

**3A. Application to our history (continued)**

**4B. Sacraments**

**1C. Baptism**

**2C. Communion**

If we were strong traditionalists then we would have communion *after* the morning sermon (per the Westminster directory of worship). So, we do not advance a “reformed” view of communion that accords with the Westminster Standards because we partake of communion *during* the morning worship: the partaking of the sermon and the partaking of the elements are a unit. At the table, we partake of the elements in the context of a sermon that focuses on Christ in a distinct way (a sermon that involves preaching communion remembrances of Christ in a way that is more directly focussed on Christ than how we focus on Him in every “regular” sermon).

**1D. We hold a reformed view versus Luther and Rome**

However, we do hold to a reformed view of communion over against Luther and Rome (see the sermons on communion from Mat 26). But we also question the Nevin (Mathison) approach to the “real presence” doctrine of Calvin. We think we are more in line with the best of Calvin here versus his confusing language. We align ourselves more with Hodge than Nevin on this point. Surely, that does not make us “non-reformed.” Since most reformed Paedobaptists do not practice Paedocommunion, then we align with the majority of reformed folk on this practice. So, we claim to be more reformed than not regarding communion.

**2D. What about the practice of preaching communion remembrances every time we have communion?**

**1E.** Many in reformed history had special communion preaching on the day of communion, either in the morning worship sermon or after it in a less lengthy but substantial preaching of communion remembrances, in association, at least with partaking of the elements.

We can see ourselves as part of the unity without unanimity that exists within the history of reformed theology because the core emphasis is on the word and sacrament, even if it is applied in a variety of ways.

**2E.** T Gordon (Johnny books) argues from the bond of word and sacrament to weekly frequency, but does this do justice to the regulative principle: what does God tell us to do in this regard? Does He command weekly communion? We argue that Gordon’s aim is reformed in principle as a logical and biblical extension of this sacrament because communion is the word of God in symbol (an objective gospel sign) that Jesus told us to observe in remembrance of Him. However, if weekly communion is not clearly (not even implicitly) commanded by God for worship, then openness on how often it is observed is the best and reformed way to go.

Moreover, it seems to us that it is fully reformed to say that Jesus calls us to remember Him in a distinct way in observing communion (remember me) and that that involves the Spirit’s reminders (sola scriptura) that covenant heads of the households of faith (pastors of local churches) are to preach (expositionally). We assert that emphasizing the Spirit’s reminders hardly makes us Zwinglian with a bare memorial. PCR is God-centered versus man-centered. The latter involves subjectivism and mysticism in the sacrament, which tend toward being bare memorials in their neglect of the Spirit’s reminders through the preached word. PCR combines notions from the second wing (objectivity in the sacraments) with notions from the first wing (BT: pastoral explanations of the Christian and fulfillment Passover) and the third wing (in our defense of the primacy of preaching in the tradition of Calvin regarding exposition book by book).