

Holy Communion and Revivalism in the First Great Awakening

By Glen J. Clary

This article explores the connection between the Lord's Supper and revivalism during the First Great Awakening in order to determine, first, what role the sacrament played in the Awakening and, second, what effect the Awakening had on shaping the church's theology and observance of the Lord's Supper. Two revivalists from the First Great Awakening—Theodore Frelinghuysen and Gilbert Tennent—are used to illustrate the connection between communion and revival in the mid-eighteenth century.

When we think of the great revivalists in American history, we do not typically picture them at the Lord's Table, but in the pulpit. We associate revival not with communion but with preaching, and rightfully so, because

THE AUTHOR: Glen J. Clary holds a Master of Divinity degree from Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, PA), and a Doctor of Ministry degree from Erskine Theological Seminary (Due West, SC). He is currently the Pastor of Providence OPC in Pflugerville, Texas.

1. See Kimberly Bracken Long, *The Eucharistic Theology of the American Holy Fairs* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011) and Leigh Eric Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scotland and the Making of American Revivalism*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001).

2. See Hughes Oliphant Old, *Holy Communion in the Piety of the Reformed Church* (Powder Springs, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2013), 239–304; Long, 105–30; and Schmidt, 11–32.

3. Throughout this article, we will use the terms *revival* and *revivalism* synonymously, though we recognize that a distinction may be made between the two terms; see Iain Murray, *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism 1750–1858* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1994).

4. On Theodore Frelinghuysen, see James Tanis, *Dutch Calvinistic Pietism in the Middle Colonies: A Study in the Life and Theology of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967). On Gilbert Tennent, see Milton J. Coalter, Jr., *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thunder* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986).

5. See especially Old, *Holy Communion*, 605–671.

6. See Herman Harmelink, "Another Look at Frelinghuysen and His Awakening," *Church History* 37 (December 1968): 423–38; and Charles Hartshorn Maxson, *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920).

preaching has always played a dominant role in revival. But if we look carefully at the two major revivals in American history—the First Great Awakening of the eighteenth century and the Second Great Awakening of the nineteenth century—we discover, perhaps to our surprise, that the Lord's Supper played a significant role in those movements.¹ To be sure, preaching occupied the first place, but the Lord's Supper played an important secondary role in the great revivals in American history.

The connection between communion and revival did not originate on American soil but with the revivalism of the Old World—particularly within Scottish and Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.² In this article, however, we will focus our attention on American revivalism.³ Specifically, we will explore the relationship between communion and revival by examining the ministry of two revivalists: Theodore Frelinghuysen and Gilbert Tennent—both of whom played a leading role in the First Great Awakening.⁴

Frelinghuysen and Tennent give us a picture of the significance of the Lord's Supper for the First Great Awakening. They also give us a sense of how revivalism shaped the church's understanding and observance of the Lord's Supper. One of the points we want to make is that revivalism did, in fact, significantly transform the church's theology and observance of the Lord's Supper, and that transformation has had a pervasive and perennial effect on communion piety and practice in the church even down to our day.⁵

In the 1720s, Theodore Frelinghuysen (a Dutch Reformed minister) and Gilbert Tennent (a Presbyterian minister) began serving different congregations in the Raritan Valley of New Jersey. They soon became close friends, and started working together at promoting revival. This was the beginning of the Great Awakening in the middle colonies.⁶ Frelinghuysen and Tennent

represent two different theological traditions that converged during the great revival of the mid-eighteenth century. There were, in fact, several theological traditions that converged in the First Great Awakening, and each tradition had something to contribute to the nature of the revival. One tradition was New England Puritanism mediated primarily through Jonathan Edwards; another was Calvinistic Methodism brought to the colonies by George Whitefield. There was also Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism and the pietistic tradition of Dutch Calvinism mediated primarily through Gilbert Tennent and Theodore Frelinghuysen respectively. The convergence of these various theological traditions contributed to the rise to the Awakening in the mid-eighteenth century.⁷

THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN

Theodore Frelinghuysen's most significant contribution to the Awakening was his method of preaching. Of course, the greatest preacher of the Awakening was George Whitefield, but even the great Whitefield learned a thing or two about preaching from Frelinghuysen (Kidd, 93). Whitefield was very impressed with Frelinghuysen's method of preaching, and he incorporated that method into his homiletical style.⁸ Frelinghuysen himself gives us a good description of his preaching method when he writes,

Though I would not prescribe a method of preaching to anyone, yet I believe that the application should be discriminating, adapting to the various conditions of the hearers (Jude 20–21; Jer. 15). The church includes all kinds of people: wicked and unconverted persons, moral persons, and Christians in appearance and profession. This last group is the largest, for “many are called but few are chosen.”⁹

Likewise, in an ordination sermon to a colleague, Frelinghuysen said,

Preaching must be structured to the different conditions of our hearers. In the church, there are godless and unconverted persons; civil, false, and pretending Christians.... There are also converted persons in the church, and little children and those more advanced. Each one ... must be spoken to and handled according to his state and frame (Beeke, xxvi).

Thus, Frelinghuysen divided the members of his church into different categories. There are basically four

categories of churchgoers.¹⁰ First, there is the strong Christian (*sterk Christen*); this is a converted person who is spiritually mature. Second, there is the concerned Christian (*bekommerde Christen*); this is also a converted person but one who struggles with “many doubts and lacks assurance of faith” (Beeke, xxxi). Third, there is the “letter-learned” (*letter-wyse*) or the “literal man;” this is an unconverted person who is “instructed and conversant in truth though not knowing its experience or power” (idem; cf. Tanis, 109). Finally, there is the ignorant (*onkunde*), an unconverted and unlearned person—one who is not instructed in the Christian faith. Tanis adds,

The most pathetic type to Frelinghuysen was the third—“Literal Man.” Such persons are “almost Christians, who are not far from the kingdom of God, who walk with Christians and seek with Christians, but not in a right manner; many shall seek to enter in and shall not be able ... the fear of God is not before their eyes, and the way of peace they have not known.” These are the people who at times affect outward holiness and often practice the externals of religion (Tanis, 109).

Having divided his congregation into these various categories, Frelinghuysen would address himself specifically

7. See Thomas Kidd, *George Whitefield: America's Spiritual Founding Father* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014); George Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004); Iain Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1987); Arnold A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield: The Life and Times of the Great Evangelist of the Eighteenth-Century Revival*, 2 volumes (Westchester, IL: Cornerstone Books, 1970–79); Alan Heimert and Perry Miller, eds., *The Great Awakening* (Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967); Leonard Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Reexamination of Colonial Presbyterianism* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1949); Archibald Alexander, *The Log College: Biographical Sketches of William Tennent and His Students, Together with an Account of the Revivals under Their Ministries* (Birmingham, AL: Solid Ground Christian Books, 1846).

8. Tanis writes, “In New York, Whitefield heard Gilbert Tennent preach and found his sermon the most searching he had ever heard. The direct forcefulness of Tennent deeply moved his new English friend. Tennent's preaching was Frelinghuysen's method perfected, the method of ‘drawing one matter out of another, thereby discovering the state and condition of his auditors to themselves.’ Whitefield's own method of preaching was greatly affected by this instruction, and so the torch which Frelinghuysen bore from East Friesland passed to Tennent, on to Whitefield, and, through him, it has never ceased to glow in evangelical preaching in America.” See Tanis, 80–81.

9. Cited in Joel Beeke, ed., *Forerunner of the Great Awakening: Sermons by Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, 1691–1747* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), xxxii.

10. See Tanis, 108–111; and Beeke, xxxi.

to each type of churchgoer and make personal application according to the condition of each one (cf. Beeke, xxx). This kind of preaching is sometimes known as discriminatory preaching or the classification method (cf. *ibid.*, xxvi, xxx–xxxiv). Frelinghuysen categorized his congregation “into various states and conditions of soul and then made personal applications in preaching to each group” (*ibid.*, xxx).

The most important point to make here is that, according to Frelinghuysen, the largest class of church members is the third group, the “letter-learned.” These are those who are Christians in appearance only (cf. Tanis, 110). They are people who have been well instructed and are conversant in the Christian faith, but they are unconverted persons. They have a form of godliness but have not experienced its power. They are “almost Christians,” not far from the kingdom of God (*ibid.*, 109). “They walk with Christians and talk like Christians, but they do not possess the new birth” (Beeke, xxxi). “Despite their outward morality and profession of truth,” they are, nevertheless, bound for hell (*idem*). They think that they are true Christians, but they are deceiving themselves. They have an outward holiness, an external form of religion, but they lack an experiential saving knowledge of God (cf. Tanis, 109–10). They have not experienced a demonstrable, experiential conversion.

Frelinghuysen preached that the new birth must be experiential. That is to say, a convert had to know how he had passed from death to life and was expected to be able to relate what God had done for his soul. Particularly these two things—a heavy emphasis on the necessity of the new birth and on classifying churchgoers into various categories—impressed Tennent, Whitefield and other revival preachers (Beeke, xxxii).

Since Frelinghuysen assumed that the vast majority of his hearers were unregenerate, his primary aim in preaching was to convert them. To us, this might seem harmless and, in fact, common-place because we are accustomed to hearing that sort of thing at evangelistic crusades, but Frelinghuysen assumed that this was the condition of the majority of the members of his own congregation. Joel Beeke explains,

Had he referred to people outside of the church as unregenerate, self-righteous hypocrites, church members might have concurred. But Frelinghuysen made it clear

11. Cited in Joseph Loux Jr., *Boel's Complaint Against Frelinghuysen* (New York: Hamilton, 1979), 18.

that he was speaking to his own parishioners. In one sermon, he applied the lesson of an earthquake in no uncertain terms: Come here, you careless ones at ease in sin; you carnal and earthly-minded ones; you unchaste whoremongers and adulterers; you proud, haughty men and women; you seekers after pleasure; you drunkards, gamblers, disobedient and wicked rejecters of the Gospel; you hypocrites and dissemblers. How do you think the Lord will deal with you? ... Be filled with terror, you impure swine, adulterers and whoremongers. Without true repentance, you will live with the impure devils. All who burn in their vile lusts will be cast into a fire that is hotter than that of Sodom and Gomorrah (*ibid.*, xv).

One individual's response to Frelinghuysen's preaching gives us an idea of how the congregation reacted to him:

We welcomed him with joy and love, in the hope that his service would be for our edification. But alas! to our great sorrow, we, soon, and increasingly found that the result was very different. His denunciations uttered against all of us from the pulpit . . . and on all occasions, to the effect that we were all unconverted . . . were severe and bitter.¹¹

Frelinghuysen regularly called upon his congregation to be converted, often issuing vehement warnings about the danger of remaining in an unconverted state.

Wo, wo, wo, unto you, ye hypocrites! No more horrible monster than a hypocrite—no hotter hell than for a hypocrite, whose portion is where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. ... These woes, as timely as they are eternal, shall come upon you, if you are not converted. Oh, be then converted before the irrevocable “Depart from me you accursed into everlasting fire” sounds in your ears (Tanis, 110–11).

Thus, the aim of his preaching was, first, to convince the members of his church that they were not genuine believers and, second, to bring them to an experiential knowledge of the new birth. Hughes Oliphant Old sums up Frelinghuysen's preaching ministry as follows:

As he understood it, the most important part of his ministry in the Raritan Valley was to bring the great mass of unconverted church attenders into conviction. He had three methods of doing this. To use the terminology of Martin Lodge, the first was the “preaching of terrors”; the second, “holding the mirror to the hearer's soul”; and the third, the “searching method.” Preaching

of terrors was nothing more than the hellfire and damnation approach of frightening people into conversion. The holding of the mirror to the hearer's soul aimed to depict the failures of the unregenerate soul in such a way that the hearer recognized himself as being still unconverted. The searching method entailed analyzing the excuses of sinners and showing how they are of no avail. Through these three approaches the preacher tried to bring his hearers into a spiritual despair which would prompt them to reach out to the promises of the gospel. Reaching out to accept the promises of the gospel was the conversion experience Frelinghuysen and the Great Awakening generally were concerned to promote.¹²

Both Gilbert Tennent and George Whitefield adopted this approach to preaching, and Whitefield, one might even say, perfected it (Kidd, 93; Tanis 80–81).

The effect of Frelinghuysen's experiential theology on his doctrine and practice of the Lord's Supper was striking. In the first place, his strict, pietistic scruples demanded the exclusion of unconverted church members from the Lord's Table.¹³ It was his duty, as a minister, to maintain the absolute purity of the Lord's Supper (cf. Tanis, 135). Thus, when he examined people for admission to the Supper, he demanded from them clear, experiential evidence of regeneration. If they were unable to give him a satisfactory account of their conversion, he would refuse them admission to the Table (cf. Beeke, xxii). For Frelinghuysen, a verbal profession of faith and an outward conformity to Christian morals were not enough to convince him that one was a converted person. "Ye civil and outwardly religious persons, ye also have reason to fear. Ye who live normally and correctly, so that nothing can be alleged against your outward conduct, and in addition, make an appearance of piety" (Tanis, 109–10). Frelinghuysen insisted on probing the condition of a person's spiritual state. He assumed the right and believed it was his duty to judge the heart (cf. Beeke, xxxvi). As Frelinghuysen put it,

Ministers ... must examine whether they [those seeking to partake of the Supper] be marked by true repentance, sincere saving faith, and heart-renewing conversion. The necessity for these things they must earnestly impress upon their minds: and examine whether they be in possession of them, with cautions against self-deception; for if without carefully examining them, and faithfully warning them, they admit any, and thus afford them occasion to eat and drink judgment to themselves, is it possible that the guilt should not, to some extent, rest upon them? (Beeke, 41–42).

Hence, if a minister admits someone to the Table who is unconverted, then the minister will share that person's guilt when he profanes the sacrament and eats and drinks judgment to himself. The minister, therefore, has the obligation to determine, through a strict and probing examination, if someone seeking admission to the Table is truly regenerate. This must be done in order to maintain the purity of the Lord's Supper and to avoid incurring guilt. In some ways, Frelinghuysen was trying to remove the distinction between the visible and invisible church. Joel Beeke rightly observes that the Domine overstepped his bounds when he tried to judge the condition of the heart, which is "God's exclusive prerogative" (ibid., xxxvi).

In a preparatory sermon entitled "The Acceptable Communicant," Frelinghuysen had the following to say to his congregation as they were preparing to take communion.

Much loved hearers, who have so often been at the Lord's Table, do you know that the unconverted may not approach? Have you then, with the utmost care examined, whether you have been born again? Were you aware what is required for an acceptable observance, when you so calmly approached the Table? Or did you go blindly forward, not only without a wedding garment but also without concern? Did you not examine yourself to see whether you were among those who were invited? Were you not aware that so much was required? You should have known it; you should at least have been acquainted with your Catechism. It is so dangerous to unworthily partake of the sacred Supper; since by so doing, such great guilt is contracted and such fearful judgment incurred. How then is it possible that Satan should so blind men and cause them so lightly to esteem it, so little to fear God's judgments, and so thoughtlessly to lay hold upon that food which, instead of eternal life, may seal to them eternal death? How is it possible that in a matter of so great importance men should act in so inconsiderate and trifling a manner? (Beeke, 40).

[W]hen they partake unworthily, [the unconverted] make themselves guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. ... Like the Jews, they mock and crucify Christ anew (Heb. 6:6). They profane the sacrament, which is

12. Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, volume 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 106.

13. D. G. Hart and Mark Noll, eds., *Dictionary of the Presbyterian and Reformed Tradition in America* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 101.

a token of the body and blood of Christ, and thus become charged with such great sin against Christ that they are liable to both temporal and eternal punishment. Such hypocrites are not much better than Judas who betrayed Christ, and the Jews and Romans who crucified him and shed his blood. “Whosoever shall receive this sacrament unworthily is as guilty as if he had slain the Lord Himself and shed the blood of Christ. Oh horrible wickedness!” (Beeke, 34).

Let us then be careful here if we would be careful anywhere. He who loves danger deserves to fall into it. Nowhere is danger so great as here! Here, by a morsel and a swallow, can the covenant of God be desecrated, His wrath brought upon the whole congregation, and ourselves made liable to temporal and eternal punishment. (Beeke, 40–41).

Therefore, it was a deadly serious matter if an unworthy person approached the Lord’s Table! Christ would be crucified again; the body and blood of Jesus would be profaned, and God’s fury and wrath would be evoked against the whole congregation. Who would dare approach the Lord’s Table after hearing that? Frelinghuysen wanted to frighten the members of his church into conversion by terrifying them with hellfire and brimstone preaching. Even the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper became a means to accomplishing that end.

Frelinghuysen used the Lord’s Supper to produce a morbidly introspective piety designed to incite doubt in the hearts of God’s people about the genuineness of their salvation. The sacrament that Christ gave to the church to increase our certainty by confirming the promises of the gospel was being used to do the exact opposite of that. Revivalism produced a subjective and introspective sort of communion piety that fostered doubt and uncertainty. In our view, this was a stark departure from the eucharistic theology of the Reformers. Calvin explains the purpose of the sacrament as follows:

For seeing that we are so weak that we cannot receive him with true heartfelt trust, when he is presented to us by simple doctrine and preaching, the Father of mercy,

14. John Calvin, *Treatises and Letters*, volume 2 (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2009), 166.

15. “The offense in the Corinthian congregation was factionalism or divisiveness within the body of Christ,” Cornelis Venema, *Children at the Lord’s Table: Assessing the Case for Paedocommunion* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2009), 105.

16. Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton, *1 Corinthians: a translator’s handbook on Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1995), 256–57.

disdaining not to condescend in this matter to our infirmity, has been pleased to add to his word a visible sign, by which he might represent the substance of his promises, to confirm and fortify us by delivering us from all doubt and uncertainty.¹⁴

Likewise, according to traditional Reformed eucharistic theology, the Lord’s Supper was not designed to turn us in on ourselves but to direct us to Jesus Christ and his gospel. The Supper was not given to the saints to be used as a mirror in which to examine the state of their souls. Rather, as we have seen, it was given as a visible gospel to confirm the promises of God and so to nurture our faith and increase our assurance. The sacrament did not come with the loud thunder of Mt. Sinai, and it is not the terrors of the law that we should hear when we come to the Lord’s Table, but the soothing and assuring promises of the gospel.

To be sure, there is a personal self-examination that must precede one’s participation in holy communion. We must, as Paul says, examine ourselves before we eat and drink (1 Cor. 11:28). However, there is nothing in 1 Corinthians 11:17–34 to suggest that the purpose of such self-examination is to determine whether one possesses the true marks of an experiential conversion. To the contrary, the text indicates that even the Corinthians who had partaken unworthily were, in fact, genuine Christians. The divine punishments that they incurred through their unworthy participation were temporal judgments, not eternal. Paul clearly distinguishes those who had been judged by God because of their unworthy participation from the world who will be judged by God with condemnation.

For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself. That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have died. But if we judged ourselves truly, we would not be judged. But when we are judged by the Lord, we are disciplined so that we may not be condemned along with the world (1 Cor. 11:29–32).

Furthermore, the problem at Corinth, to which self-examination was the solution, was the problem of disunity in the church. The Corinthians celebrated communion in such a manner that created “divisions” among them, or “factions” (1 Cor. 11:18, 19).¹⁵ The divisions were such that some members of the church, who apparently arrived early, were eating all the food and drinking all the wine, leaving the other members, who arrived later, with nothing to eat or drink.¹⁶ Consequently, says Paul, “One

goes hungry” and “another gets drunk” (1 Cor. 11:21). It was this sort of conduct that constituted partaking in an unworthy manner.¹⁷ Paul enjoins self-examination as the solution to this problem.

Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup (1 Cor. 11:27–28).

What could “examine himself” in this context mean but to examine one’s conduct with respect to the unity of the church or with respect to the other members of the body of Christ? If our conduct at the Lord’s Supper is such that we have eaten more than enough to satisfy our hunger and have left others with nothing to eat or drink, then we have partaken unworthily. The Corinthians had created a division in the church between those who had plenty to eat and those who had nothing to eat. This was the nature of the problem to which self-examination was the solution. Paul makes this clear when he concludes his instructions to the Corinthians; “So then, my brothers, when you come together to eat, wait for one another—if anyone is hungry, let him eat at home—so that when you come together it will not be for judgment” (1 Cor. 11:33–34).¹⁸

T. Nathan Trice explains the meaning of self-examination as a call for the Corinthians to repent of the specific sin that Paul accuses them of:

[Paul’s] call is for due consideration and contrition over specific sins which he has already named! That is to say, the apostle’s call for self-examination is made in the context of his having made specific charges of guilt regarding the Corinthians’ behavior. After rebuking them specifically for their scandalous degree of schism, and after declaring to them that such sin involves a profaning of the Table, he then makes the poignant observation, “Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup.” Bearing in mind this context, we can see that the apostle is not calling for self-examination apart from any and all pastoral direction. Rather, he is saying in so many words: “In light of this sin that is in your midst as a congregation, every one of you ought to consider what guilt you share in that sin, repent of it to God and to each other, and only then come together to the Table again.”¹⁹

Revivalism, however, reinterpreted Paul’s requirement

of self-examination in light of experiential notions of conversion and piety. Consequently, the admonition Paul gave to safeguard the unity of the church became a thunderbolt in revivalistic preaching to frighten people into conversion. Communion piety of the revivalistic sort is overly subjective and introspective and turns people in on themselves, leaving them in a state of doubt, anxiety and uncertainty. Frelinghuysen used the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper to promote revival by employing it as a means of challenging the genuineness of his members’ faith and calling them to an experiential knowledge of the new birth.

In all fairness, however, we should point out that Frelinghuysen’s interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:17–34 is, to some degree, in keeping with the Reformed tradition. The Reformers observed that some people are guilty of partaking of the Supper with a “mere historical faith, without a lively feeling of repentance and faith.”²⁰ Likewise, Calvin argued that the right use of the sacrament requires us to come to the Table with true faith and repentance, and therefore, if we would come to the Table “duly prepared,” a “trial must be made” as to our faith and repentance.²¹

Numerous commentators from the Reformation to the present have claimed that even though Paul is addressing the problem of disunity in the church at Corinth, his instructions regarding worthy participation and self-examination have a more general application than the particular problem in view in the text. Paul’s teaching, says Lenski, “applies to all forms and all types of unworthiness and therefore should not be restricted to the peculiar type of unworthiness found in Corinth.”²² Likewise, Charles Hodge contends that though the sin of the Corinthians is

17. Calvin says, “To eat unworthily, then, is to pervert the pure and right use of it by our abuse of it;” see John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, volume 1 (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010), 385.

18. On the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11, see C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013); Roy Ciampa and Brian Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010); David Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003); Anthony Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000).

19. T. Nathan Trice, “Drink of It, All of You: Revisiting Elements of the Traditional Reformed Fencing of the Table,” *Ordained Servant*, vol. 14, no. 1 (2005): 23.

20. Calvin, *Commentary*, 386.

21. *Ibid.*, 388.

22. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), 477.

one way to eat and drink unworthily, it is not the only way to do so.²³

Accordingly, some interpreters have understood the prerequisite of self-examination as a call “to scrutinize one’s own spiritual condition and motives” or “to examine one’s own genuineness” and, thus, to discern the validity of one’s conversion.²⁴ This is the way that Frelinghuysen interpreted the text. There is a danger, however, with such an interpretation. The Puritan John Flavel observed that this interpretation has been “a stumbling block to many” people. Flavel explains,

It seems clear, by the occasions and circumstances of his discourse, that he [Paul] does not intend we should examine our state of grace; whether we are true believers or no, and sincerely resolved to continue so; but he speaks of the actual fitness and worthiness of the Corinthians at that time, when they came to receive the Lord’s Supper. And therefore, verse 20, he sharply reproves their irreverent and unsuitable carriage at the Lord’s table: they coming thereunto disorderly, one before another.²⁵

Another insightful observation on the history of the interpretation of Paul’s teaching is offered by T. Nathan Trice.

In the history of Reformed exegesis of this text, key phrases such as this one have become freighted with a meaning broader than that intended by the apostle. One way that the concept of “eating and drinking in an unworthy manner” has been understood is by identifying it with the danger of an individual’s coming to the Lord’s Supper who is not a true Christian, or truly regenerate. But the apostle is not speaking of this reality at all. The apostle nowhere suggests that the unworthy partaking of the Table is due to the unregenerate state of certain members of the Corinthian church. In fact, he presumes that even the worst offenders among them are regenerate people, because he identifies the Lord’s “judgment” upon them as his means of preserving them from being condemned with the world (vs. 32). The apostle’s understanding of “unworthy partaking” is

something being done by those whose regenerate condition he does not question. However profitable it is to review from time to time the evidences in one’s self of a saving work of God, such an exercise is simply foreign to the apostle’s concern in 1 Corinthians 11. There is no necessary connection made here between a due preparation for the Lord’s Table and the serious entertaining of the question, “Am I really a Christian?” ... Yet due to this popular misconception of the apostle’s words, there is an unwholesome level of introspection that often accompanies our observance of the Lord’s Supper (Trice, 22–23).

In the best of the Reformed and Puritan traditions, self-examination, as a preparatory communion discipline, did not engender doubt and uncertainty regarding the validity of one’s conversion—even when such self-examination entailed a broader scope than the inspection of one’s conduct vis-à-vis the unity of the church. However one interprets Paul’s instructions in 1 Corinthians 11:17–34, our contention is that the discipline of self-examination should not work at cross purposes with the design of the sacrament itself, which is to strengthen our faith. This is the fundamental error of Frelinghuysen’s use of the Lord’s Supper.

GILBERT TENNENT

The second revivalist who illustrates the connection between communion and revival in the mid-eighteenth century is the Presbyterian minister Gilbert Tennent. In 1726, Tennent moved to New Brunswick, New Jersey in the Raritan Valley in order to establish a Presbyterian church. The whole Tennent family was thoroughly steeped in the vibrant, evangelical fervor of Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism, and that set the tone for Gilbert’s ministry in New Jersey. After his arrival in New Brunswick, Tennent came under the influence of Frelinghuysen, who “infused his Scotch-Irish piety with a strong dose of Friesian pietism and the typical pietistic approach to worship and preaching.”²⁶ Tennent “came to understand conversion as the chief purpose of preaching, to be brought about by preaching the terrors which awaited those who were unconverted and then by applying the balm of the gospel” (idem.).

Tennent was thoroughly impressed with Frelinghuysen’s ability to convert people, but shortly he became discouraged with his own inability to do the same. Before long, Frelinghuysen began to teach him his method of discriminatory preaching, and Tennent soon exceeded his mentor in urging his hearers to spiritual examination

23. Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1857), 231.

24. Cf. Ronald Trail, *An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 10–16* (Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2008), 104.

25. John Flavel, “A Familiar Conference Between a Minister and a Doubting Christian,” volume 6 of *Works* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1968), 467–68.

26. Old, *Reading and Preaching*, 107.

and, thus, convincing them of the necessity of the new birth (Tanis, 69). Frelinghuysen's biographer writes,

[Tennent's] fervent dedication soon commended him to Domine Frelinghuysen, while at the same time the unmistakable fruits of the Domine's preaching and teaching were at first a joy to the heart of young Tennent. But then, as he compared his efforts and their effects with those of the Dutch pastor, he became overwhelmed by a sense of the barrenness of his own ministry. Frelinghuysen, thereupon, wrote him a stiffening letter "respecting the necessity of dividing the Word aright, and giving to every man his portion in due season, through the divine blessing." So heartened was Tennent by Frelinghuysen's words that he was excited to even greater earnestness and sought to steep himself in Frelinghuysen's method of preaching (idem.).

Tennent's ministry became increasingly bound up with Frelinghuysen's (idem.). They held worship services together, and Frelinghuysen even invited Tennent to serve communion to his congregation (ibid., 70). Frelinghuysen's opponents (the *Klagers*) complained about this ecumenical approach to the administration of the Lord's Supper.

During these conjoint services of him [Tennent] and Frelinghuysen, he administers the covenant seals, mingling the English and Dutch languages with such other in the worship ... Now if those who belong in Dutch churches persist in employing English Dissenters, they depart from the Holland church-order and liturgy ... We must, therefore, be careful to keep things in the Dutch way in our churches ... (idem.).

The fact that Frelinghuysen allowed Tennent to participate in administering the Lord's Supper to his congregation suggests that Tennent had come to share Frelinghuysen's views on the sacrament.²⁷ Indeed, Tennent and Frelinghuysen jointly conducted the pastoral examinations of those who were seeking admission to the Lord's Table. Thus, Tennent was thoroughly trained in Frelinghuysen's manner of scrutinizing candidates in order to ascertain their spiritual condition (cf. Long, 86–87). Like his Dutch mentor, Tennent learned to use the Lord's Supper as a means of promoting an experiential knowledge of grace.²⁸ In 1735,

Gilbert Tennent introduced an overture to the Philadelphia synod, urging ministers to attend to their parishioners' preparation for Communion, and to "make it their

awful, constant, and diligent care, to approve themselves to God, to their own consciences, and to their hearers, [as] serious faithful stewards of the mysteries of God, and of holy exemplary conversions" (Long, 88–89).

Tennent believed that adult members of the congregation ought to be regularly visited by ministers for "close examinations of their behavior and, during private pre-communion conferences, tested in their experimental knowledge of grace" (Coalter, 41–42). Clearly, Tennent, like Frelinghuysen, taught that experiential knowledge of regeneration was a prerequisite for participation in the Lord's Supper. Accordingly, his preparatory sermons warned against profaning the sacrament by unworthy participation.²⁹ In the days preceding the celebration of communion, he cautioned "listeners that those who come to the table unworthily are guilty of 'profaning a sacred Institution'; it is as if they 'put a new Spear into his blessed Side, and Thorns into his holy Head'" (Long, 89).

The influence of Frelinghuysen on Tennent's communion piety and practice is undeniable, but we should not overlook the rich Scotch-Irish Presbyterian heritage that also shaped Tennent's doctrine and practice of the Lord's Supper. Kimberly Bracken Long writes,

Throughout his ministry, Tennent's sacramental preaching reflected the Scotch-Irish tradition of which he was part, a tradition that not only emphasized the necessity of carefully examining and preparing oneself before participating in the Lord's Supper, but one that also exulted in the joy of meeting Christ at the Table. His sermons are full of vivid images of betrothal and marriage, as well as poetic love language from the Song of

27. On Gilbert Tennent's theology and practice of communion see Old, *Holy Communion*, 633–51; Long, *Eucharistic Theology*; George Robertson, *Sacramental Solemnity: Gilbert Tennent, the Covenant and the Lord's Supper* (PhD dissertation; Westminster Theological Seminary, 2007); Hughes Oliphant Old, "Gilbert Tennent and the Preaching of Piety in Colonial America: Newly Discovered Tennent Manuscripts in Speer Library," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 10/2 (1989): 132–137; and Gilbert Tennent, *The Espousals, or a Passionate Perswasive to a marriage with the Lamb of God* (New York: J. Peter Zenger, 1735).

28. Tennent's biographer notes that he "stressed spiritual over external participation in church rites" such as the Lord's Supper (Coalter, 7). Long adds that for Tennent, a "formal reception was inadequate, but a spiritual reception was the mark of a lively and conscientious piety" (Long, 84).

29. See Gilbert Tennent, "The Duty of Self-Examination, considered in a Sermon, On 1 Cor. 11.28. Preached at Maiden-Head in New Jersey, October 22, 1737. Before the Celebration of the Lord's Supper," in *Sermons on Sacramental Occasions by Divers Ministers* (Boston: J. Draper, for D. Henschman in Cornhill, 1739).

Songs, which he employs to woo the faithful believer to the consummation that is communion (Long, 83).

The aspect of Tennent's communion piety that was particularly derived from his Scotch-Irish background was the ecstatic joy and pleasure that a communicant experienced by encountering the presence of Christ at the Lord's Table. Given the Great Awakening's emphasis on experience, Tennent's Scotch-Irish communion piety naturally resonated with the revivalistic fervor that began to sweep through the colonies in the mid-eighteenth century. According to Hughes Oliphant Old, Tennent gives us "the most profound look at the sacrament of Holy Communion and how it fit into the worship of the Great Awakening."³⁰ His sermons on the Lord's Supper "show how clearly the revivals of eighteenth-century America were connected to the celebration of the sacraments."³¹

Tennent's communion piety included both a rigorous discipline of preparation for the sacrament and an intense anticipation of the profound experience awaiting those who come to the Lord's Table. These facets of his communion piety are reflected in his preparation sermons and action sermons. As Long explains,

Tennent's communion sermons reflect his desire that the people not only prepare for Communion, but also seek it, long for it, and delight in it. To that end he preached two types of sermons in the context of the sacramental occasion: preparatory sermons, which urged people toward self-examination and repentance; and invitation (or action) sermons, which sought to woo believers to communion with Christ at the Supper (Long, 89)

The path to the Table is stringent, and the process of preparation, which begins months before, culminates in the days just before celebrating the sacrament with preaching that urges the faithful to engage in thorough self-examination. When the day of Communion comes,

30. Old, *Holy Communion*, 633. "True to the heritage of Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism, Tennent's piety gave cardinal importance to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A number of his early communion sermons were published in a volume entitled *Sermons on Sacramental Occasions*, published in Boston in 1739. Special series of sacramental sermons had become an important feature of Reformed preaching" (Old, *Reading and Preaching*, 107).

31. Old, *Holy Communion*, 637.

32. "The theme of betrothal, or espousal, is prominent in Tennent's preaching at the sacrament. 'De nuptiis cum Christo' ('On Marriage with Christ') draws on the parable of the wedding banquet from Matthew 22 and uses marital imagery, as well as numerous citations from the Song of Songs, to describe the nature of the believer's relationship to Jesus" (Long, 92).

however, the preaching takes on a radically different tone. In the sermon delivered just before the sacrament—what is sometimes called the "action sermon," when the invitation to the Table is given—the preacher acts as an advocate for Jesus, the lover who would woo his beloved to union in the sacrament (*ibid.*, 91).

Tennent's sacramental occasions were "full of emotion, spiritual fervor, and demonstrative celebrations of the Supper," for which he was harshly criticized by some of his Old Side colleagues (*ibid.*, 100). His action sermons, in particular, were brimming with emotional, even ecstatic, energy, and euphoric, even erotic, language that would make most Christians today blush (*idem.*). Tennent is especially fond of nuptial imagery to describe the intimate intercourse a communicant has with Christ in the Lord's Supper.³² He frequently draws on the story of the lovers in the Song of Songs to describe the communicants' experience at the Table.

Tennent often uses this heightened language to describe the soul that is "sick with Longing," the "insatiable desires" of the bride who prepares to meet her Bridegroom in the sacrament, and the "unwearied Endeavour after his Presence ... and sweet Delight in it when obtain'd." That "sweet Delight" is found in Communion; the Table is the place where the marriage between Bridegroom and bride is consummated (*ibid.*, 98).

The action sermon is an invitation to "the very embrace of Christ, where the believer may 'enjoy the kisses of [his] marriage love'" (*idem.*). Of course, for Tennent, knowledge of this intimate fellowship with Christ at the Table is not merely theoretical but experimental. Union and communion with Christ through the sacrament is not merely an objective reality but a subjective experience. Tennent asks his congregation,

Have you had Communion with Christ by his Word and Spirit? This is a Natural and necessary Consequence of a vital Union.... Know ye what it is by Experience to have the kisses of the King, his Love spread abroad in your Hearts, so that you could say with the Spouse, my beloved is mine, and I am his, he feedeth among the Lilies? (*ibid.*, 99).

The profound experience of the presence of Christ in communion lies at the heart of Tennent's communion piety.

One of Tennent's communion sermons, preached in 1735, was entitled "The espousals, or a passionate

persuasive to a marriage with the Lamb of God, wherein the Sinners Misery and the Redeemers Glory is unveiled in.” In keeping with a longstanding tradition in Scottish Presbyterianism, Tennent employed the marriage typology of the Old Testament to explain the significance of the Lord’s Supper. The sermon text is Genesis 24:49 where Abraham’s servant, Eliezer, says to Rebecca regarding Isaac, “Now then, if you are going to show steadfast love and faithfulness to my master, tell me; and if not, tell me, that I may turn to the right hand or to the left.”

Tennent points to Eliezer as a type of the Christian ministers who are sent by the Father to find a wife for his Son Jesus Christ. Thus, it is the “responsibility of the minister to woo the congregation for his Lord. Just as Eliezer was supposed to win the assent of Rebecca, so the minister of the gospel is supposed to win his congregation to Christ, so that they leave the land of sin and come to be the bride of Christ.”³³

Tennent tells his congregation that his purpose in preaching is to bring those in his congregation into a marriage covenant with the great God. He wants to awaken them to their absolute need of union to and communion with Christ. Tennent is very realistic. He reminds his congregation that part of the marriage covenant is self-denial and taking up the cross, but on the other hand this union with Christ is a union of the deepest intimacy. It is to experience “the kisses of the King.” It is to have his love spread about in our hearts. It is to be able to say as we find it in the Song of Solomon, “My beloved is mine, and I am his: he feedeth among the lilies” (Song of Solomon 2:16, KJV). It is to know by experience what it is to be sealed by the Spirit and to cry, *Abba, Father* (*ibid.*, 647–48).

For Tennent, the communicant’s encounter with the presence of Christ at the Lord’s Table is a mystical experience. Tennent “has a very mystical understanding of communion. It is union with Christ to which the congregation is invited. Mysticism as Tennent seems to understand it is a heightened sense of the presence of Christ” (*ibid.*, 648).

In Reformed theology, union with Christ has always been regarded as the chief benefit of the Lord’s Supper; but in Tennent’s revivalism, the benefit of union with Christ is something that the communicant comes to know by experience. This experimental union with Christ is different than the concept of vital union with Christ through Spirit-wrought faith (e.g. Shorter Catechism 30), which has sometimes been referred to as

experiential or existential union.³⁴ Rather, it is a heightened sense of the presence of Christ—something the communicant experiences as a profound impression on his soul. The Reformed church has always believed that Christ is truly present, given and received through the Lord’s Supper by the power of the Holy Spirit, but this was understood primarily as an objective reality and not a subjective experience.

Revivalism, however, turned the Lord’s Supper into an experimental encounter with the risen Christ. It was Jacob’s Bethel experience or “the mountaintop” experience of Moses or of the disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration. Holy communion became a momentous event, a close encounter of the God kind. Tennent himself describes it this way:

As the Countenance of Moses shone by conversing with God on the Mount, with such Brightness that the People of Israel could not behold it. So the Soul by beholding of, and having Communion with the blessed Jesus, through Faith, is transformed into the divine Image, and derives such Beauty, from the eternal Fountain of it, that she is all glorious within: Divine Light is shed into the Mind, and divine Love and Holiness into the heart, so that all the powers are chang’d and turn’d in their free and general Drift towards the precious Lord Jesus as their Center.³⁵

The point in all this is that revivalistic communion piety caused people to look at the Lord’s Supper as an experience—a profound, mystical experience. By the late eighteenth century (both in Scotland and America) revivalism had turned the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper into a grand festival—a holy fair that was that quite a spectacle to behold. We see this especially in the communion seasons of John Willison, James McGready and Barton Stone.³⁶

REVIVALISM’S IMPACT ON COMMUNION PIETY

Revivalism significantly transformed the church’s theology and observance of the Lord’s Supper, and that transformation has had a pervasive and perennial effect

33. Old, *Holy Communion*, 647.

34. See Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul’s Soteriology* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1987), 50–51; and Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *By Faith, Not by Sight: Paul and the Order of Salvation* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2013), 37. See also John Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1955), 161–73.

35. Cited in Long, 99.

36. See Long, 63–82; and Schmidt, 11–68.

on communion piety and practice in the church even down to our day. One of the consequences of sacramental revivalism—which is what one might call the sort of communion piety and practice inspired by revival—is a commitment to an infrequent celebration of communion. Revivalism works against a frequent observance of the sacrament because it requires such an intense level of preparation, as illustrated in the preparatory disciplines and sermons of Frelinghuysen and Tennent. As T. Nathan Trice observes,

When coming rightly to the Lord's Supper involves a regiment of self-examination and an emotional and spiritual preparation distinct from what is required by the other elements of worship, then it is easy to think that the observance of the Table should be reserved for more infrequent, "special" occasions (Trice, 27).

Likewise, revivalism heightens the expectations of the communicants in terms of what they hope to experience when they participate in the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper is a "mountaintop" experience, a momentous event in which one encounters the presence of Christ in a profound and mystical way. This is clear in the action sermons of Gilbert Tennent, but it is even more clear in the communion sermons of the Second Great Awakening (cf. Long, 63–82).

As we see it, both the intensity of preparation and the unrealistic expectations produced by revivalistic communion piety fight against a frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper. For example, a common objection to weekly communion is "We cannot have communion every week because it is too much of a burden on us to prepare for it." Another common objection is, "We cannot have communion every week because if we do, it will no longer be a special event in which we experience the presence of Christ in a unique way." An infrequent celebration of the Lord's Supper fits quite naturally with the sort of communion piety fostered by revivalism.

A second consequence of sacramental revivalism is that the covenant nurture of children was ultimately supplanted by a quest for a demonstrable conversion experience. Even though the revivalists of the First Great Awakening tended to emphasize covenant nurture through catechesis in addition to an experiential knowledge of grace, by the end of the eighteenth century, covenant nurture had all but fallen by the wayside. Revivalism eventually made experiential conversion the sole prerequisite for admission to the Lord's Supper.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some Reformed churches and theologians recognized this error and endeavored to correct it. In 1902, for example, the Reformed Church in the United States published an edition of the Heidelberg Catechism, which addressed the issue of requiring a conversion experience as a prerequisite to the Lord's Table.

What are the qualifications for full [communicant] membership?

Answer: an intelligent, cheerful, humble, sincere, earnest 'yes' to the three confirmation vows of repentance, faith, and obedience.

Need I tell you that this fitness is conversion? Some persons, not understanding our church life and customs, foolishly think that we confirm our young people no matter what their state of mind and heart is, and that we do not believe in conversion.

This is a great mistake. We require a high degree of fitness for confirmation, namely, an intelligent, sincere, and unreserved taking of three most searching and far-reaching vows in the name of the holy Trinity.

Then, too, this fitness for confirmation may be called 'a change in heart,' though this is only another name for conversion. This change is not sudden, but runs through years. You have not had any wonderful religious experiences, such as you hear about in others; but the Holy Ghost has done much in you in a very quiet way.

Nor need you doubt your conversion, your change in heart, because you cannot tell the day when it took place, as many profess to do. It did not take place in a day, or you might tell it. It is the growth of years ... and therefore all the more reliable. You cannot tell when you learned to walk, talk, think, and work. You do not know when you learned to love your earthly father, much less the heavenly.

This is the Reformed doctrine of 'getting religion.' We get religion, not in bulk but little by little. Just as we get natural life and strength, so spiritual life and strength, day by day.

To this fitness, this preparation of heart and mind, you profess to have come. You are about to take your vows, turning your back to the Devil, the world, and the flesh, while you look heavenward. Fix your whole heart upon

Christ. Consecrate yourself fully to his service, realizing that with body and soul, in life and in death, you are his.³⁷

The legacy of revivalism with regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper needs to be explored in greater detail.³⁸ In our estimation, revivalism has played a more significant role in shaping the communion piety and

practice of the modern Reformed church than the theology and practice of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. If this is the case, then a comprehensive study of the connection between communion and revival in the Reformed church would be an enormous help in facilitating our understanding of the theological and historical roots of the communion piety and practice of the modern Reformed church.■

In Brief: Union with Christ and Mysticism John Murray

It has been customary to use the word mystical to express the mysticism which enters into the exercise of faith. It is necessary for us to recognize that there is an intelligent mysticism in the life of faith. Believers are called into the fellowship of Christ and fellowship means communion. The life of faith is one of living union and communion with the exalted and ever-present Redeemer. Faith is directed not only to a Redeemer who has come and completed once for all a work of redemption. It is directed to him not merely as the one who died but as the one who rose again and who ever lives as our great high priest and advocate. And because faith is directed to him as living Saviour and Lord, fellowship reaches the zenith of its exercise. There is no communion among men that is comparable to fellowship with Christ—he communes with his people and his people commune with him in conscious reciprocal love. “Whom having not seen ye love,” wrote the apostle Peter, “in whom though now ye see him not yet believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory” (1 Peter 1:8). The life of faith is the life of love, and the life of love is the life of fellowship, or mystic communion with him who ever lives to make intercession for his people and who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. It is fellowship with him who has an inexhaustible reservoir of sympathy with his people's temptations, afflictions, and infirmities because he was tempted in all points like as they are, yet without sin. The life of true faith cannot be that of cold metallic assent. It must have the passion and warmth of love and communion because communion with God is the crown and apex of true religion. “Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 John 1:3)....

Here indeed is mysticism on the highest plane. It is not the mysticism of vague unintelligible feeling or rapture. It is the mysticism of communion with the one true and living God, and it is communion with

the one true and living God because and only because it is communion with the three distinct persons of the Godhead in the strict particularity which belongs to each person in that grand economy of saving relationship to us. Believers know the Father and have fellowship with him in his own distinguishing character and operation as the Father. They know the Son and have fellowship with him in his own distinguishing character and operation as the Son, the Saviour, the Redeemer, the exalted Lord. They know and have fellowship with the Holy Spirit in his own distinguishing character and operation as the Spirit, the Advocate, the Comforter, the Sanctifier. It is not the blurred confusion of rapturous ecstasy. It is faith solidly founded on the revelation deposited for us in the Scripture and it is faith actively receiving that revelation by the inward witness of the Holy Spirit. But it is also faith that stirs the deepest springs of emotion in the raptures of holy love and joy. Believers enter into the holy of holies of communion with the triune God and they do so because they have been raised up together and made to sit together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:6). Their life is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3). They draw nigh in full assurance of faith having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure water because Christ is not entered into holy places made with hands but into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for them (Heb. 9:24).

John Murray *Redemption, Accomplished and Applied* (William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1955), 169–173.■

37. Cited at <http://blog.jakebelder.com/post/we-dont-get-religion-in-bulk/>; retrieved on November 5, 2015.

38. The works of Old, *Holy Communion*; Long, *Eucharistic Theology*; and Schmidt, *Holy Fairs* make a significant contribution to the legacy of revivalism on the Lord's Supper, but more work needs to be done on the subject.