AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY

The persons whose signatures appear below have consulted this thesis by .... and are aware that it is available for study only and that no quotations, or substantive information not otherwise available, may be published therefrom without the consent of the author and of .....

NAME	DATE	NAME	DATE
Matthew Tookey	9.4.02		
Matthew Tookey	9-10-02		

Permission is given/not given to the University Librarian or his representative to allow persons other than students or members of staff of the University to consult my thesis only for the purposes of private study and research.

PAPAL THOUGHT ON THE NATURE OF SACRED MUSIC

Alison Hope

A research project submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements
for the Graduate Diploma in Music (Musicology)
at The Australian National University,
Institute of the Arts, Canberra School of Music.

Submitted 31 January 1998

B20196660

Contents

	Page
Notes	1
Introduction	2
Part 1...Outline: Principles	4
Part 2...Discussion: Types of principles	38
Part 3...Conclusions: Themes	41
Appendix 1	44
Bibliography	47

Notes

i. The term 'he' is frequently used in this paper as the impersonal. This use is a grammatical choice only. Where it was possible to use the plural 'they' smoothly and without grammatical inconsistency, that term has been used, in recognition of the sensitivity that some readers may have to the impersonal 'he'. However, I have chosen not to use 'he/she', an unwieldy term, nor do I use the plural where it would lead to grammatical incompatibilities, where the phrasing would be rendered clumsy or where the singular strengthens and clarifies a given example.

ii. The term 'the Church' is, in this paper, used as shorthand for 'the Catholic Church'.

iii. My thanks go to Robyn Holmes, my supervisor, for her decisive direction, particularly in defining the topic of this thesis, and her readiness to comment on and offer ideas. Also to Deborah Crisp and Helen Lawrence for their encouragement and advice after a talk, based on this paper, that I gave as part of the 1997 Graduate Seminar series.

Introduction

A member of any modern Catholic congregation, turning up two minutes after Mass had begun, would not be surprised to hear seeping out from the church the strains of congregational hymns, a solo singer on a microphone, or a folk mass, replete with drums and electric guitar. Most would, however, be taken aback to hear, instead, the sound of chant or a polyphonic choir, no matter how popular these might be in the early music sections of record stores. The same members would probably be aware that chant was once used in the Church, but might well be surprised to learn that the Catholic Church has affirmed with remarkable stability for almost 2000 years - most recently in Vatican Council II (1963) - that the normative liturgical music of the Church is chant and polyphony. This paper sets out to understand part of the reason why the Church has adhered to these two forms by investigating papal statements that indicate what the popes saw as characteristics essential to sacred music.

Such statements may be found in Church documents dealing with liturgy, as well as in those dealing exclusively with sacred music. Any papal statement from either source that defines sacred music and recurs over time I have called a 'principle' of sacred music. The main work of this paper is to elicit and present those principles, illustrating them with quotations from the documents, showing the interaction between papal thought and linked musical and social developments that produced the principles, and tracing continuity and change within each principle over time.

Yet understanding what the papacy thought made music sacred involves not only compiling the criteria designated as integral to sacred music, but understanding *why* and *how* these criteria have the power to make music 'sacred'. To do this, after grouping the principles thematically, I will try to place those themes within a theological framework that reveals the reasoning (or intuition) at the heart of papal directives on sacred music.

For its source material this paper draws on a collection of papal documents dating from the

year 95 to the year 1977.[1] The collection gathers together all forms of papal documents dealing with sacred music: letters, speeches, encyclicals and regulations; documents written or signed by popes themselves and those issued in the pope's name by regulatory bodies of the Church; documents addressed to individuals, to groups such as guilds and sodalities, and to regions, alongside those addressed to the whole Church. For the purposes of this paper, only documents released by popes to the universal church have been accepted as testimony to the views of the papacy, and the term 'the papal documents' will refer to these authoritative documents. Letters or speeches to individual groups have been used as evidence where a quote is particularly applicable or indicates a view that later fed into a papal document, and these more private documents will be noted as such in the text.

In the documents examined, there are indications of marked regional differences, which suggest that this type of study could be usefully done on individual dioceses. It would be interesting to compare the results from different regions to see whether the end result differed substantially from that of the whole Church. Nonetheless, papal documents can be justifiably studied as an overall indication of the Church's attitude because, despite the variations, large sections of the Church adhered (some by choice, others by compulsion) to the liturgical practice of the Church in Rome, and increasingly so from the early middle ages on.[2]

The paper is divided into three parts:

1. Outline of the ten principles.
2. Discussion of the types of principles
3. Conclusion drawing out premises and themes.

---

1 Hayburn, R.F: *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music, 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D.* The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1979, p. 77.

2 See Hull, G: *The Banished Heart.* Spes Nova, Sydney, 1995.

Part 1...Outline

The principles

Until the 14th century, judging by the surviving documents, the nature of sacred music was little dealt with by the popes. They were more concerned with organisational matters, such as ordering the liturgical calendar. Only three requirements for sacred music were named during that long period. The first, and most ancient, of these requirements was that sacred music should be clearly distinguished from pagan or secular music. The second was that sacred music should arouse devotion in the listeners, and the third, closely linked, was that sacred music should express religious ideas.

1. Must not have pagan or secular origins, 0-20th c

To define 'the holy' in terms of what it is not is an ancient practice.[3] The 'not' separates things concerning God from things concerning the world. St Clement of Alexandria (150-211/216 AD) wrote that if we "cast ourselves into the greatness of Christ, and then advance into His immensity by holiness we may reach somehow to the conception of the Almighty, knowing not what He is but what He is not".[4] Earlier still, in the *Epistles of St Peter* is found the phrase, "But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God".[5] The concept of holy expressed here is that of being separate from the ordinary world. Even this simple definition requires qualification, however. 'World', in Christianity and used in this context, signifies not material existence, embracing the totality of nature and people, but specifically material existence insofar as it ignores or excludes God. So 'worldliness' refers to the habit of being immersed in the affairs of earthly life to the exclusion of God. 'Sacred', signifies the opposite of worldliness. The more a thing is concerned with the affairs of God,

---

3 See Jurgens, W.A: *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, vols 1-3. The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1979. References under 'Knowledge of God' in the *Doctrinal Index*, for the proposition 'We attempt to arrive at some knowledge of the perfections of God from a consideration of his creatures, by the way of negation'. See also Otto, R: *The Idea of the Holy*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, London, 1950, Appendix V, p. 197.

4 Jurgens, op cit., p. 183, no. 423.

5 1 Peter 2:9.

the more sacred, or 'hallowed', it is considered.

When Pope Clement (92-101AD), therefore, directed that liturgical chant was not to be used at pagan festivals, he was establishing a division between the music used at Christian and at pagan ceremonies that was both practical, designed to avoid associating pagan ideas with the Christian ceremonies, and theoretical, drawing upon a longstanding concept of the sacred as 'set apart'.

This division between sacred and worldly was consistently reiterated in later papal documents that dealt with sacred music. It has been the first and most frequently specified principle of the sacred in music throughout the twenty centuries of papal documents. Between the first and the 20th centuries, however, reference to pagan religion is non-existent, presumably because pagan forms of religion steadily died out in the Christian world, East and West, following Constantine's adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire in the 4th century. From the 17th century on, when the division was next mentioned explicitly, it was instead a division between music that, having originated in the secular world, was designed to fulfil secular purposes, and music that, having originated in the Church, was designed to fulfil sacred purposes.

This attempt to keep secular and sacred music separate was motivated by the burgeoning growth of secular, and particularly instrumental, forms of music, and their employment in the liturgy. Pope Alexander VII, in his encyclical *Piae sollicitudinis* (1657), wrote that "Music which imitates dance music and profane rather than ecclesiastical melody must be excluded, and must be banished from the churches".[6] During the 18th and 19th centuries, keeping the two forms of music distinct became ever more difficult as secular music forms became normative and sacred music receded to the status of a genre. Secular music was widely known and popular with listeners. It was printed, sold, and performed in homes. Composers naturally wished to pursue the musical ideas of their time. The 17th and 18th century flourishing of opera and the *stilo nuovo*, with its solo, ornamented singing style, led to the transfer of recitative and aria song forms, as well as a more virtuosic style of singing, into the

6 Hayburn, op cit., p. 77.

liturgy.

Operatic forms and singing styles proved particularly difficult to exclude from the liturgy. Pope Benedict XIII, in whose era the popularity of the 'classical mass' and the presentation of the Mass as a performance reached its zenith, examined carefully the opinions of theologians, both ancient and contemporary, on what form sacred music should take. Following his research, he released an encyclical entitled *Annus qui* (1749), which contained a summary of theological opinion, his own conclusions and practical directions flowing from these.

He noted that what he called harmonic or figurative chant' of the type "proper to the platforms and to theatres" and "everything that evokes profane themes of love or warrior feats dear to classic music" were widely opposed by writers on sacred music, and he decided there was a need to "fix the limits between Church chant and music and that of the theaters. We must state the difference between the two because in our days figurative or harmonic chant accompanied by the playing of instruments are adopted both in theatres and in churches [whereas in the Judaic culture they were heard only in the Temple]".[7] Pius VI, in an 18th century encyclical addressed to French clergy, added a further note, explaining that it was not only that secular music brought into the liturgy inappropriate associations, but also that the origins of sacred music had given it a certain sacred quality. "The clergy", he wrote, "were not inspired by games and profane amusements to produce the tone and modulation of religious music, but by the Fathers of the Old and New Testament."[8]

These prohibitions and directions were evidently not entirely successful, for in the 19th century, the Congregation of Sacred Rites once again produced a Regulation, addressed to Italian bishops, prohibiting music "which by its character or by the form which it takes tends to distract the faithful in the house of prayer".[9] Specifically, this meant music "composed upon theatrical or profane themes or selections...as well as music of too light or too sensuous a

7 Ibid., p. 103.

8 Ibid., p. 113. In *Quod aliquantum* (1791).

9 Ibid., p. 137. In *Ordination quoad sacram musicam* (1884).

style...or recitatives of a theatrical nature" and "all dances whatsoever".[10]

Popes of the 20th century produced more voluminous and detailed writings on sacred music than those of all the preceding centuries. Pius X had, from his earliest years as a priest, a profound interest in music, and especially the debates that were raging at that time over the revival of Gregorian Chant and the correct way of interpreting the chant. Before becoming pope, he had already, as Bishop of Venice, co-authored and put into effect a document which expressed most of the views that later appeared in his *motu proprio* of 1903. While still defending the division between secular and sacred music, Pius X concentrated more of his energy upon 'modern music' than on 'secular music'. Sacred music, he wrote, was necessarily holy; by which he meant not profane, theatrical, frivolous, vulgar or trivial, nor reminiscent of secular works, either in itself or in the way it was performed.[11] In particular, the *motu proprio* warned, the Church had to be cautious in accepting modern music because it had "become chiefly a secular art".[12] In his earlier work, Pius X explained his views in greater detail. Like Pius VI, he saw the origins of a musical form as an important influence on its nature:

> "...these [modern] kinds of music are more sacred and more liturgical insofar as they approach in their inspiration and taste either Gregorian Chant or Classical Polyphony. They are unfitting for the Church if they depart from these models. (The intrinsic reason for all this is thatGregorian Chant andClassical Polyphony arose in the church and for the Church. But all other kinds of modern music arose in the theater and for the theater. Therefore they cannot be brought into the Church unless they are first rid of all that is profane and theatrical...There certainly must be an intrinsic difference between theatrical music and sacred music. The first condition for a good composer of Church music is, without doubt, that he express the feeling of the sacred text without using the forms which are customary to express profane love in the theater, and without the intention of entertaining a profane gathering...this modern music can have some

10 Ibid., pp. 137-138.

11 Ibid., p. 205. In his submission (1893) to a commission on sacred music, while he was Patriarch of Venice. In this paper he first clearly formulated the views presented later in his *motu proprio* (1903).

12 Ibid., p. 225.

good points about it, but in itself it does not possess the sacred character proper to Gregorian Chant and Classical Polyphony".[13]

Pius XI continued to uphold the exclusion of secular forms of music from the liturgy, while adding that this prohibition on secular music was not intended as a condemnation of secular music per se: "Certain compositions...however excellent in themselves, ought never to have been given in a Church, since they are not in keeping with the holy place and the sacredness of the liturgy".[14] In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928), his encyclical on the liturgy, he maintained but made more specific the traditional definition of secular, classifying music as secular when its sound, technique or music were profane or mingled with the profane. He, too, had special reservations about 'modern music', writing of the "danger lest a profane spirit should invade the House of God through newfangled musical styles which, should they get a real foothold, the Church would be bound to condemn".[15] Modern music, in his view, was "a sort of art which is merely the offspring of experiment and restless seeking, with all the attending innovations that are not accepted without questioning even in secular music circles".[16]

Pius XII released no less than three documents concerning sacred music, two of which were exclusively about sacred music. Here, there is evidence of a slight shift in the attitude towards modern music. The first of the three documents, *Mediator Dei* (1947), while reaffirming the propriety of excluding modern music that did not draw its inspiration from religion "to express what is suitable and more in keeping with the requirements of worship"[17], asserted that modern music "can contribute in no small way to the splendour of the sacred ceremonies, can lift the mind to higher things and foster true devotion of soul".[18] Hence, *Mediator Dei* permitted any forms of modern music and singing as long as they were "not profane nor unbecoming to the sacredness of the place and function, and do not spring from a desire to

---

13 Ibid., p. 207.

14 Ibid., p. 329.

15 Ibid., p. 331.

16 Ibid., p. 336.

17 Ibid., pp. 340-1.

18 Ibid., p. 340.

achieve extraordinary and unusual effects...".[19] In his two later documents, Pius XII maintained the position adopted here, restricting himself to reiterating general principles in keeping with those traditionally held by popes, such as the prohibition of "anything profane and foreign to divine worship, outside the boundaries of sacred music, lascivious or impure, illicit or immoderate, or devoid of any religious inspiration..."[20]

This position involved a rejection of the practice of labelling forms or styles inappropriate for the liturgy. Manifest in it was the assumption that any form or style of music might be capable of fulfilling the principles of sacred music. Entire forms or styles should therefore not be banned out of hand. This approach differed from that of Pius X, who required music used in the liturgy to stylistically resemble Gregorian chant and Renaissance polyphony, and also from that of Pius XI, who did not accept that modern music could be suitable for use in the liturgy. Pius XII, although he upheld the primacy of Gregorian chant and Renaissance polyphony in his writings, refrained from setting up any form of music as a stylistic standard.

His focus, instead, was the individual work and composer. Thus, the criteria he was using to evaluate a work now included the faith of the composer - a subjective criteria, that extended evaluation to the person behind the music - and excluded the origins of a style - an objective criteria, that examined the circumstances in which, or function for which, a musical style was created. This exclusion would seem to de-emphasize also the effect of associations between particular styles of music and secular activities, perhaps because the styles were by then widely used and not exclusively associated with a particular activity.

Let it not be said, however, that Pius XII had abandoned the principle of origin. Clearly, the composer's faith, while both less sweeping and more subjective, was still a question of origin - a reflection of the intention and religious understanding that shaped the music.[21] In addition, other statements in his later documents testified to his continuing adherence to the principle of origin and associations. When he considered the question of which instruments should be

19 Ibid., p. 340.

20 Ibid., p. 346. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

21 The issue of the faith and intentions of the composer, a 20th century product, will be dealt with more fully in its chronological position at the end of the Outline, where the comparison of this idea with other principles will be more meaningful.

used in the liturgy, Pius XII classified instruments into three categories by origins: those fitted by nature and origin for sacred music; those, like strings, more easily adapted; and those proper to profane music. Not only this, but the instruments were not to produce sounds resembling those of secular music: "The sound of these [chosen] instruments [should] be produced in such manner and with such gravity (with a sort of religious chastity) as to avoid the clangour of profane music and to foster the devotion of the faithful".[22]

It cannot be said, therefore, that his writings broke with Pius X or his other predecessors by denying the significance of origin. He still supported the idea that the origins of music influenced its nature and that a secular origin and nature rendered music unfit for the liturgy. But he was no longer prepared to label a work irreligious because it used styles that had originated outside the Church and for secular functions, if its composer had used those styles with the intent of constructing a liturgically suitable work.[23]

The final document of the 20th century to deal with sacred music was the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* decreed by Vatican Council II in 1963. In this document, the cautious shift of Pius XII away from associating sanctity with any stylistic characteristic of music was overtaken by a definite desertion of the idea that the origins of music rendered it secular or sacred. In the *Constitution*, any music and instruments that had the right qualities were deemed acceptable for the liturgy. Furthermore, rather than determining what made music sacred and requiring that type of music to be used in the liturgy, Vatican Council II appeared to reverse the equation, stating that "...sacred music is to be considered the more holy, the more closely connected it is with the liturgical action, whether making prayer more pleasing, promoting unity of minds, or conferring greater solemnity upon the sacred rites".[24]

Over time, 'sacred', as defined by its origin or associations, was defined ever more narrowly, on account of papal attempts to overcome problems of their own time. This definition reached its apotheosis in the writings of Pius X, who defined sacred music as a particular style of

---

22 Ibid., pp. 369-70. In *Instruction on sacred music* (1958).

23 The issue of the faith and intentions of the composer, a 20th century product, will be dealt with more fully in its chronological position at the end of the Outline, where the comparison of this idea with other principles will be more meaningful.

24 Ibid., p. 383.

music. Maintained for several decades after his death, this strict stylistic definition was loosened slightly by the mid-20th century, particularly by taking the composer's faith as an alternative standard, and by encouraging the use of native music in the liturgy. Not long thereafter, the strict definition was entirely abandoned in favour of allowing any music that adhered to general principles.

2. Must inspire devotion, 0-20th c

The second, ancient criteria that distinguished sacred music was that it should inspire 'devotion'. Devotion was, curiously for a concept so frequently referred to, never really defined, but seems to consist of two connected elements: first, emotion; and second, thought concerned with God. Devotion was that which allowed people to feel their love for God, through an emotion associated with thoughts of God. Both these elements will be visible in the quotes given below.

Devotion has strong and obvious links with sacred music, for sacred music consists precisely of texts, which lift the mind to God, and music, which has a power, arguably unique in its force, to arouse emotion. The association of sacred music and devotion was first mentioned in the ninth century by Leo IV. He referred to sacred music as: "Musical art for the stirring up or moving more intensely of human spirits, in order to draw to the churches by the sound of its skilfully wrought melody, not just ecclesiastics, but even unlettered and hardened souls".[25]

John XXII, who, in the early 14th century, clamped down on the use of polyphony in the liturgy, fearing it encouraged an excessive concentration on pleasure given to the senses, was persuaded by 'devotion' to mitigate his ruling against polyphony: at Feasts and Offices, those consonances that didn't disguise the chant were permitted on the grounds that they "are pleasing to the ear and arouse devotion, and they prevent torpor among those who sing in honour of God".[26] Alexander VII, fighting the introduction of new styles of music into the liturgy during the 17th century, forbade the use of harmonized music that hindered devotion

25 Ibid., p. 8.

26 Ibid., p. 21.

and elevation of hearts to things that are above.[27] But his successor relented to allow motets to be sung at the Elevation or at Exposition "in order to nourish the devotion of the faithful", as long as the texts used were those specified by the Church.[28] In *Annus qui* (1749), Benedict XIII noted that chant, when sung properly, "excites the souls of the faithful to devotion and piety".[29]

During the 19th century, the rise of the liturgical movement and the intense interest in chant aroused by the work of the monks of Solesmes led to conscious consideration of what music could accomplish for religion. A letter of Pius IX stated that good church music should "recall minds from the allurements of human affairs and lead them to the consideration and contemplation of celestial goods".[30] The 19th century encyclical *Quod Sanctus Augustinus* (1894) applied a quote about the hymns and chants of the fourth century, taken from the writings of St Augustine - "a weaker soul rises to a sense of devotion for having heard and enjoyed it" - to the Gregorian chant of the 19th century.[31] Pius X, attempting a summary of all previous papal writings on sacred music in his *motu proprio* of 1903, defined the purpose of sacred music as being the sanctification and edification of the faithful.[32] Pius XI, referring to Gregorian chant, wrote that in the sacred liturgy, a chant should be employed "which is capable of raising the mind to God Almighty and better fitted than any other to foster the piety of the nations...".[33]

The 20th century saw a deepening papal concern that the faithful participate, both interiorly and exteriorly, in the liturgy. Sacred music was believed to have an important role in increasing that participation. Pius XI, in *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928), wrote that through

---

27 Ibid., p. 76. In *Piae sollicitudins* (1657).

28 Ibid., p. 81.

29 Ibid., p. 95.

30 Ibid., p. 128.

31 Ibid., p. 163.

32 Ibid., p. 225.

33 Ibid., p. 323.

Pius X's revivial of chant, "the faithful, imbued more deeply with liturgical sense, have gained the habit of participating more zealously in the Eucharistic rite, in singing the Psalms and in the public prayers".[34] In a private document, he added that through sacred music "the faithful are moved and they participate more religiously in the divine mysteries, and their souls are lifted up with greater courage, and they thereby concelebrate His great glory".[35]

Pius XII, while admitting modern music that conformed to the principles of sacred music articulated by the Church, did not hesitate to forbid any modern music that shocked "Christian taste, modesty and devotion" or offended "true religious sense".[36] In a fuller statement, taken from his first encyclical on sacred music, he repeatedly testifed to the importance of the link between sacred music and devotion: liturgical music should raise the minds of the faithful to God, moving them so that greater fruit was derived from the liturgy and revealed in a more Christian life; the "only purpose [of sacred art] is to give the faithful the greatest aid in turning their minds piously to God through the works it directs to their senses of sight and hearing"; sacred music had always had the purpose of contributing to "spiritual joy and the delight of the soul"; the organ was specially fitted to the liturgy because it moved souls by the "grandeur and sweetness of its tones", lifted the mind to God and higher things and gave the mind heavenly joy.[37]

There was, then, from the 9th century to the present, a continous and unchanging adherence by the popes to the principle that sacred music, through its combination of music capable of awakening emotion and text capable of lifting the mind to God, should arouse devotion in listeners of faith.

3. Must have expressive power, 0-14th c, 19th-20th c

The third ancient characteristic of sacred music identified by the papacy was expressive power.

---

34 Ibid., pp. 328-9.

35 Ibid., p. 334. In a letter to the archbishop of Toledo (1928).

36 Ibid., p. 341. In *Mediator Dei* (1947).

37 Ibid., pp. 346, 349-50 and 353. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

This characteristic was linked with the former, devotion, for it was music's power to express the meaning of the text that allowed it to have an emotional effect on the listener that was deemed appropriate for the liturgy. The mere arousal of emotion was certainly not desired by the popes. But emotion that helped to clarify the meaning of the liturgical texts, that deepened their effect by helping the listener to experience the text rather than simply read it: this was the body co-operating with the soul to bring the whole person to God and could be freely commended. Through expressive power, emotion became devotion. This quality was therefore understood by the popes to be fundamental to sacred music from the earliest centuries of Christianity.

Pope Gregory the Great, he after whom Gregorian chant was named, was the first to require sacred music to be expressive. Writing about the Feast of the Holy Innocents during the 6th century, he desired that the music for the feast should "associate us with the sentiments of the pious women who mourned the death of the Innocents".[38] He wanted the music to create in the listeners a sense of empathy with the sufferings of the mothers that would bring the feast to life for the faithful.

Between the 14th and the 19th centuries, references to expressiveness died out, as the papal focus moved onto other principles of sacred music. During these centures, writings on sacred music became more concerned with preventing abuses than with delineating goals. But in the 19th century, expressive power as an important principle of sacred music came to the forefront in papal writings. Leo XIII wrote in a letter to the monks at Solesmes that "it was to make the meaning of the words clear that the Gregorian melodies were composed in the first place, with perfect skill and taste. Provided only they are sung artfully, there is in them a great force which combines gentleness with solemnity, to reach into the souls of the hearers and to excite in them the movements of prayer and of salutary thoughts."[39]

Pius X testified to the link between expressive power and devotion in his *motu proprio* (1903), saying that sacred music illuminated the text with melody, so that the faithful, comprehending

38 Ibid., p. 7.

39 Ibid., p. 191.

its meaning more fully, would be roused to greater devotion and better disposed to receive grace fruitfully.[40] Pius XI, in a private letter, claimed that sacred music could, "As if by a flash of lightning...illuminate the various words of the worshippers".[41] And in *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955), Pius XII expressed his conviction that liturgical music should bring liturgical prayers to life. Chant is the Church's most favoured form of sacred music, he wrote, because the close conformity of melody to words conveys their meaning forcefully to mind. In considering the instruments suitable for liturgical use, he decided that strings were particularly acceptable because they "express the joyous and sad sentiments of the soul with an indescribable power".[42]

This latter quote reveals a second side to the expressive power required of sacred music. Not only text should be expressed, but also other sentiments appropriate to the Church, the liturgy or the Christian soul. A preface to the Vatican Edition of the *Graduale* (1908) stated that: "The chant which is used in the Liturgy should be clothed with those characteristics which alone make it sacred...It should...be able to reflect, with sweetness and exactness, the thoughts of the Christian soul".[43] Pius XI referred eloquently to chant as "the language of the liturgy",[44] and explained that the organ was approved for use in the Church where other instruments were not because it was suitable to support voices, to fill silence with "soft harmonies", to express "the majesty of the place" and to breathe "the sanctity of the rites".[45]

Expressive power has thus been seen as a central principle of sacred music by popes in those periods during which the relationship between music and liturgy has been harmonious enough to allow the popes to focus on desireable, rather than undesireable, traits of sacred music. This expressive power underwrote the devotion so consistently reiterated as a necessary effect

---

40 Ibid., p. 225.

41 Ibid., p. 334. In a letter to the Mechlin Institute of Sacred Music (1929).

42 Ibid., pp. 348, 351 & 353.

43 Ibid., p. 269.

44 Ibid., p. 324.

45 Ibid., p. 331. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928).

of sacred music and was applied by the papacy particularly to liturgical texts, but also to other sentiments.

4. Must be subject to text, 14th-20th c

The first great controversy over sacred music occurred in the 14th century, with the advent of polyphony. The great sweetness and beauty of the polyphonic harmonies raised in both popes and theologians alike the ancient fear of St Augustine (who loved music) that he might fall into sin by revelling too greatly in the 'delights of the ear'. "I perceive", he wrote, "that our minds are more devoutly and earnestly elevated into a flame of devotion by the holy words when they are thus sung than when they are not". Yet the "senses do not so attend on reason as to follow her patiently, but rather, having gained admission for her sake, they strive even to run on before her and be her leader."[46]

This fear that sensual[47] delight or emotion might overwhelm the intellect, so that the listener ceased to pay attention to the words and was immersed in purely human sensation, was particularly keen in the 14th century. John XXII, the first great campaigner against the practices of the *ars nova* and polyphony (probably at the instigation of the theologians of his time) believed that devotion was prevented by what he called 'sensuality without sense'. Sense in this context referred to the meaning, or sense, of the words. Sensuality without sense occurred whenever the text was rendered incoherent, for example, due to lack of pauses, when the dramatic gestures of musicians distracted listeners from or undermined the meaning of the text, or when the delight of the sound was so intoxicating as to disable the mind. He warned against delights to the ear which "intoxicate the ear but without satisfying it", drawing a clear analogy with the greed of drunkenness.[48] His attitude is clarified by a quote taken from the writings of a Cistercian monk writing during the same period, who explained that "...sound is not to be preferred to sense, but sound combined with sense, so as to be a help to greater

---

46 St Augustine, *The Confessions*, Book 10, Ch. 33. The Folio Society, London, 1993, p. 195.

47 'Sensual' here meaning not 'erotic', as the word is commonly interpreted today, but, rather, 'derived from the senses'.

48 Hayward, op cit., p. 21. In *De vita et honestate clericorum*, book 3, ch. 1 of *Extravagantes communes* (1324-1325).

fervour".[49]

Two centuries later, at the Council of Trent, different parties within the Church were still debating whether polyphonic music, which "delights the ears more than the mind and which is seen to excite the faithful to lascivious rather than to religious thoughts, should be taken away from the Masses".[50] Although the debate came down on the side of polyphony, there was nevertheless sufficient concern about excessive aural delight for the Council to decree that the "whole plan of singing in musical modes should be constituted not to give empty pleasure to the ear, but in such a way that the words may be clearly understood by all, and thus the hearts of the listeners be drawn to the desire of heavenly harmonies, in the contemplation of the joys of the blessed."[51]

When we find statements about 'understanding the text' multiplying in the papal writings about sacred music from the Council of Trent on, we need to bear in mind that the pursuit of textual clarity originated not in the desire to educate the faithful but in the concern to prevent sacred music from being an inducement to sensuality instead of the intended devotion. Quite possibly the whole Enlightenment focus on education and rationality sprang from this root. Sacred music was intended to feed the soul through the medium of the senses, not to feed the senses alone. The context of the 'clarity of the text' concern was therefore more the debate on the body-soul relationship than the debate about the value of educating the public.

In *Annus qui* (1749), the origins of concern for textual clarity are still quite evident:

> "Music must be executed in a serious and moderate manner, so that it not only charms the soul but above all gives first place to the meaning of what it sings and to what helps truly pious sentiments...If it is true, as We are told, that the figurative music of theaters is executed in such a way as to offer to all those listening to it a sense of delight and have them enjoy the rhythm, melody and

---

49 Ibid., p. 19. In *Speculum charitatis*, book 2, ch. 23, by St Aelred, Cistercian abbot of Rievaulx Abbey in Yorkshire, England (1109-1166).

50 Ibid., p. 27. Proposal discussed during meetings leading up to the Council (1562).

51 Ibid., p. 27. Proposed canon in the section dealing with liturgical abuses, from a general session of the Council held in 1562,

> music itself; and that those present get pleasure out of the sweetness of the various voices without perceiving, in most cases, the exact meaning of the words; this must not be so with ecclesiastical chant; in fact, for this the opposite must be sought."[52]

As a result of these considerations, he concluded, in line with St Augustine, that the music must not obscure or distract from the words, for our devotion should spring from words as well as music. The quote above indicates that the concern about excessive sensual delight was also at the heart of papal opposition to using theatrical styles of music in the liturgy.

In later centuries, the papacy continued to oppose any aspect of sacred music that might lead the faithful to neglect the texts, leaving them immersed in sensation alone. In the 19th century, therefore, we find exhortations against compositions and musicianship that were so brilliant as to distract.[53] Alongside these were instructions aimed at ensuring the text was audibly coherent - the text was to be included in its entirety, was to be repeated only moderately, in its original order, without inversion, at speaking speed, and was not to be confused by singing different words simultaneously - and precautions to ensure that sacred music, while possessing grace, colouring and "sweetness of religious mirth", was not excessively sweet.[54]

But during these last two centuries, the concern for textual clarity tended to become separated from the issue of balancing sensual delight with the delight of devotion. Of the three mechanisms for protecting textual clarity listed above, for example, only the last touched upon sensual delight, and neither of the first two were presented as causally related to the last. Again, Pius X's *motu proprio* (1903) ruled without further explanation that the text must be Latin, unchanged in words or ordering, audibly comprehensible and without excess repetition.[55] That he was not unaware of the rationale for these rules is clear from his

---

52 Ibid., p. 105.

53 Ibid., p. 135. In a regulation issued by the Vicar-General of Rome (1856).

54 Ibid., p. 136. In a decree (1856).

55 Ibid., pp. 226-7.

submission to the Congregation of Sacred Rites (1893), in which he explained that operatic music was unsuited to the Church because its goal was sense pleasure alone, its musical structure was designed to please crowds, and its text was adapted to the music rather than vice versa.[56] But the two concepts were no longer openly linked in papal documents.

The preface to the Vatican Edition of the *Graduale* (1908) stated, somewhat vaguely, that the "chant which is used in the Liturgy should be clothed with those characteristics which alone make it sacred, and which adapt it to the needs of the soul".[57] Pius XII, while encouraging the use of hymns to replace the "worldly songs, which because of the quality of their melodies or the frequently voluptous and lascivious words that go with them are a danger to Christians, especially the young",[58] did not explain how or why their melodies might endanger Christians. Nor did he express concern about music's power to overwhelm the intellect, although his directive that hymns must conform to Catholic doctrine and correctly express it with simple, calm, sparing words and melody suggests that he envisaged a clear, rather ascetic style for sacred music.[59]

Thus, although preserving the sense of the text from the sensuality of the music was an important concern of popes from the 14th century on, the means of this principle - textual clarity - became increasingly independent from its end - sensual restraint. Nonetheless, its ramifications for sacred music were considerable: the adoption of a polyphonic template in Palestrina's less emotive, strict contrapuntal style, the refusal to accept any theatrical characteristics in sacred music, and the emphasis on textual clarity were three consequences that strongly shaped the style of sacred music over time.

5. Must be subject to liturgy, 17th-20th c

In the 17th century, a different type of criteria for sacred music sprang up. Being the age of

---

56 Ibid., p. 207. In submission prepared for a commission on sacred music, while Patriarch of Venice.

57 Ibid., p. 269.

58 Ibid., p. 354.

59 Ibid., p. 353. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

instrumental music, all sorts of instruments hitherto strangers to the liturgy were introduced into the Mass. Styles of writing music developed outside the Church were used to compose liturgical music. These innovations raised concerns not only that attention might transfer from text to music, but that the liturgy might be disrupted by the physical characteristics or atmosphere of the music. From this time on, then, there poured forth from the Vatican a stream of directives designed to quarantine sacred music from developments in secular music or, at the least, to rein in sacred music to the pace of the liturgy.

The first, fairly general directive to ensure that sacred music was fitted to the liturgy came from Alexander VII, in *Piae sollicitudinis* (1657), which prohibited harmonized music that was either not in accord with ecclesiastical ritual or indecorous. This direction encompassed both the physical and spiritual character of the music, but without any specific instructions. By the 18th century, instructions focussed squarely on the physical characteristics of the music. Orchestral music, wrote Benedict XIII in *Annus qui* (1749), was permitted as long as it was serious, not too long, so as to bore or hold up the singers or the celebrant, and not too loud.[60] These instructions appear to be not very subtle allusions to the classical mass.

The 19th century documents displayed a deepened interest in conformity between sacred music and the spiritual atmosphere of the liturgy. Church music should be "in harmony with the sanctity of the house of God and the majesty of the divine rites", said Pius IX, in a letter to the German Society of St Cecilia.[61] The Congregation of Sacred Rites added that instrumental interludes should "correspond with the serious tone of sacred Liturgy".[62] A 19th century encyclical explained that chant was the only form of sacred music officially put out by the Church because chant was profoundly in harmony with "the spirit of the accompanying sacred function" and with the meaning of text and rite.[63]

Pius X summed up the concerns of the preceding three centuries in his *motu proprio* (1903).

---

60 Ibid., p. 105.

61 Ibid., p. 128.

62 Ibid., p. 137. In *Ordinatio quoad sacram musicam*, dated 1884.

63 Ibid., p. 141. In *De musica sacra*, dated 1894.

Modern music, he wrote, and, indeed, any good and beautiful development, was accepted by the Church insofar as it did not "offend against the laws of her liturgy".[64] This meant, for example, that each Mass or Office part had to be retained as an undivided unity, not divided into independent sections so as to take the forms of arias, concerti, etc; or, again, that music must not dominate or hold up the liturgy. In a pastoral letter to his Venetian clergy and congregations, he compressed the various ideas into a one line principle: music must serve liturgy, not liturgy music.[65]

Papal attempts to ensure that sacred music fitted the liturgy in form and spirit continued into the first half of the 20th century. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928), Pius XI took up and justified the principle of service articulated by Pius X. Beginning with the statement that the arts should "serve divine worship as most noble ministers", he went on to point out that such service was not in any way "to the detriment but rather to the greater dignity and splendour of these arts themselves when they are employed in holy places".[66] Pius XII, in *Musicae sacrae disciplinae* (1955), explained in greater detail why and how sacred music should serve the liturgy. Standards of sacred art, he wrote, apply "in a stricter and holier way" to sacred music than to other arts because sacred music not only provides the setting for the liturgy but is a performed part of the liturgy. Thus sacred music must serve the liturgy and anything unbecoming to liturgy or distracting to the faithful's concentration on God must be avoided. The example of unbecoming or distracting sacred music provided was a "heavy and bombastic" style of polyphony, which obscured the words by exaggerating them, hindered the other elements of the liturgy and challenged overmuch the competence of the singers.[67]

So in the 17th century a new, less theological and more practical criteria for defining sacred music was born. Its conception was linked to the forms of music then being used in the liturgy, and its continued presence in papal writings until the mid-20th century indicates that these forms of music went on being used despite the papal instructions. Starting as a fairly

64 Ibid., p. 225.

65 Ibid., pp. 217, 227 & 230.

66 Ibid., p. 328.

67 Ibid., pp. 341, 349 & 353.

general direction that sacred music should fit the liturgy, it solidified into a series of concrete instructions about the precise forms that sacred music should and should not take, which were then trimmed into a carefully explained and justified principle.

In this fifth principle, distinct overtones of earlier principles appear. Surely the idea that music must serve liturgy is reminiscent of principle four, which asserted that music must serve text? And, again, the concept that the tone of sacred music should be one with that of the liturgy resembles closely the idea, found in principle three, that sacred music should be able to express the spirit of the liturgy, an idea which was itself linked to the capacity of music to create devotion in the listener (principle two). Thus, in the course of analysing each principle sequentially, there emerges a pattern of linkages and interdependency which suggests that, underlying the various types of instruction on sacred music, there may be an integrated concept of what makes music sacred.

6. Must be choral, not solo, 17th c, 19th-20th c

The musical practices of the 17th century generated a second practical principle: that music used in the liturgy should be written for choral, not solo voices. The thrust of this principle was that individuals should not be spotlit during the liturgy: first, because, while a human offering, the liturgy's attention was properly focused on the object of the offering (God), not on the giver (man); and second, because man's role in the liturgy was collective - the Mass was understood to be a sacrificial act of all mankind, caught up in the person of Christ. To focus on an individual, and particularly on personal ability, character or emotions, was at odds with the liturgy. Ideally, the anonymity of the priest, carefully preserved by his ritualised stance, movements, clothing and words, would be reflected in the attitude of other participants.

In practice, this 'collective' principle took two main forms. The first, and earlier, form clamped down on solo styles of singing that allowed singers to use sacred music as a showcase for their vocal skill. Thus Alexander VII, in *Piae sollicitudinis* (1657), directed that no solos were to be sung in psalms, hymns or motets. This rule was relaxed slightly to allow psalmodic

solos alternating between high and low voices but only when chant was not sung in choir (for example, when sung in a private home). Again, a 19th century decree prohibited forms of music that, born in the theatre, were designed to be sung solo or to showcase the singer (for example, recitative and arias).[68] And Pius X's *motu proprio* (1903) permitted solos only as secondary emphases, explaining that sacred music was properly choral.[69]

The second form taken by the collective principle did not appear in papal documents until the time of Pius XII. The principle, in this form, upheld the 'impersonal' nature of sacred music, attempting to prevent its subversion to personal expression or musical experimentation. Hence, Pius XII held that modern art which expressed the artist's taste or talent over any devotional theme should be excluded from the precincts of churches.[70] Some years later, in a section of *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955) devoted to defining in some depth the purpose and place of art in creation, he added that art, like all human works, was subject to the divine law and did not exist to satisfy the artist's own whims or curiosity.[71] His reservations about modern music (noted above, in the principle of origins) can thus be traced back to its tendency to be highly personal or experimental.

The collective principle primarily aimed to ensure that sacred music adhered to the spirit of the liturgy, which, as a human offering to God, was inherently collective, and therefore impersonal. Although it spanned a period from the 17th to the 20th century, documents from the 18th century, the era of opera, failed, curiously, to mention it once. Also not mentioned explicitly in the Vatican II documents, it was nonetheless embraced by the Vatican II directive that sacred music conform to the spirit of the liturgy.

7. Must be vocal, not instrumental, 18th-20th c

The principle that sacred music was properly vocal, not instrumental, appeared in papal

---

68 Ibid., p. 136.

69 Ibid., p. 228.

70 Ibid., p. 340. In *Mediator Dei* (1944).

71 Ibid., p. 350.

documents from the 18th to the 20th century. A certain wariness of instruments had long been a feature of Christian thought - probably because instruments had played an incendiary role in pagan rituals. But in the 18th century there developed in the papal writings a definite move to define the voice as the primary instrument of the liturgy and ensure the subordination of other instruments to the voice. Once more, this move is clearly linked to developments in secular music: the orchestra, whose volume could overwhelm even a choir of voices; and forms of tonal music that, possessing their own interior logic, could stand independent of text or attributed meanings. Such forms splintered music from text, putting at risk sacred music's intrinsically expressive nature. To safeguard the voice was to preserve the presence of text.

Benedict XIII allotted a large proportion of *Annus qui* (1749) to considering the opinions held by leading Christian figures on the use of instruments in the liturgy. He concluded that certain instruments should be permitted, for the general drift of opinion held that they helped to impress the text's meaning in the minds of the listeners and to move their souls to contemplate spiritual things, thereby inspiring them to love God and divine things more deeply. However, still following the majority opinion, he also decreed that instruments were not to play continuously, to try to produce thrills, or to drown out or obscure the voices and the meaning of the words.[72]

A 19th century document further articulated the primary place of the voice in liturgy, ruling that instrumental music should "sustain and enrich the singing and not be the master...[nor should it] overpower it, make it subordinate and treat it as a matter of secondary consideration."[73] Pius X, as always, stated the principle plainly: sacred music was properly vocal, so instruments were to support, not overwhelm, voices. He added that all permitted instrumental music must conform to the principles of sacred music and to the nature of the organ, implying thereby that the organ was an instrument which by nature fulfilled the requirements of sacred music.[74]

---

72 Ibid., p. 105.

73 Ibid., p. 136-7. In a decree of Pius IX (1856), addressed to composers.

74 Ibid., p. 229. In his *motu proprio* (1903).

Pius XI wrote in support of the primary place allotted to voice in the liturgy on numerous occasions, and provided new justifications for its pre-eminence. Dealing first of all with the competition, he dismissed orchestral music as "a kind of music which in no way befits the sacred offices, particularly on account of its immoderate use of instruments. We hereby declare that chant combined with orchestra is by no means considered by the Church as a more perfect form of music or more suited to sacred things. It is proper that the voice itself rather than musical instruments should be heard in the churches; that is, the voice of the clergy, singers and congregation." Then, moving to justification, he explained: "It must not be thought that the Church is opposed to the advance of musical art in preferring the human voice to any instrument: but no instrument, however excellent and perfect, can surpass the human voice in expressing the feelings of the soul, most of all when it is used by the mind to offer prayer and praise to Almighty God".[75]

In a speech given in 1933, he expressed more detailed preferences regarding the voice: the voices of boys, "better than others even highly cultivated, invite one to prayer and devotion by the charm of their innocence, their peculiar efficacy and perfection".[76] He rounded off his point by asserting that the human voice was "the noblest instrument created by God", and had chief place in liturgy by right.[77] While not actually banning instruments, therefore, Pius XI clearly felt that voice alone was the most effective incitement to full participation in the spirit of the liturgy.

Pius XII had a more restrained view of the the virtues of the voice and was more inclined to concede that instruments could increase the devotional effect of voices. He allowed instruments other than the organ to be used in the liturgy as long as they helped achieve splendour and devotion, did not play profane, clamorous or strident works, nor anything undignified or out of place, and as long as they were not used to produce extraordinary or unusual effects.[78] However, he, too, upheld the importance of the human contribution to

75 Ibid., p. 331. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928).

76 Ibid., p. 336. In a speech concerning the Congress of the Society of St Cecilia, given in Regensburg (1933).

77 Ibid., p. 336.

78 Ibid., p. 353. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

sacred music, forbidding the use of "automatically operated instruments" in the liturgy.[79]

All these decrees revolved round the principle that sacred music should be an offering to God that came forth from man. The more human the matter of the music, the more fitted that music was to be an integral part of man's worship of God; and, vice versa, the more mechanized the music, the less suitable to liturgy. Not only must man produce the music, he must be physically present to produce it. Where actual physical presence was lacking, for example, in recordings, music was deemed unfit for the liturgy. An analogy would be sending, in response to an invitation to a formal dinner party, a series of recorded monologues in place of one's own presence - a gesture faintly insulting to the dignity of the host and also a subtle denial of the irreplaceable quality of a living presence. The principle of primacy of the voice attempted to ensure that the performance of sacred music was an unmediated offering of human worship.

8. Must increase splendour of liturgy, 18th and 20th c

Another quality the 18th century deemed indispensable to sacred music was a capacity to increase the splendour of the liturgy for the honour of God. Although it would seem this capacity was always understood by the Church - the habit of using polyphony on more important feasts, for example, witnessed to the Church's comprehension of the role music could play in enhancing splendour - the papacy did not explicitly represent it as a function of sacred music until the 18th century.

The first mention of this function was in the encyclical *Quod aliquantum* (1791), written by Pius VI to the clergy in the newly republican France. In the letter Pius VI praised the Gallican Rite of the liturgy, saying it "gave to ecclesiastics...a means of ...nourishing piety, arousing the faithful's devotion and attracting them by means of chant and the splendour of ceremonies to fulfil their religious duties and thereby merit new graces".[80] Pius X, XI and XII, as one, attributed to sacred music the faculty of enhancing splendour: the purpose of sacred music is

79 Ibid., p. 369. In *Instruction on sacred music* (1958).

80 Ibid., p. 113.

to give glory to God through enhancing the beauty and splendour of the liturgy, wrote Pius X;[81] chant gives "dignity and splendour to the Divine Office" agreed Pius XI;[82] and Pius XII, distinguishing between the different forms of sacred music, noted that liturgical music was intended to embellish religious ceremony and increase the honour given to God.[83]

Capacity to increase the splendour of liturgy was a power that Vatican Council II continued to hold up as a defining principle of sacred music. The 1963 *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* held that: "Liturgical worship is given a more noble form when the divine offices are celebrated solemnly in song with the assistance of sacred ministers and the active participation of the people."[84]

Although articulated quite late in the Church's history, this faculty of sacred music was recognized in practice certainly from the introduction of polyphony. Given the usual papal practice of articulating a principle only when violations of that principle arose, the fact that this principle came more to the fore in the 20th century than in any previous century indicates either that the type of music then being used in the liturgy lacked the power to enhance splendour or that the use of *any* type of music in the liturgy was waning. The principle's absence from papal documents during the 19th century, when the Church underwent a resurgence of interest in chant, lends further credence to these hypotheses.

9. Must be universal, 19th-20th c

From the 19th century on, the popes seem to have felt that sacred music should possess some sort of unity across time and space. Papal instructions groped vaguely around what was to become the principle of universality, but no pope prior to Pius X succeeded in defining universality as a quality of sacred music. Pius IX, Leo XIII and Pius X[85] hoped that

81 Ibid., p. 225. In *motu proprio* (1903).

82 Ibid., p. 329. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928).

83 Ibid., pp. 346 & 348. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

84 Ibid., p. 383.

85 Pius X strongly promoted universal resort to the Vatican Edition of the *Graduale*.

universality could be achieved in sacred music by encouraging all dioceses to follow the same liturgical practice as Rome - a spatial unity.[86] Pius X, and others in the Church who sided firmly with Solesmes during the furor over approving the Solesmes version of the chant, also showed signs of seeking a universality based on adherence to the musical practice of those who first created Gregorian chant - a temporal unity.[87] Yet in his *motu proprio* (1903), Pius X ultimately rejected both these views, cutting through the confusion with the incisive insight that universality did not mean uniformity.

While he believed that sacred music should possess a unity that reflected the unity of belief,[88] he defined universality not as identical music, but as unity of style and spirit. The *motu proprio* laid down two guidelines for assessing whether music was universal or not. The first stated that in univeral music, national traditions should be so oriented to the principles of sacred music that their presence did not scandalize visitors. The second held up Gregorian chant as a model of style and spirit by which other works could be rated: "...the more a musical composition for use in church is like Gregorian Chant in its movement, its inspiration, and its feeling, so much the more is it right and liturgical, and the more it differs from this highest model, so much the less is it worthy of the house of God".[89] Whatever the sacred quality was, that could appeal universally across time and space, Gregorian chant possessed it most fully. Neither of the guidelines prescribed a certain type of music as normative for the universal Church, as earlier understandings of universality had. Both allowed any form of music but tested their status as sacred music by their degree of universality.

Pius X's readiness to nominate a particular form of music as the template for sacred music, even if only in general terms of style and spirit, derived from his belief that musical taste did not change essentially over time. This view, perhaps based on the belief that beauty, like goodness and truth, was universally recognizable to human nature, could be glimpsed in his exhortation to restore chant, "which formed the delight of past generations in the fairest days

---

86 Ibid., pp. 154-5, 157, & 159-60.

87 Pius X favoured the Solesmes restoration of the chant to its "primitive purity". Ibid., p. 256. In a *motu proprio* (1904).

88 Ibid., p. 205.

89 Ibid., p. 225.

of Christian piety".[90] Such an exhortation implied that music which had delighted people in the past would continue to delight them in the present. The Vatican Edition of the *Graduale* presented the same idea in slightly different terms: "The chant which is used in the Liturgy should be...catholic - that is, it should meet the needs of all peoples, climes, ages".[91]

After Pius X's reign, the principle of universality slid from view, reappearing in a new guise during Pius XII's pontificate. Pius XII utilized the term 'universality' but nudged its meaning sideways. In proposing that sacred music be universal, Pius XII meant that all Catholics should use and be familiar with it: "in this way...", he wrote, "the unity and the universality of the Church may shine forth more powerfully every day".[92] Because he did not consider universality an intrinsic quality of the music, he could not retain chant as a role model of universality. Chant, he thought, should be a consoling mark of the unity of the Church.[93] But, while firm in its applause, he did not set it up as a standard of spirit or style. Pius XII had, then, shifted away from understanding universality as a quality by which sacred music could be recognized,[94] and towards understanding it as an outcome of successful management policy.

Of all ten principles, universality was the most indefinable. Resting upon the idea of a common human nature, albeit a spiritual nature, it implied the presence of a quality that was universally appealing: universal music had some element deep within that touched all who heard it, regardless of cultural background or era. Note, it was not the *universality* that was appealing, but the quality or element within the music, let us call it holiness, for example. But universality was the *quality* of appealing to all humanity. Holiness possessed the quality of universality. Universality, in its turn, implied the presence of holiness.

Universality was also the most variably interpreted principle of the ten. All popes who dealt with the concept had the idea that sacred music should be unified over time and/or space in

---

90 Ibid., p. 252.

91 Ibid., p. 269.

92 Ibid., p. 351.

93 idid., p. 351.

94 Ibid., pp. 345 & 351. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

some way. Most applied this idea in a prescriptive fashion, encouraging or commanding the same form of sacred music to be used across time and space. Popes who took this view attempted to apply a particular musical form from a certain time or place to the entire Church (while not, of course, prohibiting other forms). Pius X's understanding of universality stepped outside this prescriptive concept: he replaced the prescription designed to render sacred music universal with a principle designed to render sacred music recognizable by its universality. It is the latter definition only that allows universality to be considered one of the principles that makes music sacred.

10. Must be aesthetic

The other principle of sacred music to be produced by the 19th century was the requirement that sacred music should be of a high aesthetic quality. Aesthetic quality encompassed two distinct, though related, concepts: beauty and artistic quality.

Beauty, 19th-20th c

The insistence that the Church have a care for "the beauty and uniformity of Ecclesiastical Music"[95] developed in the 19th century: the phrase, "the beauty of chant", cropped up in *Quod Sanctus Augustinus* (1894).[96] However it only flourished fully during the 20th century.

Pius X maintained that sacred music must be beautiful to fit "the beauty of the House of God".[97] In dealing with the problem of musical progress, he used beauty as part of a twofold criteria for discerning what developments should be permitted as part of the liturgy: the Church "admits to the service of her functions whatever is good and beautiful in their development during different centuries".[98] Pius XI referred to chant in terms of beauty, holding that through Pius X's reforms, "the ancient beauty of an exquisite art has begun to

95 Ibid., p. 159. In a decree about the Ratisbon Edition of the Graduale (1883), later rejected.

96 Ibid., p. 163.

97 Ibid., pp. 225 & 240.

98 Ibid., p. 225. In his motu proprio (1903).

revive and a religious spirit to flourish and prosper".[99]

Musicae sacrae disciplina (1955) linked the concept of beauty to sacred music in a number of ways. First, explaining how sacred music was to be made beautiful, Pius XII stated that the beauty of sacred music would logically follow from its holiness, for the beauty of art reflected divine beauty. It was on this account that art was able to help man reach his supernatural end. Second, he made beauty one of the ends of liturgical music, saying that it should beautify and embellish the voices of priest and people and the ceremony as a whole. Third, he attributed to beauty a missionary role, advising missionaries to use the beauty of the chant melodies in mission countries to convert the people to Christian truths. By this stance he allied himself with Pius X in endorsing the universal human appeal of beauty, particularly the beauty of chant.[100]

Artistry, 20th c

The second concept, artistry, did not appear in papal documents until the 20th century but featured strongly in papal thought throughout that century. Without artistic quality, Pius X wrote, music cannot be good and therefore cannot inspire the soul.[101] From this earlier thought flowed the precept found in his *motu proprio* (1903), that sacred music must be a fine art so as to accomplish what the art of sound can in man.[102] The Vatican Edition of the *Graduale* (1908) also listed as one of the characteristics that made chant sacred its combination of "simplicity with perfect art".[103]

Pius XI followed up Pius X's statement that beauty would naturally proceed from holiness by applying the same idea to art: "...whatever proceeds from the interior life of the Church transcends even the most perfect works of this world". This was why so many works of "high

99 Ibid., pp. 328-9. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928).

100 Ibid., pp. 345, & 350-1.

101 Ibid., p. 205. In his submission to a commission on sacred music, while Patriarch of Venice (1893).

102 Ibid., p. 225.

103 Ibid., p. 269.

artistic achievement" had come down to them from the Christian past.[104]

In keeping with his reluctance to set up a single form of music as the template for sacred music and his consequent acceptance of modern music as a suitable liturgical style, Pius XII wrote in *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955) that determining what music was appropriate for liturgy was "not a case of drawing up laws of aesthetics or technical rules that apply to the subject of music". Nonetheless, he reproved artists who refused to accept any boundaries, even 'religious or moral', to their artistic freedom and hence introduced into the church art "completely at variance with the right rules of art".[105] Artistic quality, in Pius XII's theology, eschewed an extremity of style that ignored art's rightful subjection to "man's last end".[106] Thus, in *Mediator Dei* (1947) he had ruled that modern art which was imbalanced in style (that is, too realistic or too symbolic) should be excluded.[107] Like Pius X, he praised the simple, plain modes of chant, so artfully composed that they universally moved listeners to admiration and provided an almost inexhaustible source of melody for composers. He also welcomed the artistic potential of polyphony, which, when it had "artistic purity and richness of melody", could increase the magnificence of divine worship and move the faithful to religious dispositions.[108]

High aesthetic quality, a combination of beauty and artistry, was thus pinpointed by 19th and 20th century popes as a feature that should mark sacred music. Without it, and particularly without beauty, music was not considered acceptable for the liturgy. The insistence on beauty - in theology, the radiance of divine being and inseparable sister of goodness and truth[109] - was unsurprising. Artistry, probably understood simply as technical skill in earlier references, became took on greater importance when it was defined by Pius XII as a subjection of the artist's whim to the supernatural role of art in human life. Flavours of principle nine, with its

---

104 Ibid., p. 332. In *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (1928).

105 Ibid.,, p. 348.

106 Ibid., p. 348.

107 Ibid., p. 340.

108 Ibid., pp. 350-1. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

109 See O'Donaghue, N: "A theology of beauty" in *The Analogy of Beauty* by John Riches (ed.). T. & T. Clark Ltd, Edinburgh, 1986, p. 1; and Balthasar, H.U.V: *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 1. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1982, p. 18.

rejection of individual expression, and principle five, which ensured the subjection of the human to the divine, are plain in this definition. Beauty, which reflected the inner 'form' or essence of art, and artistic quality, which governed its outward form, thus became witnesses to the properly sacred nature of the music used in the liturgy.

1.1. Must by composed by Catholic, 20th c

As mentioned in principle one, this faith of the composer is a sub-section of the origins and associations principle. I have separated the two because the emergence of this particular strand of thought only in the 20th century is, I think, significant and the correspondence between developments in human thought generally and papal thought on sacred music is demonstrated more clearly by presenting this principle in its chronological position. Moreoever, the following discussion about conflict between this and other principles makes little sense without a prior understanding of the other principles.

In the first principle, music was considered sacred if it was written for the Church in a style that originated in the Church. The popes believed that music written for secular purposes (for example, aural pleasure) would be shaped by those purposes into a style that jarred with or even contradicted the intentions of the liturgy. In addition, such a style would carry with it associations of secular situations. Hence, music written in those styles was not to be used in the liturgy, even if the composer had written specifically for the Church and employed a sacred subject.[110] In centuries prior to the 20th, then, the intention of the composer was not a central consideration.

In the 20th century, however, it began to hold a more important place in papal thought on sacred music. The century began with Pius X's summary of the principle that had held until that point in time. Writing in a submission to a commission on sacred music (1893), he explained bluntly that sacred music was not made sacred by mere intention: "They wrote their music [of secular origin] in the spirit of piety and also tried to give a better expression to the

110 While it could be pointed out that music written in those styles had in fact always been used in the liturgy, PiusX himself replied to that argument in his submission to the commission on sacred music in 1893: "We might say that any music which has been performed under the vigilant authority of the Church is good. This is true, yet some people forget also that this same music had really been openly condemned." Ibid., p. 211.

words of the sacred text by adding music to it. If this is a good enough excuse to absolve thecomposers, certainly it does not save their compositions".[111] His willingness to indicate certain musical styles as intrinsically sacred and others as intrinsically secular flows smoothly from this argument.

Pius XII, as we have seen, shifted his stance on the question of how inexorably musical style was shaped by its origins. Logically, therefore, his perspective on compositional intention also altered. "...The house of God", he wrote, "should open its portals to the new, which...is composed by gifted artists in a true Catholic spirit, even though in the modern style and contemporary technique".[112] Not only did he attribute more influence over the spirit and effect of a piece of music to the composer's intention than to the origins and associations of its style, but he was convinced that the composer's faith determined his capacity to write sacred music. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1954), he stated that an artist without faith was incapable of sacred art, for lacking "the inward eye with which he might see what God's majesty and His worship demand", his works would not "breathe forth the piety and faith that befit God's temple and His holiness", however technically brilliant they might be. In summary, he believed that sacred art was an expression of the artist's piety, worship and love of God, and the truths he held.[113]

Now this was not intrisically opposed to the former attitudes of the Church. If the popes had believed that it was essential for sacred music to have originated in the Church, it was presumably because they believed that the music's style would be shaped by the faith of the Church. Pius XII was saying much the same thing, but was narrowing the idea down to the single composer. However, stating that sacred music was an expression of the artist's faith and piety ran dangerously close to endorsing sacred music as a form of personal expression - precisely the individualistic quality that earlier popes tried to avoid by defining impersonality as a quality essential to sacred music's harmony with the collective nature of liturgy (see principle six). There was a fine line here between sacred music as 'an expression of the piety

111 Ibid., p. 208.

112 Ibid., p. 345. In *Mediator Dei*, dated 1947.

113 Ibid., p. 349.

of the Christian soul' (approved in principle three) and sacred music as 'an expression of the piety of the composer's soul' (disapproved in principle nine). Taken one way, 'the artist's piety, worship and love of God, and the truths he holds' could be assumed to be those common to all Catholics. Yet taken another way - and Pius XII's phraseology allowed this interpretation - it could be read as granting the composer approval to use sacred music as a medium for his personal religious feelings and convictions.

It needs to be borne in mind, however, that Pius XII, in writing about sacred music, had in mind not only liturgical music but music designed to be used at a variety of more or less liturgical functions. He defined religious music, for example, as a form of sacred music, not intended for liturgy, which expressed and aroused pious sentiment by means of the composer's intention or the subject of the work.[114] Hymns, permitted in the liturgy on certain occasions, sprang forth from 'religious sentiment' but the sentiment was one "with which human beings have been endowed by the Creator Himself" - that is, a human, not an individual, response.[115] It seems likely, therefore, that he adhered to the principle that liturgical music should not express the individual, and determined the degree of personal expression permissable by the degree to which a function was liturgical.

Nevertheless, in refusing to prohibit any particular style of music from the liturgy, Pius XII credited the composer with more power to overcome the effects of a style's origins (by bending the style to express his own intentions) than popes had hitherto been willing to grant to him. In so doing, he moved away from the traditional papal view that music which sprang from sources outside the Church for non-religious purposes was irretrievably stamped with the mark of its origins and burdened by inappropriate associations.

These are the ten principles of sacred music that stand out in papal thought as elements essential to qualify music as sacred. Several other strands of thought cropped up frequently in that context also, but were later discarded because I concluded that they did not contribute to understanding what popes thought made music sacred. These were:

---

114 Ibid., p. 359. In *Instruction on sacred music*, dated 1958.

115 Ibid., p. 358.

1. *Sacred music has the power to attract people to church.* This statement implied no more than that some people liked sacred music and, on that account, if no other, came to church. Turned into a principle - sacred music should attract people to church - it would imply that sacred music should universally arouse a liking strong enough to act as a motive for church attendance, which the papacy very sensibly did not try to claim. Nor did the statement really say anything about the nature of the music, whereas the requirement that music should cause devotion, while it, too, referred to an effect of sacred music on the listener, implied something about the emotional power of the music and how the music should relate to the text.

2. *Sacred music should be performed devoutly.* This statement clearly concerned the style of performance, not the style of the music.

3. *Lay participation in sacred music increases the grandeur, symbolic unity and fruitfulness of the liturgy.* This was a concept whose inclusion I debated over for some time. Not being mentioned until Pius XI's era, it was nonetheless strongly emphasized by Pius XII. However, it was, again, something which concerned more the way music was performed than the nature of the music. Furthermore, to conclude from this statement that Pius XI and XII believed that lay participation was an essential element of sacred music would contradict the views they expressed frequently and forthrightly in the same documents.

4. *Music is sacred to the extent that it is involved with sacred activity, for example the liturgy and the Eucharist.* This statement said nothing about the music. It simply indicated that holy things rendered whatever interacted with them holy also.

5. *Sacred music should express the culture of the people engaged in liturgical worship.* Put forward by 20th century popes from Pius XII on, this was a recommendation, rather than a principle by which sacred music could be distinguished from non-sacred. It was not directed towards sacred music as a whole, but only to sacred music used as

a means to help missionize non-Christian peoples, It was, however, a significant recommendation, because it seemed to diverge from the earlier view that Christian and pagan music should be distinct because the origins of a musical style would govern its effect on the listener. This issue is examined in Appendix 1.

Part 2...Discussion

Types of principle

The following section of this thesis divides the ten principles into more general categories that define which aspect of the music rendered it sacred: its origins, its effect on the listener, its structure or a quality within the music. In some principles, more than one aspect of the music was involved. Only the two most important have been shown in Table 1. Grouping the principles thus by category makes it easy to identify which principles are of practical value for identifying sacred music and which are more abstract. In addition, the links between the principles and the patterns of thought over time stand out more sharply from the mass of data.

Table 1. What makes music sacred, by category

No.	*Century*	*Content of principle*	*Category*	*Secondary category*
1	1st	No pagan/secular origins/ associations	Origin & associations	Quality (expressiveness)
1.1	20th	Composed by Catholic	Origin & associations	Quality (expressiveness)
2	1st	Causes devotion	Effect	
3	1st	Expressive (of Catholic faith)	Quality (expressiveness)	Effect (on devotion)
4	14th	Subject to text	Structure	
5	17th	Subject to liturgy	Structure	Quality (expressiveness)
6	17th	Individual subject to collective (choral)	Structure	Quality (expressiveness)
7	17th	Mechanical subject to human (vocal)	Structure	Quality (expressiveness)
8	18th	Adds splendour to liturgy	Quality (expressiveness)	Effect (on devotion)
9	19th	Universal	Quality	
10	20th	Aesthetic (beautiful and artistic)	Quality	Quality (expressiveness)

In principle one, the *origins and associations* of sacred music were considered to be what made music sacred. The origins principle rested on a premise that the composer, consciously or unconsciously, shaped the music to express his faith and his purpose in composing. Because origins and associations *cause* the structure and quality of the music, and, hence, also

cause its effect, this first principle does not fall within any of the other categories and must be grouped on its own. Origins and associations can be deemed 'objective' criteria because origins, at least, can be factually ascertained through research, and associations follow logically from the origins and uses of music. This is, then, a principle that can be practically applied to identify sacred music.

Effect was a second criterion by which music could be identified as sacred. Sacred music was expected to cause devotion in the listener. Devotion encompassed two distinct effects, one on the emotions, one on the mind. First, sacred music should, by arousing an emotion associated with religious ideas, enhance the emotional committment of the listener to God and to anything associated with God, for example, the saints or the Church. Second, sacred music should deepen the listener's understanding of and empathy for whatever the music was composed to express, be it the theme of a feast or a few lines of text. By associating their own emotion with the theme or text, the listener made that idea more his own, thereby entering into a fuller union with the mind of the Church, and deepened his understanding of biblical or theological concepts. Two of the other principles, while being primarily qualities of the music, were also expected to have this effect on the listener. Effect is, then, a subsidiary of the quality category as well as a category in its own right.

The category of effect is more difficult to use as a practical means of identifying sacred music, for, in that it concerns the feelings of the listener, it is a subjective criterion. While it is possible to conduct a survey of listeners to find out their reactions to different pieces of music, the survey, being limited to late 20th century listeners, would not be representative, and the results, being based on a subjective question, would still be a (possibly) objective collection of subjective responses.

Many of the principles required music to possess a certain *quality* to qualify as sacred music. The most common quality required was the ability to express a meaning beyond itself. A principle in itself, expressiveness also played a part in virtually all the other principles. For example, music's subjection to liturgy partly depended on the idea that music could express the spirit of the liturgy. And again, beauty was seen as an expression of divine beauty. But

although a capacity to express the spirit of the liturgy or other concepts of the Catholic faith was referred, the papacy most commonly required music to express the meaning of its text.

The second, rather amorphous, quality required of sacred music - universality - was defined as the quality of appealing to all humanity. Its presence was a sign that the music possessed some quality such as holiness, beauty or goodness, which was inherently compatible with the sacred because it expressed divine attributes. Recognisable at the level of human nature, it immediately marked music out as sacred to its listeners, regardless of the culture from which they came and the forms of music they were used to.[116]

Third, sacred music was defined by the aesthetic qualities of beauty and artistic merit. Beauty was also premised on the concept of human nature, being understood as a quality immediately and naturally perceptible to that faculty of human beings designed to know beauty in any material object or rational concept. Artistic merit was a derivative concept, founded on beauty, but extended to assess more objective aspects of music, such as technical excellence and stylistic balance.

The qualities that were seen as essential to sacred music were mostly, then, immaterial or even mystical in nature. Erecting concrete criteria by which their presence in music could be tested was almost impossible, and the papacy rarely offered any, apparently relying upon the weight of tradition, accepted canons and human nature to support their claims that these qualities were "found most perfectly in Gregorian chant" and "to a high degree in music of the Roman school, which reached its greatest perfection in the sixteenth century under Pierluigi da Palestrina".[117] They would also have relied upon the reaction of a common human nature to what were at the time regarded as at least partly objective qualities. Today these qualities would be widely regarded as subjective, but there is continuing debate amongst music philosophers and aestheticians over the objective presence of qualities in music.[118]

---

116 The quality of universality was also understood less mystically as the universal use of a single form of music, but such a definition makes no point about the nature of the music, and is not here considered as one the principles of sacred music.

117 Hayburn, op cit, p. 225. In the *motu proprio* of Pius X, dated 1903.

118 See, for example, Graham, G: 'The value of music' in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 53, no. 2, Spring 1995, pp. 139-153; and Raffman, D: 'Towards a cognitive theory of musical ineffability' in *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 41, June 1988, pp. 685-706.

The final category of principles defining sacred music was *structural*: sacred music had to be structurally subject to the text and liturgy, so that its form derived from these rather than from any stylistic imperative; individual expression or roles had to be kept subject to the properly collective nature of sacred music; and instruments were to be subject to voice. These are all objective criteria that can be practically applied to distinguish sacred music.

Table 1 displays not only the broad categories within which the ten principles of sacred music fall, but also the tendency of the principles to originate in clusters of a particular category. Leaving aside the three pre-Renaissance principles, the period from the 14th to the 17th centuries was characterised by a focus on structural principles, while the 18th to the 20th centuries saw a focus on qualitative principles. This tendency testifies once more to the links between musical and ideological developments and papal definitions about the nature of sacred music.

Part 3...Conclusions

Premises and themes

In the preceding description and discussion of the ten principles, certain concepts have cropped up repeatedly, some acting as premises to the principles, others emerging as themes. The premises, drawn from a theological framework largely synthesised by the time of the Renaissance, have come under sustained questioning in more recent centuries. Two concern music: namely, that music can possess immaterial qualities and can express ideas. The other two concern man: that man has a common physiological, emotional and intellectual makeup that identifies him as a human being, and that man, as a mixture of both matter and spirit, is capable of perceiving spiritual qualities. All ten principles, and, indeed, even the conviction that 'sacred music' is a form of music characterised by more than simply presence in the liturgy, are founded on one or another of these four premises.

Three themes jut out well above the jostling stream of thoughts that comprise the ten

principles. The first, and most pervasive, is the theme of *expressiveness*. As the outline of the principles showed, it was one of the three earliest and most consistently reiterated principles. Additionally, it played a role in most of the other principles, as can be seen from Table 1. The importance of expressiveness for sacred music was that it enabled the music to point to a meaning beyond itself. Expressiveness extended the significance of music beyond that attainable through its own resources. In stressing expressiveness, the papacy was trying to preserve sacred music as a sign that gestured, as we see from the divine qualities it was intended to represent, towards God.

Expressiveness was supported in its object by the action of a second theme. A conspicuous presence in the structural principles produced from the 14th century on, the motif of *subjection* ordered hierarchically several relationships within the sphere of sacred music: music was to be subject to text and to liturgy; the individual subject to the collective; and instruments to voices. Subjection was strongly connected to expressiveness, for it defined how, in practical terms, our attention was to be directed to God. The emphasis on shaping music to text, and on using the voice, which ensured the presence of text; the concern that listeners not be wholly caught up in the sound, nor focussed on the composer or performers; nor jarred out of the flow of the liturgy by music that unfolded according to the demands of its own form: all these witnessed to a sustained attempt by the papacy to ensure that sacred music directed to God the hearts, souls and minds of any listeners, not allowing them to focus upon the music, their own emotions, the talents of performers or any other facet of natural human life.

The final theme apparent in the ten principles completes the picture half-sketched by the first two themes by identifying sacred music as a human product. The collective principle, which rejected individualism, combined with the universality and expressiveness principles, which implied faculties and sentiments common to all human beings, promoted the idea of sacred music as a product of humanity as a whole. Moreover, in the prohibition of tape recorders or excessively dominant instruments, 'human' was contrasted not only with 'individual', but also with 'mechanical' or 'automated'. The first theme concerned the direction of sacred music; this last theme concerned its source. Music was to come forth from mankind and to tend towards

God. It was to kindle emotions that made man desire to think of God. And it was in maintaining the balance between these two - source and direction, man and God, emotion and mind - so that the rightful place of each was preserved, that the role of the second theme lay. Subjection aimed not to extinguish the human in sacred music, but, by keeping the human as the 'from' and God as the 'to', to send the human offering of music swirling like incense towards the throne of God, and carrying with it the hearts and minds of man.

However reactively the papal principles were formulated, then, the papacy nonetheless seems to have had an instinct, if not a conscious concept, that governed which developments in music were resisted, for though the principles differed they proved to contain again and again the same three themes - themes which, by reflecting the relationship between man and God, made sacred music more truly 'the language of the liturgy'.[119]

119 See Catholic Church: *Catechism of the Catholic Church.* St Pauls, NSW, 1994, p. 299, para. 1157. Liturgy aims to bring man to God by invoking him to glorify God, amd music is a sign of the liturgy.

Appendix 1

The first recorded papal statement about origins and associations forbade music used in Christian liturgy to be used at pagan functions. By this measure, Pope Clement aimed to prevent Christian liturgy from becoming associated with pagan or secular ideas.[120] In the later 20th century, the popes began to consider how sacred music might be used to help missionize non-Christian peoples. The statements released on this subject seem to diverge from the earlier view that Christian and pagan music should be distinct because the origins of a musical style would govern its effect on the listener.

Pius XII directed that hymns should be used in mission countries to replace the religious music used for idolatry. The hymns would employ the music and language of those peoples but with Christian words and ideas.[121] Such a direction implied that the origins of the music, possibly inherited from pagan ritual or secular contexts, did not affect its capacity to act as a means of Christian expression. The direction also implied that the music was not expressive in any intimate way of the text; but then hymns, being a strophic form, in which a series of different words are applied to a single melody, were never a form in which music and text were integrally interwoven. In his later *Instruction on sacred music* (1958), Pius XII noted that chant was useful for missionary work because chants "often have a certain affinity to [native people's] own songs".[122] Again, this stressed the similarities between the two forms of music, probably due to date of origin, and downplayed differences due to the beliefs from which each originated.

In a private letter of John XXIII to the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music (1961), a like attitude can be seen. "The peoples to whom the preachers of the Gospel carry the light and kingdom of God often possess ancient musical treasures and find great delight in their native chants. It is a wise plan which seeks to collect native songs, for the people's spiritual

120 His wording suggests that he was concerned not so much that those ideas might then be carried into the Christian liturgy but that those associations would cheapen the music, making it unfit for an offering to God.

121 Ibid., pp. 354 & 376. In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955).

122 Ibid., p. 376.

welfare,and to destine them to the service in good usage of the Catholic religion. One may lay the foundations in this manner for a native religious music."[123] And Vatican Council II's *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963) went further still, holding that traditional native music was to be accepted in the liturgy as an aid to "forming [native people's] religious sense and also in adapting worship to their native genius".[124]

These late 20th century statements put forward two different views on the nature of sacred music: one, that the same ideas can be conveyed by music of a radically different ideological origin; and two, that liturgy and sacred music ought to express the character of a people. The late 20th century, then, saw a steadily developing principle that sacred music ought to be attuned to the character of the people using it to worship God, and a belief that this could be achieved without detriment to the fullness of the Catholic faith being passed on. The principle was perhaps linked to a feeling that worship, to be geniune, must well up from within the person, rather than being a series of formalised actions. This sense of a need to subsidize impersonal liturgy with ritual providing for more personal and cultural identification with the process of worshipping God was present earlier in the century too, faintly colouring Pius XII's concerns for 'active participation' and promotion of hymns.[125] It reached its full flowering in the rise of the charismatic movement and the liturgical changes that followed Vatican II.

This final principle of sacred music seemed in opposition to three earlier principles: the first, that sacred music should be created by Christians for explicitly Christian purposes and that as a result any styles proceeding from pagan or secular contexts were unsuitable for use in the liturgy (principle one); the second, that sacred music should be collective, not a vehicle for individual expression; and the third, that sacred music should be universal in character, that is, in a style that all ages and places would recognize without scandal as suited to the sacred liturgy. Such a music would avoid expressions of religious sentiments that were personal, and equally, logic would suggest, those that were tribal/national. Rather, it would seek to express only that religious sentiment which emerged from human nature brought face to face with

123 Ibid., p. 316.

124 Ibid., p. 384.

125 For example, allowing members of the congregation to perform pious exercises during the liturgy as "spiritual needs are not the same ...for any individual". See pp. 337-8, in *Mediator Dei* (1948) and p. 364, in *Instruction on sacred music* (1958).

Christ.

However, while there was indubitably a contradiction between the earliest version of the principle of origins[126] and that of cultural expressiveness, later versions, which concentrated on avoiding secular origins, rather than non-Christian origins, could be seen as harmonious with the 20th century position: the documents did not actually specify whether native music used for the liturgy had to be of a religious character or whether any form of native music was acceptable, but it is possible that native religious music only was meant.

In other ways, too, cultural expressiveness was more an apparent than a real contradiction. The principle of universality, surprisingly at first glance, harmonises without difficult with the concept of cultural expressiveness. Universality implied that, whatever the sacred quality was, it should be recognisable across cultures. Like beauty, then, universality depended on some faculty common to human nature that could sense the objective presence of a sacred quality or that could induce a state of mind associated with encountering the holy. Such a human faculty, being found at the level of human nature, would operate at a seamless substrata of the human person, lying below cultural divides. The principle of cultural expressiveness did not, therefore, undercut that of universality, for the two appealed to different levels of the human person.

Cultural expressiveness did, however, undermine the principle of collectivity. If liturgy eschewed individual expression because it was an act in which Christ represented the entire human race to God, then it must also reject cultural expression. Collectivity is inherently opposed as much to national boundaries as to personal traits.

126 Which forbade association between Christian sacred music and pagan activities.

Bibliography

Balthasar, H.U.V: *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 1. T. & T. Clark Ltd, Edinburgh, 1982.

The Bible, New International Version. International Bible Society, 1984.

Catholic Church: *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*. St Pauls, NSW, 1994.

Graham, G: 'The value of music' in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 53, no. 2, Spring 1995.

Hayburn, R.F: *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music, 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D.* The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1979.

Hull, G: *The Banished Heart*. Spes Nova, Sydney, 1995.

Jurgens, W.A: *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, vols 1-3. The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1979.

O'Donaghue, N: 'A theology of beauty' in *The Analogy of Beauty* by John Riches (ed.). T. & T. Clark Ltd, Edinburgh, 1986.

Otto, R: *The Idea of the Holy*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, London, 1950.

Raffman, D: 'Towards a cognitive theory of musical ineffability' in *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 41, June 1988.

Scholes, P.A: *The Oxford Companion to Music*. 10th ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1970.