

*Prayer* organized jointly with Edward King House, which has also been the venue for a demonstration of the proposed eucharistic rite, and day in December 1997 on liturgical presidency led by Michael Perham. In most of these initiatives we have had the enthusiastic help of the Parish Education and Local Ministry officers; so, although the Liturgical Committee technically remains an episcopal advisory group, it now integrates more fully with the synodical system than was previously the case, to our mutual advantage.

Further events are in the pipeline, including a day on the new eucharistic rites once they are finally authorized. In the meanwhile two of our members have been giving a lot of time and energy to revising *Saints and Martyrs of the Diocese* to bring it into line with the new Calendar and this should be ready for approval by the summer. We might even think up a new title for it as well!

Last year both Donald Gray and Tim Barker (of the Alcuin Club) moved to the diocese and joined our numbers. When Jane Logan, our indefatigable secretary, left us in January to become Assistant Diocesan Secretary at Ely, Tim very kindly stepped into the breach and continues to maintain the high standards we have all come to almost take for granted. The only continuing problem, of such it is, is how we can best fit into the regional structure of PRAXIS. We don't exactly, although historically we have linked in with Midlands PRAXIS. At times this had made us fee out on a limb as they tend to look towards Leicester and Birmingham. We have thought about East Anglican PRAXIS, but equally they look in another direction just as far away, like Norwich or Ipswich. Now the suggestion is that we try and relate to that in Yorkshire, but somehow I don't think this will be any better. We could of course become members of *all three*, but at the end of the day it might be easiest if we accepted our isolation for what it is, cut our losses and in a kind of UDI formed LINCOLN PRAXIS. Well, why not? It does sound rather good, doesn't it, and who knows where it might lead? The other three might want to join us instead!

Tony Reader-Moore  
Chairman, Lincoln Diocesan Liturgical Committee

---

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 293

May 1999

## EDITORIAL

### 450TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BCP

Last month we carried a review of a book by two Americans published to mark the 450th anniversary of the 1549 Prayer Book. It was a salutary reminder to the English, for, as far as I am aware, there has been no publication here to mark the date. I am prompted to recall the occasion in December 1984 when I went (with some C/E notables) to give a set of lectures at a conference staged by the University of Milan to mark the 450th anniversary of the Act of Supremacy and thus of the formal separation of the Church of England from Rome, and of its independent life since then. The conference (which had its fun—ending in a threatened airline strike which cut it short and brought the English home early) had two fairly mind-blowing features to it: firstly, that hardly any Italian student attending it had ever encountered the Church of England or knew anything about it; and secondly, that no-one in England itself had even noticed the anniversary or had arranged anything with which to celebrate it. (I gave a paper on 'The Church of England—Catholic and Protestant' which was the only one that touched on present-day Anglicanism at all—and I still have Italian-language offprints of my paper sitting around and available free if any reader of NOL reckons that the Italian-language section of his or her library of books about Anglicanism looks a bit thin . . . but write early to beat the rush.) Milan alone had noted the date!

Well, I do digress, but you will see the parallel. In this case, however, the cultural and ecclesiastical distance that separates modern ECUSA from 1549 is actually not as great as that Milan gulf; and NOL itself is about to prove (prompted in time by the Americans) that not everyone in England itself is unmindful of the anniversary. This editorial is a toast to that first English-language BCP. It will even include a few elements of sheer, or nearly sheer, fact.

The Book did not arise in a vacuum. There were precedents, to which I give a few lines below. and there was a process. The process was given formal shape by Cranmer's conference of divines at Chertsey in September 1548. We have no minutes of that and it is tempting to think that Cranmer put a complete text on the table, mentioned in passing how dangerous (and heretical) it was to resist the monarch's will (so clearly expressed by his 'dear uncle', the Lord Protector, Duke of Somerset), and how sensible it would be to agree the Book as tabled. If it then took three

weeks to bring them to a common mind (what an astonishing period of residential conferencing for a Liturgical Commission that would be nowadays), that is not because the text on the table was undergoing change but because certain minds round the table were being required to. There is fascinating reference back to what they had just managed to agree in a speech by Thirlby in the debate in the House of Lords in December 1548.

That House of Lords debate on the Bill which was to become the Act of Uniformity is the next bit of defined history, as the first-ever parliamentary reporter has left his manuscript account of a view from the gallery for us. Years ago I followed two nineteenth century scholars in transcribing this (it is in the manuscript section of the British Library), and published it in the old Grove Liturgical Study no.35, *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549* (1983). The debate is conducted almost entirely by the bishops, and is totally concerned with eucharistic theology, and mostly with doctrines of eucharistic presence. It would be interesting to-day to see if the present Lords Spiritual could match the patristic (and classical) learning of their forebears. Fascinating as the account is, it hardly refers to the draft text of the Book (though Thirlby, who was wanting a form of eucharistic oblation, is complaining about what is *not* in the Book, which had been there when he last saw it at Chertsey, but had somehow disappeared since (comparable behind-the-scenes activities in liturgical revision have been encountered in this present century also)).

The Act, with the Book attached, went through both Houses successfully, and gained the Royal Assent in January 1549 (that is our dating—to them it was 1548 until Lady Day—and *that* would have made a good side-argument about when a millennium should start . . .). The Act required the use of the Book from Whitsunday (or Pentecost), which in 1549 fell on 9 June. The first printed copies are dated 7 March, and the Act permitted its use before the Whit deadline 'if the book might be had earlier, then three weeks after a copy had been procured'. No excuse would have sufficed for being *after* the deadline.

This line from the Act gives one clue to the nature of the Prayer Book culture of Tudor times—one often forgotten by modern-day apologists for Cranmer's rites. The 1549 and subsequent Books were *not* people's handbooks; they were designed for the clergy to read from, and were largely designed for monologue 'up-front' recitation. One copy per parish was all that was expected (see the line from the Act above); and its price was controlled at three shillings and fourpence. That looks somewhere near to a farm-labourer's wages for a week—which today (with a minimum wage in force) would be above £140. So for several good reasons there was no PCC buying 100 copies of the new Book to put in the pews (and, if there had been, in most parishes there would have been less than ten per cent able to read them). In 1549 they retained 'clerks' who sang occasional responses—but they would have learned them by heart (and anyway they got abolished in 1552)—whilst, if the congregation were to join in anything (including the Lord's Prayer), then the recitation would be done by 'lining'. This activity meant that the minister read a line, and the people repeated it after him. The sole relic of this to-day is to be

Common Worship needs to sell itself on its own merits. We cannot make clergy and laity use or enjoy CW—they will only do so if what they get is better than they had before. If the services help people to express their relationship with God and one another better, then CW will be bought despite the demands of the new roof. But then—what do we do with thousands of redundant ASBs?

Dana Beney  
Durham Diocesan Officer for Development of Worship

#### DIOCESAN REPORTS: 1999-2000 CYCLE—5 LINCOLN

Four or five years ago the Lincoln Diocesan Liturgical Committee was so low-profile that apart from its members, hardly anyone else in the diocese knew it existed! Indeed several years before that it had produced a number of liturgical resources, in particular a small booklet entitled *Saints and Martyrs of the Diocese: Prayers and Readings for Diocesan Observations*, which was much appreciated at the time, but, except for an abortive attempt at revising the diocesan institution service, nothing had been attempted. It was not that it was moribund exactly, more that it had declined genteelly (as one would expect in Lincolnshire) into little more than a cosy talking-shop, meeting periodically for a pleasant afternoon's reminiscence of things long past (cf. Jasper and co) in the faded comfort of the now defunct theological college. And very pleasant it was too!

Then, all of a sudden, new members were appointed, a change of personnel, in particular the chairman, heralded an entirely different approach. From being concerned in the main with the academic, not to mention the anecdotal, aspects of liturgy, it found itself being transformed into to working committee whose business was to educate and inform the diocese as a whole in the run-up to the introduction of *Common Worship*. Now, considering the committee's own condition and the fact that in some parts of the diocese folk have only just come across the ASB (indeed, it is rumoured that in one or two of the more remote rural parishes they are still getting used to the BCP—1549 version), this was at first glance a bit of a tall order. However, we manfully faced up to the challenge and with the help of the Diocesan Clergy Training Officer, Peter Mullins, who is not only a member of General Synod, but also more importantly a member of this committee, we embarked on what the Bishop termed a 'road show' of training events in different parts of this geographically vast diocese.

That was three or more years ago and the process has continued unabated ever since. The first was a series of three separate training days on *Patterns for Worship* which proved very successful. This has been followed by evening sessions on the Three Year Lectionary and, most recently, three day events looking at the *Common Worship* baptism service. In addition there has been a day on *Celebrating Common*

## DIOCESAN REPORTS: 1999-2000 CYCLE—4 DURHAM

A year ago Bishop Michael asked me to work under the catchy job title, 'Diocesan Officer for easing the change-over from the ASB to Common Worship'.

I have enjoyed spending this year passing on information from the Liturgical Commission and Church House to clergy and laity—although more often I feel that I'm passing on a sense of uncertainty and confusion surrounding the authorisation and publication of our new liturgy.

How relieved I am that the Church of England does not operate a liturgical police force! As I travel around Durham diocese in the course of my work, I am constantly amazed at the diversity of liturgical use—one authorized modern language service, and a seemingly unlimited variety of usage. At least I have no responsibility for ensuring conformity, and it seems to me that Common Worship not only recognizes, but celebrates and encourages that local variety.

An enthusiastic group of liturgists has been working with me to introduce CW to parishes, chapters, and deaneries. However, most of our energy has gone into running a series of roadshows, six a year, around the diocese, where we introduce and demonstrate CW. Lay people, readers and clergy have attended in roughly equal numbers, and we have covered the ethos behind the new liturgy, as well as CLC, initiation, service of the word, children and communion, daily prayer (with particular emphasis on Durham *Daily Prayer*, of course), *Visual Liturgy*, singing psalms and seasonal material.

Our largest event this year is a clergy training day in June with Chris Irvine (Mirfield) and Jeremy Fletcher (LC). Because of the size of the conference venue (the Bishop's palace) we have been able to open the event to surrounding dioceses. Michael Perham would be proud of us—I'll be acting as lay deacon for the Bishop as he celebrates using Eucharistic Prayer F for the first time. Although much of the energy of the DLC is spent on CW, we continue to resource other aspects of diocesan liturgy, and musically the diocese is more active than ever. The DLC regularly runs Taizé and Iona worship and workshops, and has been helping parishes with limited musical resources. The Organists Training Scheme works with local musicians. We are looking into outside funding for a person to work in the diocese to improve the standard of music in our churches.

One of the joys of my job is to act as a focus for liturgy in Durham. While I am often at a loss, I can usually find some one who isn't. . . The internet has proved invaluable in enabling that process of dissemination! Questions about resourcing CW are frequent, and especially from those who are not computer literate. I hope that I will be able to offer parishes localized service booklets from the middle of 2000, which should give a little breathing space for those who have to choose between the new roof and the new liturgy. Help with spell checking would be appreciated!

found in the persistent marriage liturgy tradition of the officiant saying 'I, Paul, do take you, Susie, to be my married wife' and Paul then repeating it.

Apart from such rare articulation, the people's part was to listen, and to say 'Amen' at the end of prayers—and these two functions were connected, because Cranmer's great concern was that the people should understand what was being said in the liturgy, and should thus be able to say a true and meant Amen. But as to joining in in a congregational way—that was never in view (and remember there were no congregational hymns (or hymnbooks) in the Church of England in those days).

This itself gives a further clue to the reaction among them to the coming of the Book. The House of Lords might debate eucharistic doctrine and subtleties of sacramental wording. But these were academic luxuries for skilled readers, men who knew their Latin texts intimately as well the new English ones. They could in many cases think in both languages at once, and the concept of worshipping in English was not hitting them quite as it would the actual worshippers six months later, for their Lordships were debating written texts, and their attention was held by the niceties of theological debate about the eucharist, not by the cultural vulgarity of actually worshipping in the common tongue. Indeed they had already had an overview of the whole thing coming—an English Bible in 1537, an English litany in 1544, reading of Epistle and Gospel in English in 1547, and *The Order of the Communion*, a whole liturgical insertion into the mass, also in English, in March 1548. There was no point in fighting that trend, and quite probably the majority of bishops had already decided that the common tongue was coming anyway, and there was little point in resisting it on a point of principle.

Not so the average worshipper. By comparison it may hardly have mattered whether eucharistic doctrine had shifted or not (though they would certainly have noticed when the rite did not actually continue to the sacramental half of the service, because none had indicated in advance that they would communicate with the priest, and/or because none had remained in the chancel after coming up to offer their alms to the poor box, as the new rubrics required). But what shrieked novelty to the congregations was the vast cultural shift to the use of English for every detail of the service. The sound and feel and atmosphere were now to be created by the culture of the English-language liturgy. The old order, strenuously defended by Henry VIII, was now about to perish, for the very foundations were being shaken. From that point of view the issue of whether eucharistic doctrine had or had not been nuanced was very recondite indeed. As a matter of sheer fact, the priest was forbidden '*any elevation or showing the sacrament to the people*' in the relevant rubric, and the rite might have therefore seemed to have lost its heart to those who came primarily or exclusively to adore at the point of consecration. But it was equally likely, after a year of the unforeseen results of *The Order of the Communion*, that it would be much more noticeable that most Sundays now had no communion at all. At the offertory, the people (if they were obeying the rubrics) would process to the East wall to put their money in the poor men's box, and then

would process out again (was this, it is speculated, the 'Christmas game' to which the West Country rebels objected?). When the priest turned round and found no one there in the chancel, he could not proceed with the communion (which is one of the incidental side-proofs that 'offertory' from 1549 onwards means *money*, and it comes (as being in the ante-communion) whether there is a communion or not—which is plain sensible. Laying the table is a different exercise . . . but I am diverging again). The point was that the average worshipper would see enormous changes on a Sunday, changes which theologians and bishops might ignore for many purposes of their own debates.

So it came. It is my own contention that well before the point of publication, and probably even before they reached Chertsey in September 1548, Cranmer was clear that he was compiling a book which would hold the line for the moment, but which was itself to be but interim and was to be a 'teeing up' for that which was to come in the subsequent years. 1552 was already coming up over the horizon as 1549 took the limelight at Whit Sunday 1549. The story continues in 2000.

Colin Buchanan

#### THE NICENE CREED—SOME COMINGS AND GOINGS (AND EVEN PROCEEDINGS)

In the ELLC text of the Nicene Creed, published in *Praying Together* (Canterbury Press, 1990), lines 15 and 16 read as follows:

'[Jesus Christ] was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became truly human.'

To clear up one initial point we may note that the favoured ICET phrase of the early 1970s—'by the power of the Holy Spirit'—is now passing out of favour, having, in the eyes of ELLC, gone beyond the evidence. But the result still poses large questions, and the General Synod and its related bodies have been aware of those questions, even whilst finding themselves in an apparent procedural maelstrom about the answer. The ELLC commentary reads as follows:

[Re line 15] The Greek original (*ek Pneumatos hagiou kai Marias tes parthenou*) uses only one preposition *ek* (literally "out of" or "from") in relation to both the Holy Spirit and our Lord's mother. In English renderings of the Creed, however, the traditional idiom has long been "incarnate of", which the Consultation has decided to retain. An objection to "from" in English is that it tends to suggest too slight a role for Mary, as a mere channel, in the work of redemption . . . In the Vulgate version of the New Testament *de* is used, where the Greek original has *ek*, of both the Virgin (Galatians 4.4) and the Spirit (Matthew 1.20) . . . The Creed wants to make it clear that Jesus, the incarnate Son, is completely God and completely human and that the operation of both the Virgin and the Spirit were equally essential . . .'

Sarum College, *Confirmation Training Pack: Music in Worship* (Sarum College Press, 1999, £3.95 postfree from Sarum)

This pack has two components. An A5 booklet for the candidates (which costs 75p for extra copies) and a substantial 'Leader's Notes' on A4 sheets. The hope is that a confirmation course would include, say, one evening on 'Music in Worship', and these materials would help give shape, content and direction to such an evening. Part of the Leader's Notes is meant to be converted to an OHP—and the evening is meant to start with actual singing. I think Sarum is assuming more vocal members of the class than most parishes round my way produce, but the idea is right. We hope to give a more thorough review later.

COB

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

As an infrequent chalice assistant at the rail of a small Devon parish, I am amazed to see the number of people there who receive by intinction, and go nowhere near handling the chalice themselves. I would estimate it is about 1 in 12 communicants.

When I was last active in a parish (say 10 years ago), intinction was extremely rare, and as a new curate (20 years ago) I would be surprised to find it once a month.

I am not aware of any reason why, in this ordinary parish, there should be a preference for intinction. Is there a sudden rush going on elsewhere: if so why? Is it a fear of germs, bugs, or worse from your fellow-communicants? Or is it (as I sometimes suspect) that people are slightly afraid of the chalice (too big, might drop it, can't bear seeing lipstick on it . . .), and so they are voting with their mouths?

Whatever the reason is it to be encouraged, or are people to be gently dissuaded?

The Revd. Stephen Lynas  
Millennium Officer

#### Next Month's Publication . . .

. . . is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no.43, *Baptism in Early Byzantine Palestine, 325-451*, by Juliette Day. Juliette Day read a fascinating paper on this subject at the SLS Conference in 1998, and has now turned it into a published Study. It is distinguished by her great care about issues of both topography and dating, which has both corrected other scholars and given a notable overview of a special period.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Martin Kitchen, Georgina Heskins and Stephen Motyer, *Word of Promise* (Canterbury Press, 1998, 139pp. pb. £9.99)

*Word of Promise* provides a basic commentary on the principal service readings for each Sunday and major holy day in Year A of the new lectionary, the year of Matthew, which of course we are following at the moment. This is the second of a three volume series that the authors are providing: *Word of Life* was published last year (Year C) and *Word of Truth* is promised for the next (Year B).

The commentary is concise, combining a thoughtful engagement with the biblical text with an eye for pastoral application. Preachers will find the material a useful stimulus and starting point for sermon preparation. There may also be occasions when the commentary could be used as it stands: it could read as a means of prompting discussion on the readings within a Bible study group, or to aid reflection on the readings within a service when an alternative to a delivered sermon might be appropriate.

The only small quibble is with the way the commentary has a tendency to identify common themes in the readings in ordinary time when, unlike the ASB lectionary, the new lectionary is designed to free us from a thematic approach.

Despite this, this book is a worthy addition to a preacher's bookshelf.

James Steven

George Otto Simms, with prayers by Brian Mayne, *Commemorating Saints & Others of the Irish Church* (Columba Press, Dublin, 72pp. £3.99)

This is a very special little book for me. Partly because it emerged from the work of the Church of Ireland Liturgical Advisory Committee, as a kind of unofficial Irish 'supplement' to *Clouds of Witnesses* but even more so because we have here some of the last work of the dearly-loved George Otto Simms. As with all his writing, it is beautiful in its simplicity, as also are the prayers written by Brian Mayne. This will be a treasury for members of the Church of Ireland and others, taking us back to our richly-nourished roots in Celtic spirituality, and enabling us to celebrate in understanding and prayer those who have made the Gospel known throughout this island. The book is beautifully and simply produced, and enhanced by a picture of Saul Church (in the Diocese of Down, naturally!) on its cover.

Harold Miller

Bishop of Down and Dromore

[Re line 16] ' . . . Some would have preferred to keep "and became man" as showing the particularity of the incarnation in a male person, Jesus. The Consultation rejected this as misrepresenting what the Creed affirms at this point. Neither the Greek *anthropos* nor the Latin *homo* carry male overtones as "man" in contemporary English normally does.'

In 1993 Synod authorized a set of *Affirmations of Faith*, approved and printed alongside its companion of *A Service of the Word*. In this the text of the Nicene Creed was identical to its old form in the ASB, including the un-inclusive 'us men' and the double procession of the Spirit. The ELLC text had fallen under grave criticism for just the two lines examined closely above, and I have noted separately above the fall from favour of 'the power of the Holy Spirit'. However, a strong mind behind the scenes had been expressed by some bishops against 'was made fully human'. So, when the newer version of *A Service of the Word and Affirmations of Faith* was going through the House of Bishops and Synod in 1997-98, we were still grappling with the ASB forms as before (though not 'us men') - and the text still read 'by the power of the Holy Spirit he became incarnate of the Holy Spirit by the Virgin Mary, and became man.' The Synod bought it, and *A Service of the Word* was in November authorized with that text.

However, the draft eucharistic rites for *Common Worship* have had a more complex history. They have followed ELLC in 'was incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary; but, because of earlier doubts in the House of Bishops, have retained the earlier 'and was made man'. When they came to Synod for their Second Revision Stage in November, the incarnation line drew the attention of Tony Thiselton. He moved the return to the ASB text in this line also and carried the Synod for the change back.

The House of Bishops considered this one in January, just as they did the Lord's Prayer. Their 'Summary of decisions' reads as follows:

'The House considered the amendment that was passed at the November Group of Sessions concerning line 16 of the Nicene Creed. The Synod's decision to substitute ". . . by the power of the Holy Spirit he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary" (as in the ASB) for ". . . was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary" (as in the ELLC text) raised doctrinal issues. After discussion, the House agreed that it continued to stand by the ELLC text. It further agreed to draw up explanatory papers in time for its June meeting, with the intention that these should be made available to Synod members well in advance of a Synod debate on these matters.

'It was noted that, in order to enable full and proper consideration by the Synod of the matter, it might become necessary to separate the text of the Nicene Creed and the issues it raised from the Final Approval of the Order for the Celebration of the Holy Communion.'

So what's the great issue? Well, the theologians say that there is actually no mirror-image comparability between the role of the Spirit and the role of the Virgin Mary in the incarnation, and to say blankly 'was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and

the Virgin Mary' is to risk the most frightful (indeed unmentionable) heresy. The traditionalist and ELLC reply that, if that is so, the Nicene Creed is itself in error in its original Greek, which has a simple 'ek' governing both the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary indifferently!

There may well be a battle ahead. It may well include an element of outrage at the House of Bishops for reversing an amendment made in full Synod. It cannot of itself be a plea to stick closely with ELLC, as 'was made fully human' has never really figured in the discussion. Nor, we may add, is departure from ELLC as serious as with the Lord's Prayer—the Creed is said in worship and in informal groups far far less often than the Lord's Prayer, and, when it is said, it is said from the printed text rather than from memory. Disagreements here (as with the Filioque) can be contained. With the Lord's Prayer they bid fair to be fatal to any widespread use of a modern text, but that is not the case with the Creed, where ancient texts are not printed in parallel with the modern.

### A SYNODICAL CASUALTY

My own Private Member's Motion, which I have advertised here in the past, was to discontinue the requirement of confirmation for those baptized in 'riper years'. But less than 75 persons have signed my motion in its first twelve months, so it now lapses. When you believe you have some significant fragment to add to the total package of Anglican conventions, rules and more, it is humiliating to find such a small percentage will go with the idea. But supporting lost causes is no novelty in my life

COB

### OTHER SYNODICAL LIKELIHOODS

There will be news of final, or next, stages in revision in Synod in the June issue of NOL. One clear result already available is the fact that the 'Wholeness and Healing' revision is not yet finished and the Second Revision Stage cannot therefore take place in July, but will have to come in November,

### WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

Pat Dearnley has supplied us with his last two from Liverpool (he is retiring this month). At a recent Synod, after an address about the needs of the deaf, the eucharistic prayer began:

'The Lord is hear.'

Later on, a crescendo of a well-known hymn was reached with:

'High king of heaven, my treasurer thou art.'

Jeremy Fletcher writes of a variant on Kendrick that the Son of God came

'... not so much to be served as to swerve.'

whilst Jerry Lepine hit trouble in the same hymn with

'He calls us not to follow him.'

Stephen Lynas, he of millennium fame, writes (from within his own province) that in Gloucester, whilst the City Council is not laying anything on on New Year's Eve, the cathedral is planning an 'economical Watch Night Service' (Stephen fears it is his CTE budget being squeezed again).

Simon Law of Becontree wonders about the meaning of 'BCF' in the March review (the one that tackled the Daft Psalter) as the term is clearly calendrical—and he speculates on 'Before Calendrical Fussiness' or 'Before Correct Fudging'. But then he objects to what it would have meant if it had been correct—a strongly Christian standpoint.

And Adrian Daffern, he who provided the Lichfield report last month, very properly points out that there are some things a Spellcheck (much despised in these quarters) *would* have uncovered where his own perfect spelling had been bowdlerized by the NOL dumbing down processes. These included:

'Lichefield' for 'Lichfield'

'bing' for 'being'

'ooffer' for 'offer'

'opportutnity' for 'opportunity'

'dicussion' for 'discussion' (or possibly for 'percussion')

'clerlgy' for 'clergy'

And, yes, they were OK when sent to us. It is our particular genius to make the material unique and unrepeatable.

Finally there is that which has, we think, been reported in the *Church Times*. The new baptismal rite has the Apostles' Creed in it. An untraced cleric did a baptism for one young girl one week and another the next. The first one was called 'Mary' and the second 'Edna'. The cleric instructed the computer to replace 'Mary' with 'Edna' throughout, and then ran off the service. Sure enough—and we know you have seen it coming—the Apostles' Creed included 'born of the Virgin Edna'. Oh yes, and similarly!

Dear Bishop Colin

Liturgical Spell Check, well, not spell check exactly, but the same sort of thing. We print Orders of Service for Marriages (rather better than commercial ones). Personalizing them is usually a simple matter of changing hymns etc. and using 'Find & Replace' to change the names. Fortunately my word processor has a count in this feature so when it told me it had replaced 7 Paul with Dylan, but only 6 Jennifer with Jacqueline I became suspicious and did a manual check. Sure enough there was the Scripture Reading 'from the letter of St. Dylan to the Corinthians'!

Mind, I did wonder how many of those attending would have known any better ...

Bruce Carlin