The aim proposed by Christiaan Mostert in his paper “One God: One Church” is to explore the extent to which a correspondence might exist between the unity of the triune God and its ‘image’ in the unity of the church. The practical correlate is important too: what theological impulse does such a correspondence give to the imperative of visible unity? This reply will develop along three lines, reflecting on:

1. The nature of theological models, and this one in particular;
2. Problems that arise from a perichoretic model for unity; and
3. The priority of the mediatorial model for church unity, visible and invisible.

**Theological Models**

What is to be made of the claim that the model for church communion is Trinitarian pericherosis? Colin Gunton argues that some inadequacy in the doctrine of the church derives from the fact that “it has never seriously and consistently been rooted in a conception of the being of God as triune.”

something new. On the other hand, maybe the fathers had some good reasons for not applying their Trinitarian perspectives in this area. I tend to think that the explanation lies in the latter and that this was not just related to their anti-arian polemic either. Perhaps their idea of Trinitarian communion of persons did not seem to them fruitful as a model for the church, at least compared with others such as the people and kingdom of God and the body of Christ.

In order to be useful and durable, theological models seem to have to meet three requirements:

1. **Biblical warrant.** In this instance, what is the biblical weight of the analogy between the one God and the one church? It seems less imposing than its advocates suppose. Even in Ephesians 4 the reference to the Trinity is not to their *communion*, but to the individual *persons*. As Robert Letham says, “the unity of God takes a threefold pattern.”

2. **Theological usefulness.** Is the one God/Trinitarian communion—one church/unity model—really useful in terms of being internally self-sustaining and capable of drawing other theological models into its scope? Can it be ‘thought into’ other images of the church? This is certainly an aspect the paper could have explored.

3. **Applicability.** Finally, a valid theological model stimulates ‘thinking outward’ and encourages orthopraxis. How does the *koinonia* model help with practical questions, such as that of openness and its limits? Does *koinonia* itself provide guidelines?

What follows is an attempt to consider some of the suggestions of the paper in the light of these considerations.

**Some Reflections on the One God—One Church Model for Unity**

Christiaan Mostert argues that some correspondence does exist between the unity of the church and the triune being of one God, and that it has consequences for the visible unity of the churches.3

---


3 Section III.