

area squeezed between three-decker pulpit and the stumps of the screen. What we see on those occasions is hardly typical. But our eyes are opened to the enormous challenges of worship in the countryside. We realize how awkward are the inherited furnishings for those who want to sway together in the Spirit; how close to being unviable are the small groups which gather in the cold (or with heads oppressed by the overhead heaters). And how resourceful and inventive many parishes are in making the best of what they have.

After a moratorium on holding Worship Study Days, it's probably time to have another go. Interest in working hard at liturgy, both by clergy and lay people, needs to be fed. On 31 October the Team Ministry of Halesworth (far on the Omsk side of Ipswich) had a valiant training day which included an input on Liturgy. The parishes involved may be remote: but the questions they asked were not those of rustics. What, they asked urgently, about children and the Eucharist? How far have we got in the revision of the lectionary, and what about discography? How relieved our representative was to be able to deliver the 'answers', though without his style, which had been given by David Stancliffe at the Conference of 13 October!

Liturgical Committee representation on the DAC is very valuable. Liturgy in so many churches has to be thought through in the presence of the actual furniture and layout: and sometimes in the presence of the failures of previous experiments. We could, for example, do with some sharing of ideas on what to do with chancels (with or without screens). It is also interesting to visit churches which have been turned sideways for their liturgy, just as sometimes happened in the eighteenth century. Some results are dreadful; some not.

The Committee's proposals for bringing the Institution Service up to date disappeared into the Bishop's Staff meeting and silence fell. A difference of opinion about the roles of Bishop and Archdeacon seemed to cause the paralysis. Just before Christmas the matter suddenly came to life again. Now we hope that we have agreed the principles for a more radical re-handling of the service. As in the American Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, we shall recommend the use of symbols (water ewer, eucharistic elements, Bible etc) to share the commitment of priest and people to the work of ministry. The Archdeacon will be in charge of the walk to the door and to the tolling of the bell and the seating in the stall. The Rural Dean will orchestrate the welcomes from the local churches and community. We shall see how we get on.

And as we prepare for our first meeting in 1994, we suddenly find that we have a rather long agenda. Excellent.

Keith Jones  
Diocesan Liturgical Secretary

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1994 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-851818 or 855252; 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) 733292

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 229

January 1994

## Editorial

When there is no hot news, it has been the custom of NOL's editorial to turn to anniversaries (or invent some hot news, of course). This month, invention has deserted me, and, as it is the beginning of the year, I reflect on ten-year intervals of the last fifty years in the Church of England's liturgical endeavours.

1944 saw the publication of *Confirmation Today*, which, although it had some continuities with the past, is more notable as beginning a whole series of reports and considerations about initiation (indeed, the very word 'initiation' gained its currency in Anglicanism through those debates).

1954 was the year that the Convocations, aware that the Church of England might one day have power to provide new services, asked the Archbishops to set up a Liturgical Commission. It may surprise readers to note that, with the sole exception of an 'Advisory Committee on Liturgical Questions' at the beginning of the First World War (a committee which, like a player of *Trivial Pursuits*, was only expected to answer the actual (trivial) questions put to him), no liturgical group had ever been involved in drafting or revising liturgy all this century (and long before). The early history of the Commission can be read in Ronald Jasper's book, *The Development of Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980*.

1964 was the year the 'Alternative Service Measure' went through the Church Assembly, ready for Parliament—and the Vesture of Ministers Measure went through Parliament (I recall writing to my MP to ask him to vote against it . . .). It is an anniversary for me, as it was the year I was brought onto the Liturgical Commission. I have written about this elsewhere, but I acknowledge now, not only that it gave me something to get my teeth into (it did that), but also that I was greatly privileged to be invited—out of the blue, so to speak—onto the Commission at that point (they had just started working on Series 2 communion!).

1974 was the year that the Worship and Doctrine Measure went through both Synod and Parliament, with Michael Ramsey moving it in the House of Lords on his last day in office. It was also the year that the initiation issues (from the Ely report) came in force onto the Synod agenda—some of which I wrote up in my recent *Infant Baptism and the Gospel*.

1984? Well, leaving George Orwell aside, it was the year that a certain thunderbolt hit York Minster for indeterminate reasons . . .

And 1994? This is the year of practical and effective liturgy—the ordination of women presbyters and of visiting bishops.

Have a good year—and stay with us

Colin Buchanan

## THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS, JANUARY 1994

The House of Bishops met in Manchester from 10 to 13 January, and gave preliminary consideration to various documents from the Liturgical Commission. There were three major areas which should break surface within the Church of England in the next few months:

- (a) There are some English Language issues, and these include: issues of 'traditional' language, inclusive language, Bible translations, the Psalter, and international texts from ELLC. The Commission was asking for a Synod debate in July, and that looks a likely outcome.
- (b) Should there be one book, or more than one? This was aired in the Autumn, inspected by the House of Bishops, and will also be debated in Synod in July.
- (c) The Commission brought draft eucharistic proposals to the House of Bishops (and it will be recalled that the House 'bounced' the last drafting in January 1992). The new proposals included texts 'for use when children are present'. The House is very concerned about what texts it feeds into the Synodical processes, though it has now before it an example from the progress of *A Service of the Word* through Synod in 1993, which was smooth beyond most people's expectations. (Again, it should be recalled that, before 1993, the last time Synod had authorized liturgy was in 1982-83, when the 'Blessing of Oils' and the 'Reconciliation of a Penitent' were both defeated in the House of Laity. But even if both had been 'acceptable, the present House of Bishops includes many who were not then on Synod, and the processes feel untried to them. So there may—as with 'Extended Communion' in November—be a 'Take Note' debate, seminar style, before any texts are introduced for 'General Consideration'. Meanwhile the Commission has yet another chance, in the light of the House of Bishops' remarks, to touch up the eucharistic proposals further.

In addition to these forward-looking papers, there had to be a look back to the debate in November. The 'extended communion' material had, of course, caught everyone out when the agenda threatened to go off into 'lay presidency' (see NOL of November 1993). The negative effect was that the textual proposals of the Commission were not much debated. We are likely to see efforts at producing public guidelines for the practice, whilst the Commission (as so often) has yet another chance to look at the text. (And the House of Bishops had also to take note that that 'lay presidency' motion, directly addressed to the House of Bishops, is top of the list for Private Members' Motions in July. If any member of General Synod reading this does *not* want a debate on lay presidency in July, your only hope is to attach your name at the February one-day session to *my* PMM on 'direct state control'—for a few more names would put me way back to the top of the list, and I am quite keen to get it debated . . .)

The House was also naturally concerned about the services for the ordination of women, on which the Liturgical Commission has given advice. One missing point of evidence, as far as NOL is aware, is how and when existing women presbyters (i.e. those ordained elsewhere in the Anglican, including one member of the House of Clergy of General Synod!) will be acknowledged/reinstated/re-licensed? Will there be 'coming out ceremonies'? If so, will they be in position to lay hands as presbyters on the first ones being newly ordained?

COB

## DIOCESAN REPORT 12: WORCESTER

In the last two years there has been a sea change in the diocesan Liturgical Committee, both in membership and work set before it. It was perhaps, in the past, a reactive group, waiting for work to be thrown to it, like the scraps from the rich man's table. The scraps were neither tasty or appetizing. So we have set out to take the initiative. We discovered that liturgy was being written for all sorts of diocesan occasions, and the official committee never given a thought. So we have been involved with a leaving service for the Bishop of Dudley, and more importantly, the devising of a new form of Induction and Licensing service. The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1995 will also give us plenty of opportunity.

The Induction service is still under wraps, but we are looking at two alternatives—one in the context of a eucharist, and one non-eucharistic. We are fortunate in three members who have moved to Worcester from other dioceses—such is its forward looking image—who were active in producing such services. We built up quite a collection of them. It has long puzzled us why, at the start of a new ministry, the eucharist was so rigidly excluded in many dioceses.

Our major piece of work has been the organization of a Liturgical Day last September in the cathedral. In our discussions, it became obvious that the developments in new forms of service for Sundays; family worship; the resource books which liturgists take for granted, were passing many parishes, and clergy by. We enlisted the help of Praxis, and Trevor Lloyd and Helen Alexander (BBC) undertook to organize the day. Our Bishop, though not at first very happy about the name ('Making Worship your own'), sent out a two-line whip, with the result that about 200 came on the day. We looked at worship structure, Resources material, the setting up of worship groups. Perhaps the groups trying to put together a worship service for Harvest or Advent, and the afternoon ones on 'special interests', ranging from music to prayer to dance, were the most revealing. It showed how little the best efforts of liturgists influenced perhaps 60% of parishes. Typical comments: 'Your lay people are allowed to read in your church?; Is it really permissible to deviate from the ASB at family services?; Can you devise you own intercessions?'

It was a very useful day, and one that will have to be repeated the nearer we get to the revision of the ASB. Our next seminar is to be on the new Family Service forms, now thankfully that Synod has caught up with what many have been doing for years. Liturgically, these are exciting times to live in.

Guy Smith  
Diocesan Liturgical Secretary

## DIOCESAN REPORT 13: ST. EDMUNDSBURY AND IPSWICH

'What are they doing out there?' If that question is asked by the Bishops and Archdeacons of a broad and deep countryside like ours, the answers are not easily come by. These days, it may be the ordination of a Local Ordained Priest which is the liturgical glory of the year. And then from far and wide we come to see the remarkable fusion of late medieval pews and deep deep chancels, with the drum-kit and the thickly carpeted worship

## THE NEW LITURGICAL CANONS

We print the next revised Canon affected by the passing of Amending Canon no. 17.

---

### B2 OF THE APPROVAL OF FORMS OF SERVICE

1. It shall be lawful for the General Synod:
  - (a) to approve forms of services for use in the Church of England and to amend any form of service approved by the General Synod under this Canon;
  - (b) to approve the use of any such form of service for a limited period, or without limit of period;
  - (c) to extend the period of use of any such form of service and to discontinue any such form of service;

and any form of service or amendment thereof approved by the General Synod under this Canon shall be such as in the opinion of the General Synod is neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter.

2. Any approval, amendment, continuance or discontinuance of any form of service shall not have effect unless the form of service or the amendment, continuance or discontinuance thereof is finally approved by the General Synod with a majority in each House thereof of not less than two-thirds of those present and voting.
  3. In this Canon the expression 'form of service' has the same meaning as in Canon B1.
- 

### Correction

In Canon B1, as published in December NOL, there was an omission in B1(3). In paragraph 3 insert a new (iv) as follows:

'(iv) any Table of rules for regulating a service;' and re-number (iv) as printed to be now '(v)'.

### Commentary

The addition to B2 of B2(3) is its only change. It ensures that all Calendar and Lectionary materials can be authorized as 'alternative services'. It was one of the precipitating factors that first led to this revision of the Canons. The same addition is to be added to Canon B3, as B3(6), and that Canon will not be reprinted in NOL.

## THE COMMISSION AND THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

(We conclude the printing we ran through 1993 of the interchange between the two bodies in Autumn 1992)

### THE PBS SUBMISSION

11. There is, we believe, no way in which a normative Anglican liturgy can or should accommodate a multi-faith perspective or indeed the kind of fashionable pantheism which often underlies ecological concerns.

12. The Commission needs to ask itself how far communitarian emphases and other cultural trends from the Sixties have been allowed to influence liturgical revision and have affected such things as when to stand or kneel, which way to face, the orientation of altar and people, what many feel to be the intrusion of 'The Peace' and the amount of other 'participation'. In our view these could benefit from critical evaluation.

### THE COMMISSION'S RESPONSE

11. The members of the Commission vary in the amount of sympathy they have for inter-faith worship, but all are agreed that this has no place in normative liturgy. We detect no signs of it in the ASB or in any more recent authorized or commended material.

12. Members of the Commission share these concerns. We would defend a greater variety of posture than in the past (but not the loss of kneeling as expressing a proper humility in prayer), the Greeting of Peace (though not in all its manifestations) and participation (but with an emphasis on prayerfulness as the deepest participation, and with the right balance between passivity and activity in worship).

---

To sum up: the Commission is able to respond positively to the Prayer Book Society's submission, though not to some of the other public statements of the Society. It recognizes the genuine love that its members have for the liturgy of the Church of England, as well as the sense of hurt that they feel. But it also asks for recognition that the Commission is not the iconoclastic body it has sometimes been portrayed to be. It has to help the Church to be like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old, and that is by no means easy in the complexity of Church life today. The Commission welcomes dialogue with all those who care deeply about the worship of the Church.

December 1992

### IN MEMORIAM—BRIAN REDHEAD

NOL joins with the millions who grieved near the end of January over the death of Brian Redhead. Obviously, his Christianity was not a major audible feature of his broadcasting, but was known and respected—and his fair dealings with a vast variety of the opinionated and the deaf, as well as the gracious and the good, were exemplary. We thank God for every remembrance of him.

COB

**This month's Booklet is . . .**

. . . Worship Series no. 127, *Music and Worship: Principles to Practice*, by Peter Mojer, a very practical guide.

**and next month's**

is Evangelism Series no. 25, *Evangelistic Preaching*, by Chris Edmundson . . . and Spirituality Series no. 48, *The Spirituality of Taizé*, by Tim Haggis.

**THE PORVOO STATEMENT**

We gave space last month to the 'Porvoo Common Statement', which had been published in November within a larger report of the General Synod Council for Christian Unity entitled *Together in Mission and Ministry: The Porvoo Common Statement with Essays on Church and Ministry in Northern Europe* (CHP, 218pp., £8.50). There was one straight error of fact of which we repent: through the sheer complexity of material, we failed to report the Latvian transmission of the historic episcopate— or rather, the Latvian shortcomings in this respect. In fact the Lutheran Church of Latvia (as is clearly set out in the report) had 'superintendents' until 1920, when Archbishop Soderblom of Uppsala consecrated their first 'bishop'. The succession lapsed again before the War, and the issue was then buried by first the German Occupation, and then the forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union. 'Historic' consecration was resumed by the Swedish bishop Sven Dannel in 1969.

We subjoin now the liturgical and sacramental sections of the 'Porvoo Common Statement':

-----  
e. We confess and celebrate the apostolic faith in *liturgical worship*. We acknowledge in the liturgy both a celebration of salvation through Christ and a significant factor in forming the consensus fidelium. We rejoice at the extent of our 'common tradition of spirituality, liturgy and sacrament of life' which has given us similar forms of worship and common texts, hymns, canticles and prayers. We are influenced by a common liturgical renewal and by the variety of expression shown in different cultural settings.<sup>23</sup>

f. We believe that *the Church* is constituted and sustained by the Triune God through God's saving action in word and sacraments. We believe that the Church is a sign, instrument and foretaste of the Kingdom of God. But we also recognize that it stands in constant need of reform and renewal.<sup>24</sup>

g. We believe that through baptism with water in the name of the Trinity God unites the one baptized with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, initiates into the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and confers the gracious gift of new life in the Spirit. Since we in our churches practise and value infant baptism, we also take seriously our catechetical task for the nurture of baptized children to mature commitment to

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Meissen*, para. 15 (iii).

<sup>24</sup> *Meissen*, para. 15 (vii); cf. *Helsinki*, paras. 44-51; see also paras 14-20 above.

I shared with him my view as to the restrictive nature of the Hodders software development and my suspicion about Hodders', claim that the development of the software was expensive.

I consider that CBF and Liturgical Commission should not be allowed to sign any further exclusive contract beyond 1997: first, on the basis that General Synod's mind was that the original ASB should be accessible to various publishers; secondly, on the grounds that there is more than one approach to software development.

Hodders are taking the approach of 'up-front' software with add-on 'modules'. Harper/Collins are proposing a 'Book on a Disk' software which does not oblige users of any one book to buy in the expensive up-front package first. The indexing and manipulative programmes will be duplicated on each disk. It will not be less sophisticated than the Hodders package but very much less expensive.

Having ASB on disk will enable churches to incorporate hymns and liturgical texts in their printed service programmes. Harper/Collins have a good market base on books, including (for better or worse) the best-selling *Mission Praise*. Hodders do not have this advantage and are relying on selections of songs and hymns which do not easily co-ordinate with the available music books.

If the contract is only until 1997 not too much is lost—but we certainly should not mortgage the future.

Yours sincerely,  
Michael Perry (Tonbridge)

Dear Colin,

May I respond to a point in the report of the Praxis consultation on 'Writing Liturgical Language' which appears in the November issue of *News of Liturgy*.

It is there stated that some supporters of traditional language regarded such usage as entailing less commitment 'to every detail of the articles of the Creed'. While I do not recall this remark being made, I do not wish to challenge the accuracy of the report, but to forestall any supposition that this view is widely shared. Although I was not present at the meeting as a representative of the Prayer Book Society but in a private capacity, perhaps I may be allowed to say on behalf of this Society that it holds unequivocally to belief that the Book of Common Prayer safeguards orthodox doctrine and enshrines the Catholic and Reformed tradition of the Church of England. The language of the Book of Common Prayer is upheld primarily for its devotional content and its quality of reverence. Features of elegance and beauty are important, but must always be secondary to the presentation of a *lex orandi* which enshrines a sound *lex credendi*.

It is natural that many views on the writing of liturgy will continue to be strongly held and argued. We all desire the most effective proclamation of faith through worship, and we all have something to learn from one another. Happily, dialogue is increasingly replacing confrontation.

Yours sincerely,  
Raymond Chapman (Professor)

## THE LORD'S PRAYER

We have now received the text of the Statement issued last year by JLG. It is not *very* bold, but stands to the adventurous side of Norwich.

### STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE JOINT LITURGICAL GROUP OF GREAT BRITAIN ON THE USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

In response to the renewed emphasis on broadly Christian acts of worship in schools and to the perceived need for encouraging a common heritage in that worship, the Joint Liturgical Group has consulted educational and religious sources with regard to how the Lord's Prayer should be taught and said in schools in England and Wales.

The Joint Liturgical Group, on which all the major British Churches are represented, has been an active partner in the international study and preparation of liturgical texts, and has reviewed the many different versions (both traditional and modern) now available. From its survey the Group is reluctant to propose a single version, but offers for guidance the suggestion that choice be made from the two forms we reproduce below. We acknowledge that local circumstances will affect the decisions which schools will have to make and commend both versions as having widespread acceptance in the Christian Church.

**Our Father, who art in heaven,  
hallowed be thy Name.  
Thy kingdom come,  
thy will be done,  
on earth as it is in heaven.  
Give us this day our daily bread.  
And forgive us our trespasses,  
as we forgive those who trespass against us.  
And lead us not into temptation,  
but deliver us from evil:  
For thine is the kingdom,  
the power, and the glory,  
for ever and ever. Amen.**

**Our Father in heaven,  
hallowed be your name,  
your kingdom come,  
your will be done,  
on earth as in heaven.  
Give us today our daily bread.  
Forgive us our sins  
as we forgive those who sin against us.  
Lead us not into temptation,  
but deliver us from evil.  
For the kingdom the power  
and the glory are yours  
now and for ever. Amen.**

We trust that our commendation of these texts will serve the double purpose of ensuring a degree of common usage in our schools and of introducing pupils to those forms which they are most likely to encounter in church.

Westminster Abbey, Donald Gray, *Chairman Joint Liturgical Group*

### Correspondence

Dear Colin,

I understand from a senior member of the Liturgical Commission that an exclusive contract with Hodder's re software for official liturgical texts has been signed, but it lasts only until 1997.

Christ.<sup>25</sup> In all our traditions *baptism* is followed by a rite of *confirmation*. We recognize two practices in our churches, both of which have precedents in earlier centuries: in Anglican churches, confirmation administered by the bishop; in the Nordic and Baltic churches, confirmation usually administered by a local priest. In all our churches this includes invocation of the Triune God, renewal of the baptismal profession of faith and a prayer that through the renewal of the grace of baptism the candidate may be strengthened now and for ever.

h. We believe that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed and received under the forms of bread and wine in *the Lord's Supper (Eucharist)*. In this way we receive the body and blood of Christ, crucified and risen, and in him the forgiveness of sins and all other benefits of his passion.<sup>26</sup> The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance, but the Church's effectual proclamation of God's mighty acts.<sup>27</sup> Although we are unable to offer to God a worthy sacrifice, Christ unites us with himself in his self-offering to the Father, the one, full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice which he has offered for us all. In the eucharist God himself acts, giving life to the body of Christ and renewing each member.<sup>28</sup> Celebrating the eucharist, the Church is reconstituted and nourished, strengthened in faith and hope, in witness and service in daily life. Here we already have a foretaste of the eternal joy of God's Kingdom.<sup>29</sup>

i. We believe that *all members of the Church* are called to participate in its apostolic mission. All the baptized are therefore given various gifts and ministries by the Holy Spirit. They are called to offer their being as 'a living sacrifice' and to intercede for the Church and the salvation of the world.<sup>30</sup> This is the corporate priesthood of the whole people of God and the calling to ministry and service (1 Peter 2.5).

<sup>25</sup> *Meissen*, para. 15 (iv); cf. *Helsinki*, paras. 22-25.

<sup>26</sup> *Pullach*, para. 67.

<sup>27</sup> *Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. The Final Report*, Windsor, September 1981 (London, 1982) (ARCIC I), *Eucharistic Doctrine*, para. 5.

<sup>28</sup> *BEM, Eucharist*, para. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *Helsinki*, para. 28.

<sup>30</sup> *BEM, Ministry*, para. 17.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Niagara*, para. 68, *Meissen*, para. 15 (viii) and *Helsinki*, paras 32-42.

<sup>32</sup> *BEM, Ministry*, para. 17.

<sup>33</sup> *BEM, Ministry*, para. 22.

## AUSTRALIAN EUCHARIST

In July 1993 there was published in Australia *THE HOLY COMMUNION, also called the Eucharist and the Lord's Supper*, a report of the Liturgical Commission of the Anglican Church in Australia, published under the imprint of Broughton Books by E. J. Dwyer (Australia) Pty. Ltd. 3/32-72 Alice Street, Newtown, NSW 2042. The intention is that the proposals should go to General Synod in 1995 and be officially authorized then, but, under the Constitution, they can be used immediately wherever the diocesan bishop sees fit.

In line with the modern Australian practice there are two 'Orders', the first of which is a streamlined 1662, very similar to the order following the pattern of the BCP in Rite A in the ASB. I understand the main use of the 'First Order' has been in Sydney diocese, and it is also the case that Sydney has produced its own rites, which I hope to review shortly.

The Second Order is in sequence from the Second Order in *AAPB* of 1978. It contains very few surprises, though it is, of course, in inclusive language, and has come into the known style of playing down masculine pronouns and possessive adjectives in respect of God ('It is right to give *our* thanks and praise,'). There are six Great Thanksgivings, and they descend in both content and structure from the *AAPB* provision. Anglicans from most other Provinces would quickly note the use of Acclamations after the anamnesis in most of the Thanksgivings—a structural nicety which makes better sense of the logic of the Thanksgiving, but *feels* wrong to those used to the rite A style. Only one of the Thanksgivings is responsive over and above what we are used to, and that, Thanksgiving 5, is printed out below.

#### THANKSGIVING 5

[The Lord be with you.

**And also with you]**

Lift up your hearts.

**We lift them to the Lord.**

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

**It is right to give our thanks and praise.**

Loving God,  
you have brought us together  
to give you thanks and praise  
for all the wonderful things you have done.

We thank you for this universe,  
a world of wonder and delight.  
You have given it to all your creatures  
to enjoy and to care for.  
Lord our God,

**we give you thanks and praise.**

*[Special thanksgivings appropriate to the season or occasion may be prepared for use here, or members of the congregation may be invited to express their thanks for particular things.]*

We thank you for Jesus whom you sent  
to live and work as one of us.

He showed us how we can love you  
and he set us free to serve one another.

Lord our God,

**we give you thanks and praise.**

He came to take away sin  
which keeps us from each other and from you;  
he frees us from the hate and fear  
which destroy love and trust.

Lord our God,

**we give you thanks and praise.**

And so with everyone who believes in you,  
with all the saints and angels,  
we rejoice and praise you, saying:

**Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,  
heaven and earth are full of your glory.  
Hosanna in the highest.**

**[Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.  
Hosanna in the highest.]**

And now we thank you  
for these gifts of bread and wine;  
may we who receive them,  
as Jesus said,  
share his body and his blood.

On the night he was betrayed, he took bread and gave you thanks.  
He broke the bread and gave it to his friends, and said,  
'Take and eat. This is my body given for you.  
Do this to remember me.'  
After supper he took the cup and gave you thanks.  
He shared the cup with them and said,  
'This is my blood poured out  
so that sins may be forgiven.  
Do this to remember me.'

**Christ has died;**

**Christ is risen;**

**Christ will come again.**

You have gathered us together  
to receive Christ's body and blood,  
to remember all he has done for us,  
his suffering and death,  
his rising to new life  
and his ascending into heaven.  
Lord our God,

**we give you thanks and praise.**

Fill us with your Spirit,  
that we may follow Jesus  
in all we do and say.  
Help us to work for justice  
and to bring your peace to others.  
Lord our God,

**we give you thanks and praise.**

Accept our prayers through Jesus Christ our Lord.  
Through him, in the power of the Holy Spirit,  
we rejoice and praise you, gracious Father. **Amen.**