

### Next month's publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 175, *Scripture-based Liturgies*, edited by Ian Tarrant. This booklet brings together five sample services by different authors, each service displaying very strong dependence upon a particular New Testament passage or whole letter. They are designed for use, and can be adapted for one-off worship events in your specific context; but the real goal of the booklet is to stimulate more creative worship events in the same *genre*.

### A PROMISING YOUNGSTER?

The story the Bishop of Lincoln told in General Synod, supposedly in connection with collects, was that, at a confirmation, after the actual confirming of the candidates a warm sharing of the Peace ensued. He was hemmed in for some time thus sharing in the midst of the congregation; and when he got back to his seat, he found a young lad (who had been pointed out to him as hyperactive) sitting on the chair with another kneeling in front of him, and the seated one laying a hand on the other and saying 'God give him whatever it is you're giving away'.

### HOW ARE YOUR ARCHIVES OF NOL LOOKING?

Henry Whyte (The Rev, of 6 Horn Park Lane, SE12 8UU), had a note in our columns recently selling his Grove Booklets off on retirement (a voluntary and perhaps ill-advised asset-stripping—it is not required by the Pensions Board), and they apparently all sold and sold well, and enabled him to live in South-East London in retirement. However his offer of NOL, nos. 1-333, was not taken up, and he awaits an offer. Good day-off reading for some young bored cleric perhaps. (But people occasionally use them for doctorates . . .) And individual numbers missing from your set can very likely be supplied by COB.

---

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ  
Phone 0208-699-7771 Fax: 0208-699-7949  
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 2003 £8.50 (by air £12.00, US\$24.00)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**  
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU  
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

---

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 339

March 2003

### EDITORIAL

We had an old and oft-repeated debating point served up to us in the General Synod debate on the new collects (on which see pages 3 and 11 below). I contend that the point is in fact highly debatable; and this editorial is being used this time for that debating purpose.

And the point is? Ah, the point is that you must not in prayer tell God things he already knows. It is not that you are tempted into beginning your prayer (as the hoary joke once had it) 'Lord, surely you have read the *Manchester Guardian* this morning?' You are probably not tempted more by an extemporary prayer I once heard (and hesitated about endorsing with 'Amen') at an informal prayer meeting of theological students; one of the men had just learned his wife was pregnant, and another student (from another land where prayers may be different) said in his prayer 'Lord, you know what it is like to look down on a little someone looking up at you . . .' I fear the room was shaking with scarcely contained suppressed rib-rippling silent laughter. Well, I now say, was the Lord hearing something he already knew? Or not? And is he in *your* prayers?

Let me start with a theological logical point. Are we allowed to tell the Lord *anything* in prayer? If we are, then what we tell him must consist either of things that he does know or of things that he does not know. If we stand back from that dilemma, it is surely more likely—and more acceptable—that we tell him things that he does know, rather than surprise him with things that until that moment he has not known? On the other hand, if we cannot tell him anything, that may leave a good chunk of our existing patterns of prayer right outside the picture.

I explore an Old Testament prayer to check out the system. When Jeremiah is in prison we find him praying a prayer which begins with the following:

'Ah Lord God! It is you who made the heavens and the earth by your great power and your outstretched arm! Nothing is too hard for you. You show steadfast love to the thousandth generation, but repay the guilt of parents into the laps of their children after them, O great and mighty God whose name is the Lord of hosts, great in counsel and mighty in deed; whose eyes are open to all the ways of mortals, rewarding all according to their ways and according to the fruit of their doings. You showed signs and wonders in the land of Egypt . . .' (Jer. 32.17-20, NRSV)

This must be our proof text to dismiss the objection about 'telling God things he already knows'.

Part of the problem, I think, is that the objectors in General Synod thought that main clauses with a main verb in the indicative that said to God 'You have raised Jesus from the dead' were the improper innovation that has now so lately invaded our prayer forms and must be a cause of complaint. But put Jeremiah alongside this, and see the hollowness of the objection. Jeremiah, in this translation, has three different forms for ways of telling God things about God, thus:

- (a) Straight main clause ('It is you . . . Nothing is too hard for you');
- (b) Relative clause ('who made the heavens and the earth . . . whose name is the Lord of hosts . . . whose eyes are open . . .')
- (c) Appositional nouns, adjectives, and phrases ('great in counsel and mighty in deed').

Somehow, it seems that people who have been using forms (b) and (c) as ways of telling God things about himself for years or decades, *don't seem to have realized what they were doing*. It is only with the advent of form (a) that they have taken up cudgels. But in fact the theology issue is the same in any of the three forms—and the pattern of translation may well differ from version to version of the Scriptures, for translators have never thought they were straying into doubtful theology by using (a). Look at the Psalms if you want to sort yourself out. Much of the change is precipitated grammatically by the difficulty of a second person relative clause, in a way which was not felt with Tudor language—ie, you can say 'Our Father, who art in heaven', but you cannot so easily say 'Our Father, who are in heaven', and so we don't. But don't let us kid ourselves that 'Our Father, who art in heaven' is not any less an attempt to convey information to God—of course it is, just as much and just as little as 'Our Father; you are in heaven' would be.

But if we don't think God needs his store of knowledge (often his knowledge of what he himself has done or might do in the future) expanded by our information-giving, then why should we do it? And the answer is—or ought to be—that we set out the actions or the characteristics of God *to increase our faith*, rather than to remedy his ignorance.

It is actually very obvious. And I am weary of the apparent cleverness of those who think they have spotted an improper innovation and are confident enough to denounce it.

Colin Buchanan

### GENERAL SYNOD FEBRUARY 2003

General Synod met in London 24-26 February. There was first on 24 and 25 February the extension of authorization of Series One Marriage and Burial services. These have current authorization till 31 December 2005, and the renewed licence was to be from 1 January 2006 until such point as the General Synod takes further action. The prayers for the dead in the 1928 Burial service—which is the origin of Series One—have been opposed at every renewal since first authorization in Autumn 1966, and that happened again (though, curiously, it is likely that, without circularization of texts, members of

### THOSE NEW COLLECTS

See the earlier report of the debate in Synod (and also the editorial). We continue last month's opportunity to compare the Tudoresque (CW) and newly minted of four occasions alongside each other, leading on from the four Sundays of Lent printed then:

Lent	Common Worship	Additional Collects
Mother's Sunday— Lent 4	God of compassion, whose Son Jesus Christ, the child of Mary, shared the life of a home in Nazareth, and on the cross drew the whole human family to himself: strengthen us in our daily living that in joy and sorrow we may know the power of your presence to bind together and to heal; through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord, who is alive . . .	God of love, passionate and strong, tender and careful: watch over us and hold us all the days of our life; through Jesus Christ our Lord.
5 Passion	Most merciful God, who by the death and resurrection of your Son Jesus Christ delivered and saved the world: grant that by faith in him who suffered on the cross we may triumph in the power of his victory; through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord, who is alive . . .	Holy God, in the Saviour's cross your boundless love meets human sin; strengthen and deliver us that we may know that the victory is ours through Jesus Christ our Lord.
6 Palm	Almighty and everlasting God, who in your tender love towards the human race sent your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to take upon him our flesh and suffer death upon the cross: grant that we may follow the example of his patience and humility, and also be made partakers of his resurrection through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord, who is alive . . .	True and humble King, the crowd hailed you as Messiah then turned against you: may our praise last longer than a day; may we be found beside you on the way of the cross, which is the path of glory.
Maundy Thurs	God our Father, you have invited us to share in the supper which your Son gave to his Church to proclaim his death until he comes: may he nourish us by his presence, and unite us in his love: who is alive . . .	God our Father, your Son Jesus Christ was obedient to the end and drank the cup prepared for him: may we who share his table watch with him through the night of suffering and be faithful.

NB: All comments to be sent to the Revision Committee, c/o the Liturgical Commission, Church House, Great Smith Street, SW1P 3NZ, by 1 April.

e.org.uk. If your email address changes, do let us know so that we can update your details. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Best wishes  
David Green

### AN INTERESTING CENTENARY

The *Church Times* of 7 March carried as a centenary item a report of a 'Church Discipline Bill' going to Parliament in 1903—an attempt (which CT rooted in Liverpool, for obvious reasons) to clear out the illegalities of the clergy. I mean 'clear out' rather than 'clear up', for CT, a somewhat hostile witness, reckoned it would make *ten thousand* clergy incapable of holding a living. It never happened, of course; but it is illustrative of the background against which Archbishop Davidson was wrestling when he commuted such efforts into the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. It also indicates where the threatening word 'discipline' originated, to pass into the title of the Royal Commission.

### MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AFTER DIVORCE

We undertook in August to provide readers with the advice about remarriage in church offered by the House of Bishops in Annex 1 to GS 1449 referred to in the General Synod resolution reprinted in the August NOL. This is the seventh instalment. The whole Annex is substantial and has taken some months, and the cosmetic revision of it by the House which was expected has now come and is incorporated.

### ADVICE TO CLERGY

#### 6. Legal Formalities

##### Divorce Documents

6.1 Clergy conducting the marriage must see and check the relevant divorce documents before arranging the marriage preliminaries. Particular note should be taken that a decree absolute has been obtained, not merely a decree nisi. The advice of the Diocesan Registrar and/or civil registrars should be sought if there are doubts about the document(s) presented.

6.2 The Church recognises a declaration of nullity made by the civil courts in the United Kingdom; that is, a declaration that there is no valid marriage in existence. A cleric has the same obligation to marry a parishioner whose marriage has been annulled in this way as would exist if the parishioner had never gone through a form of marriage. If in doubt, seek advice from the Registrar.

6.3 Marriage preliminaries are the responsibility of the priest and couple concerned. They should follow the pattern applicable to all other marriages, and if there is any doubt the priest should contact the Diocesan Registrar or the Archdeacon.

the House of Laity (and possibly of the House of Clergy) were voting without ever having seen the texts . . .). The voting was as follows:

	Marriage	Burial
Bishops	24-0	26-0
Clergy	104-5	140-21
Laity	125-4	154-37

The extended licence was therefore duly accorded for both services. (Your reporter was out of the chamber for the vote on the Burial services.)

Next, near the end of the afternoon of 25 February, came the collects—seeking General Approval on the alternative set to be found in GS 1493. Paul Roberts was the Commission member responsible for the collectographical group, and he told us from the platform that they had been swamped with replies to their questionnaire from readers of NOL. (See NOL November 2001.) He virtually said they had not wanted so much response, and that NOL had made public a private document—a traduction which NOL strenuously resists. If a certain category of respondents only was wanted, it should have been stated in the text. NOL, as a journal of record, had little option but to print any official document which came its way. Paul Roberts also hinted that he could spot the NOL readers—and virtually hinted that, having spotted them, he could ignore their replies. We would be interested to learn the scale of such response and the general characteristics which gave them away—and any justification for setting them aside. At any rate, the group has done its work; the texts were there; and the comment from the floor came. There was a broad welcome for them, with only the most reactionary speakers sighing for a bit more touch of the stained glass and BCP-out-of-Stancliffe. There were two or three telling the Synod how inappropriate it was to tell God things he already knows, and I have attempted to see them off in the editorial of this issue (qv). We also had a plea from Geoffrey Rowell (Bishop in Europe) for a vocative or two (by which he meant an address that begins 'O God'). Paul Roberts on the platform (a notably efficient performer there) suggested that saying 'God' without an 'O' is still a vocative (it assuredly is). Tim Stratford talked helpfully about non-book people, and thought a seasonal collect had a better chance of winding its way into liturgical memories (a view reinforced in the Grove Worship Series no. 171 last Summer, *The Collects—An Alternative View*). There was also a serious point made about the lack of 'creation theology', and a less serious one about whether this or that identifiable group of people could cope with even lightweight imagery like 'salt of the gospel' or 'your Almighty Word leapt down from heaven' (an apocryphal text we saw off once in 1979 as a scripture verse . . .). The Bishop of Lincoln told us a story which, good as it was, had so little to do with collects that it is placed elsewhere in this NOL (he says it is about pithy wording). The General Approval came overwhelmingly, and the texts go to a Revision Committee and comment and/or suggestions (which can be submitted by anyone, not just members of Synod) should be received by 1 April.

Finally, we came to Daily Prayer. This was a debate for the Liturgical Commission to hear before retouching the existing CW Daily Prayer. Comment was requested in

the original pink book a year ago (see pages 812-815), and the first deadline for comment was 31 January, and the Commission is already digesting what it received by that date. The second deadline is 30 June, and the record of the Synod debate will feed into that. The kinds of thrusts in the debate which this member of Synod detected were:

- (a) could penitence be more overtly part of Evening Prayer?
- (b) apparently 'Benedictus is for life, not just for Christmas'—and, indeed, there are plenty of other good canticles in the book, but they 'sit there like wallflowers, waiting in vain for someone to ask them to dance' (because we have to use Benedictus every day for the rest of our lives).
- (c) 'I want to "rejoice in the gift of this new day" even in Lent' and in other special seasons (when Daily Prayer has dropped this feature).

David Standcliffe replied that all this would be sympathetically considered, and a new mid-week lectionary would also appear—and the deal would be done between the House of Bishops and the Liturgical Commission; so it would not return to the Synod (for it is, when the chips are down, not exactly an 'authorized service' but a sample of what is authorizable as a Service of the Word (but plenty else is too)).

So now is the time for all good daily pray-ers to get their submissions in to the secretary of the Commission (labelled 'Daily Prayer Survey') at Church House. The Commission's questionnaire is fairly long for us to reprint, and it is there on pages 812-815 for everyone so using the pink book as to be able to comment on it. But they ask you to photo-copy each of the four pages up to A4 size. Write to us with SAE if you have no access to magnification.

There was also a question in question-time from the persistent David Bird about how much work the Commission had put in on texts accessible to children or young people. This has become worth a separate heading here, so read on.

### THE BIRD QUESTION—ARE CHILDREN'S RITES IN HAND?

David Bird asked the chairman of the Liturgical Commission this question:

'In the light of two years experience of *Common Worship* and the concerns raised during the life of the last Synod about the relevance and accessibility of texts to children and young people, has the Commission done any work on this issue?'

The reply he received ran like this:

'The relevance and accessibility of texts to children and young people are one among many criteria that the Commission works with in drafting liturgical texts for the worship of the Church, though Mr Bird will remember that the previous Synod to which he refers declined to request texts that had this as their prime criterion. However, this Synod sees the introduction of an alternative set of Collects, and a second and revised version of *Patterns for Worship* has recently appeared. Both of these reflect the Commission's concern to see that the Church is well served in this matter. But Mr Bird will know

### FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH—GREEN WITH INFORMATION

David Green's E-mail of 21 February reads as follows:

I am writing with news of Common Worship.

#### SYNOD PREPARES FOR LITURGICAL BUSINESS

The next General Synod Group of Sessions begins on Monday 24 February and several important elements of liturgical business are on the agenda.

Final Approval of a proposed extension (until further resolution of the Synod) to the period of authorization for Series One Solemnization of Matrimony and Series One Burial Services will be discussed on Monday.

On Tuesday, a report on Common Worship: Daily Prayer will be provided by the Liturgical Commission and first consideration will be given to the Additional Collects. The draft additional collects are available to download on the Synod's 'Papers' area of the Church of England web site: <http://www.cofe.anglican.org/synod/index.html>

#### VISUAL LITURGY 4.0 APPROACHES

With the launch of *Visual Liturgy 4.0* at the Christian Resources Exhibition, Esher in May just a few short months away, the Visual Liturgy web site continues to preview the software, give details of events around the country and provide all the necessary information.

More information can be found at: <http://www.vislit.com/>

#### RSCM POINTED PSALTER IS PUBLISHED

The *Common Worship Psalter*, pointed for use with Anglican Chant, has been on the RSCM web site for some time. However, you can now buy printed editions of the same material—a 'words only' edition and a 'with chants' edition.

More information can be found at: <http://www.rscm.com/>

#### DESKTOP ORDERS OF SERVICE TRAINING DAY—3 APRIL 2003

Take a day out to produce the elegant Order of Service you have always wanted for your church. Put the principles of good liturgical design into practice and take your work away on disk. The tutor is Martin Short, Head of Communications Training and Development with the Church of England. Cost is £70 (inc. VAT) or book two places and save £25! The course will be held in Church House, Westminster.

More information can be found at:

<http://www.commstraining.cofe.anglican.org/2003/dos.php>

#### FINAL WORDS

The Common Worship web site can be found at

<http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/>

If you have been forwarded this message and would like to subscribe for yourself or if you wish to unsubscribe from this list please email me at [david.green@c-of-](mailto:david.green@c-of-)

2. 'Anglican Liturgical Reform in Kenya: Some Reflections' by John Chesworth. This reflects at some depth on the background Liturgical Study, *Offerings from Kenya to Anglicanism: Liturgical Texts and Contexts* (Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies no.51, 2001), and identifies how closely the background is exhibited in the eventual texts.
3. 'The New Kenya Anglican Liturgy' by Zebedi Muga. This is a major review of both the history of compilation of the Book, and the principles which were followed in that history
4. 'Liturgical Revision in the Anglican Church of Kenya' by Pauline Wanjiku. This is a somewhat shorter treatment of inculturation issues.

It will be very promising if a growing corpus of literature can start to surround the new Kenya Book and can help it on to its further stages. It will be of great interest elsewhere in the Communion also, as a different member of the liturgical family affects the calm assumptions of some of the more traditionally orientated ones. The Kenyans have now to address the task of translation into Swahili.

### BOOK REVIEWS

Stephen Hance, *Beyond Confirmation: Going for Growth in your Christian Life* (BRE, 2003, 144pp, small pb, £6.99) ISBN 1 84101 241 6

This is not, in the strictest sense, a book about liturgy—it is 'Beyond' confirmation, rather than at it. But it spells out a great range of the implications of the Christian life, not only in the baptismal vows and affirmations which are renewed at confirmation, but also in the framework given to that Christian life by the 'Commission' which, in the Common Worship services, follows closely in the rite after the act of confirmation. It is searching, encouraging, practical, and very wise; and I would commend it in any post-confirmation circles where reading a book looked a likely (or possible) procedure.

I asked myself what in a confirmation rite I value myself but did not find in the book. Perhaps I might say a word on behalf of sponsors. All the illustrations about friendship—and even mentors—which I found in this book (and there are quite a few) tended to resolve themselves into assurances about Jesus and the Holy Spirit being present with us as friends. Fellowship, belongingness and love with other Christians are there too. But what of the particular responsibility of an experienced and wise Christian peer who marches with you through preparation, through the rite of confirmation, and on into the mature Christian discipleship which lies 'beyond'? This is not exactly a niggle, and certainly not a dissuasive (for I think the book is great), but just a hint for the second edition.

COB

that the Liturgical Commission prepares new material at the request of the House of Bishops, and the House has not asked the Commission for texts that respond to these concerns.'

David Bird writes to NOL about the above:

'This led to several supplementaries from others. For myself, I was unaware that the House of Bishops were the group to request the Liturgical Commission to address issues and I am amazed that this has not been done. My speech in the debate on the additional Collects made reference to this. Several folk spoke to me about the issue and were supportive of my view that this area and the whole issue of non-book adults is a huge gaping hole in the liturgical provision. I begin to think that the problem is that there are a number of Anglicans who think that the church is the middle and upper classes at prayer and so people like me who were not brought up in that tradition are really not proper Anglicans! Or am I really in a minority of one who thinks that the liturgy needs to be targeted towards people who have no liturgical memory and who need more accessible language? To be honest I find the whole thing depressing and wonder whether it is worth pursuing this. I am going to write to the House of Bishops but I don't hold out a great deal of hope of change.'

### THE (DOUBLE) ENTHRONEMENT OF THE 104TH ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Archbishop Rowan Williams, who had certainly not been under wraps prior to his enthronement, was nevertheless unwrapped, sworn in, seated (sedated?), presented, welcomed and acclaimed in Canterbury Cathedral on the afternoon of Thursday, 27 February. The date is the feast of one George Herbert, and we thus had a collect from *Exciting Holiness*; musically we had the Newport (Monmouth) cathedral choir sing 'Come my way, my truth, my life'; we sang 'Let all the world in every corner sing' congregationally; and as a bonus we had the Canterbury Cathedral choir sing (to music commissioned for this service) the words George Herbert inscribed on the hall mantelpiece of Bremerton Rectory when he had himself paid for its restoration:

Alleluia.

If thou chance to find

A new House to thy mind,

And built without thy Cost

Be good to the Poor,

As God gives thee store,

And then, my Labour's not lost.

Alleluia.

After this it is probably necessary to distinguish the Archbishop from the rite, though presumably he had his own input into it (it is an interesting question just how much, over and above his own translation of a Welsh song sung with harp accompaniment,

was his—though I guess the choice of other hymns and the scripture readings and their readers must have been his). But, as your liturgical journalist present, I offer a critical analysis also.

Firstly, the service book has no less than *ten pages* in total of orders of procession—out of a total of 27 pages which carry the actual service for the congregation in the cathedral. I have asked myself whether there could have been less, and I suspect there could have been, even if all the information about who was in each procession really had to be conveyed to the congregation (which I doubt). How? Simply by using smaller and less obtrusive print for processions! Photo-copied sample pages will be provided to make the point to all NOL readers who send an SAE.

Secondly, the enthronements (plural) came relatively early in the service, and they were delayed by the reading of scripture, and not by the plethora of ceremonies that some deans and chapters seem to want to get into the rite—like anointing, vesting, visiting tombs, or generally being held up from reaching the chair. Full marks there.

Thirdly, if there is a case for a double sedation, then I do think the rite could spell it out much more clearly. One could hardly ask for the applause to be split between the home team for the first chair and the worldwide team for the second chair; but some diocesan and provincial bonding with him (by the words of representatives) after the first, and some similar Anglican Communion bonding with him after the second, would illustrate the two roles. At root, I doubt the two chairs—it is because and as the occupant is Archbishop of Canterbury that the Communion 'looks to him' (to take the words from the second enthroning). But then the cathedral does have two chairs, so the temptation is always there. The diocese at large, its clergy and laity, did not get a look in, except through dean and chapter and one small walk-on part of the Bishop of Dover. If the Archbishop is really beginning his ministry in the diocese, then surely he ought to have a diocesan orientation to at least something and some people in the rite? (If, on the other hand, as is generally expected, the major task of leading the diocese is deputed to the Bishop of Dover, then surely that commissioning and handing on of responsibility should have been in the rite?) The Kent factor got obliterated—a profound symbol of which came in the dean's opening words, when he mentioned St Augustine 'who brought the faith of Christ to this land': 'to Kent' might have been more accurate there.

Fourthly, we had the sermon. It was wonderful and has reaped great favourable press comment. You will have read it in the church press—Rowan preached the knowledge of Jesus to us, truly and simply.

Fifthly, for the third Archbishop running we had the Nicene Creed without the *Filioque*. I would be ready to salute the new Archbishop, and say he had taken his own independent decision to use the CW permissive text for ecumenical occasions (see CW main book page 140). But I have to say that it looked suspiciously as though it had in fact come out of the capitular archives (whether at his request or not I am unclear)—for its text was *not* the CW one, but the outdated and possibly illegal ASB Nicene Creed (even including 'us men'), and its lines about the incarnation were

neither the double 'from' of our Order One (contemporary) nor the double 'of' of our ecumenical text, but the old 'by the power of the Holy Spirit, he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary'. I dare repeat what I have said in 1980 and in 1991, that enthronements do not necessitate Nicene Creeds, and those who do include texts of the Creed need to know why and to get it right. I look forward to nudging the 105th Archbishop in advance of his event—probably equally in vain. Illegal or nor, it was boldly labelled in the rubric as '*The Creed which is said in its original form*'—I think we would need Greek for that, not out-of-time English.

Sixthly there was a strong ecumenical role with walk-on parts for various eminences of different denominations. There was also an African dance, but there are no details of it in the programme.

Finally, and also ecumenically, we had the heart of the Methodist Covenant Service—which must have been the personal choice of the Archbishop. Its 'commitment' was very appropriate. Then after the intercessions, there were two archiepiscopal blessings—one in the quire, one in the nave (with *Cwm Rhondda* sung on the way)—but I am not sure why. There was no attempt at the West door to bless the city and county (and, presumably, in the role of this Archbishop, nation and universe); top marks for that too. Funnily enough the nation never got a look in (for all that Prince Charles, PM, *et al* were all there)—and the dean's opening call for our prayers were for the Archbishop's 'ministry in this Diocese, in the Province of Canterbury and throughout the worldwide Anglican Communion', which certainly played down to the point of extinction his 'Primate of All-England' role.

—————  
Eight days later, and he has officiated at his first consecration of a bishop in England. I report very briefly that (a) he wore a chasuble (must be first primate to do so at a consecration since the Reformation); and (b) he stood to ordain (also without precedent since the Reformation in the Canterbury Province—and much to be welcomed).

COB

## THOSE KENYAN PRAYER BOOKS

The price has come down! We are no longer paying air postage for the copies kept in stock at the NOL office (ie the editor's address), so we can now offer copies @ £11 inclusive of postage. Meanwhile NOL has received a copy of Number 2 of a journal entitled *Encounter: An Anglican Forum for Theological Reflection*, which is 'an occasional publication of the Board of Theological Education and Training, Anglican Church of Kenya'. This issue is wholly devoted to liturgy, with the new Book at the centre of its treatment. The articles are as follows:

1. 'Liturgical Developments in the Anglican Church of Kenya' by Joyce Karuri (editor of the new Book). She tells the outline of the story of the development of the new Book.