



33/2(86)  
PONTIFICIO COLLEGIO BEDA  
VIALE DI S. PAOLO. 18  
00146 ROMA  
ITALY

10th March, 1986

TELEPHONE  
STAFF 5501700/5585890  
STUDENTS 5561738/5575274-SISTERS 5566048

Dear Kevin,

May I offer a few comments on the Graymoor draft for consideration by the drafting committee.

Par.1, page I. I am not happy about Julian Charley's objection to the word 'through' in the second last line. It seems to threaten the expression of the instrumentality of the Church. I accept his alternative as accurate but would regret the elimination of 'through'.

Par.2, page I. The last sentence will seem strange unless it is in quotation marks.

Paras I-10. I acknowledge the force of Julian Charley's comment. Could a caveat be added to avert the reaction he expects?

Para.15, Last Sentence, page 10. I apologise for being a bore but I am still unhappy. As it stands the statement is true, but many readers are likely to ask themselves 'What does ARCIC think about the salvation of those who never encounter the believing community?' I accept that the issue of the salvation of unbelievers is not one which divides or has divided us. But it is the context in which much modern discussion of faith and justification is carried out. If we completely ignore it our statement will have a very old fashioned look, and we do want it to be a statement of what our communions believe now (see page 2 of Cardinal Willebrands' letter). Would it be possible for the chairmen to say in their introduction that we are aware of current discussions about the salvation of unbelievers and of the relationship of faith to religious belief, but do not discuss these issues because they are not matters on which we have seemed to be divided? The matter is very important because, it seems to me, if we imply that God has not made provision for the salvation of unbelievers, then we imply that he is an uncaring God.

Par.17, page 10, 2nd sentence. Could we omit 'This does not mean that' and put a 'not' between 'this is' and 'a reward'? There does not seem to be any reason why the previous sentence should 'mean that'.

Para 22, Page 14. Line 6 onwards. May I suggest a rewording?

A response of faith to the proclamation of Christ is impossible without the grace of God, so without grace we cannot be saved. Nevertheless human beings remain responsible in God's eyes for the choices they make, to the

extent that these embody personal consent. Even sinners retain a certain freedom of choice, but it is not the freedom of the children of God which is given them through grace. That freedom is given to us once we accept God's offer of salvation. It is a freedom...

I have dropped 'fundamental' because it seems to imply that we are not responsible in God's eyes for lesser choices. I have added the subordinate clause concerning personal consent to emphasise that we are aware of the limitations on human freedom. The rest is intended to express the difference between Christian freedom and the freedom of choice which is an endowment of human nature.

Para 23, page 15, line 4. Concerning Donald Cameron's suggestion. Could 'response' be dropped and 'acceptance of our good works' be substituted?

Para 22, page 14. The second last sentence seems to imply a disjunction between God and the Spirit of Christ.

Para 24, page 15. I agree that this needs more discussion.

Para 28, page 17. I am not convinced of the reasonableness of Julian Charley's objection.

Para 29, page 15, 3rd to 5th sentences. This needs careful attention. The Church is holy because it is the Body of Christ. Its members may be unholy but I am not sure we should attribute their unholiness to the Church. May I suggest an alternative wording?

But this in no way implies that the members of the Church on earth are without failures in the fulfillment of their vocation. By their sins they undermine the credibility of their witness. All are in constant need of repentance and renewal, so that the Church might more clearly be seen for what it is, the holy Body of Christ.

Para 29, page 15, line 3. I am not sure I agree with Julian Charley. He is weakening the sentence. Is the Church only a sacrament, or is it the sacrament? The point may have theological importance.

Para 32, page 19. Do we want to speak of two Churches, as if we were quite separated? I would rather refer to two communions. Sociologically we are two, but I like to think that theologically we are more one than two.

I hope you are keeping well,

Yours very sincerely,

*Brendan Soane*

Brendan Soane.