

common denominator kind of children's language, or only suitable for children, but prayers which are suitable for the whole church and are capable of frequent repetition.

Any discussion about language can be pretty subjective, depending on our own cultural and philosophical background. What is vivid to one may sound traditional and boring to another. Someone commented on one of the Eucharistic Prayers in the July package that it sounded as if it had been put together by a Committee, when in fact it was written largely by one Commission member working with an English Literature specialist and only very lightly revised by the Commission. There is no guarantee that the synodical revision process will produce more poetry and rhythm, but we do invite all poets here to write in with alternative suggestions . . .

I end with three instances of the language problems the Commission faces. In Prayer A, lines 9 and 10, 'Water and dry ground, wind and sky' could be much more colourful, but this bit needs to be fairly short, and we are told that our praise for creation should include pictures which those in the inner city can identify with. This city emphasis was balanced in the July Report by the rich and biblical thanksgiving for creation in its Prayer 3. Again, look at the way we meet the demand for some more responsive prayers—it doesn't seem so long if it's not a monologue. Prayer B simply uses the Rite A responses, though you can insert 'to you be the glory and praise' at intervals. Prayer A uses the interjection 'Hosanna in the highest' to highlight the structure. But we do not have the two prayers the Commission produced where the responses of the congregation take the action forward, producing a more deliberate sharing in the celebration between priest and people. Or again, look at the institution narrative in Prayer A. One of the ways of handling this is to make it more story-like in form as we have done here: people enter into stories. But this makes it a lot longer, so we deliberately had, in Prayer 1 in the July package, a very short narrative for those who sometimes wanted a shorter prayer. It is difficult to test out that kind of linguistic variety without a slightly wider selection of prayers.

I will leave it to other members of Synod to comment on any other elements that they wish to see here, though I have heard some people expressing regret that the practical pastoral suggestions about eucharists with children have been omitted. What matters is that we have enough here to test the mind of the church as we prepare for the revision of Rites A and B. We need the kind of accessibility in language and structure that will keep our church, open as it is to cultural and theological division together in our obedience to the command of Jesus Christ to 'Do this . . .', and in our celebration of all that God has done for us and all that he offers us in Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit today and for ever. Amen.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1995 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

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

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. (01634) 851818 or 855252; Fax (01634) 573549)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

BRAMCOTE NOTTINGHAM NG9 3DS

(Tel: (0115) 943 0786 Fax: (0115) 922 0134)

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0115) 973 3292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 240

December 1994

Editorial

NEW EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS—AND A TIMETABLE?

On 30 November General Synod did that which in essence opened the era of synodical process towards the post-2000 official liturgical provision of the Church of England. That closes off a more or less fallow period of fifteen years since the rites in the ASB were finally approved in November 1979. To be absolutely accurate, the whole authorization process was used in 1981-83 for the rites in *Ministry to the Sick*, as a kind of run-down from the ASB processes—and the current procedure was used in full in 1993 for *A Service of the Word*, as a kind of run-up towards the more content-ful rites which may follow from now on.

The two eucharistic prayers concerned were numbers 2 and 4 of the five set out in the report of the House of Bishops to the Synod in July 1994, entitled *Eucharistic Prayers* (GS 1135). They were also published by an act of piracy in the July 1994 NOL. Then the House of Bishops decided in October to bring forward these two prayers only. In their brief report to the Synod the House of Bishops gave no particular reasons why it had recommended two prayers and excised three, though it is no secret that, irrespective of their particular merits, the House has a general disposition towards few rather than many. The House did comment that it does not view the request of the Synod for a prayer suitable for use when children are present as met by either of the prayers it has not cut out. I have given some impressions of the Synod debate on these elsewhere in this NOL, and have also revived memories of the text of the two prayers proposed, by setting them out (in small type) also.

What I am seeking to do here is to set the prayers in a larger context, as given to us in Synod by Trevor Lloyd when he introduced them. With a kind following wind, a Revision Committee could complete its task in time for the July group of sessions of General Synod. There will then be a Revision Stage. If all went well then, the prayers would be remitted to the House of Bishops for their last chance to touch them up; and they would then come to the November group of sessions (of the newly elected General Synod) for final approval—which could well give authorization in the first place until 31 December 2000, the date when all other currently authorized rites also lapse.

But it might not work out that way. The Revision Committee might have too hard a task to do to complete its work in time for July; or the Revision Stage in Synod might run out of time, or a second Revision Stage might be necessary; or all three of these contingencies might happen. Any one of these might take the prayers into Summer 1996 before authorization.

Meanwhile, we have reason to expect that the Commission will have started an initiation 'package' on its route through the House of Bishops to the synodical process; and coming up behind that there may well be marriage and funeral provisions. We also got a strong hint that the Commission is doing a polishing up job on the rest of Rite A, and will want to

get that into the process as early as possible during the next quinquennium. I guess one can be fairly confident that the three-year lectionary (known nowadays as the *Revised Common Lectionary (RCL)*) is also due for introduction at an early stage.

History only shows in this field that nothing is secure, no forecast can be confidently made. But now the revision era has begun, it would be a great help (to journalists as well as liturgists), if the Commission's hoped-for timetable for executing the task were set out. At least then, if it were not achieved, we could all see where the hold-up had occurred and would know where, if vindictive, to place the blame, or where, if constructive, to apply the crowbars.

NOL will be asking the chairman of the Commission to set out such a timetable (presumably after consultation with the Standing Committee of the House of Bishops), in order that we may all know where we are.

STOP PRESS: I find I am myself on the Revision Committee for the eucharistic prayers, so it will now be the stable-boy reporting on the form of the horses.

We hope we are not over-given to self-congratulation. However, this issue completes twenty years of NOL, published once a month since January 1975 without interruption. Whilst we do not have as yet that complex index to the journal's 240 issues which one kind correspondent recently suggested, we do hope to have a bumper edition to begin 1995.

The first issue of all recorded the passage of the Worship and Doctrine Measure through the Commons in December 1974 (it came into force on 1 September that year). Thus NOL itself starts from the same constitutional watershed as current liturgical revision does, and has kept the news flowing whilst liturgical revision and renewal of worship has been flowing too. That same first edition of NOL also recorded the latest ICET texts, which were to be published later in 1975 in the revised edition of *Prayers we have in Common* (SPCK, 1975), thus beginning our declared policy of getting ahead of official channels with the news whenever we can. There was also a review in issue no. 1 of the symposium on Series 3 communion, which Ronald Japser had edited, namely *The Eucharist Today: Studies in Series 3* (SPCK). It was in that book that Leslie Houlden produced his attack on liturgical texts as too conservative. His essay was called 'Liturgy and her Companions'—and was in my view a dangerous attempted stab in the back by a member of the Commission who had himself signed the texts. (I have twice since in print tried to refute his argument that liturgy should not describe creation, virgin birth or resurrection as though they were actual 'events' of the past.)

Of course NOL could never have been launched if there had not been behind it three years of build-up by Grove Booklets which produced a direct mailing market of those who took 'Ministry and Worship' booklets monthly on standing order. These had started on 31 December 1971 when the ARCIC I Agreement on the Eucharist was published, and Julian Charley's short commentary in that Booklet scooped the pool. NOL simply then went out to standing order customers (as it still does), but it has since built up its own direct mailing on subscription, its own overseas airmail clientele, and its own role (with the Liturgical Commission's backing) as the means of inter-diocesan exchange.

And this year I can wish you a happy Christmas and expect it to get to you in time. I do so wish.

Colin Buchanan

The thrust of my argument from history is that

1. We need not be bound by one Hippolytan structure, but should be open to a certain amount of variety.
2. We should have at least some prayers which reflect the deep underlying Trinitarian structure of the Eastern tradition.
3. We can see the attractiveness of having only one set of words of institution, but we need to recognize that the recitation of one identical institution narrative may appear to align us with one particular view of consecration. We believe we should allow for other views of consecration which look to the whole action of thanksgiving—supplication—breaking—sharing. This would mean the institution narrative could then vary—as it does in the Gospels—and be in the same style as the rest of the prayers.
4. It is possible that the ancient tradition of a variable section of praise and thanksgiving in the preface may be one way of handling the varied needs of different communities, including children. This is not one of the possibilities before you today, but it was at a much earlier stage of drafting one of the possible ways of using what became Eucharistic Prayer 1 in the July booklet: we felt this was ahead of where the church is at, and so took it no further: members must tell us if we got it wrong.

This leads to what I want to say about language. It has been so good to be reminded in our worship this morning that we are one church with different cultures. Some kind of variable preface would be one way of getting various cultural groups to make the eucharistic prayer their own, without creating the kind of division that is already happening with people writing their own complete eucharistic prayer or importing one from elsewhere.

The *Faith in the City* report asked for language that was less conceptual, more concrete, more pictorial. Others have asked for language which children can understand, though recognizing the problems of producing one prayer which is all right for children of different ages—and it is important to note that only the first of the two prayers we have today was written with children in mind.

When we look at language, we need to look at three things:

First, can the individual words be understood—and yet is it right to exclude words like covenant, or grace or forgiveness?

Second, is the sentence structure right?—and yet if everything is in very short sentences we lose all sense of rhythm; so we have deliberately varied it.

Third, do the images, concepts and pictures ring true to our largely non-biblical culture, and are there too many of them for the mind to grasp at one go? And yet if everything is plain, you lose all sense of mystery of poetry, all sense of growth either into the rich biblical background or into the range of different images in the text.

We were very encouraged in meeting with members of the Voluntary and Continuing Education Committee for the Board of Education recently, to find agreement that we do not want a prayer—or prayers—in a lowest

Go back to the second century and Justin Martyr gives you a delightful description, some of which you will recognize as Rite A:

‘When we have ended the prayers, we greet one another with a kiss. Then bread and a cup of water and of mixed wine are brought to him who presides . . . , and he takes them and offers praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at some length. . . . When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present give their assent by saying “Amen”.’

Here we have a familiar pattern: intercessions—peace—thanksgiving—distribution. Some people think they can see a straight line of development from the Jewish meal prayers, through descriptions like that of Justin and of the Didache to Hippolytus and the eucharistic prayer of St. Basil. These prayers, like the Jewish prayers, move from thanksgiving to supplication, from a theological praise to the creator through Christological thanksgiving (concluding sometimes with the Sanctus), through to supplication for the gathering of the church. As the prayers develop, the Christological thanksgiving climaxes in the narrative of institution, which is followed by a sentence combining the ideas of remembering, offering and thanksgiving. The prayer at that point turns to supplication and the invocation of the Spirit on the church. This Trinitarian pattern is the same as in the baptismal creeds—and it is the pattern which is reflected in both of the eucharistic prayers before you today, and in two of those which you don’t see before you today. And this Trinitarian pattern is probably more important than where you put—or whether you have—some of the other bits and pieces. Some of the early prayers had the Sanctus, others didn’t; most had an institution narrative, but some didn’t, including the Jerusalem rite on which the liturgy of St. James was based. There was far more variety, even on matters which many today regard as essential.

But note one more bit of history, which shows why the Rite A interpretation of Hippolytus messes up the Trinitarian pattern. In the Western tradition, as the Roman Church abandons Greek forms at the end of the fourth century and begins to use Latin for its eucharistic prayers, we find Ambrose speaking of praise to God, which still seems to have been variable and therefore unwritten: what is written down is the part which remains the same, which is the supplication, and the narrative, also written, becomes located within this part, instead of being the Christological climax to praise and thanksgiving. It is but a short step from this to losing the praise altogether (and Cranmer’s prayer, betraying his Western medieval origins, has no real praise) and to seeing the prayer, not as eucharist/thanksgiving, but as a prayer of consecration, of which the most important and performatory words are the institution narrative, together with manual acts. This fundamentally different use of the institution narrative demands in Rite A an invocation of the Spirit before it as part of the consecration, and this adds to the dislocation of the Trinitarian pattern.

Underlying much of our debate today will be the question: What do you have to do, to have a eucharistic prayer? Is there one ancient pattern by which we are bound? Does it always have to be the same? Particularly if we have children present, are there some bits we can leave out? Do we need all those words? Who can join in?

This month’s publication . . .

. . . is not a Worship Booklet nor a Joint Liturgical Study—the December Liturgical Study has been swallowed up by the double-size number, 29-30, published in September, *On Baptismal Fonts—Ancient and Modern*, by S. Anita Stauffer.

. . . and next month’s

is Worship Series no. 131, *The Lord’s Prayer in the Church of England*, by Colin Buchanan. Curiously, there has never been an official study about the text of the Lord’s Prayer, ever since liturgical revision started. COB here attempts to fill the gap in the defences, and is unashamedly advocating the phasing out of the ‘traditional’ text and the universal use of a modern one. There is a paradox in this, in that the use of a modern text would be much more easily furthered if the Roman Catholics in England and Wales went over to such a text—yet, if they do, they will almost certainly adopt ‘Save us from the time of trial/and’. That will create a difficulty—but, says COB, it is *not* a difficulty which should cause us to react back into ‘Our Father, who art . . .’. That text must die, and every strenuous effort made to bring the Church of England into a modern use.

. . . and renewing your sub for 1995

should be done now if not already completed. Our subscription is unchanged from 1994, a rare bonus. Or give your vicar/curate/reader a sub for Christmas. Details at the bottom of page 12.

WHAT IS THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION UP TO?

Following the meeting of DLC representatives in October, the PRAXIS meeting on key issues in liturgical revision on 12 November offered a further chance to over 50 people to learn from Michael Perham and David Hebblethwaite what is planned (I was there as a makeweight, but these two are near to the action).

Michael Perham kicked off by asking us to work in groups at what we thought were the strengths—and weaknesses—of the ASB. The process of feeding in the answers from the groups confirmed the interest in the very areas in which the Commission was eager to report:

- (i) Calendar, lectionary and collects: here the three-year *Revised Common Lectionary* seems almost certain to win the day. Collects, we were told, will be re-sorted once themes have been abolished from Sundays, and will more than likely re-appear on the Sunday they once had in the BCP. We are even likely to go back to Sundays after Trinity (not if I can help it—COB).
- (ii) Initiation: the outline of possible contents of an initiation ‘package’, such as was given to the DLCs’ meeting last month, is published overleaf. The first drafts of rites exist.
- (iii) Offices: Celebrating Common Prayer holds the field.
- (iv) Funerals: there was much criticism of the ASB rite.

David Hebblethwaite explained the synodical processes, and the present speed of production by the Commission and of slow passage through the House of Bishops (often with referring back to the Commission, or of running a preliminary stage in Synod as with the eucharistic prayers) leaves a strong suspicion that it will prove difficult, if not impossible, to get into place everything that is needed for 1 January 2001. Some stopgap arrangement will be needed, or we shall find ourselves with but 1662 . . .

CHRISTIAN INITIATION—TABLE OF CONTENTS OF INTENDED LITURGICAL COMMISSION REPORT

1 Theological Introduction

2 Holy Baptism

- (1) Outline structure
- (b) Introductory Note
- (c) The Order for Baptism
- (d) Table of Readings
- (e) Propers for the Baptismal Seasons
- (f) Recalling Baptism in the Sunday Assembly

3 Confirmation, Reaffirmation and Reception

- (a) Outline structures
- (b) Introductory Note
- (c) Confirmation
- (d) Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist
- (e) Confirmation, Reaffirmation and Reception
- (f) Table of Readings

4 Supporting Enquirers

- (a) Introductory Note
- (b) Welcome of an enquirer
- (c) Prayers for those exploring the Way

5 Supporting candidates for baptism, confirmation etc.

- (a) Introductory Note
- (b) Rite of decision/call
- (c) Rites and prayers before baptism etc.
- (d) Rites and prayers after baptism etc.
- (e) Affirming the call to mission
- (f) Table of Readings

6 Rites surrounding baptism of infants

- (a) Introductory Note
- (b) Prayers during pregnancy
- (c) Thanksgiving for birth or adoption
- (d) Welcome and support of parents/godparents
- (e) Pre-baptism prayer service
- (f) Rites in stages
- (g) Rite of welcome and reception at Sunday eucharist

7 Reconciliation and Restoration

- (a) Introductory Note
- (b) Diocesan Rite
- (c) Parish Rite
- (d) Individual Rites
- (e) Table of Readings

TREVOR LLOYD'S INTRODUCTION TO THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS IN SYNOD

Members will recognize these two eucharistic prayers as being part of a larger package of eucharistic material before us in July which included five eucharistic prayers, acclamations and words for the breaking of bread and the distribution of communion, together with introductory material and pastoral suggestions for Eucharists when children are present. May I remind the Synod that what we are seeking to do is to authorize some prayers for a period of less than five years to give us some idea of the pattern of eucharistic prayers which the Church needs in the books which are due to replace the ASB in the year 2000. It may help the Synod to know that the proposals for revision of Rites A and B on which the Commission is currently working—and which should come to Synod within about three years—are fairly conservative. It is largely in this area around the eucharistic prayer that we see the need for slightly more variety, which might be provided by introducing one or more of these new prayers and combining or omitting some of the present ASB prayers: there is no suggestion that we will simply add a whole range of new prayers to the existing ones in 2000, though Synod will of course have the opportunity of taking those decisions when the time comes.

It is important that we put what we are doing today into a much wider context, and so I want to say a few words about the historical structure of eucharistic prayers and a few words about the complex issue of the language of eucharistic prayers. Last time I stood here introducing a piece of liturgical business it was *A Service of the Word*, which was overwhelmingly welcomed by the Synod and the Church at large as bringing a further measure of freedom into our worship. The thinking that led to that pattern was based on an examination of the historical development of the Word Service from the time of Justin Martyr in the second century onwards. The possibility of having it as a first part of the Holy Communion was based on the pattern of the *missa catechumenis*, when those enquiring or under instruction about the Christian faith left before the holy mysteries. The catechumenate is once again a familiar word to us, a word we will meet again when the Synod debates the issues around initiation and Christian nurture. It so happens that some of these second or fourth century patterns clearly meet the need for the Church today whose missionary and evangelistic situation and position in society is simply not the same as it was at the end of the middle ages when the Reformation happened and our traditional Prayer Book services were provided for a 'Christendom' situation.

It is the same with eucharistic prayers. But there are dangers in simply going back into history and looking for some standard 'original' eucharistic prayer. Hippolytus' third century prayer is the basis for the first three prayers in Rite A, which came together at a time when some thought his prayer was the earliest and therefore normative. But when you examine it you find Hippolytus put it forward as a sample for a bishop to use at his ordination. Because it was a model and the preface at least would have been extempore, we don't have the text of the spontaneous prayer modelled on it. Because it was for a special occasion it was not necessarily what they usually did on Sundays. And because it was an ordination, you find the bishop doing the third century equivalent of the Declaration of Assent, and working his way through the credal statement of the mighty acts of God—the creed itself wasn't yet part of the service. But in Rite A on Sundays we've already said the creed, and this interpretation of Hippolytus actually disturbs one of the ancient rhythms of the prayer.

historical introduction to them. This is a matter to be taken up between the Commission and the House of Bishops. After that, speakers were mildly appreciative, though some were still hungering after that elusive text 'for use when children are present', and others had a slight instinct for texts not before the Synod, such as they had seen last July. There was a fear or two about the epiclesis, a desire to present Jesus as 'victim', and an on-running worry about poetry and resonance. Perhaps the more memorable flavour of the debate is best conveyed by some quotes:

COB (if I may be allowed): 'The line "Pour out your Holy Spirit over us and these your gifts" always reminds me of custard.'

Hilary Unwin: 'There is a giggle-factor in "the silent music of your praise"—if it is silent, how do you know it is music—it might be prose? And it is much worse if it also "echoes" ...'

Osmond Aisbitt: 'It is important that a eucharistic prayer should, so to speak, ring bells at the right places.'

Edward Dixon: 'Meaning depends upon context. I am a prison chaplain. Where I am "Do not bring us to the time of trial" can only mean one thing.'

Rodney Schofield: 'Why do I have to give thanks for "dry land"—I want to give thanks for wet and boggy land?' and 'Why do I have to say "As a mother tenderly gathers her children"—mothers usually gather their children with a curse or a clip round the ear?'

The Bishop of Ely: 'Speaking of poets I once took W. H. Auden out to a meal and introduced discussion by saying I gathered he was on the PECUSA Liturgical Commission. He replied: "I gave it up: I've joined the Orthodox: liturgical revision is a clerical hobby".'

Michael Perry (Rochester): [After pointing out how many lines had been criticized] 'Can the Commission get good advice?'

The text was approved for 'General Consideration' with only a handful of votes against, and now goes to a Revision Committee. Suggested amendments go to the Secretary General of Synod not later than Tuesday 3 January. Readers of NOL should write in, whether on Synod or not.

Other glimpses of liturgical issues came in other debates. The debate on the cathedrals was eaten up by examining the 'governance' of them, with differing views as to whether or why they needed to be so separate from the life of their various dioceses. Worship was only mentioned in terms of the thousands who came, the music, and, once or twice, the choir-school.

So we came on the last day to the Private Member's Motion:

'That this Synod request the Standing Committee to bring forward proposals to allow divorcees to be remarried in the church of England.'

There are great problems in this motion as to what such 'proposals' would be. They could hardly be an amendment to the Law of the land, as the Law already provides for this. They could, I suppose, be a solemn 'Act of Synod', rescinding the old resolutions of the Convocations. The debate, went back and forth and ended with the issue being remitted to the House of Bishops.

The diocesan motions now include *five* about the admission of children to communion prior to confirmation. There can be no precedent for such a concerted rush of simultaneous and spontaneous synodical action about an issue has not been referred to them.

8 Wholeness and Healing

- (a) Introductory Note
- (b) A Public Rite
- (c) Individual Ministry
- (d) Additional resources—laments?
- (e) Table of readings

9 Additional Resources

- (a) Baptismal Prayers
- (b) Baptismal Homilies
- (c) Baptismal Hymns
- (d) Penitential Prayers

NB. Since this list was issued on the DLC's day, it has become clear that the material will not be published as a single package, and some may never see the light of day at all—or only by unofficial publications. Note also the reference in 4(c) to 'the Way'—a clear hint to watch out for the catechumenate report (affectionately known as NIFCAT), *On the Way*, to be published early in the New Year.

COB

MORE FROM AUSTRALIA

We learn from Australia that Bishop David Silk's plea for an adapted ICEL eucharistic prayer, in the rites to be authorized by their General Synod in 1995, is not only not acceptable to the evangelical vigilantes in Australia, but is also a problem in relation to ICEL itself. The chairman of the Australian Commission, Canon Lawrie Baetlett, writes:

'As part of our process, we had begun negotiations with ICEL to see whether they might be willing to give permission for their prayer to be issued in a revised form by another church. It turns out that they are now considering whether they might do further work on this prayer themselves. Therefore, until they have resolved this matter, it would be clearly inappropriate for another church to work independently on a different revision. So you will see that our work on this prayer has now been put on hold until we have further word from ICEL.'

To an English observer of the Australian scene, this sounds remarkably as though there will now be no time to run the process in such a way as to bring an agreed adaptation of an ICEL prayer, the original text of which is still unknown, before their General Synod in mid-1995.

The Australian Commission has not been idle on the traditionalist front. We have been sent their *In Living Use* (E. J. Dwyer, 1994, iv/58pp., AUS\$6.95). This glossy and attractively printed collection of traditional (1662) rites in 1662 language sprang from a resolution in the 1662 General Synod meeting in Australia. On the other hand, the change-over to modern rites (even modernized 1662 rites) has appeared to be so widespread, if not exhaustive, as to raise questions about the kind of market that could exist for this to-day.

THE TWO PRAYERS IN SYNOD

A

The Lord be with you *or* The Lord is here.
and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give him thanks and praise.
We bless you, God of life,
creator of the universe.
We praise you for water and dry ground,
wind and sky.
We thank you for making all the peoples of the
world.

For the wonder of creation we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

You made our hearts to share your love,
to delight in each other's joy
and to feel each other's pain.

For your gift of love we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

Therefore with all your people in every age and
place
we join the saints and angels
in songs of everlasting praise:

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

This anthem may also be used
**Blessed is he who comes in the name of
the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest!**

Father, you love us so much that you gave your Son,
born of Mary, to live among us
and to die rejected on the cross.
You raised him in victory from the dead
to be with you in heaven for ever.

For your gift of Christ we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

At table with his friends
on the night before he died
Jesus took the bread and gave you thanks.
He broke it, gave it to them, and said
'This is my body, given up for you.'

When they had eaten, he took the cup of wine.
He gave you thanks, gave it to them, and said
'Drink this, all of you,
This is my blood of the new covenant,
shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of
sins.
Do this, whenever you drink it, in memory of me.'

For new life in Christ we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

B

The Lord be with you *or* The Lord is here
and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give him thanks and praise.

Blessed are you, Lord God, our light and our
salvation;
to you be glory and praise for ever!
From the beginning you have created all things
and all your works echo the silent music of your
praise.

In the fullness of time you made us in your image,
the crown of all creation.
You give us breath and speech that with all the
powers of heaven
we may find a voice to sing your praise:

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

This anthem may also be used
**Blessed is he who comes in the name of
the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.**

How wonderful the work of your hands, O Lord!
As a mother tenderly gathers her children
you embraced a people as your own...*

Insertions (a) optional here

From them you raised up Jesus, our Saviour,
born of Mary,
to be the living bread, in whom all our hungers are
satisfied...*

Insertions (b) optional here

On the night before he died,
he came to supper with his friends,
and taking bread, he gave you thanks.
He broke it and gave it to them, saying:
'This is my body, given for you.'*

At the end of supper, taking the cup of wine,
he gave you thanks and said:
'Take this, all of you, and drink:
this is my blood of the new covenant,
shed for the forgiveness of sins.
Do this in remembrance of me.'*

Great is the mystery of faith:

**Christ has died:
Christ is risen:
Christ will come again.**

So now we do this in memory of Jesus your Son:
We stand before you with this bread and this cup,
and proclaim the Lord's death until he comes again.
We praise you for Jesus our living Lord:
He is the one sacrifice who brings us peace with
you.

For the peace of Christ we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

Through him, risen and ascended,
you send your Spirit
to bring life to your people.
Come, Holy Spirit,
and feed us with the body and blood of Christ,
that we may live and grow in him.

For your gift of the Spirit we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

Unite us around this table
with your whole church in earth and heaven.
Bring us to feast in your kingdom,
with (N and) all the friends of Jesus our Lord.
There we shall rejoice with them for ever,
and sing you a song without end.

Glory and honour to you, Father,
through your Son
in the power of your Spirit,
for ever and ever
Amen. Amen. Hosanna in the highest!
Silence should be kept

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1994

General Synod met from 29 November to 2 December. The main liturgical item on the agenda was 'General Consideration' of 'Eucharistic Prayers'. The House of Bishops sent only *two* eucharistic prayers to Synod, despite the five that were laid before Synod in July, and despite Synod's urging them to bring forward 'up to five' of them. But of the five set out in July NOL, the present package contains only nos. 2 and 4. They were duly introduced into the Synod by Trevor Lloyd, the Archdeacon of Barnstaple, who is chairing the Steering Committee which now has to see the texts down their rock-strewn path through Synod. The texts are set out above.

The Archdeacon did a very fine job. He rudely banished Hippolytus, the reputed sire of three of the four eucharistic prayers in Rite A, to the sidelines, and took us back to Justin Martyr. He twitted the Synod with delicious pleasure as to how, in Justin's account, the president gave thanks 'at some length'. He stated that in prayer 1 (see July NOL) the Commission 'was ahead of the Church, so we took it no further'. He mentioned the responsive features of the prayers, but pointed out that these are mere echoes in the prayers we have, and we do not now have before us those prayers in which the responses took the action forward. He retained his dignity by giving no value-judgment to that loss, but one listener at least thought he detected some regretful sigh over the excissory action of House of Bishops. His whole speech is to be found on pages 9-12 below.

The debate began—actually with COB as first speaker. His line was to raise questions as to how the Commission had found itself introducing two prayers without any published explanation as to *why* the House of Bishops has reduced the number to two, or any published liturgical and

Father, we plead with confidence
his sacrifice made once for all upon the cross;
we remember his dying and rising in glory,
and we rejoice that he prays for us at your right
hand:

Pour out your Holy Spirit over us and these your
gifts,
which we bring before you from your own creation;
Show them to be for us the body and blood of your
dear Son...*

Insertions (c) optional here

By him, with him, and in him,
with all who stand before you in earth and
heaven,
we worship you, Father almighty,
in songs of everlasting praise:

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

Silence should be kept

*[Insertions to go at (a), (b), and (c) for the
'proper' occasions follow but are omitted
here.]*