



- 3 FEB 1986

# Anglican Church Diocese of Sydney

ST ANDREW'S HOUSE SYDNEY SQUARE NSW 2000  
TELEPHONE (02) 265 1555 TELEX COFE 24183

PO BOX Q190 QUEEN VICTORIA BUILDINGS SYDNEY 2000  
CABLES 'ANGELICAN' SYDNEY AUS DOC No DX 878

From the Rt. Rev. E. D. Cameron  
Bishop of North Sydney

29th January, 1986

The Rev. Canon Christopher Hill,  
Archbishop of Canterbury's Secretary for Ecumenical Affairs,  
Lambeth Palace,  
LONDON SE1 7JU ENGLAND

My dear Christopher,

I am replying to your joint letter of 11th November, requesting comments on the Graymoor Draft. Before making some specific comments, I would like to begin with general observations.

First, I would judge it helpful to bear in mind the growth of the "Salvation and the Church" statement. It would appear that, having as a starting point, some concerns about Justification, the Commission then moved into the wider consideration of Salvation, this theological journey proceeding hand-in-hand with an ecclesiological concern which finds its expression in the latter part of the document. One asks oneself the question whether we, having been part of the process, may have in our minds certain preconceptions which makes the statement easier to understand than it would be for those who would read it in its completed state for the first time?

Second, the historical section needs, I assume, criticism only from the point of view of care. Accuracy is obviously essential. The matter of relevance, not in the sense of relevance to contemporary aspirations but relevance in the sense of integration into the argument of the statement as a whole, would seem to be a matter of judgement.

Thirdly, I think I would like to observe that the document generally commands my support. Not that the document is the way that perhaps any individual member of the Commission would have written it, but that it represents a consensus of opinion on its subject which we wish to test against the wisdom and experience of our respective Churches.

Fourth, the section, "Salvation and Faith", "Salvation and Justification", etc., contains excursions into New Testament theology and will be studied by people with both competence and convictions in this matter. Section 15 and section 20, with which I almost entirely agree, will require the most careful use of language.

Fifth, except by way of passing reference, formularies and ecclesiastical pronouncements have been left untouched. This may be wise, but if so, should we not say so? I think particularly of some of the Tridentine decrees, e.g., Session VI, chapter VII, which would be cited by some in their response to our document.

Following these general observations, I would offer the undernoted specific comments:-

(Numbers refer to paragraphs, "Graymoor Draft")

2. Should second sentence be re-worded? The introduction to the topic of Justification by way of a conditional clause with a definition in brackets, does not appear to me to be an ideal way to introduce one of the major topics. I would suggest that this statement could be improved by the removal of some of the material in Section 7 to this paragraph.

3. "Luther proclaimed ... the soul is worth nothing." Controvertible, and could be better phrased. I assume what is meant here is that Luther taught that individual human beings had no claim on God's mercy, acceptance or goodwill by any inherent quality intrinsic to their own salvation.

6. Sentence 2. "Some Reformation ..." I am embarrassed about bringing this point up again, but I would still submit as I submitted last year, that I am in doubt about this statement. For myself I do not recognize it as a main tenet of Reformation thinking. Certainly the doctrine of "Final Perseverance" was taught, but this was seen as distinct from, though conceptually linked with, "justifying faith". Perhaps the ambiguity lies in the phrase, "as constitutive of ..."

12. (Page 8.) "... faith remains dead". Is "remains" the right word? Why not "is"?

17. "Sanctification and justification are two aspects of the same fundamental reality .." Is "reality" the right word? Would not the vocabulary be more consistent within itself if we said, "Sanctification and justification are two aspects of ... salvation"?

19. (Last line, p. 11) "... so that ..." Is the syntax doubtful or ambiguous? If this latter part of the sentence is a 'result clause' then the statement becomes theologically disputatious. Why not, "the law of Christ has become the pattern of our life. We are unable to produce works which are the fruit of the Holy Spirit"?

23. (P. 15). "God's loving response ..." What the response is to, does not seem clear to me from the context.

24. This paragraph is the one part of the whole document to which I would feel unable to assent. Thus, expand or omit.

Thank you very much for the opportunity of offering these comments.

All good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

