

what generates the plan itself in the first instance is liturgical requirement.

Then don't let him engage a decorative artist of the second, third or any subsequent rank to apply fiddling little bits of art to a structure which will probably at least have the humble merit of plainness. Again and again as one turns these pages one is struck by the pity of it – messy ceramic plaques, vacuous mural reliefs, busy semi-abstract stained glass windows of overblown cosmological significance, facile streamlined statues of sacred personages *appliqué* to fine blank walls with about as much relevance as if one were to stick a Valentine card on a Mondriaan abstract . . . if only they'd refrained! So unless you can afford the prices payable to the Chagalls, Rouaults or Légers of this world, let the architecture do the talking: it has a far better chance of avoiding the arbitrary, the personal, and therefore the distracting.

This should not be taken to apply to church furnishings. A number of designers are available who could make perfectly good and even excellent chalices, candlesticks, chasubles, chairs. It is only in the realm of large fixed decorative surfaces or solid objects that there is a danger of the visually-aware members of the congregation suffering from recurrent distraction or irritation as a result of receiving, in Jacques Maritain's phrase, 'Mr X's religious sensibility full in the chest'. Mr X might be a very good artist and a very sincere man, but in one way even a pink and blue repository statuette is preferable to what he'll give you, because although repellent it is familiar enough to be ignored.

Lastly, for reasons given above, don't expect too much. Don't assume that, because the architect you've commissioned is young and a disciple of the modern movement, this is either much credit to yourself (you could do no less) or a guarantee of anything more than bare adequacy in terms of a solution. The state of the culture is against you: but you are a long way on if you recognise the fact and start from there. There is even some meagre comfort in the thought, because to admit that the times deny us certain possibilities is by implication to suggest that those possibilities may one day, perhaps not far hence, be swept within our grasp. For times change: what human beings have once done they can do again. What has been withdrawn might be restored.

2. Music in Vernacular Liturgy by Anthony Milner.

In considering the place of music and the vernacular in the restoration of the liturgy commanded by the Second Vatican Council, the main purpose of the reform needs to be constantly kept in mind. 'All the faithful should be led to that full, conscious and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of liturgy . . . In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy *this full and active participation by all the people* is the aim to be considered before all else;

for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit' (art. 14). Consequently 'in this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify; the Christian people, so far as is possible, should be enabled to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community' (art. 21). 'To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons and hymns, as well as by actions, gestures, and bodily attitudes' (art. 113).

Viewed in the light of these directives, by far the greatest part of the repertoire of liturgical music seems irrelevant. The history of church music is the account of the gradual usurpation of the people's share of the liturgical chant by clerical singers until every portion that had once been sung by the people became a clerical preserve; and then of the purely musical expansion and liturgical deformation of the chant for reasons of musical enjoyment and display. The present forms of Gregorian chant were shaped largely by monastic singers and composers during the eighth to tenth centuries. Despite the beauty of this music it was never intended for and is almost totally unsuited for congregational use. Polyphonic music which first appeared in the tenth century has still further widened the gap between the congregation and liturgical participation.

At the moment, when England still lags behind the U.S.A., Canada, France and Germany in the amount of vernacular permitted during Mass, it is perhaps hard to see what will be the final shape of the liturgy even for the short period before the promulgation of the revised Missal now in active preparation. But assuming that English practice will eventually include all that is permitted to Canada from March 7th, namely: everything sung or spoken aloud will be in the vernacular, it is possible to see what a High Mass or a *missa cantata* fulfilling such conditions will offer in the way of music. The sung portions of the Ordinary must be an inalienable preserve of the people. Even if these are divided between choir and congregation, polyphonic settings should henceforth be regarded as anachronisms: Palestrina and his sixteenth-century contemporaries have had their day just as Léonin and Pérotin of the thirteenth-century have. The liturgy is not an art-museum, neither is the church a concert hall. The Introit and Communion will be full psalms (as already permitted by the Instruction of 1958) sung responsorially, the congregation singing an antiphon-refrain after each verse or group of verses sung by a soloist or the choir. The Gradual and alleluia verse also contain responsorial elements. If the offertory procession is revived, then the offertory psalm should be sung in full, responsorially; if the procession is omitted, the offertory antiphon could well be a polyphonic

piece for the choir. All responses and the Paternoster will be sung by the congregation.

How much, if any, of plainchant can be adapted for English? Musically speaking, there are five main categories of chant: (i) the psalm tones and lesson tones, and a few ancient Ordinary chants e.g. Sanctus and Agnus of Mass XVIII; (ii) simple syllabic melodies including some Communion and Office antiphons; (iii) melismatic chants of the Proper; (iv) more or less elaborate Ordinary chants nearly all composed 10th to 14th centuries and not designed for congregations; (v) chants to metrical texts such as hymns and sequences. If we desire to have the existing chant fitted to English then the Anglicans have done it for us already as well as it can be done, though at the cost of emphasizing unimportant words and syllables such as 'the', 'of', and 'and'. But such adapted chants will still be too difficult for congregations. Categories (i), (ii) and (v) can be easily adapted provided that the music is adapted to the words and not vice versa. But categories (iii) and (iv) are largely professional music and moreover militate against a return to full liturgical practice e.g. the average Introit antiphon is now too elaborate and lengthy to serve its proper function as a refrain to a psalm.

Moreover, there is another problem: in the sixteenth century a profound revolution occurred in the relationship between words and music. For the first time since classical antiquity, it became normal practice to consider in detail the spoken rhythm of words and in some way or other to match their mood and meaning in the music. This cannot be undone. English fitted to the chant as it now stands will be unconvincing and thus will seem remote to the faithful. Furthermore, if any English adaptations are made, it will be wise to avoid following the equal-note rhythm of Solesmes which is of doubtful historical validity and will make congregational participation more difficult. English rhythms are very varied, complex and delicate, and the composer who sets them needs an impeccable taste and a sensitive ear.

From what has been said so far, it will be obvious that a great deal of new music will be needed. What a chance for composers. But this new music will necessarily be simple; the choir, especially the polyphonic choir, will not have nearly so large a part to play when full participation is restored to the congregation. This 'condition of complete simplicity, costing not less than everything' imposes severe discipline on the composer. Speaking personally, as one who has been engaged for some years now on the problems of chant adaptation and making new music, I find it both stimulating and beneficial. Will this new music be 'contemporary', in the sense that it will use serial technique, aleatoric methods of fragmentation? Hardly, because such techniques exclude popular participation. The music of the avant-garde has been out of touch with the people for most of the century. Composers and musicians must

be humble to serve these new (or rather, ancient) needs of the liturgy adequately: not emphasizing their personal style as individuals but contributing their share to the worship of the Christian community so that it may indeed 'pray and sing with one voice'.

Spain by Louise Mally

The skull
Was never beautiful.

Ten fields will never know
The plow
For the men who are dying now

And twenty presses rust.
The strict bones turn to dust
In an eventual hour.

The finely netted skin
Will take corruption in
At greater speed.

Only the withering leaf
Perfects itself in grief.