

ASPECTS OF CATHOLICISM AND MODERNITY THROUGH THE EXAMPLE OF CHRISTIAN POPULAR MUSIC

KINGA POVEDÁK*

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the ambivalent connection between modernisation and Roman Catholic religion. It focuses on the appearance of popular music in a religious environment and seeks an answer to the question of how the official and lived religion responded to the changes of late modernity. What dynamic tensions arose from the different ways in which the Church and the communities of believers have judged in the past and judge today the invasive spread of Christian popular music? What connection is there between the emerging or reviving religious music styles and the various interpretations of religious modernisation?

Keywords: Catholicism and modernity, religious modernization, transformation of Catholic ritual music, Vatican Council II.

INTRODUCTION

At first hearing the two words evoke contradictory associations in the layperson. *Obviously they do not match, religion is basically conservative, a phenomenon that preserves the values of the past, while modernisation is everything opposed to that.* But is this commonly held opinion really true and is there an irreconcilable contradiction between *the church defending the ruins of the past*, and the social transformation that *wants to sweep away the ruins of the past*? However, the situation is far from being so straightforward and clear-cut. Just as we cannot speak of a single pattern and uniformly occurring process of modernisation, so we cannot speak of a uniform Catholic reaction either. Just as there are many different kinds of modernity, so there is also Catholicism modernising in many different ways.

* Research Fellow, MTA-SZTE Research Group for the Study of Religious Culture, Egyetem u. 2, 6722 Szeged, Hungary; e-mail: povedakkinga@gmail.com.

„**Revista română de sociologie**”, serie nouă, anul XXVII, nr. 1–2, p. 25–37, București, 2016



Creative Commons License
Attribution-NonCommercial CC BY-ND

CATHOLICISM AND MODERNITY

This process, the interactions and reactions of the two can be grasped by focusing on the changes in music, giving a much clearer picture of the explanatory factors that led to tensions, either internally (among the different actors of the institution), or externally (between trends in the institution and in the profane sphere). It enables us to understand all the accommodation strategies by which religion tries to enculturate among the conditions of the given age, and to give relevant answers to its believers. This involves questions, the problems arising from them and the difficulties of self-interpretation of no less import than those formulated by the theologian and philosopher Tamás Nyíri: “the question of undoubtedly the greatest concern for the Christian believer today is: where is my place in the modern world.” (Nyíri, 1965: 5) From the second half of the 20th century all this becomes of special interest in the light of the “secularisation” trends of late modernity. The process of secularisation that is also interpreted in various ways in religious studies, was experienced by the Catholic church basically as the shrinking of its influence, social role and following, and in its continuous frustration over this it raises again and again the fundamental question of whether the church is following the right path or it is rather being threatened by the nightmare of extinction and will itself become a victim of modernisation. Naturally, only a brief, superficial answer can be given to this question within the frame of the present article.

Before beginning an analysis of the topic, it is worth noting that among the many definitions of modernity, the one used here is that of multiple modernities that rejects the idea that there could be a single perspective, a kind of master narrative to explain the changes, and that takes the position that alternative modernities have arisen side by side. It must be stressed therefore that there is no generally valid modernisation thesis and that the most frequent use of the term as a synonym of westernisation and Europeanisation (Altermatt, 2001: 33) is mistaken. As Herzfeld concluded, modernity cannot be regarded as exclusively the property of the West. (Herzfeld, 2001: 83) Naturally, this does not mean that the importance of the West in the processes is being questioned, but simply that its role is not regarded as absolute and the global processes are decentralised. This must be regarded as especially true if we are examining the reactions of the transnational churches, in this case the Roman Catholic Church. Obviously, in such an examination, both a supranational, generalised approach and research limited within national frames can throw light on only a part of the whole picture. The two need to be linked if we are to reveal the responses given by religion to modernisation in different regions of the world. This is not the aim of the present study due to their numerous overlaps and interactions. As Niedermüller writes, “research must move beyond the previously accustomed national, regional or local frames, it must also extend its attention to the global connections.” (Niedermüller,

2008: 9) For the present topic, because the analysis is directed at the contemporary situation, the debates concerning the historical beginnings of modernisation are of secondary importance. Whether the origins of modernity can be traced to the 18th, 17th or even to the 16th century (Taylor, 2008: 26) is of no significance here because it was only in the 19th century that the Catholic Church as an institution responded to its manifested forms.

If one begins the analyses from the perspective of the connections between the church(es) and modernity, we must first cast aside a few widely held suppositions that could basically mislead researchers (and have in fact misled them in a number of cases). The first of these is that religion and modernity are inherently opposed. According to this supposition – as Hellemans notes – religion is not part of the process of modernity, and so it is increasingly subjected to negative influences from that direction. In contrast, in reality religion as an element of the society and the culture in the same way as politics, the economy, the sciences or indeed the family is a part of modernity, and similarly to the way that the economy or politics developed from pre-modern forms, the same thing happened to religion. We cannot therefore regard religion as some kind of pre-modern relic alien to modernisation. In place of the contradictions one should focus rather on the various forms of interaction between the two and the changes resulting from these interactions (Hellemans, 2001: 20). These soon reveal that the increasingly strong centralisation of the transnational Roman Catholic Church in the 19th century could only have been achieved under the circumstances of modernisation and certainly cannot be interpreted as a relic of pre-modernity. As Hellemans also puts it, this is not pre-modern backlash but rather a manifestation of modernization. (Hellemans, 2001: 22) The “opening of doors”, among which other example are the circumstances of becoming a priest, entering an order, or even the growing congregations, is also a consequence of modernity even in spite of the fact that this modernity also resulted in a strong conservatism. Generally speaking, as Zsinka points out; “a certain tendency to idealise mediaeval Christian society can be observed in 19th century Catholic thinking, and seen from this viewpoint the bourgeois societies – together with their economic consequences, the market economy and capitalism – were to be rejected”. (Zsinka, 2010) While from the beginning of the French Revolution Catholicism moved in the opposite direction to the processes of modernity, the changes and the direction of development or to the strengthening of subjective individualism, this also occurred within the frames of “diverse modernisation” and not outside those frames. In the words of Hellemans, religion, including its institutionalised forms, is imbedded in modernisation and is in continuous interaction with it¹.

¹ “Religion, including church-shaped religion, is embedded in modernity and is continually remade in interaction with modernity”. (Hellemans, 2001: 22)

As a consequence the question that is also raised by Altermatt – *Is it true that Catholicism (was) fundamentally opposed to and the antithesis of the modern age? Is anti-modernism one of the constants of the Catholic mentality and way of life?* (Altermatt, 2001: 33) – cannot be answered with a straightforward yes or no. A distinction must be made, on one hand between the institution itself and the believers, and within these, among the various, often opposed groups with conflicting interests. Of course, within this, in the spirit of diverse modernity, the situation for example of the American church operating among the challenges of the religious market, is entirely different from that of states behind the iron curtain, or the Catholics of the African missions. We must also take into account the change occurring over time, the different attitudes of different periods. On the other hand, modernity may also have various aspects also within the frames of religiosity, and it cannot be stated that a correlation exists between the different dimensions. Examining, for example, the important musical dimension, it is far from certain that those who do not support the use of Christian popular music within the frames of the liturgy are also opposed to the Church's use of the latest communication technologies, among others to their appearance in the social media. At the same time the dichotomy of tradition versus modernity must also be handled in a more nuanced way. Among other examples, it can be clearly seen from the renaissance of Gregorian chants beginning at the end of the 20th century, in its various arrangements and albums, that tradition can also use the tools of modernity. As Patrick Kavanaugh also remarks: “After years of neglect, chant has recently made a well-deserved comeback. In the mid-1990s, chant suddenly sold millions of CDs and tapes”. (Kavanaugh, 1999: 15)

Another example is evidenced in the melodic world of the Taize songs evoking the Middle Ages in which one can also discover the traditionalism of a spiritual movement that has features of modernity. Modernity can thus transform the segments and actors of religious culture in a variety of ways and at different paces. As Kamarás also stresses: “The counteraction may arise in the spirit of innovation or traditionalism, and innovation may also take place in the spirit of traditionalism, in response to which M. Mártonffy noted: traditionalism that arbitrarily selects a particular historical slice of theological interpretation and regards it as exemplary arises from a – typically modern – time pressure and may become dangerous to the individual and the community”. (Kamarás, 2003: 16)

If one wishes to examine chronologically how the attitude of the Church towards modernisation changed in the different periods, one would also obtain an answer to the questions of how and why the Church reacted in the given period in the way it did, to the innovations manifested in religious music. Taking these considerations into account, on the basis of MacSweeney and Hellemans one can distinguish four basic periods in modern church history. The main characteristic of the first period, from the French Revolution to 1878, was the total rejection of a “licentious and impermanent disorder”. The second period beginning in 1878, that

is, from Leo XIII to the Second Vatican Council gave way to competition “against a hostile order”. The years immediately following the Council were characterised by alliance, while the fourth period beginning in 1978 is marked by an alternative voice. These, in turn, are connected to four self-images of the Church: *1.* victim of temporary, revolutionary agitation; *2.* counter-power fighting a fearsome enemy; *3.* partnership with modernity; *4.* embattled minority group. These also link with the mirror images of how the Church perceived modernity: *1.* sinful interruption; *2.* secular power; *3.* partner; *4.* social context hostile to the Church. (Hellemans, 2001: 117–127)

In the decades following the French Revolution the Catholic Church perceived itself as a loser due to the changes in Europe, and expressed many reservations about the bourgeois society that was coming into being. (Zsinka, 2010) “Conservative Catholicism reacted to the crises by placing greater emphasis on the religious-ethical values of its own world-view. The more opaque and unstable the world became, the more aggressively the Catholic elite proclaimed its own world-view as an antidote”. (Altermatt, 2001: 45) And as Altermatt points out, the same thing happened during the major changes of the 1870s, 1930s or the 1970s. By the 1870s, under, Pius IX (1846–1878) a mass Catholic religiosity arose with the use of what were at the time modern means of communication. Pilgrimages, the cult of the saints, the cult of Mary, the proliferation of confraternities, congregations and societies were all part of this trend. In the course of this shift, Catholicism changed from a popular, vernacular religion to a popularised religion that was also manifested in mass culture directed from above. (Altermatt, 2001: 46) In the face of modernisation and the general cultural, moral and social changes and threats it represented, Catholicism tried to isolate its followers and shelter them behind the bastions of tradition. And it was able to do so because the power of the Catholic Church, by which is meant both the side turned outwards towards its followers and its internal hierarchy, had increased. The priests developed a tendency to attribute all problems of religious morality to the excesses or distortions of modernisation. In religious music all this meant that as Catholicism separated itself from the culture of the period (Meier cited by Altermatt, 2001: 35) in the 1860s it turned back towards the music of early classicism. This shift was strengthened by Pope Pius X in 1903 with his *Motu Proprio* that represents the victory of traditionalism despite the fact that it also allows more use of modern music with strict limitations:

“...modern music is also admitted to the Church, since it, too, furnishes compositions of such excellence, sobriety and gravity, that they are in no way unworthy of the liturgical functions. Still, since modern music has risen mainly to serve profane uses, greater care must be taken with regard to it, in order that the musical compositions of modern style which are admitted in the Church may contain nothing profane, be free from reminiscences of motifs adopted in the theatres, and be not fashioned even in their external forms after the manner of profane pieces. [...] It is strictly forbidden to have bands play in church...”

Pope Pius X also declared that Gregorian chant was:

“proper to the Roman Church, the only chant she has inherited from the ancient fathers, which she has jealously guarded for centuries in her liturgical codices, which she directly proposes to the faithful as her own, which she prescribes exclusively for some parts of the liturgy, and which the most recent studies have so happily restored to their integrity and purity. On these grounds Gregorian Chant has always been regarded as the supreme model for sacred music, so that it is fully legitimate to lay down the following rule: *the more closely a composition for church approaches in its movement, inspiration and savour the Gregorian form, the more sacred and liturgical it becomes; and the more out of harmony it is with that supreme model, the less worthy it is of the temple.* The ancient traditional Gregorian chant must, therefore, in a large measure be restored to the functions of public worship... The above-mentioned qualities are also possessed in an excellent degree by Classic Polyphony... [It] agrees admirably with Gregorian chant, the supreme model of all sacred music, and hence it has been found worthy of a place side by side with Gregorian chant, in the more solemn functions of the Church”.

(<http://egyhazzene.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/motuproprio.pdf>)

The hierarchical Church was still able to maintain processes directed from the centre, from above, it was able to go against the new trends appearing in the popular culture of the period. However, as the means of mass communications became widespread, and in the light of the political and cultural processes, the changing values, and in general the trends of mass civilisation towards uniformity, all this became increasingly difficult. The Church was less and less able to achieve its ideal and practice of a hermetically isolated, autocratic Catholic society operating on the basis of Christian values. In the words of Béla Fila, the Catholic Church “towards the end of the papacy of Pius XII, by the late 1950s had become rigid and in deep crisis because it had not solved the problems of modern life, the question of modernism that appeared in the early 20th century”. (Fila, n.d.) With the radically accelerating social and technical changes, an answer had to be found to the processes endangering the prestige and status of the Roman Catholic Church, as there had not really been any comprehensive reforms up to the Second Vatican Council. At the same time grassroots movements had arisen among the believers as spontaneous reactions in a bottom-up process. Because this process was unregulated and lacked any clear guidance, these movements became increasingly diverse and spread ever wider. In this sense the Second Vatican Council was both a product of the reforms and contributed to their advance. Its innovations were based on already existing demands, and this was due to the fact that the Church was less and less able to keep pace with the changes that accelerated after the Second World War. The Church structures drifted further away from social consciousness, and this naturally resulted in a widening of the gap between the Catholic faithful (who were also part of social consciousness) and the institutional Church. As Altermatt

emphasised, the Church and the faithful no longer lived in the same time. (Altermatt, 2001: 255–257) The period in time had come, says Gelineau, for the Church to finally make an effort to bring itself into line with the *zeitgeist*, to change, just as all other living organisms change. (Wilson-Dickson, 1998: 263) The convocation of a synod became unavoidable.

Even before the convocation of the synod opened it aroused much hope, fear and speculation. (O'Malley, 2015: 13) The guidelines and decisions of the basically pastoral synod would determine the course of the Church for a considerable time. (Pákozdi, 2013: 7) What is regarded by many people as the most significant religious event of the 20th century is most frequently associated with three symbolic words that in practice characterise the nature of the radical changes that occurred: *aggiornamento* (“bringing up to date”, “modernisation”), development (progress) and *ressourcement* (“return to the sources”). *Aggiornamento* focuses on the present, development on the future, and *ressourcement* on the past. (O'Malley, 2015: 59)

There have already been many thorough surveys of the changes made by the council. What is of interest here among the areas of reform are mainly the most spectacular and at the same time most contradictory liturgical changes, their implementation and reception. As Lukács also emphasises, beyond the changes in the particular areas, at the deepest level they appeared in the entire ecclesiology. (Lukács, 2013: 10) The Council was held over four sessions between 1962 and 1965, in the autumn of each year. Up to 8 December 1965 Pope Paul VI proclaimed sixteen documents in his own name and that of the Council. Of these, four were constitutions (on the sacred liturgy, on the Church, on divine revelation and on the Church in the contemporary world), nine were decrees of the council (among others, on the media of social communication, on ecumenism, on the lay apostolate), and three were declarations (on Christian education, on non-Christian religions and on religious liberty). (O'Malley, 2015: 14–15) Among others, it was stated as a basic principle that “the liturgy is the summit and the font of the life of the Church”, in which “the full and active participation of the faithful is important”, and in the renewal of the liturgy “sound tradition should be retained and the way remain open to legitimate progress”. (Lukács, 2013: 11) The aims also included easing the ritual rigidity of the mass, and promoting the active participation of the people. As a consequence of the liturgical reform, the form of the mass changed. The celebrant priest now stands facing the congregation, not with his back to them, the screen separating the sanctuary from the nave - and the faithful – has disappeared. Within a few years the exclusive use of Latin for prayers was replaced by the national language throughout the world. O'Malley stresses that we cannot speak of modernisation of the mass, what was achieved was that it was made to correspond more precisely to certain fundamental and traditional principles. (O'Malley, 2015: 194–195)

From the musical point of view these are considered to be revolutionary, because the opening and the possibility of active participation inspired creativity in many. A whole series of church guitar groups appeared with widely differing abilities. Lukács notes that:

“encouraged by the reforms under way, the desire to innovate flourished in various countries of Europe. In many churches [...] a wide variety of innovations were introduced into the mass [...] There were reports of ‘Eucharistic suppers, of ‘parties’ involving whole congregations, reports and photos that many found offensive appeared in the papers. Since the life of the Church is manifested primarily in the liturgy, the struggle between the two extreme camps during these years appeared almost to threaten the unity of the Church ...”. (Lukács 2013: 15–16)

AFTER THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

In the case of the Roman Catholic Church, after the reforms of the Second Vatican Council the Church appears as an interpreter of the signs of the times, as a fellow traveller of modernity and as a partner of modernity. On the one hand the Council gave greater value to the laity and on the other hand it modernised the forms of the religious cult. It ended the Catholic “new Enlightenment”, or pushed the Baroque forms of devotion into the background, provoking a resistance among some groups of lay persons. The Church found its way back to the lost emotional values, and the institution, as Hellemans noted, no longer condemned modernity, but under the key word of “aggiornamento” strove to bring itself closer to modern times, to adapt Catholicism to modernity, although this effort was far from straightforward and problem-free. Regarding the Second Vatican Council Baldovin basically distinguished five different attitudes that clearly show the contradictory effects of the Council among Roman Catholics living in different parts of the world. (Baldovin, 2008) These attitudes are: **1.** demand for further reforms; **2.** return to the status quo before the Council; **3.** revision of the Council’s reforms; **4.** inculturation of the reform; **5.** re-Catholicisation of the reform.

Although the Council tried, in the spirit of “aggiornamento” to bridge the gap and approach its own age, the sudden reforms had an ambivalent effect. In place of a simple solution the transformation did more to provoke an internal crisis. It can be regarded as an automatic effect that a counter-reaction basically aimed at strengthening the restoration after the Council, coming from some of the clergy and faithful who had been socialised in the institution operating according to unquestionably traditionalist and strict principles in the period from the mid-19th century to the 1950s, contributing to the creation of a Church model fraught with ambivalences. Within this model a trend turning inwards to traditionalism and increasingly breaking away from the present, and another trend increasingly

adapting to the circumstances of the period have lived side by side and opposed to each other within Catholicism, often giving rise to greater tensions between the two than compared to some trends outside Catholicism. People who clung to the traditions observed with alarm what were in many cases subjective evaluations of the Council's decisions. (Wilson-Dickson 1998: 264) In the case of music it is an indication of this ambivalent process that together with the marginalisation of Latin almost all music linked to it was also neglected. In this way the valuable legacy of the chorale and polyphony disappeared from use. During this period of the Church was fraught with internal tensions and was divided into parts, yet it strengthened and still continues to do so today. (Altermatt, 2001: 255) However, as Altermatt points out, it is a mistake to assume that all this was caused by the Church or the Council adapting fully to the modern age.

“The Church drew closer to the modern world, but it did not allow itself to be incorporated into it. The ambivalent nature of the processes of adaptation led to uncertainty. Shortly after the stage of optimistic awakening, the certain belief that the texts of the council were being interpreted correctly was shaken and led to differences of opinion within the church. While some warned of the age of renewal, others feared the approach of restoration. The progressive and conservative trends clashed with each other on practically all issues. [...] Catholic culture lost its cohesive force; the closed Catholic micro world fragmented. [...] The monolithic church society – if it ever existed – is now a thing of the past” (Altermatt, 2001: 257–258).

A further factor contributing to this was that the Council was practically held at the same time as the general transformation of society and the wave of modernisation that brought turbulence to the revolutionary character (Altermatt, 2001: 254). (Wilson-Dickson, 1998: 263) In 1998 (!), arguing for reform of the reform, Ratzinger stressed that “The present low point of the Church is to a great extent based on the disintegration of the liturgy. [...] That is why a new liturgical movement is needed, that will bring to life the real legacy of the Second Vatican Council”. (Ratzinger 2005: 164) Nor can we fail to mention that the political events of 1968, and the appearance of the cultural revolution that emerged after the Council fundamentally influenced the reception and evaluation of the Council, and in this light the struggle of the conservative, traditionalist trend versus the progressive trend in part also acquires a different meaning that is not determined only by the religious reforms.

Parallel with the strengthening of the “secularisation trends” in Europe, the ambivalent attitude towards modernity has been occupying a growing space in Christian discourse since the beginning of the Second Vatican Council. At this point it is worth making a brief digression in the direction of secularisation, another disputed territory. If one examines the studies analysing the connection between modernity, our times and religion, for a long while one finds the predominance of secularisation theses, but now this paradigm has quite clearly become untenable. In

1991, Peter Berger wrote a study titled ‘Desecularization of the World’, emphasising that secularisation is not necessarily the correlation between modernity and religion. Religion cannot always be linked to the past or to peripheral situations. (Davie, 2010: 16) This is true if for no other reason than the diverse modernity presupposes diverse secularisation models. Some are compatible with religion and some are not. The overemphasis on secularisation is also confirmed by the international political conflicts of our time, and we cannot explain contemporary social changes without taking into account religion, as Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Simmel did in their time. (Davie, 2010: 18) Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of the Roman Catholic Church (and historically Christian churches) it is a problem that, under certain circumstances, the rapidly spreading “desecularisation” in some regions is not resulting principally in a return to the traditional religions. Zulehner stresses that “The ‘old’ Christian churches, as parts of the culture, are suffering from a deep crisis of transformation. In particular the Catholic Church has not yet been capable of dealing with the problem of modernisation of the culture and as a result it also has to face a crisis of modernity”. (Zulehner, 2004: 14–15) Undoubtedly a sign of this is the crisis of the traditional forms of institutional religion, one of the symptoms of which is the slow erosion of membership (Davie, 2010: 20). Because of the pluralisation of culture, and together with it the growing proportion of those turning away from the historical churches, the privatisation of religion transforming it into a private affair “*the church can no longer rely on Christianity being passed down socioculturally by itself*” [...]. Zulehner points out that “As a consequence the gospel must be proclaimed to every new rising generation, that is, under the circumstances of an always new *ecclesiogenesis*. The period of foundation of a new church has dawned”. (Zulehner, 2004: 15) As early as the start of the 20th century, Georg Simmel stressed that modern people are not necessarily less religious than their ancestors were. They are religious in a different way because the forms of religion are changing together with the society of which they are a part. (Davie, 2010: 53) In other words, the Church too must articulate its’ principles in a manner consistent with the latest circumstances.

What does all this mean for music? In all parts of the world modernisation is making its effect felt in Catholic music, although with shorter or longer delays. An explosive change occurred in the 1960s. Music was the most striking manifestation of the general cultural revolution that appeared in the 1960s, especially in the western world; it was able to express in an explicit way the feelings of the young generation of that time which turned away from the values of their parents based on conformism, authoritarianism and hierarchy. Because of the prominent part it plays, for the young generations music is never just music, it is always at the same time an expression of a way of life, a life feeling, rebellion, autonomy or separateness: a confession of faith, way of behaviour, lifestyle, world-view. However, the rebellion and opposition did not result in atheism but in a spiritual

awakening, the awakening opening in the spirit of liberalism towards previously unknown and therefore attractive, exotic eastern philosophies and religions. A Rousseauian “back to nature” concept, communes based on utopian equality or the rejection of consumer civilisation spread in the “hippie” movement as a quasi-religious new ideology/lifestyle. Eastern religions and cults appeared, in many cases popularised by the musicians themselves. At the same time contents linked to Christianity can also be found in the songs of many performers indicating that it is not right to say the period unequivocally turned away from Christianity. Two different manifestations of this are apparent: one where the religious appears in popular culture and the other where elements of popular culture seep into religious culture. Both can be regarded as an effect of modernisation, even if they were judged and used entirely differently. Regarding the former, it is worth mentioning a few examples. Cliff Richard openly spread Anglicanism in his performances. Jeremy Faith’s Jesus was successful in France and the UK. The title of the album of the group Quintessence and the theme of its songs was: Sweet Jesus. José Feliciano, the sightless Puerto Rican singer performs the religious songs of his native land. In 1970 a rock opera with a biblical theme was performed in Essen under the title *Jesuspiltz*, and in London as *Godspell*. The undoubted peak of all this was the rock opera “Jesus Christ Superstar”, begun by Andrew Lloyd Webber and Tim Rice in 1968 and completed by 1970.

There was another direction in the intertwining of religious and popular culture, including music that is more closely linked to the topic of this study: the renewal in a fashionable style of music serving a religious function. It is quite obvious that in its musicality the religious music revolution of the 1960s was built on the fashionable music styles of the time. There were a number of trends within it, arising independently of each other but, in the final analysis, reaching the same end. The “folk mass” movement that began in America in the 1960s under the influence of the “folk songs” hallmarked by the name of Bob Dylan; in the 1950s the French Jesuit Father Aimé Duval, inspired by French chansons picked up a guitar and travelled around the world with his music. The guitar number *Dominique*, by the Belgian Dominican nun, Soeur Sourire, even reached the top of the American pop charts. The style appeared behind the iron curtain entirely independently of them. In Hungary, already in 1967 Imre Szilas wrote a beat mass that launched a whole guitar mass movement and the new songs of the new generations also spread within the liturgy. Of course, in its function the same style had a different significance in the eyes of believers within the frames of socialism. The renewal here was perhaps targeted even more firmly at retaining the younger generations which, under the given circumstances, was not only a religious but also a political question. During the period of roughly half a century since then the increasingly diverse and complex new religious movement has spread to all parts of the world.

FINAL REMARKS

There are places where a whole industry has been built on contemporary religious music as an economic aspect of modernisation. In the United States alone, as Cusic observes, in the year 2000, sales of Christian music, books and films were worth more than 3 billion dollars. Within these sales of recorded gospel Christian music amounted to 747 million dollars, and the proceeds of concerts added at least an additional 300 million dollars. (Cusic, 2012: vii) The number of gospel/Christian music recordings sold was double that of Latin American music and was more than the combined sales of jazz, classical and New Age music. (Cusic, 2012: x) Compared to this, there is practically no “Christian popular music industry” in the countries of the former socialist bloc. But what all these trends have in common is the reception: entirely independently of each other, rejection of the new, modern religious music appears with elemental force, in many cases taking the form of a “worship war” aimed at eradicating the new musical styles in churches. From the 1980s the latter music has also been experiencing a renaissance and Gregorian chants are now just as much part of the offer of video sharing portals and music publishers as, for example, Christian rock groups.

Modernisation and Catholicism: clearly the two are inseparable, but it is also inconceivable that the interaction of the two will take place without cataclysms. The intertwining of religion with modernisation is a predestined characteristic, in the same way as the rejection of modernisation and shaping the future with the instruments of the (distant) past.

REFERENCES

1. ALTERMATT, URS (2001). *A katolicizmus és a modern kor* [Catholicism and the Modern Age], Budapest: Osiris kiadó.
2. CUSIC, DON (2012). *Saved by Song. A History of Gospel and Christian Music*, Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
3. DAVIE, GRACE (2010). *A vallás szociológiája* [The Sociology of Religion], Pannonhalma: Bencés Kiadó.
4. FILA, BÉLA (n.d.). A II Vatikáni Zsinat maradandó jelentősége [The Imperishable Significance of the Second Vatican Council]. http://www.kathaz.hu/docs/Fila_Bela_Zsinat.pdf (last accessed 01 May 2016).
5. HELLEMANS, STAF (2001). “From ‘Catholicism Against Modernity’ to the Problematic ‘Modernity of Catholicism’”. In *Ethical Perspectives*, vol. 8, nr. 2, <http://www.ethicalperspectives.be/viewpic.php?LAN=E&TABLE=EP&ID=115> (last accessed 01 May 2016).
6. HELLEMANS, STAF (2012). “Tracking the New Shape of the Catholic Church in the West”. In S. Hellemans and J. Wissink (eds.), *Towards a New Catholic Church in Advanced Modernity. Transformations, Visions, Tensions*, Münster: LIT Verlag, p. 19–50.
7. HERZFELD, MICHAEL (2001). *Anthropology. Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8. KAMARÁS, ISTVÁN (2003). *Kis magyar religiográfia* [Concise Hungarian Religiography], Pécs: Pro Pannónia Kiadó.
9. KAVANAUGH, PATRICK (1999). *The Music of Angels: A Listener's Guide to Sacred Music from Chant to Christian Rock*, Chicago: Loyola Press.
10. LUKÁCS LÁSZLÓ (2013). „Joseph Ratzinger és a liturgia teológiája” [Joseph Ratzinger and the Theology of Liturgy]. In Pákozdi István (ed.), *Öt évtizeddel a lekipásztori zsinat után* [Five Decades After the Pastoral Synod], Budapest: Vigilia Kiadó, p. 9–72.
11. NIEDERMÜLLER, PÉTER (2008). “Sokféle modernitás: perspektívák, modellek, értelmezések” [Multiple Modernities: Perspectives, Models, Interpretations]. In P. Niedermüller, K. Horváth, M. Oblath, and M. Zombory (eds.), *Sokféle modernitás. A modernizáció stratégiai és modelljei a globális világban*. [Multiple Modernities. Strategies and Models of Modernity in the Global World], Budapest: Nyitott Könyv – L'Harmattan, p. 7–18.
12. NYÍRI, TAMÁS (1965). *A keresztény ember küldetése a világban* [The Mission of the Christian in the World], Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
13. O'MALLEY, JOHN S. J. (2015). *Mi történt a II. vatikáni zsinaton?* [What Happened at Vatican II.], Budapest: Jezsuita Kiadó.
14. PÁKOZDI ISTVÁN (2013). “A liturgikus megújulás nyomai a Vigilia folyóirat tükrében” [Traces of the Liturgical Renewal in the Vigilia Journal]. In I. Pákozdi (ed.), *Öt évtizeddel a lekipásztori zsinat után* [Five Decades After the Pastoral Synod], Budapest: Vigilia Kiadó, p. 85–92.
15. RATZINGER, JOSEPH (2005). *Életutam* [My Life's Journey], Budapest: Szent István Társulat.
16. TAYLOR, PETER J. (2008). “Modern, modernitás, modernizmus, modernizáció.” [Modern, Modernity, Modernism, Modernisation.]. In: P. Niedermüller, K. Horváth, M. Oblath, and M. Zombory (eds.), *Sokféle modernitás. A modernizáció stratégiai és modelljei a globális világban*. [Multiple Modernities. Strategies and Models of Modernity in the Global World], Budapest: Nyitott Könyv - L'Harmattan, p. 19–33.
17. WILSON-DICKSON, ANDREW (1998). *Fejezetek a kereszténység zenéjéből* [A Brief History of the Christian Music], Budapest: Gemini Budapest Kiadó.
18. ZULEHNER, PAUL M. (2004). “Igen a vallásra – nem az egyházra? Az egyház a holnap multikulturális társadalmában” [Yes to religion and no to church? The church in tomorrow's multicultural society] In M. Kock (ed.), *Az egyház a 21. században* [The church in the 21st century], Budapest: Magyarországi Református Egyház Kálvin János kiadója.
19. ZSINKA LÁSZLÓ (2010). Modernitás, globalizáció, nemzetközi rendszer és a katolikus társadalmi tanítás fejlődése. [Modernity, Globalization, Transnational System and the Evolution of the Catholic Social Teaching.], http://unipub.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/1085/1/Zsinka_2010a.pdf (last accessed 01 May 2016).

Cited internet sites (last accessed 12 June 2015):

<http://egyhazzene.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/motuproprio.pdf>

