

RENEWING THE KOINONIA BETWEEN OUR TWO CHURCHES

I

THE THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

J.M.R. Tillard. O.P.

To speak of koinonia - I shall use the Greek word to avoid the ambiguities caused by the too broad use of the word communion in the language of our two Churches - is to summon up, at once and inseparably, marvellous grace and an exacting demand. Koinonia is what God introduces us into by Baptism, giving us a part in the reality of Salvation, and it is also what God asks us to spread through the world. To speak of an exacting demand (exigence) is to say much more than 'a task'. It calls for fidelity to what one is - not being content to restrict oneself to what one is supposed to be.

I

THE FOUNDATION OF THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF COMMUNION
KOINONIA AS A GIFT RECEIVED, THAT IS AS THE CONTENT ITSELF
OF THE GRACE OF SALVATION

1. We should begin by establishing one point. For the apostolic faith, to be saved is not simply to be saved, rescued from "this crooked generation" (Acts II,40) and introduced into the benefits of divine friendship. It is this, but ^{also,} by entering into a new state of humanity as such, ^{to be} rescued from its situation of mortal division and introduced into the fulness of reconciliation.

We are saved by participating in a collective state, in a grace which aims fundamentally at a totality. And what is the Church of God on this earth but that part of mankind which accepts (in faith and through the power of the Holy Spirit) to live in this new state, wholly dependent on what God has worked in his Son our Lord Jesus Christ?

A. What is it to be baptised? It is not enough to answer

"to enter into belonging to Christ by faith and the power of water in which the Spirit works". This answer is incomplete. It distorts the New Testament perspective as this appears in the apostolic traditions as a whole, even in the Johannine tradition which pays more attention than the others to the disciple's personal relation with Christ Jesus (1). We should say "to be baptised is to become a member of the Body of Christ (according to the Pauline tradition), " it is to become a living stone in the house of God" (cf. I Pet. II,5; Eph. II; 20-22) (2), "it is to be integrated into the holy , priestly community of God (the hierateuma hagion) (I Pet. II,5; cf. II,9) (3). "it is to enter into the chosen race, the holy nation, God's own people (I Pet. II, 9-10)" it is to pass into the household of God (Eph II, 19) "it is to be made a fellow citizen with the saints" (Eph. II,19) "It is to belong to the community (the yahad, translated into Greek as eni to auto (Acts II, 44,47) (4) "it is to be a branch of the Father's vine (John XV,5) "It is to be brought into the flock of the good shepherd" (John X, 1-16), "it is to put on Christ-in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, male nor female for all are one" (Gal. III, 27-28) "it is to be of Abraham's offspring" (Gal. III,29) "It is to be invited to the banquet of the Kingdom, with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Rev. XII 9)

The simple list of these expressions drawn from the New Testament traditions is eloquent. Thomas Aquinas interpreted this vision very justly when he said that at baptism binding to Christ and binding to his members are simultaneous, that one becomes a member of Christ by being associated with the other members, one is incorporated in Christ in being incorporated in the Church. (5). Moreover, if the personal relation to Christ Jesus opens out in this way into relation with all those "who are in Christ", it is because since Pentecost Christ is inseparable from his ecclesial body. He is united to it in a radical way which, again, the apostolic traditions try to express by a cluster of images: he is the Head which cannot exist without a Body; he is the Bridegroom united to his Bride; he is the new (kainè) Adam who as such is inseparable from his descendents, he bears the title of Christ which binds him necessarily to a People. All these titles express a relation to a multitude, and it is because of this relation that they are given. The paschal glorification is aimed at a seizure of the whole of humanity by the person of the Lord Jesus, such that the multitude will be born in his person, which the Holy Spirit will expand to the dimension of a divine Lordship.

B. On a first level koinonia designated this state of Salvation, that is the seizure of the multitude of the saved in the unbreakable unity of the person and work of the Lord Jesus. It is the multitude not only gathered but unified in and through the Oneness of God. What was in the Old Covenant the cahal of Yahweh - translated in the Septuagint as ekklesia tou Theou i.e. the assembly before God of all the children of Israel and all the

tribes unified by faith in the Word: that is the christian koinonia, but from now on unified in the person of him whom the Johannine tradition will call the Word made flesh (6). The Church of God is that community of believers who make but one in Christ and so are no longer simply shoulder to shoulder but form, even more than the twelve tribes of Israel, what the Acts summaries will call a being-together.

That locking of the human multitude in the one Lord Jesus Christ constitutes the ekklesia tou Theou. So much so that the fulness of the Church is identified inseparably with the totality of that multitude and the absoluteness of that embrace. There would not be full the Church without that double relation.

2. If the quality of Him who thus encompasses the multitude within himself (to the point of appearing as a corporate personality)(7) is essential to the nature of koinonia, no less so is the quality of those making up the multitude. Now, for the New Testament as a whole, despite the deep differences in the judgement passed on those Jews who do not accept the apostolic witness on the messianic character of Jesus (8), the multitude consists of two groups. On the one hand there are "the sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God gave to the Fathers" (Acts III,25) the "Israelites (to whom) belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship and the promises"(Rom IX,4), they "who first hoped in Christ" (Eph. I,12) (9) those that is who come from the People of the Old Covenant. On the other hand there are "the Gentiles" (Acts X,45) the "wild olive shoot grafted to share the richness of the olive tree" (Rom. XI,17) those who were "at one time....Gentiles in the flesh... separated from Christ,

alienated from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world" (Eph. II, 11-12), who "once were not People of God" (cf. I, Pet, II, 10): in a word those who belonged to the Gentile world. Since for the Jewish tradition mankind is divided into "children of promise" and pagans, the multitude which makes up the christian koinonia is the totality of the human race.

I must at once clarify this formula. It is not at all a question of the totality of the human race as such, but the totality of this race as reconciled. He who encompasses it in his unity is the Christ Jesus of whom the Johannine tradition says that he died "for the people, and not only for them but to gather into unity the scattered children of God" (10).

In quite another context, the Acts of the Apostles seems to see in the event of Pentecost the reversal of the drama of Babel, the apostles making themselves understood in the language of the different nationalities present, recreating the unity broken up after the story of the Tower (Acts II, 4, cf. Gen XI, 1-9). This was how the Fathers understood it. (11) It is a unity re-fashioned, hence a "new" unity (kainè)

The letter to the Ephesians, undoubtedly to put right a situation of tension, goes deeper into the nature of this "new" unity when it explains that here is a unity deriving from the reconciliation of mankind in the cross of Christ Jesus. This has demolished the wall which divided humanity into two mutually impenetrable blocks. The assertions are very strong. Those who "were afar off have been brought near" (II, 13); "He has made us both one and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility" (II, 14).

His achievement has been to "create in himself one new man (kainos) in place of the two" (II,15); He willed to "reconcile... both to God in one body, through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end"(II,16). The word koinonia is not used, but it is clear that the unity evoked is that I have been describing. The Christian community "household of God," "dwelling place of God" "holy temple" (cf. II,18-22) - is, through the work of Christ, composed of members who were at one time separated or would normally be separated but from now on are " a single reality", a unity. This relation to a state of separation seems to me of capital importance for understanding the profound being of the Church. It is the community of those who, because of Christ, are no longer separated. Thus it is a contradiction in terms to speak of "separated christians".

But the letter to the Ephesians does not present this "new" unity as a fusion, as the appearance of genus tertium in which Jews and Gentiles lose their diversities. This is a community whose reconciliation finds its grandeur in the fact that people are reconciled while remaining different. One group is not absorbed by the other; the two are not swallowed up in one reality where they dissolve; they are not ground down so as to become a wholly new entity (neos) (13). In the language of today we would say that the community is one of pluralism (14). Moreover the history of the first christian generations show that, following the mission to the pagans, Judeo-christian and Gentile Churches live the same faith in different ways. The Johannine tradition especially seems to witness to this co-existence with the problems it raises for koinonia (15)

Reconciliation is coupled with maintaining the features proper to each group: from the outset it is "catholic".

Much more, when the author of the epistle pursues his reflection making use of the image of the building of a temple, he implicitly says that on the whole this constituted diversity is itself constructive, in other words that it is not a makeshift. It is insofar as it integrates Jews and others that the Temple can reveal the overwhelming grandeur of the "mystery" (Mysterion) "the Gentiles are fellow heirs, members of the same body and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus" (Eph. III,6).

3. It is the Johannine tradition which, although it is more concerned with the personal relationship of the disciple with Christ and his Father, is best able to display the richness of koinonia which is the Church. In the first Johannine letter, which uses the word koinonia three times, it says that our koinonia with each other is lodged within an infinitely deeper one from which it is inseparable "our fellowship (koinonia) is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ (I John I,3;6-7) Using not the term koinonia but the expression "to be one" the Johannine gospel goes to the depth of this insight, connecting it explicitly with the being-in-common of christians it puts into the mouth of Jesus a prayer that the disciples may be one, but showing at the same time that that unity is their passage to unity with the Father. He is in them as the Father is in him. By this fact they are borne along into the divine communion deriving from the Father being in him and he in the Father (John XVII,21-23). Thus they are one as Father and Son are one; and the whole context immerses this unity of Father and Son in the eternal reality of Him who glorifies the Son "before the world was made" (XVII,5). For they are two - with the Holy

Spirit - in a single divine life.

In the light of this we see how unity and pluralism, far from being a symbiosis, to which identity between unity and uniformity would be preferable, are the refraction of the divine line in the density of the "saved" human reality and, as the Fathers put it, brought to their identity as "images and likeness" of the living God. We then understand better the unbreakable tie, in the great commandment, between love of God and love of others (I John III, 14-19). Above all we understand why the whole Church cannot be witness to the living God (its essential martyria in this world) except insofar as in the Church the multitude remaining plural and diverse is joined solidly in a koinonia of faith, of charity which constitutes its life. And just as in the living God it is at the heart of the communion of Father and Son that the design of salvation has its source, so in the Church commitment to the salvation of the world is authentic by reference to fraternal koinonia.

Such is the depth of koinonia as a received gift. Thus we can say that it is the very content of the grace of Salvation. That is why it can only be received in adoration before God. But it is also the reason why every situation which disrupts or prejudices koinonia is infinitely more than an institutional or juridical matter affecting only the surface. It touches the grandeur of the grace of God. It is an offence against the gift of God. When two divided christian communities fail to use every means to restore koinonia it is to God himself that they are unfaithful. And even if one side believes itself to have been innocent or fully in the right in the quarrel leading to the rupture, its fidelity to God does not permit it to take a stand on this. It has a duty before God.

I KOINONIA AS SHARING, MUTUAL CARE, TAKING CHARGE OF OTHERS,
MUTUAL RELATIONS

To the gift I have been describing there attached also demands. To realise koinonia it is not enough to be together. We must also live in a certain way, that which is evoked by the words sharing, mutual care, taking responsibility for each other. It is admitted by the majority of specialists (16) that the dominant idea implied in the term koinonia is that of common participation in the same benefits, shared possession of the same reality. This quasi-definition shows that two elements are implied, on the one hand the shared reality or benefit which causes unity, on the other unity itself or the experience of sharing a unique reality. If the image were not worn, I would speak of the vertical relation to the shared benefit and the horizontal relation between participants. In the Greek example of the tribe and the family (17) koinonia expresses both the race, the blood, the heredity, the tradition which all the members share and the solidarity, the community of spirit, the community of interest, the close and natural bond which makes each one feel affected by what touches another member of the tribe or family. Now if it is certain that in the New Testament the experience of koinonia is considered above all in function of the reality which christians share, i.e. of the divine benefits of which the Holy Spirit makes them part, it is just as certain that various apostolic traditions attach a very great importance to the togetherness of Christ's disciples. In other words, those traditions do not stop at saying that in Christ human unity is restored. They add that it is essential to live as persons knit together again, as believers transforming their behaviour into brotherly behaviour, as disciples conscious of forming but one body.

The koinonia given by God should then necessarily issue in koinonia among christians,. In the striking words of H.Schlier (18 in Christ on the Cross the constraint was broken which kept men in egoism, confined in their own dimension... in Him they can open out to God and consequently to each other! Living in brotherly koinonia we are in God's koinonia. This is what, in its particular context, the 1st Johannine epistle testifies when it says "We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren. He who does not, ^{love} remains in death "(I John III,14)

We see clearly at this level, without having to invoke the ut sint unum of John XVII, that the division of christians into separate blocks - even if the walls of separation are often no more than juridical and do not necessarily touch the content of the faith - calls in question the koinonia with God himself. Division does not allow the gift of God to reach its fulness, it makes of it something merely offered, not issuing in the effective transformation of humanity into a fraternal world; it is an obstacle to the realisation of the "mystery" in full human flesh: this although by faith and baptism we have been joined to the community of Christ's disciples. The question of ecclesial life-in-koinonia is a question about relations with God himself even before it is a question about the welfare of the communities concerned. And this relation to God, this fidelity before God precedes the relation to the world, the witness before the world evoked by Jesus' prayer for his disciples, "that they may be one.... so that the world may know that thou hast sent me".

It is essential, given the situation of our two Churches still separated, to re-evangelise them on this very point. Their rupture of koinonia affects their fidelity to God. Here is an infidelity infinitely more serious than disobeying a commandment of Christ. It touches the heart of the eternal design of the living God. It wounds God's will. In this koinonia of fraternal relations, established owing to God and before God, there is a compass, a quality which I shall call the mystical. It is rarely referred to, yet more and more it strikes one as very important. In Pauline writings the terms koinonia and koinōnos (from the same root) are used to express this essential dimension of christian existence. Christians are called to be together (cf. 2 Cor. I,7; Phil. I,5) in koinonia with Christ Jesus in his difficult and demanding commitment for the advent of the Kingdom. Not as individuals, but in koinonia.

In the sharing of pains, of persecutions, of distresses, of agonies all endured for the Gospel of God it is the Body of Christ as such with its complementary charismata and functions that is associated with the coming to birth of the messianic Kingdom, of which the Jewish tradition says that it cannot be born except in tribulations, distresses, trials. Communion (koinonia) is by the will of the Father - that the world should be saved, that mankind should become what it was created to be. But that communion comes through communion in what the Lord Jesus suffered, mystically engraved on each by the "baptism into death" (Rom. VI,3-5) which is also the sacramental moment at which each is grafted on

his ecclesial body (I Cor. XII,13). The commitment of the People of God to a better world cannot be genuine if it is not lived in intense solidarity (koinonia) which wholly possesses them. So that what such and such a community endures under such and such a regime is the business of all the other communities, whatever their political colour; ^{it is} for the suffering of the messianic People as such.

It must be acknowledged that we are far even from being simply aware of this dimension of being a Christian. On the one hand, in our separate Churches we think very little about it except on rare occasions. On the other hand the division of our Churches fragments the messianic People so that koinonia with the sufferings of Christ is lived in communities which by their divisions contradict the *raison d'etre* of those sufferings; which is "to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad" (John XI,52). Thus in a certain fashion we can speak of anguish rendered vain, especially where Churches place themselves on opposite sides of the same barricades. Something of the "mystery of the last times" is thus obscured, even besmirched. When there is so much talk of the commitment of the Churches to transforming the word and when it has become evident that such commitment leads everywhere almost certainly to persecution, this urgently needs thinking about. This forgotten chapter of ecclesiology must again find its place in our concerns.

Without falling into a romanticism which here above all would be out of place, we can open our eyes again to God's design and the economy of Salvation. Surely, if Paul can say that by pure grace pagans enter into the inheritance of Israel, becoming thus syn-koinônoi (Rom. XI,17), that association - owed to the divine gratuity and to that alone, should not be contemptuous

towards the painful and uncouth "obedience" (cf. Rom. XI,30-32) of faithful Israel in the long centuries of the old covenant. Those times were a tissue of trials, dramatic sufferings, exile, persecution. The advent of Christ Jesus was not without its link with that fidelity. The Fathers of the Church were not wrong to see in the "yes" which Luke puts into the mouth of Mary at the annunciation the summing up of all the difficult "yesses" of Israel since that of Abraham. It is all that "humus" of witness and service, reaching back into the night of time, that our divisions break up.

But fraternal koinonia has not simply to be achieved on this level of a solidarity in shared commitment to a breakthrough of the Kingdom of God into this world and into that human history which needs re-orientating. It must also be lived in a community of sharing where the gifts of all are placed at the service of others, where there is a flow of mutual interest in each others' lives, where the cares and pains of others are borne in an effort to remedy them even at personal cost.

It is not by chance that in the Acts of the Apostles the first descriptions of the community follows immediately on the account of Pentecost and uses the term koinonia. (Acts 5, 42-47). Many interpretations have been given of the word koinonia in this context in connection with the other terms used in this little 'summary' and in the other two sketches of the life of the first believers put into the first part of the book of Acts. (II,41-47; IV,32-35; V, 12-16) (19)

It is illuminating to read these passages together:

ACTS. II, 42-47

"And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles. And all who believed were together and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need. And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved."

ACTS. IV, 32-35

"Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had everything in common. And with great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all. There was not a needy person among them, for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the proceeds of what was sold and laid it at the apostles' feet and distribution was made to each as any had need".

ACTS. V, 12 -16

"Now many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles. And they were all together in Solomon's Portico. None of the rest dared join them, but the people held them in high honour. And more than ever believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. So that they even carried out the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and pallets, that as Peter came by at least his shadow might fall on some of them. The people also gathered from the towns around Jerusalem, bringing the sick and those afflicted with unclean spirits and they were all healed."

The word koinonia is in Acts II,42. But the adjective derived from the same root (koinos) is in II, 44 and IV, 32 (20). The believers (II,44; IV,32) are one community (epi to auto, II, 44,47) they are 'of one heart and one soul' (IV,32) they live in a union which leads them to have "all things in common" ("hapanta koina, panta koina") (II,44;IV,32). This means in practice selling property and goods, sharing the price according to the needs of each (II,45;IV, 34-35)

so that no one poor is any longer found among them. This last takes us back to a passage of Deuteronomy which, in Hebrew, is an order: "Let there be no poor among you" but which the Septuagint changes into a promise "there will be no poor among you" (Deut. XV,4.) (21) The remark in our "summaries" has then important overtones: it emphasises that the community realised, by its koinonia the ideal proposed by God right from the beginning of the Covenant. It is not just a detail.

We find in these few lines, manifestly idyllic, a group of expressions all pointing to unity, but in an outburst of brotherhood. They speak of putting things in common and of sharing, of oneness of mind (homothymadon, II,46; V,12), of "one heart and one soul," of community in the sense of the semitic yahad (22). Everything inclines us to see in the expression epi to auto (II,44-47) much more than a place in common, a simultaneous presence. It means being together in a single unique body, bound in the solidarity which shared adherence to Christ creates.

As in yahad, the conviction which faith implies is translated into living, into conduct, so that the community becomes "the community of God's truth" (23). To grasp what koinonia means in the "summaries" it must be immersed in this context. It is not just sharing the same goods, nor even to remain in the solidarity which results from this sharing. The believers of the Jerusalem community

draw the consequences of their solidarity by practising koinonia perseveringly, putting in common everything they possess. Their attitude is the opposite of the individualist egoism of "everyone for himself". It is care for others (cf. Phil. II,4; I.Cor.X,24,33; XIII,5; Rom XV.2)..... this koinonia consists more especially in putting everything they have at the disposal of those in need, without keeping back anything for themselves; thus it appears as the practical manifestation and sensible sign of the union of hearts and souls. (25)

We have then, inseparably, consciousness of the unity created by shared adherence to Christ Jesus and the expression of that unity in deeds connected with the essentials of human existence in its more fundamental needs. To be saved (cf. ACTS II,47) is to enter "by the grace of the Spirit into that communion which embraces radically the whole of life. I don't think I am playing on words when I offer this gloss: in koinonia we are saved even from want, from hunger, from wretchedness, by our solidarity with other believers. Koinonia is, at that depth, a solidarity in sharing and mutual concern, because of our common belonging to Christ Jesus. The epistle to the Hebrews does not hesitate to make of this koinonia a sacrifice pleasing to God (Hebr. XIII,16), giving to the word sacrifice the sense of a pure offering agreeable to God. It is agreeable to him because it answers to his design.

We can deduce from this view of koinonia a new consequence for ecclesiology. It points again an accusing finger at the infidelity resulting from our state of division. The latter makes impossible, even in one area, the attitudes described in the Acts "summaries": hearing together the apostolic word, praying together, and breaking bread together, oneness of mind, belonging to the yahad, pooling resources, sharing beyond our own boundaries. Our churches which stand near each other, bring together groups of people who (whatever their internal solidarity may be) know nothing of the kind of sharing implied by koinonia and are strangers to each other, though they all boast the label "baptised into Jesus Christ", this proves that we do not live the whole truth of God's grace.

4. If we are to judge by Paul's concern and the warm recommendation made to him when he met James, Peter and John (Gal. II,10) (26) the apostolic Churches very soon realised that the koinonia of sharing and mutual care could not be confined within the limits of the local community.

The collection for the poor of Jerusalem is presented to Paul explicitly as the work of the koinonia (Rom XV,26; 2 Cor. XIII,4; IX,13). The commentaries on Galatians do not emphasise enough how the koinonia with "James, Cephas and John, reputed to be pillars" who gave to Paul "the right hand of fellowship" (Gal. XX,9) which ensures koinonia between the Pauline churches and those of the other apostles in a unity of faith and charity, of "life in Christ" and hope - is put into practice in the care for the poor of the mother Church. The approval of what he preaches is the Gospel of God, and hence the assurance that " he had not run in vain" (I,2) since he is in koinonia of faith with the Church of Jerusalem leads into the reminder that he must concern himself with the poor of that community with which he is in koinonia. The aim is not pragmatic but downright dogmatic. And there is a close link between Paul's fixed determination to remain in koinonia with Jerusalem and his anxiety about the collection for the poor (cf. Rom. XV. 30-32). They are two aspects of the same will to communion.

Koinonia goes beyond the closed circle of each community to weave between all the communities not only koinonia in faith but also, because of it and in dependence on it, a koinonia of mutual aid, mutual sustenance and even of sharing. The poorest Churches will show their generosity in thanksgiving and in intercession (2 Cor, IX,12-15). It is essential to stress that Paul sees in this koinonia between communities the realisation of the koinonia which each of them has with Christ Jesus:

"though he was rich yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich" (2 Cor. VIII, 9). The koinonia of all in "the service of the saints" (2 Cor. VIII, 4-5) is rooted in the service of Christ and represents the blossoming in his ecclesial body (27). It is the translation into realistic and costly steps, on a scale as wide as the christian world, of the in Christo. By it that step which is at the heart of faith - not just the incarnation but an incarnation carried by the gift of his whole self to the extreme of kenosis - is buried and become fertile in the flesh of history. Thus the great ecclesial Tradition will read it as a demand written into the very nature of the Church of God. What the Johannine tradition, more concerned with the personal relationship of the disciple with Christ Jesus, presents as an eternal law about the fidelity of each believer (I John. III, 17) is broadened to embrace each community as such in its relation with other communities.

Once again we face a conclusion heavy with ecclesiological consequences. I have already stressed that ecclesial koinonia is not just togetherness but calls for sharing, is not satisfied with feelings about the needs of others but requires practical commitment to getting them out of their predicament. The outlook must be even wider. It is not just a matter of the many material needs of a dignified and happy human life, the precariousness of which in some local Churches leads Paul to develop the view I have been recalling. The question arises also for every necessity of "life in Christ".

Pluralism is there. I have said that in the whole Church-viewed with wide perspective which marks the letter to the Ephesians - unity should enclose a multitude which remains plural and various. Now it is not enough just to accept this pluralism - it must be lived. Pluralism of tradition - rooted in plurality of cultures, of historical breeding grounds, of social conditions - is neither a makeshift we have to put up with whether we like it or not nor an ornament displaying the splendour of catholicity. It is wealth in which everybody should have a part. And this sharing should normally happen through the exchange of different points of view on the same problems, views of the biblical data which are mutually complementary, fraternal discussion about such and such a decision of one of our Churches, offering other churches benefits and facilities which without compromising their identity allows them to practice their faith better, even perhaps taking charge of some part of another Church's responsibility which for the moment it cannot itself assume. The catholicity of the Church of God is not a passive attribute. It is to be understood in the same way as dynamic koinonia, woven of interactions and mutual care, filled with practical concern for each other, traversed by a stream of mutual aid, such as I have spoken of.

Obviously our state of divisions is making such a universal range of koinonia impossible - even within the same region, the same nation. If we are ready to accept a certain pluralism we ^{are} no longer able to give it practical ecclesial expression. Catholicity-in all its dynamic density - is shattered.

This breakage prevents us realising fully our entry into the movement of Christ Jesus giving himself to enrich those whom the New Testament calls his brothers and sisters.

5. It will no doubt have been noticed how what I have been saying - in close touch with the scriptural data - has never had recourse to juridical categories. This needs underlining. I have remained at the level of the practical life of the Churches, seen in the network of relations between Christians based on their common belonging to Christ. Koinonia is the form which that life of grace takes, of its own nature and because of its ultimate origin in the Trinitarian life of God. Thus it is not just one model among others which Churches can take or leave. It comes before all other models. Nor is it just one of the laws of Christian behaviour - it is the very flesh of being a Christian.

What we have so far discovered about the nature of koinonia may be summed up in the following propositions:

- a) koinonia is the positive expression of the reconciliation with the Father and between human beings accomplished by the death and Resurrection of Christ: it is the content itself of the grace of Salvation.
- b) the koinonia given by God tends necessarily to issue in relations woven between those who believe in Christ and are indwelt by his Spirit.
- c) the fraternal koinonia thus rooted in common faith in Jesus Christ and his gifts, translated into a shared association with Christ's commitment to the coming of the Kingdom and the transformation of humanity into the humanity which God wants, sharing the messianic sufferings.

d) fraternal koinonia in each community is realised practically in mutual concern, in sharing, a common taking of responsibility, a gift of one's goods to others, readiness to pay, activity in common.

e) fraternal koinonia transcends the limits of each community, extends to others and sets up a tissue of exchanges and mutual support and help, of everything that can give practical expression of unity of all communities in the same faith in Jesus Christ.

To remain in koinonia or where it has been broken, to mend it, are not steps which do no more than skim the surface of church life. On the contrary they go to the heart of what, for God, the Church ought to be. But on the other hand it is clear that this koinonia can be neither made nor mended simply by a juridical move, however official. It will come - to resume my image - from the very heart of Christian being. For koinonia is not primarily a matter of structures, but of life. Structures only exist to serve life.

II

The Source of Ecclesial Koinonia

KOINONIA AS FRUIT OF THE EUCHARIST OF THE LORD

If the joining of believers in fraternal koinonia and that of local Churches in a koinonia of "communion" cannot depend upon a simple juridical step, it is because in God's design the source of both is the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, his personal, Risen body, as given in the Eucharist. Of that certainty on which the Tradition of the Fathers lives, Paul remains the great witness.

1. In First Corinthians, Paul addresses himself to a local Church which the spirit of party threatens to tear asunder (I. Cor. I, 10-13; III,4; XI,17-22) (28).

The Church of God is being split by cliques, Paul goes straight to the heart of the problem, with extreme realism: Christ Jesus cannot be divided (I,13). This is why division in the community appears, to the eyes of faith, monstrous. Because if it is a body, it is not in the same way as a political 'social body', such as the city whose cohesion and unity is based primarily on a pact between the citizens. It is a body because it is the body of Christ, caught up in the breakable reality of his unique Risen body. And the passage from that personal Body to the ecclesial Body is made possible by the koinonia which the bread and cup of the Eucharist bring about: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake (metechomen) of the same loaf" (I, Cor., X 16-17)

To be sure, the interpretation of these verses is difficult. Some read them as merely affirming a unity among believers coming from their sitting down together, from the fact that they join in taking food at the Lord's Table. The majority however note that the context, which is explicitly sacrificial (X,18-22) demands taking account of the fact that, in every sacrificial movement, there is communion between the divinity and the faithful. And later on, (XI,24-29) Paul underlines the connection between the meal at the Lord's Table and the Lord's death. Whatever is said of the way in which the Body and Blood of the Lord are linked to the bread and the cup - a hard problem which we do not have to discuss here - Paul intends to say firmly that thanks to this bread and this cup believers have part together in that Body and Blood and in what these bear of the power of Salvation and hence of reconciliation. They enter into the koinonia of Christ Jesus as he acts as Saviour. The reality of Christ the Lord, perceived in his connection with the act of Salvation, is the reality pre-existent to and accounting for their fraternal unity. It is that which holds them together at the Lord's Table, makes them "communicants" in what happens there(cf. X.18-20). But it takes hold of them all together enclosing them in its unique indivisible reality to the point where they are only a single body in the unique Body of Christ, a single bread (29). In the Body of reconciliation they become reconciled Body. The Lord's Table thus becomes the very focus of God's Church. So humanity in every place where it celebrates the "emorial of the Lord, throughout all generations, takes its place in the "vital space opened in the Body of

Christ on the Cross" (130) and where the Spirit builds the Church.

Life in koinonia, seen from the dynamic viewpoint that I have brought out, finds here its full depth. It is the fruit of the Eucharist. We should note that Paul in the verses we are studying speaks of "the cup of benediction (tês eulogias) which we bless" . In line with Jewish tradition the benediction referred to is the expression of the wonder, filled with gratitude, of the People of the Covenant in the face of what God bestows on them. The Church is koinonia in the Lord's Body, made solid in fraternal koinonia in the very movement in which it proclaims God's marvels. Its spiritual priesthood and its nature as koinonia are inseparable. On the other hand - and this is undoubtedly more important - the Church is not only under the Word of God, it is also in the Risen Body of the Lord, "who died for sins": it is not only the sum total of those justified by their faith, it is also the koinonia of those who have been sanctified by entering into the koinonia of the Lord. However subtle, this nuance seems to me of capital importance.

It follows that the reality of the koinonia depends on the Eucharist, but just as the members of a christian community are not fully in koinonia and hence do not fully make up among themselves a Church of God except insofar as they are united in sharing the Eucharist, so Christian communities are not fully in koinonia and hence do not fully make up together a Church of God except to the extent that they are united in sharing the Eucharist.

From this viewpoint the whole ecumenical effort should be towards a common Eucharist. But it is clear that this common character in something more profound than community of rites, or even of doctrines. It is not enough to celebrate together....

2. There is indeed another side to this Pauline view - the demands made by the Eucharist. The next chapter of First Corinthians reveals a conviction of Paul's that the great Tradition will make its own. A certain state of division forbids the celebration together in truth of the Memorial of the Lord.

To the Church of Corinth, divided and disunited (31), Paul writes the the rite it celebrates when it gathers together (epi to auto, in assembly) "is not the Lord's meal" (I.Cor. XI,20), rather as he had said earlier "you cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons." "You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons" (X.21) Divisions, even social, spread (XI,22). Eating and drinking then in an unworthy manner, not discerning the body "one becomes guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" and so "eats and drinks judgement upon himself" (XI,27-29) Whatever the rite observed, because there is no fraternal communion and the demand for solidarity made by membership of the Body is violated, the celebration is a cheat. For "it is not enough to break with the community feasts of the pagans; even within the christian communions we can be guilty of that which rules out real community with the Lord of the feast (32). We do not celebrate this Meal of Unity while we are not truthfully engaged in that unity. Koinonia in the body and blood of Christ (I,16) does not produce its effect in a magical or mechanical fashion, like a talisman. It calls for sincerity, a true will to meet the

requirements of fraternal koinonia planted in each believer and each community by the body of the Lord. The essential content of this I have set out above. Such sincerity, such will are always possible in the power of the Spirit; and the koinonia given by the Lord's Body and Blood is not a reward, a crown of merit. It belongs, quite simply, to the context of Covenant (XI,25) and the attitude required is nothing other than free readiness before God's gift, and opening our hearts and directing our intentions so that our existence may be in harmony with what we are given. God respects liberty. The whole drama of the Fall and of Salvation witness to this. Nobody could be dragged against his or her will into the unifying force of the Body of Christ.

In the situation of our divided Churches, this second half of Paul's view - the only time he speaks explicitly of the Eucharist apart from the account of its institution - forces us to mistrust facile intercommunion. To arrive at a common eucharist some stages have to be passed through. These could not be purely juridical decisions. They touch the life of the communities themselves. Thus it is crucial to discover what are the pre-requisites for a truly common eucharist, which would create and authentically signify koinonia between the Churches.

A fundamental pre-requisite: plainly what Paul, still talking of unity, expounds in the same passage of Corinthians, is baptism. Indeed, that is the first foundation of koinonia. For the latter is not an affair of all or nothing. It admits of degrees. The Eucharist comes to achieve, to make fast in the unbreakable unity of the personal Body of the Lord a communion already given but not yet having its seal. It nourishes that communion, signifies it. It does not stop at consolidating it - it gives it its authentic status (33). It locks it in its

right place. If the image does not sound bizarre here, I might say that it turns to bone what would otherwise remain only cartilage.

Paul writes: "by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body - Jews or Greeks, slaves or free, and all were made to drink of one Spirit. For the body does not consist of one member but of many (I Cor. XII,13-14). Thence he deduces the impossibility of division and the need "that the members may have the same care for one another" (XII,25) It is to this requirement that, outside their assemblies, the Corinthians are not faithful. Baptism - Paul emphasises that it is into one Spirit - makes of all in their diversity "one sole body" "the body of Christ" of which all are individually members (XII,27) Undoubtedly it is not sinking into concordism to throw light on this insistence of Paul on the Spirit (apart from the Acts and the gospel this is the only part of the New Testament where there is question of baptism in the Spirit) by recalling the account of Pentecost, where the multitude of races finds itself unified , the Spirit of the Lord reversing the dramatic state of things created by Babel. Baptism, which is for the forgiveness of sins, introduces the baptised into the solidarity of Christ, where the multitude is forged into a community. The baptismal requirement is that this meeting of unity and multitude shall not be flouted.

Access to the Eucharist therefore requires not only - what for the Tradition is quite evident - true baptism (or valid, to use the language of the canonists) but also that one should live by the essential demand of baptism in the domain of communion. For baptism is not reducible to a mere rite. It creates a situation, and that is what it exists to do. It is clear that the Eucharist is not in conflict with or - as has been written -

"in tension" - with baptism. It does not replace it, there is no economising. On the contrary, refusing to see in baptism a rite without effect, a preliminary pure and simple, it will restore the community to its baptismal situation, but after having put it into the embrace of the personal body of the Lord. There is only one life in Christo, that which is received in baptism and which does not cease to be the baptismal "grace" of reconciliation. The Eucharist is the moment where that life meets its source, and seized by it, take its imprint.

4. The eucharistic requirement then points back to the baptismal requirement, and in the quest for ^{the} κοινωνία to be restored between divided Churches it is there that effort should be brought to bear. We should enquire into the content of what is demanded by baptism - this time on the level not only of what is required between persons but between communities.

The first element at stake is unity of faith. The New Testament in its entirety witnesses that Paul's warning to the Galatians faithfully reflects the thought of the apostolic Church. "If anyone is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accused" (Gal. I, 8-9; cf. 2 Cor XI, 4). Here the word anathema has its strong sense (34), in line with the Hebrew hèrem, of putting to the ban. Indeed the gratuitousness of Salvation is entirely rivetted on the Revelation of a truth which comes only from God and from which depends the whole of existence as believers and thence existence under grace. Thus anything that harms that truth harms the authenticity and depth of the christian experience as such.

There is only one Christian truth because there is only one Lord Jesus Christ in whom God has revealed himself fully. (cf. I. Cor. VIII, 6; III, 11). But it is not enough to call Christ Jesus to witness. We must also understand the content and the essential implications of his work, of his message, of the event of his coming, of his person. In this revelation moreover there were included truths about Salvation and about the means which God puts at our disposal to attain it. These belong to what lies at the heart of faith, the divine design for a Salvation in which the Father takes the initiative and provides the means.

It is impossible to be in a koinonia based on Christ's welcome and the working of his grace if on essential points of faith we are separated. Alas, history proves amply that, if it is relatively easy to reach agreement on articles of faith about God and Christ - even though the Filioque and monophysite questions have been hotly disputed - on everything that touches the Church and the means of salvation understanding is less easy. Common sense suggests that in the quest for koinonia among Churches, points of divergence which touch on important elements about the nature and mission of the Church can prevent any unity more than an unstable amalgamation or a rickety construction.

I have spoken of pluralism and diversity and of the need to give them in koinonia the place that belongs to them. But this pluralism and diversity can only be a different realisation of the same common gift, the translation of the same faith at least in its essentials. Hence Churches that wish to restore koinonia and examine themselves on their fidelity

also e

to their baptismal requirements, must ask whether they are fundamentally in agreement on id quod requoritur ad unitatem et et sufficit. In other words, they ask whether, beneath the differences in their theologies, their traditions, their expressions of doctrine they confess, at least on major points about God and Salvation, the same faith. This is especially necessary with questions which were originally disputed and led to the rupture.

It seems to me more than ever necessary to add that the baptismal demands go with an evangelical view of human behaviour, in other words with conformity to ethical principles linked to the biblical conception of man's vocation and dignity. They bear on justice, the rise of power, the control of sexuality, the domination of creation, the relation to life. A unity constructed without regard to this field of practical daily life would be nothing but ritual or juridical. It would not reach the connective tissue of ecclesial reality. To be sure this dimension of baptismal fidelity is not to be put on the same footing as confession of the great dogmatic truths about God, Christ and the means of Salvation. None the less to neglect it would be an irreparable fault.

5. The Tradition of the first centuries, most especially the handful of apostolic traditions, states in a thousand ways that the koinonia of the Churches is under the care, the episkopè of an inter-related group of ministers, who take charge both of the internal cohesion of each group and of that of all the groups with each other. But in thus serving communion, they must

also ensure a constant link for each local Church and for the Churches as a whole with the apostolic community. For this is not only the point of departure of the christian experience in both its personal and community aspects, but also a constant point of reference, the normative way of realising the koinonia willed by God, the unique witness to the ephapax of the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The whole life of the Church, since it is founded on the Word of God and on faith in that Word, cannot be lived except in apostolic witness and in absolute fidelity to its content. This goes too for conformity of baptismal life to the authentic design of God for his Church, under pain of "running in vain". The apostolic Church must be found in every Church.

It is the function of ministry to watch and to make sure that this "continuity" is in no way broken. It is not therefore enough for the Churches to have devoted and good ministers at grips with the world's problems and the needs of humanity. They must also be in apostolic continuity in such a way that these Churches, in their particular setting and their own historical situation, remain in the "apostolic tradition". In this I include "apostolic succession" but set within a larger whole: "continuity" in the teaching of the faith, "continuity" in sacramental life, "continuity" of inspiration and mission, "continuity" in keeping the community favouring the poor (attested by all the Tradition) "continuity" of solidarity with all the Churches, "continuity" in faithful transmission of what "has been received from the apostles". In short, it is up to ministers to watch (episkopein) that their local Church and other local Churches are in koinonia (in the strong sense of the word) with the apostolic community; a koinonia which stretches across history and binds hic et nunc the various regions. The truth (or validity) of their ordinations

is regulated by these criteria which measure up to features identifying the primitive apostolic community. It is a guarantee in respect of this continuity. And the whole history of the Church, to say nothing of the strange situation of episcopi vagantes,⁽³⁵⁾ shows that the 'validity' of an ordination can be nothing but a 'vestigial organ' (?) where there is not integration into the continuity of apostolic life.

Eucharistic koinonia between communities could not be genuine, from this point of view unless in each of them there existed a ministry connecting them with the apostolic ministry. Otherwise the gathering of these communities could have no guaranteed anchorage in the apostolic assembly around the Lord and in the Spirit of Pentecost. Their unity and internal cohesion - which might be real and sometimes stronger in groups not endowed with a ministry in apostolic continuity than in some that are - would not be fully attached to the koinonia of the apostles in faith, mission and service of the poor, the praise of the living God. They would lack that tie with ^{the} apostolic group which ensures in all ages and throughout history, what the Catholic traditions call "collegiality" of ministries, that is their association with what the apostles established as a "college" and not as a simple addition of individuals acting each according to his own judgement. This koinonia with the koinonia of the apostles means on the one hand that the apostolic Church can be "recognised" in each Church and on the other that each can "recognise" the apostolic Church in each other. Thus they have

among themselves a koinonia based on the presence in each of the faith and order which united the apostolic community in the koinonia of Christ Jesus. The ministry has - justifying its quasi-instrumental function in the service of the gift of grace to the community, its function of steward - a symbolic function (in the sense contemporary philosophy gives to this term (36) with regard to the apostolic groups. It has a vicarious relationship to the ministry of the Twelve on which the Church is forever founded (37). In and through it is that apostolic ministry now eluding our experience, which is rendered present and active: the one cannot dispense with the other, yet it transcends it.

The Churches of the Orthodox east rightly insist on this "symbolic essence" of the ministry. A minister cannot preside in the Church unless he is seen as vicar of the college of the Twelve. What the reformed Churches say of the ecclesial word, that it should always bring with it the apostolic word, the Catholic traditions say of ecclesial ministry, that it should always be bearer of the apostolic ministry. Hence then insistence on apostolic "succession" as a major condition of koinonia if the latter wishes to be in koinonia with what has been done "from the earliest times".

Crafted on to this question, and radically dependent on it, is the problem of the "ministry of unity", charged with taking care (we are still talking about episkopè) that these responsible for ministry are themselves an authentic "college" keeping themselves faithful to the apostolic witness. But it is clear that this "requirement" cannot be considered except where everything I have set out above is assured. For the Catholic traditions, the ministry of a universal Primate is

at the service of an "episcopal" ministry which does not have its source at Rome but is born of the Holy Spirit. The bishop of the local Church is not a representative or delegate of the bishop of Rome. In the strong words of Lumen Gentium about bishops (par. 27)

"The pastoral office or the habitual and daily care of their sheep is entrusted to them completely. Nor are they to be regarded as vicars of the Roman Pontiff, for they exercise an authority which is proper to them and are quite correctly called prelates".

Communion with the bishop of Rome is to bind the ministry of all bishops not in obedience to a monarch but in obedience to the apostolic faith and in conformity with the mission transmitted by the Apostles.. The Roman Catholic tradition says that this communion is necessary not for reasons of convenience but because it is the guarantee of existence in koinonia and the sign that the local Church, however particular its customs and proper traits, stands within the "catholic" symphony (catholic in the ancient sense of the term).

In the present situation, officially the Roman Catholic Church is the only one to see in this an unavoidable requirement for koinonia between Churches, although others - along them the Anglican communion - are challenged by the conclusions of certain dialogue commissions which have^{moved} in that direction (38). It is clear that in any project for koinonia in which the Roman Catholic Church is involved this element in ecclesial communion cannot be left aside.

7 These are I think, for an ecclesiology which refuses to be built on a purely juridical basis but aims to be founded on the very nature of being-in-grace, the prerequisites for any authentic and enduring koinonia between Churches. Is it necessary to insist that they are headings for the agenda of the journey towards unity?

NOTES

- (1) This is well stressed by Raymond BROWN, The Churches the Apostles left Behind. New York 1984, 84-85.
- (2) Note that here the image is different from that of the Temple as given in I Cor. 3:16
- (3) On this "holy community of God" see especially J.H. ELLIOTT, The elect and the holy, an exegetical examination of I.P 2:4-10 and the phrase basileion hierateuma Leyden 1966; K.R. SNODGRASS, "I Peter 2: 1-10: its Formation and Literary Affinities in NTS 24, 1977-1978, 97-106
J. COPPEN, "Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles; un commentaire de la Pet. II, 4-10" in Au service de la Parole de Dieu, melanges Charue, Gembloux 1969, 61-75; P. SANDEVOIR, "Un royaume de prêtres? in Etudes sur la première lettre de Pierre, coll. Lectio divina 102, Paris 1989, 65-96.
- (4) See J. DUPONT, "L'Union entre les premiers chrétiens dans dans les Actes des Apôtres", in Nouvelles études sur les Actes des Apôtres, coll. Lectio divina 118, Paris 1988, 296-318 (306-309)
Summa Theologica IIIa 69.5
- (5) Note that the term Ekklesia is not found in the Johannine tradition.
- (6) See H.W. ROBINSON, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality", in Zeitschrift für Antestamentliche Wissenschaft 66, 1936, 49-61; J. De FRAINE, Adam et son lignage, étude sur la personnalité corporative dans la Bible, Bruges-Paris 1959.
- (7) See Raymond BROWN, op.cit especially 21-22, 115-118
- (8) It seems to me, indeed, that this is about Jews and not about Christians as a whole.
- (9) On the meaning of this verse see especially F. SCHWABERGER, The Gospel according to St John. vol. 2 New York 1980, 356-357:
"The children of God who are scattered about the world, whom the exalted one draws to himself by his death on the cross (12-32) are gathered into one, the one flock of Christ which includes sheep from the previous fold and other sheep not from that fold (10-16). We begin to see the shape of the one Church made up of Jews and Gentiles, which embraces all the 'children of God' who have followed the call of the redeemer and bringer of salvation. The old

image of the gathering of the scattered Israelites is taken up into the universal perspective of all those chosen by God, particularly the Gentiles, who have so far stood at a distance; they now come to Jesus and he does not reject them. (cf. 12-20ff) and this is one fruit of his saving death (cf. 12:24,32)."

- (11) See the passage I quote in J.M.R.TILLARD, "L'Eglise de Dieu dans le dessein de Dieu" in Irenikon 58, 1985, 21-60
- (12) This is very well gone into in Markus BARTH, Ephesians 1-3 coll. The Anchor Bible New York, 1974, 307-311
- (13) On the distinction between neos and kainos see especially P.A.HARRISVILLE, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament" in JEL, 74, 1965, 69-79, developed in ID., The concept of Newness in the New Testament. Minneapolis 1960
- (14) The final report of the Synod of Catholic Bishops, in December 1985 introduces a rather strange distinction between pluralism and pluriformity. It seems to me not at all happy in this context.
- (15) I follow here the judgement of Raymond BROWN in his little book The Community of the Beloved Disciple, New York 1979.
- (16) Especially since the fundamental study of J.Y.CAMPBELL, "Koinonia and its Cognates in the New Testament" in Journal of Biblical Literature 51, 1932, 352-390. See also the big work of G. PANIKULAN, Koinonia in the New Testament coll. Anal. Bibl. 85, Rome 1979 (biblio : see especially chap 8). and the articles on "koinonia" in le Dict. de Spir.
- (17) Thus ARISTOTLE, Politics I, 1252 a; Eudemian Ethics VIII, 1241
- (18) H SCHUBER, "L'unité de l'Eglise dans la pensée de saint Paul" in Le temps de l'Eglise
- (19) On this question of the summaries see especially J. BURTON, op. cit., et IT., "la communauté des biens aux premiers jours de l'Eglise", in Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres coll. Lectio divina 45, Paris 1967, 503-519; A PASCO, Actus Apostolorum. Introductio et exempla exegetica fasc.2 Rome 1966 271-330, G GHIRELLI, "I tratti riassuntivi degli Atti degli Apostoli", in Il Messaggio della Salvezza - Scritti apostolici, Turin 1968, 137-150.

- (20) Clearly this usage has nothing to do with the sense of "unclean" which the word sometimes has with Luke. (Ac. 10;14; 11.7; 10:28;)
- (21) See J. DUPONT. "La communauté des biens...." 509-510
- (22) On the yahad and its connection with the Qumran literature see M.E. BOISWARD, "The First Epistle of John and the writings of Qumrânin James H. CHARLESWORTH, John and Qumrân London 1972, 156-165; M. WILCOCK, The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford 1965, 93-100.
- (23) "From the Acts of the Apostles (2:44; 4:32) we learn that at least in Jerusalem the first Christian community held all their possession in common and endeavoured to achieve a heart-felt unity in the service of God. Many commentators see here an influence of the Essene ideal upon primitive Christianity in Jerusalem. Elsewhere, the Gospel of John insists in a characteristic manner on the unity which joins together all Christians (10:16; 11:52) and especially 17:11, 20-22). This being so, it is probably not by chance that the First Epistle of John employs four times in three verses (1:3; 3,6,) the word "community" or "fellowship" (koinonia), which corresponds exactly to the Hebrew word yahad, which was used to designate the "community formed by the people of Qumran". This word, koinonia signifies not only the "fellowship" of Christians among themselves (1:3a,7) but also the "fellowship" of Christians with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ (1:3b,6). From the opening of his Epistle, John wishes to recall discreetly the ideal of "fellowship" among all who are in God's service. This emphasis brings to mind the ideal of the Essenes" M. BOISWARD, loc. cit 160-161.
- (24) On the nuance between metchô and koinôneô see the few lines by C. SPICQ; L'Épître aux Hébreux, coll. Études Bibliques, Paris Bibliques, Paris 1953, T.2.43.
- (25) J. DUPONT "La communauté des biens..." 513,
- (26) See especially T.T. BRUCE, Commentary on Galatians, Grand Rapids, 1982, 126-128.
- (27) Paul does not draw out here this connection with the whole Body of Christ; see I Cor. 12:26.
- (28) On this question see J. MOFFATT, The First Epistle to the Corinthians London 1947, 8-13; J. DUPONT "Reflexions de saint Paul à l'adresse d'une Église divisée" in L. De IOPENZI, Paolo e una Chiesa divisa, Rome 1980, 215-231

- (29) See J. MOFFATT op.cit 234-142; J. HEPING, La première Epître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens, Neuchâtel Paris 1949, 85 who suggests translating (on the same lines as MOFFATT) "we are one bread, one body, though we make up a multitude".
- (30) According to H. SCHLIER op.cit 292-293 On this question see the study by K. LEON-DUFOUT, "Corps du Christ et Eucharistie" according to saint Paul", in Le corps et Le Corps du Christ, coll. Lectio divina 114, Paris 1983, 225-255 (234-236)
- (31) This context of disunion seems essential for understanding the passage.
- (32) J. MOFFATT, op.cit. 161

(33) This is why in the tradition of the Eastern Churches, as in that of the Catholic Churches of the East, christian initiation culminates in the eucharistic celebration, as their ritual for adult baptism demonstrates.

(34) cf F.F. Bruce, Commentary on Galatians, 83-84

(35) On this question of episcopi vagantes, read especially P.F. ANSON, Bishops at Large, London 1964; A.J. MACDONALD, Episcopi Vagantes in Church History, Oxford 1945; for the Anglican Communion, H.R.T. Brandreth, Episcopi Vagantes and the Anglican Church, London 1961.

(36) cf especially G. DURAND, L'imagination symbolique, Parish 1976; E. ORTIGUES, Le discours et le symbole, Parish 1962.

(37) I went into this matter on J.M.R. TILLARD, The Bishop of Rome (SPCK 1983).

(38) Read on this subject W.A. VISSER 'T HOOFT "Le Conseil œcuménique et l'Eglise Catholique, ultimes réflexions du pasteur W.A. Visser't Hooft" in D C 83, 1986, 125-129.
