

**OPEN COMMUNION
IN THE OPC**

B. R. Hofford

Published by the Inter League Publication Board Box 783 London Ontario Canada N6A 4Y8

Open Communion in the OPC

by B.R. Hofford

Copyright Inter League Publication Board
London, June 1990

London Ontario

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by the Inter League Publication Board
Box 783 London Ontario Canada N6A 4Y8

ISBN 0-88666-038-6

INTRODUCTION

The three letters in this publication present a comparison between the Westminster Standards of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Three Forms of Unity, with special reference to the proper administration of the Lord's Table.

These letters were written by Rev. B.R. Hofford to the congregation of the Tri-County Reformed Church of Laurel, Maryland, U.S.A. They originated during the time this congregation was studying the question of affiliation with the Canadian and American Reformed Churches. This congregation seceded from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in June of 1983 over the question of the proper protection of the Lord's Supper, especially with regard to visitors.

Until their affiliation with the Canadian and American Reformed Churches in March of 1987, the congregation made a transition from the subscription to the Westminster Standards to adherence to the Three Forms of Unity. The three letters represent part of the study which led to the change in confessions for the congregation.

LETTER #1

June 8, 1985

Dear Congregation:

As you know, for some time we have been in the process of comparing and contrasting the Westminster Standards and the Three Forms of Unity. One of the comments which Rev. P. Kingma (of the American Reformed Church at Grand Rapids, MI., Ed.) has repeatedly made to us about the Westminster Standards is that it contains wrong ideas about the covenant and about the church. With regard to the church, the Standards teach an invisible church and a visible church. These two areas of covenant and church are related. The covenant with the elect corresponds with the invisible church, and the covenant with believers and their seed corresponds with the visible church.

These criticisms of the Westminster Standards are also expressed in the 1983 Acts of General Synod of the Canadian Reformed Churches in the report of the Committee for Contact with the OPC (Orthodox Presbyterian Church). So these are not just Rev. Kingma's ideas.

Although we have recognized the validity of Rev. Kingma's criticisms of the Westminster Standards, it wasn't until just recently that I came to see more clearly the pervasiveness and the importance of these ideas.

1. The Problem

First, let us note where these problems arise in the Standards. The idea of the covenant with the elect is very clearly and explicitly found in WLC (Westminster Larger Catechism) 31, which reads: "With whom was the covenant of grace made? The covenant of grace was made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him with all the elect as his seed." In fact, I have not been able to discover any clearly explicit reference in the Standards to the covenant being made with believers and their seed. However, such a concept may be inferred from the various references to the visible church throughout the Standards. For example, WSC (Westminster Shorter Catechism) 92 teaches that the sacraments are signs and seals of the new covenant. In question 95, about baptism, it states that this sacrament is to be administered only to those who are in the visible church. Since the visible church is composed of believers and their seed, these two questions imply the idea of the covenant with believers.

The teachings about the invisible and visible church are clearly set forth in Chapter 25 of the WC (Westminster Confession), especially sections I and 2.

It might appear from these isolated references that these problems are minor and could easily be remedied by a few alterations or deletions. However my recent study has revealed that these ideas are quite pervasive throughout the Standards. And many more references could be given to illustrate this emphasis.

Before showing how these ideas dominate, it is important to note the origin of this emphasis.

Once this is understood, then the emphasis is easily recognized. The root of the problem is found in the WC (Westminster Confession) 3 which sets forth the teaching about God's eternal decree. Specifically, among other things, it spells out the doctrine of election,

especially in sections 3-6. Taken by themselves, the statements in these sections are Biblical. However the problem arises when throughout the rest of the Standards, salvation is always viewed from the perspective of this election. Why is this wrong? It is wrong because it is an attempt to understand and apply salvation from the viewpoint of the secret will of God.

In contrast to this, the Bible views salvation and its application to us from the perspective of the revealed will. To be sure, the Bible does teach us about election, and this doctrine has a proper place in understanding the application of salvation. For example, the Bible does not know of an invisible church composed of the elect; it only knows of a visible church made up of those who have professed the true religion. It speaks to these people as the elect even though some of them may later apostacize. The Bible is never bothered, so to speak, by what our western way of thinking appears to be an irreconcilable dilemma. It appears that the authors of the Westminster Standards attempted to deal with this dilemma by writing the Standards from the viewpoint of election.

Having seen the origin of this emphasis on the covenant with the elect and the invisible church in the Westminster's secret will perspective, we will show how this emphasis is expressed. Throughout the Standards the predominant way of referring to people as elect, in some way or another. For example in WC 7:3, the expression is: "all those that are ordained unto eternal life." In 8:1, the terms are, "unto whom He did from all eternity give a people, to be His seed," and 8:5, "for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him." In 8:6, they are "the elect." In 10:1, "all those whom God hath predestined unto life, and those only." In 19:6, "true believers," and "the regenerate." And so on throughout the Confession and both Catechisms.

We might, at first glance, see nothing wrong with such references. After all, the Bible uses this same language, and in fact, some of these phrases are quotes of the Bible. However the pervasive perspective is the viewpoint of election, so that even innocuous terms such as "believers" come to mean, by implication, the elect, not just those who profess the true religion. It may also seem to us as we read through the Standards that this kind of language is wise because it is an attempt to guard ourselves against applying to the reprobate those things which are true only of the elect. But this gets at the heart of the problem. We may not adopt a distorted perspective and way of speaking in order to avoid a dilemma or problem which the Bible does not avoid in this same way. There are serious consequences of such distortions, as we shall see.

2. First Person vs. Third Person

There is another more subtle manifestation of this perspective on election in the Westminster Standards. It is the almost complete use of the third person rather than the first person when referring to Christians. And when the third person is not used, there is the frequent use of impersonal forms of address, such as, "a Christian," or "true believers." The first person is used in some of the Standards, but it is clear in these instances, from the predominance of the third person, that these first person references must also mean the elect. It is this pervasive use of the third person and these impersonal forms of address that give the Standards their impersonal quality, in contrast to the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism. It is important to note that this emphasis is not just a mere difference in style, but a reflection of a difference in theology.

Some illustrations will be helpful to show the difference between the two confessional

documents. A casual glance at the Belgic Confession will reveal the repeated use of phrases such as, "We believe," and "We confess." And the Heidelberg Catechism approaches things from the same perspective. For example, "What do you believe." There is the constant use of either the first or second person throughout these two documents. Why is this significant? It is not simply a matter of preference or that perhaps one provides a bit more personal comfort than the other. Rather, it reveals an important difference in perspective. These two Forms of Unity approach matters from the perspective of those who profess the true religion and who are members of the true church. Like the Bible, these documents are not bothered by the fact that some who make this confession may later turn out to be reprobate. These documents also confess the truth about election, and in fact the Third Form of Unity, the Canons of Dordt, address these issues quite extensively. But this doctrine of election does not become the perspective in which everything else is seen. Thus, when we come to the doctrine of the church, there is no need of an invisible church in order to distinguish the elect from those who may be members of the church but not the elect, as in the Westminster Standards. Rather there is only the visible church, composed of those who profess the true religion. There is no attempt to view the situation from the viewpoint of God's secret will so that the church must be defined in terms of election.

3. Implications for Lord's Supper

For us, the most significant consequence of this emphasis on election and the invisible church is open communion. It is not so much that the OPC consciously arrived at this position from a study of the Westminster Standards, but rather that the Standards provided a theological background and way of thinking about the church which, when applied in our American situation, resulted in open communion. From the perspective of the Westminster Standards it is not difficult to see how this position is arrived at and defended. If the elect are members of the invisible church, that is, they belong to Christ, then who are we to refuse to give them the sign and seal of their union with Christ? While it may be true that a case can be made I against this line of reasoning from within the framework of the Westminster Standards themselves, the fact remains that the predominate influence is the pervasive secret-will orientation we have described above.

Based on my recent study, and finding how pervasive this faulty emphasis is throughout the Standards, it would appear unlikely that we could successfully amend the Standards without a rather radical revision. This conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that there are other problem areas in the Standards as well. I hope to address some of these in a further communication.

In light of this situation, it would appear that we ought to more seriously consider abandoning the Westminster Standards and adopting some version of the Three Forms of Unity. Let us continue to pray and study, so that the LORD will guide us in the way of truth.

Sincerely,

B. Hofford

Summary

Westminster Standards vs. Three Forms of Unity

secret-will viewpoint revealed-will viewpoint

covenant with elect covenant with believers

invisible church visible church

LETTER #2

June 15, 1985

Dear Congregation:

In my last letter to you, I outlined a major problem with the Westminster Standards -- the covenant with the elect and the invisible church. In that letter, I mentioned that there is another area in the confessions which poses serious problems for us, and in this letter I will try to make it clear.

This other problem is also related to the doctrine of the church, and it also helps explain why we found open communion defended so vigorously in the OPC. This problem is the pluriformity of the church. By this term is meant the idea that the true churches may exist in a variety of denominations in any given location.

We must look in an unexpected place in the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF) to find this issue set forth most clearly. This place is Chapter 23, "Of the Civil Magistrate." As you may know, the version of this chapter which appears in the back of Trinity Hymnal is not the same as the version originally written in the Confession and still held by some other presbyterian bodies. Thus, of particular interest to us here is the form of Chapter 23:3 as held by the OPC and found in the Trinity Hymnal.

The part of Chapter 23:3 which is of importance for this discussion is as follows:

"It is the duty of the civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in His Church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief."

Of particular significance here is not what the Confession teaches about the role of government per se. Rather, we want to observe what this section reveals is the view of pluriformity. Notice, for example, the expression: "church of our common Lord." This presupposes the idea that there is one church of Christ, but that this church exists in various

forms in the same country. What these churches have in common is the same Lord, even though they may not have unity in beliefs, practice or organization. This interpretation is confirmed by the explicit reference to "any denomination of Christians." But are these various denominations all acknowledged by the WC to be valid manifestations of the church? Yes, for it goes on to describe "ecclesiastical persons" discharging "sacred functions." If these "persons" were officers in acknowledged false churches, the WC would be ill-advised to describe their functions as sacred. Such language is the terminology of approbation. Again, this view is confirmed by what follows. For the confession goes on to again affirm its convictions about "denominations of Christians" as having validity because they manifest the "regular government and discipline" which "Jesus Christ hath appointed ... in His Church."

There can be no doubt about the view of the church expressed in this chapter on the civil magistrate. This view of the church is completed in Chapter 25:4, which states: "This catholic Church hath sometimes been more, sometimes less visible. And particular Churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the Gospel is - taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them."

Whatever may have been the views and intentions of the authors of the original Confession, it is clear what these two sections teach about the church, and this teaching has been observed in practice in the OPC. Chapter 25:4 becomes the guide for viewing non-OPC churches. It is not a question of which churches are true or false. Rather, "particular churches," which may be local congregations or denominations of churches, are more or less pure. What distinguishes the OPC from Baptists? Not true vs. false. But more pure vs. less pure. To be sure, section 5 teaches that some churches have so degenerated as to become synagogues of Satan, but you will have great difficulty in getting the OPC to ever officially declare which church or churches may fall into this category. As we found, some were even loathe to classify the Roman Catholic Church as such. Thus, it is clear that Chapter 23:3 lays the foundation, and 25:4 is the superstructure of the Confession's view of this aspect of the church.

It is worth noting that in the original Confession, 23:3 did not contain this false view of the church. Furthermore, some have made a good case for the fact that 25:4 was never intended to be applied in the framework of the revised 23:3. Thus, the authors of the confession did believe in true and false churches. More or less pure churches, in this context, only referred to true churches. Baptist churches, for example, would not have been considered true and thus not a less pure church as viewed by the OPC. Whether or not this historical understanding of the Confession is correct is not ultimately important for us. What is important is the practical understanding and application of 25:4 today.

Here again, it is not difficult to see how open communion flows out of this view of the church. If a visitor seeks admission to the Lord's Supper and he is a member of the "church of our common Lord," even though he may be from a church which is less pure than the OPC, who are we to deny him the sacrament? Again, even though we sought to argue against this approach to the Lord's Supper from 25:4 about synagogues of Satan as false churches, it was clear that the pluriformity understanding outlined above prevailed.

There is a further application of this view of the church which is expressed in the understanding and application of other parts of the Confession. In 25:2 we read that the visible church consists of all those who "profess the true religion." And earlier in 24:3, we read of "such as profess the true reformed religion." How are we to understand these phrases?

Given the election-oriented perspective, which we have observed earlier, and now the pluriformity perspective, it is clear that these references mean anyone who gives some evidence of believing the so-called "core of the gospel." After all, 25:3 speaks explicitly of the gospel being less purely taught in some churches. Thus, one can be a member of a less pure church (or denomination) and still be counted as confessing the true "reformed" religion, so long as he is not Roman Catholic.

In contrast to this, we find in the Canadian Reformed Churches that to profess the true religion is to profess all that is confessed in the Three Forms of Unity. There is no "core of the gospel" separate from the Confessions of the Church. This view is called confessional membership. In the OPC, however, one could become a member of the church so long as he professed a minimal core of Christianity -- enough to assure the session that the applicant for membership was probably among the elect, that is, a "true Christian." Thus, one who did not believe in baptizing their children could never become a member of the Canadian Reformed Churches; whereas, such a person could easily become a member of the OPC.

Once again, the relationship of this viewpoint of the Westminster Standards to open communion can easily be seen. When a visitor seeks admission to the Lord's Table, the key questions are: is he one of the elect (i.e., a "true believer"), and therefore a member of the invisible church (i.e., "Christ's church")? Or, is he a member of a less pure church? Or, does he profess the "true religion," defined as some minimal content not identical with the confession of the church? If the answer to any or all of these is positive, then we are hard pressed to deny him the sacrament.

This perspective on those who profess the true religion is further confirmed by 26:2 which in referring to the communion of saints says, "Which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." It should not be difficult to see how this group of people will be defined by those who follow the perspectives of the WCF. Again, the ideas of a core gospel and pluriformity are fostered by expressions such as this.

As you know, we have been moving in the direction of confessional membership, and away from the doctrine of pluriformity, and the invisible church. The more we study the Westminster Standards, the more we see how pervasive are these wrong notions of the church. This confirmed by the understanding and application of these wrong ideas as we experienced in the OPC. Thus, it becomes increasingly difficult to think in terms of revising or amending the Westminster Standards. Rather, we must continue to study the Three Forms of Unity with a view to adopting them.

Sincerely,

B. Hofford

Summary

Westminster Standards vs. Three Forms of Unity

pluriformity of the church uniformity of the church

more or less pure true or false

core-gospel membership confessional membership
open communion closed communion

LETTER #3

June 21, 1985

Dear Congregation:

This is the third and final letter in my series about the Westminster Standards. The purpose of this letter is to bring together some of the threads of the previous two letters and to help explain the issues further.

You will recall that in the first letter I wrote about the secret-will/election orientation of the Confession with its resultant invisible church. In the second letter, I focused on the doctrine of the pluriformity of the church. In both letters I sought to show how these wrong ideas fostered the open Lord's Supper Table.

Some might wonder if we are making more out of these issues than the situation actually allows. In the most recent issue of THE CLARION (Vol. 34, No. 10, pg. 222), there is an article about some of the matters in which an OPC answer is given. This answer, in essence, says that not too much should be made of the invisible/visible distinction. These are just two aspects of the one church known in the Confession. But is this accurate? First, the Confession nowhere explains or applies the notion of the invisible church as simply one aspect of one church. Furthermore, as we have sought to show in the last two letters, the fact is that the notion of the invisible church functions in the OPC much more pervasively and detrimentally than one would be led to believe by the OPC explanation.

If one simply looks casually at the Westminster Confession's statement about the invisible church, one might conclude that nothing very significant is at stake. But we have tried to explain that this doctrine of the invisible church is only the flower. There is also an extensive root system supporting life for this flower. This root system is the election perspective of the Confession. It is only when you begin to see the significance of their application in the life of the church.

I may have left the impression from my last two letters that the OPC does not have any view of the visible church. Such an impression would be incorrect. There is a dual tension in the OPC. They do confess and practice their belief in the visible church. However, we must also be careful to see that their belief and practice of the invisible church is also very much at work, and in fact undercuts, ultimately, their attempt to live out the visible church concept.

Furthermore, it should be recognized that this practice of the invisible church within the OPC is not always self-conscious, nor does it always use the language of the Confession (eg., about election). In fact, it is impossible to say how and to what degree these problems in the Confession affect given individuals in the OPC. Nor is it important that we make such judgments. The fact is that these wrong notions have their pervasive influence on the thinking and life of the OPC, and this is nowhere more clearly seen than in their tenaciously clinging to open communion.

It should be evident by now that the root of the problem regarding the Lord's Supper in the OPC is not their doctrine of the sacrament per se, but rather their view of the church. We can safely say that as long as the election perspective, the invisible church, the pluriformity of the church, and the more/less pure churches views are held, so long will the OPC cling to open communion. This explains why our stance in the controversy was almost always viewed by the OPC in terms of "more or less restriction." The OPC was willing to discuss the question on this basis, and in the end they concluded that our position of "more restriction," could not be imposed on those who believed that "less restriction" was O.K. The OPC never got beyond this relative view of the question because they never were willing to accept the fact that their relative view of the church was the problem. In reality, of course, we were not pleading for "more restriction," but rather for the proper restriction, commensurate with our correct view of the church as visible, true/false, and uniform. Once the Lord's Supper issue is abstracted from the doctrine of the church, the battle is lost in a sea of relativity.

Perhaps a few examples of how the wrong notions outlined above come to expression will be helpful. You may recall that when we seceded from Covenant, we took the attitude that those who remained were in the category of those described in Matthew 18 as gentiles and publicans. In other words, we treated them from the revealed-will perspective. They were confronted with Christ's Word and called to obedience. When, after due process, they refused to submit to that Word, we were obligated to break fellowship with them as brothers in Christ. But you may also recall that some of these people then challenged us from the viewpoint of election. They would ask us whether we considered them "true Christians" or whether we thought they were going to hell because they disagreed with us about the Lord's Supper. The problem with this challenge is that it tempts us to shift the ground of our judgment about them from the revealed-will to the secret-will perspective. Our answer to them is that we can make no judgment about their ultimate destiny in terms of election or reprobation (because some of them might eventually repent and return to the true church). Thus we had to refuse this bait to switch the basis of our judgment about them. Here is an example of the OPC living out of the secret-will orientation. They would still confess their belief in the visible church. And perhaps they would never use the language of election in making the challenge. However, our analysis reveals their true operating perspective.

This understanding is confirmed by their consternation at our unwillingness to continue to consider them "true Christians" just because we disagreed over a "minor point" of doctrine. After all, weren't they showing Christian magnanimity by their willingness to still consider and treat us as brothers? This consternation on their part reveals their failure to break out of their election oriented/invisible church perspective. To this day I don't believe most of them understand why we view them as we do.

The Bible confirms this revealed-will orientation which we have believed and acted upon. For example, Jesus treated Judas as one of the twelve -- a member of the true church, even though Jesus knows that Judas will betray Him at some future point. Jesus even preceeds to administer the Lord's Supper to Judas at the verge of his betrayal. And our Lord does these things because He has learned from His Father that He must live and act out of the revealed will, not the secret will. The forces of eternal election and reprobation are at work in the lives of the twelve, but so long as Judas continues to publicly profess and live as a member of the visible church, he must be treated as a member of good standing.

Another illustration of the revealed will perspective is found in the book of Acts. How did the early church identify "true Christians?" They did so on the basis of the revealed will, that is,

when a person confessed faith in the truth and was baptized, they were considered a brother. Note in Acts 22: 16 that Paul is considered having his sins forgiven when he is baptized, not when the Holy Spirit first worked in his heart as determined by some subjective criteria based on Paul's testimony of his experience. In short, the Bible does indeed teach us about election and reprobation, but it gives us no encouragement to act on these in the day-to-day administration of the visible church. Rather, we are taught to administer the church based on the objective criteria set forth in the Bible itself for determining who is a "true Christian."

We see the secret-will orientation again manifesting itself in the view taken by many in the OPC towards "true Christians" in "bad" denominations (the term "false" would never be used; but "bad" is consistent with the relativity of "more or less pure"). Thus, there may be "true Christians" in all sorts of churches, ranging from the Roman Catholic at one end of the spectrum, all the way up to the PCA (Presbyterian Church of America) at the other end of the spectrum. How do they know that these "true Christians" exist in these churches? Partly as a result of their personal knowledge of individuals who, they subjectively judge, show evidence of believing the "core of the gospel." Indeed, some of these people may not be members of any church. But how can it be denied that they are "true Christians" when their testimony seems so convincing?

The next step, of course, is to formulate some view of the mass of these "true Christians" in bad denominations. Here is where the invisible church comes in so handy. If they are true Christians, then they must be elect. And the Confession provides them with a category in which to place all these people -- the invisible church. There is a certain unity which they feel with these people, even though some may be in denominations of which they cannot approve. From this point, it is again not difficult to see how open communion develops. When one of these "true Christians" shows up as a visitor to the Lord's Table, and he maintains that he is a "real believer," it would be uncharitable and offensive to deny him the sacrament. Who are we to deny the validity of his testimony?

In contrast to the above practice, it may be helpful to set forth the correct approach. What do we do with people in the true church who seem to know and confess at least some of the truth? First, we must always refrain from feeling obligated to make a judgment about his person's election. Indeed, we must resist the often intimidating attitude that challenges us to make some judgment from this secret will perspective. At the same time that we must be careful not to jump to conclusions about the election of the person, so we must be careful not to jump to the opposite conclusion -- that he is reprobate. The point is, we don't know God's secret will regarding this person. All we can do is acknowledge with gratitude whatever amount of the Bible the person confesses, but then, as opportunity and occasion permit, confront the person with what it means to follow Christ fully. In short, sooner or later, the person in question must be encouraged to join the true church if he indeed does believe the Bible. Only when he joins the true church may we then consider him a Christian brother. This is not being uncharitable or skeptical. Rather, it is being honest, attempting to take people seriously, and at the same time, seeking to live out the revealed-will perspective of the Bible.

We may well wonder why it is many have difficulty in seeing and accepting these notions we are describing. Conversely, why are the wrong beliefs so strongly cherished? It is impossible, of course, to read people's hearts, but here are a few suggestions. In many cases, at root may be simple unbelief. Specifically, it may be unbelief regarding the absoluteness of the truth of the Bible. After all, it is easier and more comforting to believe in the more or less pure churches than to believe in the true or false ones. One wonders whether the same people who

adhere to the more or less pure churches idea would also, when pressed to the wall, admit that there are more or less pure gospels which all will count towards heaven.

Secondly, people may adhere to the wrong notions out of fear of rejection by others. We saw this at Covenant Church. There was the fear of offending a visitor by denying them the Lord's Supper. Or there was the fear of offending some relative or friend who might visit someday and want the Lord's Supper, even though they are from some patently false church. Coupled with this is the fear that perhaps they would be violating the Bible's injunction to assume the best about a brother. To deny the Lord's Supper to a visitor who claimed to be a true Christian would therefore be basically un-Christian.

Finally, there may be the fear of ruining the roll on success. I have come to believe that this drive towards success in terms of numbers was more powerful in the OPC than we recognized. It is obvious that our view of the Lord's Supper, and the church, would significantly affect one's prospects for "success" in these terms. It may even be, although none can know for sure, that the General Assembly was adverse to even studying this question for fear that it might spoil the ecumenical drive towards the PCA, or drive a wedge between them and others in the NAPARC (North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council).

Undoubtedly there were and continue to be other reasons why our views of the church and the Lord's Supper were rejected by the OPC. We may never know or understand some of them. And it is not necessary. However, it helps to understand what we can about these matters, and how they are fostered by the Westminster Standards.

If you have questions about these issues, feel free to call me to discuss them. Perhaps on one of our sessional visits, we can discuss them also.

Sincerely,

B. Hofford

Summary

Doctrine

A. There is a visible church.

B. There is an invisible church (only in the sense that we can conceive of all the elect past, present, and future as one day being in heaven with God).

Practice

A. Right (Tri-County Reformed Church)

1. We only consider, address, and treat members of the true visible church as the elect.
2. We don't consider, address, and treat non-members of the true visible church as either elect or reprobate.

B. Wrong (OPC, WCF)

1. They consider, address, and treat certain members of true and false churches as elect.
2. They don't always consider, address, and treat all members of the true visible church as elect (especially in the WCF).