

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 195

March 1991

Editorial

that, we had arranged things so that the new priest actually 'did' the part of the eucharist he had just been commissioned to 'do'. Logical enough: but did that mean that the bishop would be present but not presiding? Shades of Fortescue and O'Connell, it did! So that idea had to go, and with it a draft that never got beyond the committee stage.

Then we fell back on devices already tried and tested. Perambulating the church was popular, so we kept the perambulations. Now people have begun to say that they often cannot see what is going on. We understood that a eucharistic context was valued, so we encouraged the use of the rite at a eucharist at which the bishop presides as before. Quite unexpected, and from all shades of churchmanship, has been a frequent comment that the service works better when it is *not* eucharistic; which takes us back to pre-Series 3 days. Some novelties have made their way in. We invited all the clergy (of all denominations) and lay representatives to join the bishop in laying hands on the incumbent. We postponed the induction to the very end, and made it part of the dismissal. These points too have attracted a lot of attention and may need reassessment.

For all this, in one respect we have been able to break successfully with previous services. The passages of scripture that illustrate five aspects of ministry—baptism, the reading and exposition of scripture, prayer, the offering of the eucharist, sacrificial service—have all been taken from the Gospels. We have been able to affirm unmistakably that all ministry is a sharing in the ministry of our Lord. But working out the parochial and diocesan implications of that great truth? We are still trying. Thus is theology written, and it is a sobering thought.

J. C. Thewlis, Secretary

This month's publication ...

is Joint Liturgical Study no. 17, *The Preaching Service—The Glory of the Methodists*, by Adrian Burdon (£3.50). The great weight of this Study (derived from a thesis) falls upon the eighteenth century origins, but the development of the Preaching Service in the various nineteenth century strands of Methodism is well covered, and the twentieth century with its reunion of British Methodism, and the cross-current of the Liturgical Movement has a reasonable share also.

... and next month's

is scheduled to be Worship Series no. 116, *Introducing the Promise of His Glory*, by Trevor Lloyd, Jane Sinclair, and Michael Vasey. These are the same three members of the Commission who last year brought us *Introducing Patterns for Worship*. The final published text of *Promise* will, it appears, not emerge till some weeks later, as there has been a slippage—but the Grove Booklet will merely hit the streets first.

AND A TAILPIECE RE PRAXIS

On 28 April from 10.30 to 4 at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields PRAXIS present a day considering *Patterns*, led by Liturgical Commission members. Just turn up and pay on the day—£3.50.

ISSN 0263-7170

28p

Postal Subscription for 1991 £5 (by air £6 or US\$13)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,
Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634 51818; Fax 0634 573549)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS
(Tel: 0602 430786 Fax: 0602 220134)

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 732292

As we go to press, there is a brouhaha in the media and the church press about the remark in *Reader's Digest* of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. George Carey (no longer 'designate', nor even, by Her Majesty's permission, 'elect', but actually Archbishop when you read this—and to be enthroned, with some minor liturgical innovations, on 19 April).

Dr. Carey apparently wrote this article some time ago, and called a certain view a 'heresy'. We come to the view in a minute. When pressed by the media and attacked by fellow-delegates in Canberra at the WCC, he re-cast his evaluation as 'a fundamental theological error'. This has not entirely assuaged the ire—or fear—of his opponents. And many of them have taken it upon themselves to contend that the view he so categorizes is the uninterrupted theological position of the historic Churches of East and West, and was the position held by all Anglicans also until the day before yesterday. The implication is that Dr. Carey has targetted a powerful munitions dump for his unthinking attack, and in hitting it he has blown up most of his own forces in the process. So perhaps we can do a slow replay of the attack, and see what other target may have been in view, whether he has successfully hit it, and whether, if he has, it is as fatal to his own position as is alleged.

What do we learn from the replay? Well, it may be that 'heresy' is a lighter accusation nowadays (with lighter penalties) than it was in the days of the Inquisition. I have not infrequently been accused of heresy, especially (as readers will have guessed) when I have been in the right. And perhaps we all have a *little* heresy mixed with our orthodoxy and rectitudes. It has been said that orthodoxy is my 'doxy' and heterodoxy is your 'doxy'.

Then, what did he write? When interviewed by *Reader's Digest* he said 'the idea that only a male can represent Christ at the altar is a most serious heresy'. Well, let it be so—but let us put a more profound construction upon it. Is it possible for *anyone* to 'represent Christ at the altar'? Indeed, is it this undergirding of the views of those whom he opposes which he clobbered as heretical? Their statement might then partake of heresy, but not because of its conclusion, but rather because of its premise.

Indeed, it is not many years since Bishop John Baker of Salisbury made an effectual undercutting of the opposition to women being made presbyter by contending that the presbyter does *not* 'represent Christ' in any specialized or unique way when he (or she) presides at communion. Even on the most 'Catholic' of premises, the major 'representations' of Christ at the eucharist are (a) the eucharistic elements, and (b) the whole body of believers. Is it then really basic to Eastern and Western official theology that the priest at the altar represents Christ—or is this a popular and corner-cutting way of speaking of the priesthood? Again, on the most 'Catholic' of premises, is it not as sinful human being that the priest genuflects before the consecrated elements? Is it not on behalf of the church that he offers the eucharistic sacrifice? Whilst all kinds of mystique may attach to his orders and his position in the congregation, is this really

such as to turn him—in this distinct function, if not in the whole of his life—into an *alter Christus*? Indeed, what meaning can *alter Christus* have? Can there be another Christ without implicit impairment of the work and the sufficiency of the one Christ?

Let theologians speculate as they wish about the manner in which Christ makes himself present in and through both the elements and the whole body gathered. But if we are to hold to a doctrine of 'real presence' (and surely this kind of 'representation' requires that?) specific to the person of the presiding presbyter (let alone spare concelebrants—do they represent rather less, perhaps?), then we have a funny old set of doctrines running. I am open to correction, but if this *is* the historic doctrine of East and West, so much the worse for them all, and 'heresy' is not inappropriate as a charge. Anglicans stand in a doctrinal succession which springs from Cranmer, and implies that, in the Reformation controversies, we prefer his side to the counter-Reformation one. And almost every feature of Roman teaching on the eucharist he dubs 'superstition', 'corruption', 'blasphemous fables', 'foulest and most heinous error' etc. And on the point at issue he wrote:

... the difference that is between the priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministration; that the priest, as a common minister of the church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's supper unto the other, and other receive it at his hands.' (*Works of Archbishop Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society, 1844, p.350)).

As far as I can see, this Fifth Book of Cranmer does not handle the 'representation' issue—and I think that this is because the error was not around or was not virulent—but this kind of statement, dealing with other features of the sacrifice of the mass, makes it clear that Cranmer could not have thought in such terms. Perhaps his opponents could have—but I guess it was not to the forefront of their theology of either ministry or eucharist. I can find nothing like it in the Council of Trent.

I tried the ARCIC statement on ordination. It does manage to say
... Christ, who through his minister presides at the Lord's Supper and gives himself sacramentally.' (Para. 13).

So is presidency 'representing Christ at the altar'? Yes, but only, as far as this statement is concerned, in distributing the elements to the people—for it is the giving of himself which is the action of Christ identified here, and it would be as appropriate and quite parallel to speak of Christ delivering his *word* through the ministry given to a lay preacher, and giving himself thus to his people. Later in the same paragraph the ARCIC statement says that Christian ministers
are—particularly in presiding at the eucharist—representative of the whole Church in the fulfilment of its priestly vocation. . . .

So here the priesthood represents the whole church, so (a) it is not being said that the priest represents *Christ* 'at the altar', and (b) the implication of such representation as is indicated cannot be gender-specific, for the priest represents the *whole* church, which by definition means no exact correlation of his (or her) gender with that of those who are being represented (who are of both sexes).

The fact that so many couples go to such great lengths to 'tart up' their weddings probably indicates that what the Church provides is lacking in symbolism, drama and a sense of occasion. There is no doubt that the new marriage service urgently needs revising and it is to be hoped that the new Commission will turn their attention to this task fairly soon. Kenneth's chapter provides many excellent points of departure.

Charles Read

DIOCESAN REPORT 4—SOUTHWARK

Last month's news from Bath and Wells struck a sadly familiar chord. We too are revising our Collation/Institution and Induction service, and the frustrations have been similar. We at least only had to get as far as an eighth draft before launching an experimental rite, and now we have had twelve months' experience of its use. Work on the ninth draft is about to begin; and if all goes well the final product will be ready for the Bishop to authorize just as he gets ready to retire

When the project was handed to us in March 1988 we were told that the basic problem was lay ministry: the existing was not felt to be doing it justice—an interesting comment on something that was then not much more than a dozen years old. In fact, the basic problem turns out to be quite a profound one: *who does what, for whom, and with what authority?* Virtually all the assumptions of the old service were to do with *descending* authority, and now we were being asked to do justice to an *ascending* authority too.

The question was easy enough to frame. Finding an acceptable answer has been—not so easy. Perhaps we were naive to expect anything else. Collation/Institution and Induction do not sit easily together at the best of times. The one is an episcopal and therefore 'central' affair, the other is rooted in the local church. Revising a service of this sort has brought home to us very forcibly just how many discordant themes there are in our whole theology of ministry: *eigenkirche* and ecumenism, possessory rights and church planting. In my most jaded moments I have marvelled at the strangely contradictory vested interests (mine included), and at one point I began to think that the ideal rite would be the one that could combine the most exciting *dernier cri* with patterns tried and tested since well before the Black Death. We have therefore had to work very hard indeed at devising a service that tries to do justice to everything; and that in the process does not make the new incumbent look and feel like grist between the upper and the lower millstones.

Relatively uncontroversial (we thought) would be some stylistic tidying up. The pleasant eighteenth century language of the collation/institution proper is out of keeping with that of the ASB. By the same token the institution *per sigillum* and the reading of the mandate were not precisely in the spirit of the shared ministry we were supposed to be emphasizing. We already had the practice of administering the oaths in the sacristy before the public ceremony, and that is where we transferred the legal collation too. What surprised us was that the point has been carried only with some reluctance.

At first, we thought of taking the structure of the eucharist itself as our vehicle for expressing the shared nature of ministry. Clearly, if this was going to work, then the bishop ought to be associated with the new priest and the laity at each stage of the question-and-answer process. Fine: but then what would the archdeacon do? We realized that we had written an adequate service of welcome, but we had forgotten to induct. Worse than

The Methodist Church

1. *Services for Entry into the Church*

The Faith and Order Committee submitted to the Conference new Services for Entry into the Church. Many amendments were preferred, and the work was referred back to the Committee.

2. *The Methodist Service Book*

The Conference directed the Faith and Order Committee to begin work on the revision of the Methodist Service Book and to present and report on progress, giving details of the proposed content of the revised book, to the Conference in 1991. The Conference directed that the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion (1936 Service) to be included. It is hoped that the new book may be presented to the Conference in 1995, though that is provisional.

REVIEW OF KENNETH STEVENSON'S CHAPTER IN *LITURGY FOR A NEW CENTURY*

The Marriage Service is one of the least revised of the services in the ASB. In this chapter, Kenneth Stevenson suggests some reasons why the marriage rite needs revising and indicates some lines along which that revision may proceed. Anyone familiar with Kenneth's two books on marriage *Nuptial Blessing* (SPCK, 1982) and *To Join Together* (Pueblo, 1987) will find no surprises here. Indeed, some of the revisions which Kenneth suggests can already be found in the American BCP of 1979 and in the current Roman Catholic proposals for England and Wales.

Kenneth's proposals include some restructuring of the marriage service to give it a more coherent shape. This would include having the readings and address at the earlier point in the service and the registration linked with the consent and vows (since the registration is the legal counterpart of the latter).

He also suggests that we need to find new symbolism to go into the marriage rite. The exchange of rings is just about the only one we have at present, and could easily be supplemented with such things as wedding candles and a symbolic gift from the worshipping congregation. Anointing with oil and the use of crowns are also symbols (from the Eastern traditions) which Kenneth mentions. A symbol we might profitably ditch is the giving away, with its medieval feudal overtones.

There is also a case to be made out for strengthening and reordering the blessings and prayers at the end of the service. There is a lot of material to draw on here from other Christian traditions and, while Kenneth acknowledges that there is some fuzziness in this area, he does not deal with the Church of England's rather odd dilemma whereby a deacon may pronounce the blessing over the couple but may not over the congregation. Surely a blessing is a blessing, whatever you actually think you are doing when you administer one! As COB has pointed out, what do you do with a double wedding, and at what point does the deacon's power to bless become so thinly spread that it becomes ineffectual?

Kenneth also calls for more participation in the service by the congregation and particularly by the families concerned. He further suggests that the notion of marriage as covenant needs incorporating more fully into the service. Alongside these changes to the marriage service itself, he suggests that there ought to be a set of phased rites (cf. RCIA and the Catholic Funeral Rites).

I do not know if I would have said heresy, and I cannot be sure that George Carey was aiming for the foundations, but they are certainly at best shaky and at worst up for instant removal. The ordination of women to the presbyterate cannot be fought out on such a false basis.

Colin Buchanan

THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION'S QUARTERLY COLUMN THE INITIATION DEBATE

by Mark Dalby

The 1991-96 Liturgical Commission has now been appointed, and it will be holding its first meeting in May. Our detailed agenda will become clearer once Synod has had the opportunity of a wide-ranging debate on liturgy. This may not be till next year, but one area where there is certainly work to be done is initiation, and Synod will have at least one debate on this (maybe two) in July of this year.

What precise resolutions the bishops will put forward in July remains to be seen but, quite apart from what the bishops themselves will produce, Synod members are likely to have two documents in front of them. One will be the report by Canon Martin Reardon commissioned by the Standing Committee as a result of Roger Godin's motion. The other, a GS Misc from the Liturgical Commission, will cover wider issues and outline the possibilities of rites for renewal of faith, reconciliation and healing, and reception into the Church of England.

The area of initiation covers, or touches upon, at least six issues:

1. Infant baptism: open or restricted. After the Godin motion, the Standing Committee were criticized for not appointing a full working party. But the conclusions of a working party can often be determined in advance simply by looking at its membership. Martin Reardon has appointed his task with splendid objectivity and consulted with all shades of opinion. His report will probably not please any of us entirely, but it will be a good background to the debate. I doubt if the debate will result in anything startling, but the Commission will be paying attention both to the nuances and to the voting. In particular we will hope to learn whether the church as a whole is happy with the more restrictive methods of ASB or whether it wants to return to the greater openness of the Prayer Book.

2. The catechumenate. In February 1990 Synod requested the bishops to consider the arguments for reviving the catechumenate for adults, young people and infants and 'for making provision for a draft order of service, whereby candidates would be admitted to such a catechumenate'. I did not detect much enthusiasm for this motion, but church bodies excel at supporting motions which call only for consideration. The Reardon report will doubtless touch on the catechumenate, but it would be a pity if discussion centres largely on infant candidates. In many parishes there is a lapse of newly-baptized and confirmed adults as well as of teenagers, and clearly something more is required than a dozen classes in a vicar's study. If the bishops are impressed by the catechumenate arguments, it will be for the Commission to provide draft orders of service, and our obvious starting point would be ECUSA's *Book of Occasional Services*.

3. The catechism. *The Revised Catechism* was first authorized in 1962 for seven years, and Synod has made clear that it is not prepared to go on authorizing it *ad infinitum*. In 1987 the bishops invited the Board of Education to consider the appropriateness of the catechetical method and, if convinced of it, to prepare a second revised catechism. The Board appointed a small working party under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Lewes. It believed that the catechetical method was still appropriate, and its submission, duly revised by the bishops, was published last year as *A New Revised Catechism*. The bishops hope that it will be 'widely considered and discussed', and it is certainly worthy of this. Its main strengths are that it seeks to recover something of the poetry of the Prayer Book catechism and, like the Prayer Book catechism again, it is set in the context of worship. The absence of a catechism has left a gap in ASB, and hopefully *A New Revised Catechism* will eventually fill this.

4. Confirmation and Admission to Communion. The Knaresborough report, which recommended admission to communion before confirmation, was received by Synod in 1985, and we can expect this subject to be considered again in July. The situation is complicated by the fact that there are at least five different positions here:

- (a) The *status quo*. A bit on the defensive nowadays, but far from beaten.
- (b) Baptism alone, followed by immediate infant communion. Logical if baptism alone initiates, but very radical.
- (c) Baptism alone, followed by basic instruction and communion at 7 or 8. More practical, but difficult to defend theologically against (b) above.
- (d) Baptism and confirmation, followed by immediate infant communion. Logical on a sacramental view of confirmation, but again very radical.
- (e) Baptism and confirmation, followed by basic instruction and communion at 7 or 8. Practical, preferable to (c) if you hold a sacramental view of confirmation, but again difficult to defend theologically against (d).

The adoption of (c) or (e) could involve the Commission in preparing a simple rite of admission to communion. But in the absence of a consensus for change, the bishops may well recommend adherence to the *status quo*.

5. Reaffirmation of Baptismal Vows. The bishops are well aware of the desire of some 'converts' for a second baptism and, like COB, they are firmly upholding 'one baptism once'. But the renewal of baptismal vows is very different from rebaptism. Confirmation is preceded by a renewal. Romans and many Anglicans renew at Easter, and ASB provides a simple form for use on various occasions. The converts usually want something dramatic, and the Roman renewal at Easter can be very dramatic—but the converts are rarely of that tradition. COB's proposed use of water, based on New Zealand Presbyterian usage, has been widely criticized on the ground that, whatever may be said, it may still appear as a rebaptism. Yet some use of water, if only sprinkling, is allowed in several overseas rites—Anglicans in South Africa, Methodist in the USA and Uniting Church in Australia. Perhaps the C. of E. is not yet ready to reflect the extended view of confirmation, popular in North America, whereby laying on of hands can be used equally for renewal, reception and reconciliation.

David Holeton on Canada. Bruno Burki and Jean-Louis Bonjour both contribute articles on Swiss developments. 181 (1990) has essays on Louis Duchesne; 182 is on Pastoral matters, including articles on baptism and confirmation; and 183/4 is a variety, including something on exorcisms. OCP 56.2 contains articles by M. Arranz on the Diataxis of Patriarch Methodius for the Reconciliation of Apostates, and U. Zanette on the distributing of psalms in the Coptic horologion. *Ecclesia Orans* VII/2 includes Paul Holmès on Nicholas I's reply to the Bulgarians on marriage, and Vincent Desprez writes on the eucharist and Pseudo-Macarios. VII/3 has another article by D. Serras on the blessing of baptismal water at the paschal vigil—the post-Vatican II reform. *Andrew University Seminary Studies* 28:2 19910 has an article by Kenneth A. Strand on Sunday, Easter and Quartodecimanism in the Early Church. *Theology* Nov/Dec 1990 has T. G. A. Baker on The ASB 2000. It includes the problems caused by calling the Family Service by that name. He writes: 'Diocesan bishops need to obtain the services of sensible and competent liturgists in an advisory capacity, and to cause provision for training in the principles and conduct of public worship to be given a high profile in diocesan schemes for Christian Education, and as part of the in-service training of the clergy, who by the time they are forty may have fallen into bad habits in this respect'. *Liturgy* 14.6 has the theme 'Liturgy and the Environment'; 15:1 contains reports from the Catholic Liturgy Committees; and 15.2 is a Miscellany, and includes an article by the American liturgist Robert Hovda on 'Relevance of the Liturgy'. *Proche Orient Chretien* 39 (1989) 1-11 has an article by Samir on the Coptic liturgical year.

DENOMINATIONAL REPORTS—THE JLG NEWS SHEET

(Part of the Reports, circulated late by JLG)

The Church of Scotland

1. The work of revision of the *Book of Common Order* is still in progress.
2. Three new works have been published:
The Covenant Service; Clann ag Urnaigh ('Children Praying');
Worshipping Together.
3. Consideration is given to *Pray Today*, the Annual Prayer Calendar (on a monthly cycle): is it the best way to enable the prayers of the church? Future Prayer Calendars may be quite different.
4. The General Assembly has instructed the Panel on Worship to explore the relationship between Worship and Mission.

The Scottish Episcopal Church

1. *Calendar*
The new Calendar will be submitted to the General Synod in 1991, for use as from the first Sunday in Advent, 1991.
2. *Biographies of Saints*
A publication containing short biographies of the Saints contained in the Sanctorale of the new Calendar is due to be published before the new Calendar enters into operation.
3. *Initiation*
The work on the revision of the rites of Initiation is progressing. The new revision is intended for use in conjunction with an agreed policy on Christian nurture and education.

FROM THE JOURNALS

by Bryan Spinks

Studia Liturgica now appears twice a year, and thanks to Paul Bradshaw, it also appears with some regularity. Its link with *Societas Liturgica* means that at least one issue every two years contains *Societas Papers*. Vol. 20.1 contains the York papers on Inculturation, including the devastating paper of Aidan Kavanagh, who is always merciless with those who take themselves too seriously. Vol. 20.2 has a number of useful articles—Martin Klockener on the liturgy and young people, Bill Grisbrooke on the *Laudate Psalms*, Maxwell Johnson on the origins of Lent, Alexander Volker on liturgy in the German Evangelical Church, and a very useful bibliography on the Liturgical Architecture 1960-1990 by Susan White. The Church Service Society *Record* 23 (Autumn 1990) appeared late. It has a very good article on Baptism by Colin Williamson.

ATR 72.3 has an article by David Holeton on Liturgical Research and Pastoral Liturgy, looking at how recent studies of the history of worship have had a pastoral application in the new liturgies. Commenting on Confirmation in the nineteenth century he writes: 'most Anglican bishops probably believed they were doing what had always been done so by their predecessors in confirming. That is to say, they probably didn't have any reflected theological opinion on what was taking place'. One suspects that for some bishops this is still true today! *Worship* 64.4 has an article by Thomas Watkins, 'Protestant Worship: Many Traditions or One?', entering into debate with James White's book, *Protestant Worship*.

Watkins questions White's definition of protestant, and his dismissal of the eucharist as a central feature of protestantism. Watkins finally urges that traditions from Anglicanism to Frontier have drawn upon Calvin quite heavily, and thus Calvin is an important key to understanding the one protestant tradition of worship. Frank Senn also enters into debate with White. *Worship* 64.5 has James Dallen's useful piece on Reconciliation in the Sacrament of Penance. German Martinez looks at the integration of cult and culture, comparing different models through history, from the Judeo-Christian to Hellenistic Paradigm, through to Vatican II with its openness towards human progress. Raymond Brown writes on the Resurrection in John 21. *Worship* 64.6 has a good article by Richard Rutherford on Catholics and Cremation, which is useful to read alongside the Douglas Davies study. Gail Ramshaw looks at the use of the Old Testament, concluding that there are three approaches—complementarity (Isaiah 60/Matt. 2), metaphoric parallels (images of Christian redemption) and parallel by contrast (Eve/Mary), but all contain dangers. Liturgies can help in making a positive imaginative identification with the Israelites. There are also articles on Advent themes in Bach's Cantatas, and on the sacramental theology of Leonardo Boff, and a look at three ninth century catecheses. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 104.2/3 has a lengthy article by David Tripp on the Prayer of St. Polycarp and the development of the eucharistic prayer. 104.4/5 has something on the 1984 Ceremonies for Bishops, and Cuthbert Johnson has a lengthy article on the liturgical scholarship of the late Dom Henry Ashworth. 104.6 all in Italian, includes something on the office. *La Maison-Dieu* 180 (1989) looks at liturgical changes in the Reformation churches, and Geoffrey Steel and Michael Vasey write on the Church of England, and

6. Reconciliation. Catholic tradition would say that what the new 'convert' really needs (assuming he has been baptized) is reconciliation to the church through confession and absolution, Jerome's second plank for shipwrecked mariners. But modern mariners have limited enthusiasm for traditional confession, and it is widely ignored in many parishes, both Roman and Anglo. Yet forgiveness and reconciliation are at the heart of a gospel ministry. There are still times when something needs to be said and done, and there are still people who want to do it. Synod's last attempt to provide 'A form for the Reconciliation of a Penitent' came unstuck because of its retention of the BCP's declaratory formula. In November 1987 Synod requested the bishops to reintroduce the form 'at the earliest opportunity', but the bishops declined and we are unlikely to see new drafts in July. But the dilemma remains. If 'I absolve you' is omitted, the forms may be approved but not used. If it is included, the forms may well be rejected.

Synod will not tackle all these issues in July, nor will it be asked to, but it will certainly start to engage with some of them. It should be an interesting weekend.

STOP PRESS—THE NEW LITURGICAL COMMISSION

The Bishop of Winchester (chairman); the Bishop of Southwell; Mark Dalby; Molly Dow; Roger Greenacre; Baroness James (P. D. James); Trevor Lloyd; Stephen Oliver; Michael Perham; Jane Sinclair; David Stancliffe; Kenneth Stevenson; John Sweet; Michael Vasey; Susan White. [Sorry no clerical courtesies through speed].

LIMA IN CANBERRA

The text below was used at the March meeting of the Church Representatives Meeting of the Council of Churches of Britain and Ireland. It was presented as the form of the Lima Liturgy, as used at the WCC in Canberra, but its accuracy has not been checked against the original. At first sight it is *not* the Lima Liturgy, but it proves to be the same groundplan with a different thematic heart—the 'baptism, eucharist, ministry' refrain has been almost totally removed and a Holy Spirit theme introduced to replace it. The text below omits the music of the chanted responses, and only covers the eucharistic prayer and its flanking material.

LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST

L.: Blessed are you, Lord God of the universe;
you are the giver of this bread
fruit of the earth and of human labour,
let it become the bread of Life.

P.: **Blessed be God, now and for ever**

L.: Blessed are you, Lord God of the universe,
you are the giver of this wine,
fruit of the vine and of human labour,
let it become the wine of the eternal Kingdom.

P.: **Blessed be God, now and for ever**

L.: As the grain once scattered in the fields
and the grapes once dispersed on the hillside
are now reunited on this table in bread and wine,
so, Lord, may your whole Church soon be gathered together
from the corners of the earth into your kingdom.

THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

L.: The Lord be with you

P.: **And also with you.**

L.: Lift up your hearts.

P.: **We lift them to the Lord.**

L.: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

P.: **It is right to give God thanks and praise.**

L.: Truly it is right and good to glorify you,
at all times and in all places,
to offer you our thanksgiving
O Lord, Holy Father,
Almighty and Everlasting God.
Through your living Word
you created all things,
and pronounced them good.
You made human beings in your own image,
to share your life and reflect your glory
When the time had fully come,
you gave Christ to us
as the Way, the Truth and the Life.
He accepted baptism and consecration as your Servant
to announce the good news to the poor.

We give you thanks because by the Holy Spirit
you lead us into all truth,
and give us power to proclaim your Gospel to the nations,
and to serve you as a royal priesthood.
So, with the angels and all the saints,
we proclaim and sing your glory:

P.: **Holy, holy, holy . . .
Blessed is he who comes . . .**

L.: O God, Lord of the universe, you are holy
and your glory is beyond measure.

We are grateful that Christ bequeathed to us the eucharist,
that we should celebrate the memorial of the cross and
resurrection,
and receive his presence as food.

May this Creator Spirit
accomplish the words of your beloved Son,
who, on the night in which he was betrayed,
took bread, and when he had given thanks to you,
broke it and gave it to his disciples, saying:
Take, eat: this is my body, which is given for you.
Do this for the remembrance of me.
After supper he took the cup
and when he had given thanks,
he gave it to them and said:
Drink this, all of you: this is my blood of the new covenant,
which is shed for you and for many
for the forgiveness of sins.
Do this for the remembrance of me.

P.: **Veni Creator, Veni Creator, Veni Creator Spiritus**

L.: Gracious God,
we celebrate today the memorial of our redemption:
we recall the birth and life of your Son among us,
his death and descent to the abode of the dead.
We proclaim Christ's resurrection and ascension in glory,
where as our Great High Priest
he ever intercedes for all people;
and we look for his coming at the last.

P.: **Veni Creator . . .**

L.: Behold, Lord, this eucharist
which you yourself gave to the Church
and graciously receive it,
as you accept the offering of your Son
whereby we are reinstated in your Covenant.

Upon this eucharist
send your life-giving Spirit.
May the outpouring of this Spirit of Fire
transfigure this thanksgiving meal
that this bread and wine
may become for us the body and blood of Christ.
As we partake of Christ's body and blood
that we may be one body and one spirit in Christ,
a living sacrifice to the praise of your glory.

P.: **Veni Creator . . .**

L.: Remember loving God,
your one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church,
redeemed by the blood of Christ.
Reveal its unity, guard its faith, and preserve it in peace.
Remember, all the servants of your Church:
bishops, presbyters, deacons,
and all to whom you have given special gifts of ministry.

P.: **Veni Creator . . .**

L.: Remember also all our sisters and brothers
who have died in the peace of Christ,
and those whose faith is known to you alone:
guide them to the joyful feast
prepared for all peoples in your presence,
with the blessed Virgin Mary,
with the patriarchs and prophets,
the apostles and martyrs,
and all the saints for whom your friendship was life.
With all these we sing your praise
and await the happiness of your Kingdom
where with the whole creation,
finally delivered from sin and death,
we shall be enabled to glorify you through Christ our Lord.
Through Christ, with Christ, in Christ,
all honour and glory is yours.
Almighty God and Father,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
now and for ever:

P.: **Amen.**