

GS 1822Y

Additional Eucharistic Prayers

Report of the Revision Committee

January 2012

GENERAL SYNOD

ADDITIONAL EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

REPORT OF THE REVISION COMMITTEE

Chairman:

The Bishop of Coventry

Ex Officio Members (Steering Committee):

The Bishop of Wakefield (Chairman)
Miss Joy Gilliver (*Chichester*)
The Revd Philip North (*London*)
The Revd Dr Tim Stratford (*Liverpool*)
Mrs Susan Witts (*Blackburn*)

Appointed Members:

Mrs Shayne Ardron (*Leicester*)
The Ven Paul Ferguson (*York*)
The Revd Dr Sandra Millar (*Gloucester*)
Mrs Kathy Playle (*Chelmsford*)
The Revd Fr Thomas Seville CR (*Religious Communities*)

In Attendance:

The Revd Christopher Woods (Secretary)
Sue Moore (Assistant Secretary)
The Revd Dr Anders Bergquist (Consultant)

1. A report by the Liturgical Commission entitled 'Additional Eucharistic Prayers' received First Consideration from the General Synod in July 2011 and was committed to a Revision Committee.
2. Proposals for amendment were received from the following members of the Synod under Standing Order 53 (a):

The Revd Janet Appleby (*Newcastle*)
Mrs Shayne Ardron (*Leicester*)
Mr Gerald Burrows (*Blackburn*)
The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham
The Revd John Cook (*Oxford*)
The Revd James Dudley-Smith (*Bath & Wells*)
Mrs Mary Durlacher (*Chelmsford*)
Mrs Sarah Finch (*London*)

Miss Emma Forward (*Exeter*)
The Revd Jonathan Frai (*Chichester*)
Mr Nick Harding (*Southwell & Nottingham*)
Mr Michael Heppleston (*Manchester*)
The Revd Richard Hibbert (*St Albans*)
Mrs Anne Martin (*Guildford*)
Mr Andrew Presland (*Peterborough*)
Mr Adrian Vincent (*Guildford*)
The Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (*Guildford*)
Mrs Ruth Whitworth (*Chelmsford*)

In addition, some proposals for amendment were received from the following people who are not Synod members:

Mr David Bell (*Adviser for ministry among children, Chester*)
Mr Steve Dixon (*Children's work officer, Manchester*)
The Revd Mark Earey (*Tutor in Liturgy, Queen's Foundation Birmingham*)

A submission from Mr Clive Scowen (*London*) was received after the deadline.

3. Standing Order 54 (b) requires the Committee to list in its report all the proposals for amendment received under Standing Order 53 (a), together with 'a summary of their reasons for accepting or rejecting such proposals, and for making such amendments'. Such a list and summary are provided in Appendix 1 to this report. In the main body of this report, all page and line references relate to GS1822A. In the Appendix, the references relate to GS1822.
4. The Committee agreed at the outset that it would also consider the proposals received from non-Synod correspondents, as well as Mr Scowen's submission.
5. The Committee met on two occasions in the autumn of 2011. Mr Michael Heppleston (*Manchester*), Mr Adrian Vincent (*Guildford*), Mrs Anne Martin (*Guildford*) and Mrs Sarah Finch (*London*) attended parts of the Committee meetings under Standing Order 53 (b) to speak to their submissions.
6. With the permission of the Chairman, the Revd Dr Anders Bergquist was in attendance as a consultant to the Steering Committee. The Committee is grateful to him for invaluable advice and assistance.

GENERAL COMMENTS

7. It was noted that the Eucharistic Prayers had been in the drafting process already for more than three years and that the texts, whilst not perfect, were at a very mature stage. The Committee agreed that the Synod debate in July 2011 was very positive and therefore a 'fine tuning' approach to the process of revision should be adopted rather than a radical 'unpicking' of the texts.
8. Some of the submissions included points which the Committee felt were relevant to the *Guidance Notes* rather than texts or rubrics. Production of *Guidance Notes* did not

however fall within the Committee's terms of reference. Any points raised by submissions which fell into this category would be forwarded to the Liturgical Commission to be considered for inclusion.

9. A detail raised by three of the submissions related to the removal of the square brackets in parts of the text, such as '*Holy, Holy, **Holy***' and '*Amen, Amen, **Amen***' (page 4, lines 12, 24 & 33; page 5, line 42; page 6, lines 7 & 13). Square brackets denote that the words contained in them may be used, but equally that they may be omitted. The Committee felt that it was more beneficial to retain the brackets for maximum flexibility and to meet the needs of different liturgical contexts.
10. One submission suggested that one Eucharistic Prayer would be sufficient, while another submission requested the addition of a third prayer that spoke more appositely to a child under the age of 10, and that the needs of adults who were not worship- or scripture-literate be considered. A further suggestion asked that the needs of adults with learning difficulties be taken into account. The Committee, however, concluded that these requests were beyond its remit.
11. Concern over the wording and position of the *epiclesis*¹ was a strand running through several submissions with regard to both Eucharistic Prayers. Some submissions argued that the Western position of the *epiclesis* (before the Narrative of Institution and *anamnesis*²) was preferable to the Eastern position (after the *anamnesis*) in Prayer One, while others questioned the inclusion of an invocation of the Holy Spirit at all. The Committee took note of these points, recognising that the while the Liturgical Commission had gone to great lengths to reproduce phrasing of existing authorized Eucharistic Prayers, it would be beneficial to re-examine the text in the light of submissions. More detailed comments are given later in this report when they relate to the individual prayers.
12. The Committee agreed with one proposal from the Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham relating to both prayers, that 'The Lord is here: his Spirit is with us' be included as an alternative to 'The Lord be with you: and also with you' as is the case with existing authorized Eucharistic Prayers.
13. Mr Adrian Vincent argued that the language of the current opening dialogue in both prayers might be too obscure for children to relate to. In discussion, the Committee came to the view that it would perhaps be unhelpful to disconnect children from the text of a dialogue common to all *Common Worship* Eucharistic Prayers and to which they would be exposed in many Church services. In resisting the suggested change, the Committee also recognized that children can learn in ways other than the verbal and are capable of grasping and growing into complicated concepts through familiarity and imagination. For the same reasons, the optional use of the *Benedictus* was maintained after the *Sanctus* in both prayers rather than removing it completely, which was suggested.

¹ *epiclesis* – invocation of the Holy Spirit over the gifts or over the people.

² *anamnesis* – the liturgical text which refers to the memorial character of the Eucharist.

14. One submission suggested that mention of Jesus' teaching and healing ministry be included in both prayers. The Committee noted that it was impossible to include everything in every prayer, that the prayers needed to be kept succinct and that they needed to be viewed in the context of the whole rite where other aspects of doctrine and theology could be drawn out, for example in the Liturgy of the Word or in the Prayers of the People.

EUCCHARISTIC PRAYER ONE

15. Two submissions expressed unease at the cumulative effect of the use of 'Father' in Prayer One and in particular in the lines of the pre-Sanctus where 'Father', 'strong' and 'king' occurred in close succession. While recognising the positive resonance of the *Trisagion*, and content that the First Person of the Trinity is named as 'Father' at other critical moments in the Prayer, the Committee has adapted the text at this point (page 4, lines 14-18).
16. One submission requested that a repeated refrain be incorporated into Prayer One. The suggested cue line ('Our God is holy') would have meant a complete re-writing of the prayer and so this submission was resisted.
17. There was some discussion of the line 'Jesus, Saviour, Mary's child' (page 4, line 27). One submission felt that the theology could be strengthened by adding the word 'Lord' before 'Saviour', while another suggested altering the phrase to become 'Jesus *our* Saviour...'. The question of whether or not to include the reference to Jesus being the child of Mary was also debated, but it was felt that to emphasise the Incarnation was important at this point in the prayer. The Committee agreed to alter the text to become 'Jesus our Saviour, Mary's child', both to further connect Christ's salvation to those who will pray the prayer, and also because the text flows more smoothly as a result of the possessive pronoun. Two further submissions suggested a more substantial change to these lines, but the Committee resisted these in favour of the amended text.
18. Two submissions requested that reference be made to the Ascension in the pre-Sanctus. The Committee had sympathy with this suggestion but, on reflection, it was felt that it was problematic to try and pack too much into what needed to be kept succinct. The point was repeated that not every doctrine needed to be mentioned in every prayer. The reference to the Ascension was therefore not included.
19. Three submissions highlighted the difficulty some children might face with the phrase 'fill us with power from on high'. The Committee thought that some children might interpret 'on high' too literally and spatially but was content to remain with biblical imagery. The Committee considered incorporating 'love' in addition to or even instead of 'power', but made the decision that there is in fact nothing negative for children in encountering power which is life-giving and fulfilling. The Committee changed 'fill' to 'clothe' (page 4, line 37), as the latter incorporates a Lucan reference (cf. Luke 12: 28) and signifies a more comforting but nonetheless strengthening characteristic of the Holy Spirit. A further submission which asked for a slight textual change by adding 'to' before 'fill us with power...' was resisted as it did not add anything substantial to the prayer.

20. The Committee did not accept a suggestion that ‘join the angels’ be replaced by ‘join *with* the angels, as it clutters the flow of the text. One submission requested a further inclusion of the response ‘*Holy, Holy, Holy*’ at the point of the Sanctus. This was also resisted as it was deemed vital that the mainstream ‘ordinary’ texts common to all Eucharistic Prayers be maintained.
21. The Committee resisted suggestions to swap ‘he’ and ‘Jesus’ (in lines 8 and 9 of page 5), as it was felt that the sentence did not need improvement. In the same portion of the prayer it was suggested that ‘Jesus shared a special meal with his friends’ should replace ‘Jesus shared a meal...’. The Committee resisted this proposal on the basis that ‘special’ would be incongruous in this context.
22. Several submissions offered alternative texts for or changes to the Words of Institution (page 5, lines 11-20). One submission suggested that ‘take and eat; this is my body...’ would be less cluttered than ‘take this and eat it, this is...’. The Committee agreed to this change. One submission asked for ‘Do this in remembrance of me’ to replace ‘Do this to remember me’, but the Committee resisted this on the basis that ‘to remember’ is, as the description of an action, much more direct, easier to recall and therefore a more suitable phrase for children to grasp than ‘in remembrance of’.
23. One submission requested that ‘*Amen, Amen, Amen*’ be inserted between the Words of Institution. The Committee resisted this as it would have broken the flow of the text and added unnecessary emphasis.
24. One submission asked for the words ‘poured out for you’ to be included in the phrase ‘This is my blood, the new promise of God’s love’, and two submissions suggested replacing ‘love’ with ‘forgiveness and love’, or ‘forgiveness’. These submissions were resisted by the Committee as the House of Bishops had specifically requested ‘covenant’ to be translated as ‘new promise of God’s love’. A further submission asked that this phrase be altered to ‘a sign of God’s love’, but was resisted for the same reason.
25. As indicated in paragraph 11 above, the Committee received submissions in respect of the wording of the first *epiclesis* and considered them carefully. The Committee agreed unanimously to redraft the *anamnesis* and first *epiclesis* in Prayer One (page 5, lines 36-40). It is hoped that the new wording is now more acceptable. The Committee decided not to move the position of the *epiclesis*.
26. The Committee was asked in no fewer than six submissions to review the words of the second *epiclesis* (invocation of the Holy Spirit over the people). One submission referred to working for ‘the peace of the earth’ as being a little ambitious. The Committee decided to change ‘peace’ to ‘healing’, which has helpful biblical resonances (cf Revelation 22:2). Suggestions which requested changes to the final doxology were resisted as it would have added unnecessary words when the text already adequately states what is essential.

EUCCHARISTIC PRAYER TWO

27. The majority of the submissions received in respect of Prayer Two related to the phraseology of the *seder*-style questions, the short proper prefaces, the words of Institution, and the final section of the prayer. The Committee devoted an entire meeting to considering the submissions in respect of Prayer Two.
28. The Committee considered several submissions relating to the wording of the optional questions (the issue of who would ask the questions and respond to them would be dealt with in the *Guidance Notes* as well as in the Notes which precede the Prayers themselves). The most problematic words highlighted by some submissions were ‘Listen’ and ‘hearing’. This was especially the case in respect of their impact on members of deaf communities in the Church of England. The Committee recalled the earlier consultations which the Liturgical Commission had held with a wide range of people in the initial drafting stages of the prayers. After several attempts to find alternative words for the responses, minor changes have been made. ‘Listen and you will hear’ is now ‘Listen, and we will hear’. The comma after ‘Listen’ was added deliberately to encourage a natural and dramatic pause when the prayer is being spoken.
29. Several members of the Synod offered specially-composed short proper prefaces for use in Prayer Two and the Committee is grateful to all who offered suggestions. A text by Mrs Anne Martin (*Guildford*) has been incorporated. It was noted that Note 3 permits proper prefaces to be composed locally for specific occasions. This will also be highlighted in the *Guidance Notes*. In light of this, the Committee was reluctant to include a larger number of prefaces for authorization or substantially to redraft every preface. In the first of the current prefaces, however, ‘star-lit sky’ has replaced ‘starry sky’ in response to submissions requesting such a change.
30. The Committee decided to remove the sub-headings to the proper prefaces, for example ‘for use in the country’, ‘for use in the city’, ‘at times of sadness’ and so on. It was felt that to restrict the prefaces to these locations and occasions would be counter-productive.
31. The Committee devoted a significant proportion of its time to producing a suitable ‘urban’-style preface (page 7, lines 35-38). It includes eschatological references which it hopes would be helpful in an urban context.
32. In order to reflect parity rather than difference, two submissions requested that the lines ‘You made us all, each wonderfully different’ (page 8, lines 14 & 15), be changed. The Committee resisted this because it felt that children should be encouraged to rejoice in their diversity.
33. The Committee considered one submission which suggested that the text of the immediate pre-Sanctus was grammatically complex. It was felt on reflection that these lines were succinct and rich and could not be improved upon.

34. One submission suggested that highlighting the theology of the cross was not child-friendly. The Committee took the view that even if the theology is difficult, it is from the gospels and therefore should not be changed or weakened. Conversely, another submission suggested that the theology of the Fall was not sufficiently present in the prayer. As a result the Committee decided to redraft the lines immediately following the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* (see page 8, lines 27-31).
35. The Committee was faced with a choice of whether or not to change the words of the *epiclesis* in Prayer Two in light of submissions (page 8, lines 33-35). Having redrafted the words of the first *epiclesis* in Prayer One, it was agreed unanimously not to amend the text in Prayer Two in order that theological breadth be maintained across the prayers.
36. One submission requested that the line ‘when darkness had fallen’ (page 9, line 2) be removed or changed, because it has negative connotations and that children might be scared of the ‘darkness’. The Committee decided to leave the text unchanged because it resonates with the Johannine reference and allows potential for use of the imagination.
37. Five submissions asked for the Words of Institution in Prayer Two to be reworded and in particular for ‘Do this to remember me’ to be inserted after the consecration of the wine (page 9, 9-12). The Committee decided not to make this change but rather to follow the Lucan model which does not repeat the instruction to remember a second time.
38. One submission requested the insertion of the word ‘supper’ into the line ‘After they had eaten, he took the cup of wine’, which was resisted on the basis that ‘supper’ refers to dinner in some modern-day contexts and a late evening snack before bed in others and is therefore confusing. Two other submissions asked for ‘wine’ to replace ‘cup’. Again, this was resisted because the word ‘cup’ is consonant with the scriptural texts.
39. The Committee considered several submissions which asked for slight changes in the wording of the *anamnesis*. These suggestions were resisted on the grounds that the text as it currently stood articulated all that needed to be said at this point in a suitably succinct way.
40. Having considered carefully the contents of seven submissions which related to the wording of the final section of Prayer Two, the Committee has produced a fresh version (page 9 lines 29-33). In particular, attention is drawn to the removal of the line which, in the words of one of the submissions, ‘replaces the Parousia by Millennium development goals’.

CONCLUSION

41. The Committee presents this account of the work it has done on the texts in the light of submissions received. It commends these revised texts for approval by the Synod and eventual authorization.

On behalf of the Committee

✠ **CHRISTOPHER COVENTRY**
Chairman

The Epiphany, 6 January 2012

General Comments:

From	Submission	Proposal
Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead	Consider providing a third prayer which speaks more into the life of an 8-10 year old.	It was agreed that these requests were beyond the Committee's terms of reference. See paragraph 10.
Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead	Consider needs of adults who are not worship- or scripture-literate	
Revd Janet Appleby	Consider adding adults with learning difficulties to rubric about use when significant numbers of children are present.	
Revd James Dudley-Smith	Keep bracketed material as optional to maximise usefulness of both prayers.	This was agreed. See paragraph 9.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	(Guidance Notes) Note 2: Suggested addition for end of note.	It was agreed that these points would be considered after work on the Prayers had been completed. See paragraph 8.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	(Guidance Notes) Note 3: Suggested addition to note.	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	(Guidance Notes) Note 17: Suggested addition to note.	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	(Guidance Notes) Note 23: Suggested amendment to note.	
Mr Michael Heppleston	Prefer the Western position of epiclesis rather than current (Eastern) position in Prayer One.	It was agreed that the Committee may wish to consider the wording of the epiclesis rather than its position, as there was currently a deliberate balance between the two prayers. See paragraph 11.
Miss Emma Forward	Why do we assume that so many children of 'Primary school age' would be ready to receive communion? Suggest broader wording that signifies that it is more important that "the mass is offered to God" rather than received by all present. Adapt wording accordingly.	It was suggested that this was a matter for the guidance notes. See paragraph 11.
Mr Adrian Vincent	Do not need two additional Eucharistic Prayers - dispense with Prayer Two.	Resisted. The House of Bishops had asked for two prayers to be provided. See paragraph 10.
Mr Nick Harding	Suggest having repeated refrain throughout Prayer One.	The suggested cue line would mean rewriting the prayer so the submission was resisted. See Paragraph 16.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P6 Ln 12 Omit brackets on 'Holy, holy, holy' and throughout Prayer One.	Resisted as the Committee had already agreed to retain the brackets for maximum flexibility. See paragraph 9.
Mr Nick Harding	P6 Ln 12 Omit brackets on 'Holy, holy, holy' and throughout Prayer One.	

Mr Andrew Presland	P7 Ln 38-49 & P10 Ln 33-35 Remove invocation of the Holy Spirit on the bread and wine in Prayers One and Two.	It was noted that the text of the epiclesis was deliberately the same as that used in existing authorized Eucharistic Prayers. The Committee agreed to consider the wording in Prayer 1 (as already agreed above), particularly as the epiclesis in Prayer 2 was already split. See paragraph 11.
Revd John Cook	P7 Ln 38-49 & P10 Ln 33-35 Remove invocation of the Holy Spirit on the bread and wine in Prayers One and Two.	

Specific comments on Prayer One:

From	Submission	Proposal
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P6 Ln 3-4 add 'The Lord is here/His Spirit is with us' as alternative.	This was agreed. See paragraph 12.
Revd Mark Earey	P6 Ln 3-4 allow 'The Lord is here / His Spirit is with us'	
Mr Adrian Vincent	P6 Ln 3-10 suggested replacement	Suggestions resisted as does not maintain resonance with existing Eucharistic Prayers. See paragraph 13.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P7 Ln 5-6 Delete	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P6 Ln 6-7 Suggest 'Be still in the presence of the Lord / For our God is a holy God' as alternative.	
Mr Michael Heppleston	P7 Ln 8 omit 'Father'	It was agreed that 'Father' was used frequently in the prayers. The Committee would bear this in mind when looking at the overall text of each prayer. See paragraph 15.
Mr Andrew Presland	P7 Ln 8-9 Change 'he' in Ln 8 to 'Jesus' and 'Jesus' in Ln 9 to 'he'.	Resisted: does not affect sense or clarity of the phrase. See paragraph 21.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P7 Ln 8-9 swap 'he' (ln 8) and 'Jesus' (ln 9)	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P7 Ln 9 Suggest 'Jesus shared a special meal with his friends'	Although suggested phrasing partly addresses the issue, 'special' was not felt to be the right word. Resisted. See paragraph 21.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P6 Ln 14-15 Delete. Or amendment needed if suggestion re Ln 3-10 accepted.	Resisted as consequence of decision re submission on lines 3-10. See paragraph 16.
Revd Mark Earey	P6 Ln 14-18 suggested rewording to avoid predictable male metaphor about God	Even though changing would lose reflection of Trisagion, this was accepted. See paragraph 15.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P6 Ln 21-22 Use two short sentences rather than repeat 'and'	Resist. Text needs longer sentences in places rather than shorter. See paragraph 17.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P6 Ln 26-31 Various suggestions offered.	Not accepted. See paragraph 17.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P6 Ln 26-32 Alternative text suggested	
Mr Clive Scowen	P6 Ln 26 replace 'you' with 'although we selfishly turned away from you, you did not abandon us but ...'	

Mrs Mary Durlacher	P6 Ln 27 Replace 'Mary's child' with 'Son of the Father'	Not accepted. Loses earthed-ness and adds extra 'Father'. See paragraph 17.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P6 Ln 27 suggest 'Jesus, our Saviour and Lord'	Accept 'our' but not 'Lord'. See paragraph 17.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P6 Ln 29-31 Like truthfulness and straightforwardness.	Noted.
Mr Clive Scowen	P6 Ln 29-31 suggested rewording	Lack of reference to Ascension noted. Suggested rewording/new line 32. See paragraph 18.
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P6 Ln 30 grateful for clarity of line.	Noted.
Revd Richard Hibbert	P6 Ln 31 delete 'in glory'	Committee agreed to consider rewording. See paragraph 18.
Revd Richard Hibbert	P6 Ln 32 insert 'and ascended to reign with you in glory'	
Mr Adrian Vincent	P6 Ln 35-37 alternatives to 'power from on high' suggested	'On high' too vertical. Committee agreed to consider rewording, possibly to 'power and love'. See paragraph 19.
Revd Mark Earey	P6 Ln 35-37 broaden reference to the Spirit so not just associated with power.	
Mr Clive Scowen	P6 Ln 36 add 'Through Jesus' at the beginning of the line	
Steve Dixon	P6 Ln 37 omit 'from on high'	
Mr Clive Scowen	P6 Ln 37 add 'to' before 'fill'	Not necessary. See paragraph 19.
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P6 Ln 39 add 'with': 'And so we join <i>with</i> the angels'	Breaks rhythm and unnecessary – reject. See paragraph 19.
Mr Nick Harding	P7 Ln 1 'Holy, holy, holy' response could also be used here.	If suggesting instead of Sanctus, reject. Need cross-reference to adult liturgy. See paragraph 20.
Steve Dixon	P7 Ln 13 suggest 'take and eat; this is my body' as less cluttered	Accepted. See paragraph 22.
Mr Gerald Burrows	P7 Ln 14 and Ln 20 'do this to remember me' is weak. Suggest 'do this in remembrance of me.'	Requests for both versions. 'To remember' is more direct and easier to understand than 'in remembrance'. See paragraph 22.
Mr Michael Heppleston	P7 Ln 15 insert '[Amen, amen, amen]'	Too much emphasis at wrong point in the prayer; disrupts flow. Resist. See paragraph 23.
Mr Clive Scowen	P7 Ln 18 Add 'poured out for you' at end of line	Not accepted. See paragraph 24.
Mr Clive Scowen	P7 Ln 19 Replace 'love' with 'forgiveness' (or possibly 'forgiveness and love')	Not accepted. House of Bishops requested 'new promise' as translation of 'covenant'. See paragraph 24.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P7 Ln 19 replace 'the new promise of God's love' with 'given so that we might be forgiven'.	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P7 Ln 19 Replace 'the new promise of God's love' with 'the renewed promise of God's unchanging love' or 'the new sign of God's promise'.	No. This is not a 'sign of' the new promise – it <i>is</i> it! See paragraph 24.

Mr Michael Heppleston	P7 Ln 20 insert '[Amen, amen, amen]'	Too much emphasis at wrong point in the prayer; disrupts flow. Resist. See paragraph 23.
Mr Michael Heppleston	P7 Ln 36-40 Move to P7 Ln 8-12.	Resist moving, but Committee agreed to reconsider wording. See paragraph 26.
Mr Andrew Presland	P7 Ln 37 Change 'he' to 'Jesus' and 'Jesus' to 'he'.	Does not alter sense. Resist. See paragraph 21.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P7 Ln 37 change 'his' to 'Jesus'	Need to bear in mind 'Christ has died ...' just used, so will make clear in use. See paragraph 25.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P7 Ln 37 suggest 'the death and resurrection of Jesus'	
Revd Jonathan Frai	P7 Ln 38 omit	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P7 Ln 38 Suggested alternative text	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P7 Ln 38-40 Remove Ln 38. Change Ln 39-40 to 'may this bread and wine / be to us Christ's body and his blood.'	
Mr Clive Scowen	P7 Ln 38-P8 Ln 7 Suggested rewording to merge epiclesis.	
Revd Jonathan Frai	P7 Ln 39-40 suggested rewording	Committee agreed to review wording. See paragraph 25.
David Bell	P7 Ln 39-40 Provide alternative paragraph without language of bringing/offering.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P7 Ln 39 change to 'that this bread and wine'. Omit 'we bring before you'.	
David Bell	P7 Ln 39 - uncomfortable with 'bring before you'	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P8 Ln 1 Suggest 'Strengthen us with the Holy Spirit'	'Pour' is biblical – cf Joel. Resist See paragraph 24.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P8 Ln 1-2 Either insert 'so' at the beginning of Ln 2 or change to 'to help us love another'	Renders wording clumsy. Resist. See paragraph 24.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P8 Ln 2 add 'so' before 'that'	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P8 Ln 3 'as we work for the peace of the earth' too ambitious. Suggest 'as we work for peace on earth'.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P8 Ln 3 change to 'as we work for peace on earth'	Committee agreed to reconsider at text. See paragraph 26.
Revd Richard Hibbert	P8 Ln 3 to read 'as we share the Good News of the Gospel, work for the peace of the earth'	
Mr Adrian Vincent	P8 Ln 1-4 Various suggestions offered.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P8 Ln 8 Change 'for' to 'all'.	
Mr Adrian Vincent	P8 Ln 8 Replace 'For honour and praise belong to you' with 'We thank and praise you'	'For' refers back to what has already been said. See paragraph 26.
Steve Dixon	P8 Ln 8 suggest 'We honour and praise you, Father'	

Specific Comments on Prayer Two:

13

From	Submission	Proposal
	Prefaces	Committee agreed to retain as models for people to write their own, or as default prefaces. See paragraph 29.
Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead	Fine for nursery and infant schools but not 8-10 year-olds.	Committee accepted that text would not suit all but there has to be some crossover point. See paragraph 10.
Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead	Like seder references but not the response 'Listen ...'	Committee noted that 'Listen' was major issue re Prayer 2, in particular the following points: Recognised that much depends on interpretation of 'listen'. Is 'we' better than 'you'? Will using 'listen' be a problem for the deaf church? Seder prayer does not have a response. Is using the same question/answer every time helpful? Agreed to consider re overall shape of the prayer. See paragraph 27.
Mrs Shayne Ardron	Suggest 'Let us listen so we can learn/remember' in place of 'Listen and you will hear' as response each time. Response should not be from clergy.	
Mr Nick Harding	Answer is not appropriate - feels as though congregation is being told off. Suggested alternatives	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P9 Ln 12-13 and throughout suggest 'Listen and you will learn'	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P9 Ln 13 suggest 'Because God is great'	
Mrs Anne Martin	Children love the sound of language and respond to poetry. Suggested short prefaces submitted.	
Mr Michael Heppleston	Questions and answers good, but use sparingly.	Noted.
Revd John Cook	Retain all square brackets and ensure that 'blessed is he who comes' is similarly marked as optional.	Agreed. See paragraph 9.
Mr Clive Scowen	Emphasis seems to be more on creation than redemption. Surely focus should be on Jesus Christ.	Agreed re prefaces. Prayer 1 prefaces are all seasonal; Prayer prefaces 2 were written to focus on school year. See paragraph 29.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P9 Generally unimpressed with proper prefaces	Optional – can write own. See paragraph 29.
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P9 Ln 3-10 Grateful for opening responses linking to experience in church	Noted.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P9 Ln 3-10 suggested replacement	Committee confirmed its decision in respect of Prayer 1 not to amend text. See paragraph 13.
Revd Mark Earey	P9 Ln 3-4 allow 'The Lord is here / His Spirit is with us'	Agreed. See paragraph 12.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P9 Ln 3-4 Allow 'The Lord is here/his Spirit is with us'	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P9 Ln 10 add 'him' after 'give'	Resist. Not <i>Common Worship</i> version of text. See paragraph 13.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P9 Ln 10 add 'him' after 'give'.	

Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P9 Ln 12-13 Remove brackets from questions - and throughout	Retain brackets to enable maximum flexibility. See paragraph 9.
Mr Nick Harding	P9 Ln 12-13 Remove brackets from questions - and throughout	
Mr Adrian Vincent	P9 Ln 15-19 suggested replacement	Committee agreed to retain main preface as drafted.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P9 Ln 21 Add urban example of short proper preface	All short prefaces under review. See paragraphs 29-31.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P9 Ln 23 - P10 Ln 14 numerous suggestions offered	All short prefaces under review. See paragraphs 29-31.
Steve Dixon	P9 Ln 23 'star-lit sky' better than 'starry'. Also picks up 'light' later on.	Accepted. See Paragraph 29.
Mr Nick Harding	P9 Ln 23 'starry sky' is trite. Suggest 'sky with stars'	Committee agreed to review wording. See paragraph 29.
Mr Michael Heppleston	P9 Ln 23 suggest 'star filled' or other less twee phrase	
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P9 Ln 23-24 Suggested rewording	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P9 Ln 23-26 Suggested alternative	
Steve Dixon	P9 Ln 24-25 too many 'ands'. Suggest 'the sun, the moon, / and everything.'	Not accepted. See paragraphs 28-29.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P9 Ln 26 Omit	Committee could see no reason for omission. Resisted. See paragraphs 29-31.
Mr Michael Heppleston	P9 Ln 29-33 language changes halfway through, as though it was written by two people	Committee did not agree. See paragraphs 29-30.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P9 Ln 32-33 Omit	Not accepted. See paragraphs 29-31.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P9 Ln 36 'Parks and schools' will date and is too UK/'postcode' specific	Committee agreed. See paragraphs 29-31.
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P9 Ln 36-38 Suggested alternative text	Committee agreed to reconsider text. 'Joy, laughter and safety' considered as possible option. See paragraphs 29-31.
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P9 Ln 37-38 Suggested rewording	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P9 Ln 38 suggest 'shouts' instead of 'shrieks'	
Mr Michael Heppleston	P9 Ln 38 'shrieks' does not gel into what is trying to be put across.	
Revd John Cook	P9 Ln 38 'shrieks of laughter' is clumsy	
Steve Dixon	P9 Ln 38 suggest 'joy, laughter and safety' instead of 'shrieks'	
Mr Michael Heppleston	P10 Ln 10-14 Replace 'happy times' with 'good times'	'Happy' is more child-like. Resist. See paragraphs 29-31.
Revd John Cook	P10 Ln 13 'In these we taste your kingdom' - muddling and complicated for children.	Noted, but other submissions are saying there is not enough poetry. Committee agreed to consider rewording.

Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P10 Ln 13 Omit	Committee agreed to reconsider wording. See paragraph 29.
Mr Gerald Burrows	P10 Ln 13 suggest 'Jesus said ...' (cf P10 Ln 5)	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P10 Ln 13-14 Replace with 'a feast for all your children'	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P10 Ln 13-14 Replace with 'a taste of your kingdom to come'	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P10 Ln 13-14 suggest 'In these we taste your goodness, / your love for all you have made.'	
Mr Gerald Burrows	P10 Ln 14 No mention of Christ.	Committee considered that 'all your children' would raise questions about those not receiving communion. See paragraph 32.
Mr Gerald Burrows	P9 Ln 15-17 Suggest reflection of Col 1.15-17	
Mr Clive Scowen	P10 Ln 16-17 Suggested rewording 'You made us all in your image, yet each wonderfully different'	Not accepted. See paragraph 32.
Miss Emma Forward	P10 Ln 17 Don't like 'each wonderfully different'. Parity is key at this moment not difference.	Committee disagreed. Not accepted. See paragraph 32.
Steve Dixon	P10 Ln 18 Grammatically complex. Suggest beginning new sentence 'We join with the angels ...'	Committee agreed to look at wording. See paragraph 33.
Mr Adrian Vincent	P10 Ln 25-27 Delete	Text in brackets anyway. Committee agreed to resist. See paragraph 9.
Mr Michael Heppleston	P10 Ln 2-7 Really like	Noted.
David Bell	P10 Ln 31 uncomfortable with 'he gave his life for us on the cross' - not child-friendly	Cannot change Gospel story! Resist. See paragraph 34.
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P10 Ln 29-31 Suggested alternative text	Prayer needs to be seen as part of whole service, where mention will have been made about Jesus healing and teaching. Current text based on BCP collect. See Paragraph 14.
Mr Nick Harding	P10 Ln 29-35 Add 2 lines about Jesus' life and ministry after Ln 30. Suggestion given.	
Mr Clive Scowen	P10 Ln 29-35 No mention of the Fall or to Jesus' resurrection etc. Alternative text suggested.	Not accepted. See paragraph 34.
David Bell	P10 Ln 33-35 Not child-friendly	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P10 Ln 33-35 Omit	
Mrs Sarah Finch	P10 Ln 33-35 Remove Ln 33. Change Ln 34-35 to 'may this bread and wine / be to us Christ's body and his blood.'	Accepted. See paragraph 35.
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P10 Ln 33-35 Replace with 'By the power of the Holy Spirit / may these gifts of bread and wine / be for us Christ's body and his blood'.	Not accepted. See paragraph 35.
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P10 Ln 33-35. Omit Ln 33, suggested rewording Ln 34-35	

Revd John Cook	P10 Ln 35 change to ‘ may be <i>to us ...</i> ’	Not accepted. See paragraph 35.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P10 Ln 35-36 Omit	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 2 Omit	Suggestions do not add anything or make prayer clearer. Passover meal would be at dusk so is key detail. Picks up Johannine reference. See paragraph 36.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P11 Ln 2 Omit	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P11 Ln 2 replace ‘when darkness fell’ with ‘when evening had come’	
Miss Emma Forward	P11 Ln 2 what does ‘when darkness had fallen’ add to the prayer? Suggest replacing with different detail.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 7 and 12 change to ‘Do this in remembrance of me’	Not accepted. See paragraph 37.
Mr Andrew Presland	P11 Ln 7 and Ln 12 change to ‘Do this in remembrance of me’.	
Revd John Cook	P11 Ln 7 change ‘Do this to remember me’ to something more modern	
Mr Michael Heppleston	P11 Ln 7 move to Ln 13	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P11 Ln 7 replace ‘Do this to remember me’ with ‘do this in memory of me’.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 9 change ‘they had eaten’ to ‘supper’	Regional differences in meaning of word ‘supper’. Not accepted. See paragraph 38.
David Bell	P11 Ln 12 Not child-friendly. Suggest more modern translation, eg New Century Version ‘Poured out for many to forgive their sins.’	Not accepted.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 14 change ‘cup’ to ‘wine’	Not accepted. ‘Cup’ is scriptural. See paragraph 38.
Mrs Sarah Finch	P11 Ln 14 suggest ‘wine’ instead of ‘cup.’	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P11 Ln 15 insert ‘your Son’ - ‘we celebrate <i>your Son</i> - his love, his death ...’	Not accepted. Phrase can only refer to Jesus. See paragraph 39.
Miss Emma Forward	P11 Ln 16 - change ‘as you feed us’ to something broader (see general comments)	Not accepted. See paragraph 39.
Revd Mark Earey	P11 Ln 16-19 suggested alternatives	Committee agreed to retain existing text. See paragraph 39.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 17-19 Change to ‘May your Holy Spirit change us to be / more and more like Jesus our Saviour’.	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P11 Ln 22 Suggest ‘By doing what he told us to do’	Answers redrafted. See paragraphs 27-28
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P11 Ln 22 Replace with ‘With the help of the Lord. So let us pray:’	
Mr Gerald Burrows	P11 Ln 24 add ‘... to love one another, as Jesus taught us to love one another as he loved us’ or ‘Jesus came that we may have life and have it abundantly’	The Committee did not agree. See paragraph 40

Mr Adrian Vincent	P11 Ln 24-28 Suggestions offered	The committee accepted some of the points raised and agreed to reconsider the text. However it agreed to retain line 28. See paragraph 40.
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 25 change 'work together for ' with 'look forward to'	
Revd James Dudley-Smith	P11 Ln 25 Reconsider 'that day' cf Prayer One P8 Ln3-4.	
Mrs Mary Durlacher	P11 Ln 25-26 Unclear. Suggest 'When the Lord Jesus returns in glory' in Ln 26	
Revd John Cook	P11 Ln 26 Why 'when the whole world is fed'? Look to Revelation 21.3-4 for alternative.	
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P11 Ln 26-28 Suggested rewording	
Mr Clive Scowen	P11 Ln 26-28 Parousia seems to have been replaced by Millennium development goals. Suggested alternative text.	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 28 change 'gathered in your loving arms' with 'renewed'	See paragraph 40.
Revd Richard Hibbert	P11 Ln 28 delete and replace with 'and all creation acknowledges that your Son, Jesus Christ, is Lord and Saviour of all'.	
Mr Gerald Burrows	P11 Ln 31 add 'loving Father'	Not accepted. See paragraph 40.
Mr Gerald Burrows	P11 Ln 32 add 'through the grace of your Son Jesus Christ'	
Mr Gerald Burrows	P11 Ln 33 add 'in the fellowship and power of the Holy Spirit'	
Mrs Ruth Whitworth	P11 Ln 37 'r' missing from 'Prayer'	Typographical errors will be corrected.
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	P11 Ln 37 's' missing on 'Prayer'	
Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham	P11 Ln 38 Suggest 'Because Jesus told us to do so'	Questions and Answers reconsidered. See paragraph 28.

NB.

In the Appendix alone, page and line numbers refer to GS1822.

The shaded areas in the tables above indicate submissions received from non-Synod members, or received out of time.