

(The following is reprinted from the JLG Newsletter, Spring/Summer, 1994)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LITURGICAL CONSULTATION: PRAYING TOGETHER

In 1991 the English Language Consultation (ELLC) released its revision of the 'common' liturgical texts under the title *Praying Together*. In Britain this was published by the Canterbury Press, ELLC is now asking member churches to answer a number of questions relating to *Praying Together* in order to ascertain how the texts are being used and where there are difficulties. Responses may be sent to The Secretary of the Joint Liturgical Group, whose address is 52 Gisburn Road, Barnoldswick, Lancs., BB5 8HA.

1. Is your church agreed that the provision of common liturgical texts is a benefit in the present ecumenical climate?
2. Are there parts of the texts in *Praying Together* which your church finds unsatisfactory but which you would continue to use because of their ecumenical status?
3. Does your church have suggestions for the improvement of such texts?
4. Are there parts of these common texts that are unacceptable to your church?
5. What are your church's recommendations for changes in such texts that would render them acceptable?
6. Are there parts of these common texts which your church has already changed? If so, please give full details.
7. If your church has made such changes, please indicate whether these changes are experimental, alternative, or definitive.

The timetable for responses needs to be strictly followed in order that the various stages may be dealt with properly.

• Churches represented at JLG are asked to send copies of their replies to the Group's next meeting (12-13 October 1994) through their representatives. Churches not represented at the Group may send their responses directly to the Secretary. In either event, JLG needs to be in possession of Churches' responses for that meeting. The Group will then collate the replies in preparation for a unified report to ELLC.

• JLG members will receive a draft report collating the various responses in good time for their meetings of 22-23 March 1995.

• JLG will then produce its formal response, which must be with the Secretariat of ELLC by 1 June 1995.

• ELLC will then use the responses from its member bodies to form a significant part of the agenda for its meetings in Dublin in August 1995.

ELLC's commitment to this review process is two-fold:

1. It will undertake detailed scrutiny of the responses, so that when the time is appropriate further revision will be informed by the answers of its members.
2. It undertakes not to introduce any immediate revisions, so that churches presently introducing new service books will not find all their work undermined by fresh liturgical emendations.

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. 233

May 1994

Editorial

I have just come from the annual public conference of the Movement for the Reform of Infant Baptism (MORIB), a Movement of which I am president. The baptismal reformers are very keen to be distinguished from abolitionists, and the whole nationwide conscience they represent arises from pastoral, doctrinal and missionary concerns. (Some of the history and ideology leading to this I have recorded in *Infant Baptism and the Gospel: The Church of England's Dilemma* which was published last year.) The reformers have been slower to see baptismal issues as in essence liturgical ones, though I for my part am constantly urging that baptismal policies should be part of the brief of diocesan liturgical committees.

With that rationale I can easily report in NOL on the baptism conference. It had a few specially distinguishing features this year:

Firstly, it had a bishop who is not COB speaking at it;

Secondly, it had a good proportion of parish lay visiting teams attending it;

Thirdly, it also had a testimony from a couple converted through applying for baptism (where the father had in due course been baptized with his son, both being dunked at the same time).

The bishop concerned, Michael Gear, Bishop of Doncaster, gave us an illustration he had picked up, which demonstrates the different agendas with which applicants and clergy approach a request for baptism:

'It is as though one were approaching the checkout at a supermarket wishing to make a small purchase and even to pay a small price for it, only to find oneself interviewed and cross-examined as though one had applied for a post on the supermarket's staff.'

The conference took the point, whilst also noting that we are *not* simply purveying a small purchase on the basis of a 'brief encounter' (where have I heard that phrase before?) at the check-out. MORIB would like to see some synodical thrust coming up through deaneries and dioceses. Any hopes where you are?

I want to stress here the general point that sacramental initiation lies primarily in the liturgical field, and it must not be hi-jacked by merely disciplinary or canonical concerns. It is up to the liturgists to do the groundwork which will highlight the tremendous change signified in baptism—a passing from death to life, from the kingdom of darkness to the realm of Christ. If we get the rite right we shall start to get the candidates right.

Colin Buchanan

PS: If you are interested in joining MORIB, then it costs £10 per head per annum for individuals and £35 for PCCs. Write to me or to the Rev. Graham Booth, 22 Barden Road, Nottingham NG3 5QD.

LITURGICAL COMMISSION NOTICE BOARD

- (i) The Commission has recently been considering its meeting dates for 1995 and that involved deciding whether there should be a residential conference as there was in 1985 and 1990. The Commission's current phase of work does not provide such an obvious 'framework' for such a conference as did *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* and *The Promise of His Glory* but progress toward liturgical revision in 2000 will by then have reached such a stage that the Commission judges that a residential conference involving diocesan liturgical representatives could fulfil a useful purpose. No firm details are yet available but dates have been set aside, namely, Monday 25-Wednesday 27 September, 1995, probably at Selwyn College, Cambridge.
- (ii) The July 1994 General Synod will include a number of debates of liturgical interest and diocesan liturgical representatives are reminded that Synod papers are public documents and can be obtained from Church House Book Shop. The two main debates mounted by the Commission will be on *One Book or a Series of Volumes in 2000?* (GS 11 14) and *Language and the Worship of the Church* (GS 11 15). Both papers raise subjects of importance for the next phase of liturgical revision. In addition the House of Bishops will be bringing a paper to which will be appended the Commission's eucharistic proposals (including eucharistic prayers for use when children are present). This will *not* be the first stage of liturgical authorization but a general debate on the principles involved. There will also be debates on the *Filioque* clause (including its liturgical implications) and, as is well known, the private member's motion on lay presidency.
- (iii) A recent publication from the Canterbury Press is *Sing Together Bible Songs and Canticles* by LeGrice. This is commended by Michael Perham of the Commission particularly for the context of *A Service of the Word* since it contains metrical translations of all the Canticles of Morning and Evening Prayer in the Alternative Service Book singable to familiar hymn tunes.
- (iv) As recipients of this letter will know *A Service of the Word and Affirmations of Faith* were authorized by General Synod for liturgical use to the end of the year 2000 last November (13). To date no published version has appeared and the text is to be found in GS 1037B and GS 1038B (obtainable from Church House Book Shop). It is hoped that a 'plain' version will soon be obtainable from Church House Publishing but the text will appear, in due course, in a second edition of *Patterns for Worship*, though no publication date for that second edition can yet be given.

David Hebblethwaite
Secretary of the Commission

I review this before I can confidently reckon to have got hold of the whole detail of the book. But I have a growing suspicion that this book in the hands of a parish worship committee might actually bring in *changes!* Few books on liturgy can claim as much.

[ABC are also advertising recent books on liturgy which have not reached us yet. Look out for John W. B. Hill, *Into the Household of God: A Presbyterian's Manual for the Rite of Baptism in the Book of Alternative Services*, and for David Robson, *Thinking about Weddings*. More information in future issues of NOL].

COB

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

There is much in the March issue of *News of Liturgy* for the Liturgical Commission and its officer to note. I write, however, merely to offer a footnote to the correspondence about reception in two kinds. Section 8 of the Sacrament Act 1547 is still in force and provides that communion shall be received under both kinds '... except necessity otherwise require'. That is the statutory sanction for reception in one kind. Avoiding a relapse into alcoholism could surely be regarded as a 'necessity' as much as an inability to swallow solid food? A purely personal decision to avoid consuming alcohol might not be regarded as a 'necessity' in this context.

Yours sincerely,
David Hebblethwaite,
Secretary, Liturgical Commission

BUILDINGS, UNBUILDING, AND RE-BUILDING

We note that the Archbishop of Canterbury called at Easter for more state help with the care of our ecclesiastical architectural heritage. Our only comment at this point is that the Church of England must safeguard the reason why we still possess the buildings—that is, because they are used *for worship*. That may appear obvious—but it is proverbially not always obvious to every DAC, and certainly not to English Heritage and other preservation Trusts. So no aid from anywhere ought to have concealed strings limiting the proper contemporary use of the building for worship.

To this extent, we cannot but endorse the Templeman Commission findings that 24 City Churches should be closed in London. And to cap it all by noting that new demands for the re-building of the bombed St. Ethelburga's have been voiced in quite high quarters. One is left gasping, and must ask:

- (a) By definition *can* we build a medieval building to-day?
- (b) What is the need of this building for the worship of the Christian Church to-day?

The case rests.

Book Review

Paul MacLean and Douglas Cowling *Sharing the Banquet: Liturgical Renewal in Your Parish* (ABC, Toronto, 1993, imported by Canterbury Press, Norwich, xv/171 pp.)

The two authors are members of St. Mary Magdalene's Anglican parish in Toronto, and they write out of the experience of planning and participation in the liturgy in that parish. They exult in the all-age dimensions of their eucharistic worship, not least in having re-discovered that baptism is the sole sacramental means of initiation into Christ, and for that reason having admitted infants and children to communion. And at first sight the book is an attractively illustrated, child-conscious, 'how to do it in liturgy'. But the more I read, the more I realized the book is far more than that. It has a world-wide purview from which its experience is drawn, but it is also deeper than that might be, for instance:

'We were a gathering of about 200 . . . seated in an oval about five rows deep [at a Roman Catholic Summer School for students]. Unlike on other occasions, no books or leaflets were handed out, but we were soon engaged in learning a musical setting [for Luke 4.18-19] . . . at the end of which a priest, dressed in a simple chasuble, stepped into the centre of the oval, said the collect of the day, and then we all sat down.

With the next episode it became apparent that, much like the theatre in the round, we were defining the liturgical space by our oval. Someone emerged from the congregation and uttered a short passage from Isaiah in much the same way an actor would deliver a speech to an audience. In quick succession, an African stood in the centre and told us what the prophet's words meant to someone who had lived daily with oppression and poverty; and American spoke on their meaning for a member of the suburban middle class; another signed the passage for the deaf with beautiful fluid movements; and a young dancer gave a simple and graceful interpretation. Each of these reflections on the prophet's declamation were separated by silence and then the sung refrain which had begun the liturgy, acting as a sort of antiphon. Taken together, the various pieces of spoken words, bodily movements, stillness and music built on each other to create a rich and powerful effect. The prophetic word was heard and felt in many dimensions.'

Another illustration of the scope of the liturgical advice is in a fascinating chapter entitled 'Politics'. This not only deals with bringing issues of the social order into liturgy—and *disputed* issues of the social order too—but also handles the internal 'politics' of congregations varying in size ('The majority of North American congregations of all denominations are of a pastoral size, that is 50-150 adults on a given Sunday'), as well as varying in their views and convictions ('Congregations are held together by the ability of their members to compromise').

The second half of the book deals more closely with liturgical particularities—baptism, Christmas, story-telling. This is obviously nearer to 'How to do it in liturgy', but still the riches of ideological undergirding and expansion are there.

This month's booklet . . .

is when there is no Worship publication. The Spirituality Booklet is no. 49, *Essentials of Evangelical Spirituality*, by John Cockerton, whilst the Evangelism one is no. 26, *A Prayer-Evangelism Strategy*, by David Sherwin.

. . . and next month's

is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no. 28, *Anglican Liturgical Inculturation in Africa*, edited by David Gitari, the Bishop of Kirinyaga in the Church of the Province of Kenya. Readers of NOL may recall that last July we circulated the 'Kanamai Statement' as part of our July issue. This year David Gitari has edited together the opening papers of the Consultation—one by Elisha Mbonigaba in Uganda, and one by COB—together with the Kanamai Statement itself, and a direct response from Nigeria, the major Province of Africa not represented at the Consultation.

. . . and some changes

arise from new management at the Company—firstly, in a new format for Booklets, and secondly, in an attempt to bring the date forward till NOL publishes at the beginning of its month not at the end. Watch and see how we do.

THE NEW LITURGICAL CANONS

We published last month the new Canon B8. B9 follows and is almost completely re-written. The new text is:

B9 OF REVERENCE AND ATTENTION TO BE USED IN THE TIME OF DIVINE SERVICE

1. All persons present at the time of divine service shall audibly with the minister make the answers appointed and in due place join in such parts of the service as are appointed to be said or sung by all present.
2. They shall give reverent attention in the time of divine service, give due reverence to the name of the Lord Jesus and stand at the Creed and the reading of the Holy Gospel at the Holy Communion. When the Prayers are read and Psalms and Canticles are said or sung, they shall have regard to the rubrics of the service and locally established custom in the matter of posture, whether of standing, kneeling or sitting

Commentary

The changes to the Canon are fairly minimal. In paragraph 1 the Canon does not now specify the liturgical items to be said together, but recognizes there may be a great variety of such congregational parts. In paragraph 2 the requirements about posture have been slightly, very slightly, slackened, to provide for 'locally established custom' which did not appear before, but is now placed alongside 'the rubrics of the service'. (It will be recalled that alternative services are not very prescriptive about posture in their rubrics—an opening note says that where a certain posture is 'appropriate' to a particular piece of liturgy, that posture is indicated in the service. But wording showing what is 'appropriate' is not the same thing as one which says a posture is mandatory.

CONSECRATION OF A 'FLYING BISHOP'

There were three new bishops consecrated at St. Paul's cathedral on 29 April, and one of them was the first Bishop of Ebbsfleet. Ebbsfleet itself is a sandbank (so we are told) where Augustine first came ashore in 597. It is clearly no place for hanging about, and the Bishop of Ebbsfleet (John Richards) is unlikely to be seen there very often—indeed he is living in Lichfield, and is most likely to be employed around the Midlands, as the presence of a phalanx of bishops opposed to the ordination of women in London makes it actually unnecessary for Ebbsfleet to visit Kent.

As we have been charting episcopal ordinations in the Province of Canterbury recently, we report that this time there were no prostrations. This ceremony, it seems, is not obligatory. There was anointing (with the same text as before), the forehead and hands being anointed. One or two mutters were heard in the changing rooms as to whether this was also viewed as optional and could be refused by the incoming bishop. There is no way of testing that.

Rumour had it that the choice of a preacher had provided a deadlock (for or against the ordination of women?) and the Archbishop had simply chosen the Bishop of Winchester himself, disregarding all advice or hopes from the three bishops to-be. But the Ebbsfleet Constituency had smuggled in that rather tendentious eucharistic hymn by Stuckey Coles which finishes:

'For praise, and thanks and worship,
for mercy and for aid,
the catholic oblation
of Jesus Christ is made.'

So perhaps the Ebbsfleetians went home with a crumb of Tractarian comfort. It can hardly have been biblical.

ON GOING TO ROME

At the end of April, it was announced that Graham Leonard, the last Bishop of London, had not only become a Roman Catholic, but had also been conditionally ordained priest (or presbyter) in that Church. This is not the place to give a eulogy, though I confess to a very warm response of affection for my own area bishop in my Northwood days on the staff of the old London College of Divinity (which emigrated to become St. John's, Nottingham, in Summer 1970). In the last Autumn before we moved I went into partnership with Bishop Graham, and we each hauled in our heavyweight theological consultants (he invited Eric Mascall, and I Jim Packer) and we produced a joint book of doctrine, which was also a tract against the then existent Anglican-Methodist Schem. The work we did on eucharistic sacrifice (as well as on integration of ministries) has won quite a bit of respect since. The book was *Growing into Union*.

Of course there now come to mind many occasions on which Graham Leonard was told 'But the Roman Catholic Church says . . .', and he always replied 'But I am not a Roman Catholic and am in no way bound by that ruling'. So there must have been a genuine change of conviction on several points.

President: Lord, you are holy indeed,
To-day we remember your Son
and the Last Supper he shared with his friends.
We too want to be part of him,
and we bring to mind his words,
with bread for his body, and wine for his blood.

We will share in the special meal of our king who said:
'Do this now while you are together
in remembrance of me.'

All: **Christ has died!
Christ is risen!
Christ will come again!**

President: Father, in remembrance of Christ your Son,
who was born like us, lived in a family,
taught us about you and healed in your name,
who suffered and died upon the cross for us all,
but came alive again to give us hope,
and returned to be with you,
promising and sending us the gift of the Holy Spirit.
In sharing together, we come as a family,
in praise and worship
and in songs of everlasting praise:

All: **Blessing and honour and glory and power
be yours for ever and ever. Amen.**

So there it is. It was a true thanksgiving, very unprofessional, very 'instant', and of course simply read aloud on behalf of a congregation who, apart from cue words had little idea what would be coming. It does *not* conform to any known liturgical principles—and least of all to the principles set out by Thomas Talley (Talley's Canon?) in the March Joint Liturgical Study, *Revising the Eucharist*. It is also, one might mention, wholly illegal, and is not to be cribbed for use on any Sunday. It is, however, *no more* illegal than anything in, say Rite C in *Patterns* (one of the eucharistic prayers from which I recently heard used on a Sunday morning on BBC radio).

DIOCESAN REPORTS

We have been short in recent months. Please send us official reports from dioceses—or, equally, send us other reports of diocesan debates, worship events, and teaching sessions. One little tittle-tattle which is creeping round our doors is the character of diocesan training days for women about-to-be-presbyters, showing them how—and how *exactly*—to preside at communion. I do not think this has ever been part of diocesan training for male deacons, but when I have queried it I have been told the women themselves have been requesting it. Fine. I now ask: have they been happy and enlightened with what they have got?

texts 'A', 'B' and 'C'. I gave them a written brief as following. Instructing them to function with my beginning and ending cues. I answered one or two questions, and then left them to it.

Brief for small groups:

TEXT A: Praise to the Lord through the Son, and for the works of God, especially the sending of the Son—and for his ascension. It should be set out in lines—not more than ten lines in all.

TEXT B: 'Link' text taking us from the praise of heaven to a reference to the Last Supper. It should be set out in lines—not more than ten lines in all.

TEXT C: Text of remembering the Lord Jesus and praying for the benefits of communion, concluding with upward sweep of prayer. It should be set out in lines—not more than ten lines in all.

Interestingly, the group working on text C wanted to write in Ascension references and so they sent an emissary to the group on text A, and negotiated how the writing would be divided. Without other background or training (and also, I think, without any advance preparation for a task they had never done before), the three groups all wrote creatively, and wrote words which were really sayable in a spoken liturgy; and it fell to me as president of the rite to use their words. The text I found myself employing ran as follows:

President: The Lord is here.

All: **His Spirit is with us.**

President: Lift up your hearts;

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

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

All: **It is right to give him thanks and praise.**

President: It is indeed right that we should praise you, Lord Jesus Christ.
your name is above every name,
the eternal Son of the eternal Father,
sharing our human life in humility
even to the point of suffering and death.
Now we see you raised, ascended,
and reigning gloriously in heaven.

We wait with joy and expectation,
forever praising you and saying:

All: **Holy, holy, holy, Lord,
God of power and might,
heaven and earth all tell of your glory,
Hosanna in the highest.**

One of the points at which he went beyond most anglo-catholics in relation to the ordination of women as presbyters was in his denouncing such ordinations as being theologically impossible. This far outbids those who have said 'We have no authority to take such a decision', a stance which meant that, if the Pope (or, more probably, the next Pope) were to provide for the ordination of women, then it would be agreed *he* did have such authority, and consciences could be adjusted to the new move. But Graham Leonard in his address at the Lambeth Conference so staked out the objective theological ground that he could no more agree that the Pope could change the rules than that the General Synod of the Church of England could.

This in turn has made me reflect carefully on what consistent position can be held as an Anglican which would permit or even prompt a departure to Rome with a single short step. (This is a relevant consideration as the step is not, as far as we can tell, being provoked by any changes by Rome, but solely by the decision of the Church of England to ordain women as presbyters).

Well, I wrote about this recently in the Australian Church weekly, *Church Scene*, to which I contribute a fortnightly column from England (not a very liturgical column). I wrote then:

'... what is it in an Anglican's beliefs that prejudice him or her towards Rome when the Church of England becomes difficult to inhabit? Well, I must say from my own prejudiced corner that it is difficult to winkle out, but the main elements would appear to be:

- (1) There is but one historic Western Church;
- (2) Rome is a large part of this one Church, but the C/E is another smaller part;
- (3) We hold the same Catholic title deeds as Rome, partly by virtue of holding the ancient buildings, sees, parishes, etc., as we did when we were fully in communion with the Pope;
- (4) We did nothing at the Reformation to separate us doctrinally from the Catholic Church;
- (5) Rome has remained the centre of unity of this Western Catholic Church, though the Pope is probably a little less than infallible;
- (6) The Pope is the Western patriarch, and is entitled to full deference from us as such;
- (7) The Synod, the House of Bishops and Parliament too represent irrelevant and often erroneous interventions into the life of this branch of the Catholic Church, which owes its allegiance to the Pope even though that cannot be formally expressed.

I think that such a cluster of beliefs could leave a man or woman able to step fairly painlessly from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, with little actual change of mind—let alone repentance. But I submit that it is actually quite difficult to hold the cluster of beliefs in the first place—for they sit ill with the Reformation or with the history of Anglicanism since, and can only be held by a most determined form of unrealism.

THE NEW WELSH EUCHARIST

The Church in Wales at the meeting of its Governing Body in April authorized for experimental use 'An Alternative Order for the Holy Eucharist'. This does for Wales what the outline orders of various sorts have done for other Provinces (provided in the Church of England by the use of *A Service of the Word* as an ante-communion). So on the second page there is a heading 'Structure', and this is the main alternative rite replacing the 1984 Modern English rite. Most of the document is a set of appendices to this list, providing the requisite liturgical materials. In a brief list at the bottom of the page comes what is actually another kind of service:

Outline Order

- 1 We Gather in the Lord's Name
- 2 We share God's Peace
- 3 We Proclaim the Word of God
- 4 We Pray with the Church
- 5 We Offer Thanksgiving
- 6 We Share the Gifts
- 7 We Go in God's Strength

This has three pages at the back of the 41-page booklet, and of course the rubric there requires one of the euchaistic prayers from the main 'Structure' rite. The oddity would seem to be about the position of the Peace, which comes at the usual place in the 'Structure' list, but at no. 2 here in the 'Outline Order' list. The thin yellow accompanying 'Guide to the Use of An Alternative Order for the Holy Eucharist', says this rite is for 'occasions (such as youth camps, eucharist meals, home-groups etc.) when a less formal order is needed', and clearly the position of the Peace must have been thought through for that purpose.

There are four eucharistic prayers (and three more in a slim green pamphlet 'Some Additional Eucharistic Prayers: Not Authorized for inclusion in the proposed rite'). There is an occasional sideways glance at 'Rite C' in *Patterns* (including a prelude form 'We take this bread, we take this wine, to follow Christ's example and to obey his command'), so that, for example, prayer I concludes with the Sanctus. There is a notable range of positions for a 'consecratory epiclesis', though, interestingly, there is almost no mention of the Holy Spirit in the form for additional consecration (but, yes, there is a passing reference).

The language has moved on to the 'fully inclusive' with just some hints of reticence about calling God 'he; the modern Lord's Prayer is the international one ('Save us from the time of trial and . . .'); and there is a form ('The Lord Jesus bless you') for blessing non-communicants.

COB

WRITING YOUR OWN (ILLEGAL) EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

We reported last month that in Rochester diocese we were running from our Diocesan Liturgical Committee a day conference on 'All-Age Worship'. Full details will follow, no doubt when we next report as a diocese in NOL, but I offer a personal report of the workshop I ran.

The whole Conference spent the morning on general principles (much of it in small workshops), but in the early afternoon prepared for a newly created eucharist for Ascensiontide, as taking a thematic controlling principle for a 'once-off' event obviously assisted the hope that the task of the different workshops would pull together into a single liturgy. The compilation of the components had to be done in around 45 minutes, and then be fitted together in about five minutes. Some highly imaginative work was done in many areas, including music, children's banner-making, dance (even for newcomers), the writing of liturgical prose, the use of interactive teaching, and so on. My own workshop had the task of writing a eucharistic prayer. In order to use the time efficiently, I had (as other workshop leaders had) to lay down certain elements in advance. I thus created and duplicated in advance the following familiar-looking matrix:

President: The Lord is here.

All: **His Spirit is with us.**

President: Lift up your hearts.

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

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

All: **It is right to give him thanks and praise.**

President: It is indeed right . . .

[TEXT A TO BE DEvised]

. . . forever praising you and saying:

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

President: Lord, you are holy indeed . . .

[TEXT B TO BE DEvised]

. . . in remembrance of me

All: **Christ has died!
Christ is risen!
Christ will come again!**

President: Father, in remembrance of Christ your Son . . .

[TEXT C TO BE DEvised]

. . . songs of everlasting praise:

All: **Blessing and honour and glory and power
be yours for ever and ever. Amen.**

This matrix was going to be in the hands of the whole congregation when the celebration happened. I thus told my workshop that they were to divide into three groups (which had about four people in each) to write