"NO RIGID UNIFORMITY?"

MUSIC IN THE AMERICAN ROMAN CATHOLIC LITURGY

SINCE THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

A dissertation submitted to the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies

at Drew University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of the degree,

Doctor of Letters

Francis Xavier Klose

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

May, 2014

ABSTRACT

No Rigid Uniformity? Music in the American Roman Catholic Liturgy Since the Second Vatican Council.

Doctor of Letters Dissertation by

Francis Xavier Klose

The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies
Drew University May 2014

This dissertation takes a look at music in the Roman Catholic liturgy in the approximately 50 years since the Second Vatican Council. Beginning with *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, I look at documents of the Catholic Church that address the role of music in the liturgy and the literature that demonstrates how the different guidelines published from local terrestrial church authorities. I explain how the initial goals of the Second Vatican Council have, in the United States, transformed from an emphasis on inculturation and inclusivity of varied cultures to an emphasis on a uniform expression of Catholicism.

In the approximately 50 years since the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church in the United States saw popular music styles of American culture and music from Spanish-speaking countries and African-American culture help many Catholics fully participate in their faith. This dissertation shows how some common practices employed in music of the liturgy in the wake of the Second Vatican Council has been replaced with new rules with more restrictions. Data has been compiled from official church documents both in the Vatican and from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, along with articles publications designed to aid music ministers in employing

church teaching, scholarly analysis of development in church practice, and hymnals used by the faithful of the church.

This dissertation asserts that the mandates of the Second Vatican Council have been ignored or treated as irrelevant in the short period since. The Catholic Church in the United States represent many different cultures and an American culture alike. A Church that asserts just one perspective that is of one particular time and place will not serve the needs of the Church. As the Second Vatican Council asserts, "no rigid uniformity" is needed for the full participation of all.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Bill Rogers and Father Frank Berna for mentoring me throughout this process. Much of my graduate education was done with both of them and I could have not completed this without them. I am grateful for their instruction, the informal conversations that helped form this, and the academic instruction that led to this dissertation.

I am most grateful to my parents Frank and Debbie Klose who have helped made this possible in many ways. This had its origin in my formative years as they read to me, helped me learn lessons academic and otherwise. They have both supported me financially and otherwise to help me continue my education from grade school to high school to college and beyond.

I could not have done this without the plethora of pastoral musicians and pastors I have worked with over the years, especially my pastors I worked extensively with on liturgies: Father Raymond Himsworth, Father Tom Heron, Father Chris Redcay, and Father Paul Kennedy, as well as the various parish residents, administrators, and parochial vicars, as well as all who have helped me along the way Saint James Parish, Our Lady of Ransom Parish, and Saint Katherine of Siena parish. Further, I must thank my sister and right-hand cantor Kristi Erbele, who was right alongside me at three parishes learning the liturgy and serving as a music minister. I must not forget my "Uncle George", Bishop George Murry, S.J., whose insight as a mentor and even in casual conversation over the years have helped me come to understand the liturgy and ministry as a whole.

I am grateful for personal contributions from several in the field of liturgical music that I greatly admire: Fr. Mike Joncas, Fr. Ricky Manalo, Dr. Dennis Doyle, and Kathleen Basi. Each of these published theologians and liturgical composers took the time to response to my personal emails, often sending me some of their materials to help me along my way. Further, I am grateful for all liturgical composers everywhere who have inspired me along the way.

I also would like to thank those at my academic institutions who have given me opportunities to learn, teach and grow. I am grateful to Holy Ghost Prep, where while observing the academic excellence of my colleagues I began to wish to pursue a doctoral degree. I am grateful to all at La Salle University and Cabrini College, where I have earned an academic degree, worked as a music minister, and taught. I am also grateful Holy Family University, where I serve as adjunct faculty. I am particularly grateful to my department chairpersons and administrators who continue to give me opportunities.

I am grateful to the tremendous administrative staff at Drew University, especially Joanne Montross and Linda Blank, who have helped me keep my head on straight during this process. I am also most grateful for Katie Hummel, whose incredibly talented eye for writing has helped polish this dissertation into its current form. I could not have done this without any of you.

Most especially, I am grateful to Drew University's Arts and Letters program, where I was able to study my passions across the disciplines. To my instructors, Dr. Bill Rogers, Dr. James Pain, Dr. David Greybeal, Dr. Glen Olsen, and Dr. Carol Wipf, who have taken me through this journey. I hope I can help others in the same way.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

At the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church affirmed in *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* a new vision of "full, conscious and active participation" (7) in liturgical celebrations of the Church. In order to help fulfill this new vision of the Church, the document further states, "the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, and songs." Furthermore, the Council resolved that "the Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity; rather does respect and foster the qualities and talents of the various races and nations" (13).

Since the Council, the American Catholic Church has experienced an internal struggle as a rigid uniformity has formed under the direction of American Catholic leadership. The "American" music that was first embraced by the Church in the United States has become more and more directed toward conformity with past styles and language. With many ethnically and racially diverse communities, the worship life of individual communities within the greater American community look for music that represents their cultures. I propose that since the Second Vatican Council created and implemented these reforms, the direction of the American Catholic Church in regards to music in the liturgy has steadily moved closer to an expectation of rigid uniformity.

In the American Catholic Church today, the church has recently witnessed a new translation of the Roman Missal, which has sparked debate among advocates and opponents of the translation. The implementation of the missal occurred in November, 2011, and has had a drastic effect on music in the liturgy, as many of the commonly sung

responses and prayers at Mass now have new texts, and therefore require new or revised music. The implementation of the new texts calls for strict expectations for composers, leaving no room for creativity with the language.

History of Research

Most writing about liturgical music has been limited to current messages about how to implement the latest instructions from the Church, beginning with commentary on *Music in Catholic Worship* in 1962 and continuing through *Sing to the Lord* of 2007. One work that charts the progression from one era to the next is *The History of American Catholic Hymnals Since Vatican II* by Donald Boccardi, which chronicles the different types of music that appear in church hymnals since the Second Vatican Council. The piece runs through the General Instruction of the Roman Missal of 2005, but does not necessarily tie together trends related to edicts from the church in regards to liturgical music. A new look at the status of liturgical music in the Church is a great opportunity, as the implementation of the Third Edition of the Roman Missal has not only transformed the language of commonly said and sung prayers, but caused many to create new rules and new approaches to the liturgy.

Methodology/Research Design

To show the continued development of rigid uniformity, I will chronicle the development of Church documents about liturgical music and liturgical music itself from the Second Vatican Council through current writings on the recent translation of the Roman Missal. These include articles for Catholic publications published between the

Second Vatican Council and the present, including articles from Catholic magazines, newspapers and journals; Catholic hymnals published between the Second Vatican Council and today; and official Church documents or decrees, specifically in the United States. Special consideration will be given to both African American and Latin American Catholics who themselves have struggled to find their place in the Church that was supposed to be open to those in "all the nations" and without "rigid uniformity".

Significance

With the recent implementation of the third edition of the Roman Missal, Catholic worship has radically changed, as most familiar responses and acclamations are now re-worded in both said and sung prayer. As composers and liturgical music ministers scurry to find new music for sung responses, many familiar and beloved pieces of music are being thrown out or revised drastically. Along with individual pieces of music, publishers of liturgical music are responding with new hymnals and revised music that attempt to capture the spirit of the original pieces. As Catholic Churches continue to adjust to the translations of the Roman Missal, new challenges have presented themselves to American Catholics.

I believe that this work will represent an original, relevant and timely contribution to the field. This work will show that despite the success in the American Catholic Church in the years after the Second Vatican Council, a dramatic shift has put the Church into a trajectory away from the Council's advances. Often, these changes are made in the name of the Second Vatican Council but fail to capture the spirit of "full, active, and conscious participation".

Proposed Layout

The second chapter of this dissertation will focus on initial reactions to the new-found freedom afforded to liturgical musicians after the Second Vatican Council beginning in 1963. "The only limits placed on a church musician are those that are self-imposed," wrote James M. Burns in 1976. The first document to address liturgical music was *Musicam Sacram* in 1967, followed by *Music in Catholic Worship* in 1972. These documents established guidelines for the liturgical musician. At first in these documents, the priorities seemed to address the practical needs and interests of the worshipping body. Neither document was overly restrictive, but both promoted the good of the worshipping body.

The three functions of liturgical music are outlined in *Music in Catholic Worship* as musical, liturgical, and pastoral. In this model of approach to the liturgy, "Only artistically sound music will be effective in the long run." Therefore, early Church music recognized musical quality as having priority in liturgical celebrations. Not only were early post-Vatican II hymns easy to sing, but they were also aesthetically pleasing. While there was indeed some minimal structure forming in the immediate post-Second Vatican Council period, flexibility did exist for the liturgical ministers and much success occurred throughout the first 35 years after the Council.

The third chapter will focus on how music in ethnic churches began to thrive in the post-Second Vatican Council liturgical life in the United States. While the decree from the Vatican talks about there being "no rigid uniformity" imposed on "the nations," what consideration is given to the United States, which is so racially and culturally diverse? White, mainstream, Catholic America is very different from the urban, ethnic

experiences of African and Latin Americans in particular. Must there then be a model that is supposed to fit all Catholic Americans as one cohesive unit?

The Church responded with both the "Subcommittee on Black Liturgy" and the Bishops' document, *National Plan for Hispanic Ministry*. The African American community finally received its own hymnal in the 1987 publication *Lead Me, Guide Me* by GIA Publications. The Latino community is receiving continued resources in publications such as *Flor y Canto* in 1993 and a greater percentage of hymns have been published in Spanish in hymnals such as *Breaking Bread* and *Music Issue* from Oregon Catholic Press. However, the music traditionally associated with both communities has continued to struggle to find its place as respective populations shift and rules have increased over time.

The fourth chapter of the dissertation will focus on a movement towards a Neo-Caecilianism, or what M. Francis Mannion calls a "restoration agenda," in which there is a movement to bring back a style of music that preceded the Second Vatican Council. Pope Pius X once declared Gregorian chant "the supreme model for sacred music" and many wish to restore it as the sole formula for liturgical music. Along with this is the push towards Renaissance polyphony and a strong preference for the pipe organ as the supreme and only instrument in the Church.

Also of note in this chapter will be the decrying of music from prominent and popular composers in the post-Second Vatican Council era and a rejection of instruments other than the organ in the liturgy. The chapter will also examine a movement towards singing exclusively in Latin in the liturgy, as used in liturgical celebrations throughout the country, including some calling for all Catholics to learn certain sung responses in

Latin. In this movement, the individual gifts and talents of American Catholicism are either ignored or seen as irrelevant and insignificant compared to past styles and approaches.

The fifth chapter looks at the American Catholic response to the Catholic Church's revision of the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* of 2002. The publication of the revised *GIRM* created movements that have placed even tighter restrictions on American Catholic liturgical music. This revision places strong restrictions on Catholic liturgical music in the United States, leaving little room for creativity of the individual music minister or composer and includes an addendum from the United States Catholic Bishops for additional rules for the American Catholic Church.

The sixth chapter relates to movements in the years after the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* in which the Bishops of the American Catholic Church looked to create a system and structure for liturgical music in the United States. *Sing to the Lord* is very direct in establishing clear guidelines for music and music directors to follow strict liturgical rules first and foremost, creating a culture in which music should fill a liturgical requirement rather than meeting aesthetic qualities or even fulfilling the goal of the Second Vatican Council for "full and conscious participation". *Sing to the Lord* reestablishes the priorities in choosing liturgical music previously set forth in *Music in Catholic Worship*. Musical judgment, once given the highest priority, shifts to the third priority, as liturgical judgment is placed first and pastoral judgment second. The result has become a legalistic approach that has the potential to ignore the wants and needs of the worshipping faithful.

The seventh chapter will look at the newly-implemented third edition of the Roman Missal and what it implies for liturgical music in the American Catholic Church, both musically and in overall approach to the liturgy. The third edition, a radical re-translation of the texts and prayers said and sung in the Roman Catholic liturgy, looks to take the original Latin missal word by word, and line by line to match the text to the original Latin text, regardless of context or how Americans speak the English language.

The effect is that many sung responses familiar to American Catholics must be changed or omitted altogether. Further, there is the expectation of rigid adherence to the texts, which must match up word for word, with no additions and no subtractions. For example, one of the most-sung "Lamb of God" prayers begins, "Jesus, Lamb of God...". The word "Jesus" is not part of the text, and therefore the sung acclamation is no longer permitted to be sung in its current state. Further, gender-neutral language is rejected if it did not appear in the original Latin language. At times, the strict focus on keeping the prayers line by line equal to previous Latin editions has created an English that barely resembles American English, creating incredible challenges for the American Catholic musician and the worshipping faithful.

The final chapter and conclusion will tie the five chapters together and show how progressively the Church has tightened the rules since the Second Vatican Council. While claiming that the “full, active, and conscious participation” is still the goal, the stringent approach to music publications and rules, over the content of hymns and songs continues to grow. The end result is a questionable future for the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

Chapter 2

THE END OF "RIGID UNIFORMITY": THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL AND AMERICAN RESPONSE TO *THE CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY*

The Second Vatican Council was a major turning point in liturgical music in the American Roman Catholic Church. At the Council, the document *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* declared:

> Even in the liturgy, the Church has no wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters that do not affect the faith or good of the whole community; rather, the Church respects and fosters the genius and talents of various races and peoples (13).

The result was a pastoral approach which intended to minister to the local church community rather than a set of fixed rules. Theologian and liturgical musician Lucien Deiss, C.S.Sp. writes: "In the past the rubrics scarcely concerned themselves with the community itself; all the attention went into seeing that the chant conformed not to the spirit of a people but to the letter of rubrical laws" (9). Thus, the initial period after the Second Vatican Council was spent trying to best appropriate the new freedoms afforded to the liturgical musician.

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (CSL)* was promulgated by Pope Paul VI at the second session of the Second Vatican Council on December 4, 1963. Much like a country's constitution, this document serves as the charter for Roman Catholic liturgy around the world. Since the Council, this document has not been changed, with the exception of occasional clarifications which act as further expressions of this document. The period ranging from the promulgation of this document through the late 1990s was

one that promoted freedom to capture the spirit of the document and official documents of the Church in Rome. These goals reflect the fundamental dynamic of the Second Vatican Council to return to the sources and adapt to the current circumstances. *Musicam Sacram: Instruction on Music in the Liturgy* was the first follow-up in 1967. A second response in the United States was entitled *Music in Catholic Worship,* written in 1972 and revised in 1983. In the period during which the documents were considered authoritative before being replaced by other documents, the American Catholic Church saw indeed "the true genius and talents" of the American people, who responded with four decades of musical freedom and worship (*CSL* 7).

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* was driven by what the document called the need for a "full, conscious, and active participation" of the faithful. This, of course, would be very relevant to liturgical music. Fernandino Antonelli, a priest who worked in the Roman Curia told the faithful at the Second Vatican Council that, "A great pastoral problem had to be addressed. The faithful had become 'mute spectators' at Mass instead of active participants in the liturgical action" (O'Malley 116). Antonelli cited several recent papal teachings and actions to make the argument that the need was nothing new. Thus, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* declared:

> Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that fully conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy. Such participation by the Christian people as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people" (1 Pet. 2:9; cf. 2:4-5), is their right and duty by reason of their baptism. In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy, this

> full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else; for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit; and therefore pastors of souls must zealously strive to achieve it, by means of the necessary instruction, in all their pastoral work (*CSL* 14).

With active participation in mind, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* presents a new-found freedom in regard to liturgical music. The *Constitution* devotes Chapter VI to music in the liturgy. The overall theme of the chapter is to open new possibilities but at the same time recognize the tradition of the Church so as not to totally undo what had already existed. The first element regarded in high esteem with the option for new possibilities is Gregorian chant. The second major mark of recognition is to preserve the musical traditions of various nations, while the third major element is the emphasis given to the pipe organ, previously the virtually exclusive instrument for the liturgy. While recognizing its core religious roots, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* opens new doors for liturgical musicians.

The first preservation is Gregorian chant. Gregorian chant is recognized in the document as having "pride of place" in the Roman Liturgy (*CSL* 36). While not minimizing the impact Gregorian chant has had in the history of the Church, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* opens the door for more; "Other kinds of sacred music, especially polyphony, are by no means excluded from liturgical celebrations as long as they accord with the spirit of the liturgical action" (*CSL* 36). American culture in the 1960s did not feature Gregorian chant as a popular musical style. What, then, Americans were now free to ask, best captured the spirit of liturgical action? American

liturgical musicians began to explore different styles of music that reflected popular American culture, and there was a need for it. The limitations of Gregorian chant were noted in the document, stating, "It is desirable that an edition be prepared containing simpler melodies, for use in small churches" (*CSL* 36).

The second preservation highlighted in *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* aims to secure the musical traditions of those in lands "in certain parts of the world including mission lands" (*CSL* 37). The United States is not necessarily a "mission land," but the principle still applies. The document states, "There are peoples who have their own musical traditions and these play a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason, due importance is to be attached to their music, and a suitable place is to be given to it, not only in forming their attitude toward religion, but also in adapting worship to their native genius" (*CSL* 37). Missionaries, the document states, should "become competent in promoting the traditional music of these peoples" (*CSL* 37). If this is the case, the Church must recognize the integration of religion and culture, and invite music that captures the music that is considered "traditional" in peoples' native lands. The principle allowed Americans to feel free to capture that which encompasses a great part of their social life, and help them live their religious lives.

Finally, the document explains that the organ is "held in high esteem" in the church and in liturgical worship (*CSL* 37). The important element of the organ, as noted, is that it "lifts up man's mind to God and to higher things" (*CSL* 37). Then, as other instruments can fulfill the same principle of worship, "Other instruments also may be admitted for use in divine worship...on the condition that the instruments are suitable, or can be made suitable" (*CSL* 37). The notion of "suitability can be found in the

aforementioned place of the organ; whatever 'lifts up man's mind to God and higher things'" (*CSL 37).* Any instrument capable of this became free to be used in the Roman liturgy in the American Catholic Church, drawing strongly on the gifts of American culture.

Active Participation: Reforms from *Musicam Sacram*

The late Lucien Deiss, C.S.Sp. was a Second Vatican Council-era liturgical music composer and theologian. Deiss shows the need of the celebrating assembly to be active in *Visions of Liturgy and Music for a New Century.* He writes, "A liturgical celebration does not exist in itself. It is lived and participated in by an assembly; it is incarnated in an assembly. Ministerial function must thus be judged in the context of the celebrating assembly" (7).

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, Deiss says, "forcibly demands" active participation through participation in acclamations, responses, psalms, antiphons, hymns, and actions (Deiss 7). Following the initial reaction to the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, the Second Vatican Council kept working to carry out the ideals of the Council. Sacred music was seriously considered in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* and in *Musicam Sacram: Instruction on Music in the Liturgy* shortly thereafter in January, 1967; the council sought to clarify the "forcible demand" for participation by the faithful. Deiss says that, "No document has ever been so concerned with people, and none has demanded with such insistence that their thoughts, desires, and capacities be taken into account" (8). *Musicam Sacram* serves as a "continuation and complement" on the

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, and looks to clarify "problems" that arose after the first document (*Musicam Sacram* 1).

To clarify such "problems", *Musicam Sacram* (*MS*) sets up some "general norms" for the Catholic pastoral musician. These are not distinct rules intended to overly restrict, but rather general guidelines that allow the fullness of the freedoms afforded by the Second Vatican Council. *Musicam Sacram* defines sacred music itself as "Gregorian chant, sacred polyphony in its various forms both ancient and modern, sacred music for the organ and other approved instruments, and sacred popular music, be it liturgical or simply religious" (*MS* 2). The definition is clear: many styles and types of sacred music are fair for use in the Church. The "full, active, and conscious participation" is expected to be formulated in a variety of ways, including recognizing the individual worshipping community's talents and treasures, encouraging participation through choirs, and opening such opportunities to women.

First, the community's unique disposition, culture and talents are placed at the forefront and recognized as the primary starting point for liturgical music choices. "In selecting the kind of sacred music to be used, the capacities of those who are to sing the music must be taken into account" (*MS* 3). Whatever the community is comfortable using to give glory to God is therefore acceptable. "No kind of sacred music is to be prohibited from liturgical actions by the Church as long as it corresponds to the spirit of the liturgical celebration itself and the nature of its individual parts and does not hinder the active participation of the faithful" (*MS* 3).

Affirming the role of the faithful to fulfill their "full and active participation" in the liturgy, *Musicam Sacram* places an emphasis on singing as a way to "fulfill their

liturgical role" in the liturgy, considered a duty of the Christian by virtue of Baptism into the Church (*MS* 3). The music minister, then, must bear the responsibility of selecting appropriate styles related to his/her individual community to truly foster and support the faithful in their "full, active participation."

One ministerial role that takes a new approach with this goal in mind is that of the role of the choir. Church choirs were not new, but the call to "full and active participation" required a new view of the role of the Church choir. *Musicam Sacram* not only recognizes the previous role held by the choir but also affirms the new role in the Church with its new added significance. As the document states,

> Its role has become something of yet greater importance and weight by reason of the norms of the Council concerning the liturgical renewal. Its duty is, in effect, to ensure the proper performance of the parts which belong to it, according to the different kinds of music sung, and to encourage the active participation of the faithful in singing (*MS* 3).

As such, the choir functioned from that point forward, with a few reforms.

The first reform in *Musicam Sacram* affirms the liturgical significance of the large choirs that have long existed in cathedrals, monasteries, and other churches, and encourages that these choirs continue. However, the role of the choir shifts; the choirs should now encourage the faithful to "always associate themselves with the singing" (*MS* 4). This would mean that the singing should not be done in a performance manner with a silent faithful, but rather support and include the worshipping body in the church. The role of the choir has expanded to the whole congregation.

Another reform is in regard to the physical placement of the choir in worship space. Most churches were designed with a choir loft placed in the back of a church, behind the worshipping body. *Musicam Sacram*, however, dictates that the choir be placed at a location in the church that shows the choir to be "part of the whole congregation and that fulfills its liturgical function" (*MS* 4). The members of the choir must be able to partake in the celebration of the Mass beyond the function of the singing.

Third, women are now free to join liturgical choirs. Of the previous restrictions for choir membership, Deiss writes,

> Women may not sing in the choir. Such was the law in force until recently. We should note that it was not enforced everywhere, but it clearly reflected a clerical mentality. Besides, in order to show that the choir represented the “choir of Levites,” the men were dressed in cassocks, even when they were the elderly fathers of families, and the boys were disguised as miniature priests, dressed in albs and wearing crosses on their chests (Deiss 41).

Looking for participation of the full liturgical body, *Musicam Sacram* explains that the gender identification for the choir should be "either men and boys, or men and boys only, or men and women, or even where there is a case for it, women only” (*MS* 5). *Musicam Sacram* indicates that gender and other makeup of the choir is now left to particular communities and the local culture.

The contributions of women previously were exclusively ordered to behind-the-scenes work. Justine Ward, though not able to sing in the choir herself, wrote a couple key pieces for the periodical *Orate Frates* with the goal of making the music of the day,

Gregorian chant, more accessible to people. She wrote a textbook for children entitled *Music: First Year* designed to help bring children into full participation through music. Ward discusses some issues addressed in the Second Vatican Council, including the issue of experience or participation in the face of compliance toward ritual, as noticed in Kathleen Harmon's *There Were Also Many Women There:*

> One of the issues with which Ward was concerned was how a love for the liturgy could be stifled by tripping up over mere technicalities. While she had experienced children who enjoyed singing and teachers who were increasingly open to developing chant as part of their musical programs, she found that the lack of accessible, fundamental resources and texts with regard not just to the *music* but to its rubrical application in the liturgy was one of the biggest issues holding back the liturgical movement (Harmon 83).

Ward would push for content on who was supposed to sing, what roles they were to fulfill, what parts of the Mass were to be sung and in what matter, and other practical issues. Ward noted that despite the fact that many people had a partial understanding of Latin, “They simply could not discover official, authoritative answers to these simple rubrical questions for the correct use of chant" (Harmon 84). Even after the Second Vatican Council, documents such as *Musicam Sacram* responded to the need to determine the roles of women and many other liturgical issues, spelled out in the way that Ward and others longed for.

Musicam Sacram revisits the teaching from the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* in regards to the use of other instruments in the liturgy. Musical instruments are

considered useful in the liturgy "whether they accompany the singing or whether they are played as solo instruments" (*MS* 12). The two previous statements on the pipe organ are included, stating that the organ is held in "high esteem", but also that the instruments found in peoples' traditions and customs should be included. *Musicam Sacram* makes a few clarifications about the use of instruments.

One statement in *Musicam Sacram* that is rather vague is the reference to other musical instruments in the liturgy beyond the pipe organ. While affirming that "musical traditions and customs" of individual nations and peoples should be kept, it says that instruments that "by common opinion" are "suitable for secular use only" should be prohibited (*MS* 12). This statement is rather vague and does not point to any specific instrument, much less the ones only suitable “for secular use.”

The use of musical instruments, according to *Musicam Sacram*, is to “act as a support to the voices, render participation easily, and achieve a deeper union with the assembly” (*MS* 12). Further, the instrument should "meet the needs of the worshipping faithful." This mandate, which is consistent with the fullness of the worshipping body to be able to find “full, active, and conscious” participation, is that instruments support, not overwhelm the celebrations.

The final major contribution to sacred music in *Musicam Sacram* is the call for commissions for the “promotion of Sacred Music” (*MS* 12). The goal of such commissions is to be of "valuable assistance in promoting sacred music together with pastoral liturgical action in the diocese" (*MS* 12).

Active Participation: Freedom of American Liturgical Music

In 1972, the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy introduced the first key document on liturgical music in the United States, entitled *Music in Catholic Worship*. The document is divided into three sections: "The Theology of Celebration", "Pastoral Planning for Celebration", and "The Place of Music in the Celebration". Each of the three sections serves to reaffirm the Second Vatican Council's freedom of expression in liturgical music. Because this document comes from the United States Catholic Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, it is the first official document written on the matter that is specifically American after the Second Vatican Council.

The first topic addressed is the Theology of Celebration. The term "celebration" itself evokes a very strong dynamic that encourages all participants to be interested and involved with their full being.

> We are celebrating when we involve ourselves meaningfully in the thoughts, words, songs, and gestures of the worshipping community when everything we do is wholeheartedly and authentic for us when we mean the words and want to do what is done (*Music in Catholic Worship* 1).

As such, the musical expression must capture the "wholehearted and authentic" nature of the American Catholic, in the same manner in which a disc jockey seeks to do at a wedding reception. If the music at a wedding is poor, people will not dance and take an active part in the celebration. However, if the disc jockey selects music that encourages the guests at a wedding reception to get up and celebrate, the event would be considered successful.

An essential element in the liturgical celebration is faith. *Music in Catholic Worship (MCW)* states, "Faith grows when it is well-expressed in celebration. Good

celebrations foster and nourish faith. Poor celebrations weaken and destroy faith" (3). To achieve this goal, the document states, signs become the vehicle to "full meaning and impact" for the worshipper at the celebration (*MCW* 3). Further, if the signs are going to be successful in bringing the worshipper to the faith, "they must be humanly attractive." Additionally, the signs should speak for themselves without explanation, as they will be watched by those at the celebration rather than celebrated. Music must be attractive enough to the worshipping community to draw people into the celebration and unite them with their faith.

The second section of *MCW* focuses on the need of pastoral planning for liturgical celebrations. *MCW* states, "The particular preparation for each liturgical celebration should be done in a spirit of cooperation by all parties concerned" because "the powers of a liturgical celebration to shape faith will frequently depend on its unity" (*MCW* 2). This unity, according to *MCW*, is an "artistic unity flowing from the skillful and sensitive selection of options, music and related arts" (*MCW* 2). In planning, all involved are necessary to truly represent the nature of the worshipping community. The document recognizes the freedom of the community to select that which allows its members to prosper in faith and in celebration. All resources in the community, including the worshipping faithful beyond the pastoral staff are "sensitive to the present day thirst" of the people for "the values of scriptural theology and prayer" (*MCW* 2). Consideration is given to the people for the occasion and to the celebrant.

The people are central to pastoral planning. The music, *MCW* states, "should be within the competence of most of the worshippers. It should suit their age level, cultural background, and level of faith" (4). By level of faith, the document recognizes that the

people are at varying levels of faith and that the liturgical celebration presupposes a "minimum of biblical knowledge." If the community needs to be led towards faith, music can fulfill this role. As such, "greater liberty in the choice of music and style of the celebration may be required" (*MCW* 4). This liberty is extended to the diverse community involved in a liturgical celebration. "Can the same parish liturgy be an authentic expression for a grade school girl, her college-age brother, her married sister with a young family, their parents, their grandparents?" (*MCW* 4). The liturgical musician, then, must be ready to respond to the needs of all involved in participating in pastoral planning. This recognizes the fullness of the directives of the Second Vatican Council to "impose no rigid uniformity" on the liturgy.

The occasion in pastoral planning also requires significant thought in pastoral planning of liturgical celebrations. *MCW* states, "Each feast and season has its own spirit and its own music" while "penitential occasions demand more restraint" (*MCW* 4). *MCW* recognizes that an assembly or choir will want to sing more during the sacred seasons of Christmas and Easter. As to the typical Sunday liturgy, *MCW* recognizes that the celebration will "be celebrated with variety" and reflect that Sunday is "the day of the Lord" (4).

Finally, the celebrant is considered in pastoral planning. Not only do the demeanor and disposition have strong roles in the liturgy, but they also have direct effects on the music that results from them.

> No other single factor affects the liturgy as much as the attitude, style, and bearing of the celebrant; his sincere faith and warmth as he welcomes

> the worshipping community, his human naturalness combined with dignity and seriousness as he breaks the bread of Word and Eucharist (*MCW* 5).

Thus, pastoral musicians should work with pastoral musicians to find the appropriate rapport in celebrating the liturgy together.

What is perhaps the strongest contribution to American Catholic music are the three judgments in the place of the celebration, set forth by *Music in Catholic Worship*. "The quality of the joy and enthusiasm which music adds to communal worship cannot be attained any other way" (*MCW* 5). The elements of the three-fold judgment are musical, liturgical and pastoral. Ranked in order by *Music in Catholic Worship*, these demonstrate the necessity of musical judgment to capture the "joy and enthusiasm" of the worshipping body.

The first question asked in regard to musical judgment is, "Is the music technically, aesthetically, and expressively good?" (*MCW* 6). *Music in Catholic Worship* indicates that without good music its purpose is negated. Therefore, the judgment of liturgical music begins with the musical aspect. The liturgical and pastoral needs will be poorly served, should the music fail to inspire the faithful to connect their faith to joy and enthusiasm. "Only artistically sound music will be effective in the long-run" (*MCW* 6). Not considered artistically pleasing is the "cheap, the trite, and musically cliché" music that is put together for "instant liturgy" (*MCW* 6). Liturgical musicians are commissioned to "search for and create musical texts that belong with the new liturgy. To help, musical texts from other traditions are to be considered" (*MCW* 6).

With the thought that "instant liturgy" from poorly-composed music would be detrimental, many well-known hymns from other traditions such as "Amazing Grace",

"A Mighty Fortress Is Our God", and others were used immediately in the American Roman Catholic Church. The publication of *Hymnal of Christian Unity* in 1964 included the popular traditional Catholic hymns "Sing of Mary, Pure and Lowly" and "The God Whom Earth and Sea and Sky" that were frequently used outside of the liturgy setting for devotion. Also published in 1964 was *People's Mass Book* that included several traditional Protestant songs, including what Donald Boccardi calls "the startling inclusion of Martin Luther's anthem, 'A Mighty Fortress is Our God'" (Boccardi 47). The musical judgment's call for solid music included the open-mindedness to reach out to other faith traditions to find that which already was proven to work within a worshipping body.

Placing the liturgical judgment second to musical judgment is most appropriate in creating liturgy. What is called for in the liturgy is important, but of course must initially be founded on solid music. First, *Music in Catholic Worship* makes a small plea to reflect the "relative importance" of each individual part of the Mass and its relation to the rest of the Mass (*MCW* 7). For example, an elaborate piece next to a spoken prayer instead of a hymn could diminish the importance of the words being said. Of course, the sung text must capture the correct spirit captured by the text. In selecting music, *Music in Catholic Worship* asks, "Does the music express and interpret the text correctly and make it more meaningful?" (*MCW* 7). The liturgical judgment is very musically-focused in many ways, particularly in discussion of role-differentiation in the church.

The cantor, choir, and instrumentalists are given clear liturgical roles, which should be to lead and inspire the faithful. In fact, the role of the assembly is limited to just this—"The music for everyone must be within the performance ability of those who

gather. The whole assembly must be comfortable and secure with what is to be done to celebrate well" (*MCW* 8). The assembly is mentioned first, as the music minister's role is to support the worshipping body above all else. This direction thus enhances the freedom and responsibility of the various ministries in music.

The role of the cantor is new to the Roman Catholic Church, established between the publications of *Musicam Sacram* of 1968 and *Music in Catholic Worship* of 1972. Previously, *Musicam Sacram* recommended a singer who could "lead and support the faithful as needed" (*MS* 4). While maintaining the freedom afforded to liturgical musicians, the cantor here is added with the purpose of leading the people to the fullest participation possible. The Responsorial Psalm, a sung response added between the first and second readings after the Second Vatican Council, is mentioned in particular to be led by the cantor.

After the Second Vatican Council, the choir takes a new role as one that "assists and encourages the singing of the whole assembly" (*MCW* 9). The choir is to be "within the assembly of the faithful" and "assumes the role of leadership" in singing within the worshipping community (*MCW* 9). When or if the liturgical demands exceed the competence of a worshipping assembly, the choir may sing alone, according to *Music in Catholic Worship*. To help fulfill this directive, the choir should be relocated. *Music in Catholic Worship* asks for placement of the choir and the organ or other instruments to be in a place that can successfully "facilitate participation", specifically near the front of the church to best foster the participation of the worshipping assembly despite many churches existing with balconies or "choir lofts" behind the congregation (*MCW* 10).

While the practical implementation is difficult, Deiss makes two points regarding the placement of the choir.

The first is that the ideal location for the choir is "at the junction of the sanctuary and the nave" (Deiss 47). This best accomplishes the goal to be a visible and functioning part of the worshipping assembly. "It testifies to the choir's perfect integration into the celebration" (Deiss 47). This does not mean that such a placement is not problematic. Indeed, the choir is in sight of everyone in the worshipping assembly, which could create anxiety for choir directors and those in the choir. But, "from a liturgical point of view, the least acceptable place for the choir is the balcony" (Deiss 47). There are advantages to the balcony, such as freedom to direct the choir and perhaps more space to do so. However, as Deiss states, "the choir is separated from the assembly and less integrated into the whole celebration" (47). New construction would allow for worship space that meets these requirements.

The liturgical judgment calls for appropriate placing of the organ or other instruments to avoid time lags that might exist due to a distance between the organ console or musicians and the choir. The use of musical instruments other than the organ is seen as a liturgical judgment, as musical instruments have the ability to "stimulate feelings of joy and contemplation at appropriate times" (*MCW* 10). Along with this aspect of liturgical judgment comes freedom to pick that which is appropriate to a specific worshipping community. "Their use depends on circumstances, the nature of the community, etc" (*MCW* 10).

The third judgment is the pastoral judgment, which "governs the use and function of every element of celebration" (*MCW* 10). The central question posed in *Music in*

Catholic Worship is, "Does music in the celebration enable these people to express their faith, in this place, in this age, in this culture?" (*MCW* 10). In the statement that perhaps best captures the intent of the Second Vatican Council, *Music in Catholic Worship* states, "No set of rubrics or regulations of itself will ever achieve a truly pastoral celebration of the sacramental rites. Such regulations must always be applied with a pastoral concern for the given worshipping community" (*MCW* 10).

Early Struggles in Response to New Teachings

By 1976, the effects of *Music in Catholic Worship* had not permeated throughout the United States. The Church Music Committee within the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions surveyed liturgical musicians throughout the United States in 93 different dioceses. The results appeared in "Church Music in the U.S. Today," and an article in *Pastoral Music (PM)*, the publication of the National Pastoral Musicians. The survey contained seven different questions assessing how the parishes have fared in implementing liturgical music and included questions on educational programs for church musicians, the state of choirs since the Second Vatican Council, what problems church musicians face in their diocese, the degree of support and direction from clergy, training centers, and specific information about leadership in each diocese. The conclusion of the author was that much work remained to be done.

> In general, it would be correct to make the statement that liturgical music in the United States is not meeting the current needs of the worshipers, and in the vast majority of dioceses the prospect for much growth in this area is very dim without a great deal of assistance on the part of some central agency (*PM* 33).

Implementation of the new musical freedom would not happen overnight, but gradually over time.

Question one was omitted from the article, but question two asked the pastoral musicians, "How well have choirs fared in your diocese?" Of the responses to the survey, the overall consensus was that choirs, who once used to perform as people silently prayed, had trouble understanding and implementing their new, post-Second Vatican Council role in the liturgy. One response from Saginaw, Michigan, stated, "Why bother with beauty when you don't really have to?" Another response from Portland, Oregon stated, "Many disappeared. A limited few have prospered. Pastors are discouraged, tired of fighting, willing to accept anything in order to be relieved of constant bickering." Another from Georgia echoed the same sentiment: "As far as positive thrust in implementing the invitations of the council, I think very poorly. Choirs still seem stuck in the pattern of the five-movement Ordinary and although they take advantage of other acclamations, etc., it seems they still maintain a distance from the congregation." Another top-listed complaint is that there is "too great a distance between the choir and the congregation, physically and psychologically" (*PM* 34)

The third question asked, "What problems in general do church musicians have in your diocese?" The results indicated many common issues in this period, just two years after *Music in Catholic Worship*. The strongest response, included in 415 of respondents, was a lack of quality music from which to choose. The same question also solicited strong responses about money, specifically the financial commitment given to music ministry. Forty-four respondents listed "inadequate (if any) salaries paid to music directors, organists, and other musicians" (*PM* 34). One response from Cincinnati, Ohio,

said, “The usual poor salaries, responsibilities too often measured in terms of hours put in rather than level of ability and perfection.” A response from Indianapolis, Indiana sees the problem as a double dynamic: “On the one hand, a lack of competent personnel, professionally trained both musically and liturgically; and on the other hand, an unwillingness to financially support good parish liturgical music programs.” Finally, one response from St. Cloud, Minnesota saw a lack of motivation on the part of poorly-paid directors: “There is little incentive to go into the work because they are poorly paid, and the people seem more ready to criticize than to encourage their efforts.”

The next question asks, “To what degree does the clergy give support and direction to church music?” While most responses appear to be less than satisfied with the efforts of clergy for such support, 410 respondents said that the level of clerical assistance was “improving”. The motivation not to offer assistance may be one of ignorance or one of selfishness, according to the sample responses. One response from Portland, Maine, states, “Few give direction. Most not interested nor informed enough about good liturgical music.” One from Milwaukee, Wisconsin feels that the clergy is coming around towards providing what is necessary for liturgical music: “We have a few who give real direction to the choirs and those working in music in their parishes. Increasing numbers of clergy seem to be recognizing the need of musical competence and are willing to pay for it.” Finally, some felt that pastors declared themselves the authority on music, and musicians were trapped, accordingly, such as this reply from Baker, Oregon, “From what I have observed, each priest considers himself to be the expert on music and this seems to be an area not to be encroached on by others” (*PM* 34).

Question seven looked to what type of support outside organizations could offer liturgical musicians, namely the National Catholic Music Educators Association and the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions. The responses tended to indicate the need for a strong national body of liturgical music, or more specifically a national Catholic hymnal. The study ranked eight major areas of need in the American Catholic Church for liturgical musicians.

First was "A strong push nationally for high-caliber liturgical music" as people had the "feeling that much of the 'new' music brought into parishes is either unsingable for congregational use or of poor quality" (*PM* 35). The responses, such as this one from Davenport, Iowa, called for "some real work done on 'good' church music which will be available and able to be done by simple choirs and people." A respondent from Sioux City, Iowa, would like someone at the national level to "produce music that is easy to learn with text that conveys a religious message." The two organizations – the National Catholic Music Educators Association and the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions—even took the criticism of the respondents, including this one from San Angelo, Texas: "The music that these two organizations seem to encourage is beyond the taste and ability of our people. We need simple, more familiar music and we don't know how to obtain it, other than guitar music and music provided by the various missalettes." The missalette began in 1934 by the Catholic Truth Society of Oregon (today Oregon Catholic Press) to assist worshippers in the Latin Mass. After the Second Vatican Council, missalettes had begun to include limited amounts of hymns to be sung and picked up popularity in the 1950s and 1960s.

What followed, after the request for better music, was the call for a national Catholic hymnal. Simply, time had not allowed for a national repertoire to develop, and liturgical musicians were becoming frustrated by the lack of choices afforded to them in monthly missalettes, which were the only real option for music. As one respondent from Hartford, Connecticut pointed out, there was a "proliferation of hymnals," though there were "only a few good hymns in each one" which left musicians "with a situation of either singing bad hymns often or buying all kinds of hymnals which is too expensive and bad pedagogy." As another respondent from Worcester, Massachusetts put it, "We think the time has come to supplant the poor monthly Mass booklets with a national Catholic hymnal and service book."

This survey did reflect concerns of the liturgical musician. Some other issues, according to Donald Boccardi, included the disposable nature of most missalettes or worship aids. He quotes Omer Westendorf, editor of the *People's Mass Book* as writing, "The very concept of throw-away hymns and throw-away scriptures tends to reinforce their feelings of insecurity, of unending changes of a faith in a permanent state of flux" (*PM* 36). Further, in a "universal ecological crisis" Americans were not too keen on throwing out seven million missalettes per month, totaling 84 million missalettes per year. Plus, some worried about the unity of the Mass when people were focused on reading during Mass (Boccardi 59).

Another issue was the training, support, and encouragement for composers. While the focus became hymns that a congregation could easily sing, some were still stuck in an older mold of choral music that did not evoke congregational participation. A reply from Detroit, Michigan summed it up, stating, "The Composers' forum is doing a

great job in choral music, but we need 'people's' music: good hymns, unison ritual music, etc. We can't do the job without good music and plenty of it. Available hymnals-ugh! Missalettes—ugh! Ugh!" (*PM* 36). This sentiment was echoed from a reply out of Hartford, Connecticut, which expressed the need to "Commission quality composers to write simple hymns that can be sung in unison or in two parts only." Further, said a respondent from Oakland, California, "We need new forms for singing of the Psalms and acclamations for Mass. These forms must be simple yet powerful and expressive. We cannot continue to adapt Gregorian chant to English. The lack of good music for the psalms is leading in many places to the complete dropping of the Responsorial Psalm, sometimes replacing it with silence only." While some turned to silence, others instead turned to violating copyright to meet their liturgical needs.

One popular early "folk" hymn in the reformed liturgy illustrates the problems of the new era and copyright:"They'll Know We Are Christians By Our Love". The hymn was so popular that many liturgical musicians copied the hymn for use in their own congregations. Its author, Dennis Fitzpatrick, charged that people were illegally reproducing his copyrighted work, which included "They'll Know We Are Christians by Our Love" and other hymns, and filed suit against the Archdiocese of Chicago and five parishes in 1976 claiming copyright infringement, and claimed $30 million in damages. A year later in 1977, Fitzpatrick filed suit against the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference and fifteen other dioceses (Boccardi 58). The charges worked against Fitzpatrick, as many composers abandoned his F.E.L. publisher label, and other publishers rose to prominence, including North American Liturgy Resources, World Library Publications, and GIA Publications.

Early Successes in the Wake of the Second Vatican Council

One way that the United States embraced the new freedom of the liturgy is what commonly became known as the "folk mass". According to Lawrence Madden, S.J., the 1960s was the right time for such music at Mass. "In the early 1960s, Pete Seeger's voice and guitar invited Americans to sing along with him. Little by little, people who had only sung in the shower or whistled while they worked began singing American folk songs together" (Madden 1). What made the folk song relevant to the lives of the people in America, according to Madden, was that the songs were about "ordinary life, about the joy and pain of love, but also about songs about issues that disturbed the conscience of the country" (Madden 53). The major issues that people sang about in this time period included the Vietnam War, the March on Washington in support of civil rights, as well as the rock festival in Woodstock, New York.

In the piece entitled, "Is the Folk Mass America's Only Contribution to the Liturgy?" Madden recognizes the goal of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*: that the music be the "music of the people" (*CSL* 37). The Catholic Church should look no further than the daily activities of the American people:

> America is a country awash in music. I recall the three…young men who passed me on the street last week doing a rap song…all in fluid union with a complex movement of their bodies…Incredible! Rock concerts, stereo sets, and CD sales are all booming. Students seem to have headsets permanently attached to their temples as they crank out term papers. Even more incredible! Commuters play George Winston in the car on the way

> home from a day of stressful work to get their head or emotions back together (Madden 54).

Up until then, Madden points out, the "engagement with music seems to stop at the church door" (Madden 55). Such engagement inspired many of the early "folk" composers, including Dan Schutte, John Foley, S.J., Bob Dufford, S.J., Tim Manion, and Robert "Roc" O'Connor, S.J., who would become the group known as the "St. Louis Jesuits" (McDermott 7).

The St. Louis Jesuits have become a mainstay in American liturgical life. Jim McDermott, S.J. writes, "If you've been to a Mass in the last 30 years, you have definitely sung their music." The music of the St. Louis Jesuits, as McDermott notes, has been heard at President Ronald Reagan's funeral, President Bill Clinton's inauguration, and was featured in the film "Dead Man Walking." Susan Sarandon, who portrayed Sr. Helen Prejean, sang to Sean Penn's character on death row the hymn "Be Not Afraid". When the Church shifted from a Latin liturgy to a vernacular liturgy, musicians such as the St. Louis Jesuits began writing music when they were brought together at the Fusz Memorial Jesuit Community at St. Louis University (McDermott 9).

Bob Dufford was a piano player who grew up listening to show tunes, Tchaikovsky, and the music of his dad's quartet. Dufford himself sang in the choir. Dufford did not really participate in "folk" music until fellow Jesuit John Foley "arrived with an original song and a guitar", to which Dufford is quoted as having thought, "There's goes the neighborhood" (McDermott 8). But, Dufford was transformed by Foley's piece, saying, "You played through it and you sang it, and I thought, 'this is not

what I was expecting.'" At that point, Bob Dufford began to write some of his own music (McDermott 8).

Roc O'Connor had wishes to play drums, but his parents were not keen on the idea and purchased him a guitar instead. Upon entering the Jesuits, he found like-minded men including Dan Schutte who were very passionate about music and organized a rock-and-roll band called "Mogen David and the Grapes of Wrath." O'Connor was inspired by Pete Townsend of the rock band "The Who" and Schutte was inspired by Peter, Paul, and Mary, as well as Simon and Garfunkel, all popular musicians of their day. The Jesuit novitiate soon was singing the music of Foley, and the music "stimulated" them. Schutte said, "Their stuff was singable and scriptural and it reached your heart in a way that was more than the sentimental group stuff that was being produced" (McDermott 9).

Soon thereafter joined by Tim Manion, they were catering to requests and made copy after copy of their original music to those who came to St. Louis for Mass, as "it seemed that everyone who came to Mass at Fusz wanted copies of what they heard" (McDermott 9). With Ditto machines as the only means of production and with "probably…35 to 50 copies" the limit for each master copy, the "work became rather tiresome to share" (McDermott 9). By 1973, there was a clear need to publish the work for practical purposes, and for the purpose that many of those involved would be moving on to other assignments. In 1974, a four-album set was published to "strong demand" and "active church ministers came from all over the world to study" with the Fusz community at St. Louis (McDermott 9). Due to high demand, they recorded the album "Neither Silver Nor Gold", which became one of the top selling Catholic albums of all-time (McDermott 10).

Another area in which the St. Louis Jesuits broke new ground was in the singing of scripture. McDermott recalls the lack of participation from the faithful at Mass, and indifference to scripture. "Mass included readings and a homily, yet for the most part the preconciliar liturgy was a time of silent witness to the event happening at the altar and an occasion for private devotions" (McDermott 7). By introducing hymns that quoted scripture, an important need was filled in the American Catholic liturgy.

The publisher of the music from the St. Louis Jesuits North American Liturgy Resources gained notoriety with the publication of the St. Louis Jesuits and other folk composers. Donald Boccardi says that part of their success was “innovative copyright sharing” and “a new kind of folk music, thanks to “widespread use of Scripture and of antiphonal compositions” (Boccardi 56). And as Boccardi points out, the issue of copyrighted music was one of the biggest challenges to music in the 1970s. While freedom of musical expression and the “music of the people” were front and center in the American Roman Catholic liturgy, it turned out freedom was somewhat restricted by external factors, including lawsuits over published liturgical music such as “They’ll Know We Are Christians By Our Love” and other hymns.

Development of Church Music Associations

In July 1976, the Association of National Pastoral Musicians was born, as the National Catholic Music Education Association and the Catholic Musician Association of America had merged. The organization would unite liturgical musicians from across the country, keeping them informed through the publication of its journal, *Pastoral Music*.

In the first issue of *Pastoral Music*, dated October-November 1976, president Virgil Funk summed up the group's goals in their welcoming message:

> On a parish level—the critical level, the question of priorities must be addressed; are we willing to spend the money….and the time…to develop quality music within our liturgical celebration? Yes or No? Once that question is answered honestly, then, and only then can we move to our other questions. While it is true you cannot buy good liturgy, it is equally true that without a serious commitment to developing a music program it will not just 'happen' (4).

The critical question of copyright would also be addressed:

> There are two problems: the fact that the present copyright laws are being flagrantly violated by many, many parishes in the United States is a scandal; and the fact that all the publishers of Church music have not been able to develop a mutually-agreed-upon plan for the use of their music by the parishes is equally a scandal. Both work to the detriment of good liturgy and good music (4).

Funk stated that his "greatest" wish would be that those problems be cleared up almost immediately. Funk and the National Association of Pastoral Musicians would indeed make it happen. The association would hold annual national conventions and regional conventions to educate and gather resources; soon, hymnals would be developed that would better meet the needs of the worshipping faithful within the church.

Development of Hymnals that Reflect Wide Range of Musical Styles

Addressing the need for both copyright issues and for a national hymnal, the period following the Second Vatican Council was flush with publications. Early hymnals tended to pick up on Protestant hymns and whatever else publishers could quickly access. But, as compositions grew in all musical styles, the number of hymnals increased and options for liturgical musicians became larger and larger. From the period of 1964 through 2000, the fullness of the Council appears in the many hymnals and demonstrates that there is no "rigid uniformity" in musical styles in the liturgy.

1964 saw the first two hymnals of Post-Conciliar era. The Gregorian Institute of America in Toledo, Ohio, published the *Hymnal of Christian Unity*, dedicated to Pope John XXIII, who launched the Second Vatican Council "and to the praise of God" (Boccardi 46.) The hymnal lists just 100 hymns, which of course is very limited, considering the frequency in which they would be used. Donald Boccardi states that the hymnal was a "noble attempt, an opening of a new page of ecumenical concern" (46).

Also released in 1964 was the first edition of the *People's Mass Book*. This was thanks to the initiative of a group of seminarians who approached known lyricist Omer Westendorf about creating a hymnal. This hymnal would become what Boccardi says is the "most successful and widely used hymnal in the immediate post-Vatican II period" (47). Two million copies of the hymnal were sold. The "startling inclusion" of Martin Luther's "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" and other Protestant hymns also marked a push toward ecumenism. The hymnal contained 191 hymns, 24 responsorial psalm settings, and two Mass settings. The *People's Mass Book* had continued success with many

editions published and would become one of the bigger names in Church music and new editions published.

1965 saw two hymnals published: *Our Parish Prays and Sings* by Liturgical Press in Collegeville, Minnesota, and *The English Liturgy Hymnal* by The Friends of the English Liturgy. Neither book had a long-lasting impression. *Our Parish Prays and Sings* included the Sunday readings, but "unsuccessfully attempted to adapt some chant to English words" and "the selection was awfully meager". The *English Liturgy Hymnal* was "a tentative first step, but one that was quickly outdated" (Boccardi 48). Despite the failed efforts, the ability to make the effort demonstrated that the Council was working.

The following year brought the *Hymnal for Young Christians* (which was revised later in 1970 and again in 1973). This book was another contribution from the Friends of the English Liturgy. The hymnal is dedicated to the "challenge of Vatican II" and "as American as the pioneer spirit it implies, this group of hymns and songs for young people represents one possible avenue for the quest, particularly in catechetical work and liturgical ceremonies, and as such receives the approbation of the Music Division of the Liturgical Commission, Diocese of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, August 15, 1966" (Boccardi 49). The hymnal is noteworthy for popular hymns "The King of Glory," "Whatsoever You Do," and "They'll Know We Are Christians by Our Love."

Two more hymnals were published in 1966: *The Catholic Hymnal and Service Book*, and *Parish Liturgy*. The *Catholic Hymnal and Service Book* contained 252 "musical items" and was mostly a service book, which served the needs of the people in following the liturgy while simultaneously including some music. The hymns were "difficult to follow" with no titles to accompany page numbers and "seemed outdated"

even at the time of its publication. *Parish Liturgy* was published by the World Library of Sacred Publications and is “based on liturgical function” (Boccardi 50). St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Chicago published *The Johannine Hymnal* in 1967 and revised it in 1970, and St. Mary's Press in New York published the *New Catholic Hymnal* in 1972.

GIA Publications published the first edition of *Worship* in 1971, and just three years later edited the text to form *Worship II*, a very successful hymnal. Traditional in nature, it expanded with yet another edition in 1986, *Worship III*, after recognizing "the importance that the folk idiom be represented by such composers as Marty Haugen and David Haas and music from Taize in France, along with the need for inclusive language and a general updating" (Boccardi 83). *Worship* was updated once again in 2011, with the revision of the Roman Missal, as will be discussed in Chapter 5. While the *Worship* hymnals were becoming a mainstay, many other short-lived hymnals were being published.

Among the evanescent hymnals is *Book for Catholic Worship* of 1974 from St. John the Baptist publishing company in Canton, Ohio. While noted for having a wide selection of hymns from various ethnic traditions, the hymnal is one of the firsts to omit scripture readings and promote the responses of the congregation by only including congregational parts. Boccardi says that "like most early hymnals of this period, indices are minimal"(65). Also, "for some unacknowledged reason", the book opens with three pages devoted to a list of Popes (65). For similar reasons, other hymnals of those few years from 1975-1977 did not make it, including *The Catholic Liturgy Book* of Helicon Press of Baltimore in 1975, the *Vatican II Hymnal* of New Catholic Press in 1975, *Christian Prayer: The Liturgy of the Hours* of Heilcon Press intended to serve

communities that gathered for morning prayer and evening prayer, an Anglican non-Eucharistic liturgy that included ecumenical and Orthodox touches, a separate goal of the Second Vatican Council. The *Pray Together Hymnal* of 1977 included one-third of its selections from composer Willard Jabusch, and *Book of Sacred Song* by the Liturgical Press, a revision of *Our Parish Prays and Sings*. One success from the time period was *Cantemos al Señor* from Our Sunday Visitor Press in 1975, one of the first that met needs of a growing Spanish-speaking population. More on this in chapter 5.

Finally, North American Liturgy Resources published a collection that began to integrate some of the successful music that is the St. Louis Jesuits. *Glory and Praise* debuted in 1977 with the first of three smaller collections with 81 hymns from composers such as the five St. Louis Jesuits-- John Foley, Dan Schutte, Bob Dufford, Tim Manion, Roc O'Connor-- as well as popular composer Carey Landry. The second book followed in 1980 with 92 selections, and the third edition in 1982 with 101 more hymns. In 1983, the three editions were combined together into *Glory and Praise Combined Edition*. This book would "become a staple of many parishes in the country, even though better and broader collections with new composers became available" (Boccardi 76).

Other hymnals published between 1978 and 1983 included *The Hymnbook: The Johannine Hymnal*, a revision by the American Catholic Press in 1978 of the previous *Johannine* series, *The St. Gregory Hymnal and Catholic Choir Book* of 1979 published by GIA publications, *A Benedictine Book of Song* by The Liturgical Press in 1979, the *ICEL Resource Collection of 1981* from the International Commission on English in the Liturgy*, Songs of Praise* from Servant Publications in 1981, *Hymns, Psalms, and Spiritual Canticles* in 1983 from Theodore Marer. who included 94 of his own hymns,

and *The Summit Choir Book* and *The Summit Choir Book* of 1983 Summit Press. Also of note were two more Hispanic community hymnals: *La familia de Dios celebra* by the San Antonio Music Association in 1981, and *Canticos de gracias y alabanza* by Oregon Catholic Press in 1982. By 1983, *Worship* and *Glory and Praise* were the major successes in the midst of a flood of hymnals as the industry moved forward to what Donald Boccardi a period of a "maturing process" of hymnals.

In the period from 1984-1994, the vast production of hymnals became streamlined as some major hymnals emerged. The period began with the last edition of the *Peoples Mass Book* from World Library Publications in 1984. Boccardi says that the *Peoples Mass Book* "has proved to be one of the most useful and successful of contemporary hymnals" (80). The hymnal builds on the success of the 1970 edition to offer a more complete collection of hymns. Boccardi points to a reviewer that states, "We have a hymnal that will not intimidate the inexperienced parish and yet can provide challenging music for the experienced congregation. It is truly a parish book of worship that invites musical faith expression for every liturgical service through the Church year" (82). The aforementioned *Worship III* was published in 1986, and one final *Glory and Praise* hymnal was published in 1987. Boccardi calls *Glory and Praise* of 1987 a "last hurrah" for North American Liturgy Resources, which was absorbed by Oregon Catholic Press, who would become a major player in Liturgical music. Primarily published by North American Liturgy Resources, it was completed in conjunction with GIA Publications (88).

The Church saw the first *Gather* hymnal from GIA published in 1988. This was also a joint venture between North American Liturgy Resources primarily published on

the GIA side, and it intended to supplement the "traditional" hymnal *Worship* (Boccardi 89). This success would pave the way for both *Gather- Second Edition* in 1994 and *Gather: Comprehensive Edition*, also in 1994, that combined the successes of the two.

The growth of major hymnals was the result of many years' hard work in trying to meet the needs of the various styles of music in the United States after the Second Vatican Council. The accessibility of these hymnals allowed for the Church to become on board with copyright law and move forward with worship. The pastoral musician would have the know-how, the tools, and freedom to be able to promote the "full, conscious, and active participation" the Second Vatican Council spoke of, with no rigid uniformity to stand in its way.

Chapter 3

ADVANCEMENTS IN ETHNIC MUSIC IN THE UNITED STATES

With the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* and *Musica Sacra* affirming the need for cultural music and the "music of the people", ethnic groups were able to finally bring their cultural identities to the liturgy in the form of music. To some cultures, particularly the African-American culture, Spanish-speaking cultures, and European cultures, the Second Vatican Council offered an opportunity for people to worship in their own way. Both the Spanish speaking cultures and African-American cultures thrived during the years after the Second Vatican Council, thanks to an acceptance of the cultural ways of life of each group. Thanks to the Second Vatican Council declaring that the European way was not the only way, more and more resources became available, including culturally-tuned hymnals and other resources to help ethnic and cultural groups worship in their own way.

The Constitution on the Sacred liturgy laid out clearly that the musical traditions of various groups should be respected:

> In certain countries, especially in mission lands, there are people who have their own musical tradition, and this plays a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason their music should be held in proper esteem and a suitable place is to be given to it, not only in forming their religious sense but also in adapting worship to their native genus (*CSL* 40).

Clearly, the United States is a "certain country", made up of many different ethnicities and traditions.

Anscar J. Chupungco is a Benedictine monk and influential speaker on inculturation, or the process of bringing cultures into the liturgy. Chupungco proposed two models that have become the expression of inculturation that the Second Vatican Council offered in the *aggorinamento* of the Church. Chupungco described inculturation in the following way:

> It is a process whereby pertinent elements of a local culture are integrated into the worship of a local Church. Integration means that culture will influence the way prayer formularies are composed and proclaimed, ritual actions are performed, and the message is expressed in art forms. Integration can also mean that local rites, symbols, and festivals, after due critique and Christian reinterpretation, will become part of the liturgical worship of a local Church (Chupungco 2).

Including music, then, would involve not just providing a literal translation of the language, but bringing the real experience of the Church to the experience of culture. This would be accomplished in two models: creative assimilation and dynamic equivalence.

Assimilation occurred in the early Church in multiple forms with Greek and Roman rites. With anointing at baptism, the giving of the cup of milk and honey and the foot-washing of neophytes were rituals that found their home in the Roman Catholic liturgy as the Church was formed. Chupungco writes that should items pass a test, they should be welcome in the Roman Catholic liturgy even today, provided they reflect the spirit of the liturgy:

> First, supposing the integrated cultural elements manifest some similarity to Christian liturgy, have they been made to undergo the process of doctrinal purification? We should remember that similarity is not always a gauge of orthodoxy and orthopraxis. Second, are the biblical types that are used to "purify" or "Christianize" the cultural elements appropriate? We need to avoid doing violence to the biblical text in order to accommodate culture. Third, do the cultural elements enhance the theological understanding of the Christian rite? (Chupungco 3).

In terms of music, the varied instruments of the people come to mind. How these instruments and music translate into the liturgy of ethnic traditions that have become part of the religious life of a community, such as a *quinceañera* celebration or the *Dia de los Muertos* celebration, should be given great consideration so as to assimilate multiple cultures into one strong Catholic faith. A *quinceañera* celebration originated in Puerto Rico and is a coming of age ritual for girls turning 15 years old. *Dia de los Muertos,* or the "day of the dead", is a cultural celebration of the deceased originating in Mexico. Both have become part of Catholic cultures in their respective lands and the United States.

Chupungco's second model of inculturation, dynamic equivalence, allows the faithful to speak or sing the liturgy in a way that is familiar to their cultural background while expressing the core message of the Catholic faith. Chupungco notes that with the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, the Roman order of mass, or *ordo*, being celebrated can be done in a way that rings true to each respective culture:

> Dynamic equivalence starts with what exists in Christian liturgy and how culture can further develop its *ordo*, which is the composites of the rite…I would describe dynamic equivalence in terms of translation. In other words, it re-expresses the liturgical *ordo* in the living language, rites, and symbols of a local community. Dynamic equivalence consists of replacing elements of the liturgical *ordo* with something that has an equal meaning or value in the culture of the people, and hence can suitably transmit the message intended by the *ordo* (Chupungco 4).

With inculturation in mind, the Church published *Comme le Prevoit: On The Translation Of Liturgical Texts For Celebrations With A Congregation* that stated,

> Thus, in the case of liturgical communication, it is necessary to take into account not only the message to be conveyed, but also the speaker, the audience, and the style. Translations, therefore, must be faithful to the art of communication in all its various aspects, but especially in regard to the message itself, in regard to the audience for which it is intended, and in regard to the manner of expression (*Comme le Prevoit* 7).

With so much of the liturgy sung, there is a great opportunity in liturgical music to take advantage of this teaching of the Second Vatican Council to speak or sing the liturgy in a way that means the most to the people of the Church. As we would see particularly with African American communities and Latino or Hispanic communities, assimilation and dynamic equivalence would allow both to thrive in the period after the Second Vatican Council.

The African-American Catholic experience was strengthened by the Second Vatican Council and aforementioned precepts. Instead of having to conform to the Latin-language music and organ music, African Americans were finally free to bring their "native genius" to worship. Kevin P. Johnson, writing for the Black Catholic Congress, wrote,

> Since Vatican II, African American sacred music and in particular, gospel music, has transformed the way many black Catholics and other Catholic believers worship God in the Holy Mass and in their everyday lives. This music has been at the core of African American survival in America and has for more than fifty years allowed African Americans and others to worship God in a manner befitting their cultural practices in the Holy Mass (Johnson 1).

The declaration from the Council that brought about such freedom was article 119 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, which states,

> In certain parts of the world, especially mission lands, there are peoples who have their own musical traditions, and these play a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason due importance is to be attached to their music, and a suitable place is to be given to it, not only in forming their attitude toward religion, but also in adapting worship to their native genius (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy 119).*

Sister Thea Bowman, a scholar on African American Catholicism links African American sacred music to the slave trade that brought many Africans to the United States.

> To the Americas, African men and women brought sacred songs and chants that reminded them to their homelands and that sustained them in separation and in captivity, songs to respond to all life situations, and the ability to create new songs to answer new needs (Bowman 1).

As a result, she describes African American sacred music in the United States as soulful and she uses five adjectives to describe what it is.

> First, African American music is holistic, "challenging the full engagement of mind, imagination, memory, feeling, emotion, voice, and body". Second, African American sacred song is participatory, "inviting the worshipping community to join in contemplation, in celebration, and in prayer". Third, it is real, "celebrating the immediate concrete reality of the worshipping community – grief or separation, struggle or oppression, determination or joy – bringing that reality to prayer within the community of believers. Fourth it is spirit-filled, "energetic, engrossing, intense". And finally, it is life-giving, "refreshing, encouraging, consoling, invigorating" and "sustaining" (Bowman 2).

African American music is not a matter of African culture exclusively, but also of an era in the United States in which, without freedom, African Americans had to learn how to cope and maintain hope and their spirituality under oppressive conditions.

> African Americans in sacred song preserved the memory of African religious rites and symbols, of a holistic African spirituality, of rhythms and tones and harmonies that communicated their deepest feelings across barriers of region and language. African Americans in fields and quarters,

> at work, in secret meetings, in slave festivals, in churches, camp meets and revivals, wherever they met or congregated, consoled and strengthened themselves and one another with sacred song—moans, chants, shouts, psalms, hymns, and jubilees, first African songs, then African American songs (Bowman 3).

With such clear needs for the African American community within the Catholic Church, the next natural step would be to formulate a hymnal that would cater to the needs of African American Catholics that included those moans, chants, and shouts, as well as various worship needs of African Americans.

In 1983, the Black Catholic Clergy Conference began a new project: they would assemble the first African American Catholic hymnal in the United States as resources significantly developed for African American worship in the United States. In 1984 the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops established a Black Liturgy Subcommittee after the group called for "an effective structure for the support of Black Catholics" (McGann 22). The year 1987 was a busy year for the African American church leadership. While the National Conference of Catholic Bishops completed *In Spirit and Truth: Black Catholic Reflections on the Order of Mass,* the African American community would complete their hymnal that same year with the publication of *Lead Me, Guide Me.*

GIA Publications published *Lead Me, Guide Me* under the guidance of the African American bishop James P. Lyke. The release of the hymnal was over 20 years in the making, roughly the time of the Second Vatican Council in 1965 through its publication in 1987. The goals were clear:

> For a long time, but particularly within the last two decades, Black Catholics and the pastoral staffs who minister to our people have increasingly seen the need for liturgical and devotional settings and hymnody that lend themselves to the unique and varied styles of song and expression that are characteristic of our people. Similarly, black Catholics, who embody various religions and cultural traditions, wish to share our gifts with the wider ecclesial community and draw from the great musical corpus of our own Roman Catholic tradition and that of our sister Churches (Lyke 1).

This is not to say that the Catholic tradition was discarded. The Rev. Edward Foley evaluated all included hymns, giving each a theological assessment. Further, Rev. John Ford evaluated the hymns from "a black theological perspective" and looked into historical and cultural perspectives of the contents as well (*LMGM* 4). European and American expressions of Catholicism were to be included as well. According to J. Glenn Murray, there should be an intersection of the two:

> At this juncture, we would be wise to examine our need to express the complete variety of our Black Catholic musical heritage. In order to express adequately this heritage, we need to be attentive not only to our Euro-American legacy (Latin chants, motets, polyphony, and hymns), but to the musical variety of our Afro-American culture as well (Murray 2).

Therefore, African American Catholicism included the traditions not just of the African American experience, but the greater Catholic experience as well, rich in European roots.

However, Murray finds three major types of music necessary to be included in *Lead Me, Guide Me.*

Lead Me, Guide Me included many traditional spirituals of the past, including "Soon and Very Soon", "Balm in Gilead", and "We Shall Overcome". This is the first category of music included in the hymnal. A second group of the music in the hymnal with deep African American roots is very simple, with the technique of "lining out", as J. Glenn Murray explains:

> Hymns—those hymns and psalms which used the process of 'lining out', i.e., the process by wherein the worship leader spoke a line or so, which the congregation sang thereafter, a very effective tool in a time when illiteracy was widespread and the use of hymnals virtually not-existent (Murray 2).

A third type of music found in *Lead Me, Guide Me* was a collection of hymns from contemporary composers, such as Grayson Warren Brown, Leon Roberts, and Clarence Rivers, who wrote from and for African American Catholic worship.

But this would not close out the African American Experience. According to Murray, African American Catholics should remember that the celebration of the liturgy remains Catholic. Thus, the Roman Rite is always to be remembered in gathering resources for the liturgy and for participation in the liturgy:

> If our celebration of the Eucharistic Liturgy…is to be both Catholic and Black, then those whose responsibility it is to plan and execute worship must continue to *study* the Roman Liturgy in order to understand its inner dynamics, come to *appreciate* the significance and integrity of each of its

> parts, *learn* those places where improvisation may legitimately occur, *keep the assembly central, read* voraciously about inculturation, and *remain open* to the Spirit (Murray 5).

Thus moving forward, African American composers would continue to write music that would create an opportunity to fill what it means to be Catholic while maintaining fidelity to African American culture. One such composer, Leon Roberts, would appear in the first edition of *Lead Me, Guide Me* in 1987, and his worked continued until his death in 1999. Roberts died just a year after receiving a Special Achievement Award from the Archdiocese of New York and Archbishop John Cardinal O'Connor, recognizing his contributions to the African American Catholic community in the United States.

A second publication from GIA Publications would support liturgical music among African Americans in the United States. *The African American Hymnal*, edited by Nolan Williams and published in 2001, was not an exclusively Catholic hymnal. This hymnal contained many of the same hymns from *Lead Me, Guide Me* with a significant number of new additions. Not tied to a particular denomination, this publication will not serve all needs of the African American Catholic community, but for many parishes with an African American population it served as a supplement to *Lead Me, Guide Me*, offering 586 hymns and songs.

Another major ethnic group to benefit from inculturation that came forth from the Second Vatican Council would be Latino or Hispanic cultures. Both names are used since they often mean different things; "Latino" can refer to those with Latin American or North American roots. "Hispanic" can refer to the Iberian Peninsula in Europe. The two groups are linked by a common heritage: the spoken Spanish language. But both groups

tend to be at least somewhat connected in spirituality because Iberian influence touched the communities when explorers brought the Spanish language to those people. But, the North American and Central American communities have plenty of their own individual cultural attributes that make it difficult to characterize all needs as one when looking at the Latino or Hispanic communities in the United States. Similarly, they have developed significant differences in the use of the Spanish language.

During the 17th and 18th centuries, Franciscan missionaries came to areas such as Mexico and present-day New Mexico, teaching both European Catholic musical traditions such as Gregorian chant, European polyphony, and traditional Spanish religious music from Spain. Mark Bangert points out that thanks to the influence of the Franciscans in these lands, there was plenty that would become an important part of those cultures:

> In spite of the fact that so much of this music was taught in Spanish without singable translations, the natives responded well to it. *Villancicos*, *aguinaldos* (Christmas songs), *alabados* and *alabanzas* (general praise songs) continued to be used and loved in southwest North America as were folk plays like *Los Pastores* (the shepherds) and the music which accompanied them, particularly the *Posada* which portrayed the story of the Holy Family in search of lodging (Bangert 370).

So it would be fair to say that some musical traditions in many of the Latino and Hispanic communities date back to the day that they became Catholic. And as time went on, more and more practices have become part of the Hispanic and Latino cultures as they have developed and grown.

This growth can be attributed to many developments in particular areas. For example, the vision of the Virgin Mary at Guadalupe makes for an extra focus on Mary. As such, as Dennis Doyle writes, many Catholics of those backgrounds are not given their due, since the approach is a different one than mainstream Catholics:

> U.S. Hispanics find themselves living 'in between' the dominant culture and their more traditional one….a person shaped exclusively by the dominant culture of the United States cannot understand the religious practices and experiences of the U.S. Hispanic because their individualistic understanding of the human person can only allow them to regard Hispanic interaction with Jesus and Mary and the saints as magical and superstitious. Only a lived experience of human interconnection that includes Jesus and Mary as present members of the community can undergird an understanding of Hispanic religious practices as authentic (Doyle 12).

The cause for Hispanic and Latino Catholics in the United States would be advanced in the *National Plan for Hispanic Ministry*. This would be the fruit of the work of Rev. Robert Stern, the director of the Hispanic Apostolate for the Archdiocese of New York. Shortly after Father Robert Beltran was appointed by the United States Catholic Conference after the Second Vatican Council as a member of their Spanish-speaking division, Stern invited Beltran to a meeting to discuss forming a regional plan for Hispanic ministry. The regional meeting would end up being a group of 250 people from throughout the country gathered in Washington, D.C.. The group developed a list of 78 items that they felt were keeping the Hispanic community from full participation in

the Church. Among the items was a call for Hispanic leadership at every level to help advance the case for Hispanic and Latino Catholics everywhere. The work would culminate with the *National Plan for Hispanic Ministry* by the United States Catholic Bishops in 1987. The *National Plan* would call for the engagement of Hispanic and Latino culture at all levels, particularly in music and art. At that time, the Hispanic and Latino Catholics in the United States would not yet have a hymnal that embodied their culture and tradition.

Just two years after the *National Plan for Hispanic Ministry* in 1989, Oregon Catholic Press would publish the very first hymnal for Spanish-speaking Catholics. *Flor y Canto*, which translates to "flower and song", would fill this need. This would be a popular hymnal for Catholics of Hispanic and Latino backgrounds.

> It has been said that the very title *Flor y Canto* (Flower and Song) conveys the heart of Hispanic piety and therefore its music, for both flower and song grow from the fertile ground and are dependent upon the nurture of God. Imagery is rich in Hispanic music, often fresh, vigorous, and dynamic. Song texts rely on strophe/refrain patterns (*estrofa/estribillo)* and are not restricted by rhyming schemes. When combined with music the syllabic style predominates though often, much to the consternation of the uninitiated, more than one syllable is required on a given note (Beinert 372).

Those who worked on *Flor y Canto* used models of the stranger and the one exiled in introducing this new work to the people. Bishop William J. Levada, then Archbishop of Portland in Oregon, wrote,

> The Hispanic people have led the way with steadfast courage in reminding our society of our call to hospitality to the immigrant and stranger: we were all strangers here at one time. The prophets of the Old Testament and our Lord himself teach us that the stranger might well be the bearer of special graces, and might very well be an angel in disguise. And so it is with the Spanish-speaking people who have joined us in the United States. They are a people whose presence and message embodies justice and the call to peaceful resolution of human difference (Levada 1).

Msgr. Secareo Gabarain, of Our Lady of the Snows Parish in Madrid, Spain, turned to the Babylonian Exile, when the people of Israel were thrust from their homeland by the invading Babylonian forces, to make the people that for many Spanish-speakers feel as if they are outside of their home:

> They said to the Hebrews existed in Babylonia: "Sing us a song from your country." And they answered, "How can we sing if we are so far from our land and our homes?" When we sing in church we express the joy we feel, for we are in the house of God. There we are united with all our brothers and sisters. So we sing because we feel at home (Gabarain 1).

Gabarain's comments show the need for cultural adaptation; if one does not feel welcome in the Church or "at home" there, they lose the opportunity to feel united with one another to give glory to God and really truly sing. *Flor y Canto* takes care of this need.

Flor y Canto would undergo two revisions, once in 2001 and again 2012 as the American English speaking church began use of a new translation of the mass. GIA Publications did not publish a Spanish-language hymnal until 2012's *Cantamos al Señor*,

but included many bilingual hymns in their standard-issue hymnals. 2011's *Gather: Third Edition* would make a special point to include Spanish translations alongside the English language of many popular hymns.

In 2002, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops would publish *Encuentro and Mission: A Renewed Pastoral Framework for Hispanic Ministry*, a revision of the 1987 work. In terms of music, *Encuentro and Mission* would encourage the formation of liturgical ministers, including music. The document called for the Church to "develop and provide—through collaboration between the diocesan offices for worship and for Hispanic ministry—training to ordained and other liturgical ministers in Spanish, particularly in the areas of preaching and selection of liturgical music" (*Encuentro and Mission* 16). The document further encourages people to all work together and to celebrate together, creating liturgies that are culturally diverse and allow the gifts of all to come for in the liturgy, music included. This is because the universal message of the Catholic Church has moved the Church to end the creation of specific ethnic parishes.

While the creation of two hymnals to address the two largest ethnic minority communities in the United States took 20 years, it reflects the Second Vatican Council's inclusive approach toward liturgy. While these two groups have had time to get much of their work done, other groups have only begun a process of inculturation in the United States, experiencing growth in the United States. For example, the rapid growth of Catholicism in some parts of Asia and the Asian Pacific along with immigration to the United States has created the need for liturgical music in languages such as Tagalog and

Korean. As long as principles from the Second Vatican Council continue, expect more and more to help bring outsiders to feel at home once again.

Chapter 4

AGENDAS TO RESTORE GREGORIAN CHANT, POLYPHONY, AND LATIN AS EXCLUSIVE FORMS OF MUSIC WORSHIP

Emerging from the Second Vatican Council is a number of "restoration" agendas: positions held by Catholics that advocate for certain forms of liturgical music that have existed almost exclusively at one time or another throughout the history of the Church. These agendas most often promote the use of Gregorian chant, Renaissance polyphony, and more basically the use of only a pipe organ during liturgical celebrations. Only this music is considered "sacred"; all else presumably then, profane. While the intention of restoring the "sacred" nature of worship is good, it closes off other possibilities and methods of worship. Even more significantly, the restoration agenda limits the notion of the sacred to a particular era or style of music. Such attitudes, which have been implemented steadily over the 50 years since the Second Vatican Council, undermine the "no rigid uniformity" declaration of the Second Vatican Council. This is often accompanied by the attitude that there must be rigid uniformity in this regard, and often demand that this agenda be universally adopted by the American Catholic Church.

Singing goes back to earliest Christian history; in the Gospels, the Apostles sang hymns and in his letters, St. Paul writes that Christians should sing hymns, psalms, and sacred songs to God. Gregorian chant has a long history in the Roman Catholic Church. Gregorian chant dates to the eighth century. It is named for Pope Gregory I, one of two in the Catholic Church to be honored with the title, "The Great". Gregory is often pictured in art with a dove sitting on his shoulder, expressing the idea that the Holy Spirit rested upon him as he devised Gregorian chant at some point during the fifth century C.E.

Scholars now feel that it was 300 years or so after his death that this chant came to be within a community of monks. By design, Gregorian chant is bound to text and is meant to function liturgically:

> The task of the melody is to decorate the text, to interpret it and, to help the hearer assimilate it. For this chant, the song is a liturgical act—a prayer to, and a praise of Almighty God. Its words are sacred for they are nearly all taken from the Bible from the Psalter in particular. And apart from a few Greek and Hebrew exceptions, the language is Latin (Cardine 5).

By design, chant is monophonic; it does not add any notes beyond its melody line.

For Church use there are two types: type chant and cantus chant. Type chants are composed so that many different texts may fit with it, constructed using tones that accommodate varying numbers of words. Cantus chant has a formula that uses existing set musical phrases to form a new or extended melody. Many chanted texts in use in the Church today use this formula. In these melodies, one will find not only the basic musical material, perfect design and intentionally neutral colors, capable of evoking all sorts of emotions, but a musical setting perfectly adapted and geared towards bringing out the meaning of a particular text (Cardine 11).

Rhythm is a point of contention in Gregorian chant, as we will see in reflections from musicians at the period around the time of the Second Vatican Council. Since Gregorian chant existed prior to musical notation as we know it today, there are no set time signatures or rhythms. While many musicians saw it as a problem, Cardine sees it as a bonus:

> The text has written itself all the liberty of prose, a liberty which it communicates through the chant and as, while phrases and parts of phrases are in proportion to one another, there remains a great deal of flexibility. A rigid sense of symmetry is nowhere to be found (19).

But by the scholar and advocate Dom Eugine Cardine's own admission, Gregorian aesthetics are difficult to discuss; the individual's ear and feeling are the primary judges. Surely chant has captured the ear and feelings of Cardine, but this may not necessarily translate to others.

As musical notation developed, chant evolved into what Cardine calls a period of "decadence" (2). Since musical notation did not allow for different values of notes that went outside of the fixed musical rules, the development of notation made some things problematic for chant. In the 13th century, musical development continued and groups such as the Cistercians and Dominicans adapted chant to the new musical rules. This initial period of change was kept from getting out of hand, according to Cardine, because "an attachment to and love for authentic tradition prevented the evil from spreading any further" (34).

Soon, composers added descants to melody lines, usually four or five notes above on the musical scale above the melody line, causing the monadic (one-tone) character of chant to be lost. Soon, the two tone chant evolved into polyphony and counterpoint and Cardine says the chant was reduced to being a mere source of themes to be developed. To many musicians, the name given to Gregorian chant became "plainsong", a term to which chant scholars such as Cardine take offense. As chant became "plain", polyphony emerged as a great artistic form of music in the period of the Italian Renaissance.

Polyphony tended to look down upon Gregorian chant as "barbaric" because it infringed upon quantitative rules governing the melodic treatment of Latin syllables (Cardine 36).

This change led to more substitutes for chant known as "musical plain chant" in the 18th and 19th century, particularly in France, thanks to well-known musicians such as Henri Du Mont. To champions of authentic chant such as Cardine, this was not authentic Gregorian chant and soon the chant faded away, along with polyphony that had been reduced to single and double note values. Cardine wrote, "This spurious category of compositions illustrates how dull and uninteresting the last remaining vestiges of Gregorian chant had become" (57).

Perhaps what is best remembered by those enamored with Gregorian chant is a period of chant restoration in the late 19th to early 20th century. If the great chant could be restored once, then advocates would certainly think that it should be and could be restored once again. The late 1800s saw a movement towards bringing back what scholars see as the authentic Gregorian chant. Pius X's *Motu Proprio*, *Tra le Sollecitudini*, a papal decree intended to reform liturgical music, set Gregorian chant back into motion.

Tra le Sollecitudini was the standard instruction on liturgical music once issued by Pope Pius X in 1903 and was the authoritative statement on liturgical music up until the Second Vatican Council and subsequent documents that followed. Pius X's approach to Gregorian chant was a call for a full restoration to its former glory on the grounds that this chant possessed the characteristics necessary for sacred music: it excluded profanity, it was true art, and it had a suitable melody to adapt to liturgical text:

> On these grounds, Gregorian chant has long been regarded as the supreme model for sacred music, so that it is fully legitimate to lay down the following rule: the more closely a composition for Church approaches in its movement, inspiration and savor the Gregorian form, the more sacred and liturgical it becomes; and the more out of harmony it is with that supreme model, the less worthy it is of the Temple (Pius X 3).

And with the "worthiness" declared by Pius X came a decree mandating the restoration of chant:

> The ancient traditional Gregorian chant then must, therefore, in a large measure be restored to the functions of liturgical worship, and the fact must be accepted by all that an ecclesiastical function loses none of its solemnity when accompanied by this music alone. Special efforts are to be made to restore the use of Gregorian chant by the people so that the faithful may again take a more active part in the ecclesiastical offices, as well was the case in ancient times (Pius X 4).

Unfortunately, from 1903 through the period of the council, the fact was not accepted by all, and the Council opened some other doors while affirming the great contributions of chant to history.

The failure of chant to take hold in the United States was not without effort. Justine Bayard Ward took on the task of working to bring about chant according to the messages of Pope Pius X in *Tre Le Sollecitundini*. In *There Were Also Many Women There,* Ward is quoted as saying, "This Papal document had a profound impression on me, and I had already promised myself that when I was received into the Church I would

work for this good cause." (Harmon 18). The "Ward Method" would become known around the world and Ward herself helped organize the International Congress of Gregorian Chant.

The Congress, well-intentioned and with great effort, did not meet Ward's goals and did not accomplish Ward's goal of converting Americans to chant. As Katharine Harmon notes, Benedictine choirmaster Dom Andre Moeguerean, O.S.B., had concluded that the Congress failed to "convert all of America to chant" (Harmon 18). The teaching of chant to children only found success within small groups. The Second Vatican Council allowed for those groups who found success to use it; at the Council other options became viable. But for some, the council was intended to keep working on such efforts that were up until that point unsuccessful.

The documents of the Second Vatican Council recognized the contributions of chant and affirmed the good that chant had brought to the Church. Some would misinterperate this declaration as being a push toward an exclusivity to chant, including Cardine, who sees the Council as doing nothing more than advancing his particular love for Gregorian Chant: “Vatican II expressed the wish that the restoration be pursued and brought to completion” (Cardine 43). According to Cardine, the statement declares his point of view that all should feel his way: “It is common knowledge that to this day, Gregorian chant themes continue to provide inspiration for many composers and for many musical masterpieces, especially among those written for voice and for organ” (35). But, thanks to the Second Vatican Council, many would prefer to find their voice through different styles of music.

At the time of the Second Vatican Council, those involved in liturgical music knew there would be change, and the Church Music Association of America was most aware. In the Winter 1965 edition of *Caecilia*, the Catholic music review publication of the Association, editor Francis P. Schmitt included one last editorial; along with the changes of the Second Vatican Council, the organization itself would also make some changes. The *aggorniamento* – an Italian word for the "updating" of the church taking place—would come to the association, and the response of Schmitt is not a happy one. In the response, an undercurrent of hostility develops that will continue from the Second Vatican Council onward.

Perhaps liturgical musicians could have seen a push away from chant coming, and the magazine itself may have been part of the problem of chant. Just as occurred at earlier points in history, the publication often discussed problems of rhythm that occurred in the free-flowing chant. The controversy was documented in John Rayburn's *Gregorian Chant: A History of the Controversy Surrounding its Rhythm.* Much of the text cites *Caecilia* magazine. Because he may have helped the cause against chant, Schmitt points a finger of blame to himself for the updating that would soon take place in the Church. Schmitt says even he was "giddy joining the debunkers of the legend which had the Holy Ghost perched atop St. Gregory's shoulder as he penned the melodies which took his name" (137).

At the start, Schmitt sounds like someone about to lose something very near and dear to his heart. His approach, at least initially, is a very reasonable one that resonates with the message of the Second Vatican Council:

> I do not say that Gregorian chant is meat for everybody, but let no one say that it is meat for nobody. I am very sure that were it not for the general musical decline that has set in since the chant restoration, a decline that continues with a devastating thrust, the chant would not now be despised as something not pastoral (137).

Schmitt recognizes that chant is "meat" for some, though not all. Should the Council's propositions be implemented, chant would be preserved as a great treasure and a great option for those who can use it for an authentic faith experience. But Schmitt's resentment for other styles of music seems to exist as grounds to launch a counter-attack.

A great seed of the preservation movement comes from Schmitt's allegation that Americans did not really participate in the Second Vatican Council. "There was that joke about the American hierarchy reported during the first session of Vatican II by Father Raymond Bosler, I believe: everyone had come to Rome with ideas except the Americans who came with return tickets" (138). Schmitt hoped that many would have come to the defense of chant within the Church. While not a total fan of English-style chant, Schmitt indicates that Anglican churches have successfully chanted in the vernacular and that any chance to compromise this way has been "airily cast aside" (139).

Besides being upset about his preferred Gregorian chant being cast aside, Schmitt was not happy with what began to become a part of the American Catholic liturgy. He concludes his essay with a section that says "almost anything" has been allowed into liturgical use, including many new attempts that come with ineptitude in the name of congregational participation:

> The other-than-chant picture is possibly even more depressing. Here one wishes that he might reach those to whom chant has never made sense. He should dare to wish so because these people know nothing, care nothing about music, liturgical or otherwise. But they are mightily interested in congregational participation, as the saying goes (Schmitt 139).

In other words, Schmitt reduces the call for congregational participation is an excuse for trying anything that may get the people of the congregation involved in the liturgy. But, Schmitt concludes that the call for congregational involvement would lead to passing fads in the liturgy.

Schmitt's thought is that, like a hit song on the radio, new pop-style liturgical music would quickly disappear as music does from the hit charts. And, like popular music the composers would be doing so for profit.

> As a Congregationalist, I should, on the whole, be more inclined to look kindly on the fad of liturgical, hip-swinging pop-music. The trouble is that in the "world" the pop people know and expect their fate: idols of a generation of two year's life or less. Get them into church and they would likely be canonized if only because their music, paid for, would be on the shelves. Even such a state of affairs would not be especially deleterious except for the fact that today's pop folk inevitably become square and disgusting to tomorrow's (Schmitt 140).

Even if liturgical music were to go the way of pop-style music in which some compositions gain popularity and fade, many have withstood the test of time. History has

shown that many such hymns in the post-conciliar era indeed have become standards in the liturgy over time. Two good sources of this are "100 Songs Every Parish Should Know By Heart", published by Sheila Browne and Richard P. Gibala in 2004 in *Church Magazine*, as well as the results of a 2006 Association of National Pastoral Musicians poll of liturgical compositions that most "fostered and nourished" the respondent's personal life (Brown 37).

Appearing on both lists is a number of hymns written immediately after the Second Vatican Council and includes 1966's "I Am the Bread of Life" by Sister Suzanne Toolan, R.S.M. The hymn placed number 39 in "100 Songs Every Parish Should Know By Heart" and number 13 in the National Pastoral Musicians' poll. The hymn appears in four prominent hymnals currently in print: G.I.A. Publications' "traditional" hymnal *Worship: Fourth Edition*; G.I.A. Publications' "contemporary" hymnal *Gather: Third Edition*; Oregon Catholic Press' most popular hymnal *Breaking Bread*; and World Library Publications' *We Celebrate* missal. Schmitt was correct; much of the music of 1966 has disappeared from use in these hymnals. But, a number remain because they promoted congregational participation and outlasted any fad.

One final concern of Schmitt is music catering to youth through popular music in worship. A priest and youth choir director of the group known as "Father Flanagan's Boys Town", Schmitt worked often with young boys at a home and school that was for orphan boys. These boys, according to Schmitt, listened to popular music like everyone else. Therefore there was no reason to introduce music in liturgy geared to youth:

> My boys canvass the campus with transistors like anybody else. And they would die laughing if it were subjected to them that we manage some sort

> of Freudian sublimation in matters of worship. Having sung Father Daniel Lord's mission verses to all the old football songs in my own halcyon days, I doubt whether the church needs so to reach out to our youth, or any other social stratum. Let them and their clerical dance masters have at it, and all the way – outside of worship (Schmitt 140).

Father Daniel Lord, S.J. was a forward-thinking priest and educational reformer who died in 1955. His composition "For Christ the King" became well known and was sung by many youth in the same manner of popular music of the day. While not a liturgical composition, the song became a sung "anthem" of the movement. To someone with a rigid worldview of liturgical music such as Francis Schmitt, it is easy to see why separate music appealing to the youth would be a concern. But, opportunities to rally the youth created an opportunity for catechesis for the youth and Lord has been lauded long after his death. And, if the youth cannot associate music familiar to their senses, they may not grow within the faith.

Schmitt's goals appear to be the same as the Council: he wanted more vibrant participation that represented a great commitment to the faith. However, because he was at odds with other musical styles he was unable to reconcile the idea of music that might be of the popular realm. Ultimately, Schmitt said to a former choir member of his that he was "put out to pasture by the new Boys Town regime. Was told there's no need for a choir director there" (Shannon 4). This left people like Schmitt disappointed that times had changed, and eventually they changed to the point where he felt as if they did not need him anymore. According to the declarations of the Council, there would be room for all types of music. As time went on, the restorationists and those looking for

something new began to reject the other side, and some began to push for a return to polyphony, the work of the great composers such as Mozart, Haydn and Schubert.

Much of the use of Renaissance polyphony had disappeared from use in the Roman Catholic by the end of the 1960s. Mozart, Haydn, Schubert and many other big-name composers wrote many pieces and settings of the sung parts of the mass in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, which grew out of the principles of the Italian Renaissance. Much of this music ended up being performed by choirs and orchestras outside of a liturgical setting, due to their complexity and length. After a 1978 article in the *Wall Street Journal* about a performance of Handel's *Messiah* Haydn's *Lord Nelson Mass* and Monteverdi's *Magnificat* held at Avery Fisher Hall in New York City, Virginia Schubert wrote in *Musicam Sacram* magazine that 18th and 19th century music should be moved from the concert hall and back into a church, where she believed it belonged. She represents the view that due to the sacred nature of the music, its most suitable place is within a church, and not a concert hall. However, these pieces do not allow for the "full, conscious, and active" participation of the faithful at Mass because they are meant to be performances.

While Schubert is pleased that those involved in the publication of *Musicam Sacram* are treating sacred music with such great enthusiasm and vigor, she feels that because they were written for the Roman Catholic liturgy and specifically for the Mass, the group does not do the great works full justice:

> Even from a purely artistic viewpoint a concert performance of a Mass is deficient. You probably have all attended such concerts, as have I. Although a fine choir with orchestra performs a Mozart or Haydn or

> Schubert Mass in a technically impeccable way, there is something artistically unsatisfactory, even upsetting about the succession without pause of parts which do not relate to each other, but fit rather into an overall action which they should embellish, illustrate, and solemnize (Schubert 13).

Several reasons prohibit use of this music in the liturgy. First, by Schubert's own admission, a conductor must be aware of the sacred action of the Mass and be able to capture the true spirit of the pieces. Having accomplished conductors trained in both theology and music would be difficult to do at every parish. Further, every parish would have to have a choir talented enough to sing these complicated pieces. Third, the costs required to hire a qualified conductor would be prohibitive to many parishes. But most importantly, the advanced works from the 18th and 19th centuries would diminish the ability of a congregation to participate, undermining the goal of the Second Vatican Council.

For an illustration of the associated costs involved, we can find them in Schubert's own work. A concert at Avery Fisher Hall required an admission of four to ten dollars for the audience of 3000 to watch them perform. The musicians and singers were all paid union-scale salaries. Presumably there was rent to be paid for the hall as well. The article states that the money collected accounted for just seventy percent of the total cost of the performance. Thousands of dollars per Mass is simply not doable for most churches in the United States. Schubert believes that in Europe, free cathedral choirs have given "performances of excellent quality" and that "trained amateurs have, can, and do perform Catholic liturgical music with great beauty and artistry" (Schubert 15). Her

next solution is that Churches arrange performances of groups such as *Musicam Sacram* occasionally. But, that demeans the ministerial aspect of the choir in the local community in which the members of the choir participate in leading the faithful.

The intricate nature of the music exceeds the talent of most Roman Catholic parishes to participate with music. If the issue is availability and the peoples' ability to sing, Schubert proposes that the availability for a performance at announced Church services would make the music available to them and become part of their ability:

> It would seem to me that the performance of sacred music as a publicly announced church service would make it more accessible to the general public than a concept performance because there would be no admission charge. Entrance would no longer be limited to the moneyed elite or to those who frequent concert series. A new public could be introduced to classical music (Schubert 14).

But, could the average Catholic participate in these Masses, fully in Latin and in four different vocal parts with intricate placement of notes? Music this difficult requires professionals. Like the concert hall, people in the congregation would be reduced to simple spectators. Schubert's own use of the word "performance" best applies to this type of music.

Finally, Schubert's call for the return to the polyphonic music of the Classical era includes a call for a return to many pre-conciliar ideals that the council changed:

> In order to be faithful to Haydn's religious intention and to put the Mass in a fitting artistic setting, the music must be part of a total picture of language (Latin), ministers, ceremonies, and vestments that equal the

> complexity, style and richness of the music, or else it will always be a concert in the choir loft with no relation to a pedestrian reading of the Mass in the sanctuary. Such a performance would be as aesthetically deficient as one in a concert call, and spiritually, for those of us who care, not just about music, but about how God is worshiped, the liturgical action of the Mass would come off second best to the music (Schubert 16).

Schubert calls for the church to "proudly reclaim its heritage" and "make an artistic statement that inspires and fosters the creation of truly beautiful and artistic works" (Schubert 17). But, failure to move forward would undo any progress that was previously made. And, her repeated call for "performances" contrast sharply what the Second Vatican Council was about: the full, conscious, and active participation of all people. "Performances," no matter how beautiful they may or may not be, do not give the people in the pews a sense of ownership over their worship. Beautiful? Maybe, but the concert hall is the place most appropriate for such music in the retooled Church.

As different styles of liturgical music developed in the United States, Monsignor Richard T. Shuler's 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood in 1985 roughly coincided with the 20th anniversary of the Second Vatican Council. The jubilee celebration, held at the Church of Saint Agnes in Saint Paul, Minnesota, was a Latin Mass that included Mass parts such as the Gloria, Alleluia, etc. from the elaborate Mass setting *Missa in Tempre Belli* by Haden. *Musicam Sacram,* the magazine that succeeded *Caecilian,* published the homily delivered by Father Richard M. Hogan at the jubilee mass. Father Hogan's remarks affirm the need for people to accept the changes of the Second Vatican Council but also seem to deliver a message that rejects change.

Reflecting upon change in the litury, Hogan said, "This must be so" (22). One might think that he was headed to an affirmation of the principles of the Second Vatican Council with a reflection such as this:

> The Church is a living and growing institution which must change and develop with the times. In one way the council was long overdue. The Church needed to grow and develop along with the twentieth century (Hogan 23).

Hogan is correct in his assessment that the Second Vatican Council was a much needed change for the Church. However, he finds a way to jump to the defense of some particular styles of music and advocate a particular position.

Hogan describes the two extremes that developed after the Second Vatican Council: either people pushed for a total rejection of the old, or, people pushed toward a total rejection of the new. Delivered in the context of the Latin Mass, Hogan declared that sometimes with change is the "wholehearted acceptance of the new and a total rejection of the old" (Hogan 24). With the Second Vatican Council opening up the vernacular for liturgies, those seeking the restoration suggest no real change in the liturgy and do little to fulfill the reforms of the rites that were advanced by the Second Vatican Council. As Hogan described, there were reactions that met both extremes.

Hogan mentions by name Father Gommar De Pauw as one example of an extreme. De Pauw was respected and Pope Paul VI bestowed the Monsignor title on him as "a mark of the Holy Father's appreciation and gratitude for Father De Pauw's work" (Cuneo 3). De Pauw is credited for founding what is known as the "Catholic Traditionalist Movement", which argued in favor of preserving the Latin Mass; the group

eventually tried to reverse some principles of the Second Vatican Council. The group rejected the Order of the Mass developed by Pope Paul VI, the set of prayers and sung responses used universally for the liturgy. Another group even argued in favor of the Tridentine rite, a different form of the Latin liturgy which predated even that which the Catholic traditionalist movement advocated. The 1962 *Order of the Mass* by Pope Paul VI did allow for Latin to be used in public and private masses, but most opted for the vernacular.

Hogan pointed out that while the old is good enough for some, change for others meant "the wholesale abandoning of the past", including the use of Latin, church books and teaching:

> Many believed Latin was outlawed. Gregorian chant and the wonderful polyphony of past ages was to be relegated solely to the concert hall. Churches had to be completely rebuilt. Old books were to be discarded and even burned. Catechisms had to be tossed. Everything which predated 1965 was invalid (Hogan 24).

Hogan himself says that this approach was "complete nonsense" and that neither extreme "satisfies the will of the Church". While this assessment may be correct, Hogan's proposed solution of a "middle road" will not work either, as Hogan maintains the church should "retain what we have" (24). One wonders precisely what time period or which *Order of the Mass* Hogan advocates.

The next decade introduced one of the best-known examples advocating restoration positions: *Why Catholics Can't Sing: The Culture of Catholicism and the Triumph of Bad Taste*. This book, published in 1991, demonstrates that there exists a

narrow-minded, judgmental view within the church regarding what constitutes "proper" liturgical music. The book's author, Thomas Day, identifies himself as a highly-qualified musician. He holds a Ph.D. in musicology from Columbia University and is a member of the American Guild of Organists. The Guild of Organists often advocates use of exclusively organ music. In the introduction to his book, Day's mission is made strikingly clear to his readers:

> A large number of American Catholics, I have to report, do not know what is meant by such terms as 'good, standard hymns, vigorously sung,' 'Gregorian chant,' 'pipe organ,' or 'sung Mass.' Some bewildered readers may have to visit various churches of different denominations and listen to recordings to become familiar with music once considered the common inheritance of all Roman Catholics (Day 5).

There are two implications to be taken away from this statement. The first is that many within the Church did invoke a spirit of the Second Vatican Council that, at least initially, there were other options for liturgical music beyond Gregorian chant and pipe organ music. Further, when speaking of certain types of music as being "once considered the common inheritance of Roman Catholics", he seems to advocate that such music return to be that "inheritance" (Day 5).

But would that "common inheritance indeed return to the American Catholic Church", given the declarations of the Second Vatican Council? Ironically enough, Day believes that without the Second Vatican Council, music would have completely disappeared from the Roman Catholic liturgy in the United States. "Music would have virtually disappeared from the majority of churches, except for pastel background music

during communion and wedding marches" (Day 14). Prior to the Second Vatican Council, little to no music was used in the liturgy. Generally, there was music at one Mass on a given Sunday, and the choir did all the singing. Otherwise, people usually sung while involved in popular devotions and in little else. So, if music would have "virtually disappeared" from American Catholic churches altogether, why, then would Day promote particular types of music?

Day explains, "The classic Christian hymn is big and broad and essentially simple in its construction; it can hold a group of people in its large motions. The German-speakers, the Poles, the Slovaks, and other ethnic groups carried this broad "sound" in their memories when they arrived in America" (Day 28). The Irish, Day believes, came to the United States with their own folk music used exclusively in their own parishes. But Day argues that the movement in the liturgy has moved from the "big and broad hymns" to become part of an "ego renewal" rather than authentic worship.

Day speaks as if the American folk mass almost deceptively entered its way into the American Catholic Church through this "ego renewal" that puts the emphasis on the liturgy on either the priest or the liturgical musicians. To observe what Day calls:

> Ego renewal, the 'softer image,' and people-music (as opposed to adoration music)…one should page through a songbook entitled *Glory and Praise*. This collection, published by North American Liturgy Resources, started out in the 1970s as a book for the folk group, for that special folk liturgy once a week. By the mid-1980s, however, *Glory and Praise* had received a new format to make it look like a regular hymnal (Day 69).

By Day's own admission the hymnal had become a best-seller. He bemoans the lack of older music in the collection and says that "countless Catholic institutions have tossed out most of the great hymns, organ music, chant, and choral music into a trash can called 'churchy music'" (Day 70). Instead of advocating that newer music be added to the repertoire, Day looks to completely eradicate it.

Accordingly Day attempts to discredit particular pieces of liturgical music that are in the genre of American folk music that have become a central part of Catholic worship in the United States since the Second Vatican Council, calling out several by name in an attempt to eradicate them from the liturgy. Of the particular hymns called out is Bob Dufford's "Be Not Afraid":

> The whole style of "Be Not Afraid" could be described as 'studied whimsy.' The group or the soloist up front whimsically feel the meaning of the words; when one 'feels.' One lingers, one moves unexpectedly. That dreaming and drifting from note to note, all carefully specified in the notation on the page, does not make life easy for the poor congregation. Musical whimsy of this sort is quite difficult for an assembly of people to reproduce (Day 74).

"Be Not Afraid" was another hymn featured prominently in both the Association of National Pastoral Musicians survey and in "100 Songs Every Parish Should Learn By Heart". In the survey, "Be Not Afraid" placed third in the list of hymns that "fostered and nourished the respondent's life", and 11th in the list of hymns that every parish should know. Despite the allegation by Day that "The congregation must again get out calculators and hold 'you' for the exact number of micropulses before quickly snapping

in with the rapid pitches on 'through it'", the hymn has withstood the period of time since its initial publication (Day 74). In fact, the hymn is published in G.I.A. Publications' "traditional" hymnal *Worship: Fourth Edition*; G.I.A. Publications' "contemporary" hymnal *Gather: Third Edition*; Oregon Catholic Press' most popular hymnal *Breaking Bread*; and World Library Publications' *We Celebrate* missal. Additionally, in ethnic circles, "Be Not Afraid" is published in the 2012 edition of *Lead Me, Guide Me*, the hymnal for African-American communities, and is translated into Spanish for the 2012 edition of *Oramos Cantando*.

Another well-known hymn with which Day takes issue is John Foley's "One Bread, One Body". Another hymn from the mentioned *Glory and Praise* collection, Day feels that it is unsingable:

> The theologian, the liturgical expert, or the member of the parish liturgy committee will move his or her index finger up and down the words of a song like "One Bread, One Body", count up the appropriate doctrinal references, and then declare the composition to be an imperishable masterpiece. But nobody, certainly no mere musician, is allowed to evaluate the work as assembly music. Look at the melody: 'One bread' (pause, gasp) – "one body"—pause, gasp) – 'one Lord of all" (pause, gasp), and so on. It seems to be suffering a debilitating case of emphysema (Day 75).

"One Bread One Body" is another hymn that has withstood the test of time since its publication and remains one of the top hymns in the Church today. Like "Be Not Afraid", "One Bread One Body" is published in G.I.A. Publications' "traditional" hymnal

Worship: Fourth Edition, G.I.A. Publications' "contemporary" hymnal *Gather: Third Edition*, Oregon Catholic Press' most popular hymnal *Breaking Bread*, and World Library Publications' *We Celebrate* missal. In "100 Songs Every Parish Should Learn By Heart", "One Bread, One Body" placed number 71; on the National Pastoral Musicians survey it came in number 21.

Day's personal selections, those from the 18th and 19th centuries, encounter the same types of challenges in participation mentioned before. But, this debate did not end with Day himself. Many prominent writers jumped on the Thomas Day bandwagon and have cited him as an authoritative source regarding contemporary liturgical music. Some were so inspired to the point that his contributions moved along their own writings on liturgical music. Almost immediately some began to notice, including Catherine Dower in 1991.

Dower writes for the magazine *Sacred Music*, the publication of the Church Music Association of America, an organization which champions a return to chant and organ music and rejects contemporary music movements that began after the Second Vatican Council:

> Now it appears that the liturgical renewal must begin all over again. Day suggests that we "smash" the microphones, and I heartily agree. He wants good, plain and wholesome music: a few basic hymns and unaccompanied chant-like singing. Gregorian chant has an aesthetic, an hypnotic sound. It is impersonal, humbling. Church music should elevate the people to prayer. The problem with music at present is that it is unsingable, unmetered, and not congregationally oriented (Dower 112).

Dower believes that the solution to people not singing is a return to the old hymns and chants she thinks they will be able to sing more easily. Dower is not the only one to follow Day's lead.

Another such author is Father Richard John Neuhaus who wrote on music in his book *Catholic Matters: Confusion, Controversy, and the Splendor of Truth*. He calls for Catholics to be different. Neuhaus, a convert to Catholicism himself, is targeting potential converts to Catholicism, and to Neuhaus, the music is a form of embarrassment. Neuhaus cites Day as his main source:

> Anyone thinking about becoming Catholic is forewarned. Must reading is a little book by Thomas Day, a modern classic, *Why Catholics Can't Sing: The Culture of Catholicism and the Triumph of Bad Taste.* It is both comic and sad. Cradle Catholics read it laughing through their tears. Converts brace themselves. Day sends up chatty priests who emcee the Mass as though it were their own live talk show, song leaders who challenge anyone else to sing, and happy-clappy ditties that might embarrass preschoolers (Neuhaus 112).

The "ego renewal" thesis is clear in Neuhaus' writing as he said that most of the text of liturgical music today is much more concerned with the people in the assembly rather than God.

Though not directly inspired by Day, others scholars share the same concern that Catholics are not singing. For 30 years, the push toward removing the "unacceptable" and "unworthy" continued full-steam. William Abbott, a career writer and active Catholic, believes that a return to chant will solve all the Church's singing problems. Abbott found

in 1998 the music of the American Catholic Church to be "annoyingly intrusive". Abbott goes to Mass with the intention to "communicate with God", and considers Church music a performance because either "Catholics don't sing" or the music is "just plain unsingable" (Abbott 2). In his view expressed in "Post Vatican II ' La Author - La La Music Unworthy of the Catholic Church'", Abbott misses the point of the Second Vatican Council as he advocates one style of music, Gregorian chant, as the "only" form of art.

Abbott is quick to criticize composition approaches in the American Catholic Church that challenge the "old". One approach to composition is to take text that is "a difficult set of words" and put it to music (Abbott 2). Any newer setting of the Lord's Prayer is not good enough: "You can't let 'as we forgive those who trespass against us into a neat music phrase" (Abbott 2). As a result there are "at least five versions of the Our Father floating around nowadays: the jumpy one, the slow, slow one", neglecting to describe the other two. "The new guys have made a mess of it, and they seemingly refuse to give up and let us sing the old one", as "none has beauty or grace" such as that one (Abbott 2).

Abbott's view sees beauty as having a very limited definition. By calling the "old one" the only one with beauty, there appears to be a bias toward the familiar. Once again we are brought to the "true art" argument. Only the style advocated is good enough for the liturgy. Abbott offers two examples of "true art": the Sistine Chapel and Gregorian chant. "The glory and vitality of any organization are reflected in its creative accomplishments...The passion of our faith has fueled the machinery of creativity and driven it to supreme achievements" (Abbott 3). To Abbott, anything else is a "third-rate

adaptation". The Second Vatican Council allowed for people to find their own passion in the faith through styles of music that are, in the eyes of the beholder, true beauty. This is not the same for everyone, and the primary of the principle of full, active, and conscious participation.

In a similar vein is Webster Young. In "On Vatican II and the Music of the People", in a commentary Young condemns musical taste in the United States published in the *National Catholic Register*. Young finds fault with the phrase, "The music of the people", the mandate from the Second Vatican Council to the whole world. The reason Young takes issue to this mandate is that he sees many styles of music "superior" to others, and believes that people are "musically ignorant" (Young 1). Young seems to think that when the Second Vatican Council made this declaration, they were unaware that music would be what it is and "music of the people" should not apply.

Young sees music as "forced upon" roughly 90 million Americans every single day and finds American music to be less than accomplished musically. The result is that "musical ignorance is on the rise among the populace, and music taste is in decline" and "nearly every country in the world has come under the dominance of rock and pop music", and "there is no question that this is the 'music of the people'" (1). Due to what he feels is sub-par music, Young advocates that the Church do what is contrary to the spirit of Second Vatican Council and undo the "music of the people" edict found in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* point 119.

To Young, the music of today never would have been considered suitable, had those who facilitated the Second Vatican Council been privy to what music was going to become: “The participants of Vatican II could not know that ‘the people's music' would

soon mirror all over the world, the juggernaut of American popular music - one of the weakest folk music forms in music history, and yet a superpower in music" (Young 1). Any musical style that is truly "the music of the people," should be suitable for the liturgy today. Young simply does not like that that happens to be.

Young arrives at his true agenda: Gregorian chant is his preferred style of liturgical music. "Typical three- and four-chord harmonies of pop songs and melodies that do not reach the level of mediocre when compared to disciplined music, the great hymns, Gregorian chant, or classical melody" (2). Had qualified musicians been consulted, Young believes things would have been different. Young identifies himself as a pianist, violinist, and guitarist who has "never once been spontaneously asked for advice by anyone" and is commonly asked to play at Mass "to work under a volunteer little qualified for his or her position" (23). While Young may indeed be a skilled musician and have a point about volunteers working in music director positions in the church, he offers no conclusive evidence that all music directors would have this same opinion.

The parent company that owns *The National Catholic Register,* The Eternal Word Television Network, commonly known as EWTN, is a Catholic cable television station. Their website features an "Ask the Expert" section in which Church-related questions are answered by a designated staff member knowledgeable on various matters. Colin B. Donovan, who possesses a Licentiate in Sacred Theology degree from the Pontifical University of St. Thomas in Rome, Vice President of EWTN, and host of his own talk show, answered a question about musical instruments in the liturgy. Donovan curiously

cites the documents of the Second Vatican Council arguing for a preservation of preconciliar rules for liturgical music.

Responding to a question about which instruments are acceptable to the Roman Catholic liturgy, Donovan describes it as one of the "ongoing controversies" in the Catholic Church today. He writes,

> Fortunately, the experimentation of the past, when there were rock masses, jazz masses, and even polka masses, is for the most part over. Naturally if there is no regard for the nature of the liturgy or the norms of the church, anything is still possible. Such "liturgies" (if they can be called that), are sometimes justified as "what Vatican II was about", opening the windows, trying new things, using worldly forms. Nothing could be further from the truth (Donovan 3).

Donovan follows with a selective collection of quotes from the documents of the Second Vatican Council designed to advance his position that Gregorian chant is the superior style of liturgical music.

Sancrosanctum Conciliam, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, "makes clear the motive of authentic liturgical reform" (Donovan 4). This document of the Second Vatican Council contains 130 articles on the subject of liturgy with great attention paid to liturgical music. Donovan includes just 12 of these 130 articles to state his case, sometimes even alluding to articles not present in his article. Further, Donovan selectively uses bold-type to accentuate particular principles while drawing attention away from others. Donovan skews the pivotal document of the Second Vatican Council,

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy to advance his own agenda, implying that many of the styles named are without regard for what is truly sacred, in his opinion.

Donovan includes the full text of article 37, the article that includes the pivotal statement that "the Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity, even in the liturgy." However, he uses bold after this statement to accentuate "so long as they harmonize with the nature and authentic spirit" of the liturgy. While many writers accentuate the new-found freedom from "rigid uniformity", Donovan suggests that there indeed must be a particular criteria in the liturgy after all.

In article 114, Donovan draws attention away from a pivotal "but" that would change the meaning of the article. Placed in bold by Donovan, article 114 states, "The treasure of sacred music is to be preserved and fostered with great care". What follows this statement in the same sentence, Donovan chooses to ignore: "but bishops and other pastors of souls must be at pains to assure that, whenever the sacred action is to be celebrated with song, the whole body of the faithful be able to contribute to the active participation which is rightfully theirs, as laid down in articles 28 and 30" (Donovan 4).

In article 116, Donovan uses bold once again, yet also ignores a pivotal "but" in that very sentence and continues to fail to address articles alluded to in his quotes. Donovan's bolded statement reads, "The Church acknowledges Gregorian chant as specifically suited to the Roman liturgy; therefore all things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services." Then, not in bold is a "but"—"But other kinds of music, especially polyphony, are by no means excluded from liturgical celebrations." Then, once again, is a reference to article 30, which does not appear in Donovan's piece.

Article 30 states, "To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, psalmody, antiphons, and songs, as well as by actions, gestures, and bodily attitudes." Could it be that Gregorian Chant is not a form of "song?" Articles 114 and 116 are not given the full context by Donovan and readers may easily be misled. Donovan fails to give the full context of articles 114 and 116 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*.

The final issue taken by Donovan is a look at instruments in the liturgy, and Donovan's approach is no different. Article 120 of the *Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy* states, "In the Latin Church, the pipe organ is to be held in high esteem, for it is the traditional musical instrument which adds a wonderful splendor to the Church's ceremonies and powerfully lifts up man's mind to God and to higher things". Donovan bolds, "held in high esteem". Skipping over another "but", Donovan accentuates that "other instruments may be admitted for use in divine worship" then skips to "on the condition that the instruments are suitable or can be made suitable for sacred use in accord with the dignity of the temple, and truly contribute to the edification of the faithful". What Donovan skips is the phrase "with the judgment of competent territorial authority as noted in articles 22, 52, 37, and 40." Once again, Donovan includes citation of two articles without any further elaboration on article 52 and article 40.

Article 52 is not directly relevant to the topic at hand, but 40 is very important in the selection of instruments for use in the liturgy. Article 40 shows the need for cultural adaptations to the liturgy, even adaptations that may seem extreme compared to others. Specifically the article mentions mission lands and the need to adapt to the culture of those lands. In this case the “competent territorial ecclesiastical authority” mentioned in

article 40 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* is able to make the judgment and be flexible with liturgical rules. Perhaps Donovan fears that if people know that there are allowances in the rules for the musical instruments of any culture, people would depart from his agenda.

In his role as Vice-President and host for EWTN, Donovan is a role model for instruction about the Catholic faith. As is characteristic of the station itself, Donovan promotes his own particular viewpoint that is not consistent with the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. Donovan's clear preference is to state that many common instruments are not worthy of the liturgy and he clearly uses his platform to advocate it.

As noted with previous advocates of a restoration agenda, Donovan holds a similar limited perspective in the nature of the sacred. A further example of about the limitation of the sacred in music is Joan Roccasalvo in 1995's "The 'Sacred' in Sacred Music". Roccasalvo proposes that the sacred is tied to a societal movement towards chant. Roccosalvo purports to explain "how Christian chant may be interpreted as sacred", how the formula for a human encounter with God can be met through chant, and that any other styles of music that appear to be creating such an encounter are nothing more than superficial experiences (Roccasalvo 19).

What is sacred? Roccasalvo identifies that which is sacred as what is familiar to the senses, what experiences bring people closer to the divine, and what therefore enables them to make the final leap required to reach the sacred from a point of faith. In music, Roccasalvo says this three step process can be achieved through Gregorian chant. Beauty is not subjective, but rather can be found in a particular formula to achieve the goal of reaching the divine. The trap is that sometimes the senses are "second fiddle" to a

superficial sense to the "earthly that satisfies the flesh" (Roccasalvo 20). The sacred and how people respond to it are spelled out like a magic formula to Roccasalvo. Though chant may give a negative impression, it is one that can be overcome through each of the components of Gregorian chant, once one has come to terms with what is really true beauty and true art.

Roccasalvo uses an article from Barbara Tuchman that appeared in *the New York Times* in 1991 called "Quality" to make her case:

> Materials are sound and durable or they are sloppy; method is painstaking or whatever is easiest. Quality is achieving or reaching for the highest standard as against the sloppy or fraudulent. It is honest of purpose as against catering to sensational sentiment. It does not allow compromise with the second rate (20).

Unfortunately for Roccasalvo, the article she cites does not adequately make her case. In fact, Tuchman tends to argue against Roccasalvo's points on art:

> Art, in any case, is a slippery area for discussion of the problem, because values in the perception of art change radically from one generation to another. Everyone knows how the French Impressionists were scorned when they first exhibited, only in recent decades to reach the peak of repute and honor and what seems to be permanent popularity (Tuchman 2).

Indeed Gregorian chant as true art has stood the test of time. However, if Gregorian chant is directly connected to the sacred, the first eight centuries of the Church would

have been unable to experience the sacred, making Roccasalvo's argument logically flawed.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* has three criteria for the role of music in the liturgy, as cited by Roccasalvo: "Beauty expressive of prayer, the unanimous participation of the assembly the designated moments, and the solemn character of the celebration" (1157). As such, Roccasalvo advocates that beauty is "central to the liturgy" and that this is directly tied to the prayerfulness of those in the assembly (21). But prayerfulness does not only come in the form of "prayer and reverence" that she indicates. Additionally, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* identifies prayer as vocal, contemplative, and meditative. In particular, with the vocal prayer, "We are body and spirit, and we experience the need to translate our feelings externally. We must pray with our whole being to give all power possible to our supplication" (2702). So when Roccasalvo says that "we foster reverence or we impair it" she tends to constrict the definition of prayer to one that is very subdued, lacking fervor and one that keeps one's "whole being" from being involved in prayer. Roccasalvo advocates for a single style reflective of a Eurocentric perspective locked in a particular period of time.

While many Catholics have found this definition of prayer on their own through particular hymns, they still may not be good enough for Roccasalvo. In fact, Roccasalvo names one popular hymn in particular:

> Sacred beauty in word begets its own music. "Let There Be Peace on Earth," by Sy Miller and Jill Jackson, exemplifies the opposite. The piece is roller-skating music with a kind thought expressed in a prosaic way.

> Currently in church use, it would have been the perfect song for Judy Garland! (Roccasalvo 21).

What Roccasalvo characterizes as "roller-skating music" has been seen as important to the spirituality of Catholic musicians. "Let There Be Peace on Earth" was ranked 12th on the Association of Pastoral Musicians' 2006 survey as to which music had "most fostered and nourished the respondent's life" (Pattison 1).

If indeed "Let There Be Peace on Earth" fosters that reverence within a believer or allows the believer to give his or her full fervor to the prayer, then it is most acceptable in the liturgy and important for people to be able to take part. Roccasalvo herself may find no spiritual benefit to this song and may find great spiritual benefit to Gregorian chant. Clearly the Second Vatican Council advocated a principle of inculturation recognizing beauty and experience of the holy in non-Eurocentric forms. The Second Vatican Council advocated unity not in stylistic unity, but in charity. However, this does not stop "style wars" from breaking out advocating rigid positions.

Distinguished composer and author J. Michael Joncas noted in 2005 that the Church was at war with itself over linguistic and musical styles. Joncas opened an address to the Association of National Pastoral Musicians by introducing three versions of the fourth Station of the Cross: one from a traditional United States parish celebration, one from a celebration in England, and one celebrated in Italy. The three texts were all different, "clothed in a different style", but Joncas shows that the substance is exactly the same (Joncas 30). These are the foundations for Joncas' point: multiple expressions are acceptable for the same prayers. Since the Second Vatican Council, Joncas has heard the argument:

> Whether since "Gregorian chant holds pride of place because it is proper to the Roman Liturgy" it is the only style that should be allowed; whether since "other types of music, in particular polyphony, are in no way excluded" they should have a place in every Roman Rite worship service; whether or not the whole assembly can participate vocally; whether and to what extent Roman Rite Catholic worship should welcome ethnic musical styles…; whether it is appropriate to employ music developed in other Christian denominations…; whether and to what extent Roman Rite Catholic worship should welcome music developed in secular contexts from jazz and twelve-tone row compositions through Broadway and pop lyricism to heavy metal and rap (Joncas 26).

Joncas says all of these arguments are passionately held and argued, and that these arguments will continue among average people in the pews and liturgical musicians. To make his case, Joncas looks to thirteenth century scholastic theologian Thomas Aquinas, a composer of hymns, prayers, and a key figure in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

Thomas Aquinas directly addresses the topic of music in *Summa Theologiae*, article two, question 91, which Joncas finds most suitable in addressing the question of music in the liturgy:

> The praise of the voice is necessary in order to arouse man's devotion towards God. Wherefore whatever is useful in conducing to this result is becoming adopted in the divine praises. Now it is evident that the human soul is moved in various ways according to various melodies of sound, as

> the Philosopher states, and also Boethius. Hence the use of music in the divine praises is a salutary institution, that the souls of the faint-hearted may be more incited to devotion (Joncas 27).

Despite a call from one of the Church's most prominent theologians throughout history, many other theologians still are entrenched in positions that leave them advocating one position or another.

The first area Joncas sees the struggle is in "linguistic style wars" in which Christians battle over biblical or liturgical texts (28). That is, when composed, how close to the original text must the sung prayer come? If there is any leeway, to what extent, and what are the parameters? There are four main approaches to sung text, which will be further explained in chapter six: "original only", "reproduce the original", "dynamic equivalence" and "textual creativity". Each of these represents a strong opinion Joncas feels advocates a particular position as the "only" way.

The "original only" position advocates that all texts must be sung in their original language at all times. So, if the text was Hebrew, then it should be sung in Hebrew; Greek text should be sung in Greek; Latin text should be sung in Latin, etc. A consideration not made by people in this view is to whether or not the people in the congregation understand the language. Joncas points to a time prior to the Second Vatican Council where participants often had worship books in which the Latin prayers were on the left and the English equivalent was on the right so that they may follow along. The "reproduce the original" position allows that the vernacular may be used, though it insists that as far as possible the translation uses the grammar, syntax, and style of the original source that holds the sacred character. The "dynamic equivalence"

perspective holds that the biblical readings and texts may be written in the vernacular and allows for a paraphrase or addition to carry the same dynamic meaning of the original text but incorporating it into the language used, so that the effect of the text is captured more so than grammar, language, and syntax. With "textual creativity" comes a response to particular linguistic subgroups of society and appeals to their particular linguistic traditions.

Chapter 5

THE 2002 REVISION OF THE GENERAL INSTRUCTION OF THE ROMAN MISSAL AND THE RESPONSE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH

The *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (*GIRM*) serves as the manual for clergy and all liturgical ministers and explains the manner in which liturgical action should be completed. The 2002 revision of the *GIRM* was the first since 1973. This particular revision is noteworthy because it includes many new directives on music that would change and restrict the approach to the liturgy for many musicians. The 1973 edition commented very little on use of music in the liturgy. Rev. Paul Colloton, O.S.F.S., director of continuing education for the National Pastoral Musicians Association writes, "One can discern nuances that, depending on their interpretation, may be viewed as a return to a pre-Vatican II theology of the Eucharist or a continuation of the movement that was made concrete in the Council" (Colloton 22). Those who did see the *GIRM* as movement to a pre-Vatican II approach have implemented key elements of the period with an approach of rigid uniformity and compliance to the law, a movement away from the teachings of the Second Vatican Council.

Kathleen Harmon, a liturgical minister and writer for *Liturgical Ministry* magazine, believes that the new document moved the Church away from many advances that were made in the liturgy.

> In terms of vision….GIRM 2002 both goes beyond its predecessor by strengthening the case for the role of music in the liturgy and takes some steps backwards. The task of implementing the new directives then rouses a number of challenges (Harmon 168).

Harmon identifies a number of “challenges, hindrances, and headaches” that demonstrate a more rigid, inflexible approach to the liturgy, including the suggestion that catechetics become the responsibility of the music director.

The *GIRM's* suggestion that the music in the liturgy must serve some sort of catechetical purpose becomes very difficult to employ. Should all sung music be a recitation of the catechism? Or should it simply be related to the overall theme of the particular liturgy? Putting full or major responsibility of catechetic work in the hands of the music director is problematic in many ways. First, this creates a challenge for the training of music directors. Second, this could be problematic when using traditional Roman Catholic hymnody. Third, the principle instruction should be from the homilist, reflecting on the readings.

The role of liturgical music director has shifted. Once the well-meaning volunteer, most positions for liturgical music director have become positions requiring a professional, and coming with that professional responsibility is the director’s role to instruct musicians. One example given by Harmon suggests the need for catechesis and training of liturgical ministers. Harmon cites an example from her own experience with a music director to suggest the need:

> With great chagrin she related that the musician in charge of the early Sunday morning mass in her parish asked as they were making final preparations for the Triduum, "Since you have prepared Michael to sing the Exsultet Saturday night, should I line up Christine to sing it at the 8:00 mass? (Harmon 169).

The musician failed to realize that the Exsultet, part of the liturgy for the Saturday Easter Vigil Mass, is not part of Easter Sunday's morning liturgy. Harmon's reasoning is flawed. First, the "musician for Sunday morning" is not the music director. Second, the pastor of the parish should be able to address minor issues as to how the liturgy functions. Additionally, if the goal is to have incredibly extensive training in theology, consider remote or low income parishes. Is Harmon is suggesting that everyone in church music have a graduate degree in theology? It becomes impractical.

Harmon writes, "Music fulfills its ministry only when it enables the assembly to surrender more deeply to the mystery of what it means to be the body of Christ dying and rising for the life of the world" (169). While Harmon may be correct, I do not feel that her assessment is accurate. Music is only one part of a greater picture of church life and catechesis. In an ideal situation the music director and musicians will have theological training and have earned appropriate academic degrees. But in a real parish setting, there will have to be some compromise or adjustment. Making such a declaration promoting such conformity will not work.

The second major issue with relying on music for catechesis is that many traditional Roman Catholic hymns do not contain enough substance at times to serve as an instructional tool. Many of these hymns are limited in their context and focused on general praise of God or devotion to Jesus or his mother Mary. Take, for example, the ancient hymn that has been universally known and used in the Catholic Church: "Holy God, We Praise Thy Name". Verse one of the hymn reads, "Holy God, we praise thy name. / Lord of all, we bow before thee. / All on earth thy scepter reign. / All in heaven above adore thee. / Infinite, thy vast domain, everlasting is thy reign" (*Worship* 524).

This hymn has become an important part of Catholic life; it is sung at benediction and sung at many liturgies throughout the year. It would be a stretch to say that the hymn is instructional in nature, other than God is to be praised, worshiped, and obeyed. Verse three may recognize the Catholic dogma of the Trinity, offering praise to Father, Son, and Spirit.

If hymns were turned over specifically for catechesis, the Church would have to mostly ignore or even discard "Holy God We Praise Thy Name" and many other hymns important to the spirituality of many of the followers. This is just not practical. Further, individual congregations should be able to sing the hymns of their own culture and spirituality. This cannot be accomplished with a rigid, uniform approach in which the music selections are tied to catechetics instead of a form of expression. The full experience of what it means to be catechized involves the imaginative and poetic; simple focuses on hymn texts cannot accomplish this in themselves.

Finally, music selections from a well-trained liturgical musician should be attuned to the readings of the day and exist in harmony with the pastor's homily. In the liturgy, the homily is the primary teaching tool. By definition, in the *GIRM* itself,:

> The homily is part of the Liturgy and is strongly recommended for it is necessary for the nurturing of the Christian life. It should be an exposition of some aspect of the readings from Sacred scripture or of another text from the Ordinary or from the Proper of the Mass of the day and should take into account both the mystery being celebrated and the particular needs of the listeners (*GIRM* 64).

While the *GIRM* has plenty of restrictions, the homily is one part of the liturgy that has the flexibility to accomplish the catechetical goal within the liturgy.

The liturgy indeed should draw the believer closer to the mystery of the body of Christ. However, to suggest that musical selections should conform to particular messages at all times or that minor issues about the liturgy cannot be handled at the parish level with a pastor or music director is a bit of a reach. The liturgy, designed with the homily, should be sufficient catechetics, even without a high-priced music director or paying for an expensive theological education. The worship experience is not one in which the participant is looking for catechesis.

The second major point that puts rigid uniformity into the liturgy is the 2002 *GIRM* giving the local bishop the task of regulating liturgical music:

> The Bishop should therefore be determined that the priests, the deacons, and the lay Christian faithful grasp ever more deeply the genuine meaning of the rites and liturgical texts and thereby be led to an active and fruitful celebration of the Eucharist. To the same end, he should also be vigilant that the dignity of these celebrations be enhanced. In promoting this dignity, the beauty of the sacred place, of music, and of art should contribute as greatly as possible (*GIRM* 22).

In the new approach, the local bishop takes on the responsibility of judging "the beauty" of the different elements of the liturgy, and even by name, music. The document recognizes claim to Episcopal authority; the *GIRM* should also recognize legitimate contributions of artists, musicians, and liturgical theologians. There are many issues that can come out of the bishop interfering with the ground-level decisions about music and

the flexibility afforded to the parish from the Second Vatican Council. It is impractical to think that a bishop in a large diocese can effectively administer the whole diocese made up of many parishes while worrying about smaller matters such as music; the Second Vatican Council advocates collaboration and subsidiarity. Further, the bishop's personal preference cannot effectively translate to an entire diocese. In a diocese of many different peoples and cultures, creating one legislation about "beauty" would be opposed to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council as the bishop legislating music will only lead to rigid uniformity in the liturgy.

The bishop taking on an additional role of diocesan music supervisor removes from practices from the Second Vatican Council designed for the good of the greater church. Collaboration with the laity is essential to the life of the church. Not all important work is left for the bishop alone:

> In the Church there is a diversity of ministry but a oneness of mission. Christ conferred on the Apostles and their successors the duty of teaching, sanctifying, and ruling in His name and power. But the laity likewise share in the priestly, prophetic, and royal office of Christ and therefore have their own share in the mission of the whole people of God in the Church and in the world (*Apostolicam Actuositatem* 2).

Thus, relying exclusively on the local bishop to police minor matters at a local level such as liturgical music is contrary to the teachings of the Church.

The second major issue with a bishop overseeing liturgical music is that the bishop's personal tastes cannot possibly be in sync with the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. What is the "beauty" exactly that the bishop is to oversee? If the

bishop's preference is Gregorian chant and mandates that parishes use exclusively Gregorian chant to constitute "quality", those who use the traditional hymnody of the church, spirituals, and contemporary styles of music will be forced to change their ways. As we will see in Chapter Six, bishops have gone as far as to mandate particular settings of the Mass, including chant settings. If the bishop does not find other common instruments to be lacking "quality" such as guitars, then the musical landscape would be forced to change radically.

The third major issue with the bishops having control over music in a diocese is that a bishop likely cannot make legislation that would universally apply to all cultures within an entire diocese. One "case study" from Amy Lynn Strickland indicates the differences in approach that comes with cultures:

> In a community with a multicultural mix of Anglo American and African American cultures, the music director has chosen a Communion song which focuses entirely on the "Jesus and me" relationship. The director is questioned about it because it does not express the theology of the "Jesus and we" of the Body of Christ. The response offered to the pastor is: "You don't understand our culture." The pastor decides to let it go" (Strickland 44).

The pastor's decision to let this issue go is appropriate given the circumstances. The bishop's role is to highlight principles and address necessary problems. It may be true that in some remote areas the population of a diocese is rather uniform. However, by design a diocese is a large geographical area, and more often than not is made up of many ethnicities and cultures. In particular, the Spanish-speaking and African American

communities have particular needs and musical styles that should be met in order to fulfill the cultural spirituality.

With the bishop given the task of overseeing music, the opportunities for the traditions, culture, and local parish to express themselves and their faith more accurately can only be damaged, not helped. No one vision at the diocesan level can sufficiently satisfy the needs of a diocese's worth of worshippers. The document appears to echo a centralization in the Vatican, diocesan offices, and traditions associated with Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI.

Another issue with the 2002 *GIRM* is the suggestion that music be reduced to an almost functional state devoid of the human emotion that comes along with music and why music is an important aspect of human life, let alone worship. Music ministers are reduced to doing a "duty" rather than nurturing spiritual lives. The president and chief executive officer of J. Michael McMahon describes this duty: "Pastoral ministers have a duty to help people embrace liturgical changes, but they have a far deeper responsibility to draw those people into the mystery of God who is present and acting for us in the liturgy and to respond to their call to live as disciples of Christ in the world" (McMahon 52). With the 2002 *GIRM's* mandate that the bishop is the moderator of the "quality" of liturgical music, the role of the music minister is really reduced to doing a duty of someone else's judge of "quality". The response of the congregation cannot be reduced to the idea that their spirituality is successful as the product of a particular formula.

Harmon writes, "Whenever the music is aimed at another target (e.g. keeping the people interested, making them feel good, stroking the ego of a cantor) it distracts the people from the real purpose of the liturgy and stunts growth to full stature as members of

the body of Christ" (Harmon 169). Two words used by Harmon that are sure to make a considerable difference in the lives of worshippers: "feel good" and "interested". The human emotion of joy is frequently expressed in the Christian tradition and therefore should be an integral point of musical worship. Further, one may have trouble understanding that people should not be "interested" in the music in the liturgy. While an individual's ego over the good of the liturgical action is rather obvious, the other two points require much more attention. The goal of the liturgy is to give praise to God, and leave happy and motivated about their faith, without a feeling of gloominess.

Therein lies the problem: this suggestion that the congregation should not "feel good", as joy intends, reduces liturgical music to perfunctory status. That is, compliance toward the part of Mass being sung and less emphasis on the joy that the Catholic Church teaches that comes forth from Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. At Christmas, the Church declares in scripture that the angel brings "good news of great joy" and declares what is considered the "ancient and venerable" hymn: "Glory to God in the highest!" (*GIRM* 30). Granted, "joy" may be different than "feeling good", but Christians are motivated by sharing in this Christian joy rather than mere external compliance. That should be that "full, active, and conscious" participation of which the Second Vatican Council spoke of rather than fulfilling proper formulas.

Further, the properly catechized Christian should be "interested" in just what the Church itself describes in the *GIRM*: the mystery that the Eucharistic celebration is to provide in *GIRM* 66, and participate in a way that is “full, conscious and active”. If the music's whole purpose is to make people embrace that mystery, then yes, music should

help people become more interested. Albert Boehm described one visit to Mass during a 2002 edition of *America* magazine:

> Recently I sat behind two teenage girls at Mass. They slouched in their seats and did not pay attention to what was going on. They were bored. I have to admit, I was a little bored myself. I talked to them later. They were not bored with Christ. They were not bored with church. In fact, they were active in their youth organization. But they were bored at that Mass (Boehm 23).

The intangibles involved in one's spirituality are simply too variable and to exclude music that "keeps interested" the worshipping faithful is inappropriate. While the two girls mentioned may be regularly involved in their Church, they do not appear to be having true faith experiences in their attendance of Mass. If music is able to help bring them to it, there should be sufficient accommodation. Meanwhile, the priest or deacon's homily should be sufficiently engaging and encouraging to those at church.

Composers are going to be held back from doing their part in music ministry, too, again at the determination of the quality of music according to the local bishops. In the addendum of the 2002 *GIRM*, the United States bishops add the following:

> All musical settings of the texts for the people's responses and acclamations in the Order of Mass and for special rites that occur in the course of the liturgical year must be submitted to the Secretariat for the Liturgy of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for review and approval prior to publication (*GIRM* 393).

The concern of some scholars is that this could lead to a minimal amount of approved settings in the United States. Jan Michael Joncas, composer and assistant professor of theology at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, writes:

> While this article--and even the inclusion of such settings in the official books--does not prohibit composers from creating and submitting other settings for approval, they might voluntarily limit proliferating settings of such texts so that sung ritual responses might be learned by heart, remain the same throughout a given territory, and arise quasi-spontaneously from the assembly, since worshippers would not have to pause to be cued for the setting they are singing in a given celebration (Joncas 39).

As long as the words used in the musical settings are the words of the prayer, there is no reason for the bishops to get involved. A local pastor could determine if a Mass setting is suitable or not for use in the Church. The document and practical experience demonstrate frequently enough that regulation of mass settings primarily becomes a matter of episcopal control.

Simply put, having a moderators controlling liturgical compositions is subject to personal preference. With a specifically-ordered aim in the liturgy, there is no room for growth, creativity, or even interest when the fundamental principles because all too specific directives. If only the moment's standards are acceptable, there will be no room for the Church to grow and for tomorrow's standards to develop. We also see this with further restrictions on the liturgy, particularly less singing and more singing.

The 2002 *GIRM* takes more control over the singing, namely how and when music is to be sung. In some instances there is more music. In other interests there is less

music. The many different mandates for either silence or for more music make the liturgy into a uniform service, particularly on Sundays. The new rules fail to take into consideration the ability or comfort of the presider, deacon, and lector. Second, singing or silence becomes forced upon worshippers rather than being chosen. Finally, having to conform to excessive rules interrupts traditions held by local worshipping assemblies. The flexibility for individual communities making their own individual pastoral decisions is interrupted.

The flexibility for particular congregations to avoid singing when the minister does not have the ability to sing was taken away from the Church in the 2002 *GIRM*. In 1975, the GIRM read as follows:

> With due consideration for the culture and ability of each congregation, great emphasis should be attached to the use of singing at mass; but it is not always necessary to sing all the texts that are of themselves meant to be sung (1973 *GIRM* 40).

This flexibility in the liturgy was replaced in 2002 in the *GIRM* with:

> Although it is not always necessary (e.g. in weekday masses) to sing all the texts that are of themselves meant to be sung, every care must be taken that singing by the ministers and by the people is not absent in celebrations that occur on Sundays and on Holy Days of obligation (*GIRM* 2002).

This new statement gives the distinct impression that priests, deacons, and lay ministers sing all of the responses on a weekday Mass, clearly ignoring the pastoral exemption for those without singing ability. They now may feel forced to embarrass themselves. The

GIRM indicates that within the liturgy the presider or people sing dialogues between the minister and assembly, the acclamations are sung by everyone, and the responsorial psalm and processional hymns accompany a liturgical action. This is a clear example that freedoms are being taken away from local parishes, which fails to appreciate various levels of solemnity.

Almost ironically, after mandating more singing in certain parts of the liturgy, the 2002 *GIRM* requires less music at other times. Before Mass begins, the *GIRM* now considers silence "commendable". Point 45 of the 2002 *GIRM* reads:

> Sacred silence also, as part of the celebration, is to be observed at designated times...Even before the celebration itself, it is commendable that silence is to be observed in the church, in the sacristy, in the vesting room, and in adjacent areas so that all may dispose themselves to carry out the sacred action in a devout and fitting manner (*GIRM* 45).

One custom in many parishes is to sing a meditation piece prior to the beginning of Mass. The intention of singing prior to the liturgy is to fill the same purpose as they suggest silence will: preparing the people for the upcoming Mass and what is about to occur. It is wrong to conclude for people in individual congregations as to what prepares them best for the liturgy.

Avoiding those preludes and imposing silence interferes with locally-held customs and traditions. The choral singing before Mass may have been one opportunity for a congregation to express themselves through choral music and create an atmosphere that is suitable for worship. With the liturgy becoming more and more uniform, the opportunity occurs for a choir to sing a choral piece without the involvement from the

faithful. While the choir singing alone is mentioned as a possibility, the focus during the liturgy is on communal singing:

> Among the faithful, the *scola cantorum* or choir exercises its own liturgical function, ensuring that the parts proper to it, in keeping with the different types of chants are carried out and frosting the active participation of the faithful through the singing (*GIRM* 103).

Prior to Mass may be the best opportunity for the choir to sing choral pieces without interfering with the singing of the faithful during mass.

As Harmon earlier mentioned, the ego of a cantor cannot be the reason for singing. The same can be said for the choir. The singing done by the choir is an art and a gift that helps create an atmosphere appropriate for the liturgy. Having the opportunity to sing such pieces prior to Mass would represent that opportunity. Further, the sung dialogues by people who have no ability to do so is also wrong. Singing more in some cases and less and others may balance out, but something will be lost in the transition.

One aspect of the 2002 *GIRM* that is going to affect people the most is the teaching regarding Catholic funerals. Some of the instruction toward funerals is aimed toward issues not about music, such as insisting there not be any eulogy at the funeral mass (*GIRM* 382). But many are directly related to music in a funeral liturgy. At a time when mourning is at its peak, there should be as much flexibility as possible. This means that if the deceased or their loved ones have some song requests that are important to the family and the process of healing, then in the name of "no rigid uniformity" of the Second Vatican Council, the Church should allow these requests. In *America* magazine in the June 5-12 issue from 2006, Terry Golway reflected upon Catholic funerals in the

wake of the 2002 *GIRM* in a piece entitled, "It's Your Funeral". Golway is correct in asserting the need for a funeral that is tailored to the needs of a mourning family and celebration of the loved one and flexible. Not allowing families to mourn as people do is a terrible tragedy in the Church. What approach to take is simply, is this a celebration or a mere ritual? The Christian teaching on death is that life is changed, not ended. It would make sense, then, that the attitude for a Christian funeral should be that of celebration. Golway writes, "I have been to enough to appreciate a mass that satisfies our need to mourn and to celebrate life, and that addresses both our anxieties and our faith" (8). Music should help do the latter and not be subject to rigid instructions. Whether the Catholic faith should be profoundly human in its approach to life with proper formulas from the *GIRM* should not be a concern, but rather compassion toward one's family, particularly with an added pastoral challenge to help those who are regularly disconnected from the church mourn, should be the most important.

One example of rigid uniformity interfering with a family's ability to mourn appropriately is the singing of the Irish song, "O Danny Boy". The 2002 *GIRM* states that funerals should be planned "with due regard also for all the other requirements of the norm of the law" (381). And, in response to the 2002 *GIRM*, the Catholic Diocese of Covington, KY declared the following:

> A variety of music may be used to foster the participation of the assembly – but the distinctions drawn in the documents on music should be borne in mind between religious music, sacred music, liturgical music. Not every "song" with some religious sentiment is suitable for worship (1).

Thus, "O Danny Boy" is not considered suitable for the liturgy in many dioceses. And this has caused further angst to mourning Catholics. Despite having been used at the funeral of President John F. Kennedy in the period since the Second Vatican Council, "O Danny Boy" has subsequently been banned by many dioceses, and not without controversy. In 2007, the song continued to be a pastoral challenge, as was noted in the press:

> The Danny Boy shame came to light again yesterday at the funeral for a 78-year-old Irish American (and 40-year parishioner) at St. Theresa Roman Catholic Church in Trumbull, Connecticut within the Bridgeport diocese...Among the departed's last request was that Danny Boy be sung at his funeral. But days after an Irish singer had been booked to sing the sacred Irish song at the service, the church pastor phoned the deceased's family to inform them that the song is not "liturgical" in nature, meaning it is not appropriate to be sung or played in church. The singer was forced to wait miles away, by the graveside. The lyrics were read from the pulpit during a eulogy, however, while a mischievous bagpiper waited outside the church to play the tune after the service (Kearns 2).

The liturgical legalese in the 2002 *GIRM* is not pastoral, and judging by the responses, Catholics are forced to play the game of inserting their favorite music anyway. St. John's Parish in Lincoln, Nebraska, encourages people to find other ways:

> Some music is not appropriate for the funeral Mass. For example, O Danny Boy is a wonderful song, but because it does not have sacred words, it is not appropriate for a Catholic Mass. If you have a favorite

> song that cannot be used during Mass, you may want to play it during the luncheon or during a slide show (St. John Funeral Packet 7).

If the Church has a "find a loophole" approach to include such music - and people frequently use them - why not just allow people to use the music that is important to them?

But Golway would go a step further than the addition of something as culturally-tuned as "O Danny Boy". Golway was attending a memorial Mass for a friend in which the pastor allowed some creativity. In addition to a well-prepared homily and readings, after the final blessing the priest allowed for something opposed to the 2002 *GIRM*: a prerecorded secular song.

> The most moving money, for me anyway, came after the final blessing. Suddenly, over the church's sound system, we heard the voice of Sting, the British singer, accompanied by the Irish folk group, the Chieftains. Most of the words were in Gaelic, but even we non-Gaelic speakers could tell the song was about defiance and courage and life itself. The song ends with a brilliant combination of drums and bagpipes and Sting's brilliant voice conveying words we didn't know but emotions that brought a smile to our faces (Golway 8).

Technically, the Mass was over. Was this a violation of the rules? Maybe, maybe not. But what was clear to Golway is that this was not something that is commonly considered acceptable in the church:

> I have no doubt that some priests and bishops would have been horrified...but the people in the pews have a right to be concerned, too.

> Instead of dealing with cold, unforgiving rules regulating music and eulogies, they would like to hear their priests and bishops say, 'O.K., it's your funeral' (Golway 6).

This represents a good example of pastoral planning that is sensitive to the needs of the mourners and at the same time serves the goals of the Church.

While it is true that there should be protection from serious abuses within a Catholic liturgy, "O Danny Boy" hardly qualifies as such. For many Irish, this song is an example of when culture and religion have been blended so completely that the lines between religious and cultural really do not exist. To deny one is to deny another. The original context of the hymn requires little contention at this time. At the delicate time of a loved one's funeral, the Church should worry about more serious abuses instead of a simple music request for a funeral Mass. In addition to cultural music, even the issue of language once again became an issue in the 2002 *GIRM*. Similar challenges are also faced at many Catholic weddings when favorites tend to clash with liturgy.

One item in the 2002 *GIRM* that directly opposes reforms of the Second Vatican Council is the recommendation that people throughout the church be able to sing a significant part of the liturgy in Latin, namely the Nicene Creed and the Lord's Prayer. Item 41 reads: "Since faithful from different countries come together evermore frequently, it is fitting that they know how to sing together at least some parts of the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin, especially the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, set to simpler melodies" (*GIRM* 41). Doing so is impractical for three reasons. The lack of flexibility created from attempting to make an accommodation could disrupt a worship community's

traditions. Further, a return to Latin and away from the vernacular would help undo the Second Vatican Council's push towards "full, active, and conscious participation".

Of the parts of the Mass, the Creed may be the longest and most challenging to sing. The Lord's Prayer is a prayer more manageable in length but also long. But for the most part, neither prayer is regularly sung in parishes of the United States. Yet, the *GIRM* names those as two prayers to be sung. The logic in the *GIRM* is well-intentioned: if Catholics from throughout the world will gather together for Mass, then why not have something common ready to for when the instance occurs. In a local parish setting, just how many people will be attending international liturgies? Why should communities that would benefit greatly from learning about each other take on yet an additional language not spoken and go through growing pains at Mass? One may question the point of singing these prayers at all. It does not benefit the people, but instead disrupts the liturgy.

On the local level when there are multiple ethnicities, a bilingual liturgy might make much more sense. If the stated goals are unity, then each group could recognize the value the other brings to the table and try to accommodate the other's language. Latin is not a spoken language in the United States; taking the time to learn some prayers in the language of another could lead to increased harmony and unity in the long run.

There are parishes that have different traditions during these prayers. For example, a parish may have held hands during the Lord's prayer. This interrupts traditions as worshippers will have to take the time to learn the prayers in Latin. Additionally, there are many published settings of the Lord's Prayer in English. In the spirit of "no rigid uniformity", The Church should leave this one alone. While the Church prelates from around the world frequently gather in Rome and could potentially

meet the challenge of finding common ground by planning use of some particular parts in Latin, the average American Catholic would be much better off using multiple languages for the liturgy. One might invite the people to even pray in their own tongue. Unity in the mystery of the Mass is not necessarily a conformity.

Finally, reverting back to Latin would be tampering with one of the great advances of the Second Vatican Council: use of the vernacular in the liturgy. Use of Latin over the vernacular was enough to help cause the Protestant Reformation; millions of people changed their religious affiliation just to be able to pray in their own language. The Second Vatican Council fixed a major flaw with the Church: an atmosphere of formal compliance without an understanding of what was going on in the liturgy. Granted, a committed Catholic today already familiar with both prayers would certainly know what the words of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer were saying because they would of course be in the same point of the liturgy to which everyone is accustomed. But to the younger Catholics not yet exposed at length to the Creed and Lord's prayer, they may never know exactly what they are singing, which is not a good idea, particularly since the creed is the profession of faith, identifying the key teachings about what makes one Catholic. With present challenges to sing in the vernacular already established, adding Latin would exacerbate the challenge already present.

While well-intentioned, forcing the use of sung prayers in Latin to help some international liturgies has the possibility to be detrimental to the faith. The church cannot expect "full, conscious, and active participation" of its members while at the same time making unreasonable demands of their followers. The suggestion that the faithful learn to sing certain parts of the liturgy in Latin would find the liturgy relegated to the cantor or

choir with the congregation listening at best. The issue of singing certain parts in Latin and all of the other issues unfortunately is framed by a greater issue: the overall status of the document in the Church.

Perhaps the most alarming issue with the 2002 *GIRM* is that it took on the status of law within the Catholic Church, and the reemergence of legalism or rubricism has elicited a response that has been very critical from followers. The response of the Church is almost ironic given Jesus' movement away from the hard law the Pharisees were looking to employ and the very pastoral approach he initiated. This tends to reflect the re-emergence of clericalism addressed by Pope Francis in his first year in the Vatican. Without pastoral sensitivity, the Church cannot exist and effectively extend the pastoral life-giving ministry of Christ.

Amy Jill Strickland asks an important question in light of the new law: where does charity come in? She cites John Paul II to show that there is truly room for pastoral sensitivity. In the introduction to the 1983 Code of Canon Law, John Paul II wrote:

> It is sufficiently clear that the purpose of the Code is not in any way to replace faith, grace, charisms, and above all charity in the life of the Church or Christ's faithful. On the contrary, the Code rather looks toward the achievement of order in the ecclesial society, such that while attributing a primacy to love, grace, and the charisms, it facilitates at the same time an orderly development in the life of both the ecclesial society and of the individual persons who belong to it". (*CCL* 1983).

Strickland says that it is a "gross distortion to use the law to cause division" (44). Yet when one holds tightly to the liturgical law in the face of pastoral need, the thought is that the law will usually win. In fact, the results are often way less than charitable:

> Regrettably, such distortions occur when people are dealing with the liturgical law, including the GIRM. In the short time since its promulgation, individuals and groups have isolated certain provisions...and made them the litmus test of liturgical orthodoxy. Some take this to yet a further extreme making one's opinion on a particular issue the standard by which one is measured as a "good" or "faithful" Catholic" (Strickland 45).

Unfortunately, this is what American Catholicism has become. As with the legalism in the response to "O Danny Boy", it is clear that there will be continued liturgical disagreement over use of music in the liturgy.

Chapter 6

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS CREATE NEW GUIDELINES FOR MUSIC

In 2006, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops attempted to publish a document entitled the "Directory for Music and the Liturgy for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America". The document looked to draw upon the 2002 GIRM and the 2001 instruction from the Vatican entitled *Liturgiam Authenticam*, to invoke restrictions on liturgical music in the United States. The proposal was thorough; the directory purposed to get much closer toward rigid uniformity in the American Catholic liturgy. Some items the bishops proposed were a matter of common sense. Others were intrusive to the point that they essentially led to the change in status of the document from being law to being simply “guidelines”.

Liturgiam Authenticam, serving as the fifth instruction "on the correct implementation of liturgical renewal", motivated the bishops drafting the document to require specific norms, including:

> 1. The approval of liturgical songs is reserved to the Diocesan Bishop in whose diocese an individual song is published. He is supported in his work by this directory and by the USCCB Secretariat on the Liturgy.
> 2. The Diocesan Bishop is assisted in his review of individual texts through the formation of a committee for the review of liturgical songs consisting of theologians, liturgists, and musicians. The committee shall assure that each text is suitable for liturgical use based on the principles articulated in this directory.

> 3. Within three years, the Committee on the Liturgy will formulate a Common Repertoire of Liturgical Songs for use in all places where the Roman liturgy is celebrated in the United States of America. While songs outside the core repertoire may also be used in the Liturgy, this core repertoire will be included in all worship aids used in the dioceses of the United States of America (USCCB 1).

The basic tone of the document calls for a well-prepared liturgy; any well-prepared liturgist could interpret the work and reply.

Some of the work in the document was blatantly obvious. The document proposed says that "individual songs should be consonant with Catholic teaching and free from doctrinal error" (USCCB 1). But the authority to intervene already came with the GIRM in 2002. Archbishop of Philadelphia, Justin Cardinal Rigali, already intervened in 2004 to ban a hymn that was among popular liturgical music, "The Supper of the Lord". As Rigali contends, the hymn refers to Jesus being present "in" bread and wine, closer to a Lutheran teaching of consubstantiation instead of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. The composer of the hymn likely did not intend to challenge Catholic teaching; the hymn could be made doctrinally accurate by changing the word "in" to "as". However, this is an example that the authority to intervene in use of music in a diocese is already in place and was already in use by the time that the bishops drafted the directory.

Besides doctrinal concerns, the document also attempted to strengthen the ability of United States bishops to intervene on other matters less important. The directory stated that music would now be judged by a common repertoire that would be balanced as "the repertoire of a core liturgical songs in any given place should reflect a balanced

approach to Catholic theological elements" (USCCB 1). This could become very problematic. Does this mean that the bishops will carefully review each hymnal to assure that the hymnal itself is balanced enough? Or will this mean that each diocese will require liturgical musicians to submit to a central authority the hymns that each parish is planning to use in a given liturgical season? The amount of control requested by this directory is cause for concern that the Church is indeed headed toward rigid uniformity. In Chapter Six, we will see that there were specific hymns declared “unsuitable for the liturgy” in various dioceses.

One other area of concern with the document is the protection of old liturgical hymns from being updated with the purpose of removing what is considered by many Catholics to be sexist language. The proposed document stated, "The doctrine of the Trinity should never be compromised through the consistent replacement of masculine pronominal references to the three divine persons" (USCCB 1). Without denying traditional language, hymns may expand the imagination and analogies by which the human alone can speak of God.

The final concern with the directory is the idea that the Bishops will publish a list of hymns deemed acceptable for liturgical use. The document states that "a certain stable core of liturgical songs might serve as an exemplary and a stabilizing factor" and thus the bishops hope to publish such a list (USCCB 1). One can note the desire for certain stability; however, a core repertoire that crosses all cultural boundaries will be difficult to assemble. While a general list may prove helpful as a guide, liturgical principles mandate pastoral adaptation, not slavery to a list. Individual communities should follow what works best for their own particular ministries and populations, not succumb to a list.

Without involvement from bishops, it is likely that a common list of hymns will emerge as having use throughout a good number, though not all, parish communities. Publishers will publish hymns accordingly and continue to publish new composers' work that may be blocked by such a list that may not be updated with any regularity. To suggest that one particular list of hymns will work in every community is to invite failure and oversteps the bounds by which the local bishop should exercise authority.

Five years after the 2002 revision of the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops wrote their own extensive document specifically focusing on liturgical music. The document contains 259 points over 88 pages and covers almost every imaginable celebration that involves music. It is entitled *Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship.* While the introduction describes the document as "a revision of *Music in Catholic Worship*," the document has so much material to the point that it barely resembles what it replaced. Unlike the GIRM, this document was written primarily for the United States, with approval from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. While *Sing to the Lord* retains some key language and ideas, it offers a new perspective on liturgical music that is more specific, more restrictive, and allows for fewer options for liturgical music in the American Catholic Church.

Sing to the Lord was intended to be published with the status of church law and the bishops who drafted the document wanted to send the document to Rome to have it recognized as law. After a vote in 2007 about the status of the document, 88 percent of the bishops voted to pass the document as "guidelines" instead of law, after some internal disagreement as to the document’s status. Had this passed on as law, the document

would be much more difficult to change. Even though the document was not ultimately passed as law, the intentions of at least the bishops who drafted it are clear: they wish to impose on American Catholics a particular way of liturgical life, as the document tends to reflect the general tenor of centralization from the United States Catholic Bishops. Despite claims that the document is tied to "full, active, and conscious participation" that the Second Vatican Council pushed for, the document has many issues that appear to contradict this principle.

Despite the fact that *Sing to the Lord* was not published with the authority of law, the bishops' territorial authority in the United States gives the distinct impression that under their jurisdiction, the document will be law, and could lead people to treat the document as such. It would be hard for the obedient, faithful Catholics to ignore the teaching of the bishops, whether it be church law or simply "guidelines", whatever that actually means. Traditional Catholic practice seldom appreciates the difference between “law” and “guidelines”, therefore making the distinction between the two cloudy.

Sing to the Lord makes several shifts toward a uniform liturgy. The hymn appears to be pushed aside, though many Catholics have plenty of favorite hymns. *Music in Catholic Worship's* once standard three-fold evaluation of liturgical music has been revised. A variety of instruments seem to be pushed aside in favor of exclusively organ music. Latin is stressed more than any point since the Second Vatican Council. Gregorian chant is re-emphasized as various musical styles are suggested to be inferior. A new emphasis on singing the dialogues in the Mass has put new demands on the liturgy never seen before. All in all, *Sing to the Lord* is a movement toward a uniform and sometimes preconciliar approach to the liturgy. In *True Reform: Liturgy and*

Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium, Massimo Faggioli wonders if the Church would return to a pre-conciliar model of liturgy. Faggioli asks, "Will future Catholicism be a hardware Catholicism more focused on the devotional labels shaped in a traditionalist and neo-ultramonatist fashion, where the hierarchical worldview is coming back via calls for a "reform of the reform" in the liturgy?" (Faggioli 144). Ultramonatism refers to a papacy that is deeply rooted and unmovable like a mountain, as the Latin root suggests. To return to a model in which the Church hands down fixed, rigid rules would be a return to a time before the Second Vatican Council. "The basic ideas of the liturgical reform are so connected with the core values of the council that recognizing the liturgical reform is a manifesto for the renunciation of Vatican II" (Faggioli 144). But yet, the church has seen tinkering take place in *Sing to the Lord* that would make one wonder if Faggioli's fears have been realized.

One item seemingly tossed aside in *Sing to the Lord* is the hymn. The USCCB names and ranks the types of music in the liturgy, with the hymn being ranked last. Ranked first are the dialogues and acclamations, including the Gospel Acclamation, the Sanctus (Holy), Memorial Acclamation, and the Great Amen. Psalms and antiphons are second, refrains repeated responses third, and then finally the hymn. The hymn became the lifeblood of the liturgy after the Second Vatican Council. Putting the hymn behind other parts to be sung is damaging to the liturgy for three reasons. First, the antiphons, mostly at the entrance and communion, change weekly, to the disadvantage of the people's ability to sing. Further, abandoning the long-standing tradition of hymns would be damaging to the spirituality of the Catholics attending Mass, for many hymns are part of a long-standing tradition and important to the faith lives of those at Mass. With

antiphons as a single sentence or sometimes two, the gathering rite likely cannot be accomplished.

The first trouble with the diminished emphasis on the hymn is what the hymns will be replaced with: antiphons that are sung both at the beginning of Mass and at communion. Both appear in the Roman Missal (previously referred to as the Sacramentary as of 2007 when *Sing to the Lord* was published). These antiphons vary by the day and by the Mass; each is assigned an entrance antiphon and communion antiphon according to the liturgical season and the readings of the day. That means that from week to week the congregation will have to learn a new melody every time they attend Mass, making the gathering rite ineffective. While efforts surely will be made to make these as easy as possible, no learning curve can possibly account for the large number of antiphons. If the goal is the "full, active, and conscious" participation of those in the worshipping assembly that was the goal of the Second Vatican Council, the constantly changing melodies and words of the antiphons will not accomplish such a goal.

The hymn has become a beloved part of the Roman Catholic liturgy. As we saw while looking at funerals, the hymn is meaningful to many, especially at important times in the lives of the faithful. In the United States, the hymn has become an important means of expression. As we saw with the "100 Hymns Every Parish Should Know By Heart" and the National Pastoral Musicians' survey of the top 235 hymns that have enriched people spiritually in their lives, the hymn is a very important part of Catholic worship life. *Sing to the Lord* appears to treat the hymn as simply an option over being an element important to the liturgy, an option that is placed fourth and dead last among options, with the antiphon first. This could lead many to reduce the use of hymnody at the

liturgy, or even remove it altogether. Anthony Ruff of St. John's University sees that the effect is already being felt in the United States. "Some zealots but misinformed voices in recent years have begun to attack hymnody as if it were not liturgical (Ruff 81). As we saw with the attempt at the directory of hymns prior to *Sing to the Lord*, this document sought to carry out some of the goals of the directory, with probably plans for future restrictions. Ruff writes,

> When the hymn directory is developed it will most likely consist of a modest number of hymns and songs in a "core repertoire" to be used alongside many other pieces not in the directory but subject to episcopal approval as are all the hymns and songs currently in hymnals and worship aids. It seems reasonable to surmise that bishops will exercise greater vigilance over the texts of the vernacular hymns in coming years in the spirit of *Sing to the Lord* 115d (Ruff 81).

This will be a tough sell to the worshipping community if a beloved hymn is removed from the approved list.

The "three judgments" were once the strengths of *Music in Catholic Worship* and reflect an understanding of the Second Vatican Council. *Music in Catholic Worship* asked that "to determine the value of a given musical element in a liturgical celebration a threefold judgment must be made: musical, liturgical, and pastoral" (MCW 25). These were ranked. While all three elements have importance in the liturgy, the musical was placed ahead of the liturgical. The re-ordering of these three evaluations in *Sing to the Lord* is a burden on the church for three reasons: First, it seems to allow for poor music for the sake of liturgical function. Second, the definition of "pastoral" comes with a sense

of obligation towards the liturgical, avoiding the true meaning of the word. Finally, the musical judgment treats popular styles of music as worthy of "ridicule", suggesting that there is no room for any type of flexibility in the Church's narrow definition of the liturgy. While the three judgments in *Music in Catholic Worship* were once a strong point in the Church, allowing flexibility for congregations, they are now essentially useless.

The pastoral judgment in *Sing to the Lord* hardly allows for true pastoral judgment in the understood sense of the word. The explanation tries to lend credence to individual cultures and traditions, but reads right back into a uniform approach. *Sing to the Lord* says that such peoples "have their own musical traditions and this plays a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason, then music should be held in proper esteem and a suitable place is to be given to it not only in forming them to their native genius" (STL 131). But ultimately, the document backtracks from the progress from the Second Vatican Council. The description reads, "The pastoral question, finally, is always the same: will this composition draw the particular people closer to the mystery of Christ, which is at the heart of this liturgical celebration?" (STL 133). The document suggests that the liturgy is being given something instead of the people giving something of themselves. The question originally posed about the pastoral judgment was written in *Music in Catholic Worship* but had roots in *The Place of Music in Eucharistic Celebrations* of 1968. It asked, "Does music in the celebration enable these people to express their faith, in this place, in this age, in this culture?" Time, place, and culture were reduced to "drawing closer" to "mysteries celebrated". This leads us back to the 2002 GIRM: there are particular ways the Church appears to believe accomplishes that

goal. This pastoral judgment, in light of the GIRM, is anything but, and this is evident by the motivation to change the description of "pastoral", as Virgil Funk explained:

> Some parish musicians were using the “pastoral judgment” as a trump card to cancel the musical or liturgical judgment. The trump card was expressed in various forms, but perhaps the most obvious was, “Well, of course our parish can't sing 'that' song because it's not 'pastoral,' that is, it's not 'appropriate' to our parish.” The pastoral judgment was used inappropriately to excuse poor music and bad liturgical practice that were chosen and promoted by the local priest, musician, or parish committee (Funk 29).

True pastoral judgment and sensitivity does not judge which music is "poor music". In *Sing to the Lord,* the new description of musical judgment is cloudy; on the one hand there is flexibility to be pastoral, and on the other, there is no flexibility.

The "musical" judgment treats some of the actual judgment of musical quality with contempt and without flexibility. Musical styles change, as the popular music of a culture changes. We have seen evidence of this in the United States when the focus of the popular culture in the 1960s became the "folk mass" in the American Catholic Church. According to the bishops in *Sing to the Lord*, history could not repeat itself in today's world as they say, "To admit to the liturgy the cheap, trite, or the musical cliché often found in secular popular songs is to cheapen the liturgy, to expose it to ridicule, and to invite failure" (STL 135). Almost hypocritically the document states thereafter: "The church has not adopted a particular style of art as her own. She has admitted styles from every period in keeping with the natural characteristics and conditions of peoples and the

needs of the various rites" (STL 136). It appears, however, in practice the church has become one uniform style. The discussion on musical judgment closes with the document stating, "In recent times, the Church has consistently recognized and freely welcomed the use of various styles of music as an aid to liturgical worship" (STL 136). One may ask question what judgment is used as long as the Bishops call some music "cheap", "trite", or "musically cliché". A true musical judgment allows for the pastoral musician to make decisions about all types of music, depending on the culture in which he or she ministers.

While the three judgments appear in a particular order with emphasis on the liturgical, the bishops do roll the three into one bigger evaluation and into one overall question: "Is this particular piece of music appropriate for use in this particular liturgy?" (STL 126). While trying as best as possible to look as if there is flexibility in musical selections, the new presentation of these three judgments has funneled all liturgical music into one narrow, uniform approach to liturgy, losing some very important flexibility in the liturgy afforded to the Church at the Second Vatican Council. We will see this in Chapter Seven with the example of “Jesus Died Upon The Cross”.

Sing to the Lord addresses the use of various instruments in the liturgy. In doing so, it places emphasis on an almost exclusive use of the organ in the liturgy at the expense of other instruments. *Sing to the Lord* states:

> Among all other instruments which are suitable for divine worship, the organ is "afforded pride of place" because of the ability to sustain the singing of a large gathered assembly, due to both its size and its ability to give "resonance to the fullness of Christian sentiments, from joy to

> sadness, from praise to lamentation." Likewise, the manifold possibilities of the organ in some way remind us of the immensity and significance of God (STL 87).

In addition, *Sing to the Lord* claims that the sound of the organ is "most suited" for playing sacred music, and claims that the organ has cultural significance and "outreach to the greater community" through concerts. While explaining later that other instruments may be used, they are given many "buts", in effect discouraging use of these instruments. The strong statements about the organ are certainly slanted toward one way of thinking, insensitive to the cultural practice and practical needs of people in the United States. First, most organs today in use in the United States Catholic churches are not real organs, partially because of the high cost of maintaining and purchasing a pipe organ, which negates the stated effect and benefit of using the organ to begin with. And, most importantly, the pipe organ is not in tune with local custom and culture in the United States, which would require use of other instruments in accord with *Sing to the Lord.*

Sing to the Lord is quick to point out the benefits of the organ in the Catholic Church. However, most organs in the United States today are not real pipe organs. Pipe organs are much harder to come by and considerably much harder to come by and considerably more difficult to maintain. Most church organs are not built with pipes but instead consist of electronic keyboards and amplifiers and speakers. The bishops' stated goal is not met by these artificial organs and that should be taken into account when deciding upon liturgical music.

American culture and American music does not really involve use of the organ. Despite the bishops' claims that organs are a great part of cultural events and concerts in

the United States, the instruments used culturally tend to be keyboards, guitars, and percussion. Evidence of this is seen in sporting arenas throughout the United States. MLB.com's Scott Merkin wrote in 2006 that the use of pipe organs in Major League Ballparks is in great decline: "Most parks still have an organist, in some sort of in-game capacity or another. But whereas they once served as the hub of entertainment, almost a focal point for some, now they seem to be more background music" (Merkin 3). Merkin writes that in most cases, the music comes in recorded form from popular music. Merkin also points out that in Philadelphia, when Citizens Bank Park opened in 2004, the team did not build an organ booth and the Phillies' organist was relegated to playing on the concourse an hour before games until his retirement a year later. Considering that the organ is almost completely gone from other venues such as roller skating rinks and homes, the organ is no longer representative of American culture.

Even in the liturgy itself, the musical culture is different, as notes the National Pastoral Musicians executive board:

> Many - if not most - Catholic churches in the United States today make use of the piano as a central instrument to lead and support the singing of the assembly because of its unique combination of melodic, harmonic, and percussive qualities. Liturgical music ensembles use guitar, bass, and percussion instruments to undergird the singing as well as wind, string, and brass instruments to support the melody, provide harmonic interest, and enrich the singing with various musical colors (McMahon 23).

To deny people the cultural and musical benefits that come from these types of musical instrument accompaniment is to deny culture.

This is not to say that there is no place for the organ in liturgical music; for the stated reasons from the bishops, the organ can have an important part in Catholic liturgical life. But for arrangements in which the use of the organ involves "cheap" or "trite" substitutions sometimes including prerecorded music, a stigma of sorts is attached to using anything but, and the true goals of the church are not met. Again, the bishops' emphasis on a traditional organ reflects some unrealistic expectations and a limited reading of American culture.

Sing to the Lord makes music the vehicle to reintroduce Latin in the liturgy on a regular basis. While appearing to contradict itself at times, *Sing to the Lord* gives the impression that the liturgy should have a strong presence of Latin and that there is a distinct place in the American liturgy for widespread use of Latin. *Sing to the Lord* says:

> Care should be taken to foster the role of Latin in the liturgy, particularly in liturgical song. Pastors should ensure that the faithful may also be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them. They should be able to sing these parts of the mass proper to them at least according to the simpler melodies (*STL* 61).

In the same passage, *Sing to the Lord* states that "The use of vernacular is the norm in most liturgical celebrations in the dioceses of the United States 'for the sake of a better comprehension of the mystery being celebrated (STL 61). The bishops of the United States appear that they are looking to bring Latin back into the liturgy in the form of song, as it is one means that they have control over. This is opposed to what the Second Vatican Council prescribed, because it stunts participation and picks up Latin as an issue without placing it in the context of the old right instead of the right established at the

Second Vatican Council. While the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* allows for the use of Latin in the liturgy, the development that took place in light of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* has negated the need for Latin in the liturgy.

The request by the bishops to employ the use of Latin is not consistent with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council's introduction of the use of the vernacular for worship. The use of vernacular was for good reason; it gave the worshipper ownership of the Mass. Instead of being external, the person worshipping at Mass could relate to the new language because it was very accessible and therefore the liturgy became more of a human experience for many in the pews. If there would be a change back to Latin, even in most of the peoples' responses, a new generation of worshippers would be confused and disconnected to the content. Any change is possible; if the purpose of the change is sensible, the people will adapt. While those currently in the Church will remember the words in their own language and know what they are praying, future generations will become part of the celebration at a marked disadvantage. While only a small part of the Mass, moving some of it back to Latin gives the distinct impression to many of the faithful that the bishops are looking to undo the Second Vatican Council, failing to appreciate the development of liturgical music in the time since the Second Vatican Council.

The irony in the bishops attempting to use music as a vehicle to bring Latin back to the liturgy is that they do so in the context of the ordinary Mass as prescribed by the Second Vatican Council, instead of where the Latin Mass has its roots. Virgil Funk in *Today's Liturgy* magazine points out that "Even though this document discusses the use of Latin and Gregorian chant, it does not discuss the extraordinary form of the Mass and

the other sacraments and Liturgical rites (often called the Tridentine rite)" (Funk 22). While the Church has affirmed that these rules may be used in the United States and other parts of the world, the United States bishops are promoting the option to have such masses if there is a demand for it and instead essentially mandating the use of Latin. Even the use of Latin is considered acceptable when there is a pastoral need, even in light of the acceptance of the vernacular. One wonders if bishops are trying to harmonize with the Tridentine or something more traditional than current practice.

At the Second Vatican Council, Gregorian chant was held up high as being a proud part of the Church's heritage. However the Church stated that Gregorian chant would not be the only type of music for use at the liturgy. *Sing to the Lord* addresses Gregorian chant, referring to the Second Vatican Council's declaration that Gregorian chant has "pride of place" but at the same time takes a turn toward encouraging use of Gregorian chant. *Sing to the Lord* states,

> Gregorian Chant is uniquely the Church's own music. Chant is a living connection with the forebears of the faith, the traditional music of the Roman Rite, a sign of communion with the universal church, a bond of unity across cultures, a means for diverse communities to participate together in song, and a summons to contemplative participation in the Liturgy (STL 72).

This paragraph does little to support the notion that all types of music are equal, as the Second Vatican Council stated. This section of *Sing to the Lord* has lent to some important people in the Church to take a heavy slant toward Gregorian chant. Chant is to

a particular time and place. While part of a rich heritage, one must raise question of the current value of chant.

Anthony Ruff is the leader of the chant interest section for the National Pastoral Musicians, so his dedication to Gregorian chant is clear. Ruff writes that chant comes from long held "strong advocacy" from the Roman Church:

> Given the strong advocacy of Gregorian Chant in the Roman documents, but its virtual disappearance from Catholic liturgy in the United States, it was perhaps to be expected that chant would become something of a political football in the so-called “liturgy wars”. *Sing to the Lord* needed to speak to the question of Gregorian Chant in the reformed liturgy (Ruff 82).

Ruff's assessment of a "strong advocacy" by the Church for Gregorian chant is not consistent with the Second Vatican Council, which clearly advocated principles of inculturation. As for *Sing to the Lord*, it does cater to those like Ruff who wish to use Gregorian chant in the liturgy.

Ruff is correct in saying *Sing to the Lord* "speaks about chant with specificity and uses technical terminology that suggests serious engagement with the chant repertoire" (Ruff 82). *Sing to the Lord* does so with the point that musicians should be "sensitive to the cultural and spatial milieu of their communities, in order to build up the church in unity and peace" (73). That statement suggests that no one should start a fight over music, but the push toward Gregorian chant is clear. For someone like Ruff, who is clearly devoted to using chant, nothing has really changed; the Second Vatican Council allowed for chant alongside every other style of liturgical music tuned to the culture of

the people. Ruff was always free to use chant in a place where it worked culturally. The "virtual disappearance" that Ruff laments may be best explained by recognizing that Gregorian chant no longer constitutes a significant dimension of American Catholic culture.

The Church may have hoped to affirm both chant and other alternatives, but the clear impression from *Sing to the Lord* is a clear preference to Gregorian chant that will undoubtedly affect the Church going forward, given the influence of the bishops. While many thoroughly enjoy Gregorian chant and find it to be an important part of their spirituality, the Second Vatican Council affirmed that chant was indeed one way, but not the only way. While people in the Church such as Ruff have felt that the road to chant was an uphill battle in advocating the use of chant, the option existed all along. Now, with the United States bishops advocating chant, the options appear fewer and fewer as the Church moves closer and closer to a more rigid uniformity in the liturgy, seemingly afraid of the recognizing and engaging contemporary American Catholic culture.

Another prominent feature of *Sing to the Lord* is the directive to sing the dialogues of the Mass. The goal of doing so is in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council's call for full, conscious, and active participation. While it is a noble assertion, the directive faces obstacles. The biggest problem with this new guideline, aside from those already addressed with the 2002 *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, are that the singing can reach uncomfortable levels that may prohibit the “full, conscious, and active participation” of the faithful and discourage participation in the liturgy. This presupposes a priest who can sing well and a congregation that is schooled on one particular response. As Harmon notes, *Sing to the Lord* is not asking anything new of the

worshipping assembly; the directive has existed since *Musicam Sacram* in 1968. That might suggest that there are reasons that this particular singing never became a part of the liturgy in the United States. Leaders in the field such as Harmon have done a fine job explaining why the singing might be a positive contribution to the liturgy, but there are reasons while a directive would fail to appreciate the practicality of doing so in most cases.

What is the motivation for the bishops looking to implement singing of all dialogues in the liturgy? Harmon says:

> *Sing to the Lord* directs us to sing these texts because unlike other musical elements that only embellish or accompany the rite, these texts constitute the rite. To sing these texts is to sing the liturgy. At the deepest level liturgy enacts within and among us the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ…our singing of these liturgical texts is our living, breathing actualization of the rite or, more accurately, the Holy Spirit actualization of the rite within and among us (Harmon 195).

Further, Harmon says that the Church's version of the liturgy is musical. To make the liturgy exclusively one way is to assume that each person's spirituality is of one formula, as evidenced by the new definition of "pastoral" that the bishops appear to define in *Sing to the Lord*. While singing the dialogues may be spiritually beneficial for some, the bishops cannot assume that this will be the case for everyone.

While music is an important element of the liturgy, the liturgy first and foremost is profoundly human. The Greek word *leitourgia* refers to the "work of the people"; this recognizes the active part that the assembly has within the liturgy. When the liturgy is

made out of reach, then the liturgy has been taken away from the people. If a lector, deacon, priest, bishop, etc. is required to sing and is not comfortable doing so, or does not possess the ability to sing, that serves only to damage the liturgy and disrupt worship for all involved. Allowing communities to implement these directives to the extent that they work for the people involved with a strong recommendation to sing the dialogues would be much more appropriate for the Church.

While some say that *Sing to the Lord* attempts to eliminate many of the controversies in the so-called "liturgy wars" that exist among American Catholics, the document does little to solve any conflict. Instead, the document has tightened restrictions among many areas within American Catholic worship: the judgment of liturgical music, the use of the hymn, use of Gregorian chant, use of Latin in the liturgy, use of instruments, and new instructions to sing more and more of the liturgy than ever before. As long as the Church takes a stance of formal compliance versus "no rigid uniformity", tension will surround the liturgy. This is particularly true when it is interpreted as law and not guidelines. While that is the same goal of these new restrictions, the American Catholic bishops fall short. The same *Liturgiam Authenicam* that the bishops used as inspiration for these documents would end up inspiring a radical change in the American Catholic liturgy and the rest of the English-speaking world, in the form a new translation of all texts used for the Mass.

Chapter 7

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH RESPONDS TO A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE ROMAN MISSAL

The major document of the Second Vatican Council *Sacrosanctam Concilium: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* included conciliar reforms on the liturgy that gave principles and set direction, and the promulgation of the document was the basis for liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic Church. Continually since the council, the Church has issued updates that began with the title, "Instruction on the Right Implementation of the Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council". The first "right implementation" occurred during the time of the Second Vatican Council on September 26, 1964. The second would take place shortly thereafter on May 4, 1967 and the third on September 5, 1970. Occurring so close to the council itself, neither represented much of a change, considering that the conciliar reforms were mostly not implemented. However, following this period of implementation, the church introduced some new "right implementations". The fourth "right implementation" was issued on January 25, 1994, approaching 29 years after the Second Vatican Council. This document was a response to the growing inculturation within the Catholic Church.

At the 25th anniversary of the Second Vatican Council, Pope John Paul II marked the anniversary with an apostolic letter that called for a "new gradual process of evaluation, completion, and consolidation of the liturgical renewal" (22). This would begin a process of questioning existing liturgical translations, including those texts in English in the United States. In 1997, Pope John Paul II asked the Congregation for Divine Worship to "codify" conclusions from studies on the liturgy that they had been

doing over the years. This led to the Fifth Instruction for the Right Application of the Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, entitled *Liturgiam Authenticam*, or "Authentic Liturgy". The authenticity that the document called for was a re-translation of all liturgical texts to be faithful to the Latin texts from which they came. In the United States, the task was to retranslate all prayers of the liturgy once again.

The Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments published, "On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy" to explain just what *Liturgiam Authenticam* would mean to the United States and other countries. The document states that:

> In order that such a rich patrimony may be preserved and passed on through the centuries, it is to be kept in mind from the beginning that the translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. While it is permissible to arrange the wording, the syntax and the style in such a way as to prepare a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer, the original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses. Any adaptation to the characteristics or the nature of the various vernacular languages is to be sober and discreet (*Liturgiam Authenticam* 3).

The Church has witnessed previously the effects of a translation that has gone awry. In the 400s,

Saint Jerome translated all scripture from its original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into what would become the Latin Vulgate, a full set of scripture that would become the standard of the Church. Once that Latin Vulgate became the basis for other translations, the text became more and more obscured. In the wake of the Second Vatican Council and modern Biblical scholarship, translating to the vernacular was done from modern language, as seen in the New American Bible and Revised Standard Bible. The issues surrounding this strict translation from the Latin in the liturgy would create restrictions in terms of music and in turn greatly restrict the ability to express their faith appropriately in various languages and in various cultures.

With the new translation completed, American composers set out in an attempt to adjust their musical settings or write new ones altogether. This was no easy task; thanks to the principles of translation, composers lost some flexibility. The composer had to use the language, in English, which formally corresponded to the Latin text. The principle of formal correspondence stated, "The original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses" (*Liturgiam Authenticam* 22).

This translation principle that seeks to translate in the "most exact manner" is often referred to as "formal equivalence" and would replace a translation model that employed "dynamic equivalence". The model of dynamic equivalence was in the document, *Comme le Prevoit: On The Translation Of Liturgical Texts For Celebrations With A Congregation*, published on January 25, 1969 by the Concilium for Instituting the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. The goal of the document is to show that the Church

is the most important method of expressing salvation to the world. Thus, the document describes a method of translation that would do that best:

> To achieve this end, it is not sufficient that a liturgical translation merely reproduce the expressions and ideas of the original text. Rather it must faithfully communicate to a given people, and in their own language, that which the Church by means of this given text originally intended to communicate to another people in another time. A faithful translation, therefore, cannot be judged on the basis of individual words: the total context of this specific act of communication must be kept in mind, as well as the literary form proper to the respective language (CP 2).

Further, *Comme le Prevoit* notes that the text can be translated in multiple ways as it is important to capture and express the original meaning of the text. This is not accomplished with a word-for-word translation. Using a word-for-word translation that would maintain the same meaning is certainly a valid means. Some cultural expressions such as metaphors changed because the true sense of the meaning is not known to the audience. Additionally, the text notes that in some cases, the text expresses an idea that can no longer be understood, because it is tied to a time, place, or people. In some cases the Christian community has also changed.

> The prayer of the Church is always the prayer of some actual community, assembled here and now. It is not sufficient that a formula handed down from some other time or region be translated verbatim, even if accurately, for liturgical use. The formula translated must become the genuine prayer

> of the congregation and in it each of its members should be able to find and express himself or herself (*Comme le Prevoit* 20).

And thus, despite this directive, Catholics would struggle to express themselves in many ways, including in song.

Despite the dynamic equivalence method of translation directly stemming from the work of the Second Vatican Council, the decision to change the method is explained as something unrelated to the Second Vatican Council. According to Gordon Truitt, editor of publications for the National Pastoral Musicians, the change was not intended to disrupt or undo teachings of the Second Vatican Council:

> These decisions did not intend to undo the Second Vatican Council or replace the *Missale Romanum* of Pope Paul VI, but they were aimed at correcting what the Vatican has long seen as inadequacies in the way the reformed rites were received, perceived, and implemented. Some of these initiatives, especially in the area of translation, it must be granted, could have been better developed or applied, but one can certainly see them all as attempting to address—with more or less success, suavity, or heavy-handedness—the concerns expressed by popes all the way back to Paul VI (Truitt 14).

But even though *Comme le Prevoit* called for "cautious adaptation", the document called for adaptation. Without adaptation, the result is a confused English that puzzles composers, the congregations, and presiders. Whether they intended to do so or not, this is a marked shift from the response of the Second Vatican Council.

This new approach would lock down composers into texts that are unbalanced, unpoetic, and difficult to put to music. Putting together texts from "dynamic equivalence" approached translation from the perspective of, "What is the best way to say this particular phrase in the English language?" Instead, composers had to employ the formal correspondence of *Liturgiam Authenticam* and use a text that matched up word for word with a Latin text. Just as *Comme le Prevoit* warned about translating the liturgical texts, often the translations do not represent how Americans speak English and do not make for easy work for a composer. Thus, one might wonder the motivation for this new translation.

Rev. Ricky Manalo, C.S.P., a Catholic priest and composer with Oregon Catholic Press, lamented that the new translation has made the prayers of the Mass "unpoetic" and disrupts the creative process of the composer.

> Rather than an *explosion* of liturgical creativity, one could describe this period as a *creative implosion* due to more restrictions and regulations. Composers needed to adjust their craft to navigate better through these new regulatory frameworks while maintaining musical, theological, and pastoral integrity (Manalo 26).

Manalo notes that composers had four years in preparation of the new translation of the Roman Missal to do some "pastoral hindsight" and look into what worked and what did not work from the Second Vatican Council through the period in which composers began working with the re-translated texts. But, whether these texts of the post-conciliar era worked or did not work, that did not matter; the new text would be enforced.

Composers were restricted by the overall approach to translating the liturgy. The former translation employed dynamic equivalence. With the goal of the unity of the Church from language to language the same, each translation looked to contain the same message, but with the flexibility to express it in a way that would be faithful to local language and local culture. The result was a translation of the Mass that people could recite, sing, and understand. For example, the "Glory to God" prayer, usually sung, used the words "Glory to God in the highest, and peace to his people on earth." Manalo shows that those words provide the appropriate rhythmic structure for composers to create settings for people to sing: "There are natural accents on "Glo… God… high… peace… peo…earth" (Manalo 26). But the new rules for translation called for something other than that which could be easily sung.

Looking at the 2011 translation of the text, it now sings, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of good will." This text frustrated composers like Manalo, who lost the use of the natural accents he mentions for the previous text. Manalo writes that this new translation of the text, "does not follow such a logical rhythmic structure, flow, and pace…for many composers, this phrase was the most difficult to set in the whole new translation. In fact, some of us thought that if we could just set *this one phrase* to music, everything else would be easier" (Manalo 27). But, Manalo and other composers labored to complete the prayer anyway, and composers are still trying to master the sung "Glory to God."

One irony in the fidelity-to-Latin argument, is that the Latin portrays something other than what it is supposed to be: a line from the Gospel of Luke, Chapter 2. In the translation of Luke that is used at the midnight Christmas liturgy in the Church, that line

reads, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests”. However, as the hymn of the liturgy, this particular piece may not necessarily be quoting scripture. But, if the purpose of the Glory to God is a hymn and not creed, it should be singable. Participating in Mass and watching the priest stumble over sung prayer is also an issue with the new translation of the Roman Missal.

With the added emphasis on singing the prayers on the part of the priest, the new text will need to be sung not just on congregational elements, but increasingly singing is required on the part of the presiding priest at the liturgy. The new text of the Eucharistic prayers are increasingly wordy and difficult for both the priest to sing and for the people at the Mass to understand. Rita Ferrone of *Commonweal Magazine* in “It Doesn’t Sing” noted that the overly wordy prayers are difficult to proclaim and for people to understand. She compares two prayers, one from the Roman Missal prior to 2011 and one from the 2011 edition that are meant to be sung by the presider. The first reads:

> We come to you, Father, with praise and thanksgiving, through Jesus Christ your Son. Through him we ask you to accept and bless these gifts we offer you in sacrifice. We offer them for your holy catholic Church (Roman Missal 1970).

The retranslated prayer now reads:

> To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer and petition through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: That you accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices which we offer you firstly for your holy Catholic Church (Roman Missal 2011).

Ferrone is quick to point out the flaws of these two passages, which use an English not spoken by most Americans:

> The current translation [the 1970 Missal] is simple and direct. It follows the speech patterns and rhythms of contemporary spoken English. It flows easily off the tongue. Its meaning is clear. The new translation, on the other hand, is mannered and complex. We arrive at the subject of the sentence only after we have heard the dative 'to you'; the conjunction 'therefore'; a superlative adjective 'most merciful'; and a noun in apposition, 'Father.'

A priest singing this version of the text is indeed easy for the faithful to understand. But looking at the new translation, it is tricky:

> The new translation is wordy. In place of 'these gifts,' we offer 'these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices.'
>
> Having offered these gifts, offerings, holy and unblemished sacrifices *firstly* for the church, you might be thinking there is a *secondly* coming along in a paragraph or two. If so, you would be wrong. There is no *secondly*. What does *firstly* mean in this context? It's not clear that it means anything at all.
>
> Different words, same prayer? Both are translations of the same Latin text, yet the results are quite different and you change the prayer.

With these texts sung to the congregation, what are the odds that people can follow them at all? Ferrone is correct that the ability to pray these words has been greatly diminished. But the incoherence of the texts are not the only challenge for a priest

attempting to sing this Eucharistic prayer. The added prayers consist of run-on sentences, convoluted phrasing, and generally poor grammar.

Ferrone points out the following statistics about the Eucharistic prayers:

- The longest sentence of the new Eucharistic prayers is 82 words.
- The average sentence is 35.4 words per sentence, an increase from 20.4 words per sentence.
- Pope Benedict's Ash Wednesday homily averaged 23.2 words per sentence.
- The wordy Letter to the Romans by Paul is only 27.38 words per sentence (Ferrone 6).

To a priest attempting to sing the Eucharistic prayer, he must be able to take the appropriate breaths necessary to proclaim the text. To an untrained singer, this could be difficult. Yet, the new translation is incredibly wordy, making it even more difficult for a priest to proclaim the Eucharistic prayer. Regarding the listener in the pew, Ferrone says, they will not be able to comprehend:

> That 53-word sentence makes sense if one has the leisure to study it and perhaps draw a diagram. But the person in the pew does not have that luxury…An individual word or phrase may ring a bell. But the essential meaning of the prayer will be lost. An act of oral communication, a text such as this cannot but fail for the vast majority of Catholics. Like so many of the newly translated prayers, it will come off as theo-babble, holy nonsense (Ferrone 7).

Extra challenges will exist for the hard of hearing and those for whom English is not their first language. We are reminded that for the New Roman Missal, the first preference is to sing the Eucharistic prayers. But as Ferrone's title says plainly, it doesn't sing.

If one does indeed technically "sing" a new text, does it mean that it is sung with full meaning in various cultures? One major issue with the strict new translation of the Roman Missal is that previous flexibility for inculturation as noted in *Comme le Prevoit* is discarded in favor of a strict, word-for-word translation of the Roman Missal. The expressions in liturgy are more than simple words. To be proclaimed with emotion and with an emphatic expression truly connects the believers to the liturgy and that which is being celebrated. While the words were different from language to language, or even culture to culture, the core message should have weight. Yet, the new translation of the Roman Missal keeps many Americans from truly sharing in the message because linguistic legalese has replaced cultural expression. One wonders what the real issue was for the Church in Rome: General pastoral problems or hierarchical control.

J. Michael Joncas, previously mentioned to be composer of the popular "On Eagle's Wings" and assistant professor at St. Thomas University in Minnesota, writes that the new translation of the missal has essentially overstepped the cultural context that allows for full expression of the texts. Joncas uses the "Mystery of Faith" prayer that is sung in the revised liturgy as a test case to show that inculturation has been taken out of the prayers. The text in question is the acclamation used after the Roman Missal re-translation, "We proclaim your death, O Lord, and profess your resurrection until you come again". To make his point, Joncas refers to the original Latin text that the new translation is supposed to be translated faithfully.

"In a slavish literal translation, this Latin sentence could be rendered, 'Your death we are proclaiming, Lord, and your resurrection we are professing, until you [may/might/should] come"' (Joncas 1). The approach to this acclamation has completely removed cultural context, and in turn, meaning for the American English-speaking Catholic.

In the previous edition of the Roman Missal, two acclamations were used from this saying. One commonly used option was "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again". Joncas points out the obvious: this was not a literal, formally corresponding translation of the text:

> It should be immediately clear that neither was intended as a literal translation of the underlying Latin sentence. Rather, the translators posited that in English-language cultural contexts, speakers do not usually employ language to describe what they are doing but use it performatively to accomplish the intention…so in the judgment of the translators, the single Latin sentence, appropriately for that linguistic system and cultural context making a declaration about what the assembly is doing, should become in English two or three sentences by which the assembly actually does linguistically what the Latin text prescribes (Joncas 2).

This acclamation in itself in spoken form shows a flawed translation from the perspective of meaning. But, ironically, the translation is not completely faithful to the text itself. Joncas points out that the translators even add a word. "The translators add 'again' after 'come' when the underlying Latin had no equivalent word modifying 'venias.' If the goal is strict adherence to the Latin text, the translators seem to have made a gratuitous addition" (Joncas 2). With this new, flawed translation in mind comes the need to set

this text to music in a way that accomplishes cultural meaning, with the text already deficient for English language speakers.

With the new translation, the ability to add words within the context of an acclamation was ended, even though the translators made extra additions themselves. Settings of the Mass with added words are not approved for liturgical use. Joncas shows that two musical settings of this particular acclamation commonly used prior to the new translation of the Roman Missal embodied the true meaning of the text while incorporating cultural attributes to the music. One is "Christ Has Died, Alleluia" by Joe Wise; the other is "Jesus Died Upon the Cross" by Grayson Warren Brown. These include additional words, but Joncas believes both properly embodied, in their own unique cultural context, the true essence of the acclamation.

"Christ Has Died, Alleluia" by Joe Wise includes the "Christ Has Died" acclamation but with an addition: the word "Alleluia". The acclamation sings, "Christ has died, Alleluia. Christ is risen, Alleluia. Christ will come again. Alleluia, Alleluia!" Joncas states that the extra word is indeed an appropriate addition:

> This Hebrew text, meaning, "Praise YHWH," is presumably considered an appropriate text to heighten the acclamatory character of these sentences. I suspect the composer did not consider this addition too far a stretch for the memorial acclamation since it also serves as an acclamatory text before the Gospel (Joncas 3).

With the addition of text and the fact that the translation has been completely changed to not include the "Christ has died" acclamation, this would no longer be considered appropriate for liturgical use. Thus, the "We proclaim your death" acclamation ignores

the cultural gifts that come with this setting. The recording of the acclamation makes use of instruments such as the banjo further enculturates this text.

> I would claim that this setting, while by no means an example of high art, is very much an example of an enculturated musical setting of a liturgical text, whose melody (through syncopation) and arrangement (especially in the use of banjo) bespeaks a distinctly American/Country/Appalachian idiom (Joncas 4).

Thus, part of the American Catholic Church has truly lost something meaningful when they lost this acclamation in the new translation of the Roman Missal.

The second example comes from an African American experience. Grayson Warren Brown's "Jesus Died Upon the Cross" comes from an album intended to embody the African American Catholic experience entitled, "Songs of a Soulful People". That text proclaims, "Jesus died upon the cross, Christ arose from the dead; and just as sure as the sun will rise, Jesus Christ, my Lord and Savior, will come again!". This text also adds text to the "Christ has died" acclamation, but the additions are important elements of the faith, with expression coming in the African American tradition. Joncas believes that this acclamation, too, expresses the true nature of the acclamation.

> The composer has recast the three declarative sentences with creedal additions (died "upon the cross"; arose "from the dead") and a simile ("just as sure as the sun will rise") that would ring quite true in the African American context for which Grayson Warren Brown is writing. Notice the distinction between "Jesus" and "Christ": is this a subtle way of making the distinction between "proclaiming" (*annuntiamus*) a historical

> event – the death of Jesus on the cross – and "professing" (*confitemur*) a mystery of faith – the resurrection of Christ? (Joncas 6).

While not the "legal" acclamation, this renders a valid "translation" using dynamic equivalence of the prayer being acclaimed. Further criticism comes from the adaptation of the "I" perspective rather than the "we" that is in the prayer as proclaimed. Joncas recognizes that this is part of the African American spiritual tradition.

> One can mount a strong argument that the African American spiritual and gospel singing tradition frequently operates with a sense of corporate personality by which the "I" of the sung text reflects the experience of the entire community (Joncas 7).

Both acclamations represent the true nature of the text, but yet neither one is considered an acceptable option in American worship anymore. This is unfortunate, because formal compliance to a Latin translation should be superseded by a cultural application that will allow a congregation to truly and more completely proclaim the mystery of faith.

Despite what Joncas called the "gratuitous" addition of the word "again" in the acclamation "We proclaim...", composers were no longer allowed to add any words to the texts in the new compositions for the new translation of the Roman Missal. Aside from the noted cultural additions that Joncas explored, the restrictions have affected some well known sung parts of the Mass that had minor additions to the text. The additions served as support to the text itself or to help provide balance in musical composition. Two particular popular sung prayers have lost their effect by taking away the ability to use minor additions.

The "Glory to God" prayer from David Haas' "Mass of Light" of 1988 was a popular musical setting in the American Catholic Church prior to the new translation of the Mass. Hass himself wrote, "It is always fun to have adults come up to me (who were children at the time of the original version) and share how the Glory to God has been an important part of their faith life" (Haas 1). However, the new translation of this piece may not have the same effect of the original, thanks to the removal of one word: "sing".

The refrain to the original piece included the lyrics, "Glory to God in the highest! Sing Glory to God! Glory to God in the highest, and peace to his people on earth!" The text itself was the third sentence, "Glory to God in the highest, and peace to his people on earth." The addition of an extra word, "sing", helped drive the enthusiasm of the piece. Haas himself asked, "How can I make these new texts sound fresh and vital while not having to sacrifice certain rhythmic and melodic devices that made the original version appealing?" (Haas 1). This provides a perfect example of why composers of liturgical music should have been part of the work of the new translation.

In rewriting this composition, Haas had to use the newly translated text, "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to people of good will". Haas' new composition had to omit the word "sing". In order to match the original musical accompaniment, the text now reads, "Glory to God in the highest! Glory to God and on earth peace to people, to people of good will". The hard "g" sounds of the second "glory" hardly has the emphasis of "sing", particularly because "glory" is stretched out the former phrase, "Sing Glory", two syllables over five beats instead the word "sing" for three beats and two for "glory", losing the effect of the old acclamation. Haas wrote in the introduction to the

publication of the retranslated prayer, "All I can say is that I did best with the parameters that we have been given as composers" (Haas 1).

Another acclamation that had a similar fate was one popular "Lamb of God" prayer sung right before the reception of communion during the Mass. Marty Haugen, who composed a musical arrangement of the prayer for "Mass of Creation" published in 1985, began with the words, "Jesus, Lamb of God" instead of simply "Lamb of God". The text's biblical roots in the Gospel of John demonstrate that the prayer is clearly directed toward Jesus. A vast majority of the new settings were published without this extra word; it was officially outlawed in 2012. The new version has the identical rhythm to the original, but instead of "Jesus, Lamb" the word "Lamb" is slurred over all three syllables and three notes, creating an awkward expression for a favorite prayer.

These two examples are not the only ones of the removal of minor textual additions, but they may be the most popular of those affected. While some changing of the text has the potential to be gratuitous and alter the meaning of the text, these two particular additions do not in any way negatively affect the prayer being prayed. If anything, one may argue that the additions of these extra words only supported the true meaning of the text, despite not being a word for word formal correspondence to the Latin language prayer. The Catholic Church in the United States truly lost something important in the faith life of many.

Even with words identical to the new translation of the Mass, that would not be enough for some dioceses in the United States. In many dioceses, cultural ability to make pastoral decisions was affected further. In addition to being restricted to the sung acclamations that fit the new translations of the Mass, some dioceses used the new

translation of the Mass to restrict the choices of local parishes even further. This was done in the context of mandated or recommended Mass settings that took choices away from parishes.

In the Diocese of Jackson, Mississippi, all parishes were expected to respond to the new translation by using only two particular Mass settings. A decree from Bishop Joseph N. Latino forcefully mandated the use of two particular musical settings of the Mass, "The Belmont Mass" and the "*Missa Simplex*". The bishop wrote:

> As Bishop and Guardian of the Liturgy for the faithful in the diocese, I mandate all parishes in the Diocese of Jackson to use only the above two Mass settings for Masses in English for the above listed transition period. This applies to all Masses including school and youth masses (Latino 1).

Bishop Latino's mandate suggested that this would "better facilitate" the use of the new parts of the Mass. The goal could have been to get people more familiar with the new translation. However, doing so has taken local culture out of Mass. Both "The Belmont Mass" and "*Missa Simplex*" are Gregorian chant-style Masses, and not Mass settings that could be done in various styles. Again, this is perhaps an indication of the real intention of the hierarchy.

While the mandate refers to English-speaking Masses only, would not it seem appropriate to have a similar concern for other language groups in the diocese? Even though the Spanish translation of the Mass is not yet completed, the rich heritage of African American culture is ignored. Further, with chant generally accompanied by a pipe organ, what should faith communities do that employ use of a guitar group or other instruments do to accompany the singing of these chanted Masses? The selections by

Bishop Latino indicate that other cultural styles are not welcome in the Diocese of Jackson.

Then the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Denver, Archbishop Charles J. Chaput, also issued a decree on May 18, 2011 about the new translation of the Roman Missal in regard to Mass settings. This one was more flexible than the decree from the Diocese of Jackson. In Denver, the Archdiocese Music Committee reviewed over 100 texts and ultimately recommended eight settings. Of the eight settings, the two aforementioned chant settings are included there, but so are Mass settings that are composed for use on organ, piano, guitar, and other instruments that would allow for parishes within various cultural settings to employ something that would resonate with the communities. Further, Chaput is quick to point out that the recommendations were just that—not mandatory. But, Chaput does make a remark which would be difficult for many to accept: throw out the old acclamations in use for in some cases 30 or 40 years.

Many Mass settings have been staples in the American Roman Catholic Church and have become an important part of the faith life of many Catholics. The Archdiocese of Denver recommended that none that were in prior use would be adapted:

> All of the new mass settings that the committee recommended are newly composed. The reason behind only newly composed settings was that with revised settings, such as *Mass of Creation* by Marty Haugen it is easy to slip into "automatic pilot" when singing and revert to the former text of the Ordinaries of the Mass (Gloria, Sanctus, etc). Though the composers have changed some of their melodic lines and texts to reflect the new texts, it was recommended to start fresh and anew (Chaput 1).

The Mass of Creation may be the most popular sung setting of the Mass since the Second Vatican Council. Losing the Mass of Creation as a viable option would negatively affect worshipping communities.

The composer of Mass of Creation, Marty Haugen, reflected upon his Mass of Creation on the occasion of revising the Mass setting in a piece entitled, "Mass of Creation at 25". Haugen explained that the reason he wrote the setting was to create one Mass setting that could be done in the large parish where he served as music director by a large four-part choir, in the "folk ensemble" with a variety of instruments, with a children's choir, a hand bell choir, and with various cantors. That is what led to the success:

> Because the setting was created for multiple ensembles and because it was new to all the various groups, it did not become associated with a particular style. All of the liturgical music groups were willing to learn it and quickly incorporated it into their repertoire…For the first time in their history, the choir and the folk ensemble participated together in the Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday liturgies and were able to sing the same mass setting (Haugen 2).

As in Haugen's own parish, the setting became a very popular setting across the United States for the same reasons. That is why it is important that settings like Mass of Creation continue to be used in American Catholic worship.

Haugen himself acknowledged that the task of the composer was difficult; he or she must remain faithful to the familiar melody but at the same time keep up with the new text:

> When revising a published setting, is it better to try to adhere very closely to the original familiar music (and run the risk of confusing congregations) or to create music that varies from the original music (and run the risk of frustrating congregations that need something familiar, especially during a time of transition)? (Haugen 3).

Despite the challenges, it would seem people could more readily adjust to minor changes within the familiar. One wonders when the United States Catholic Church will achieve a level of familiarity expanding beyond individual parishes and diocese which have come with the widespread use of the Mass of Creation. With proper attention to the changes in parishes, there would be the opportunity to teach the congregants the changes. Haugen's editor, GIA Publications, had a certain idea in mind:

> At the suggestion of the editorial staff at GIA, the revised *Mass of Creation* will stay as close as possible to the original melodies. Having said that it is important to realize that, in ritual music, the melody must always be a support to the text and will have to change to accommodate text changes. In addition, subtle changes in the music will support the changes to the text; in other words, it is hoped that there will be enough change to avoid confusing the new version with the old version (Haugen 3).

The new setting of Mass of Creation was included in post-translation hymnals *Gather: Third Edition*, *Worship: Fourth Edition*, and *Breaking Bread*, indicating that people believe that there is room for the settings that help people express their faith. However, the resistance from some Church leadership has taken that option away.

While many have stressed that revised texts should be avoided, the chants within the missal themselves were indeed revised with the English words placed over Latin words within the context of the same melodies. These melodies remain the same but the newly-translated prayers give the sung prayers awkward accents and do not reflect the spirit of the prayer in American English. Beyond the issues of translation, there is another aspect involving the Bishops' control.

Gaudium et Spes: The Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World gave the Catholic Church a renewed understanding about how the Holy Spirit works in the world, both within the membership of the Church and outside the membership of the Church. The Church has struggled since to balance this two-fold understanding. In the Church's worship life we see this struggle in liturgical music. Some liturgical music capturing a message of *Gaudium Et Spes* is currently under fire by some who prefer an ecclesiology that identifies the Church as a perfect society. They prefer clear boundaries between the believers and non-believers. One such example is the hymn, "All Are Welcome", by composer Marty Haugen. This hymn reflects the struggle to balance the Church within, and the Church outside.

Written for the gathering rite of the liturgy, "All Are Welcome" calls the Church to worship. Haugen's hymn opens with the words,

> Let us build a house where love can dwell and all can safely live./ A place where saints and children tell how hearts learn to forgive/...All are welcome, all are welcome, all are welcome in this place.

The struggle exists in the final phrase of the hymn's refrain: "All are welcome". The concern? An ancient Church adage echoed at the Second Vatican Council says, *Lex orandi, lex credendi* - as we pray, so we believe.

So what does the church believe: Are all people welcome in the Church, or more specifically the liturgy? To answer this question we must look to who Jesus Christ came to save. The introductory statement *Gaudium et Spes* teaches us that Christ died for all of mankind, not simply the faithful within the Church. It says, "The Church firmly believes that Christ, who died and was raised up for all, can through his Spirit offer man the light and the strength to measure up to his supreme destiny" (*Gaudium et Spes* 10). This firm belief is expressed in the document's view of the human person.

Part One of *Gaudium et Spes*, originally intended to be the whole document, focuses on the nature of humankind. With the foundational statement that Jesus died and was raised for all, *Gaudium et Spes* explores four key components of Catholic theology regarding humankind: the dignity of the human person, the human community, humanity's activity in the universe, and the role of the Church in the modern world.

Chapter One focuses on the dignity of humankind as created in the "image of God". All of humankind, not some, is created in this image. Within the concept of the image of God is the gift of free choice, and with free choice the potential to conformity to the divine image of Jesus. When freedom leads to sin, God's grace is there to fill the gap. If the gap is large? *Gaudium et Spes* specifically notes that the church is aware of atheism and while declaring atheism a problem, she recognizes the good that may come from those who are atheist. *Gaudium et Spes* says the Church "courteously invites atheists to examine the Gospel of Christ with an open mind." If those who openly reject

God are invited by the Church to examine the Gospel, one would consider them indeed welcome. Even those who are entering the Catholic Church and have the status of "catechumen" are welcomed into the community, where they are developed. They do not receive the sacraments while in this status, but at the very least they are welcomed into the Church on Sundays.

Chapter Two focuses on the community of mankind. With the world becoming more and more interdependent on one another thanks to the development of technological advances —and we would probably agree is that true more than ever —"brotherly dialogue" is more important than it has previously been. This dialogue demands a "mutual respect for the full spiritual dignity of the person". As paragraph 24 states,

> God, who has fatherly concern for everyone, has willed that all men should constitute one family and treat one another in a spirit of brotherhood....all men are called to one and the same goal, namely God himself (24).

To fill that goal of God himself, one must demonstrate great love of God. Love of God means that one must demonstrate that in a love of neighbor.

> In our times a special obligation binds us to make ourselves the neighbor of every person without exception and of actively helping him when he comes across our path, whether he be an old person abandoned by all, a foreign laborer unjustly looked down upon, a refugee, a child born of an unlawful union and wrongly suffering for a sin he did not commit, or a hungry person who disturbs our conscience by recalling the voice of the

> Lord, "As long as you did it for one of these the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (27).

This means that the love of God requires that love of neighbor be extended to all, without exception. In other words, they must be welcomed.

Chapter Three focuses on the role of the human person in the world: to be bearers of the message of Christ. Those created in the image of God and extending outward to the community must share that message that they possess within.

> Christ is now at work in the hearts of men through the energy of His Holy Spirit, arousing not only a desire for the age to come, but by that very fact animating, purifying and strengthening those noble longings too by which the human family makes its life more human and strives to render the whole earth submissive to this goal (.

Human effort is a key part of building the Kingdom of God. While earthly progress is not the same as Christ's kingdom, humankind's best effort will be "brought into full flower" upon the return of Christ.

Chapter Four looks at the role of the Church in the modern world. The Church's mission is clear and simple: they wish for the coming of God's kingdom and the whole human race be saved. The Lord is the goal of all human history and the Church works to reestablish all things in Christ. The layperson in the world serves as a witness to Christ through "all things in the midst of human society" (40). Thus, the document demands that Christians engage the outside world and with engagement is the expectation of a welcoming church.

As such, one may easily conclude that the hymn "All Are Welcome" is the perfect

embodiment of the message of *Gaudium et Spes*. Created in God's image, all are brought together, pre-wired with inherent dignity and are welcome parts of the Body of Christ. The focus on the community of humankind indicates that we all should gather in the name of Christ. To be bearers of the message in the outside world requires that all gather together; how else could the message be shared? And, if the goal of the Church is to reestablish all things in Christ, gathering at the liturgy would constitute a perfect starting point. Yet, in recent times there has been controversy surrounding the hymn, "All Are Welcome".

As new hymnals were being prepared to be published in conjunction with the release of the Third Roman Missal, GIA Publications in Chicago, Illinois found themselves in the middle of a controversy over "All Our Welcome," despite it being one of their more popular pieces. In fact, the President of GIA Publications, Alec Harris, said that the hymn was "probably in our top five" in the publisher's catalog (Erickson 2). As is true with any Catholic publication, the hymnal needed to have Ecclesiastical approval from the local Bishop. In this case, that would require the approval of Francis Cardinal George. While there was some push to omit "All Are Welcome" in their newest line of hymnals, Cardinal George declared the hymn (and hundreds of others) "free from doctrinal or moral error" and GIA Publications included "All Are Welcome" in their newest hymnals (Erickson 2).

However, not all those in Ecclesiastical authority agree with the message contained in "All Are Welcome". Bishop Robert Molino of the Diocese of Madison, Wisconsin, argues that the hymn is not appropriate for liturgical use. In October, 2011, in the Bishop's weekly column in the *Madison Catholic Herald*, Molino wrote,

> Some of the songs that we sing at liturgy contain lyrics which clearly are not true -- for example, the song "All Are Welcome". As a matter of fact, the liturgy takes place mystically in the heavenly sanctuary. All are welcome at the liturgy who seek salvation in and through Jesus Christ, by following God's Will, as spelled out through his Son's very Body, the Church. People who have very little interest in doing God's will don't fit at the liturgy (2).

Molino wrote that the liturgy, "as the worship which the Holy Spirit has given His Church always requires beauty in its' celebrations" and that "since the mistaken implementation of Vatican II..., many liturgies have taken place which are, at least, less than beautiful" (Molino 2).

The secular newspaper *The Wisconsin State Journal* covered the Bishop's remarks in a news story. The piece contained quotes obtained from Madison Diocese Spokesperson Brent King, who supported the Bishop's comments by replying that "some are welcome". King said, "In short, all are invited but not all have chosen, or will choose, to accept this invitation, and by their own choosing, some are not welcome" (Erickson 1). This spokesperson seems to overlook the Gospel theme of reconciliation, allowing for the reunification despite sin.

Bishop Molino is not the only Church official to publicly find fault in "All Are Welcome". Rev. Scott Ardinger, Director of Worship in the Allentown, Pennsylvania Diocese, echoed similar sentiments in a workshop on the new translation of the Roman Missal just four days prior to Molino's comments in October, 2011. Along with a lengthy

list of other hymns, Ardinger argued that such a message is a violation of Baptismal Theology. Ardinger wrote,

> All Catholic theology is rooted in a Theology of Baptism. This theology accentuates the primacy of grace and at the same time the theology of free will. It is also necessary to acknowledge that it is at Baptism that we are gathered into the Body of Christ and set apart for worship. Any hymn that denigrates the ontological effects of the sacrament of Baptism in favor of an earthly human gathering in a particular community affected by our gathering and not primarily Baptism is false (Ardinger 1).

As such, Ardinger considers "All Are Welcome" unsuitable for the liturgy.

The composer of the piece, Marty Haugen, replied to the controversy by saying, "Jesus ate with prostitutes, Pharisees, tax collectors, and sinners. I don't remember him refusing anyone, and that was the spirit in which I wrote it" (Erickson 2). The systematic exclusion of various groups of the Church, as Haugen notes, challenges the hymn from a different angle. Haugen also said controversy existed in the piece for other reasons. While presenting at a conference, he was accused of being "hypocritical" by a homosexual man who spoke up and stated he felt unwelcomed at the liturgy.

The premise that "some are welcome" arose once again during the recent translation of the Roman Missal. The Eucharistic prayer at Mass in the 1970 Roman Missal stated that Jesus died "for all". Looking to the original Latin missal text, the phrase used was *pro multis*. Pope Benedict XVI had a strong conviction that despite what he called "exegetical consensus" that the phrase's Hebrew roots mean "for all", the phrase "for many" was the proper translation. Following English-speaking Catholics, in

May 2012, Pope Benedict ordered that the German Catholic Church update their language to "for many". Critics of Haugen's hymn likely find in this translation support for their claim that only some are welcome.

However, in recent weeks the Catholic Church once again has a reason to believe that all are welcome at the liturgy. Pope Francis chose to celebrate his first Holy Thursday liturgy at Casal De Marmo, a youth detention center. Pope Francis went right for the population that Haugen described —a group of criminals. When it was time for the Holy Thursday tradition to wash the feet of twelve at the liturgy to commemorate the action of Jesus at the Last Supper, Pope Francis demonstrated who he felt was welcome. Pope Francis washed the feet of male and female prisoners, including one Muslim woman. A member of another faith would surely be considered someone who Molino would point out did not "accept the invitation" of a calling in Christ.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states, "The Church's faith precedes the faith of the believer who is invited to adhere to it" (1113). *Gaudium et Spes*, with the whole of the Second Vatican Council's teachings, moved the Church into the world. The Council initiated the hoped-for dream of Pope John XXIII to open up to the world. The Church, in and of itself was to be a church in and for the world. As such, it ought to be a people who celebrate that all are welcome.

Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

The Second Vatican Council was instrumental in bringing to the people some comfort and familiarity, in the language, in the approach, and in liturgical music, thanks to the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* declaring that there be "no rigid uniformity" in the liturgy and that the talents and treasures of cultures be respected. For the first time, cultures and subcultures in the United States and throughout the world were able to express themselves from their own musical styles and instruments. Many successes emerged from the Second Vatican Council in terms of music. American culture was able to take the "folk" music of the day and bring it to the liturgy. Hispanic and Latino Americans could express themselves through song in a Hispanic or Latino style in Spanish. African Americans could use the gospel style and instruments that relate to their culture and worship accordingly. However, in more recent times after the Second Vatican Council, the freedom to express one's culture was greatly diminished, due to increased rigid structures and rules. As evidenced by some members of the Church hierarchy, their way is the only acceptable way. Despite claims to the contrary, the processes of centralization and ecclesiastical control suggest a certain dismantling of the Church envisioned by the Second Vatican Council.

The early success in terms of liturgical music was clear. At the time, the opportunity was opened to worship in the vernacular and for the average Catholic worshipper to engage in full, active, and conscious participation in the celebration of the liturgy, Catholics had only a few English hymns that they used in devotional prayer. After initially incorporating Protestant hymns the Church engaged composers to employ

more contemporary music and folk music, and to create liturgical music that was accessible to most people. The composers captured the spirit of American "folk music", while retaining some more traditional styles. In the decades following the Second Vatican Council, composers provided a wide variety of hymns and liturgical settings. They often echoed Biblical texts and provided engaging responsories for the Sunday Psalms. While some of the music of lesser quality disappeared, some continues to reflect and sustain the spirituality of the faithful.

The music of well-known composers such as the St. Louis Jesuits, Michael Joncas, Lucien Deiss, and others is still used in the Church today. The result was some hymns that have become staples of the American Catholic worship life that many would credit as an important part of their spirituality. This includes the top-ranked hymn "On Eagles Wings", along with those ranked second and third, "Here I Am, Lord", and "Be Not Afraid", respectively, in the 2006 Survey by the National Pastoral Musicians of music that ranked the music American Catholics credited as being the most important parts of their spirituality. All in all, the post-Second Vatican Council hymns appeared in just under half of the 25 slots on the survey, and the hymns on the list appear in most of the hymnals produced in the United States.

Within the context of a greater American culture, ethnic subcultures also benefitted greatly from the work of the Second Vatican Council. Often, these groups would have two disadvantages: they would be followers of an American Catholic Church dominated by an Anglo-European culture of heritage and they tried to maintain a personal identity with their culture. The Second Vatican Council afforded minority

groups in the Church a real opportunity to express their cultural identity in the wider context of the American Church.

It took the Church approximately 20 years to develop hymnals for each respective group, and this work continues today. The publication of *Lead Me, Guide Me* in 1987 and *Flor y Canto* in 1989 went a long way in helping groups worship in their "native genius". While the core of the Roman Catholic liturgy would remain the same, the principle of dynamic equivalence would allow ethnic groups to pray prayers from their own viewpoint and their own perspective of understanding to make it more genuine and heartfelt. With revisions of both hymnals and the publication of many other resources, the worship of ethnic groups continues to grow today. One might wonder what happens if Rome mandates a more literal translation of the missal.

The Second Vatican Council affirmed that while opening up the door to many other musical instruments and musical styles, traditional Catholic modes of music were held in high esteem or "pride of place". This includes use of the pipe organ as the traditional instrument in the Catholic liturgy, polyphony that had roots in the Italian Renaissance, and the continued use of Gregorian chant in liturgies. With the Second Vatican Council allowing for all forms of liturgical music, the opportunity was there to expand these musical styles and employ them in a way that fostered the "full, conscious, and active participation" of the worshipping faithful. The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* called for singing beyond the choir lofts in a style not limited to a particular time or culture. The Church sought to tap into the many resources from the Church's storied history and bring them to their fullness that would allow all to worship in these ways.

Unfortunately, the end of the 20th century saw the rise of groups that would attempt to reform the reform. These groups advocated traditional ways of worship: use of the pipe organ, Renaissance polyphony, and Gregorian chant. While holding these traditional styles in high esteem, the Second Vatican Council proposed that other gifts should be welcomed from all cultures: American culture and the subcultures that help make up American life. Advocating reform, these movements would propose legalistic interpretations of Church documents, placing importance on some Church documents that would put into law some of the restrictions that would define musical worship in the American Roman Catholic liturgy.

The implementation of the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* in 2002 and the subsequent publication of *Sing to the Lord* by the United States Catholic Bishops in 2007 have only served to restrict the creativity of composers who are looking to create authentic worship experiences for American Catholics. To ensure clarity and quality, the Church always needs to examine the liturgical life, which these documents represent. At the same time, a legalistic application of these documents limits the creativity of liturgical musicians who seek to nourish and sustain the spiritual life of the Church. The inability to phrase a piece of music in a way that speaks to a particular ethnic group or community despite maintaining the true essence of a prayer has only hurt the worship life of communities. Moving away from a hymn that gathers a community together in the liturgy in exchange for chanted introits is not the American Catholic way of life and likely will not be the American Catholic way of life anytime soon. Both documents, particularly as some people interpret them, seem to take away an emphasis on singing hymns and push the liturgy towards a functionalism that that does not ring true to the

people who seek to worship. This functionalism instead alienates them from their Catholic faith to a damaging degree. The *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* is a universal document, but how that document is employed by bishops in the United States should indeed be something specifically American.

Sing to the Lord is published by the United States Catholic Bishops to be specifically American and serve as guidelines for music in the American Roman Catholic liturgy. While the document was not able to be passed as particular law —perhaps a sign of hope that the Second Vatican Council's spirit will continue to be felt in the United States —the document serves as guidelines for the American Catholic population, and typically, when a bishop asks the faithful to do something, they generally do it. The biggest issues with *Sing to the Lord* involve the promotion of the preconciliar styles of music. Those that were pushing an exclusive return towards Renaissance polyphony, organ music, and Gregorian chant may have felt validated by the document that places an emphasis on these styles. While claiming to have not endorsed any particular musical style, *Sing to the Lord* has given various sides in the liturgical debate fuel to argue with each other.

The new translation of the Roman Missal in 2011 further created a rigid uniformity in American Catholic worship life. The very principle of the work— that all language used in the liturgy should formally correspond to the Latin text, word for word— ignores the ability to speak in terms of American culture and in the perspective of the American subcultures. The principle of dynamic equivalence, an integral part of inculturation the liturgy, was abandoned completely, leaving worship communities stunned as they had to conform to singing words that did not express the true meaning or

understanding of their cultures, leaving the worship assembly confused and feeling as if they were not able to express their faith in the way that they know how, the way that culturally they are tuned to understand.

Composers struggled to adapt musical texts to unwieldy language that followed no rhythmic pattern or made any particular sense to those who would be singing it. Certain liturgical compositions of the Mass that had become engrained in American Catholic life were abandoned in the name of rigid uniformity. And, further, the flexibility to support these texts with simple words that did not alter the meaning in any way whatsoever were banned and considered unacceptable for use in the liturgy. Cultural adaptations had no place in the liturgy, despite conveying the true essence of the prayer. The push toward rigid uniformity continued.

Using the new translation of the Roman Missal as a primary argument, some began dismissing hymns for the liturgy in the name of the Roman Missal, much to the dismay of the worshipping faithful. Controversy surrounded a popular hymn, "All Are Welcome", in part, because the new translation of the liturgy indicated that Jesus died for "many", not "all", and therefore, not all would be welcome at the liturgy. A church in and for the world must be a welcoming church. Thus, the Second Vatican Council calling for "no rigid uniformity" in the liturgy has been displaced; hospitality requires a certain flexibility.

Liturgist Rita Ferrone would agree: the Church has been dismantling the work of the Second Vatican Council bit by bit, and the new translation of the Roman Missal shows us just how.

> Beneath the words of the new translation, one senses a drive to minimize the practical effects of Vatican II. The reforms of Vatican II prized clarity and intelligibility in the liturgy; they gave priority to the work of ecumenism and evangelization; they respected the local work of bishops' conferences; they invited aggiornamento and engagement with the world. This vital heritage is being eclipsed by another agenda. We are seeing a wooden loyalty to the Latin text at the price of clarity and intelligibility. We are seeing a retreat from advances already made in ecumenism. We are seeing the proper role of local bishops and bishops conferences increasingly taken over by the authorities in Rome. We are seeing the liturgy re-imagined as an event taking place in some sacral space outside of our world, rather than the beating heart of a world made new (39).

If the liturgy —whose very meaning is rooted in the Greek word *leitourgia*, or the work of the people in Jesus Christ — becomes a matter of compliance to something external, then the people's part in sharing in the liturgy is diminished. A culture's spirituality cannot be reduced to formal compliance.

In the midst of the debates, Kathleen M. Basi of *Catholic Mothers Online* took some time to write about the need for people to be respectful of various forms of music. Basi penned a piece called "Ending the Liturgy Wars", trying to get people to move toward respect and out of rigid, exclusive views. She reflects upon a woman who once told her that any music published after Mozart was "too emotional" and had no place in the liturgy.

> Aside from the gross ignorance of music history (music, by its very nature, is emotionally evocative; only the aesthetic changes as the ages pass), I have one overwhelming objection to this argument. Namely, it implies that the Holy Spirit stopped inspiring people at some point in history. How can you put God in such a tiny box?
>
> I'm a contemporary musician, but I'm not here to argue that we replace chant and hymnody. They are beautiful, powerful forms of music, which I know and love after earning two degrees in flute performance.
>
> I do, however, take issue with the assertion that guitars, drums and contemporary music have no place in the liturgy—because they, too, have beauty and power (Basi 1).

Sadly, the comments left for her from readers reflect an unwillingness to be open-minded and welcome the gifts of people who do not fit a "traditional" mold.

In the *National Catholic Register* in 2013, Mark Shea echoes similar sentiments in letting Mass be directed toward God while he just fills his role. "Just give me my lines and blocking", Shea writes (2). Shea is not a fan of all types of music, but he is not going to be "too choosy" in the liturgy:

> I…don't think the Little Drummer Boy insulted God by not playing Palestrina. I'm not super-inspired by singing "City of God", and I can't stand "Anthem", but on the whole, I think that if that's the worst suffering I have to endure, I'm getting off way better than the Hiroshima martyrs and I am not going to let it destroy my peace….Any liturgy holy Church offers me, Ordinary Form, Extraordinary Form, Maronite, Byzantine, you

> name it, I will receive it with gratitude. If it's celebrated reverently by people who are giving it their best—even if their best is a pedestrian homily, bland music, and mumbled responses—I'm going to receive it with gratitude and honor the reverence Christ honored the Widow and her mite (Shea 2).

One cannot expect the liturgy to be within the scope of one's personal tastes every time. "Why am I at Mass? I want God. That's why" (Shea 2). If people followed Shea's perspective and remained focused on the true reason for Mass, the discord would end.

The music that some may not care for does provide a real pastoral need for people at various points of their lives. Consider the loss of a loved one and planning a funeral in the Church. It is very easy for a music director to consider what constitutes the best "quality" of music. The pastoral musicians must take an approach such as Sunday's, too. Stephen R. Janco writes in *Celebration: A Comprehensive Worship Resource* the need to meet the musical needs of a mourner:

> The musical options that the family helped to select would be familiar to most, if not all…they are familiar to the vast majority of English-speaking Catholics in the United States who are regulars at Sunday Mass. And they were familiar even to the not-nearly-as-regular family members who were in church for our parishioner's funeral: 'Be Not Afraid', "Shepherd Me, O God", "*Ave Maria*", "On Eagle's Wings", and "Amazing Grace". While many pastoral musicians may feign displeasure with the quality of these individual pieces or with having to perform them so frequently, our

> instincts tell us that they have now achieved a status that puts them beyond the evaluation of an individual (Janco 3).

Janco makes no commentary on any of those individual pieces as to their quality or the musical styles; their status in the lives of people helps understand what singing is all about in the liturgy. Janco writes, "Song doesn't exist on the pages of a worship aid or hymnal. It lives somewhere in the bones of each worshiper; it is etched into the memory of a community of believers" (Janco 4). Only once most have an understanding of what song truly is can the Church really connect to the Second Vatican Council and truly sing.

The Roman Catholic Church is a big church. It involves millions and millions of people in many lands, each of them with their own gifts, methods of spirituality, and musical traditions that can all play a part in the universal worship of the Church. To dismiss any of them in the name of compliance in a rigid, uniform liturgy is to deny the true essence of what it means to be a Church. Only when, as the *Second Vatican Council* indicated, people from all over the world can bring their native genius to the liturgy, will it truly satisfy a message of universal salvation preached by Jesus Christ. Anything less would be the work of a small, exclusivist club that frowns upon outsiders. The historical Jesus would seem to want it otherwise.

WORKS CITED

Abbott, William J. "Post-Vatican II 'La La La' Music Unworthy of the Catholic Church." *New Oxford Review.* The Catholic Liturgical Library, 1998. Web. 16 June 2012.

Ardinger, Scott. *Three of the Most Important Theological Principles for Choosing Good Catholic Hymnody, and the Most Oft Abused*. Handout. Allentown: Diocese of Allentown, 2011. Print

Bangert, Mark P. "Liturgical Music, Culturally Tuned." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 360-383. Print.

Basi, Kathleen M. "Ending the Liturgy Wars." *Catholic Mothers Online* 9 February 2011: 4. Web.

Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Music in Catholic Worship: Revised Edition*. Washington D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, Inc., 1983. Print.

Boccardi, Donald, SM. *The History of American Catholic Hymnals Since Vatican II*. Chicago: GIA Publications, Inc, 2001. Print.

Boehm, Albert. "Let the Congregation Sing Out." *America.* 6 May 2002: 22-24. Print.

Bowman, Sr. Thea, F.S.P.A. "The Gift of African American Sacred Song." In *Lead Me, Guide Me: The African American Catholic Hymnal.* pp. iii—vii. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1987. Print.

Brown, Frank Burch. "Religious Meanings and Musical Styles: A Matter of Taste?" *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 135-155. Print.

Browne, Sheila and Richard P. Gibala. "100 Songs Every Parish Should Learn by Heart." *Church.* Winter 2004: 37-43. Print.

Burns, James. "From Drums and Profane Instruments...to Drums and Profane Instruments." *Pastoral Music.* Oct.-Nov. 1976: 20-25. Print.

Buszin, Walter E. "Caecilia: A Review of Catholic Church Music." *The Vernacular in Christian Worship*. 91.4 (1965): 135-142. Print.

California Catholic Daily. "A pioneering composer of post-Vatican II church songs." *California Catholic Daily.* Oct. 2007. Web. 16 June 2011.

Cardine, Dom Eugene. *An Overview of Gregorian Chant.* Trans. Dom Gregory Casprini. Brewster: Paraclete Press, 1992. Print.

Carroll, Beverly and Cecile Motus. "Building a More Inclusive Church: Intercultural Competence for Ministry." *Pastoral Music.* Jan. 2012: 29-32. Print.

Catholic News Service. "Theologian calls music ministers trailblazers of Vatican II church." *Catholic News Service.* United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004. Web. 16 June 2011.

Chaput, Most Rev. Charles J., O.F.M. "Letter, May 18, 2011." *Archdiocese of Denver.* Print.

Chupungco, Anscar J. "Inculturation of Worship: Forty Years of Progress and Tradition." *Valparaiso Insitute of Liturgical Studies Occasional Papers* 2003. 9 October 2013.

—. "Liturgical Inculturation: The Future that Awaits Us." *Valparaiso Insitute of Liturgical Studies Occasional Papers* 2003.

Colloton, Paul. "The Meaning of Our Signs: The Pastoral Theology of the General Instruction." Gordon Truett, Ed. *The Way We Worship: Pastoral Reflections on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*. Silver Spring: National Pastoral Musicians, 2003. 21-32. Print.

Day, Thomas. *Why Catholics Can't Sing: The Culture of Catholicism and the Triumph of Bad Taste*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990. Print.

Deiss, Lucien. *Visions of Liturgy and Music for a New Century.* Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996. Print.

Donovan, Colin B. *Music and Instruments in the Liturgy*. EWTN Global Catholic Network. Web. 10 May 2011.

Dower, Catherine. "Why Catholics Don't Sing." *Sacred Music*. Winter 1991. Web. 9 August 2012.

Doyle, Dennis M. "The Concept of Inculturation in Roman Catholicism: A Theological Consideration." *U.S. Catholic Historian* Winter 2012: 1-13. Web.

Erickson, Doug. "In the Spirit: "All Are Welcome," With a Few Qualifications." *Wisconsin State Journal* 11 December 2011. Web.

Faggioli, Massimo. *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012.

Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions. "Church Music in the U.S. Today." *Pastoral Music*. Oct-Nov. 1976: 33-37. Print.

Ferrone, Rita. "It Doesn't Sing: The Trouble with the New Roman Missal." *Commonweal Magazine,* 2011. Web. 9 Feb. 2012.

Foley, Edward. *From Age to Age*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008. Print.

---. "Liturgical Music: A Bibliographic Essay." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning*. Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 411-452. Print.

---. *Music in Ritual: A Pre-Theological Investigation*. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1984. Print.

Foley, John, S.J. "All at Once the Music Changed: Reflections on Liturgical Music in the United States since Vatican II." *Toward Ritual Transformation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003. 109-128. Print.

Foys, Most Rev. Roger J., D.D. "Letter, November 2011." *Diocese of Covington*. Print.

Francis, The Very Reverend Mark R., CSV. "Liturgical Participation of God's People." *With One Voice.* Washington, D.C.: Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commission, 2010. Print.

Funk, Virgil. "Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship: A Commentary Part I." *Today's Liturgy.* Advent-Christmas 2009: 22-25. Print.

---. "Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship: A Commentary Part II." *Today's Liturgy.* Lent-Easter Triduum 2009: 16-19. Print.

---. "Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship: A Commentary Part III." *Today's Liturgy.* Ordinary Time 1 2009: 18-20. Print.

---. "Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship: A Commentary Part IV." *Today's Liturgy.* Ordinary Time 2 2009: 27-29. Print.

Gabarain, Msgr. Gesareo. "Praising God With Song." Owen Alstott, Ed. *Flor y Canto*. Portland: Oregon Catholic Press, 1989. vii. Print.

GIA Publications. *Gather: Comprehensive Edition*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1994. Print.

---. *Gather: Fourth Edition*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2011. Print.

---. *Lead Me, Guide Me: The African American Catholic Hymnal.* Chicago: GIA Publications, 1987. Print.

---. *Lead Me, Guide Me: Volume 2.* Chicago: GIA Publications, 2012. Print.

Glover, Raymond F. "Liturgical Music: Its Forms and Functions." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 231-251. Print.

Golway, Terry. "It's Your Funeral." *America.* June 2006: 8. Print.

Haas, David. *Mass of Light - Full Score Revised Order of the Mass*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2010. Print.

Harmon, Katharine E. *There Were Also Many Women There: Lay Women in the Liturgical Movement in the United States*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012.

Harmon, Kathleen, SND de N. "Liturgical Music as Prayer." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 265-280. Print.

---. "Liturgical Music Ministry as Communion for Mission." *Perspectives on* Sing to the Lord. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2010. 13-22. Print.

---. "Music Notes: GIRM 2002 and Music." *Liturgical Ministry.* Summer 2003: 168-172. Print.

---. "Sing to the Lord and the Challenge of Singing the Dialogues." *Liturgical Ministry.* Fall 2008: 194-195. Print.

---. *The Ministry of Music*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004. Print.

Haugen, Marty. "Mass of Creation at 25." *GIA Publications, Inc.* Web. 1 June 2012.

Hawn, C. Michael. "Reverse Missions: Global Singing for Local Congregations." *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 98-111. Print.

Hogan, Rev. Richard M. "Twenty Years Since the Council." *Musica Sacra.* Winter 1985: 23-25. Print.

Irwin, Kevin W. "A New Missal and a New Translation: How Did We Get Here?" *Pastoral Music.* Nov. 2011: 23-34. Print.

---. *Models of the Eucharist*. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2005. Print.

Janco, Steven R. "Sing to the Lord an Old Song." *Celebration* April 2013: 3-5. Print.

Johnson, Kevin P., D.M.A. "African American Sacred Music in Catholic Worship." *Black Catholic Monthly.* The National Black Catholic Congress, 2003. Web. 21 Feb. 2012.

Joncas, Jan Michael. *From Sacred Song to Ritual Music: Twentieth-Century Understandings of Roman Catholic Worship Music*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997. 49-69. Print.

---. "Liturgical Music as Music: The Contribution of the Human Sciences." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 220-230. Print.

---. "Presenting, Adorning, Enriching, Subverting: Inculturation in Musical Settings of Liturgical Texts." *Tradition and Progress: Sacrosanctum Concilium After 50 Years*. Washington, D.C., Sept. 12-14 2013. Lecture.

---. "Ritual Transformations: Principles, Patterns and Peoples." *Toward Ritual Transformation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003. Print.

---. "Style Wars." *Pastoral Music.* Oct.-Nov. 2005: 26-35. Print.

Kearns, Burt. *Tabloid Baby*. 12 December 2007. Web. 1 August 2012

Kelly, Jessica. "Texas priest seen as 'godfather' or nascent liturgical music movement." *Catholic News Service.* Dec. 2007. Web. 18 Jan. 2012.

Kroeker, Charlotte. "Choosing Music for Worship." *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 191-205. Print.

---. "Using Music from Other Cultures in Worship: A Conversation with Mary K. Oyer." *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 156-190. Print.

Lareau, Renee M. "Reflections of a Catholic, Female Generation Xer." *America.* Dec. 2001: 14-17. Print.

Leaver, Robin A. "Liturgical Music as Anamnesis." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning*. Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 395-410. Print.

---. "What is Liturgical Music?" *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 211-219. Print.

Levada, Archbishop William J. "Introduction." Owen Alstott, Ed. *Flor Y Canto*. Portland: Oregon Catholic Press, 1989. iii. Print.

Liturgy, Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred. "Comme Le Prevoit—On The Translation Of Liturgical Texts For Celebrations With A Congregation." 1969. Web.

Lyke, Bishop James P. "Preface." Publications, GIA. *Lead Me, Guide Me*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1987. iv, v. Print.

Madden, Lawrence J., S.J. "Is the Folk Mass America's Only Contribution to Liturgy?" *Pastoral Music.* April-May 1990: 53-55. Print.

Manalo, Ricky, CSP. "Making the Unpoetic Poetic: Setting the New Translation of the *Roman Missal* to Music." *Pastoral Music.* Sept. 2011: 25-28. Print.

---. "*Sing to the Lord:* Cultural Perspectives." *Perspectives on* Sing to the Lord. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2010. 39-54. Print.

Mannion, M. Francis. *Masterworks of God: Essays in Liturgical Theory and Practice*. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2004. Print.

McAllister, Lewis. "Judging the Quality of Church Music." *Pastoral Music.* Oct.-Nov. 1976: 29-32. Print.

McDermott, Jim. "Sing a New Song." *America.* May 23, 2005: 7-10. Print.

---. "Sing a New Song Part 2, The St. Louis Jesuits: Earthen Vessels." *America*. May 30, 2005: 1-5. Print.

McGann, Mary E. *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2002. Print.

McLain, John J. "The Rhythms of the Saints." *America.* May 2006: 26-27. Print.

McMahon, J. Michael. "Music Ministry." *America.* April 2004: 13-15. Print.

---. *Singing Our Worship: A Pastoral Musician's Guide to the General Instruction of the Roman Missal.* Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2007. Print.

McMahon, J. Michael, Paul Colloton, and Gordon E. Truitt. *Seven Sessions:The NPM Study Guide to Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship*. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2009. Print.

McNamara, Fr. Edward. "Polka Masses." *ZENIT Daily Dispatch.* Eternal World Television Network, 2004. Web. 21 Feb. 2012.

Merkin, Scott. "To many, organs give life to baseball." *MLB.com.* April 2006. Web. 1 Nov. 2011.

Molloy, Michael James. "Liturgical Music as Corporate Song 3: Opportunities for Hymnody in Catholic Worship." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 324-339. Print.

Morlino, Bishop Robert M. "The Beauty of Our Worship In the Liturgy." *Diocese of Madison Catholic Herald* 20 October 2011. Web.

Murray, Rev. J-Glenn, S.J. "The Liturgy of the Roman Rite and African American Worship." In*Lead Me, Guide Me: The African American Catholic Hymnal.* pp. viii-xii. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1987. Print.

Murray, Lorraine V. "A Dancing Baby and Other Notes from the Choir." *America*. Aug. 2003: 24-25. Print.

National Pastoral Musicians Staff. "When the Choir Sings." *The Choir in the Liturgy*. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2006. 1-3. Print.

Neuhaus, Fr. Richard John. "Catholic Matters: Confusion, Controversy, and the Splendor of Truth—an excerpt." *Catholic Matters: Confusion, Controversy, and the Splendor of Truth.* Catholic Education Resource Center, 2006. Web. 9 August 2012.

North American Liturgy Resources. *Glory & Praise*. Phoenix: North American Liturgy Resources, 1987. Print.

OCP. "Preparing for and Implementing the New *Roman Missal*: A Timeline." *Today's Liturgy.*33.4 (2011): 12-14. Print.

Olmsted, Bishop Thomas J. "Singing the Mass." *The Catholic Sun*. Web. 13 Mar. 2012.

O'Malley, John W. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

The Participants. "Sing a New Song." *Pastoral Music*. Nov. 2011: 75-76. Print.

Pattison, Mark. " 'On Eagle's Wings' tops all songs in online liturgical music survey." *Catholic News Service.* USCCB, 2006. Web. 9 August 2012.

Pecklers, Keith F., S.J. *The Genius of the Roman Rite*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2009. Print.

Penkala, Gary D. "Faithful Moderates." *CanticaNOVA Publications.* Web. 16 June 2011.

Peters, Nathaniel. "The Catholic Case for Protestant Hymns." *On the Square.* First Things, 2012. Web. 22 Mar. 2012

Polman, Bert F. "Forward Steps and Side Steps in a Walk-Through of Christian Hymnody." *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 62-72. Print.

Pope John Paul II. "On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy." *The Vatican.* Web. 16 June 2011.

Pope Paul VI. "*Musicam Sacram:* Instruction on Music in the Liturgy." *Second Vatican Ecumenical Council.* The Holy See, 1967. Web. 13 Dec. 2010.

Pope Pius X. "*Tra le Sollecitudini:* Instruction on Sacred Music." *Church Documents.* Adoremus: Society for the Renewal of the Sacred Liturgy, 1999. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Porchiran, Bennett John. "Choral Repetoire: Good Choirs Sing Good Music." *The Choir in the Liturgy*. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2006. 15-21. Print.

Quinn, Frank C., O.P. "Liturgical Music as Corporate Song 2: Problems of Hymnody in Catholic Worship." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 308-323. Print.

Rendler-McQueeney, Elaine. "Full, Conscious and Active Preparation." *Today's Liturgy.* 33.1 (2010): 7. Print.

---. "Full, Conscious and Active Participation." *Today's Liturgy.* 33.4 (2011): 7. Print.

Roccasalvo, Joan L. "The 'Sacred' in Sacred Music." *America*. Oct. 1995: 19-21. Print.

Ruff, Anthony. "Pastoral Focus: Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship." *Liturgical Ministry* (2008): 77-84. Print.

---. *Sacred Music and Liturgical Reform: Treasures and Transformations*. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2007. Print.

---. "*Sing to the Lord:* Gifts and Challenges." *Perspectives on* Sing to the Lord. Silver Spring:NPM Publications, 2010. 1-12. Print.

---. "Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship." *Liturgical Ministry* (2008): 77-84. Print.

Ryan, Michael G. "Time to say 'yes.'" *The Tablet.* 3 Sept. 2011. Web. 14 Sept. 2011.

Saliers, Don E. "Liturgical Musical Formation." *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 384-394. Print.

Savage, James. "The Transforming Power of Music: Tales of Transformation, 200-2000." *Toward Ritual Transformation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003. 89-107. Print.

Schaefer, Edward. *Catholic Needs through the Ages: Balancing the Needs of a Worshipping Church.* Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2008. Print.

Schmitt, Francis P. "Vale Atque Ave." *Caecilia: A Review of Catholic Church Music* Winter 1965: 135-140. Print.

Schubert, Virginia A. "Church or Concert Hall?" *Musica Sacra*. Summer 1978: 13-17. Print.

Schuler, Richard J. "Church Music After Vatican II." *Sacred Music.* Winter 1976: 16-19. Print.

Schultz, Valerie. "This One's Called 'Praise'." *America*. Feb. 2003: 22-23. Print.

Second Vatican Council. *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Washington, D.C.: United

States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1963. Print.

---. *Musicam Sacram: Instruction on Music in the Liturgy*. Vatican City: The Vatican, 1966. Print.

Shannon, William. "Music delivered a young boy from despair but it died at Boys Town with Father Schmitt." *The Progressive Populist*. The Progressive Populist Mag., 1996. Web.9 August 2012.

Shea, Mark. "Just Give Me My Lines and My Blocking." *National Catholic Register* 18 August 2013: 1-4. Web.

Shellnutt, Kate. "Expanded resources enrich Hispanic Catholic worship." *Chron.com Blogs*, 2011. Web. 1 Mar. 2012.

Simmons, Joe. "The Psalmist: Leader of Poetic Prayer." *Psalmist and Cantor: A Pastoral Music Resource.* Ed. Gordon E. Truitt. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2005. 1-10. Print.

Stommes, Mary, ed. *Give Us This Day.* Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2011. Print.

St. John the Apostle Catholic Church. "Funeral Planner." n.d. *St. John the Apostle Catholic Church.* Web. 1 August 2012.

Strickland, Amy Jill. "In Essentials, Unity: Liturgical Law and the General Instruction." Gordon Truitt, Ed. *The Way We Worship: Pastoral Reflections on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*. Silver Spring: National Pastoral Musicians, 2003. 41-46. Print.

Swain, Joseph P. "Inculcating Liturgical Music." *America.* 13 Sept. 2004: 14-17. Print.

Truitt, Gordon E. "Wailing and Praising: The *Roman Missal* and Rome's Wider Interests." *Pastoral Music.* Sept. 2011: 13-18. Print.

---. *Why We Sing What We Sing and Do What We Do at Mass*. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2010. Print.

Tuchman, Barbara W. "The Decline of Quality." *The New York Times* 2 November 1980: 38. Print.

Turner, Rev. Paul. "Divining the Vernacular of Ritual Texts." *With One Voice*. Washington, D.C.: Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commission, 2010. Print.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*. Washington D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc., 2002. Print.

---. *Encuentro and Mission: A Renewed Pastoral Framework for Hispanic Ministry*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2002. Print.

---. "Guidelines for the Catholic Church Liturgical Musician." *Liturgical Music Today.* Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc., 1982. Print.

---. *Music in Catholic Worship.* Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc., 1983. Print.

---. "Music in Catholic Worship." *Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy: United States Catholic Conference.* BCL, 1972. Print.

---. *Sing to the Lord: Music in Divine Worship.* Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc., 2007. Print.

U.S. Catholic Church. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Washington, D.C.: USCCB Publishing, 1995. Print.

VI, Pope Paul. "Degree on the Apostolate of the Laity." 1965. Web.

Vogt, Kevin. "*Sing to the Lord* and the Treasury of Sacred Music." *Perspectives on* Sing to the Lord. Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2010. 23-38. Print.

Walser, Robert. "The Polka Mass: Music of Postmodern Ethnicity." *American Music.* 10.2 (1992): 183-202. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Feb. 2012.

Weakland, Archbishop Rembert G., O.S.B. "Church Music: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow." *Today's Parish.* American Catholic Press, 1999. Web. 1 June 2012.

Werner, Joanne. "Less is More." *Psalmist and Cantor: A Pastoral Music Resource.* Silver Spring: NPM Publications, 2005. 49-53. Print.

Westermeyer, Paul. *Let Justice Sing: Hymnody and Justice*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. Print.

Wilkins, John. "Lost in Translation: The Bishops, The Vatican and the English Liturgy." *Commonweal Magazine*, 2005. Web. 21 Dec. 2011.

Witvliet, John D. "The Virtue of Liturgical Discernment." *Music in Christian Worship.* Ed: Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005. 83-97. Print.

Young, Webster. "On Vatican II and the Music of the People." *National Catholic Register*. August 2007. Web. 16 June 2011.

Zaragoza, Rufino, OFM. "Multicultural Liturgies and the New *Roman Missal*." *Today's Liturgy*. 33.4 (2011): 24-25. Print.

Zimmerman, Joyce Ann, C.PP.S. "Liturgical Assembly: Who is the Subject of Liturgy?" *Liturgy and Music: Lifetime Learning.* Eds: Robin A. Leaver and Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998. 38-59. Print.

VITA

Full name: Francis Xavier Klose, III

Place and date of birth: Philadelphia, PA, September 12, 1981

Parents Name: Francis Xavier Klose, Jr.
Deborah Klose

Educational Institutions:

	School	Place	Degree	Date
Secondary:	Cardinal Dougherty High School,	Philadelphia, PA	Diploma	6-99
Collegiate:	La Salle University	Philadelphia, PA	B.A.	5-03
Graduate:	La Salle University	Philadelphia, PA	M.A.	1-06
	Cabrini College	Radnor, PA	M.Ed.	5-08