

Music in the Catholic liturgy is an oral tradition. Oral traditions are fragile. The efforts of the past 150 years to restore and harmonize music in the liturgy have paradoxically led the publications of countless publications: liturgy books, but also decrees, opinions,... and more “alternative” liturgy books.... In their 2003 essay “the voices of plainchant” (Les voix du plainchant), Marcel Peres and Jacques Cheyronnaud show how the oral tradition of singing the liturgy has suffered in the last century and a half.

How can we fix a damaged oral tradition? By practicing it. This is how in the 19th century, the monks of Solesmes were able to revive Gregorian chant. In “Mélodies Grégoriennes”, Dom Pothier described how their practice brought life to the manuscripts they gathered from all over Europe. In turn, they were able to publish the most complete tool for chant than any Catholics ever had: the Liber Usualis. Since its publication, all successive popes, as well as the fathers of the Vatican II Eucumenical Council, re-affirmed the timeless value of Solesmes’ masterpiece. In their short essay, Peres, a singer and music historian, and Cheyronnaud, an ethnologue, spotlight how seizing this historic opportunity require that we Catholics learn, through practice, to differentiate the oral tradition from the books that aim to support it.

Below is my English translation of the introduction of their essay.

Hervé Blanquart
August 2020

Introduction

Today, the debate on Catholic religious singing is diluted by regrettable confusion over words and their meanings, the consequence of a restrictive view of the unfolding of events that have occurred over the past two centuries. The reflection on ecclesiastical singing would gain by freeing itself from the formulations of the time, because the world has changed, and the stakes are different. The new attention paid to the works of the past and to oral traditions has an impact on musical practices, these will strongly evolve in the coming years and the Church could play an essential role in this movement, if it succeeds in building a fruitful reflection on what could concretely be a heritage policy within the framework of its institutions. With this essay, we would like to offer the reader some points of reference that can feed his thinking.

This book is the fruit of the meeting between a musician and an ethnologist. In 1988, Jacques Cheyronnaud heard about my research on Corsican chant. Our conversation quickly turned to his work and in particular to his thesis devoted to cantors and the lectern. Finally, I met someone who had really asked the question of the historiography of Latin religious chant of the last two centuries. The few surveys that I had carried out at the time on the cantoral practices of the nineteenth century had shown me that many traditions, some of which may predate the Council of Trent, were still in use at the time. It then appeared to me that the reflection on the interpretation of so-called old music could not ignore long-lasting phenomena. Thus the study on the interpretation of medieval music - the different Latin plains-chants, but also polyphonic repertoires - had to integrate data from all eras. However, medieval musicology is still strongly dependent on concepts forged in the 19th century.

In 1997, I asked Jacques Cheyronnaud to collaborate in the research program on Corsican Confraternitas (Note: *Confraternitas* is a brotherhood of cantors) that, within the framework of Cerimm (Cerimm is the French acronym for "European Centre for Research on the Performance of Medieval Music"), I had initiated a few years earlier. It was a question of helping the Confraternitas to situate their traditions in the history of the Church and to formulate proposals which could appease the relations, then rather tense, with the clergy. Since the beginning of the 1980s, the Corsican Confraternitas have experienced a remarkable resurgence of activity. This renewal takes place in different ways depending on the history of each brotherhood. Although a few have kept their main ceremonies, most have forgotten chants or even liturgical services that were essential. In many cases, therefore, a problem of restoration arises, because this resurgence of fraternal practices brings to light cantoral traditions which remained impervious to the reforms of Pius X in 1903. It comes at a time when the Church has ceased to invest in them. ancient rituals in Latin to replace them by others, in vernacular languages. The Confraternitas, by their attachment to ancient practices, therefore find themselves at odds with the Church of today, which tries to promote the liturgical models developed over the past thirty years. This situation often produces tensions because there are many misunderstandings about the nature of traditions. The clergy understood that this dynamic renewal of the Confraternitas can regenerate the practice of worship. But how can the remains of ancient ceremonies be integrated into the concerns of liturgical pastoral care today? For their part, the Confraternitas feel the custodians of and responsible for a very fragile liturgical heritage, which could easily disappear if it were to be diluted by new uses introduced indiscriminately. Reconstructing confraternal practices without reviving the

spirit of the ancient liturgies could lead to misunderstandings. All the more so as the age gap between the young and the old confreres means that only the oldest have retained the memory of the musical shape of the liturgies.

It was as a result of this experience that the need was felt to write a book which could help to understand how the facts which led to the disappearance of the cantoral traditions of Catholicism were linked; and why, when fossil remains of these skills emerge, as in the case of the Corsican Confraternitas, the Church is helpless in the face of living testimonies of her liturgical past.

We shared the work. Jacques Cheyronnaud evokes the various stages which led the Church to weaken the role of cantors in the 19th century. For my part, I tried to describe how the historiography of plain-chants was constructed at the same time, and how a number of facts were dismissed or ignored. Bringing them back to light would renew how the Church approaches ecclesiastical chant. By detaching itself from these liturgical actors that the cantors were, the Church has alienated herself from the product of more than fifteen centuries of traditions. We will try to determine concretely what has been lost from a musical point of view. The unease that reigns today in the conduct of liturgical chant could perhaps begin to dissipate if contemporary reflection incorporated another vision of the past.

The Church and the memory of its cantoral traditions

The twentieth century was inaugurated by a pope, Saint Pius X, who proclaimed that the people of God should pray for beauty. This statement crowned the very important efforts of Catholic musicians, liturgists and musicologists who since the second

third of the 19th century had done their best to provide the liturgy with dignified and exemplary music. However, a century later, it is clear that all these efforts have not yielded the desired result. The reform desired by Pius X was only effective for about fifty years, and its degree of application has yet to be assessed. Today, on reading the texts of the time, we are astonished by the concerns of the time, the authorizations of the Sacred Congregation of Rites necessary to add or subtract a B flat from a psalmody, the adjective "authentic" attached to certain melodic versions, the special authorizations to be able to sing such prose in such diocese. A few decades separate us from these times and yet we have the feeling that this was another world. The word "tradition", which throughout history guided all religious behavior, is now excluded from the conversation. It is a word that embarrasses, using it automatically arouses suspicions, so many prefer to avoid it. Catholics lack benchmarks. First, on their own traditions. Today the evocation of the "traditional" circles of the Church refers to those who did not accept the liturgical upheavals, or the theological developments following the last Council. Musically, this meaning induces a first confusion. The so-called "traditional" circles all reiterate – if we set aside a few exceptions that have appeared in recent years - an aesthetic of chant inherited from the reforms formalized by Pius X. However, this reform had profoundly modified the aesthetics of liturgical chant by operating a true cultural revolution. These changes were long thought out and tested during the last two thirds of the 19th century. The Benedictine monks of Solesmes played a driving and determining role. The repertoires and editions were completely re-examined, reformed and imposed throughout Catholicism as the authentic documents of ecclesiastical chant. The consequence of these radical transformations was the gradual suppression of the cantors and therefore of everything of which they were

custodians, in the first place, a way of singing, the last expression of the cantoral traditions of Catholicism. They were replaced by parish choirs.

At the time, the cantors' vocal behavior was, it is true, often altered, even dilapidated, like the Church of the Ancien Régime, of which they remained a vestige. They represented, in many cases, the last testimonies of aesthetics of the voice very far from the criteria of beautiful singing then in vogue. But let us be careful not to take in the first degree all the negative texts which then castigated these traditions (1). The context was controversial and the imperative need to restore the Church was not embarrassed by the respect that today we cultivate for any cultural expression in the process of disappearing. The notion of conservation of an oral heritage, then, did not exist. Those leftovers of bygone time were almost eradicated, and almost everyone was happy. This lack of interest in cantoral traditions unfortunately persisted throughout the twentieth century; which explains the extremely small number of recordings of these cantors available today, practically nothing before the end of the 1960s. The *Motu Proprio* of 1903 did not really become effective in most parishes until after the First World War. However, in some rural parishes, a few old cantors continued to officiate until the last Council in the general indifference from Church music historians.

This attitude is explained by the historiography that was forged in the previous century. It was asserted, without any complex, that Gregorian chant, introduced in Gaul at the end of the 8th century, experienced a golden age in the Carolingian period, but that the introduction of polyphony in the 12th century would irreparably provoke a decadence, more and more scabrous, until the reforms of the end of the XIX century when finally the true Gregorian, decked out for the occasion of

the adjective "authentic", regained its letters of nobility thanks to the restoration work of the French Benedictines . In short, everything that was edited or produced between the 12th and the 19th centuries, in the matter of plainchant, was of no interest and did not justify wasting time studying it. The contemporary bibliography on monodic ecclesiastical chant espouses this militant vision of history, which explains why the plainchant repertoires after the 12th century have been very little studied, compared to the impressive mass of theses and articles devoted to manuscripts prior to the 13th century (2).

History: evolutions, permanence, breaks, restorations, omissions.

During the 19th century, the Roman Catholic Church experienced an immense movement to reappropriate its liturgical heritage. But this movement was selective. Faced with the attacks to which it was the object, it seemed necessary to close ranks and therefore to have a liturgical expression common to the whole Catholic world; however, there was great diversity at the time, a vestige of the fruitful and abundant activity of previous centuries - certain large cathedrals, such as Toledo, in the 18th century employed up to 120 musicians. At the end of the 1820s, after the revolutionary turmoil and the Napoleonic disorders, there was nothing left but the remains of the great ecclesiastical institutions. Religious orders were almost everywhere banned, the desire to reconstitute them began to animate some men, but the resumption of ecclesiastical practices arose in terms of reconstruction. The old world no longer existed, we had to create something else while being part of a tradition. It was the occasion for certain thinkers to reconsider the liturgical questions and naturally, which constitutes the primordial matter of any celebration, the

chant. Models had to be found, but the singing traditions then existing seemed far too connoted with the world of the Ancien Régime and no longer corresponded to what society had become. The Church needed, for her official doctrinal proclamation, to fashion a model that was beyond the fads and vagaries of worldly music. Because it was also necessary to stand out from the style of music promoted by the Opera, which then aroused an overwhelming enthusiasm. Caught between, on the one hand, an archaic music whose expression seemed more and more ridiculous, and on the other hand a powerful, bewitching music which corresponded too much to what was the delights of the sensibilities of the time - therefore dangerous because that risking to introduce into the Church a cult of subjectivity and the individual harmful to the development of the religious spirit, the Church had to show a third way.

The so-called Gregorian chant was very diverse depending on the place. It expressed major national or regional trends, within which certain local traditions were still strongly established. Since the end of the 7th century, when the chant of Rome was introduced in Western Europe, this repertoire had undergone a multitude of transformations, additions, adaptations and reforms. However, despite the centuries and the vagaries of history, the manuscripts, from the tenth to the eighteenth century, presented, in most cases, a unity in the construction of the melodies and in their liturgical assignment, essentially for the chants of the Mass. , from Advent to Pentecost. On the other hand, the masses on Sundays after Pentecost, the feasts of saints, often with specific chants according to the dioceses, as well as the offices and the chants of processions presented many more differences. However, besides this standard repertoire, transmitted by multiple editions each having its own particularities, other

compositions had flourished over the centuries and some places practiced very different liturgies from the Roman rite, either by ancestral tradition, as in Milan, Lyon. or Braga, either through the effect of a desire to cultivate, develop and institute local particularisms, such was the case in Toledo with Mozarabic chant at the end of the 15th century and in France with neo-Gallican chant, after the Council of Trent.

In the context of the great reorganization of the Church in the 19th century, the field of chant was, from the 1930s, the object of intense research. In a few decades it appeared that chant could be the determining factor of a liturgical unification which would make it possible to express the coherence of the Church, as an institution, and to ensure its doctrinal proclamation by a chant. identical in all Catholicity; in short, to make tangible the universality of the Church of Rome by a uniform public expression.

These ideas were largely developed and implemented within the liturgical laboratory that became the Abbey of Solesmes. For this, it was first necessary to develop an edition of the chants which would constitute the tool of such an enterprise. It was the time of the great expansion of philology; it was decided to apply the same methods to music in order to find, through the diversity of the variants, the original form of the Roman melodies which many believed to have been composed by Pope Gregory himself. And we went in search of the lost archetype by collating the greatest number of manuscripts in order to determine what might have been, at the origin, the true content of the melodies. In a few decades it was possible to reconstitute the melodies of all the chants of the Office and of the Mass. Naturally, although the search for the archetype remained the ultimate objective, it was sometimes necessary to make choices between different variants and above all, to go very quickly because enormous stakes were looming.

The idea of conforming all liturgical practices to Roman usage was already well established in the middle of the century among a large number of ecclesiastical leaders, but the problem of editions remained unresolved. Even admitting the ecclesial need to practice the Roman rite, what could one sing, on which books and ... how? The most widespread editions of Roman chant at the time stemmed, for the most part, from an edition developed at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, called the Medicean edition. During the 17th and 18th centuries several amendments of detail had been made by various authors. Thus, when Roman usage was generalized during the second half of the century, many dioceses chose to reissue the editions of previous centuries in order to deal with the most urgent. Great differences continued to exist. Of course, each edition had its own melodic and rhythmic peculiarities, but that was not the point; the way of singing, the vocal behaviors were quickly pointed out. Indeed, the desired reform was not only an arrangement, a restoration of melodies in order to taste their ancient flavors. No, it was about something deeper, more radical. It was a question of creating a new religious feeling which broke with the two aesthetic currents which then divided the Church: "worldly" music which found its most complete expression in opera, and the aesthetic of liturgical chant. bequeathed by the two centuries that had just passed. The appearance and sound of the liturgical act had to conform to new norms which were gradually being conceptualized and implemented. To coat these reforms with antiquity, which would break with the ancestral traditions then alive, the figure of Pope Gregory was put forward. When Pius X published his *Motu Proprio* in 1903, the tools developed in Solesmes for more than fifty years were ready. Twenty years later, the editions of Solesmes were spread throughout Catholicity, on all continents. The most

widely used book had been dubbed “Liber Usualis”. It was a prodigious tool, never in the course of its history had the Church succeeded in creating such an object. All the chants of Mass on Sundays and feasts as well as the offices of the great feasts, their readings and the corresponding prayers were recorded there. The desire, which had during the 1930s of the 19th century, to be able to have as many people as possible sing the same melody with one voice, was finally going to be able to become operational. But this revolution came at the cost of a radical change of the cantoral function within the ritual. The cantors were replaced by the parish choirs. This loss went almost unnoticed, yet it was at this time that Catholics, abandoning themselves to the mirages of “Gregorian” antiquity, lost their traditions of liturgical chant (3).

The relationship to heritage has evolved considerably during the second half of the 20th century. Today we are expressing a globalizing approach which is gradually freed from qualitative categorizations. We are shocked when we read from the pen of authors, who sometimes have only preceded us by a few decades, value judgments on the quality of such and such a work or composer. The once very strong nationalisms in Europe also often influenced musicological discourse. The superiority of such and such a national school over its neighbors was praised and demonstrated. Non-European music was ignored, often despised, only a few aesthetes paid attention to it. All this has changed and even the relationship to music from before the last three centuries has changed profoundly. Few people still dare to say that the men of the past had a very different sensibility from ours and therefore that in order to restore their works of art, we must “translate” them into a contemporary language. “The authentic” now prevails. The more an art form is exotic and distant from what we know, the better it will be received because it will enrich

the sensitivity. This desire to learn more about heritage can sometimes even be expressed as an aspiration to live the past, not to reconstitute lifestyles and situations which, in any case, will never be those of origin, but to integrate into the present. skills, gestures and life behaviors that could broaden the feeling of being and open up sensitivity to new perspectives. When these movements are part of an identity process that seeks only to reproduce a formalism supposed to protect against the excesses of modernity, there is a risk of fundamentalism and exclusive withdrawal into oneself. But when this interest is irrigated by a thought which seeks to understand, beyond the appearances of identity, the play of successive stratifications which over the centuries have fixed the traces of complex migratory movements, the passion for the cultures of the past can give new meaning. meaning in today's cultural policies. (4)

It is important to have these premises in mind in order to try to understand why the Roman Catholic Church is experiencing a deep aesthetic crisis today. Of course, this crisis is part of a complex context and the causes of the problems facing Catholicism today are multiple, social, moral, structural, theological, etc. They will not be mentioned here; others have done it, are doing it or will do it better than us. Rather, we would like to give readers some information that would help to think differently about the problematic of the relationship of the Church to her aesthetic, especially musical, and liturgical heritage. The discourse on church music, still in use today, is strongly influenced by concepts, vocabulary, behaviors and historiography which were forged during the 19th century and implemented with authority and method in the first mid-twentieth century. The facts and their accounts are extremely confused if one does not keep in mind the perspective of what came before and this does not only concern the field of church

music, but also musicological discourse and reflection on the interpretation of so-called old music. Beyond the small world of Western Europe, a clarification will also make it possible to build bridges towards other repertoires which, even if they seem very different from what we imagine Western music, are nonetheless very similar, by their historical origins: the repertoires of North Africa, the Near East, the Middle East and the various Byzantine repertoires. This music is expressed through behaviors and attitudes that were once ours. An objective history of plains-chants and oral practices in Western music will make an essential contribution to the development of a common historiography of all these repertoires.

Did you say Gregorian? Words can be misleading...

Gregorian chant, plain-chant, authentic, pure, scientific, musicological, semiological, traditional, popular, learned, religious, secular, prayerful, mundane, Western, oriental, baroque, classical, medieval, late, fanciful, lively, austere, sensual ...

It is sometimes confusing to note how the words, supposed to enlighten us in the complexity of reality, present and past confused, can lose us, lead us astray in attitudes, convictions, behaviors which in the end hide from us the richness of the diversity of facts. Sometimes certain words can determine the fields of investigation for more than a century, ignore some or, worse, deny others.

In the area we are concerned with here, we have often experienced words as obstacles to dialogue and reflection. They are either used to build thought patterns that reinforce cognitive sensation, or assaulted in order to create a bulwark intended to ward off any unbecoming curiosity, or even to disqualify, without possible recourse. Musicologists often

reiterate an agreed vocabulary, taken up indiscriminately by music critics. Interpreters, in good faith, fit into these categorizations and produce objects that corroborate them. And the circle is complete. Yet a minimum of reflection could prevent us from this chain of misunderstandings. The words that open this chapter all seem to refer to very specific realities, yet when we carefully examine their semantic field we see that they all contain a good dose of subjectivism and irrationality. How many times do we hear that such and such a way of doing things is "Eastern", when this way is simply out of use in Western Europe, sometimes only a few decades ago. The adjective "classical" is perhaps the most fanciful of all: depending on the country, it refers to the 16th century, elsewhere it will be the 17th century, sometimes also qualified as "baroque", or the beginning of the 20th century musics Arabs. Depending on the discipline also this term may qualify realities that are more than two millennia away. Do we not speak of "classic letters" to evoke the Latin and Greek literature of Antiquity, while a man who somehow ties a tie around his neck will see his dress style qualified as classic, and do not speak of Beethoven's Fifth, a masterpiece of ... classical music.

And the Gregorian chant in all of this?

Talking about Gregorian chant is a horribly perilous exercise. Because these two words convey, beyond the musical facts, a tangle of unspoken words which concern the Church, its representation, its doctrinal proclamation, the choices which, at specific times, presided over the structuring of its official memory. . Let us agree that a priori it is not easy for a musician or an honest man to understand how we got there: I mean the current situation of church singing, light years away from what it was in past centuries, and, apparently, in total contradiction

with the clearly stated will of the Pope, Saint Pius X, who wished to make the Church the model of an organization responsible for its cultural heritage, which consecrates the best of its energies to study it, restore it and bring it to life.

The words fool us, the notes too. I mean musical notes, those which are recorded on paper, parchment, vellum and which learned paleographers, codicologists, semiologists dissect and comment on. Yes, the sources on which historiography is based deceive us, because we end up representing the realities of the past only through them. In addition, the reading and analysis grids used satisfy the ways of thinking that prevail today, but are often out of step with the standards of those who designed these objects. What did three notes lying on a parchment sound like in the 13th century? Will these three notes really correspond to three distinct sounds, or will they be the sign of a vocal gesture, the outline of an intricate ornament or even the initial of a whole sentence? Why have we written such and such a book, to standardize a use, to impose a new one, to establish an authority, or simply to transmit beautiful melodies? Books are often traps because, in good faith, we tend to believe in the veracity of what they contain, to think that they are always a reflection of reality, while often they only express reality. of a moment, even a dream, or, more elaborate, a utopia. They can also, without having to analyze their content, offer a symbolic function which serves to establish legitimacy, a norm, laws. Musical books are also part of this movement. The polyphonic books of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are very often riddled with errors. It is disturbing and one wonders what those who read them really sang. As for the books of Gregorian chant, their melodies, for the repertoires of the mass, agree in most of the books, apart from a few details. For the antiphonaries, the melodies are much more diversified; as for the processions, they are

inexhaustible mines for those interested in the diversity of local customs. But, since the melodies of the Mass agree, does this mean everyone sang in the same way, whatever the place and time? It looks like it doesn't, and it's a strange constant in this repertoire. From the Carolingian period to the present day, the condemnations, the decadences, the anathemas, the reforms, the return to the sources, the improvements, the restorations, the bans, the authentic editions and the adulterated versions follow one another, collide , mix, arouse passions, and ... fall into oblivion.

What is this Gregorian chant? How many times have I been asked this question! Yet I still find it difficult to answer it. What to say? It all depends in the first place on the level of the conversation. You must first understand what the questioner already knows on the subject. For the majority, it is a song in Latin which brings to mind a monastic aesthetic. For those who have attended the preconciliar liturgies, this is all that is recorded in the "Liber Usualis", or, more precisely, the melodies recorded in the authentic Vatican edition of 1908. Some still sincerely believe that Pope Gregory has composed most of these melodies, as the official historiography of the Church has taught in recent centuries.

At another level of knowledge, for those who have followed the evolutions of the last thirty years, the Gregorian chant is that corpus of liturgical melodies formed in the Carolingian period when the chant of Rome was imported. It would represent the synthesis between the previous repertoires called "Gallicans" and the chant of Rome. Thanks to the political organization of the Empire and the development of several notation systems, this repertoire, intended to serve the Roman liturgy which was then imposed almost everywhere, spread throughout Europe. And the plainchant? Plain-chant, from cantus planus. For some authors of the 19th and 20th centuries this term designates

monodic chants that are not Gregorian and in particular melodies composed after the Council of Trent (1545-1563). Sometimes these melodies are grouped together under the name of musical plainchant. Here we use plain-chant in its generic sense of monodic chant, commonly used throughout history. It was a flat chant, that is to say one which has no relief, in which it differed from the discantus, the polyphony in which the voices were disjointed. There was also talk of a term which also referred to a monophony and which referred to the particular way of singing used for ecclesiastical monody: with a firm, strong, unshakeable voice. The two expressions, cantus planus and cantus firmus, are often synonymous. Cantus firmus is also used to designate, in the architecture of a polyphony, the voice which holds the liturgical melody sung in long values. To understand what has happened in recent centuries and try to propose initiatives to revive this heritage today, we have chosen to present a little history of the history of Latin plains-chants. We will not evoke everything, only a few points which seem essential to us to understand the main axes of the evolution of these repertoires and the ways in which their nature was perceived. The reader will find there a small anthology of reforms, creations and restorations which over the centuries have punctuated ecclesiastical chant.

The origins: Jewish, Greek, Roman, Frankish and old Roman chant.

The 12th century: The first normative reforms that we can observe in religious orders with the Benedictines of Cluny, then with the Cistercians.

XIII century: Dominican and Franciscan reforms. The Dominican books offer us a first precise description of the interpretation of plainchant, while with the Franciscans, we are

witnessing the creation of a popular repertoire in the vernacular, and the creation of Confraternitas of lay cantors.

XIV century: With the decretal letter of John XXII, for the first time, a pontifical text speaks concretely about the music of his time. We can also observe in this text the dichotomy that already existed between the written style and the oral style. The 14th century is also the century in which polyphonic masses appear.

15th century: Mozarabic chant from Toledo, transcription of an oral tradition, or for the first time composition of a new repertoire in an archaic style?

The plains-chants of the following centuries, from the end of the 16th century with the Medicean edition then those which were composed in the 17th and 18th centuries, form a whole evoked in the chapters that Jacques Cheyronnaud produced on the 19th century (cf. . infra). We will try to determine, by concluding this work, what was concretely lost with the disappearance of the cantors.

NOTES:

(1) Not so long ago, less than thirty years, the Corsican polyphonic traditions which today are the delights of festivals and in which the Corsicans recognize the privileged expression of their identity, were mocked and despised by most Corsicans who preferred opera arias and songs by Tino Rossi (Note: a US equivalent to Tino Rossi could be Mario Lanza).

(2) There has been a positive trend in recent years. Thus, since the colloquium organized by the Cerimm and the Center de musique baroque de Versailles in 1992, the study of French

repertoires of the 17th and 18th centuries has clearly progressed (eg *Plain-chant et liturgie en France in the 17th century*. by Jean Duron, Editions du Center de musique baroque de Versailles, Éditions Klincksieck, Fondation Royaumont, 1997). "

However, the corresponding directories in Italy and on the Iberian Peninsula are still waiting for researchers to devote themselves to it.

(3) A century later, it is interesting to observe what in the immense musical corpus then accessible, was selected and presented as a model of Roman catholicity: Gregorian chant and polyphonies in the manner of Palestrina; and what has been discarded: the polyphonies prior to Palestrina, the tropes (musical and poetic commentaries on Gregorian chant in use in a large number of places since the 9th century, they begin to disappear after the 13th century, and the Council of Thirty will exclude them from the liturgy), the post-Tridentine plains-chants (certain chants such as the little *Salve Regina* or the *Rorate caeli desuper* have however been preserved), the last vestiges of oral polyphonic traditions.

(4) By "migratory movement" is meant not only population movements but also movements of thought, movements of individuals carrying knowledge and know-how which transformed practices and behaviors.