
POST-CONCILIAR LITURGICAL REFORM IN THE CZECH LANDS AND MUSIC OF THE LITURGY

PAVEL KOPEČEK

ABSTRACT

The article describes the introduction of the liturgical reform in the Czech Republic and the associated musical creation that would correspond to the renewed liturgy. It focuses on the work of individual liturgical commissions, the determination of the criteria of musical creation and the prominent music protagonists. At the same time, it describes the progress of the work on the common song-book for the Czech and Moravian dioceses.

Key words

Liturgical music; Roman Liturgy; Eucharistic Prayer; Mass Ordinary; Gregorian chant; Liturgical Movement; Liturgical Reform

DOI: 10.14712/23363398.2018.49

The Liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC) determines the basic requirements for liturgical music: “*Therefore sacred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is more closely connected with the liturgical action, whether it adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites. But the Church approves of all forms of true art having the needed qualities, and admits them into divine worship*”.¹ From this point of view, three main criteria are to be observed as concerns liturgical music: close connection with liturgy through its musical and text-based form, character of prayer that forms sacral service and artistic quality. In addition, musicians

¹ SC No. 112.

who try to fulfil these conditions discover another feature of liturgical music – its universality – Catholicism. This universal character enables every nation to use its very own and original musical production within liturgy, which, however, corresponds with the general conditions placed on liturgical music and prescribed by the Church documents. Liturgical music is and ought to be a work of art; it should address the spirit and the soul of all service participants. Because of this fact, the Church approves of all musical forms and, if they possess appropriate qualities, they are accepted into liturgy. By being included into liturgy, music becomes not only sacred, but it is also sanctified in this way.

Two basic notions concerning liturgical music have been already shaped within the course of the Second Vatican Council. Nowadays, these two views have their supporters and promoters. The first notion emphasizes that liturgical music is “canonical” because of its perfect form, and it is sacred by itself. The opposite notion accepts any liturgical music which is considered appropriate for particular communities (congregations). The fact that the music in itself is not sacred may speak against the first opinion; however, the second opinion does not have to always comply with the artistic and liturgical criteria.

Liturgical Music and the Second Vatican Council

The Liturgical Movement formed the basic i.e., of liturgical music that can be traced in the Church documents of that time, from the Pope Pius X to Pius XII. The evolution of the notion of liturgical music in the pre-council Church, from the chorale and polyphony up to “modern music”, is also presented in the text of the council’s Liturgical Constitution.² Higiní Anglès, the relator of the Preparatory Commission on Sacred Music, pursued different ideas of liturgical music and Gregorian chant than other members of this working group.³ Certain part of

² Motu proprio on church music from November 22, 1903, highlights choral and polyphony, the instructions of September 3, 1958 give far more space to “modern music” in the liturgy. Cf. *Sacra Rituum Congregatio. Instructio De Musica Sacra et Sacra Liturgia ad mentem Litterarum encyclicarum Pii Papae XII “Musicae sacrae disciplina” et “Mediator Dei”*. *AAS* 50 (1958), pp. 630–663.

³ The preparatory or pre-conciliar commission had 13 sub-commissions, one of which worked on the text of sacred music, consisted of Relator: H. Anglès; Secretary: E. Cardine; Consulters: J. Hervás, P. Jones, P. Jounel, L. Brinkhoff, C. Kniewald. This pre-conciliar commission elaborated the scheme of the liturgical constitution *Instrumentum laboris*, which was discussed and edited during the Council. It is therefore clear how important this work has been and what concept of liturgical music this text has pre-

this committee perceived chorale and liturgical singing according to the interpretation of the French Benedictine School; however, Anglès followed the notion of the motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* of the Pope Pius X from 1903.⁴ Whereas the Benedictines from the French Solesmes Abbey promoted precision and beauty of the Gregorian chant that was typical for monastic communities, the Spanish rector of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music Higinio Anglès tried to include chorale into parish service. He perceived chorale as a one-voice vocal sung by all believers and presumed that it is possible to preserve and further develop this vocal. He was a strong supporter of Latin in liturgy precisely because of the musical point of view. He reasoned by the Church documents and, first of all, by the motu proprio of the Pope Pius X and hoped that in the post-council Church the chorale will spread throughout parishes and pervade every type of service. According to this document, he accepted only two basic categories of liturgical singing: Gregorian chant and polyphonic choral singing. His rigid conception of liturgical music led to the fact that he did not attach any importance to folk sacred songs, which had already been a part of the liturgy in many countries for many centuries. He considered the folk sacred songs as a part of reformation and as the secondary musical production of the Catholic Church.

In context of these disputes within the sacred music preparatory council subcommittee, the article concerning liturgical music was written without being connected to the liturgical movement; it expected conceptual transformation of liturgy and valorization of local liturgical and musical traditions. The subcommittee's work result is a text that regulates basic requirements of the document *Tra le sollecitudini*:

With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to the ministers, which must be always sung in Gregorian Chant, and without accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of levites, and, therefore, singers in the church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir. Hence

sented. Cf. Pavel Kopeček. *Liturgické hnutí v Českých zemích a pokoncilní reforma*. Brno: CDK 2018, pp. 185–186.

⁴ Pius X. *Tra le sollecitudini*. Motu proprio on church music of November 22, 1903. *AAS* 36 (1905), pp. 387–395.

the music rendered by them must, at least for the greater part, retain the character of choral music.⁵

Even though the text is based on this document, it also reflects the ideas of other magisterial documents: the Apostolic Constitution on Sacred Music “Divini cultus sanctitatem” of Pius XI from 20 December 1928;⁶ the Encyclicals of Pius XII “Musicae sacrae disciplina” from 25 December 1955;⁷ the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning Church music and liturgy “De Musica Sacra et Sacra Liturgia” from September 3, 1958.⁸

Within the preparatory stage, the view of music in liturgy did not develop in the manner that is indicated in the document of 1958, where the term sacred music stands for: Gregorian singing, sacred polyphony, modern sacred music, organ sacred music, folk religious vocals and religious music.⁹ In this document these forms of liturgical music are

⁵ Pius X. *Tra le sollecitudini*, pp. 389–390.

⁶ The text of this constitution says: “*Quo autem actuosius fideles divinum cultum participant, cantus gregorianus, in iis quae ad populum spectant, in usum populi restituantur. Ac revera perneceesse est ut fideles, non tamquam extranei vel multi spectatores, sed penitus liturgiae pulchritudine affecti, sic caerimoniiis sacris intersint – tum etiam cum pompae seu processiones, quas vocant, instructo cleri ac sodalitatum agmine, aguntur – ut vocem suam sacerdotis vel scholae vocibus, ad praescriptas normas, alternent; quod si auspicate contingat, iam non illud eveniet ut populus aut nequaquam, aut levi quodam demissoque murmure communibus precibus, liturgica vulgarive lingua propositis, vix respondeat.*” Cf. Pius XI. *Divinus cultus sanctitatem. Constitutio apostolica de Liturgia deque Cantu gregoriano et Musica Sacra cotidie magis provehendis. AAS* 21 (1929), No. 2, pp. 33–41.

⁷ In this letter, the Pope points out that liturgical music “*must be holy. It must not allow within itself anything that savors of the profane nor allow any such thing to slip into the melodies in which it is expressed. The Gregorian chant which has been used in the Church over the course of so many centuries, and which may be called, as it were, its patrimony, is gloriously outstanding for this holiness. This chant, because of the close adaptation of the melody to the sacred text, is not only most intimately conformed to the words, but also in a way interprets their force and efficacy and brings delight to the minds of the hearers. It does this by the use of musical modes that are simple and plain, but which are still composed with such sublime and holy art that they move everyone to sincere admiration and constitute an almost inexhaustible source from which musicians and composers draw new melodies.*” Cf. Pius XII. *Musicae sacrae disciplina. Encyclical of pope on sacred music. AAS* 48 (1956), No. 42–43, p. 15.

⁸ A very thorough analysis and commentary on this Instruction was submitted by the Secretary of the Pre-Concilium Commission. Cf. Annibale Bugnini. *Liturgia viva*. Milano: Ancora 1962. *Sacra Rituum Congregatio. Instructio De Musica Sacra et Sacra Liturgia ad mentem Litterarum encyclicarum Pii Papae XII „Musicae sacrae disciplina“ et „Mediator Dei“.* *AAS* 50 (1958), pp. 630–663.

⁹ „Sub nomine « Musicae sacrae » hic comprehenduntur : a) Cantus gregorianus, b) Polyphonia sacra, c) Musica sacra moderna, d) Musica sacra pro organo, e) Can-

described and explained as opposed to the Council Constitution, where they are not mentioned at all. The Instruction “De Musica Sacra et Sacra Liturgia” states when and at what occasions these forms of vocals and music are allowed to be used within the pre-council liturgy and thus has prepared the foundation for the following application in the renewed liturgy. Presumed renewal of the liturgical music built on this foundation was not recorded in *Instrumentum Laboris*, and the prevailing opinion of the preparatory committee was that the text on church music is imperfect and elaborated only by the relator himself, who did not communicate with the members of the subcommittee almost at all. Anglès proceeded from the pre-council conception of liturgy, and unfortunately he did not fully reflect on its notion as it was presented to other subcommittees of the preparatory liturgical committee. He did not trust the secretary Bugnini and tried to preserve Latin in liturgy as much as possible whereas the committee gave bigger space to national languages. In this context, his emphasis on Gregorian chant and vocals in Latin is more understandable. Singing in Latin was connected with the knowledge of “Missa Mundi” and possibly with the celebrations of “Missa de Angelis”. He presented these ideas at the committee meeting in April 1961, where the mentioned tension within the preparatory committee and essential difference concerning the view of liturgical music appeared. The situation escalated at the last preparatory committee meeting in January 1962, when the text of the preparatory council document was finalized and during the discussion over the chapter dealing with the sacred music Anglès left the meeting in the middle of negotiations filled with indignation.¹⁰ For temporal and procedural reasons, it was not possible to continue with the work on the text concerning liturgical music; therefore, it was generally presumed that this theme was too little discussed and reflected in broader connection in the preparatory stage. These different opinions of the distinguished members of the pre-council committee were reflected in the council negotiations and the following post-council reform.

tus popularis religiosus, f) Musica religiosa.“ Cf. Sacra Rituum Congregatio. Instructio De Musica Sacra et Sacra Liturgia, p. 633.

¹⁰ Annibale Bugnini, Secretary of the Commission, states that Anglès was “out” hinting at the turbulence of the debate. Cf. Kopeček. *Liturgické hnutí v Českých zemích a pokoncilní reforma*, p. 186.

Requirements Concerning Liturgical Music in the Instruction *Inter oecumenici*

In the attempt to implement post-council liturgical reform and correct the interpretation of the Liturgical Constitution text and also the wish of council fathers, a committee was established that issued the first Instruction for correct application of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* as early as in 1964.¹¹ The Instruction text lays several demands on liturgical music; in the first place, it concerns the Mass that is still divided into “missa lecta” and “missa cantata”. The demand on musicalization of particular parts for “missa cantata” in national language was expressed by granting the possibility to use the folk language in larger scale. Another demand is musical education of priests and seminarists, setting the rules for “missa cantata”: “*Die vero dominica aliisque maioribus diebus festis, Missa in cantu celebretur ...*”.¹²

The Instruction imposes the formation of diocesan and national liturgical committees, which should support and develop not only liturgical singing but also liturgical music. New musical section was always established along with the arising committees. The document determines which parts ought to (may) be in folk language: individual readings, Gospel, prayers of believers, Ordinary vocals (Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei), antiphony for introit and communion, responsorial psalm, acclamation, greetings and dialogues, then also the Lord’s Prayer with admonition and embolism.¹³ For singing of these parts, it was necessary to translate and musicalize the Ordinary, Psalms and relevant parts of the Order of Mass. The text of the document does not clearly state whether these parts in folk language should be musicalized by a chorale melody or if new musical compositions of these vocals are to be created.

The discussion about music and language with regard to so far unchallenged thesis that Gregorian chant is the Roman liturgy vocal proper¹⁴ and the language of liturgy is Latin¹⁵ continued even in the

¹¹ Sacra Rituum Congregatio et Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia. Instructio (prima) ad executionem Constitutionis de sacra Liturgia recte ordinandam „Inter Oecumenici“ /IOE/ (26. 9. 1964). *AAS* 56 (1964), pp. 877–900.

¹² *IOE* No. 15.

¹³ *IOE* No. 57.

¹⁴ *SC* No. 116.

¹⁵ *SC* No. 36.

post-council committee “*Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*”. This post-council discussion concerning liturgical music resulted in the issue of the *Graduale Simplex* and preservation of the Gregorian vocal; however, at the same time it allowed new musical production.¹⁶ The fact that the Instruction was issued at the end of September 1964 and the changes stated in the Instruction were to be implemented on March 7, 1965 (Small Liturgical Reform) does not give sufficient space for the rapid introduction of new musical compositions for “*missa cantata*”.¹⁷

When a question of liturgical music was discussed in the “*Consilium*” as well as its incorporation into *Inter Oecumenici*, the committee reached the conclusion that this subject requires larger space and wider discussion. After the issue of the Instruction, composers started to turn to “*Consilium*” with practical questions and demanded clarification of the Articles No. 112, 114 and 117 of the Liturgical Constitution that refer to liturgical music. It was explained to them that the new Instruction could not embrace all issues of the Constitution and there will be a separate document prepared in cooperation with musicians and composers dealing with the music in liturgy. In January 1965, they began to work on the document concerning liturgical music, whose aim to clearly define: a) the competences of local bishop conferences concerning the use of folk language in the liturgy; b) the form of the dialogic Mass with people; c) whether it is the priest’s or church rector’s competence to decide on the type of liturgical singing – Gregorian chant, polyphony and modern sacral music; d) as some parts of the Latin Mass are in folk language (Liturgy of the Word) – what vocals should be used with respect to active participation of believers; e) if *Credo* and *Sanctus* should be sung in chorale melody or in different melody familiar to people.¹⁸

As early as in February 12, 1965, the first scheme of the new instruction on sacred music was done. It was prepared by the *Consilium* and the process of submission of comments from the part of musicians

¹⁶ In addition to *Graduale simplex* (1967), other post-council books on the Gregorian chant were published: *Kyriale simplex* (1964), *Ordo Cantus Missae* (1972) and *Gradual* (1974).

¹⁷ The text states: “*auuctoritate Sua confirmavit, et publici iuris fieri iussit, ab omnibus ad quos spectat, a die 7 martii anno 1965, prima dominica in Quadragesima, sedulo servandam.*” *IOE* No. 99.

¹⁸ Cf. Bugnini. *La reforma liturgica (1948–1975)*, pp. 865–866.

and competent authorities immediately followed. On March 25, 1965, following the approach of the Academic Senate of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music, Anglès sent a letter to the Pope Paul VI, in which he pointed out that there were no music professionals participating in the elaboration of the document nor were they surveyed as it had been notified. Another letter was sent on June 7. In this letter, the work of Consilium was critically evaluated with the following reservations: no “real musicians” were consulted, but only supporters of “certain trend”; according to *Inter Oecumenici*, the whole Mass “Proprium” and “Ordinarium” should be in folk language; there are priests who ask for the abandonment of Latin not for the sake of believers or because of their active participation in the Mass, but because they maintain “nationalistic and anti-Rome” positions; believers do not understand some parts of the Mass that is sung in folk language; in the course of several months all was abandoned (Latin and chorale); non-Catholics practise Gregorian chant more than Catholic Church.¹⁹ This letter initiated critical evaluation of the Consilium’s work, and strictly speaking, it was an attempt to prevent the implementation of liturgical reform.

At this moment, it was obvious that it is inevitable that musicians have to participate in the document concerning liturgical music prepared by ritualists. Therefore, following the recommendation of the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music, the Secretariat of State asked the Association “Pueri Cantores” and its Chairman Fr Fiorenzo Romita²⁰ for cooperation. Consilium established a committee consisting of 43 specialists. Half of them were musicians and the other half were liturgists.²¹ They all received the scheme of the instruction on sacred music and were asked to submit comments on it. On the basis of their comments, the scheme was modified and subsequently read in the Consilium. The comments were further submitted and the scheme was discussed in the course of the years 1965 and 1966. Only the 12th

¹⁹ Bugnini. *La reforma liturgica (1948–1975)*, p. 867.

²⁰ Cf. <http://www.puericantores.org/about-pueri-cantores,history/august2017/>.

²¹ These experts were: J. Wagner, A.-G. Martimort, A. Dirks, P. Jones, A. Hänggi, J. Gelineau, L. Agustoni, L. Buijs, H. Schmidt, L. Borello, L. Trimeloni, S. Famoso, P. Journel, F. McManus, J. Smits van Waesberge, A. Franquesa, E. Lengeling, A. Jungmann, E. Monet Caglio, B. Neunheuser, P. Damilano, J. Hourlier, E. Cardine, T. Schnitzler, PM. Gyth, R. Falsini, R. Weakland, J. Beilliard, J. Harmel, J. Claire, L. Kunz, I. Tassi, C. Vagaggini, H. Anglès, F. Romita, M. Altisent, B. Fischer, E. Bonet, H. Hucke, D. Bartolucci, L. Migliavacca, J. Overath, F. Schmitt. This list, together with selected consultants, was presented to the Pope Paul VI, who was satisfied with the choice of the experts. Bugnini. *La reforma liturgica (1948–1975)*, p. 867.

scheme introduced to the Pope in February 1967 was approved by him, and on March 5, 1967, the Instruction on Music in Liturgy *Musicae Sacram* was published. The whole course of preparation of this document shows the divergence of attitudes towards this theme and that it was a matter of seeking compromises whereas the first impulse were practical questions in the area of liturgical music regarding the introduction of the “Small Liturgical Reform” announced for March 1965 by the Instruction *Inter Oecumenici*. It was expected that with the publication of new liturgical books and by the introduction of the “Great Liturgical Reform” on November 30, 1969, a tract on liturgical music corresponding with the New Order of Mass, the incorporation of folk language in the service and local music production will be published. The long process of preparation and confirmation of the Instruction *Musicae Sacram* drew the attention to the differences in opinion concerning the question of liturgical music whereas the main conviction was the fact that this Instruction fully complies with the requirements of the renewed post-council liturgy.

Sacred Music and Liturgy Committee for Bohemia and Moravia

Individual subcommittees were established at the appointing meeting of the Liturgy Committee for Bohemia and Moravia (hereinafter referred to as the LCBM) in March 1965. Musical subcommittee included only one member of the LCBM, namely Father Kouřil from Prague; other members were expert advisers from individual dioceses: Josef Olejník (Olomouc), František Holík and Karel Cikrle (Brno), Karel Kudr (Prague), Vilém Müller (Hradec Králové), Jaroslav Elšák (Český Těšín).²² In 1952–1969, prof. Jaroslav Kouřil taught at the CMTF (Sts Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology) in Litoměřice, where he lectured on pastoral theology and liturgics. He was not a significant expert in liturgical music or a composer. A conviction to entrust the theme of liturgical music to musicians prevailed already at the first LCBM meeting. This fact is also supported by the selection of advisers and, as distinct from other subcommittees, by appointing only one member of the LCBM to musical section.

²² See: Registration of the Constituent Meeting of the Liturgical Commission for Bohemia and Moravia of Olomouc, March 10, 1965. *Archives of Josef Bradáč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc.*

At the second LCBM meeting in August 1965, after the introductory word, its main topics immediately followed, mainly the choice of the new head of the musical section as Kouřil resigned from his function and nominated several candidates as his successors, namely Olejník, Kudr, Koukl, Grimmig, Korejs and others. After four months in this function, Jaroslav Kouřil resigns “for the lack of time and general busyness”. I presume that the opening discussion concerning the musicalization of Czech Ordinary also played an important part in his resignation. The discussion whether to use chorale melody or compose own melody developed within the subcommittee with respect to the introduction of the “Small Liturgical Reform” in March 1965. The committee decided choose Fr. Olejník, who worked on the musicalization of the Mass Ordinary, as the new head of the musical section.²⁵ The secretary of the LCBM addressed Olejník in this respect, but it is not evident whether he took the lead of the Church musical section. Discussion regarding the intonation of invariable parts of the Mass took place in the committee when the canon Antonín Veselý (Administration of Český Těšín) demanded the preservation of the Gregorian chant in Latin and also in the renewed liturgy in accordance with the Instruction *Inter Oecumenici*.²⁴ The representative of the Czech Catholic Charity invited the LCBM musical subcommittee and the Charity musical section (František Kotalík and Stanislav Mach), which worked on the publication of the Anthology of Sacred Music, to cooperation.²⁵

The third meeting of the Czech Liturgical Committee, formerly the LCBM,²⁶ took place in Prague at the Charles Square in the Caritas Palace on May 12, 1966. The main topic of the discussion was the personnel composition of the musical section. Olejník withdrew from cooperation, because he did not approve of the application of the chorale melody to Czech lyrics, in particular of the chorale melody for

²⁵ Cf. Registration of the 2nd Meeting of the Liturgical Commission for Bohemia and Moravia in Trnava on August 17, 1965. *Archives of Josef Bradáč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc*.

²⁴ Registration of the 2nd Meeting of the Liturgical Commission, p. 2.

²⁵ This cooperation seemed desirable also with regard to the matter of a common song-book. Cf. Registration of the 2nd Meeting of the Liturgical Commission for Bohemia and Moravia in Trnava on August 17, 1965. *Archives of Josef Bradáč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc*, p. 2.

²⁶ The name of the commission was changed to the CLC meeting in Olomouc on April 14, 1966. Cf. Registration of the 3rd Meeting of the Czech Liturgical Commission on May 11, 1966. *Archives of Josef Bradáč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc*, p. 1.

the Lord's Prayer. Even though the musical section forbade the use of chorale melody for the Lord's Prayer and recommended to use only three particular melodies (Olejník, Tichý, Jistebnický), the Czech Liturgical Committee approved of it. The discussion regarding Gregorian melody is still topical within our Church, and nowadays we commonly encounter both the chorale melody and the melody of Olejník, possibly also other melodies.²⁷ The approval of the chorale melody by the CLC (Czech Liturgical Committee) in 1966 was caused by two circumstances: as Latin was still partly present in liturgy (language reason) and by the reaction to the spontaneity of musical production (practical reason).²⁸

With regard to further musical production, it was stated that the Ordinary by Petr Eben, Vladimír Tichý, Josef Olejník, Josef Blatný and Stanislav Mach is almost finished. The Charity was prepared to issue several Ordinaries as early as in 1966, namely three in Latin and three in Czech. Its musical section recommended the Czech Ordinaries by Olejník, Eben and Mach for publication.²⁹

Significant deed of the musical section of the Czech Liturgical Committee was the organization of the training of the Bohemian and Moravian priests that took place at the consistory in Hradec Králové on April 11, 1967. This training was focused on the explanation and application of the Instruction on Music in Liturgy (*Musicam sacram*) from March 5, 1967. In addition to the introduction of the approved melodies, the following vocals were practised during the schedule: Preface vocal sung by priest, vocal of Oration and relevant parts of the Order of Mass, Czech and Latin Ordinaries, Proper of the Mass. It was also conferred on the question which songs were going to be included in the common

²⁷ See the reference to the two songs in the Czech Ordo Missae. Sekretariát České liturgické komise. *Mešní řád s modlitbami nad dary a s prefacemi*. Praha: Česká liturgická komise 1984, 548 p.

²⁸ Many priests and musicians composed the songs of the Czech Mass and asked for their approval and introduction to the liturgy, which was also due to the fact that the CLC was not able to respond quickly to all tasks. In 1967, the CLC did not give the preface to the preface, so the task moved to the DLC, which commissioned to create the relevant musician from their music sections.

²⁹ At this meeting, three ordinaries were selected for the common song-book: Olejník, Bříza, Eben and later added fourth from Pololáník. Cf. Registration of the 3rd Meeting of the Czech Liturgical Commission on May 11, 1966. *Archives of Josef Braddč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc*, p. 3.

hymnbook of the Czech Church. Fathers Holík, Nosek and Simajchl participated in this training for the Diocese of Brno.⁵⁰

During 1966, the Committee for Unified Hymnal of all Czech and Moravian Dioceses was established; its chairman was originally Ladislav Simajchl (city of Brno), shortly also Miroslav Venhoda (Prague) and the work was subsequently managed by Karel Cikrle (Brno and Litoměřice).⁵¹ Other members of the committee were: Jaroslav Elšák (Český Těšín), František Holík (Brno), Pavel Janeček (České Budějovice), Vilém Müller (Hradec Králové), Václav Renč (Brno) and Jan Veselka (Olomouc).⁵² The Committee struggled with many difficulties that were not connected only with the selection of songs, their text and musical form, composition and structure of the hymnal, but also with the adaptation of the existing sacred songs according to the New Order of Mass. František Šmíd remembers this period of time as follows:

In 1965–69, work on the Hymnal was in progress. In the beginning, the Brno members brought a list of songs that was put together by friars from all dioceses during their internment in the Želiv Monastery in the fifties of the last century. It was the list of songs that every single priest would wish to have in their hymnbook. This list included songs of different quality, and above all, it was the list of songs of the pre-council liturgy. The main advantage of this list was its formation because the people in the prison agree on things much better than in the years of freedom. Furthermore, it included commonly known songs that do not need to be practised, which is a good foundation for unity. Step by step, this list was modified and supplemented by the Committee. Texts of the songs were modified and poeticized and the selection of melodic variations was discussed.⁵³

⁵⁰ See: Report on Training in Hradec Králové, April 11, 1967. *Diocesan Archives of the Bishop of Brno*, Inv. No. 16878, e. 5364, f. 65.

⁵¹ The first issue was prepared by the whole commission; the main editor was P. Simajchl and subsequently the work was done by P. Karel Cikrle. Cf. Pavlína Švestková. *Jednota Musica sacra 1993–2012 a P. PhDr. Karel Cikrle*. Olomouc: CMTF UP 2013, p. 57, (thesis). The editor himself notes that “the common song-book cannot be a perfect tool because we are only gradually acquiring the beginning of the new liturgical practice and its spirit ... it is to be a bridge to the unity of ecclesiastical singing and to stimulate the development of folk singing in the renewed liturgy.” Ladislav Simajchl (ed.). *Kancionál – společný zpěvník českých a moravských diecézí*. Praha: Česká katolická charita 1973, p. 6.

⁵² Cf. *Via* I / 5, 1968, pp. 94–95. See: http://depositum.cz/knihovny/via/tiskclanek.php?id=c_20398/July 2017/.

⁵³ František Šmíd. Můj pohled na naše současné kancionály. *Psalterium*. Vol. 1., No. 2/2007, p. 14.

In 1968, they introduced the result of their work, which was judged in a highly critical manner. Václav Konzal and Bonaventura Bouše prepared the critical analysis of the Hymnal for the Magazine *Via*.⁵⁴ Number of their comments was accepted; however, it was not possible to fully comply with all suggestions. For that reason, Bouše repeatedly criticized the Hymnal.⁵⁵

At the meeting of the CLC (Czech Liturgical Committee) on August 19, 1969, Bradáč opened this issue and the Committee came to the conclusion that it was possible to use these mass vocals but only under the condition that the division of the verses was modified in such a manner so that they would comply with the new “Ordo”.⁵⁶ In October 1969, Simajchl reported that bishops supported publication of the unified Hymnal, and that they prescribed the places in the new Order of Mass (*Ordo missae*) which could be used for vocals: the Entrance, singing before reading the Gospel, preparation of gifts, Holy Communion (Eucharist), the Conclusion. One disputable place remained, because singing of “Gloria” is paraphrased in some mass songs, and even though it was decided that it should never overlap with the song verse, it often happens in practice.⁵⁷ After many complications the Hymnal was published in 1973.

The CLC meeting from November 5, 1969 was significant for one particular reason. The bishop Tomášek decided to introduce the New Order of Mass on one date common for the whole Church. At the same time, he prepared the common Pastoral List for bishops.⁵⁸ The whole agenda proceeded with regard to the preparation of the introduction of

⁵⁴ *Via* I/5, 1968, pp. 94–96. See: http://depositum.cz/knihovny/via/tiskclanek.php?id=c_20398/July 2017/.

⁵⁵ Bonaventura Z. Bouše. *Malá katolická liturgika*. Praha: Vyšehrad 2004, pp. 37–38.

⁵⁶ In the pre-conciliar liturgy there was a spiritual folk song, which was sung as a “mass song”. This formation was based on another liturgical paradigm of an accompanying worship form. Songs suggested what was happening at the time at the altar because people did not hear and often did not see it. The Second Vatican Council describes liturgical music and its criteria for inclusion in worship in the way that “sacred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is more closely connected with the liturgical action, whether it adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites.” (*SC* No. 112). It is a question of whether a spiritual folk song meets these conciliatory criteria.

⁵⁷ See the Song No. 829: „Ejhle oltář“. *Kancionál – společný zpěvník českých a moravských diecézí*. Praha: Česká katolická charita 1990, p. 485.

⁵⁸ The renewed liturgy began to be applied from November 30, 1969, respectively on January 1, 1970 in all parishes. Cf. Registration of the meeting of the Czech Liturgical Commission on November 5, 1969. Ref. 106/69. *Archives of Josef Bradáč, Department of Liturgical Theology CMTF UP Olomouc*, p. 1.

the post-council liturgy in dioceses and parishes. Regarding the question of liturgical music, the publication of Hymnal, Ordinary, the Proper of the Mass melodies and the Order of Mass was the subject of negotiation. It was stated that every matter in question is so well prepared that, after the introduction of the New Order of Mass, “missa cantata” may be celebrated from November 30, 1969 or from January 1, 1970 at the latest.³⁹

Czech Post-Council Liturgical Music Protagonists

Out of the great number of the composers who composed the Mass Ordinary and the Proper of the Mass, psalms and mass vocals, I would like to highlight the work of two authors whom I consider inspiring.

Josef Olejník

At the time of the introduction of the liturgical reform, Olejník worked in Jeseníky area and in the district of Bruntál, namely in the parishes Andělská hora /Engelberg/, Dětrichovice and Rudná. Here, he composed the “Czech Mass from Engelberg” in 1966.⁴⁰ The Czech Mass was followed by other Ordinaries but also by the Proper of the Mass, musicalization of psalms, Liturgy of the Hours and the Order of Mass liturgy; in addition, he created graduals and composed sacred songs.⁴¹ Olejník concluded, quite rightly, that the chorale melody for the Czech “missa cantata” cannot be the best and only solution. The complication would be not only the transposition of unequal number of syllables to chorale melody but also different melodies of spoken Latin and Czech. The transposition would not benefit our mother language and harm the chorale. For that reason, Olejník emphasized “new musical language”, which was not comprehended in the CLC. He comments on that:

Then the Council came hand in hand with the liturgical reform. So we went to Prague for the musicians training, but we could not reach any agreement with them. I told them, right from the beginning, that it would require something new. We cannot transfer the chorale into Czech, because

³⁹ Cf. Nový Ordo Missae (č.j. K 3108/69). *Oběžník apoštolské administratury pražské arcidiecéze*, No. 3295/69, No. 7, July 2, 1969, p. 40.

⁴⁰ Cf. Jiří Kotrba. Rozhovor s P. J. Olejníkem. *Seminární průvan*, 2006, No. 5, pp. 5–7.

⁴¹ See: www.josefolejnik.cz/, /July 2017/.

the chorale is a closed chapter, because of the accent. I got out of it and worked on it alone, at first for my parish only. [...] I did not make up any breaknecks.

Olejník left the musical section of the CLC in spring 1966. In the subsequent years, he cooperated with the section again. He perfectly understood the need of liturgy in the Czech language and he prepared everything what was needed for it. Altogether, he musicalized three Ordinaries to the Czech text, one for the Old Slavonic language, the Proper of the Mass for almost all holy days, Sunday Vespers, responsorial psalms for every day and all sung parts of liturgy: Oration, Preface, the Lord's Prayer, Canon, dialogues with people, greetings and the priest's appeals. Even though he composed individual parts gradually and individually, his priest's vocals together with the Mass Ordinary and the Proper of the Mass create an integrated musical piece.

When Olejník started to work on the musical form of the modified Order of Mass in 1965 and thought over the Preface vocal and its dialogue, he was led by the i.e., that the chorale "cannot be mutilated". There is one story connected with the creation of dialogue before the Preface. When he walked home from the Mass, he was rehearsing its Czech text and also the text in Latin with the chorale melody, and he suddenly heard a melody in his head. He sat down on a foot-stone, pulled out his jotter and wrote down the melody in order not to forget it.⁴² In spite of being based on the chorale melody, there are certain changes in both the text and the melody. The Latin chorale works with tetrachords. The Czech chorale is diatonic; it is based on common chord. The dialogue is built up in sequences to express the accruing solemnity and depth of the text. It is recorded in E flat major: "*The Lord be with you – And with your spirit*" is within the register of the second E flat – F, "*Lift up your hearts – We lift them up to the Lord*" the register broadens to third G, "*Let us give thanks to the Lord our God – It is right and just*", the melody goes to A flat major to fourth.

Olejník introduced this musicalized dialogue to František Holík, who encouraged him to further work: "*If you composed the dialogue, then you should do the Preface as well.*" Later on, he musicalized all 26 Prefaces included in the Czech Missal. Every syllable in all Prefaces has been recorded in its exact pitch of tone and length of tone at which

⁴² Josef Suchánek. *Česká mše z Andělské Hory*. Olomouc: Studio Velehrad 1989. [video].

it should be sung. The Prefaces include three inventions (cadences) that repeat. The preludes to the Prefaces and Conclusions before singing Holy are the same. Olejník composed the Preface melody so that priests could easily learn it and thus underline the beauty of the new liturgy by their singing.⁴⁵ Processing of other parts of melodies for the priest and people is also based on the dialogue and Preface. They start in F major as opposed to the Preface that is in E flat major, which is a good pitch for a vocal.

Olejník's vocals for priest and people in the liturgy are regular with logical construction, which is based on the effort to proceed from the substance of liturgical texts and rites. At the CLC meeting in 1969, it was decided to use Father Olejník's melody during the missa cantata.

Olejník took charge of leading the vocal rehearsals and organizing the priests' trainings. In the process, he made sure that everything was sung in the proper manner and the spiritual and theological aspect of the vocal was understood. During the practice, he primarily explained the essence of certain parts of the Mass and function of music therein. The vocal itself then should stick to the following rules:

a) Melody – must be absolutely authentic, any “improvement” is forbidden.

b) Rhythm – division into bars has basically the phrasing function; the compositions otherwise consist mainly of binary or triple groups.

c) Tempo – is given by a metronome; basically, it may be stated that the character of music is rather brisk. However, in beseeching parts, it should be slower and urging.

d) Interpretation – the melody should form an arch from piano through mezzo forte to forte and back.

As a big danger, he regards the organists who try to harmonize and modify the Mass: they either will not be able to cope with the more difficult places, or they will try to improve them, both of which are always detrimental.⁴⁴ In the parish Engelberg, Olejník worked with the whole assembly of believers and, in this manner, proved that his compositions can be sung anywhere.

I see the real value of Father Josef Olejník's work in the fact that, thanks to him, the whole Moravia sings. The Vatican Council Reform

⁴⁵ František Kolčava. *Česká liturgická hudba po II. vatikánském koncilu*. Olomouc: Ped. fakulta UP (Katedra hudební výchovy) 2012, p. 21, (bachelor's thesis).

⁴⁴ Karel Komárek. *P. Mgr. Josef Olejník: kněz a skladatel liturgické hudby*. Olomouc: Burget 2001, pp. 26–27.

headed towards active liturgical participation of believers in the Mass, which they should understand, and his vocals fully correspond with this intention. They unite the whole assembly of believers into one uniform voice heading towards God. Olejník reacted to the topical need of the Church in his own compositional style that was quickly adopted by people and became natural to them. Which of the Czech composers can say that his or her musical works are played at so many places in the Czech Republic on a daily basis?

Bohuslav Korejs

Practical training with the rehearsals for both priests and seminarians as well as for ordinary believers was vital for the introduction of vocals in the renewed liturgy. These trainings were also connected with the training of organists and other musicians. In Moravia, this work was realized by Father Olejník while, in Prague and the whole Bohemia, Bohuslav Korejs, an organist and choirmaster of the “Týn Church”, was responsible for this work.⁴⁵ His most significant deed in the area of liturgical music is the musicalization of psalms in Czech and the creation of their three-year cycle. On Jan Matějka’s recommendation, these psalms were published under the title “Vocals with the People’s Reply” and are widely used in the Czech environment.

From 1965, Korejs worked in the musical section of the *Archdiocesan Liturgical Commission* (ALC), and he also was an adviser of the CLC. He participated in the organization of the Archdiocesan Liturgical Day that took place in the “Týn Church”. František Šmíd remembers the establishment of the musical section of the Liturgical Commission in 1965:

About 30 people were present at first meetings of the newly arising musical commission, mostly Prague organists and choirmasters. O. A. Tichý, Dr J. Hruška (choirmaster of the St. Vitus Cathedral), J. Hercl and O. Novák (St. Jacob’s Church), Prof M. Venhoda (choirmaster of the Prague Madrigalists), Dr V. Plocek (The Institute for Musicology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences – CSAS), B. Korejs (the Church of Mother of God before Týn), Dr V. Macek (St. Havel Church) and other organists from all eminent Prague churches were among them. Out of the Prague

⁴⁵ Archdiocese liturgical day. Ref. 4645/65. *Circular letter of the Apostolic Administration in Prague*, No. 6, August 5, 1965, pp. 2–3.

Archdiocese priesthood, there were Father Karel Kudr and Father Josef Koukl, who was elected a chairman of the commission. The diocese of Brno was also well represented: Father Ladislav Simajchl, Dr Karel Cikrle, and Father Holík. At one of the next meetings, Father Olejník from the Diocese of Olomouc also turned up. Other dioceses sent one representative each from the priesthood, often not until the work of the commission started. First, the discussions concerned priest's vocals and Ordinaries in the Czech language. They started using the Czech text under the chorale melodies of the priest's vocals. Three Ordinaries (Ordinary by K. Bříza, P. Eben and O. A. Tichý) were selected for publication as well as the Lord's Prayer and other vocals.⁴⁶

Bohuslav Korejs did not attend the next meetings of the CLC because of the number of participants was subsequently limited; however, he continued as the musical section adviser. Korejs remembers his participation in the musical section and its formation as follows:

I do not even remember how the Czech Liturgical Committee came into existence. The Ministry was in charge over everything. It was time when the best possible thing was to know almost nothing, particularly names. I do not even know who arranged my appointment to the function and who my removal from the function. I was appointed as a member of "the musical section of the Czech Liturgical Committee"; however, only by the time when the Ministry decided that only priests can be members of the committee and no lay people. After the criticism of presented responsorial psalms, I was invited to present my own suggestions at the next meeting.⁴⁷

In 1984, the "Vocals with the People's Reply" were published and included responsorial psalms and other vocals for the liturgy. They form a set, in certain way, with "Mass Vocals". The author of most of the psalm melodies is Korejs, but there are also melodies by Petr Eben and Karel Sklenička.⁴⁸ Psalm tunes, i.e., responses and melodies for singing

⁴⁶ František Šmíd. Můj pohled na naše současné kancionály. *Psalterium*. Vol 1., No. 2/2007, p. 13.

⁴⁷ Pavla Jůzová. *Liturgická reforma a duchovní hudba v pražské arcidiecézi po II. vatikánském koncilu*. Thesis. Olomouc: CMTF UP 2014, p. 14.

⁴⁸ Organ accompaniments to songs are part of the publication: *Varhanní doprovod k mešním zpěvům, k hymnům pro denní modlitbu církve a ke zpěvům s odpovědí lidu*. Praha: Sekretariát České liturgické komise 1990, 322 p.

of verses, were composed according to topical needs of the authors. Korejs was preparing psalms for the everyday use in the Church of Mother of God before Týn, where children sang them from ambo.

The main part of “the Vocals with the People’s Reply” consists of the psalms with responsorial answers by Bohuslav Korejs (pp. 9–318), which are marked with the letter K and a serial number. After that the section includes the tunes by Petr Eben; the book presents 20 of his psalms marked with the letter E and a serial number. The last musicalized psalm is the vocal by Karel Sklenička (marked with the letter S). The psalm section is closed in the page 365 by his simple universal tune. The second part of the book consists of various casual songs: vocal before the Gospel, Good Friday’s vocals for worshipping the cross, litanies to the Saints and Latin vocals. Even though Korejs musicalized responsorial psalms and antiphonies for all liturgical events throughout the year, only psalms for Sundays, celebrations and feasts are available in this publication. The final tables and division of responsorial psalms into individual liturgical types and celebrations within the liturgical year is a very practical tool for organists and singers. By creating a set of answers easy to remember, the author made possible their wider use; some answers may be combined with more psalms.

The selection of these two musicians (Olejník and Korejs) was motivated partly by their involvement in the musical section of the CLC and their active participation in the post-council liturgical renewal connected with the musical formation of priests, seminarists and believers (they both taught liturgical singing at the Faculty of Theology), but also by the significant expansion of their tunes in our Church.

Conclusion

Musical forms of the post-council liturgy must be perceived in connection with the introduction of the Czech language into liturgy, which happened in two steps; the first modifications came in 1965 in accordance with the Instruction *Inter Oecumenici* (Small Reform). The liturgy renewal proper started with the introduction of the New Order of Mass and by the publication of the Czech Missal (Great Reform). In the first step, we may see the emphasis on the common folk vocal that replaced certain parts of the Ordinary and replies of believers in the

course of the Mass, for example during the Word Service.⁴⁹ The second step concerned musicalization of the whole Mass that was celebrated in national languages.

Basic requirements for the post-council liturgical music were determined right from the beginning. These requirements concern artistic quality, the manner of interpretation and liturgical level. The Second Vatican Council describes sacral music as a music which corresponds with the spirit of liturgical laws, which may be used for sacred service or could be adapted for it and which is in concordance with the sacredness of a temple and contributes to spiritual uplifting of believers.⁵⁰

Musician and his liturgical music are affected by *metanoia* (change of thinking); music thus becomes the means for exoneration and the singing brings hope and zeal for life. The fact that the whole assembly is the subject of liturgical event is factually manifested within the form of the service and singing. I do not sing about God, but I sing to God; I do not sing during the liturgy, but I sing the liturgy; I do not describe liturgical rite, but I perform it and accompany it with singing. Music within the liturgical event is its integral part, and it should raise the dialogue between man and God that is held during the liturgy. The faith takes on a musical form. Current state of liturgical music and vocal in our land can be evaluated positively. The liturgical reform was, with some exceptions, accepted favourably and we are sure that our tradition of the Slavic service based on Cyril and Methodius, our musical tradition, folk sacred songs and the Czech pre-council movement contributed to this. This all created not only the well-known *sentire cum ecclesia* but also certain *sensus liturgicus* and interconnected *sensus musicus*. *Sensus musicus* is manifested by rejecting the application of Gregorian melodies to the Czech texts and by the tendency to produce new compositions for the texts in national languages.

The acceptance of the renewed liturgy has a theological context; it is the manifestation of the willingness of the gathered community to

⁴⁹ Individual parishes were interviewed through vicariates about the small liturgical reform and about how the “novelties” are accepted by believers. The spiritual administrators have positively evaluated that the number of believers is increasing, the number of receiving is growing, the Czech is welcomed in worship, the faithful of the liturgy understand more and their active participation is enhanced by singing. Overall, the changes are accepted positively. See: Příloha vizitačního protokolu pro farnosti českých a moravských diecézí za rok 1966. *Diocesan Archives of the Bishop of Brno*, Inv. 16878, e. 5364, f. 222.

⁵⁰ SC No. 112–113.

accept and hold the function of the liturgical celebration subject and actively participate in the liturgy by singing. Celebrating liturgy is not about satisfaction of individual religious needs but about satisfaction of one common need by all the present, who respond to God's love by praise, thanksgiving and singing.

*Sts Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology, Palacký University
Department of Liturgical Theology
Univerzitní 22
771 11 Olomouc
Czech Republic
E-mail: pavel.kopecek@upol.cz*