December 30, 2019

To the editors of *The Journal of Analytic Theology*,

I would like to submit the following discussion paper, on behalf of myself and my co-authors, to be considered for publication.

This paper is a short note responding to Jc Beall and Jared Henderson’s “A Neglected Qua Solution to The Fundamental Problem of Christology”, In *Faith and Philosophy* 36(2):157--172 (2019).

In this note, we press a new objection to Beall and Henderson’s 0-Qua view. Our objection, in brief, is that certain claims about Christ which we take to be distinctive of Christian belief are rendered, on Beall and Henderson’s account, either such that they cannot be truthfully believed by the Orthodox Christian, or being such that they can be truthfully believed by anyone familiar with the story of Christ. We think this objection makes a new contribution to the literature, and so will be of interest to your readership.

Because it is a response note, it is only 2,051 words long. We hope you’ll agree that this length is adequate to present our objection and those elements of Beall and Henderson’s views which are needed in order for our objection to be understood.

Attached are copies of the paper and this cover letter in MS Doc format. The authors along with their affiliations and email addresses, are as follows:

Grace Paterson, The University of Vienna, grace.paterson@univie.ac.at

David W. Ripley, Monash University, davewripley@gmail.com

Andrew Tedder, The Czech Academy of Sciences, ajtedder.at@gmail.com

The title and abstract are as follows:

Title: Qua Solution, 0-Qua Has Problems

Abstract: We present an objection to Beall & Henderson’s recent paper defending a solution to the fundamental problem of conciliar Christology using qua or secundum clauses. We argue that certain claims the acceptance/rejection of which distinguish the Conciliar Christian from others fail to so distinguish on Beall & Henderson’s 0-Qua view. This is because on their 0-Qua account, these claims are either acceptable both to Conciliar Christians as well as those who are not Conciliar Christians or because they are acceptable to neither.

Thank you for considering this paper, please direct any future correspondence to me.

Sincerely,

Dr. Andrew Tedder

The Czech Academy of Sciences