altar for the smoke.

Neither does one mind the plea for the omission of the Last Gospel, for there is already a foundation for its omission in recent liturgical legislation. *But where on earth do you come up with the notion of omitting the Gradual?* You talk about the necessity of going back to the very oldest of the Church's traditions. Certainly the Gradual, the Alleluia, and their versicles rank among these. Certainly the meditative function during this singing is of high importance. It does not matter one whit that pastors and church-music practitioners the world over have glossed over this traditionally important function between the services of the Word. One might be permitted to adjudge that if reform is needed, this is precisely a place where it ought to be introduced, and that it would be the least "romantic" of all reforms.

In closing, Father Küng, may I say that I appreciated your adhering to traditional, if archaic, translations into English? Scriptural texts must have unction, and besides, everybody knows what "thy" means. A far cry from a particular "English Mass Demonstration" making the rounds (copyright, if you please) which would have us respond to "The Lord be with you" with a flip: "and with you, too!"

Francis P. Schmitt

Credits

In our last issue (Summer, 1963), several reviews were unsigned. While such errors must be blamed on editor and proof-reader alike, in this case the reviewer, who, with characteristic modesty, failed to sign them, must share the blame. We wish nonetheless to give full and proper credit to Sister Theophane, O.S.F.

Abbot Weakland

It is matter of joy and pride that one of our contributing editors, Father Rembert Weakland, O.S.B., has been raised to the rank of Co-adjutor Arch-abbot. We are confident that the venerable Arch-abbey of St. Vincent, Latrobe, Pa., is the richer for this appointment. And we hope, with equal confidence, that genuine scholarship in the field of liturgical music will not be the loser. We thought first of Dr. Basilius Ebel, Abbot of Maria-Laach, who was a pupil of Peter Wagner at Fribourg. Abbot Weakland has reminded us of Gevaert, who managed both the duties of an abbot and the interests of a musicologist.

Theodore Marier

On last Ascension Thursday, Mr. Theodore Marier was presented with the Medal of St. Gregory by Msgr. Augustine F. Hickey, pastor of St. Paul's parish, Cambridge, Mass. The medal is conferred by the Society of St. Gregory in recognition of outstanding service to church music. During the distinguished editorial tenure of the late Dom Ermin Vitry, Mr. Marier performed, without fanfare, a good many of the menial chores connected with publishing *Caecilia*. Besides that, there was an interim during which he, together with publisher Arthur Reilly, essayed the full task of this journal's continuance. We should be less than gracious, therefore—or grateful—if we did not now join the Society of St. Gregory in fêting Mr. Marier for his many services to the musical portion of the apostolate of public worship.

Father Vitry and Vernacular Chant

In a story which we saw only in the last issue of the *Choir-master*, Father Vitry was quoted as having said flatly that the chant could not be used successfully with English words. The occasion was the national convention of the American Theological Society, and, as we understand it, the reference was made during a session presided over by Father Gerard S. Sloyan, president of the National Liturgical Conference. The story credits an unnamed commentator, not Father Sloyan, with the remark. We are told that "Father Sloyan would not go that far, although he acknowledged that most chant melodies were more than 400 years old, and written for Latin words." Scarcely a statement that will shake the world of scholarship, musical or otherwise. And while I might say that more people than he might imagine grow terribly weary of his like pontificating about the liturgical evil of a congregation listening to a motet of Palestrina, I am concerned mostly with the utterly uninformed "commentator" who broke into print. Father Vitry simply never did say that chant could not be used successfully with English words. No one need take my word for it. He was a pioneer on the matter of vernacular adaptation, and I need only refer you to the many publications of his own *Fides Jubilans* press. What he did say was that adaptation involved some mutilation, and that we were faced with one or the other. If Father Sloyan wants to talk only about the last 400 years, he would be confronted with a Father Vitry quite as unhappy about *Latin* adaptations of typical melodies as he was about current and rankly amateur vernacular adaptations. He would not for a minute have stood for the mere matter of language—English or Chinese—waving a *nunc dimittis* to so vital a spiritual element in public worship as the chant. Neither will we.

Murder in the Abbey

We have had a number of reports about the recent discontinuance of the High Mass at St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn. Allow me to quote one correspondent: "You may already be aware of the fact that the Sunday conventual mass at the Abbey here is now a low Mass with a potpourri of English-Latin talking-singing "participation." As a layman, all too often caught up in the rush of secular life and consequently forced to clip ends here and there by necessity in the preparation of our parochial high mass, I for one look to the great abbeys of our land to shine forth with all the splendor of the liturgy. For the bread that I and others seek, the monks of St. John now hand us a stone."

Our first inclination was to tell our correspondent that he had simply been looking for bread in the wrong places. For I

can think of no one in the past two generations to whom he might have looked except Dom Gregory Huegle, a one-time editor of this journal. The impetus for liturgical and musical propriety in our country has come, historically, not from the abbeys, but from the diocesan seminaries. But so categorical a response would surely be unfair to any number of monks, including some at St. John's, caught in the bind. We could have told him, too, that this switch on the part of the authorities at St. John's came to us as no particular surprise, though it likely would have caught Alcuin Deutsch and Virgil Michael napping. Novelty for novelty's sake, and a convenient disregard for the plain pronouncements of the Holy See in these matters have been in the wind for years.

This writer had occasion recently to visit the great new abbey church. He arrived during Vespers, and he was properly impressed with the sung office as he was with the contemporary architecture. He is less sure about the practical function of the cavernous structure. Because of the late hour, he first imagined himself to be in the controversial underground church at Lourdes. But the acoustical properties of the high vault soon gave the lie to any such notion—only these were less kind to the magnificent speaking properties of the new Holtkamp installation than those of the medieval edifices of, say, St. Rombout in Mechelen, Notre Dame in Paris, Rheims, or Chartres, the Three Kings in Cologne. His "liberal" friends were astounded that he accepted the statue of John the Baptist in the baptistry as fairly conventional. There was one anomaly on this particular evening. As the monks chanted their Vespers in the body of the great church, there lay—rather shoved off in a corner of the baptistry—the body of one of their brethren. Father Pius was his name, they said. I do not know why he was not in the body of the church, in their midst. Or even less why, at either end of the casket, stood two horrid mortician's lamps. Or why, for the life of me, they had put bifocals on the corpse. Had there been a Book of Hours in his hands (I do not remember if there was a rosary), there might have been some symbolic significance.

As we sat at Vespers, I picked up a bound copy of that miserable hodge-podge called "Our Parish Prays and Sings" (parts of it stolen from a lay publisher who opines that "A liturgist used to be one who explained and moved you to a love of the liturgy; now he's one who destroys it.") I stuck it in the ribs of a lay friend. He would find no Vespers there! St. John's abbey church is no parish church. Why go into vulgar theatrics? I suggest that the good monks, from the Abbot on down, re-examine the truly traditional role of the *Missa in Cantu*, in and out of the monastery.

PROJECT 90 (I)

The American Society of St. Caecilia respectfully submits to the consideration of their Eminences and their Excellencies, the Most Reverend Fathers of the Second Vatican Council, the following petitions.

1. Regarding the place of music in the liturgy:

In view of the fact that the church has always regarded the function of the cantor and the trained choir, as well as that of the singing congregation, as an integral and necessary element of public worship, this Society is sincerely hopeful that the Fathers of the Council, before making any changes which might affect the structure of the services, will give earnest consideration to the importance of these traditional elements. While this tradition is not founded upon recent documents, we should desire the retention of the principles so clearly outlined in Pope St. Pius X's *Motu Proprio* and in the *Musicae Sacrae Disciplina* of Pope Pius XII.

2. Regarding the Propers of the Sung Mass:

If any changes are to be made in the structure of the Proper of the Mass, this Society respectfully urges that the Fathers of the Council give careful thought to the fundamental structure of the service, and therefore to the meaning and value of each part, clearly preserving the roles of the cantor and trained choir. This Society also begs that art and beauty, which are inherent and not foreign to the casting of the Proper parts, not be sacrificed to the single issue of simplicity and brevity.

3. Regarding the Ordinary of the Sung Mass:

Since the necessity of a clearer insight into what worship really is presses for a greater sharing by the people in the song of the Church, this Society earnestly recommends that the congregation be encouraged to share in the singing at Mass, not necessarily according to the medieval and mistaken norm of the Ordinary as a unit, but with due regard for the place the various chants have in the fundamental structure of the service. It therefore also pleads that the great treasures of medieval chant and classical polyphony, as well as the riches of modern and contemporary music, not be discarded on the untraditional plea that there is no place for participation by listening.

4. Regarding the music at Low Mass:

This Society respectfully urges that consideration be given to maintaining the sung mass as the norm for congregational service, and where necessity demands, that provision be made for a simplified form of sung Mass that requires only the service of a trained cantor to supplement the singing of the congregation.

The singing of hymns at low Mass, a solution suggested by the 1958 decree, is not completely satisfactory, because it remains extraneous to the action at the altar.

5. Regarding the use of the vernacular in the sung liturgy:

The Society of St. Caecilia recognizes that the vernacular problem is a pastoral problem, but even more basically a problem involving the proper attitude toward worship. Because music is an integral part of worship, the problem is necessarily also a musical one. This Society therefore urges care and caution, since the musical problems involved are certainly very great, whether in creating a new music for a vernacular text or in adapting a vernacular text to the rich store of chant and polyphony and other music from the past. The Society especially suggests vernacular adaptations to the offices of the church which have fallen into disuse, notably parish Vespers.

6. Regarding the practical realization of a sung liturgy:

The Society of St. Caecilia urges the Fathers of the Council to implement the repeated wishes of the Holy See by encouraging the musical training of both clergy and laity, and especially of choirmasters and organists, according to the norms laid down in the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of September

3, 1958, so that the ideals of a reverential and artistic musical worship may be realized.

The above articles have been approved by the Most Reverend Gerald T. Bergan, Archbishop of Omaha, the Liturgy and Music Commissions of the Archdiocese of Omaha, and by the Boys Town Liturgical Music Institute's eleventh national session.

For the Society of St. Caecilia:
September 12, 1963

Msgr. Francis P. Schmitt, President
Rev. Francis A. Brunner, C.Ss.R., Secretary
James P. Keenan, Treasurer

PROJECT 90 (II)

The following paragraphs are meant to be implementations of the six articles recently released by the American Society of St. Caecilia. They have been prepared by the editors of *Caecilia*, but do not necessarily represent the views of any particular editor. In them you will find the elements of the discussions which led to a concurrence in the articles as well as a number of points which we thought best not to include in the articles; for these were drawn up with no thought of argumentation or specific point of suggestion in the matter of reform.

1. Regarding the place of music in the liturgy.

Generally the discussion on this point followed the somewhat lengthy article on liturgical music as *pars integrans* and *true art* which appeared in the Spring issue of *Caecilia* (Vol. 90, No. 1). The only real point of discussion centered around translations and interpretations of *pars integrans*. It was agreed that the word "complementary," as descriptive of the role of music as compared to the text was too weak to indicate the mind of Pius X, and the use of the word "essential," as developed by Dr. Basilius Ebel of Maria-laach, in a paper delivered at the International Congress for Church Music in Cologne, and reflected in the above mentioned article in *Caecilia*, was more proper. Reference was also made to Father Vitry's thought on this matter, in another article entitled "Aftermath of Assisi," which appeared in *Caecilia* shortly after the first International Liturgical Congress at Assisi. Father Brunner offered a succinct appraisal of the discussion:

"In view of the many liturgical problems that confront the Church of the Second Vatican Council, it may seem impertinent for Church musicians to interject yet another. But it is imperative that the interest of liturgical music be stated, however briefly, because music and worship must go hand in hand.

“Because music is capable of arousing and venting emotions beyond the power of mere utterance, and because music is the ideal means of forming and expressing the communitive spirit of the Mystical Body, liturgy calls for music as an expression. Music is not just something decorative, serving to enhance the beauty of the service; not just something devotional, serving to inspire the faithful. It is this, but it is more. Music is, in the words of Pope St. Pius X, a necessary and integral part of the solemn liturgy. Of all the arts music is closest to the very act of worship. Architecture, painting, and sculpture are used to create a setting for the liturgy, but music, as the same holy pontiff said, has as its chief function to clothe with suitable melody the very text proposed for the understanding of the faithful. Words are not the only elements of language; for the voice must not only translate discursive thinking but also suggest and induce what cannot be said. That is why speech so easily and so naturally turns to song; that is why the language of the liturgy must, at times, put on the garb of music; that is why the Church has always regarded music as an integrating part of worship.”

2. Regarding the Propers of the Sung Mass.

A sung Mass is a Mass enriched by music—music in the service of worship. Something is missing if the proper of the Mass is regarded merely as a text that must somehow be included, at least by being recited. This viewpoint obscures not only the role of music in worship but also the ancient and traditional role of the cantor and choir. The Mass is being robbed of its musical vesture. The Propers contain a vital sense of “casting,” and you may take this in a theatrical sense if you will. They and the music which develops the content, as a budding flower, set the stage for every segment of the true, real drama of the liturgical calendar.

Music serves a double purpose in the liturgy. In some cases it serves to reinforce the prayers: to make a cry for mercy more plaintive, to accentuate a word of praise, to underline the profession of faith, to unite the whole person, mind and heart and tongue, with the song of the angels or the proclamation of the Baptist. This is the service of the music of the Ordinary. But the music of the Proper serves a far different end; its role is still functional, but here the function is not so much to enrich a text as to enhance a movement in the ceremonies or to embroider a moment in the service. Here if anywhere the music is paramount. The liturgical action stops, so to say, and the music takes over. The important thing is the music. For in the Proper of the Mass music is used not as an ornament of prayer but as a vehicle of devotion in its own right. Here, if anywhere, music is more than a decoration; it becomes an essential part

of the solemn liturgy. And this idea springs not from an age of liturgical decadence but from a period of incontestable liturgical radiance; this is the system of the age when the liturgy was actually being formed. Time and the changes brought about by time have somewhat obscured the purpose of the Proper of the Mass or at least dimmed its meaning for us. Three of the chants of the Proper are simply "processional" chants, intended as a musical cover for the movements at the entrance, at the offertory and at the communion of the faithful. They are choir songs to accompany the activities of these three moments at the Mass. They set a mood, provide a musical cloak to cover the actions. The songs between the readings are of a different type, richly ornamented solo-choral songs to provide a musical relief between the lessons. They do not accompany anything, for in reality nothing is going on at the altar; they are of interest in their own right, songs to meditate by, songs to help us think and pray.

It is contrary to all historical precedent to transfer these to the congregation. They are solo and choral chants. If the congregation has a role here it is only by way of a refrain. (It may be interesting to note that in the early ages of Christianity the soloists or choir sang the psalm verses, not the people; after all, the latter had no books! If the congregation sang at all, it was only to repeat a refrain or responsory.) As a matter of fact, if there were no other music, they would form, on the basis of ancient tradition, a basis for music as *pars integrans*. It does not matter that we have neglected this part of the musical service perhaps more than any other. Indeed many of our separated brethren have a better notion of this particular role than we.

During this discussion there was some interesting comment on the *Introit*, the official (and prescribed) processional hymn. It was pointed out that on the average Sunday, particularly in churches with a vested choir—boy or otherwise—it is often customary to sing a processional in the vernacular. This is followed by a second processional, the "*Asperges Me*"; and finally, in third places comes the *Introit*. By the following evening several concrete suggestions were made. Sister Rosalie had solved part of the problem on feast days, when there is no *Asperges*. The *Introit*, with its psalm, was simply used as the procession-hymn, no matter—as at Christmas—how elaborate the procession. It was then suggested that this procedure be used each Sunday, preserving still the *Asperges* rite with its Easter-Baptismal significance. It was felt that there was no good reason why the *Asperges* rite could not take place during the singing of the prescribed *Introit* song, and the text and music of the *Asperges*

be assigned as an *Introit* to one particular Sunday. The same would hold true during the Easter Season when the *Vidi Aquam* is used. It was felt that the *Vidi Aquam* would be an excellent musical accompaniment for the Easter Vigil rite of sprinkling the congregation with Easter Water—there being no music presently assigned to that procession. Certainly the *Introits* of the Easter Season vie with the *Vidi Aquam* as appropriate.

3. Regarding the Ordinary of the Sung Mass.

Holy Mother Church has, in unmistakable tones, called for greater participation by the congregation in the song of the Church. She has also made it plain that congregational participation must be channeled. It must be directed to its proper purpose, to integrating pew and altar. It is not to be activity for activity's sake, but for the sake of participating in the act of worship by Christ our Lord in the totality of His Mystical Body.

Often an appeal is made to history as a norm for congregational participation. This is a very dubious norm. In the early centuries the congregation did little more than make response to the officiant's prayers, and join in the singing of the *Sanctus*, which itself was a response to the Preface. This concept remains especially noticeable in the *Sanctus* of the plain-song *Requiem*. (An Anglican priest demurred at this point, remarking that his background had led him to the opinion that precisely here the greatest musical embellishment was called for, and at least one Roman priest concurred. One supposes that the question is this: is a tradition more proper simply because it is the oldest tradition?)

The point was also made that we have come, quite erroneously, to consider the songs of the Ordinary as a unit. It must always be remembered that the primary *musical* service of the Mass was contained in the Propers. These alone were always sung, whereas even today the only parts of the Ordinary which are never omitted are the *Kyrie* and *Sanctus*. It was the Propers, not the Ordinary, which deserved to become known as the "Missa." So that it is a simplification, much over-wrought by people who declaim about "when the people sang," to simply assign the Ordinary to the Congregation. It grew gradually and when the different parts of it were introduced it was likely the prerogative of the assisting clergy to sing the new songs. (One thinks especially of the *Gloria*.)

Anyway, it was agreed that, of the Ordinary parts, the first to be assigned to the congregation should be the *Sanctus-Benedictus*. The second should be the *Credo*, as an affirmation of faith by the Christian body. It is true that so long a chant can be sustained

by the congregation only with great difficulty, but Dr. Cornelius Bouman constantly reminded us of the "sing-song" fashion of early congregational chants, and Father Jungman has told us that such parts as the congregation sang were little more than elevated speech. In the matter of the *Credo*, the participants of the Workshop had some experience in the use of a contemporary *Credo*, "Symbolum Recitativo," by Monnikendam which was used at the closing Pontifical. Scored for choir, congregation, brass, and organ, the congregational parts were such that anyone with the most rudimentary musical education (something that one ought to be able to presuppose these days) could negotiate.

In this matter, it must not be history, let alone a mistaken notion of history, which must be the norm, but practicality. It is all right to talk about pastoral considerations, but what value have these considerations, say, in the large city parish of shifting population? Worship, as worship, and the dignity thereof, ought to be the prime consideration. In the matter of the appeal of history, there were those who pointed out that for well over a thousand years there has been a tradition of a very ornamented type of Ordinary that could be sung only by trained singers. For that matter most of the chants of our present *Kyriale* were intended for trained singers. It is true that the giants of the great chant reform in the early part of this century—men like Dom Pothier and Peter Wagner—considered the new *Kyriale* to be a congregational book. By now, as the 1958 Instruction attests, we know their hopes to be mistaken, but in justice to them it must be said that their generation was far more likely to encompass the musical problems of the *Kyriale* than is ours. There is also the matter of a second *Kyriale*, containing older and simpler melodies, which Msgr. Agles asserted, at the Congress at Cologne, to be forthcoming. This could certainly be a help in solving problems of congregation participation, as can decent contemporary contributions. But a further question was posed: what about the Ordinary settings of the polyphonic and post-polyphonic periods? Are these to be junked? Well, there is certainly no necessity for junking all of them, or relegating them to the concert stage, for they were certainly not composed as concert music, but with as abiding a faith as ever offered tribute to the Sacrifice. (One thinks of M. Daniel Rops' avowal—certainly post-Belloc—that the age of Cathedral and Crusade was humanity's finest hour.) Suppose one insisted on congregational response for the *Sanctus-Benedictus*. On how many other occasions could one not properly use the classical settings of this text! And how rarely are the settings of the *Credo* and other long chants used anyway? A choirmaster can scarcely begrudge the time given to congregational response, for the oppor-

tunity for work with a schola is limitless. But he might rightly consider continued use of more ornamented types of Ordinaries in particular Churches, on particular occasions. He might hope that there might be places designated for performance of the full Latin Rite mostly as we have known it—perhaps in Cathedrals, Seminaries, Religious Houses—even in the post-council era. The point of participation by listening is an elementary and vital one. Still, one cannot press too hard the observation that people who in the past perhaps told their beads while listening to a highly ornamented Ordinary were therefore participating, by listening, in the action of the Mass. (Something quite different from “Xavier Rynn’s” assertion that some of the Fathers of the Council were disappointed at having to hear a “polyphonic concert” during the opening session. One would think that at that level, and perhaps at that age, they should have enjoyed, in the best spiritual sense, not having to give vocal but rather meditative expression.) One must remember that it was the same Pope St. Pius X who first called for “active participation” who also suggested that polyphonic settings were the more appropriate for particular feasts and particular places. And all of us recall Dom Vitry’s—whose admiration for the magnitude of polyphonic settings bowed to no one’s—saying that the chant must be our “daily bread.” Here again, the matter of practicality. Here again, the picture of our forefathers of the primitive Church—following the tradition of the synagogue—joining in the prayer of the Church largely by listening to the officiant’s oration and the cantor’s cantillation.

Finally, there were those present who have somehow got the idea—an unfortunately widespread idea—that a switch to the vernacular would solve our musical problems, even the matter of the processional discussed in Article 2. There is simply no relevance here. Our music will not be one whit better the day after the vernacular arrives. On the contrary, it should be clear that for generations to come it will be worse.

4. Regarding the Music at Low Mass.

The introduction of hymns into the Low Mass is a case of paralleling two diverse and separate elements. The congregation is singing a song which follows at a distance the words of the priest at the altar. Undoubtedly, this is helpful in fixing the attention, in focusing the mind on the sacred action. But, we may ask, is it basically better than following the prayers by means of a missal? The *Singmesse* after which the indirect method of participation is patterned was introduced into Austria and parts of Germany and Poland during the eighteenth century, during the period of the

Enlightenment. It has a certain catechetical value, but as a form of worship it is far from ideal. As a matter of fact these forms paid scant attention to Scripture, and played down the psalms on the ludicrous supposition that they were un-Christian. It also obscures the variable parts of the Mass, one of the glories of the Roman Rite, and substitutes unchanging verses to be sung Sunday after Sunday.

A certain paradox is posed here by some liturgical schools of thought. On the one hand, we are told that the cycles of scriptural readings in the Mass-Liturgy must be expanded over extended periods so as to include more Scripture. On the other, a prominent American Liturgist, writing in a recent issue of *Worship*, urges the adoption of unchanging seasonal Propers: something that would lead to an even greater spiritual and musical impoverishment than the *Singmesse* idea. At this meeting, Father Bernard Christman pointed out what should be plain to anyone engaged in education, juvenile or adult: it is invariably a psychological mistake to play down to people's tastes. They don't need teachers or pastors for that. Education is etymologically a matter of leading. That is our job, and no one will respect us less than the people to be led if we don't perform it.

Perhaps there can be a new form of sung Mass for ordinary occasions, a Mass that does not require the services of a choir but only of a cantor. This is the practice in many oriental communities and, no doubt, represents the practice of the earlier Church in localities that had not the services of skilled choral groups. But there are several drawbacks to this suggestion. If such provisions are made for a simplified service, this must not be made an excuse for dispensing with a choir when a choir can be had. (This has happened in the past few years; the congregation substituted for the choir in all parts of the Mass, contrary to the tradition of the Roman Rite.) And if a cantor is to be used, he must be sufficiently skilled and trained, so that his singing will be indeed an enhancement of the liturgy. Please, let no one construe the suggestion in paragraph one of Article 4 as an excuse for the all too common rushed, truncated, solo High Mass. There was a serious discussion here about leveling stipends: that is, that there be no difference between the stipend for a High Mass and a Low Mass—that the celebration of the High Mass be dictated by liturgical and parochial demand rather than by the stipend. We know this poses a problem. But neither the clergy nor the organist should be dependent on a stipend. Dr. Bouman related that the Dutch Hierarchy had already taken this step several years ago, and a nearly similar arrangement in at least one American diocese was cited.

Finally, one clerical gentleman pointed out that singing hymns during Mass was quite as extraneous to the action of the Mass as public recitation of the rosary during Mass. All agreed.

5. Regarding the Use of the Vernacular in the Sung Liturgy.

It would be a mistake to overlook the grave musical problems that would arise from the adoption of a vernacular liturgy. The question of translating the existing Roman liturgy is already a thorny one, not easily to be discounted as already solved by the many popular missals on the market. How easy it is to overlook a nuance of thought, how difficult to render an idiom of expression. But when to this must be added the task of adaptation to a musical vehicle, the difficulties are multiplied. What is to be done? Is a music to be created for the new English text? Or is the new English text to be fitted to the existing melodies? The problems are not insuperable, it is true, but they are certainly formidable. This can perhaps be illustrated by an investigation of the history of the vernacular liturgies of the Protestant Reformation.

Lutheranism was not at first faced with the problem of a vernacular and even when the German Mass was shaped, it was not universally adopted. Many Lutheran churches continued to sing at least parts of the Latin Mass right down to the last century. Was this because of reverence for the Latin text? Or was it because the task of translation was so difficult? Meanwhile, however, a musical service was developed in the various vernaculars, German and Scandinavian, but this differs considerably in form and content from the Roman Rite, so that much of the great music of the Catholic Church has no place. The most significant development was the chorale. In recent years an American service book has been put together and adopted by several of the Lutheran communities. Though it was the work of experts, it has not proved satisfactory. Criticism has been leveled precisely at the musical portions of the book, the adaptations of the English texts to ancient plainsong melodies and to the German chorales.

Music presents no serious problem to the Reformed churches because Calvin's ban of the organ, polyphony, and "hymns of human composure" left room only for a vernacular psalmody of the simplest sort. There was therefore no question of adapting music to a vernacular or composing an artistic vernacular music. For the past century, however, Presbyterian and other Calvinist churches have adopted music from many sources, mostly in the form of cantatas, hymns, and motets. Often these choirs sing the music in the language of the original.

Closer to the Catholic problem is the history of the Ordinary of the Mass in the Anglican Church. The first English Prayer Book was issued in 1549. This was, in rough outline, a translation of the Missal done by Cranmer. A year later came *The Booke of Common Praier Noted* (1550), the work of John Merbecke, organist of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. The services were set to a music of the simplest sort, in strict accordance with Cranmer's idea that the music should be purely syllabic, note for syllable. Merbecke redid the traditional music to fit the new text; the old Gregorian melodies, as used in the Sarum Rite, were so reduced to their starkest outlines that nothing remained but pure musical declamation. But at a stroke Merbecke's labors lost their relevance with the issuance of the second Prayer Book of 1552; the deletions and adjustments in this volume were such that choral work became quite secondary. A renewed attempt was made in the nineteenth century with the recasting of the service into a form more or less like that of the Roman Rite. The Vatican and ancient Sarum chants were adopted, but with English texts. Here is the real crux of the problem. How successful has this adaptation been? In many instances we find not translation but paraphrase; special texts have to be devised to fit smoothly under the ancient melodies. Such adaptations are less crude than the attempt to fit the Prayer Book texts to the existing melodies. But can we have several texts, one for reading and reciting, another for singing?

The above paragraphs form the essence of Father Brunner's introduction to the discussion on the vernacular. The discussions were held to the musical problem, on the basis of the vernacular itself being a pastoral problem. However, it was soon pointed out that while pastoral considerations are important, the really basic issue involves a proper attitude toward and a proper behavior at worship. In short, worship itself is the issue. It was felt the consideration shown the catechetical and intellectual elements of the liturgy are sometimes excessive, and detrimental to the very act of worship. Thus, no one can be expected to understand every word of the liturgy, regardless of the language, unless we wish to recruit candidates for the lunatic asylums. Following the catechetical argument to its logical conclusion, we would arrive at a point where we would be faced with the necessity of providing different sets of missals for different strata of intelligence. Nor will audibility guarantee understanding. Nor must the *mysterium* element of public worship be sacrificed.

The Workshop staff had provided a good many Anglican chant materials, and had itself worked out an English set of *Vespers* ac-

cording to the Roman Antiphonale. These materials were of various merit, and a fairly critical appraisal of them led to an opinion that the fundamental problem was not one of adapting texts to set melodies, but one of adapting melodies to texts, once we are presented with a good standard one. The typical Gregorian melodies have, after all, been reworked for centuries, and this process has not seriously affected the magnificence of the body of chant as it has come down to us. This is not to minimize the increased difficulty posed by a myriad of languages other than Latin. Even the Latin adaptations in late years have not always been successful, and one cannot expect in the space of many generations a man of the musical proportion of Joseph Pothier to appear—one Pothier each, that is, to every language group. But the problem here was this: if a nearly complete use of the vernacular comes—such as sometimes predicted by a not very responsible press, Catholic or secular—were we prepared to cast off these towering elements of Western religious culture? We were not, for an everyday historical sense would prompt the conclusion that the treasures we have could not be replaced for a thousand years and more. So that we must preserve and build on the old, taking our chances on the eventual arrival of what is good and new. Many of us felt that the vernacular psalms were especially adaptable to the genius of Gregorian psalmody. We had consulted the procedures of what, for lack of space, we may simply call the Oxford Psalter and the Augsburg (American) Psalter. Both of these were adapted to Gregorian psalmody. We wound up with gratitude toward them, but used the Confraternity translation of the psalms in the end. At least one Lutheran (and a very knowledgeable one, of the Missouri Synod) preferred, as a reverent listener at *Vespers*, some of the passages to his church's Vesper Service. One of the reasons for our having procured from our Ordinary permission to sing *Vespers*, solemnly and with Benediction, was our wish to preserve, in public worship, the official offices of the Church. Most of us had heard (the Lutherans and Anglicans hadn't) one or the other so-called "Bible-Vigil," usually with three homilies and quite hilarious homemade litanies, without benefit of Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. We felt that the traditional Vesper Service, which our forebearers knew, would be quite as attractive. One does not here pose the question of what constitutes liturgical worship. Since *Mediator Dei*, Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament has. And there are eminent scholars who feel that many our much-maligned "private devotions" really do, and could officially, constitute true public worship. The Lutherans present expressed some surprise that we kept to the traditional five Vesper Psalms—not excluding the *In Exitu*, which almost

certainly could, with approbation, be shortened—and Dr. Bouman presented a plan for a three psalm Vesper Service with a somewhat longer Little Chapter and *one* short homily. These are matters that could surely be agreed upon and receive approval.

Finally, someone made some remarks about the not uncommon spectacle of Catholics of the Latin Rite getting ecstatic about Eastern Rite Masses with or without the vernacular. It is no reflection upon the beauty of the various Eastern Rites to observe that often these people have absolutely no appreciation of their own rite, and that in some instances they rhapsodize over an unreformed Byzantine chant and a polyphony that ranges from Tschaikovsky downwards. And it was agreed that *the* ecumenical effort should be first directed toward our separated brothers of the East and those of the West who are closest to us; and that many of the suggested liturgical reforms which cater to popularity have in seed the basic errors of the reformed churches.

6. Regarding the Practical Realization of the Sung Liturgy.

The following resume is entirely the work of Father Schuler. Allow me to say only that the matter of musical education for worship in our Catholic school system was touched upon, and everyone was so agreed about the problems there (Primary grades rated a B, Secondary grades an F, and our colleges and universities whatever you can find below that.) that the discussion was discontinued as, unfortunately, irrelevant to our particular outline. There was one interesting observation to the effect that the growing system of Central Catholic High Schools, despite the system's basically great merits, was unable to give any aid, musically, to parish liturgical life. In connection with No. 4 of Father Schuler's notes, someone cited a major seminary and an Abbey of high repute where such things as "Our Parish Prays and Sings", and the going cheap, if popular, congregational Masses were found in the chapel stalls. One cannot gorge himself with popcorn and expect to give his people meat, the observer said.

"From earliest time the Church has been concerned with the education of those who are responsible for the music of the liturgy. Even before Gregory the Great there were schools in Rome for training singers, and in the Middle Ages centers for the authentic teaching of chant sprang up in various parts of Europe. In our own day, the Holy See has seen fit to establish its own school of sacred music in Rome and to encourage bishops to follow that example in other lands; numerous pronouncements, both on sacred music and on the education of the clergy, have repeatedly emphasized the

necessity of sound training of musicians, so that the music of the Church will be properly and reverently performed.

“Two levels of education are involved here. First, the training of those who will actually function as composers or performers of sacred music; and secondly, the training of those whose role it will be to encourage and supervise the musical art within the liturgy.

“In the first category are found the composer, choirmaster, organist, and—to a lesser degree—the singer and the instrumentalist. Their training must include the basic theoretical aspects of the musical art; the history of Church music; liturgical and rubrical legislation; a broad acquaintance with the literature of every period; and, of course, a proficiency in the particular role they will assume, e.g., director, organist, or instrumentalist. Included in this first category must be those who undertake the instruction of the second group, viz., seminary music professors and those in charge of music in other religious houses of formation. Too often these teachers of seminarians and novices have been priests or religious with a special talent, but lacking in the most basic musical education, a condition that would never have been tolerated in the other branches of ecclesiastical studies. If the young cleric and religious is to be given the proper appreciation of sacred music, his teacher must have himself been given a superior musical education on a par with that expected of professors of other disciplines within the institution.

“For the second group, those who will be the bishops and pastors of the future, great care must be exercised to have them learn the great treasury of sacred music, both by practical performance of it within the sacred ceremonies and by study of it in the music classes. The seminary and novitiate must never be satisfied with liturgical music of an artistic quality below the level of which it is capable. To excuse shoddy repertoire, poor performance, or popular shortcuts on the mistaken plea that this prepares the student for the reality of parochial life is erroneous procedure. A true appreciation of the love for sacred music is given the student only by contact with the greatest and the best; adaptations to lesser resources are easily made when necessary and should be taught in the classroom, not in the solemn liturgical function. The seminary and novitiate must remain in the mind of the student as the norm toward which he will strive to bring the musical art that he will direct and encourage as a part of his ministry.

“While in Europe, schools of sacred music are numerous, in the United States they are very few. But the art of music can be pursued in any of the many fine schools of music in this country,

because the trained musician can readily acquire the added knowledge of liturgy necessary for his position, but one lacking in the fundamentals of music, although he may know the requirements of the liturgy, is not an adequate Church musician. Unfortunately, too many of those who have held important musical posts in this country have had the liturgical training but have lacked adequate musical education. This is particularly true in seminaries and novitiates where the role of professor of sacred music has been frequently filled by students and passed on from year to year.

“Without properly trained leaders our people will never sing well, either as choirs or as congregations. Given a well-trained body of musicians, adequately compensated, as the Church herself has directed, the art of sacred music will again flourish and become a real means for the sanctification of our people.”

PROJECT 90 (III)

We should like to present here a resume of the generous response from our readers *re* the outline for “Project 90” contained in the spring issue of CAECILIA. We had originally intended to print these contributions, or segments of them, in the *News-Litter* section, but even segments would more than fill an entire issue. That would be a pleasant way out for an harassed editor. However, we would like our correspondents to know that they were present by direct wire at our discussions in August, even if, sometimes, they could not personally defend themselves!

1. Regarding the present status of the *Missa in cantu*, Latin usage assumed:

a) *the propers*

Quite generally, the use of the propria was at least based on the *Graduale Romanum*. The one that never seemed to be omitted, in complete chant form, was the Sequence. Almost everyone preferred a mixture of chant and polyphonic settings, the latter chiefly to give emphasis to particular feasts. One remarked that there really was no ideal usage, since this depended so much on the place—parish, seminary, etc. There were surprisingly few who depended entirely on things like the Rossini or Koch-Green arrangements. Another considered that the post-polyphonic and contemporary propers were the most useful source of material. Processional psalms

were, without bias toward them, not usually used. Here there was a range from the prescribed uses during Holy Week to occasional psalmody with the Communion antiphon principally, and sometimes the Offertory. One choirmaster used faux-bordone settings most of the time. While I do not mean to insert editorial comment into this resume, perhaps I may be permitted to say that the most disappointing answers concerned the Gradual, Alleluia and Versicle. Only a few used these and only on special feasts. Consider for a moment only the Alleluia and Versicle, as a practical matter. The Alleluias are so often repeated through the year that even a modest choir could gather them up into their repertory over not too long a period, and the Versicles are a matter for just one good voice and proficient reader. A good many choirs must have at least one. There is no need to bother about the choir coming in at the asterisk (though at the point you are often repeating the melody of the Alleluia), since these are of late and unfortunate origin. Let the soloist do the whole thing. No one knew anything about the *Graduale Pauperum*, and, to tell you the truth, neither do I; but I should be inclined to be against it. Some showed considerable interest in it. The Sisters of the Precious Blood in O'Fallon, Missouri, sent a number of chant formularies for the excessively long Graduals and Tracts during the Lenten Season, especially week days, which had been expertly done by Father Vitry. As in other areas of the questionnaire, it was remarked that time (not for rehearsal, here, but performance during Mass) was a big, unfortunate factor.

b) *the ordinary*

In the matter of the questions regarding the ordinary, there were nearly as many different answers as people answering. But not quite, as we shall see. Some gave all to the congregation; at least one gave nothing, unless we were to consider the responses as part of the ordinary. The responses were universally considered to be the property of the congregation, no matter what the distribution of the other parts or what the occasion. One did aver that, in his particular situation, where worshippers at the Sunday High Mass were usually travelers, he depended almost totally on a chancel choir for the responses, and that the total number of boys singing the responses was probably as large as often sing them anyway, unless you had at hand those gowned gentlemen who walk around the European cathedrals with knobbed sticks. Very generally, the *Gloria* and *Credo* were left to the choir, or, if the congregation was brought in, it was thought best to do this in a responsorial manner, to the choir's lead. One pointed out that congregation-choir duets are almost necessarily too shoddy. There was no doubt that the

sine qua non of congregational singing is a competent musician. And no one brought out the new chestnut of the choir's chief function being that of leading the congregation, although it was sometimes suggested that choir and congregation sing in Unison, especially at the Sanctus. The Benedictus in most of these descriptions would have been somewhat ornate and left to the choir. One group of correspondents who desired all of the ordinary to go to the congregation observed that at Christmas time the "*Et Incarnatus Est*" might be done in a polyphonic setting; at Easter, the "*Et Resurrexit*;" at Pentecost, the "*Et in Spiritum*," etc. Another gave the entire ordinary to the congregation, and saved the first Sunday of the month and several feast days for the full choir, excepting responses and *Credo*. This, he felt, both kept the people in touch and gave them variety.

In the matter of the suitability of the *Kyriale*, more than one thought that with diligence the congregation could essay all of it. A middle group started at Mass 8 or 10 and suggested everything from there on. Most started at Mass 12 and suggested 15, 16, 17, and 18; a few, only the ferial Mass. No one followed the exact line suggested in the 1958 Instruction. Regarding suitable contemporary ordinaries, some listed a few, and, in this compiler's judgement, a good few; some found nothing, some found everything. (May I refer you to the CAECILIA list of recommended liturgical music, granting that there would be worthy additions since that listing?)

Regarding No. 6 in the outline, everyone agreed that there is still a place for at least parts of polyphonic and post-polyphonic ordinaries, limited usually, as indicated above, as to time and place. One might note that this follows very closely the mind of Pope St. Pius X, as revealed in the *Motu Proprio* of 1903. The question, "ought the ordinary of every *Missa in Cantu* be congregational," logically, received the same answer.

Question No. 8 in this series was not a loose question. You will note in the articles finally adopted, and in their implementations, that the *propria* were the basically musical part of the service, and that, as a matter of fact, the ordinary, which unfairly came to be known, musically, as the "*Missa*," consisted largely of accretions. There was not too much play on this question. Most of us still think of the ordinary as a musical and liturgical unit which it decidedly was not. One did aver that the *Gloria* was a later addition and should be greatly restricted. Several, noting the recent more restricted use of the *Credo*, thought this limited the ordinary enough; and several more thought that restrictions in the ordinary should be confined to repetitions in the *Kyrie* and *Agnus Dei*.

The final query, about the role of the commentator, received a decisive response. The majority thought him a damned nuisance, except once or twice a year, but even then they thought that this sort of thing should take place quietly, in an instructional manner, before Mass begins. Most saw his role as that of an interpreter at a televised or broadcast Mass, which public worship itself is not. It is interesting to note that even those who found him useful, and one, essential, cautioned that he must be prepared and judicious, so as not to interfere with the liturgical action. You must accept, on my word, that some pretty nasty things were said about him. This forces one to conclude that the commentators whom our correspondents have met have been either properly prepared nor judicious. I quote a middle-of-the-roader: "Would you like a simple, unprintable answer or a ten-page diatribe?" He goes on to cite an experience in a metropolitan midwestern city, where, during the dedication of a church (*coram Episcopo*), the choir screamed the Rossini Intros, complete with solemn *recto tono* repeat, the while a dedicated monk read the text over a loud-speaker. The dedicated man, so our correspondent says, "never shut up the whole time I was there." A toss-up, eh, Joe?

2. Regarding music for low Mass.

This is a quite easy matter to dispose of. Most thought that, using the 1958 instruction as a norm, there were fewer suitable hymns (*re* the action of the mass) in the old hymnals than the new. Not a few pointed out, nonetheless, that however suitable, a good many of the new publications were replete with bad grammar, bad hymn-tunes, and terrible translations. Your editor can't add this up. Maybe you can. But that's the way the returns read. Question 2, in this section, and the answers to it, might provide a kind of rapport between the new and old hymnals, for, to a man, all said they would welcome an option of hymns which referred to the liturgical or festal period as quite as appropriate as those which might refer to the specific action. It was also suggested that hymns were an external accretion, and it was hoped that the council would do something about what this writer took to mean an organic *musical* development of the "low" Mass. There was no certain opinion at all on the equivalent of the German "Sing-messe," and so I refer you to the discussion regarding it in *Project 90 (II)*.

3. Possible solutions in the event of vernacular concession.

In the matter of the history of vernacular attempts, there was not much specific comment. Most seemed to think that the use of the vernacular in both Eastern and Protestant rites added up to

a net gain, and it was somewhat surprising to note that practically no one saw anything in the lost column. All of these answers centered upon the advantages of a vernacular text. Those who supported the Eastern Liturgies, declaring that their communions were happy with them, failed to note that: a) a good deal of the music is often inferior to that of the Latin Rite (Confer *Project 90 (I)*), and b) that despite the absence of the vernacular, the Latin Rite, without any prejudice at all to our Eastern brethren, has nonetheless been quite as dynamic.

Again, in the matter of Protestant Service Music, it was generally assumed that the German Chorale in particular was a net gain. The Anglican return to plainsong received genuine, but politely critical approval. There was no mention of recent Lutheran attempts to return to plainsong as ideal music for public worship, or to note that, to date, these attempts have resulted in little more than textual adaptations to modal formularies—a situation that Lutheran liturgical musicians and liturgical scholars are not completely happy about. They know what they have gained and our correspondents know what they have gained. They know what they have lost, and our correspondents don't seem aware. There certainly are singing Protestant congregations, but they *may* be congregations of people who simply like to sing. Protestant churches, despite adherence to the vernacular, have, perhaps because of the pietism which has affected the Catholic community as well, lost, not the sense of participation, but congregations.

About problems inherent to the wedding of text to melody: again there was, in the middle of conflicting opinions, some concurrence. Some pointed to the success of Anglican and Lutheran adaptations, also to their shortcomings. All agreed that plainsong adaptations presented grave problems. Only a couple held them to be impossible. Most thought the metrical chant, the hymns, were most adaptable; one thought them the least. Most thought the syllabic chants easier to adapt than the melismatic, but there were a few who observed the long melismas were over vowels, and it didn't much matter what language the vowels were part of. Generally, the adaptations to polyphonic and post-polyphonic works were thought to be even more difficult except in some of the metrical music that hadn't much value anyway. *But* there was almost unanimous preference for an honest try at such adaptations, by thoroughly competent people, to new formulae. The necessity of experimentation was also pointed out, but no one wanted any fooling with the simple responses. And no one seemed satisfied with the vernacular texts that we have, except one who wanted the St. James.

There was a quite general high opinion of the more elevated use of English by the Episcopalians, and in this connection it should have been said that, in the hymn area, not a few spoke highly of the Episcopal Hymnal of 1940. One group felt that, if one followed the accentualist chant position, the problems were not nearly as great, and also suggested that the Introit, for example, could be set in hymn-tune form, with three verses: one "ordinary," which everybody would sing, a second changeable one for the choir, a third for the doxology which would go to the congregation. Still another felt that, if the exponents of chant mensuralism ever found a common key, the hazards would be greatly reduced. Most thought vernacular adaptations to Gregorian psalmody the simplest of all, citing protracted personal experience of singing parts of the Office thus. There was also an opinion that the Confraternity's translation of the Psalter was far superior to its New Testament. Finally, someone pointed out that he considered the major obstacle to vernacular adaptations to be the fact that English texts to melodies we are used to singing or hearing in Latin simply sound funny to most people, and that they would have to be prepared for things to sound "funny" for an extended period. Another brought up the very real problem of adapting any kind of music written with "foreign" texts in mind.

The suggestions made under the division "C," concerned with the specific musical form of vernacular settings, often became so involved with the last division "D" (*re the lacunae in the outline*) that we shall discuss them together. One or two pointed out that the outline presumed that the Mass would be retained in its present form, but were kind enough to add that this was perhaps the only presumption possible in an outline of this kind. Anyway, the reconstructions suggested reflected generally what one reads in the press, liturgical journals and books, and we had not considered them our specific problem. The soundest, and the folks at the workshop concurred, involved some straightening out and simplifying of the present Offertory rite. Many of the matters touching upon the priest's recitatives, the music of the foremass, etc., have already crept into these notes. Opinions varied and were often at complete odds. Some wanted the Epistle and Gospel simply proclaimed in a kind of elevated speech. Others wanted it sung according to the present Gregorian formularies. There were a couple of sincere, if acid, warnings: "If a Mass in English means that all the stupid mannerisms of the clergy that we accept as normal now will be carried over into the new rite, then the clergy will have to be educated to stand, walk, read and sing properly. Choirs will have to learn to pronounce the words so that they can be understood, for if they are ministers of liturgical stature, they must take their share

of the responsibility of bringing the Word of God to the congregation, enhanced by music. Members of the congregation are going to have to accept their part in things, but they are the least likely to do this spontaneously." Another: "There is certainly the danger that vernacular services will become as stereotyped and uncommunicative as some sections of the Latin Mass. Also, there is the danger that the art-form which would develop might be very poor—even cheap and tawdry, if one considers some of the music that has been written and suggested for liturgical usage."

Many felt that the priest should join in the singing of the *Sanctus*, starting the Canon only after the singing was finished. Quite widespread too was the opinion that the people join in the *Pater Noster*, almost always according to the present melody, as the Anglicans do. This reminds your compiler of one correspondent's earlier suggestion that we settle on either the ferial or solemn tone in both this matter and that of the Preface responses. Finally, there was the expression that the High Mass remain in Latin, the Low Mass entirely in the vernacular. In between, some would have the service of the Word in the vernacular, the rest in Latin. None of our correspondents posed a problem inherent in this kind of thinking. It was brought up during the discussions, and since I do not recall mentioning it in the compiled implementations, perhaps it ought to be brought up here: the good people who answered this questionnaire are all of them vitally interested in the sung liturgy. Does not the matter of relegating all reconstruction, all vernacular, to the Low Mass give an extremely untraditional emphasis to the Low Mass? The problem is basic, although there are those who think that attendance at High Mass—a decent High Mass—would be proportionately about the same.

We arrive then at the final division "D," entitled "General Problems." I shall try simply to give representative answers to the four questions in quotation form.

- 1) Your reaction to the use of the vernacular if permitted:
 - "Leave the Solemn Mass as it is—in Latin with choir."
 - "The congregation can sing vernacular hymns capably at Low Mass."
 - "I should be reluctant to use the vernacular exclusively."
 - "Yes, yes, yes, though I still appreciate the use of some of the simpler Latin, Greek and Hebrew words."
 - "We hope and pray that the vernacular will be permitted."
 - "I would hope that the sung mass would be entirely in Latin."
 - "As a member for years of the Vernacular Society, I anxiously

await the blessed day when the entire liturgy is in the native tongue. I mean all of the mass, none of this half-way business."

"English should be used and will be warmly welcomed."

"Hooray!"

"In general I am not in favor of it."

- 2) Your reaction to the use of the vernacular if prescribed:
All expressed, whatever their opinion regarding question one, that they would follow the dictates of the Holy See, whether the vernacular were prescribed, permitted in particular instances, or not introduced at all. This we found admirable. One European scholar had told us that things had been allowed to go in so many directions in his country, with the bishops winking their eyes, that he really feared that Humpty-Dumpty could not be put together again, no matter what the Council said.
- 3) Universal agreement that, if the decision is to be made on a national level in the United States, the bishops call on a thoroughly competent commission, clerical and lay—competent, that is, both in liturgical and textual, musical and artistic matters.
- 4) Our little trivia escaped some, though one said: "Keep the *Amen* in Hebrew." Only one wanted to try *aymen*, and, in any case, the overwhelming majority favored preserving these pre-Latin texts. One said: "A bit of foolishness on my part—Let's say *Ay-men* and sing *Ah-men*." Another felt that while there was no substitute for *Amen*, there is a translation: "So be it." The same party, a thorough-going vernaculist, said of a proposed national commission:

"No radicals should be allowed in this group. We need advisors with level heads." Passage was capitalized. Finally, someone suggested an official "rite of blessing or ordering, of Cantor for members of the choir, to emphasize their ministry."

As a conclusion to this compilation, I should like to quote the final paragraphs of one of the correspondents. This gentleman identified himself as "favourable" to the use of the vernacular, whether permitted or prescribed: "Besides general theory, not here considered, this schema is sufficiently complete as far as the mass as we have it now is concerned. It would, of course, be merely hypothetical to discuss a mass which has an organization entirely different from that which we have now. . . . I think, then, that the basic problems are these:

1) a mass in which the structure is clear to the participant, and in which the parts for congregational participation are an integral part. (The vernacular psalms are fine to sing at mass, although it would be interesting if some liturgists would realize that this is only a beginning, and that the music so far composed for these psalms is experimental and not perfect. But still these pieces define a general mood; they are actually extraneous to the Celebration.)

2) A solution to the problem of participation. (Parts for the congregation, should the schola or choir continue to exist . . .) Certainly many statements made by our liturgists show not only a lamentable lack of historical knowledge (and feel for tradition), but especially a careless and cavalier attitude towards the music to be used in the "new" liturgy. And unfortunately our musicians go right along with them. Despite their training and past work, they seem quite ready to slit their own throats. And this with very little thought given to the matter."

REVIEW

Books

THE LAYMAN'S MISSAL

Today many new and exciting things are happening in Christendom. Not the least in its far reaching consequence is the liturgical movement in the Roman Catholic Church.

The liturgical movement has long since passed the esoteric mark and could not be called popular. Lay men and women who heretofore have either gazed mutely at the altar or mumbled the rosary, now talk about vernacular masses, chants and hymns, and even the Holy Scriptures!

For all this progress one still has to be mindful that any popular movement can by its own momentum or excess zeal of its avant-garde make changes to be regretted in sober retrospect.

In particular I would mention the danger of "vulgarization", or stating this another way, the loss of beauty and mystery. As an Anglican, an American Episcopalian, interested in liturgy, I have followed the Latin text and English translations of the propers in the St. Andrew Daily Missal by Dom Gaspar Lefebvre. This translation closely follows the style and in many cases the exact form of the Book of Common Prayer which was first set forth, translated from Latin into English, in 1549. The excellence of the arrangement of the printing and the woodcuts, it would seem to me, would make this a standard English rite for English speaking Roman Catholics. However, one visiting a church supply house sees not a few missals, each having a different translation. A few months ago I purchased the Laymen's Missal by Helicon Press, Baltimore, Maryland. This book is most attractively printed and bound. The illustrations and modern cuts in two colors represent the best of modern symbolic art. The explanations which are given for the various seasons and rites appear to be well done. However, to this Episcopalian, used to the 16th Century English prose of the Book of Common Prayer, the modern English translation is shocking. Rather than look for a special illustration I have selected the Collect of last Sunday at the time of this writing for illustrating the violent contrast in the various translations, the 10th Sunday after Pentecost. This Collect found in the Common Prayer Book reads, "O God, who declarest thy almighty power chiefly in showing mercy and pity; Mercifully

grant unto us such a measure of thy grace, that we, running the way of thy commandments, may obtain thy gracious promises, and be made partakers of thy heavenly treasure; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” The St. Andrew’s Missal closely parallels the Prayer Book translation, “O God, who dost manifest thy Almighty power chiefly in showing mercy and pity, increase thy mercy towards us that we seeking the way of thy promises, may be made partakers of thy heavenly treasures.” Now the Helicon Press modern translation reads, “O God, your might is shown most especially in your forgiveness and mercy; increase your forbearance towards us, that we may press on to gain what you have promised and may all share the delights of heaven.” One can see in this simple comparison that in the modern translation we have no grand style, no prose which lifts the heart and mind upward to God, no subtle inter-play of vowel-sounds. In brief, no beauty.

It would seem entirely proper that the language of prayer should not be the language of the street but rather a slightly archaic language, if I can use the term. The translation should have rhythm as well as interesting vowel-sounds. The sentence in the King James Bible, also found in the Prayer Book, “Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee,” illustrates this very happily. There are four long *i*-sounds in succession which produce a unique effect and in the second half of this translation there is an equally characteristic broad *o*-sound. The first half of the sentence ends with the decisive “come”, and the second with the tripping melody of five short vowels culminating in the long “thee”. The St. Andrew’s Missal preserves the authorized King James style. This is to be found in the Epistle for the Epiphany, Isaiah 60, “Arise, be enlightened for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.” However, for this final comparison we look to our modern Laymen’s Missal, and we read something that shatters one’s sense of proportion, “Rise up, shine forth; thy dawn has come, breaks the glory of the Lord upon thee!”. In conclusion, what do I propose? The answer is 16th-17th Century English, a great inheritance which we all may share. This literary English will continue to be uniform, standards have been laid down long ago. The English Book of Common Prayer has exactly that value of hieratic language, comparable to Latin, with the gain that it does not sacrifice understanding.

The Reverend James Brice Clark

JESUS, A DIALOGUE WITH THE SAVIOUR

Desclee Co., Inc.—\$3.50

(By a monk of the Eastern Church, translated by a monk of the Western Church.)

Many Desclee publications have been treated unkindly at the hands of this journal. But these concerned, quite properly, musical matters. One suspects that they are a thing of the past. A publisher friend writes that, in view of the liturgical changes afoot, he looks in the paper each day to see whether Joe Desclee has jumped off the Eiffel Tower. He needn't. But it should be said that never again must Desclee or Pustet or anyone else so control the church's own publications. In any case, I am happy to report that rarely have I been able to review anything with such whole-hearted enthusiasm. It seems to me that this book poses a very basic question to the whole matter of reform which Vatican Council II is popularly expected—presto—to accomplish. Reform will come, not the day after the Council issues its dicta, but when you and I, in the pattern of so basic an individual-social concept as that of St. Francis of Assisi, or St. Catherine of Siena, *reform*. It will come only when we give something more than lip-service to the perennial urging of so great a Christian as Dorothy Day.

For the rest, I quote from the foreword by Father Louis Bouyer of the Oratory: "Among the books which are published every day, we consider as priceless those which renew for us our acquaintance with Jesus. Such books are rare. Not because a great deal is not written about Him. But because even the most scholarly research of the historian, the most profound speculations of the theologian, to say nothing of art and literature, often prove incapable of revealing Him to us. . . . A book which does not confine itself to speaking *about* Jesus, which does not make us dizzy from a lot of tittle-tattle serving only to distract us from speaking to Him ourselves and all the more from hearing Him, is a very rare thing indeed. Yet it seems that such a book has just appeared. . . . Cast aside all your ponderous, wordy books and read this one."

Francis Schmitt

Organ Music

CANTANTIBUS ORGANIS

(Six Volumes)

Publisher: Friederich Pustet, Regensburg

These volumes are a veritable treasury of organ music for the church musician who is a devotee of Pre-Bach and the classical period of organ literature. Based for the greater part on Gregorian themes from the different parts of the Ordinary of the Mass and the hymns for Vespers and Lauds, they also include extended modal compositions suitable for preludes and postludes in the Cathedrals and large churches of Europe.

The list of composers reads like an index in a history of music of the western world. Although some of the selections appear quite simple, a well trained organist and an adequate organ of classical design is essential for the effective use of these compositions.

One disappointing feature of the publication is that all of the biographical and historical notes are in German. This reviewer wished for a better reading knowledge of that language—or a good translation!

Winifred T. Flanagan

ORGAN MUSIC

Old wine in new bottles and vintages fresh off the press. Without belaboring metaphors, that well might summarize a report of findings in a parcel of newly published organ music. It came from the houses of J. Fischer & Bro. and Concordia.

From the latter "Six Little Fugues" attributed to Handel. The word, attributed, is used advisedly for none is certain of their authorship. Of a certainty, for any of extensive acquaintances with Handelian style and mannerisms they strongly smack of Handel. Be that as it may, we would hazard a guess that they might have been that master doing his morning contrapuntal setting-up exercises, and not for posterity.

At any rate, written for but one keyboard, without pedals, they are a jolly, charming set. Though not self-playing, they should be alluring to both counterpoint students and organists, young and old. Assuredly they are far above the category of mere museum pieces. (\$1.50)

Also from Concordia: "Prelude, Offertory and Postlude" on the lovely "Schmucke dich, o liebe Seele" by Myron D. Casner. After the manner of Bach they add up to grateful, graceful, smoothly written music to make a welcome supplement to any organist's service repertoire. (\$1.00)

From Fischer & Bro.: "English Keyboard Music of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries" especially for organ, collected and edited by William Tubbs. Too few of us, probably, are aware of the fact that English composers such as Dr. Maurice Green, Samuel Long, Charles Wesley and Thomas Adams were writing music of a degree of grace, fluency and skill to worthily make it comparable to that of such contemporaries and forerunners farther south, as Scarlatti and Couperin. Recommended for those of musical palates for those days of yore. (\$2.50)

"French Masterworks for Organ" collected and edited by Alexander Schreiner. Music by Vierne, Widor, Mulet, Gigout and Dupont. If you are not sufficiently aged to already have acquired more or less complete works of these masters of that particular era this will give you an excellent start in its sampling of better known music from that distinguished company. (\$3.00)

"Twelve Versets on the Pange Lingua" by Joseph J. McGrath. Novel treatment in that each of the six rhetorical phrases of the text and the chant are given two little one-page, beautifully written meditations. Hammond organ registration also shown. (\$1.50)

"Twelve Organ Interludes on Gregorian Themes" by Sister M. Gilana, O.S.F.. Written for pipe or reed organ with optional pedal in the best of musical taste. They are of such technical simplicity as to prove something of a God-send for those not holding advanced musical degrees from which to climb down. Hammond registration too. (\$2.25).

"Bach, Sinfonia in F, from Cantata 156" arranged by Alexander Schreiner. The out-of-this-world beauty of this melody is so well known as to obviate gilding. (\$1.00)

The next six: "The Heavens Declare" by Robert Wetzler, "Seascape" by Darwin Wolford, "The Peaceful Wood" by Hilton Tufty, "Marche Pontifical" by Camil Van Hulse, "Toccata and Hymn" by William McHarris, and "Seven Tone Poems" by Gordan Young. All are self-descriptive, nicely done if on the innocuous side. Hammond registration also. (\$0.75)

"Sortie, (O Filii et Filiae)" by Louis L. Balogh. An extended and varied treatment of this grand old hymn calling for bravura technic. Much of it is "eye music" to alarm the ear in hearing, though the old tune momentarily becomes recognizable. After playing and hearing may you turn back to Guilman's, Dubois' and Lynwood Farnam's treatment of that noble tune for solace. (\$1.50)

"Claire de Lune" by Debussy, arranged for organ and piano by William Reddick. Oh, no! (1.50)

"May Day Carol", English Folk Song transcribed and harmonized by Deems Taylor and adapted for organ by William Reddick. A gem of the first water for organists in non-liturgical churches and recitalists. (\$1.00)

Martin W. Bush

Records

A NEW RECORDING BY THE BOYS TOWN CHOIR

In listening to the new record just released by the Boys Town Choir, one cannot help recalling the three fundamentals which make music truly inspiring: beautiful music, beautiful tone quality, and a beautiful performance, for in this new release we have them all. The music ranges from fine examples of 16th century polyphony sung with painstaking attention to the "three independencies" of this school, to contemporary numbers by Max Jobst and Herman Strate-gier, and includes Songs for Twelfth Night and three short compositions by Morley, Pelouquin, and Jaeggi.

The tone quality of this choir is like that of no other choir singing today. The boy sopranos have a timbre all their own: it is light, pure, beautifully blended, free from the English hoot and the French edge, flexible, soft and pure yet entirely adequate in volume. The counter-tenors would delight Father Finn (and do delight

Ripley Dorr) with their warmth and richness and perfect blending quality. But the biggest surprise is in the "men's" section. It is hard to realize that these fine tenors and basses are actually high school boys, adolescents, so mature is their tone, and so vibrant and sonorous their quality.

In his interpretation of the program Msgr. Schmitt reveals his vast understanding of the whole range of choral literature. In the polyphony we hear the fascinating interplay of independent voices. In the bright numbers there are unanimity, crispness of attack, and vitality of rhythm, and in every kind of music, a sympathetic appreciation of the intent of the composer.

Altogether, this new record is a "must" for every lover of fine choral music. And, I might add, stereo offers no advantages over the monophonic recording.

William Ripley Dorr

DEMONSTRATION ENGLISH MASS

Dennis Fitzpatrick

\$4.98

In an early policy statement on reviews, *Caecilia* averred that it would be more interested in praising the good than panning the bad. This record is under review, therefore, only because there has been a not inconsiderable propaganda backing its distribution. Its own Madison Avenue broadside assures us that it is in the hands of every American bishop. This reviewer has not been able to listen to the entire record at one sitting; but he heard a live demonstration of the whole kit and kaboodle at a clinic last June. He does not quarrel as much with the structural experiments of public worship as he does with almost everything of a textual and musical nature. The composer eschews the Gregorian settings of the simple responses in favor of what is erroneously billed as "American Chant." It is, of course, neither American nor chant. This writer is shackled with not a few lacunae in his musical education, but he is by this time not so dull as not to recognize bad tonal relationships when he hears them. The responsorial elements of Mr. Fitzpatrick's effort are ludicrous, no matter how well meant, no matter the avowed years of preparation.

The most successful portion of the demonstration musically, is the adaptation of the Canon of the Mass to the formula of the *Exultet*. The figured Communion motet, based on the *O Filii*, is unimportant. To repeat, one cannot reasonably object to liturgical experimentation at this point, though he should prefer that it be done on a somewhat more modest scale. Surely Mr. Fitzpatrick must be greatly embarrassed by the blurb on the record-jacket which declares him to be the greatest gift to the Christian world since St. Ambrose.

Nonetheless, critics of the record would do well to note carefully that it does portray a *High Mass*, though not of great or even good musical content.*

Trouble is, one of the syndicated columnists for the Catholic press, Donald McDonald, who begins by acknowledging his ignorance of matters liturgical and musical, has urged every Catholic son and daughter in the country to buy the record. When Father Schuler challenged his competence in the *Bulletin* of St. Paul, the record received a second national recommendation from the aforesaid columnist. I remember Mr. McDonald as a respected liberal editor of the *Davenport Messenger*. How his liberalism fares as an instructor of journalism at Marquette University would be a little difficult to guess. But, in this instance, like a good many Catholic liberals these days, he turns purple when anyone dares to disagree with him in a field entirely beyond his own competence. I do not mind saying here that the whole foolish matter of liberal versus conservative, as reported by the press in Council matters, galls this editor beyond expression. A "conservative" columnist has gone so far as to say that, at the council, the two tabs must be reversed. That is, that the political conservative is an ecclesiastical liberal because he desires a hide-bound adherence to the most ancient tradition; and that the political liberal is an ecclesiastical conservative because he holds that the ancient tradition was not necessarily the best. How silly can you get? I should not mind if the current liturgical "liberals" appealed to their own imaginations, rather than the tenuous and very often inaccurately stated matter of ancient tradition.

Further, I have excellent reason to state that I know of no more monolithic, and therefore basically illeberal, press than the

* On the structural side, I would only mention the boy-scout hand-shake which replaces the *Pax*, and which the promoters wish to be fairly noisy. It is no reflection on the reverential, if let's-play-house, attitude of the ministers and participants of the dry-run I observed to state that the lady with whom I shook hands accused me of trying to steal her bracelet.

Catholic press at this moment. William Randolph Hearst would stand aghast, and Chesterton and Heywood Broun would laugh aloud. Some months ago, Evelyn Waugh made bold to register some disagreement with the party line, and he had to go to Mr. Buckley's *National Review* for publication. Waugh's stated case was no paragon of strength, but it was enough to cause almost everyone, from the *Commonweal* boys on down, to mount to the great crusade. Do not for a moment misunderstand me. I bow in my liberalism to no one, even though it was acquired at that "quaint" product of the Council of Trent, the seminary. (I am quite sure that I am the only American priest ever to have been elected president of a *bona fide* union local.) I can scarcely have needed that fresh air which is engendering the ecumenical spirit; I got it years ago, when I was appointed curate to Father Flanagan at Boys Town. In what other "Catholic" institution will you find a Protestant chapel and a salaried Protestant chaplain? I am not against the "reforms" contained in the Council's Schema on the Church. There is not much in it that we were not taught by Father John Gruden a quarter of a century ago. I am not against liturgical reform or the introduction of the vernacular into public worship. What educator could be? But I must decry to such small audience as I have the mouthings of charlatans who pass as Evangelists.

And so when Donald McDonald pronounces upon the value of this particular record—with as much pomposity as ever emanated from the Curia and with no authority at all—when he assures the readers of the Catholic Press that this is the thing to expect, I must say that I don't really expect it. Not any more than I expect Barry Goldwater. There simply must be a larger treasury of Christian common sense. And, if it should be lost for a while, it will emerge again when the shallows of misguided enthusiasms have abated. One need have no fear that the human heart and that mind which, as the psalmist says, is signed with the light of God's own countenance, will not in the end turn, as flowers do to the sun, to the highest beauty it can reach.

Francis Schmitt

NEWS LITTER

OF NOTE: The following circular letter of an American Abbot has found its way to our desk:

Dear Oblates and Friends,

In our times there is much talk about "participation" by the laity. And I hasten to proclaim that I am all for it. *Of course* the laity must take part in the liturgy and life of the Church; that's what it's really all about; that's what the Mystical Body of Christ is. All that great doctrine of St. Paul was not given in conferences to the clergy but in pastoral letters to the faithful. And furthermore, we all (well, nearly all) recognize now that the deep reality of our sharing in the life of Christ in his Church does depend, in part, on some degree of active participation in the Church's life and worship. Psychologically, pedagogically, morally, we proceed much more effectively if we have something to do, some active role to fulfill. We are creatures; but God himself has made us creative creatures; we are made to be not passive but active. Grace is a wholly free gift of God to us; yet he gives it to us ordinarily through great sacramental signs, through things for us to do. "Take ye and eat . . . Do this in remembrance of me."

Having said all that to show that I am on the right side, I would like to offer one or two slightly different considerations. For it is clear that the movement towards more and more active participation is going to go forward; it has plenty of strength behind it now and is gathering more all the time. So I feel that while it is rolling forward, it may be useful to recall one or two points that might possibly be overlooked.

Sometimes people speak of participation as though it were identical with vocal or physical activity. The more we sing or say, the more truly and fruitfully we share in the mass. But this is not necessarily so at all, is it? In fact, when St. Paul was using the figure of the body of Christ to express the unity of the church, he was also explaining its diversity. We are essentially and spiritually one in Christ; but we make up many diverse members, each with his own place and work. "If the whole were one single organ, what would become of the body?" . . . The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of you, or the head to the feet, I have no need of you . . . God has given us different positions in the church . . . Are all of us apostles, all prophets, all teachers?" (cf. 1 Cor. 12).

Therefore, as regards the actual physical participation in the Church's work and worship, there will always rightly be diversity. The one final and essential participation in the life of Christ which the whole Church shares in common is at the deep interior spiritual level. It is our sharing in Christ's interior oblation, our sharing in his divine life of grace by supernatural faith, hope and charity; this is the one supreme bond. That is what St. Paul is referring to in the next chapter of the same epistle to the Corinthians, when he says so strikingly that even though I have every gift and good work, "if I lack charity I count for nothing". (cf. 1 Cor. 13)

Now, it is true that one of the most effective means to attain and exercise this interior sharing of divine life is precisely the liturgical and sacramental life of the church rightly understood and "participated" in. And it does seem that for far too long now, many Christians have not had a sufficiently active and intelligent participation in liturgical life. This is not to say that these generations have been cut off from their share of supernatural life; their interior holiness has been nourished in other ways; by devotional piety, holy reading and meditation, self-discipline and virtuous life. Certainly their moral behavior stands comparison with that of our own generation. But still it does appear that too many people have been deprived of a vital means of sanctification and Christian life that they were meant to have. Nothing can finally take the place of the operation of the word of God and the action of the Holy Spirit in the full activity of the sacramental liturgical life of the Church.

So now we are stressing "active participation." Excellent! But this is still a means, not an end. The end is always spiritual, interior: union with God's holy will for his glory and our sanctification. That is the whole purpose of the liturgy. And the great spiritual machinery of the liturgy is still, in one sense machinery, and therefore subject to the limitations of all "mechanical" processes. It will be wonderful if we can re-activate some of the neglected parts without damaging some of the already working ones.

For, even within the liturgy itself, there are many elements to its rich instrumentality. For example, the presently desired active participation by the whole congregation will probably necessitate a good deal of simplifying, abbreviating, eliminating. Shall we have to give up the beautiful melodies of the ancient chant? Will those wonderful wings of prayer be "participated" out of existence? How much room will there be for beauty and art in worship? And can there be any participation by listening, still? And what of all the deep element of mystery, of awe, in religion? Man cannot really meet his God in an ordinary plain business deal. The divine must often transcend our concepts and our words; and then we can only adore in faith, in awe, in silence. Indeed, it may well be that that is our deepest and purest prayer.

I am not proposing that our liturgical assemblies take on the taciturnity of a Quaker meeting. But there is a time to speak and a time to be silent. Our communication, especially our communication with God in worship, is concerned not only with plain facts but also with the symbolic, the mystical, the ineffable. The poet Wordsworth, in reaction from the formal, artificial verse of the eighteenth century, felt that poetry should be written in the language of everyday life. He wrote some of the most unforgettably beautiful, and also some of the silliest, lines in English literature. Perhaps the language of liturgical worship must face a similar risk.

Since the incarnation of the eternal Word in our humanity, the whole character of religion has been a sacramental one; that is, the fulfillment of supernatural ends through human and material instrumentality. Somehow the Godhead has to stoop to meet us in our world; and somehow our nature has to rise to the divine. It is a wonderful, perilous, paradoxical meeting, this sacramental encounter. For it must be a combination of everyday human and material realities, in speech and act, with eternal realities in infinite mystery and transcendence. Therefore it can never be finally packaged in any created instrumentality. Even in heaven itself, when we shall be enlightened by the beatific vision, and strengthened by the light of glory, we shall never be able to "fulfill" our vocation: the divine beauty, the divine goodness, the divine love, will always gloriously surpass our soul's embrace. And on earth all our efforts, even the wonderful liturgical efforts of the Church herself, will always fall far short; will always be having to fall back in order to try to rise again towards God by other means: song and silence, action and mystery, everyday familiar things and gleams of the heavenly vision.

That is why there is always a certain rightness and comfort in that instinct for some degree of objectivity, even impersonality, in the manifestation of our Catholic faith. Its heart lies too deep to be too closely dependent on outward display or subjective feeling. Man has always felt the need to clothe his religious practice in a degree of mystery, of ritual and symbol, precisely because he feels it surpasses all expression.

For the real point, the real joy, will always be that beneath all our human signs, our words, our sacramental strivings, lies divine reality, lies supernatural life, the promise, the victory. It is not our singing nor our silence, not our fervor nor our liturgical knowledge, not our strength nor our neuroses, not the cultivated voices and manners of our clergy (or otherwise), not the social image of our church; it is none of these, finally, although it may be found in all of them. But "Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created; and thou shalt renew the face of the earth." It is the triumphant creative Holy Spirit of Christ at work in his church, that is, in the souls of his faithful. That is what we hold by the precious gift of our faith. May we never loosen our fervent humble grasp on it.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS
OF
IMPRESSIVE QUALITY

T. MARIER—*Cantus Populi*

Useful hymnal for choirs and congregations, SATB. (Unison Edition on press.)

FLOR PEETERS—*Magnificat*

SATB. (Introduced by Roger Wagner Chorale.)

C. ALEXANDER PELOQUIN—*Missa Domini*

Nationally broadcast Easter Sunday. For Congregation, Men's Voices and Orchestra.

H. SCHROEDER—*Missa Melismatica*

SATB. A cappella.

H. STRATEGIER—*30 Inventions*

For Organ. Destined for popularity as useful, interesting and distinctive music.

P. LADD—*Christian Life in Song*

An unusually fine repertory. For schools.

McLAUGHLIN & REILLY

252 Huntington Avenue

BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS

NEW HYMNS

PSALMS

SACRED ANTHEMS

RENAISSANCE MOTETS

BAROQUE MUSIC

MASSES

ORGAN MUSIC

PIANO MUSIC

SECULAR CHORUSES

CHAMBER INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

FOLK MUSIC

BOOKS

RECORDINGS

World
Library of Sacred Music

1846 Westwood Ave.

Cincinnati 14, Ohio, U.S.A.

Aims of the Society of Saint Caecilia

1. To devote itself to the understanding and further propagation of the *Motu Proprio* "Inter Pastorales Officii Sollicitudines" of St. Pius X, Nov. 22, 1903; the constitution "Divini Cultum Sanctitatem" of Pius XI, Dec. 20, 1938; the encyclical "Mediator Dei" of Pius XII, Nov. 20, 1947; the encyclical "Musicae Sacrae Disciplina" of Pius XII, Dec. 25, 1955.
2. To seek the cultivation of Gregorian Chant, of Polyphony, of modern and especially contemporary music, of good vernacular hymns, of artistic organ playing, of church music research.
3. To foster all efforts toward the improvement of church musicians: choirmasters and choirs, organists, composers and publishers of liturgical music, and through all of these a sound musical approach to congregational participation.
4. To publish its journal, "Caecilia", and to establish a non-commercial repertory service.
5. To gain without fees, the following memberships:
 - a) Individual members (persons active in liturgical music)
 - b) Group members (an entire choir)
 - c) Sustaining members (subscribers to Caecilia)

For further information write:

CAECILIA, 3558 Cass St., Omaha 31, Nebr.

“Thus with the favor and under the auspices of the Church the study of sacred music has gone a long way over the course of the centuries. In this journey, although sometimes slowly and laboriously, it has gradually progressed from the simple and ingenious Gregorian modes to great and magnificent works of art. To these works not only the human voice, but also the organ and other musical instruments, add dignity, majesty and a prodigious richness.

The progress of this musical art clearly shows how sincerely the Church has desired to render divine worship ever more splendid and more pleasing to the Christian people. It likewise shows why the Church must insist that this art remain within its proper limits and must prevent anything profane and foreign to divine worship from entering into sacred music along with genuine progress, and perverting it.”

Pius XII—Mus. Sac. Disc.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Enclosed is \$3.00 for a year's subscription to *Caecilia*.

Send to:

Name

Address

City and State