

The new Draft rite does not reflect this New Testament view of the Eucharist. The rite neatly dovetails the thanksgiving for creation, redemption, and sanctification; many Evangelicals will welcome the fuller rehearsal of the mighty acts of God, for the Cross is thereby placed in its rightful setting (though it is regrettable that the Second Coming is virtually abstracted); the breaking of the bread together with the repetition of 1 Cor. 10 : 16, 17 is great gain; and if the above view of the Eucharist were enshrined here, there would be little fear of a misinterpretation of the new words of administration, which are no more literalist than the words Christ Himself used.

But basically the rite is defective. The Hippolytan oblation of the bread and cup, apart from being a feature for which there is no biblical justification, can be interpreted, because of this static view which is maintained, as an offering, by the people of God, of Christ Himself, and so it is further cause for greater dissatisfaction with the rite. It is almost unbelievable that the Commission, which is aware of the dispute concerning the offertory, seems unaware of the deeper dispute in the Church concerning doctrines of eucharistic sacrifice associated with the oblation.

The Conclusion of the service is brief and rapid comprising a précis of the 1662 Prayer of Thanksgiving, or in its place a responsive self-offering by the communicants, and the dismissal.

These services are experimental and as such are meant to call forth discussion and criticism and constructive suggestion. The points raised in this article are put forward as a contribution to that discussion.

## Lambeth 1958 and the "Liturgy for Africa" (II)

BY ROGER BECKWITH

**I**N the former part of this study we reviewed the main proposals regarding liturgical revision made by the committee which reported on the Book of Common Prayer at the 1958 Lambeth Conference, and saw how the first two proposals have been implemented in the experimental *Liturgy for Africa*—the proposals, namely, that the 1662 Prayer Book should cease to be regarded in the Anglican Communion as a norm either of doctrine or of worship, and that all Anglican services of Holy Communion should be revised so as to conform to a new structure, of which the committee laid the foundations. We noted that a second communion service, constructed on similar lines to the *Liturgy for Africa* by the Church of England Liturgical Commission, was known to be in preparation, and an interim draft of this has now appeared in *Alternative Services : Second Series* (S.P.C.K., 1965), which is discussed in the preceding article. Like the *Liturgy for Africa*, it is "a radical revision" (*Second Series*, p. 145) and embodies virtually all the

suggestions of the Lambeth committee regarding the structure : if there are still striking differences between the two services, this is partly because the committee's intention that its new structure should be completed has not been carried out. In the second half of this study we must consider the rest of the committee's main proposals, which are recommendations for specific innovations of doctrine, and see how far these also are reflected in the *Liturgy for Africa*. Nor will it be irrelevant to note in passing how far they are reflected in the English service as well.

\* \* \* \*

It is readily understandable, after the committee has proposed that 1662 should cease to be a norm of doctrine, that it goes on to express the opinion that controversy about the eucharistic sacrifice can be "laid aside", and to recommend prayer for the dead. But these are not the sole instances of divergence from Anglican doctrine, either in the committee's report or in the *Liturgy for Africa* : they are simply the most prominent. There are two others of importance, which we listed among the committee's suggestions about the new structure, and which, since they can be dealt with fairly briefly, it is convenient to deal with first.

One of these is the committee's suggestion, implemented in the *Liturgy for Africa* (as also in the proposed English service, *Second Series*, pp. 153f., and cf. pp. 4, 6, where the words of the committee are quoted), that "the present corporate expressions of penitence" in the Prayer Book "need to be modified both in length and language". The confessions in the *Liturgy for Africa* (there is a choice of three) are not in themselves objectionable : indeed, more objection might be taken to the form of the absolution, which (as in the proposed English service) omits God's promise to forgive those who repent and believe, leaving this to be expressed simply in the now optional comfortable words. One of the confessions is derived from the C.S.I. liturgy, where it is in turn derived from the *Book of Common Order* of the Church of Scotland (a parent church of the C.S.I.) ; the other two are derived, either directly or *via* the South African and U.M.C.A. rites, from the Roman mass. The disturbing thing is that it was thought necessary to weaken the language of 1662, with the result that the 1662 confession is not retained even as one among the many options. This is all of a piece with the provision whereby the preceding declaration of the Law is made optional, and with the tendency in many of the revisions of the Prayer Book used in different parts of the Anglican Communion to play down the themes of sin, penitence, and judgment. The C.I.P.B.C. committee, in the course of its report, considered this trend in Anglican thought, against which so strong a stand had been made by writers like D. R. Davies (*Down Peacock's Feathers : studies in the Contemporary Significance of the General Confession*, Centenary Press, 1942). Its report contains a section on the "Alleged Humanistic Optimism" of the revised Prayer Books, and it finds the charge to some extent justified (*op. cit.*, pp. 21-23) ; but, though this report, like that of the English Liturgical Commission, was sent to all bishops attending the 1958 Lambeth Conference, none of its authors was put on the Lambeth

Prayer Book committee, and it seems to have had little influence on the committee's work. Consequently, we find the Lambeth committee encouraging this deplorable tendency in Prayer Book revision, and the tendency itself continued in the work of the Church of England Liturgical Commission (see its baptism service, its outline for the revision of the communion service, *Re-shaping the Liturgy*, pp. 4, 21f., and now its services of morning and evening prayer and holy communion) and in the *Liturgy for Africa*.

The second proposal of the Lambeth committee that concerns us here is its suggestion that "the events for which thanksgiving is made in the Consecration Prayer are not to be confined to Calvary but include thanksgiving for all the principal 'mighty works of God', especially the resurrection and the ascension of our Lord, and his return in glory". This is in itself a harmless proposal, based on ancient usage, and nearly every revised communion service of the Anglican world has made some change in this direction. But there is real danger that if the change is made without due circumspection, the central place which Christ's death and resurrection have in the New Testament may be lost to view among the other "mighty works of God", and the fact that the eucharist itself was instituted in commemoration primarily of Christ's *death* may be obscured.

It is not always observed that in 1 Cor. 11: 26 St. Paul gives a formal exposition of our Lord's words, "Do this in commemoration of me", which he has just quoted, interpreting them as meaning "Do this in proclamation of my *death*". The symbolism of the rite fully supports St. Paul's interpretation. Hence, when Cranmer's communion services (especially in the exhortations, the consecration prayer, and the 1552 words of distribution) draw attention to the fact that the sacrament is instituted in remembrance of Christ's death, he is not guided by medieval conceptions, as is often supposed today (see, for example, *Re-shaping the Liturgy*, p. 30), but by the New Testament itself. The revised Anglican communion services have not always retained Cranmer's exhortations or words of distribution, but they all retain, in whole or in part, usually in the same position, those impressive words of his with which 1662 begins its prayer of consecration, "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ *to suffer death upon the cross* for our redemption; who made *there* (by his *one* oblation of himself *once* offered) a *full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction*, for the sins of the *whole* world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a *perpetual memory of that his precious death*, until his coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, *in remembrance of his death and passion*, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. . . ." Where these words stand in pride of place, the death of Christ can never lose its proper centrality in the service. But such relics of this language as remain in the consecration prayer of the *Liturgy for Africa* (no relics at all remain in that of the proposed English service) are introduced quite incidentally, and are practically lost in a prayer where the opening thanksgivings, as

well as the *anamnesis* after the institution narrative, simply include Christ's death in a recital of the gospel events, as having no special importance among them. It is doubtful whether any previous Anglican liturgy (except the eccentric Bombay liturgy) gives the death of Christ so little emphasis, and, whatever be the cause of this, nothing can justify it in face of New Testament teaching as recovered by Cranmer. The cause is not actually far to seek. It lies partly, one may surmise, in the fact that not all the ancient liturgies give the death of Christ adequate emphasis, and partly in the fact that the conceptions of the atonement now popular exclude all penal, propitiatory, and substitutionary ideas, and consequently take the emphasis off Christ's death, with which those ideas are inextricably bound up. It has, of course, been demonstrated by writers like Leon Morris (*The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, Tyndale Press, 1955) that to exclude such ideas and to take the emphasis off Christ's death when treating of the atonement does the greatest violence to the witness of the New Testament. But their words were lost upon the Lambeth committee, who, in their excursus on "The Eucharistic Sacrifice", lay it down as a principle that "the sacrifice of Christ as the offering of willing obedience included not only his death on the Cross but all that contributed to it, of which it was the culmination. The finished work of Calvary is consummated in the resurrection and ascension". Everything in this statement clearly depends upon the definition of Christ's sacrifice as "the offering of willing obedience". It is only by treating this part of the truth as the whole that the committee can draw the conclusions it does.

\* \* \* \*

The third divergence from Anglican doctrine is in the matter of prayer for the dead. The Lambeth committee here says a good deal of which Evangelicals would approve. It concedes that prayers which reflect the doctrines of purgatory and pardons are unscriptural and unanglican. It concedes that there is a difference of opinion among Anglicans as to other sorts of prayers for the dead, though it claims that the vast majority is in favour of them. It declares that there is need for a fresh study of biblical teaching in this regard, and also for "the elucidation and criticism of traditional liturgical forms" used for this purpose. And it proposes that in the meantime provinces revising the Prayer Book should make prayers for the dead optional, and should provide thanksgivings as alternatives. The committee could hardly have gone further than this without condemning the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., which has an obligatory petition that the faithful departed may grow in grace in its prayer of consecration. The committee apparently favours the notion behind this petition, but rightly considers that no such speculation ought in future to be inflicted on Christians in general, as it necessarily is when made an obligatory element in public worship.

It is worth remembering that those distinguished Anglican divines from the end of the classical period (men like Bramhall, Thorndike, Morton, Ussher, and Jeremy Taylor) who defended the practice of the early church in praying for the dead, were not concerned to promote

this speculation about growth in grace during the intermediate state, any more than they were concerned to promote the baldly anti-biblical ideas that the faithful departed need to be delivered from purgatorial torments (contrary to Lk. 16: 19-31 ; 23: 43 ; 2 Cor. 5: 6-8 ; Phil. 1: 21, 23 ; Rev. 6: 11 ; 14: 13) and that those who have not been justified by faith in this life can be justified after death (contrary to Jn. 3: 36 ; 8: 21, 24 ; Rom. 1-3 ; Heb. 9: 27). Generally speaking, they were quite clear that one could only pray lawfully for those whom God could rightly be expected to bless, and could only ask blessings which were really future and which God could rightly be expected to grant. This virtually meant confining one's petitions to three themes : that the blessed dead might continue in blessedness, that their resurrection might be hastened, and that they might obtain a merciful judgment and the consummation of their bliss at the Last Day. The need for these careful restrictions, and the knowledge how constantly in the history of the Church they have been transgressed, are sufficient to show the danger of the practice of praying for the dead, and the timeliness of the committee's call for a scrutiny of those vague or misleading expressions of it which have lately come into common use among Anglicans. It is significant that hardly any of the divines in question seem to have desired that prayer for the dead should be brought back into public use. Consequently, the opportunity of bringing it back at the 1662 revision was not taken, and even the Laudian revisers Wren and Cosin did not propose that it should be (see G. J. Cuming, ed., *The Durham Book*, Oxford, 1961, paras. 221, 224).

The Lambeth committee makes certain other statements on prayer for the dead which are not so easy to defend as those we have so far considered. The committee concedes that "the Book of Common Prayer (1662) makes no clear provision" for the practice, but it apparently intends us to infer that provision is made by implication, since it afterwards says that "our Church formularies deliberately leave room" for both points of view on the subject. This is an idea which goes well back into the seventeenth century, for in 1658 we find Bramhall maintaining that the phrase "we with this our brother and all other departed in the true faith of thy holy name" in the prayer before the collect at the burial of the dead is to be interpreted as making the departed as well as us the subject of the petition (*Works*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, vol. 2, p. 633f.). Cosin, if we may judge from his manuscript *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer* (series one and two), interpreted the phrase in the same way. But in actual fact this prayer was introduced in 1552 as a *substitute* for the prayer for the departed that stood in this place in the Prayer Book of 1549. The same form of language found its way (*via* the bidding prayers of Queen Elizabeth's *Injunctions* and of Canon 55) into the 1662 prayer for the Church at holy communion ; but the 1662 revisers had no intention of introducing prayer for the dead at this point (cf. Cuming, *loc. cit.*), and the ultimate decision to retain the words "militant here in earth" at the head of the prayer made the fact explicit. Since these are the only plausible examples of prayer for the dead that can be produced, it is certain that the 1662 Prayer Book

makes no provision whatever for the practice ; and as for the rest of " our Church formularies ", the Book of Homilies, after discussing the practice, actually condemns it (" Concerning Prayer ", pt. 3).

In reality, prayer for the dead which is recognizable as such had no place in any authorized Anglican liturgy between 1552 and 1912. It is therefore a departure from a tradition of continuous Anglican usage over three and a half centuries long. " Official " forms of prayer containing petitions for the dead were issued in England in the Boer War and the First World War, and have since become common. But it was in Scotland that prayer for the dead was first introduced into the formularies, the 1912 Scottish Prayer Book including such a prayer in its service for the burial of a child. Prayer for the dead was first introduced into the communion service by one or other of the U.M.C.A. dioceses, which began to adopt their distinctive liturgies about 1919. All other Anglican churches which have prayer for the dead in their formularies (such as the churches in the U.S.A., South Africa, Canada, and Japan) have introduced it since that date.

Seeing, then, that prayer for the dead is not an authentic element in the Anglican tradition of public worship, and seeing that the practice is not, of course, enjoined in Scripture and has proved itself so lamentably open to abuse, it is regrettable that the Lambeth committee recommends it, even as an option. The *Liturgy for Africa*, however, has followed this recommendation (as has the proposed English service, *Second Series*, p. 153), and among the optional biddings of which its " Intercession " consists is the following :

" For all who have departed this life in thy faith and fear, we pray to thee, O God " .

A petition as vague as this admits of an orthodox interpretation, but also gives scope for mistaken ideas of many kinds.

\* \* \* \*

The Lambeth committee's excursus on the eucharistic sacrifice has incurred serious criticism both from the Evangelical side and from the Anglo-Catholic (see J. I. Packer, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, Church Book Room Press, 1962, pp. 1-21, and the appended note by E. L. Mascall in A. Couratin, *Lambeth and Liturgy*). It may well be thought that teaching which Mascall judges to go beyond the teaching of Rome (*op. cit.*, p. 15) can hardly be a satisfactory expression of Anglicanism ! Yet, once the committee has defined Christ's sacrifice as simply " the offering of willing obedience " (a definition which we have already criticized), there is nothing surprising in the inferences it draws. It infers not only that Christ's sacrifice extended through the whole of His work on earth, but also that we ourselves can share in the offering of it. (This is not precisely the teaching of Rome, but differs chiefly in being based on a less biblical conception of the atonement.) The latter influence of course raises the problem of the gap in time between the first century and the twentieth, but this the committee attempts to bridge by a medley of arguments derived from the timelessness of God, the ministry of the Spirit, the status of the Church as the mystical body, and the believer's death and resurrection with Christ. By stretching the first and second of these doctrines beyond their biblical

spheres, and treating the remaining two as literal, not figurative, truths, the committee is enabled to draw the conclusion (quite at variance with the Gospel) that in the eucharist "we present it (*sc.* Christ's sacrifice) again". On the basis of this "new knowledge", which the committee congratulates biblical and liturgical scholars for supplying, it reaffirms its belief that a new structure for the communion service is possible, such as will win its way throughout the whole Anglican Communion, and will resolve the present tension between services of the 1549 and 1552 types. There is no need to add that the new structure would be nearer to that of 1549 than to that of 1552, and nearer still to that of the Roman mass.

In accordance with the committee's advice, the *Liturgy for Africa* includes in its consecration prayer, after the institution narrative, an *anamnesis* in which the bread and wine are offered to God. (The proposed English service does the same.) At this point in the service even ambiguous language, like that of the C.S.I. liturgy, is hardly tolerable, and the language of the *Liturgy for Africa*, though a trifle apologetic, is in no way ambiguous. "Offering to thee, *with this holy Bread and Cup*, our praise and thanksgiving" is the expression used, and "Bread" and "Cup" are each given a capital letter, which they retain for the rest of the service, whereas small letters have been used prior to this prayer. One cannot, therefore, doubt that it is the *consecrated* bread and wine which are being offered to God (as is also shown by the fact that the *unconsecrated* elements have already been offered to God at the offertory), and the overtones of the sacrifice of the mass are unmistakable.

It is true, of course, that an oblation of the elements at this point has ancient precedent, not only in the Roman mass itself, but also in the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. In several of these liturgies, however, the oblation is followed by a consecratory *epiclesis* or invocation of the Spirit upon the elements, such as to make it clear that anciently the elements were not conceived of as consecrated at the time of the oblation, despite the way the Roman and Eastern churches understand their liturgies today. The Nonjurors' liturgies of 1718 and 1734 and their immediate descendants, the Scottish liturgy of 1764 and the American of 1790, follow the same pattern; and the Nonjurors and eighteenth century high churchmen taught emphatically that the oblation was to be thought of as an oblation of bread and wine. But the *epiclesis* and the oblation of the *unconsecrated* elements are themselves open to objection, so the gain is only a limited one. And when the apparent meaning of such a liturgy is contradicted by the teaching of those who draw it up (as is the case with certain recent liturgies of Anglo-Catholic origin—the South African, for example), the value of the *epiclesis* decreases further. It is not, therefore, an unmitigated disaster that this feature, which dominated the minds of revisers from before 1718 until after 1928, has now fallen into disrepute, as being rather less ancient than was formerly thought, and consequently does not appear in the *Liturgy for Africa* (or in the proposed English service). But one cannot get away from the fact that its absence makes the retention

of the oblation even more serious than it would otherwise be, for, with the disappearance also of virtually all that is said in the exordium of the consecration prayer about Christ's finished work at Calvary (a loss which we have already deplored), there is now no safeguard left against doctrine of a Roman type. And the urgent need for safeguards today is sufficiently shown by the character of the Lambeth committee's excursus, and by the fact that it emanates not simply from Anglo-Catholics, but from men of quite varied churchmanship.

\* \* \* \*

Such, then, are the doctrinal innovations which the Lambeth committee recommends and which the *Liturgy for Africa* embodies. It is clear that at least three of the four are connected: for a watered-down doctrine of sin naturally belongs with a watered-down doctrine of the atonement, and the two together open the way for a doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice which makes us in effect our own saviours. The service has other faults also. Thus, the oblation of the unconsecrated bread and wine at the offertory would only be meaningful if it were made clear that these must be a real part of the people's gifts, as in the early Church. The psalm and the creed, which are entirely optional, ought to be obligatory at the main hour of Sunday worship—the occasion for which the service is primarily intended; nor does there seem to be any good reason why the *Gloria in Excelsis* should not be obligatory then. But these are small matters compared with the doctrinal innovations, which, far from being acceptable to all modern Anglicans, are bound to divide Anglicans in their worship during the experimental period, and at the end of that period could even cause disruption.

This is not mere speculation. For the African provinces have lately been considering what use they will make of the *Liturgy* during the experimental period. West Africa played little part in its preparation and is apparently not likely to use it at all. Uganda and the two Anglo-Catholic provinces have authorized their dioceses to use the published version, though one wonders how far the diocese of Uganda will want to use it, in view of its doctrinal character, and how far those of South Africa and Central Africa will want to use it, when they already have liturgies of the same doctrinal character which are even more outspoken. But it is the action taken in East Africa that is really significant, for in that province the dioceses have been authorized to use the *Liturgy*, but in a different version, from which the petition for the dead has been deliberately excluded. Archbishop Brown admits that prayer for the dead is the reason why East Africa has its own version (*Relevant Liturgy*, p. 59), and one can only hope that other Anglican provinces elsewhere will take due warning, and will not be misled by the Lambeth committee's report into making the same mistake as the authors of the *Liturgy for Africa* and the proposed English service have made. For those who suppose that the controversies which split the Church at the Reformation are of easy solution, and throw over the 1662 pattern of worship in favour of a pre-Reformation pattern, are going the right way towards splitting the Church again.



## EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

### E.F.A.C. News

**Australia.** Well-attended courses in theology and practical Christianity have been held at Holy Trinity Church, Adelaide. On Sunday afternoons there have been intermediate lectures for adult classes in preliminary theology (using a course produced by Moore Theological College, Sydney) and also a theological study circle.

**Iran.** Two missions have been held : a one-week series of meetings in the Christian Hospital and in the church at Isfahan, where the attendance of non-Christians was most encouraging ; and a smaller mission in Teheran sponsored by the Evangelical Church of Iran, at which the Bishop, the Rt. Rev. H. B. Dehqani-Tafti, was the main speaker. During the summer there was the usual two-month course for church members—the "Garden of Evangelism"—providing training in Bible study, church life, and evangelism.

**Uganda.** There has been a considerable increase in E.F.A.C. membership here. The Rev. Michael Green of the London College of Divinity visited and spoke at Bishop Tucker College, and many students have been converted since.

**Kenya.** Members of the Rift Valley Evangelical Fellowship have been considering together questions relating to the communication of the Gospel—the relationship between doctrine and testimony in preaching, especially in the light of revival in Africa, and the methods that may be used in preaching, such as pictorial language and parables which are so well suited to African listeners.

**South Africa.** The conventions held at uBhekitemba in Natal and at Kwa Thema in the Transvaal were well supported. The Rev. Dick Lucas, Rector of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, in the City of London, conducted services for business men in the main cities of the Union and also attended the seventh annual E.F.A.C. conference (C.P.S.A.) held at Forest Sanctuary, Stutterheim, the theme of which was "The Growing Church". Other speakers were the Rev. Jim Sexby, the Rev. Stanley Syson, and the Rev. Peter Akehurst. Officers for the ensuing year were elected as follows : National Chairman, the Rev. Canon S. G. Wakeling ; National Vice-Chairman, the Rev. P. R. Akehurst ; Clerical Secretary, the Rev. I. R. M. Main ; Lay Secretary, Mr. R. I. V. Hall.

**Tributes to Bishop G. F. B. Morris.** The death of George Frederick Bingley Morris on 20 June 1965 was widely reported in both the religious and the secular press. His life was devoted to the ministry of the Gospel in Africa. At Cambridge he had been President of the C.I.C.C.U. In 1913 he went out to Central Africa to serve with the Africa Inland Mission. Thirty years later he was appointed Bishop in North Africa. In 1955, shortly after his retirement from the North African Bishopric, he responded to a call to go to South Africa as Bishop of the C.E.S.A. We quote from two of the many tributes which were paid to his memory : The Archbishop of East Africa, Dr. L. J. Beecher, wrote : "The passing of Bishop Morris removes a man deeply devoted and greatly beloved from his family and a very wide circle of friends to whom his ministry over a very long number of years has been

a very wonderful experience". And the Rt. Rev. Neville Langford-Smith, Bishop of Nakuru (where Bishop Morris spent his last days) wrote: "We had accepted him as he was among us in Nakuru, a father in the Faith, a humble servant of his Master, and a man of gentle and friendly spirit. All who knew him loved him. . . . We thank God for his life of faith and obedience, and for those closing years reflecting the peace and joy of Christ".

**Protestant Episcopal Church of America.** "The Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion, United States Branch," formed last year, has been accepted into group membership of E.F.A.C. The President is the Rev. Dr. Philip E. Hughes, who is Guest Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Columbia Theological Seminary, Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels Episcopal Church, Stone Mountain, Georgia, and Editor of *The Churchman*; and its Secretary (to whom all correspondence should be addressed) is the Rev. Peter C. Moore, Director of the Council for Religion in Independent Schools, 626 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10031.

**Argentina.** "La Asociacion de Anglicanos Evangelicos de Argentina" has also been welcomed as an E.F.A.C. group member. Its Chairman is the Ven. W. J. H. Flagg, Archdeacon of Northern Argentina; and its Secretary (to whom all correspondence should be addressed) is the Rev. Maurice M. H. Jones, Mision Chaquena, Padre Lozano, F.C.N.G.B. (Salta), Argentina.

**Christian Foundations.** The six titles due to be published in 1966 are:

- 11 Jan. *Rome and Reformation* (A Stubborn Problem Re-examined) by James Atkinson
- 12 Mar. *For All the World* (The Christian Mission in the Modern Age) by John V. Taylor
- 13 May *The Open Table* (Christian Hospitality at the Lord's Supper) by James Hickinbotham
- 14 July *The People's Church* (A Layman's Plea for Partnership) by George Goyder
- 15 Sept. *Right to Baptize* (The Contemporary Dilemma) by Geoffrey Hart
- 16 Nov. *Glory in the Cross* (A Study in Atonement) by Leon Morris

**E.F.A.C. Bursary Scheme.** Six African clergy (one from Nigeria, two from Uganda, one from Kenya, and one from Tanzania) were brought to England as E.F.A.C. Bursary Students in September 1965. Each was chosen by an E.F.A.C. Bursary Selection Committee in his own country. They are studying for a degree or diploma in theology at the London College of Divinity (Northwood), Cranmer Hall (Durham), and Clifton Theological College (Bristol). They are also gaining further experience during the vacations in evangelical parishes, which are contributing to their support. It is hoped to bring over another six students for the 1966/67 academic year, including one from Asia. Donations are urgently needed, and may be sent to the Hon. Secretary of the E.F.A.C. Bursary Scheme, the Rev. W. M. D. Persson, Christ Church Vicarage, St. Alban's Road, Barnet, Herts.