

PAEDOCOMMUNIONISM VERSUS PROTESTANTISM

(Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty)

by

Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee, Queensland Presbyterian Theological College



“If you vow abstinence from wine...if you have some end in view that is not perverse, no one can disapprove.” Yet the opposite applies after childhood - in making ‘Profession of Faith.’ For “there is one vow common to all believers which, taken in Baptism, we ‘confirm’ and as it were sanction by our Catechism and partaking of the Lord’s Supper.” In the Early Church, “the infants...who had been initiated by Baptism - not then having given a ‘Confession of Faith’ to the Church - were again, toward the end of their boyhood or on adolescence, brought forward by their parents and were examined by the Overseer [or Minister] in terms of the Catechism.... The ceremony of laying on of hands was also used. Thus the youth, on his faith being approved, was dismissed with a solemn blessing.” J. Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV:13:4-6 & 19:4.

PREFACE

Even if the fall had never occurred - covenant boys would nevertheless have been born to godly couples like the unfallen Adam and Eve. Genesis 1:26f. Yet each such boy would have remained a minor - till he himself would have become old enough to leave his father and his mother and to cleave to his wife and thus become one flesh with her. Genesis 2:24.

Yet that could not occur till adolescence or thereafter. Matthew 19:5f. This was still the case, even after the fall. Genesis 17:26 & 18:24-32 & 21:20f *cf.* Exodus 12:3f & 12:24-27 & 12:37 with First Chronicles 21:5 & Proverbs 22:6 and Luke 2:40-49. Furthermore, this would still continue to be the case - also after Calvary. First Corinthians 3:2 & 10:8-21 & 11:28-32 & 13:11 & 14:20 & 16:13 - *cf.* Ephesians 6:1-4; Colossians 3:20f; Hebrews 5:12 to 6:2f.

Before Calvary - minors were never permitted to eat the meat of the Passover lamb. Since then - it is similarly impermissible for minors to eat of the Lord's Supper which precisely in Christ's Calvary week replaced that ancient sacrifice.

In Holy Scripture, we are told that - at Calvary - Baptism replaced Circumcision. Romans 4:11-24; Galatians 3:16-29; Colossians 2:11-13. The Lord Himself declares that Circumcision was administered usually in infancy - just eight days after birth. Genesis 17:12f; 21:4f; Luke 2:21; Philippians 3:5f.

God's Word also teaches that the Lord's Supper replaced sacrificing in general and the Holy Passover in particular. Luke 22:1-20; First Corinthians 5:6f; Hebrews 10:1f. Yet such sacrificing and the Passover were only for catechized adults. Genesis 18:2,7,12,32f; Exodus 12:3f,26f,37f,48f; Numbers 9:2-14; First Chronicles 21:5; and Luke 2:40-47. So too is the Lord's Supper. First Corinthians 11:27f; 13:11f; 14:20; 16:13. Thus - Catechism before Communion! Hebrews 5:12-14; 6:1-2; 10:22-23; 13:10-17.

Ancient Paedocommunionism was conceived in Paganism. Only later did it infiltrate into the Early-Medieval Church. It did so, through the magical syncretism between the Eastern Rites and Eastern Paganism, and also by way of Post-Christian Judaism. Yet, as such, it is totally averse and foreign to God's infallible Word.

As Rev. Professor Dr. John Calvin remarks in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (IV:15:30): 'The Supper is intended for those of riper years.... He does not admit all to partake of the Supper - but confines it to those who are fit to discern the body and blood of the Lord.... 'He who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body' [First Corinthians 11:29].... Why should we offer poison - to our young children? The Passover for which the Supper is substituted...was duly eaten only by those who were of age sufficient to ask the meaning of it. Exodus 12:26.'

PAEDOCOMMUNIONISM versus PROTESTANTISM

From even before the beginning, the Triune God has always been **mature**. In the beginning, He created the universe - and on the sixth day of formation week He made adult man as His **mature** image.

To our God-catechized and mature forefather Adam, the tree of life bore a 'sacramental' character. Even before the fall, he brought God offerings - from which also the Lord's Supper initially derives. Yet his immature descendants needed to be catechized - toward 'sacramental' manducation **only when themselves mature**. Genesis 1:26f ; 2:24f ; 4:1-17; 5:18f ; 14:14f,18,24; Exodus 12:3f,26,37; Prov. 22:6; Luke 2:41f. Such is **Biblical** alias **Mature** Communionism.

Paedocommunionism, however, is rooted in **post-fall Paganism**. Foreign to the Bible, it later crept into the Early-Mediaeval Eastern Church. It was recycled sectarianly by Anabaptists in the West, in their later polemic against antipaedocommunionistic Protestant Paedobaptists.

In Scripture, there were '**Catechism Schools**' to train Pre-Communicants before admission to the Passover and the Eucharist. Thus: Professor Samuel Miller, Dr. John Gill, and the *Talmud*. A minimum number or *minyán* of ten adult males was needed at every official ecclesiastical worship service (Genesis 4:3-26; Exodus 12:3f,21-26,37 cf. Ruth 4:2 & Luke 22:7-30).

Some Christians reject everything in the *Talmud* outright. Yet as the Anti-Judaistic Martin Luther himself rightly comments on Genesis 4:17, "the opinion of the Jews...does not seem to be at variance with the truth.... We must read the writings of the Jews with critical judgment, so that we may keep what is likely to prove true and refute what has been fabricated."

Also the *Lex Gentium* regards attaining adolescence and the accompanying training needed - to be essential for admission to all the responsibilities of adulthood. Thus *e.g.* the Early Britons; the Anglo-Saxons; and the legislation of the English kings Alfred, Athelstane & Canute.

Now Classic Protestantism rejected not just Infant Communion, but also Pre-Adolescent Communion. Yet at Trent, Romanism condemned such strict catechizings at puberty. All of the Calvinistic *Confessions of Faith* either explicitly or implicitly condemn Paedocommunionism.

The present and ongoing Neo-Paedocommunionism in the West - is a rancid fruit of the Neo-Pagan 1789f French Revolution with its warped emphasis on 'reason' and the equality of all. Today, this has resulted even in grossly-exaggerated "children's rights" (*sic*).

Professor Kamphuis rightly views Child Communion as the end of all Church Discipline. The modern heresy of Neo-Paedocommunionism has been condemned by Iain Murray, Dr. K. Deddens, Dr. Leonard Coppes, Dr. Edwin Elliott, Dr. Richard Bacon, Dr. Joe Morecraft, Dr. Ken Gentry, Theo Danzfuss, Bob Grossmann, Dr. Morton Smith, Parnell McCarter, Matthew Winzer and Dr. Francis Nigel Lee. Sadly, some modern Western denominations have capitulated to this

product of the ongoing march of the French Revolution even into many churches. What is needed, against such Paedocommunionistic Deformation, then, is a New Protestant Reformation.

1. Paedocommunionism a sectarian Anabaptist recycling of Early-Mediaeval Syncretism

Rev. Professor Dr. John Calvin's most notorious opponent, the arch-heretic Michael Servetus, was an antitrinitarian Anabaptist. Just like the postmodern Quasi-Protestant Neo-Paedocommunionists - also Servetus recycled the Early-Mediaeval syncretism between paedocommunionistic Paganism and the Post-Cyprianic ecclesiastical deformation, and wrongly insisted that Paedobaptism and Paedocommunion need to go hand in hand together.

“Servetus, one of their masters,” wrote Dr. Calvin in his *Institutes* IV:16:29-31 of the Anabaptists, ‘had begun to act the prophet.... At length, they [the Anabaptists] object that there is not greater reason for admitting infants to Baptism, than to the Lord's Supper - to which [latter], however, they are never admitted. As if Scripture did not in every way draw a wide distinction between them!... Baptism...is a kind of entrance and as it were initiation into the Church.... The Supper is intended for those of riper years who, having passed the tender period of infancy, are fit to bear solid food. This distinction is very clearly pointed out in Scripture....

“As regards Baptism, the Lord makes no selection of age - whereas He does not admit all to partake of the Supper but confines it to those who are fit to discern the body and blood of the Lord.... Why should we stretch out poison to our young children, instead of vivifying food?... Pray, how can we require infants to commemorate any event of which they have no understanding? How require them ‘to show forth the Lord's death’ - of the nature and benefit of which they have no idea?

‘Nothing of the kind is prescribed by Baptism.... There is the greatest difference between the two signs. This also we observe in similar signs under the old dispensation. Circumcision which, as is well known, corresponds to our Baptism, was intended for infants. But the Passover, for which the Supper is substituted, did not admit all kinds of guests promiscuously - but was duly eaten only by those who were of an age sufficient to ask the meaning of it (Exodus 12:26).

‘Had these men [the heretical Anabaptists] the least particle of soundness in their brain - would they thus be blind as to a matter so very clear and obvious? Though I am unwilling to annoy the reader with the series of conceits which Servetus, not the least among the Anabaptists, deemed, when he adduced them, to be specious arguments - it will be worth while briefly to dispose of them.... Who can infer...that Baptism is to be denied to infants whom...the Lord consecrates to Himself by gratuitous adoption? His [Servetus's] objection, that if they [such infants] are renewed humans, they must be fed with spiritual food - is easily obviated. By Baptism they are admitted into the fold of Christ, and the symbol of adoption is sufficient for them until they grow up and become fit to bear solid food. We must therefore wait for the time of examination which God distinctly demands in the sacred Supper.

‘His [Servetus’s] next objection is that Christ invited all His people to the sacred Supper. But as it is plain that He admits those only who are prepared to celebrate the commemoration of His death - it follows that infants whom He honoured with His embrace, remain in a distinct and peculiar position until they grow up; but yet, are not aliens....

‘When he [Servetus] objects that it is strange why the infant does not partake of the Supper, I [Calvin] answer that souls are fed by other food than the external eating of the Supper.... Accordingly, Christ is the food of infants - though they partake not of the symbol....

‘He [Servetus] alleges that all Christians are ‘brethren’ and that infants cannot belong to this class so long as we exclude them from the Supper. But I [Calvin] return to my position.... Infants are joined [to God], in common with adults.... Temporary abstinence from the Supper, does not prevent them from belonging to the body of Christ.”

The implications of this are as clear as crystal. Calvinism is implacably opposed to Paedopassoverism and to Paedocommunionism. For Paedocommunionism is a heretical suggestion of Anabaptism.

2. ‘Catechism Schools’ in Holy Scripture for the Passover and for Holy Communion

Since its inception, the Passover was a ‘Catechism School’ for those seeking admission to that Sacrament at puberty. According to Webster’s 1959 *New Collegiate Dictionary* (based on the famous second edition of *Webster’s New International Dictionary*), ‘puberty’ means:

‘The state or quality of being first capable of begetting or bearing offspring; the period at which sexual maturity is reached. The age of puberty is commonly designated legally, as fourteen for boys and twelve for girls.’ It is derived from the Latin word *pubes* (which means an ‘adult’).

From this word ‘puberty’ - also its cognate word ‘pubescent’ is derived. According to Webster, that means: ‘arriving at puberty’; ‘downy or hairy’; ‘covered with soft fine hairs.’ It is derived from the Latin word *pubescens*, meaning ‘reaching puberty’ and ‘growing hairy.’ At puberty, humans grow ‘hairy.’ It is the age when, together with those under the arm-pits and in the area of the groin, in males also the facial hair or beard starts to grow.

The A.D. 107 Church Overseer Ignatius, in his *Epistle to the Magnesians* (chapter 3), maintains that ‘Solomon when ‘twelve years old’...judged between two women” (*cf.* First Kings 3:7-28). Indeed, that wise King later counselled his own son: “Catechize a lad in the way he should go; then, when his beard starts to grow, he shall not depart from it!” Thus Proverbs 22:6.

Also the erudite Westminster Assembly Commissioner and Talmudic Scholar Lightfoot explains regarding Luke 2:41*f* that ‘when Jesus was twelve years old’ He at the time of the annual ‘Feast of the Passover went up to Jerusalem according to the custom of the Feast.’ That He did, in a numbered group or *chebraah*.

This, Lightfoot relates to the Talmudic tract *Chetubim* (folio 50). There, one reads: ‘Let a man deal gently with his son, till he come to be twelve years old!’ Also at ‘twelve years old,’ elucidates Lightfoot from *Joma* 82:1, the Hebrews ‘were wont to inure children to fasting’ and to feasting - so ‘that they might be accustomed to it and so be capable of fasting upon the day of atonement’ and likewise feasting on the day of the Passover.

Now such Catechism Schools for those reaching puberty - were attached to the Temple, to the Synagogues, and later to the Churches (alias the Christian Congregations). There, from the Holy Scriptures, covenant youth were officially catechized - ‘line upon line.’ Exodus 12:3-4; 12:21; 12:28; 12:37; Proverbs 1:1-10*f* & 22:6; Ecclesiastes 1:1 & 11:9*f* & 12:1,9-12*f*; Isaiah 28:9*f*; Luke 2:42-47; John 21:15; Ephesians 4:5,11*f*; First Peter 5:1-5; First John 2:13*f*.

The noun ‘Catechism’ (meaning ‘Instruction’) is derived from the Greek verb *kat-eechein* (meaning: ‘to echo thoroughly’). The verb is found in the New Testament, at: Luke 1:4; Acts 18:25 & 21:21 & 21:24; Romans 2:18; First Corinthians 14:19; Galatians 6:6; and Hebrews 10:23. There, it refers: to Hebraic instruction from God’s Law; to the Christian catechizing of Theophilus and Apollos; to good educating by the Apostle Paul; to the training of others in the Church; to in-doctrin-ating in and being in-doctrin-ated into the teachings of Christianity; and to ‘hold[ing] fast the ‘Profession of our Faith’” made on becoming Communicants of the Church.

3. Princeton’s Presbyterian the catechetical Rev. Professor Dr. Samuel Miller

Princeton’s first Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, wrote his book *Infant Baptism* in 1834. There, he brilliantly refutes the Baptist ‘objection - often urged with confidence - against Infant Membership” in Christ’s Church.

Baptists, explained Miller¹ - and he might very well also have added the Anabaptists, whose stepchildren they are - often argue against the Presbyterian doctrine of Infant Baptism. Baptists often object that if the Presbyterian doctrine were to ‘be well founded - then it follows, of course, that every baptized young person” including every ‘child who feels disposed to do so, has a right to come to the Lord’s Table” too. To this specious argument of yesterday’s Baptists, also today’s Neo-Paedocommunionistic Paedobaptists have fallen victim!

Yet, replies Miller, ‘this objection is founded on an entire mistake. And a recurrence, for one moment, to the principles of civil society - will at once expose it. Every child is a citizen of the country in which he was born: a plenary citizen. There is no such thing as half-way citizenship in this case. He is a free-born citizen in the fullest extent of the term. Yet, until he reach a certain age and possess certain qualifications - he is not eligible to the most important offices which his country has to confer. And, after he has been elected, he cannot take his seat for the discharge of these official functions - until he has taken certain prescribed oaths.

‘In like manner, every baptized child is a Member - a plenary Member - of the Church in which he received the sacramental seal [of Baptism]. Still, the Church to which this ecclesiastical

minor belongs, in the exercise of that ‘authority which Christ has give for edification and not for destruction’ [Second Corinthians 10:8 *cf.* Second Corinthians 11:23-34], will not suffer [or ever allow] him, if she does her duty, to come to the Lord’s Table - until he has reached an age when he has ‘knowledge to discern the Lord’s body’ (First Corinthians 11:27-29), and until he shall manifest that exemplary deportment and hopeful piety which become [or behooves] one who claims the privileges of Christian Communion.”

4. Rev. Dr. Miller on the Non-Paedocommunionism of Old and New Testament Church

Dr. Miller goes on: ‘No one, of any age, has a right to come to her Communion - without the consent of the Church. When one, after coming to that Communion, has been debarred from it for a time by regular ecclesiastical authority, he has no right to come again - until the interdict is taken off. Of course, by parity of reasoning, one who has never yet come at all - cannot come, without asking and obtaining the permission of those who are set to govern in the Church.

“This view of the subject is at once illustrated and confirmed by the uniform practise of the Old Testament Church. The [male] children of Jewish parents, though regular Church Members in virtue of their birth, and recognized as such in virtue of their Circumcision, were still not allowed to come to the Passover until they were ceremonially clean.”

That is to say, soon after their attainment of adolescence, the Elders first had to examine and then to pronounce them ‘clean’ - before admitting them to the Passover. Exodus 12:21,26,37,43 *f* & Leviticus 15:2-33 *cf.* Numbers 9:2-14 & Luke 2:40-47.

Miller insists: “This is so well attested by sacred antiquarians, both Jewish and Christian, that it cannot be reasonably called in[to] question. Calvin remarks that ‘the Passover, which has now been succeeded by the sacred Supper, did not admit guests of all descriptions promiscuously; but was rightly eaten only by those who were of sufficient age to be able to inquire into its signification.’ Thus, in all centuries, the Christian parents should keep on ‘bringing their children to their Minister at the close of childhood - to be examined according to Catechism.”

5. Dr. Miller approvingly cites Baptist Rev. Dr. Gill on communion threshold at age 13

Miller then concludes: “The same distinct statement is also made by Rev. Dr. Gill, an eminent commentator of the Baptist denomination. ‘According to the maxims of the Jews,’ says he, ‘persons were not obliged to the duties of the Law, or subject to the penalties of it in case of non-performance - until they were...a male at the age of thirteen years and one day [emphasis mine - Dr. F.N. Lee]....

“They” - meaning the Hebrews - explains Dr. Gill, “used to train up their children and inure them to religious exercises before [puberty.... But] they were not properly under the Law, until they were arrived at the age above mentioned. Nor were they reckoned Adult Church

Members until then. Nor then neither - unless worthy persons.' For, so it is said, 'he that is worthy at thirteen years of age - is called "a Son of the Congregation of Israel.'" *Commentary on Luke 2:42.*" Thus the famous Baptist Theologian Rev. Dr. John Gill - approvingly cited by the great Presbyterian Professor Dr. Samuel Miller, so that Gill's view on this matter is identical to that of Miller.

There is no real discrepancy in Gill's above-quoted comment on Luke 2:42. Rightly did Gill there state that "persons were not obliged to the duties of the Law, or subject to the penalties of it, in case of non-performance - until they were...a male at the age of thirteen years and one day." Proverbs 22:6; Song 8:8; Luke 2:41*f*.

In Old Testament times, females too were catechized; but, unlike males, this was not done in order for them to become Communicants. For only those both circumcised and catechized (no sooner than at the end of childhood) - could partake of the Passover. Exodus 12:3-5; 12:24-28; 12:37; 12:43-48.

At least one passage in the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, implies the admission to the Passover of the male Israelite at his adolescence. This admission was apparently expected to occur precisely at the onset of his puberty. Thus, the original language of Proverbs 22:6 clearly teaches: "Keep on catechizing a lad as to the way in which he should go! Then, when his beard begins to grow [*yazqiyn*], he will not depart from it." Cf.: Exodus 12:3*f* & 12:26*f* & 12:37 and Isaiah 7:14*f* & 28:9*f*.

6. The Hebrew *Talmud* on thirteen as the age of religious maturity

More explicitly, also the Hebrew *Talmud* fallibly (yet illuminatingly) comments on the infallible Holy Scriptures of the Hebrews. Indeed, the *Talmud* specifically addresses even the matter as to who should eat the Passover.

The *Talmud*, at whatever time it got inscripturated (*circa* 400 B.C. to 500 A.D.), was derived from a **much more ancient** collection of rabbinical comments upon the Old Testament. It gives only fallible comments on (*inter alia*) the infallible Holy Scriptures of the Old(er) Testament. Yet - together with ancient translations (such as the *Septuagint*) and together with the *Targums* (alias the ancient Aramaic explanations) of those inspired books - the *Talmud* is practically the most ancient extant 'commentary' on those infallible Scriptures. Consequently, we do well to give it a serious hearing. Thus too great Christian Scholars such as: Lightfoot; Matthew Henry; Barclay; Edersheim; Schuerer; Farrar; Kittel; and Strack-Billerbeck; *etc*.

According to the *Talmud*, both males and females had their final pre-puberty catechizing at age twelve.² The thus-catechized males were immediately thereafter then also given a more intensive explanation of their duties even as regards Communion at the Passover. See Exodus 12:3*f* & 12:26*f* & 12:37. Indeed, they were (yet subsequently) first admitted to manducate at the Passover Table only when at least thirteen years and one day old.³

States the *Talmud*: “One trains the children a year or two before [age thirteen], in order that they may become used to religious observances.”⁴ All this throws very valuable light on the deeper implications of Luke 2:41,42,46,52.

Now the Passover was instituted for “the Congregation of Israel” (alias mature males approved after their catechization) - under the leadership of “the Elders.” Exodus 12:3-5,21. We have already seen that the famous Baptist Commentator Rev. Dr. Gill himself states in his *Commentary on Luke* (2:42) that, also according to the Ancient Hebrew maxims, “he that is worthy at thirteen years of age - is called ‘a Son of the Congregation of Israel.’”

Holy Scripture itself in Deuteronomy 23:1 specifies the composition of the Hebrew “Congregation” solely in terms of unimpaired adult males. There, it provides that he who was sexually impaired - like a boy before puberty - “shall not enter” into constituting such a meeting. Indeed, with reference to the above Deuteronomy 23:1, the *Talmud* insists that “all my slaughter[ing of sacrificial animals] and their slaughter, is valid - except [that of] a deaf mute, an imbecile, or a minor: lest they invalidate their slaughtering.”⁵

7. The Talmudic tracts *Niddah* and *P’sachim* on the age of maturity at thirteen

Before age thirteen, says the *Talmud*, no vows are valid.⁶ “Any who is not old enough to be trained, is forbidden to read the [sc]roll in the Synagogue.” Consequently, the law in Deuteronomy 21:18-21 for stoning “a stubborn and rebellious son” - applied only to those beyond the age of puberty who were regarded as sufficiently accountable adults.⁷

The *Talmud* also commends the one who “slaughtered the Passover for its eaters alias those ‘numbered’ to eat it.”⁸ However, such Talmudic passages also rightly condemn the person who wrongly “slaughtered the Passover...for uncircumcised and for unclean persons. He is guilty.”

As regards the Passover for “the married woman - while she is in the house of her husband, her husband slaughtered on her account” *etc.* That is, though she did not herself manducate at the Passover, her husband’s (active) offering of that sacrifice was imputed to her (passively).

Yet what about the unmarried woman - while she was yet in the house of her father? “Her father slaughtered on her account.” This in itself benefitted her - even without her own personal manducatory participation.

Thus does the *Talmud* describe the first manducations at the annual Passover Feast - by the grown-up boys of pious Israelites. These manducations occurred soon after those grown-up boys had become ‘sons of the Law’ when turning thirteen. This was after they at that time made their solemn vows, and were then admitted and confirmed as Communicants.

According to the *Talmud* - after their being catechized, and on the attainment of their manhood at puberty - “one says to his sons: ‘I am ready to slaughter the Passover for you who

shall [now] first go up to Jerusalem.” Also Holy Scripture itself teaches exactly the same. Luke 2:41 *cf.* Genesis 14:14; 17:25*f.*; 18:7-33; 22:1-19 & Exodus 12:26*f.* On this matter, see too the famous 37*f.* A.D. Jewish Historian Josephus.⁹

Like the New Testament about the Lord’s Supper (*cf.* First Corinthians 11:27-30*f.*), the *Talmud* too asks about manducation by those who are ill. What about ‘the sick and the aged, who are able to eat [Passover food] the size of an olive?’

“They [healthy slaughterers] may slaughter the Passover for them” [the sick *etc.*]. However, “they must not slaughter the Passover for [only] one person.” Such a single adult male ‘person’ must join a ‘Company’ (or *Chebraah*) - together with his qualified neighbours. *Cf.* Exodus 12:4-6.

To be valid, this ‘Company’ required a minimum of ten previously circumcised and confirmed men (= a minimum of ten males aged thirteen and above). Here see: Genesis 17:25-27 (= men of thirteen-plus years); 18:2,7,32*f.* (= ten men); Exodus 12:3-4; 12:26-28; 12:37; 18:12,21 (= Elders over ten men themselves each the head of a household); Deuteronomy 1:13-15 (= the same); Ruth 4:2 (“ten men of the Elders”); Luke 2:41-44 (= ‘the Company’); and Luke 22:1-15 *f.* (Jesus’ company of his ten-plus adult male disciples of ‘the Number’).

Yet “even for a ‘Company’ of a hundred, when they [together with that ‘Company’] cannot eat the size of an olive - they [the slaughterers] must not slaughter the Passover” for such persons. Indeed, “they must not form a ‘Company’ of women...and of little ones.” Thus the Hebrew *Talmud* - rooted as it is also in much earlier Hebrew traditions from Old Testament times.¹⁰

8. *Minyan*: the ‘Number’ of ‘Men’ needed for a Biblical ‘Congregation’ of God’s People

Ten is the minimum ‘Number’ (or *Minyan*) of ‘Men’ - alias the lowest possible amount of mature male Communicants present, who were (and still are) needed to constitute any official meeting of a ‘Congregation’ of Israel. The *Talmud*¹¹ also adds that even then, such mature adult ‘men should not stand up to pray - except with reverential head’ (*cf.* First Timothy 2:8*f.*).

Even if there is no *Minyan* of at least ten adult males - also even “three men who have eaten together, are bound to bless after food.” Deuteronomy 16:18*f.*; 17:5*f.*; 19:12*f.*; Matthew 18:16-20. Declares the *Talmud*: “There is no blessing at food for women...and children [*cf.* Acts 16:13*f.*]... If there be three [adult males present], one says, ‘Bless ye!’ *etc.*” Yet if there is the *Minyan* alias the minimum ‘Number’ of “ten [men] - he says, ‘let us bless our God’” *etc.* So too - ‘if there be ten, or ten myriads.’”

Thus, only at meetings of at least ten mature male Communicants - can an official ‘Congregation of Israel’ (alias an *^A:dath Yisjraa’eel*) be constituted. Then, “they should bless ‘according to the Number’ of the Assembly” - alias the *Minyan* of that Israelitic Congregation. *Cf.* especially Exodus 12:4. Compare too: Genesis 18:26-33 & 37:2-9; Exodus 18:12-35 and

Luke 2:44 & 22:13-18. Then, “they should not bless the wine till it has been mixed.” Cf. Matthew 26:19-29 & First Corinthians 11:20f.

Precisely in respect of the Passover, the inspired book of Exodus (12:3-4 & 12:21f cf. 18:21f) speaks of this above-mentioned decimal ‘Number’ etc. This is what is meant there by ‘the number of the souls’ of qualified persons in ‘all the Congregation of Israel’ - alias each *‘iysh* or mature male Communicant (in the expression “every man according to his eating”). Thus - in its relevant article (on ‘Minyan’) - *Vallentine’s Jewish Encyclopaedia* declares that the ‘Minyan’ (alias literally ‘the Number’) is “the minimum required for a ‘Congregation.’”

That ‘number’ is “ten male Jews” circumcised and catechized and confirmed, above the age of thirteen.... The *Talmud*¹³ infers from the Bible that “when ten [adult male Communicants] pray, the *Shechinah* [or ‘Glory’] is with them.” See here: First Samuel 1:8 & 8:1 cf. Genesis 14:14; 17:25-27; 18:1-7,12,24-32f; 24:1-4; Exodus 12:3-4,21; 12:37,43-48; 18:1-25 (especially verses 1 & 2 & 21); 24:1-18; Deuteronomy 1:13-15; 23:1-2; Joshua 22:14; Judges 6:26-27 & 20:10; and Ruth 4:1-2’s “ten men” as official witnesses.

The *Talmud* then goes on: “Only male adult Jews may be included - neither women, nor minors, nor slaves, nor Jews who have been excommunicated, nor apostates.” Cf. here also First Timothy 2:8 to 3:5.

The primordial correlation between this decimal *Minyan* or ‘Number’ of ten catechized adult males, and the minimum needed to constitute a Passover ‘Company’ (Luke 2:41f & 22:1-15) - should be obvious. Only unteachable Paedocommunionists seem unable to see this.

“A quorum of ten male Jews is necessary” - so *Vallentine’s Jewish Encyclopaedia* tells us further.¹⁴ Now the *Bar Mitzvaah* ceremony was “originally applied to every adult Israelite...boy attaining the age of thirteen” [emphasis mine - F.N. Lee]. Even today, “on the sabbath following his birthday, he is ‘called up’ to the ‘Reading of the Law’ - and recites the *Haftarah*....

“Henceforth, he is included in the *Minyan* - alias ‘the Number’ or the “minimum required for a ‘Con-greg-ation.” That is: ten male Hebrews above the age of thirteen. After his Confirmation thus, the pre-catechized and mature teenage Hebrew was “and is vested with the responsibilities of an adult male.” And such adult male responsibilities include that of manducating at the Passover. Exodus 12:3-4 & 12:26f & 12:37 cf. Luke 2:40f.

9. Doctrine of Old Testament and *Talmud* on maturity continued in New Testament

Very significantly, such catechization toward adolescence and ‘*Minyan*-counting’ at adolescence as the “age of maturity” for participation at the Passover (and at the Eucharist as its replacement at Calvary) - continued also in the New Testament. Matthew 14:12-21; Luke 1:1-4 & 2:41-47 & 22:1-20; John 6:4-10; Acts 22:3; First Corinthians 3:1f & 5:6f & 10:1-16 & 11:11-33 & 13:10f & 14:20f & 16:13; Second Corinthians 1:21f; Ephesians 4:5-15 & 6:1-4; Philippians

3:5; First Timothy 2:8-15 & 6:12 & 6:21; Second Timothy 1:5-6 & 3:15-17; Hebrews 4:14 & 5:11 to 6:5 & 10:22f & 13:10-16; Second Peter 2:13-14; First John 2:12-21; Jude 12-13; and Revelation 2:2-7 & 2:20f & 3:20 & 19:7-9f & 22:2-15.

Catechization, alias prior instruction before Communion, was emphasized also in Early Church History (thus the *Didachee* and Justin Martyr) - and implied also by Ignatius and Pliny. Irenaeus and Tertullian stressed the necessity of Pre-Communion Catechism. The *Liturgy of St. James* removes from the body of Communicants, right before the Eucharist is served, "the unbaptized" as well as the baptized "catechumens" and "those who are unable to join with us."

Clement of Alexandria's Catechetical School insisted on instruction before receiving the Supper. Hippolytus and Origen repudiated 'Infant Intinction' as well as Paedocommunion. And Commodian as well as the Syrian *Didaskalia* both emphasized Pre-Communion Confirmation.

Even as late as A.D. 251, the sacramentalizing Cyprian in his *Treatise* 3:9 & 3:25f disapproved of pagan 'child communion' with idols - and of ecclesiastical exorcism against it. He seems to have disapproved of the then-novel and then-still-incipient "Christian" eucharizing even of catechized **small** children of the Covenant. And he certainly disapproved of the "Christian" eucharizing of uncatechizable infants and toddlers. For he clearly upheld the attainment of a mature discernment (to be attained *inter alia* by prior catechization) as one of the Eucharist's pre-requisites. See his *Epistles* 2(8):3; 9(16):2; 10(15):4; 12(17):1f; 25(31):6; 51(55):5; 72(73):22 - and his *Treatises* 3:15f & 9:14 & 5:2. Cf. too Matthew 7:6 in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 29:8q.

Even the Late-Patristic Church long stuck to the Biblical practice of 'Catechism before Communion.' Thus: the Council of Nicea; the *Apostolic Constitutions*; Cyril; Athanasius; early Liturgies; Ambrose; Chrysostom; and Augustine.

Yet sadly, the Church then started syncretizing with Paganism. Then, the 325-375f A.D. *Apostolic Constitutions* and even the somewhat sacramentalizing A.D. 400f Augustine permitted **catechized** children (but not **uncatechizable** sucklings or toddlers) to partake of the Supper.

In Early-Mediaeval times - especially under the influence of Pseudo-Dionysius and Evagrius and John Moschus and John of Damascus - syncretistic Eastern-Orthodoxy embraced neo-pagan sucklings' communion and toddlers' communion. Yet the Western Church, despite declensions, still held to post-catechetical sacramental communion only at a "reasonable age" (cf. Aquinas).

10. Lex Gentium on puberty among natural nations, Early Britons, and Anglo-Saxons

In his justly-famous book *The Education of Ripening Youth*,¹⁵ the renowned Reformed Dogmatician Rev. Professor Dr. Herman Bavinck refers to the above Ancient Hebrew practice of confirming aspirant Communicants at puberty (as reflected in the Old Testament and in the *Talmud*). Bavinck insists that even that practice, itself roots in the Law of nature's God; and so,

as a result, also in the 'Law of nature' or the *Lex natura* itself (cf. First Corinthians 11:9-34).

Such puberty rites, rooting in the *Lex natura*, are found also in the later *Lex gentium* or the 'Law of nations' which unfolds from it. Bavinck therefore states that even regarding the natural 'nations' alias the so-called 'primitive peoples': 'Man is always and everywhere born into a society.... The relationships into which he is received from his birth onward, can be distinguished into two large groups. The first period is that of childhood. The second period starts at puberty [emphases mine - F.N. Lee].

"The second is regarded as the more important. The transition from child to youth...is the most important turning-point in human life, and is solemnly celebrated in ceremonial Feasts among all tribes and nations. At this age, the youth is also initiated into all the traditions, rights, laws, customs and ceremonies of the tribe. In [Ancient] Rome..., at age fifteen the youth was received at the Feast of Bacchus in the Forum..., when his public life now commenced."

Naturally, all the just-mentioned pagan puberty rites are indeed perversions of God's original puberty rites. Yet even perverted pagan rites, could initially pervert only God's original revelations to Adam and Eve (and further also to their descendants Cain and Abel in their youth). Genesis 2:18-25 & 4:2-17f, cf. First Corinthians 11:9-14 & 15:45. For this is surely one of those 'circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the 'light of nature' and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word which are always to be observed. First Corinthians 11:13-14." *Westminster Confession of Faith*, I:6.

Thus, in his *Gallic Wars*,¹⁶ the 58f B.C. Pagan Roman Julius Caesar observed of the catechizing Druids among the Ancient Britons and the Ancient Gauls that "a great number of youths (*adolescentium*) resort to these, for the purpose of training...in Britain (and from thence...in Gaul).... They discuss and impart many things to the youths (*juventuti*)....

"They do not permit their children to approach them publicly unless grown up (*adoleverint*) - so that they may be able to bear the duty of military service.... They consider it shameful for a son in boyish age (*puerili aetate*) to attend in the presence of his father in public."

We next look at the age of legal accountability in Early-Church History. Among the even earlier Ancient Israelites, as we have already seen, this was and still is the age of thirteen years (and one day). At thirteen, a Hebrew boy, after Catechism, becomes a mature man alias a 'son of the Covenant' and thus a Communicant Member of the Con-greg-ation. Genesis 17:25; Exodus 12:3f; 12:26f; 12:37; First Chronicles 21:5; Luke 2:41f.

As already seen above, it was quite the same in the Common Law of the Ancient British Celts and also of the Ancient Gauls in what is now France. So too, even among the Pre-Christian Anglo-Saxons (by God's common grace) - as well as among the later Christian Britons and Saxons (by God's special grace) in the Church of Christ.

The 98 A.D. Pagan Roman Historian Tacitus has discussed this. He writes¹⁷ about the ancient ancestors of the later English Anglo-Saxons: “It is not...usual for anyone to wear arms, till the State has recognized his power to use them. Then, in the presence of the Council [or the Elders-of-hundreds, *cf.* Exodus 18:12-21], one of the chiefs - or the father or some kinsman of the young man - equips him with a shield and a spear. These arms are...the first honour with which youth is invested. Up to this time, he is regarded as a member of a household; afterwards, as a member of the Commonwealth.” That is: “*Ante domus, mox republicae*.”

Ernest Young makes a similar observation in his article *The Anglo-Saxon Family Law*. There he explains¹⁸ that also in Early-Mediaeval Britain, the Saxon ‘boy...twelve years old...can no longer be chastised [by the parents alone (*cf.* Deuteronomy 21:18f)]. Henceforth, he acts for himself and is himself responsible for his acts. He must take oath to observe the laws and enroll himself in one of the organizations provided for that purpose.

“What better commentary could be found on the [above] words of Tacitus [*Ante domus, mox republicae*]? And this personal and legal independence of the son, which Tacitus tells us was in his time acquired by the gift of arms in the Assembly, is now acquired *ipso facto* by the attainment of majority. Before the completion of the...twelfth year, the boy is legally independent. He is no longer a boy, but a man - possessed of all the rights and subject to all the duties that belong to complete manhood.” Thus Ernest Young (all emphases mine - F.N. Lee).

11. Puberty in the Common Law of England’s Kings Alfred, Athelstane, and Canute

Declared the 880 A.D. Anglo-Saxon Christian King Alfred:¹⁹ “Daughters remained under their father’s power until the day she married.” Comments Ernest Young: “Still, the laws made a distinction between girls and adult women. This distinction...had a legal effect.

“The age of majority for girls was probably the same as that for boys. Girls attained their majority at the completion of the twelfth year - the ordinary majority for boys [too] during the greater part of the Saxon period. The effect of majority for women, was to free their persons from the arbitrary disposal of the father. Even girls under age, could not be married against their will.” Emphases mine - F.N. Lee. So ‘Paedocommunion’ (*sic!*) was unknown to also Alfred.

The 925 A.D. English Christian King Athelstane too insists: “One should spare no thief, taken in the act, over twelve winters” of age.²⁰ Moreover, the 1014 A.D. Anglo-Danish Christian King Canute adds: “We will that every freeman who wishes to be entitled to satisfaction...if anyone slays him after he is twelve winters old - be brought into a hundred or a tithing. Every freeman above twelve years, [must] make oath that he will neither be a thief nor cognizant of a theft” by aiding or abetting it”²¹ - *cf.* Exodus 12:3f,26,37 & 18:12-21f and Luke 2:42-47. Thus, the young teenager (on becoming a Communicant) must publically swear to uphold the Decalogue. (Emphases mine - F.N. Lee.)

That is what the Lord said, in His Holy Word. That is in turn echoed by the Hebrew *Talmud*. Significantly, thus too says Ancient Rome as well as Ancient-British and Anglo-Saxon Common Law - right down through all the centuries.

Interestingly, even the great Mediaeval Theologian Thomas Aquinas (1224-74) restricted manducation at the Eucharist not to little children (*puelli*) but only to such pueri or “children as have some use of reason [and]...are able to grasp the sanctity of this sacrament” – *quando iam pueri incipiunt aliqualem usum rationis habere, ut possint devotionem concipere huius sacramenti, tunc potest eis hoc sacramentum conferri*. Thus his *Summa Theologiae* (Part IIIa Question 80 Article 9).

12. The Classic Protestant and Reformed/Presbyterian rejection of Paedocommunion

Also the Protestant Reformation brought about no change to the above Ancient and Biblical and Talmudic and Early-Patristic and Natural-Law and Early-Celtic and Anglo-Saxon practices and Mediaeval-British ecclesiastical recognition of a young person’s coming of age at puberty. For both Luther and Calvin and those who followed them and those who still follow them, insisted on catechism before communion not prior to puberty.

Since the time of Augustine, syncretizing Rome advocated the admission of non-infantile children alias catechized pre-teenagers - and, far worse yet, mysticistic Eastern-Orthodoxy advocated the admission of speechless infants alias uncatechized sucklings - to manducation at the Eucharist. Yet both then and thereafter, even before the Protestant Reformation, there were always Proto-Protestants like the Waldensians and the Wycliffites and the Wycliffean Hussites who Biblically continued to insist that their own youths be well pre-catechized - before being admitted to their Lord’s Table.²²

At the Protestant Reformation, Luther insisted that catechetical instruction be based (as in earlier centuries) on confessable knowledge of the Decalogue, the Apostles’ Creed, and the Lord’s Prayer. He said that “every person, when he reaches his tenth year, needs to be acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, within which the true heart and marrow of life is enclosed.”²³

Luther himself composed several *Catechisms*. To him, after the Catechumen had learned the material, the latter had to pass his ‘Examination of Faith’ - before being allowed to manducate at the Lord’s Supper only after Confirmation around age fourteen.²⁴

Also Zwingli not only rejected both ‘Child Communion’ and the Romish ‘Sacrament’ of ‘Chrism’ *etc.* He also appreciated teenage Confirmation (*viz.* of infantly-baptized children) only after personal ‘Profession of Faith.’²⁵ Similarly, the great Polish Reformer John Lasco determined in his *Church Order* -- for the Dutch Refugee Congregation in London -- that covenant children should confess their faith at puberty (around fourteen years of age), and manducate at the following Lord’s Supper.²⁶ This was followed also in the Dutch Reformed Churches on the European Continent.

13. John Calvin's intensely-catechetical Antipaedocommunionism

Calvin is copiously antipaedocommunionistic. Already at our outset, we showed how the genius of Geneva in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* rejected the demands of Servetus and his Anabaptists that the Reformers should institute Paedocommunion.

Likewise, modern Calvinists should equally reject the same demands of modern Paedocommunionists - as the maverick stepchildren of those Anabaptists. Some of these modern paedocommunionistic groups - such as the Mormons and the so-called 'Old Apostolic' and 'New Apostolic' sects - devolve at least in part from the Anabaptists, *via* other intermediaries.

"To keep the **Passover** aright at this day," explained Calvin, "we must make confession of our faith.... Let us use the Sacrament of the **Lord's Supper**, so that we may ask one another what is **meant** by it!...

"In the twelfth [chapter] of Exodus [12:26], our Lord shows us full well that we must **profit in His School**, in order to be partakers of the Paschal Lamb.... We must inquire diligently to **know** the benefits which our Lord Jesus Christ has brought us.... Truly, the use of the Lord's Supper ought to put us in mind that our coming there ought **not to be without instruction**.... It be **not lawful to admit** young **children** to the Lord's Supper **until** they **know** what is **meant** by that Sacrament and **why** it was ordained."²⁷

Further: "Moses indicates the age when they are capable of being taught.... The Paschal Lamb corresponds with the Holy Supper. We may gather from hence that **none can duly be admitted to receive it, but those who are capable of being taught**.... None but the matriculated (*emmatriculez*) were admitted.... Only the faithful should be received - **after** they have **professed** themselves to be followers of Christ.... God includes under the terms 'males' - only those comprised in the census"²⁸ during Old Testament times.

So too as regards the Eucharist, concludes Calvin. Already at the outset of this work, we gave a long excerpt against Paedocommunion from Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* against the one he calls a 'monstrous miscreant' - Michael Servetus (and his Anabaptists). Here below we give a very brief summary of that excerpt, to refresh our memories: "The Supper is intended for those of **riper years** who, **having passed** the tender **period of infancy**, are fit to bear solid food.... He does not admit all to partake of the Supper, but **confines** it to those who are fit to **discern** the body and **blood** of the Lord.... **Examination, therefore, must precede; and this it were vain to expect from infants**....

"'He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.' If they cannot partake worthily without being able duly to discern the sanctity of the Lord's body - why should we stretch out **poison** to our young children, instead of vivifying food?... The **Passover, for which the Supper is substituted, did not** admit all kinds

of guests promiscuously, but was **duly eaten only** by those who were of an **age** sufficient to **ask** the **meaning** of it [Exodus 12:26]."²⁹

Further: "As far as **young children** are concerned, **Christ's ordinance forbids them to participate in the Lord's Supper.**" Why? "Because they cannot yet [test or] try themselves, or celebrate the **remembrance** of the death of Christ."³⁰

Again: "The children of believers were baptized as infants.... Then, **after** their infancy was over and they had been instructed in the Faith, they offered themselves for a **Catechuminate**.... Another sign was then added - in the '**laying on of hands**' [at Confirmation].... The origin of this rite came from the **Apostles**...to **confirm** the '**Profession of Faith**' which **adolescents** make when they **pass from their childhood**.... **We must retain the institution in its purity.**"³¹

Consequently, declares Dr. Calvin: "I do not condemn the use of the laying on of hands by 'the men of old' - to **confirm adults** in the 'Profession of Faith.'"³² (All of the emphases above, are mine - F.N. Lee.)

Coming now to the rise of novel Paedocommunionism in **Post-Patristic Mediaeval Church History** **prior** to the **Protestant Reformation and Restoration of Primitive Christianity**, Dr. Calvin explains:³³ "Those who have read [the 750 A.D. 'Eastern-Orthodox' Theologian John of Damascus alias] **Damascenus**, if they have one ounce of sound judgment, will not defer much to his authority! Who knows **not** that ancient [*viz.* **Post-Patristic** 'Eastern-Orthodox'] Christians were wont to give the Eucharist to infants?.... They no doubt thought that the practice was founded on 'Apostolic Tradition'.... But that the practice was perverse and alien to the institution of Christ, is testified by Paul.... In short, a **posterior** age [namely that of the Western Church in the **Post-Damascene Late-Middle Ages** and especially in the time of the **Protestant Reformation**] not without good reason corrected it."

Continues Calvin:³⁴ "In the [**Post-Apostolic A.D. 251**] Early Church, indeed, the Lord's Supper was frequently given to infants [or small children] - as appears from Cyprian and Augustine.... But the practice justly became obsolete.... It was, [**more**] **anciently, customary** for the children of Christians, after they had grown up, to appear before the Overseer - to fulfil that duty which was required of such **adults** as present themselves for Baptism.... [Such infantly-baptized covenant children were] 'toward the **end of their boyhood** or **on adolescence** brought forward by their parents and were **examined** by the Overseers in terms of the *Catechism*....

"I wish we could retain the custom which, as I have observed, existed in the [Apostolic and Post-Apostolic yet Pre-Cyprianic if not also Ante-Nicene] Early Church.... A boy of **ten years of age** would present himself to the Church [at the **beginning of his three-years-long catechetical period**, in order **later**] to make a 'Profession of Faith'.... [He would **then**] be questioned on each head - and give answers to each [Luke 2:40-47 *cf.* Proverbs 22:6]."

In 1540, to his close colleague Farel, Calvin wrote:³⁵ "On Easter-day, when I gave out the intimation that we were to celebrate the Supper on next Lord's day, I announced at the same time

that no one would be admitted to the Table of the Lord by me, who had not beforehand presented himself for examination." Cf. Acts 20:6-11 and First Corinthians 5:6-8 & 11:20-32.

In his 1541 *Catechism*, Calvin added:³⁶ "It has ever[!] been the practice of the Church...to see that **children** should duly be **instructed** in the Christian Religion.... It was a received public custom and practice to **question children** in the **churches**.... To secure this being done in order, there was written out a Formula which was called a *Catechism*. In this way, the administration...of the Supper...is confined.... The Minister ought to take heed not to give it to anyone who is clearly unworthy of receiving it."

In his *Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances*, Calvin enjoined:³⁷ "The Supper was instituted by our Lord.... It would be administered four times a year.... On the Sunday before its celebration, an announcement shall be made that **no child** is to come to it, **before** having made '**Profession of Faith**' in accordance with what is taught in the *Catechism*.... When a child has been sufficiently instructed to pass on from the *Catechism* - he shall solemnly recite the sum of what is contained in it, and he shall do this as a **profession** of his Christianity in presence of the Church. Before this has been done, no child is to be admitted as a Communicant to the Supper....

"Parents are cautioned not to bring them before this time. For it is very perilous both for the children and for their fathers to present them without good and sufficient instruction.... Those who contravene this order, shall be called before the Company of Elders." Indeed: "No one shall be admitted to the Supper, unless he has first made 'Confession of his Faith'; that is to say, has declared before the Minister that he wishes to live according to the reformation of the Gospel - and **knows** the [Apostles'] *Creed*, the *Lord's Prayer*, and the *Commandments of God*."³⁸ Cf. Exodus 12:21-26 & 12:43-48.

Too, in his *Tracts and Treatises*, Rev. Dr. John Calvin stated:³⁹ "**The young do not come forward to the Sacred Table till** they have **given an account of their faith**.... It is most false to say that we knowingly and willingly offer the Supper indiscriminately to strangers and persons not approved.... [The Anti-Calvinist] Westphal is wrong, too, in inferring that...we admit to the Supper without previous examination!"

Calvin wrote his *Catechism(s)* for his fellow-countrymen - in French. His *First Catechism*, intended for adults, was taken from his *Institutes* of 1536, and appeared in 1537. Before 1630, it had gone through some 77 editions and been translated into almost every European language.

His *Second Catechism*, intended for children, appeared in 1541 - and also went through multiple translations. It was divided into lessons for every Sunday afternoon of the year. Here, Calvin determined the way in which covenant children were to be admitted to Holy Communion. Apparently, they were to be enrolled as Catechumens when ten, and to graduate to the Lord's Table at the threshold of their teens - **after** being 'confirmed' by the '**laying on of hands**' (thus Bucer).⁴⁰ See too Proverbs 22:6; Song 8:8; Luke 2:41f.

14. Romanism's condemnation of Protestantism's strict catechizings at "adolescence"

Now the Contra-Reformation's 1545 *f* Romish 'Council of Trent' - in spite of its many errors regarding what Rome there claims is true Christianity - rightly states the Protestant position on catechizing. It states all of the first Protestants indeed said that their non-sacramental "Confirmation...was nothing else than a kind of catechizing - by which those on the eve of adolescence explained the reason of their faith, in the presence of the Church."

Rome herself, however, strongly disagreed. For, at her Council of Trent - the Papal Church anathematized "whosoever shall say that infants..., when they grow up, are to be interrogated [as to] whether they are willing to ratify what their godfathers promised in their name when they were baptized" during infancy. Rome's own presumed *ex opere operato* 'Confirmation' - itself falsely deemed to be a mechanically-effective Sacrament - was and is divorced from any need first to complete any possible catechizings prior thereto.

Now Rome rightly restricted manducation at the Eucharist only to those reaching years of reason (which Rome usually put at age seven). Yet she wrongly cursed the Biblical practice of the Protestant Reformation in first catechizing children strictly - at the threshold of their puberty or "on the eve of adolescence" - before admitting them to the Lord's Supper (or, in Rome's case, to her own so-called "Mass").

Furthermore, all of the Church's recalcitrant adolescents, maintains Protestantism - whenever they might answer to any ecclesiastical enquiry that they are not willing [to become Communicant Members of the Church] - should be reprimanded and, if necessary, censured. They should not be forced to a Christian life, by some or other threat of temporal punishment - although, of course, "they are to be kept back from receiving the Eucharist until they repent."⁴¹

15. Western-European and Central-European Calvinistic Catechisms (1561*f*)

The 1561 *Belgic Confession* of the Calvinistic Dutch Reformed Churches presupposes that the Lord's Supper is for adults only. For it declares that "no one ought to come to this table without having previously rightly examined himself; lest by eating of this bread and drinking of this cup he eat and drink judgment to himself."⁴²

This is even clearer from Ursinus's and Olevianus's 1562 *Heidelberg Catechism* of the Calvinistic German Reformed Churches, which they were confident that also the Lutherans would endorse. It asks: "Who are to come unto the Table of the Lord?" And then it answers that "the impenitent and hypocrites eat and drink judgment to themselves."

It also asks further: "Are they then also to be admitted to this Supper, who show themselves to be by their confession and life unbelieving and ungodly?" This it answers: "No!"

That is so, because ‘by this the covenant of God is profaned and His wrath provoked against the whole Congregation [First Corinthians 10:20-22 cf. 11:27-29]. Therefore the Christian Church is bound, according to the ordinance of Christ and His Apostles, by the office of the keys, to exclude such persons - until they amend their lives.’⁴³

Wrote Ursinus himself in his *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism* (which he himself co-authored): ‘The infant children of the Church are...not admitted to the use of the Lord’s Supper.’ For only ‘they are to be admitted...who are of a proper age to examine themselves.’⁴⁴

At Armentiers, the 1563 *French Reformed Church* insisted on the making of **Profession of Faith** before first communing. Similarly, the 1566 *Swiss Confession* states: ‘It is the duty of the Ministers...to **catechize the unlearned**.’ For ‘he who comes to this sacred Table of the Lord without faith..., does not receive the substance.... Such men unworthily eat of the Lord’s Table.

‘Whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord - and eats and drinks judgment upon himself [First Corinthians 11:26-29].... We are admonished in the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, to be mindful of Whose body we have become Members - and that therefore we may be of one mind with all the brethren [to] live a holy life and not pollute ourselves.... It is therefore fitting that when we would come to the Supper, we first examine ourselves.’⁴⁵

16. The undiluted British and American Calvinistic Standards (1560-1643f)

Already from the time of Luther and Zwingli and Calvin onward, then, ‘Catechism Before Communion’ (but not until adolescence) became a characteristic hallmark of Protestantism. Indeed, that had been so, previously: among the Old Testament Israelites; among the New Testament Christians; and in the Early-Patristic Church. Indirectly, this influenced even Romanism (by way of her ‘Counter-Reformation’) - thus deepening the wedge between the anti-paedocommunionistic Western Church in the Occident, and the sadly pro-paedocommunionistic ‘Eastern-Orthodox’ establishment in the Orient (at least from the fifth century onward).

It was Calvin’s pupil the great John Knox who opposed Anabaptism and thereby assured the Protestant establishment of Antipaedocommunionism in Britain. In May 1560, the ‘Six Johns’ (John Knox and five other Johns) completed their classic *First Book of Discipline*.

This insists⁴⁶ that ‘the Sunday must straitly be kept both before and after noon in all towns. Before noon, must the Word be preached and Sacrament ministered.... After noon, must the young children be publically examined in their catechism in the audience of the people.’ In so doing, ‘the Minister must take great diligence as well to cause the people [to] **understand** the questions proponed, as [the] answers and the doctrine that may be collected thereof.’ Too, ‘the order’ must be kept in teaching the catechism - ‘and how much is appointed for every Sunday....

“**Four** times in the **year** we think **sufficient** to the administration of the **Lord’s Table**... All Ministers must be admonished to be more **careful to instruct** the **ignorant**...and to use **sharp examination** [also by way of catechization] rather than indulgence **in admitting** to these great ‘Mysteries’ such as be **ignorant**....

“The administration of the Table ought never to be without examination passing before[hand] - and especially of them whose knowledge is suspect.... **None** are to be **admitted** to this ‘Mystery’ **who cannot formally say** the *Lord’s Prayer*, the Articles of the Belief [alias the *Apostles’ Creed*], nor **declare** the Sum of the Law [alias the Ten Commandments] -- **and understandeth not** the use and virtue of **this Holy Sacrament**....

“Every master of household must be commanded either to instruct or cause to be instructed his children, servants and family in the principles of the Christian Religion - without the knowledge whereof ought none to be admitted to the Table of the Lord Jesus. For such as be dull and so ignorant that they can neither try themselves nor yet know the dignity and mystery of that action - cannot eat and drink of that Table worthily.... If they understand not; nor can rehearse the **Commandments of God’s Law**; know not how to pray; neither wherein their righteousness stands or consists - they ought not to be admitted to the Lord’s Table.”

In August 1560, the above-mentioned “Six Johns” released their *Scots Confession*. There, it is clearly stated:⁴⁷ “If the recipient does not understand what is being done, the Sacrament is not being rightly used. Similarly, if the Teacher teaches false doctrine, which is hateful to God - even though the Sacraments are His Own ordinance, they are not rightly used....

“We hold that the Supper of the Lord is only for those who are of the household of faith and can try and examine themselves -- both in their faith, and their duty to their neighbours. Those who eat and drink at that Holy Table without faith, or without peace and goodwill to their brethren - eat unworthily. This is the reason why Ministers in our Kirk make **public** and **individual examination** of those who are **admitted** to the **Table** of the Lord Jesus.”

Also the *Westminster Standards* of British and American Calvinism insist:⁴⁸ “Wicked men...are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation.... All **ignorant** and ungodly persons...are **unfit** to enjoy **communion**...and **cannot without great sin** against Christ...**partake** of these **holy mysteries** or be **admitted** thereunto. First Corinthians 5:6f,13; Second Thessalonians 3:6,14f; Matthew 7:6.”

Moreover: “They that receive the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper are, before they come, to **prepare** themselves thereunto by **examining** themselves of their being in Christ; of...the truth and **measure** of their **knowledge**, faith, repentance, love to God and the brethren, charity to all men, forgiving those that have done them wrong; of their desires after Christ and of their new obedience; and by renewing the exercise of their graces by **serious meditation** and fervent prayer.”⁴⁹

‘Such as are found to be ignorant..., notwithstanding their profession of the faith and desire to come to the Lord’s Supper - may and **ought to be kept from that Sacrament** by the power which Christ hath left in His Church, until they receive instruction...”⁵⁰

‘Baptism is to be administered but once..., to be a...seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants.... **The Lord’s Supper** is to be administered often, in the elements of bread and wine, to represent and exhibit Christ as spiritual nourishment to the soul, and to confirm our continuance and growth in Him, and that **only** to such as are of years and **ability to examine themselves.**”⁵¹

This agrees with the view of the Presbyterian Church of Australia. For we read in her 1965 *Order for the Confirmation of Baptized Persons and for their Admission to the Lord’s Supper* : ‘Dearly beloved, we are about to admit to Confirmation of their Baptism and to participation in the Lord’s Supper these persons...[who] have **already been under special instruction in the teaching of the Church.** The Session is satisfied as to their Christian faith and character and has resolved to receive them, and they are ready to profess publicly the faith into which they were baptized.”⁵²

17. Ongoing paedocommunionistic aftermath of ungodly French Revolution of 1789

Yet Humanism’s French Revolution of 1789 - itself the grand-daughter of Anabaptistic egalitarianism also between adults and children - had a dramatic and ever-increasing impact on World History. So too did Socialism as its daughter, and Communism as its grand-daughter.

Indeed, these three modern Anabaptistic heresies - Humanism, Socialism, and Communism - all sowed the seeds which would later undermine even Christian-Western civilization itself. As a result - under the increasing pressure of the *zeitgeist* of a radical democratization and socialisticization also in **ecclesiastical** affairs during and after World War II, the face even of the Church began to change. For it now began to be argued with an ever-increasing crescendo and vehemence - that **all discrimination, even between children and adults, is intolerable.**

Even the nineteenth-century’s ‘High-Church’ Oxford Movement within the Anglican Church (everywhere), itself, all too clearly heralded a progressive **abandonment** of formerly-strict anti-transubstantiationistic and **protestant catechization** of young Episcopalians. Consequently, their Eucharistic practices more and more began to resemble those of Romanism.

Interestingly, even Rome herself - in doctrinal decline and in stark contradistinction to the historic Protestant practice - in 1910 issued the semi-paedocommunionizing statement: ‘The age of discretion first for confession, then holy communion, is...about seven years.’ *Aetas discretionis tum ad confessionem tum ad sanctam communionem...est circa septimum annum* (etc.). Thus the authoritative Denzinger’s *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (17th edition, Friburg, 1928, p. 588 no. 2137).

Too, in the U.S.A., where more than 90% of the World's Baptists reside - and especially in the South where Baptists far outnumber all other denominations put together - the majority-party Baptists' practice of admitting their own children both to Baptism and to the Table simultaneously, when about eight or nine years old - began to rub off, there, also onto the minority-party Presbyterians. This inexorably pressured loose-subscriptionistic American Presbyterians progressively to follow the by-then ecclesiastically-dominant Baptists, and to lower their own Historic-Presbyterian admission-threshold to the Table - from adolescence or puberty to the baptistic earlier age.

Why? Probably, we ourselves think, for fear of losing their own Eucharist-demanding loose-subscriptionist 'Presbyterian' families - to the younger-age-threshold Baptists!

Under pressure from the apostately-ecumenical 1948f World[ly] Council of Churches on the one hand, and the concomitant spread of Eastern-Orthodoxy's paedocommunionistic theology even among **maverick 'Calvinists'** there on the other hand - the sentimental notion of eucharizing also children finally began to spread even among nominal Protestants. Indeed, from the establishment of the WCC in 1948 onward - the various wayward Ecumenical Movements have disseminated a whole spate of pro-paedocommun(ion)istic propaganda.⁵³ Especially the constant pressure on the World[ly] Council of Churches, coming strongly from the aggressively pro-paedocommunionistic 'Eastern-Orthodox' Churches which joined it - has propelled also the WCC to propagandize it.

Other pressure has come from its large contingent of modernist denominations, with their commitment to admit both women and children as such to every possible and impossible ecclesiastical office and sacrament. Thus, e.g., the 'United '**Presbyterian**' Church' (UPUSA) - which in 1970 allowed the practice of Paedocommunion at the discretion of the local congregation.

Consequently, we ourselves regard the year 1948 in which the World[ly] Council of Churches was established - as the great historic turning-point in the Biblical opposition to Paedocommunion till then coming from the ranks of the nominal 'Protestant' Churches. After that, it took just one generation (forty years) for this to filter through to lightweight 'Evanjellyfish' and to the merely 'moderately Reformed.'" Thus, as we shall see below, by 1988f - even many (but not all) thitherto solidly **Presbyterian** and/or Reformed denominations began to get invaded and progressively more infected with this Anti-Protestant Paedocommunion virus.

Even among some of the **Reformed**, the rot set in. Thus, in 1965 G. Visee wrote eight articles on this matter.⁵⁴ So it was that the then-ecumenizing and later ecumaniacalizing *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (GKN)* alias the so-called *Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (RCN)* - already in 1976 succumbed to Paedocommunion. The reason? Because, it rationalized, 'God's Word neither commands nor forbids it' (sic).

Thus too, similarly, did the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)* - alias the so-called 'Evangelical Church in Germany' (*ECG*), in 1980. Even though it had been pointed out already

in December 1976 that “suckling communion can be defended only on the basis of a magical conception of the Lord’s Supper.”

The battle to maintain the Reformation against the Revolution in our own wayward generation, had now been joined. One of the first pro-reformation denominations to sound the alarm, was the *Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS)*.

In 1977, its broadest or highest court adopted the following statement: “Candidates for the Ministry of the *Reformed Church in the United States* who hold the position of infant or young child communion, are not to be received as licentiates in our Church - since licensure requires subscription to the *Heidelberg Catechism*” (including Questions and Answers 80 to 85). And some years later, their congregation in Arvada (Colorado) was disfellowshipped by their South Central Classis or Presbytery - for defiantly practising Paedocommunion.

18. Professor Dr. Kamphuis: Child Communion the end of all Church Discipline

In 1982, Rev. Professor Dr. B. Kamphuis of the Non-Synodical *Free Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (FRCN)* - the *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland Vrijgemaakt (GKNV)* - published three short articles against Paedocommunionism. Their 1983 English translation’s title is: *Infant Baptism and Infant Communion*. In the original Dutch articles (*Kinderdoop en Kindercommunie*), Kamphuis wrote:

“Today, it is becoming fashionable to oppose Infant Baptism and to advocate Infant Communion.... The discussion was ignited especially by the actions of Karl Barth.... [But] after the data supplied by Roger T. Beckwith in *The Westminster Theological Journal* [1976], the much-aired claim that ‘the Ancient Church knew of Infant Communion’ is in general [demonstrably] incorrect....

“Until only 20 years ago, there was no mention of Infant Communion in the Protestant Churches.” The great change started with the growth of the World Council of Churches especially from 1962 onward.

“It is true that in Geneva and elsewhere [at the time of the Reformation], young folk made their professions of faith and therefore also partook of their first communion at a considerably earlier age than in our time [at age 18 to 21 in Orthodox Reformed Churches in the Netherlands] - probably around age 15. [See M.B. van ’t Veer’s 1942 work *Catechese en Catechetische Stof bij Calvijn (Catechism and Catechetical Material in Calvin)*].... [Yet] from the 1960s, Infant Communion has more and more been defended and practised.

“In 1971, the ‘Faith and Order’ Commission of the World Council of Churches **advocated** it (*Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist*, in *Faith and Order*, Louvain, 1971). In 1974, the Synod of the *Hervormde Kerk* [in the Netherlands (alias the *HKN*)] circulated the report *De Deelneming aan het Avondmaal [Participation in the Lord’s Supper]* which pleaded for Infant Communion....

And since 1978, a Majority Report advocating it led to experiments with it in the Synodical Churches [namely the *Gereformeerde Kerken Nederland* or the *GKN* alias the *Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (RCN)*]....

‘[Yet this is] Anabaptistic theology!... Rejecting Infant Baptism and advocating Infant Communion go together.... I am convinced they are internally connected....

‘In the Passover, God required an answer from His people. Eating of the Passover alone was such an answer. He who ate, was not passive [like an infant or a toddler].

‘It is also the same with the Lord’s Supper.... It is in this light that you should see also the prescription in Exodus 12:26-27, concerning home-catechizing at the Passover. It had a place there, because the manducators had to know what they had to give an answer to. You should see the prescription concerning the purity required at the Passover in Numbers 9:6-12, in that light.

‘That was the Old-Testamentical way of professing that you wished to live from the forgiveness of your sins and the renewal of your life.... The prescription at Deuteronomy 16:16 regarding the Passover, stands in the same light. All [adults] of the male sex were to appear before the face of the Lord.... A journey to Jerusalem was required. Thereby toddlers were automatically excluded.... The pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a profession of faith....

‘What applied to the Passover, applies even more to the Lord’s Supper. Nay more - for God’s promises unfold even more richly in the New Testament.... Hebrews 10:28-29; 12:18-23.... The use of ceremonies has been abolished. But the content thereof, remains (*Belgic Confession* art. 25)....

‘Christ celebrated...the Passover...not in a family context...but in the circle of His Disciples.... Christ instituted the Lord’s Supper for the circle of those who had professed His Name: ‘You are the Christ, the Son of the living God’ (Matthew 16:16).”

The same Christ, according to Paul, said: “Do this in remembrance of Me!’ (First Corinthians 11:24-25).... I would again refer to art. 35 of the *Belgic Confession*, which states *inter alia* that at the Lord’s Supper we are making a profession of our faith and of the Christian Religion....

‘First Corinthians 11:27-29 ought to be understood from verse 26: ‘For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim [*katangellete*] the Lord’s death till He comes’.... The acme of the remembrance of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, thus rests upon accentuating the confessing character of the commemoration. From this, Paul draws the conclusion that one sins - if one celebrates the Lord’s Supper unworthily....

‘What is that, but sinning against the Third Commandment? Then, one takes the Name of the Lord in vain! One does not discern the body of the Lord.... It is no small matter to proclaim Christ’s death.... For the Lord will not hold him guiltless, who takes His Name in vain....

Advocates of child communion have a strong tendency to forget the remembrance of the instituting of the Lord's Supper in general [verse 23] and of verse 26 in particular."

Paedocommunionists argue that verse 27 refers not to an inability to discern in the right way the presence of the body of the Lord Jesus in terms of the sacramental elements, but to an inability to discern that the congregation is the Lord's body. However, that cannot be. For verse 27 does not refer to undiscerning manducators incurring guilt against the congregation of the Lord's body, but of their becoming "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And the word "blood" cannot apply to the congregation, but only to the shed blood of Christ Himself!

"A further remark on 'the body' in verse 29" is important, continues Kamphuis. "There, in pleas for child communion, they like to apply it to the body of the church.... But against this, I would in the first place remark that...the reading '*to sooma tou Kuriou*' has the strongest textual evidence [*Koinee* and *Textus Receptus* and *D* and *G* etc.].

"In the second place, the expression 'the body of the Lord' in the immediate context is used only in connection with the body of the Lord Jesus sacrificed on the cross. In the third place, although the church is indeed called 'the body of Christ' in First Corinthians - it is never called 'the body of the Lord'.... In First Corinthians 11:27-29, Paul gives rules [not just for adults as Paedocommunionists assert but] for everyone who manducates at the Lord's Supper....

"From this it follows that whoever manducates at the Lord's Supper, must be able to profess his faith. For the Lord's Supper itself is a profession of faith.

"Now if one celebrates the Lord's Supper while unable to profess one's faith, one desecrates the Name of the Lord.... What is then more Biblical, in professing one's faith in public - than a binding admission to the Lord's Supper?...

"Because this is so, child-communion touches the very character of the Lord's Supper.... For many children cannot make a profession of faith, with all the responsibility which it entails.... They need to be brought to that point, especially by catechization.... If the proclamation of the death of the Lord unto atonement of our sins disappears - the essence of the Lord's Supper disappears....

"Child-communion also means another type of church.... It means a consumptive church. You can [then] come and consume bread and wine - without taking any responsibility upon yourself. Children too can do that. The only condition, is that you [then] chew bread and swallow wine...without understanding it. No profession of the Name of Jesus is then required of you.... Thus the Church loses her character as a congregation which professes the Name of Jesus....

"Thus, child-communion makes discipline impossible. For discipline speaks precisely about the responsibility of those disciplined - a responsibility which they take upon themselves by their profession of faith.... Child communion and open communion go hand in hand together....

With child communion, one irrepealably arrives at a church without discipline....

“We should be careful, in our time, of pressing for a lowering of the age-threshold.... The children of the congregation should be involved in the celebration of the Lords Supper...even though manducation at the Lord’s Supper is excluded for those who have not yet professed their faith. [Yet] the joy of the Lord’s Supper is for the whole congregation, both old and young.”

Sadly, even the Reformed Ecumenical Council began to weaken in 1984 - regarding both the Eucharist and many other matters. Indeed, in 1992 her various Member Churches were urged to give attention to the matter of Paedocommunion. Consequently, by 1996, in several Member Denominations (especially in Western lands) - children were being admitted to the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist. Truly, the Reformation was (and is) currently in decline.

Sensing a coming storm, this writer (Dr. Lee) published his short antipaedocommunionistic article *Communion for Children?* It appeared in the June 1985 issue of *The Counsel of Chalcedon* magazine - official organ of the *Reformed Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (RPCUS)*.

The article was assailed, in the magazine’s following issue, by Westminster Theological Seminary’s Paedocommunionist Peter J. Leithart -- in his *Letter Taking Issue with Dr. Francis Nigel Lee on the Subject of Paedocommunion*. For details, see Addendum E in this 2003 edition of Dr. Lee’s *Catechism Before Communion!*

19. Antipaedocommunionism of *Banner of Truth* and Rev. Iain H. Murray (1985f)

Rev. Iain H. Murray (then of Sydney) - formerly of the Free Church in Scotland, but now a Minister in the Presbyterian Church of Australia - was the eminent editor of the *Banner of Truth Magazine* and the Banner of Truth Trust’s series of Christian publications. He contacted this author in August, 1985 - about this whole matter of Paedocommunion.

Wrote Iain H. Murray:⁵⁵ “The debate on Child-Communion is World-wide. What you [Dr. Francis Nigel Lee] have written, needs to be published in the United States. I am afraid that this development is but the consequence of low views of experimental religion which have prevailed for many years. It is inconceivable how people who would have a sound view of the necessity of a clear conversion..., could fall into such an error. It is certainly another reminder - of the need of true awakening. I am glad that you have been able to write something, and do hope that you can get it into general circulation.”

A year later, in 1986, Iain Murray wrote to this author again about this matter of Child Communion. Claimed Murray: “I am sure that it is a most serious mistake. In addition to all the evidence which you produce - the testimony of subsequent Church History has surely demonstrated what happens when numbers are brought into Communicant Membership without any evidence of a saving knowledge of Christ.”⁵⁶

Rev. Iain Murray two years later contacted this author yet again about this problem. In 1988, he wrote: ‘I am more than ‘up to my eyes’ in controversial issues, and am happy to leave this one to you. I’m very glad you see it as you do. The admission of children - all church children - to the Lord’s Table, is the death of experimental religion.’⁵⁷

Then finally, in 1995, Rev. Iain Murray again wrote:⁵⁸ ‘Dear Nigel, Many thanks for your letter.... Thank you for the further information which you sent me...[on] the differences between you and [James B.] Jordan [re Paedocommunionism].... Unbelievers cannot partake of the Lord’s Supper without incurring very serious spiritual danger. If a person cannot see that from the New Testament, I don’t know how we could teach them anything.... We draw attention to your material in the Aug./Sept. issue [of the *Banner of Truth*].’

20. The antipaedocommunionistic Rev. Dr. K. Deddens (1986)

Already back in 1986, Dr. A.N. Hendriks - employing an interrogative title - wrote his very important book *Kinderen aan de tafel van Christus? (Children at Christ’s Table?)*. Also in 1986, Dr. K. Deddens circulated his own study *Children and the Lord’s Supper*. There, he accurately but alarmingly wrote:⁵⁹

‘In the USA, several ‘denominations’ decided to allow the children of the Church to partake of the Lord’s Supper.... On the mission fields also, it was the experience of Reformed missionaries that in the circles of more than one ‘denomination’ the so-called ‘Paedocommunion’ had been accepted. Therefore, it was among the topics discussed at the Fifth Conference of Reformed Mission Workers in Latin America in April 1985.... It is also worth noting that the practice of ‘Paedocommunion’ is promoted in the liberal World Council of Churches....

‘Children may not partake of the Lord’s Supper. But according to the promise of their parents at the baptismal font - they have to be instructed in the doctrine of the Church and they have to make profession of faith in order to be able to proclaim Christ’s death, to examine themselves, and to discern the body....

‘This profession of faith is actually a delayed response to their [infant] baptism, and it must be given...when a child has grown up and when he or she is able to make important decisions in life.... If a child of the covenant is instructed for several years, and he or she wants to make profession of faith at the age of let us say sixteen or seventeen - there is nothing against it. But it is wrong to postpone profession of faith one year after another [indefinitely]....

‘Let us stress to our children that it is a great privilege to be born as a child of God’s covenant, to be baptized, and also to be instructed in the doctrine of the Church in order to be and to remain a living Member of Christ’s Church! So that as part of His Congregation they [are to] seek to pass through the door of the public profession of their faith - in order to [become admitted to] proclaim Christ’s death and resurrection at His Table.’

21. Antipaedocommunionistic stance of Presbyterian Church of Australia (1986f)

As far as the Presbyterian Church of Australia (the author's own denomination) is concerned, as said above, its adherence to its traditional Calvinistic-Presbyterian *Book of Common Order*⁶⁰ has served to protect it. Indeed, specifically the latter's (1956-1965f) *Order for the Confirmation of Baptized Persons and for their Admission to the Lord's Supper*⁶¹ has proven thus far to be a very effective inoculation against the virus of Paedocommunionism.

It is true that Rev. Paul Cooper of the Presbyterian Theological Center in N.S.W. in 1986 wrote⁶² an article asking for a consideration of Paedocommunion, in *Australian Presbyterian Living Today*. However, after an immediate rebuttal by Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Nigel Lee of the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College in his short reply thereto titled *Catechism Before Communion!* (in *A.P.L.T.*), there has thus far been no counter-response.⁶³

The advocacy of Paedocommunionism also emerged, to no effect, once or twice in the Presbyterian Church of Victoria. It was nipped in the bud within the Presbytery of Tasmania - and also within the Mowbray Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland. To our knowledge, it has not raised its head elsewhere - though if it has, that would not be a surprise.

In 1996, that latter Presbytery's *ad hoc* Committee on Paedocommunion, consisting of Rev. C.E.A. Green & Rev. S.G. Teale and Elders N.L.G. Taylor & R.S. Forbes, reported back to their Presbytery in their Committee Paper: 'Paedocommunion assumes that the infants and young children of believing parents have a right to be at the Lord's Table irrespective of age and understanding.' However, the 'Committee understood that this was inconsistent with the teaching in WCF XXIX:viii [= the *Westminster Confession* 29:8]....

'Committee recognised that participation at the Lord's Table is an active not a passive reception of the Elements. It identified that participation at the Table requires a mature and active remembrance of what Christ has done; self-examination; and a rational grasp of the symbolic connection between the Elements of bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ.... The Committee felt that should the Presbyterian Church deem to set a recommended age...twelve to thirteen years of age seemed to be reasonable....

'Calvin has expressed a similar sentiment: 'When a child has been well enough instructed to pass the *Catechism*, he is to recite solemnly the sum of what it contains and also to make profession of his Christianity in the presence of the Church. Before this is done, no child is to be admitted to receive the Supper; and parents are to be informed not to bring them before this time. For it is a very perilous thing, for children as for parents, to introduce them without good and adequate instruction. For which purpose, this order is to be used.' [Dr. John Calvin's] *Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances*, 1541....

'The Committee examined chapters 27 and 29 of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and felt that their content was...specific enough to exclude Paedocommunion. The Committee

observed that chapter 29:8 identifies ungodliness and ignorance as bars to Communion, and that the *Larger Catechism* [Q. & A. 177] interprets this as restricting the Lord's Supper to only 'such as are of years and ability to examine themselves'....

"There are no good reasons for the practice of Paedocommunion.... It [Paedocommunion] allows for admission to the Table of infants who are not of 'years and ability to examine themselves'.... The Committee recommends...that the Church...suggest to Sessions that persons of twelve to thirteen years of age [Luke 2:42f] would be representative of the minimal maturity to make a competent, unprompted, credible confession of faith in Christ." Committee further recommends "that Sessions be urged to provide adequate instruction to children, parents and congregations - so that they may understand the Reformed practice concerning celebration of the Lord's Supper and may partake understandingly, worthily, and in fear of God."⁶⁴

22. Paedocommunionistic developments in the C.R.C. of the U.S.A. (1986f)

Yet a major breakthrough for anabaptizing and pro-paedocommunionizing 'Protestants' in the U.S.A. occurred with the translation (from the Dutch) and publication in the U.S.A. of the 1965 "*May - and Must - Our Children Partake of the Lord's Supper?*" (by G. Visee).⁶⁵ He claimed:⁶⁶ "Christ is...Israel's Passover Lamb.... The children partook of that Passover. They were not passive observers, but ate of the meal.... Christ celebrated the Passover with His Disciples.... There simply were no children in this group, nor were there any women. Nevertheless, they did and do participate in this meal."

Here, of course, Visee fails to realize there is good reason why, 'in this group' which manducated at Christ's Last Passover which was there and then replaced by His First Lord's Supper (Luke 22) - there "simply were no children in this group, nor were there any women." Showing his eisegetical eccentricities, Visee thence incorrectly begs the question, and misconcludes: "Nevertheless, they did and do participate in this meal."

In fact, however, the real reason why there were no children nor women in this Pre-Calvary group, is simply because till then there were no children or women in any Pre-Calvary Passover group or *Minyan*. See: Exodus 12:3f,26f,37,43-49; 23:14-17; Numbers 9:5-14; Deuteronomy 16:16; Joshua 5:4-10; Second Chronicles 30:1-24 & 35:1-19; Ezekiel 44:6-31 *cf.* 45:17-21f; Ezra 6:19-22; *Jubilees* 49:16-21; *Aboth* 5:21; *Essene Manual of Discipline*; *Qumran Document*; Josephus's *Antiquities* 18:1:5; Luke 2:41f; John 6:4-13 *cf.* Matt. 14:19-21; and Luke 22:1-20.

Yet in the 1980s, a request was made by Classis Rocky Mountain of the Christian Reformed Church (in the U.S.A.) - for a Synodical Study Committee for the CRC to be set up. For that Presbytery or Classis's own "classical study committee had set forth [allegedly] compelling theological arguments...for children being included in the Lord's Supper."

As a result, the 1986 Synod of the CRC received: (1) a *Majority Report* reiterating the need of "a faith that discerns, remembers and proclaims the body of Christ while partaking"; (2) a *First*

Minority Report urging that children from age seven be encouraged to participate; and (3) a *Second Minority Report* stating “it is desirable for covenant children to begin partaking of the Lord’s Supper at whatever age they begin to be part of the worship service.”⁶⁷ That latter, of course, would be: incipiently at their conception; and sacramentally at their baptism as soon after their birth as possible (as in Eastern-Orthodoxy).

Two years later, the CRC’s 1988 Synod considered two Reports. The *Majority Report* said that “the churches are warranted in admitting the children” and that “the consistory should admit to the Lord’s Supper those covenant children who evidence both the capacity and the desire.”

Three Members making that Report, added that such should be admitted “as soon as a child is a participating member of the worshiping covenant community regardless of age or capacity.” Yet the *Minority Report* reiterated that the sole basis for manudication is an individual profession of faith that discerns, remembers and proclaims the body of Christ.

The Advisory Committee of Synod felt neither Report was convincing. So that Advisory Committee got the Synod to adopt the Advisory Committee’s own statement: “The Bible makes it clear that participation in the Lord’s Supper is a result of status in the covenant, and also entails an act of faith on the part of those participating.”⁶⁸

Synod 1988 itself decided that “the Church is warranted in admitting to the Lord’s Supper covenant children who give evidence of faith and are able to discern the body and remember and proclaim the death of Jesus.”⁶⁹ Such pliable words almost predict later capitulation.

Pushing its own agenda to try to sell Paedocommunionism to its constituent denominations, the *Reformed Ecumenical Council News Exchange* then overstatingly reported that the CRC Synod had given “qualified approval to children at the Lord’s Supper.” Indeed, the CRC’s more liberal elder sister, the RCA (alias the Reformed Church in America), at its own June 13-17 1988 Synod had “decided that baptized children may be admitted to the Lord’s Table.”

Explained the *News Exchange* re the CRC decision: “The *Majority Report* had advocated a more liberal access to the Lord’s Supper for children. The Synod’s declarations intend to leave it up to each church. This will clearly result in changes in the common practice in most CRCNA churches.”⁷⁰

Tragically, that prognostication soon proved to be prophetic. For those changes are *contra* to Calvin; *contra* to the Reformed Confessions; and *contra* to the Pan-Protestant practice of catechizing before communion prior to admission to the Lord’s Supper not before puberty.

Indeed, in 1989 the CRC’s own Worship Committee noted what it viewed as its Synod’s [1988] desire - that younger children, than previously, should participate at its Table. Even though that Worship Committee **conceded** that the 1988 Synod had insisted that the public profession of faith as the entrance requirement be maintained!⁷¹

Synod 1991 appointed a Clarifications Committee to see to “the implementation of the 1988 decision” which had “confronted the churches with numerous practical difficulties.”⁷² That Committee reported in 1993 that it was a contentious issue, and that “we cannot resolve the theological issue at this time.”⁷³

At Synod 1993, there were two Advisory Committee reports. The *Majority Report* recommended that “Synod continue its practice of admitting persons to the Lord’s Supper upon a public profession of faith according to the Reformed Creeds.” The *Minority Report* advocated child communion after profession of faith, and a later re-profession of faith at age 18 admitting one to full church privileges and responsibilities.⁷⁴

At Synod 1995, predictably, the Clarifications Committee again brought two different Reports. *Report A* argued for “an expression of personal faith as a prerequisite for participation in the Lord’s Supper.” It based that argument on: First Corinthians 11:17-34; Rev. Professor Dr. H. Bavinck’s 1911 *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* (IV:641f); the *Heidelberg Catechism* (QQ. & AA. 76 & 77); and the *Dordt Church Order* (arts. 59 & 61). Yet better, it could also have added: *Heidelberg Catechism* QQ. & AA. 80 to 85. Sadly, however, it did not.

However, even *Report A* did declare “that belief in one’s heart and confession with one’s mouth are of utmost importance, as in Romans 10:9-10. Likewise, repentance is necessary (Acts 2:38) as well as an acknowledgement of Christ before the Church (First Timothy 6:12) and the World (Matthew 10:32).”⁷⁵

Report B was and is riddled with communalistic if not socialistic attacks against what it repeatedly denounces as individualism.⁷⁶ Yet even it admits that at least in the thirteenth century “no age younger than seven seemed to fit the circumstances, and the Council of Trent (1566) pushed in the direction of twelve as the ideal.”⁷⁷

Furthermore, *Report B* wrongly alleges that “the tradition...of allowing children of all ages to participate in the Lord’s Supper” (!) “has been in the Church from the beginning.”⁷⁸ Consequently, the Report misconcludes “that baptized children should participate in the Sacrament of Communion” and that “baptized children belong at the Table”⁷⁹ (*viz.* to manducate there together with all of those previously admitted after the latter’s completed catechization).

Although unsatisfactorily, Synod 1995 then decided “that a profession of faith is a necessary prerequisite for partaking” of the Lord’s Supper. Synod then encouraged churches to welcome qualified children there, as follows: “(1) Child expresses interest; (2) Parent discusses with child and contacts church leader; (3) Church leader meets with child and parent, hears testimony, prepares the child for profession of faith, and recommends to Council [Session] that child be admitted to Lord’s Supper; and (4) Child makes profession of faith during a worship service.”⁸⁰

23. Paedocommunionistic developments in the O.P.C. of the U.S.A. (1986f)

Paedocommunion now started to invade also the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (U.S.). At its **1886** General Assembly, together with a *Majority Report* opposing Paedocommunion there was also a *Minority Report* advocating it.

At its **1987** General Assembly, a *Majority Report* - while still not (yet) advocating the practice of infant communion - refused to condemn the communicating even of weaned toddlers. That it did - in spite of the fact that two different *Minority Reports* (respectively by Rev. Dr. Coppes and Rev. Dr. Lillback) indeed **did so condemn** the same.

After those Reports were sent down to the sessions for further study - at its **1988** General Assembly there was, again, similarly a *Majority Report* and once more two *Minority Reports*. The revolutionary *Majority Report* advocated pro-paedocommunionistic changes be made to the antipaedocommunionistic *Westminster Standards*. However, the two mutually different antipaedocommunionistic *Minority Reports* - said **nay**. Again, those latter Reports were written respectively by the learned Revs. Dr. Coppes and Dr. Lillback.⁸¹

Although none of those Reports was adopted and the General Assembly did not forbid Church Officers from holding to Paedocommunionism, it refused to amend the *Westminster Standards* and it did forbid Paedocommunion to be taught publically. Disappointingly, it did not clarify at what age a child becomes eligible to become a communicant. Indeed, it is understood that some OPC churches now admit such - as early as 7 or 8 years old.⁸²

Already in 1994⁸³ (and once again in an e-mail discussion group in 2001), Arch-Paedocommunionist and (currently) O.P.C. worshipper (Rev.?) Mr. James B. Jordan suggested that a majority of the Professors at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia had embraced Paedocommunion. Yet as of June 1995, none of the Professors on the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia were known to take a paedocommunionistic position.

As Rev. Professor Dr. Richard Gaffin then wrote ⁸⁴ to Dr. Lee: ‘In my opinion, it is not an issue in the Church at this point; there are a handful who hold a Paedocommunion position but have not been able to convince the rest of the Church and are pretty silent on the matter. So far as the Westminster Faculty is concerned, as I believe Sinclair [Rev. Professor Dr. Sinclair Ferguson] communicated to you, none of us to my knowledge take a Paedocommunion position. I can’t recall it ever being an issue in our midst (none of us who are Ministers in the OPC were on the GA Study Committee, I believe). So I’m not sure where Jim Jordan got his information.’

24. Developments in Sydney Diocese of Australian Anglican Church (1987f)

The Sydney Diocese of the Anglican Church in Australia is - or rather, until quite recently, was - well-known for its conservative Calvinism. Thus one finds oneself in substantial agreement with the well-known Australian Anglican, Rev. Canon A.A. Langdon, in his 1987 book *Communion for Children? The Current Debate*.

There, Langdon wrote:⁸⁵ “In the *Book of Common Prayer* [Anglican], Holy Communion is linked with Confirmation. It reads: ‘And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed. All branches of the Church are placing a quite justifiable and much needed emphasis on relationship factors in respect of Holy Communion.’ There were very good reasons why admission to the Holy Communion was made dependent upon the baptized person receiving ‘further instruction’ in preparation for Confirmation.”

Langdon then concluded, for today too: “Experience suggests that it is much better if the child waits to reach a stage of both cognitive and spiritual development at which concepts involved in accepting Jesus as Saviour are adequately understood before making ‘a decision’ [to commune]. Our [Sydney] Diocese has a tradition of seeking to ensure that Confirmation does represent a genuine personal decision by the Candidate. If achieving that goal is a problem at thirteen, fourteen, or later - how much more so, at a younger age, in respect of admitting children to Communion?”

However, since the above 1987 days of Canon Langdon - the Australian Anglicans in general and even their hitherto conservative Sydney Diocese have moved sharply to the left on a whole range of issues (such as the ordination of women, aboriginal land claims, and especially liturgy). On 13 October 1997, even the Sydney Diocese voted (clergy by 125 to 55 and laity by 202 to 139) to allow children to be admitted to Holy Communion before they have been confirmed.

The revolutionary bill was moved by outspoken Paedocommunionist Dr. Glenn Davies (who said that whether children could “cognitively understand” was irrelevant), and seconded by Deaconess Margaret Rodgers (Chief Executive Officer of Anglican Media and an Examiner at the Anglican’s Australian College of Theology). Dr. Paul Barnett, the Bishop of North Sydney, wisely objected that the bill would mean the collapse of confirmation and that maturity was needed to distinguish between “the symbol and the thing symbolised.” Indeed, even the otherwise trendy Canon Peter Jensen (now Archbishop of Sydney), agreed - adding that childish faith was “notoriously fickle.”⁸⁶

25. The Episcopalized Ray Sutton and the 1988f former Texas Tylerites

A different kind of ‘Anglican’ altogether, is the Rev. Ray R. Sutton. He, until his later episcopalization, was Pastor of the Tyler (Texas) paedocommunionistic ‘Westminster Presbyterian Church’ (*sic*) of the miniscule ‘Association of Reformation Churches’ in America.

Sutton explained:⁸⁷ “Westminster Presbyterian Church was part of a small Presbytery of men and churches.... The local body was as large [as] if not larger than the entire denomination.... We began the process of sorting out...Liturgy, Weekly Communion, and Paedocommunion.... When we first started to use liturgy, we created an eclectic service, drawing mainly from Episcopal and

Lutheran worship practices. Westminster Presbyterian Church has decided to follow their counsel. Anglicanism allows us to continue our present practices. The Anglican Church...predates the Reformation.

“Thus, God has shown our Congregation with near unanimous consensus that the Anglican part of His Church would be the best home for us. Last Summer (1987), we decided to adopt the new name ‘Good Shepherd Episcopal Church’ - and in December of the same year, the Congregation voted to begin using this name on January 1, 1988. I have since that time been received into the American Episcopal Church, the Anglican Diocese of the Southwest..., whose Bishop is Edwin Caudill.”

Sutton and his Ex-Tylerites are quite stimulating thinkers. They have various valuable views about Holy Scripture, and interesting insights into the Eastern-‘Orthodox’ liturgical traditions. However, one thing in particular they and all other Paedocommunionists woefully fail to assess (sociologically) - is the vicious vacuum faced by today’s teenagers. Paedocommunionism exacerbates that vacuum - by depriving especially the child of the covenant of his historic ‘manhood rite’ of admission to the Lord’s Passover Supper on reaching puberty.

Rapid urbanization and the fracturing of the family have today all but abolished puberty rites in all societies - especially in the West. The further eroding of ‘Catechism Before Communion’ at adolescence, can only pave the way to enlarging the ‘generation gap’ yet further. Indeed, it even facilitates the proliferation of idiotic initiations into teenage gangs as satanic surrogates - whenever Christian ‘Confirmation’ at puberty is abolished or minimized.

26. Paedocommunionistic developments in the P.C.A. of the U.S.A. (1988f)

In 1988, the Ad-Interim Committee to Study the Question of Paedocommunion brought its Report to the 16th General Assembly of the conservative Presbyterian Church in America. Mercifully, the conservative *Majority Report* recommended no change at all to the Church’s historic anti-paedocommunionistic position.

The twice-as-long one-man *Minority Report* of Rev. R.S. Rayburn argued in favour of child communion - but largely from a very selective view of certain fallible church writers, rather than from anything like an exhaustive or even an adequate exegetical examination of the infallible Word of God. It requested that “the Assembly find the *Minority Report* to be in agreement with the Scripture.” Yet that Report was not adopted.

The Assembly itself decided that “the PCA continue the practice defined in our *Standards*, and administer the Lord’s Supper ‘only to such as are of years and ability to examine themselves.”⁸⁸ Compare: *Westminster Larger Catechism* Q. & A. 177.

In June 1988, as one formerly a Minister in the Presbyterian Church in America, this present writer submitted his Ed.D. doctoral dissertation *Catechism Before Communion! (Why Baptized*

Children Need Catechizing Before Communion Not Prior to Puberty). Soon after that, there appeared in print⁸⁹ a *Position Paper* attacking those anti-paedocommunionistic views of Rev. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee - and demanding that the Lord's Supper be given to covenant infants.

The *Position Paper* stated that its own writer, one Vance Lemasters, is "the father of four covenant children baptized into the faith" - including a "two-year-old daughter." At the end of his paper, Lemasters called himself "an informed 'Man of Israel' who has transferred his membership from a solid [Presbyterian Church in America] PCA church, to an independent Reformed Church...on account of this very issue"- viz. Paedocommunion.

Lemasters's *Position Paper* was in fact stated by him to be "a rebuttal of Francis Nigel Lee's article *Communion for Children?*" (which had appeared in the June 1985 edition of *The Counsel of Chalcedon*). Lemasters said: "I felt it necessary to deal with his article, since it was fairly recent and best represented the consensus of much thinking regarding Paedocommunion in conservative Presbyterian circles today."

The formerly-PCA Minister Dr. Lee - by then a Theology Professor in the Presbyterian Church of Australia - soon replied⁹⁰ to Vance LeMasters's article, with his own published response *The Antipaedocommunionistic Old Testament Israelites: A Response to Vance LeMasters*. Since then, Lemasters has not responded. (For that interchange, see Addendum F in this 2003 edition of F.N. Lee's *Catechism Before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*)

27. Digest of OPC's Rev. Dr. L.J. Coppes's 1988 book against Paedocommunionism

Soon after Dr. Lee's completion (on June 4th 1988) of his doctoral dissertation against Paedocommunion, an important publishing event took place. Dr. Lee learned with surprise and much delight that his good friend Rev. Dr. Leonard J. Coppes (Th.D.) - of the Thornton (Colorado) Orthodox Presbyterian Church - had just published a ground-breaking book. It bore the title: *Daddy, May I Take Communion? - Paedocommunion Versus The Bible*.⁹¹

Dr. Coppes's book concludes:⁹² "Children were not allowed to approach the altar. The age of admission was set at the age of physical ability to bear children. Prior to Christ's day, the Elders conducted a physical examination of young men to determine if they could bear children (*i.e.*, if they were able to be federal heads).

"The age was set at thirteen. Young men may have been formally inducted into Communicant Church Membership by the rite which has come to be known as *Bar Mitzbah*.... Jesus went to the Temple." There, He then "was interviewed by the Teachers (Rabbis) at age twelve (Luke 2:42-46).

"Jesus was not admitted to the altar until He was thirteen. Can we argue that any of our children are more mature in doctrine and practice than Jesus?"

Around 1700 A.D., continues Coppes, ‘Cotton Mather suggested that a credible confession consisted primarily of one’s ability to understand and express the doctrines and teachings of Scripture. Jonathan Edwards ably demonstrated [around 1730] that in the Old Testament, there was a required ‘Confession of Faith’ prior to full participation in covenantal Sacraments.

‘It was his contention that Communicant Church Membership required a prior and credible ‘Confession of Faith.’ He said that a credible ‘Confession of Faith’ consisted of two elements: first, a grasp of Biblical and theological truth...; second, a sufficient practice of the Christian Faith. For him, a credible profession consisted of both...understanding and Christian life-style.

‘Principle bars children from the Lord’s Supper. Until they are old enough to be their own federal heads and to assume the responsibilities of that federal headship, they are to be barred from the privileges of that headship. To admit children too early, is to impugn the principle of headship...whereby one cannot be a federal head until puberty.’ Thus Coppes.

Dr. Coppes’s book was favourably reviewed by my friend Rev. Dr. Edwin P. Elliott Jr. (editor of *The Christian Observer*). In 1988 Dr. Edwin Elliott there remarked: "If someone wants to argue Paedocommunion with you, ask him to read this book first!"⁹³

Also in 1988, my friend Rev. Dr. Joseph C. Morecraft III of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States (RPCUS), warmly congratulated⁹⁴ Dr. Coppes for having repudiated ‘the ‘Paedocommunion challenge’ to the Reformed Faith.’ Dr. Morecraft rightly noted that this view ‘has swept the left wing of the Presbyterian family - and threatens to appear [even] in the Historic Presbyterian Churches.’ Rightly, Morecraft further remarked on Dr. Coppes’s 284-page work: ‘This book represents the first serious response to the ‘Paedocommunion challenge.’”

28. Dr. Lee’s 1988 evaluation of Dr. Coppes’s book against Paedocommunionism

In his book, Dr. Coppes clearly shows that the Old Testament Passover was a sacrifice. He also demonstrates that in Old Testament times, only mature males ever brought sacrifices to the altars. Indeed, Coppes further indicates that women and children were barred from the ‘court of the men’ - even from Pre-Davidic days onward.⁹⁵

Dr. Coppes’s book graciously refers⁹⁶ to whom he calls "the well-known and careful scholar Francis Nigel Lee" - adding: "Dr. Lee ‘s arguments are capably set forth." Dr. Coppes then adds: "It is with greatest caution that we disagree with him" - namely with Lee’s contention that women and children did not manducate at the initial Passover of Exodus 12.

We ourselves have the highest respect for Dr. Coppes. Here, however, we think he is not totally devoid of dispensationalistically dichotomizing the initial Passover (Exodus 12:1f) from the subsequent Passovers (Numbers 9:1f & 9:14f & Joshua 5:2-10 *etc.*). For, while (we think) wrongly presuming women and children had been manducators at the first Passover (Exodus 12) -

Dr. Coppes rightly excludes them as manducators at the second and subsequent Passovers.⁹⁷

Dr. Coppes is himself an avowed Antipaedocommunionist. Yet he has here assumed with the Tyler-Texas Paedocommunionists (and with the Non-Tylerite Paedocommunionists Rev. Chris Keidel and Rev. Robert S. Rayburn of the Presbyterian Church in America) - against the outspoken Antipaedocommunionists Calvin and Lee - that uncatechized boys (and even children) indeed manducated at the initial Passover.

We ourselves, however, think otherwise. Exodus 12:3-5,26-29,37,43-48. We have already quoted Calvin (in our sections 1 & 13 above) against the notion that uncatechized children manducated at the first Passover in Exodus 12. As consistent Calvinians, we concur with Rev. Professor Dr. John Calvin (and with Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon).

Yet, in spite of important differences on peripheral matters, we ourselves certainly agree with the basic thrust of Rev. Dr. Coppes's antipaedocommunionistic thesis. We also agree with his repeated insistence that the New Testament Eucharist is not just a continuation of the Old Testament Passover, but is in fact the final fulfilment of all three of the Old Testament Feasts each celebrated annually during Pentateuchal times.

This is precisely why we ourselves reject 'Daily Communion' and 'Weekly Communion' - opting instead for 'Biblical Communion' optimally at each quarterly season. Genesis 1:14; 8:20*f*; Exodus 12:1-5 (*cf.* 19:1*f* & 24:1-18); 23:14-37; 34:18-23; Deuteronomy 16:1-16; John 10:22; Acts 14:15-18; 15:18-21; 18:21-25; 20:6-7; 20:16; First Corinthians 5:6-9; 11:20-24;16:8.

Dr. Leonard Coppes's Eucharistic-exegetical approach is pan-sacramental, hermeneutical, and confessional. Our own personal paschal-exegetical approach is pan-biblical, catechetical, and historical.

The two approaches are somewhat different. Yet they both lead to essentially this same conclusion: no manducating of the Eucharist at least till puberty; and, even then, only after satisfactory completion of catechization.

29. Dr. Coppes's further 1988 remarks anent the paedocommunionistic challenge

Very sadly, the (May 17th-25th 1988) Fifty-Ninth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (in the U.S.A.) had passed a motion declaring that the requirement of participation in the Lord's Supper is not age, but a faith which confesses. However, as Dr. Coppes remarked⁹⁸ on June 24th 1988:

'Due to the pressure of time, the Assembly did not seem to consider carefully that the *Larger Catechism* [Q. & A. 177] does state that children should not be admitted to the Lord's Supper. A Complaint was registered, focusing precisely on this matter. Once again, the burden of the Complaint was that the motion virtually amended the *Directory for Public Worship* apart

from the constitutional process.”

On hearing about Dr. Leonard Coppes’s fine book, Dr. Francis Nigel Lee wrote him about his own just-finished dissertation *Catechism Before Communion!* Dr. Coppes then replied:⁹⁹

“Dear Nigel, I received your letter today. It certainly was heart-warming. I am mailing a copy of the Paedocommunion book today..... I am very happy to hear that, once again, we are on the same side of the aisle....

“I recently talked with a young scholar of the Netherlands Reformed Church (Dr. Joseph Beeke) who told me he had read in Calvin that he said children should not be admitted until they were twelve [cf. Luke 2:42-52 with Genesis 17:25 and Exodus 12:3f,26,37,43f & Proverbs 22:6], and if they had made no profession of faith by fourteen it was the duty of the Consistory to find out the reason why.... I am always happy to know that somewhere there are some faithful men of God who are not chasing one of the present-day winds of doctrine.”

30. Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon’s 1989 book against Paedocommunionism

1989 saw the publication of Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon’s helpful book ‘*What Mean Ye by This Service?*’ [Exodus 12:26], subtitled: *Paedocommunion in Light of the Passover*. There, Dr. Bacon refutes¹⁰⁰ the previously-mentioned paedopassoveristic and paedocommunionistic article by Lemasters.¹⁰¹

In a requested Foreword,¹⁰² Rev. Professor Dr. F.N. Lee warmly endorsed his friend Rev. Dr. Bacon’s book. That he did, under the heading *Should Infants Partake at the Lord’s Table?*

Dr. Lee there wrote: “The recent Paedocommunion polemic has providentially moved my good friend Richard Bacon to publish an excellent book ‘*What Mean Ye By This Service?*’ A Study of Paedocommunion in Light of the Passover (Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage, 1989). It is indeed a pleasant privilege for me to write the Foreword for that book.

“The title is appropriately taken from Exodus12:21-26ff. That was one of the several prescribed questions which needed to be answered satisfactorily - during the catechizing of a covenant youth by the Officers of the people of God - before the Candidate could himself commune at the Passover for the first time.

“Even in respect of the sinless Jesus, this still had to be done. Only thereafter could He too be admitted, by the ecclesiastical Elders, to the Passover Table - upon attaining teenage. Luke 2:40-47; cf. Genesis 17:25f to 18:7,8,19,33.

“As grandfather Solomon himself advised his married son in respect of the king’s own covenantal grandson: ‘Keep on catechizing the lad in the way he should go! Then, when his beard begins to grow, he will not depart from it.’” Proverbs 22:6.

‘Paul too was ‘brought up...and taught according to the perfect law of the fathers.’ Acts 22:3. So also was his pupil, the young man Timothy. Second Timothy 1:1-6 *cf.* 3:14-17. This ‘regulative principle’ of catechism and worship, clearly carries over from the Lord’s Passover to the New Testament Supper. For the latter too was instituted only for Christ’s adequately-trained mature-age followers. Luke 22:11-14*ff.*

“Al so after Calvary - whether now either male or female - they still needed to be able to discern the Lord’s body, before communing. First Corinthians 11:14-28. This means they must not be children. First Corinthians 13:11*f* (*cf.* Ephesians 4:11-14*f*). For even in their understanding, they are to be mature - and not unlearned. First Corinthians 14:20-23 & 16:13.

‘Here, then, is a succinct statement of our Puritan position. See too the *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Questions and Answers 164-177. With affection and appreciation, I warmly commend this book by Richard Bacon to all who love our Lord.’

31. Australian Reformed and Westminster Presbyterians on Paedocommunion (1988*f*)

A very important *Study Committee Report* on ‘Sacraments and Children’ presented to the 1988 Synod of the Reformed Churches of Australia insisted¹⁰³ that ‘Reformed Systematic Theology has spoken as with one voice: the Lord’s Supper is for those who have vowed their allegiance to Christ.... Like the Systematic Theologians - the *Confessions*, *Catechisms*, *Liturgies* and *Church Orders* of the Reformation speak as with one voice: the Lord’s Supper is for professed believers.

“With regard to the admission of guests, the same principle applies: no one can be a guest at the Lord’s Table without being a Communicant and Confirmed Member in full standing in his/her own Church.... If people claim to be believers without being Members of any Church, they cannot be considered guests from another Church and will have to be approached as possibly new Christians. They are [in that case] to be admitted [to the Table] only upon Profession of Faith.”

Then Synod itself rightly decided:¹⁰⁴ “There are no scriptural grounds to abandon the Reformational practice of requiring a Profession of Faith by all who seek to take part in the sacramental means of grace of the Holy Supper.” That is the case, “be they baptised children of the Church - or new converts.”

That is, of course, the position: of Holy Scripture; of the Early Church Fathers; of the Protestant Reformation; and of John Calvin. It is also the position of **all** of the Calvinistic *Confessions* (with not one single exception whatsoever).

Sadly, however, the Reformed Church of Australia went downhill very considerably over the next twelve years. For at its A.D. 2000 Synod, only technicalities in its Church Law seemed to stop that denomination from departing from its historic position against permitting the practice of Paedocommunion - and toward the innovation of child communionism.

Moving on to yet another Australian denomination, one sees the historic Calvinian position strongly reflected in the *Bloomfield Report* to the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Australia - in 1989. Titled *The Age of Communion*, that Report stated among other matters:¹⁰⁵ ‘In at least two of our congregations, pre-teenage children have been known to participate in the Lord’s Supper.... It is not an issue that will go away.... We are not Independents, but Presbyterians - thus we do not fare well by leaving the issue to be settled by each local church.

‘In researching this matter, I am indebted to the encyclopaedic mind of my near neighbour and good friend, Dr. Francis Nigel Lee’ of the Presbyterian Church of Australia denomination. He ‘gave me several hours of his valuable time and some useful reading material.

‘Probably no man in the World has researched this issue more than Dr. [F.N.] Lee. He has just finished a massive doctoral thesis...called *Catechism Before Communion*.... He comes out strongly against child-communion, arguing for the same [Antipaedocommunionism] as Calvin. *Viz.*, only those of mature enough years to profess credible faith [with]in the Church - *i.e.*, catechized teenage Communicants” and those yet older - should be given the Lord’s Supper.

‘Other sources of information include: *Westminster Theological Journal*, Spring 1975 (Keidel), for Paedocommunion; *Westminster Theological Journal*, Winter 1976 (Beckwith), against; *Journey*, Nov.-Dec. 1988, Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church in America [articles both for and against], especially Vance LeMasters vs. [Francis] Nigel Lee.” Also: “*What Mean Ye By This Service?*, Richard Bacon, 1984 (against); *Daddy, May I Take the Lord’s Supper?*, Leonard Coppes (against); Reformed Churches of Australia, *Synod Reports and Acts 1988* (against).

‘The argument for Paedocommunion is made plausible by the way it is expressed. *Viz.*... ‘if a child, even an infant, is suitable for the Church to receive in Baptism - then consistency suggests that he is suitable for the other covenant sign also, the Lord’s Supper.’

‘However, there are significant deficiencies in this argument - sufficient to render it no argument at all. It is not such a big issue in Baptist churches, for obvious reasons. Though some Baptists are arguing for it - believing that children ate the O.T. Passover before being old enough to repent and believe.’

The above *Bloomfield Report*, which was approved by the Westminster Presbyterian Churches in Australia, then recommended ‘that we maintain the well-established practice of the Reformed community, by allowing to the Lord’s Supper only those of sufficient years to make an unprompted credible profession of faith in Christ.... The general understanding is that around 12-13 years is a typical minimal maturity.”¹⁰⁶ Luke 2:40-47.

32. Leithart’s paedocommunionistic 1992 book *Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?*

This pro-paedocommunionistic book is short-titled: *Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?* Yet its provocative subtitle better expresses its true aim: *An Examination of Leonard J. Coppes’s*

“Daddy, May I Take Communion?” A few excerpts from this explosive and fanatical paperback by Peter Leithart - who had already back in 1985 written and unsolicitedly attacked an antipaedocommunionistic article by Dr. F.N. Lee¹⁰⁷ - will give some insight into its character.

In his book, Leithart pontificates that “Paedocommunion requires the contemporary Reformed Church to undergo a far-reaching repentance.” Yes, repentance (*sic*)!

Here, Paedocommunionist Leithart is being very judgmental - and acting altogether contrary to the *Westminster Larger Catechism of Faith* 177 (which he himself had sworn to uphold). Indeed, claims Leithart (apparently insinuating that antipaedocommunionism amounts to teetotalism at least for minors: “There is no Biblical prohibition on children drinking wine.”

Leithart’s is not the view of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 25:1-2, nor of the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* (on Baptism). Wrongly, therefore, does he again pontificate that the ‘Reformed view is not that children are Members of the Church **before** Baptism. Instead, he romanizingly insists, even covenant children [*ex opere operato*?!] “**become** Members of the Church through Baptism.”

Here, he also overlooks the fact that if (Infant) Baptism **were** to admit to (Paedo)Communion - then he and his Fellow-Paedocommunionists who oppose the Infant Communion and also the ‘Infant Intinction’ of covenantal sucklings - would thereby effectively undermine their own opposition to those latter practices. Worse yet. Several times - he indeed almost implies baptismal regeneration.

Leithart conveniently downplays Beckwith’s exegetical and patrological work - and also Dr. Lee’s own patriarchological account of sacramentology before the institution of the Passover. Leithart also reveals an inadequate and an inaccurate grasp of Early-Patristic Church History (before Cyprian), and Late-Mediaeval Church History (before the Protestant Reformation) - and indeed also of Classic-Calvinistic sacramentology thereafter.

Indeed, he complains that “Coppes does not recognize anything as a true Church that is not Protestant and Evangelical. But the fact is,” pontificates Leithart, “that for at least a millennium...the Church practiced Paedocommunion...”

“It was only after the fuller development of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the thirteenth century, that the Western Church began to exclude children from the Table.... It is entirely baptistic to speak of such a prerequisite [‘**faith**’] for circumcision.” *Per contra*, however, see 4:11!

“The Reformed position on infant baptism,” avers the Sub-Reformed Leithart, “does not imply a doctrine of presumptive faith.... It is known that they [*viz.* tiny covenant children] are covenant-breakers in Adam, and must be admitted to the covenant to be saved.... Coppes is simply wrong.”

The outside back cover of Leithart's book, is even more pompous. It declares:¹⁰⁸ "Coppes's book was read by very few, because it is stylistically turgid...and often employs vague and obscure language.... No longer will the Antipaedocommunionists be able to take comfort in Coppes's book. Peter J. Leithart has...weighed it in the balance of Biblical theology, and found it seriously wanting."

Yes, the handwriting is truly on the wall. Leithart, then, has settled matters: *Mene, mene, tekel, ufarsin* (cf. Daniel 5:25). Coppes and been weighed (by Leithart) and found wanting - by Leithart. The oracle hath spoken. *Leithart locuta, causa finita*. What pope-like arrogance!

33. James B. Jordan's Uterocommunion and his 1992 Letter on Paedocommunion

Already in James B. 1985, Jordan had been claiming that "Samson's mother was not to drink alcohol or eat grapes *etc.*, while she was pregnant.... We may say," continued Jordan, "on the basis of this passage - that if the fetus is to avoid sacramentally unclean food in the womb, then the fetus also participates in the sacramental food of Holy Communion in the womb...."

"When a Christian woman eats Christ's flesh and drinks His blood, these go to her baby also. When the baby is born, he is separated from the spiritual protection of the womb, excommunicated as it were, and must be baptized into the Church before he can once again partake of the Lord's Supper."¹⁰⁹

This is the novel '*in calici*' misconception (as distinct from '*in vitrio*' conception) of Uterocommunion - as conceived by Arch-Paedocommunionist Jordan. Unborn fetuses, through their communing mothers, themselves 'eating' the bread and 'drinking' from the chalice!

In 1992, however, Jordan took yet another step. That is seen in the publication of his famous *Letter on Paedocommunion*. At least one other Paedocommunionist has gone and labelled it: "Jordan's matured thought on the pragmatics of Paedocommunion."¹¹⁰

It should, however, also first be noted that Leithart's previously-mentioned book¹¹¹ was published by James B. Jordan in the latter's Niceville (Fla.) press. Perhaps then it was James B. Jordan himself, rather than his pupil Leithart, who so lavishly sang its praises on its back cover?

This latter possibility takes on an air of distinct probability - in light of J.B. Jordan's own above-mentioned pro-paedocommunionistic writing which appeared also in the same year 1992. We refer to *A Letter on Paedocommunion*, by James B. Jordan himself.

In that *Letter*, James B. Jordan sacramentalistically insists¹¹² that "allowing baptized and non-excommunicated persons to the Table of the Lord, was Biblical and desirable.... Paedocommunion...is as profound as infinity [Wow! Wow!! **Wow!!!**].... Put flowers on the Church's Table.... Put candles on the Church's Table.... Our children...belong at Christ's New Table.... Admission is by Baptism....."

‘In the Eastern Churches, the meal is prepared behind closed doors (the *iconostasis*).... Also, the Eastern Churches insisted on using common daily bread.... I do think they have preserved the simplicity of the meal....

‘On the other hand, the Reformation Churches have tended to negate the meal-character of the Supper.... When we refuse to eat the meal except four times a year, we make it into something arcane.... Reformed Churches...have also undermined the simplicity of the meal....

‘The [paedocommunionistic] church I served in Tyler, Texas, for several years...had people who would put crumbs of bread into the mouths of infants and dip their fingers in the wine and let the infant suck it off.... When the child begins to drink from the cup at home, he should be given a cup at church. When he begins to chew teething-biscuits at home, he can be given bread at church.... Not later on.

‘Some have called for ‘weaned child communion.’ If it means what I said in the paragraph above, I agree with it. If it means that the child should not commune until he is fully weaned, then I must disagree....

‘For the sake of good order, and to keep the grubby paws of children off the bread as it was passed, we in Tyler asked parents to serve their small children.... So, let parents help their children in church.

‘After a while, however, some parents came to think that it was their ‘priestly privilege’ to serve their own children. Some men decided it was their ‘priestly privilege’ to serve their own wives. Such a belief is a distortion of the nature of worship and communion.

‘This belief arose in the Tyler church, because of the influence of the ideas of R.J. Rushdoony and of ‘California Reconstructionism.’ Rushdoony’s thought is highly familistic, and at some points quite anti-ecclesiastical.... The parents are not the biological parents, but the Elders of the Church who act for Christ....

‘In my previous essay [the 1982 *Theses on Paedocommunion*], I stated that parents can separate their children from the Table for a given Sunday if the child is in impenitent sin. I wish to modify this assertion....

‘Parents should briefly confer with Elders before Church, if they believe that this week their child should not communicate. The Elders can give their okay, or else encourage the parent to relent....

‘I do not believe that Weekly Communion and Paedocommunion are of the essence of the Church.... I do indeed believe that restoration of these two practices is very important.... It will take time....

‘Virtually all American Protestants are Baptist.... The baptistic *ethos* of

individualism...pervades all of American Protestantism.... The Church of the 21st century will be a 'new garment,' coming out of the current ferment.... For centuries, baptized children have been wrongfully separated from Christ's Table."

Very frankly, such views need no refutation. Truly, like Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, Jordan's *Paedocommunion* - or should one not perhaps call it *Paedocommunism*? - contains the seeds of its own destruction. In the meantime, however - it unfortunately threatens the destruction also of much of what Dr. Morecraft calls 'the left wing' of the Reformed Churches.

34. The Decline and Fall of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod/Council (1992f)

At the 1988 meeting of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod in Harare, it was reported that Professor Nel of the University of Pretoria had been asked to try to find "a capable student to undertake the study on the [Church] Membership of baptized children. He found a student with a good training...who was willing to undertake an exegetical and catechetical study which is now well on the way....

"A later study will concentrate on the participation of baptized children in the Lord's Supper.... Dr. Maatman summarized a report to the 1988 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church in North America dealing with children partaking of the Lord's Supper....

"The...recommendations of the Youth Conference were adopted by the Synod of 1988.... Synod authorize[s] the Youth Committee to continue to study the implications of the Membership of baptized children and the participation of children in the Lord's Supper."

Between 1988 and 1992, the Reformed Ecumenical Synod 'transubstantiated' itself into the Reformed Ecumenical Council. At the 1992 Reformed Ecumenical Council in Athens, a brief survey of REC Member Churches indicated "that no one partakes of the Lord's Supper until he or she has made a 'mature' profession of faith, usually between the ages of 10 to 18....

"Some Churches whose practice is conventional are, however, discussing whether profession of faith can or perhaps should be made at a younger age.... Extensive discussion of Paedocommunion in a Church, is no guarantee that its stance will change. Furthermore, even after changing their stance, some Churches take steps to modify the new position....

"Children of the 'external' covenant partook[?!] of the Passover - which has been replaced by the Lord's Supper.... The difference between Baptism and the Lord's Supper parallels the difference between Circumcision and the Passover."

Especially the first statement above, however - is assumed quite gratuitously. No proof is offered here for such a bold assertion. Indeed, our dissertation will demonstrate the opposite regarding the Biblical Passover - and vindicate Classic Historical Calvinism on this point against the Quasi-Calvinism of the now-trendy 'Reformed Ecumenical Council.'

“The self-examination requirements in I Corinthians 11” - cavalierly continued the 1992 deforming ‘Reformed Ecumenical Council’ - are only for adults.... The Supper nourishes the faith of children as well as adults.... Does the Church have warrant for requiring a public profession of faith from individuals before allowing them to participate in the proclamation of the Lord’s death in the Sacrament (I Corinthians 11:26)?”¹¹³

In earlier and happier years, also the Reformed Ecumenical Synod - the same body as this now-renamed (yet self-same?!) ‘Reformed Ecumenical Council’ - had opposed this novelty of Paedocommunionism. But there was a capitulation to that error - first in 1976 by the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, and later in 1998 by the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa (the REC’s two largest Member Churches).

Thereupon, this ‘Reformed Ecumenical Council’ - meeting in Indonesia in July 2000 - not only decided to “maintain contact” with the World Council of Churches. More consistently, it then further resolved to “participate in the Forum of Christian Churches and Ecumenical Organizations.”

Nay more. The REC also recommended to its Member Churches: “One way of improving the situation - is the involvement of children...in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.”¹¹⁴

Thus the once-promising RES/REC. Fallen is the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. From an encouraging *introit*, to a dismal dirge. A threefold woe: Ichabod; *I-kabod*; ***I-kabod!*** The glory of the Lord has departed from the REC. First Samuel 4:21 *cf.* Revelation 18:2 & 18:16f.

35. James B. Jordan’s further paedocommunionistic propaganda in 1993f

In the Archpaedocommunionist James B. Jordan’s book *The Sociology of the Church*, one notes his liturgical lust for “singing, falling down, kneeling, dancing, clappings, processions, and so forth.” Indeed, one there further notes his statement that “the recovery of all these things for worship...must be our eventual goal.” But, for our purposes here, it is his views on the Eucharist in that book - which we find even more disturbing.

Jordan has had a colourful denominational pilgrimage from Lutheranism, through Dilletantism - and has now migrated *via* Episcopalianism to the U.S. Orthodox Presbyterian Church. As he himself points out already in his Introduction: “I need to mention three writers.... None of these men is an orthodox protestant..... They are a neo-orthodox Presbyterian, Geddes McGregor; a Roman Catholic, Louis Bouyer; and a Russian Orthodox, Alexander Schmemmann. This book would not be what it is without their insights, as an examination of the footnotes will reveal.

“The failure of the Western churches is seen.... By requiring knowledge before communion, the church cut its children off from the Table.... We must reject this residuum of gnosticism.... An understanding of ‘Eucharistic prevenience’ will result not only in the

restoration of Paedocommunion to the Church, but also can form the foundation for a True Catholicity of practice and an end to 'Closed Communion'....

'Infants and children under the Old Covenant ate at the Lord's Table. This is found in First Corinthians 10:1-5 & John 6:31-65.... The Lord has invited the children to His Table; do we dare to turn them away, as the disciples did, and receive Christ's rebuke (Matthew 19:13-15)?....

'The Bible indicates that the *foetus* participates in Jesus' Supper.... The fact that the mother of the Nazirite [Judges 13:7-14] was to abstain from the fruit of the vine, means that the Spiritual-symbolic character of food pertains to the child as much as to the mother....

'Those who believe that children do not belong at Jesus' Table, should excommunicate all pregnant women.... Only in this way can we be sure that no children are partaking.... Away with the nauseating individualism which has done so much to wreck the family during the last two centuries!'

Yet what Jordan denounces as 'individualism' has been around since Luther and Calvin - for nearly five centuries. So we say: 'Away with Jordan's Anti-Protestant Paedocommunionism which has done so much to wreck the Church during the last two decades!'

'The Scriptures,' insists James B. Jordan in his attention-grabbing book *Sociology of the Church*, 'give us the primacy of eating. By eat, we mean: eat a good chewable hunk of bread and a good-sized glass of real shalom-inducing wine....

'The Great Awakening can only be overcome when the Lord's Supper is once again part of the centre of our worship.... As a miraculous memorial, the Sacrament has a real influence.... In this sense, we must say that the sacrament does indeed work *ex opere operato*....

'The Reformation produced an overly rationalistic church.... The failure to maintain the Real Presence in the sacraments and to keep the Eucharist at the centre of weekly worship, also served to demystify and overly intellectualize Christian experience.... We need to repudiate the historical Protestant stoic and intellectualistic interpretations of worship (the regulative principle).... We need to reintroduce the mystery of the Eucharist as Christ's Real Presence in our midst, as the centre of special worship, with our children not excluded.'¹¹⁵ Emphases mine.

In 1994, this Ex-PCA James B. Jordan produced and circulated his four cassette tapes strongly promoting Paedocommunion. Those tapes were promptly refuted by Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Nigel Lee¹¹⁶ (formerly of that same Presbyterian Church in America).

On the refutations by the latter, the Banner of Truth's Rev. Iain Murray immediately wrote him: 'Dear Nigel, Many thanks...for this valuable material.... You have certainly addressed Jim Jordan's position very thoroughly.'¹¹⁷

But Jordan still would not be deterred. He then declared: 'The original Passover was

designed to save directly the firstborn sons between the ages of one month and five years.... Since the Passover was for these children, and since it was a meal, I don't see how anyone can **deny** that Passover was for them to participate in. And I don't see how anyone can deny the truth of Paedocommunion"¹¹⁸ - not even, apparently, for infants only one month old. Indeed, some Antipaedocommunionists now appeared to Jordan to be "demonic" - his own word! ¹¹⁹

36. Dr. Coppes's 1994 booklet *A Consideration of the Paedocommunion Position*

Rev. Dr. Leonard J. Coppes, however, was not to be deterred by Jordan's dire denunciations derogating "demonic" Antipaedocommunionists.. Indeed, in 1994, Coppes published his brilliant antipaedocommunionistic booklet *A Consideration of the Paedocommunion Position*.

There, he wrote:¹²⁰ "I have worked on this matter for many years and have come to the conclusion that the practise of Paedocommunion is contrary to the clear teachings of Scripture.... One must start with the Egyptian Passover [by which Dr. Coppes apparently means the Israelitic Passover in Egypt].... The Passover is but part of the larger sacrificial system which **predated** it." Ah yes - even from the antipaedocommunionistic Genesis 4:3-17 & 8:20 & 22:2 onward!

"Those offerings" before Exodus twelve, continues Coppes, "were the **prototype** of the Passover.... At the institution of the Lord's Supper...Jesus does not distinguish between the Egyptian Passover, the Levitical Passover, and the [then-traditional] Jewish Passover....

"In the Old Testament, **children could not approach the altar**.... Jesus, the perfect son of God, like all the children of the Old Testament era, did not approach the altar until He attained manhood (Luke 2).... The Paedocommunion argument admits infants and small children to the Lord's Supper.... It mandates a redefinition of the nature of the Sacrament - in the direction of or in conformity to the Roman Catholic concept of *ex opere operato*....

"On the other hand, feeding on the words of God is a necessary prerequisite for eating the Lord's Supper. Jesus...said 'It is the Spirit Who gives life; the flesh profits nothing. The words I speak to you are spirit, and they are life' (John 6:63).

"Thus, Jesus explains to us that the mere eating of the bread and drinking of the water in the wilderness and the mere eating of the bread and drinking the wine in the Lord's Supper, profit nothing. It is not sacramental.

"If a mouse, a child, or an unbeliever takes the Lord's Supper - it profits him nothing. Moreover, Paul adds that if a person takes the Lord's Supper in contempt of the Lord (which implies a degree of conscious understanding and rejection) - then he eats and drinks judgment to himself (First Corinthians 11:29)."

Indeed, a mouse chewing [or an unborn *foetus* being nourished from] bread used at the Lord's Supper, does not thereby feed on Christ - either physically, or spiritually. Mice cannot and

do not eucharize. Nor did maggots chewing the manna in the desert, receive a Sacrament. Nor did any uncircumcisable women or pre-adolescent sons eating unleavened bread for seven days, thereby sacramentally feast on the meat at the Passover. Exodus 12:3-48 *cf.* 16:15-20.

37. Rushdoony's open and continued promotion of Paedocommunionism (1994)

Meantime, Ex-O.P.C. writer Rev. R.J. Rushdoony continued to promote the unreformed remnants of the theology of his Armenian-Orthodox ancestors which were never purged out of him despite his gravitation toward Calvinism. Already in his 1973 *Institutes of Biblical Law*, he had written: 'The first celebration of the Lord's Supper...was...in fulfilment of the Passover... The children of the covenant, *i.e.*, circumcised male children and daughters of the covenant, partook[!?] of it... In the Early[?!] Church, children partook of the Sacrament.... St. Paul indicates[?!] that entire families attended and participated....

'Arguments against this inclusion of children, are more rationalistic and Pelagian than Biblical.... Infants[!?] were baptized, confirmed, and partook of the elements for perhaps the first nine or ten centuries of the Christian era....

'The Communion itself was given to infants...immediately[?!] from the time of their baptism.... The sense of covenant life is destroyed by their exclusion, and God's Law violated....

'The Armenian Church had animal sacrifices after the Old Testament law, continuing them long after the Jews abandoned them, well into the twentieth century. These took place at the church door and were a freewill offering to the Lord, commemorating the Old Testament sacrifices.... The animal had to be levitically acceptable - a yearling, and free from all blemish [*cf.* Exodus 12:5].... This writer comes from an ancient line of such hereditary Armenian priests; his father, the son of a priest, was a Presbyterian clergyman, as he is also."¹²¹

Rushdoony never revised any of the above statements. Indeed, by 1994, he had enshrined them further - in his book *Systematic Theology*. There, inaccurately, he wrongly pontificated:¹²²

'In the Early [meaning the Earliest] Church, and for some centuries, children were a part[?] of the communion services.... The Hebrew child participated[?!] in the Passover Service. The Christian child took part in Communion for the first[?!] eight centuries everywhere[?!], and the practice had some prevalence still into the fourteenth century....

'The Passover of Exodus is a family rite; it was oriented to admitting the smallest child.... In the Early Church [but certainly not the Earliest Church! - F.N. Lee]...Communion was given to baptized children.... Approaches to the Sacrament [of the Holy Eucharist] have too often been influenced by rationalistic...considerations." For more of Rushdoony's paedocommunionistic views, and refutations thereof, see in chapter 13 of our book *Catechism before Communion!*

This Antipaedocommunionism, Rushdoony further misalleged, 'represent[s] a humanistic

emphasis[?!].... If we emphasize rationalism, which is not the same as understanding, we most certainly will exclude children from the Eucharist.... This is a serious error, and a lack of discernment.” [Smile! - F.N. Lee.]

Rushdoony was indeed an orthodox Chalcedonian, and a very conservative Christian Political Scientist of considerable note. For that, one should truly praise the Lord for him - and also for his many useful writings.

Yet Rushdoony the enthralling Political Scientist and Ex-Missionary to Amerindians, was **no Theologian**. In that regard, he was sometimes even a dangerous *dilletante*.

Indeed, his promotion of Paedocommunion was as faulty as his promotion of: the revival of the levirate; the slaughter of passover lambs at church-doors; his deficient views of the Second and Fourth and other Commandments; and all other Anti-Protestant baggage transported by him into some American circles from his exotic and arcane Armenian-Orthodox background. A highly-independent and individualistic spirit, he was **not** a Confessional Presbyterian but actually a Quasi-Reformed and at best a Semi-Calvinistic maverick.

38. 1994 ‘Auburn Affirmation’ of the PCA’s Rev. Steve Wilkins and his Session

Starting June 1994, the Session of the PCA’s Rev. Steve Wilkins’s Auburn Ave. Presbyterian Church in Monroe (Louisiana) engaged in a major letter-writing push to promote paedocommunionistic heterodoxy within the Presbyterian Church in America. Indeed, it did so even on its official church letterhead - despite the fact that the General Assembly of the PCA had rejected Paedocommunionism even as recently as 1988.

That ‘Auburn Affirmation’ reads *inter alia* as follows:¹²³ ‘Dear Fellow Elders in the PCA.... Our Session committed itself to the careful study of the issue of Covenantal Communion, also known as Paedo-communion....

‘Our Session unanimously found Covenantal Communion to be the correct Biblical view of young children and their admission to the Lord’s Table.... Believing Communion to be a means of grace which is being wrongfully withheld from our children - as our [*Westminster*] *Standards* take, in our opinion, an erroneous non-covenantal position on this issue - we were faced with the decision of taking the action appropriate....

‘Our Session instructed our Teaching Elder, Steve Wilkins, to preach a series of sermons to our congregation on this issue.... We instructed TE Wilkins to have audio tapes of these sermons professionally copied and marketed for general distribution.... We believe that the PCA has not yet given this matter the serious attention and study it merits. Our prayer is that this series will contribute to the dialogue and discussion that is necessary.... RE [Ruling Elder] Dale Peacock, For the Session of Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church.’

The tapes were heard in Australia by Rev. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee, himself formerly of the Presbyterian Church in America, and then Professor of Systematic Theology of the Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary. Dr. Lee studied Wilkins's tapes, and then sent him his critique thereof.¹²⁴ See Addendum H hereunder.

39. Antipaedocommunionism of Professor Dr. M.H. Smith's 1994 *Systematic Theology*

Also in 1994, Rev. Professor Dr. Morton H. Smith, then President of the extremely conservative Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary in South Carolina, published his excellent *Systematic Theology*. There, on the issue of Paedocommunion, he wrote these memorable words:¹²⁵

“The position of the [old] Southern Presbyterian Church on the...invitation to the Table, read as follows: ‘Since...this Sacrament sets forth the communion of believers, the Minister before the celebration begins should invite all those who are Communicants in good standing in any Evangelical Church to participate in the Sacrament.’ The same was true of the [old] Northern Presbyterian Church....

“The matter has been questioned by some in the Presbyterian Church in America.... It was [however] never envisioned that...the Session did not need to be assured of the Membership of those coming to the Table.... The *Westminster Confession* [27:1 & 29:8] settles the issue....

“Another question that has been raised in recent years...is the question of whether baptized children of the covenant may partake.... Paedocommunion was practiced [not during the first nor the second but] from the third to the eighth centuries.... It is still practiced in the Eastern Church.... It was never practiced in the Reformed Churches.

“The Philadelphia Presbytery of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church refused licensure to a Candidate who espoused this view.... The PCA, after studying the matter, has disallowed its practice....

“The argument for admitting children to the Table is that since they are to be baptized because of the relation that Baptism has to Circumcision, so also they are to be recipients of the Lord's Supper because of the relation between it and the Passover.... An examination of the Old Testament passages does not substantiate the claim that infants or young children partook of the Passover. It is nowhere explicitly stated....

“Exodus 12:26 does not give evidence that the child himself partook.... The question ‘What mean ye by this service?’ would seem to indicate that the child [asking this question of the manducators] was not one of the partakers.... The absence of explicit command in connection with the Passover, is more likely to support the fact that the [children] were not included.... The regulative principle of worship held by Reformed churches, requires that we practice only what is specifically commanded....

‘Both the Passover and the Lord’s Supper are Commemoration Services. Such remembrance requires a prior knowledge and comprehension of that being remembered. The New Testament indicates that the Lord’s Supper was instituted at the time of the Passover....

‘In the institution, a conscious participation is implied. ‘Take, eat; this is My body’; ‘this do in remembrance of Me’ - clearly involves a conscious faith and a proper discernment of the Lord’s body and blood before eating and drinking of the Lord’s Supper.... Jesus commanded that we do this in remembrance of Him. To hold that infants, who cannot do this, are proper recipients of the Sacrament - is to approach the position in which the Sacrament operates *ex opere operato*....

‘Though the proponents of infant or child communion maintain that First Corinthians 11:27-29 does not apply to infants but only to adults, we must disagree. The ‘whosoever’ of verse 27, includes children as well as adults. Witsius treats this subject, and we shall take a few brief excerpts.... ‘All the words of our Lord’s command (with respect to this Sacrament) are so expressed that they cannot belong to infants’.... For ‘babes are fed with milk, and not with meat. First Corinthians 3:2; Hebrews 5:12’....

‘Herman Bavinck also discussed the question.... Circumcision was prescribed for all male children, but [not] the Passover.... Very young children were in the nature of the case excluded.... Only grown persons in possession of intellectual powers, participated in the Supper....

‘The *Heidelberg Catechism* Question 81...speaks of the necessity of repentance, faith, and obedience - as prerequisites for partaking of the Sacrament. This certainly excludes infants....

‘Ursin us, one of the authors of this *Catechism*, says: ‘They are to be admitted to the Lord’s Supper by the Church...who are of a proper age to examine themselves.... The infant children of the Church are therefore not admitted to the use of the Lord’s Supper, even though they are included among the numbers of the faithful’....

‘Calvin distinguished between Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and argued for the inclusion of infants in Baptism but not in the Lord’s Supper.... ‘Only those who know how to distinguish rightly the holiness of Christ’s body, are able to participate worthily.... Why should we offer poison, instead of life-giving food, to our tender children?’....

‘The *Larger Catechism* has several questions dealing with the reception of the Sacrament - all of which by the very nature of the case exclude infants and young children, who are not able to exercise faith and self-examination. See Questions 170 through 177.

‘The Presbyterian books of *Church Order* speak of ‘The Admission of Persons to Sealing Ordinances’ - in which the prescriptions for making a profession of faith are set forth. Only those who have been thus examined and made a public profession of their faith, are admitted to the sealing ordinances - namely Baptism for the adult who was not baptized as a covenant child; and the Lord’s Supper.’

40. Concerning Paedocommunion - Lee versus Jordan and Jordan versus Lee (1994f)

In 1994, Mr. James B. Jordan produced and circulated his four cassette tapes strongly promoting Paedocommunion. In those tapes, one gets the impression the speaker implies that all of the Faculty at Westminster Theological Seminary save two had come out against the Antipaedocommunionism of Calvin and the *Larger Catechism* (Q. 177) - and in favour of Paedocommunion.

Personal enquiries were then made by Professor Dr. F.N. Lee to Rev. Professor Dr. Sinclair Ferguson and Rev. Professor Dr. Richard Gaffin of W.T.S. in 1995. However, such established that **none** on Westminster's Faculty was then addicted to Paedocommunionism.¹²⁶

James B. Jordan's pro-paedocommunionistic tapes were promptly refuted in detail by formerly-PCA Rev. Dr. Lee. Both that refutation as well as Mr. Jordan's response to it, were circulated by Jordan himself in 1995 under the title *Concerning Paedocommunion: Lee versus Jordan & Jordan versus Lee*. (The full text can be viewed at *Addendum G* below in this 2003 edition of this Catechism Before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty.)

Jordan was formerly an Elder in the PCA. He has had a remarkably maverick pilgrimage: from Lutheranism to the PCA; then to Reconstructionism; next (under the influence of writings from the pro-paedocommunionistic St. Vladimir's Russian Orthodox Seminary) first to the congregationalistic ARC and then toward Protestant Episcopalianism.

Subsequently, Jordan renounced first Puritanism and then Theonomy. Then he re-entered the PCA; and next, as a 'Neo-Presbyterian' (*sic*), he invaded the OPC in Niceville (Fla.).

It is truly amazing how Jordan continues to have some impact on lesser minds and impressionable young 'wanabe' alias would-be 'theologians' who have teemed up to support his Paedocommunionism. Here, Jeff Myers¹²⁷ and Tommy Lee¹²⁸ and Kevin Bywater¹²⁹ all spring to mind. But 'Exhibit A' among all of Jordan's many younger epigones, is surely the one and only Mr. Mark Horne.

41. Dr. K. Gentry's Antipaedocommunion tapes and "Jordan's 'Little Horne'" (1994 f)

Also in 1994 - as an effective counter to the heterodox pro-paedocommunionistic cassette tapes of the PCA's Rev. Wilkins mailed out to 'Fellow Elders in the PCA' - the PCA's Rev. Dr. Ken Gentry produced an excellent orthodox anti-paedocommunionistic series of cassette tapes of his own titled *Paedocommunion: Faith or Fad?*¹³⁰ Immediately, Jordan's younger pupil Mark Horne hit back - in his own article *Passover, Paedocommunion, and Dr. Kenneth L. Gentry*.

There, Horne rightly states that ‘Dr. Gentry...indicates women were excluded from the first Passover’; that ‘Dr. Gentry has...said roast lamb is not for nursing infants’ [apparently meaning sucklings still being suckled]; and that ‘Exodus 12:48 proves that only adults partook of Passover.’ Horne admits Gentry (we think rightly) adduces that ‘Exodus 12:26, Luke 2:41-51 and Proverbs [22:6 and ‘Isaiah 7:13’]...‘prove ‘that children were not admitted to Passover until the age of thirteen after passing an exam before the Elders at the age of twelve.’”

Mr. Horne then wrongly states that ‘Dr. Gentry...makes God guilty of leaving us exposed to an ‘uncovered pit’ (Ex. 21:33-34)’ - and that a ‘boundary between Baptism and the Lord’s Table is simply invented ex nihilo by Dr. Gentry.’ In just four words, Horne then haughtily hollers that Dr. Gentry’s professional position is: ‘erroneous’; ‘ridiculous’; ‘demonic’; and ‘incredible.’¹³¹

Horne’s mentor and publisher and sponsor, Arch-Paedocommunionist James B. Jordan, then promptly and publically dubbed him ‘rising theologian Mark Horne’ - and recommended his other paper *God’s Uncovered Pit: Kenneth Gentry on Paedocommunionism*.¹³² Incredibly, Mr. James B. Jordan in a letter then harangued Gentry:¹³³ ‘Since Paedocommunion has been a plank of Christian Reconstruction since the beginning and surely [?!] is held by virtually all [?!] Vantillians [?!] - I was surprised that you disagree with it.... I hope eventually you’ll reconsider.

‘The only ‘Vantillian’ I have ever heard of who disagrees with Paedocommunion, is Bahnsen; but then again, while Bahnsen understands Van Til’s apologetics, he understands little else[!]. He has never[!] grasped the implications of Van Til for ecclesiology, liturgics and hermeneutics - for starters. [However:] Shepherd, Frame, Poythress, Rushdoony, North, myself, and everybody else are Paedocommunionists, or are strongly leaning that way.’

The ignorance of the above letter is exceeded only by its arrogance. To that letter, Dr. Ken Gentry made an eloquent ‘Response’ (his own word). He simply wrote on the bottom of it: ‘Jordan’s ‘Little Horne’ speaking great things!’ [cf. Daniel 7:8 & 7:25].¹³⁴

A further toot of ‘Jordan’s Little Horne’ was his 1997 *You and Your Son and Daughter: Christ’s Communion with Young Children*. In that article, Horne haughtily huffed:¹³⁵ ‘This paper was written to persuade people who were members of the [antipaedocommunionistic] Presbyterian Church in America.... I will argue that a young child whose parents have taught him to love and trust Jesus, is a professing Christian and should be admitted to the Lord’s Supper.... The Passover...was established for all Israelite families without any age limit[?!].’ At ‘Passover all Israelite children were invited to participate...(Exodus 12:3)’[?!].

Horne misquoted the *Westminster Confession* [18:2]. Then, altogether misapplying Psalm 8:2 & Matthew 21:6, he declared: ‘We have no more warrant for discounting the confession of a 3-year-old, than a 13-year-old or even a 33-year-old.... Some have begun saying that the age of thirteen, the time of the Jewish *bar mitzvah*, is the age when a child should be admitted to the Lord’s Supper.’ Ignoring the tradition or ‘custom’ of covenant lads being prepared when ‘twelve’ for the ‘feast’ of Passover in terms of Luke 2:42 cf. Exodus 12:3f & 12:26 & 12:37 - Horne almost ‘Anti-Semitically’ and Anti-Biblically pontificated that there is ‘no reason to resort

to Non-Christian Jewish traditions” [read: Ancient Hebrew traditions!] which “support making children wait until the age of 13 before they’re allowed to participate in the Lord’s Supper.”

Still ignoring Luke 2:42, Mr. Horne asserted that the regulative principle of worship is “arbitrary.” Finally, he decreed: “Our children need their faith confirmed by the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper just as much as we do.... We must reconsider our practice of barring these...little brothers and sisters in Christ - from communion with our Lord. Even apart from God’s command[?!] that we admit all His followers to the Lord’s Table, our duty to raise our children in the nurture and admonition in the Lord - requires us to admit them.”

Here follows Paedocommunionist Horne’s later pronouncement, uttered October 4th 2001 on the Warfield E-Group Discussion List: “I would not hesitate to allow a visiting Roman Catholic to take communion in my church.” Such a statement is totally irreconcilable with the *WCF* 29:6-8 of Horne’s own PCA. and the *WCF* 29:8’s words “or be admitted thereunto.”

The *Westminster Confession of Faith*, at its 29:2-4, further declares “that the Popish sacrifice of the **mass** as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ’s one only sacrifice” *etc.*, “Hebrews 7:23-27 & 10:11-14.” It then continues to affirm that “private masses” or “worshipping the elements...or carrying them about for adoration...are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament and to the institution of Christ. Matthew 15:9.”

Gentry’s ‘Jordan’s little Horne,’ however, in an exchange terminating December 13th 2001 on the bbwarfield@yahoo.com Group Discussion List, defended the word “Mass” and added that “it is what the Roman Catholics call it when they worship God by the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. We [Presbyterians?] do exactly the same thing - worship God by the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper - and we can call it a Mass without any problem. Maybe a heritage of ignorance left to 21st-century America, thanks to the efforts of hateful Presbyterians, needs to be occasionally shown for the historical error that it is. If people learn that a Mass is not the exclusive monopoly of the Roman Catholic denomination, and that it need not involve idolatrous views of a local presence or a **real** sacrifice for sins, then they will be better off.”

So the oracle Mark Horne has now spoken - loud and clear. The trumpet has sounded. Indeed, the Horne has hooted. Thus: *Papa Marcus locuta, causa finita*. All that now remains, is for the fanatical Pro-Paedocommunionists in the 1995 Knox Ring and the even more fanatical 2001f Covenant_Communion e-groups to bray ‘yea’ to Jordan and his ‘little Horne.’

“Yea!” - bray Mark Becerra, Kevin Bywater, Jeff Myers, Enas Nathan, and Ben Shafer. “Nay!” - say Dick Bacon, Chris Coldwell, Gary Good, Grover Gunn, Gillis Harp, Vaughn Hathaway, Mark Arvid Johnson, Phil Kayser, and Francis Nigel Lee. I think the “nays” have it. Nay, I’m sure the “nays” have it - even without the aid of Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, John Owen, Herman Witsius, Jonathan Edwards and every subsequent Protestant Theologian of any real substance.

Speaking of Jonathan Edwards here above, reminds one of the April 28f 1995 decision of

the PCA's Ascension Presbytery against not just the practice but also the theory of Paedocommunion. Here, we shall simply quote from an article by Darrell Todd Maurina, as it appeared in the May 29 1995 edition of *Christian Renewal*.

Reported Maurina: "Ascension Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in America has rejected a decision by one of its Congregations to allow Ruling Elders to believe that the Lord's Supper should be served to young children.... The Presbytery declared with respect to Niagara Reformed Presbyterian Church of Buffalo...that 'the allowance of the exceptions of Ruling Elders to the Constitutional Standards regarding their belief that communion should be offered to baptized children of the Church as young as two or three years old is not an allowable exception for Church Officers'.... The entire Buffalo Session had taken exception to the relevant sections of the *Westminster Larger Catechism* [177], *Westminster Shorter Catechism* [97], and the *PCA Book of Church Order* [57-1 to 59-4]....

"Rev. Steve Wilkins and Rev. Mark Duncan hold the position that baptized covenant children may partake of the Lord's Supper from very early years.... Wilkins expressed surprise that the Ascension Presbytery voted against allowing the exceptions.... According to Wilkins, very young children...should come to the Lord's Table.... 'We're talking about baptized children.... Children are Members of the Church, and should receive all of the means of grace, and the Lord's Supper is one of the means by which people come to a more full and complete understanding of the Gospel.'"

Here, the flaw in Wilkins's reasoning is obvious. Also marriage, just like sabbath-keeping and the Sacraments, is a means of grace (alias a divine ordinance in the faithful use of which one's Christian commitment is increased). Marriage strengthens a believer's trust in Christ and His Bridegroom-Bride relationship to all His Church, and is in fact even called a *musteerion* in Ephesians 5:32. There, and also at First Corinthians 4:1, Jerome in his *Vulgate* even translates *musteerion* as: "*sacramentum*."

Indeed, also the *Westminster Confession* 27:4^s and the *Westminster Form of Church-Government* (at its *Pastors*^o) applies First Corinthians 4:1's *musteeria* precisely to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper. We would like to think that even Rev. Steve Wilkins the outspoken Paedocommunionist - would anti-paedocommunionistically refuse to administer the *musteerion* of marriage to all pre-adolescents!

Continues Maurina: "Wilkins said that although he preaches and teaches in favor of Paedocommunion, his church does not practice Paedocommunion. However, the church has admitted children as young as four to the Lord's Table - based upon their profession of faith before the Session."

Frankly, this is speciously playing with words. The fact is, Wilkins both teaches and practises Paedocommunion as regards **such** four-year-old *paidaria* alias little children as his Session thinks love Jesus.

Concludes Rev. D.T. Maurina: "Even teaching [as distinct from practice] in favor of Paedocommunion - is unacceptable to Bogue, however." Dr. Carl Bogue was and is the leading Anti-Paedocommunionist in the PCA's Ascension Presbytery - as well as a World authority on the theology of Dr. Jonathan Edwards. Said Bogue: "'I've read a number of things on the subject and have seen nothing to convince me that Jonathan Edwards was wrong on the qualifications for communion' - alluding to the New England Congregationalist of the 1700s who was...insisting no one should come to the Lord's Table without being able to give a testimony of his conversion.

"I think my main concern is it's a question of discerning the Lord's body and examining oneself, and infants and young children can't do that." Thus Dr. Carl W. Bogue, who wrote his 1975 doctoral dissertation under the Free University of Amsterdam's Professor G.C. Berkouwer precisely on *Jonathan Edwards and the Covenant of Grace*.

42. Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa declines into Paedocommunionism

Surprising indeed have been developments within what once used to be by far the largest conservative Calvinist Church in the World. We refer to the *Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK)*, alias the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa (DRCSA) .

The expression 'Capitulation to the revolutionary spirit of the times' is perhaps too strong to describe that Church's own Copernican revolution on the matter of Paedocommunion. Yet it is undeniable that the left-wing Mandela takeover of South Africa in the early 1990s has pressured the DRCSA into undergoing a fundamental paradigm-shift and re-alignment on a whole range of vital matters - in order to try to shake off the contentious image often attributed to it of previously 'having discriminated on the basis of age, race and sex.'

Thus, in 1994, the *NGK's* General Synod unwisely decided to legislate on the matter of Paedocommunion in 1998. A *Report on Children at the Lord's Table*, drawn up and signed by several of the younger Professors of the denomination's Seminaries, was received by the 1998 National General Assembly (even though the more conservative Orange Free State Province's General Assembly had re-affirmed the position of Calvin and the *Heidelberg Catechism* QQ. & AA. 75-85 against Paedocommunion).

Significantly, the received Report - low on exegesis and high on liturgical renewal - errs fundamentally in stating "that all the baptized...have a right of admission to the Supper" (2.2.1.4); and that "children in Ancient Israel participated in...the Passover.... Therefore they [covenant children today] ought to participate in the Supper (2.2.2.6)."

Together with Calvin, we ourselves believe that both of those assumptions are false. Indeed, even the *Report* itself - inconsistent with its own mispresuppositions - does not countenance that baptized sucklings should manducate at the Lord's Table in the DRC of the RSA.

Despite starting off with the above two (mis)assumptions, the *Report* nevertheless ends up with many concessions of a practical nature. Thus it recommends: that each congregation phase in ‘Paedocommunion at its own pace and in its own way’ (3.2.1); that there be a ‘minimum age’ of admission (3.2.2); and that the admission of children to the Table ‘be governed by their first being approved by the Elders, after their successfully completing a simplified form of catechizing’ (3.2.3).

Practically unanimously, the 1998 General Assembly thereupon made its decisions. These then were: “(1) that baptized children who believe in Jesus Christ and meet with the requirements of First Corinthians eleven and who have the desire to take the Lord’s Supper may be permitted; (2) that Sessions of Elders decide when Congregations are ready for this, and that it is the responsibility of each Session to make specific arrangements as to the way in which the admission occurs; (3) that Sessions be requested to equip and accompany Congregations, and thus to lead them to readiness for the admission of children to take the Lord’s Supper as a Family Meal in a pastoral setting with great love and dedication.”

The 1998 General Assembly of the DRCSA further declared: “(4) that parents have the responsibility constantly to accompany their children and to instruct them in the full richness of the significance of the Supper, just as Sessions have the duty of accompanying adults; (5) that parents are to accompany their children with a view to the children’s participation in the Supper and to utilize that exceptional opportunity themselves to partake of the Supper together with their children; and (6) that Sessions be requested constantly to give attention to equipping the accompanying parents, so that they can accompany their children in partaking of the Supper.”¹³⁶

Needless to say, the above decisions are unreformed. They are totally at variance with every single catechetical book ever published by the DRCSA till then (1998).

43. Reactions within the DRCSA against its novel Paedocommunion (1998f)

At the very time the DRCSA took the above ominous decision in favour of Paedocommunion, one of its godly Ministers (Rev. Theo Danzfuss) was completing his M.Div. dissertation at the University of Pretoria against this heterodoxy. In his 377-page 1998 work *Child Communion: Reformation or Deformation?*, Danzfuss very clearly demonstrates: (1) that Paedocommunion was unknown to the Early Church before the 250 A.D. time of Cyprian; (2) that all of the Calvinistic Reformers and all of the Reformed *Church Orders* rejected it; and (3) that it has only recently invaded the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands and South Africa, largely as a result of their ecumenical flirtation with the World[ly] Council of Churches.

Danzfuss’s dissertation is a very useful contribution toward the history of doctrine. In his concluding Abstract (written in English), he states:¹³⁷ “The issue of infant communion [and/]or children’s communion has recently become a matter of concern in a number of Churches around the World, and in South Africa especially in the Dutch Reformed Church. During November 1998, the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa has become the first Afrikaans-speaking

Reformed Church which has decided to admit baptised children to the Lord's Supper without any public confession of faith.

"This is not a new practice. In the [Eastern-]Orthodox Church, the infant communion is a very old and well-known practice since the early [but not the earliest] centuries. Orthodox children are not only baptised in infancy, but they are also...given Communion in infancy. Immediately after Baptism, an Orthodox child is... 'confirmed' and as soon as possible brought to Communion. In the Roman Catholic Church, they don't practice infant communion....

"Through[out] the history of the Reformed Churches, infant and children's communion were always rejected.... During the last few decades, the ecumenical contact between the Reformed Churches and other Churches around the World has put this subject back on the Table" for consideration and even for possible implementation.

"The main problem surrounding the issue of infant communion, is basically a soteriological problem. In the Reformed way of understanding the Biblical soteriology, there is no room for the theory or the practice of infant and children's communion. Children's communion is a serious deformation in the Reformed Churches, and also a deviation from Reformed Theology and the Reformed *Confessions*."

Interestingly, also Dr. J.F.Q. Weilbach of Clocolan complained to *Die Kerkbode*, the official Church Journal of the DRCSA, in its issue of 4th June 1999. He stated the Professors who authored the 1998 Report to the General Assembly of the DRCSA which implemented Paedocommunion - "have no historical conception of the fact that Child Communion is certainly the most drastic change in our Church for at least the last two centuries."¹³⁸

Since then, the cancer of Paedocommunionism has spread yet further within the DRCSA. Nevertheless, there has still been some healthy reaction to the above appalling decisions. One such has been the *Declaration of the Session and Members of the DRCSA of Brakpan-South*.

That boldly declared to the whole World:¹³⁹ "The Session and Members of the Brakpan-South Dutch Reformed Church declare that they still stand by the Reformed conviction that Christ the Lord rules His Church through His Word and Spirit. Whenever the authority of the Word is undermined, the authority of Christ is undermined (*Belgic Confession* articles 29-32)....

"He is more and more being pushed out of His Church, until He finally stands and knocks outside of it (Revelation 3:20).... Whenever Reformed Churches become unfaithful to their own *Confession*, they thus become unfaithful to the Word of God and therefore to God Himself (First Thessalonians 2:13)....

"On the basis of *inter alia* Acts 4:19-20 and Galatians 1:6-10, the Session declares that it must obey God more than man. Therefore it declares itself to be free from those decisions [of the General Assembly] which are in conflict with the Scriptures and the Reformed *Confessions* and which are therefore bonds upon the conscience.

‘The following serve as examples. The admission of women to the teaching and ruling offices; the admission to the Lord’s Supper of children who have not made public profession of faith’; and ‘the decision of the 1998 General Assembly which implies that Jews and Muslims acknowledge the God of the Bible even though they do not know and serve Him rightly....

‘We lament that the Dutch Reformed Church, which professes its faithfulness to the *Confession*, does not always maintain it.... The decision with reference to the administration of the Lord’s Supper to children - which cannot be reconciled to the *Belgic Confession* (arts. 33-35) and the *Heidelberg Catechism* (Sundays 28-30 [cf. QQ. & AA. 75-85]....

‘It is not just the so-called ‘new view of Scripture’ which has led to unscriptural decisions. Other factors too, *inter alia* the influence of humanism, have played a part.... The following have gone hand in hand: the admission of women to the ruling office, which coincides with the so-called ‘liberation’ of women in society; the admission of small children to the Lord’s Supper, which coincides with attempts in society to exorcise ‘discrimination’ against children....

‘Ministers who took their ordination oath with conviction, are being put into an untenable position by these expectations of ecclesiastical courts. In the exercise of their ministry, they are being expected to obey decisions which are unscriptural in the light of their ordination oath. That is nothing else than forcing one to go against one’s conscience.

‘For example, a Minister who is convinced that the administration of the Lord’s Supper to children is unscriptural - can hardly proceed to serve them the Lord’s Supper. Thus, Ministers are being pressured to err - whenever ecclesiastical courts do....

‘The question has to be asked whether the above state of affairs does not indicate a movement away from the True Church toward the false church. After all, we profess that the false church is that which attributes to itself and its decisions more power and authority than it does to the Word of God (*Belgic Confession* article 29)....

‘We also wish to protest against the fact that unfaithfulness toward the doctrine and disobedience to the will of God is being permitted in congregations of the Dutch Reformed Church without being disciplined. Members who promise to remain faithful to the Reformed Confession to the end of their lives, are breaking their word. They are ignorant....

‘This ignorance must chiefly be attributed to: Parents who do not keep their baptismal covenant to teach this doctrine to their children; Church Sessions which permit young people to make a profession of faith without properly being instructed in the Word and the *Confession*; Ministers who are not keeping their Ordination Oath by *inter alia* giving attention to the doctrine of the Church in their preaching enthusiastically and persistently.... This leads to the Sacraments being served to covenant-breakers....

‘Reformation can no longer be postponed. Therefore in word and in deed we call upon the Dutch Reformed Church, which is also our spiritual mother, to return to the Word as interpreted

by the Reformed *Confessions of Faith* – **quia** or **because** they agree with the Scriptures.”

Two months later, in November 2000, a similar public declaration was issued by yet another Congregation of the DRC. That reads: ‘The Session of the Congregation [of the Namibian Dutch Reformed Church of] Henty’s Bay, after a thorough investigation of the Scriptures and an in-depth discussion of the Scriptural references and of the Report of the General Synod in this matter, came to the following decision: that - ‘Children shall not be admitted to the Holy Supper until they have completed the course of catechization and profession of faith.’

‘Motivation: 1. That the Biblical requirements for manducation at the Holy Supper as indicated in First Corinthians 11:27-32, make it impossible to admit to the Holy Table persons who have not thoroughly been prepared and made public profession. 2. That precisely the Articles of Faith (the *Heidelberg Catechism* and the *Belgic Confession*) also stress the importance of the ‘right’ use of the Holy Supper. 3. That the decision of the General Assembly [in 1998] involves a drastic distinction (discrimination) between the Sacrament[s] - namely that the Holy Supper may [now] be served to [**non-professing**] Baptismal Members...whether unweaned or whether youths, while the Sacrament of Holy Baptism may be served only to the children of those parents who are **professing** Members of the Church. 4. That, if we claim to be a ‘Reformed’ Church, we must as Reformed also hold to that which makes us different to the Romish Church.

‘The Reformed Fathers, including Calvin, clearly broke away from the Romish custom of serving the Holy Supper to children from the age of seven. Conclusion: Thus, according to Scripture, the *Articles of Confession*, and the historic...facts - the Session and the Congregation of Henty’s Bay finds it impossible to execute the[se] decisions of the General Assembly.’¹⁴⁰

Thereafter, yet more disturbing deformations followed. Listen to the following paraphrase of part of a statement (in the November 2003 edition of the Calvinist magazine *Kerkpad*) - made by Rev. Dr. J.A.E. Adendorff, shortly after he was ousted by his own Session in the DRCSA for confessionally questioning the appropriateness of yet further aberrations.

According to Rev. Dr. Adendorff, before the DRCSA’s Synod of 2002, her General Commission for Doctrine and Important Issues (AKLAS) recommended that **all** baptized children without exception be invited to manducate at the Lord’s Table. All of the Protests against Child Communion, were rejected. A so-called ‘Dedicatory Communion’ was approved where every Member in his or her own time can receive the Lord’s Supper without the official preaching of the Word. And a child-friendly Communion Formula was approved, omitting the preparatory part requiring self-examination. Clearly, the DRCSA had now deserted the Reformed road.

44. Paedocommunionistic propaganda during the new millennium (2000f)

Predictably, the ongoing international Paedocommunion interchange between James B. Jordan in the U.S.A. and Dr. Francis Nigel Lee in Australia continued even after the arrival of the

new millennium. Thus in April 2000, they crossed swords again in an e-groups discussion list which was debating the true meaning of First Corinthians 11:29f. There, Jordan decried as truly “dreadful theology” - Rev. Dr. John Calvin’s famous statement (in his *Institutes* IV:16:20) that Paedocommunionists are giving “poison” to their “young children.”

The position in Leithart’s PCA denomination, as of May 2001 - according to an e-mail evaluation by Lee Ferguson - was as follows: “The PCA denomination has ruled in relation to Paedocommunion that it is contrary to the Standards and that it may not be practiced by churches in the denomination. It has also ruled that Presbyteries can allow men to be Members of the Presbytery that hold these views, but cannot allow them to practice them. Some Presbyteries have ruled that they also cannot teach them. I am not sure if any Presbyteries have ruled that those holding to Paedocommunion cannot be received by the Presbytery. But I imagine that if that happened, the GA would uphold a Presbytery’s right to bar such men from their Presbytery.”¹⁴¹

Nevertheless, as of on July 8th 2001, according to the outspoken Paedocommunionist Enas Nathan:¹⁴² “To get the PCA current practice, I telephoned Peter Leithart a few weeks ago.... He told me that the proponents of PC [PaedoCommunion] have ‘**laid low**’ since the mid 1980s - and have essentially moved to an ‘early communion’ practice similar to the OPC. However, in his Presbytery, Leithart said that the youngest Communicant he knows of - was 18 months old [my emphasis - F.N. Lee]. He was examined by the Session, and then admitted to the Table. Hence it seems they are practicing ‘functional’ PC, **even if** the *Constitution* outlaws PC theoretically [emphasis mine - F.N. Lee].... If PC came up for a vote in his Presbytery, it would probably pass with a majority vote. Hence, he seems to think the majority opinion is shifting.

“Hence, ‘early communion’ seems to be the current practice in at least two presbyterian denominations,” concluded Nathan. “Part of me says, ‘That’s great! - at least the kiddies will get to eat’ - even if the laws exclude them at one level [emphasis mine - F.N. Lee].

“The purist in me says, ‘Make the laws right, then changes in the practice will follow!’ Leithart seems to think both are true and useful - children can eat after being examined, and maybe we can change the laws down the road.” Emphases mine - F.N. Lee. What utter duplicity!

Perhaps the most radical and provocative article to date, is *Why All Covenant Children Should be Admitted to the Lord’s Supper* - by Steven Schlei. According to Schlei, Pastor of ‘Peace Reformed Church’ (*sic*) in Colorado:¹⁴³ “Traditional Reformed teaching...is based upon faulty premises, unbiblical reasoning, and a serious misreading of the biblical data....

“It is my desire to correct these glaring errors in traditional Reformed theology, so that we do not perpetuate this injustice toward our children. In this paper, all the arguments used by John Calvin to deny our children the Lord’s Table will be...resoundingly refuted.... The arguments of Reformed theologians have not advanced beyond parroting the words of Calvin on this subject.”

According to Schlei, “children of the OT Church could partake of the feasts” and in ‘Exodus

12:4” at the Passover “there is no indication that the reckoning of the ‘number of persons’ in each household to consume the lamb excluded anybody.” *Per contra*, however, Exodus 12:37 & 12:43-49!

“The argument by Calvin that children did not participate in the Passover, is utterly absurd.... The Passover celebration is for all.... Foreign slaves often were ignorant.... Yet their ignorance did not forbid their participation in the meal that pointed to the Passover Lamb....

“Instruction was not a prerequisite to participation.... John Calvin insists that children were not allowed to come to the Passover meal until they were able to ask concerning its meaning (Exodus 12:26). This is sheer speculation.... Adam and his posterity were to eat of God’s sacramental tree of life.... Our children need to eat of God’s Tree of Life....

“There is no God-provided methodology either in the OT or the NT to bring our children to the Lord’s Table, other than through their being included in the covenant from birth.... The commandment of Christ (‘do this’) is in the imperative.... To reason that Paul was [in First Corinthians eleven] seeking to bring about self-exclusion...is absurd....

“There is no place in Scripture where covenant children are catechized with a view to making them eligible for the Lord’s Table” - *per contra*, Exodus 12:26-49 & Proverbs 22:6 & Luke 2:41-47 (thus F.N. Lee). “This whole practice is constructed whole-cloth out of human speculations.... It is man-made worship.... It suffers from God’s rejection of it as will-worship [*cf.* Colossians 2:23]....

“To refuse to allow some to participate...is an attack upon the unity of the body of Christ, a very serious matter.... To exclude part of the Church from the Lord’s Table, is schismatic.... Those who excommunicate children (or suspend them for a time)...err grievously.... God will not be pleased with us until all the body...is participating at the Lord’s Table....

“It is the practice of the Greek Orthodox Church...to dip a tiny piece of bread in the wine and give it to their infant children. I have read that the Jews gave their infants a tiny piece of meat to eat in the Passover. Thus, infants could be made to participate.

“Calvin’s objection at this point is not weighty.... Fetuses in the womb and nursing infants have participation in the Lord’s Table. They eat through Mom.... Reformed Churches should exclude pregnant women and nursing mothers, lest their infant children partake....

“Calvin...is thoroughly unbiblical.... The problem obviously is not with God’s logic, but with Calvin’s.... This whole line of thought is sheer rationalism - that is, placing man’s reasoning over against the thinking of God.... I have never understood why people find Calvin’s logic so persuasive at this point, when it is so manifestly unbiblical....

“To exclude children...is the height of absurdity and folly.... To exclude any portion of the body...for whatever reason we might deem it inappropriate for them to partake, is to act in a

schismatic fashion.... Reformed Churches are acting schismatically, and God is displeased. God will not be pleased until we end this schism and bring the whole body...to the Table.”

Comment on the above invective, is surely unnecessary. Some uncontrolled outbursts are indeed self-evident, and the above diatribe is one such. Like the Anabaptist Servetus, also ‘Peace Reformed’ Schlei is not shy. Nor is Schlei sly. As he himself **outspokenly** insists, he is averse to the sacramental stance of **Calvin’s** Theology.

Then there is also the A.D. 2002 maverick ‘Lutheran’ Marincic and the offbeat ‘Reformed’ Tim Gallant. Yet we shall defer discussing **them**, till the very end of this dissertation below.

45. Spermocommunionistic fanaticism - end of the road for Paedocommunion?

We have already noted James B. Jordan’s Uterocommunionism - the alleged eucharizing of unborn fetuses whenever their adult godly mothers themselves commune.¹⁴⁴ In 2001, one Mr. Marcus Booker took this even further - not only to Zygotocommunion [alias alleged eucharizing by a tiny human being less than a week old within the communing mother’s body] - but even to Ovocommunion [alleged eucharizing by an unfertilized human ovum] and Spermocommunion [alias alleged eucharizing by a human sperm even prior to its production of a human zygote].

We now present Mr. Booker’s thoughts - and our responses thereto. Here follows a series of excerpts, as they appeared on the pro-paedocommunionistic Covenant_Communion E-Groups Website in August 2001.

On August 11 2001, Marcus Booker wrote *inter alia*:¹⁴⁵ “When does covenant membership begin?... The answer is: from the foundation of the World.... Remember the crime of the man who spilled his seed (which is the holy seed) and refused to father his [late] brother’s wife a child?” Cf. Genesis 38:9. “That ‘seed’ that he spilled on the ground, was the ‘seed of Abraham’ just as much as was a full-fledged adult.”

This is truly an amazing statement. To it, Dr. Lee responded:¹⁴⁶ “Are you implying...that Onan’s unconceived seed was, within him, already in (covenantal **or** sacramental) communion with him - whenever Onan sacrificed, or perhaps even when he was getting circumcised [when himself but an infant], long before he spilled that seed on the ground?” Was ‘Covenanter’ Onan even then a ‘capital criminal’?

Mr. Booker did not immediately answer that question. So Dr. Lee rephrased it. He then asked Mr. Booker:¹⁴⁷ “So then, you were saying that...[**unconceiving** and fruitless] seed still within men, as distinct from **conceived zygotes** within pregnant women, eucharize when such men do? Or only when the women do; or both; or neither?”

Responded Mr. Booker:¹⁴⁸ “I think my answer is a resounding **yes!** Of course, the seed was

within him even from infancy; yet that seed more fully manifested itself later; for only mature men produce seed.... Such is covenant thought.”

Such is “covenant thought”? Well, hardly! Surely, true “covenant thought” is rather as follows:. (1) Only mature men produce seed. (2) Only mature men ate the Passover. And (3), after Calvary only mature men (and also mature women now released from the curse of the fall) - but not their fetuses or babies or toddlers - eat of the Lord’s Supper!

Booker then gave Lee more of the former’s own “covenant thought.” For Booker added: ¹⁴⁹ “God Himself communes with His people.... He communes with them and upholds them from the foundation of the World and ever thereafter (including when they are seed unfertilized)....

‘Now, even the Lord’s Supper had a physical power in the days of its proper usage. Indeed, many had grown ill and had died [*cf.* First Corinthians 11:29f] - for lack of charity respecting the Supper and the brotherhood.’

Mr. Booker had earlier asked, ¹⁵⁰ anent manducation at Exodus 12:4: ‘Does not every ‘soul’ partake?’ To that, Dr. Lee had responded: ‘According to the Eastern-Orthodox - only such souls as have been circumcised/baptized [Exodus 12:43-48 *cf.* Acts 2:38-46]. According to most of our modern Ex-Protestant Paedocommunionists - only such post-infantile circumcizees/baptizees as can grab and swallow the roast lamb. Either way - clearly **not** every ‘soul’ in the household.’

But Mr. Marcus Booker remained adamant. He responded: ‘I am saying **every** soul (adult or child, born or unborn).’

To which Dr. Lee then replied: ‘So then, if a wife got pregnant last night, and neither she nor her husband yet know it - he must nevertheless count that zygote among the number to manducate at the Passover in terms of Exodus 12:3-4? Of course, if she were then (also unbeknownly) carrying triplets - wouldn’t that throw out such a count?’

Mr. Marcus Booker’s response was less than civil: ‘Remember that I earlier said, ‘some souls eat more than others.’ Children at this very early age eat nearly nothing. If you have a family and your wife is with-child or with-children (yet unbeknown unto you) - do you have no idea what to feed her? Are you completely clueless as to what quantity of food (or lamb) would be meet for her (the children notwithstanding)?’

Mr. Booker here tries to dodge the question regarding the husband’s **numbering** of those in his household who could manducate at the Passover. Booker had insisted it was ‘sacramental’ when the Israelites ‘drank’ water from a rock in the desert (First Corinthians 10:1-4). To that argument, Dr. Lee had then responded: ‘Obviously, merely drinking water from a rock - humans, together with their animals - is hardly to be compared with sacramentally manducating at the Passover!’

To this, Mr. Booker than replied: ‘That depends! You could certainly compare them in one

sense.” Here one has visions of a Preacher’s pet dog lapping up the left-overs of baptismal water, or church-mice eating communion bread. Or, as Mr. Booker himself pointed out, of “maggots eat[ing] the left-over lamb.”

Is maggoted mutton still holy meat? Sacrament - or sacrilege? ‘Communioned’ critters? *Musterion*-munching mice? Regenerated rodents? Or just plain - ‘Rats!’

Dr. Lee had also asked Mr. Booker: ‘Have you yet satisfactorily traced the concept of adolescence from Genesis to Revelation in the original Hebrew and Greek...? It is, in fact, ingrained into human nature by the Law of Nature itself.’¹⁵¹

To that, Mr. Booker then responded: ‘This is the pith and marrow of idolatry.... Why selectively prohibit infants and young children from partaking in a mere memorial[?]..... If you do not eat of the body and drink of the blood of Christ (in truth), then you are damned.... The physical elements of bread and wine have no power to remove sin or lift the curse of the law. So - neither adults, children, infants, unborn, nor sperm need it.’

Is ‘The concept of adolescence from Genesis to Revelation in the original Hebrew and Greek’ truly **idolatry**’ - as Mr. Booker here seems to be alleging? Is he suggesting that all who ‘do not eat of the body and drink of the blood of Christ (in truth)’ - in the Eucharist - ‘are damned’? Is he serious, in linking all together (as he does) - ‘adults, children, infants’ even with the ‘unborn’ or ‘sperm’?

Dr. Lee then replied re the sperm: ‘Are you saying unfertilized sperm is already ‘family’?’ Mr. Booker retorted: ‘Were you a person, part of the family, when you were just eight cells?’ Rev. Professor Dr. Lee then answered: ‘Now you’ve shifted from unfertilized sperm to fertilize[d] zygote[s]. You said **sperms** were members of a household. Did you mean zygotes?’

Thereupon Mr. Booker rejoined: ‘Let me clarify. I was saying that the seed of your father is you, before it unites with your mother. And the seed of your mother is also you, before it unites with your father. This is what I meant when I said, ‘the two seeds, that eventually unite, are you (even before they unite).’

To this Dr. Lee responded:¹⁵² ‘Sounds like Mormon pre-existence to me! On August 11 2001, Mr. Booker wrote *inter alia*: ‘When does covenant membership begin?... The answer is: from the foundation of the World.’ And on August 16 2001, Mr. Booker added: ‘God Himself communes with His people.... He communes with them and upholds them from the foundation of the World and ever thereafter (including when they are seed unfertilized).’

To this, Dr. Lee responded: ‘Is this not embracing a false view re justification of the elect from all eternity? Is this not confusing the election of the elect from eternity - with their post-conceptual regeneration? Is it not such odd confusion of these matters, which hast propelled Booker into this quagmire?’

“Or does Booker believe in eucharizing all covenanters, regardless not only of their age but also regardless of their presumed regeneratedness?” Indeed, dare one enquire as to the Exodus 12:4 ‘number of the souls’ of Onan’s many unconceived ‘descendants’(!) - 1, prior to Genesis 38:8; 2, at Genesis 38:9; and 3, after Genesis 38:9? Such a Eucharistic theology should truly be altogether ‘in-conceiv-able’!

Also Rev. Mike Pasarilla (of Dallas’s OPC Christ Covenant Church) reacted to the mind-boggling and way-out statements of Mr. Booker. Wrote Rev. Pasarilla:¹⁵³

“Dear Marcus, I would urge you to reconsider your position.... You are in danger of getting caught up in idolatry. You are making something up, by deleting from God’s Word.... I’d urge you, brother, to not run ahead of God’s Word in this. Don’t spiritualize away the very things Christ told us to do.”

To which Mr. Booker replied:¹⁵⁴ “Do you wash feet (physically)? Christ commanded it. Both the Apostles and the Church did it.... Moreover, (physical) Circumcision was a command of God. How is it that Paul and the Church need not heed it? How is it that they argue from the Scriptures...that it was unnecessary and dispensable in the Messiah? Certainly Christ commanded a physical Supper - but only till that day that He drank the fruit of the vine with us new in His Kingdom (which has transpired already).”

Dr. Lee then responded that in such a case Mr. Booker’s Paedopassoverism would have become ‘unnecessary and dispensable’ at Calvary. Nay more. In that case, also Mr. Booker’s Paedocommunionism would have become ‘unnecessary and dispensable’ - and have reached its terminus by 70 A.D.

The above interchange had a very interesting termination. The Paedocommunionist Marcus Booker then told the list that the antipaedocommunionistic Dr. Lee “has consistently shown himself ignoble and unwilling to understand.... I waste my time.”¹⁵⁵ As if he were God, Booker also replied to Dr. Lee - publicly - by name:¹⁵⁶

“FNL, you honor me with your lips, but your heart is far from me. You teach teachings, the commands of men. You speak so as to be seen by men! Well, you have your reward already. You comfort yourself with your words. You say, ‘He tries not the reins and heart!’ And ‘the God of Jacob sees not.’ You are not wise. You have ears, but do not hear, and eyes, but do not see! You are like the work of your hands. You are a blind guide yet you say, ‘I see.’ You are still in your sins. You scoff at what you do not understand, as the ignorant are wont to do. You wallow in your own sin. You reproach not the son of man, but the very breath of God. You shall not be forgiven.”

To this outburst of Paedocommunionist Marcus Booker, the antipaedocommunionistic Dr. Lee responded in conclusion:¹⁵⁷ “Well, as a sinner forgiven by God, my not being forgiven by Marcus is irrelevant.”

Thereupon, the paedocommunionistic Moderator of this Covenant_Communion E-Groups Discussion List - one Kevin Bywater - immediately 'excommunicated' Dr. Lee. In e-mails to him dated August 18th & 21st 2001 informing Lee that he had 'bumped' him off his List, the Moderator admitted he had been a "Mormon" and did not appreciate Lee's critique of the "Mormon view of preexistence."

He also accused Lee of a "persistently unhelpful tone"; an insufficiently "charitable" attitude; of being "definitely most unhelpful"; of being "disingenuous and fallacious"; and of "maligning" the Moderator's own "motivations." The Moderator admitted currently to being "a Presbyterian" who did "have some standards." Indeed, Moderator Bywater even claimed to have some several "ethical standards" - such as, one must presume, not bumping off his List his own Fellow-Paedocommunionists who there publically and vehemently denounce the views of Antipaedocommunionists as being "ludicrous" *etc.*

What would happen if this extremely vociferous paedocommunionistic minority were ever to take over the PCA or the OPC? How much freedom of expression and practice would it then grant the present antipaedocommunionistic majority there, which currently allows this raucous pro-paedocommunionistic minority to practise and/or to preach - within the denomination - that which the latter forbids at the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177 to which it subscribes? One has every reason to ask these questions with the utmost candour.

In e-mails to the Moderator dated Aug. 20th & 21st 2001, Lee indicated that the Moderator's own sacramentalistic "Mormon background...served to remind" one "of the Mormon commitment to Child Communion and also to Weekly Communion. *Mormon Doctrine and Covenants* 19:42f; 20:40-45; 20:75; 46:4-6; 59:12; 69:25-29." Dr. Lee added that the Moderator's "list might yet find it a profitable exercise to trace the relationship between frequent [Weekly] and Child Communion in Pagan Greek-and-Oriental Mystery Religions, syncretistic Greek-Orthodoxy and Eastern-Orthodoxy, and [the] tritheistic Mormonism" of the Latter Day Ain'ts.

Lee added: "I must say I find it fascinating indeed that one who seeks to eucharize under-age covenant children in defiance of Holy Scripture as understood by the *Westminster Standards*, has no compunction about 'excommunicating' a retired 67-year-old invited Antipaedocommunionist and Presbyterian Professor of Theology with a doctoral knowledge of Paedocommunion from an E-Groups Discussion List about Paedocommunion" - to which list the Moderator had shortly before unsolicitedly invited Dr. Le as a full participant! However: "Such are the times. *O mores, o tempora.*"

Professor Lee also referred to the Moderator's own earlier publically-announced intention of winning the Elders on his Session for Paedocommunion. Dr. Lee wrote: "I refer to your message # 191 of Aug. 14th 2001 [on the Covenant_Communion E-groups Discussion List] where, 'always reforming,' you state 'we must address at some length First Corinthians [eleven] especially verses 27-29. These are the verses the *WLC* # 177 depends on.... I am currently conducting a preliminary study for my Session and would certainly like to have my proverbial ducks in a proverbial row.' Unquote."

Dr. Lee then signed off: "I take leave of the Presbyterian Ministers and Elders on your list." They are, "before the Lord, still having a sacred obligation to uphold one's binding Ordination Oath solemnly sworn before Almighty God also re the Antipaedocommunionism of the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177. Yours very sincerely...., Rev. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee."

46. Modern ex-paedocommunionistic Antipaedocommunionists (2001)

Before concluding, we should here note the utter confusion of Paedocommunionists among themselves. Apart from the newest novelties of Spermocommunion and Zygotocommunion, some allege 'Prenatal Communion' by a covenant fetus even before birth - 'Uterocommunion' (*sic*). Others would commune a covenant infant after birth yet before Baptism.

Yet others delay Communion till immediately after the baby receives Baptism. Still others give Communion only to slightly-older unweaned baptizees. Yet others do not give it till the baptizee is weanable. Still others give it only to the one actually weaned.

Yet others wait till the toddler 'honks twice' and claims to love Jesus. Others permit the parents to decide when they think their toddler can commune. Yet others say only the Minister and his Elders should admit the toddler to the Eucharist.

Quot homines, tot sententiae - there are as many opinions as there are men. But the Bible, God's Word, gives Holy Communion only to those baptizees who at maturity have professed their Christian Faith before the Elders of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Exodus 12:3,4,21,26f,37,43-49; Luke 2:41-47 & 22:1-20; First Corinthians 11:20-32.

Very refreshingly in his 2001 article *Pastoral Perspective on Paedo-Communion*, Rev. Charles W. Bradley of Hopewell Presbyterian Church states:¹⁵⁸ "I should begin by confessing that in my first pastorate, affiliated with another denomination, I practiced Paedocommunion myself and did it wholeheartedly.... After restudying the question, I must now state that I am more convinced than ever that participants in the Lord's Supper need to be capable of the full use of the mental powers that come only with the onset of maturity...."

"Some people holding the paedo view are so passionate for it that...it becomes a test of fellowship to them." However: "The burden of proof rests upon those taking the non-confessional view, and not upon those supporting the standards.... The Paedo position would force us to embrace a Roman Catholic or Lutheran understanding of how the Sacrament conveys grace.... For anyone coming from the Reformed perspective, this ought to be a paramount concern.

"After all, people were burned at the stake during the English Reformation for the Reformed view of the Sacrament. The proponents of Paedocommunion simply must answer the question of how grace is conferred in their new system.... At best they are left with the Lutheran view; at worst, the Roman.... Reformed theologians virtually all hold that the means of grace require faith

and a knowledgeable response to the signs, to be efficacious. To give the Sacrament to babies and small children, is to deny this basic requirement....

“I don’t see how that the understanding of what happens in the Sacrament in the Paedo scheme can become any more than Lutheran, that the bread and wine serve as spiritual vitamin pills with something in them that is of benefit apart from understanding - or, conversely, any less than the Roman Catholic view, where grace comes in the doing *ex opere operato*.... I remain unconvinced that babies and small children belong as participants at the Lord’s Table, Messrs. Wilkins and Schlei notwithstanding.”

There is also the excellent antipaedocommunionistic paper by Matthew Winzer of Tasmania, published under the name of Historicus and short-titled *The Reformed Practice of Discriminate Communion* at the website Evangelista.htm. “**Passover**,” argues Winzer, “**was not to be regarded simply as a covenant-meal**.... Did circumcised **infants** present **offerings** to the Lord? **Never**[!]. Though Isaac was circumcised (Genesis 21:4), and would worship the Lord with his father (22:5), [not Isaac but only] Abraham offered the sacrifices (22:13). But when Isaac **came of age**, then he presented offerings to the Lord (26:25).... The Passover lamb....was **not** just a **meal**, but a **blood-sacrifice** [Exodus 12:27].... Moses called for all the **Elders** of Israel, and said unto **them**, ‘Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the passover!’ Exodus 12:21-22....

“The paedo-communion[istic] wresting of the Scripture [Exodus 12:26f], is abominable. [The Paedocommunionist] Ray Sutton explicitly misquoted it.... He wrote, ‘It was in the context of participation that the children were prompted to ask, ‘What does this mean?’ or ‘Why do **we** do this?’” The altering of the Word of God, even the choice of pronouns [reading it as if it said *laanuu* (alias ‘for **us**’) instead of the *laachem* (alias ‘for **ye**’) which God the Holy Spirit has inscripturated here] - is **a very serious sin**....

“It would have been helpful if [the Paedocommunionist] Mr. Keidel had examined Joshua 4:6, in particular. For in this passage, the phrase occurs in the same form in which it is used in Exodus 12:26. Here Joshua commanded **the representative men** of each tribe to take up a stone upon his shoulder, out of the river Jordan, that it might be set down in the first lodging-place of the Israelites in the promised land. The purpose is stated by Joshua: ‘That this may be a sign among you, [so] that when your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, ‘what mean **ye** by these stones?’”.... Here again, it is beyond doubt that the enquirer is not understood to be a part of the action being enquired about.

‘Cross-reference Isaiah 3:15 and Ezekiel 18:2 for further instances of the ‘mean ye’ phraseology in the Hebrew Scriptures. It clearly separates the enquirer from the person or persons to whom the enquiry is being made. This Hebraism is employed also by Paul in Acts 21:13, where he distances himself from the Christians who were sorrowful at the thought of him being bound by the Jews and delivered to the hands of the Gentiles.

“The Passover,” continues Winzer, “was a propitiatory sacrifice. As such, it might [or **must**] **not** be **offered** in **ignorance**. The event was filled with spiritual significance, which the observers of the Passover were to be aware of; and that to such a degree that they could provide a knowledgeable explanation of the service they performed. When the Lord instituted the elements of the Passover, He also defined what sort of Sacrament this would be: ‘And this day shall be unto you for a **memorial** [cf. ‘in **remembrance**’ in Luke 22:19 & First Corinthians 11:24f]; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever’ (Exod. 12:14)....

“To show explicitly from Scripture that Passover was individualistic as well as corporate in nature, one need only turn over a page...to the next chapter of Exodus, where the Lord reiterated the importance of remembering His plenteous redemption to Israel: ‘And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, ‘This is done because of that which the Lord did unto **me** when **I** came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto **thee** upon **thine** hand, and for a **memorial** between **thine** eyes, [so] that the Lord’s Law may be in **thy** mouth. For with a strong hand hath the Lord brought **thee** out of Egypt. **Thou** shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season, from year to year” (Exodus 13:8-10). The Lord’s commandment could not be stated in a more explicitly individualistic way!”

Perhaps I (Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee) should point out that like Rev. Bradley mentioned earlier above, I too am an Ex-Paedocommunionistic Antipaedocommunionist. I was dedicated to Christ before I was born, by my then-Romish mother. Since my birth and Baptism when a baby, I when a child attended the Roman Catholic Church every Sunday and was admitted to manducate allegedly ‘transubstantiated’ communion bread when only seven.

Indeed, I myself eucharized more before I was eight - than most ‘Protestant’ Neo-Paedocommunionists will do in their lifetime. I first became a Calvinist Communicant when twenty-three. And now in my seventieth year, as a Protestant Minister and Professor-Emeritus in Reformed Theology of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, I am finalizing this definitive edition of my 1100-page book *Catechism Before Communion: Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*.

Finally, there is the testimony of the godly and highly-teachable Cathie Soles, who farms in Canada. Poor Cathie Soles had for many years been exposed to a variety of Neo-Anabaptist groups and paedocommunionistic practices, before gloriously coming to rest in Confessional Presbyterianism.

In August 2001, she took an important step. For it was then that she wrote to the U.S. Antipaedocommunionist Rev. Joseph Parnell McCarter: "Parnell, thank you for taking the time to repost Dr. Lee’s word concerning Communion - with the history (Jewish and Early-Christian) to verify that the ordinance be given only to young adults who had the passage of time necessary to have been taught properly...and [so as to pass] at examination by the Elders....

"Because of my lack of Church background not attending regularly any worship service

until after I was eighteen, and then having for years belonged to non-confessional congregations, I have never had the proper teaching presented to me before.... My daughters all confessed Christ at an early age between three and four years of age and I saw no harm in giving the grape juice and piece of white bread or cracker to them.... We attended many different denominations. For in many rural Canadian cities there may just be a Baptist, United, Free Evangelical, Pentecostal or Catholic Church to attend. Many of the small towns have no Presbyterian Church....

"Then, through a move two and half hours north of Edmonton, being invited to a Greg Bahnsen Conference hosted by...the Puritan Reformed Church..., our children began to benefit from the training and shepherding that we then received under the Elders Greg Barrow and Lyndon Dohms. That is: how to have family worship; the understanding of exclusive psalmody in worship; and the important use of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* in instructing our children in our home....

"We as a family are so thankful for the care we have been given by Elders who have continued to reform on many points themselves.... During this time we came to have high regard for Dr F.N. Lee and listened to his testimony of the Lord's mercy and grace and the actual power given him to forgive the repentant murderer of Dr. Lee's beloved father....

"It did not come to the Elders' attention that I had been a practicing Paedocommun[ion]ist, until the reforming of Membership and the subsequent re-interview to become a part of the Covenanting Church that we are today.... I agreed to come under care by promising not to teach my 'heresy.'

"And my own thinking in the matter was to submit to the Elders. For I was starting to think more confessionally and realized the Elders were held more accountable to God for my actions than I myself.... Plus my youngest of the five daughters at the time was over twelve - and had competently passed her own Membership Exam....

"I kept my promise, and did not teach or speak my heresy to anyone.... I know now that the Elders and my husband Grant thought that I had resolved my doubts and had come on board in my thinking.... So it was not until [my then] being on the 'Caledonia E-Groups Site' last month - that [I encountered] some dear folks who practice Paedocommunion on that list and defend their position...even though they have a *Confession* that says otherwise...

"I thought - what is the use of having a *Confession* [at all], if you continually speak against it?.... I was foolish enough to express this - and ended up having questions directed in my direction that I knew if I answered freely that I would be going against my promise to my Elders....

"Now, Parnell, you posting Dr. Lee's post has settled some things for me.... I am truly grateful.... The only thing I took exception to at first, was the line [of Rev. Professor Dr. John Calvin] that says... 'Why should we stretch out poison instead of vivifying food to our young children?...' I pondered that for a moment prayerfully.... What came to mind was the offering of strange fire by Aaron's sons, and the judgment that followed....

47. Conclusion: Paedocommunionistic Deformation, or a New Protestant Reformation?

What more shall I say? For the time would fail me to tell of the Anti- or Non-Paedocommunionists of Christ's Earliest Church - of the *Didachee*, Ignatius, Justin, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian, the *Liturgy of St. James*, Clement, Hippolytus, Origen, Commodian, and the Syrian *Didaskalia*.

Indeed, after the termination of the later innovation of Paedocommunion in the Dark Ages, at the Protestant Reformation (as already seen in Luther and Zwingli and Calvin) - the time would fail me to tell of the outspoken Antipaedocommunionism of Melanchthon, Bucer, Beza, Hyperius, Lasco, and Bullinger; of that of Wendelin, Marck(ius), the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, Walaeus, Voetius, Maastricht, Pictet, Heidegger, Turretin and Witsius; of that of Cranmer, Bradford, Ames, Perkins, the Westminster divines, Gillespie, Rutherford, Manton, Owen and Baxter; of the Cottons, the *Cambridge Platform*, the Mathers, Stoddard, Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Miller, Chas. & A.A. Hodge, Dabney, Warfield, Kuyper, Bavinck, Louis Berkhof, Dijk, Bijlsma, John Murray, Clowney, Coppes, and Morton Smith. Truly, just a few of the great cloud of witnesses that no man can number! Cf. Hebrews 11:32-40f.

It is indeed so that just over 200 years have elapsed since the egalitarian French Revolution of 1789 - which has engulfed not only almost all of the West and many parts of the East but recently also even the previously-isolated South Africa. The concept that "all (baptized) people are equal" - that infants are equal to adults - is indeed revolutionary. Indeed, the admission also of pre-adolescent toddlers to the Table - is at least semi-revolutionary.

Together with the great anti-revolutionary Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, we too would now call upon all conservative Calvinistic Christians everywhere to "oppose the Revolution with the Gospel." And the latter includes also Catechizing before Communion not Prior to Puberty.

It is true that Paedocommunionism has taken over such Presbyterian or Reformed denominations that have become theologically liberal. It is also true that Paedocommunionism has captured even some denominations still claiming to be Calvinistic.

Such include: the *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (GKN)* alias the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands; the Reformed Church in America (RCA); the Christian Reformed Church in North America (CRC); the *Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK)* alias the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa (DRCSA). Such include also: the U.S. Federation of Reformed Churches (FORC). Within the U.S.A. itself, Paedocommunionism has also taken over much of the Confederation of Reformed Evangelicals (CRE) - and some also within the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC), the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA), and the Reformed Episcopal Church (REC).

But though very aggressive, Paedocommunionism has not yet to our knowledge hijacked any of the other conservative historic Presbyterian and Reformed denominations. Indeed, the

Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS) has refused even to license known Paedocommunionists, and has disfellowshipped all who start to practise it.

The same applies to the *Gereformeerde Kerk in Suid-Afrika* alias the Reformed Church in South Africa (GKSA), the *Afrikaanse Protestantse Kerk* or the Afrikaans Protestant Church in South Africa (APK). It applies also to the Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA) - and many other denominations too many to mention.

What Rev. Dr. Joe Morecraft of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States (RPCUS) earlier above has rightly called “the ‘Paedocommunion challenge’ to the Reformed Faith” which ‘has swept the left wing of the Presbyterian family and...the Historic Presbyterian Churches’ - will not finally triumph. For over against it, stands “the Right Man on our side” -- the side of Classic Calvinism alias Historic Christianity.

Ecclesiastes 10:2 reminds us that “a wise man’s heart is at his right hand; but a fool’s heart at his left.” The Right Man Jesus Christ, that Greater Solomon, was Himself catechized as an adolescent when His beard began to grow. Proverbs 22:6 *cf.* Matthew 12:42 & Luke 11:31. That was when He was twelve -- in preparation for His Own admission to the Passover celebration in the following year when He would turn thirteen. Luke 2:41-47*f.*

Nay, more! Christ the Right Man instituted His Holy Table only for disciplined adults. Luke 22:1-20. Indeed, that is exactly what the Apostle Paul himself infallibly implies in First Corinthians 11:23. For there he states: “I had received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you.”

Paul had received from the Lord not only the statement that “the [adult] labourer is worthy of his reward” (in First Timothy 5:18-23 from Luke 10:7), but also the account of the Lord’s institution of His Supper for His catechized adult disciples alone (from Luke 22:1-20). And it is that account, which is certainly non-paedocommunionistic - which he had received from the Lord - which the Apostle Paul later delivered or transmitted also to the Apostolic Church. First Corinthians 11:23-34.

How then could our own sinful children possibly ever be more prepared for their admission to the Holy Meal - than was that sinless Right Man Himself? He Himself first communed when adolescently becoming an adult at thirteen. Indeed, He later instituted also His Holy Supper - for catechized adults alone!

ENDNOTES

- 1) S. Miller: *Infant Baptism* [1834] Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage reprint, 1984, pp. 50f & 120.
- 2) *M. Nid.* 6:11 & *Keth.* 50a. 3) Thus *Aboth RN* 16 (*Sd*) 4) *M. Yom* 8:4.
- 5) *M. Hul.* 1:1; *M. Erub.* 3:2; *M. Arak.* 1:1; *Chag.* 2b.
- 6) *M. Nid.* 5:6; cf. *Ch^etubim* 50; *Joma* 82:1; *Sh^emoth Rabb.*; Ignatius's *Ad Magn.* 3; and Lightfoot on Luke 2:41f.
- 7) *Berak* 15a; *Meg.* 19b; *M. Sam.* 1:8 & 8:1 (cf. I Sam. 1:8 & 8:1). 8) In *Pes.* 7:6 & 8:1-7.
- 9) Waterland, D.: *Enquiry Concerning Infant Communion*, in *Works* (Oxford), 1853, II, pp. 41-72.
- 10) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, I, pp. 222-234. 11) *Ibid.* 5:1 & 7:1-5.
- 12) *Vallentine' s Jewish Encyclopaedia* London: Shapiro, 1938, p. 432. 13) *Ber.* 6a.
- 14) *Op. cit.*, pp. 72, 155, 340. 15) H. Bavinck: *The Education of Ripening Youth*, Kampen: Kok, 1927, pp. 7-14.
- 16) J. Caesar: *Gallic Wars* 6:13f. 17) C. Tacitus: *Germania* (13).
- 18) E. Young: *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law*, South Hackensack, N.J.: Rothman Reprints, 1972, pp. 161f.
- 19) See *Alfred's Laws*, 26. 20) *AEthelst.* 2:1 *Pr.* 21) *Knut* 2:20-21.
- 22) Bijlsma, R: *Short Catechetics* (Callenbach, 1962), pp. 59 & 87; Wycliffe, J: *Tracts and Treatises* (ed. Vaughan, London: Wycliffe Soc., 1845, pp. lxxxviii, 140-43, 151, 301); the various *Bohemian Confessions* and *Catechisms*, in E.G.A. Böckel's *Confessions of the Evangelical Reformed Church* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1847), pp. 778f & 783 n. 9 & 814f (art. 13) and in D.W. de Villiers's *Catechizing in the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa* (Stellenbosch: Pro Rege, 1957), pp. 105f ; art. *Lasitius*, in Schaff-Herzog' s *Religious Encyclopaedia* (New York: Funk & Wagnall, 1882), II:1279; and Witsius H.: *The Economy of the Covenants* (London: Tegg, 1837), p. 441.
- 23) According to E.P. Cubberley' *History of Education*, Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge Mass., 1920, p. 312; and E. Greyling's *Religious Education in the Church*, The Sunday School Bookroom, Bloemfontein, 1955, p 7; De Villiers's *op. cit.*, pp.106f .
- 24) De Villiers's *op. cit.*, pp.106f ; Bavinck: *op. cit.* p. 21; Bijlsma: *Sh. Cat.* p. 88f ; Dijk, K.: *The Ministry of the Church* (Kampen: Kok, 1952), pp. 12 & 122.
- 25) Zwingli, U: *Refutation of the Baptist Tricks* (in the 1973 Schuler & Schultness edition of his *Works*).
- 26) Bavinck: *op. cit.*, p. 20. 27) Calvin, J.: *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (16:16f), Banner of Truth, 1987, pp. 606f.
- 28) Calvin on Ex. 12:26f & 12:43f & 23:14f [cf. Num. 1], in his *Harmony of the Pentateuch*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948, I:464f.
- 29) Calvin, J.: *Institutes* (London: Clarke) IV:16:30. 30) Calvin, J.: *The Gospel according to St. John* (6:53f).
- 31) Calvin: *Commentary on Hebrews* [6:2]. 32) Calvin' *Commentary on Acts* [19:5-6].

- 33) Calvin, J.: *The True Method of Reforming the Church* [1548], in his *Tracts & Treatises* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958), III:322f.
- 34) Calvin, J.: *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (IV:16:30f & IV:19:4-13), cf. the A.D.195f Clement of Alexandria (cf. De Villiers's *op. cit.* p. 97f) and the A.D. 325f *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII:4:32.
- 35) Calvin' *Letter to Farel*, March 1540, in *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. Bonnet (Grand Rapids: Baker), 1983, IV, pp. 175f.
- 36) Calvin' s 1541 *Geneva Catechism*, in *Tracts and Treatises* II:33-37 & 93f.
- 37) Calvin' s 1541 *Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances*, in Hughes, P.E.: *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 1966, pp. 35 & 44-47.
- 38) *The Register of the Company of Pastors in Geneva* (1546), in Hughes: *op. cit.* p. 56.
- 39) Calvin' *Tracts and Treatises* II:526 & 534f.
- 40) Greyling, E.: *The Sunday School*, Bloemfontein: S. S. Bookroom, 1955, pp 7-9; De Villiers' *op. cit.*, pp. 109f.
- 41) *Council of Trent*: 7th Session, Confirmation, canon 1; and 7th Session, Baptism, canon 14. Cited in Calvin, J.: *Tracts and Treatises* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 1958, III, pp. 166f.
- 42) *Belgic Confession*, art. 35. 43) *Heidelberg Catechism*, Questions and Answers 81- 82.
- 44) Zacharias Ursinus: *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism (in loco)*.
- 45) *Second Swiss Confession*, arts. 18 & 21.
- 46) J. Douglass, J. Knox, J. Row, J. Spottiswood, J. Willock & J. Winram: *The First Book of Discipline* XI:3-5, in Bradshaw, F.M.: *Basic Documents of Presbyterian Polity* (Sydney: PCA Christian Educ. Pubs.), 1984, pp. 35-38.
- 47) *Scots Confession of Faith*, chs. 22-23. 48) *Westminster Confession of Faith* (29:8).
- 49) *Westminster Larger Catechism* (171). 50) *Westminster Larger Catechism* (174).
- 51) *Westminster Larger Catechism* (177).
- 52) *Book of Common Order of the Presbyterian Church of Australia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 91.
- 53) See: 1, Becker, U & Lazareth, W.H.: *...and do not hinder them. An Ecumenical Plea for the Admission of Children to the Eucharist*. Faith and Order Paper no. 109, Geneva, World Council of Churches, 1982; 2, Bieritz, K.: *The Lord's Supper as Sacrament of Fellowship*, in *...And do not Hinder Them*; 3, Cyrille A.: *Children and the Eucharist*. In . . . *and do not Hinder Them*; 4, Gerlach, H.: *Kinder beim Abendmahl. Argumente, Modelle, Gebete und neue Lieder [Children at the Lord's Supper. Arguments, Models, Prayers and New Songs]*, Kassel, Johannes Stauda Verlag, 1978; 5, Holeton, D.R.: *The Communion of Infants and Young Children*, in *...and do not hinder them*; 6, Holeton, D.R. & Kenntner, E.: *Eucharist with Children in the Churches of the World*, in *...and do not hinder them*; 7, Torrance, J.B.: *Some Theological Grounds for Admitting Children to the Lord's Table*, in *Reformed Review*, vol. 40, 1987.

- 54) See in K. Deddens's *Children and Lord's Supper*, 1986, pp. 1 & 3 (C/O A.H. Bogaards, E-mail Address: ahbogaards@spg.co.za), and the Dec.1976 edition of *Kerkinformatie* (No. 65 p. 8).
- 55) I.H. Murray: *Letter to Lee*, Aug. 1985. 56) I.H. Murray: *Letter to Lee*, Nov. 1986.
- 57) I.H. Murray: *Letter to Lee*, Feb. 1988. 58) I.H. Murray: *Letter to Lee*, 25 July 1995.
- 59) Deddens: *op. cit.*, pp. 1 & 12. 60) See at n. 52 above. 61) *Op. cit.*, p. 91.
- 62) Cooper, P.: *Should Children be Allowed to Partake of the Lord's Supper?*, in *Australian Presbyterian Living Today*, Sydney: PCA Publications, Oct. 1986.
- 63) Dr. F.N. Lee: *Catechism Before Communion!* (article in *Australian Presbyterian Living Today*), Sydney: PCA Publications), Dec. 1986.
- 64) Presbyterian Church in Australia: *Report of the Committee on Paedocommunion*. Brisbane: Mowbray Presbytery, June 1996, pp. 4-7.
- 65) G. Visee's "May - and Must - Our Children Partake of the Lord's Supper?" Published in *Christian Renewal* IV:14-17, March-May 1986, and translated from his *Onderwezen in het Koninkrijk der Hemelen* (Kampen 1979).
- 66) *Christian Renewal*. IV:14, March 1986.
- 67) [Pro-paedocommunionistic] *Report to Synod 1995 of the Committee to Study Clarification of Public Profession of Faith for Covenant Children, Report B*, <http://www.crchurches.net/resources/crcstuff/DiscussionStarters/1995ProfessionOfFaith.html>... 8/6/01, p. 4.
- 68) *Acts of Synod 1988*, Grand Rapids: Christian Reformed Church, 1988, p. 558. 69) *Ib.*, p. 560.
- 70) *Reformed Ecumenical Synod News Exchange*, August 9th 1988. 71) *Agenda for Synod 1989*, pp. 63-68.
- 72) *Acts of Synod 1991*, p. 785. 73) *Agenda for Synod 1993*, p. 239. 74) *Acts of Synod 1991*, pp 552 & 556.
- 75) *Report to Synod 1995 of the Committee to Study Clarification of Public Profession of Faith for Covenant Children (Report A), of Public Profession of Faith for Covenant Children, Report A*, <http://www.crchurches.net/resources/crcstuff/DiscussionStarters/1995ProfessionOfFaith.html>... 8/6/01, pp. 2-9.
- 76) *Report to Synod 1995 of the Committee to Study Clarification of Public Profession of Faith for Covenant Children (Report A), of Public Profession of Faith for Covenant Children, Report B*, <http://www.crchurches.net/resources/crcstuff/DiscussionStarters/1995ProfessionOfFaith.html>... 8/6/01, pp. 9 & 30f: "Too often the discussion about participation in the Lord's Supper loses sight of the communal aspect of faith and overemphasizes *individual* faith.... Is the requirement to discern the body laid upon each individual? To answer yes is to accept the individualistic interpretation of I Corinthians 11.... Only an individualistic interpretation based upon an individualistic understanding and interpretation of I Corinthians 11, leads some to demand individual faith for admission to the table and excludes those not able to give such a statement."
- 77) *Ib.*, p. 35. 78) *Ib.*, pp. 31f. 79) *Ib.*, pp. 37f.

- 80) Art. *Synod Defines Children's Profession of Faith*, in *Christian Observer*, Manassas Va., July 5 1955, p. 27.
- 81) See *Addendum E* in F.N. Lee's *Catechism Before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*, rev. ed., Brisbane: Jesus Saves, 2001.
- 82) Coppes, L.J.: *Letter to Lee*, July 10th 1995; cf. E. Nathan's *Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?*, http://groups.yahoo.com/Covenant_Communion/message/43, July 8th 2001.
- 83) Lee, F.N.: *Letter to W.T.S. Rev. Prof. Dr. Sinclair Ferguson*, June 7th 1995: "I recently listened to four [1994] cassette tapes entitled *The Biblical Doctrine of Paedocommunion*, by (the Rev.?) James Jordan, formerly a graduate of W.T.S....and currently I believe a member of the O.P.C. in Niceville Fla. In his tapes, I got the impression the speaker was saying that all of the W.T.S. Faculty save two...came out against the Antipaedocommunionism of Calvin and the *Larger Catechism* (Q. 177) and in favour of Paedocommunion. Could you please give me your impression as to the correct state of affairs on this?"
- 84) See: Gaffin Jr., R.B.: *Letter to Lee*, June 27 1995. Cf. too Ferguson, S.: *Letter to Lee*, 17th June 1995: "As to the situation in the Faculty, we have never formally discussed this issue [Paedocommunion] in my time here since 1982. My impression of the Faculty is that those members whose children have come to the Lord's Table, have come as professing believers and as those received into communicant membership."
- 85) Langdon, A.A.: *Communion for Children? The Current Debate*. Sydney: Christian Education Publications, 1987, pp. 8 & 35-40.
- 86) See *Australian Presbyterian Life*, Sydney, Dec. 1997, p. 28. 87) *Geneva Review*, Tyler Tx., March 1988.
- 88) *Report of the Ad-Interim Committee to Study the Question of Paedocommunion*. 16th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, 1988, Appendix T, p. 516. In *PCA Digest*, Decatur Ga.: PCA Church Offices, pp. 498-514. Also see esp. *Addendum E* in F.N. Lee's *Catechism Before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*, rev. ed., Brisbane: Jesus Saves, 2001.
- 89) Lemasters, V.: *Position Paper* (attacking Dr. Lee's Antipaedocommunion views and demanding that the Lord's Supper be given to covenant infants). In *Journey Magazine* (Lynchburg, Va., U.S.A.), Nov.-Dec. 1988.
- 90) Lee, F.N.: *The Antipaedocommunionistic Old Testament Israelites: A Response to Vance LeMasters*. In *Journey Magazine*. Lynchburg, Va., 1989.
- 91) Coppes, L.J.: *Daddy, May I Take Communion? Paedocommunion Versus The Bible!*, Manassas, Va.: Reformed Educational Foundation, 1988.
- 92) *Op. cit.*, pp. 169, 241f & 271f. 93) Elliott, E. (ed.): *Christian Observer*, Manassas Va., June 24 1988, p. 10.
- 94) On outside back cover of Coppes' s previously-mentioned 1988 book.. 95) *Op. cit.*, pp. 73-83 & 121f.
- 96) *Ib.*, p. 195. 97) *Ib.*, pp. 194-97 & 261-63. 98) Reported in the *Christian Observer* June 24th 1988, pp. 16f.
- 99) Coppes, L.J.: *Letter to Lee*, June 13th 1988.
- 100) Bacon, R.: *What Mean Ye by This Service? [Exodus 12:26]. Paedocommunion in Light of the Passover*. Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage, 1989, pp. 3-42.

- 101) See n. 89.
- 102) Through constraints of space, that Foreword got truncated to the following endorsement on the outside back cover of Dr. Bacon's book: "Here is a succinct statement of our Puritan position.... With affection and appreciation, I warmly commend this book by Richard Bacon to all who love our Lord. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee, Professor of Systematic Theology, Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary."
- 103) *Synod Reports and Acts*, Geelong: Reformed Churches of Australia, 1988, III-10f & III-19. 104) *Ib.*, I-15.
- 105) Bloomfield, P.: *The Age of Communion: Some Guidelines for our Westminster Presbyterian Church*. Bald Hills, Qld.: Bald Hills Presbyterian Church, 1989, pp. 1 & 8.
- 106) *Ib.*, p. 8.
- 107) See *Addendum F* in F.N. Lee's *Catechism Before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*, rev. ed., Brisbane: Jesus Saves, 2001.
- 108) Leithart, P.: *Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?: An Examination of Leonard J. Coppes's "Daddy, May I Take Communion?"* Niceville Fla.: Transfiguration Press, 1992, pp. 6 & 24 & 32f & 4 & 44 & 46f & 67 and the outside back cover.
- 109) Jordan, J.B.: *Judges: God's War Against Humanism*. Tyler, Tx.: Geneva. 1985, p. 232.
- 110) Cf. Pro-Paedocommunionist Bywater's booklist *Paedocommunion Bookmarks*.http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Covenant_Communion/message/46. July 26th, 2001, p. 3.
- 111) See at nn. 107-8 above.
- 112) Jordan, J.B.: *A Letter on Paedocommunion*. Niceville Fla.: Rite Reasons, 1992, pp. 1-8.
- 113) Reformed Ecumenical Council: *Acts of the Reformed Ecumenical Council*. Grand Rapids: REC, 1996, Appendix II, pp. 231f.
- 114) Reformed Ecumenical Council: *Acts of the Reformed Ecumenical Council [Indonesia]*. Grand Rapids: REC, 2000, *in loc.* See too P. Van der Kooi: *Die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Raad [The Reformed Ecumenical Council]*, Pretoria: *Die Kerkpad*, January 2001, pp. 14f.
- 115) Jordan, J.B.: *The Sociology of the Church*. Tyler, Tx.: Geneva. 1986, pp. xi,38,246f,249. See too Robbins, J.: *Review of J.B. Jordan's 'The Sociology of the Church.'* Jefferson Md.: The Trinity Foundation, Nov. 1993.
- 116) Jordan, J.B.: *Concerning Paedocommunion*, Fla., 1995. 117) Murray, I.H.: *Letter to Lee*, 12th June 1995.
- 118) Jordan, J.B.: *Biblical Horizons* [group of articles], Niceville Fla., May 1995, p. 4. (All emphases in the above citation are those of Rev. Prof. Dr. F.N. Lee.)
- 119) Jordan, J.B.: *The Great Hangover*, in *Biblical Horizons*, Niceville Fla., July 1995, pp. 1-2: "We find Christian theologians turning to the Mishnah and Talmud to explain serious theological matters, seemingly oblivious to Jesus' condemnation of it. Those who want to deny the Lord's Supper to children, regularly turn to these demonic books in order to justify their position." So, to Jordan, the *Mishnah* and the *Talmud*

- are not only totally devoid of value -- in their understanding of Ex. 12:3-49. There are, in fact, even when commenting thereon, apparently “**demonic**” (*sic*). And so too, it would seem - in Jordan’s opinion - are all who follow such comments.
- 120) Coppes, L.J.: *Consideration of the Paedocommunion Position. “The Flesh Profits Nothing”, John 6:63.* Thornton, Co.: Dr. Leonard J. Coppes, 9161 Vine St., June 1994.
- 121) R.J. Rushdoony: *Institutes of Biblical Law*, Nutley N.J.: The Craig Press, 1973, pp. 44f,752f,794,782.
- 122) Rushdoony, R.J.: *Systematic Theology*. Vallecito, Ca.: Ross House Books, 1994, II:683, 736f, 850.
- 123) Peacock, M.D.: *Open Letter to ‘Fellow Elders in the PCA.’ For the Session of Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church*, Monroe La., June 1994.
- 124) See F.N. Lee: *Dr. Lee’s 1995 Observations on Rev. Wilkins 1994 Paedocommunion Tapes*. Wavell Heights, Australia: Jesus Lives, 1995. Incorporated as *Addendum I: Critique of Rev. Wilkins’s Paedocommunion Tapes*, in the 2001 expanded edition of F.N. Lee’s *Catechism before Communion! Why Baptized Children Need Catechizing Before First Communing Not Prior To Puberty*.
- 125) Smith, M.H.: *Systematic Theology*, Greenville, S.C.: Greenville Seminary Press, 1994, II:686-91.
- 126) See at nn. 83-84 above.
- 127) Myers, J.: *Presbyterian, Examine Thyself!* In *Rite Reasons*, Niceville Fla: Biblical Horizons, Sept. 1996, pp. 1-3.
- 128) Lee, Tommy: *The History of Paedocommunion: from the Early Church until 1500*; and *The Theology of Paedocommunion*. Both at http://www.reformed.org/sacramentology/tl_paedo/. Neither work should be overrated. These are high-sounding titles indeed: “The History” and “The Theology” of Paedocommunion. Yet the first cannot cite any pro-paedocommunionistic evidence whatsoever before the A.D. 251f Cyprian (whom Tommy Lee tries to present as a Paedocommunionist). The second is a much weaker work, saying on its very first page that “the Feast of Passover” evidences “that children are nowhere excluded from participation” and rather “they are often[?!] explicitly[?!] included[?!]. Tommy Lee’s own emphasis. Needless to say, Paedocommunionist Tommie Lee is no kin of Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Nigel Lee -- either genealogically or sacramentologically.
- 129) Bywater, K.: *Paedocommunion Bookmarks* .http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Covenant_Communion/message/46. July 26th, 2001.
- 130) Gentry, K.L: *Paedocommunion: Faith or Fad?* Reedy River Presb. Church (S.C.). Cassette tapes. 1994.
- 131) Horne, M.: *Passover, Paedocommunion, and Dr. Kenneth L. Gentry*. In *Rite Reasons*, Niceville Fla.: Biblical Horizons. Jan. 1995.
- 132) Jordan, J.B.: *Biblical Horizons*, Fla., May 1995, p. 3.
- 133) Jordan, J.B.: *Letter to Gentry*, May 22, 1995.
- 134) Subscript later added, in Gentry’s own handwriting, at bottom of Jordan’s May 22 1995 *Letter to Gentry* (copy in the possession of Dr. F.N. Lee).

- 135) Horne, M.: *You and Your Son and Daughter: Christ's Communion with Young Children*. http://www.hornes.org/theologia/mSacraments.shtml?papers/Mark_Horne_-_You_and_Your_Son_and_Daughter.htm, 1997, pp. 1-22.
- 136) Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa: *Report on Children at the Lord's Table to the 1998 General Synod of the D.R.C. of South Africa*. Cape Town: DRC Publishers, 1998.
- 137) Danzfuss, T.: *Kinderkommunie: Reformasie of Deformasie?* [*Child Communion: Reformation or Deformation?*]. University of Pretoria: M. Div. dissertation, 1998, pp. 376f.
- 138) *Die Kerkbode*, the official Church Journal of the DRC. Cape Town: DRC Publishers, 4 June 1999.
- 139) Van der Kooi, P. (ed.): *Ingrypende Reformatoriese Verklaring van NG Kerk Brakpan-Suid* [*Drastic Reformational Declaration of the Brakpan-South DRC*], Pretoria: *Die Kerkpad*, September 2000, p. 12. The full text is obtainable from: hefer@mweb.co.za
- 140) Van der Kooi, P. (ed.): *Besluit NG Kerkraad Hentiesbaai* [*Decision of the Henty's Bay DRC Session*], Pretoria, *Die Kerkpad*, January 2001, p. 10. See too Rev. Dr. J.A.E. Adendorff's article in the Nov. 2003 edition of the *Kerkpad*., where he wrote: "Wat nog meer ontstellend is, is dat daar voor die Sinode van 2002 'n voorstel van die Algemene Kommissie van Leer en Aktuele Sake (AKLAS) gedien het wat soos volg gelui het: 'Aangesien ons kinders deur die doop opgeneem is in Gods genadeverbond en derhalwe deel is van die kerk as liggaam van Christus, bestaan daar geen rede om hulle te weerhou van die nagmaal nie, en kan hulle daarom met vreugde uitgenooi word na die nagmaal' (Agenda 2002:258). Daarmee het AKLAS dus voorgestel dat alle gedoopte kinders, sonder enige voorbehoud, nagmaal kan gebruik. Dié voorstel is met 'n klein meerderheid afgewys en die Sinode het besluit om by sy besluit van 1998 te bly. Daarmee is al die beswaarskrifte téén die kindernagmaal ook afgewys. Die kans is egter goed dat 'n volgende Sinode wel AKLAS se voorstel gaan goedkeur. Trouens, prof. Flip Theron, wat AKLAS se saak gestel het, het dit vol bravade voorspel! Met bogenoemde besluite oor die sogenaamde kindernagmaal het die NG Kerk duidelik die gereformeerde pad verlaat. Die gereformeerde kerke deur die eeue heen het nog altyd gesê wie nagmaal wil gebruik, moet eers in die waarhede van die Christelike geloof onderrig word en openlik hulle geloof bely. 'n Klein kindjie kan nie aan die vereistes van 1 Kor. 11:28-31 voldoen nie.

Die groot hervormer Johannes Calvyn het in dié verband gesê: 'Wil ons iets duideliker hê as wat die apostel leer wanneer hy ons vermaan dat elkeen homself moet ondersoek en beproef, en dat hy dan van die brood moet eet en uit die beker moet drink? Die ondersoek behoort dus daaraan vooraf te gaan, en dit is iets wat tevergeefs van kinders verwag word. Net so: 'Wie op onwaardige wyse eet, eet en drink tot sy veroordeling omdat hy nie die liggaam van die Here onderskei nie.' As slegs diegene wat weet hoe om die heiligheid van die liggaam van Christus na behore te onderskei, in staat is om op waardige wyse daarvan te eet, waarom sou ons dan vir ons teer kindertjies gif aanbied as lewendmakende voedsel?' (Institusie soos vertaal deur HW Simpson, Boek 4, pp 1666-1667). Dis ernstige woorde wat ons ter harte moet neem! Tydens die Algemene Sinode van 2002 is ook allerlei gebruike in die erediens goedgekeur wat vroeër taboe was. 'n Sogenaamde wydingsnagmaal is goedgekeur waar elke lidmaat op sy/haar eie tyd (en sonder amptelike Woordverkondiging) nagmaal kan gebruik. 'n Kindervriendelike nagmaalsformulier is goedgekeur waarin die selfondersoekende voorbereidingsdeel uitgelaat is."

- 141) L. Ferguson: *Theonomy and Paedocommunion and the PCA*, bbwarfield@yahoo.com, 28 May 2001.
- 142) Nathan, E.: *Covenant Communion Discussion 'Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?'* See at http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Covenant_Communion/message/43 (July 8th 2001).

- 143) Schlei, S.: *Why All Covenant Children Should Be Admitted to the Lord's Supper*, <http://www6.addr.com/~peaceref/paedocommunion.htm>, 2001, pp. 1-8.
- 144) See at n. 109 above.
- 145) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] etc., to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [U.S.A.] Saturday, August 11, 2001 5:31 AM.
- 146) Dr. Francis Nigel Lee: [*Covenant Communion*] etc., to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Friday, August 10, 2001 7:07 PM
- 147) Dr. Francis Nigel Lee: [*Covenant Communion*] etc., to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Tuesday, August 14, 2001 2:27 PM
- 148) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] SEED!, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [U.S.A.] Tuesday, August 14, 2001 2:11 AM.
- 149) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*]SEED!, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [U.S.A.] Tuesday, August 16, 2001 7:09 AM.
- 150) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] Do elect sperms or zygotes eucharize through Uterocommunion?, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [U.S.A.] Thursday, August 16, 2001 8:27 AM.
- 151) See too the citation from Bavinck referred to at n. 15 above.
- 152) Francis Nigel Lee: [*Covenant Communion*] Mormonism - here we come!, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Saturday, August 18, 2001, 6:00 AM.
- 153) Mike Pasarilla: [*Covenant Communion*] Lord's Supper (physically) is required, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Thursday, August 16, 2001.
- 154) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] Lord's Supper (physically) is required, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Thursday, August 17, 2001, 12:30 AM.
- 155) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] Mormonism -- here we come!, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Saturday, August 18, 2001, about 7:32 AM..
- 156) Booker Marcus: [*Covenant Communion*] Mormonism -- here we come!, to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Thursday, August 17, 2001, 7:12 AM..
- 157) Francis Nigel Lee: [*Covenant Communion*] Not "forgiven", to Covenant_Communion@yahoogroups.com, [Australian EST] Saturday, August 18, 2001, 7:45 AM.
- 158) Bradley, C.: *Pastoral Perspective on Paedo-Communion*, http://www.hifo.net/hopewell/id15_m.htm, 2001.