

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 241

January 1995

Gavin Reid (on 'The Church for England') came on next with what was in effect the centrepiece of the whole programme. He expressed concern about the accessibility of Anglican worship for the 'fringe' person—and reckoned that both the Parish Communion ('The Lord's Service for the Lord's People on the Lord's Day') and full-blown charismatic worship had put up a barrier to seekers. He was pressed about this, insofar as it addressed communion, in question time, and confessed he was 'only raising a question we have to ask ourselves' and (as with Dick France) that his point had particular point in rural areas. In this he echoed the ACORA report . . .

Gavin Reid also held that, whereas he liked the theology of the BCP, it was not a book for a missionary church—and nor is the ASB, which is 'inward-turned'. The BCP is dinner-jacketed, and the ASB Sunday-suited, and we need to find more culturally adapted patterns. Again he was questioned as to his love of the BCP (for he had hinted at an unwelcome doctrinal shift) and replied 'No. As to the words, I am a Cranmer man, but actually the ASB suits to-day's people far better culturally, and the eucharistic prayer is a tremendous recitation of the gospel.'

He also had a couple of throwaway points: a firm word to say about the need for preservationists to see the *use* of church buildings and allow adaptation (see the stuff on Westminster Abbey earlier in this NOL—COB), and a passing call for everyone to be using the same Lord's Prayer by the year 2000 (greeted with acclaim, which was dampened by his addendum 'But it might not be the one you want' (and I hope it won't be the one his rural parishes probably want—see editorial above—COB)).

The responses to Gavin Reid included:

- Philip Hacking**, who so pulled his Reform punches that we could not see any basis of polarization (and only touched on worship in relation to denouncing inter-faith worship);
- Graham Cray**, who was on a much larger canvas, so again did not touch worship, but did say 'Hermeneutics is difficult when the cultural furniture is moving all round us';
- Sandy Miller**, who promoted Alpha Courses and 'Toronto' blessings without apparent reference to what happens in church on Sundays (though in fact it sounds as though 'Toronto' follows on the end of corporate worship).

The final afternoon involved **Michael Nazir-Ali**, who was exploring Christology and got involved in discussions of the inspiration of scripture, and **George Carey**, who in passing declared himself a supporter of a daily act or worship in schools (and got a patchy round of applause for it), and this appeared to be in crisp contrast to the statement of John Habgood a few days earlier in favour of less frequent acts of worship—though better ones!

The Archbishop did also make kind reference to evangelical engagement in liturgical renewal.

The worship of the Conference was in brief spurts, well-balanced, full-throated and glad-hearted, and much to be imitated . . .

ISSN 0263-7170

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

40p

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

Editorial

This month's publication gets itself into the Editorial, not only because it is by the editor of NOL (which it is), nor only because it is 40 pages long (which it is, but shouldn't be), but also because of the practical thrust to it. It is Worship Series no. 131, The Lord's Prayer in the Church of England, by COB. There has never been an official study about the text of the Lord's Prayer, ever since liturgical revision started, so I here attempt to fill the gap in the defences, and I am 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, for the ninth line 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 should be made to bring the Church of England into a modern use.

However, the writing of the Booklet (and the advice of my good friend, Michael Vasey) has drawn my attention again to the 1993 Statement by the Joint Liturgical Group providing both ancient and modern texts to be used in schools. (Their modern text was the Rite A one with 'Lead us not into temptation'—the easiest modern text for the lovers of the ancient to accept.) This recommendation, underwritten by our Liturgical Commission, was endorsed by the General Synod last July when it backed the recommendations of the Liturgical Commission in its report, *Language and the Worship of the Church* (GS1115):

'That the Church of England should welcome the initiative of the Joint Liturgical Group in urging that an agreed version of the modern Lord's Prayer should be taught in schools alongside the modified traditional version and that this initiative should be supported by the appropriate educational authorities.'

So we have: (a) an 'initiative' of the JLG (text in NOL in January 1994); (b) a recommendation by the Church of England Liturgical Commission (as above); (c) an endorsement of that (without a count) by General Synod (see report in NOL in August 1994); (d) some modest elaboration of the points at issue in my Grove Booklet (as advertised above), *The Lord's Prayer in the Church of England*.

The question I ask here is whether anyone has any actual responsibility for furthering it. I suggest that Diocesan Liturgical Committees may be just the right people to try—and I suspect that there are some well able to drag themselves from reinventing Institution services and put some muscle into it. Suppose, for the sake of argument, every DLC debated the issue;

suppose this debate led in turn to correspondence with the Diocesan Director of Education (particularly in respect of Church schools); and suppose that in some cases at least this led to correspondence with LEAs (and even with individual schools). Such correspondence should have the policy of General Synod (and thus of the Church of England—indeed of ‘the established’ Church!) central to the pressure it seeks to bring to bear on schools.

Would it be too much to hope that the action might be paralleled and reinforced by central action? Could not the chairman of the Liturgical Commission, aided by that Synod vote, be pressing the Synod’s Board of Education to make strong moves towards both the Government department and also the Diocesan Directors?

What would ensue? Would any secular authority be sufficiently resourced to be able to reply: ‘Ah, but your “temptation” text is only interim, and we know you want “Do not bring us to [or “Save us from”] the time of trial” in the long run. Get your own act together, and know and say what you *really* want, and you will find us more than willing—but meanwhile do not be surprised if we are cautious, for which the answer lies in your own hands.’ We would be interested to hear of such.

But the issue of the possible replies will never arise unless there are initiatives taken. NOL would be delighted to hear of both national and diocesan initiatives, including the actual text of letters and responses of addressees. (In one or two dioceses—not least one in East Anglia—there may be local courtesies to be observed before being so bold, but the resolution of General Synod is pretty clear.)

Above all, we would be delighted in 1995 to be recording practical *results*. Do let us know.

Colin Buchanan

A BIRTHDAY GREETING FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION

Twenty years is no mean achievement for a newsletter, but NOL has earned its place, and kept it, as an indispensable part of the Church of England’s liturgical scene over these fast-changing years. The Church owes Colin Buchanan’s nose for news, exuberant—if sometimes combative—style and love for the Church’s liturgical expression of its developing life and witness a big thank you.

Why has a newsletter lasted so well, and avoided the Scylla and Charybdis of a glossy magazine with pretentious articles and big names, or personal platforms—a monthly version of those newsletters you get in Christmas cards which tell you how perfect everybody else’s families are!?

First, because it is essentially a *newsletter*. It comes out only days after it is put together, and chronicles the latest state of play, with a good bit of attention to what is going on in the rest of the Anglican Communion, and in the world wide Church. When there isn’t much news, COB dreams it (or sometimes invents it!) and that sometimes makes even better reading!

What had precipitated it all? It looks as though the triggering came from a series of differing news items amongst Anglican evangelicals:

- firstly, there had been division among evangelicals over the ordination of women, leading to the formation of Reform, a protest group which has virtually accused all other evangelicals of abandoning the Bible, and going off into trendy causes without biblical warrant—and thus of turning soft on homosexual practices. Reform has raised questions about the local church declining to pay part or all of diocesan quotas, in order to put resources into more obviously worthwhile projects;
- secondly, there has been both an interest in the so-called ‘Toronto’ blessing, and also a genuine worry about charismatics from all sorts of sources;
- thirdly, there has been a suggestion from Reform—but not only Reform—that evangelicals compromise their principles when they become bishops;
- fourthly, the whole set of issues was shot through with an awareness of the task of evangelism—and this in turn led to questions about contemporary culture and the context of mission;
- fifthly, there are ecclesiological questions underlying most of the above, and evangelical Anglicans have known since Keele (in 1967) that they had little formulated ecclesiology—though there was one incidental kind reference to Tim Bradshaw’s book, *The Olive Branch*.

What did all this mean for liturgy? Not a lot! I was left to reflect that, had the conference taken place twenty-five years ago, then liturgy would probably have been to the forefront, and divisions over its revision would have been revealing themselves everywhere. As it was, I think no-one had put liturgy on the agenda, and no-one had specifically invited evangelicals on the Liturgical Commission to attend and both hear the argument or answer for their work (two of them were there).

So how did the issues of worship crop up? Only in passing, and so I list them as they came:

Christina Baxter (on ecclesiology) said our worship is biblical, that the cross and resurrection lie at the heart of baptism and communion, and that the Church year is a kind of witness to biblical truth.

Michael Turnbull (on the Turnbull Commission or organization) said that a commitment to providing worship in each place meant that local economics alone could not dictate where and when worship should be offered.

Dick France (in a Bible reading on Mark 9.38-41) reverted to what he was taught at Theological College over thirty years ago, namely that all English people showing any signs of wanting ministry of any sort from the Church should be treated on the ‘Charitable Assumption’ that they are believers. This principle, he said, was not only wise then, but was still applicable to-day. I found myself with two difficulties about this, which I put to Dick—firstly, that it was more a ‘formal assumption’ than a charitable one (not that it was uncharitable, but that the charitable issue does not bear on it); and, secondly, that it is only directly applicable to-day in deep rural areas, and that out, sociology of religion has so moved on in thirty odd years as to invalidate the principle in towns. Dick, who is leaving Wycliffe Hall to go to some tiny rural Mecca in deepest Herefordshire, agreed that it was perhaps that context he had had in mind . . .

The Bishop added:

'My understanding is that Mr. Blake is *not* claiming to offer any services in the name of the Church of England. My hope would be that this is always made clear to persons attracted by his advertising literature'.

Thirdly, it has to be said that, though this kind of freelancing cannot be stopped in a free country, there is something in his frankly commercial offers which not only smacks of financial piracy but is also difficult to swallow on theological grounds. Do the baptisms he performs have any undertakings with reference to the fellowship of the people of God? (That is a question quite apart from whether he charges for them—which he apparently does.) We do not know whether he is being asked to do funerals, though this is the area where, if he got round the undertakers (which he ought not to be able to do), he has most chance of earning something for nothing . . .

COB

DIOCESAN REPORTS

It is part of the role of NOL to carry regular diocesan reports, and in theory we have a rota which calls upon each DLC to report once every two years. This month marks the beginning of the third two-year cycle, and we have taken steps to be in touch with each DLC to persuade them to contribute, and to get that flow of information going which will enable them genuinely to help each other (to which the Bishop of Salisbury refers in his letter above). We may even start naming those who do not fulfil their promises . . .

Whilst we are raising DLCs, are there any who have plans for a liturgical commemoration of the tenth anniversary of *Faith in the City*? Please write in.

TURNING FULL CIRCLE

Those with long memories have asked if we will restore 'Laughter in Liturgy'. The response is 'Yes, willingly; but don't expect the harrassed editor to invent the jokes—send 'em in yourselves'.

THE EVANGELICAL LEADERS' CONFERENCE

This Conference covered 24 hours at Westminster Chapel (famous to the elderly for the ministry of Martyn Lloyd Jones) and attracted around 1200 participants. It arose from a private initiative in which evangelical bishops were prominent and Michael Baughen, Bishop of Chester, was the convenor. The very growth of numbers created a problem, for it inhibited inter-action, but it reflected a great desire for enlightenment and leadership from a large constituency. (Bishops were very visible in purple shirts—quite a gaggle of them.) So how were they truly to confer and engage with each other?

The answer was, of course, that they couldn't and didn't, but instead took in a non-stop torrent of good-to-excellent papers. The presentations came virtually end to end and raised real possibilities of indigestion. I am told I was asleep when George Carey made kind reference to Grove Booklets (actually the Ethics ones). I don't admit to this, but failed to note the reference.

Secondly, it publishes texts that are emerging, especially those that break new ground, whether the genesis is in the Anglican tradition or not. In spite of a world wide network of scholarly liturgical archaeologists, there is no ready forum for the exchange of news on the current state of pragmatic and pastoral results of liturgy in the service of the church's worship today when the more general reader can get a feel for what is going on.

Third, it provides the Diocesan Liturgical Committees a chance to share good practice, exchange ideas and needs, and move beyond the endless drafting of services for Institution and Induction and concentrate on our key function. How can we help parishes and communities to offer the best worship they can?

This is an area that could expand; the liturgical 'coaching'—helping to establish good practice in different traditions in a way which builds on a particular Church or community style, but relates that to universal norms of good practice and a clearly articulated theology—was never needed more. It is not just in imparting the skills of creating a satisfactory liturgical shape on the word processor, it is learning to score, arrange, orchestrate, produce—the images are legion—the basic text so that people who come together to worship are held, challenged, renewed and taken beyond where they could ever dream of getting by themselves.

That is why questions about musical style, gesture and vesture, and the way the church building is ordered—for example—are every bit as important in forming the community as it offers its worship as the central question of texts.

Texts remain crucial—and not just the authorized texts, but the texts of variable prayers, hymns and songs. It is the texts which form and carry the church's doctrine and inevitably the Liturgical Commission spends much of its time working in this area.

But its partnership with the Diocesan Liturgical Committees and with the wider body of consumers who take NOL, is a significant part in this developing process just because NOL can enable swift response and dialogue. Long may it continue.

With a substantial revisions being made to the ASB over the next five years before the year 2000, the Liturgical Commission has a tight timetable ahead. And in response to a question from Canon Smith at last November's General Synod, asking for regular updates on what was happening. I hope the Commission will be in a position to share its timetable for this work as soon as possible, so that parishes as well as DLCs can have some idea of which draft to expect when, and the Commission can get as much feed-back as possible in the early stages after draft texts have been published, so that what is eventually brought for final approval has had as much consumer testing as possible.

Let us hope that NOL's unofficial and independent status will continue to be as creative in this next stage as it has been over the past twenty years.

+ David Sarum

TWENTY YEARS OF NOL—A QUICK SURVEY OF THE 'NEWS'

- 1975:** Jan—new ICET texts; Feb—Synod gives final approval to Canons on Worship, and to S3 Funeral; Mar—first Grove Liturgical Study, *Sacramental Initiation Complete in Baptism*, by Charles Whitaker; May—publication of Commission reports on Weddings and Infant Baptism; Jul—Synod gives final approval to S3 Morning and Evening Prayer; Sep—Worship and Doctrine Measure comes into force on 1 September, with the related Canons; Dec—reference to biography of Henry de Candole.
- 1976:** Feb—Synod adopts concept of ASB; Jul—Synod rejects 'children at communion' (because of indifferent diocesan returns) and Series 1 and 2 Revised Communion (Rite B) gets final approval by the narrowest of margins (105-52 in the House of Clergy!); Nov—I persuaded the Synod to ask for an examination of the terms on which infants are accepted for baptism; Dec—publication of Grove Liturgical Study no. 8, *Hippolytus—A Text for Students*, edited by Geoffrey Cuming—far and away the best-selling Liturgical Study there has been in either that Series or the present one.
- 1977:** Feb—copies of the American BCP expected (still, of course, the 'Proposed' Book), also much discussion in NOL of baptism by submersion; Apr—quote from Stuart Blanch (at Nottingham NEAC) 'The Prayer Book now has to me the charm of total unfamiliarity'; Jul—Series 3 Marriage received final approval; the draft edition of *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB), the first worship book to employ the 'Frost' Psalter, became available (the Psalter was published in England itself in September); Nov—the Bishop of Durham (John Habgood) led the Synod into rejecting parallel columns and alternative versions of the Lord's Prayer; Dec—the diocesan synod of Christchurch, New Zealand, overwhelmingly passed a motion, desiring that Christmas Day should be kept on 25 June in the Antipodes.
- 1978:** Apr—the Minutes of the House of Bishops reveal that that House had deleted three draft eucharistic prayers from the six put up by the Liturgical Commission, and had tried to take the anamnesis in the first prayer back to Series 2 (but, we later learn, the Commission would not agree to this latter move, and came back strongly at the House. The minutes also record that the House was ready for experiments with the prayers it was rejecting, but simply did not want them in the ASB—though it does not appear how they could have otherwise been legalized!). The same minutes also record the famous foul deed of the restoration of Josephine Butler by a majority of one, after she had been deleted from the Calendar by the General Synod; Jul—General Synod voted not to have the modern liturgical Psalter in the ASB, and Series 3 Ordination Services and the Calendar, Lectionary and Rules to Order the Service were all finally approved (though there were ripples about Mrs. Butler); Nov—the famous 'trade-off' occurred in which Roger Beckwith and Brian Brindley made a double approach to the Revision Committee on the revision of Series 3 Communion, and put in an Hippolytan eucharistic prayer and the 1662-in-modern-language material.

Among the important appanages of the Church which have ceased to exist may be mentioned the Sacristy which stood in the angle between the north transept and the nave. This had disappeared at some date prior to 1662.

Unfortunately no views or plans of it are known to exist. But the scheme which has been put forward by the Dean and Chapter has more title than seems to be generally recognized to be regarded as a restoration of the Church to something more closely resembling its former condition.

The lessons of this are obvious: a building in use cannot be frozen in the course of its historical development to meet changing needs. Whilst no-one should want to cheapen the quality of a building, or to fasten severely clashing styles upon it, yet actual changing *use* ought to be allowed to call for alterations and additions to historic fabric—just as happened to Westminster Abbey from the mid-eleventh century to the early twentieth!

A ONE-MAN 'MINISTRY IN YOUR OWN HOME' SERVICE?

Various people ask about Jonathan Blake, the unchurched minister who has been getting some national publicity through his offers of a service 'in your own home'—and lives in Gillingham! I offer a little information, not in order to stir up interest but in the (dubious) hope of dampening it.

Firstly, there is a background. This man was a Northern ordinand, a graduate who went through St. John's College (I put it no higher than that) in my time. He was ordained in Bradford diocese on the say-so of Sheffield diocese and did two curacies in Bradford before moving to do a third in the city of Rochester. From there he went to an incumbency in Barnehurst in the Rochester diocese in 1988. He was arrested by the police in 1990 for daubing 'MENE MENE TEKEL UPHARSIN' on the walls of the House of Commons. He resigned his living in 1993 when his marriage broke up. He was provisionally expecting then to move to a curacy where his ministry was to have been rehabilitated, but the diocese did not persevere with this (for very good reasons). He then set up his independent ministry functioning from an address in Gillingham, and offering in a glossy brochure any number of churchly ministries available in your own home without the bother of going to church or satisfying any requirements.

Secondly, during Autumn 1994, during the vacancy in the See of Rochester, the Bishop's Press Officer met enquiries by issuing the following Press Statement:

MR. JONATHAN BLAKE

The Bishop of Tonbridge said that although Mr. Blake was ordained into the ministry of the Church of England in 1981, he did not now hold a licence from the Bishop of Rochester. Nor did he have permission to officiate in the diocese of Rochester.

This means that Mr. Blake may not legitimately offer to perform services according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Furthermore, it is my understanding that Mr. Blake has resigned his orders and that this resignation is being processed. The diocese of Rochester cannot accept any financial liability for any actions of Mr. Blake.

ON ADDING TO HISTORIC BUILDINGS

In our twentieth anniversary researches, our eyes wandered briefly to a *Crockford's* Preface, part of that in the 1930 edition. It ran as follows:

The Westminster Sacristy

Correspondence relating to the proposed new Sacristy at Westminster Abbey has dragged its slow length through the columns of the public press for a very considerable period. The arguments advanced by the Dean and Chapter have, however, remained unanswered; and, we venture to think, unanswerable.

1. That the increased and increasing use to which the Abbey Church is now put has made such additional accommodation absolutely necessary. (To ignore this fact would be on a par with denying that there has been any increase in the volume of traffic in the streets of London calling for fresh regulations during the present century.)

2. That every other possible site for the new building has been carefully investigated, and rejected for adequate reasons.

Opponents of the scheme have urged that the outline of a 'national monument' must be preserved as it is now for ever. But this principle—if it deserves to be called a principle—has notoriously been disregarded in that portion of the country to which some of its most vigorous champions appear to belong by birth.

Within living memory a Chapel to accommodate the Knights of the Thistle has been added to St. Giles' Church in Edinburgh, and a war memorial shrine has been erected in Edinburgh Castle. Both these outrages have, we believe, been received with general acclamation.

It is possible that some people are unaware of the changes which the Abbey Church has undergone since Henry III began to destroy a church which was already venerable to make room for his own more splendid erection. His work ended in 1269. In 1375 Simon Langham began the continuation of the nave westward, so skilfully that the difference in date between the two portions of the work is not easy to detect. The Confessor's Church did not disappear completely until 1388. The last piece of work to be done on the structure of the nave was carried out by Abbot Islip during the years 1504-6. The Chantry Chapel of Henry V had been added in 1438; the foundation stone of the great Chapel of Henry VII, which occupies the site of an older Lady Chapel, was laid in 1503.

The western towers were not completed before 1740.

The Church which we see to-day took very nearly five hundred years to reach its present form. Not one single stone of the original building is now visible to the eye of the passer-by. The fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and eighteenth centuries have all made their additions, so that the appeal to antiquity should encourage the twentieth to do likewise rather than deter it.

1979: Feb—the great Revision Stage of Series 3 Communion Revised began (with the Steering Committee receiving around 200 would-be amendments, and devising around another 100 as fall-backs or unitive ways through itself), and Series 3 Initiation rites gained final approval; May—these initiation rites failed to appear on the date scheduled, and NOL printed the infant baptism text (as well as a eucharistic prayer for use with children which was to be proposed as an addition to the eucharistic rite, though in fact this did not happen); Jul—the second half of the aforesaid Revision Stage (including the Lord's Prayer, and 'Lead us not into temptation'); Oct—beginning (on Ninth Sunday before Christmas) of ASB Calendar and Sunday Lectionary; Nov—the authorization for a ten-year period of all ASB services, the approval of the 'Frost' Psalter for inclusion in it, and the dramatic and well-publicized 'Petitions' calling upon the C/E to return to the AV and 1662.

[The next five years will be summarized in our February 1995 issue.]

OPTIONAL INSERTIONS FOR PRAYER 'B'

Prayer 4 of the five published in the July 1994 NOL is Prayer B of the two published in November 1994. These two (A and B) are now before the Revision Committee of General Synod, and the Committee has currently five dates in its diary from January to April, and in theory could then finish its work and report to the July session of General Synod. The one item which is under consideration but has not been seen by readers of NOL is the 'Insertions' to go into Prayer B. We have omitted these up till now through lack of space, but are glad now to complete the picture. It is too late to make submissions about them, but readers may like to make a note of the character of them. NOL, being so strictly on the legit side of the fence, cannot assist you to use them, but, following a time-hallowed formula, we put these out 'for study purposes only' . . .

1 *Feroa*

- (a) You filled them with longing for a peace without fear,
a justice that would never fail.
- (b) He offered his life for sinners,
and with a love stronger than death
he opened wide his arms on the cross,
- (c) May we who eat and drink in his presence
be constant in prayer and strong in love
until all creation is made one in Christ.

2 *The Kingdom, Advent*

- (a) You spoke to them through prophets
who looked for the day of deliverance to draw near.
- (b) He came among us as your servant,
to be Emmanuel, your presence with us.
- (c) Gather your Church from the ends of the earth
into your Kingdom,
that we, with all your people,
may share in Christ's eternal banquet.

3 *Incarnation*

- (a) You taught them to hope for salvation,
the joy of every longing heart.
- (b) He was born in the poverty of a stable,
to make known the riches of your Kingdom.
- (c) As we break this bread and share this cup,
may we know the presence of your Word made flesh.

4 *Baptism*

- (a) You called them in covenant
to be a light to all the nations.
- (b) Through him we are saved for ever
and born again to righteousness
- (c) By the baptism of water and your Holy Spirit
may we witness to your truth in all the world
until he comes in final victory.

and/or

Remember your Church in every land,
redeemed by the blood of your Christ.
Reveal her unity, guard her faith,
and preserve her in peace.
Remember all who minister in your Church ...
Remember those baptised today ...
... in Christ Jesus our Lord.

5 *Candlemas*

- (a) In worship and sacrifice they drew near,
entering your gates with thanksgiving.
- (b) Brought to the temple in his mother's arms,
he was proclaimed as the light of all the nations.
- (c) As by your Spirit he was welcomed with joy
by Anna and Simeon,
so may we and all your people rejoice in your presence
and be changed from glory to glory.

6 *Penitence*

- (a) Again and again you forgave them
and restored them to your love.
- (b) By his death he broke the power of sin
and made us holy through his blood.
- (c) At this table make us one in Christ;
open to us a new and living way into your presence.

7 *The Cross, Passiontide*

- (a) When they turned away and rebelled
your love remained steadfast.
- (b) For our sins he was lifted up
that he might draw the whole world to himself.
- (c) Unite in his cross
all who share the food and drink
of his unending life.

8 *Resurrection*

- (a) You delivered them from slavery
and brought them to the promised land.
- (b) By his victory over the grave
he burst the gates of death for ever.
- (c) Shine through the darkness of our doubt and sorrow
that the light of his risen presence
may brighten the path before us.

9 *Bread of Life*

- (a) You fed them with manna in the wilderness
as they walked the pilgrim path in your sight.
- (b) He broke bread with those whom others scorned
and when the multitude were hungry
he fed them abundantly.
- (c) Make us one body, a holy and living sacrifice,
to serve you acceptably as a royal priesthood.

10 *The Vine*

- (a) You planted them as your own choice vine,
but again and again they turned from you in sin.
- (b) He is the true vine, your chosen one,
to whom we are joined to bear fruit in plenty.
- (c) As we taste and see that the Lord is gracious,
may we dwell in him, as he lives in us.

11 *The Spirit*

- (a) You promised to pour upon them your Holy Spirit,
that the young might see visions
and the old have dreams of your coming Kingdom.
- (b) He breathed upon his disciples the power of your Spirit
to proclaim the good news to all peoples.
- (c) Renew the life of your Spirit
in all who share this eucharistic feast.

12 *Trinity*

- (a) To them you revealed the glory of your Godhead
as they ate and drank in your presence.
- (b) He shared with us the unity and glory
which he enjoyed with you before the world was made.
- (c) By these holy mysteries enfold us in the love
which you have revealed in your Son and in the Holy Spirit.
May we find mercy and grace in communion with all your saints
in Christ Jesus for ever

13 *City*

- (a) You gave them the hope of a city
the place of unity and peace.
- (b) He gave up his life outside the city gate
and opened for all the way to heaven.
- (c) Dwell among us as we journey to the new Jerusalem
to be your people, where our God reigns for ever in Christ.

14 *The Saints*

- (a) You made them a holy nation
and brought them home victorious.
- (b) In him you have received us as your sons and daughters
and made us citizens of your Kingdom.
- (c) Gather us into communion with (N and) all your saints,
nourish and strengthen us in the life of heaven,
and confirm us in the faith and truth of Christ.