


## CALVINIST CRITIQUE OF 2003 “AUBURN AFFIRMATION”



### REFUTATION OF THE HYPERCOVENANTAL SACRAMENTOLOGY OF REV. S. WILKINS

Back in the 1990s, Auburn Avenue P.C.A. Monroe Louisiana's Rev. Steve Wilkins, taped eight of his sermons -- proposing that also baptized but unconfirmed young children should manducate at the Lord's Supper. Later, he augmented his tapes with four articles (which were posted to his website in 2001). Here is an updated 125-point critique of those taped sermons and published articles -- by Australia's Presbyterian Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee.

1) Rev. Wilkins should note that God the Father, Son and Spirit have all and always been **mature** Persons -- from all eternity past. They have never been immature children

2) This mature Triune God made a **mature** Adam (and a mature Eve) as His Own **mature** image(s). Though infant humans too, immaturely image God -- they are immature images. So too (in His human nature) was the pre-adolescent human being, Jesus Christ Himself. Significantly, Luke 2:40-52 records His first attendance at a Passover celebration when He was twelve -- one year before attaining His human maturity at thirteen.

3) The transgression by the **mature** Adam of God's first covenant with man, is recorded at Hosea 6:7. Later, his sons Cain and Abel brought their sacrifices to God only when they had become **mature** enough to be married. Genesis 4:3-17. Indeed, even the re-establishment of this covenant with the **mature** Noah and his sons, was effected only when all of those sons were themselves **mature**. Genesis 6:18.

4) The Bible never calls the prefall tree of life, a Sacrament. Yet it was not for manducation by the unweaned or by toddlers (neither of which existed before the fall) -- but only for adults. Even if the fall had never occurred, the fruit of that tree would not have been given to unfallen children at least until after weaning them (probably around four years of age) -- and more likely yet, not till they attained adolescence and became capable of marrying (*cf.* Genesis 2:24). Indeed, the fruit of that tree of life would not have been given to anyone -- until all were **fully** mature in their service of God (*cf.* Genesis 2:9; 3:22-24; Proverbs 11:30; 13:12; 15:4; Revelation 2:7; 22:2,14,19).

5) It is true that olive-trees produce olive-shoots, and not shoots of trees other than olive-trees. Yet even olive-shoots are only **non-fruitbearing olive-shoots**. They are not fruit-bearing olive-trees -- till they themselves later **mature**. Romans 11:16*f* *cf.* John 15:1-7.

6) It is incorrect to claim that infidels' **babies** were killed at the exodus. Only the first-born sons of the Egyptians were -- and such first-born would then usually have been adults.

7) It is incorrect to claim, in Psalm 137, that the Babylonians' **babies** were to be bashed. Such babies were not criminally wicked. Those to be bashed (though called 'little ones'), were not sucklings or toddlers but obviously adolescents or adults who had cruelly wronged Israel. The same applies to the sodomites in Sodom who had pestered Lot. Genesis 18:26-33 & 19:4-11 *cf.* Second Peter 2:5-8 and (Calvin's commentary on) Jonah 4:11's "**discern**" with First Corinthians 11:28-29.

8) "Suffer the little children to come to Me" indeed includes babies (or at least toddlers who could toddle to Jesus), but has nothing to do with the Eucharist from which also Rev. Wilkins would exclude babies (yet not exclude toddlers). If he wishes to use this text to support Paedocommunion, he should admit even babies thereto. But he admits babies only to Baptism, but not to the Lord's Supper. And herein he rightly differentiates between those two Sacraments.

9) Circumcision is not the sign of **faith**, but only of the **righteousness of faith** (Romans 4:11). Yet though Circumcision (like Baptism) is intended only for those who appear to be God's regenerate children (even when infants) -- Esau was never regenerated (either before or during or after being circumcised). This disproves Rev. Wilkins's sacramentalistic view of Baptism.

10) Genesis 17 is concerned only with the **Circumcision** of males, and not at all with the **Passover** (regardless as to whether the latter was given to only one or to both of the genders). Also Rev. Wilkins denies that the Passover (but not Circumcision) should be given to babies. Accordingly, he should not appeal to Genesis 17 as a ground for **Paedocommunion**.

11) Genesis 17 requires unweaned male babies to receive Circumcision (but not to receive the Passover). At Calvary, the Circumcision of infants was replaced by Baptism for infants; and Passover for the mature was replaced by the Supper for the mature. Then, both new Sacraments were extended also to females. Genesis 3:15*f*; Acts 8:12; First Corinthians 11:11-33; Galatians 3:27 to 4:5*f*.

12) In Mark 16:15-16, note that “all creatures” includes also human babies! This text gives legitimate support to Infant Baptism. But it does not legitimize either Infant Communion or Toddler Communion or even Adult Communion. All such possible eucharistic practices, are quite foreign to this baptismal text.

13) The Passover was distinct from the other Mosaic Feasts (Exodus 12 & Leviticus 23:4-8 *per contra* 23:10-43). It should be kept distinct from them. Because: a) it antedated them; b) it was only for Circumcisees; and c) it was apparently only for both catechized and adolescent Circumcisees. This is clearly taught at Exodus 12:3f,26,37,48. Yet this (a through c above) is not so stated in respect of the other Old Testament Feasts. Indeed, of them -- the Passover alone is stated to be a Sacrifice (Exodus 12:27). And it should be remembered that only adult males were permitted to sacrifice (Gen. 4:3-17; 8:2-22; 12:7; 15:10; 22:5-13; Deuteronomy 23:1; *etc.*).

14) Leviticus 22:12-13, cited by Rev. Wilkins in his energetic attempt to defend his paedocommunionistic Paedopassoverism, does not relate to the Sacrament of the Passover. It relates to non-sacramental manducation by a priest's daughter of portions of food sacrificed and offered to God only by her mature male relative(s).

15) Joel 2:16's word “sucklings” is cited by Rev. Wilkins in his attempt to prove sucklings were Members of the Congregation or Assembly at Exodus 12:3-6 . However, Joel 2:16 has nothing to do with the Passover. Furthermore, even Joel 2:16 clearly distinguishes “the Congregation” from “the children” and from “the sucklings” and from “the bride.” And also the toddler-communionist Rev. Wilkins (unlike the Greek Orthodox Church and Jim Jordan's Tyler Texas group) **denies** the Passover to sucklings -- or at least did so, when I visited his church in 1997.

16) Luke 2:40-52 apparently refers to the twelve-year-old Jesus' first Passover trip to Jerusalem. in preparation for His later manducation thereat at his *bar mitzvaah* on reaching age 13. For He was “made under the law” -- Galatians 4:4 *cf.* Exodus 12:4,26,37. It is incorrect to assume lutheranistically that at Luke 2:46-47, Christ the Lord catechized the temple teachers. It was indeed, as Calvinists teach, exactly the opposite. The temple teachers were catechizing the in fact humanly-finite (*non capax infiniti*) 12-year-old boy Jesus -- and were astounded also by His answers. Luke 2:47.

17) Though only for an 'iysh or 'mature male' with 'uwsh or vir-ility (Exodus 12:3f), the Old Testament Passover was never purely physical and non-spiritual. Rev. Wilkins admits (as Lee himself believes) that the Passover was only for those with a conscious faith. Yet on what basis does Rev. Wilkins exclude conscious babies but include toddlers from manducating at the Passover -- except on the basis of the toddler's profession of faith (albeit yet before adolescence)?

18) First Corinthians 10:1-11 states that our 'iysh-with-'uwsh “**fathers**” all ate and drank, precisely as adolescents and adults. Such alone as are capable of either fathering or fornicating, eat and drink at the Lord's Table (10:1,8,11,16). This excludes not just the baby and the toddler but also every pre-'iysh or pre-adolescent male. Such 'uwsh-less pre-adolescents cannot “**father**” -- because

their ‘beards’ have not yet started to grow. See Proverbs 22:6’s Hebrew *yazqiyn* in the *bar mitzvaah* phrase: “Catechize a lad in the way he should go; then, when his beard starts to grow, he shall not depart from it!”

19) Also Rev. Wilkins should admit there were no Sacraments at all before the fall, either for adults or for infants -- nor even after the fall, until Abraham was circumcised (at Genesis 17:1f). Not even after Abraham was there a second Sacrament, even for mature males -- until the Exodus Passover (12:3f).

20) Therefore God’s saved ancient covenant people never really needed any Sacraments at all, for the adequate strengthening of its faith -- between the time of the redeemed Adam (Genesis 3:20) and that of the redeemed Abraham (Genesis 15:6 & 7:1f), if not even till the time of the redeemed Moses. Exodus 3:12 & 12:1f *cf.* Hebrews 11:24f (“By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin”). See *Westminster Larger Catechism Q. & A. 177*.

21) Rev. Wilkins makes a good point that Infant Baptism is anti-freewill. However, the Supper is precisely ‘freed will.’ It therefore has a different character (and a different age threshold) than has anti-freewill Baptism.

22) Rev. Wilkins does not (as do Calvin and the Reformed Confessions) rebuttably presume covenant infants to be regenerate before their Baptisms. Yet he should -- lest he ends up casting Christ’s sacramental pearls before swine (or rather before those whom some wrongly consider to be little swine). To argue that only God’s irrebuttable command (but not also the rebuttable presumption of infant faith already present) to be the basis of administering Baptism -- is to confuse commanded Infant Baptism with the need for the recipient first to seem to belong to the Lord prior to his or her Baptism. For we have no right to baptize or to eucharize unbelievers.

23) Rev. Wilkins is correct *vs.* Thornwell’s statement that covenant babies are aliens and “enemies of Christ.” But, if Rev. Wilkins were here to be consistent -- he would have to drop his sacramentalism and embrace the ‘anti-Thornwellian’ views of the Antipaedocommunionists Calvin and Kuyper anent the rebuttable presupposition of the presence of a pre-baptismal infant faith.

24) Compare too the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* (on ‘Baptism’), which states that believers’ children “are Christians and federally holy before Baptism, and therefore are to be baptized.” However, on the Lord’s Supper -- it then shortly adds that “the ignorant...are not fit to receive the Sacrament” and that the Minister is “to warn all such as are ignorant...not to come to that Holy Table; showing them that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself.”

25) Exodus 12:26 indeed establishes inquisitive children’s presence at and during the Passover celebration. But it no more establishes their manducation thereat, than First Timothy 2:8 to 3:4 establishes children’s and women’s ordainability to Eldership (as distinct from their presence during

ordinations to the Eldership of mature males alone). Only such males as are capable of growing a *zaqen* or beard can be considered for ordination as *Z'qenim* (alias bearded or beard-able Elders). Exodus 12:3f,21,26,27; 18:12-21f; Proverbs 22:6.

26) Exodus 16's *kal 'iysh 'oklow* regarding the manna (consumed even by worms), unlike that same expression regarding the different because sacramental Passover at Exodus 12, is non-sacramental. Yet both Exodus 12 and Exodus 16 exclude from manducation at least unweaned babies feeding on mothers' milk. Moreover, in both cases, only mature males do the count.

27) An appeal to Exodus 34:21-26 does not help Paedocommunionists. For infants and even (non-working) children neither ear nor harvest (verse 21), and do not gather in the firstfruits (verse 22). Moreover, the passage is restricted to males and not to non-paedocommunionizing 'girlettes' or young girls (verse 23). It also demarcates adult goats from unweaned kid-goats -- precisely in verse 26.

28) Rev. Wilkins quotes the mediaeval A.D. 425 Gelasius and the Synods of Macon (585) and Toledo (675) -- in support of his own unbiblical Paedocommunionism. Ignoring the antipaedocommunionistic evidence of the Early Fathers of the Formed Church and the Later Fathers of the Reformed Church, he instead invokes the evil medi-evil practice of the Deformed Church!

29) Rev. Wilkins further claims that all Church History till the Reformation favours Paedocommunion (without historically pressing this). However, any appeal to Church History, at least from about the time of the 250 A.D. Cyprian onward, would also favour baptismal regenerationism -- *versus* all Protestants!

30) Moreover, Rev. Wilkins seems to be unaware that Paedocommunionism was unknown before A.D. 250 and was rare before 350 -- even though baptismal regenerationism is known to have been advocated by some at least from about A.D. 150 onward (yet is of course still unbiblical). If Rev. Wilkins were to make an in-depth study of pre-250 A.D. extant materials (such as those of the Essenes, the Talmudic tract *Aboth* 5:21, the Jew Josephus, the Karaite Jews, Clement of Rome, the *Didachee*, Ignatius, Pliny, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, the earliest extant Christian *Liturgy of St. James*, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen, Commodian, the *Didaskalia*, Cyprian, Archelaus, and the expanded *Apostolic Constitutions* -- he would soon see that Ancient History is stacked solidly against his own Paedocommunionism.

31) Now the Old Testament clearly teaches the infant Circumcision of males alone (Genesis 17:10-27). It also teaches that the Passover is for "men" (*'iysh*) alias adult males, in distinction to toddlers alias "beside children" (Exodus 12:3f,26,37,48). But it does not at all teach that the Passover was then for either male or female infants or toddlers. The Old Testament restricts the Passover to mature males alone. Later Liberal Judaism (but not conservative Karaite Judaism), which extended the Passover first to women and then to children (but not to babies), is a perversion of Old Testament practice.

32) The New Testament implies Infant Baptism within families (Acts 2:38f & 16:30f). Yet it opposes giving the Supper to 'non-disciples' (either within or outside the covenant), who have not yet been 'discipled' alias taught. First Corinthians 11:23-34; 14:16; 14:23f.

33) Rev. Wilkins says that Historic Presbyterianism is wrong in its Antipaedocommunionism. As a Presbyterian, he should not say so -- nor be allowed to say so, except by way of an Overture to the General Assembly purporting to change the anti-paedocommunionistic *Westminster Standards* on this particular point. He and his Session are indeed already practising Paedocommunionism at least as regards their toddlers. As such, he and his Session are Localists -- if not outright Congregationalists -- who are fracturing the connectional principle of Presbyterianism.

34) Westminster's Lightfoot and the Hebrew-Christian Professor Alfred Edersheim and the Anglican-Liberal Dr. F.W. Farrar have all variously used the *Talmud*. Some call it a load of rubbish containing just a few bright jewels at the bottom of the bin. However, it is simply not enough for Rev. Wilkins merely to allege that "the *Talmud*" favours Paedopassoverism.

35) For many Talmudic passages are clearly anti-paedopassoveristic (e.g. *Hullin* 1:1 & *Menahoth* 9:8 & *Parah* 5:4 & *Rosh Ha-shanah* 3:8) -- not even to speak also of the Essenic *Qumran Document*, the Pharisees' Mishnaic *Aboth* 5:21, the pseudepigraphical *Book of Jubilees* 49:16-21, and Josephus's *Wars of the Jews* 2:8:7-10. So Rev. Wilkins here needs to specify (in terms of "chapter and verse") exactly which particular Talmudic passages he is referring to as teaching the opposite. He should also realize that the (non-antichristian) references in the *Talmud* which originate in B.C. times, favour the Anti-paedopassoverists. It is only the (Anti-Christ-ian) A.D. 200f Talmudic passages which support his present Paedopassoverism and Paedocommunionism.

36) Jewish 'Circumcision Prayers' -- favoured by Rev. Wilkins -- may indeed thank God for marriage. But marriage is only a yet-future and adult prospect -- for infant Circumcisees!

37) There are indeed two Sacraments, but they are by no means congruent. Circumcision was never given, and never could be given, to females. Nor was the Passover ever so given, until 200 A.D. Even today, Karaites and certain other very conservative Judaists restrict the Passover to their mature males alone. Unlike Rev. Wilkins, they take Exodus 12:48-49 exactly as it stands.

38) Covenant children belong to Christ from conception onward -- before and irrespective of baptism, and therefore *a fortiori* also irrespective of the Passover/Supper (which they never need). It is Rev. Wilkins's Hypercovenantal Hypercalvinism which confuses him on this point.

39) Now Exodus 12:26's "you" or "y'all" (meaning manducating adults) *vis-a-vis* the "we" (meaning non-manducating children) at the sacramental Passover, is clearly consistent with the participation of all not in a sacramental manducation but indeed in a non-sacramental "rejoicing" at the other feasts mentioned in Deuteronomy 12:12f. In Exodus 12, the father indeed acts also on behalf of his infant. Yet it is the father and not his child who helps slaughter the Passover lamb and who then paints its blood on the lintel above the door, which an infant (and also a toddler) himself cannot reach. Exodus 12:6-7. Indeed, also Rev. Wilkins would exclude at least the unweaned

infant from manducation of the Passover Sacrament. Thus, he should see that also uncircumcisable women and 'girlettes' were excluded from the Sacrament at Passover-time. Exodus 12:48.

40) Both in Exodus 12 & Exodus 16, it is clear that at least fetuses-with-mouths and just-born babies-with-mouths did not manducate "every **man** according to **his** eating" (*'iysh l'piy 'oklow*). Even Rev. Wilkins himself acknowledges this, in part. Though the more consistent Paedocommunionist Jim Jordan of Tyler Texas fame, does not.

41) Rev. Wilkins states: "Paul says all used the manna." No! First Corinthians 10:1-16 says that those who "ate" and "drank" were the "**fathers**" -- and pre-adolescents, note well, **cannot** be **fathers**!

42) Rev. Wilkins also states: "Passover required only prior Circumcision, except for women." No! God's Word says no uncircumcised person (including uncircumcisable women) could manducate. Exodus 12:48. God says it; that settles it; and no 'except[ion]' for Rev. Wilkins.

43) Now even Rev. Wilkins (quite rightly) still hesitates to give the Eucharist to newly-baptized infants. Why, then, does he nevertheless give it to uncircumcised 'girlettes' and women? Consistency dictates he should passively intinct also babies -- just as he passively baptizes them.

44) The expression "the whole Congregation" means a *Minyan* group of **ten mature males** or more, under the leadership of mature male **Elders-over-ten**. Genesis 18:32 & Exodus 18:21f & Ruth 4:2. In Old Testament times, membership of the "Congregation" or convened *Qaahaal* or '*Eedaah* excluded women and immature males -- even where the latter two categories sometimes attended certain meetings of that *Qaahaal*. See, *inter alia*, Deuteronomy 23:1 cf. Proverbs 22:6 *etc*

45) Rev. Wilkins says that "there is no union without communion" (meaning the eucharist). If that were true -- then uncircumcised covenantal fetuses and all uncircumcisable female humans could not be in union with God. However, Luke 1:41f teaches (and even Rev. Wilkins claims) that also covenant fetuses do have a conscious communion with Christ -- yet without manducating at the sacramental Passover/Eucharist (or even at the sacramental Circumcision/Baptism). Moreover, not just unworthy adults but also unworthy toddlers and even unworthy infants could all incur wrath -- by wrongly manducating at the Passover/Eucharist.

46) Now there were three big Old Testament Passovers (those of Hezekiah, Josiah and Ezra). Also according to Rev. Wilkins, "all the children of Israel" manducated -- or rather "all the sons of Israel" who were *bar mitzvaah* "sons of the Law." So this does not mean that even unweaned babies did. They, in fact, did not manducate -- and were indeed very properly excluded.

47) Compare Joshua 5. There, the expression "all were circumcised" clearly excludes all of the females. Hezekiah's Passover (Second Chronicles 30) was even postponed -- because many also of those who were priests had not sanctified themselves and were therefore still uncleansed. Indeed, although Christ certainly saves many infants during their babyhood -- even covenant babies and very

young children are incapable of thus sanctifying themselves.

48) Deuteronomy 16:16 was indeed not just for 'heads of households' but also for all mature adolescent and adult males -- including also those not yet 'heads of households' (like the Luke 2 twelve-year-old Jesus). Yet Deuteronomy 16:16 clearly did not include uncircumcisable females, even if such females were mature.

49) It is true that Sacraments are required to be used by appropriate persons. But the further fact that children were not required to manducate (also according to Rev. Wilkins) -- shows that any possible and unrequired participation by children in the Passover at Deuteronomy 12 was not 'sacramental.' The same applies to the ritual meals mentioned in First Samuel chapter one.

50) Eating the manna (in Exodus 16) was not 'sacramental' -- nor is this implied by its cessation at the resumption of the Passover in Joshua 5. For together with the manna, the Israelites should have continued with the Passover also between Exodus 16 and Joshua 5.

51) Rev. Wilkins claims "many of the Reformers" advocated Paedocommunion. Apart from possibly the indeed very minor theologian Wolfgang Musculus alias Fliegemann the 'Fly-man' -- this claim is quite incorrect. If Rev. Wilkins insists his statement is true -- let him supply the names and references of those "many Reformers" he says support him! It is obvious, according to Calvin, that the viciously Anti-Reformed and Anti-Trinitarian Anabaptist Servetus certainly toyed with Paedocommunionism. But every major Protestant Reformer -- whether Anglican, Calvinist, Lutheran, or Zwinglian -- rightly rejected Paedocommunionism as Anti-Protestant.

52) "All Israel" in Joshua 5's Passover clearly excludes at least those on journeys and those unclean (as in Numbers 9). Taken literalistically, some would argue that 'all' here would have to include also women (*versus* Exodus 12:48) and even infants -- which latter is clearly nonsensical also to Rev. Wilkins himself. Moreover, also Rev. Wilkins concedes that only the mature males among God's people were actually required to eat the Passover at Deuteronomy 16.

53) Rev. Wilkins says: "My contention and that of many others in the Church both today and throughout all ages is that baptized children should be admitted to the Lord's Table." Who are these "many others"? Greek Orthodox people in the deformed Greek 'Orthodox' Church -- or those influenced by them (such as Jim Jordan's Tyler Texas Paedocommunionists who were tainted by St. Vladimir's Russian Orthodox Seminary in New York City)?

54) Rev. Wilkins says: "Unless Old Testament practice is either explicitly or implicitly rescinded, it holds also for the New Testament." We agree. The Old Testament's unrescinded Anti-Paedopassoverism carries over also into the New Testament's Anti-Paedocommunionism.

55) Rev. Wilkins says: "First Corinthians 11 refers to the observance of, and not admission to, sacramental Communion." Yes. But one is not admitted -- until one first manifests acceptable behaviour deemed to agree with good observance of the Eucharist if and when one first gets admitted thereto. Hence, such acceptable behavior was pre-explained to Candidates. This explanation would



automatically exclude all babies (thus also Rev. Wilkins) and also all toddlers (thus all Calvinians) incapable of being able to understand such an explanation.

56) Rev. Wilkins says ‘First Corinthians 11 needs to be compared to First Corinthians 10.’ Yes. And in the latter, the phrase “all fell in the wilderness” means all adult-erous adol-escents and adults -- not all un-adult-eratable pre-adolescents. Hence, only adolescents or adults communed both at the Passover in Exodus 12 (and/or in First Corinthians 10) -- and at the Supper as its replacement in First Corinthians chapters 10 & 11.

57) Rev. Wilkins says that First Corinthians 11:27’s words “whosoever shall eat...unworthily” establish restrictions only for adults -- because Romans 3:22’s words “by faith” allegedly do not apply to babies. No! Lightfoot in his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* says “not discerning” in First Corinthians 11:29 ‘plainly speaks of the act of the understanding.’ And Thomas Manton points out that even Hebrews 11:6’s words “without faith” -- apply also to babies personally.

58) Rev. Wilkins says that Second Thessalonians 3:10’s words “if a man will not work, neither shall he eat” -- cannot apply to babies or to retirees. No! It applies to both. Both babies and retirees, either incipiently or retrospectively, wish to work (though are not able to) -- and hence should indeed also be fed (non-sacramentally)!

59) Rev. Wilkins says children need food to grow [we agree], and should therefore be given the Eucharist [we disagree]. Yes, babies too need food to grow. But also Rev. Wilkins (though not Jim Jordan’s Tyler Texas) rightly does not give the Eucharist to pre-toddler babies.

60) Rev. Wilkins says: ‘It is my understanding that the children of believers should be admitted to the Table because of their membership of the covenant and not because of their understanding.’ No! Yet even Rev. Wilkins speaks of their being “admitted.” But when, and how? If at their infant baptism (thus the Greek Orthodox and Jim Jordan) -- then, by what standards does Rev. Wilkins ‘deprive’ and (*sic!*) ‘excommunicate’ them of the Eucharist until they toddle? We ourselves would say -- **by the Westminster Standards**: *Westminster Confession of Faith* 29:8 & 30:1-4 and *Westminster Larger Catechism* 171-73!

61) Rev. Wilkins says “children were admitted to the Passover in the Old Testament.” Not so! Exodus 12:3f,26,37 limits the manducators at that Sacrament to those capable of being “fathers” -- alias circumcised and catechized “men” or *’iysh* with *’uwsh*, to the **exclusion** of “children.”

62) Rev. Wilkins does not “presume” that children coming to the Table are regenerate -- because, he says, he cannot be certain they are elect. We say that Rev. Wilkins should then not purport to admit them (nor anyone else) to the Supper. If one does not (rebuttably) presume would-be Communicants are already sheeps or lambs, one must either implicitly presume they are either pigs or piglets -- or otherwise, and yet worse, be agnostic about them. However, if we notwithstanding this nevertheless admit them to our Saviour’s Table (as does Rev. Wilkins) -- we certainly open up the Lord’s Table to those we do not regard as already being Christians.

63) But this is contrary to ‘being admitted’ -- and is a “ great sin” (thus the *Westminster Confession of Faith* at 29:8q citing Matthew 7:6). It is contrary also to the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*, which says our infants are to be deemed “Christians and federally holy before baptism” (even though we cannot be ‘certain’ anyone is elect until he or she gets to glory). Yet, as the *First Swiss Confession* chapter 21(22) says, our infants are presumed elect (“*electione pie est praesumendum*”). Cf. too the *Second Swiss Confession*’s words “called a son of God” (at its chapter 20). Because they are certainly in the covenant, we should certainly presume the children of those professing to be believers are themselves true covenanters -- until the contrary may become established, at which point alone disciplinary actions against them should begin.

64) Rev. Wilkins says the Sacraments are means of grace. Yes. But Sacraments do not initiate but only confirm saving grace already presumed to be present. One’s first manducation at the Eucharist does not initiate one’s faith. One’s first sacramental manducation only confirms and promotes the profession of one’s faith which one previously made.

65) Against the argument of Rev. Wilkins that the Bible nevertheless forbids eucharizing children from voting, it could be argued that (from his own false premise) Rev. Wilkins has thereby himself diminished their covenant voting rights and privileges. Not so to argue, implicitly supports Calvinian Antipaedocommunionism.

66) Rev. Wilkins says one shouldn’t give one’s 8-year-old the car keys, because it’s dangerous. Exactly! And the same applies to giving one’s 3-year old (or one’s younger baby) communion wine (First Corinthians 11:27f).

67) Rev. Wilkins rightly rejects one-person-one-vote democracy. Exactly! And only mature males -- one vote for each adult male -- partook of the Sacrament of the Passover. Exodus 12:3f,26,37,48.

68) Rev. Wilkins says Paedocommunionists take the covenant seriously. No, they do not. They deny the covenantal distinctions between Infant Circumcision and the Mature-age Passover on the one hand, and Infant Baptism and the Mature-age Eucharist which replace them on the other. Indeed, Rev. Wilkins does not have the same view of ‘improving one’s Baptism’ (towards admission to the Eucharist) as the Westminster fathers had (*Westminster Confession of Faith* 29:8 & 30:1-4 compare *Westminster Larger Catechism* QQ. 167-177).

69) Frankly, we should prune only those olive-tree branches of fruit-bearing age which don’t then bear. Rev. Wilkins would rightly cut off fruitless covenanters. But such should first be disciplined and catechized and ‘confirmed’ -- alias post-catechetically admitted to the Table -- before such pruning and, should that not help, eventual excommunication.

70) Rev. Wilkins says: “To give Baptism but to withhold the Supper, is to make Baptism a meaningless ritual.” However, in that case Jim Jordan’s Tyler Texas and the Greek-‘Orthodox’ would be right in their view that all baptized infants should be given the Supper. But then, the view of also Rev. Wilkins would then be ‘meaningless’ and indeed also wrong for withholding the Lord’s

Supper from such babies -- though giving it to toddlers..

71) Rev. Wilkins says: "To separate Baptism from the Supper, is not to depend on Christ day by day." However, if that were so -- we would need to eucharize daily.

72) Rev. Wilkins says: "Union but no (sacramental) communion does not make sense." But in that case, also the unborn John the Baptizer -- who prenatally 'communed' with Christ (Luke 1:41f) -- should right then have been baptized prenatally, and should also have eucharized before he was born.

73) Rev. Wilkins says: "Biblical Theology requires both Sacraments be given prior to the human response" (versus Arminianism). No. This is Hypercovenantal Hypercalvinism. Instead, there needs to be an ongoing repentance before and during and after one's first admission to the Eucharist. "If you shall **confess** with your mouth" *etc.* Romans 10:9.

74) Rev. Wilkins asks at what point traditionalists should start to apply amputative discipline to infantly-baptized covenanters who have never eucharized? The answer is -- when, after attaining teenage, they adamantly refuse to catechize toward their required public affirmation of faith followed by admission to the Table. Such amputative discipline, when completed, changes their status not from Communicant to Non-Communicant -- but from presumably-regenerate to presumably-unregenerate (just 'like the heathen man and the publican' in Matthew 18:15-20). But even on Rev. Wilkins's premise, one could only suspend eucharistic privileges from somebody previously admitted thereto. When and how admitted? If at infant baptism -- then the *Auburn Affirmation* should opt for a 'Jordan'-ian infant-eucharizing rather than a 'Wilkins'-onian anti-infant toddler-eucharizing!

75) One much appreciates the seriousness with which Rev. Wilkins views children's transgressions of the Fifth Commandment. Amen and amen! But that has nothing to do with Paedocommunion. Indeed, rather may Paedocommunion be regarded as transgressing the Fifth Commandment -- erasing, as it does, the distinction between "your father and your mother" on the one hand and pre-adolescent children on the other.

76) Jesus loves me, this I know; for the Bible tells me so. True -- but not because post-babyhood toddlers eucharize in Rev. Wilkins's church! For eucharizing presupposes the eucharizer **can** either **read** or be of an age to be able to read **the Bible** which tells him Jesus loves him.

77) One certainly agrees with Rev. Wilkins that the so-called "Children's Church" is very Anti-Reformed. But "Children's Communionism" (*sic!*) only helps transubstantiate the whole Church into becoming a "Children's Church" in another respect. The ideal is for children to attend every Worship Service throughout (including Eucharist Services), but not to manducate at the latter (*cf.* Exodus 12:26 & 12:37).

78) Rev. Wilkins's concluding tape is truly beautiful! Most moving! Except for its paedocommunionistic lapse right at its very beginning -- it's great! Hooray for zapping abortionists; and hooray for he-man Heman with his seventeen children (First Chronicles 25:5). But what has

anti-abortionism or prolificness of progeny to do with Paedocommunion?

79) Frankly, the Members of Rev. Wilkins's Session are breaking their ordination vows congregationalistically -- by already permitting the practice of Paedocommunion. What they should do if they wish to support this Non-Protestant position, is to preserve the connectional principle by not practising Paedocommunionism at all -- until such time as by way of successful Overture they have changed the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church in America. Meantime, for the P.C.A. to tolerate the overt practice of Paedocommunion against its own present explicit standards, is for the P.C.A. to expose itself before the watching World as already having become an unconfessionalistic and indeed even an anti-confessional 'Broad Church.'

80) In his articles *The Lord's Supper and Our Children* (<http://www.auburnavenue.org>), Rev. Wilkins wrongly states that [all] of God's people are given not only "Circumcision/Baptism" but also "Passover/Lord's Supper." Yet, on his own false premise, he and his Session inconsistently neglect to administer the Supper also to their own pre-toddlers. On his own false premise -- to use the Paedocommunionists' own favourite term -- this effectively '**excommunicates**' them.

81) Rev. Wilkins writes: "But, is it not also true that covenant union implies covenant communion? How can there be one without the other?" Here, he seems unaware of the fact that such a statement implies the correctness of Eastern-Orthodoxy's baby-communion which he rejects.

82) Rev. Wilkins writes: "The teaching of the Scriptures is that the children of believers were admitted to the first Passover (if they were physically capable of eating solid food) by virtue of their covenant membership. But here he has **nullified** the first part of his own statement, by **adding** the words: 'if they were physically capable of eating solid food.'"

83) Rev. Wilkins writes: "*The lamb chosen was to be eaten by everyone in the house or family* (Exodus 12:3-4)... 'every one [*iysh*] **according to the mouth of his eating**'.... Someone may object, 'But the command only has reference to the adult males of the household!'" Yes, indeed! *Iysh*!

84) Rev. Wilkins writes: "This phrase is used only in one other chapter in Scripture (Exodus 16:16,18,21) which concerns the gathering of manna by the children of Israel in the wilderness. Exodus 16:16 reads, 'This is the thing which the Lord has commanded: 'Let every man gather it **according to each one's need.**' Here, the phrase clearly refers to every member of the covenant congregation. Obviously, here children were included since there was nothing else to eat but manna." No! For: (1) pre-toddler unweaned children did not need the manna; (2) only the adult males ("every **man**") collected it; and (3) only the adult males were Members of the Exodus 12:3-6 "Congregation" (as distinct from the sum-total of all who then belonged either to the Invisible or to the Visible Church).

85) Rev. Wilkins writes: "Note also Exodus 12:47: '*The **whole congregation** was commanded to eat the Passover.*' Now that naturally leads us to ask, 'Who was considered to be part of the congregation of Israel?' Again, the scriptures are clear (Deuteronomy 29:10-12). The congregation consisted not only of men and women who had 'come to years of discernment' but of 'infants and

children' (see also Joel 2:16)."

86) Actually, Exodus 12:47 here says 'keep' -- not 'eat.' More importantly, however, both Joel 2:16 and Deuteronomy 29:10-12 distinguish such women and children from the 'Congregation.' Thus the latter text actually says: "You [adult males] stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your [adult male] Captains of your tribes, your [adult male] Elders and your [adult male] Officers, your little ones, your wives, and your stranger that is in your camp from the hewer of your wood unto the drawer of your water." Here, there is no mention of Rev. Wilkins's 'the whole Congregation'; nor of the Passover; nor of the [uncircumcised and uncatechized] 'stranger' paedopassoverizing. Just as in Exodus 12:43-49! On Joel 2:16, see our point 15) above.

87) Rev. Wilkins writes regarding "*Exodus 12:26-27*" that "nothing indicates that children were not allowed to participate until they could ask this question or understand the answer. In fact the Talmud instructed the son (or the youngest child) to make the inquiry." Here, Rev. Wilkins's appeal to the *Talmud* is unsubstantiated; for he ignores many Pre-Christian antipaedopassoveristic texts in that *Talmud*. More importantly, Rev. Wilkins here ignores the infallible Exodus 12:26, where its word 'ye' or 'y'all' by the questioning sons to their manducating 'fathers' (Exodus 12:3) and 'Elders' (Exodus 12:21) clearly excludes those (post-infant and post-toddler) questioning sons from themselves yet manducating thereat.

88) Rev. Wilkins writes: "What we have here is analogous to God's directives in Deuteronomy 6:20-25.... Deuteronomy 6:6-7 implies that these things were taught and enforced from earliest infancy." Here, Rev. Wilkins neglects to add that Deuteronomy 6:6-25 is not discussing the Passover. But if it were, it would condemn his non-baby toddler-paedopassoverism -- and consistently lead him to the baby-communionism of Anti-Protestant Eastern-'Orthodoxy.'

89) Rev. Wilkins writes "that even pagan slaves who had been purchased by God's people were to be circumcised and admitted to covenant privileges by virtue of being members of the covenant household (Exodus 12:43-45)." Here, Rev. Wilkins seems to be unaware of the fact that such circumcised slaves first had to "come near" -- a technical term for: post-catechetically be admitted to the Passover (Exodus 12:48). He also seems to be unaware of the fact that not the wife or children of such a stranger or such a slave but only the catechized stranger or slave himself, was admitted to the Passover ("let him come near and keep it"). And Rev. Wilkins also seems to be unaware of the fact that "one law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourns among you." Exodus 12:48. All of which is very clearly antipaedopassoveristic.

90) Rev. Wilkins writes regarding Galatians 4:1 that "the heir, as long as he is a child, does not differ at all from a slave" and that "the man who neglected the Passover was excommunicated from the covenant congregation (Numbers 9:13)." Exactly! The heir, while yet a child, was excluded also from manducation at the Passover. And only "the man who neglected the Passover, was excommunicated from the covenant Congregation." Not "a child" -- for a non-passoverizing "child" only became "the man" after catechizing for his *bar mitzvaah* when at least thirteen.

91) Rev. Wilkins writes regarding First 'Corinthians 10:1-5' that "when they ate the

mana...they were communing with Christ. They all ate and drank of Christ, **even though most of them later proved to be unbelieving covenant breakers.**” Once again, Rev. Wilkins has not detected the word “**fathers**” in Exodus 12:3 and in First Corinthians 10:1 -- nor the non-communing word “**worms**” in Exodus 16:20.

92) Rev. Wilkins writes: “To withhold either of the sacraments from our children is in effect, to annul the reality of the covenant itself.” But this is precisely what Rev. Wilkins does -- when he withholds the second Sacrament from his own pre-toddler baptized babies.

93) Rev. Wilkins writes: “It is quite likely that children participated in the second and third Passovers, at Mt. Sinai (Numbers 9:1ff) and at Gilgal (Joshua 5:2-12).” The fact is, however, Numbers 9:1f mentions only adult males as passoverizing and/or as not passoverizing. And right after the circumcising of uncircumcised males in Joshua 5:2-12, “the manna ceased.” So, far from admitting babes and unweaned toddlers to the Passover -- circumcising them only **deprived** them of the manna which Rev. Wilkins (mis)believes was a Sacrament and believes they ate of.

94) Rev. Wilkins writes that “God still supplied the manna and water from the rock which testified of His continued covenant faithfulness and actually was communion with Christ (I Corinthians 10:1-5). [Notice that Paul expressly mentions the order of baptism first then communion. All who were baptized communed.]” No! Notice that First Corinthians 10:1-5 is talking specifically about adult males “fathers” -- as too is Exodus 12:3-6 f. And pre-adolescents can never be “fathers.”

95) Rev. Wilkins writes: “*It seems plain that God only required the adult males to participate in the three feasts because of the peculiar provisions of the Old Covenant in which God required worship to be performed at a specifically designated place.... Deuteronomy 12:5-7.*” If there ever was a dispensationalistic argument -- this is it! The obvious truth, however, is that God here required only the adult males to participate by manducating at the Passover -- because the Passover had been instituted only for circumcised and catechized adult men (or *’ysh* with *’uwsh* alias ‘virility’). Exodus 12:3-6,26,37.

96) Rev. Wilkins writes: “The requirement of males to attend, does not imply the absolute prohibition of women and children from participating.” True. But the **non-prohibition** of women participating by **attending**, is to be distinguished from “the **requirement** of males to attend” by **manducating**. Hence, adult males alone manducated at the Passover -- though all might attend.

97) Rev. Wilkins then cites “Deuteronomy 12:4-7,11-14” and “Deuteronomy 14:22-26” and “Deuteronomy 15:19-20.” But none of these passages are talking about manducating at the Passover, but simply about rejoicing at non-sacramental meals.

98) Rev. Wilkins writes regarding the actions of the twelve-year-old Jesus at “Luke 2:40-50” that “even if one insists that this was the first Passover for our Savior, it does not solve the problem for the anti-covenant communionists. For the Jewish law required that a son be thirteen before he

was required to take the Passover.” Although the malediction “anti-covenant communionists” could better be attributed to Rev. Wilkins’s own Hypercovenantal Hypercalvinists than to the Antipaedocommunionist Calvinists he misapplies it to -- Luke 2:40-50 actually vindicates the position of the latter. For the latter maintain that Jesus when twelve merely attended and catechized at, but did not manducate at, that Passover.

99) Rev. Wilkins denies Jesus was then catechizing, or being catechized. Instead, he alleges that “the text indicates it was Jesus who was asking the questions of the Priests, not the other way round (vv. 46-47). If this was a catechism class, Jesus was the one doing the catechizing!” But here Rev. Wilkins has forgotten that true catechizing is a two-way street -- where both the Catechizer and the Catechumen ask as well as answer questions. Moreover, Rev. Wilkins has also forgotten the very end of the verse Luke 2:47, which states of the twelve-year-old Jesus “in the midst of the doctors” alias the **teachers** that “all that heard Him were astonished at **His** understanding and **answers.**” So then -- the **teaching** Catechizers questioned Him; and Jesus the Catechumen **answered** them.

100) Rev. Wilkins concludes on “Luke 2:40-50” that “at most all one could prove is that Jesus was concerned to fulfill the law which required all adult males -- all those over the age of accountability -- to attend the Passover.” Indeed, “**all adult males.**” And that attendance of Jesus when twelve, and His catechization then, foreshadowed His **admission** to manducation at the Passover the next year, after becoming a *bar mitzaah* or an approved **adult** “son of the law” when He turned thirteen.

101) Rev. Wilkins writes: “The Lord’s Supper...is to show forth the union of the entire body” of the Church Visible. However, if that were indeed to be the case -- Rev. Wilkins would be fracturing the body of Christ by withholding the Lord’s Supper from his own pre-toddler infants (as he indeed does).

102) Rev. Wilkins adds: “Paul’s concern is not to set forth the qualifications necessary for one to be admitted to the Lord’s table, but to bring these brethren to repentance and warn them of God’s judgment if they didn’t repent.... It wasn’t the children who were getting drunk!” However, from his own false premise -- how does Rev. Wilkins know that? From their own correct premise, however, Antipaedocommunionists know this -- because they see no evidence at all from either Luke 22:1-20 or First Corinthians 5:7-10 & 10:1 to 11:34 & 13:11 & 14:20 & 16:13 that children ever eucharized at all. Quite the contrary!

103) Rev. Wilkins writes that in First Corinthians 11:27-29 “Paul is not addressing children who had not come to ‘years of discretion’ but wicked, rebellious adults.” That is untrue. Paul is here addressing not just adults but “**whosoever**” -- thus including children too (*cf.* First Corinthians 3:2 & 13:11 & 14:20 & 16:13). True, those he here denounces and condemns were all adults. Obviously, because only adults were then eucharizing!

104) Rev. Wilkins writes: “You see, Paul’s requirement of repentance and faith was not a new

thing. It does not indicate a ‘higher standard’ for worship under the New Covenant. He was simply re-iterating God’s requirements from old.” Yes, and God’s requirements from old are that of catechizing covenant adolescents for adult communing. Cf. Exodus 12:3-4,21,26,37,48.

105) Rev. Wilkins writes that “children are to be admitted [to the Lord’s Table] upon their baptism.” This premise is false. But seeing Rev. Wilkins misbelieves it to be true – he ignores his own premise but refusing the Lord’s Supper to his own pre-toddler infant baptizees.

106) Rev. Wilkins writes: “If one insists on forcing Paul’s exhortations in I Corinthians 11 to require faith and repentance before one is admitted to the table, the same logic could be (and it seems to me ought to be) applied to Mark 16:16.” Why? Mark 16:16 is dealing with Baptism, not with the Lord’s Supper (which Rev. Wilkins wrongly views as practically congruent thereto).

107) Yet even Mark 16:16 (and the Acts 2:38-41 also cited here by Rev. Wilkins) – unlike Rev. Wilkins, presupposes faith before Baptism (“he who believes and is baptized”). And this torpedos Rev. Wilkins almost Neo-Romish *ex opere operato* sacramentology.

108) Rev. Wilkins writes: “*To insist upon intelligent understanding and articulate expression of that understanding is to make admission to the Lord’s table more difficult than entering heaven itself.*” This is untrue. But seeing Rev. Wilkins believes this to be true – why does he, on his premise, imperil his own pre-toddler infants and unbaptized infants by denying them admission to the Lord’s Table?

109) Rev. Wilkins writes: “To withhold the sacrament [of the Lord’s Supper] until there is discernment is like withholding food until there is strength and understanding.” Here Rev. Wilkins sacramentalistically confuses ordinary food with the sacramental elements – and again perilously approaches the Anti-Protestant sacramentology of Rome and Eastern-‘Orthodoxy.’

110) Rev. Wilkins writes: “Do we believe our children to be rightly members of God’s church? If so, why banish them from the sacrament as if they are rebels and strangers?” It is in fact Rev. Wilkins who banishes his pre-toddler baptized infants from the Sacrament of the Lord’s Table – in his confusion of the Invisible Church and the Visible Church as set out in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 25:1-2. Historic Calvinists, on the other hand, do not so banish any of their pre-adolescent children. For they never admit them to the Table before their adolescence. *Westminster Confession of Faith* 29:8 and *Westminster Larger Catechism* QQ. & AA. 173 & 177.

111) Rev. Wilkins writes: “To exclude covenant children from the table, is, effectively, to nullify the covenant. This is why in most Presbyterian churches children are not viewed as members of the church until they make public profession of their faith and are admitted to the Lord’s table. Everyone talks of them ‘joining the church’ when the reality is that they were made members by their baptism!” That may be true of many baptistic U.S. sick (*sic*) “Presbyterian” churches. But it is certainly untrue of U.S. **Presbyterian** Churches. And it is also untrue of all **Truly Reformed** presbyterial denominations in the U.S. and everywhere else throughout the World.



112) Rev. Wilkins writes “that if one doesn’t commune with us, he is not one of us.” This can only mean that to Rev. Wilkins, his own pre-toddler baptized infants and the occasional antipaedocommunicistic Calvinist Visitor at his Auburn Avenue church who does not take the eucharistic elements there – is in his opinion not one of them.

113) That is true. When I myself preached in 1997 at an Auburn Avenue Sunday Morning Service and was horrified after my sermon to see every toddler in the church consuming (and being expected to consume the elements) – I certainly did not feel like one of them (and could not in good conscience eucharize with them). For my latter action, Rev. Wilkins next day reprovved me at the airport just prior to my departure. And indeed, his schismatic and Anti-Calvinistic practice in this matter the previous day -- did then sever me from them as a very tiny part of the body of Christ, at least during the course of that particular Lord’s Supper.

114) Rev. Wilkins writes: “*To say that baptized children should be admitted to the Lord’s table is not to say that we must presume our children to be among the elect or regenerate.*” To the contrary, however! While Rev. Wilkins presumes his children do not belong to the elect (at least not until they are baptized almost *ex opere operato*, and perhaps not even thereafter till he might think they have ‘improved their Baptism’) -- Calvin and all True Calvinists rebuttably presume their children were regenerated before baptism and that they should therefore be baptized. (See my *Baby Belief Before Baptism* on my website <http://www.dr-fnlee.org>).

115) Rev. Wilkins writes: “We do not base our position upon presumption, assumption, or inference.” Ah, but Rev, Wilkins indeed does presume something! He presumes, and wrongly so, that all post-infantile baptized toddlers should eucharize -- even before they have been catechized and then publicly and credibly professed their faith in Christ. True Calvinists, on the other hand, presume that only those baptizees should eucharize who have been catechized and who have then publicly and credibly professed their faith in Christ when “of age.” *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Q. & A. 177.

116) Rev. Wilkins writes that what he paedocommunicisticly miterms “Covenant Communion” -- viz. eucharizing uncatechized baptized toddlers -- “takes the covenant seriously.” That is untrue. His position does not take the covenant seriously enough! For, as the *Reformed Formula for the Administration of Baptism to Infants of Believers* rightly remarks: “All covenants consist of **two** parts. Therefore are we by God through Baptism admonished of and obliged unto a new obedience.” And therefore: “Do you promise and intend to see these children **when come to years of discretion** (whereof you are either parents or witnesses), **instructed** and **brought up** in the aforesaid doctrine or to help or cause them to be instructed therein to the utmost of your power?”

117) Rev. Wilkins writes: “Rather than exhorting them to be faithful to the obligations of God’s gracious covenant, we end up exhorting them to get into covenant with God. ‘Oh, but,’ someone says, ‘aren’t we to be concerned that they repent and believe?’ Yes! But you don’t have to deny the objective reality of their covenant relationship to do that! In the Scriptures, those in covenant with God are warned against breaking the covenant.”

118) Yes indeed. But to achieve this, Rev. Wilkins should not paedocommunionize his baptized post-infantile yet uncatechized toddlers. That, quite frankly, denies the objective reality of their covenant relationship having not one but **two** parts. Instead, Rev. Wilkins should be reminding non-eucharized older children and adolescents, with the *Westminster Larger Catechism* Q. & A. 167 compare the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 29:8, that it is time for them to “improve their baptism” and catechize toward **admission** to the Holy Table.

119) Rev. Wilkins cites Revelation 3:5, which has nothing at all to do with the Holy Supper. Frankly, he would be better off, a few verses later, citing Revelation 3:20. There, Christ declares: “Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any **man** hear My voice and **open** the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him -- and he with Me.” But of course, that again emphasizes the “**two** parts” of the covenant -- over against Rev. Wilkins’s Hypercalvinistic Hypercovenantalism!

120) Rev. Wilkins writes: “Baptism demands the Lord’s Supper. The Lord’s Supper unavoidably requires Baptism.” However, the **order** is not chronologically reversible. Nor are the two different Sacraments *einheitlich* or on the same level. One is passive; the other, active; one is *ephapax* (or initiatorily once and for all); the other is frequentative and responsive (and therefore only for those who have attained years of discretion).

121) Rev. Wilkins writes: “How can you be a member of Christ’s body and not have communion with Him?” -- but which he means: eucharize with Him. Well, how can he exclude his own pre-toddler baptized babies (who are Members of Christ’s body the Church Visible) from the eucharist? Yet he does so -- until, when toddlers, they make their “Auburn Affirmation” by in my view inadequately alleging to his Session: “I love Jesus.”

122) Rev. Wilkins writes that “in Arminian theology, man comes to God.” He adds: “To withhold the sacraments until there is a faithful response is to reverse the Biblical picture of salvation.” Well, I guess that makes the antipaedocommunionistic Calvinist Calvin and Calvinian Calvinists “Arminian” -- in Rev. Wilkins’s view. But frankly, I’d much rather have Calvin’s Calvinism -- than Rev. Wilkins Non-Calvinian Hypercalvinistic Hypercovenantalism!

123) Rev. Wilkins writes: “Children are given a false assurance” and “Children have a ‘faulty’ assurance” -- apparently in mainstream antipaedocommunionistic Calvinistic Churches. For, he adds: “*This prevents us from identifying clear articulation with understanding and thus unnecessarily keeping children from the sacrament.* The present position (of admitting children to the table based upon their profession of faith) forces elders to act upon some degree of uncertainty and presumption.”

124) Actually, it is precisely in paedocommunionistic groups that “children are given a false assurance” and “have a ‘faulty’ assurance.” For they keep manducating the holy bread and the wine. Indeed, in their circles, they are deemed to have a right to it -- and so themselves too presumptuously so conclude. And the Elders of such groups conduct such a perfunctory ‘examination’ of such toddlers in admitting them to the Lord’s Supper -- as can only increase their uncertainty.

125) Rev. Wilkins further boldly writes that, in the Historic Calvinistic and Reformed Antipaedocommunionism, “effectively the reality of the covenant is denied. Our children are not really members of the church at all. Their membership is basically meaningless.”

126) Frankly, I cannot see this to be true. But I can see the Paedocommunionists’ post-eucharistic catechizing of paedocommunionized toddlers to be “meaningless.” And I can also see how, over the decades, it is likely to destroy any group that practises Paedocommunion.

127) In his article *A Covenant of Life*, Rev. Wilkins rightly stresses the importance of the Answer to Question 12 of the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. That starts off by saying: “When God had created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him.” Rev. Wilkins then explains: “As God’s image-bearers, we are given a three-fold definition” -- in that we are to be “covenant priests” and “covenant heads” and “covenant kings.” Rev. Wilkins says the latter means that “man is therefore defined by his labor.”

128) We ignore the common error of Rev. Wilkins in here calling men “God’s image-bearers” (a totally Romish concept), rather than with the Bible calling men “God’s images.” Yet even Rev. Wilkins own definition, disproves his Paedocommunionism. For: “covenant priests” were only installed in their priestly work, when they had become adults; “covenant heads” only function in marriage, after their attainment of adolescence; and “covenant kings” only begin to “labor” (without benefit of the labours of their regents), when those kings themselves reach maturity.

129) In his article *Baptism and Our Children*, Rev. Wilkins wrongly states: “From the beginning, the covenant has been signified and sealed by sacraments. Even in the Garden of Eden, prior to the Fall, Adam was given the sacrament of communion.... Thus, communing with the Lord by means of the Tree of Life was the only sign and seal necessary to signify the covenant relationship with God which Adam and Eve enjoyed.”

130) However, the truth is that the covenant of life from the beginning before the fall, had no Sacraments. For Sacraments, to Protestants but not to Romanists and Romanizers, seal and signify redemption from sin (which for humans is a post-fall category). Moreover, the notion that Adam and Eve partook of the tree of life before the fall is a Lutheran construction foreign to Scripture (see Genesis 3:22). Yet even if this construction were to be correct, it would establish only that the adult Adam and the adult Eve (but not their then-nonexistent children) then manducated of the fruit of that tree of life (Genesis 2:9-24). Even Luther was an Antipaedocommunionist. But not those modern Paedocommunionists who would syncretize Lutheranism with Eastern-‘Orthodoxy’!

131) Continues Rev. Wilkins: “After the Fall, the covenant has not one, but two kinds of sacraments.... How do these sacraments relate to our children?.... What circumcision was under the Old Covenant, baptism is under the New Covenant (Colossians 2:11,12).... In Titus 3:5, Paul identifies the washing with water with the renewal of the Holy Spirit.... Baptism signifies and seals the righteousness which is received by faith (I Peter 3:21).... Does this mean we believe our children are regenerate? No. We cannot presume that.”

132) However, Titus 3:5 does not with Rev. Wilkins romishly “**identify**” a baptismal “washing with water with the renewal of the Holy Spirit.” It says nothing about either Baptism or water, and it even **distinguishes** “the washing of regeneration” and the “renewing of the Holy Spirit.” Also First Peter 3:21 clarifies that “Baptism” is “ **not** the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.” And again, if one does not believe and presume one’s children to be regenerate -- one has no business getting them baptized at all (unless with Rome one believes baptizing them regenerates them). See our points 22 & 62-64 & 114 above, and see too (on our website <http://www.dr-fnlee.org>) our articles *Baby Belief Before Baptism* and *Baptism Does Not Regenerate!* (subtitled: *Calvin versus “Christening”*).

Such, then -- regarding Paedocommunion and the denial of Calvinism’s presumed regeneratedness of covenant children before their Infant Baptism -- is this novel third-millennium’s **revisionistic** *Auburn Affirmation* of Auburn Avenue’s Rev. Wilkins. Just like the much earlier twentieth-century Auburn Affirmation of Liberal ‘Presbyterianism’ -- it too is (on these points) opposed to the *Westminster Standards*. See *Westminster Confession of Faith* 25:1-2 & 29:3-8 & 30:1-4 and *Westminster Larger Catechism* QQ. & AA. 167 to 177, the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* QQ. & AA. 96-97, and the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* (on Baptism and on the Lord’s Supper).

From all such **revisionism** – turn away!

-- Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. F.N. Lee (ex-P.C.A.),  
Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Australia.