

COMMENTS ON THE GRAYMOOR DRAFT

These recommendations are disparate; together with a few substantial points there are many minor points of drafting. I hope it will be in order for me to include suggestions concerning the earlier section of the document which was agreed at Graymoor. I wished to make some of these remarks then, but held back as we were trying to produce a final text in a short time. Now that more time is available I would like to have the points considered.

par.1, 1.4. More grammatical to say: "whose death and resurrection have accomplished".

par.1, 1.7. Better: "this communion with God and with each other".

par.1, 1.8. Better not to stress gender here. "Given to human beings".

par.2, 11. 3-4. It sounds as if the disagreements in the 14th and 15th centuries concerned the relationship between the individual and the community in justification, whereas the more relevant disagreement concerned the respective parts played by human beings and God. Write: "part played by human beings if".

par.2, 1.5. The section beginning "Most theologians" is an exposition, not of the disagreements, but of agreements that existed despite the disagreements. Therefore write: "However most theologians ..."

par.4, 1.9. Better to say "these Anglican formularies", as the Six Articles had been compiled in 1539.

page 2, last line. Could one say: "Trent could rightly be taken to accommodate their demands"?

par.5, 1.6. Omit "This is at the heart of the Gospel", as we have used the phrase in the first sentence of the document. If we must keep it here, we could explicitly refer back to par.1 by saying: "This is, as we have said, the heart ...". Another way of making the point would be to say in par.5, 1.2: "Above all there was agreement about the fundamental truth of the Gospel, namely that the act ..." Alternatively for sentence 3 substitute the following: "This is the fundamental truth of the Gospel."

page 4, 1.4. To speak of faith supporting hope is to use too weak a word. Could we not omit the words "rather than supporting it"?

page 4, 11. 6-7. These lines would read more smoothly if we wrote: "had lapsed into scrupulosity or mere externalism and so lost Christian hope and assurance".

page 4, note 1. Delete comma after "verb".

par.7, penult. line. The word "forged", which implies effort, is an inappropriate word for the imparting by God of habitual grace. Write "created".

pages 4-5, note 2. The first sentence of this note seems misplaced. It refers to the matter discussed in par. 8. Could we add at the end of that par. (in the text, not as a note) "The Anglican theologians of the reformation age held 'good works' to be insufficient but not irrelevant to salvation, and took 'by faith alone' to mean 'only for the merit of Christ' (so Cranmer's Homily on Salvation)."? The rest of the note is relevant to par.7, but the first words would have to be changed: "To the Anglicans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, imputed ..." Would this sentence be more appropriate in the text, at the end of par.7?

par.9, 1st sent. The point would be made clearer if we wrote: "the role of the Church in the process of salvation was also at issue". We are not concerned with the doctrine of the Church in general, but with its relation to salvation.

par.10, 1.5: "But today we believe" sounds as if it meant "Christians in general today believe". I suggest "The Commission believes" (omitting "But").

par.10, last sent. An ugly sentence with which to end a section. Could we write: "We shall set out the reasons which have led us to this conclusion, dealing with each of these areas in turn."

par.11, 1.9: "This ability to respond". The point is rather that the actual response is God's gift. "The human response to ..."

par.12, 2nd sent. The multiplication of the word "of" is ugly and creates ambiguity. Perhaps: "The gospel, by proclaiming Christ's definitive atoning work, the gift and pledge of the Holy Spirit to every believer, and the certainty of God's promise of eternal life..."

par.12, 11. 4-5. It is imprecise to say that the Gospel "brings ... faith", though it does bring "assurance". ("Faith" refers to the state of the Christian; "assurance" refers either to the Christian's state of mind or to the promise made to him.) Could we say: "calls Christians to faith in the mercy of God and brings them assurance ..."?

par.12, 11.5-6: "God's ... will ... includes the joyful confidence" is awkward. I am moreover unhappy about the word "joyful", because many saints experience a dark night in which joy is absent. Perhaps: "It is God's gracious will that we should be confident that ..." or "Christians therefore can and should be confident that ..."?

par.12, 1.8: "as children of God", is awkwardly placed at the end of the sentence, seeing that there is another "as" clause two lines earlier. Could the 2 "as" clauses be joined?

"... confident that, as his children (Rom, 1 Jn) whom he has called through the Gospel and granted his grace, we have ..."
These two sentences would therefore read: "The gospel, by proclaiming Christ's definitive atoning work, the gift and pledge of the Holy Spirit to every believer, and the certainty of God's promise of eternal life, calls Christians to faith in the mercy of God and brings them assurance of salvation. It is God's gracious will that, as his children (Rom, 1 Jn) whom he has called through the Gospel and granted his grace, we should be confident that we have the gift of eternal life."

par.12, penult. line. Could "this" be clarified as "this assurance"?

par.13.: The emphasis would be clearer if we wrote: "Yet, although Christians may never presume on the gift of final perseverance, they should live ..."

page 9, l.2. Is it accurate to suggest that the beatific vision is only of God *the Father*?

par.14. Do we need the 2nd half of the par. ("Thus Scripture speaks ... final resurrection"), which only repeats more fully what we said in the preceding sentence ("This salvation ... God the Father")? Any possible shortening of this long document should be welcome.

par.15, ll.4-6. We first say there is no all-embracing term, then we suggest one. Could we omit "all-embracing" the second time it occurs?

page 11, l.1. Wouldn't it be clearer if we said "solely due to" instead of "indissolubly linked with"?

par.19, l.1. The reference of "this" is not clear. "*The righteousness would be clearer.*"

par.19, l.4. "We are being conformed" sounds odd, though I see the point. Could we say "we are in the process of being conformed", or simply "we grow in conformity with"?

par.22, l.8. It is not only our "fundamental" choices for which we are responsible. Could we say our "*moral* choices"? The sentence beginning "Nevertheless" contrasts, not with the preceding sentence beginning "A response of faith", but with the one before that, beginning "The effect of our sinfulness". Therefore the "Nevertheless" sentence should be placed before the "A response" sentence, which should now be introduced by a connective such as "Yet".

par.23. I much regret that a half sentence from the Pleshey draft (par.24, end) has dropped out: "when we have done all that is commanded we must still say, 'We are unprofitable servants, we have only done our duty' (Lk 17:10)" These words (which could be added at the end of our par.23) make a point not made explicitly anywhere else, viz. that although God *makes* us righteous, our confidence before God must lie not in this

"inhering" righteousness but in God's mercy. (This is the point that Seripando urged so passionately at Trent.)

par.24, 1.2. We need to say by whom they have been so understood - by some or all Anglicans? by RCs also? by ARCIC? I suggest: "have sometimes (or 'often') been understood by Anglicans to imply ..."

par.24, 1.3. I think we agreed to change "part" to "work".

par.25, end. Add the reference.

par.26, 1.1. The function of "also" is not clear; the word is better omitted.

par.26, 1.8. Wouldn't "Moreover" be more appropriate than "Yet"?

pars. 26-29. It would help the reader if the words "sign", "stewardship", "instrument" and "sacrament" were italicised when each first occurs.

par.27, 1.4. "serving this double reality" is obscure. Is the double reality the once-for-all work of Christ and its continuing actualization? If so, it is hard to see how the Church serves the once-for-all work. Couldn't we just say: "In serving this atoning work of Christ"?

par.30, 1st sent. This reduplicates the 1st sent. of par.29. Could we begin the par. at the words "the community of believers"?

par.30, 11.14-16: "It is in the constantly renewed ... what she is". Do we need this sentence, as the point about the Eucharist is made again in the following sentence. Perhaps delete the sentence beginning "It is", adding in the next sentence, after "grace" "who hear the word"

par.30, 1.24. "shared with each other" is syntactically unsatisfactory. Shouldn't we say "with others" or "with one another". If the latter, change "one another" in the previous sentence to "each other".

par.30, 1.26. It would read better if we said "and" instead of "where".

par.30, 1.28. Could we say "as" instead of "and be"?

par.31, 1st sent. Could we say "in proclaiming ... through its words and deeds"?

page 19, 1.4. "for their inadequacy" seems to take the inadequacy for granted. Wouldn't it be less arrogant to say "where they are inadequate"?

par.32, 1.5. Does not the word "enshrined" strike too deferential a note with regard to the debates of the 16th and

17th centuries? Do we want to say that we have discovered the insights of that period, or that we have tried to express the truth which those debates to some extent concealed? Could we not continue the thought suggested by the word "reclaim" and say "which in the course of controversy became partially obscured"?

par.32, ll.8-9. "can ... communion" is a little clumsy and contains an ugly alliteration. Could we say "can justify our continuing separation"?

par 32, last sent. I presume the last 12 words refer to a service beyond our own 2 Churches. If so, could we make this clear, e.g. by adding ", more widely," after "also"?

E.J. Yarnold, S.J.