

## Week 28, Wednesday, August 3, 2022: of The Lord's Supper

R.C. Sproul says, "When we examine life in the first-century Christian community, even apart from the passages of the New Testament, it is clear that the celebration of the Lord's Supper was central to the worship of the people of God."<sup>561</sup> What's more, it "is the central symbol of the Christian religion."<sup>562</sup>

WCF 29:1: *Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein He was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of His body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in His Church, unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of Himself in His death; the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, their further engagement in and to all duties which they owe unto Him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with Him, and with each other, as members of His mystical body.(a)*

(a)1 Cor. 11:23-26; 1 Cor. 10:16-17,21; 1 Cor. 12:13.

Communion is a sacrament because the Lord Jesus instituted it as such "in His Church". It is always highlighted that the last meal of *fellowship* ended with *betrayal* to begin the process of redemption by "His body and blood". The Supper is a "remembrance" or memorial of what Jesus has done for us. Yet it is for our "spiritual nourishment and growth in Him", and that because it is a "seal" of the benefits Christ assures us of in our living covenant union and communion with Him. It also is a constant, engaging affirmation of our pledge to Him and His people: "Every time the Christian partakes of the Lord's Supper he renews the oath, taken in baptism, to be the Lord's."<sup>563</sup> It is "perpetual" to see us through *together* until the End: "There is a clear connection between this communion and the 'communion of saints.'"<sup>564</sup> It is sometimes called the Eucharist, because of the Greek verb (εὐχαριστέω), "to give thanks" or "thanksgiving". The Lord's Supper is a ceremonial meal that celebrates life.<sup>565</sup> And as it does, it not only looks back, but here and ahead. Van Dixhoorn notes, "The meal so often called the last supper was really the first supper."<sup>566</sup> Packer explains:

The prescribed ritual of the Supper has three levels of meaning for participants. First, it has a *past* reference to Christ's death which we remember. Second, it has a *present* reference to our corporate feeding on him by faith, with implications for how we treat our fellow believers (1 Corinthians 11:20-22). Third, it has a *future* reference as we look ahead to Christ's return and are encouraged by the thought of it.<sup>567</sup>

WCF 29:2: *In this sacrament, Christ is not offered up to His Father; nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins of the quick or dead;(b) but only a commemoration of that one*

---

<sup>561</sup> Sproul, vol. 3, 134.

<sup>562</sup> Green, 217.

<sup>563</sup> Green, 219.

<sup>564</sup> Spear, 152.

<sup>565</sup> Packer, 217.

<sup>566</sup> Van Dixhoorn, 386.

<sup>567</sup> Packer, 219. See Psalm 116:13-14, 18.

*offering up of Himself, by Himself, upon the cross, once for all: and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same:(c) so that the Popish sacrifice of the mass (as they call it) is most abominably injurious to Christ's one, only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of His elect.(d)*

(b)Heb. 9:22, 25-26, 28. (c)1 Cor. 11:24-26; Matt. 26:26-27. (d)Heb. 7:23-24, 27; Heb 10:11-12,14,18.

Christ is the final High Priest and His offering of Himself was the true and final sacrifice. His name was Jesus, because He saved His people from their sins. His cross work *is finished*; “... there is no more offering for sin” (Heb. 10:18). There is now no altar, but a table. There is no place for the ongoing Popish “mass” that understands the Lord’s Supper to be a literal ongoing sacrifice to pay for sins. “Christ offered himself at one time for all time. There was no room for repetition of any kind.”<sup>568</sup> The Lord’s Supper is only a “commemoration”.<sup>569</sup> It is a memorial of Jesus’ final sacrifice to truly pay for our sins. Jesus did not give salvation to His disciples in the Lord’s Supper (they were saved by faith in Him). He gave them the Supper to feed their faith, as they were about to lose Him: “It showed them what they possessed. And it testified to them that they did possess it.”<sup>570</sup> Ken Golden explains, “The Holy Spirit works through the word to *create* faith, while the Spirit works through the sacraments to *confirm* faith.”<sup>571</sup>

WCF 29:3: *The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed His ministers to declare His word of institution to the people; to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to a holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants;(e) but to none who are not then present in the congregation.(f)*

(e)Matt. 26:26-28 and Mark 14:22-24 and Luke 22:19-20 with 1 Cor. 11:23-26. (f)Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:20.

King Jesus ordained this sacrament for His Church and also set apart His ministers (only) to set apart the elements in worship for holy and orderly use (another indication of the three-office view of

---

<sup>568</sup> Sproul, vol. 3, 143. “Section 2 has to do with one of the critical disagreements between Rome and Protestantism ... The Roman Catholic Church teaches that every time the Mass is celebrated, Christ is offered up afresh to the Father in a real sacrifice.” (142). Van Dixhoorn offers these helpful critiques: “First, in contrast to the old covenant regime, Jesus has no intention to ‘offer himself repeatedly’, or to ‘suffer repeatedly’. The very thought is absurd to the author of Hebrews. We see this in Hebrews 9:25, 26 ... Second, there is no way of improving or adding to a finished work ... We see this in Hebrews 9:26. Third, the so-called bloodless ‘sacrifice’ that is supposedly offered in the Roman Catholic mass can have no merit because ‘without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins’. We see this in Hebrews 9:22.” (387).

<sup>569</sup> Against Roman Catholic vague disclaimers, “... this sacrament is not a commemorative offering but a ‘commemoration’ of an offering.” Van Dixhoorn, 388. He adds, “The ‘sacrifice of the mass requires the return to a temporary priesthood, while we have priests enough in the one permanent priest who is Christ (*Heb. 7:23, 24*). The ‘sacrifice’ of the mass calls for continued offerings when Christ has ‘once for all ... offered up himself’ (*Heb. 7:27*).

<sup>570</sup> Williamson, 218.

<sup>571</sup> Ken Golden, *Eating and Drinking with God* (Lancaster, Pa.: Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals, 2020) , iv.

church government).<sup>572</sup> They are to “declare His word of institution to the people”, for the sacraments are not independent of the Word. Still, as with Baptism, the Lord’s Supper is meant to be complimentary to the Word and meet our human needs for physical reminders of spiritual realities: “The Lord’s Supper ‘is a visible sermon, wherein Christ crucified is set before us’ (Thomas Watson, *The Ten Commandments*, p. 186).”<sup>573</sup> The Lord’s Supper “exhibits” salvation. It visibly reminds us Christ’s body was beaten for us, and His blood was shed for us: “This is my body which was broken for you.” When the *Confession* speaks of not bringing the Lord’s Supper to those not in the congregation, it focuses on queens who had private masses with private priests (completely contradictory to what the Supper is, a NT communal gathering of the OT Passover Feast)<sup>574</sup>.

WCF 29:4: *Private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest or any other alone; (g) as likewise, the denial of the cup to the people, (h) worshipping the elements, the lifting them up or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use; are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ. (i)*  
(g) 1 Cor. 10:16. (h) Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:25-29. (i) Matt. 15:9.

Private masses are particularly condemned, as well as is denying the people the partaking of wine (which became the practice of the Roman Catholic Church because they were concerned that the laymen might spill the blood of Christ on the floor of the church<sup>575</sup>). The various examples of

---

<sup>572</sup> “They that are against commanded gospel ordinances and ministers of Christ, whom they look upon as the priests of Baal, would (if they durst) shake off the very Scripture and Word of God.” Dickson, 27. See WCF 27:4, WLC 156, 158-159, 169 on who may read and preach the Word and who may administer the Lord’s Supper and Baptism. See also Ken Golden, *Eating and Drinking with God*, p. 64.

<sup>573</sup> Ibid, 217.

<sup>574</sup> “... Christ did institute the last supper not for one apart, but for many together (*Matt.* 26:27-28). Dickson, 230.

<sup>575</sup> Van Dixhoorn, 391.

worshipping the elements condemned are all related to the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>576</sup> It should not surprise us that such idol worship evolves within a belief system of Transubstantiation, holding the bread and wine to truly become the body and blood of Jesus Christ—nor that priests get drunk on left over wine because they may not pour down the drain what has now become Christ’s blood. Golden points out, “what should happen to the leftovers [in the Roman Catholic ceremony]? ... they must be *worshipped*. The adoration of the Eucharist takes the transubstantiation to its logical conclusion.”<sup>577</sup> Again, we approach a “table”, not an “altar”. More importantly, the mistaken understanding of the “nature” of the Supper is why Catholics believe salvation is through the ongoing infusion of Jesus dying for them, so there is no salvation without this continually repeated sacrificial drip. Thus, “To the extent that Rome persuades men to believe her doctrine, she also persuades men to abandon legitimate hope.”<sup>578</sup> Most Catholics will (logically) never say that they know they are going to heaven.

WCF 29:5: *The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to Him crucified, as that, truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; (k) albeit in substance and nature they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before. (l)*  
 (k)Matt. 26:26-28. (l)1 Cor. 11:26-28; Matt. 26:29.

This section relates to 27:2 in that the Scriptures speak figuratively of the sacraments. We read the Bible “literarily” all as literal truth, but not infrequently through metaphorical language. So we speak of the “body and blood” of Jesus Christ knowing it as a figurative expression, just as we understand that Jesus is not a literal door or vine or shepherd. Reformed Protestants believe that Christ is spiritually present in the Supper, but *only* spiritually. Remember that the first Lord’s Supper should inform how we understand the subsequent ones: Jesus said, “This is my body”, but He ate of it and it

---

<sup>576</sup> “Section 4 is a far-reaching condemnation of Roman Catholic practices ... The elements are ... Exalted and adored in Roman Catholic liturgy and ritual ... In every Roman Catholic church, at the back of the altar, there is a so-called tabernacle. It is usually a gold box of sorts. The tabernacle contains the consecrated element, which means that Christ is truly present at all times in the tabernacle. A Roman Catholic, upon entering the church sanctuary, before being seated, genuflects. The priest, ministering in front of the altar, genuflects repeatedly during the service when he passes the tabernacle. They genuflect because they believe Christ is physically present in the tabernacle. It was in opposition to such a view that section 4 was written.” Sproul, vol. 3, 146-147. Dickson writes, “... if the elements ought to be adored because Christ is sacramentally present in them ... the water of baptism ought to be worshipped, seeing the whole Trinity is no less present there than in the Supper.” (231). He adds, “... transubstantiation takes away the sacramental analogy; and so when the sign is turned into the thing signified all similitude between them is gone and ceaseth ... From this doctrine do follow many great absurdities inconsistent with religion sense, and reason. As first, that Christ in the Supper did both eat and drink himself, that he was wholly in his own mouth ... that a mouse or rat may eat Christ's body; that his body being reserved and laid up into a cupboard in a short time may turn into vermin. Must not Christ's body be in many places at once? Must not his body and all the parts therefore, his head, hands, and feet be in the smallest and least crumb of the host?” (233); and, “... Christ said the bread was his body which was broken; the wine was his blood which was shed. But neither was his body broken under the bread, nor his blood shed under the wine, seeing Christ as yet was not betrayed, crucified, and dead.” (236) Also criticizing the Lutheran consubstantiation as “contrary to the articles of our faith” he adds, “It makes as many bodies of Christ as there are pieces of eucharistical bread. It makes his body to be broken in, with, and under the bread, and bruised with the teeth; it sends his body down to the stomach where it is turned into a man's substance and afterwards thrown out.” (237)

<sup>577</sup> Golden, 15.

<sup>578</sup> Williamson, 221.

was only bread off the table, not flesh off His arm. As well, He said, “this is my blood”, but it was wine that He and the disciples drank out of an earthen vessel, not from His veins. Such continues to be the case. As well, the elements are not important alone, but in the action of partaking of them together: “... the essence of the sacrament consists in the eating and the drinking.”<sup>579</sup> It is the virtue of what was purchased for us by Christ’s body and blood that is present and fed upon.<sup>580</sup>

WCF 29:6: *That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, and hath been, and is the cause of manifold superstitions; yea, of gross idolatries.(m)*

(m)Acts 3:21 with 1 Cor. 11:24-26; Luke 24:6, 39.

Most directly, Transubstantiation (literally, “across the substance”<sup>581</sup>) is taught against here (belief that the bread and wine change completely into the literal body and blood of Jesus Christ and are consumed as such); this is what is namely wrong with the Roman Catholic Church: “The Mass is the heart of Romanism. And idolatry is the heart of the Mass.”<sup>582</sup> Notice the appeal to “common sense and reason”, which are vital in the Christian faith to rule out such error; sadly Reformed folk are suspicious of logic in recent times, and this plays into wanting to over emphasize Christ’s presence somehow mystically in the elements rather than focus on Christ present in the spiritual feasting. If we throw out reason, we lose the entire “nature” of the sacrament: a “remembrance” (paragraph 1) and a “commemoration” (paragraph 2).

WCF 29:7: *Worthy receivers outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, (n) do then also, inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death: the body and blood of Christ being then, not corporally or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet, as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.(o)*

(n)1 Cor. 11:28. (o)1 Cor. 10:16.

“Worthy receivers” actually benefit spiritually from the supper of thanksgiving by feeding their faith. Christ’s body is not in, with, or under the elements (this is teaching against Lutheran Consubstantiation—“lit. ‘with the substance’”<sup>583</sup>—and Luther’s concept of the ubiquity of Christ’s

---

<sup>579</sup> Hodge, 359.

<sup>580</sup> Ibid, 362-363. Dickson, 231: “... the bread and the wine are not sacramental symbols but in the very action (*I Cor. II:26*). Here it is said, 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup', but not as often as ye reserve this bread.”

<sup>581</sup> Golden, 11.

<sup>582</sup> Williamson, 226.

<sup>583</sup> Golden, 15. He adds, “Due to the local presence of Christ in the sacrament, Lutherans also teach that the real presence is received by believers and unbelievers alike.” Ibid, 17. Further, “... Roman Catholics and Lutherans ... require that Christ descends to us. The Reformed believe the opposite; rather than Christ coming down, the Spirit raises us up to Christ and seats us in the heavenly places (Eph. 2:6; Col. 3.1). Ours is a fellowship with the incarnate Christ. His humanity is circumscribed to a place, available by the Spirit, and received by faith.” Ibid, 20.

body, which kept the Reformed and Lutherans from uniting at the Marburg Colloquy).<sup>584</sup> But Christ's body and blood are really spiritually present to the faith of true believers. Notice the parallel: wine and bread feed the mouth and stomach of the physical body. Christ's spiritual benefits feed our faith (not our mouth). Jesus is present in the Supper, not as the "host" in the meal, but the Host of the meal. Christ was not physically present in the *elements* of the Lord's Supper, but He was physically present *at the Supper*. Similarly, while Jesus is not present in the elements of our worship, He is spiritually present with us, serving the meal and reminding us of our union and communion with Him by the Spirit: "The Lord invites us to share a meal with Him as a pledge of His love to us in Christ."<sup>585</sup> Christ's perfect Personal union of His two natures that remain distinct is important to keep in view, with His human nature remaining in heaven while His divine nature is with us on earth.<sup>586</sup> Again, Jesus began the Lord's Supper at a Passover Feast; when one studies it along with temple sacrifices, it is seen that God is having a meal with His people in His house after a sacrifice was made. Similarly, we share a meal with God in His house because of the final sacrifice of the Lamb of God, Who hosts the meal in our presence. Christ feeds your inner soul by use of these outward signs and senses. Make sure to come prepared with a gracious appetite of faith to develop a deeper spiritual taste each time.

WCF 29:8: *Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament: yet they receive not the thing signified thereby, but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation. Wherefore, all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table; and cannot, without great sin against Christ while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, (p) or be admitted thereunto. (q)*

(p) 1 Cor. 11:27-29; 2 Cor. 6:14-16. (q) 1 Cor. 5:6-7, 13; 2 Thess. 3:6, 14-15; Matt. 7:6.

As the Visible Church is a mixed multitude, there are those who partake while actually receiving no spiritual benefit (not of faith). Notice that ignorant persons may not partake; unlike baptism, children must be able to express that they understand the basics of the faith and what is going on in the Lord's Supper. As well, those who are engaged in open sin either in doctrine or practice must not be admitted until there is repentance and restoration (it will damn them), and so PRPC practices "session-controlled" communion.<sup>587</sup> This is not the same as "closed communion". We only allow communicant members of PRPC to partake along with visitors who first meet with Session to demonstrate that they are baptized communicant members of a Visible Church in good standing and thus worthy to partake. See Exodus 12 and Joshua 5 for how a person needs to be committed to

---

<sup>584</sup> "According to Luther ... There is not a change of elements, but an addition to them." Sproul, vol. 3, 148.

<sup>585</sup> Spear, 151.

<sup>586</sup> Sproul, vol. 3, 150-151. "Christ is present at the Lord's Supper ... to us by the divine nature." (151). "Through his divine nature, we commune with the whole Christ. We meet the whole person of Jesus at the Lord's Table, not because his human nature can be physically present here and all over the world, but because the divine nature that is perfectly united to the human nature does come to visit us. When he comes, he does not come without the whole person." (155).

<sup>587</sup> See WLC 173 teaches only some may be admitted, and it is a duty of the officers to guard the table of others. Dickson writes, "... all were not admitted to eat of the Passover, neither was it for all promiscuously to partake thereof (*Num. 9:6-7; 2 Chron. 23:19; Ezek. 22:26*) ... the Lord will not suffer such as are manifestly and contumaciously wicked to take his covenant in their mouth; and therefore to such persons the seals and symbols of his covenant ought not to be offered (*Psa. 50:17*). (239)

commune. Another phrase for this practice is “fencing the table”. Against the idea of “open communion”, we should remember that Jesus privately shared His supper with select people.<sup>588</sup> Ken Golden explains, “Christ has fulfilled the covenant requirements so that we can dine at His table, but we must still respond. Conditions must still be met. In ecclesiastical circles, this is called ‘fencing the table’, but ... we’ll call it *family expectations* ... that are required for us to participate in the sacrament ... one must first join the family. For Christians this happens through the sacrament of baptism ... that sacrament of joining God’s family must precede the sacrament of partaking the family meal ... Since the Lord’s Supper is the family meal of the church, one needs to join the family before partaking ... the Lord’s Supper is a visible church ordinance. For that reason, only members of a visible church in good standing should be allowed to partake ... Self-examination ... doesn’t exclude the decisions of church officers. The church still has a responsibility to judge its own, especially when its members are blind to their sins.”<sup>589</sup>

Closing comments: Due to the Regulative Principle of Worship and the relation of meaning to mode (see comments in the Baptism section), we reject the practice of Intinction (dipping bread in one cup and consuming instead of separating the elements). PRPC celebrates the Lord’s Supper weekly after during the morning service (it would seem from Acts that they partook every Lord’s Day, which Calvin argued for).<sup>590</sup> Also, wine, not grape juice, is served related to the Regulative Principle previously discussed under worship. See the articles below for suggested reading to understand these practices.

*Some closing thoughts by Thomas Watson, from The Ten Commandments:*

“The Lord’s Supper is the most spiritual and sweetest ordinance that ever was instituted. Here we have to do more immediately with the person of Christ. In prayer, we draw nigh to God; in the sacrament, we become one with him. In prayer, we look up to Christ; in the sacrament, by faith, we touch him. In the word preached, we hear Christ’s voice; in the sacrament, we feed on him” (223). “We dress ourselves when we come to the table of some great monarch; so, when we are going to the table of the Lord, we should dress ourselves by holy meditation and heart consideration” (223). “It is a visible sermon ... How unseemly is it to see any come to these holy elements, having hearts leavened with pride, covetousness, or envy? These, with Judas, receive the devil in the sop, and are

---

<sup>588</sup> “... we cannot, on any scriptural basis, get away from the notion of restricted communion. The Lord’s supper is not for all indiscriminately as the gospel is ... It is part of the whole counsel of God that those conditions be clearly and insistent set forth, to the end that those who are eligible partake and those who are not refrain.” John Murray, “Restricted Communion”, in *Collected Writings*, vol. 2, 381. He adds, “The session must act upon the basis of credibility and observable data ... the session is under obligation to exclude from the Lord’s supper those who are guilty of such overt sin as requires exclusion ... there may be a person present who is not a member of any church, who is indeed a notorious character but who for one or several erroneous and unworthy reasons wishes to participate.” (382-383).

<sup>589</sup> Golden, 23-25, 27, 29.

<sup>590</sup> Golden writes: “The question of frequency—how often or seldom we do something—isn’t a trivial matter ... Our bodies need food and drink to survive, the right amount to thrive.” Ibid, 33. Also, he points out that in 1 Cor. 11:17-20 instructing on the Lord’s Supper, “... vs. 20 explicitly says they were receiving the sacrament *when they came together*. The obvious conclusion is that the sacrament was celebrated whenever they congregated!” Ibid, 36. Also, “If the sacrament is a means of spiritual growth, then why limit the opportunities to receive it? Since Paul calls it fellowship with the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16), we should seek such fellowship as often as possible.” Ibid, 37-38.

no better than crucifiers of the Lord of glory” (224). “Eating shows the infinite delight the believing soul has in Christ. Eating is grateful and pleasing to the palate; so feeding on Christ by a lively faith is delicious ... Eating denotes nourishment ... so eating Christ’s flesh and drinking his blood, is nutritive to the soul” (225). “The taking of the cup denotes the redundancy of merit in Christ, and the fulness of our redemption by him. He not only took the bread, but the cup” (226). “It is an ordinance appointed to confirm our faith ... strengthened ... Christ’s intercession is made available to us by virtue of his death ... our remembering his death in the sacrament must be, [I] A mournful remembrance ... Zech xii 10 ... [2] It must be a joyful remembrance ... John viii 56” (227). “This ordinance of the supper is an earnest of heaven ... God has appointed the sacrament on purpose to cheer and revive a sad heart. When we look on our sins we have cause to mourn; but when we see Christ’s blood shed for our sins we rejoice ... To see Christ crucified for us is a means to crucify sin in us” (228). “Grace is like a lamp, which if it be not often fed with oil is apt to go out. Rev iii 2. How then do they sin against God who come but very seldom to this ordinance! ... God’s table should be guarded, that the profane should not come near. Exod xix 12 In primitive times, after sermon was done, and the Lord’s supper was about to be celebrated, an officer stood up and cried, ‘Holy things for holy men;’ and then several of the congregation departed” (229). “The wicked do not eat Christ’s flesh, but tear it; they do not drink his blood, but spill it” (230). “To come to such an ordinance slightly, without examination, is to come in an undue manner, and is like eating the passover raw” (231). “We are to pray that this great ordinance may be poison to our sins, and food to our graces” (236). “Christ received aright sacramentally, is a universal medicine for healing, and a universal cordial for cheering our distressed souls” (238).

### Suggested Readings:

- “Restricted Communion”, Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland: <http://www.fpchurch.org.uk/about-us/what-we-stand-for/the-lords-supper/restricted-communication/>
- “Why Do the Minister and Elders Interview Intending Communicants?”, Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland: <http://www.fpchurch.org.uk/about-us/what-we-stand-for/the-lords-supper/why-do-the-minister-and-elders-interview-intending-communicants/>
- “Restricted Communion”, John Murray, in *Collected Writings*, vol. 2 (pp 381-383)
- *The Lord’s Supper: A Celebration of Grace*, Gordon J. Keddie
- *Eating and Drinking with God*, Ken Golden
- “What Mean Ye?”, Richard Bacon (Connection of Passover Meal and the Lord’s Supper, teaching against paedocommunion): [http://www.fpcr.org/blue\\_banner\\_articles/meanye1.htm](http://www.fpcr.org/blue_banner_articles/meanye1.htm)
- Other articles linked on PRPC’s website Resources page:
  - “The Westminster Standards and the Frequency of the Lord’s Supper”, Richard Bacon
  - “Wine in the Communion Cup”, Marion Lovett
  - “Danger of Being Overwise (Wine in Communion)”, William B. Sprague
- Pastor Grant’s article arguing for weekly communion, “A Frequent Expression of Love”: <https://www.reformation21.org/blog/a-frequent-expression-of-love>
- T. David Gordon, “Why Weekly Communion,” *Ordained Servant* 17 (2008): 109. Found online here: [https://opc.org/os.html?article\\_id=104](https://opc.org/os.html?article_id=104)
- Free audio lectures at [www.feedingonchrist.com/the-theology-of-the-lords-supper/](http://www.feedingonchrist.com/the-theology-of-the-lords-supper/):
  - “Feeding on Christ in the Lord’s Supper According to Calvin and the Westminster Confession.”
  - “Calvin and Westminster on the Lord’s Supper: Exegetical Considerations.” Wayne Spear, <https://reformedresources.org/calvin-and-westminster-on-the-lords-supper-exegetical->



[considerations-mp3-download/](https://reformedresources.org/feeding-on-christ-in-the-lords-supper-according-to-calvin-and-the-westminster-confession-mp3-download/)<sup>591</sup> See also by Spear, “Feeding on Christ in the Lord’s Supper According to Calvin and the Westminster Confession”: <https://reformedresources.org/feeding-on-christ-in-the-lords-supper-according-to-calvin-and-the-westminster-confession-mp3-download/>

**Assigned Readings for Wednesday, August 10:**  
WCF 30, “Of Church Censures”

---

<sup>591</sup> These lectures explore the mystical union emphasis of Calvin on the Lord’s presence in the Supper (labeled “substance efficacy”, not separated from “faith efficacy”) criticized by the likes of Hodge and Dabney. These lectures are helpful to point to if ever pejoratively accused of being “Zwinglian” on the subject for holding closely to the explicit language of memorializing in our *Confession* and not being pressured to become vague like Calvin. Dr. Spear summarizes that the *Westminster Confession* “allows” for a distinctive Calvinian view (“faith” and “substance efficacy”), but does not require it, and is fully compatible with solely having a “faith efficacy” view. It may also be helpful here to note what seems to be the real problem with Zwingli that seems to be often misrepresented: “Ulrich Zwingli . . . rejected the idea that the sacraments are means of grace and instead contended that they are merely signs and pledges of the believer’s faith . . . For Zwingli, the sacraments . . . were only man’s pledge of fidelity to God; they were not seals of God’s promises to the church.” (Fesko, 329).