and what it means to be saved.

One dimension of salvation that some traditional theologies have slighted is the salvation of the world. Our koinonia exists for the sake of the world's salvation, according to the Scriptures. And that salvation, in Catholic thought, is complete liberation from sin and all its effects—from the injustice and violence, too. What does it mean for Catholics and Pentecostals to be such a koinonia serving God's plan for the total liberation of all God's people? That's a question that all of us who talk about the Church could well reflect on more fully.

Fr. Frank Colborn, Chaplain
Claremont University Center
919 N. Columbia
Claremont, CA 91711

_Perspectives on Koinonia:
A Roman Catholic Response_

_Perspectives on Koinonia_ offers a model of the way in which serious ecumenical dialogue among Christians can and ought to happen. It carefully delineates areas of agreement and honestly indicates areas of belief in which theological consensus continues to elude Catholics and Pentecostals.

Given the assigned brevity of this response, I would like in these paragraphs to focus on three issues of disagreement that have emerged from the dialogue between Catholics and Pentecostals on the meaning of koinonia. I choose these issues for discussion, not in order to heighten the disagreement but in order to suggest possible paths of dialogue that might eventually resolve them. I have selected the issues of canonicity, church, and sacraments.

1. Canonicity

_Perspectives on Koinonia_, (19) indicates that Catholics and Pentecostals continue to disagree on the canon of the Scriptures. The document notes that while Catholics and Orthodox Christians share the same canon, Pentecostals follow the canon adopted by the Reformation Churches.

The problem of canonicity remains a vexing one because the establishment of a scriptural canon within any Christian church always functions as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Once a community includes a particular book of the Bible in its list of inspired books, it will thereafter experience that book as inspired. If it excludes a particular book of the Bible from its list of inspired books, it will thereafter experience the book as not inspired.
In such a situation, clearly the mere comparison of canonical lists leads nowhere. The lists do not match. We know that. We have known it for centuries. As long as ecumenical discourse remains restricted to the mere comparison of lists, it will clearly go nowhere.

Dialogue might, however, begin to go somewhere, if Catholics and Pentecostals began to explore in greater detail more basic questions. I mean questions like: What does the term canonicity mean? How in fact have Catholics and Orthodox established their norms for Biblical canonicity, on the one hand, and how have the Reformation churches in fact established their norms, on the other? How ought one to understand the relationship between what one means by Biblical inspiration, on the one hand, and canonicity, on the other?

In such a discussion, two fundamental tasks face us. First, we need to use history in order to contextualize the way in which both Catholics and Pentecostals came to identify certain Christian writings as canonical and to exclude others from the same canon. Second, we need to evaluate the comparative adequacy of the norms invoked by each community in the establishment of a Biblical canon.

In assessing the different norms for Biblical canonicity invoked either by Catholics or by the churches of the Reformation, we need to take care not to confuse problems of truth with problems of adequacy. Questions of truth concern the validity or invalidity of particular propositions. For example, in the present instance, any reflection on Biblical canonicity must address the question: "Is the letter of James inspired by the Holy Spirit?" Questions of adequacy, however, look, not to particular propositions, but to the frames of reference, the tacit assumptions, within which particular propositions find assertion. In order to reflect intelligently on the norms one's community invokes for establishing the canonicity of specific books of the Bible, both Catholics and Pentecostals need in my opinion to clarify their understanding of the relationship between what each communion means by canonicity and inspiration. Since, moreover, we need greater clarity on this question in both churches, real dialogue on this issue ought to be possible.

2. Church:

*Perspectives on Koinonia.* (29-32) notes correctly that Catholics and Pentecostals view church communion differently, that Catholics tend to stress the God-givenness of koinonia, while Pentecostals tend to ground koinonia in an experience of personal repentance and faith.

It seems to me that here both churches have grasped two profound and interrelated truths and need to appropriate more systematically one another's insight. Catholics need to insist more systematically than they have that genuine Christian communion roots itself in integral conversion before God. In stressing the God-givenness of Christian communion, however, Catholics, it seems to me, have grasped another profound truth: namely, that conversion never occurs in a vacuum and