

Msgr. Andrew Wadsworth, Director of ICEL
Archdiocesan workshop, Archdiocese of New York
June 22, Immaculate Heart of Mary, Scarsdale
Part 2 / Q&A

So, I thought in this second session together, we'll come to rest more obviously on music, which is the thing which brings us together this afternoon. But I just wanted to pick up where we left off, and that's in relation to "...and with your spirit." For forty years, the answer to "The Lord be with you" has been...

(audience answers: "And also with you.")

...which in many ways seems quite reasonable, if the only consideration is that particular exchange and the function it occupies in our liturgical celebration. You might be interested to know that there are a number of texts which we hold in common with other Christian communities, and those texts are called ICET texts, not ICEL texts, and that is one such text. It's something that has a use, at least initially, more widely than in the Catholic Church, although many non-Catholic communities have been through a revision of their liturgy rather sooner than we've looked at ours. The initial proposal for the translation of that dialogue was: "The Spirit of the Lord is with you," and the response was, "And also with you." Except when that was proposed by the ICET group, there was a great reaction to the fact that *Dominus vobiscum* doesn't mean "The Spirit of the Lord is with you." It means "The Lord is with you." Having removed the Spirit from the first part of the dialogue, it wasn't moved into the second part. That's a documented fact in the development of that translation. But as I said previously, in moving to a translation that says "The Lord be with you/ And with your spirit," we adopt what languages more widely have as a reasonable expression of that Latin greeting and response.

But of course, it's something which has a far bigger life than that. St. John Chrysostom, commenting on that dialogue when it appears at the beginning of the Eucharistic prayers, says, "Do you not know that when the priest says to you, 'The Lord be with you,' he is able to do that by the gift of the Holy Spirit he has received?" You think, well, I don't like that idea because it sounds rather clerical. But St. John goes on to say, "And you are able to respond by virtue of the gift of the Holy Spirit that you have received." So the same Spirit alive in the Church and evidenced in the liturgical action of our celebration of the Eucharist. Some of the informing ideas behind that particular change.

Now, what I'd like to do for about twenty minutes now is focus rather specifically on the musical task. What I hope that we'll be able to do together is to identify some sort of

common strategies based on principles in relation to our liturgical music. If we're going to do that, then I think that we have to ask ourselves some very basic questions.

Firstly, we have to say, quite simply, what is liturgical music? What is the function of music in our liturgical celebration? Well, if we're going to look at the documents which inspire our liturgical renewal, then we'll get different things from different texts. If we look at *Sacrosanctum concilium*, we learn quite a lot about the nature and the character of our worship, because that document predates any of the liturgical reform.

Sacrosanctum concilium is 1964; the revised Roman missal is 1969, after the work of the Consilium; and the first English version of that missal is 1973, some nine years after *Sacrosanctum concilium*. If we look at the *General Instruction on the Roman Missal*, we get an idea about the function of music in our liturgical celebration, and an idea of its particular purpose. If we were to perhaps settle for the most straightforward definition of what our music is when we celebrate the liturgy in general, and perhaps the Mass in particular, the music is part of our prayer. It's part of what we do, the work which is the liturgy. You know that the origin of that word in the Greek is "the work of the people." So it's part of the work that we do when we come to celebrate the liturgy, that as well as spoken texts, there are sung texts, many sung texts, if we look at the liturgy in its most natural and obvious form.

That would seem to be a pretty uncontentious idea – that music is a part of our prayer. But I think it's probably true to say that for most of us, that's become a rather distant idea. Why should that have been the case? Well, I think it's true in generic terms that in English-speaking territories, there is a very dominant low Mass culture. And there's pretty good reasons why that is the case. What do I mean by that? I mean that even at the time of Vatican II, and it's important to be truthful about this, because there are those that would want to suggest that perhaps beautiful Gregorian chant was the norm in every parish and that was swept away and one week it was the *Graduale Romanum* and the next week it was "Michael, Row the Boat Ashore..." (*laughter*)

That is not the truth. For most communities, a low Mass was punctuated by some singing. That might have been plainsong. It might have been the proper texts of the Mass. But more commonly, it would be one Mass setting that was known by the congregation, and quite probably vernacular hymns. And something of that sort of culture has endured in the way that we experience music in the liturgy. Not at the best level. So I'm not saying for a moment that this is necessarily what you experience in your parish or in your community. But you'll recognize a commonality in the idea of going to Mass that's punctuated by four songs or hymns – one at the beginning, one at the offertory, one at communion, one at the end. Well, such a celebration cannot claim to have music as integral to it. The music is a sort of add-on. You've basically got a spoken liturgy with a bit of music sort of drafted on.

So what's the relationship between that and a liturgy which is of its essence sung? Well, the truth is that many of our liturgical texts are intended for singing. This seems to be news to some people. *(laughter)* And I'm afraid it seems to be news to a lot of my brethren who are used to not singing.

I had an experience not too long ago in a conversation with a bishop in my own country, who said, in response to something similar to what we're doing today, "I just want you to know, I never sing in public, not even 'Happy Birthday.'" Well, that's an extraordinary thing to say, but of course, there are lots of people who lack any confidence when it comes to singing. I'm happy to report that that bishop doesn't say that now because he underwent a sort of... perhaps it's not too dramatic to say, conversion experience. I said to him, "Excellency, you know, it's great being in your situation, because you don't have to sing with anybody else, firstly, you only have to sing on your own. You can sing the prayers on one note. And you can pick the note, and whatever you pick, it will be right." *(laughter)*

Well, taking that rather basic advice, he started singing at Confirmations. That bishop now sings the Preface when he celebrates Mass, and his whole personal attitude towards singing in the liturgy [has changed], and he's got a nice voice, he's just never been in the position to sing. And perhaps – he's a religious, actually, and he'd come from a community that sings well, and I think probably he was surrounded by other people in his community who sang very nicely and he had a very poor opinion of his own ability in that respect and so never really made it to singing.

We ought to see singing as integral to our celebration of the Mass. That is a truth that is evidenced in the Missal that we're about to receive. It's evidenced visually. When you open the book, it has more music than any edition of the Roman Missal that has ever been produced by the Church. All of the prefaces – and there are more prefaces than in any other Missal – are set to music, many of them both in the simple and the solemn tone. The ten Eucharistic prayers are set both in the simple and the solemn tone. The music for everyone to sing in a form of the Order of Mass is provided in place. So actually, the visual suggestion – you can't turn many pages before you meet music. And that really is there for a purpose – so that the visual reminder in the book is that singing is integral to what we do.

Of course, what we sing is where things start to get rather more difficult, when we come to discuss these things. Because the truth is, that we represent perhaps even in this gathering today, quite a diversity of style, and taste, and experience when it comes to music. That can be a very personal thing, but when it comes to the liturgy of the Church, what's the relationship between personal and local experience and what is actually a sense of the universality of the Church? This is an important consideration, and it's the consideration which, as Catholics, we always have to bear in mind, because we belong to

a Church of a billion people. Not just an English-speaking Church, not just an American church, not just a Church of the diocese of New York, not just this parish in Scarsdale, but in a very real way, all of our communities, however small, are part of a bigger whole.

To what sense does that “universality” of the Church need to be reflected in our liturgical celebration? Well, you will know, if you know anything about the development of the Catholic liturgy, that up until the Second Vatican Council, that universality was very much reflected in a sort of uniformity, although there were different styles of celebration, the spectrum, shall we say, was much narrower, and certain things were not negotiable in the way that they currently are. The Church permits greater freedom of style in liturgical celebration, so long as it is an authentic interpretation of the liturgical norms which govern our life together. So if a community or an individual tries to do something which is not part of what the Church does, they set themselves against that universality, and that’s a very important consideration.

The music in the Missal is all of one type, because it is an English rendition of music that is in the Latin missal, which it translates. So it’s plainsong – it’s a form of music which had reached its finished form, shall we say, by the end of the first millennium, and a form of music which the Church tells us, in *Sacrosanctum concilium*, is to be given first place in our choice of liturgical music. Now, that’s one of the things of *Sacrosanctum concilium* that has been universally not applied, because if you’re in a situation where Gregorian chant is your usual and exclusive experience, then you’re either in a community which celebrates the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite, or you’re in a very particular parish.

The truth is, that this musical repertoire which is a shared repertoire with Catholics throughout the world, has receded in the knowledge of our people. And that’s not recent, for the reasons that I’ve just explained. That’s a process that’s been going on for a long time. Possibly, in some places, for centuries. So what is the value of regaining something of that? Well, firstly, it offers us the possibility, the very real possibility, for the first time, of a shared repertory of music which all Catholics of the Roman Rite hold in common – at least when those texts are sung in Latin. When those texts are sung in English – same tunes – we have a shared body of liturgical song, which unites all Catholics who worship in English. That’s not been our experience. Coming from another country two years ago, I found it strangely alienating going to a Sunday Mass where I didn’t know the tune to the Our Father. The Snow tune which you have in your Missal in this country is sung in the United States – very reasonably. But not generally known beyond this country. So we get to a prayer that everyone’s used to saying or singing and suddenly it’s unfamiliar.

Now, does this mean that we’re being called to a uniformity which levels out any element of freedom in terms of style or character in our liturgical music? I think not. I

think not. But I think we are being called to ask ourselves the question, and it's a very serious question, what is the relationship between the music which we use in the celebration of the liturgy, and the action of the celebration of the liturgy?

Now, what do I mean by that? Perhaps I can give you an example. Is our use of music when we celebrate the Mass conceived as integral to the whole celebration? Or is it, as I've suggested has perhaps been the case in some places historically, perhaps seen as incidental to the action? Does it respect the particular character of certain moments of the liturgy? I'll give you an example. I love the great tradition of liturgical music, not only chant but also polyphony. But the use of a polyphonic setting of the Holy, Holy, and the Lamb of God can lead to very particular difficulties. Firstly, in polyphonic settings, those parts of the Mass were conceived with a different idea of the celebration of the liturgy. The priest continues with the Eucharistic prayer while those pieces are being sung. When they're used in the most modern form of the Mass, the liturgical action stops at that point while we all join in that acclamation. So if you have a Sanctus followed by a Benedictus, you might have seven minutes of everybody standing there listening to the choir sing. It may be beautiful, and it may on occasion be the right thing to do, because our participation can equally be listening – we don't all have to sing everything. But we have to ask ourselves the question of whether we are respecting the particular character of certain moments of the liturgy.

Once again, thinking of the universality of certain forms which we receive, the liturgy is something which comes to us as a gift from the Church for our sanctification to express the way in which we participate in the mystery of Christ. Just as the formulas of faith come to us through tradition, there are certain aspects of our liturgical celebration that are shaped by that same tradition. If we're going to stop and spend a moment thinking about what we do with our music when we come to Mass on a Sunday, perhaps we have to look at the starting point of what's on the page. A greater relationship between the choice of music and the liturgical text for that particular day.

For instance, there are two texts that are found in every Mass in the missal which commonly do not have a musical life. They are the entrance antiphon, or the introit, which covers the entrance procession, and they are the communion antiphon, or *communio*, which covers the communion procession. Two very important moments of the liturgy. I would say it's almost universal practice to substitute in those two places a hymn or a song. They are almost always, if not scriptural verses, then a gloss on Scripture, a text which most obviously owes its existence to a scriptural text. So we're supplanting a scriptural element of the Mass with something which may not be scriptural and perhaps have nothing to do with the ideas that are expressed in those texts.

There's a challenge in that. There's certainly a renewed interest in the idea of singing these proper texts in the Mass. It's true to say that there's been a dearth of material that makes this a possibility. I think composers are now responding very creatively to that. There are a number of initiatives – one of them was published only last week, the *Simple English Propers* by Adam Bartlett, freely available on the internet, technology at the service of the liturgy. I think it's right to expect that there will be a proliferation of such material in a variety of different styles, not only in chant-based styles but perhaps in more contemporary styles as well. But something which responds more obviously to the liturgical action at particular moments.

We have to consider what I would want to call the “liturgical voice.” If we look at the texts of the liturgy, they are majorly more about God than they are about us. We want to say so much about God when we come to worship Him, and what we say about ourselves is in relation to him. That's evident in the first part of the Mass, isn't it, when we acknowledge our sinfulness, and from that penitential moment, we enter more fully into the celebration of the liturgy. These are fundamental characteristics which govern our liturgical celebration. When I spoke almost a year ago in Atlanta, we had a lively discussion of these sort of things, and I was very taken, really, by one person who stood up and made it clear that he was responsible for the music in his parish, and that he didn't recognize elements of his own experience in the sort of texts that I was proposing should be sung. And he expressed it in a sort of neat way. He said, “I can't see where the ‘we’ songs are in all of this.” The songs about the community. And I found that a very interesting and provocative question, really. Because if you look at our liturgical tradition as it's expressed in the texts and the music that goes with that, there's not very much about the community itself. It's always in terms of the mystery of Christ and our participation in it. One of the aspects that we have to judge wisely in planning our liturgical celebrations is our treatment of the nature of the community – at what point does our communal celebration of the liturgy become a celebration of the community itself? At that point, we become further detached, perhaps, from the liturgical action which is so obviously proposed to us, not least of all when we celebrate the Eucharist.

I'd go as far as to say to you that there are many people in the church now who feel that they have experiences of “non-correlation,” what they experience on a Sunday when they go to their Sunday Mass doesn't strike the deepest chord within them. I think that this is to be expected. And I'll explain why. One of the great areas of development in the experience of the Church since the Second Vatican Council is our renewed emphasis and experience on catechesis, the stages of which are marked by liturgical rites. The most obvious example of this is the RCIA – the Rite of the Christian Initiation of Adults. And if you've come into the Church by that route, or if you have been engaged with accompanying others who have come into the Church in that way, you will know that there's an intensity in that experience. That the preparation for baptism (which is the RCIA at its basic understanding, although we often use it to describe more generally the

incorporation into the Church of those who are already baptized) but those who are preparing for baptism follow an itinerary that is characterized by a certain intensity. Their own soul-searching. The process of their formation as they come to learn and believe the basic tenets of our faith. And the very powerful rites which punctuate that process, up to and including the glorious celebration of baptism in the holiest liturgy of the year, the Great Vigil of Easter. It would be hard for something not to be anticlimactic after that. Having been through all of that experience, characterized by intensity, by growing personal engagement with what it means in a most basic way to be a Christian, to then find that that intensity is not mirrored in our Sunday celebration of the Eucharist, that we find, not intensity, but maybe a superficiality of Eucharistic life. Now, I think all of us, regardless of the situations in which we find ourselves, are being called at the present time to carefully think about what we do. And to consider some of these important issues.

The things I've touched on are not exhaustive. I'm sure you could add an equally valid list of considerations. And there'll be more ideas that will occur to us as we journey with these things. But suffice to say at this stage that music is essential to the endeavor, because it most powerfully determines the culture of the liturgy that we celebrate. In so many ways, the character of the liturgy is determined by the music which is integral to it.

I often celebrate Mass in the parish in which I live, in D.C. And if it falls to me to celebrate the last Mass on a Sunday, which is the latest advertised mass in the District of Columbia (*laughter*), it is a Mass which is majorly full of young people. People in their twenties and thirties. Not exclusively, but a lot of young people. It is a Mass which traditionally has no music. It's quite difficult to get to a Mass in D.C. that doesn't have music. Even the 7 a.m. Mass at the National Basilica has music, so to find a Sunday Mass that doesn't is quite rare. I said to the pastor, "Have you never had music at the evening Mass on a Sunday?" And he said, "Oh no. People like it without music. A lot of people come because it has no music." We think of music as being something which enhances and beautifies and encourages our engagement in the liturgy, but sometimes it's something which alienates or keeps people at a distance.

Such a personal thing, isn't it, music? Our own formulations, our own likes and our own dislikes which we, I'm sure, on occasion, are all tempted to rehearse. "What I can't stand is..." whatever. We all have that within us. Isn't it interesting that God in his providence gives us a form of communal celebration which contains something which is so very personal, and which we are called to, somehow, overcome any personal thought or tendency and accept something which unites us, rather than divides us.

I'm just going to conclude this thought with one last idea, and then we'll go to questions. A parish that I often stay in when I go back to the U.K. is trying to respond creatively, as

we all are, to all these moments and challenges in the Church at the present time, and the pastor wrote me an e-mail just last week and said that the parish had had a “music day” on Saturday that was animated by the parish director of Music and she had presented some of the ideas we’ve thought about, perhaps today, in the context of the chants of the Roman Missal. And, I should say, that the musical experience of that parish, which is good, is three contemporary music groups. So the musicians of those groups came together and after getting over the initial shock that here was music that didn’t have guitar symbols, at least in the way that it was presented in the Missal, once they realized that what they were being asked to do on this particular occasion was to sing without instrumental accompaniment and to learn these very simple chants in such a way that they could be sung without accompaniment, one of the younger members of one of the groups said to the pastor, “You know, I like this new music...” *(laughter)* “...because it’s different to what we normally have and I think this new music could be a platform on which everybody meets because it’s different to what we all have.”

Is there a moment in what we’re about to experience that takes us to a new place of having a shared experience of the liturgy, which so easily can divide – is there an opportunity to be welcomed and grasped? I would suggest that there is. And I think the next part of our afternoon is a sort of presentation of that in action. So if you’re still to be persuaded that this is desirable, perhaps you’d suspend your judgment a little longer, so that we can enter into this together and by virtue of seeing some of the youngest members, at least, of this parish community, respond to new music, we can see, perhaps, what lies at the heart of this, and so often, the heart of all that we do when we celebrate the Mass together. Thank you very much.

(applause)

Q1: In your comments, you had talked about some of the comfort we feel because there may be some standardization, unification, certainly in this region – there are certain mass settings that are more common than others, so when folks travel from community to community, there is a level of comfort and feeling at home because we know the music. Is there a concern as we move into this next stage where there are 25, 30 different settings, where a person who may travel from one Catholic church to another may not know the music – and is there a concern that we should look for more standardization, or are we okay with throwing caution to the wind and we all choose what we feel is best?

I don’t think it’s a case of either/or, really. I think it’s a case of both/and. Some dioceses have, in their initial response to the implementation of the new translation, decided that they will stick just to a small number of settings in a limited period of time to help familiarization with the text and to have some sense of cohesion, say, within the diocese.

I don't think there's any suggestion that our choice of music should be limited. But there is the additional invitation that beyond what we do locally, there might be forms of music which we all share in common.

Q2. Along the same lines... are we expected or encouraged to make sure that our congregations and our parishes know the chant settings, to reach that universality that you keep referring to?

Well, I think, in this particular situation, in this conference, in this country, your bishops have decided that at any participation aid, that a selection of Mass settings can be made available, but the chants will be present as well. You see, there are chants in the current Missal, but hardly anybody knows them. I celebrated a Mass at a large gathering last week for musicians, and at the Mass that was celebrated in English, nobody seemed to know with any sort of uniformity, the responses before the Gospel or the responses to the Preface dialogue. It's after forty years of them being them in the book. I think that yes, there are different settings of those moments, but there is a common setting that's evidenced in all of our liturgical books, all of the books that are on the altar and used in the sanctuary in the celebration of the liturgy have those musical dialogues in them. Surely, that's something we should all know, whatever else we add to it in terms of our individual experience. So I'd say yes, we are being encouraged to learn the chants of the Roman Missal as part of our common liturgical patrimony and as something which will unite over distance and differences of style and approach to the liturgy.

Q3. Monsignor, thank you for your thoughts. But there are those of us who come from what I would consider to be the inner city, and whose resources are somewhat limited and who are also dealing with bilingual congregations. We, in my particular parish, have about 2300 people coming to Mass. The vast majority of them are Hispanic. But they come to the English Masses so they can get a seat and get out sooner (*chuckles*) so we have issues with people not knowing the basic responses and basically being unable to participate.

We also have an issue – and I'm glad you talked about the 5:30 Mass – because we have one on Saturday night in my parish, and I am the leader of song. I am absolutely terrified of leading Gregorian chant because, truthfully, I don't know it, and we have no music at that Mass.

We also have foreign priests in our parish whose English is rather limited, and ... what resources they're going to be given to help them along. I'm sure that our pastor who sings pretty well will take care of those masses that he does, but it's really going to leave the rest of us up a little bit of a creek.

Right. Well, you've made several important points. Perhaps I could just respond to a couple of them. Firstly, I don't know that we need big resources to have music in the Mass. If you've got a voice and you can manage to sing a bit then you probably have sufficient resources to cope with the music. I think one of the banes of the lives of people who go to Mass during the week is having large amounts of music intended for Sunday celebrations foisted on them on ferial weekdays. We've often lost the light and shade when it comes to the way we use music. One of the things that the chant embodies is that it bears repetition. It's simple and very basic. The decision to present the chant, not in plainsong notation as it is in the Latin missal, but in ordinary musical staff notation was based on accessibility – so that everybody who can read music and read ordinary staff music has some opportunity to engage with that.

We live in an age where there's plenty of support for these things. NPM [has] produced recordings of all of the music that's in the Missal, including all of the priests' parts. Priests can download an .MP3 file of the preface that they're going to sing on Sunday, can listen to it on their iPod or iPhone or whatever device, can have it in the car and be singing it as they drive through the week in preparation for Sunday. I think, if we have the generosity – and I mean this for all of us – it's going to be a challenge, because it's something different from what we've done – then I think there's going to be a lot of support to enable us to find our way with all of this. It won't happen overnight, you know. It's ... going to be a process implied in all of this. And the response that you make, in your particular situation, in your parish, will not necessarily be the same as the parish next to you or the parish in an entirely different situation.

For instance, the bilingual situation you mention, which is such a feature of the Church in this country in relation to English and Spanish, I think has been responded to very creatively by a number of publishers who promote settings that are bilingual. The same music which can be sung in English and Spanish. I would suggest to you that the changes in the Order of Mass will be more recognizable to a Spanish-speaker, because they are more in harmony with what Spanish already has. And I think that that's a point of connection that ought to be stressed, particularly in relation to Spanish-speakers. There are resources; I think they'll be many more, as we find our way forward with all of this. I just want to encourage you, really, as far as that's concerned.

Q4. I was wondering if new music is already being written for the new translation, and how [will] people in the choir learn it by September, and how soon, and what it's going to be like.

As far as I know, all of the publishers make their music settings available, and have done for some time. I think we're going to hear from some of the publishers and composers as the afternoon unfolds. A lot of this information is available online. The chants of the Missal, you can download from the ICEL site, but a number of other sites as well, and

there are accompaniments provided for those chants. So, now is the season to be engaging with that. The bishops have said that these settings can be sung from September, so I suppose now is the time to inform ourselves of what's available and what's most appropriate in our particular situation.

Q5. Just a question: is this being encouraged, or is this going to be mandatory? In other words, do we have the ability to change it... not change it, but integrate some, and maybe not all, or...

What are we talking about? Musical settings, or...?

...this whole...well, the liturgy change is mandatory for the priest, I think, correct?

It's mandatory for the English-speaking church.

Okay, so in other words, we have to adopt this in musically.

Yes.

Okay.

Q6. Hi.... I'm a convert, and I discovered... I went from the point of meditating and jogging to chanting spontaneously as a way of speaking to God, kind of on my own, and then I converted, and I discovered that there was much more continuity with music directors who used chanting, a good bit of chanting in the Mass, than people who sang a lot of hymns – you know, your typical hymns, which are good, but it's a different kind of experience, because it's kind of like a Ping-Pong game between your pastor or the officiant at the Mass and then you catching what he's saying in a chanting way, and it's reinforced by contemplative prayer. You can do it while you're jogging, while you're alone in the house doing housework, or waiting on a train, or a bus, you know, you can even do it in your mind, but it's really not that far away from speaking. The inflections in the chanting and everything. You say, "Oh, how am I going to do this? How am I going to do that?" Well, you just say, well, say it first, and then sing it, and it's like *The Sound of Music*. You hear the nuns chanting in *The Sound of Music*. It's the same thing, except that you're adding a little bit more musicality to speaking. So you shouldn't be afraid of it, and it's a very unifying experience.

So, just out of curiosity, I went to a Latin Mass to see what would you do in music with a Latin Mass. And I said, I'd be out of a job, if the priest were chanting in Latin, they wouldn't need me except for maybe a couple of

hymns maybe someplace. So this I guess is a meeting of all the changes that you want to make, but chanting is nothing to be afraid of.

I think the most interesting aspect of the various things that you said is the dialogical nature – the fact that we’re encouraged to sing the dialogues in the liturgy. And that’s something we majorly haven’t done very much of. It’s not part of our universal experience. And perhaps in this next period that’s something which more universally will come about. Because if we’re going to sing those very simple dialogues, the greetings at the beginning of Mass, the dialogue before the Gospel, the dialogue before the singing of the Preface, the easiest way to do that is in the chant as it’s in the Missal. There are other ways of doing it; it doesn’t exclude those ways. But the easiest and perhaps the most universally known way is using the very simple chants, which as you say, pick up the speech rhythm of the words, and just slightly inflect them, often with just the addition of a second note. So all on one note, and then a slight inflection at some point. Perhaps the obvious way of singing those dialogues will be to do what it says in the Missal. Thank you.

Q7. So I understand that the Mass will be entirely in English – the sung Mass.

No, not necessarily. I think that one of the visual aspects of the liturgical books is a lot of these chants are in English and in Latin, which suggests the idea that it’s absolutely okay to have certain moments, because I think a lot of us do, in a majorly English Mass setting, the “Holy, Holy” might be sung in Latin. In bilingual communities, it certainly doesn’t preclude the possibility of singing in Spanish at an English Mass. I’ve often been present at Masses in which the psalm or the gospel acclamation is sung in Spanish or the Communion song is sung in Spanish. I think all of that would continue.

Well, I’m worried about losing the Latin, and I’m worried about losing the great masters. Would the Palestrina *Missa Brevis*, or the *Missa Ascendo ad Patrem...* be sung by choirs? I know the community can’t sing it.

I think that there’s every encouragement to maintain the traditional repertory – both chant and polyphony and settings, so long as they are accommodated to the spirit of the liturgy. The observation that I made about the Holy, Holy doesn’t exclude the use of that sort of music, but it means that perhaps we have to recognize that the place of the Holy, Holy, in the ordinary form of the Mass, is not the same as the place that it is in the Extraordinary Form of the Mass. But that doesn’t preclude the use in celebrations of the Kyrie, the Gloria, the Agnus Dei, and perhaps on some occasions, with some settings, the Holy, Holy as well. But all I’m saying is that I think we’ve got an opportunity once again to think about how all of this fits together. I don’t think in any way it threatens any sort of traditional patrimony, as far as music is concerned. I think it rather more encourages it.

Q8. What would you consider to be a proper rollout strategy for the new parts of the Mass? Obviously, if we go to our choirs the week after Labor Day and say, “Okay, we’re going to learn a whole new translation,” you’re going to see a scampering of feet out the door. So...how would we best go ahead and implement these different Mass parts for our choirs and for the congregation?

Well, I think both the bishops’ conference in this country and individual dioceses have indicated such rollout programs. But I think if we were to take it at its most general, there should be nobody who is actively engaged in our parish communities that doesn’t know that there’s a change coming now. So, if they don’t, we need to do something about it – this week. *(laughter)*

Q9. Okay, I just want to make sure that I’m getting my head around this properly. Because, you know, there’s been all sorts of people being scared about this whole thing coming down the road. You’re saying that music should be more of an integral part of the actual liturgy, of the give and take back and forth. So more of it should be sung. Is that correct?

Well, I’m saying that many parts of the liturgy are by their nature sung, and not to sing them is to lose out on a lot. For instance, I think we all would recognize, I would imagine, that reciting the Gloria, particularly in a Mass that has other music, is a very flat moment. Reciting the Gospel acclamation, or even reciting the psalm, can be a very flat moment, if there’s other music in the Mass. That certain moments in the Mass, of their nature, call out to be sung. Obviously, in a said Mass, a Mass where there isn’t any music, then that’s the case. But often we find ourselves in a situation where there *is* music, and the most important and most obvious moments that should be sung are neglected, and I think it’s an invitation to look at that again.

Okay, because it seems to me that there’s a duality here of what we as music ministries do, because we’ve been criticized – we sing a lot of parts of the mass, and we’ve been criticized, “Oh, well, if you’re singing the Gloria, then you shouldn’t be singing the Our Father,” and it seems to me like a lot of the parts should be sung as far as the act of the people, but then there’s the other part, which is the reflective part, which is what the songs play a part of, and that seems to be a very important thing to the people as well, that either they’re singing with us, or they’re listening and it’s reflecting on what just happened at a particular part of the Mass, so both should be important.

It seems to me that it’s a matter of balance, isn’t it? You know, I was at a Sunday Mass recently in which there was a lot of music, and it was beautiful music. But it took us almost an hour and a half to get to the beginning of the Preface. *(laughter)* And then the second half of the Mass, from that moment onwards, was over in 25 minutes. So there

was an imbalance. There was a great prolongation of the first part of the liturgy, and the second part was moved over rather hastily. So every element in the Liturgy of the Word had been sung. But many elements of the Liturgy of the Eucharist were not sung.

Now, individually, all of the musical elements were excellent in themselves. But actually, taken as a whole, there was an imbalance in that liturgical celebration. And I think that the Mass has a natural rhythm of its own. It's like a musical composition in terms of the relationship of its individual elements. And I think we have to work hard in our planning, in our preparation, to preserve something of that balance, and that natural relationship. And we can all think of moments when that works well and moments when it works less well.

Q10. We actually started using some of the Mass parts already. Probably pre-empted it a little bit too soon, but what we did was, starting at Easter, we put the words in our parish newsletter, and actually the *Mass of Creation* seems to be the most familiar with the congregation. They seem to balk less at that. We found that to be the easiest. And then, we did start doing some plainchant with one of the earlier Masses. And it seemed to fit very well.

My question was: In the *Mass of Creation*, I thought we were getting away from the refrain in the Gloria. I thought it was supposed to be more a continual prayer. But some of the musical settings still seem to have a refrain.

Well, I think that's part of the difficulty of adapting existing compositions to a new text. But you'd have to really speak to the composer in relation to that. I think we have to be good psychologists in the way that we deal with this. And there seems to be a value in certain musical elements which are familiar representing continuity. Let me draw to your attention the two parts – one is the Lord, have mercy and the other is the Lamb of God – where the texts aren't changing at all. You can use those in the new settings immediately. *(laughter)*

With regard to the plainchant, are we trying to get away from light organ accompanying? Because typically congregations do benefit from having light organ underneath that.

I think it's a good idea if it helps people to sing in tune and it doesn't impose heavily on the singing. I think you have to be trusted to make good decisions for the community in the circumstances in which you find yourself. You know, the musicians and those who have responsibility are trusted in that respect.

Last question.

Q11. Is there a problem in changing an existing composition where the composer is dead?

I think some publishers have republished older works and they've been adapted to bring them into conformity with the new text. Publishers would be better to comment on that than I am. I suppose you're suggesting, is it okay for you yourself to change them.

That's right. *(pause, then laughter)*

I suppose it's a matter of what the market will stand, as far as anything. *(more laughter)*

If you have any question that you would very much like to put to me, write down my e-mail address. I'm happy to hear from you. I get e-mails all the time from parish musicians, and we are at the service of you, and the work that you're doing in your own parish.

My e-mail address is: awadsworth@eliturgy.org

So if you prefer to write to me privately, I'd be happy to hear from you.

Can I just take the opportunity, as I close now, to thank you for all that you do in your parishes and your communities. I think that we are well-served by the wealth of talents that our musicians represent. And I know that you do all that you do in the service of the Church that we love so much, and so that many people, not least of all those in our own communities, can come to a far deeper understanding of the Christian mystery and how it shapes and guides our lives. Thank you very much.