

Some Comments on the Sub-Commission's Papers

---

by the Revd. Julian Charley

Paper 3(a) Bishop Butler's paper is in many ways most helpful and illuminating, though I feel that it is not an adequate clarification of precisely what is meant such as would commend itself to people of a different background. His allusions on the last page to D-S 1752 and 1743 raise traditional statements that I can only still find objectionable. On page 3 of his paper at the top the comment about tradition I find is expressed in very questionable language, though I see the point that is being made. I am not wholly convinced by his conclusion near the bottom of the same page. Although I share his conviction that the sacrifice of Christ manifestly transcends all Old Testament sacrifices, I think that a great deal of our difficulty arises from a failure to take the Old Testament background seriously (this is in reference to his comment at the top of page 4).

Paper 4 Sections 2, 3 and 4 seem to me to confuse the issue and yet they are expressed as a statement of general agreement. At the end of section 8, I would want to say that it is not a matter of time so much as of logic that evangelicals are concerned to underline. Paragraph 10 seems to me to be a confusing reference to evangelicals - it is just not the kind of language that we would want to use, though I see what is trying to be expressed. The first sentence of section 12 begs the whole issue and I would very seriously question it.

Paper 6 Paragraphs 4 and 6: I am just a little worried at the possible implications lying behind the comment here. While I agree with the basic distinction drawn by Cullman, I question the implication that appears to lie behind this in a universalist direction. The allusion to F.D. Maurice hints at the 'become what you are' type of theology, which I find misleading. I do not quite know if this is the implication intended but a little clarification would help. I confess that I do not understand the first sentence of paragraph 8 - what is meant by 'the sacrificial life itself'? In conclusion, with regard to this paper, I honestly do not find that it meets any of the issues that I raised in my own paper, which I understood from the heading it was intended to do. This may simply indicate my inability to see the point!

Paper 7

Eucharistic Sacrifice in the New Testament: I find this paper very confusing. The first sentence seems to beg the whole question and paragraph 1 I find to be a non sequitur. I think the problem here is a confusion over an understanding of the type of sacrifice such as the Old Testament suggests. I do not agree with the suggestion in paragraph 4 concerning Hebrews 13.10. There is no allusion whatever to the Eucharist here but the Christian altar is explicitly the sacrifice of Christ. My answer to the final question posed by Ted Yarnold would be a straightforward 'no'.