5

Some Reflections on "Contemporary" Hymns

Mary Oberle Hubley

Twenty-five years ago, and nearly within a year or two of the start of the liturgical reform, the musical landscape of our Catholic parishes was transformed. Music and texts which had withstood the rigorous test of time were injudiciously and almost wholly replaced, often by mere doggerel and ditties. Much of this music had been hastily produced in answer to the major Catholic publishers' pleas for newly written hymns in the vernacular; for the illicit abandonment of Latin created a dearth of hymns. Simultaneously, songs were immediately needed to accommodate that exemplar of parish "love," "community" and "democracy," the guitar which was in fact a pre-eminent symbol of the protest movements during the Sixties.

The pipe organ and its musically trained organists were pre-empted by amateurish strummers who managed, at best, to "chord" the puerile harmonies supplied by the musically illiterate songwriters. I personally knew two of the latter; they expressed good-humoured chagrin at their success with a couple Chicago-based publishers, and this in spite of their acknowledged ignorance of music theory, harmony, form and history. A third and far more successful songwriter (an oxymoron?) said that he did not even know how to tune his own guitar! The three would "come up with" melodies, graft them onto vaguely biblical texts, and with help of their friends would manage to get the music written down for submission to the publisher. I felt and indeed still feel a deep sadness, as well

as embarrassment, at the lack of Catholic publishers' responsibility in this area. Ought we not to have expected some measure of responsibility, some upholding of musical standards at the very least, from firms with, no doubt, long time-honored traditions of service to the Church?

But then, the "times they were a-changin" in the Sixties. Numerous pressing social changes (greater accessibility of higher education to the young, the spectre of Viet Nam, smug optimism brought about by expansive economic boom, the civil-rights turmoil, etc.) seemed to dictate the need to make things "relevant" for the young people. They were riding high on the big baby boom and, candidly, quite spoiled and gradually becoming aware of their "clout". Simultaneously, as reflected in their rapidly plummeting SAT scores, the beginnings of our current educational failure made themselves felt in unravelling academic, artistic and behavioural standards.

> "The rebellion of the young found its voice in folk music. The guitar became the young person's favorite instrument (much in the same way that the ukelele had been in the 1920's). Singing songs with folk themes to strumming guitar chords became a favored form of entertainment in college dorms, on the beach, and in pads from Greenwich Village to Haight-Asbury. When they were not making folk music, the young were listening to it through the records of the Kingston Trio, the Chad Mitchell Trio, the Limeliters, the New Christy Minstrels, all of whose best-selling records were of the folk song variety."[1]

By the mid-sixties, America's rage with the guitar coincided with its adoption and that of the current soft-rock, "folk" type music in many Catholic churches.

In 1966, speaking at the Fifth International Church Music Congress[2] held in Chicago-Milwaukee, the eminent musicologist from Columbia University, Paul Henry Lang, sounded an alarm:

> "Historians and sociologists cannot but be aware that the worst kind of pseudo-popular, "commercial" music is threatening to invade the Mass. Guitar, rock n' roll and jazz Masses do not represent the *actuosa participatio* envisaged by the Council. This not only lacks the devotional

quality but also the particular grace of art, because it gives us in the raw those cultural traits that were not influenced by Christian ethics."[3]

The reason for Mr. Lang's alarm is his witness to not only the departure from, but actual rejection of natural, organic development in Catholic church music. This is synonymous with revolution.

As a matter of definition, "folk" music as commonly referred to in its use in Catholic churches, is a misnomer. True folk music is that which is anonymous and unwritten, handed down from generation to generation. Again, Mr. Lang:

> "There is a distinction between 'folk' and 'popular' art, the one being popular in origin, that is, of communal growth, the other being popular by destination, e.g., containing elements drawn from common experience calculated to assure popular adoption. The first of these categories, true folk music, can be used to advantage in the Church; a good many of the fine hymns were based on such tunes.
>
> As to the second category, and this includes the commercial product commonly and erroneously called 'folk music', its use would be a denial of everything our Catholic tradition and piety has stood for ever since the first songs rose in the catacombs."[4]

But perhaps many of the adults' inner convictions of the truth and eminence of their own Catholicity were not secure; for why else did they feel the overriding need to make the Church and its music "relevant" to their young? Why the frenetic desire to please and placate the youth, if not for a genuine lack of confidence on the part of the parents and, yes, the priests? It seems that the closing of the Council in 1965 did not coincide with, but rather only followed some serious weakening already apparent in the body of the Church.

At any rate, the radical newness of guitars and guitar music in Church might well provide the enticement to keep the kids in the Church and going to Mass, far away from the radicalism and drugs slowly inundating American society. "Do your own thing" was becoming a common tenet of these Sixties; "don't think twice, it's all right" was another. The prevailing senti-

ments "blowin' in the wind" were directed to self; a whole jargon of popular psychology was adjuring the youth to "do your own thing" as true flower children.

The guitar and its kind of music flowed naturally out of these narcissistic impulses. It was a relatively inexpensive instrument, and, outside the percussive instruments, the easiest to begin playing. No exerted and continual amount of discipline was demanded of the player; it was not even necessary to know the rudiments of music reading, including rhythm. Being a soft instrument, it was "a natural" to accompany the human voice; one could sing and play simultaneously. Its portability, and that of the now ubiquitous microphone, therefore enabled the guitarist to lead the group or congregation, shifting the musicians' locus from the choir loft to the sanctuary.

In the frantic rush for "relevance" and self-expression through use of the guitar, the traditional choirs were largely disbanded through lack of clerical support. Parenthetically, the question presents itself: Why? Were the priests and especially the pastors taught up in the confusion of the times? It seems that, in spite (or because of?) their seminary training, when the seeds of theological and liturgical knowledge and formation were cultivated, the clerics were confused as much as the laity they were supposed to lead. It is hard to explain otherwise the near wholesale capitulation of the clergy to the secular din, and their intimidation by theologically and musically untrained parishioners.

Concurrent with the abandonment of the choir, the veneration and use of Latin, with its tradition of fine chant which stretched back to the halls of antiquity, overnight became passe'. In the twinkling of an eye, Catholicism's unparalleled sacred music, the brilliant jewel wrought by centuries of development, was muffled, then silenced. Of course, it was not considered relevant.

The common sense and sensibilities of our Catholic faithful were systematically offended; their instincts that something was seriously amiss were, when articulated, often rebuffed in the name of the "spirit of Vatican II". Their observation that even the documents of Vatican II, when read, were also contrary to the spirit of Vatican II put an end to the dialogue.

Since those early days of the "new music", some of the too obviously infantile and tawdry songs have fallen to the wayside. (Do you remember singing "Kumbaya" incessantly? And do you remember your parish church soft-rocking to that Australian radio hit of the "Our Father"?) However, serious harm was caused which persists to this day. Most noticeable, perhaps, is that the cheap music with its cheap lyrics established a tone of informality and irreverence within our sacred liturgies. The texts of much of this music are so theologically innocuous as to waft one's intelligence off to the land of Nod; while some songs even sport(ed) theology contrary to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

An example of this comes readily to mind.

A full generation of Catholic grade, high school and CCD children and parish congregations were reared on the lusty HAPPY THE MAN.[5] The center section advises

He seeks no gold,
He wants no gain,
He knows those things are all in vain.
He needs no praise
nor honor too (sic)

climaxing with the ringing

His only motto: "To your own self be true".

Is the whole of Christianity, of Catholicism, able to be distilled into a single "motto"? Unless for the Saints' predilection for brevity as in "To live is Christ, to die is gain!", or the abundance of Christocentric inspirations which nourished the lives of our holy ones through the ages: but "'To your own self be true"??! Did not Christ, rather, insist, "He who would save his life must lose it for My sake", and countless times adjure us to deny ourselves?

And yet for over twenty years, under the aegis of the Catholic liturgy, our impressionable children and faithful were quite literally reared (in many parts of the country, this song is one of the big "hits") by its saccharine nonsense. And there is the matter of the music — specifically, the melody.

If I were to successfully disassociate by remembrance of the melody from the twenty-year plus experience of it in

Catholic churches, regarding it solely in itself, I would say, "How cute! What a nice, bouncy little thing! It would be perfect for a — television sitcom theme! Or a child's play song, such as a scout song". Even though the tune is appropriate to its rather breezy, nonchalant lyrics, the question begs answering: Is the music, and are the lyrics as well, appropriate for use in our Catholic liturgies? For that matter, are the lyrics appropriate as a rendering of the great Psalm 40? The casual informality of such a song does not do justice to our profound Catholic conviction that we, in our Catholic churches, are in the Eucharistic Presence of the Godhead.

Rather, such mediocrity has gained acceptability and even a quasi-respectability within our churches and liturgies, providing the conduit through which the secular and worldly invade the domain of the sacred.

In the sixth Chapter of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,[6] the Second Vatican Council proclaims that music intended for worship must possess the dignity and the "qualities proper to genuine sacred music", and that the "instruments accord with the dignity of the temple, and truly contribute to the edification of the faithful."

As is being observed more and more frequently from even disparate quarters, the concept of the sacred is receding from people's consciousness. Throughout all of Western society there is a general erosion in actual belief in God; hence, things of God such as His works, His creation of heaven and hell, His revelation and, of course, His Church and sacraments. It only follows, therefore, that the meaning of the concept of "Sacred" is greatly distorted and diminished.

The Latin word "sacer" means "set apart, untouched, taboo." That which the sacred is set apart from is the "profane", from the Latin *pro* + *fanum*, literally "outside the temple". Here we can understand "profane" in its wide sense as the everyday, the usual — not necessarily as something bad, or something to be condemned . — but the common, the popular, the trite; the secular (worldly).

> In the history of all religions of mankind we find this distinction, this separation (of the sacred and the profane). Christianity has always taken great care to treat

> that which is sacred under sacred forms, and to exclude everything profane.
>
> This distinction can be better understood in light of the subordination of the profane to the sacred, or rather by maintaining that the sacred holds a higher place as something above ordinary life: something nobler, more worthy, exalted as the content of religion itself. . .like the desired goal which is eternal life. In this sense it is desired for worship.[7]

Monsignor Schubert continues:

> When music, rhythms and instruments which are borrowed directly from contemporary profane music are brought into the church, it occasions serious consequences in scandal, separations from Church and cult, a diminishing respect for the Church, and increasing religious doubt and confusion.[8]

The above is indeed a serious charge; and though first enunciated in 1966, finds its prophetic fulfillment in much "contemporary" music and the consequences of its use in our churches today.

It is indispensable to a clear understanding of music that the basic fact be first acknowledged; and that is that music — its melody, rhythm, harmony and form — is an abstract medium. As such, it is neutral. There is no such thing as a sacred triplet, or a sacred dominant chord.

It in this very abstractness that makes it so difficult to be precise in regard to music: whether it is sacred, and thus fitting for use in our churches, or not; whether it is appropriate, or not.

By the time of the Council of Trent in the mid-sixteenth century, general criteria for solving this dilemma had been established. St. Charles Borromeo, then a Cardinal, was a highly knowledgeable lover of music who dedicated himself to applying these criteria in the wake of Trent. By the Second Vatican Council these same general principles were acknowledged, assuring the continuity and organic growth of responsible musical understanding until this very day. Without the benefit of these general principles, the task of appraising the suitability of music in our churches would be analogous to

poll-taking: one's opinion would be as good, or bad, as another's and ruled by subjective feelings, by likes and dislikes.

What Makes Music Sacred?

Music is made sacred by its association to other, related factors, each of which is indispensable:

1.) By association with the occasion (or purpose);

2.) By association with a sacred text;

3.) By association with that which is set apart, or separate from the worldly or profane;

4.) By association with what is truly art;

5.) By association with a particular tradition.

1.) By association with the occasion

The music used in our Catholic churches must be worthy (Anglo-Saxon — value) for the occasion, which is the worshipping of the Divinity through rites and prayers in His House.

It ought not to be understood in terms of ourselves, such as in celebrating ourselves, as a "community"; for true community will flow naturally and honestly only out of our first giving God His due, which is the priority. A self-directed perspective is too limiting of God as well as of ourselves; it would direct the rites to ourselves, not to God, Who alone gives them meaning and significance.

Our music, then, must reflect God as He reveals Himself (His transcendence, His omnipotence, His immanence); not as we deem Him to be through our puny, created minds and vision.

PEACE IS FLOWING LIKE A RIVER, a song which claims to be based on Psalm 107, is an example of a self-directed, community-oriented song. It is symptomatic of many of these songs, so often of pentecostalist inspiration, that almost nothing is said in regard to God while the real reference is to the congregation.[9] Also symptomatic is the juvenile character of the melody; second graders are unchallenged by it, which fact complements the monotonous repetition of the text. The text, by the way, is utter nonsense.

Another song which offers an example of self (community) — not God-direction is the immensely popular ALL THAT WE HAVE.[10] So minimal is its reference to God that He is only obliquely referred to in the third person. The actual subjects of the folksy reflections are "some", "others", "sometimes", etc.

2.) By association with a sacred text

The elements of music, such as its melody, are of an abstract medium and hence cannot be deemed sacred in themselves. Scripture, however, since it is the inspired Word of God, is indeed sacred in itself; and, derivatively, the verbal form of rites.

Music, therefore, which "fulfills" the worthy text is sacred. It renders the sacred text respectfully, and does justice to its dignity as the Word of God. It must be understood and accepted, however, that the *text itself* must be worthy, and itself "fitting" for the occasion.

> "In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat
> apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum."
> "In the beginning was the Word
> and the Word was with God; and
> the Word was God."[11]

How serious our responsibility, since the Second Person Himself is Word!

One of the great scandals of large amounts of church music in the last twenty-five years has been the corruption of Scripture or (often through omission) theology presented through it. In his apostolic letter "Vigesimus Quintus Annus", marking the 25th anniversary of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, the Holy Father wrote:

> "Side by side with these benefits of the liturgical reform, one has to acknowledge with regret deviations of greater or lesser seriousness in its application.
>
> On occasion there have been noted ... songs which are not conducive to faith or to a sense of the sacred".[12]

The corruption of texts seems to fall into two categories, the first being a listless paraphrasing of Scripture, necessarily

adapting it to the Procrustean bed of popular, secular melody. Although this loose rendering of the Scripture is often identified by terminology such as "text based on Psalm...," frequently the text is only remotely similar. A fine example of this careless rendering of Biblical text is COME UNTO ME.[13] Such a practice, because it only approximates scriptural verses, does not in itself invalidate its claim to being appropriate for use in our churches; many fine hymns of the past do the same, such as HOLY GOD, WE PRAISE THY NAME (a rendition of the ancient prayer TE DEUM.) However, because of the extreme looseness of the paraphrasing, the *integrity* of the text is compromised, if not lost. It is an injustice to Scripture itself; and an injustice to the faithful, who have a right to the *truth* in Scripture to be presented to them.[14]

Another category in which texts are inappropriate and unworthy is in a type of song known musically as the "gospel song". This type of song is, prior to the sixties, profoundly alien to our Catholic tradition. Whereas the hymn, because it is (supposed) to focus on God, is proper for worship (literally "worthship", i.e. reverence, dignity, respect offered to God and to God alone); the gospel song is of a totally different genre. It does not focus on God, therefore not on worship. Rather, it is subjective and sentimental, expressing feelings and personal testimony.

In the early nineteenth century, on the heels of the romanticism and naturalism which permeated the West, less formal and structured sects such as the Baptists, evangelicals and other Protestant fundamentalists developed the gospel song. Initially, the mainstream Protestant churches resisted this new kind of music preferring the more dignified "hymns". Little by little, though, gospel songs were allowed not just in the less formal evening services, but since the 1950's in the more formal morning services as well. (It is worth noting that the music of parishes has followed in the wake of the Protestant churches, although about fifteen or twenty years behind.)

Examples of gospel songs now abound in our Catholic liturgies and churches; all of them are products of the 60's, 70's and 80's. Each of the afore-mentioned songs[15] are more truly gospel songs than hymns.

In Chapter 6 of the Sacred Constitution on the Liturgy, Article 121 states:

> Composers, filled with the Christian spirit, should feel that their vocation is to cultivate sacred music and increase its store of treasures. Let them produce compositions which have the qualities proper to genuine sacred music...

The Council Fathers admonish that

> The texts intended to be sung must always be in conformity with Catholic doctrine; indeed they should be drawn chiefly from Holy Scripture and from liturgical sources.[16]

The commentator's note to the above article states:

> There is need for new music, both for Mass and for devotions; new hymns should be liturgically and scripturally inspired, and not in the sentimental "devotional" manner that has proved the bane of much Catholic hymnody.[17]

Gospel songs (generally but wrongfully called Catholic folk music, guitar songs, or contemporary hymns) have been attaining a greater measure of textual sophistication in the last several years. It is as though the form has been "growing up"; and as with a crooked twig which, unless destroyed or rooted up early on, will develop into a crooked tree, the sentimentality of the genre becomes the vehicle for a yet more serious abuse. As the twig bends, so grows the tree.

The powerful symbolism inherent in our Catholic cultural milieu lends itself wonderfully to poetic expression; and a mere textual nod here and there in its direction is enough for most Catholics to accept unquestioningly the faulty text's real meaning.

Partly because of its upbeat, engaging melody and poetic text, GATHER US IN[18] has become immensely popular in some areas of the country. Nearly every other phrase of the text contain some kind of mumbo-jumbo; and not only is the melody exuberant, but the text positively exudes fresh triumph, well-being and glory.

> Here in this place, new light is streaming,
> Now is the darkness vanished away.
>
> See, in this space, our fears and our dreamings
> Brought here to you in the light of this day.

Gather us in, etc....
Call to us now, and we shall awaken,
We shall arise at the sound of our (sic) name.

The second verse proclaims:

We have been sung throughout all of history,
Called to be light to the whole human race...
Give us the courage to enter the song.

The third verse blithely continues

Here we will take the wine and the water,
Here we will take the bread of new birth...
to drink the wine of compassion....

Fourth:

Not in the dark of buildings confining (?!)
Not in some heaven (!), light years away (?) but
Here in this place, the new light is shining,
Now is the Kingdom, now is the day...
Gather us in all peoples together,
Fire of love in our flesh and our bone. (Emp. M.O.H.)

This pastiche of New Age mysticism, nods and curtseys to Christianity and breezy Gnosticism is the stone given to our Catholic faithful where they have a right to expect bread. Actually it is also a pretty good example of the vaguely pentecostalist utopianism which Christopher Derrick, in an address entitled "Brave New Church" (given last year to the Ronald Knox Society at Oxford) referred to as "revolutionary euphoria":

> ". . . I am suggesting that the last 24 years or so have been characterized by a spectacular outbreak of Revolutionary Euphoria within the Catholic Church...
>
> At any period, certain states of mind — more or less Gnostic in tendency — can generate compulsive need to see all history as divided into three epochs or *aetates*, of which the third and last and most perfect is now gloriously beginning. Among Christians, this becomes a conviction that the Dispensation of the Son — with all those dogmas and restrictions and regulations — is now giving place to the third and final Dispensation, that of freedom in the pure spirit.

> ...A great many of us behave exactly as though they believed it (that "the Second Vatican Council actually did usher in a new Dispensation in that full theological sense"), and always with much emphasis upon "the Council" as constituting the charter and liberation of their Brave New Catholicism".[19]

Examples of "new" and dangerous music which is flooding our liturgies and churches are abounding. GATHER US IN was found in the Oregon Catholic Press (published with Ecclesiastical Approbation) Music Issue 1990; and the very next song enjoins us that

> If you will follow me, follow where life will lead;
> do not look for me among the dead, for
> I am hidden in pain, risen in love. (Verse 1)

Or, how about this?

> "... if you would rise with me,
> rise through your destiny... "[20]

> To all falsity there is an element of truth, or else it would not be appealing. The ignorance and confusion of many of our Catholic faithful provides fertile ground for the pseudo-mysticism and Gnosticism exemplified in many of the "contemporary" songs. References to religious belief are vague and there seems to be a curious reluctance to mention God, Christ or the Church. There are also veiled slaps at the Church, and also at Tradition, upon which, coupled with Scripture, the magnificent edifice of our Faith is built.
>
> Where the Gnostic is concerned, there is no continuity, no tradition. History, including that of the Church, moves in stages, so to say, discontinuously. In Gnostic eyes, the destruction of what they see as the trappings of the past, serves not infrequently for what you might call a kind of bastard-sacrament; an outward sign of the inward light that will flood their minds, then shine out on a brave New Church of their own making, when the rubble of the ages is cleared away from its past.[21]

The inchoate beginnings of this corruption may have been observable in the near bacchanalian frenzy of twenty-five years ago; although no one at first noticed the absence of specifically Catholic themes—those central to our Catholic identity—in the

new music. Our liturgies were shorn of musical hymns and songs to Mary, the Mother of God; to the angels, the saints, the Sacred Heart. It is as though the hastily assembled hack songs, borrowed Protestant music, spirituals and the like, produced a leveling effect upon our Catholic consciousness. Rather, generic texts without reference to the liturgical year or specific feasts became common, and the liturgical year was in fact demolished for our people as a result of the catastrophic pseudo—"reform" of the ecclesiastical calendar. Often now, Pentecost is indistinguishable from Easter, and even Easter from Christmas. Advent and Lent as penitential seasons have been destroyed.

3.) Music is made sacred by its association with that which is set apart, or separate, from the worldly or profane.

Were a priest/homilist to liberally pepper his presentation with "ain't"s he would insure not only an alert congregation, straining to determine if it heard correctly; but, without doubt, a gradually angered congregation. The people would consider his imposed grammatical lapse "in poor taste". They would slightly deem it a barbarism wholly inappropriate, and responsible for lowering the level of the priest's discourse, no matter how edifying the homily might otherwise be. Many people would be disturbed, and many even irate, at the common vulgarism which had crept into their consciousness under the guise of the priest's homily.

Much of the music produced since the early sixties, and at use in our churches today, convicts us of using "Musical ain'ts" liberally. We ought to be disturbed, and irate, at the common secularism and worldliness which have crept into our churches under the guise of church music. It is because of the secular nature of much of this "new music" that, in similarity to the strategy of the Trojan Horse, the worldly was allowed to invade our churches and, of course, the prayers and spiritual lives of our Catholic faithful. The celebration of our sacred liturgical rites was cheapened.

As defined earlier, music can roughly be divided into the sacred and the non-sacred, or profane; better yet, between the

sacred and the secular. ('The Latin root *saecularis* means "worldly".)

Of secular music, that which is commonly called popular (from the Latin *populus*, people) is that music flooding the mass, commercial media: television, radio, film and advertising music. This massive outpouring of media music has two ends: that of selling, and that of entertaining. Because it "costs little trouble or effort to obtain", it consequently is "worthless or not worth much": hence, not prized or esteemed. It is literally, "cheap".[22]

Right around twenty-five years ago, a collective decision was made to borrow from the things of the world for the purpose of getting young people into church. By using the enticing things of the world — "by hook or by crook", so to speak — the church would be made to look better and be more appealing; it would be more relevant to the worldly-wise youth.

The massive failure of strong Catholic witness at that time, briefly alluded to earlier, is a topic well worth attention in some other study. Certainly it is important to seek understanding of that which amounted to actual revolution in the music of the church; understanding would be indispensable so that the breach in our Catholic tradition of sacred music be acknowledged and repaired.

One of the most identifiable characteristics of popular, media music is its emotional, sensual quality. It does not seek to appeal to people in the context of their higher, more worthy selves — engaging the mind and spiritual nature of the person — but deliberately intends to provoke an immediate emotional response from the listener. Rather than appealing to the noble, disinterested part of the person, popular music appeals to the lower, immediately gratified part. Unaware of their vulnerability, all too often people are ready and willing to be "worked over" and manipulated; to "go with the flow" without exercising any discretion or exertion whatsoever.

For well over two thousand years, the eminent power of music in the ethical lives of men was carefully observed and commented upon. Its emotional power was so suspect that Plato (one of the first in the known line of commentators) insisted in "The Republic" that

> "Music must be of the right sort; the serious qualities of certain modes are dangerous, and a strong censorship must be imposed. He went so far as to seek regulation of particular modes because of their supposed effect on people."[23]

It is well to be reminded that just because a piece of music exists (and might be found in church), it does not follow that it is therefore good, or good for the occasion. Similarly, just because something is found in the newspaper, or in print, it does not follow that it is true.

Besides the 1.) emotional quality of popular music other characteristics are 2.) lack of originality, 3.) use of cliche'. 4.) imitation of "what's out there," 5.) impermanency, 6,) predictability and 7.) datedness.

With few exceptions, the music contained in the ubiquitous GLORY AND PRAISE,[24] (Volume I, II and III) exemplifies the above characteristics. (Many of the *Glory and Praise* songs do double duty in the pages of various missalettes, also.)

Although occasionally *text* in *Glory and Praise* songs may be above criticism (many are not) the *music,* by its association with or reminder of media pop music, pronounces it to be secular. It is related to the world, but not to God who created the world. It quite well expresses our human and societal milieu, but not the divine and heavenly. It is not set apart from the world; it actually represents it. A lot of songs, especially from Volume I and II, are dated; people are tired of them. Their music does not direct our people to the spiritual, transcendent "Other" which is the bread their souls crave. Instead, it proffers an anti-spiritual, anti-transcendent stone which leaves the spirit impoverished though the outer self is suffused with contentment.

ONLY A SHADOW[25] is a well-known and popular song. Its emotional quality evokes a sentimental, warm and fuzzy, "carebear" feeling. It represents a musical immaturity commensurate to its juvenile shallowness. It possesses no depth of music (i.e., melody, harmony) to match what ought to be an awesome and profound reflection, since it is of the very essence and attributes of God.

Another song, ONE BREAD, ONE BODY[26] is reminiscent of ONLY A SHADOW due to its power to wrap the singers in

big, warm, soft communal blankets of comfortable well-being. It lulls the mind to sleep, and consequently the person's moral accountability. It is musically trite and predictable: we know "where it is going" and, as with trite things, "what is going to happen". There is no development of melody, for it is akin to trite novels or stories which have no development of characters or plot. Its melodic patterns are used at the expense of the text; and even if the lyrics had some dignity, as befitting the texts which it paraphrases, it lacks a proper musical setting. Like Muzak in countless stores and offices, it makes no demands on one's intelligence.

ON EAGLE'S WINGS[27] has taken some of our Catholic faithful by storm because of its delightful and attractive tune. The melody is, in fact, so appealing in its sentimental and romantic expansiveness that the person's response to it is not only immediate and expansive, but actually cathartic. The people experience such an enthusiastic response to this music that they do not have to "go any further", such as reaching out further to God. The music really impedes this "reaching out to God", which is an act of the will, since the person is so spent emotionally because of the music.

This kind of song, though beautiful in itself as are a number of *Glory and Praise* songs, is wholly inappropriate for use in our Catholic liturgies. It creates a very dangerous and fraudulent effect: in the Catholic church, led by the priest, in the context of the sacred liturgy, such music leads the person to believe that a religious experience has been had when, in response to the powerful music merely an emotional experience has been enjoyed. What was apprehended was not God, but one's emotions. It is not worship "in spirit and in truth", but sensual enjoyment under the guise of worship: entertainment in the House of God.

ON EAGLE'S WINGS is a parish version of that dated hit CLIMB EVERY MOUNTAIN from *The Sound of Music.* It would be appropriate and well-received in a Rodgers and Hammerstein or Broadway musical; it could easily vie with CHARIOTS OF FIRE as fine film music; it would be a big hit on the Christian "rock" radio stations, where it belongs. However, Jesus Christ angrily whipped the moneychangers out of the temple; would He be less angry at entertainment in His Father's House?

4.) Music is made sacred by association with that which is truly art.

The term "art" comes to us from the Latin *ars*, or skill. In its general meaning within Western thought, art is a work of excellence produced by an intellectual, creative act.

Just as the recognition of the sacred has receded in people's consciousness, so also has the recognition of the excellence of true, valid art. It is tempting to ascribe this phenomenon to the emergence of the mass communication/entertainment media, especially from the 1950's on. However, perhaps as strong a case could be made for the wrenching effect of the two World Wars upon the psyche of the Western world.

What is known with surety is the fact that art has always, from the beginnings of history, been closely associated with religion. Two factors which explain this ubiquitous linkage are 1.) the creative element of art and 2.) the use of art in ritual.

Longfellow alluded to the former when stating than:

Nature is a revelation of God

Art is a revelation of man.[28]

God, in His bringing forth of creation is not only a model for mankind, but in His infinite generosity He created a being with powers to himself "create" through the work of his hands and his mind. In applying his intellect to the arts, man truly shares in the creative powers of the Almighty.

(Parenthetically, it is important to extend the paradigm to that of Mary, who through the activity of the Holy Spirit brought forth her Son, Jesus — the Logos.) Art through the centuries, whether it be visual or musical, found profound inspiration in its contemplation of Mary, the primal Chantress of the New Testament.

Art, as a creative essence, is *good* because God made us to be creative and because we ourselves are created beings. And art is valid, or *true*, if it implies the essence of goodness.

The Sacred Constitution on the Liturgy laid down basic directions for the purpose of sacred art and music:

> The fine arts are rightly classed among the noblest activities of man's genius; this is especially true of religious art and of its highest manifestation, sacred art. Of their nature the arts are directed toward expressing in some way the infinite beauty of God in works made by human hands. Their dedication to the increase of God's praise and of His glory is more complete, the more exclusively they are devoted to turning men's minds devoutly toward God.[29] (emphasis M.O.H.)

A particular function of art is its use in ritual. The more singularly music turns the faithful's minds devoutly toward God, then, the more it can be said to represent true art. Article 112 of Chapter VI (Sacred Music) even goes so far as to emphasize the pride of place music holds before all other arts:

> The musical tradition of the universal Church is a treasure of immeasurable value, greater even than that of any other art. The main reason for this pre-eminence is that, as sacred melody united to words, it forms a necessary or integral part of the solemn liturgy.[30]

The role of music in ritual is indispensable. It gives focus and tangible concreteness to the rite, and clothes it in drama.

It also gives an oftentimes conscious memory in the melody, the lasting power of which represents to the faithful the experience of the ritual to which it had been inextricably linked. Music, finally, will abstract the otherwise ephemeral religious notions such as feelings and the transcendent and transmission.

> Therefore sacred music increases in holiness to the degree that it is intimately linked with liturgical action, winningly expresses prayerfulness, promotes solidarity, and enriches sacred rites with heightened solemnity.[31]

Much of the music of Lucien Deiss provides fine examples of serious attempts at modern sacred hymnody. Most well known of them are PRIESTLY PEOPLE, KEEP IN MIND, THIS IS THE DAY THE LORD HAS MADE, as well as many of his compositions as yet untried. Their advantages are obvious: musical maturity, Scriptural and doctrinal richness, objectivity in focusing and directing the hearts of the faithful toward the service of God and the liturgy. A few of these hymns are

standing the test of time twenty years after their first use in our churches, each provides new insights, new depths of understanding to the faithful. There is an almost timeless quality to some of these hymns; they may well be just as fresh and unique fifty years from now as twenty years ago. There is little alloy of worldliness about this music: it is "set apart" from the secular. It truly seems to serve God, not mammon.

> The Church indeed approves of all forms of true art, and admits them into divine worship when they show appropriate qualities.[32]

The issue of glaring importance regarding music in our Catholic Churches is this: How can the good, true art (sacred music) be distinguished from the bad, false art (or non-sacred, unworthy music)? Or, in the words of the elderly Leo Tolstoi a couple years before the turn of the century:

> . . .I think it would be useful, first, to separate what really is art from what has no right to that name; and, secondly, taking what really is art, to distinguish what is important and good from what is insignificant and bad.
>
> The question of how and where to draw the line separating Art from Non-Art, and the good and important in art from the insignificant and evil, is one of enormous importance in life.[33]

The absolutes which governed recognition of art (such as goodness, truth, beauty and significance) are now rejected, much as the reality of the sacred has been rejected. Instead, a merely subjective definition of art (also, worthiness) has arrogantly re-defined sacred music according to its own worldly, popular terms. The absolutes have given way to relativism.

Nowadays, subjective opinions and tastes represent the guiding principles in choice of church music; not objective judgment. Church music is valued by "how it affects me. If it means something to me, then it must be good". Inversely, "If I cannot relate to it, then *it has no meaning.*" There is no differentiation between "liking", which is an immediate sensory response (emotion), and approbation or "judgement" (intellect) which is rational and reflective.

The function of art in our sacred liturgies demands its excellence. Rather than upholding a standard which conforms to

worship of the living God in our churches, graced by the sublime Eucharistic Presence, the popular entertainment music of the "world" masquerades as sacred music. The denigration and ignorance of true art in sacred music is an obvious sign of our hedonistic times.

5.) Music is made sacred by its association with the Roman Catholic tradition.

Adherence to this eminent principle undergirds the very presence of musical integrity and unity within our liturgies, but for a large number of Catholics, especially those of the last two generations, it is nearly meaningless.

With the modern West looking on, millions upon millions of ethnic people are now repudiating the monotonous tyrannies of their despotic rulers. Long suppressed manifestations of nationalistic ethnic traditions in dance, dress, song, language and literature are being tearfully and hungrily embraced. Children, young people, and all those denied their cultural patrimony from forty to as many as seventy years now eagerly absorb the long-denied right to their cultural heritage. So essential were these traditions to the very soul of these peoples that, bereft of them, their spirits were impoverished; they despaired of their identity as a people: they did not know who they were. Such is the preciousness of tradition!

It is good for us — denizens of modernity—to learn the lesson that history is teaching us through the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe. As we approach the second millennium of our Roman Catholic faith, we are witness to the enshrinement of the New and Now in our parishes and churches. Our spirits have been impoverished because of the general lack of musical tradition in our rites; we (especially those growing up in the wake of Vatican II) have been largely bereft of our Catholic identity. We have had a difficult time knowing who we were as Roman Catholics, the majority of us (those still remaining) distinguishing little difference between music in our liturgies and that of non-Catholic services.

Although little heeded, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, especially the sixth chapter dealing with sacred music, lays down in explicit and uncompromising terms that:

> The treasure of sacred music is to be preserved and fostered with very great care.[34]

We were charged with the glad duty to preserve (and be enriched by!) the Church's imposing patrimony of sacred music. And yet, now, surveying the near triumph of modernity in our churches and the consequent rejection of our musical heritage, one is at first overwhelmed. Great is the difference between what, in fidelity to the Council, ought to be versus what, instead, exists. It is, in fact, a commonplace that the last two generations of our Catholics have no idea what makes up their musical tradition. Truly, a musical "ground zero" began twenty-five years ago. However may we go about repairing the breach?

First it is comforting to realize that the apparent unanimity of assent in departure from our musical roots was not that at all. For rather than being met with a surge of enthusiasm, the "new music" was imposed upon a confused and resisting laity by a small, powerful and well-orchestrated bureaucracy.[35] Still amongst us, but immeasurably more powerful, well-financed, and virtually unchallenged, this "pastoral" music bureaucracy plays the Goliath to the David of honest adherence to Vatican II. Its predominance is evident to anyone attending any of the numerous pastoral music conferences and conventions on diocesan, regional and national levels.

"Music is made sacred by its association with the Roman Catholic tradition". Since this tradition is usually not in evidence in our churches, then, it is essential to turn to the uncompromising principles of Chapter VI on *Sacred Music.* A thorough reading of this document is not only a pleasure but a necessity. Among other tenets, it stipulates that:

> . . .choirs must be diligently promoted; (114)
>
> . . .teachers are to be carefully trained and put in charge of the teaching of Sacred music; (115)
>
> . . .The Church acknowledges Gregorian chant as proper to the Roman Liturgy: therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services; (116)
>
> . . .other kinds of sacred music especially polyphony, are by no means excluded from liturgical celebrations; (116)

> . . .It is desirable, also, that an edition (of Gregorian chant) be prepared containing simpler melodies, for use in small churches; (117)
>
> . . .the voices of the faithful may ring out according to the norms and requirements of the rubrics; (118)
>
> . . .the pipe organ is to be held in high esteem, for it is the traditional musical instrument, and one that adds a wonderful splendor to the Church's ceremonies and powerfully lifts up man's mind to God and to heavenly things; (120)
>
> . . .Composers. . .should feel that their vocation is to cultivate sacred music and increase its store of treasures. (121)[36]

Also, from Chapter Two of the same Constitution, specifically, Article 54:

> . . .In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue. . . Nevertheless, steps should be taken so 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.[37]

The task of recovering our musical traditions, due to the range of our departure from it, is immense and discouraging. For far too many Catholics, the Mass represents very little more than a commonplace ritual for "gathering the assembly" (typical liturgical jargon), much as a picnic is the focus for a family reunion. Their sense of the sacred has been dulled; and even for our older people, the anti-spiritual entertainment music to which they have grown accustomed wrongfully represents "church music".

One of the most profound fundamentals of our liturgical tradition is the ancient practice of listening with "the heart" *even without* understanding of the mind. To this day our Eastern Rite Catholics firmly maintain the importance of the "wisdom of the heart"; it flourishes untrammeled in their rites.

Because of the rationalistic arrogance of our age, many of the Roman rite have "bought into" the notion that the only way to understand is through the mind. As with a diptych, however, a balance of two fulfills the whole. Faith comes

through understanding: not merely intellectual understanding, but especially understanding of the heart. The apparent dichotomy between mind/heart, active/passive or active/contemplative is also a unity: each side of the diptych needs the other for the sake of the integrity of the whole.

The Catholic faithful, through century after century of widespread illiteracy, *knew* what the Mass was, *knew* the Mysteries unfolding before them, *knew* the grandeur, solace and presence of the Church in their lives. Sacred chant, polyphony and the entire treasury of sacred music enriched and *informed* their hearts and their souls. Though the Latin words were often inexplicable to them, when the words were wedded to sacred music, their hearts understood.

> There is an easily and generally propagated error in the minds of many that active participation, to which the Constitution is inviting people, is of a purely physical kind. Even listening is a form of intense activity. The modern human being, wearied by the noisy and hectic life, through an attentive listening can find in church a restful peace which is the springboard for true prayer. "Music to be listened to" (the greater part of the Gregorian repertoire, the multi-voiced singing of the choir, and organ music) is of great pastoral significance for the education of the people.[38]

The rejection of our musical tradition has been a worldwide, soul-felt scandal. Were our priests and pastors to prayerfully re-introduce the eminence of this profound truth — that faith comes through listening not just with the mind, but also with the heart — they could go a long way towards recovery and use of our musical and spiritual riches so recently lost.

Had there been honest adherence to the mandates of Vatican II, it is doubtful that lower level Church authorities would have needed to "sell their birthright for a mess of pottage." There would not have been the mad rush to fill the gaping void occasioned by their non-canonical (therefore, illicit) abolition of Latin.[39]

> There must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.[40]

The natural and organic development and renewal of sacred song would have been assured, where instead an artificial and manufactured imposition of the rootless "new" resulted. We have been "spinning our wheels" ever since; for an error to be maintained, others must follow it to shore up the consequent weakness.

Article 36 of the Sacred Constitution states:

> (1) Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rite.
>
> (2) But since the use of the mother tongue. . . may frequently be of great advantage to the people. . . the limits of its employment may be extended.
>
> (3) It is for the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority. . . to decide whether, and to what extent, the vernacular language is to be used according to these norms.[41]

Ten years following the initial scramble for finding English text music for use in the Mass, a music publisher, surveying the continuing fray, announced:

> The Roman Catholic Church has its own sacred music tradition, but that tradition does not include a long history of singing in the English language. Unlike their *fellow Americans of the same "melting pot" culture,* Catholic parishes for the most part have yet to experience the same vitality of song that echoes from their neighboring Christian churches. Musicians and liturgists have long expressed a need for a Roman Catholic hymnal that is theologically sound. . . and respects the *hymnological traditions of those commonly referred to as "protestant"* (sic) *hymnals.* [42]

The above lobbying for "melting pot" homogeneity aside, it is fair to ask if the goal of "vitality of song" has indeed been achieved in our parishes and places of worship, given the hybrid nature of much of the song.

To repeat, *music is made sacred by its association with the Roman Catholic Tradition.* That music which flows out of a separate, non-Catholic tradition is inimical to our own; hence, it is not sacred music and its use in our liturgies is contrary to the expressed mind of the Church.

Examples of non-Catholic music are:

1. Spirituals
2. Ethnic folk music
3. Protestant songs and chorales

1. Although spirituals are religious songs, they derive from a faith alien to that which the Catholic Church recognizes and thus are inappropriate for use in our sacred liturgies.

The spiritual was developed from North American rural Negro and white folk melodies and themes. It was popularized at Protestant evangelical camp and revival meetings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Clearly, it is unsuitable for Catholic liturgical use.

2. Folk music, whether of American vintage or that of other national or religious groups, is so heavily laden with the respective cultures that its Catholic use occasions multiple confusions to the faithful. The folk song will be used with both the melody and folk text; or a contemporary "Catholic" text is grafted onto the melody. Whatever the case, such is the power of a good melody that uppermost in the people's minds are not the prayer of the text (which ought to be merely *served* by the music), but the heavy associations of that particular folk culture. The intended prayer is obfuscated. Also, an injury could be done to that tradition and its peoples: the integrity of their song, which is their exclusive possession and represents their own identity, is compromised. It is stolen, which to sensitive peoples might constitute an injury.

Borrowing from other national and ethnic cultures abounds, becoming almost a virtue in itself. Examples include the Quaker "How Can I Keep From Singing," Shaker "'Tis a Gift to be Simple," from the Israeli tradition, "The King of Glory," American rural "Amazing Grace," and Shaker "The Lord of the Dance." Incidentally, the texts are simplistic (a typical trait of "gospel songs") and on that account alone undeserving of a place in our sacred liturgies.

3. It is now common for songs from the Protestant tradition to be introduced into and maintained in our Catholic churches. Twenty five years ago, this practice devolved from the sore, but manufactured need for English language congregational hymns. Their use was sanctioned by a genial and

euphoric "spirit" of ecumenism, wafting undisciplined throughout Catholicism.

Our current ignorance of history notwithstanding, Protestant hymnody emerged in the seventeenth century as a direct result of widespread rejection of the Mass, the Sacraments, and a thousand years of developed Christian doctrine. Thousands of courageous Catholics, among them the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales (St. Thomas More, St. John Fisher, St. Margaret Clitherow, etc.) submitted themselves to barbarous tortures and death in their refusal to renounce the Church and the papacy. One of them, St. Philip Howard, lingered years in prison when

> Finally, feeling that death was near, he appealed to the queen to be allowed to meet his wife and his little son, whom he had never seen. The answer was that, if he would but once attend the Protestant church services, not only would his request be granted but all his honors would be restored to him. He refused, and died soon afterwards on October 19, 1595.[43]

Although it is a fact that distant sources for the melodies and texts of Protestant hymnody are found in plainsong and early Christian texts, such is the case with practically all song found in our Western culture: it could not be helped.

Much of Protestant hymnody, which represents the antithesis of our Catholic doctrine and tradition, is consequently alien to Catholicism. Many of these Protestant songs — including those of the Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist sects — are eminently singable, but they are not Roman Catholic.

Protestant hymns, thus, are not sacred music. The word "sacred" is, at root, synonymous with "sacrament": and *only in the Catholic tradition* is not only the existence, but also the validity of all the Christ-given sacraments maintained. Only in the Catholic Church is the very Eucharistic Presence of Christ Himself proclaimed.

A serious argument can be made that those confused and doctrinally illiterate Catholics who have taken themselves, their families, and their support to non-Catholic churches are only acting out a premise first learned in their Catholic parish. For, participating in the frequent and unquestioned singing

of Protestant songs in their Catholic liturgies, they opine: what difference is there between one church and another, as long as you go to some church?

Among the many acute scandals afflicting American Catholicism in the last twenty-five years, one of the most noticeable has been the emptying of our churches to the advantage of those of our Protestant brethren.

Interest in the use of Protestant hymnody reflects a telling symptom of not only ignorance regarding our Catholic musical and historical background, but also a misunderstanding of the basic premise of Catholic evangelization.

Protestant hymns confuse and often-times antagonize our Catholic faithful. Truly their use contributes in large measure to the phenomenon that our people, especially young people, are not only unaware of their Catholic roots and identity, but see no compelling reason for being so. Singability? At what price!

It is important to make clear that music presented by means of mechanical reproduction, such as that on tapes, records, or through manipulation of the synthesizer and its derivatives, is not appropriate for use in our churches and ought not to be admitted. For our Catholic liturgies are living and immediate prayer to the living God; for any aspect of them to lack genuineness and authenticity is a mockery of God the Creator, as well as of His creatures and of their sacred rites. This principle is especially urgent due to the Lord's inestimable Gift to us in our churches; His Real Presence in the Eucharist.

Article 120 of *Sacred Music* states that although instruments other than the pipe organ "may be admitted for use in divine worship," this may be "only on condition that the instruments are *suitable for sacred use.*" The increasing use of piano music is another and serious divergence from our Catholic tradition. As the child is father to the man, the particular style of a piece of music is largely determined by the instrument upon which it is performed. And since the pipe organ, after its introduction over a thousand years ago has without exception been considered the church instrument *par excellence,* it goes without saying that it is appropriate for sacred use.

The piano, however, has been an exclusively secular instrument from its completion in the late eighteenth century. Its initial function was that of a recital instrument; the son of Bach, Johann Christian, gave the first public piano recital in 1768. Because of its relative portability compared to the organ, it immediately enjoyed popularity not only in the concert halls but also in private homes, which is its most common focus to this day. The piano also enjoys the dubious distinction, for well over the last one hundred years, of presiding over entertainment proffered in public houses such as pubs, bars, saloons and cocktail lounges.

The use of the piano in our churches, with its heavy associations of entertainment — from the most refined, to the most common, to the most bawdy — reflects not only bad taste but, also, a most irreligious blurring of moral distinctions. It overwhelmingly detracts from the sacred character of our churches and liturgies; and it does a disservice to the faithful, who, again, are given a stone when they *hunger for bread.*

Now, twenty-five years after those heady days during and following Vatican II, the musical dust has settled in our parishes, convents, seminaries and other places of worship. The time is past due for a prayerful and honest re-assessment of the music dominating our churches and chapels.

Much of that music — in style, textual content, instrumentation and by association — is not proper to Roman Catholic worship and conducive to the sense of the sacred. Due in large part to this music, large numbers of our Catholic people (those who have not yet left) have been lulled into a soporific non-accountability before God and His Church.

"By their fruits you shall know them. . . " Are our people more disposed to personal, individual prayer following their communal prayer, or to less? Are they persuaded through their music to a greater acknowledgment of personal accountability? Are our people persuaded to a greater contrition? To a greater sense of that *sine qua non,* unworthiness before God?

As a result of the passing of the Marian Year, are our people more musically enriched in regard to hymns and texts reflective of Mary and her eminent place in the Church? Or do we still notice the absence of specifically Catholic themes,

such as those regarding Mary, the angels, the saints, the Sacred Heart: those devotions which, rather than diminishing our focus on the Mass, heighten and encourage it?

Does much of our music reflect a spiritual maturity and depth? Does it show a *musical* depth, or does it fall into the "Peter, Paul and Mary" style so prominent over the airwaves in the 1960's and 1970's? Does this superficiality produce in our people a concomitant superficiality? A warm, fuzzy benignness and tolerance? Do we sometimes sense a vague, congregational narcissism?

Paramount to our re-assessment is the question that will not be stilled: What has happened to our tradition, both musical and textual? Where is the Gregorian chant, that universal song of the Universal Church? Where is our Latin, guaranteed by the Council Fathers in the documents of Vatican II?

Our musical patrimony is an unparalleled and glorious one.

> If the Church of Rome had done no more than preserve a part of the treasures of ancient culture, a part of musical antiquity, this would be a great honor. . . But Roman Catholicism has in fact created a great part of that musical inheritance of the human race, and in sacred music brought into existence the greatest treasury which exists today for singing the praise of God.[44]

The fact is that most, usually all, of what is used today in missalettes, hymnbooks or sheet music is a great departure from our Catholic musical inheritance and, it follows, from our Catholic identity as well.

Christian hymnody derived from the singing of psalms in the Jewish synagogues. After the legalization of Christianity by Constantine in 313, it began a systematic development, flourishing earliest in Syria. The Byzantine Church adopted the practice and, in an unbroken continuity, hymns have occupied a prominent place in its liturgy.

In the West, the first book of hymn texts was composed by St. Hilary of Poitiers in 360 A.D. Soon after, St. Ambrose instituted congregational singing of hymns.

In poetic form, these early hymns derived from Christian Latin poetry of the period; combined with early plainsong (chant) one syllable of text to each musical note was usual.

However, by the late Middle Ages trained choirs supplanted the congregation in the singing of these hymns with the rise of polyphony, acknowledged to be the jewel in the crown of sacred music.

The Counter-Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century stimulated the writing, again, of many fine Catholic hymns. A further revival of interest in the late nineteenth century eventually led to the English language Westminster Hymnal of 1940.

As at several times through our long history, we now again need faith-expressing tests set to strong, well-structured and truly musical melodies for use by our congregations. At the same time we need other compositions, both in Latin and in the vernacular, intended for choirs in their proper and essential role in the liturgy.

The repetition of Catholic teachings in our worship is essential to their acceptance and perseverance in Catholic life. When sacred texts are set to fine, appropriate music, they then penetrate the soul and nourish the holiness that all people are called upon to develop. Our Catholic people are starving for this means of holiness which it is their right to have.

The Second Vatican Council called upon composers to produce just this. Little by little such efforts will be forthcoming. We should be alert to find them and support their endeavors, always bearing in mind the charge to "bring out of your storeroom the old and the new."

Equally important, we should seek and employ in our parishes and schools those musicians not only conversant with but also gladly submissive to the principles enunciated in the Sacred Constitution on the Liturgy. With the proper tools and support, the Director of Music can be a means of holiness,

> . . . having regard for the purpose of sacred music, which is the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful.[45]

Endnotes

1. David Ewen, *All the Years of American Popular Music* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977), p. 642.

2. As described by Monsignor Johannes Overath in the preface to the Congress proceedings: "On November 22, 1963, with the chirograph

Nobile subsidium liturgiae, Pope Paul VI established the Consociato Internationalis Musicae Sacrae. One of the tasks entrusted to the newly organized society was that of arranging for international meetings of church musicians, continuing the series of congresses begun in Rome in the Holy Year, 1950, with subsequent assemblies in Vienna in 1954, Paris in 1957, and Cologne in 1961. The Holy Father named the first officers of CIMS in 1964 (Monsignor Johannes Overath of Cologne was appointed President — M.O.H.)

In 1965, many conferences and discussions took place between the officers of CIMS and leading church musicians of the United States, especially Rt. Rev. Coadjutor Archabbot Rembert G. Weakland, OSB, president of the newly organized Church Music Association of America and his colleagues in that society.

The 1966 Fifth International Church Music Congress opened with Catholic musicologists from the universities of Europe, America and the Orient present, along with many well-known Catholic composers and performers. As members of CIMS, they demonstrated a vital interest in sacred music and a sincere concern for preserving its precious heritage and solving its new problems. Several non-Catholic musicologists and artists also cooperated in the work.

3. Johannes Overath, ed. *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform After Vatican II.* Proceedings of the Fifth International Church Music Congress, Chicago-Milwaukee, August 21-28, 1966 (Rome, Italy: Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae (CIMS) 1969 (Printed by North Central Publishing Company, Saint Paul, Minnesota) p. 246.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 247.

5. World Library of Sacred Music, *People's Mass Book,* Edition B (Cincinnati, Ohio: World Library Publications, Inc., 1971) p. 322.

6. Walter M. Abbott, SJ, Gen. Ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (The America Press/Association Press, 1966) Articles 121 and 120, p. 173.

7. Overath, *Ibid.*, p. 187. Resolution submitted by Rt. Rev. Guilherme Schubert (Representative of Jaime Cardinal Barros de Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro).

8. North American Liturgy Resources, *Glory and Praise* (Phoenix, Arizona: 1977) p. 55 by (former Rev.) Carey Landry.

9. Verse 1 Peace is flowing like a river,
flowing out of you and me.
Flowing out into the desert,
setting all the captives free.

Verse 2. His love is flowing like a river, etc. *ibid.*

Verse 3. His healing's flowing like a river, etc. *ibid.*

Verse 4. Alleluia, etc.

Verse 5. His peace is flowing like a river, etc.

10. *Ibid.*, Volume 2, p. 7, by Gary Ault.

11. John 1:1.

12. Dated December 4, 1988 and released on Pentecost Sunday, May 13, 1989. (Under "The Practical Applications of Reform; C. Erroneous applications").

13. Oregon Catholic Press, *Today's Missal* (Portland, Oregon, 1990) *Music Issue* 1990) by Bob Hurd, n. 442.

14. See Canon 217: The Christian faithful, since they are called by baptism to lead a life in conformity with the teaching of the gospel, have the *right to a Christian education* by which they will be properly instructed so as to develop the maturity of a human person and at the same time come to know and live the mystery of salvation. (tr. by Canon Law Society of America: *Code of Canon Law.* Washington, D.C., 1983, p. 73).

15. "Peace is Flowing like a River", "All that We Have", "Come Unto Me", "Happy the Man."

16. Abbott, SJ., *Ibid.*, p. 173, art. 121.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 173, n. 60.

18. Oregon Catholic Press, *Ibid.*, by Marty Haugen, n. 320.

19. Christopher Derrick, "Brave New Church" *Fidelity,* Vol. 8, N. 8, July 1989 (Address given on May 8, 1989.)

20. Oregon Catholic Press, *Ibid.*, by Bernadette Farrell. Published in England by St. Thomas More Centre, London. The text was "based on Luke 12:2-3."

21. Paul Crane, SJ., "The Mass: Old and New: 4", *Christian Order,* Vol. 31, n. 1; January 1990. p. 25.

22. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1958 Second Edition, Springfield, Mass., G & C. Merriam Co., p. 141 under "cheap."

23. Encyclopedia Britannica; Macropaedia, Fifteen edition, 1976. "Music, Art of," G.E., pg. 663.

24. North American Liturgy Resources, Glory & Praise — Songs for Christian Assembly — (Phoenix, Arizona: 1977), etc.

25. *Ibid.*, Volume 1, p. 54; by (former Rev.) Carey Landry.

26. *Ibid.*, Volume 2, p. 47; by John Foley, SJ.

27. *Ibid.*, Volume 2, p. 46; by Michael Joncas.

28. Hyperion, 1839.

29. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Chapter seven, Article 122. Quoted in Karol Wojtyla, *Sources of Renewal: The Implementation of Vatican II.* (New York, New York) Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., Translation by Harry J. Costello and Austin Flannery, O.P., p. 243.

30. Abbott, *Ibid.*, p. 171, par. 1.

31. Abbott, *Ibid.*, p. 171, par. 3.

32. Abbott, *Ibid.*, p. 171, par. 3.

33. Albert William Levi, *Varieties of Experience* (New York, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957) p. 377.

34. Abbott, Ibid., p. 171, art. 114.

35. For a review of the liturgical "reform" — both from the point of view of the facts and from the viewpoint of canon law — see the indispensable testimony as mentioned in the proceedings of the Fifth International Church Music Congress (*Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform, ibid.*) See especially the Introduction by Monsignor Overath, pp. 5-27. Of interest, also, is Appendix II (Statement on the Criticisms of the Fifth International Church Music Congress in the American Press), pp. 284-288, including the following:

> Those who organized the Congress are grateful to those reviewers who by their presence were in a position to give their immediate impressions of what they saw and heard. The fact is, however, that some who were not present in Chicago, for example, Rev. C.J. McNaspy, SJ, Robert J. Snow and Rev. Robert Brom, among others, also published accounts of the Congress. A number of such reports appeared in the American press in which inaccuracies of reporting were coupled with a prejudice against the Congress. In each case falsifications were necessary to substantiate the preconceived view point with which the author began. One can detect from the ideas that recur and from the phrases used a common source for most of these adverse criticisms. . .
>
> It was hardly a warm welcome that the foreign visitors received in the Jesuit journal, America, for August 13, 1966, when Rev. C.J. McNaspy, SJ, referred to the congress which was meeting with the approbation of the Holy See in these words: 'A cabalistic air surrounds the whispers of secret attitudes in liturgical-music thinking. One hears about the planned exclusion. . . and the invitation of a closed circle to a 'super-secret' session.'
>
> The most amazing thing is that Fr. McNaspy was not present for any part of the Congress, and yet he presumed to report on it in a nationwide journal. . .
>
> Archabbot Weakland pointed out that the American delegates were distressed and shocked at the narrow, restrictive tone of everything being pushed. . . Perhaps the most dismal and self-defeating note of the whole proceedings, however, was what the archabbot called its negative and restrictive character. (*America,* September 24, 1966).
>
> But even before that the attitude of the archabbot was to be regretted, since he arrived in Chicago for the study sessions

> only on the last day, even though he was the president of the Church Music Association of America. Despite his absence from most of the meetings, he still voiced open criticism of the themes, procedures and even the intentions of the speakers. . . The subject matter was approved by the Holy See, and several letters from the Vatican Secretariate of State provided direction during the preparations for the meetings. . . Perhaps if the critics had been present they would have grasped the content of the studies and the methods of the procedure." Etc. (Overath, *Ibid.*, pp. 284. 285).

36. Abbott, *Ibid.*, pp. 171-173.

37. Abbott, *Ibid.*, p. 156.

38. Overath, *Ibid.*, p. 151. (Study paper by Joseph Lennards, Roermond, Netherlands: Possibilities and Limitations of Congregational Singing.)

39. Overath, *Ibid.*, pp. 11-24. "An extreme solution to the question of the use of vernacular, which in the days since the Council has to be the rule in many places, . . . contradicts the will of the Council. Such a practice which we now see would have been unacceptable to the majority of the Fathers of the Council."

40. Abbott, *Ibid.*, Art. 23, p. 146 ff.

41. Abbott, *Ibid.*, p. 150.

42. *Worship II,* A Hymnal for Roman Catholic Parishes. (Chicago, Illinois: G.I.A. Publications, Inc., 1975), Preface, par. 2.

43. Father James Walsh, SJ, *Forty Martyrs of England and Wales,* London, England: Catholic Truth Society, p. 12.

44. Overath, *Ibid.*, p. 255. Letter from Rector of Pontifical College of Sacred Music in Rome, Mons. Higinio Angles.

45. Abbott, *Ibid.*, Chapter 6, Art. 112.