

## COMBE 319 PUT IN APPENDIX

Addressed to all the members and consultants of the Commission, this Memorandum, dated April 2, was printed, and comprised twenty-one lines in all, wherein was explained the procedure followed when examining the texts proposed by the Editors:

It could possibly be useful and certainly acceptable to the members of the Commission who are not in a position to participate in the deliberations to know the procedure that is followed at the meetings when the texts proposed by the Editors are examined.

Each one present has a copy of the proofs to be examined. The President has written on his copy the various proposals from absent members so as to be able to tell how many are favorable or unfavorable to such-and-such a reading. When a passage emerges about which one of the members has a comment to make, or when one of the absent members has written a question or remark, the President stops and the problem is discussed, reading the absent member's own text or observation, if necessary. If the feelings of the gathering are clear, the debate is closed. If no agreement is evident, however, the President asks each member his opinion in turn, and when a majority is reached, a decision is made. One of the members has been assigned to recapitulate in writing the reasons for arriving at a decision. To help him in his task, he gathers the various folders of proofs on which each one has recorded his observations. Clearly, the method is detailed enough, but orderly and sure.

Rome, April 2, 1905.

Dom Joseph Pothier, President.

(COMPARE WITH BERGERON'S VERSION in her book pg 147 where she added:

Each one present has a copy of the proofs to be examined. The President has written on his copy the various proposals from absent members so as to be able to tell how many are favorable or unfavorable to such-and-such a reading. **The president begins by singing from the proof.** When a passage emerges about which one of the members

Quoted in Combe, page 321

Most Reverend Father:

It has come to the attention of the Holy Father that, among those who are working to prepare the Vatican Edition of the liturgical books, a doubt has arisen as to the best manner of responding to the intentions of His Holiness relative to the restoration of sacred music. The August Pontiff is pleased to state that the differences between one side and the other have arisen out of a desire to respond to his intentions in the best way possible. However, in order to eliminate any occasion and any pretext of doubt and incertitude, His Holiness has instructed me to inform Your Reverence that when He decided on the return to the ancient Gregorian chant, He did not intend to make this work exclusively favorable to the archaeology of the chant, to the point that models of Gregorian melodies that have been received over the course of the centuries cannot be accepted today. In his *motu proprio* of November 22, 1903, the Holy Father recalled very opportunely that "the Church has always recognized and encouraged the advancement of the arts, allowing for use in its worship services anything that artistic genius has found good and beautiful over the course of the centuries, as long as liturgical rules are respected at all times."

In his second *motu proprio* of April 25, 1904, establishing the rules of order with regard to the Vatican Edition of the liturgical books, His Holiness wisely decided that "the integrity and purity of the melodies of the Church, known as Gregorian chant, will be restored according to the most ancient manuscripts, but particularly bearing in mind the legitimate tradition contained in the manuscripts over the course of the centuries, as well as the practical use in current liturgy."

According to these principles, which express the true tradition of the Church, it will not be against the intention of His Holiness that the Pontifical Commission for the Vatican Edition of Gregorian liturgical books should give preference to some less ancient compositions, provided that they have the true character of Gregorian music. In fact, it cannot be demonstrated that the most ancient chant is necessarily and always the best for practical adaptation. Because of certain subsequent developments in the art, the ancient melodies could have evolved logically, or even could have acquired certain embellishments, without causing harm to their original purity.

Please share these authoritative explanations with the Commission over which you preside with such dignity, so that the Commission might take them as a norm and guide in doing its work, and may the Commission continue to prove ever more worthy of the trust that His Holiness has placed in it.

In the meanwhile, I am happy to take this opportunity to express to you my distinguished expressions of esteem, and remain

Yours very affectionately in the Lord,

*R. Card. Merry del Val,*  
Rome, April 3, 1905.

IMPORTANT ADD ON FROM BERGERON pg 150

Combe makes a confusing error on page 322, when says, referring to the above letter, *written by the Cardinal:*

Dom Pothier sent this letter on April 5 and, according to Father Holly, it was inspired by Dr. Wagner (Holly, June 27, 1906 to Dom Mocquereau). After it was read aloud by Dom Janssens at the April 5th meeting, there followed "a lively discussion of the document which had just been read, and of other current topics."