



Witnessing in unity

Lukas Vischer (1993)

- Why have we come together?
 - Why are we divided?
 - Why do we so easily divide?
 - The unity we seek
 - What way forward?
-

● Why have we come together?

"It is a cheering sign of the time that in the most different Protestant lands, and particularly in the bosom of the Reformed Church, in which religious individualism both in the good and in the bad sense has been most fully developed, it is coming to be felt more and more that the existing divisions of the Church are wrong, and with this is waking more and more an earnest longing after a true union of all believers."¹

These words were written almost 150 years ago by Philip Schaff (1819-1893), one of the most significant Reformed theologians of the 19th century. Born in Switzerland, he spent most of his active life in the United States. He was one of the great pioneers of the ecumenical movement, a founding father of both the Evangelical Alliance and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. In his judgement the great perspectives of the Reformation had been lost sight of. The Reformed churches, undermined by rationalism and sectarianism, had split into a multitude of denominations, groups and sects.

During five decades he promoted the need for a new departure. "In any view the Reformation must be regarded as still incomplete; it needs yet its concluding act to unite what has fallen asunder, to bring the subjective to a reconciliation with the objective."²

Exactly one hundred years ago, and just a few months before his death, Schaff, who was already seriously ill, attended the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago. There he issued a passionate appeal for "a fraternal pan-Christian council in Jerusalem, where the mother church of Christendom held the first council of reconciliation and peace. The war between Rome, Constantinople, Wittenberg, Geneva and Oxford," he said, "will be fought out to a peaceful end, when all the churches shall be thoroughly Christianized and all the creeds of Christendom unified in the creed of Christ."³

To what extent have these hopes and appeals been fulfilled? Much indeed

has changed. We have witnessed the rise of the ecumenical movement. A new atmosphere has been created. Many Reformed theologians and churches have been instrumental in promoting the cause of unity. In some cases they have even become partners in projects of union. Generally, however, the internal situation of the Reformed churches has hardly changed. Divisions not only have continued to exist but have multiplied. Despite active participation in the ecumenical movement the sense of the Reformed churches to represent the body of the Christ in this world has continually been eroded. The divisions we face today are even more numerous than 150 years ago.

In many respects the record of the Reformed churches is impressive. Through the missionary movement the message of the Reformation has penetrated into all parts of the world. Churches of this or that Reformed type can be found in almost every country of the world. The gospel has been so proclaimed that it could be heard as a liberating word of hope. In many countries the witness borne by Reformed churches has been particularly constructive. As we look back on the past decades there is therefore much reason for gratitude. But there has also been failure with destructive consequences. Obviously, the Reformed churches have not succeeded in maintaining the bond of unity. Though effectively proclaimed, the message of reconciliation has been betrayed by conflicts and sectarian splits. The movement which has spread all over the world has not resulted in a worldwide fellowship of churches bound together in mutual accountability and support.

How can this fragmentation be overcome? How can the trend towards more and more division be reversed? How can the Reformed churches be more credible signs of God's kingdom? Ultimately, of course, the credibility of the church's witness does not depend on the quality of its communion. The power of persuasion lies in God's spirit. To some extent the church is always bound to fail in the fulfilment of its mission. Its communion will never be perfect. God's great design can be reflected in its life no better than pure sunlight is reflected by an imperfect mirror. It may even be dangerous for the church to claim perfection and to forget that it will always remain a community in need of forgiveness. It is part of the church's obedience to turn again and again to God and to rely on divine intervention. But these inevitable shortcomings must not be used as a pretext for taking lightly the divisions which disfigure the face of the church. God has chosen to act through the weakness and imperfection of human beings. We are called to be part of the process of communicating the gospel. We are to be vessels and instruments in God's service. Without presuming that God's Spirit is in any way dependent on us we have to make every possible effort at removing the obstacles which obstruct God's encounter with the world.

The task is daunting. The divisions have accumulated in the course of centuries. While in some cases reunion has become possible, in other cases the divisions have continued far beyond the original causes for the split. Old divisions have been filled with new content, and in each generation additional conflicts have arisen which threaten the unity of the body. If there is no change of mind, the history of Reformed division is likely to continue in the future.

We are committed to reflect together on possible solutions and to initiate a process towards a new manifestation of the oneness of the body. Clearly, a concerted action is required. No single church can take upon itself to serve as the focus of unity. Initiatives need to be taken by the different churches at the same time. Everywhere in the Reformed world the voice of unity needs to be raised. Everywhere people will need to call into question what

tends to be accepted as the inescapable fate of the Reformed tradition. Each individual is called to contribute. Each congregation has its role to play, and above all the concern has to be on the minds of those bearing responsibility for the churches at the national and international levels. From all a kind of conversion is required - faith in Jesus Christ in whom no wall, not even the wall between Jews and Gentiles, is strong enough to resist; imagination to see beyond the present antagonisms; patience to persevere in the task.

● **Why are we divided?**

The present situation is the result of a complicated history, too complicated to be fully analysed here. For a fuller picture I refer to earlier attempts, especially the article in the preparatory booklet for the general council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in Seoul.⁴ Let me recall here just a few aspects of this history.

1. From the early days of the Reformation there has been a tendency among the Reformed churches to divide. Struggling for the true church almost inevitably led to controversies not only with the church of Rome but also within the camp of the Reformation. From the beginnings the Reformed churches were shaken by numerous debates on doctrine. They divided especially over issues of the structure of the church. What form of ministry is required in the church? What role has the local community to play in governing the church? What are the adequate relations between church and state? In the course of centuries, controversies over these questions gave birth to various Reformed "sub-traditions" - Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Free Churches. Though the debates have lost much of their sharpness, these sub-traditions continue their separate existence in many places even today. Another type of division was caused by differences on the authority and function of the confessions of faith. Within the Reformed family we find churches emphasizing the permanent role of the Reformed confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries, and others advocating a more dynamic interpretation of the Reformed heritage. In many countries disputes over the nature and authority of the Bible have led to lasting splits. Fundamentalism has made deep inroads into the Reformed family. Other divisions were caused by attempts at renewing the church - eg, the movement of the Disciples of Christ, the revival of the 19th century, and in more recent times the response to Pentecostalism which turns out to be divisive in more and more countries.

No doubt, there is behind all these developments the desire to be faithful to the gospel. Something of the ethos of the Reformers is at work. God alone must be obeyed. Where God's truth is at stake, no compromise can be admitted. The history of the Reformed churches illustrates at the same time, however, that any attempt at preserving the true church by splitting is eventually self-defeating. Anyone seeking purity by separating from others runs the risk of ending up in sectarianism. The Reformers were aware of this danger, which is why they did not spare any effort to preserve the unity of God's church. Under no circumstances should the Reformation be seen as an attempt at founding a new church. Later generations were less restrained, and again and again the same process was repeated. Instead of manifesting the true face of the Church, the oneness of the body of Christ was obscured.

2. Often in the history of the Reformed churches division occurred in connection with the church's witness in society. Churches parted ways, for

instance, on the issues of slavery, race discrimination, recognition of dictatorial rule and the fight against communism. Feminist views and cooperation with representatives of other religions may in the future increasingly become a cause of separation. Debates on these issues are, of course, inevitable, and since they touch on the substance and integrity of the church's witness these debates are bound to be fierce. But do they necessarily need to lead to separation? The price for separating needs to be carefully weighed. Though it may temporarily bring clarity, it may turn out to be destructive in the long run. Because history goes on. The issue at stake will fade and the church will have to face new challenges. But the separation once consummated is likely to persist much longer. In some cases, divided Reformed churches are simply monuments to the memory of past debates. Every effort needs therefore to be made to maintain at least a remnant of unity even in the fiercest debates. For clarity's sake temporary separation may be inevitable, but basically the struggle for the church's witness in society needs to take place within the communion of the church. With a view to today's great debates it will be essential to find ways of taking sides for the sake of the gospel without definitively breaking the communion between the churches. At this moment of history, this consideration applies especially to those Reformed churches which, legitimately, have taken a clear stand on apartheid.

3. There is still another aspect which needs to be mentioned. One of the main reasons for the divided state of the Reformed family lies in the history of the missionary movement. In the last two centuries, individual Reformed churches and mission agencies have been engaged in missionary work in the same country without coordinating their efforts with the work of other churches. In many places, therefore, several Reformed churches have come into being. They have never separated; rather, they are separated by birth. Though they share basically the same teaching and the same organizational patterns, they have developed separately and have acquired, in the course of their history, distinct characteristics. In some cases, they now represent a particular class or minority within the population. Generally, they have closer links with their "mother" churches than with one another. Mission agencies, though they have of course drastically modified their mission strategies, continue to have an impact on their life and witness. The missionary movement has not laid the ground of a common witness of the Reformed churches at the national level. In many countries, relations among the Reformed churches are not a matter of course. Sometimes they are not aware of one another's existence. Unfortunately, these non-coordinated missionary efforts are not simply past history; they continue today. In various countries, Reformed - or should I rather say "evangelical" - mission agencies are at work without paying much attention to the need for visibly manifesting the fundamental oneness of Christ's body. I am thinking, for instance, of the situation in Burkina-Faso and perhaps even more of the increasingly extended and impressive missionary work the divided Korean Christians are undertaking in many parts of the world.

4. The last factor to which I want to refer is migration. Many churches are the result of ethnic immigration. The most striking illustration is provided by the situation in the United States. To a large extent, the diversity of the Reformed churches in the United States is due to different waves of immigration. Scottish, Dutch, German and Hungarian immigrants did not gather in one church but formed their own churches which continue to exist even today. If no radical change of perspective takes place, the same historical process is likely to be repeated with the increasing Chinese and Korean communities in the United States. There is, of course, much to be said in favour of the formation of ethnic communities. People arriving in a

foreign land need to be given an opportunity to worship in their mother tongue and to cultivate their inherited culture. But can this legitimate need justify separation? Does not the gospel, on the contrary, teach the relativity of nations and national identities? In the light of the biblical witness, separation along ethnic lines is an obvious denial of God's gift of grace. If it is true that "in Christ there is no Jew or Gentile", people of different ethnic origin will recognise one another as members of the one body of Christ. They will rejoice in the diversity of gifts and seek to communicate with one another despite their differences. The true church is a sign of God's intention to gather all nations.

Migration is likely to increase in the future. More and more people will move or will have to move due to wars, misery, ecological catastrophes, and other adverse circumstances. The situation the Reformed churches will have to face will be increasingly complex. How can the oneness of God's church be manifested in an ethnically pluralistic society? It is essential that Reformed churches develop a constructive answer to this question.

● **Why do Reformed churches so easily divide?**

Clearly, in most divisions moral failure is involved. Normally the official arguments put forward by the protagonists are not the whole story. In reality, a vast variety of human factors play their role. Differences of race, language and culture can sharpen the conflict. Often, economic interests are at stake, and in almost all cases ambition and pride are at work. Divisions are the results of power struggles; and very often it is the fear of losing status and influence which prevents church leaders from promoting the union or reunion of "their" church. Situations of division cannot adequately be understood without an honest and thorough analysis of all these factors.

But then a disturbing question must be asked. Why is it that Reformed churches divide more easily than other Protestant traditions, eg, the Anglican, the Lutheran or the Methodist churches? How can it be explained that they succumb more readily to the pressures which threaten their unity? Are there aspects in their theological and spiritual convictions which make them more vulnerable in this respect than others? Observing and analysing the history of Reformed churches, I am increasingly inclined to say that this is the case. There is not just moral failure. Why should Reformed Christians be morally inferior to Christians of other traditions? The Reformed propensity to divide must have deeper reasons.

It is due, I think, to a one-sided interpretation of the great discoveries of the Reformation. The insights of the Reformers could easily be misunderstood. The primary emphasis they place on the gift of salvation in Christ could be interpreted so as to loosen the sense of communion. The liberating message they formulated had also a negative impact: it was followed by the shadow of insensitivity to the building up the church and its needs. The trend towards more and more division can therefore not be reversed by mere appeals. Neither can reunion be achieved merely by the introduction of new programmes and projects. Structural considerations, as imaginative as they may be, are not enough. A theological and spiritual reorientation is required. There is need for a new reflection on the relationship between the great affirmations of the Reformation and the communion in Christ. It must become clear that the great emphases of the Reformation make sense only as long as they are supported by a strong commitment to the church: Their implementation requires from each and every member of the church a strong "discipline of communion".

Three considerations may serve as illustration:

1. The Reformation emphasized the presence of Christ in the church. Through his word, Christ, the crucified and risen lord, communicates himself to the church today. "The holy Christian church whose only head is Christ has been born from God's word; she stays with it and does not listen to any extraneous voice," declared the Berne theses of 1528, one of the earliest Reformed confessions of faith. Christ's presence is not mediated by the church; rather through Christ's presence the church comes into being. "Through word and spirit Christ gathers, protects and preserves the church" (Heidelberg catechism 54) . It is the creature of the word and bound to respond to the word.

This emphasis is a source of immense freedom. The church's life is not determined by her past. Christ is her life, and as the church conforms to him and his word it is capable of renewal and new departures. The church is a wandering people, constantly transcending what it has received from earlier generations.

But there are also risks involved. With this emphasis Reformed Christians easily underestimate the significance of the church for the Christian faith. They tend to think that it has emerged from their own response to God's word and easily forget that it existed long before they came to believe in Christ and decided to follow him as disciples. God has in Christ been creating the church from generation to generation. It has been the sign of God's faithfulness through the centuries. Its doors have been opened for us in our time and we have been included in its communion. The church is not a voluntary association called to serve the cause of Christ; rather it is Christ present in the world, associating us with him and his purposes. As another American theologian of the last century, John Williamson Nevin, put it pointedly: "The church does not rest upon its members but the members rest upon the church."⁵ The same thought was expressed by John Calvin when he spoke of the church as the mother and of those who believe as her children. "There is no way of enter permanent life than through being conceived in the womb of this mother; she has to give birth and to feed us with her breasts; she has to sustain and to guard us under her guidance and government until we shall be freed from this flesh and shall be like angels."⁶ Reformed Christians need to learn, perhaps through a more frequent celebration of the eucharist, that the church is a gift which needs to be received again and again.

2. The Reformers emphasized the freedom of each person. Through his word Christ speaks to each person. Whoever receives the gospel, whoever is incorporated in Christ's body by the sign of baptism, men and women, people of all classes and cultures, has direct access to God. They are free. They can speak to God and are called to use their judgement in listening to God's word. They are to contribute their gifts to the upbuilding of the church. They are all priests, and the church is therefore a communion of priests which does not need the mediation of priests to invoke God's presence in their midst.

Again, a liberating message! But again, there are risks involved. Reformed Christians, as they think of the church, tend to start from their own experience, insights and judgement. They tend to look upon the church as an association of individuals. They have difficulty in recognizing fully the role of the church in communicating, nourishing and protecting the faith. Christ speaks to each person, but his voice can be heard and rightly understood only in the communion of the church. Philip Schaff, whom I

have quoted in the beginning, is right in saying the following: "Only in regular and rational subordination can the individual Christian be truly free; his or her personal piety can as little come to perfection apart from an inward and outward communion with the life of the church, as a limb separated from the body or a branch torn from the vine."⁷ We are free only insofar as we recognize ourselves to be part of the whole - a minuscule element in God's great design in which we are called to participate. Many divisions could have been avoided if these two aspects had consistently been kept together.

3. Finally, the Reformation emphasized the significance of the local church. "Where two or three are gathered in my name I am in their midst" (Mt 18.20) is one of the biblical phrases most often quoted by the Reformers. Christ is present in the church where the word is preached and where the sacraments are administered; he is therefore present in the local community which gathers to listen to the word and to celebrate the sacraments. There is no mediating hierarchy required. Each local church has direct access to Christ. As she receives his word, it receives the whole gospel and all gifts it needs for the fulfilment of its calling.

This emphasis has had far-reaching consequences in the life of Reformed churches. On the one hand, it has led to a strong sense of responsibility of each local congregation. On the other, it has reduced the vision of the universal church. True, the Reformed, and especially the Presbyterian churches, have developed structures for common decision-making and witness within each nation or region. Synods and synodal practice have become characteristics of the Reformed churches, and there is truth in the statement that the Reformed tradition has been a cradle of a participatory style of decision-making both at the local and national levels. But it is also true that the Reformed churches have not succeeded in developing a strong sense of common responsibility at the universal level of the church's life. There has always been a deep-seated mistrust of any authority and decision-making beyond the national level. Each church tends to act independently from the others - each considers itself responsible for formulating its confession of faith, for training its pastors, for conceiving of its evangelistic and missionary work and its role in society. The individual Reformed churches do not pay attention, as a matter of course, to the common calling and mission of all Reformed churches. "Rome has spoken, the matter is concluded", the saying goes about the Roman Catholic Church; the Reformed version would need to read "The national synod has spoken, there is no need for further discussion".

The consequence of this self-sufficiency is an uncoordinated approach to all issues which concern the common witness of all Reformed churches - their confession, their self-understanding and their missionary outreach. Is this inevitable? Or can this weakness be overcome without losing what is sound in the emphasis on the significance of the local church? An urgent need for Reformed churches is to strengthen their vision of the universal church and to combine the recognition of Christ's presence in the local church with a new respect for Christ's presence in all churches.

The unity we seek

As we seek to overcome the divisions which paralyse the common witness, what kind of unity are we looking for? In Reformed circles it is, I think, of paramount importance to get rid from the very beginning of a widespread prejudice. The unity we seek is not the end of diversity. It is not uniformity but communion in diversity. To give expression to the oneness of the

church of Jesus Christ there is no need for the churches to adopt identical ways of thinking and acting. The decisive point is rather that despite their diverse profiles, they succeed in recognizing and respecting one another, in establishing living communication, and in mutually supporting their witness. Visible unity is a living communion which puts an end not to diversity but to fragmentation, mutual indifference and the scandal of visible disunity.

This unity is primarily a spiritual reality. As we recognize God's initiative in Christ, we are included in a communion which is not of our own making. The church is made up of people who have responded to God's gift of reconciliation and have therefore been reconciled also among themselves. It is a communion of gratitude and praise. For this reason the Reformers placed so much emphasis on the proclamation of the gospel and the celebration of the Lord's Supper. They knew that God's gift of reconciliation had to be constantly recalled and placed before the church. In order to maintain its unity, the church had to return again and again to the very source of its unity. Movements towards union can therefore bear fruits only by concentrating on this primary spiritual reality.

It would be an illusion, however, to be content with the spiritual level. For unity not to remain a mere idea or sentiment, a framework is required by which communion is supported and protected and on which it can rely. Reformed Christians tend to underestimate the importance of structures. They fear that communion may lose its authenticity by relying too heavily on external means. Therefore, they quickly become impatient with efforts towards union and call into question the concern for consensus and agreed structures. This impatience is short-sighted. In order to resist the pressures of disunity a general agreement on both "faith" and "order" is indispensable. In order to survive, communion needs the appropriate vessel. This is true for the church in each country and it is also true for the universal communion of all churches. It can only exist and function if it is built on a common basis and can rely on agreed structures.

Even more important is perhaps the recognition that communion is a constant process. Unity is never definitively achieved, but is in constant need of being re-built. Communion is vulnerable; it can easily be broken. Disunity is like a weed that appears and reappears after it has been removed. As part of discipleship there is, therefore, a discipline of communion required. Where divisions have occurred, oppositions and antagonisms have to be overcome. Negative memories need to be purified. Where unity is threatened, tensions and hidden feelings need to be brought into the open. In Reformed churches, because of their particular vulnerability, this constant effort at healing and constructing is even more necessary than in other traditions. The emphasis on freedom which is characteristic of Reformed churches needs to be coupled with a strong commitment to maintaining communion. A constant movement, sustained by imagination and perseverance, needs to take place in the Reformed churches.

● **What can be said about the way forward?**

Let me for the sake of exchange and discussion submit the following seven considerations:

- 1.** Reformed churches need to become more fully aware of one another. Today, they have on the whole a rather limited knowledge of their own family. Normally, they know the churches of their own country and certain

partners with whom they have historical links. But generally, they have no clear idea of the extent of the Reformed family. It is characteristic that there is no centre in the world where reliable information on the history and present situation of all Reformed churches can be obtained. Documentation, mutual information, sharing stories of the past and the present are therefore urgent priorities. They are the prerequisite of an increased consciousness of their common calling.

2. Initiatives towards unity need to be taken in each country. With the Reformed emphasis on the significance of the local church, the movement towards union clearly cannot be dictated from above but must start from below. The churches from the same region need to meet. As a first step they will seek to establish an atmosphere of mutual confidence. Through contacts, personal friendships and common celebrations they will seek to enlarge their common ground, although certain groups will remain apart. On the basis of a careful analysis of both the origin and the present situation of each church, they will seek to discover why the divisions have occurred and how they could possibly be overcome. They will seek to gain clarity on the content of the mission with which they have been entrusted in their country; and eventually they will also seek to agree on the form of unity which is required in their country and which will provide the appropriate vessel for their common witness.

3. This emphasis on national plans of unity does not mean that no action from outside is required. On the contrary, as we have seen, in many countries disunity has its cause in factors outside the boundaries of the country. As the churches of a given country seek one another, much depends therefore on the attitude of the churches and mission agencies abroad. How will they relate to their partner churches? More and more the rule should be generally accepted among the Reformed churches that, in their relations with a given country, churches should have in mind the common life and witness of all churches in that country. As long as they act in isolation, the impact of their witness and especially of their financial support can easily turn out to be negative. Unintentionally they often contribute to maintaining or fortifying existing divisions. As they allow themselves to be guided by the needs of the common life and witness of all Reformed churches they can serve as catalysts of unity.

4. As we have seen, in many countries the pattern of missionary work which led to separate churches in the past continues also today. New churches are being established without respecting the fact that "there are churches in that place that are already attempting to express the love of God in Jesus Christ in their context". Generally, Reformed churches should "strengthen the witness of churches that are already in a particular place rather than attempt to plant new churches".⁸ Urgently required is new common thinking about the legitimacy and the role of ethnic churches which result from today's great migration movements. A common approach needs to be developed among Reformed churches to avoid the further fragmentation of the Reformed family. Can this consultation suggest initiatives in this direction?

5. Experience shows that the impact of theological seminaries on the mission and unity of the churches is deeply ambivalent. By bringing together students from various churches they can promote a wider horizon and lay the ground for a discipline of communion. By seeking to introduce into the church a certain type of theological teaching they can also play a leading role in favouring division. Seminaries can be sectarian centres. In many cases they have been responsible for doctrinal disputes which have eventually led to ruptures. The role of seminaries and their relation to the

decision-making bodies of the church call therefore for careful scrutiny. What is the authority of seminaries in the life of the church? How can the traditional double emphasis of Reformed churches on doctrine and on independent thinking be combined with the sense of service and communion?

6. If the movement towards unity is to be generalized, the role of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches will have to be rethought. For unity to be promoted in a universal perspective a centre is required which is capable of placing the challenge of unity before the Reformed churches. At present the international exchange among Reformed churches is primarily provided by bilateral relations and to a certain extent by partial international associations such as the *Communauté évangélique d'action apostolique* (CEVAA) or the Reformed Ecumenical Council (REC). A real sense of universality can only develop if the various parts of the Reformed family form a truly multilateral fellowship. To a certain extent the World Alliance of Reformed Churches represents such a fellowship, but it is too weak to fulfil its function effectively. There is, of course, no question of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches exercising institutional authority over the member churches. But could it not act much more fully as a centre and symbol of fellowship, as a clearing house and facilitator of unifying relationships? The Alliance could be the instrument for promoting common perspectives in understanding the Christian faith. It could serve as a catalyst for the churches as they seek closer relations among themselves. In particular, it could provide a platform to bring, in the perspective of universality, order into the complex network of bilateral relations.

7. Ultimately, communion in Christ is a fellowship of prayer and intercession. As the churches open themselves to God in prayer they will also gain the strength to open themselves to one another. It is therefore essential that prayer for unity takes root in the Reformed churches and that the movement towards unity is supported by informed intercession for one another. A few years ago, in preparation for the general council in Seoul, an attempt was made to propose to the Reformed churches a "cycle of intercessory prayers". Could this suggestion perhaps now be renewed?

It may be appropriate to recall in conclusion one of the prayers which were then proposed:

"O Lord, our God, who has reconciled us to yourself and to one another through the death of your son and has entrusted to us the ministry of reconciliation, keep ever before our hearts and minds the price that you have paid for the salvation of the world. Crucify our pride, destroy our enmities, and let the cross of your son bear in us all the fruits of righteousness and peace."

Originally published in *Mission in Unity: Towards deeper communion between Reformed churches worldwide*, John Knox Series no.8 (Geneva: JKIRC, 1993), pp.3-14.

Notes

1. James Hastings Nichols, ed., *The Mercersburg Theology* (New York, 1966), p.136.

2. *Ibid.*, p.130.

3. David S Schaff, *The Life of Philip Schaff* (New York, 1897), p.488.

4. World Alliance of Reformed Churches, *Mission and Unity*: Discussion paper for the

22nd general council, Seoul, 1989 (Geneva, 1989), pp.38-56

5. *The Mercersburg Theology*, p.40.

6. John Calvin, *Institutes IV*, 1,4.

7. *The Mercersburg Theology*, p.126.

8. Report of representatives of mission agencies, Basel, October 1992.