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Though research pertaining to Christian hymnals published in the late twentieth century is substantial with much of the work focusing on cultural issues, statistical comparisons, textual concerns, and denominational legislation, a significant examination of the decision-making process used by editorial boards to compile Roman Catholic hymnals is lacking. For the many Christian churches that create their own denominational hymnals there are reports and committee minutes within an official legislative record that detail the compilation process. In the case of the Roman Catholic Church, where the main publishers are unattached to the official church, fewer details are in the public record.

This study examines the challenging process of issuing a hymnal specifically for use in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States during the hymnal explosion of the 1980s, focusing on the decisions made by GIA Publications’ editorial committee to provide parishes with a collection of songs sensitive to the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council, the effects of the twentieth century’s global ecumenical movement, the call for increased theological relevance pertaining to issues of ecology, poverty, urban life, hunger, and peace, and contemporary concerns about language that might require the creation of new, more appropriate texts, the revision of older texts, or the elimination of now inappropriate texts. Through a series of interviews with the still-living members of the editorial board of GIA Publications’ Worship: A Hymnal and Service Book for Roman Catholics, third edition (1986), an examination of the marketing literature produced by the publisher encouraging potential customers to purchase the hymnal, and articles written in support or in review of the hymnal in professional journals, there emerges a clear picture of a decision-making process informed by the Second Vatican Council’s directives for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation, tempered by the reality of publishing within a corporate, for-profit environment.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Though music has been a part of rites of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries, congregational singing during Mass is a more recent phenomenon, entering the liturgical picture in the mid-twentieth century, and coming into prominence with the liturgical reforms instituted following the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). With the promulgation of the Constitution on the Liturgy (Sacrosanctum concilium) by Pope Paul VI in 1963, a new era of liturgical action commenced, with the council encouraging greater participation of the laity in the Mass:

The Church earnestly desires that all the faithful be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations called for by the very nature of the liturgy. Such participation by the Christian people as “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people” (1 Pt 2:9; see 2:4–5) is their right and duty by reason of their baptism.¹

To that end, the council touted the advantage of using the vernacular and ended the Church’s interdiction on its use: “But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its use may be extended.”² In the sixth chapter of the Constitution, the council affirmed the importance of sacred music and the role of the people in the church’s song: “A liturgical service takes on a nobler aspect when the rites are celebrated with singing, the sacred ministers take their parts in them, and the faithful actively participate.”³ Given the council’s desire for greater congregational participation, its easing of restrictions on the use of the vernacular in the Mass, and its encouragement of sacred song within the liturgy, church musicians turned their attention to the congregational hymn.

². Ibid., 11.
³. Ibid., 24.
Most simply, a hymn can be characterized as a song of praise, the word deriving from the Greek *hymnos* and in use long before the Christian era. Erik Routley defines a hymn as “a strophic song on a Christian subject capable of being sung by a congregation.” Balancing the mystical with the practical, Austin Lovelace characterizes it as “a poetic statement of a personal religious encounter or insight, universal in its truth, and suitable for corporate expression when sung in stanzas to a hymn tune.” Congregational hymns play a complex role in worship, enhancing more than just the textual and musical beauty of the liturgy. Lovelace points to a formative dimension:

> The spirit of hymnody is found in movement—in development of Christian concepts. Its purpose is not the creation of an aura or mood of vague “spiritual emotion” … but rather development of thought along spiritual and theological lines, using poetic devices which will speed the process and make vivid the imagery.

Hymns offer people words to sing and to pray, and in their repetitive nature, they prove to be a powerful learning tool for passing on liturgical theology and as a source of theological statement. Early hymnody was not congregational—that is, sung by the laity—rather, it was used within a “professionally-administered liturgy” by clergy and religious. Modern hymnody, specifically, that sung by the congregation, was founded in the sixteenth century, an offspring of the Protestant Reformation. In the nineteenth century, the widespread revivalist influence and a contagious camp meeting culture “resulted in increased denominational activity in America [which led to] the publication of denominational hymnals.”

---

5. Ibid., 4.
7. Ibid., 104.
Ongoing musical efforts to discern a “common heritage for congregational singing” among both Protestant and Catholic churches were further supported by a second important movement that had a profound impact on Christian hymnody. The revivalist efforts that led to a surge of denominational hymnals in the United States were a national component of the global missionary push that would lead to a crisis among Christian denominations and a search for a theological rationale for Christian unity. This global ecumenical movement brought with it a concerted effort within and among many churches to find common ground, and to explore the possibility of interdenominational cooperation through formal agreements and covenants.

In his 1982 publication, *Christian Hymns Observed*, Routley reminds readers that the greatest strides in any church’s hymnody have been made in times of internal or external stress:

Hymns … have flourished most vigorously on the far edges of the church: at what some might call its growing points and others its vulnerable or even heretical points. The pattern forms itself at once: periods when somebody somewhere is tearing up the turf and asking questions and organizing rebellions and reconstructing disciplines produce hymns: when the steam goes out of such movements, or they become part of an expanded main stream, hymn writing goes on in a more tranquil way, but never for very long.

The post-conciliar era was one such hymn-producing period. The Second Vatican Council’s efforts for liturgical reform, together with the global Christian ecumenical movement, resulted in a reexamination of denominational differences, a wealth of new congregational music that freely crossed denominational boundaries, and eventually, an explosion of new hymnals for congregations throughout the United States.

In their discussion of hymnals compiled in the twentieth century, and especially in the late twentieth century, William J. Reynolds and Milburn Price observe that “strict denominational lines have given way to a merging of many traditions, as hymnal committees have drawn on the resources of a common heritage for congregational singing.” Robin A. Leaver considers a theological basis:

11. Ibid., 107.
Our theological perspectives are generally wider than those of earlier generations, embracing, for example, social responsibility, ethnic diversity, the world-wide church, ecology, the changing forms of hymnic and liturgical language, and so forth. But all are included within a basic theological framework and expressed within the context of public worship.¹⁴

One response to a survey conducted by the hymnal committee of the Presbyterian Church (USA) in preparation for the publication of the church’s 1990 hymnal illustrates this breadth: “For it to be accepted in our congregation (the new hymnal) will have to be simply a grand collection of hymns drawn from a variety of Christian musical resources with some things old and new to suit all tastes in our pluralistic Church.”¹⁵

With a few exceptions, Protestant churches publish a unified hymnal for use by the entire denomination that is the result of direction, supervision, approval, and funding from the church’s national legislative body. The aforementioned Presbyterian Hymnal was created through directed action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA) at its first meeting following the 1983 merger of the Presbyterian Church in the United States with the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (UPCUSA). A hymnal was sought to provide the newly combined congregations with a unified musical resource. The language of the motion offered to implement the hymnal’s publication was carried over from the final UPCUSA assembly, and the motion’s language illustrates the legislative nature of the process (see Figure 1). A similar effort was begun in 1979 in the Episcopal Church by its General Convention and Standing Committee on Church Music, which resulted in the publication of the Hymnal 1982. Other Protestant hymnals of the period include the 1989 United Methodist Hymnal, published at the direction of the denomination’s General Conference as a unified hymnal for the United Methodist Church after the 1968 merger of the Methodist Church with the Evangelical United Brethren Church, and the 1978 Lutheran Book of Worship, a joint project of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, the Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran Church, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.


Figure 1. Overture 10, on preparing a new book of services for corporate worship.  
Hymnal publication for congregations in the Roman Catholic Church is a completely different proposition. The Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States allows independent, commercial publishers to create and distribute new hymnals, requiring only ecclesiastical approval by the local bishop before publication. Roman Catholic hymnals for American congregations are published in a for-profit environment by a variety of competing companies, with each publisher trying to discern the best course for publishing and selling a new hymnal that fills a wide range of musical, cultural, and liturgical needs.

With the 1986 publication of *Worship: A Hymnal and Service Book for Roman Catholics* by GIA Publications, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States was presented with “a new approach to hymn books, both in terms of content and also of presentation … a conventional hymn book for use in Roman Catholic congregations.”¹⁶ This hymnal did not look like the Catholic hymnals of previous decades, mirroring instead its Protestant contemporaries with its liturgical arrangement, optional harmonic settings, indexes, and the inclusion of many contemporary tunes and texts. The editorial committee charged with producing the third edition of *Worship* appeared to have made different choices from their historical predecessors in determining the contents of the new hymnal. An examination of how this committee developed the 1986 hymnal provides a clear picture of a decision-making process informed by the Second Vatican Council’s directives for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation, tempered by the reality of publishing within a corporate, for-profit environment.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

A significant body of research exists on the subject of Christian hymnody. Research pertaining to this study falls into three broad categories: (1) research considering the legislative, theological, and practical evolution of church music; (2) scholarly work focused upon hymn texts and tunes; and (3) material discussing the global ecumenical movement and denominational responses to that movement.

---

Robert F. Hayburn’s *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music: 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D.* gathers into one volume the official and personal documents on sacred music written by the popes through nearly two millennia, translated into English, as well as writings on the subject by other important official figures and organizations within the Roman Catholic Church. With this unprecedented collection of material, Hayburn is able to argue that the cumulative effect of generations of papal documents on sacred music and the liturgy is significant, that Pope Pius X’s 1903 *motu proprio* on sacred music did not emerge within a theological vacuum, and that succeeding documents from consecutive popes led, inevitably, to both the calling of the Second Vatican Council and the substantial reforms of the liturgy the council produced.

James F. White’s *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* traces the development of reformed Christian traditions in North America and Europe through five centuries since their departure from the Roman Catholic Church in 1520, and provides insight into the use of liturgical song to foster theological understanding. Of interest to this study are White’s insights about the intersection of Protestant worship and the Roman Catholic tradition, both in the earliest years of the Protestant Reformation and during the ecumenical era of the twentieth century. White offers an experiential approach to illuminate the development of active participation by the whole congregation, a core issue in both sixteenth-century Protestant Reformation liturgical practice and twentieth-century Roman Catholic liturgical reform. White also discusses the key role congregational singing played within early Protestant worship, as both an expression of piety and a tool for passing on liturgical theology, illustrating parallels to the reform efforts of the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century.

The evolution of English-language congregational song through 1980 is thoroughly developed by Erik Routley in his exhaustive *Panorama of Christian Hymnody* and in the posthumous *Christian Hymns Observed: When in Our Music God Is Glorified*. The latter offers a philosophical approach, lacking in some of Routley’s earlier works, which provides insight into the circumstances in which the great hymns of faith, both texts and tunes, are created. In this small volume Routley investigates the relationship between cycles of theological upheaval and parallel surges of hymn-writing throughout Christian history, which
strongly resonates with the discussions of this study, especially in Routley’s chapters on the nature of hymnody and on Roman Catholic hymnody since 1964.

J. Vincent Higginson’s *History of American Catholic Hymnals: Survey and Background* and Donald Boccardi’s *The History of American Catholic Hymnals since Vatican II* survey the hymnals of the American church and the cultural environment in which they were crafted. Higginson’s book traces the publication and use of Catholic hymnals in the United States from 1787 to 1975, and is divided into sections that focus on the effect of fluctuating religious freedom experienced by English Catholics in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the influence of papal and conciliar directives upon American Catholic hymnody in the twentieth century. Each part begins with an introduction to an era and commentary on general factors influencing hymnals of that period. The last two parts of the book discuss hymnals within the time frame this paper examines, each containing a discussion of individual hymnals and noting the historical background and content of each song book.

Boccardi’s book, the successor to Higginson’s *History*, presents a chronological listing of Catholic hymnals published in the United States from 1964 to 1999, separated into chapters spanning roughly a decade. For each period, he offers a historical overview, a discussion of the liturgical and musical issues surrounding that period, and a listing of published hymnals with commentary on each song book’s relevance. The primary hymnal examined in this study as well as its predecessors are discussed in this resource. Boccardi also provides a list of contemporary Catholic composers found in contemporary Protestant hymnals. In his discussion of the effects of the directives of the Second Vatican Council upon church music and musicians, Boccardi champions the creativity, pastoral care, and liturgical insight musicians are called to exhibit by the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy, reminding readers that the council was not opposed to any kind of music because of structure or form, saying, “The church has opened the door to musicians for all beautiful things.”17 He also notes a tendency toward extremism in implementation of the council’s directives, with one side portraying all liturgical practice predating the council as in need of

the reform called for in the conciliar documents, and the other, which Martin E. Marty characterizes as a “cult of Catholic nostalgia,” calling for liturgical practice to return solely to the traditional forms also championed in the documents. Boccardi argues the benefit of the middle ground in these early post-conciliar musical debates, suggesting that a “both-and” approach could be argued from the directives of the council’s documents, and maintaining his optimism for a future of sacred music that can explore new horizons while honoring the past.

Boccardi’s discussion offers a marked contrast to Richard J. Schuler’s series of articles, which present serious concerns about the interpretation and implementation of the council’s directives. Schuler chronicles the history of church music in the United States during the twentieth century in light of changes mandated by the Second Vatican Council in a series of articles (1982–1983) in Sacred Music. Tracing the history of liturgical reform and the music associated with it, Schuler, the journal’s editor, is concerned with the speed and the scope of the changes being incorporated into the liturgy. He argues that the changes ignore fundamental truths contained within and directed by the conciliar documents, and notes the consequences:

The results of the greatly advertised “changes” introduced into the post-conciliar Church by the modernist camp can be seen in the catastrophe we have witnessed in the closed schools, defections from the clergy, decayed religious life, fewer converts, a substantial drop in attendance at Sunday Mass, theologians who defy the Magisterium, fewer vocations to the priesthood, and the banality, profanity and ineptitude of what is now promoted as liturgical music.

The opinions about the musical events following the Second Vatican Council found in Schuler’s series of articles and in Boccardi’s book cannot be in greater contrast. Schuler and Boccardi articulate the primary division that existed among musicians and liturgists engaged in the worship wars of the first decades following the council. It is into this highly fractious world of liturgical interpretation and opinion that our subject hymnal is being introduced.

---


The global ecumenical movement is given a thorough overview in Thomas E. FitzGerald’s *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History*, which is “designed to introduce the topic of the ecumenical movement to a wider audience, especially those studying the Christian Church and Christianity in the past century,” and which provides “an appreciation of the essential elements of the ecumenical movement and its centrality to Christian life and thought.”

FitzGerald presents a detailed history of the ecumenical movement in the twentieth century, including sections on historical divisions among Christian denominations, early-twentieth-century church unity movements leading to the formation of the World Council of Churches, and the entrance of the Roman Catholic Church into the global ecumenical movement. This study juxtaposes the twentieth-century papal efforts for liturgical and musical reform described in Hayburn with the contemporaneous development of the global ecumenical movement described by FitzGerald, examining how ecumenism and liturgical reform influenced the hymnic landscape of late-twentieth-century hymnals as well as the area where these two movements overlap.

In a series of articles for the Hymn Society of America’s journal, *The Hymn*, C. Michael Hawn tracks and evaluates the contents of hymnals from many larger Christian churches since 1976 in order to identify important trends, especially in the Protestant hymnals. In his article “The Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody: An Evaluation of Its Influence in Selected English Language Hymnals Published in the United States and Canada since 1976,” Hawn traces the history and influence of a list of ecumenical hymns produced by the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody (CEH) and published in *The Hymn* upon hymnal compilation during the period in question. In his analysis, Hawn notes an unexpected finding:

> Generally speaking, there is a high correlation between denominations represented in the CEH and a greater number of hymns from the list that appear in

---


the [denomination’s] hymnal. [But] hymnals produced by Roman Catholic publishers, although participants in the CEH, made less use of the list.\textsuperscript{23}

He goes on to note, however, that the large number of Roman Catholic hymnals as compared to other denominations makes it “difficult to ascertain the direct influence of the CEH on this denomination.”\textsuperscript{24}

Hawn’s analysis of the comparative data and his inability to determine the influence of the CEH list on Roman Catholic hymnals provide a key issue driving this inquiry: if participation in the creation of the CEH list led most denominations to include a greater number of those hymns in their hymnals, why was this not the case for Roman Catholic publishers? More generally, one can ask, what were the factors that influenced the choice of material in Roman Catholic hymnals? This study attempts to answer these questions.

Though research pertaining to Christian hymnals published in the late twentieth century is substantial, with much of the work focusing on cultural issues, statistical comparisons, textual concerns, and denominational legislation, a significant examination of the decision-making process used by editorial boards to compile Roman Catholic hymnals has not been undertaken. For the many Christian churches that create their own denominational hymnals, there are reports and committee minutes within an official legislative record that detail the compilation process. In the case of the Roman Catholic Church, where the main publishers are unattached to the official church, fewer details appear in the public record.

\textbf{PURPOSE}

The purpose of this research is to illuminate the decision-making process used by the editorial board of GIA Publications to compile the 1986 Roman Catholic hymnal, \textit{Worship}, third edition, and to analyze how the directives of the Second Vatican Council for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation influenced this process.

\textsuperscript{23} Hawn, “Consultation,” 29.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
LIMITATIONS

This study will examine the decision-making criteria used for compilation of hymnals for worship in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States following the Second Vatican Council, and specifically those used by the editorial committee tasked with the creation of the 1986 third edition of GIA Publications’ hymnal, *Worship*. Interviews conducted to gather information about the process of compiling this hymnal are limited to the members of the editorial committee and others who may have had direct input into the committee’s decision-making process. The publication of the first two editions of *Worship*, in 1971 and 1975, will be investigated to a lesser extent to provide historical context and an understanding of aspects of the editorial approach of their creation that may have had an impact on that of the third edition. Though the relative importance or inherent musical quality of any specific hymn is not addressed, the use of particular hymns in Catholic Christian worship over time may be illustrative of this study’s conclusions. Other denominations and hymnals will be examined only as they relate to the historical development of late-twentieth-century hymnody in the Roman Catholic Church and to the creation of the hymnal in question. Hawn’s evaluation of a list of “Hymns and Tunes Recommended for Ecumenical Use” produced by the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody provides one of the key issues driving this study, but the data he presents indicating the use of the Consultation’s list in current hymnals will not be used. The study will not look at songbooks, music pamphlets, hymnal companions, supplements, etc., as primary sources of the representative hymnody of the Roman Catholic Church, although these sources may be investigated peripherally. In its discussion of theological issues, historical precedents, or cultural concerns relating to hymns, the study will limit itself to specific contemporary concerns pertaining to hymn texts and will not evaluate the specific merits of any stated theological, historical, or cultural issues. This paper will limit itself to the twentieth century, focusing on the twenty-five years following the Second Vatican Council, although material from other eras will been examined to facilitate understanding of the historical development of the hymnal in question.

METODOLOGY

This study will begin with a historical survey of liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, the twentieth century’s ecumenical movement, and the
development of Roman Catholic hymnody in order to provide a historical context, identifying the people and organizations as well as the theological, musical, and cultural issues that factored into the subject hymnal’s creation. This study will then examine introductory material found within the first three editions of the hymnal and the marketing literature produced by the publisher that encouraged potential customers to purchase the hymnal as well as articles written in support or in review of the hymnal in professional journals. A series of interviews of the still-living participants of GIA Publications’ editorial committee for the 1986 hymnal will be conducted to collect data about the process used and the decisions made in choosing material for inclusion in the hymnal. The interviews also will investigate the reasons for publishing this series of hymnals and why multiple editions were introduced over a relatively short amount of time. The interview questions appear in Appendix A of this document. An analysis of the materials and data collected will be undertaken to determine the extent that the ecumenical movement influenced the creation of the hymnal as compared with other factors such as the theological, musical, and cultural issues determined by the bibliographic research. The study will conclude with suggestions for further research on the topic.

**ORGANIZATION**

This thesis is organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes the introduction, review of literature, purpose, limitations, and methodology of the study. The second chapter will offer a summary of the historical context from which the subject hymnal emerged, specifically focusing on the twentieth-century movements for liturgical reform and ecumenism, the pre-conciliar evolution of Roman Catholic hymnals since their inception in the 1880s, and the musical and textual concerns influencing Christian hymnal publishing in the post-conciliar era. The third chapter will examine the written record surrounding the publication of the hymnal, focusing on its two precursor editions, the hymnal itself, marketing literature offered by the publisher to prospective customers, and articles in professional journals authored by the publisher’s representatives and others in support of the new hymnal. The fourth chapter will present information gathered from interviews with members of the hymnal’s editorial team about the creation of the subject hymnal, the rationale for its initial publication, the specific issues with which the editorial committee was
concerned as they chose music for inclusion in the hymnal, and the reasons for the issuance of three editions over a relatively short span of twenty-five years. The final chapter will present the conclusions reached during the examination of this subject and offer suggestions for further study.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

*actuosa participatio populi*: Literally meaning “active participation of the people.”

The participation of the laity was one of the first issues considered by the Second Vatican Council. The council’s declaration on the subject is found in article 14 of the Constitution on the Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, which reads:

> The Church earnestly desires that all the faithful be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations called for by the very nature of the liturgy. Such participation by the Christian people as “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people” (1 Pt 2:9; see 2:4–5) is their right and duty by reason of their baptism.25

*Ecumenical*: The meaning of this term has changed over time, but originated from the ancient Greek word *ekoumeni*, which means “the whole world” … used in this sense in the New Testament in Matthew 24:14 and Acts 17:31…. By the fourth century, the church uses the word to speak about the Ecumenical Councils (see “Ecumenical council”)…. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries [ecumenical is used] with reference to new Christian organizations or new international church organizations…. [From 1937], ecumenical began to describe perspectives on Christian teachings that took into account views of divided churches.26

The term is distinguished from interdenominational and interconfessional, which are used to describe relationships among Protestant churches, and from interfaith, which refers to “contacts between Christians and other living religions such as Judaism and Islam.”27

*Ecumenical council*: In the Roman Catholic Church, this term refers to a council of bishops and other theologians … gathered together in particular cities and at certain times to address issues of Christian faith that are being questioned and to

---

26. FitzGerald, 3.
27. Ibid., 4–5.
find the means of reconciliation of divided parties … [addressing] issues affecting … all the church throughout the world.\textsuperscript{28}

In the broader Christian world in the twentieth century, the term refers to “meetings and councils bringing together the representatives of Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Old Catholic, and most Protestant churches.”\textsuperscript{29}

\textit{Ecumenical movement: “The quest of Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Old Catholic, and most Protestant churches for reconciliation, and the restoration of their visible unity in faith, sacramental life, and witness in the world.”}\textsuperscript{30}

\textit{motu proprio: Literally meaning “on his own impulse.”} This term is used to describe a document issued by the pope on his own initiative and personally signed by him, which can be addressed to the whole Church, to part of it, or to some individuals.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

This second chapter presents a summary of the historical context from which the 1986 third edition of GIA Publications’ *Worship: A Hymnal and Service Book for Roman Catholics* emerged, specifically focusing on the twentieth-century movements for liturgical reform and ecumenism, the pre-conciliar evolution of Roman Catholic hymnals since their inception in the 1880s, and the musical and textual concerns influencing Christian hymnal publishing in the post-conciliar era.

**LITURGICAL REFORM**

Liturgy within the Roman Catholic Church has undergone internal evaluation on many levels since the church’s earliest times. At one level, evaluation has resulted in ongoing revisions to the liturgies and to the music which permeates these liturgies. On another, schisms have occurred leading to the Protestant Reformation and the creation of a multitude of offshoot denominational traditions through the ensuing centuries. Our discussion begins with an overview of the Roman Catholic reform movement in the twentieth century, the musical implications of those reform efforts, and a very brief look at how the Protestant Reformation relates to that of the Roman Catholic Church.

**Roman Catholic Liturgical Reform to 1962**

With the promulgation of his *motu proprio*, *Tra le sollecitudini*, in 1903 Pope Pius X initiated the Roman Catholic Church’s twentieth-century efforts for liturgical reform, beginning with a reform of church music. In this Instruction on Sacred Music, Pius X offered a foundational understanding of sacred music, noting its integral role within the liturgy. Sacred music was “to make [liturgical] text more efficacious, so that the faithful through this means may be the more roused to devotion, and better disposed to gather to themselves the
fruits of grace which come from the celebration of the most holy mysteries.” To that end, sacred music was to be holy (that is, sacred, set apart) and be true art conducive to the goals of the Church’s liturgy, “the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful.” Beginning with this motu proprio issued in the initial months of his pontificate (1903–1914), Pius X was determined to effect change within the organization of the Church and the life of the faithful, wanting people to take on a larger role in corporate worship and knowing that music would play an important role.

The motu proprio did not emerge within a vacuum; its antecedents are found from the first century to the time of Pius X as succeeding popes regulated the use of song and instruments in the sacred liturgy. Earlier legislation, and especially the 1749 encyclical of Pope Benedict XIV, Annum qui, focused on Gregorian chant, polyphony, modern music (by which in papal documents is generally meant everything following Renaissance polyphony), and the use of instruments in an effort to foster music that conformed to liturgical requirements. Robert Hayburn suggests that the cumulative effect of previous papal documents on sacred music is significant, in that they acted “as one great crescendo which reached its fortissimo with … this motu propio on sacred music [as] the climax of all previous legislation on Church music.” Hayburn underscores the importance of Pius X’s contribution, noting that this pope wrote more on the subject of music in liturgy and worship than all his predecessors combined, and that “his documents concerning liturgy and worship have had a profound effect on the organization of the Church and the life of the faithful.”

The movement toward liturgical reform continued through the efforts of Pius X’s successors who authored additional documents and decrees refining and augmenting the
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principles laid down in the 1903 motu proprio. Though they added little that was new, the documents set forth liturgical and musical norms for contemporary usage.\textsuperscript{38} The wartime pontificate of Benedict XV (1914–1921) produced no new official papal documents on liturgical reform, but the pope’s personal and official correspondence demonstrates “an ardent interest in the reform of Church music.”\textsuperscript{39} During the reign of Pope Pius XI (1921–1938) many documents on church music emerged illustrating his desire to continue the policies of both Pius X and Benedict XV.\textsuperscript{40} Pius XI’s apostolic constitution Divini cultus sanctitatem of December 20, 1928, “written to reemphasize the preceptive character of Tra le sollecitudini, restates the principles of earlier work and makes more certain points in it, [and] is concerned with the fuller participation of the faithful in worship of the Church.”\textsuperscript{41}

One of the first significant documents on music of the pontificate of Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) was his 1947 encyclical, Mediator Dei, in which he clarified and expanded the directions for the active participation of the faithful in sacred worship.\textsuperscript{42} Building on the foundation set by Mediator Dei, Pius XII’s even more substantial encyclical Musicae sacrae disciplina, promulgated on Christmas Day in 1955, provided extensive direction both historical, quoting the Church Fathers concerning the use of music in early liturgies, and practical, offering conclusions which were relevant for the current day.\textsuperscript{43} Following patterns set by Pius X and Pius XI, the encyclical confirmed the direction of previous documents while adding “a new dimension of freedom and progress.”\textsuperscript{44} Pius XII’s encyclical offered a variety of instructions that would please both those who wanted to honor the historical roots of church music as well as those looking to the expanding horizons of the future, including reaffirmation of Gregorian chant as the most appropriate music of the Church, commendation
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and approval of medieval and renaissance music for use in the liturgy, urging of instruction for composers and choirs, and encouragement of congregations to participate in the liturgy.\footnote{Ibid.}

Three years after Pius XII’s encyclical \textit{Musicae sacrae disciplina}, the Roman Curia’s Sacred Congregation of Rites enacted specific legislation in the form of an instruction, \textit{De musica sacra et sacra liturgia}. Richard J. Schuler notes its practical vision for the future:

It stated clearly a well-organized code of church music legislation. In 118 paragraphs the church musician had his pattern for action. It set the direction for the continuing reform, protected the art of sacred music and determined its relationship with the liturgical action, both in general norms and in specific actions. It remains today the basis for much of the conciliar and post-conciliar directives.\footnote{Ibid.}

The pontificate of Pope John XXIII (1958–1963) proved to be a watershed for liturgical reform. On January 25, 1959, less than three months after his election in October 1958, the pope gave notice of his intention to convene an ecumenical council, the Second Vatican Council, to address relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the modern world. On January 1, 1961, giving practical application to six decades of papal legislation and the 1958 curial instruction, John XXIII approved the new \textit{Rubrics of the Roman Breviary and Missal}, the legal code regarding the celebration of the Latin Rite Mass and the Divine Office, in the \textit{motu proprio}, \textit{Rubricarum instructum}. These rubrics were incorporated into the typical edition of the \textit{Roman Missal} issued in 1962.\footnote{Hayburn, 382.}

Twentieth-century liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic Church was driven by the liturgical goals of Pius X and his successors, and was illuminated by the publication and promulgation of many papal and curial documents pertaining to the liturgy. In addition to these official legislative actions, there also was significant musical activity initiated by both clergy and laity in support of the reform.

\textbf{Musical Implications of Liturgical Reform to 1962}

Following Pius X’s 1903 \textit{motu proprio}, Roman Catholic church musicians in the United States worked to implement the new instructions, but efforts to improve church music
already had begun in the previous century. Thomas F. Stransky notes the general view of church historians who have dubbed the 1800s as the “great century” of prolific Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox missions.\textsuperscript{48} In the United States, these missions led to widespread “revival” events and “resulted in increased denominational activity.”\textsuperscript{49} Music was a key ingredient of the revivals, but Catholic musicians quickly realized that their liturgical songs were both musically inferior and less accessible than the “decadent American hymnody” that dominated the rest of the church music scene.\textsuperscript{50}

Initial attempts to provide new, higher quality music for the church focused on the schools, starting with the 1860 publication of a volume of original hymn texts by Jeremiah Cummings entitled \textit{Songs for Catholic Schools and Aids to the Catechism}, the first by an American Catholic author.\textsuperscript{51} Well-trained organists and choirmasters also sought to improve the music of the church through the creation of music societies.\textsuperscript{52} The American Society of St. Cecilia, established in 1874 by John Singenberger, championed a multi-faceted approach, incorporating theological, inspirational, and educational means:

\begin{quote}
The work of the Society of St. Cecilia was two-fold. It strove to acquaint Church musicians with the laws of the Church on sacred music. At the same time these groups presented acceptable Church music to the organists and choirmasters, in order that they would perform music in accordance with Church legislation…. Congresses and conventions of sacred music were held at regular intervals, often annually. Workshops were organized to diffuse technical knowledge, and at competitions choral groups could hear the results of the reform.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

New hymnals flourished in the 1880s following a lull in publications that attended the Civil War (1861–1865) and the Panic of 1873, a severe international economic depression in both Europe and the United States that lasted until 1879.\textsuperscript{54} Taking a page from the
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established Protestant approach, hymnals began to appear in Catholic schools and churches, although music not of the Ordinary of the Mass was used solely for devotional, academic, and personal purposes. Despite fledgling efforts at writing Catholic hymns, the first major American Catholic hymnal, the *Catholic Hymnal* of 1884, mostly included hymns and tunes by non-Catholics. In the editor’s preface, Alfred Young justifies this approach, commenting that these hymns are “compositions by professed non-Catholics, yet contain well worded expressions of Catholic doctrine and are full of religious feelings.”

The need for quality congregational music intensified with the issuance of the 1903 *motu proprio*. The American Society of St. Cecilia increased its efforts and heralded the occasion of the encyclical to publish Singenberger’s *Guide to Catholic Music* in 1905. This 270-page document listed music the society thought to be acceptable for church. J. Vincent Higginson writes, “The Guide contained the names and publishers of over a thousand Masses, together with hundreds of settings of the Proper of the Mass, motets, supplementary Offertories, as well as organ selections,” and that it proved to be of far-reaching importance, as “many bishops of the United States directed their priests and laity to follow this Guide in selecting music to be used in their dioceses.” Other efforts to implement the directives of the *motu proprio* included the appearance of Catholic publishing houses as early as 1906.

The poor overall quality of Catholic hymnody continued to be problematic, however, and posed a dilemma for Catholic publishers. “In this … reform movement,” Higginson remarks, “any Catholic editor faced a trying situation in deciding what poor traditional melodies should be discarded. Furthermore, tunes that replaced them had little chance of being accepted, and few were.” A survey of hymnals of the era illustrates the editors’ desire to balance the competing issues: (1) eliminating now-inappropriate texts and overly-sentimental tunes while retaining enough familiar tunes to keep people happy, (2) finding
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good new hymn texts and tunes of Catholic origin, and (3) adhering to the new directives. In the preface to *Hosanna*, published in 1910 by B. Herder Book Company in St. Louis, Missouri, editor Ludwig Bonvin states his intention “to obtain better relations between texts and tunes” while at the same time seeking “to avoid all sentimentality, verbiage, and meaningless ringing phrases.” Higginson offers the 1910 *St. Mark’s Hymnal*, published by J. Fischer and Bro. of New York, as an example demonstrating an editor’s desire “to provide good hymns as well as tunes with which they were acquainted.” He comments, “While Catholic in tone, [the hymnal] has a non-Catholic base, material which they believed would better set the standard of hymnody in their area.” The *American Catholic Hymnal*, published in 1913 by P. J. Kenedy & Sons of New York, broadened the search for new material into religious periodicals, introducing numerous hymns overlooked by other publishers. The text on the title page of this hymnal (see Figure 2) illustrates the intended scope of this new generation and the impetus for its creation. Higginson notes the statement of intent within the hymnal’s preface:

To follow the principles of the *motu proprio* and replace many of the poor hymns with new and original texts and tunes [that] were judged on the principles synthesized in the encyclical as sanctity, purity of form, from which results true art, and universality.

Forty years after the American Society of St. Cecilia was formed, a similarly-intentioned Society of St. Gregory in America was founded in 1914 under the leadership of Nicola A. Montani. The society received formal approval of the Holy See in May 1915 and in 1921 published *The Saint Gregory Hymnal and Catholic Choir Book*, which “set standards that succeeding American hymnals had to meet.” Instead of offering poor melodies with alternatives, a practice of previous reform-minded hymnal editors, Montani simply replaced
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Figure 2. Title page from *American Catholic Hymnal.*
them, which proved to be a successful formula for hymnal acceptance.\textsuperscript{66} The 1935 \textit{St. Cecilia Hymnal}, edited by J. Alfred Schehl and published in New York by Frederick Pustet and Co., can also be regarded as a breakthrough with the introduction of many non-Catholic, multicultural hymnic sources, including traditional English and translated German chorales, older Latin translations, recent English hymns, songs from the French Psalters, and Italian hymnody.\textsuperscript{67}

Efforts focused on musical aspects of liturgical reform in the United States extended beyond the publication of new hymnals, and included the founding of the Liturgical Press in 1926 and its publication of \textit{Orate Fratres}; the founding of the Pius X Institute of Liturgical Music in 1928; the initial publication of \textit{My Sunday Missal} in 1932; the publication of \textit{Caecelia} by the Society of St. Cecilia (later consolidated with the Society of St. Gregory’s \textit{Catholic Choirmaster} into the publication \textit{Sacred Music}, the journal of the Church Music Association of America, founded in 1964); the founding in 1941 of the Gregorian Institute of America, from which GIA Publications emerged; the founding of the Vernacular Society with its publication, \textit{Amen}; the beginning of Joseph Gelineau’s experimentation with the vernacular use of the psalms in the late 1940s; and the founding of the World Library of Sacred Music by Omer Westendorf, which distributed music from European sources.\textsuperscript{68}

Schuler details additional efforts in the period leading up the Second World War:

\begin{itemize}
    \item Seminary music courses had been established; departments of music that gave training in church music existed; religious orders of Sisters had prepared their members to teach the chant in the parochial schools; societies of church musicians continued to publish their journals; several firms made materials available for study and performance; many dioceses had issued regulations based on the Roman decrees; guilds of organists and choirmasters had been founded … many parishes had good choirs and dedicated musicians worked hard to carry out the reforms.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
    \item 66. Ibid., 177.
    \item 67. Ibid., 191–192.
    \item 68. Boccardi, 1–4.
    \item 69. Schuler, “Chronicle … II,” 11.
\end{itemize}
Schuler also recounts the influence upon the musical reform effort of those returning to the United States from Europe after the war:

Interest in church music grew as returning soldiers told of what they had heard in the great cathedrals and churches in Europe. Prisoners of war told of the important role singing and especially sacred music played in their lives during captivity. European publishing houses … began to advertise their catalogs in the United States and open agencies to sell their publications in this country.70

The 1947 encyclical Mediator Dei brought practical and readily identifiable changes to the Mass. Before its promulgation, most Catholics had been singing vernacular hymns solely through attendance at novena services, Benediction, parish missions, Stations of the Cross, and May crowning.71 The encyclical sanctioned and encouraged both the Latin Dialogue Mass, where the people, no longer silent observers, recited some of the Latin responses, and the increased use of hymns in the Low Mass.72 The Dialogue Mass can be seen as an intermediate step that linked Pius X’s desire for active participation to the forthcoming vernacular Mass promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1969, following the Second Vatican Council. Although proponents of liturgical reform had made great strides in reviewing and renewing the meaning of liturgical worship in their local circles, for the average Catholic—priest and lay person alike—it was the dramatic shift to the Dialogue Mass and the subsequent changes in the Holy Week rites that were their first exposure to English in the liturgy.73 Donald Boccardi suggests the Holy Week changes were critical to the ongoing evolution of the people’s participation and understanding:

The rediscovery of the Triduum—from Holy Thursday evening Eucharist through Good Friday afternoon services to the Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday night—revolutionized the celebration of Holy Week and brought greater numbers of people to participate and understand the integrity of these high holy days.74

The decade following Mediator Dei saw continuing efforts toward musical reform, and with the beatification of Pius X in 1951 and his elevation to sainthood by Pius XII in 1954, church musicians rededicated themselves to the continuing implementation of the new
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saint’s 1903 *motu proprio*.

One of these efforts was the publication of *The People’s Hymnal* in 1955 by Omer Westendorf’s World Library of Sacred Music. In the language of its preface, we encounter three governing principles for publishers as they continued their efforts to implement musical aspects of liturgical reform:

1) Every hymn considered for inclusion must be a straightforward, meaningful prayer, whether of praise, penitence, petition, or thanksgiving, and express without distortion the sentiments likely to be experienced by those singing. 2) The music must be a fitting and unobtrusive garment for the text, and not a mere chromatic delight to be enjoyed for its own sake; the text must be meaningful and as simple and direct as the words of a child to its father. 3) The hymn must express, not what makes its subject “sweet” or “beautiful” alone, but what makes it so holy and magnificent and lovable, so worth singing to and about.

With the promulgation of the 1955 papal encyclical, *Musicae sacrae disciplina*, and the detailed 1958 curial instruction, *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia*, musicians and liturgists sensed significant, imminent change. John XXIII’s calling of the Second Vatican Council in January 1959 signaled a new era in which all the current hymnals would become outdated, and a downturn in the volume of hymnal publication was expected until new practices and protocols for liturgical music emerged.

The twentieth century to this point witnessed a constant stream of papal legislation and many attempts to implement these new directives, but the Roman Catholic Church was not the only Christian tradition making changes. At the dawn of the twentieth century, Protestant churches in the United States were ramping up the ongoing reexamination of their own liturgical practices, and the results of these activities would have a significant impact in the years leading up to and immediately following the Second Vatican Council.

**Protestant Liturgical Reform**

Although liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic Church developed slowly through the centuries with the implementation of small, incremental legislative actions that blossomed during the twentieth century into the great undertaking following the Second Vatican Council, Protestant churches in the United States were ramping up the ongoing reexamination of their own liturgical practices, and the results of these activities would have a significant impact in the years leading up to and immediately following the Second Vatican Council.

---


Vatican Council, for Protestant churches, the shape of the reform was the opposite. The majority of the large-scale events occurred soon after the publication of Martin Luther’s 1520 treatise, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, and continued at a lesser pace over the centuries to follow. James F. White summarizes:

> Within a period of fifty years, five significantly different traditions were formed to meet the varying needs of diverse kinds of sixteenth-century people. Between 1520 and 1570, the Lutheran, Reformed, Anabaptist, Anglican, and Puritan traditions achieved substantially their lasting forms and agendas. In the centuries since, the process has been slower but no less definite. It has averaged one new tradition per century: Quaker in the seventeenth, Methodist in the eighteenth, Frontier in the nineteenth, and Pentecostal in the twentieth.  

White emphasizes that these Protestant traditions have maintained an individual identity over the centuries based upon the circumstances of their original creation. But despite these different identities, they exhibited certain commonalities in development, specifically in how they adapted to the needs of their local environment, how they borrowed liturgical practices from each other, and how each generation made its mark on its inherited tradition. White points to an additional, critical feature of their development:

> One feature … that we cannot overlook is the broadening of the possibilities for active participation by the whole congregation. The first changes in the sixteenth century not only made hearing and seeing more important but brought new forms of active participation such as congregational hymnody among Lutherans and sung psalmody among the Reformed. Subsequent traditions brought congregational discussion of the sermon among Puritans or speaking from the Spirit among Quakers. New forms of spontaneous prayer and testimony, as well as renewed hymnody, characterized Methodism. Even the [mid-nineteenth century Catholic] revival in Anglicanism was accompanied by congregational hymnody.

The parallels between the development of Protestant churches and the movement toward liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic Church are notable. The active participation of the congregation, which had been important to the Protestant churches since their inception, emerged as a foundational concern of Pius X at the beginning of the twentieth century. Efforts to improve the standards for congregational music pushed Catholic publishers to cross denominational boundaries in search of quality music options from the

---
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Protestant tradition. From a liturgical standpoint, Roman Catholic and Protestant churches were moving closer together.

**GLOBAL ECUMENISM**

Ongoing efforts to reform liturgical and musical practices encouraged substantial alteration of Roman Catholic Church worship in the United States. But at the dawn of the twentieth century, a global ecumenical movement toward Christian unity took shape that would impact both the character of and the interaction among Christian faith traditions, and consequently their music.

**The Ecumenical Movement to 1962**

The nineteenth century has been described as a “great century” of prolific Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox missionary activity, but by the end of the century it had become apparent that missionary activities were competing with each other to the detriment of the global Christian evangelization.\(^80\) In response, a World Missionary Conference with more than one thousand participants, including 414 delegates from 122 Protestant denominations and 43 countries was convened in 1910 in Edinburgh, Scotland, to discuss an agenda including “Christian education and national life, the missionary message in relation to non-Christian religions, the preparation of missionaries, missions, and governments, and cooperation between mission agencies and their denominations.”\(^81\) A report from the conference’s Commission on Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity specifically addressed the impediments to mission activity resulting from denominational competition. Geoffrey Wainright summarizes:

> In the eyes of some, divisions among Christians were not simply a practical impediment to mission; they amounted to ‘the scandal of disunity’: communities living unreconciled among themselves undercut the credibility of the gospel as the world’s reconciliation to God (2 Cor. 5:19) and schisms between parties claiming ecclesial status inflicted wounds on the body of Christ, if they did not indeed dismember it.\(^82\)
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For Protestants, the Edinburgh conference offered a theological rationale for unity among Christian churches, and the following decades saw a concerted effort within and among many churches to find common ground and to explore the possibility of interdenominational cooperation through formal agreements and covenants. Following the first World War, the Orthodox Church joined the call to Christian unity when its patriarchate in Constantinople appealed for a permanent global institution of fellowship and cooperation of “all the churches,” similar to the League of Nations. The ecumenical movement found surer footing with the creation in 1921 of the International Missionary Council, a forum of Protestant national councils of mission agencies in Europe and North America as well as of local councils of churches in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. From the Lutheran Church in Sweden emerged in 1925 the first Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which developed into the global Life and Work movement devoted to the concerns of freedom, peace, and justice in national and international affairs. Holding its first world conference in 1927, the Faith and Order movement arose from the Anglican tradition and devoted itself to matters of doctrine, worship, and pastoral structures that would need to be strengthened among the churches on their way to fuller unity.

Following a second unthinkable world war among Christian nations, Life and Work offered an initiative, accepted with some hesitation on the part of Faith and Order, to establish a World Council of Churches whose founding assembly took place in 1948. By the World Council of Churches’ third assembly in 1961, the International Missionary Council and its concerns for direct evangelization were integrated into the interests of the other groups. With this effort, the “three principal streams of ecumenical movement: faith and order, life and work, mission and evangelism” were flowing in the same direction. The inclusion in 1961 of the Russian and several other Eastern Orthodox churches further
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strengthened the World Council of Churches’ ecumenical foundation.\textsuperscript{89} The refusal of the Roman Catholic Church, the world’s largest Christian body, to join the membership of the World Council of Churches is notable, though the church had been concerned with ecumenism from its own perspective for some years.

**Ecumenism in the Roman Catholic Church**

Though the nineteenth century saw important contacts between Orthodox, Anglicans, and some Protestant churches, Thomas E. FitzGerald points to “a number of formal developments [that] occurred in the Roman Catholic Church [strengthening] the line of demarcation between it and other Christian churches,” including missionary activity in traditionally Orthodox areas and the proclamation of the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception of Mary in 1854 and of the Infallibility of the Pope in 1896.\textsuperscript{90} The Catholic Church declined to enter into formal dialogue on Christian unity with representatives of other churches, calling instead for its “separated brethren” to return to itself.\textsuperscript{91} Historian George Tavard notes, however, that despite this rocky start, “Leo XIII was the first Pope to take up ecumenism. He must be given credit for laying the basis of modern Catholic ecumenism. It will be possible for Benedict XV, Pius X, and Pius XII to elaborate a highly developed ecumenical position” stemming from Leo XIII’s efforts to reach out to the Orthodox churches in Athens and Constantinople.\textsuperscript{92}

The first four decades of the twentieth century, especially those years of the two world wars, stimulated ecumenical thinking within the Roman Catholic Church, as FitzGerald explains:

First, there was a recognition that the doctrinal issues, which divided the churches for centuries, had to be seriously examined with a new spirit and with a new commitment to resolve the wounds of the past … second, there was a recognition that the churches had an obligation to come together, even in spite of their divisions, to provide a Christian witness in the society … [and] finally, there was

---
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the recognition that the churches and their members had the obligation to pray for reconciliation and unity. The reconciliation of Christians and the unity of the churches would result not simply from theological reflection and common witness but also from common prayer.  

New thinking brought new initiatives for unity. In 1908, Fr. Spencer Jones, an Anglican priest, and Rev. Paul James Watson, a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, proposed an Octave of Prayer for Unity (January 18–25) to offer prayers for the reunion of Christendom. The observance received the official blessing of Pius X in 1909 and later Benedict XV extended its observance to the whole Roman Catholic Church despite the unacceptability to most Protestant churches of the Catholic presupposition whereby reunion necessitated a return to Rome.  

In the early 1930s, the Abbé (later Monsignor) Paul Couturier, a priest of the Catholic archdiocese of Lyons, found in the Roman Missal a formula of prayer that might solve the dilemma the Octave had created for non-Roman Catholic Christians, and he began to advocate the Octave of Prayer on the inclusive basis that “our Lord would grant to His Church on earth that peace and unity which were in His mind and purpose when, on the eve of His Passion, He prayed that all might be one.”  

FitzGerald notes that this approach provided a basis for the present-day Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, where the prayer focus is “not bound to a particular view of unity, but open to the movements of God.”  

The establishment in 1940 of the ecumenical community of prayer and hospitality in Taizé, Burgundy, France, by the Swiss Reformed Church’s Frère (Brother) Roger Louis Schütz-Marsauche is another important landmark. FitzGerald describes the worship services of Taizé as “a very important expression of the importance of prayer in the quest for Christian unity.” The community became a venue where “Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox monks could come together in prayer, reflection, and service … a place of
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pilgrimage and common prayer for countless thousands of Christians from various traditions.”

Despite these fledgling efforts for prayer and unity, it would not be until the papacies of John XXIII and Paul VI (1963–1978) that the Roman Catholic Church would formally enter into substantial dialogue with both the Orthodox Church and some Protestant churches. FitzGerald relates the importance of the proclamation of the Second Vatican Council’s Decree on Ecumenism, \textit{Unitatis redintegratio}, by Paul VI on November 21, 1965:

\begin{quote}
The Roman Catholic Church formally committed itself to ecumenical prayer, dialogue, and cooperation aimed at the restoration of visible unity among the divided churches…. The council’s Constitution on the Church and its Decree on Ecumenism provided a more nuanced theological approach to the reality of other Christian churches and ecclesial communities, as well as to the quest for the unity of the churches.\end{quote}

The change was dramatic, as the church, under the leadership of Paul VI, “agreed to establish formal bilateral dialogues with the Orthodox Church, the Anglican Communion, and a number of Protestant churches. From 1965 onward, it also agreed to cooperate in a number of areas with the World Council of Churches.” In more recent years, the church has “formally joined a number of local and regional Councils of Churches [and] encouraged prayer, theological dialogue, and common witness for unity at all levels of church life.” On May 25, 1995, seventeen years into his pontificate (1978–2005), Pope John Paul II promulgated the encyclical, \textit{Ut unum sint}, reaffirming the commitment of the Roman Catholic Church to the ecumenical movement and its quest for the visible unity of the churches in the same faith and eucharist. At one point in the document, he affirms, “At times it seems that we are closer to being able finally to seal this ‘real although not yet full’ communion. A century ago who could even have imagined such a thing?”

\begin{itemize}
\item 98. Ibid.
\item 99. Ibid., 58.
\item 100. Ibid., 142.
\item 101. Ibid., 143.
\item 102. Ibid.
\end{itemize}
THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

On the eve of the Second Vatican Council in early 1962, the Roman Catholic Church found itself at a launching point, its musical practice reshaped by six decades of evolving papal legislation and reinvigorated by new connections to its own musical past and from fresh extra-denominational sources. Mindful of the expanding influence of the global movement for reconciliation and unity among all Christian churches, the Second Vatican Council attempted to provide liturgical, musical, and ecumenical direction for a church moving toward its third millennium.

Liturgical Implications

The Second Vatican Council commenced October 11, 1962, during the pontificate of John XXIII and concluded December 8, 1965, during the pontificate of Paul VI. The major goals of the council were articulated in the Constitution on the Liturgy, the first conciliar document, promulgated by Paul VI on December 4, 1963:

This Sacred Council has several aims in view: it desires to impart an ever increasing vigor to the Christian life of the faithful; to adapt more suitably to the needs of our own times those institutions that are subject to change; to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ; to strengthen whatever can help to call the whole of humanity into the household of the Church.  

Reform of the liturgy was the paramount challenge: “The Council also desires that, where necessary, the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.”  

Continuing on the path of previous legislation, the Constitution reinforced previous positions on liturgical music, as Peggy Ann Licon summarizes:

From [Pius X’s] *motu proprio*, it reaffirmed the directives of *actuosa participatio populi*, the time honored position of Gregorian chant as the pride of the liturgy, it reaffirmed that sacred music be integral to the liturgy, that it be ministerial in function, and that its purpose be designed for the glorification of God and the sanctification of the faithful. From the *Musicae Sacrae Disciplina*, it reaffirmed that sacred music must be true art, that the entire musical treasury, both ancient and recent, had its rightful place in the liturgy, and from the *De Music Sacra et
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Sacra Liturgia, it reaffirmed some of the regulations and guidelines for the performance and composition of sacred music.\textsuperscript{106}

The Constitution offered specific encouragement and direction about the people’s active participation, affirming the Church’s previous position: “The people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, and songs, as well as by actions, gestures, and bearing. And at the proper times all should observe a reverent silence.”\textsuperscript{107} Articulating its concern for the “circumstances and needs of modern times,”\textsuperscript{108} the council affirmed, “The use of the mother tongue … frequently may be of great advantage to the people,”\textsuperscript{109} and directed, “in Masses celebrated with the people a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue … [including] the readings and ‘the universal prayer,’ [and] those parts belonging to the people.”\textsuperscript{110} The document also connected the people’s participation to the quality of the rites, stating, “A liturgical service takes on a nobler aspect when the rites are celebrated with singing, the sacred ministers take their parts in them, and the faithful actively participate.”\textsuperscript{111} Moreover, the Constitution emphasized that liturgical and musical leadership “must be at pains to ensure that whenever a liturgical service is to be celebrated with song, the whole assembly of the faithful is enabled … to contribute the active participation that rightly belongs to it.”\textsuperscript{112} Recognizing local cultural realities, the Council members further directed, “The people’s own religious songs are to be encouraged with care so that in sacred devotions as well as during services of the liturgy itself … the faithful may raise their voices in song.”\textsuperscript{113}
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Musical Implications

The Second Vatican Council mandated that the liturgy be reformed: the people were to participate fully, with the option of using their own language, and they were to sing. The sixth chapter of the Constitution concerns itself specifically with sacred music, stating, “The musical tradition of the universal Church is a treasure of inestimable value, greater even than that of any other art. The main reason for this preeminence is that, as sacred song is closely bound to the text, it forms a necessary or integral part of the solemn liturgy.”

In addition to its emphasis on congregational participation, the council also stressed the importance of musical quality by its non-congregational musicians, stating, “Choirs must be diligently developed…. Great importance is to be attached to the teaching and practice of music…. Those in charge of teaching sacred music are to receive thorough training.”

A global period of transition to the post-conciliar liturgical era began a year before the final session of the council concluded in December 1965. Boccardi describes how, overnight, everything seemed to change: “On the last Sunday of the church year in 1964, Catholics all over the world attended Mass as usual…. The very next week, on the First Sunday of Advent, Catholics all over the world were invited to celebrate the Eucharist.”

Alan J. Hommerding describes how even the language of the worshiping assembly’s experience changed:

It was new to “gather” as an assembly instead of “going to church.” It was new to “celebrate” the Mass instead of “hearing” it. “All singing” as the “People of God” spoke of both the conciliar vision for participation and the renewed image of the Church as the “People of God” as opposed to its more common reference to the hierarchy. Hearing the scripture proclaimed, especially the “Good News” at Mass was a novelty as well as the priest “presiding” at the celebration instead of “saying” Mass.

English entered the Mass through congregational song, but it was a completely new experience. “Although hymns have always been a part of the Liturgy of the Hours, the only hymn singing experienced in parish churches prior to 1964 was that of devotional hymns
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sung during the low [spoken] Mass.”\textsuperscript{118} Protestants had been singing congregational songs in their principal worship services for four centuries. Catholics encountered that First Sunday of Advent with very little preparation, making what Thomas Day characterizes as the “musical equivalent of the Great Leap Forward.”\textsuperscript{119} He elaborates:

One week there was silence at Mass; the next week the congregation was supposed to sing four hymns…. [Catholic] congregations in the United States, with rare exceptions, never struggled through a stage of musical apprenticeship or even infancy. With very little preparation they went immediately into the “advanced class.”\textsuperscript{120}

The increased amount of singing within worship services led to additional opportunities for congregational exposure to scripture in the vernacular since “a connection or relation to the Lectionary readings for the day became the primary criterion for selecting the congregation’s music for the Mass.”\textsuperscript{121} Hymn writers such as Omer Westendorf, Dolores Dufner, and James Quinn penned new texts, which offered a “renewed understanding within Roman Catholicism of baptism, not ordination, as being the foundational sacrament of the Church … [an] awareness of the many gifts that come together to build the Church, [and] references to the Church’s diversity within unity.”\textsuperscript{122}

The development of Catholic hymnals through the twentieth century meant that some musical resources were already available for use in the transitional period. The benefit of using Protestant hymns had been obvious to Catholic hymnal compilers for decades, and the justified use of these hymns in pre-conciliar Catholic hymnals facilitated their inclusion in newly-purposed hymnals. Published in 1964, the World Library of Sacred Music’s People’s Mass Book was a significant publication with a third edition offered by 1970, as Boccardi relates:

[The hymnal] sold over two million copies and provided music both old and new, with a wealth of material from ecumenical sources…. The collection helped to
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introduce many fine traditional Protestant hymns into the Roman Catholic repertoire, one being the startling inclusion of Martin Luther’s anthem “A Mighty Fortress Is Our God.”

The New...St. Joseph’s Missal and Hymnal of 1966 is also representative of this transitional period, with two-thirds of the included hymns found in other non-Catholic hymnals of that time. Boccardi points to the “unexpected ecumenical dimension … as a flood of traditional Protestant hymns—e.g., ‘A Mighty Fortress,’ ‘For All the Saints,’ and ‘The Church’s One Foundation’—began to enter into the Catholic musical vocabulary during this early post-conciliar period.” According to Boccardi, there is a single surviving Catholic vernacular hymn from the earlier era, “Holy God, We Praise Thy Name,” which moved in the opposite direction, and which is found today in such divergent Protestant hymnals as those of the Lutheran, United Methodist, Presbyterian, Christian Reformed, Mennonite, and Assembly of God traditions.

The flow of songs from Catholic to Protestant churches would not remain limited to a single vernacular song and the tunes that Protestant denominations had appropriated from the Catholic Church in their formative years. A new style of music based on the contemporary folk idiom would emerge during the post-conciliar era, cross denominational boundaries, and have a great impact on the compilation of both Protestant and Catholic hymnals to the present day.

Instruction on implementing the reforms made its way from the Vatican to the national conferences of bishops and to the parishes. Newly revised and translated liturgical books were created and approved for use in 1970; in the interim period, portions of the old books were revised using temporary translations and offered as a stopgap measure. Parish musicians found themselves trying to find or create music for the constantly changing iterations of the Mass based on their parish needs, while national musical leadership worked to provide an official path to implementation by which “the Church’s musical and liturgical

---

123. Boccardi, 47.
125. Boccardi, 34.
126. Ibid., 8.
tradition [would not] be jettisoned, but worked with and adapted creatively in the current generation for the spiritual life of future generations.”127 This process moved slower than local musicians wished, and this lack of immediate direction coupled with the excitement about the reform gave rise to “a flood of experimentation, some of it faddish, with the inevitable throwing aside of the old in favor of the new, whatever that was to be.”128 The “new” was folk-style music, popularized and spread by musicians from college campuses, the Cursillo Movement, and the Glenmary Home Missioners to the forefront of Catholic liturgical music in the parishes.129

The reception of the new style of music varied among parishes, with a blended approach being the most popular. Boccardi elaborates, “Some still held on to the past [and] some gave up the past in favor of the new … [but] the vast majority of parishes and other religious institutions found themselves at various places along the spectrum between then and now, trying to synthesize rather than dichotomize.”130 This synthesis of the older and newer styles of liturgical music became the norm, and a multitude of options along the stylistic spectrum appeared. Boccardi notes that this diversity led to the rejection of a national Catholic hymnal: “A National Hymnal Study project was conducted by the [Federation of Diocesan Liturgy Commissions] in 1973. The conclusion was finally reached that a national hymnal was not desirable. Arguments favoring the hymnal as ‘a book of dignity’ did not prevail. There was also fear of too much national determination.”131 During the implementation of the transitional rites and, eventually, the American revised rites of 1970, it is no surprise that an inexpensive, disposable participation aid in the form of J. S. Paluch’s *Monthly Missalette* with the assembly’s texts and music “became the most established norm for liturgical participation, much to the chagrin of liturgists.”132
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Folk-style liturgical music continued to proliferate, and Boccardi stresses its importance within the broader scope of Catholic and Christian hymnody in the post-conciliar era:

The “folk” idiom in liturgical music was one of the most important developments during the period since the Council and can be traced from its infancy in the 1960s through its adolescence in the 1970s into a beginning of maturity in the 1980s and 1990s, finding its way into special hymnals and into the revised and new collections of traditional hymnals, both Catholic and Protestant.133

Parishes began to incorporate congregational music from a wide musical spectrum, and this led to the publication of hymnals that included music of the folk-style as well as “contemporary” collections that contained traditional hymns. With the continuing publishing success of its rival’s People’s Mass Book, GIA Publications published its first hardbound hymnal, Worship, edited by Robert Batastini. Boccardi observes the presence of composers from throughout the style spectrum, including Richard Proulx, Noel Goemanne, Eugene Englert, and Howard Hughes, SM, in the traditional vein and Marty Haugen and David Haas representing the folk idiom, as well as music from Taizé in France.134

Hymnals entered the American Catholic sphere in the 1880s, incorporating tunes and texts from both Protestant predecessors and Catholic hymnic roots, and provided resources for limited congregational singing throughout the period leading up to the Second Vatican Council. Despite significant changes in liturgical music in the early post-conciliar era, the first years found both hymnals and disposable missalettes being used for worship, with missalettes allowing for the speedy distribution of new songs and styles, and hymnals, with their slightly longer gestation period, providing still-appropriate music from the past as well as music from the current era that had stood a brief test of time. This ability of the more long-lived hymnals to incorporate the best of distant past and recent present—traditional hymns and contemporary songs—offers insight as to why hymnals are good indicators of the state of the reform efforts of the Second Vatican Council.
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COMPILING HYMNALS IN THE POST-CONCILIAR ERA

With the close of the Second Vatican Council, the effects of liturgical reform and the intentions of the ecumenical movement permeated the Roman Catholic Church, with each ready to offer insights as congregations moved to a new level of full, active, and conscious participation in the liturgy. Three additional topics provide the final context for examining the process by which the hymnal under consideration was created: the dual role of post-conciliar Catholic hymnals as both keepers of musical tradition and disseminators of new music, the general Christian hymnal explosion in the 1980s and 1990s, and the distinctive place of music publishers within the Catholic Church.

Rediscovering Tradition

Frank Campbell-Watson, music editor of the 1966 Catholic Hymnal and Service Book, summarized the challenge for post-conciliar congregations in that hymnal’s preface:

With the far-reaching changes in the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church, emphasizing the use of the vernacular, both sung and spoken, a challenge is born. Congregations are no longer silent observers…. They have become active participants in all of the religious services provided by the Church. This active participation emphasizes congregational singing, long considered a more or less non-Catholic preoccupation and generally confined to Protestant forms of worship.135

The problem was compounded by the fact that “much of the [existing] Catholic hymnodic matter was less than inspiring in both text and music.”136 For the editorial committee of the Catholic Hymnal and Song Book, the lack of quality Catholic musical resources and “a study of hymnals of other religious bodies, with their long histories of corporate worship, convinced the committee of the need for a book that would supply all the worshiper’s needs.”137 Since this service book was intended to serve as a resource for a new era, and the committee, working on behalf of the Archdiocese of New York, felt free to diverge from previous Catholic precedent:
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The committee had two singular advantages in its work. First, since active participation is a new experience for many worshippers, almost all hymns will be “a new song”; and it is as easy to learn a good hymn as a poor one. Secondly, the committee was free from the narrow approach of a group which develops a hymnal for a given locale; rather, it has tried to present a hymnal of the widest appeal.\textsuperscript{138}

With this clean-slate approach, there was “no pressure to include popular hymns.”\textsuperscript{139} Since Protestants had enjoyed centuries of experience honing their congregational singing, their approach was an easily accessible model for the new Catholic approach. In the introductory essay of the hymnal, the committee described its next step:

The editorial committee of \textit{The Catholic Hymnal} undertook the task of studying and analyzing hundreds upon hundreds of hymns from the collections used in Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious communities, to produce a hymnal of unsurpassed quality in its style, and in musical, theological and ecumenical content.\textsuperscript{140}

The committee rediscovered a “Catholic tradition” of hymnody through its research into Protestant hymnody:

\begin{quote}
Sources of texts reveal many of the continuing lines of Christian hymnody—it was of interest to discover that many hymns which we knew only in English have their origins in the early hymnody of the Church. Many tunes revealed transformations from Latin hymnody to more singable arrangements perpetuated by Protestant Churches.\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

The broad range of old and new (to them) material included, for example, “German hymnaries, French diocesan hymnaries, the vast storehouse of Anglican hymnody, the metrical Psalters, the hymns of the Breviaries, hymn chants of traditional Gregorian origin, as well as new and hitherto unpublished hymns.”\textsuperscript{142} Despite ongoing difficulties that plagued discussions by theologians focused on Christian unity, church musicians were busy crossing denominational borders in search of quality material, both old and new.

The Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody (CEH) is one example of a group of musicians working across Christian denominations. The CEH was convened in 1968 out of a
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desire by the United Church of Christ’s newly-tasked hymnal committee to work with colleagues of other member denominations within the Consultation on Church Union. While the creation of a single, ecumenical hymnal was unlikely, “it was hoped that in the various hymnal revisions or supplement projects then under way some sort of cooperation or at least sharing of experience might result.”143 C. Michael Hawn points to the extra-denominational aspect of the Consultation’s efforts:

The work of the CEH was a logical and creative process that took place in the wake of the liturgical reforms of [the Second Vatican Council] and the ecumenical interest that ensued. The CEH involved persons from representative denominational bodies who gathered to discuss and, ultimately, to decide what hymns transcended denominational structures.144

Ford Lewis Battles and Morgan Simmons, members of the CEH, point to some of the commonalities facing hymnal projects in the mid-1960s:

(1) that at least half of the hymns we would choose were from the common store, (2) that gathering and compiling and editing a hymnal is not a different task for a Presbyterian or a Lutheran or an Episcopalian, (3) that the physical production, promotion and marketing of hymnals and hymnal supplements are problems common to all denominations. Hence we decided in 1968 to begin listening to one another.145

Quoting from the minutes of an early CEH meeting, Hawn notes:

The Consultation’s purpose was multi-faceted and included “sharing work done in the preparation of hymns, liturgical music, conferring on cooperative and joint projects relating to hymnody, seeking consensus on texts and tunes for hymns common to the several churches, encouraging the writing of new hymns, both tunes and texts, and undertaking such other projects as the committee may determine.”146

The CEH was representative of a wide variety of denominations, including Disciples of Christ, Protestant Episcopal Church, Evangelical Covenant Church of North America, Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod, ALC, and LCA), United Methodist Church, Moravian Church, Presbyterian Church (US and USA), Roman Catholic Church, and United Church of
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Battles and Simmons summarize a particularly ecumenical dilemma that the group faced, noting the group’s juxtaposed goals of diversity and unity:

We are quite aware of the diversity of our styles of worship and the consequent reality that no one innovative hymn is going to fit the need of every ecclesial community. We are aware, however, that all of us profess the following of Christ and are charged with advancing his kingdom in the same modern world. We suspect, then, that we are closer to one another hymnically than we ever realized before this Consultation began its precarious existence.\textsuperscript{148}

An initial list of 150 hymns was adopted on September 8, 1971, drawn from the twenty-six sources that were consulted, including three hymnals from the Roman Catholic Church: Canada’s \textit{Catholic Book of Worship}, \textit{Worship} (GIA Publications), and \textit{Johannine Hymnal} (Archdiocese of Chicago).\textsuperscript{149} An additional 77 hymns were added in 1976 in light of hymnals that had been published in the interim, and the complete listing of 227 hymns was published by the Hymn Society of America in the October 1977 issue of their journal, \textit{The Hymn}.\textsuperscript{150}

Hawn summarizes the impact and importance the CEH has had on ecumenical hymnody since its inception:

The Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody was the primary force in the formation of a core of ecumenical congregational song in the United States during the last half of [the twentieth] century. Church musicians, hymnology professors, and, most of all, hymnal committees have consulted … the findings of the Consultation as one important source for the inclusion of hymns in their worship, courses, and hymnals, respectively.\textsuperscript{151}

Noting the tumultuous times of the Consultation’s inception, he adds that its work “was a benchmark in a fluid liturgical, social, and musical scene.”\textsuperscript{152} However, in his evaluation of the influence the CEH list has had on the compilation of hymnals, Hawn points to one notable exception where the CEH did not seem to influence the hymnal selection of one of its participant denominations, “Generally speaking, there is a high correlation between denominations represented in the CEH and a greater number of hymns from the list that
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appear in [their respective hymnal(s)]. Hymnals produced by Roman Catholic publishers, although participants in the CEH made less use of the list.”

The existence of the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody is indicative of new approaches to interdenominational musical exploration that characterized the post-conciliar era. The CEH not only looked to the existing hymnody that could “transcend denominational structures,” but also encouraged the new texts and tunes emerging from the current social, musical, and cultural milieu. The Roman Catholic Church, while participating in joint endeavors such as the Consultation, continued to chart its own musical course, looking not only to the current ecumenical environment, but also to its internal development in light of the reforms instituted by the Second Vatican Council.

**Mapping New Territory**

Leading up to the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church moved away from internally developed songs to embrace new sources of material, including music from Protestant traditions, as well as music from its own ancient tradition that had been lost but perpetuated in the Protestant churches. By contrast, in the post-conciliar era the Roman Catholic Church began to develop its own music influenced by the secular folk tradition and disseminated by collegiate and other musicians traveling through the country. Boccardi relates how this music found “its way into special hymnals and into the revised and new collections of traditional hymnals, both Catholic and Protestant.”

Erik Routley looks abroad, reminding us that “churches in countries which were regarded not much more than a hundred years ago as mission-receiving countries are now developing indigenous qualities and indigenous hymnody.” These qualities and hymnic traditions made their way back to the United States as part of a new vernacular hymnody. By the 1970s, two distinct styles of Catholic congregational styles had emerged, one stemming from historical roots, the other from newly-composed music of the day.
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With the completion of the new Roman Missal in 1970, the United States bishops at last were able to turn their attention to the music of the reformed liturgy. In 1981, the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) published a *Resource Collection of Hymns and Service Music for the Liturgy*, intended as a source “from which conferences of bishops, dioceses, parishes, and publishers of liturgical music may draw for the purpose of compiling their service books, hymnals, and participation aids.”\(^{157}\) The *Resource* offered a collection in two parts, the first comprised of 250 hymns in the public domain and the second of 106 contemporary musical settings for the rites.\(^{158}\) The compilation of the hymns began with a search of existing Catholic hymnals that later was expanded to include many non-Catholic and ecumenical hymnals, and the contemporary music was newly commissioned by the ICEL.\(^{159}\)

### Prolific Publishing Phenomenon

The first decade after the Second Vatican Council saw a marked decrease in the publication of Christian hymnals as publishers struggled to find firm footing in the ever-shifting sands of ecumenical influence and liturgical reform. Eventually, publishers offered music supplements to previously published hymnals. Routley summarizes the reasoning and the advantages:

> With the considerable store of new material that was coming, the difficulty in judging its durability in a hurry, the danger that too much hospitality to it might empty of the hymnals of too much that was classic and still valuable, and the cost of making full hymnals, the major denominations all decided that the right thing to do was to produce an updating supplement to be used alongside the existing book. This had immense advantages: The editors of a new supplement could concentrate on what was new, without feeling that one new piece meant the extinction of one old one; and the relatively inexpensive supplement might be renewable in a shorter time than economics would dictate in the case of a full-sized book.\(^{160}\)
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At the end of this fluid decade, a desire for more permanent song books emerged. Timothy W. Sharp describes the reemergence of hymnals within the worship environment:

Topics such as worship renewal, renewed interest in the sacraments, the preservation of the environment, world peace, inclusive language, international and developing country awareness, and the mission of the church … entered and reentered the orthodox realm of hardbound piety and belief in the form of hymnals.\(^\text{161}\)

Hawn describes a “prolific publishing phenomenon” that pervaded the twenty-year period from 1976 to 1996, which can be attributed to six phenomena that encouraged publishers to increase their output.\(^\text{162}\) First, Hawn points to a need for greater theological relevance reflecting a desire for songs incorporating current issues such as ecology, poverty, urban life, hunger, and peace. Second, he cites the availability of new English-language hymns from the global community, the resurgence of psalm singing in many denominations, and the increasing use of African-American hymnody in Anglo churches. Third, Hawn identifies the revised liturgical rites that were a result of internal reform (Roman Catholic and Episcopal) or the unification of related faith traditions (Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ) that necessitated new denominational hymnals. Fourth, he notes the innovations in publishing technology, which allowed hymnals to be published more easily and less expensively. Fifth, Hawn explores a host of cultural changes to the language that required the creation of new, more appropriate texts, the revision of older texts, or the elimination of now inappropriate texts, including a revision of antiquated language and language referring to humanity and Deity, and an increased sensitivity to militaristic and hierarchical language or texts promoting social or racial stereotypes. Finally, Hawn explores marketing considerations, noting that the publication of a hymnal could prove financially beneficial to a publisher, that collections of hymns by individual authors were readily available for hymnal committees to review, and that the relative standardization of pro-rata royalties for hymnwriters since the late 1980s made it easier for publishers to negotiate fees for hymns under copyright.
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Catholic Music Publishing

As part of this discussion of the context in which post-conciliar Roman Catholic hymnals were developed, it is important lastly to remark on the difference between Catholic publishers of hymnals and those of most other denominations. With a few exceptions, Protestant churches publish a unified hymnal for use by the entire denomination that is the result of direction, supervision, approval, and funding from the church’s national legislative body. For their American congregations, the Conference of Catholic Bishops allows independent, commercial publishers to create and distribute new hymnals without substantial review. GIA Publications’ editor Robert Batastini notes this post-conciliar change in ecclesiastical oversight:

The official administrative bodies in the church not only fail to propose directions for the publishing industry, they generally sustain a tacit “no comment” attitude toward almost everything the publisher does. Little or no effort is ever made to publically evaluate, criticize, or commend materials published for use in worship. The practice of a required Imprimatur or Nihil Obstat is no longer observed.\(^{163}\)

Although the individual conferences of bishops were charged with primary responsibility for implementing the sung congregational components of the revised 1970 rites, the length of time before the 1981 publication of ICEL’s Resource Collection of Hymns and Service Music for the Liturgy suggests a lower priority for this aspect of the implementation than for other areas and highlights the bishops’ ceding of responsibility to independent publishers for the publishing and distributing of Catholic hymnals. Routley pessimistically evaluates the musical implications of commercial publishing, where the publishers’ livelihood depends on the success of their offerings, noting “Catholic communities have been fair game for commercial publishers who have decided what congregations will enjoy and found they were more or less right in putting the standard fairly low.”\(^{164}\)

The development of Roman Catholic hymnals in the early post-conciliar era was influenced by nearly a century of hierarchical efforts for liturgical reform, the musical
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implications of that reform, and to some extent, ongoing and historical reform efforts in the Protestant churches. Certainly, the global ecumenical movement and specific efforts within various denominations also impacted the environment in which these hymnals were compiled. Following the Second Vatican Council, musicians explored both modern styles of music and historical hymnody to find congregational songs that would fulfill the directives of the council. Nearly fifteen years after the council closed, an abundance of new hymnals emerged as the needs of congregations in the new liturgical environment were better understood. Looking at the particulars of the development of GIA Publications’ third edition of *Worship* will provide insight into how Roman Catholic publishers managed in this new environment, and how the directives of the Second Vatican Council for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation influenced the compilation of these hymnals.
CHAPTER 3

THE WRITTEN RECORD

This chapter investigates the creation of the third edition of GIA Publications’ *Worship* hymnal through the lens of published materials pertaining to the hymn book. Specifically, it will examine introductory material found in the hymnal, its two predecessors, and the hymnal companion for the third edition, as well as marketing literature produced by the publisher to encourage the purchase of the hymnal, and journal articles written in support of or in review of the hymnal. From this examination, we begin to understand the editorial decision-making process as informed by the Second Vatican Council’s directives for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation, though tempered by the reality of publishing within a corporate, for-profit environment.

The hymnal reviews referenced in this chapter are authored by church music professionals who bring two distinct perspectives to their critiques. Erik Routley, J. Vincent Higginson, and Robin A. Leaver are hymnologists whose scholarly work includes studies of church music with a focus on hymnody. Their reviews offer insights into the location of the entire denomination’s hymnody and the specific hymnal within the larger field of hymnody. The other reviewers cited can be characterized as practitioners of church music, either, in the case of Rev. Joseph Roff, as a priest and composer, or as music directors and organists, in the cases of James Burns, John Rose, and William Tortolano, though the latter occupies a dual role both as academic and as practitioner. These church musicians tend to offer critiques of a more practical nature, which focus on the usefulness of a hymnal as they carry out their ministries, taking into consideration the musical and liturgical environment in which they must serve. Some of these latter reviewers also may be published by the company whose hymnal they are reviewing.
**HYMNALS**

In the early 1970s, Routley surveyed the hymnic landscape and pronounced a new era had begun for those who provided music for congregational worship:

What we have now is … [an age] of thrust towards the future, in which a quite astonishing new activity among composers and writers is producing an explosion of new hymnody in new forms and styles. In this age, there is much less respect for the past, or interest in it; but neither is there any complacency about the present. This is an age of restless urgency … when more questions have been asked about hitherto unexamined customs and styles than have been asked since the days of Luther. It is into … [this] period that the new Catholic hymnody has been born.\textsuperscript{165}

Our discussion begins with the first three editions of GIA Publications’ *Worship* and the hymnal companion to the third edition.

**Worship (1971)**

In 1968, less than a year after the close of the Second Vatican Council, GIA Publications joined World Library Publications and F.E.L. Publications in producing a joint loose-leaf hymnal, which senior editor Robert Batastini characterized as a manifestation of GIA Publications’ conviction that the development of strong congregational singing requires the availability and use of a substantial hymnbook:

[The project was] a cooperative effort using a 12-ring binder and standardized pages coded in such a way so as to enable the interfiling of materials from various publishers in logical order. In theory, this enabled parishes to have total flexibility in choosing a hymnal because thorough customization was possible through compilation on a page-by-page basis.\textsuperscript{166}

However, it soon became clear that the approach had a significant flaw, and another option presented itself:

[Parishes] almost unanimously compiled their books in predesigned sections, putting two, three, or four units together to form a “custom” hymnal that resembled just about everyone else’s custom hymnal…. It seemed only logical to conclude that the contents of these *not* so unique hymnals could be published in a bound book at a greatly reduced cost.\textsuperscript{167}


\textsuperscript{166} Batastini, “Focus,” 20.

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., 20–21.
World Library Publications had continued to revise its *People’s Mass Book* a number of times since 1964 in order to comply with each new stage of the post-conciliar liturgical reform, and this hymnal’s success, coupled with lessons learned from the loose-leaf hymnal project, led GIA Publications to introduce its own hardbound hymnal, *Worship*, in 1971.

From the title page, which states, “*Worship: A Complete Hymnal and Mass Book for the Parishes: With All Rites Prepared for People’s Participation According to the Roman Missal Promulgated on April 3, 1969,*” one can surmise an editorial desire to provide a single resource for the people in the pews and the publisher’s intent to encourage the participatory directives of the council. Following the table of contents in the accompaniment edition one finds a “Special Editor’s Note” that demonstrates a desire on the part of the editors to find a way to work in the emerging dual-stylistic environment:

The folk style songs included in this volume were intended by their composers to be accompanied by guitar and other instruments generally associated with music of this idiom. This accompaniment edition, however, offers keyboard accompaniments for these selections since it is common to find this material being accompanied by the organ. A brief word about these accompaniments is in order. Obviously, most of this material demands a different keyboard approach than the traditional hymn tune. In attempting to simulate guitar accompaniments on the organ, it is very easy to slip into a style that more closely imitates what is heard at a roller rink than the sound of a folk guitar. With this in mind, the approach used in this edition follows the general pattern of legato manuals with punctuated pedals. The pedal, or left hand, provides a rhythmic style that is more generic to folk material than the hymn tune, while the legato manuals or at least the right hand, avoid the “um-pah” sound.

In his 1973 survey of contemporary Catholic hymnody, Routley examines three nationally distributed American hymnals: *Worship*, the *People’s Mass Book*, and the *F.E.L. Hymnal* (also known as the *Armed Forces Hymnal*). Routley first notes the general climate in which these hymnals emerged:

Catholic hymn singing has erupted into a world in which there has been a 400-year tradition of Protestant hymn singing…. [Protestant hymnals] represent the end products of a long tradition, and they illustrate in various ways the pressures and inspirations which have guided editors in their work. But Catholic hymn singing has also broken in upon a period of radical revolution in people’s

---
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approach to congregational music. It has at once partaken of some of the qualities of that revolutionary climate. Routley then turns his attention to the hymnals and finds much to appreciate:

Upon my word, this is fascinating! … American Catholics have, in a desperate hurry, done a quite remarkably efficient job, and that, given a little more leisure, they will do a far better one next time … All these books show, on the one hand, some degree of naiveté in editorial technique, and on the other, an immense enthusiasm to get people singing. Routley characterizes *Worship* as the “richest and most poised” of the American Catholic hymnals surveyed and observes that it is “more carefully edited and responsibly set out … [and contains] a far more extensive use of Protestant hymns [and] many other fine doctrinal hymns of the English classics.” Routley applauds the abundant biblical emphasis—specifically, the Bible songs and psalm settings: “At a time when many other Christian communions are losing the psalms and the Bible altogether from their books and their religious speech generally, this is encouraging. In a 1972 review, Roff comments on the hymnal’s comprehensive nature, noting the inclusion of a substantial amount of congregational music for the various liturgies of the Church and an assortment of hymns, “some … of the traditional type, others in the contemporary folk idiom,” concluding, “*Worship* is more than a hymnal. It is … a complete book for congregational use…. It is evident that *Worship* was thoroughly planned in every detail…. Parishes that may be getting tired of leaflets and missalettes should welcome this latest arrival in the field of musical aids to worship.”

GIA Publications’ initial foray into the realm of hardbound hymnody was well received. With its liturgical emphasis, extensive use of ecumenical hymnody, stylistic variety, and encouragement of congregational participation, the first edition includes 351

---


171. Ibid., 207. Routley probably did not know that the “desperate hurry” he sensed in these hymnals was in fact very much the case for the first edition of *Worship*, with Robert Batastini noting he “rather presumptuously edited [the hymnal] as a one-man project in about four months.” See Robert J. Batastini, “From Correspondence Course to Worship III: The Story of G.I.A.,” *Pastoral Music* 10, no. 4 (April–May 1986): 48.
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musical items and can be seen as an initial attempt to harness all the requirements and recommendations for sacred music offered by the Second Vatican Council while not overwhelming the person in the pew, or the publisher’s resources.

**Worship II (1975)**

The 1971 edition of *Worship* encountered what Batastini characterizes as “mild success [that also] taught the publisher some lessons.”¹⁷⁵ On the positive side, he references the inclusion of significantly more Protestant hymns and the lack of textual tampering by the editors as compared with other Catholic hymnals of the period. Looking to the future, Batastini admits there is plenty of room for improvement:

> *Worship* did, however, still offer many hymns in truncated versions, bearing witness to the prevailing attitude toward hymnody in so many Catholic parishes that results in almost never singing more than two or three stanzas. Finally, an attempt to be diversified through the inclusion of folk hymns proved to be a mistake. We learned that folk hymns do not fit well into more or less permanent bound books, and most users would have preferred more traditional material in place of the guitar-type offerings.¹⁷⁶

*Worship II* followed quickly on the heels of the first edition and was released in 1975. The goals of the revised hymnal seem to have been loftier and more deliberate, as Batastini would describe a few years later:

> In preparing to publish this new hymnal for the Roman Catholic Church, G.I.A. very carefully and intentionally set about to create a Catholic hymnal that would be in the general tradition of the great hymnals of the other major Christian bodies. We hoped to publish a book that could become for Catholics what *The Lutheran Hymnal, The Service Book and Hymnal, The Hymnal 1940, The Pilgrim Hymnal*, and others are to the denominations which use them.¹⁷⁷

Unlike the first edition, *Worship II* included a preface, and its first paragraphs further illuminate the reasoning for offering Catholic congregations a hymnal in the Protestant tradition and reaffirm the publisher’s conviction that quality congregational song is best supported by a quality hymnbook:

---
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In the United States, most major Christian churches have a denominational hymnal which serves as the principal if not the only source of material for the congregation’s participation in worship. These hymnals are products of fully liturgical churches as well as totally non-liturgical churches; however, despite this wide range of sectarian diversity, they generally share a common treatment of hymnody. Within the traditions that have produced these hymnals, vigorous hymn singing is more often the norm than the exception.

The Roman Catholic Church has its own sacred music tradition, but that tradition does not include a long history of singing in the English language. Unlike their fellow Americans of the same “melting pot” culture, Catholic parishes for the most part have yet to experience the same vitality of song that echoes from their neighboring Christian churches. Musicians and liturgists have long expressed need for a Roman Catholic hymnal that is theologically sound, embraces the fullness of liturgical practice with all its options, and respects the hymnological traditions of those commonly referred to as “protestant” hymnals. It is to this need that the editors of WORSHIP II have set out to respond.\(^\text{178}\)

In this new, more careful edition the editors altered their approach to the hymnal’s texts and tunes, with Batastini remarking, “It was decided that, with rare exception, hymns should be included in full, with all stanzas and without editorial tampering.”\(^\text{179}\) Moreover, a concerted effort to look outside the denomination for new hymnic material was undertaken:

The work of the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody (an interfaith group of hymnologists given the task of identifying and agreeing upon the best form of tune and text for 150 hymns most common to all Christianity) was examined with a net result that two-thirds of their initial list found its way into Worship II. The Lutheran Worship Supplement, the Contemporary Worship series, and numerous other supplementary and developmental materials from various denominational sources were examined for new hymnic material.\(^\text{180}\)

In the hymnal’s preface, the editors highlight the book’s potential usefulness for hesitant congregations and comment on the juxtaposition of older and more contemporary material:

The section of 313 hymns which begins this book is largely the result of an extensive compilation effort. A relatively small number of hymns appear for the first time in print in this volume, and no hymns were specifically commissioned for this book. It was the editors’ intent to compile music for congregations which had already been validated as being suited to that idiom … Every hymn in the selection has been sung by people in the pews—some for centuries, some only in

---
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the church of the composer for just a few months. The collection includes chants, chorales, folk songs of European and American origin, unequal rhythm hymns of pre-Bach origin, spirituals, early American hymns, Gelineau Psalmody, and a sizeable selection of tunes and texts by contemporary composers and authors.181

In a January 1976 review, Routley continues his enthusiastic critique of progress made in the development of American Catholic hymnody, lauding the second edition as “more mature, professional and efficient than anything I have yet seen.”182 He notes the “well-presented liturgical manual [and the] editorial choice against ‘updating’ the texts (with a few exceptions),” characterizes the “selection of texts [as] judicious without being unadventurous,” and celebrates the hymnal’s “enterprise and audacity” as well as the quality of its indexes.183 Though he expresses concern with the alphabetical listing of the hymns—most hymnals had moved to organizational schemes based on the liturgical year, denominational creedal statements, or a combination of both—and the editorial tampering with some tunes, Routley concludes with a rousing endorsement, stating, “These people know how to edit a hymnal, and they clearly know most of what is going on in the hymnic world at present.”184

In a January 1977 review in the journal of the Hymn Society of America, The Hymn, Higginson reports that many of the hymnal’s texts were “new, off the beaten path and practical,” referring to the inclusion in a Catholic hymnal of translations by Catherine Winkworth and John M. Neale, as well as originals by Charles Wesley and Isaac Watts.185 Higginson also remarks on the hymnal’s tunes, commenting on the appearance of contemporary composers, the fresh approach to some accompaniments, the inclusion of early American folk hymns, and the lack of guitar chords (“to the delight of many organists”).186 Despite suggesting some concerns about the alphabetical arrangement of the hymns,
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Higginson lauds the “great care given to the planning and preparation of [the] hymn section,” and offers “praise [for] a worthy and distinctive effort of high quality.”

In a 1977 review by Rose in the journal of the American Guild of Organists and the Royal Canadian College of Organists, characterized as a “review of WORSHIP II, this one by an organist who has been using it,” Rose reports the hymnal to be comprehensive, ecumenical, and supportive of his parish’s congregational singing:

It is the first complete hymnal and service book with Psalms issued for Catholic parishes in the post-Council period, and the ecumenical range of hymnody which would be expected is present with dignity, reserve and substance. Not only do the hymns represent a wide variety of denominational and national traditions, including many hymns in original Latin chant which one might have feared lost to all modern Catholic publications, but there are no shortsighted attempts to modernize the text of ancient hymns or force-feed great amounts of “relevant” new hymns whose enduring value remains as yet unproven…. Best of all, this hymnal will not become outdated in the foreseeable future as have so many published after Vatican II, because the newly approved [liturgical] texts … are used throughout…. I’m delighted to report a genuine and enthusiastic upsurge in congregational singing and participation in the Mass [at the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in Newark].

GIA Publications’ aspirations to create a post-conciliar Catholic service book in the tradition of the great hymnals of other Christian denominations continued with the issuance of Worship II, which included 313 hymns, 327 lectionary psalm responses, and a variety of prayer resources. It met with great success, both in the professional arena and in the pews. With an increased emphasis on ecumenical hymnody, an editorial focus on more complete and more authentic musical content, a more nuanced approach to contemporary compositions, and a variety of new approaches to augment congregational singing, the second edition seemed to be the hymnal for which GIA Publications was hoping.


In an article tracing the history of GIA Publications published for the National Association of Pastoral Musicians in the spring of 1986, Batastini closes with a mention of
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the “the project that has permeated all of our efforts for the past 48 months,” a new, third edition of the Worship hymnal. Describing the circumstances leading to the revision, he relates, “It became apparent that Worship II had to be revised … mostly because it stopped selling.”

Batastini details the approach to the new book:

The concerns about language gave us a strong mandate to revise…. We decided that a revision was going to not only reflect some language changes, but was going to result in an entirely new hymnal with much material retained from its predecessor, but with a substantial amount of new material gathered from all over the English speaking world.

The editorial committee was determined to create a new type of hymnal for the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, and the members of the committee had a sense of the significance of the project:

To us, this is the most important thing we’ve ever done, and perhaps will ever do. But only time will tell whether or not we have succeeded in achieving the goal of giving the church a hymnal with which it can grow into the 21st century. The next history of G.I.A., written in fifteen or twenty years from now, will have to report on that one.

In a 1987 review in the journal of the National Association of Pastoral Musicians, Burns describes the song book’s hymnic content:

There is, at the core of this book, a collection of over four hundred hymns … a good assortment of tried and true hymns and carols that have been associated with Catholic worship, plus a number of new hymns as well as arrangements of historical items (some set to newer texts) which have become part of our ecumenical heritage…. Text alterations, judiciously employed, have all but omitted “sexist language” problems, yet the editors have allowed other texts, almost consecrated by use, to remain in their original poetry.

Burns notes as well the hymnal’s comprehensive and inclusive nature, stating:

The pew book is more than a hymnal … [it] is a service book incorporating morning and evening prayers, sacramental rites, psalms and alleluia verses for the Eucharist, a section given over to the acclamations employed in a sung Mass.
as well as a section of prayers of the individual and the household…. The music is a one-lined setting (for unison singing), thus concentrating on congregational participation.\textsuperscript{195} Commenting on the editors’ approach to the accompaniments, Burns expresses enthusiasm: “Organists will be grateful for the harmonizations; in some respects, these harmonizations are even eventful, especially where the editors have searched out the original harmonizations that have long been forgotten or ignored … [and] there are no guitar chords indicated.”\textsuperscript{196} He concludes with a rousing endorsement:

\begin{quote}
[The editors] have put together a service book (after all, it is quite a bit more than a hymnal) that is a testament of taste, liturgical sensitivity, musical acumen, and invention … a big undertaking has resulted in a big book that contains music for almost every occasion within the church’s liturgical year.\textsuperscript{197}
\end{quote}

In a January 1987 discussion of three recently released hymnals, Leaver takes up where Routley left off. He predicts that this particular hymnal, released within the “hymnal explosion” of the 1980s and influenced by both the increased hymn production of the 1960s and 1970s and the contemporaneous review and reassessment of historical hymnody, “will undoubtedly prove to be enormously influential.”\textsuperscript{198} Leaver characterizes the liturgical content of the hymnal as “extensive” but notes the difficulty for investigators attempting “to separate the liturgical from the hymnological.”\textsuperscript{199} For example, the materials in the daily office section include office hymns and the psalmody includes metrical versions that can be sung as hymns. He remarks on the similarity of the arrangement of the hymns in this edition of *Worship* and the Episcopal Church’s *Hymnal 1982*:

\begin{quote}
It is a measure of the effect of the liturgical movement which has left none of the mainline churches untouched, with each tradition learning from the experience and practice of the others. Thus Protestants are taking liturgical chant into their worship and Catholics are assimilating metrical psalms into theirs.\textsuperscript{200}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushleft}
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Leaver identifies distinctive features of the hymnal in order to evaluate “how representative they are of the main periods of hymnwriting in the past, how they employ contemporary material, and what new directions they might be pointing in.”201 In comparison to the other hymnals examined, Leaver opines, “One would have expected the Catholic [Worship, third edition] to have made more of … early Latin hymnwriters, and … made more use of Neale’s translations.”202 Leaver marks the presence of British hymnwriters and composers found in British hymnals published in the United States and the demonstrated “concern for [linguistic] modernization,” but reminds his readers that this “is a book for Catholics who do not have such a long hymnic memory as Protestants … [so] the changes will be accepted more readily.”203

In the June 1987 Journal of Church Music, Tortolano reviews the third edition, characterizing it as “an old faithful friend that has changed in appearance.”204 He lists a number of features that make the book “a comprehensive and important expression of worship,” referencing the ordering of the hymns with respect to the liturgical year, the inclusion of a significant amount of Gregorian chant and various “texts and music to cover a wide consortium of rituals and services,” and a “very strong” set of indexes.205 Expanding on his theme of old friends changing, he confesses, “It is both positive and frustrating to encounter a familiar tune and find that the text has undergone a metamorphosis,” and lists a number of texts that have changed in large or small ways from the previous edition.206 But noting the diversity found within the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, Tortolano concludes, “No hymnal can cover all the particular needs and interests of such a diverse religious group…. Worship is a fine, literate and attractive hymnal [that] must be taken seriously.”207
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Learning from the first two editions, the editorial board of the third edition attempted to produce a hymnal that would take the American church into the new millennium. With its extensive and liturgically organized content to meet the various needs of a Catholic faith community, its substantial efforts to resolve contemporary language issues, and its more focused approach to balancing historical and contemporary song selection, the third edition of *Worship* proved to be a great success and would not be revised again until the issuance of a new *Roman Missal* in 2011 precipitated a fourth edition that year.


In 1998, GIA Publications published a companion to the third edition of *Worship* in the tradition of the principal Protestant hymnal companions. The first section presents brief biographies of the hymns’ authors and composers, the second section offers notes on the origins of each hymn text and tune, and appendices and indexes offer additional information on dates, liturgical use, and content. In the book’s foreword, Batastini places the companion in historical context, stating, “This present volume, the companion to the hymnal *Worship—Third Edition*, is indeed the first of its kind. For American Roman Catholics it is the first hymnal companion ever produced, and it has been in the preparation stage for quite some time.”

Released more than ten years after the publication of the hymnal, the companion offers a glimpse of the continuing pastoral concerns of the hymnal’s editorial committee:

Catholics are still in the process of learning that we sing hymns in order to place selected *words* on the lips of assembled communities. Many worship leaders are known to schedule the assembly’s favorite hymns on a disproportionate basis, solely because they are favorites. This favor is almost always derived from the attractiveness of the tune with minimal attention paid to text. Similarly, it is common to experience common worship practices that dictate [the singing of] so many stanzas for the entrance song … and so many for the closing song … with total disregard for content. These practices betray a certain immaturity: although we sing hymns, we have not seriously delved into the cognitive content of the poetry. The words pass our lips, but we have yet to chew on them. As stated, however, we are in an evolutionary period, and this immaturity is gradually yielding to a more refined practice.
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The foreword also illuminates the editors’ continuing belief that a better use of the hymnal could alleviate their concerns:

Pastoral musicians are increasingly acquainting themselves with the hymn writers behind the words we sing. Many of them are from the early church … some of them are outstanding translators from European languages … giants of English language history … and countless gifted contemporary writers … [who] continually give new expression to our prayer and praise.… Information [in this companion] often includes when [the text] was written, why it was written, what the author has attempted to express or what inspired a particular text, and generally provides the benefit of deeper insight.210

While not adding significantly to the understanding of the intent of the 1986 hymnal, the foreword of the companion does provide an indication of the ongoing musical and liturgical concerns held by the editors at GIA Publications, and provides insight into their firm belief that the hymnal continues to be available as an instrument for ongoing education and support in efforts to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council.

**MARKETING MATERIALS**

In the for-profit world of Roman Catholic music publishing in the United States, advertising is essential to sell hymnals, and GIA Publications marketed its new products extensively. These efforts took on several guises and were present in a number of different publications, all of which pointed toward Roman Catholic liturgists and musicians. The earliest announcement of the possibility of a third edition of Worship probably came in the form of an undated cover letter (see Figure 3) inviting everyone who had purchased Worship II to complete a “Worship II Evaluation” (the complete evaluation is found as Appendix B) and asking them for “feedback as part of our remote preparation for a revision which we project for 1985 or later.”211

Other, more intentional advertising sheds clear light on the purpose of the new edition. A full-page advertisement was placed in the journal of the National Association of
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211. Robert J. Batastini, cover letter for Worship II evaluation letter, (Chicago: G.I.A. Publications, [1983?]?). This letter probably went out in the spring of 1983. In an email dated October 29, 2012, responding to an inquiry about the date of the letter, Neil Borgstrom, who worked as an assistant to the editorial committee for Worship, third edition, relates “I’m going to take a guess at spring 1983. I say this because I’m sure it was before I joined GIA (November 1984), and I have a really vague recollection that I may have filled out one of these surveys myself while organist at Crosier Seminary.”
Dear Pastoral Musician:

According to our records, your parish purchased Worship II some years ago. Assuming that you have had extended experience with this hymnal as a worship aid, we now eagerly seek your feedback as part of our remote preparation for a revision which we project for 1985 or later.

The questionnaire is admittedly a lengthy instrument. Therefore, we will be happy to receive as much input as you can provide, even if you do not complete the entire survey. If, however, you have the time, energy and desire to complete the entire form, our gratitude will be unending.

Please endeavor to return the completed form within 30 days.

With sincere thanks for your willingness to participate in this survey, I remain,

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Robert J. Batastini
Editor

Enclosure: Worship II Evaluation

Pastoral Musicians (NPM) in its April–May 1984 issue announcing “the preparation of WORSHIP – Third Edition: The Most Complete Hymnal/Service Book Ever Offered to Catholics,” and touting:

400 Hymns … 60 Psalms and Canticles … [an] enriched and expanded service music section … careful editing for inclusive language, and the modernization of archaic language in all but “classic” texts … a “Hymn-of-the-Day” calendar … a new page design [that] will permit the inclusion of nearly 25% more material than Worship II … complete settings of Sunday Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer … [with] new musical settings of the 450 required antiphons. 212

Closer to the actual date of release, GIA Publications ran a full-page notice in its 1985 fall catalog entitled “The Most Often Asked Questions About Worship – Third Edition” (see Figure 4), which provides a concrete understanding of its editorial approach to the third edition. 213 In answer to the first question—about the differences between the second and third editions—the advertisement underscores the importance of linguistic and liturgical influences upon the new hymnal, stating, “two major concerns governed the revision: the call for inclusive and contemporary language and the need for a hymnal that would better meet the Sunday by Sunday demands of the lectionary as well as the rites.” 214 The second answer—about the rites of the church—provides an opportunity to discuss ease of participation, reporting, “All music and the complete rite (including all parts of the mass for funerals and weddings) are printed together in one place so that the assembly need only be given the starting page. An emphasis has been placed on music of a more ‘instant’ nature for these occasions.” 215 The fourth answer—about the inclusion of “folk music”—fixes GIA Publications’ position on the classical-contemporary spectrum, at least for the purposes of this hymnal:
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THE MOST OFTEN ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT
WORSHIP - THIRD EDITION

Q. What is the difference between the new hymnal and WORSHIP II?
The new edition is really a totally new hymnal. It is a successor to the earlier volume, but is about as different as II was from I. Two major concerns governed the revision: the call for inclusive and contemporary language and the need for a hymnal that would better meet the Sunday by Sunday demands of the lectionary as well as the rites.

Q. What about the rites? Have they been treated any differently?
All of the rites, especially marriage, funeral and baptism - those rites which are usually celebrated with a lot of visitors present - have been given a more thorough treatment. The assembly need not flip back and forth throughout the book in order to “follow” the service. All music and the complete rite (including all parts of the mass for funerals and weddings) are printed together in one place so that the assembly need only be given the starting page. An emphasis has been placed on music of a more “instant” nature for these occasions.

Q. How many hymns will it have, and how many of the hymns from WORSHIP II have you kept?
The third edition has 425 hymns plus 88 psalms and canticles! About 90 hymns from WORSHIP II have been dropped.

Q. Is there any folk music?
No, not contemporary folk music. So much new music is written in this genre each year that a bound hymnal with its 10 to 20 year lifespan cannot faithfully represent the idiom. Rather, the consensus seems to be that the ideal is for parishes to have a self-produced supplement, or one or more of the popular paperback folk hymnals.

Q. Will there be new service music? And more of it?
Yes and yes. Our survey of WORSHIP II users told us which service music was being used and which was not. We’ve kept the best and added much more.

Q. Will there be an edition with readings? Will the choir book be so heavy? Have you done something to improve the binding of the accompaniment book?
The size of both the people’s books and the choir book will be “6x9”. People’s editions without Sunday readings will be available. The organ accompaniment is printed in a “landscape” format which is 12” wide and 9” tall. It opens to four pages at a time, and therefore has half the number of sheets.

Q. When will it be ready?????
Around Christmas…of 1985, that is.

To this we add that the guitar accompaniment, low key accompaniment, special edition for the visually impaired, and cantor book will also be available along with the regular editions, or shortly thereafter. Prices will be in line with those of WORSHIP II.

No, not contemporary folk music. So much new music is written in this genre each year that a bound hymnal with its 15 to 20 year lifespan cannot faithfully represent the idiom. Rather, the consensus seems to be that the ideal is for parishes to have a self produced supplement, or one or more of the popular paperback folk hymnals.\textsuperscript{216}

This fourth answer also suggests GIA Publications hopes for greater longevity in this hymnal compared to the previous editions. A fifteen- to twenty-year lifespan compares favorably to the four-year life of the first edition, or even the eleven years of the second edition, though it still does not fully rank with the twenty-five- to forty-year life span of many mainline Protestant hymnals. Additionally, the answer to this fourth question reminds the reader that GIA Publications is no longer in the missalette business, emphasizing the temporary nature of those resources and, obliquely, the permanence of the GIA Publications product. The fifth answer—about service music; that is, the congregational parts of the Mass including the Gloria, Sanctus, Memorial Acclamation, Amen, Agnus Dei, and other ritual music—indicates a continuing commitment to offer additional opportunities for greater participation of the people within worship; more music of this type might have meant that people wanted more variety, which could indicate greater ease by congregations in their corporate singing than in the past. An additional note at the bottom of the page provides an indication of the publisher’s ongoing commitment to serve a wide range of congregational and stylistic needs, reporting the forthcoming availability of “the guitar accompaniment, low key accompaniment, [and a] special edition for the visually impaired,” all designed to facilitate participation by the assembly.\textsuperscript{217} Coincidentally, this notice appeared directly across from the issue’s half-page advertisement for \textit{Worship II}, which states, “No other hymnal, missalette, or combination program even comes close to offering the wide array of supplemental materials available to WORSHIP II users.”\textsuperscript{218}

Oddly, this is the last advertisement in \textit{Pastoral Music} about a GIA Publications’ hymnal until its \textit{Celebration} hymnal is advertised in 1988. Advertising for the third edition did not appear in the journal in the year of its release. However, GIA Publications was
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present in the journal, and mentions of the publisher and the new hymnal did appear. In the August-September 1986 issue, an Association News piece notes the end of the four-year-long hymnal project, and offered its affirmation and a rousing endorsement:

The National Association of Pastoral Musicians salutes GIA and its president, Ed Harris, for taking so much time to carefully prepare for the American church a hymnal truly national in scope, beautiful in design and craftsmanship, thorough in its approach to the liturgy and remarkably eclectic in its musical selections. Parishes who choose to use this book will profit from doing so.219

In the following issue, a full-page advertisement honoring NPM’s tenth anniversary prominently featured GIA Publications’ name and logo. Two issues later, Batastini was the February-March 1987 issue’s Person of Note, and in the body of this article, the hymnal is mentioned favorably:

As publisher over the years [Batastini] has operated on few principles other than to be discriminating in all styles from plainsong to popular and “consciously never publish a missalette.” NPM congratulates GIA on the emergence of Worship, Third Edition, and commends Robert Batastini as a man of integrity and endurance, a genius at the center of music for all traditions, and one we can proudly call our own.220

Through its advertising specifically targeting previous customers as well as members of the wider church music profession, GIA Publications made some efforts to publicize the issuance of the third edition. Though not as prevalent as most publishers advertising in the journal of the preeminent national Catholic music organization, some representation was made, and significant endorsements of its new service book were included in those instances. An examination of the advertising approach indicates a focus on extolling the merits of the new edition across the spectrum of issues: liturgical comprehensiveness, musical quality, a commitment to longevity in the book itself and in the musical selections, and linguistic suitability within the contemporary social milieu.

The entire Worship series of hymnals, from its first edition in 1971 to the third published in 1986 and the accompanying companion edition, illustrates GIA Publications’ efforts both to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council with respect to


liturgical music and to bring the Catholic Church in the United States into musical parity with its Protestant siblings. The written record certainly indicates a robust commitment to facilitating congregational singing in all its Catholic liturgical forms, the promotion of the historical hymnic tradition of Christian singing through the presentation of high-quality musical choices for Catholic congregations, and sensitivity to linguistic influences that were of concern to the ecumenical community.
CHAPTER 4

INTERVIEWS

This chapter examines the process of creating a Catholic hymnal for the new millennium from the personal perspective of members of the editorial team that compiled the third edition of GIA Publications’ Worship. Interviews were conducted with the primary contributors to the hymnal project, including Robert J. Batastini (general editor and project director), Fred Moleck (text editor), Rev. Robert Oldershaw (liturgical and index editor), Catherine Salika (bibliographer and researcher), Michael Cymbala (permissions editor), and Neil Borgstrom (editorial assistant). Batastini, Moleck, and Oldershaw comprised the principal, four-person editorial committee together with music editor Richard Proulx, who died in 2010.

The third edition offered its users many new and innovative approaches, but its predecessors laid the foundation for its success. The first edition, derived from GIA Publications’ joint loose-leaf hymnal project with the addition of the Order of Mass, did not have much of an impact. “It was not a terrible success,” Batastini admits. “We maybe sold 150,000 to 200,000 to twenty-five or thirty parishes, maybe.”221 But feedback about the hymnal from GIA’s summer seminar participants offered the organization substantial encouragement: “Yes, this is good,” Batastini relates, “but it isn’t good enough.”222 The next step was to form an editorial committee out of the seminar faculty and commence work on a second edition. The committee was comprised of Batastini, Oldershaw, Proulx, and Daniel Reuning. Though no formal mission statement was adopted, the goal was clear:

We wanted to give Catholics a good Protestant hymnal. We wanted to expose Catholics to the wonderful body of Christian hymnody that all the other denominations were singing, to a broader repertoire of hymn tunes. We weren’t so concerned about the texts, [rather] the comprehensiveness of those hymnals—600
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hymns, 500 hymns, and all those wonderful tunes. We wanted to bring Catholics into that world. But Batastini makes an important distinction: “When I say a good Protestant hymnal, I am not talking theology at all. It is not a textual issue. It was all about tunes, a comprehensive book of great Christian hymn tunes. That’s what Worship II was about.” The process of editing the second edition was “a quick job,” according to Batastini, but the ecumenical dimension was already apparent:

We went through hymnals, a lot of Protestant books, and we picked hymns by consensus. We went through [the Episcopal Church’s] Hymnal 1940 and we went through the Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal 1958, the Methodist book that came out in the Sixties. There was a fairly new United Church of Christ hymnal, just off the press … where we found some of the new stuff. The Lutherans and the Episcopalians were publishing little pamphlets, all in preparation for their new hymnals, and we latched on to all that stuff.

Catholic sources were also consulted, and Batastini recalls looking at the People’s Mass Book from World Library Publications, the Canadian Catholic Conference’s Catholic Book of Worship, and the Benziger hymnal, even though none of these hardbound books had been very successful. Batastini asserts that the committee’s focus was solidly on the tunes. “The texts,” he says, “just sort of rode along. Catholics were still too new at hymn singing, and barely knew how to do it. We had some people who were singing ‘Sons of God’ and ‘Here We Are,’ and those who were singing hymns were singing ‘Now Thank We All Our God.’ We felt a need to move people forward.”

Cymbala, who later was in charge of marketing the third edition of the hymnal, offers this analysis of the second edition:

Worship II put GIA in the hymnal business—the first book, not so much. Prior to Worship II, GIA was a highly respected publisher of choral music. Their choral music was next to none. Worship II put them in the pews. The only competition at the time was [J. S.] Paluch. There was no OCP (Oregon Catholic Press)…
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Worship II did even better [than the first edition], maybe selling a million copies, or more.\footnote{228}

In the second edition, the Church’s organ-based musicians had a book they could call their own, but after a few years, its sales dwindled precipitously. The second edition’s demise resulted from a changing cultural environment. Batastini presents the principal issue:

\[
[\text{Worship II}] \text{ was probably the last hymnal published in all of Christianity that did not take inclusive language into account. Three years later, LBW [the Lutheran Book of Worship] came out, and it was the first hymnal to begin to deal with inclusive language. And then we knew that the Episcopal Church was working on [Hymnal] 1982. It was dealing with inclusive language, and of course there was a hue and cry in the Catholic Church, which is why—it’s the sole reason—that Worship III came out just eleven years after Worship II.} \footnote{229}
\]

Cymbala elaborates on the language issue:

\[
\text{Worship II is pretty archaic in its language…. I think a lot of people were turned off by the language. And it was just at that time when “thee” and “thou” was just not on people’s radar. Beyond that, we had texts like “Thy strong word did cleave the darkness; / At thy speaking it was done; / For created light we thank thee, / While thine ordered seasons run” [Hymn 280]. That’s beautiful poetry. The organists loved to play it [to the tune, EBENEZER] because it was fun to play. But for Joe and Mary Catholic in the third pew?} \footnote{230}
\]

Moleck asserts that another edition was inevitable: “Through his connection to the Hymn Society, Bob [Batastini] saw what was going on in the Lutherans, the Episcopalians, the Methodists. There was a concern about language, and also interpreting the signs of the time, the women’s revolution. We had to do this. Worship II was kind of clumsy.”\footnote{231} Within the changing cultural environment, new texts were being written and new tunes were being composed. Cymbala emphasizes the “renaissance of new music that was available,” noting, “Worship II had done well, and we felt that these folks would replace it if it was better. One of the reasons [the third edition] came out in just eleven years was that there was just so much more that could be done better. The Church was ready for it, and they bought it.”\footnote{232}
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Preparation for the third edition commenced with greater intentionality. The new committee met for sixty-two days over a span of two years, many of those at Batastini’s house in the town of Fennville, Michigan. “We would be sequestered,” Batastini recalls, “and we would work for two or three days at a crack. We would meet in Chicago a lot too, because Proulx was in Chicago by this time, as were Oldershaw and I. We just had to fly Fred [Moleck] in. A lot of the meetings were in Oldershaw’s rectory.”

Oldershaw describes the overarching approach:

The goal was to provide accessible music and music that was liturgically appropriate, in other words, that was reflecting the particular moments in the celebration or the rite. We wanted to respond to the need of the liturgy. We wanted to search out good music, music that was worthy, noble, that could bear the weight of the rite or whatever we were celebrating, that wasn’t “Good Night, Sweet Jesus.” … We were trying to stay a little bit ahead of the curve, or at least try to stay up with the needs or the requirements of the time. When we began the whole series, Worship II into Worship III, we had a substantial body of hymnody, but what we didn’t have in Worship II was music for the particular moments of the rites … [that would] help people to a deeper understanding of the rites through the music. We tried to develop it and key the music to the scriptural theme of the lectionary cycle.

Batastini offers three primary issues that guided the creation of the new edition: “We had already introduced tunes, so the predominant issue was language. The second issue was creating a hymn-of-the-day scheme. The third issue was finding a replacement for Dan Reuning, because, as a Lutheran, he hadn’t actually used Worship II.”

Batastini explains that the committee began with a search for appropriate hymn texts to complete a hymn-of-the-day scheme:

We decided that songs must absolutely be tied to the lectionary. So we piled the dining room table with twenty-five different hymnals and a lectionary, and we started with the First Sunday of Advent. We had three options: find a hymn that really fit the Gospel of the day and that we as a committee actually wanted to propose for inclusion; find a hymn that was a good place holder, that kind of said what we needed it to say, but was only a place holder and needed a better version; and identify the holes in the three-year cycle of Sunday readings. We went
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through all the hymnals and the scriptural indexes. We started with Worship II, identifying the hymns … that would fit into this three-year lectionary scheme.\footnote{236. Ibid.}

The committee was also open to new songs as it sought to present a balanced proportion of seasonal music for the entire Church year, as Oldershaw explains:

We began where we were at the end of Worship II. Bob Batastini was getting many texts submitted to him through the Hymn Society of America and from other denominations. Richard Proulx was working on Hymnal 1982. Realizing that we had a lot of new material, and that we were getting deeper insights into the scripture, we also wanted to try to speak to new possibilities, looking at the balance we had in the hymnal in the past and trying to rebalance the new hymnal…. We looked at the seasons, the Sundays of the year and the seasons. We had plenty of hymns for Christmas and plenty of hymns for Easter. Lent was wanting. Some of the standards—“The Glory of These Forty Days,” for example—were appropriate, but Lent is long. We also focused on the year outside of the seasons, Ordinary Time.\footnote{237. Oldershaw, interview.}

The committee’s seasonal focus would lead to a reordering of the hymnal, where the alphabetical arrangement of the second edition was replaced with a lectionary-based approach, with the Liturgy of the Hours leading the entries. Batastini elaborates:

Most good hymnals have a lot of the same hymnody. What defines a denominational hymnal is not only editorial tweaking, but the way the book is organized. We are not commanded to celebrate the Eucharist seven days a week. The Church will say that the daily prayer is the Office, so we begin with Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, and Night Prayer. The book begins there because that’s where our prayer begins. The Psalter comes right after the Office; we have all the psalms that are called for in the Liturgy of the Hours for Sundays. After daily prayer, we have RCIA [Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults], because that is your entrance into the Church. And then we go into the sacraments, and the last thing before the hymns is the Mass and all of the Mass settings. We are a lectionary-based church, so we decided that the hymn section would follow the lectionary, Advent through Christ the King. Then we chose topics, which are kind of arbitrary. I looked at a consensus of the other books.\footnote{238. Batastini, interview.}

As with the second edition, hymn texts from across the ecumenical spectrum were consulted. Oldershaw describes the evaluative process:

Richard [Proulx] had a good sense of text, but he was looking at things for singability. Will this fly? Is it worthy music? Is it singable music? Is it strong?

---
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Fred [Moleck] would be looking at the texts theologically. Is it good or poor theology? I’d be looking at it that way too. Looking at it from the angle of, Is it appropriate? If it’s a classic Protestant text, does it make sense as we understand our theology today? Fred and all of us were trying to be as inclusive as possible without destroying the integrity of a text.239

As members of the committee assigned old texts to specific liturgical uses and discovered new texts to fill in the holes, they continued to keep in mind the predominant issue, language considerations. Batastini produced language principles (see Figure 5, and Appendix C for the full document) for the committee to use, and Moleck was charged with taking the chosen texts and bringing them into compliance with the guidelines, as he describes:

I say [reading from the preface to the third edition], “the language of the hymn texts reflects a contemporary concern that language be just as well as poetic.” That was my major keel. I was looking at texts for gender inclusivity and contemporary images. All my life, being Eastern European and a passionate Democrat, while being a closeted Bolshevik, I had the concern about fairness and justice. I abhor the phrase “politically correct” because that implies ephemeral, “we’ll change it tomorrow.” But these are issues of faith and justice. And not being stupid, we cannot sing “faith of our mothers dash fathers.” That’s an icon, but we can make adjustments. We don’t always have to say “him.” In Suzanne Toolan’s “I Will Raise You Up,” the text “unless the Father calls him” becomes “unless the Father beckons.” But I can’t find [a poetic substitute for] Faith of Our [Fathers]. And “God rest you merry, gentlefolk” doesn’t make it either. But what does work is “Good Christian friends, rejoice” because the internal rhyme works. And in another ten years they won’t know there’s anything different about it.240

Salika recalls addressing textual concerns when she joined the four editors as part of a week-long sing-through of the book’s 440 hymns the summer before it was published:

We were singing off these gigantic eleven-by-seventeen pages, some of which were copies from other books and some of which were manuscript….. There were a couple of times where we weren’t certain about the tune-text marriages and a couple of those got changed…. At that point, not all of the texts had been edited, and we were making the inclusive language changes on the fly, all [spontaneously singing] the same changes. Or the thee-thy-thou language. Some of them of course tripped us up because they messed with rhyme and meter. But it was amazing how many times the bunch of us did the same thing very naturally…. Fred was busy noting the changes we made, making his own changes, or noting the changes he had to take home as homework.241
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2.

Some general principles and miscellaneous thoughts:

If the only male reference to God is found in the doxological stanza at the end of a hymn, we should examine the possibility of simply eliminating that final stanza. Often, this is not part of the author's original text to begin with.

We should actively seek texts which use feminine images of God. E.g., "O God, as a mother nuturest her child, so you care for us...", "our father and mother and maker art thou."

But God is not she, and God is not he. These metaphorical constructions need to be balanced with a host of other God titles.

When a text is found to be sexist in the sense of the hymn "Faith of our fathers," we must choose to either keep it as it is - because of its strong place in the tradition - or eliminate it entirely. To alter it to something like "Faith of our forebears" suddenly focuses on the issue.

In seeking alternative titles for God, we should avoid Yahweh, since it has recently come to light that the Jewish community finds our use of that name to be insensitive to their tradition.

Other language concerns:

We should make a conscious effort to reduce militant language in hymnody. We should love our oppressor to death, not trample over her or him.
In the Bernardin era, hawishness is definitely on the wane.

We should make an effort to modernize all idioms that do not speak clearly to people today. E.g. "peculiar honors to our king," "sound the loud triumphant lay."

We should eliminate archaic forms such as: hast, doth, wilt, art, givest, takest, etc.

The pronouns, thee, thou, thy, thine, should be replaced with modern forms.

Exceptions: Whenever we decide that a text has "classic" standing, we should avoid tampering with it. Whenever the tone of a text is such that modernizing pronouns and verb forms are out of character, we should avoid tampering. In these cases, the decision should simply be whether or not to include the text.
Changes to texts were made not only to comply with modern sensibilities. Additionally, Salika was tasked with finding the first English-language version of the older texts, and notes revision reversal also occurred:

There were instances when changes that had been made over time were less felicitous than the original, and so I at least gave Fred [Moleck] the opportunity to think about that. They might have found it in a fairly modern hymnal, but if you go back to *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, you would find that although it had the thee-thy-thou language, there might have been some other phrases that they liked better than what is in the current books.  

Although the lack of a hymn-singing tradition in the Catholic Church makes it easier to change the texts, Batastini notes there were limits:

If it called attention to itself, it becomes an agenda…. Classic texts, Gerard Manley Hopkins, we wouldn’t dare tinker with, or classic poetry. If the only male attribute of God was in the doxology, we in some cases would alter the doxology. There were a few Fathers that were changed to Creator or Maker, in a few places. But we wouldn’t draw attention to it. We wouldn’t have “Glory be to the Maker and to the Son…”

Moleck endorses keeping some older texts intact, remarking on a historical need for continuity: “If we choose not to use older texts at all because of our inability to modernize their language, we lose the chain, and I think that can’t happen.”

Oldershaw provides a pastoral perspective:

I think the goal of it was to make the text as inclusive as possible, because it wasn’t just a trend. We felt this was a responsibility that we had, and that it was a matter of justice, so that we could make these hymns, these texts accessible to as many people as we could, certainly accessible to women as well as men. And I think that, by and large, we did a good job on it. We were primarily concerned with gender language concerned with humanity, with human beings, where it was possible, without bowdlerizing the text, or changing the theology, where there were opportunities. That was also the direction of the Church at that time. There was an openness to the gender-neutral language with regard to human beings, at the same time with regard to the deity. Again, we were trying to stay ahead of the curve. We wanted to be respectful of the various cultural traditions, and particularly, since we have spirituals in there, to the African-American reality.
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From a practical standpoint, the third edition needed to be more than a hymnal. There had been discussions by the Conference of Catholic Bishops about the need for a service book for the American Church in the tradition of the Episcopal Church’s 1979 *Book of Common Prayer*, so a comprehensive service book that facilitated participation through the music and in the rites was called for. All of the *Worship* hymnals had included some of the rites of the church, but the third edition was intended to be a complete service book, incorporating the Mass, all of the sacramental rites (except for Ordination), and the Liturgy of the Hours. Batastini notes that the hymnal includes “as much as people needed to participate intelligently in the service … but only sketchy outlines of the Marriage and Confirmation rites because people almost always do programs for those. The Funeral rite was completely developed, and Baptism and Anointing were much more developed than before.”

The Liturgy of the Hours was included not only to make that particular liturgy accessible to the people in the pews, but also to encourage its use.

An additional reason to offer a comprehensive service book was to create a sense of liturgical permanence that was needed as the Church was finally settling into the post-conciliar rites. Oldershaw offers a pastoral perspective on the benefit of using a hardbound hymnal:

> It honored the people who were using it. It was a book, handsomely bound. The music was put together nicely. It said something about who we are and what this liturgy is, not that it’s here to get old or gray or something but that it’s not disposable, not throw away. We’ve got some good, solid material here, and it’s saying “This is a new liturgy.” It isn’t something that was going to be here today and gone tomorrow.”

Moleck concurs with Oldershaw’s opinion of the benefits of providing the assembly with a hardbound resource, but also acknowledges the historical importance of the disposable missalette as well:

> It gives [the new liturgy] respectability because it’s a hardbound book. But I’m not bad-mouthing the missalette, because without the missalette, we would not have been as successful in getting popular participation…. My “heretical” [non-Catholic] sisters and brothers couldn’t believe this was a Catholic hymnal because

---
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of the design and format. I hate the word “classy”—“handsome” is a good word.248

Oldershaw also underscores the long-term benefit to what they were trying to accomplish and the need to establish a formative music resource for the congregations:

There was definitely a catechetical element to the hymnal. We were trying to teach, to inspire, to throw some interest. To me it was something that evolved again and again. We were trying to find worthy music, and broaden their repertoire little by little and providing good, substantial stuff, a body of hymnody that they would spend time learning and that would last. It wasn’t the *Gebrauchsmusik*, the disposable stuff. We needed the disposable stuff too, but there was a lot of music that needed to be retired. We were searching for music that was appropriate to what was going on, and what was required at that time, and then that was good, solid music in itself, and pastorally, music that was accessible, that people could sing—the old aesthetic of the liturgical and pastoral judgment.249

To support the quality of its contents, the third edition’s production values were superior to those of its predecessors, and the production process was very deliberate, according to Batastini:

It was apparent that there are different ways to [create a hymnal]. We were looking for consensus, too, and we would take the most respected hymnals. You come to know which hymnals have been most carefully prepared, and which ones have been thrown together, or done without a real clear design and plan. So, you tend to look for consensus—the Lutherans, the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Presbyterians always do their projects with care, as do some others.250

Batastini describes the level of detail that went in to it:

[The third edition] is the most carefully designed book we’ve ever done…. We hired a book designer. The music was done on a music typewriter, but we got an early-stage computer and figured out how to measure the text. I took the hymn “The Church’s One Foundation” from all the major hymnals and took them to an engraver, and had him engrave it according to each style—centering, whether or not every line is flush left, whether or not the phrase begins with a cap, how the stemming is done—and at one of the committee meetings, I laid out on the table

---
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all ten versions. We spent the better part of a day going over these, weeding it out. No, no, not this, we agreed. No, not this. And we finally whittled it down to a final one that became GIA’s house style. 251

Participation, getting people to sing, to be involved in the rites, had always been the goal, “even with the loose-leaf hymnal,” Batastini declares. “We have always been focused on the song of the people, on their full, conscious, active participation. And we’ve always tried to do materials that we thought contributed to that.” 252 Congregational singing trumped choral singing throughout the Worship series. Batastini points to the third edition’s choir book as an exemplar of their commitment to congregational singing:

Once in a while, we get people who complain that there isn’t enough choral music in the choir book, some of the hymns are unison, and we say, a hymnal is a book for the people in the pews. When there’s four-part harmony, or three-part harmony, or a descant, we put it in the book and call it the choir book. But because it says “choir book” doesn’t mean that this is a book in which everything in it is in four-part harmony, because that’s not what a hymnal is. The choir book is not a book of choral music; it is a book of that congregational music which can be sung in parts. 253

The committee’s goal to create a hymnal that supports congregational singing shows itself in other ways as well. Moleck recalls that the first hymnals that Batastini gave him to look through were mostly from England, and that in them he discovered “all these wonderful new writers … all of them fresh people.” 254 Proulx’s involvement with the Episcopal hymnal committee made him a valuable primary source for new hymnody. All three members of the editorial committee interviewed assert that Batastini’s connection with the Hymn Society opened the door to much of the ecumenical material. “The Hymn Society is richly ecumenical,” Batastini says. “That’s where GIA came up with people like Adam Tice, a Mennonite, Mary Louise Bringle, a Presbyterian, Herman Stuempfle, a Lutheran, and Dolores Dufner, a Roman Catholic nun.” 255 Batastini notes the breadth of the committee’s search for hymns that supported congregational singing:
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Just look at the copyrights in the hymnal and you’ll see that they come from everywhere. We thought, it’s a good hymn, and it works, we need it. There have always been some factions that say, “Well, Catholics have to have Catholic hymnody,” But the Church has never said that. You sing “Hark, the Herald Angels Sing!” on Christmas and “Joy to the World” and neither of those are Catholic hymns!256

Oldershaw references a wedding custom to make the same point:

“Something borrowed, something blue, something old, and something new.” There were the great hymns of various traditions, and they should be part of this hymnal, and we should not be afraid to forge out and be pioneers to find the new hymns. We started with what we needed to more accurately, more faithfully, express the theology as it was renewing and being renewed. And so to seek out those texts that would express this, to develop texts that were both ecumenical and interfaith. It was certainly in our minds to realize the whole development that was going on. That was one of the reasons we were borrowing texts from other traditions…. This was obviously going to be a Roman Catholic hymnal, but part of Roman Catholicism is to be ecumenical and interfaith, and to reach out to our sisters and brothers in other traditions.257

The committee drew upon a wide variety of Christian traditions for the third edition, but not always a wide variety of musical styles, as Cymbala suggests:

To understand the essence of this book, you have to not only look at what’s in it, but also look at what’s not in it…. The book is geared more toward four-square hymnody than the folk music of the day…. At that time, in that era, there were really two different camps, and there were musicians on both sides that thought there was only one way to go.258

This stylistic conflict appeared during the hymn-of-the-day search process, when Oldershaw offered a folk-style song by the St. Louis Jesuits as the best scripture-based song he could find. That led to the question of balancing one of the committee’s primary goals to provide a
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257. Oldershaw, interview. Oldershaw offers a story of a choral festival that the Diocese of Chicago presented when he was director of the office of liturgy that illustrates the difficulty in incorporating of ecumenical ideas: “Under Cardinal Cody, the liturgy office held Choir Festivals in the early days teaching new Mass settings, trying to help people. I remember this one, it had 800 people singing and it was a great experience. We had Carl Schalk leading the music. It was his second visit with us from out west. I’m walking the cardinal over to the reception and he says, ‘Why do we have to have another Lutheran?’ I said, ‘Well, Your Eminence, simply because they’re doing wonderful things, and we need to lean on them for their expertise and their understanding, and it’s certainly a way that we can all come together.’ And he grunts, ‘Hmph.’ He was certainly a contradiction because he had a good friend who was one of the prominent Lutheran pastors in Chicago.”
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hymn-of-the-day with the competing desire to produce a music collection that would stand
the test of time. Eventually, Cymbala reports, Batastini came up with terminology
referencing a “classic” style and a “popular” style. Worship would be a hymnal in the
classic style and the forthcoming missalette, Gather to Remember, which led in 1988 to the
Gather hymnal, would incorporate the popular style.

The committee’s commitment to finding quality music for Worship, however, would
not preclude incorporating folk-style music, and this nomenclature helped to reconcile a
significant difference of opinion, as Moleck relates: “One of the sticking points was putting
Marty Haugen in the hymnal. That was really offensive to Richard [Proulx]; we had sold out.
So we asked him if he could write something as beautiful as [he sings] ‘Shepherd Me, O
God’? That’s a masterpiece, and he said ‘Well, you’re right.’” Cymbala relates the effort
to put Haugen’s Mass of Creation into the hymnal:

Mass of Creation came out in 1984 and took off like a rocket. Marty was in a
parish—he did the choir and the folk mass—and he said, “It’s Holy Thursday, or
Christmas Eve, and we don’t have service music.” He wanted to write something
that both camps could use. It was the hot new thing in the catalog, and Marty said
to me, “I wrote this for both camps, and it should be in this book. It should be
acceptable in that regard.” But there was something, there was a note or two in it,
an open fifth or something, that Richard had a real problem with. I know that I
had to do a lot of convincing of Bob that Marty was right. I was doing a choir and
a folk Mass myself at that time. This is good, Bob, this works. I think I convinced
him and he convinced Richard, but it did not get in until the truck was leaving for
the printer. The compromise was that all that’s included are the Eucharistic
acclamations. They drew the line; the Gloria, the Lamb, the Gospel Acclamation,
and the Kyrie are not there. But, years later I heard Richard say that Mass of
Creation was the Catholic setting.

Other folk-style music that made it into the hymnal includes Skinner Chávez-Melo’s
tune RAQUEL set to “Surely It Is God Who Saves Me,” Haugen’s “Gather Us In,” and songs
by the Episcopal Church’s Betty Pulkingham and Karen Lafferty, who contributed “Alleluia,
Alleluia, Give Thanks” and “Seek Ye First,” respectively. According to Cymbala, the
Episcopal folk music was acceptable for Proulx, but the St. Louis Jesuits, who were
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producing the same style of music within the Catholic Church, were not. The limited inclusion of folk-style material is an important indicator of the committee’s process, but this restrictive approach is not surprising as the majority of the four-member editorial committee came out of the organ tradition. “Liturgically, we were all pretty much lower high church,” Moleck describes, “There weren’t any … smells and bells. Richard would have liked more of a hint of that, but we would have made fun. I think the best word is ‘mainstream.’”

As parishes grew more diverse, the hymnal’s lack of stylistic and cultural diversity became apparent. Oldershaw notes one specific ethnic challenge the hymnal could not overcome: “We used it at the parish, and it is still in use at the cathedral. I thought it held up very well. It worked well until we had to meet the needs of the influx of a Hispanic community from a closed parish. So, we added [Oregon Catholic Press’ Spanish-language hymnal] Flor y Canto.” The inherent stylistic and cultural narrowness found in the third edition would be resolved through the future publication of GIA hymnals focused on specific constituencies—for example, the 1988 Gather hymnal for the folk-style music, the 1987 Lead Me, Guide Me for African-American Catholic churches, the 2001 Singing Our Faith for students, and the 2005 Oramos Cantando/We Pray in Song for bilingual, Spanish-English parishes. Other issues were editorial in nature, and would be addressed in future editions, as Batastini notes:

At the end of the hymn-of-the-day process, we ended up with thirteen texts without tunes. The mistake we made with these was commissioning new tunes. In the future, we would assign them tunes used with general texts from other parts of the year so they would be familiar. We also included more than one harmonization of a hymn, leaving it to Richard [Proulx] to propose the one for each text. After I got the book in my parish and I started playing it, I didn’t like some of them. After a while it became apparent that there was a reason some of these alternate historical harmonizations didn’t appear in other hymnals.

In addition to the nature of the process by which the hymnal was compiled, the changing liturgical environment in which the hymnal emerged, and the evolving musical
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styles that marked the period of its creation, the third edition is remarkable by virtue of the people who were involved. Oldershaw makes this observation:

The interesting thing about this whole hymnal project—I read and I heard, and people would talk at meetings—was all these hymnal committees, like the one *Hymnal 1982* had, and how they had to go through all the various stages and approvals. When I look at the big hymnal committees and all that, I ask, how did we happen to do *Worship II*? We were doing summer music workshops. How did I get involved in summer music workshops? I went to one once in Tampa, Florida, and I was so depressed. The classes were very good, the organ, all the choral and music stuff … but then they’d have a liturgy… and they would ask one of the priests who was at the workshop to say the Mass, and it was dreadful. And then after the Mass, people would just leave, and that was it for the day, and you’d see them the next day. And so, at the end of that conference, I said, “The presentations were great, but the Masses were terrible!” And I went down the list. And I said, “And on top of that, there’s nothing afterwards. I think you guys need a decent liturgy to celebrate what you’ve been doing all day, and you need a happy hour.” So they hired me the following year to be in charge of liturgy and happy hour. I did that for several years, and in a few years that led up to *Worship II*. When we started on *Worship II*, we took three or four days at the end of one of those, and that’s how it began.\(^{266}\)

The addition of Moleck as text editor on the editorial team for the third edition was less serendipitous, arising from previous acquaintance, as he relates:

> We (Moleck and Batastini) were friendly. I enjoyed *Worship II*, etc., etc., and the proposal was, “Could you be the text editor?” I said, “I know [nothing] about this. I can read and I can write.” And he said, “And you’re not dumb, especially in our business.” I said, “Convince me.” He said, “I will supply you with some hymnals. I want you to read through and glean what you think would be good, because your taste is excellent, because you agree with me.” Okay!\(^{267}\)

But it was Batastini who drove the process, according to Moleck:

> *Worship III* appeared after only eleven years because it’s such a unique situation for Catholics and hymnals, and because of Bob Batastini. He was the catalyst in all that. He was a big deal in the Hymn Society, which means he had the sparks around him all the time. He could see where it was going. And he’s such a faithful Catholic, it’s sickening. “What’s best for my church!” and all that. So he became a prophet. Bob said we were going to do it. He’s a good engineer; he railroads really quick. I respect and admire him so much for that.\(^{268}\)

---
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Although the committee’s approach to the hymnal changed over time, moving beyond its initial agenda, Moleck points to the circumstances surrounding the inclusion of popular music in the hymnal as indication of the malleability of the process: “It didn’t start that way [with the intention of including any of the folk-style songs]. But, you have to trust in the corporate genius. It builds up its own inertia, its own character.” 269 Oldershaw offers his own evaluation:

I think what’s amazing about it is that we were able to do this. That we could put this together and we did as well—four of us. How audacious! Absolutely! And yet, Worship III had an incredible impact on music and worship in this country. It was the right thing at the right time, and I think to myself, “Now how did I get involved in this?” For me it all began when a person didn’t show up at a parish outside Chicago to do a summer workshop for kids. And I ended up doing it. My musical background? I don’t have a musical background—but I love the liturgy. 270

Interviews with the primary contributors to GIA Publications’ Worship illuminate a series of practical and formative goals that drove the publication of the third edition. In addition to the language concerns that all of the editorial team cited as the principal reason for the revised edition, committee members expressed their intentions to provide a musical resource that shed greater light on the Catholic Church’s scriptural and seasonal focus, that supported increased sung and spoken participation in all the rites of the Church, and that honored the people using it by virtue of its worthiness as an instrument of liturgical activity. The interviews also illumine the committee’s intention to carry out the participatory and ecumenical directives of the Second Vatican Council through the hymnal’s facilitation of the people’s worship activities as well as through the committee’s intentional exploration of a wide variety of ecumenical resources. Additional information was gleaned about the stylistic and cultural dimensions of crafting a new hymnal in the changing social environment of that era, as well as about the shortcomings inherent in the hymnal that did not take into account some of these issues. Finally, the interviews provide insight into the diverse personalities behind the process, a sense that these people understand both that they were changing the history of American Catholic congregational music, and that their faith—not only their
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religious faith, but also their faith in the project itself—played an important role as they collaborated to develop a musical resource that would encourage and support the people’s song as the Roman Catholic Church in the United States moved into the twenty-first century.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In 1984, four men gathered around a table covered with hymnals to stake a claim for permanence in a Catholic musical world awash in disposable songs. Thus began a two-year journey that would culminate in the publication of a musical resource specifically intended to encourage and enliven Roman Catholic congregational singing in the United States. Their timing was fortuitous, as the liturgical and musical chaos attending the initial implementation of the conciliar directives had subsided to some extent, and valuable lessons had been learned from the issuance of two previous editions. Embarking on the third edition of Worship, Robert J. Batastini’s editorial committee was poised to offer Catholics a hymnal and service book that would facilitate the people’s full, conscious, and active participation in the next phase of the church’s post-conciliar journey.

It is clear that the council’s directives for liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, musical excellence, and congregational participation as articulated in the Constitution on the Liturgy drove much of the hymnal’s creative process, and that the hymnal in turn became a tremendous vehicle for implementing many of the council’s intentions. The editors certainly would argue that the conciliar directives necessitated their editorial focus on language, on ecumenical hymnody, and on balancing the traditional with the contemporary, and the process by which they arrived at their final product throws these issues into stark relief.

The council’s call for liturgical reform in the Constitution on the Liturgy had two distinct emphases: that “the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.” In its approach to modern language concerns, the editorial committee balanced tradition and modernity through the preservation of iconic texts, the revision of other texts that were

---

deemed alterable, and the search for new texts that spoke to the circumstances of the day. Though the council’s desire to revise the rites of the Church may not have explicitly called for the reassessment and revision of language used in previous Roman Catholic hymnals, the social environment in which Catholic publishers operated certainly facilitated this interpretation of the liturgical directive. The written record and interviews support the conclusion that a societal call for inclusive and contemporary language brought about both the demise of the second edition as well as the subsequent publication of Worship’s third edition, and that a failure to heed this call to modernization would have had significant financial consequences for any hymnal’s publisher.

The ecumenical directives articulated in the Constitution on the Liturgy stem from a desire “to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ.”

272 Although the reunification of all Christians into a single denomination is unlikely, nevertheless the twentieth century’s ecumenical movement certainly played a role in the development of the third edition. The Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody does not seem to have had a major impact, but it is clear that the editorial committee consulted Protestant hymnals from many different denominations and historical periods. Members of the editorial team specifically mention the Lutheran Book of Worship and the Episcopal Church’s Hymnal 1982 as primary resources for both new and revised materials in the third edition, and they underscore the benefit of Richard Proulx’s involvement in the Episcopal hymnal project. The ecumenical dimension of the third edition is seen in its predecessors, stemming from Batastini’s early intent to provide the Church with a hymnal that would “expose Catholics to the wonderful body of Christian hymnody that all the other denominations were singing.”

273 The search for hymnody in the second edition—which led to the inclusion of material from the Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Lutheran Churches, the United Church of Christ, and historic Catholic sources—expanded even further for the third edition to include new texts, tunes, and musical styles from other denominations. It is important to emphasize, however, that the committee never wandered from its goal of crafting a hymnal specifically for use within the Roman Catholic tradition. The third edition of Worship, like its predecessors, was never
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intended to be an ecumenical hymnal. The lack of liturgical materials in most hymnals from other faith traditions—for example, the Liturgy of the Hours and the sacramental rites—marks *Worship* as a resource intentionally crafted for use in the Roman Catholic Church.

The council’s Constitution on the Liturgy also included an entire chapter devoted to sacred music, and in it the council declared that “the musical tradition of the universal Church is a treasure of inestimable value”\(^\text{274}\) and encouraged congregations “to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, and songs.”\(^\text{275}\) In support of these complementary ideals, the editorial committee maintained a high standard of musical quality and integrity. Committee members consistently used words such as “worthy,” “noble,” “strong,” and “solid” to characterize the tunes they were seeking. For the third edition, they were willing to eliminate texts and tunes from previous editions that had not stood the test of time, and, importantly, to add tunes from non-traditional styles that had proven to be of sufficiently high quality in other publications. That the third edition’s marketing materials recommend the use of a supplemental contemporary resource in conjunction with their hymnal suggests that the editors were willing to wait until contemporary music had proven itself to be of sufficient quality before they would include it in the hardbound hymnal.

Liturgical reform, ecumenical sensitivity, and musical excellence all relate to and support what might be characterized as the council’s overarching congregational goal as expressed in the Constitution on the Liturgy—that is, its call for the “full, active, and conscious participation” of the people.\(^\text{276}\) The written record and interviews indicate that congregational participation was a central focus, if not the overriding goal, for the editorial committee. Foremost among the issues intended to make the hymnal accessible to as many people as possible was the language issue—that is, taking care with texts pertaining to humanity and to Deity in order to make the words meaningful to people in their contemporary social and cultural context. At the same time, efforts to include congregational texts for most of the sacramental rites, to present texts for the Liturgy of the Hours at the front of the book, to incorporate texts and tunes from the Church’s musical heritage, and to

---

\(^{274}\) International Commission on English in the Liturgy, *Documents*, 23.
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offer it in a “handsome” book, all point to a strong desire to provide a book that would become valuable to the people in their worship, thereby encouraging them to increased participation in the new, post-conciliar liturgy. The committee also encouraged the congregation’s participation through more practical methods. New technological methods of book design made the hymnal easier and more comfortable to read. The editorial sing-through of all the hymns a year before publication provided greater assurance that Joe and Mary Catholic in the pew would actually be able to sing everything that was included. The hymn-of-the-day scheme facilitated the connectivity between the congregation’s songs and the scriptures appointed for the day’s liturgy, while providing a much needed resource for liturgists and church music leadership.

It is apparent from the research that the influence of Protestant hymnody and hymnals upon the design and contents of the third edition was significant—there was no need to reinvent the modern hymnal when others had been honing the process for centuries—but it is also important to recognize that the Catholic hymnal experience remains different than the Protestant hymnal experience. One such difference explored in this study is the seemingly short amount of time between successive editions of the Worship hymnal—four years from the first edition to the second, and eleven years from the second to the third. Most of the interviewees downplayed the issue, with Michael Cymbala noting that the issue of comparing the time between generations of Catholic and Protestant hymnals “is an apple and an orange, because [Protestants] have the hymnal psyche. And the Catholics at the time had the missalette psyche. To say that a Catholic hymnal should have the same life expectancy as a Protestant hymnal is just not going to happen.”277 His insight into the relative immaturity of the Catholic hymnal psyche at that time is supported by the publication of the fourth edition of Worship in 2011. This twenty-five-year span more closely coincides with the once-in-a-generation hymnal revisions undertaken in other Christian denominations, every twenty-five to forty years—it would have been even longer had the issuance of new Roman Missal not necessitated a new edition of the hymnal—and it points to a maturing of the hymnal psyche in American Catholic congregations.
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Another difference between the Catholic and Protestant hymnal experience relates to the flexibility Catholic publishers had at that time in choosing and altering texts. It is difficult to imagine a Presbyterian hymnal committee, scholarly experts appointed by that denomination’s General Assembly, having the same leeway that these four men had in crafting their hymnal. Though the lack of a tradition of hymn singing in the Catholic Church provided the editors with an opportunity to make drastic changes to historical texts in order to alleviate linguistic and theological concerns, they clearly took great care in making these decisions in line with the Church’s contemporary social and theological positions.

A third difference that marks the Catholic hymnal experience is the ongoing issue of balancing the permanent and the disposable—that is, maintaining an equilibrium between establishing a long-term hymnic repertoire and providing an outlet for the flood of newly composed music. It appears that the missalette culture that carried the Catholic Church through the transitional period following the Second Vatican Council is a fixture in current Catholic congregational music circles, and that the permanent hymnal culture and the disposable missalette culture will continue to coexist for some time. It is reasonable to suggest, however, that the presence of a classic (permanent) option might encourage the inclusion of a wider range of riskier choices in popular (disposable) resources. Conversely, the greater availability of untried music in disposable resources might encourage editors of the more permanent resources to delay the addition of new materials, as they are able to wait even longer to determine the best-of-the-best to include in their books. Of course, for those communities that are not able to afford the purchase of both styles of books, the permanent books will eventually feel even less adaptable to the current reality, and disposable books will feature even greater turnover in material from one year to the next. A third option is possible, and that would be the path that GIA Publications has taken with its Gather hymnals, which incorporate what is considered to be the best of the classic and the popular musical repertoire in one book. Cymbala reports that while the third edition of Worship sold a million copies in twenty years, the stylistically-blended Gather Comprehensive sold that many copies in ten years, and is the all-time best seller for the company.278 Moreover, GIA
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Publications has published four *Gather* editions over the life of the third edition of *Worship*.\(^{279}\)

Lastly, GIA Publications’ Catholic hymnals include a significant amount of liturgical material that one does not find in most Protestant hymnals. Some denominations have complementary liturgical books that are meant to be used in combination with the hymnal—for example, the Episcopal Church’s 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* and the Presbyterian Church’s 1994 *Book of Common Worship*. The inclusion of this material, though beneficial for congregational participation in the rites, impacts the rest of the hymnal, at the very least, by limiting space that could be and, in other hymnals is, devoted to additional hymns. One must also note that the pew edition of *Worship* presents all of its congregational hymns in unison as a concession to the lack of experience Catholic congregations have in singing during the liturgy, much less singing in harmony. It will be interesting to see whether, in a few generations, harmony is introduced into the pew editions of GIA Publications’ hymnals as congregations become more experienced in singing.

The Second Vatican Council was convened to find a way to mesh the rich traditions of the Roman Catholic Church with the modern sensibilities of contemporary society. As with numerous councils before it, this council took on large, significant issues of global import that would affect people of faith across denominations and religious traditions. With the promulgation of its first document, the Constitution on the Liturgy, the council hoped to reconnect the people in the modern pew to the Church’s transcendent worship, and to make its liturgical action more accessible and, perhaps, relevant to its people’s personal journey of faith. Through this study’s detailed examination of the development of the third edition of *Worship*, one finds a powerful example of how the Roman Catholic Church’s global directives are executed at a local level, how global issues are made manifest in human activities and human decisions. In the end, the council had to rely on what Batastini characterized as “four guys sitting around a table, choosing hymns” to get the job done.\(^{280}\)


\(^{280}\) Batastini, interview. The comment was made somewhat facetiously. The process was certainly more complex than “four guys sitting around a table, choosing hymns.” Batastini is referencing the lack of significant
The editorial process for the third edition of *Worship* was driven by the relationship among the committee members—by their humanity, one might say—rather than by the process itself. Batastini’s leadership style in guiding the committee’s work relied heavily upon consensus. Batastini set up a voting system—everyone associated with the project specifically mentioned the voting system—that provided an environment in which no single person’s opinion could change the outcome of the hymnal irrevocably. There were disagreements about what should be included and what should not, sometimes vocal and with long-term consequences, but nobody was shut out of the process. Batastini relates keeping a “hopper” of music that didn’t make it into the book on a first vote, noting, “We kept [the rejected music], and any member could revisit the hopper, and say, ‘I think we need to go back and look at this again.’ Fine, we did it. And often, it moved over … but anyone could revisit anything. There were no rules that said we’ve rejected this hymn, so you can’t bring it back.”

Decisions were agreed upon by the entire group, including, sometimes, the committee’s assistants—for example, deciding the best way to typeset the hymnal, choosing the best texts from among the various versions available, and adding hymns to the pile of those under consideration. No one member could sabotage a hymn he did not like.

In contrast, hymnal committees from the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, and the Methodist Church have official minutes, reports, and records of their activities. Motions to move forward can include many “whereas” and “therefore” statements, presenting the appearance of a highly-legalistic committee environment. The committee for *Worship* seems to have compiled a hymnal almost by “feel.” Granted, there was significant research of other hymnals, of ancient and modern hymn texts and tunes, and of hymnal resources they could employ in comparison to the extensive human resources and financial resources that the contemporaneous Protestant denominational hymnals employed in their committees and subcommittees.

281. Ibid. Batastini explains the voting procedure: “My voting system, with the four of us, you voted on everything on a one-to-five basis. There was cheating, so we had to say, ‘ready, set, vote.’ If it got sixteen or more, it was in. Four or more points from each of us, it was in the book. The scale was five if you really want to fight for this hymn. Four if you think it is a good hymn and it should be in the hymnal. Three, you’re not so sure. Two, it’s not awful, but no. And one, I hate it. Some always wanted to vote zero, but sorry one was your lowest. If one person voted a one, and everyone else voted a five, it was in. The tune *AZMON* [used in the United States for ‘O for a Thousand Tongues’] was one of these. Richard Proulx hates this tune. Fred Moleck proposed it and loves it. That was probably the biggest fight we had. Oldershaw and I voted five, Proulx one, and it got in.”

282. Ibid.
design, but the process in which Batastini and his cohorts were engaged lacks the relentless legislative character that the records of other denominations seem to reflect. This leads us to recommendations for further study.

First, an examination of the larger committee and subcommittee structures employed by mainline Protestant churches in the creation of their denominational hymnals could illuminate the impact that greater size and more diverse composition might have upon the materials included in these hymnals. In comparison to most mainline Protestant hymnals, the *Worship* hymnals were compiled by a small group of people (or in the case of the first edition, by a single person) who, with the exception of Richard Proulx, and possibly Batastini, were by no means established experts in hymnody. Related to this, an investigation of the nature of Protestant denominational hymnic traditions might be undertaken to determine the extent these committees feel free to abandon or alter well-established denominational music practices in light of societal and cultural changes of the day in the interest of “justice.” In response to an inquiry whether the lack of a tradition of hymn singing facilitated the committee’s alteration of texts, Fred Moleck answered, “Yes, but we would have done it anyway.” One wonders if that phrase could possibly be uttered in a Protestant context.

Second, an examination of the inclusion of contemporary Catholic composers in a broad spectrum of Protestant hymnals would provide a deeper understanding of the bi-directional nature (Protestant-to-Catholic and Catholic-to-Protestant) of ecumenical hymnody. This study has noted the prevalence of Protestant hymnody published in Roman Catholic song books, but other crossover songs have traveled from Catholic sources to Protestant hymnals. In 1997, C. Michael Hawn presented a comprehensive listing of the most prevalent ecumenical hymns in forty Christian hymnals published in the previous twenty years, but did not include information on the composers’ denominational background. In 2001, Donald Boccardi published a list of nineteen contemporary Catholic composers who penned a total of thirty-three songs found in eight Protestant hymnals in use at that time, but the list of hymnals is not comprehensive.

---

Third, an examination of the rejection of a national Catholic hymnal within the context of a tendency toward denominational hymnody in other faith traditions in the United States would provide significant insight into the nature of congregational hymnody in the Roman Catholic Church, and possibly into the diverse nature of the Church at both local and regional levels. Research for the present study suggests the creation of a national Catholic hymnal has been discussed and rejected at these national and regional levels. Robert Oldershaw recalls, for example, discussing the possibility with his bishop: “I remember getting a memo from Cardinal Cody when I worked at the [diocesan] liturgy office and it had to do with the national Catholic hymnal, and he sent me this memo, and he said ‘I don’t approve of this because most of the bishops can’t sing anyway.’”

Finally, an examination of the publication of the fourth edition of Worship and the simultaneously released third edition of the Gather hymnal, both in 2011, would provide greater understanding of the effect conciliar directives have had on sacred music to the present day in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. In the intervening twenty-five years, the council’s directives on liturgy, ecumenism, music, and language have undergone refinement and reinterpretation as new Church leadership has brought new perspectives to these important questions of faith. Additionally, an examination of the editorial practice of Oregon Catholic Press, the other major Catholic music publisher of recent hardbound hymnals, would provide further insight to the world of Catholic congregational hymnody in the United States.

In 1971, GIA Publications embarked on a risky hymnal project that would affect the nature of Catholic congregational singing in the United States for decades. Though its first foray into the world of hardbound hymnody, Worship: A Complete Hymnal and Mass Book for Parishes, would not be a great success, GIA Publications set the stage for future editions that would facilitate and encourage congregational singing to a level never before heard in Catholic parishes in the United States. With the 1986 third edition, Worship: A Hymnal and Service Book for Roman Catholics, the publisher succeeded in producing a Catholic hymnal that rivaled the most well-crafted Protestant hymnals of the day and fulfilled Batastini’s original goal: “to expose Catholics to the wonderful body of Christian hymnody that all the
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other denominations were singing.”

Incorporating the liturgical, musical, and ecumenical directives of the Second Vatican Council, Robert J. Batastini, Fred Moleck, Robert Oldershaw, Richard Proulx, and their editorial team accomplished an even greater task—creating, in the words of their preface to the third edition: “a service book and hymnal for a church which moves into the third millennium of its existence.”

286. Batastini, interview.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
**WORSHIP, FIRST EDITION**


Why was GIA’s first hard-bound hymnal published?

Who was involved in the editorial process?
  How were they chosen?
  What function did they serve?

How were songs chosen for this hymnal?
  What resources were consulted? Why?

How did *Worship* differ from other GIA publications of the time?

What was your concept of the potential market while preparing the hymnal?

How was the hymnal received?

*In an article in NPM’s Pastoral Music (April-May 1986) Robert Batastini wrote: “Worship ... was released in 1971. We quickly learned that it had a market, but that it also failed to satisfy that market.” (“From Correspondence Course to Worship III: The Story of GIA,” 48.)*

What was the discrepancy between the perceived market and the actual one?

**WORSHIP, SECOND EDITION**


Why did GIA introduce a second edition only four years after the first?

Who was involved in the editorial process?
  How were they chosen? What function did they serve?

What did you keep from the first edition? Why?

What did you discard? Why?

The second edition is significantly larger.
  Where did all this music come from?
  How were new songs chosen?
  Who participated in the decision-making process?
  What was different this time?
  What resources were consulted? Why?

*An article in Pastoral Music notes one of the stated goals for the Worship II project was to “give Roman Catholics a hymnbook that could compare to any of the standard Protestant hymnals with which musicians are so familiar.”*

What characteristics of “standard Protestant hymnals” appealed to the editorial committee? Why was this important?
Why did GIA introduce a third edition?

Who was involved in the editorial process?
   How were they chosen?
   What function did they serve?

What did you keep from the second edition? Why?
   What did you discard? Why?

How were new songs chosen?
   Who participated in the decision-making process?
   What was different this time?
   What resources were consulted? Why?

How did the editorial group balance Catholic tradition with the day’s ecumenical influences?

To what extent did the committee search for material from the Church’s historical roots?
   What historical resources were consulted?

To what extent was there a desire to look for new material from outside the Catholic sphere?
   What ecumenical resources were consulted?

How did the editorial committee try to balance musical tradition with musical innovation?
   What stylistic resources were consulted?

   *In an article in Pastoral Music, Robert Batastini references two principal reasons for a new edition: Worship 2 had stopped selling, and there were strong concerns about language “that gave [GIA] a strong mandate to revise.”*

What were the language concerns that GIA felt it important to address in a new edition?
   How did the editorial committee address the language concerns?

   *One goal of the Second Vatican Council was the full, conscious, and active participation of the people in the liturgy.*

How did the *Worship* hymnals, and especially the third edition, facilitate the Council’s goal of participation?

   *Another concern of the Council was ecumenical involvement among Christian churches.*

Was ecumenism a part of the committee’s discussion?

What other issues did the editorial committee address in the third edition?
   How did these issues arise?
   What were the most difficult questions/concerns for the committee to resolve?
   How were these issues resolved?

How was the ordering of the hymnal determined?
   What resources were consulted in determining the order?
In the Preface to Worship III, the editors write, “The new edition has been organized to mirror who we are and how we pray as Roman Catholics within the larger Christian community.” (Batastini, et al., Preface to Worship, 3rd edition, no page number)

How did the committee see the relationship of Roman Catholics within the larger Christian community?

In 1977, the Hymn Society published a list of 277 hymns from the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody which were compiled by an ecumenical group of musicians including some from the Catholic Church.

What was the impact on the Consultation’s hymn list, if any?

In 1981, the ICEL published a Resource Collection of Hymns and Service Music for the Liturgy, which included 250 public domain hymns and 106 commissioned contemporary songs for the rites.

What was the impact of the ICEL’s Resource Collection, if any?

Are there any other issues that you think would further illuminate the decisions surrounding the publication of Worship?

Are the committee notes for Worship in existence? Might I gain access?

Is there anyone else I should talk to?
APPENDIX B

WORSHIP II EVALUATION
WORSHIP II EVALUATION

This survey is designed to go a step beyond the general feedback we have received about WORSHIP II in the seven years since its publication, with specific data relative to individual content and design items. Your cooperation in taking the time to complete as much of this form as you can will be of invaluable assistance to G.I.A. in its desire to assess the serviceability of WORSHIP II.

The survey has five parts:

1) Preliminary Questions
2) Essay questions
3) Hymn evaluations
4) Service music evaluations
5) Lectionary antiphon evaluations

Complete as much of the survey as you can. The final and longest section should be completed by those who have used the lectionary refrains to the extent of having "tested" the settings. Feel free to add comments of any kind on separate sheets.

If you have any questions, feel free to call me at 312/496-3800.

Thank you

Robert J. Batastini
General Editor

* * *

Name________________________

Have you used WORSHIP II in your parish or community?
___ yes ___ no  How many years?________

Was it used in conjunction with another participation aid?
___ yes ___ no  Which?____________________

Have you used the Gelineau Gradual regularly?
___ yes ___ no

Please mail this completed form to: G.I.A. Publications, Inc.,
7404 S. Mason Ave., Chicago, IL 60638
PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

A. Much concern has been expressed in recent years about the matter of non-inclusive or sexist language. The use of male nouns and pronouns as references to all of humanity is deemed unacceptable for public worship by many. Examples drawn from hymnal sources are:

   Good Christian men rejoice (105)
   And I will raise him up (126)
   For the love of my brethren and friends (132)
   Bears all its sons away (203)
   Sons of men and angels say (46)

Question: Do you find such texts to be....
   ___ most objectionable?  ___ somewhat of a concern?  ___ acceptable?
Comments:

B. Similarly, a concern is raised by some who oppose what are commonly called "archaic" expressions. Examples are:

   Ah, holy Jesus, how hast thou offended (6)
   All praise to thee, for thou, O King divine (15)
   O gladsome light (197)
   O praise ye the Lord (210)
   The day thou gavest, Lord, is ended (263)

Question: Do you find such language to be....
   ___ most objectionable?  ___ acceptable in some cases?  ___ acceptable?
Comments:
ESSAY QUESTIONS

Skip over questions on which you have no opinion, or which do not apply to your circumstances. Use extra paper as necessary.

1. Erik Routley was fond of referring to the hymnbook as the ordinary person's book of theology. Has WORSHIP II helped to develop the spirituality of your congregation?

2. Do you have the people's edition ___ with or ___ without the Sunday readings? What has been your experience?

3. Have you found the presentation of the Rites (funeral, marriage, reconciliation, etc.) to be useful?

4. Have you found the Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer section to be useful?

5. Are there any other rites or celebrations that you feel are missing from WORSHIP II?
6. Do you have any comments on the general format and organization of the book?

a. The alphabetization of the hymn section?

b. The numbering system? Are page numbers needed in addition to hymn numbers?

c. Is the ribbon useful or a nuisance? Should there be more?

7. Are the indices useful? Should they be in the people’s book, or is the accompaniment edition sufficient for these?

8. Aside from the above, are there other things which you feel are missing from WORSHIP II?
THE HYMNS

With the accompaniment or choral edition of WORSHIP II at hand, please consider each of the 313 hymns on three separate bases.

W = words
T = tune or melody
H = harmonization or accompaniment

For each of those three elements, give your opinion according to the following scale:

0 = no opinion
1 = poor
2 = fair to good
3 = excellent

Do not hesitate to circle "0" for "no opinion" as often as that is the case. If you are not an organist, or formal musician, you may have no opinion at all regarding harmonizations, for example.

Note: When evaluating texts, make these evaluations apart from the language considerations discussed under PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS. In other words, if you like a particular text apart from objections due to syntax or archaic language expressions, rate it favorably with the understanding that your response on page two will serve to qualify all the following ratings.

AFTER you have completely rated the hymn section, go back and circle the hymn numbers of those hymns which you have actually used in your community. Do this only if you have been or are a WORSHIP II user.

Note: Using this system, it will be possible to have either a 0, 1, 2, or 3 rating for a hymn you have used, as well as a 0, 1, 2 or 3 rating for a hymn which you have not used. Any combination is possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymn No.</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H1 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T1 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>W 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>W: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>T: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>H: 0 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SERVICE MUSIC**

Since these settings use given texts drawn from the Sacramentary, please make your evaluations on the basis of the music alone. Use the same scale of 0 1 2 3 (no opinion, poor, fair/good, excellent), and then go back and circle the numbers you have actually used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>367 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>369 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>411 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>368 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>390 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>412 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>369 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>391 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>413 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>370 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>392 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>414 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>371 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>393 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>415 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>372 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>394 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>416 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>373 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>395 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>417 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>374 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>396 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>418 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>375 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>397 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>419 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>376 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>398 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>420 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>377 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>399 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>421 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>378 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>400 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>422 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>379 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>401 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>423 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>380 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>402 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>424 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>381 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>403 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>425 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>382 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>404 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>426 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>383 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>405 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>427 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>384 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>406 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>428 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>385 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>407 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>429 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>386 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>408 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>430 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>387 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>409 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>431 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>388 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>410 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>432 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latin Service Music - Cantus Missae - 433-449**

These chants are taken from the Roman Missal and are official settings. Please check the evaluation which best represents your opinion of this material.

- No opinion  - Not useful  - Somewhat useful  - Very useful
**LECTIO NARY ANTIPHONS**

These texts are taken from the Lectionary for Mass. Once again, evaluate the musical setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>450 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>478 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>534 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>571 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>475 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>535 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>572 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>460 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>536 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>573 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>461 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>540 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>574 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>462 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>541 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>575 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>463 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>544 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>576 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>464 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>545 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>578 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>467 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>547 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>580 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>465 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>548 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>582 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>490 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>549 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>583 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>493 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>551 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>584 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>501 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>552 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>585 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>502 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>553 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>586 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>505 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>554 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>581 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>506 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>555 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>582 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>507 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>556 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>583 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>508 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>557 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>584 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>510 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>558 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>597 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>512 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>559 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>599 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>516 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>562 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>601 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>516 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>564 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>603 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>520 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>566 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>604 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>522 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>567 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>606 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>524 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>568 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>607 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>528 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>569 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>608 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>531 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>570 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>609 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>664 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>750 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>962 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>665 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>791 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>965 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>666 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>824 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>964 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>667 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>823 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>972 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>668 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>825 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>973 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>671 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>830 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>982 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>672 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>845 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>984 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>673 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>851 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>985 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>674 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>860 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>987 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>675 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>860 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>989 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>676 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>864 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>990 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>677 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>865 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>994 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>679 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>873 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>996 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>682 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>875 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>997 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>689 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>876 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1006 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>692 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>877 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1006 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>693 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>876 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1006 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>703 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>886 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1002 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>709 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>889 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1002 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>711 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>894 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1003 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>717 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>895 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1003 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>733 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>896 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1005 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>733 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>896 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1005 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>730 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>900 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>731 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>903 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>734 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>903 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>735 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>904 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>736 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>906 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>766 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>961 0 1 2 3</td>
<td>1013 0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sources: Faithful and Fair, Keith Watkins, Abingdon Press, 1981

"The Gender of God", Gail Ramshaw Schmidt, Worship, March '82

This is a period during which language in general, and the language of worship in particular is under transition. We are moving from the time when language was (and is) dominated by masculine images for humanity as a whole, and masculine metaphors for the deity. It will be our job to use a language that is fair to both women and men, and is faithful to our experience of God - in tradition, scripture and the worship experience.

The challenge we face it that of trying to remove language forms that are offensive to a substantial part of society - specifically forms which are unfair to women through the use of exclusively male images for people, and forms which name God as "he" - while not calling attention to the issue in such a way so as to offend that part of the Church which at this time does not have a problem with these forms.

The issue of exclusive language falls into two categories:

1) Language which identifies people; either the individual or a collective group ranging from the worshippers present in a specific assembly to humanity as a whole.

2) Language that specifically attributes male gender to God.

Regarding the first category: we must make a thorough effort to remove all forms that refer to the worshipper, or the worshipping assembly as "he", "brother", "son", "man", or "men". New forms must be found. At no time should a woman have to sing words such as "peace on earth, good will to men."

Occupations should be stripped of gender, e.g., workman, authoress.

Inanimate objects should be referred to with the pronoun "it" rather than "she" (a ship, a country, the church!).

Male forms should be used only when they refer to males.

Regarding category two: we must attempt to reduce the number of uses of male words as metaphors for God, e.g., Father, King, He, replacing them with Creator, Holy One, God, the Almighty, Incarnate One, Eternal One, and even feminine metaphors - God our Mother!

The principle here, is not one of trying to eliminate the reference to God as Father, or trying to refrain from speaking of God as "he", but one of reducing the occurrences of such usage without calling attention to the issue. We will continue to use the title Father, but only deliberately, and not as the spontaneous verbal ejaculation it now seems to be. In the Lords Prayer, the Gloria Patri (any form of doxology) and other standard Trinitarian forms, the title Father should remain so as not to call attention to the issue.
2.

Some general principles and miscellaneous thoughts:

If the only male reference to God is found in the doxological stanza at the end of a hymn, we should examine the possibility of simply eliminating that final stanza. Often, this is not part of the author's original text to begin with.

We should actively seek texts which use feminine images of God. E.g., "O God, as a mother nurtures her child, so you care for us...", "our father and mother and maker art thou."

But God is not she, and God is not he. These metaphorical constructions need to be balanced with a host of other God titles.

When a text is found to be sexist in the sense of the hymn "Faith of our fathers," we must choose to either keep it as it is - because of its strong place in the tradition - or eliminate it entirely. To alter it to something like "Faith of our forebears" suddenly focuses on the issue.

In seeking alternative titles for God, we should avoid Yahweh, since it has recently come to light that the Jewish community finds our use of that name to be insensitive to their tradition.

Other language concerns:

We should make a conscious effort to reduce militant language in hymnody. We should love our oppressor to death, not trample over her or him. In the Bernardin era, hawkbiness is definitely on the wane.

We should make an effort to modernize all idioms that do not speak clearly to people today. E.g. "peculiar honors to our king," "sound the loud triumphant lay."

We should eliminate archaic forms such as: hast, doth, wilt, art, givest, takest, etc.

The pronouns, thee, thou, thy, thine, should be replaced with modern forms.

Exceptions: Whenever we decide that a text has "classic" standing, we should avoid tampering with it. Whenever the tone of a text is such that modernizing pronouns and verb forms are out of character, we should avoid tampering. In these cases, the decision should simply be whether or not to include the text.