

was to come, both in the speech against the provision by Bishop Paul Barnett ('95% of me agrees with it') and in the overshadowing Appellate Tribunal finding that constitutionally the diocese could not do it, except by a Canon of General Synod. On the other hand, I, at 11,000 miles distance, had read the signs as suggesting that a 'yes' outcome was the more probable.

The Archbishop of Sydney must now feel like a single policeman stretching his arms across a narrowish street against the advance of a determined, if so far peaceable, march of a great phalanx of protesters. He may be able to hold them back—though that is far from certain. It is very unlikely they will turn back; rather they will await an increase in their own numbers, or a boldness to push against the brave Horatius, or (and this is not that far ahead) a change of duty policeman to one who will not stretch out his arms against them.

Meanwhile, the Archbishop of Sydney himself is striving to maximize on the moral leverage he might just gain in respect of the rest of the Anglican Communion. If Sydney will restrain itself from an action of the rightness of which it is theologically persuaded (and it must be remembered that many of the people who voted against the ordinance had themselves no theological problems with it), then will other parts of the Anglican Communion refrain from promoting gay relations and making a virtue of ordaining practising gay people into holy orders? Something quite deep in Anglican ecclesiology is at stake in this issue. He is saying to the Americans (*inter alios*) 'If you want to do something because you deem it right in itself, and do not care two hoots if it shocks others and brings the Anglican Communion to breaking-point, then (a) you must not complain if other parts of the Communion take in good conscience steps which shock you, and (b) you must note that we are not yet actually acting on your principle of schism, but are rather respecting your (highly inconsistent) principle of Anglican unity and of respecting each others' consciences—so, O selfish Americans, will you please determine which principle is your underlying and basic one and act on it, and *we* will then know what to do on *your* principle? But don't then try to clobber us with the principle you have just yourselves over-ridden.'

The policeman's hold against the protesters from his own quarter of the city may yet prove to be frail—but he has just a chance of morally wrong-footing the real opposition in a different part of the city, and he is attempting to maximize on it.

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ

Phone 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949

E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1999 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 299

November 1999

EDITORIAL

LAY PRESIDENCY IN SYDNEY?

On 19 October the synod of the Anglican diocese of Sydney voted in favour of final approval (called 'third reading') of an ordinance permitting lay and diaconal presidency of the eucharist. *The Church of England Newspaper* recorded the vote as 228-124 in the House of Clergy and 122-66 in the House of Laity; *Church Times* reported a total vote of 346-194 in favour and added that it 'was passed by two-thirds majorities' in both Houses—but this on inspection appears unlikely, and the *CEN* figures (which do not add up to the *CT* ones!) would suggest that the majority did not reach two-thirds in either House.

However, the actual figures are of minor significance (there was no requirement of a two-thirds majority); but the decision has gone round the world. At the time of writing the Archbishop of Sydney (Harry Goodhew) has not yet endorsed the decision, and it does not become legislative until he does (and we may just get his decision in as a 'Stop-press' item). But the general reaction has been one of holding-hands-up-in-horror. Apparently an Anglican diocese which legitimates lay presidency will cause whole provincial constitutions to unravel, will undermine the historic threefold ministry and will commit all sorts of good people to attending communion services where they cannot be sure that it is a true sacrament which is being celebrated. There has also been a tendency to portray Sydney diocese as doing something equivalent to scribbling on lavatory walls—an act of childish defiance, rather than a constructive reform of the church. And it is possible that the advocacy of the main mover, John Woodhouse, who allows that lay and diaconal presidency might occur only rarely, does suggest it is not shrieking pastoral need which is being alleged (and it is reasonably safe to guess that parishes with a daily eucharist are few and far between in Sydney). The Sydney Synod is seeking to make a point!

There is actually another procedural impediment to consider before the issue of substance can really come into the forefront. The Appellate Tribunal of the Australian Anglican Church had considered in January 1998 whether it would be lawful for a diocese to enact a Canon permitting this practice, and had ruled (by four votes to three) that it would be lawful—BUT ONLY if it were backed by a Canon of General Synod authorizing diocesan synods to take this step if they chose. (This is a not unusual way of proceeding in Australia, where General Synod meets only once every four years, and where diocesan authority is almost autonomous—

it was, for instance, how the ordination of women came in.) There had been some sense of hands-up-in-horror simply at that ruling (and it was alleged that it was the Sydney-related persons who had given that bare majority to the Tribunal)—but the ruling, however dangerous and far-reaching, did not provide for Sydney to take a unilateral step without a General Synod Canon. And that appears to be what the Sydney Synod is now doing. So if the Synod ignores the Appellate Tribunal's finding (itself thought by many to have been overbalanced towards Sydney), then perhaps the constitution is unravelling. Certainly there are hints around that, if Sydney goes ahead, there may be secular court cases ahead—presumably seeking injunctions to prevent lay persons presiding, and resting upon the Appellate Tribunal's findings, that a Canon of General Synod is needed first. So the Archbishop of Sydney has a twenty years' head of steam in his diocesan synod on the one hand, and a trusteeship for the constitution (and for the cash which litigation will certainly squander) on the other.

Here in England the issue is unresolved but was at last aired and discussed in the 1990s, and has been discussed as a real issue in which a 'yes' or a 'no' are equally possible outcomes. It has certainly not been strongly alleged to be *ultra vires*. Indeed there is a strong case of need which can be made, in which plugging temporary gaps by short-term licences might be viewed as better sense than the overkill of ordination for life. It is not my intention to make the argument either way here. For there is another dynamic also at work, one of which the Sydney synodspeople were well aware.

The issue is how the Anglican Communion changes its ways. The received practice seems to be that central and worldwide decisions are too elusive for our structures and cannot be made—and thus one diocese or province inaugurates a practice which seems good to it and others follow (or do not follow). This goes right back to Scottish liturgical rites in the eighteenth century—or the formation of a General Convention in the USA in 1789, as well as to more recent decisions about church union (as in South India in 1947), or children receiving communion before confirmation (which began in New Zealand in 1970), or the ordination of women (the dates and places of which are well known), or even the omission of the *Filioque*. I can still hear the howls when the Provincial Synod of the Southern Cone of South America was lent upon by North American visitors not to approve lay presidency (and then decided not to by eight votes to seven!), when those same Americans had a few years earlier claimed the right to approve the ordination of women without the say-so of any other part of the world. Sydney is not unaware of rumblings in favour of lay presidency elsewhere in the world, and is hoping to start of larger movement by relying on the same principle that brought in the ordination of women. There are those who invoke the blessed word 'reception' at this point in the argument.

But there does not appear this far to be a very favourable pan-Anglican climate for such reception . . .

Colin Buchanan

The Annunciation of Our Lord

It is indeed right and good
our duty and our salvation
always and everywhere to give you thanks,
holy Father, almighty and eternal God,
through Jesus Christ, your Son our Lord.
We give you thanks and praise
that the Virgin Mary heard with faith the message of the angel,
and by the power of the Holy Spirit
conceived and bore the Word made flesh.
From the warmth of her womb
to the stillness of the grave
he shared our life in human form.
In him new light has dawned upon the world
and you have become one with us
that we might become one with you
in your glorious kingdom.
Therefore earth unites with heaven
to sing a new song of praise;
we too join with angels and archangels
as they proclaim your glory without end:

From the Fifth Sunday of Lent until the Wednesday of Holy Week

It is indeed right and good
our duty and our salvation,
always and everywhere to give you thanks,
holy Father, almighty and eternal God
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
For as the time of his passion and resurrection draw near the whole world is
called to acknowledge his hidden majesty.
The power of the life-giving cross
reveals the judgment that has come upon the world
and the triumph of Christ crucified.
He is the victim who dies no more,
the Lamb once slain, who lives for ever,
our advocate in heaven to plead our cause, exalting us there to join with
angels and archangels
for ever praising you and *saying*:

STOP PRESS—HE SAYS 'NO'

The Archbishop of Sydney on 10 November blocked the diocesan ordinance which is the subject of the editorial here. He explicitly relates this decision to the relationships of the diocese (and the Anglican Church of Australia) to the rest of the Anglican Communion, rather than to any convictions of his own contrary to the principle of lay presidency. There may have been advance hints that this decision

'... incarnate by the Holy Spirit
of the Virgin Mary' (Bishop of Liverpool)

'... incarnate by the Holy Spirit
and the Virgin Mary' (David Bone)

'... incarnate from the Holy Spirit
and the Virgin Mary' (Bishop of Birmingham)

All these were swept aside, though the Bishop of Liverpool (James Jones) probably came out of it best, and the substantial motion went through by: Bishops 38-1; Clergy 179-22; Laity 131-76. A further motion to provide a text on the Liverpool lines in an appendix (alongside the Filioque-less text already promised) was also defeated. Some mutterings occurred by the minority that they were now boxed in with a text which they could not in conscience use, but the general reaction was that the debating had been enriching in doctrinal content (yes, it really had been) and charitable—and the House of Bishops had come over as good guys, not simply purple-shirted synodical steamrollers. But then your correspondent was emotionally disengaged from this one, and will explain why at leisure some time.

INSTITUTE FOR LITURGY AND MISSION

Here is the remainder of the programme.

Leading Worship—1-2 March 2000

A chance to look afresh at the basic principles and practical skills of planning and leading acts of worship.

Common Worship and the Parish Musician—21-22 March 2000

What changes will Common Worship bring to the musical content of Church of England worship? What new opportunities are there and what new music has been produced?

Designing for Worship 2000: The Place of Baptism—2-4 May 2000

In the light of new developments in the theology and practice of baptism, revised rites in various churches, and a growing sensitivity to symbolism, this seminar for architects, artists and church people will consider principles and practical solutions for locating, designing and equipping baptisteries and fonts.

Come Holy Spirit—20-22 June 2000

An exploration of the role of the Holy Spirit in the worship, music and spirituality of different Christian traditions, Eastern, Western, Reformed, liturgical and charismatic.

Apply to ILM, 19 The Close, Salisbury, Wilts SP1 2EE (tel. 01722 424800; fax 01722 338508; e-mail liturgy@sarum.co.uk).

EXTENDED PREFACES OF THE DRAFT EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

The following are more of the long extended prefaces 'to replace all the material . . . [in prayers A, B and E] . . . before the Sanctus'.

FOOTNOTE TO NOL

The year of our Lord is not the only number with a '99' in it this month. NOL began in January 1975, so reaches 300 in December 1999. The editor of the last twenty-five years has asked first the Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW), and then the meeting of Diocesan Liturgical Secretaries (see report in this issue) for advice re its future. Now the readership is invited to have a go—why do you read it? How would you like it improved? Would you like it fuller but less frequent? A silver jubilee is a time for reconsideration—neither the present format nor the present formatter is likely to do another quarter century.

FREE PROVINCE

We have been sent the press release of the Forward in Faith congress on 22 October which sets out a fullish case for a 'third'—nay a 'free'—province of the Church of England. One reader's response is that this is cloud-cuckoo-land. Whilst the present relationship with the state continues, Parliament will never approve a division which would damage the role of the one General Synod in relation to legislation and a host of other matters. If disestablishment were in view, then surely the General Synod would become autonomous, and it would decline to tear dioceses in half, or give away property etc? I write not of what might be argued to be right or wrong, only of what is likely or possible. The resultant third province if, *per impossibile*, it came into being, would immediately (by its own decision) be out of communion with the mainstream Church of England, and might not therefore qualify as a member of the Anglican Communion (which is defined by its member Churches being 'in communion with the see of Canterbury'). So it would look more like 'continuing Anglicans' (who are tending to call themselves 'traditionalists' as FiF also tend to).

But think of some other features. Would they cut out Church House, Westminster, and diocesan officers and run a lightweight connexion? If so, might parishes want to join them *as cheaper*? Or would it be the other way round—that the two provinces would keep all the cash, and the third would have to raise its capital from nothing? But—and this entitles NOL to discuss it—what would its Canons on liturgy look like? Would it have the tight discipline that its strictures on the laxity of the rest of us would imply? Or would it have the anarchy of each doing what was right in his own eyes (I am allowed to use the masculine pronoun here), which their liturgical history would suggest?

LEX ORANDI?

Michael Church writes an article in *Worship* (September 1999) about Prosper of Aquitaine in which he points out that Prosper did not say '*lex orandi lex credendi*', but '*ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*'—and goes on to say 'What Prosper has to teach us is not about authority, but about the condition of Christians before God.'

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1999

General Synod meets from 15 to 19 November (again, as relatively early in the month, probably inhibiting our getting the November NOL into your hands prior to the date). But the likely programme looks something like this:

Final Approval: Wholeness and Healing

The Lord's Prayer

Thanksgiving for the Gift of a Child

The Funeral Services

Second Revision Stage: The Marriage Service

Eucharistic Prayers (see Prayer G below)

Communion by Extension (the perennial losers)

First Revision Stage: Weekday Lectionaries

Rules to Order the Service and

Miscellaneous Liturgical Provisions

Debates not concerning 'alternatives to the BCP':

Supplementary Funeral provision

Liturgical Publishing Committee

A Psalter

All will be reported next month.

EUCCHARISTIC PRAYER G

Prayer H was printed last month. But the Revision Committee has also responded to the Bishop of Oxford's request for a Preface with a whole eucharistic prayer, thus:

I . . . 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 angels and archangels
and all the powers of heaven
we may find a voice to sing your praise:

Holy, holy, holy 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.
When they turned away and rebelled
your love remained steadfast.

the Revision Committee and the Bishop of Salisbury round too. The second Revision Stage in November 1998 had not dented the new arrangement. The House of Bishops had endorsed that by 29-6 in January 1999 and it had not been reached in July 1999, so it came now for Final Approval—and the period was to start the following Sunday, 21 November. Your correspondent had two alternative following motions tabled, in the hope that these would affect the voting on the substantial Final Approval. In the event he was swept away as convincingly as on any other occasion—the Church of England General Synod is determined to use a splinter-movement modern text of the Lord's Prayer ('Lead us not into temptation') and the voting was: Bishops 34-1; Clergy 180-5; Laity 158-35. So it went through overwhelmingly, and I was getting warnings that some of the few negatives registered were those of people actually opposed to any ELLC text presence at all, or even opposed to any modern-language text at all.

Well, I got my chance to move my following motion:

'that this Synod ask the House of Bishops, to reconsider the priorities of presentation of modern language texts of the Lord's Prayer and then report to Synod urgently if the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales gives official sanction to the international (ELLC) text in any authorized English-language rites it publishes.'

I made my speech, including mentioning that in the Dome (being ecumenical) visitors would be saying 'Save us from the time of trial' (and this interested the press gallery, who were trying to guess what text the Archbishop of Canterbury would be using in that hour before midnight on a certain forthcoming occasion). But I was shot up by a friend who moved that the Synod should pass to next business. And we did—on a count—by 214-135. That finished off my efforts—though I may permit myself a murmur in these columns occasionally.

There were two amending Canons with a bearing on liturgy in the early afternoon. First was no. 22, which allows bishops, on application by parishes, to permit the continued use of rites being officially discontinued (this went through by 26-0; 129-0; 151-9). Then came no.23 allowing other languages than English, including British Sign Language (BSL), and this also galloped through (by 32-1; 156-0; 169-13).

We then had the high drama of the Nicene Creed and the wording of the line about the incarnation. The House of Bishops had set up an unemotive further testing of the mind of Synod, prior to fixing the text at its meeting in January, ready for Final Approval, within the text of the eucharist, at the February 2000 session of Synod.

The Bishop of Rochester moved, on behalf of the House of Bishops, thus:

'That this Synod would support the authorization of the following form of the Nicene Creed, when the new orders for the Holy Communion are brought to the Synod for final approval:

[The ELLC text then follows, including lines 17-18:

“. . . was incarnate of the Holy Spirit
and the Virgin Mary.”

but line 19 reads “and was made man”]

The other options to lines 17 and 18 being debated were:

CHURCH TIMES ADVERTISES SUBVERSION

The *Church Times* of 8 October has an extraordinary advert on page 3:

A Resurrected Priesthood for 2000

Are you—Called to be a priest/minister?

—A Selection Conference reject?

—An unlicensed priest?

—A vicar/curate but disillusioned?

Then come to the conference

HOW TO ESTABLISH YOURSELF AS AN INDEPENDENT FREELANCE PRIEST

[Details then follow—the conference is run by the famous unchurched Jonathan Blake. The blurb includes his book, *For God's Sake Don't Go To Church* of which, we are told, readers have written 'wonderful . . . inspiring . . . challenging . . . blazing with colour and truth . . . compulsory reading for every churchgoer.' NOL is *not* advertising the conference—merely being shocked at CT—so does not give you details of where to go to privatize your ministry, and Jonathan Blake himself does not say where the conference will be. Nor has he sent us his book for review. Our business would be ruined if we got people to treat the book as 'compulsory'.]

STOP PRESS - GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1999

Despite the expectations on page 4 above, publication has been sufficiently delayed to get the liturgical proceedings of Tuesday 16 November in General Synod reported here. A report of the rest of the week (and notably the eucharistic prayers and the psalter) will come in December.

First on was Thanksgiving for the Gift of a Child for Final Approval (GS 1298H). This text has not been the subject of much comment here (though there is reason to see it as one of Michael Vasey's bequests to the Church of England). The word 'Gift' in the title includes both birth and adoption. It is uncontroversial (there were no re-committals in July), and is to have a 'pastoral introduction'. Its dating was to be 'for a period from Sunday 3 December 2000 until further Resolution of the Synod'—and this dating begins to show us the future. Common Worship is clearly viewed as beginning as an across-the-board provision from Advent Sunday next year. We shall be learning soon when it is proposed that the 'core-book' should be published. Voting for this was: Bishops 27-0; Clergy 151-0; Laity 160-0.

Next came the Funeral Services for Final Approval (GS 1298 I). These too had escaped re-committal in July, and were apparently fully agreed (and, indeed, admired). Here it is Trevor Lloyd who deserves our plaudits. Much funerary material has in fact been allocated to the 'commended' category and is for discussion later in the week. This had the same period of currency as the previous item. It duly passed by: Bishops 29-0; Clergy 162-0; Laity 161-0.

The last item for Final Approval was the Lord's Prayer, where your correspondent was also a sniping combatant and cannot provide his normal objective report. The scenario was that the ELLC text ('Save us from the time of trial') had been the proposed modern text until the first revision stage in July 1998, when Tony Thiselton's intervention had changed the Synod round—and changed

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

He offered his life for sinners
and with a love stronger than death
he opened wide his arms on the cross.

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:
Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you;
do this in remembrance of me.

At the end of supper, taking the cup of wine,
he gave you thanks, and said:
Drink this, all of you; this is my blood of the new covenant,
which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.
Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.

(ACCLAMATIONS)

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 intercedes for us at your right hand.

Pour out you Holy Spirit as we bring before you
these gifts of your creation;
may they be for us the body and blood of your dear Son.

As we eat and drink these holy things in your presence,
form us into the likeness of Christ,
and build us into a living temple to your glory.

[Remember Lord your Church in every land.
Reveal her unity, guard her faith,
and preserve her in peace . . .]

*Bring us at the last with (N N and) all the saints
to the vision of that eternal splendour
for which you have created us;*

through Jesus Christ, our Lord,
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.**

BOOK REVIEW

John Leach, *Leading Worship that Connects: A Training Course* (SPCK/ Lynx and Anglican Renewal Ministries, 1999, 72pp., £4.99)

John Leach is Director of ARM, a member of GROW, and a Board member of Grove Books Ltd. and a notable bridge person between the ordered Anglican liturgy which is our inheritance, and the supposedly unordered and unpredictable world of charismatic worship. His ministry in bridging this supposed gap is of enormous significance in to-day's Church of England, and he exercises that ministry in part by brisk and immensely useful writing.

This book is a training course that takes a local church right through from selecting those who can be trained as worship leaders to the explanation of the 'expectancy violation' (such as the punch-line of a joke) which in certain kinds of music can have certain physical effects on listeners. In relation to the last point, I should add that John has no truck with a charismatic 'God of the gaps'—there is a physical, even chemical, explanation available and we do not have to create a specific and particula pneumatology to account for the *frisson*. Conversely, we are to reckon that the Lord is present with his people even when they are not falling over under the Toronto blessing.

A large amount of John's concerns are to help people connect with each other. This is not only a leadership skill (though it is that), but is also a corporate goal. Chapter after chapter gives group tasks, interactive dynamics, and ways of helping each supportively. His well-attested confidence in good liturgical principles is also kept in sight, whilst his treatment of the unexpected looks extremely sensible. I am biased, but I think John and his secure bridging role are a vital asset in today's Church of England.

COB

Bro. Tristram SSF has produced his annual *Ordo* for *Celebrating Common Prayer* (ie for the Calendar year 2000), and has kindly provided copies for readers of NOL. Simply send an SAE to the editorial address on page 12 and we will send you an *ordo*.

VIDEO REVIEW

Roger Royle, *Welcome to Baptism: Journey of a Lifetime* (Grayswood Studio, The Vicarage, Clammer Hill, Grayswood, Surrey GU27 2DZ, 22 mins, £16.50 (post free))

This video is intended for parents and godparents asking for infant baptism. It makes no judgments about who are proper applicants and who, if any, are improper. It never gives a hint about being turned down or delayed. On the other hand it

does emphasize commitment, and, in handling the new baptismal rite, picks up and turns over carefully the undertakings of the parents and godparents to bring the child into the life of the worshipping community. The video has the accolade of Mark Earey upon it, so I should not carp. Let me simply say that I found the switching of sites and contexts, as well as the cutting back and forth to Roger Royle, somewhat 'bitty'; that I was surprised at the omission of the six undertakings under the title 'The Decision'; that the prayer over the water was a seasonal one (not used responsively); that the reasons for baptizing infants (rather than delaying them) were rooted in the opinions of four lay people (it would be easy to find four whose opinions were opposed); that the implications of baptism for an adult were not brought into the discussion; and that the eucharistic context which was aired did not obviously include the communion of the parents and godparents, let alone that of the infant!—so why was it aired? I am not sure I have ever seen red as the liturgical colour for baptism before (except possibly in combination with confirmation, or perhaps at the Beheading of John the Baptist); and I suspect the officiant was left-handed by the way he held the babe (but that is contrary to no rubric). He only *just* poured water on the babe. Roger Royle himself seemed somewhat surprised to find a font near the communion table—it rather knocked out the 'West door' symbolism he had been expounding. Full marks, though, for being multi-ethnic; and, yes, it is fairly accessible.

COB

Next Month's Publications are . . .

. . . two Joint Liturgical Studies: firstly, the one due in September, no. 44, *Ambrosianum Mysterium: The Church of Milan and its Liturgical Tradition*, edited by Cesar Alzati and translated from the Italian by George Guiver; and, secondly, the planned December one, no. 45, *The Liturgies of Nestorius and Theodore*, edited with the translated text by Bryan Spinks. We apologize for the delay in no. 44, but hope that readers will forgive the editor and translator, and recognize that the quality of the product far outweighs the delay.

. . . and last month's

was not, as stated here, *Worship* no. 156, but no. 155, *Alternative Worship in the Church of England*, by Paul Roberts. Get the number right when ordering—or you'll get a different title.

This month's scrounging . . .

. . . is a request from Chipinge, in the diocese of Manicaland in Eastern Zimbabwe, for words copies of *Hymns Ancient and Modern Revised*, if any church is throwing out old copies. Please contact COB in the first instance. And, by the way, they would also like a thurible.