

NO COMMUNION BEFORE TEENAGE!

PASSOVER

BAPTISM

CATECHIZING

COMMUNING



A CATECHISM AGAINST AND FOR CONVERTING PAEDOCOMMUNIONISTS

by

Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee

**Formerly Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History
Queensland Presbyterian Theological College
Brisbane, Australia**

Third edition, June 2005

CATECHISM AGAINST AND FOR CONVERTING PAEDOCOMMUNIONISTS

In this Catechism, we shall show that Paedocommunion is irreconcilable with the Ontological Trinity; with God's Pre-Mosaic revelations; with the Mosaic Exodus; and with the Post-Exodus Pentateuch. It is irreconcilable also with God's revelations from Judges to Jeremiah, and from Ezekiel to Christ's Advent. It is irreconcilable with the youth of Christ Himself; with His Own mature teachings; and with the Acts of the Apostles.

Paedocommunion is irreconcilable further: with First Corinthians one to ten; with First Corinthians eleven; and with First Corinthians chapters 12 to 16. It is irreconcilable with Paul's other Epistles; with the Book of Hebrews; and with the writings of Luke and John.

Paedocommunion is irreconcilable also with all of the extant writings of the Church Fathers till after Augustine. Intruding from Neo-Paganism into the Mediaeval Church, it was withstood by some even in the Middle Ages. It was resisted especially between the Reformation and the Westminster Assembly, and also by all leading Protestant Theologians from Westminster onward and till today. Consequently, one must conclude that Paedocommunion is an alien concept -- yesterday, today, and for ever.

1. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the Ontological Trinity

Q. 1 (Question by Teacher). Who made you and everything else?

A. 1 (Answer by Pupil). The Triune God -- Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Q. 2. What do you mean when you call God a Father?

A. 2. He has always been mature, and has never been without the Son or the Spirit.

Q. 3. But wouldn't the divine Son then have been the smaller child of the Father?

A. 3. No, that Son has always been with the Father and equally mature (John 1:1-18). Thus the *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Questions and Answers 11 & 36.

Q. 4. Did God the Father and Son then create the Holy Spirit?

A. 4. No, for the Father and the Son have always been linked maturely by God the Spirit.

Q. 5. You mean like an eternal Family of three different yet **mature Persons**?

A. 5. Yes, in covenant, like the mature Noah & his wife & sons & their wives (Genesis 6:18).

2. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with God's Pre-Mosaic revelations

Q. 6. Were Noah and his mature children, then, the first ever covenantal human family?

A. 6. No, they descended from the first covenantal Adam and Eve and family (Hosea 6:7).

Q. 7. Did the Triune God create Adam and Eve as babies, or as mature persons?

A. 7. He created them as His mature images -- as adults (Genesis 2:7-25).

- Q. 8. Did He tell them to eat of the fruit of the tree of life in the garden of Eden?
 A. 8. He did not forbid it to those adults, yet they never ate of it when in Eden.
- Q. 9. Why did they then not eat that fruit at that time?
 A. 9. Because they fell into sin before eating of it, and were then expelled from Eden.
- Q. 10. So that their children, as children, could not eat of the fruit of that tree in Eden?
 A. 10. Yes; God told Adam a man would only later leave his parents and cleave to his wife.
- Q. 11. Adam's children were then born outside of Eden, and only after the fall?
 A. 11. Yes; only "in process of time" did Abel bring God bloody sacrifices (Genesis 4:4).
- Q. 12. Were Cain and Abel perhaps still little boys at that time (Genesis 4:3f)?
 A. 12. No, they were grown up. Cain was marriageable, and Abel owned a flock of sheep.
- Q. 13. But didn't Adam and Eve also have other children, such as Seth?
 A. 13. Yes, and they -- and Seth too -- catechized their children unto maturity (Genesis 4:26).
- Q. 14. How do you know those descendants themselves catechized their children?
 A. 14. Because Adam's descendant Jared called his son Enoch -- which means "catechized."
- Q. 15. What was the result of Jared catechizing his son Enoch?
 A. 15. Enoch walked with God; and also catechized his own children (Genesis 5:19-24).
- Q. 16. Who were Enoch's son, grandson, and great-grandson?
 A. 16. The Sethites Methuselah, Lamech and Noah.
- Q. 17. Were they too catechized, and did they too "walk with God"?
 A. 17. Yes; Lamech trusted the Lord, and Noah "walked with God" (Genesis 5:29 & 6:9).
- Q. 18. After God destroyed the wicked in the Great Flood, who next "walked with God"?
 A. 18. Abram or Abraham walked before the Lord (Genesis 12:3-8 & 15:6 & 17:1-25).
- Q. 19. How did Melchizedek show that God had made Abram into a righteous man?
 A. 19. Abram catechized his servants, before they ate holy bread and wine (Genesis 14:14-18).
- Q. 20. How else do you know this?
 A. 20. Abram circumcised those men, and his son Ishmael when thirteen (Genesis 17:23-25).
- Q. 21. What else did Abram do?
 A. 21. He commanded his whole household to keep the way of the Lord (Genesis 18:19).
- Q. 22. Did God spare wicked Sodom after the sacrificing Abram prayed for it?
 A. 22. No; for there were not even ten godly adult males in Sodom (Genesis 18:1-9, 18:18-20 & 18:32 *cf.* Exodus 18:12-21; Joshua 22:14; Judges 6:25-27 & 20:10; Ruth 4:2-11 *cf.* Luke 22:1-20). Ten males were a *minyán* -- necessary for worship and communion!

- Q. 23. How old was Isaac, before he assisted his father Abram to sacrifice?
 A. 23. He had clearly become a teenager (Genesis 21:8-20 & 22:6-13).
- Q. 24. Did anyone before teenage ever bring a sacrifice to God -- before the Passover?
 A. 24. No, all of those sacrificing back then -- were mature males alone.
- Q. 25. Mention the names of some of those men who brought sacrifices?
 A. 25. Adam, Abel, Noah, Abram, Isaac, and Jacob or Israel (Genesis 25:21 to 35:14).
- Q. 26. And did Jacob or Israel teach his mature sons the Israelites to sacrifice?
 A. 26. He certainly did so teach those Israelites (Genesis 46:1-4; 46:32-34; 47:3f; 49:11f; 50:8).

3. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the Mosaic Exodus

- Q. 27. What about the later Israelites, under Moses, before their exodus from Egypt?
 Q. 27. They too were so taught (Exodus 3:6-18; 5:1-17; 10:9-25; 12:3-50 *cf.* 18:12-21).
- Q. 28. Does Exodus 10:9-25 imply also women and children co-sacrificed with the men?
 A. 28. No, it just says they would be with the men, while "those who are men" feasted -- after Moses and Aaron and the menfolk brought "sacrifice to the Lord."
- Q. 29. Does Exodus 11:2 teach babes & toddlers would recover goods from the neighbours?
 A. 29. No, it teaches every man would recover goods from his male neighbour; and that every woman would recover jewels from her female neighbour (*cf.* 3:22 & 12:4 & 12:35).
- Q. 30. Does Exodus 12:3-4 teach all would share the Passover lamb with their neighbours?
 A. 30. No, but that a few adult men should share the Passover with their male neighbours.
- Q. 31. But doesn't Exodus 12:1-47 teach all the Congregation of Israel kept the Passover?
 A. 31. That "Congregation" consisted only of adult males under the leadership of Elders.
- Q. 32. How can you say that such "Congregation" excluded the women and children?
 A. 32. God says it was "every man...according to the house of the fathers" (Exodus 12:1-3).
- Q. 33. You say the "Congregation" was limited to circumcised and mature adult males?
 A. 33. Yes; and they needed to be catechized before eating the Passover (Exodus 12:26-48).
- Q. 34. But doesn't Exodus 12:3 say "a lamb for each household" (including wives & babes)?
 A. 34. No, it says "every man a lamb, according to the house of the fathers" -- not the mothers.
- Q. 35. Yet it also adds "a lamb for a house!"
 A. 35. Yes, for "every man a lamb, according to the house of the fathers."
- Q. 36. But doesn't Exodus 12:3-4 say "every person who has a mouth shall eat"?
 A. 36. No. Speaking of "the house of their fathers," it says: "If the household is too small for the [male] lamb, let him [the male householder] and his male neighbour take it [the

mature ram] according to the number of the souls of every **man** [or adult male] according to his eating, and make your count for the lamb."

- Q. 37. Are you saying only the mature males who would eat of the lamb were counted?
A. 37. That's what God says; and He adds that even the lamb to be used, is to be a **mature male** (Exodus 12:5).
- Q. 38. Doesn't Exodus 12:6 say "the whole assembly of the Congregation...shall kill it?"
A. 38. That Assembly excluded all too young to **kill the ram**; and Exodus 12:7 says the eaters would paint the ram's blood on the upper doorpost (unreachable by small children!).
- Q. 39. Doesn't Exodus 12:8 say they would then roast and eat the meat with bitter herbs?
A. 39. That's right. And toddlers can't roast; nor unweaned babies eat bitter herbs.
- Q. 40. Exodus 12:11 says to eat it hastily with "your shoes on your feet, with staff in hand."
A. 40. Such must obviously exclude shoeless babies and staffless toddlers!
- Q. 41. In Exodus 12:12 God says: "I...will...this night...smite all the firstborn...of Egypt."
A. 41. Yes, Egypt's grown-up first-born -- not Egypt's last-born babies or toddlers!
- Q. 42. In Exodus 12:14a, God says: "This day shall be to you for a **memorial**."
A. 42. Indeed! And how can a speechless infant or a toddler remember and commemorate?
- Q. 43. Exodus 12:14b adds: "You shall keep it a Feast to the Lord throughout generations."
A. 43. Exactly! Those who keep it and who commemorate it, do so in each generation.
- Q. 44. Exodus 12:15 says the Feasters must remove leaven from their homes for seven days.
A. 44. Indeed. Their wives and toddlers must not there eat leaven; as distinct from co-feasting.
- Q. 45. How do you know wives and toddlers did not co-feast?
A. 45. Because Exodus 12:16 adds that no man may then work (and toddlers can't work).
- Q. 46. Exodus 12:21 says: "Then Moses called for the Elders of Israel to kill the lamb."
A. 46. Elders (*Z'qeeniyim*) means "the bearded ones"; and that excludes women and children.
- Q. 47. Yet Exodus 12:24 says the Passover shall be observed by bearded ones -- and their sons!
A. 47. But it does not say those sons ate it before they too at teenage become bearded ones!
- Q. 48. Did Moses teach his mature sons how to sacrifice?
A. 48. Yes, also at the sacrifice of the Passover (Exodus 12:26-28 *cf.* 18:2-12).
- Q. 49. Exodus 12:26 clarifies that also the sons of bearded ones attended the Passover Service.
A. 49. Yes, and such sons were not speechless infants; for they asked a **mature question!**
- Q. 50. They asked the bearded ones eating: "What do you mean by this Service?"
A. 50. Yes. If the askers too had eaten, they would say (but didn't): "Why are we doing this?!"

- Q. 51. What does Calvin say about this verse in his *Institutes* IV:16:30?
 A. 51. He says: "Circumcision, which...corresponds to our Baptism [Colossians 2:11-13], was intended for infants; but the Passover, for which the Supper is substituted, did not admit all...but was duly **eaten only** by those who were of an age sufficient to **ask the meaning** of it (Exodus 12:26). Had these [Anabaptists] the least particle of soundness in their brain -- would they be thus blind, as to a matter so very clear?"
- Q. 52. What did those catechizing bearded Elders then reply to their questioning sons?
 Q. 52. They said: "It is the sacrifice of the Passover of the Lord Who passed over the houses of the sons of Israel in Egypt when He smote the Egyptians but delivered our homes."
- Q. 53. So only the mature adult males then sacrificed -- but not the women and children?
 Q. 53. Yes -- from the time of Adam right down to the time of Moses and beyond!
- Q. 54. Doesn't the word "first-born" in Exodus 12:29 mean that babies ate the Passover?
 Q. 54. No; the firstborn had grown up and already sat on Pharaoh's throne, or in his dungeon.
- Q. 55. Exodus 12:37 speaks of 600 000 "**men** -- beside children" clinging to their mothers.
 A. 55. Such 600 000 was the "count" for the eating of the Passover lamb (at Exodus 12:4)!
- Q. 56. Wasn't the Passover, like the Supper which replaced it, for 'whosoever will'?
 A. 56. No. Exodus 12:43-45 say: "No stranger shall eat of it"; and "a hired servant shall not."
- Q. 57. Doesn't Exodus 12:44 says one's purchased slave in one's home, may eat of it?
 A. 57. Only after being circumcised and, as we shall see, also being catechized.
- Q. 58. Does this mean that uncircumcised believers were not to eat of it?
 A. 58. Indeed! No uncircumcised prenatal or baby or girl or adult woman might do so!
- Q. 59. Would that then not mean that baptized women may not take **the Lord's Supper**?
 A. 59. No, for after Calvary, such are admitted to both Sacraments (Genesis 3:15; Acts 8:12; First Corinthians 11:11-24; Galatians 3:27-29).
- Q. 60. Does Exodus 12:46 forbid carrying the Mass through the streets?
 A. 60. Among other things, that is implicitly indeed what it also forbids!
- Q. 61. But Exodus 12:47 says: "All the Congregation shall keep it."
 A. 61. Yes; which means only **catechized adult males** -- not uncircumcised babes & women!
- Q. 62. Why then must such circumcised adult males also be catechized?
 A. 62. For Exodus 12:48 says they must 'come near' -- meaning: 'be catechized' (12:26f).
- Q. 63. After strangers have been catechized, may their circumcised boys too eat?
 A. 63. No, God says "let him" (the stranger **but not his boys**) then "keep" it. Exodus 12:48.
- Q. 64. When can such a stranger's circumcised boys "keep" and eat of the Passover?
 A. 64. Only when such sons themselves have later been catechized and 'come near.'

- Q. 65. But isn't such a law only for strangers -- and not also for those born Israelites?
- A. 65. No! For Exodus 12:49 commands: "One law shall be to him who is homeborn, and to the stranger who sojourns among you!"
- Q. 66. Who then determines when a covenant child had become a communicable man?
- A. 66. Not the child, nor the child's parents, but the bearded Elders alone (Exodus 12:21-27 *cf.* Deuteronomy 19:12-15 & 23:1).

4. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the Post-Exodus Pentateuch

- Q. 67. But doesn't Exodus 13:8-14 imply that also baby Israelites ate the Passover?
- A. 67. No! For babies cannot ask questions and be catechized -- any more than the questionless firstborn animals which open the womb of animals should eat the Passover!
- Q. 68. Doesn't Exodus 16:16, *cf.* with 12:4, prove that all those children who ate the manna -- also ate the Sacrament of the Passover?
- A. 68. No. For unweaned babies did not -- but worms did! -- eat the manna (Exodus 16:20). Only the mature men, the complaining Congregation, gathered it. Perhaps even the Israelites' unprofessing halfbreeds and even some of their animals did eat that unsacramental manna. But the mature men who gathered it, did so only for those in their tents who could eat it -- not for their prenatal babes or their unweaned infants (16:10-16).
- Q. 69. Were women and children to eat of the Passover and the other two annual Feasts?
- A. 69. Exodus 23:10-19 says: "You men shall keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread.... So too the Feast of Harvest, the first-fruits of the labours of you men..., and the Feast of Ingathering...when you men have gathered in your labours.... Three times you men shall keep a Feast to Me in the year.... Your males shall appear before the Lord."
- Q. 70. Is this stated also elsewhere in the Book of Exodus?
- A. 70. Exodus 34:12-26 states: "Take heed...lest you men make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land!... The Feast of Unleavened Bread, you men shall keep.... You men shall observe the Feast of Weeks...and the Feast of Ingathering.... Thrice in the year, all your males shall appear before the Lord God.... Neither shall any man desire your land, when you men shall go up to appear before the Lord your God thrice in the year."
- Q. 71. Don't some cite Leviticus 12:6-8 as if also women and children sacrificed?
- A. 71. But Leviticus 1:2*f* says: "Speak to the sons of Israel and say to them: 'If any man of you brings an offering to the Lord -- you shall bring your offering!'" Leviticus 12:6-8 says that a new mother shall bring a lamb as a burnt offering not to the female door-keepers at the door of the tabernacle but "to the priest" (who was always an adult male).
- Q. 72. Did women and children manducate at the second Passover in Numbers 9:1-14?
- A. 72. No. Certain adult men defiled by a dead body were refused that Passover till they had cleansed themselves during the next month. This was instituted also for future generations.

- Q. 73. You say, then, that such precludes manducation by women and children?
- A. 73. In the *Talmud*, Rabbi Jose here comments: "It excludes a minor!" And Christian Scholars like Dr. Richard Bacon and Dr. Joe Morecraft observe that Numbers 9 must also exclude from the Passover for ever -- all women menstruating during both the first month and the second month (and therefore by implication also all other women).
- Q. 74. Aren't those views of the twenty-first century's Bacon and Morecraft rather far-fetched?
- A. 74. They seem to have fetched them from Herman Witsius's far-off 1763 *Economy of the Covenants* (4:9:15)! He explained that they could become unclean "by touching a dead body; or by a leprosy; or whose seed went from them; or by any other accident [Leviticus 13:1 to 15:17]; and women in their monthly courses [see *inter alia* Leviticus 15:18-33 *cf.* 12:2-8 *etc.*] were debarred from the Passover. Numbers 9:6*f.*"
- Q. 75. Did Israelitic women and children manducate at the pagan feasts of Numbers 25 & 31? *Cf.* too First Corinthians 10:1-11 -- where, among other adulteries and idolatries, such are discussed in connection with sinning before and during the Lord's Supper?
- A. 75. They did not. Those punished for such actions, were the adult Israelitic men and the whoring Midianitesses concerned. But no Israelite women or pre-adolescent children.
- Q. 76. Doesn't Deuteronomy 6:20*f.*, compared to Exodus 12:16, imply Paedocommunion?
- A. 76. No, Deuteronomy 6:20*f.* has nothing to do with the Passover. Yet even there, no answer is offered at all -- before the son gets **old enough** to ask a similar question!
- Q. 77. Does God discriminate between men -- and women and children?
- A. 77. Very clearly! In Deuteronomy 20:13, He calls for the death only of weapon-bearing enemy males (*cf.* Exodus 12:3*f.* and 12:37) -- but not of their women and children.
- Q. 78. Does Deuteronomy 12:6-18 teach women and children co-sacrificed with men?
- Q. 78. No. It teaches men sacrificed, but women and children merely co-rejoiced -- while unclean people too might co-eat meat from unsacrificial and unsacramental offerings.
- Q. 79. And what does Deuteronomy 16:1-15 teach?
- A. 79. First, that only the Passover is here called a sacrifice. Second, that all the men shall appear thrice annually at the Feasts of the Passover and of Weeks and of Tabernacles. And third, that then "every man shall give as he is able."
- Q. 80. What did Calvin teach in his *Sermon* on this passage?
- A. 80. "We must also 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! For in Exodus 12:26, our Lord shows us full well that we must profit in His School to be partakers of the paschal lamb.... The Lord's Supper ought to remind that our coming there ought not to be without instruction.... It be not lawful to admit young children to the Lord's Supper!"
- Q. 81. Does Deuteronomy 23:1*f.* prohibit sexually-minor males sacrificing passover lambs?
- A. 81. Clearly! Not only Moses, but also the *Talmud* teaches on this: "All slaughter is valid -- except...[that of] an imbecile or a minor.... They invalidate their slaughtering."

5. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with Scripture from Judges to Jeremiah

- Q. 82. Does Judges 13:3-7 teach that Samson sacramentally communed prenatally?
- A. 82. This has nothing to do with the Passover! A fetus does not avoid unclean food, nor manducate sacramental food. That notion is sacramentalistic to the core. Only physical nourishment and alcohol poisoning could be absorbed by a fetus *via* a manducating mother. For a fetus is nourished not through a mouth as in Exodus 12:3f but through his umbilical cord. And thus he no more than communes, than he would be getting baptized simply by his pregnant mother herself getting baptized.
- Q. 83. Don't First Samuel one & two imply Elkanah's wives and children ate the Passover?
- A. 83. These passages do not mention the Passover, nor teach that his wives or any of his children co-sacrificed. It tells us Hannah didn't eat or drink at an annual feast before Samuel was conceived (1:7-15); nor till after he was weaned and reached late childhood (1:21-25); nor that Samuel himself did so till a teenager (2:1-26 *cf.* Luke 2:40-47).
- Q. 84. Does Solomon teach only trained youth are to come for Wisdom's bread & wine?
- A. 84. Matthew Henry comments on Proverbs nine: "The grace of the Gospel is thus set before us in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.... Ministers of the Gospel are commissioned and commanded to give notice of the preparations which God has made in the Everlasting Covenant for all those that are willing to come up to the terms of it.... Who is the tempter? 'A foolish [sex-depraved] woman'.... Who are the tempted? Young people who have been well educated." Thus catechized **adolescent youth** -- as distinct from all pre-adolescent children!
- Q. 85. What does Solomon really mean and require in Proverbs 22:6?
- A. 85. "**Catechize a lad** for the time his **beard** begins to grow!" Attaining adolescence is to be the normal *terminus ad quem* of catechizing -- for admission to the Lord's Supper. *Cf.* too the growth of the breasts for non-sacrificing **females**, in Song of Solomon 8:8-10.
- Q. 86. Was Hezekiah's Passover at Second Chronicles 30 restrictive, or for "whosoever will"?
- A. 86. The *Westminster Larger Catechism* (171) cited *inter alia* also from that chapter, to prove that "they that receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper are before they come -- to prepare themselves thereto, by examining themselves." Unlike those who at Second Chronicles 30:18 "had not cleansed themselves yet did...eat the Passover" so sinfully.
- Q. 87. What light do Joel 1:3 & 2:16 shed against Paedocommunion?
- A. 87. Joel distinguishes the "Congregation" and the "Elders" -- from "the children" and "the sucklings,." He urges his adult addressees to catechize their children, so that they in turn should later inform their children about God's awesome works.
- Q. 88. Did Calvin regard Isaiah (7:14f) as relevant to Antipaedocommunionism?
- Q. 88. Calvin commented: "There can be no doubt that the Prophet referred to Christ.... He will be reared in the same manner children commonly are..., until He arrives at that age when He can distinguish between good and evil -- or, as we commonly say, 'till the years of discretion.'" *Viz.* Luke 2:41-47 *cf.* the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177.

- Q. 89. Was Isaiah (28:7f) relevant to Matthew Henry's Antipaedocommunionism?
- Q. 89. He commented on "Ministers designed...to 'make them understand doctrine,' verse 9. This is God's way of dealing with men -- to enlighten men's minds first with the knowledge of His truth.... It is good to begin betimes with children -- to teach them, as they are capable, the good knowledge of the Lord, and to instruct them.... For our instruction in the things of God, it is requisite that we have precept upon precept and line upon line.... The same precept and the same line should often be repeated and inculcated.... **Children...have 'need of milk' and 'cannot bear strong meat'** (Hebrews 5:12)."
- Q. 90. Does Second Chronicles 35:1-17f teach that children kept the Passover?
- Q. 90. It teaches that "Josiah kept a Passover" -- and got the mature male Congregation to prepare by the houses of their "fathers," and to "sanctify" themselves and "prepare" their "brethren" so that the mature "sons of Israel...kept the Passover."
- Q. 91. What does Second Kings 23:9-21 teach, had happened just before that Passover?
- Q. 91. Matthew Henry there commented: "The ordinance of the Lord's Supper resembles the Passover.... Religion cannot flourish where that Passover is...not **duly** observed.... He charged them [Priests and Levites] to sanctify themselves and prepare their brethren. Ministers...must sanctify themselves in the first place.... But it must not end there. They must do what they can, to prepare their brethren -- by admonishing, **instructing**.... The whole solemnity was performed with great exactness."
- Q. 92. Are there any cases of Paedocommunion during Old Testament times?
- Q. 92. Not among the faithful! But indeed among those syncretized with Paganism, and thus among the syncretistic Samaritans (Second Kings 17:24-34 cf. Ezra 4:1-10f).
- Q. 93. Is this reflected in Jeremiah (7:18), where he complains: "The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough to make cakes to the Queen of Heaven and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods"?
- A. 93. Yes. And Calvin comments about the Lamentations 2:12 & 4:4 of that same faithful Jeremiah: "The use of wine is not allowed to infants." For Jeremiah "speaks not of sucklings -- but of children three or four years old" and yet older.

6. Paedocommunion unprescribed from Ezekiel to Christ's Advent

- Q. 94. What does the Prophet Ezekiel (44:4-21) predict, about the cleansed Passover alias the New Testament Lord's Supper?
- A. 94. Dr. Leonard Coppes says in his book *Paedocommunion versus the Bible* (pp. 22-24): "In Ezekiel 44:4-9, God says that the New Covenant Israel is responsible to discipline [or to disciple] those who approach Him. In the Judaism of Jesus' day, Ezekiel 44 was manifested in what has come to be known as *bar mitzvah*. God submitted Jesus to this institution, before He was allowed to approach God's presence [cf. Luke 2:40-47].... The Rabbis forbid children to drink the wine.... The article 'Education' [in the] *Jewish Encyclopedia*, [says]...the children were to be treated -- as if they were to become Priests.... Leviticus 10:8 and Ezekiel 44:21 forbids priests to drink wine."

- Q. 95. Why does Nehemiah (8:2) state "Ezra...brought the Law before the Congregation of men, and to the women and all of them who could hear with understanding"?
- A. 95. Matthew Henry here commented that the men "began to offer their burnt-offerings.... Masters of families should bring their families with them to the public worship of God.... Little ones, as they come to the exercise of reason, must be trained up in the exercises of religion.... As young people grow up to be capable of distinguishing between good and evil and of acting intelligently, they ought to make it their own act and deed to 'join themselves to the Lord.'"
- Q. 96. What is the significance to Paedocommunion of Ezra 2:64-65?
- A. 96. It says of "the whole Congregation" of 42 360 adult males, that it excludes "their servants and their maids" and also their 200 "singing men and women." This seems to show that, as in the Passover passage Exodus 12:3-37, women and children were not included with the adult males in the number of the Congregation.
- Q. 97. Does Ezra 10:1f disprove women and children were counted in the Congregation?
- A. 97. There was "a very great Congregation of men -- and women and children.... Ezra...said...: 'You have transgressed, and have taken strange wives.... Therefore you must...separate yourselves from...the foreign wives.' Then all the Congregation [cf. Exodus 12:3-47] answered...with a loud voice: 'As you have said, we must do!'"
- Q. 98. In the Intertestamentary Period, did the Judaistic Essenes practise Paedocommunion?
- A. 98. The B.C. 130 Essenic *Book of Jubilees*, explicitly quoted in the *Qumran Damascus Document* (CD 16:3f), teaches only mature men ate the Passover. *Jubilees* 49:6-21 teaches that "every man' from twenty years old and upwards..., shall eat it in the sanctuary" -- and that their married men ate the Passover alone, without their women and children. Of the Essenes, Josephus wrote in his A.D. 75 *Wars of the Jews* (2:8:7-10) that "if anyone has a mind to come over to their sect, he is not immediately admitted; but he is prescribed the same method of living which they use -- for a year, while he continues excluded.... When he has given evidence during that time...that he...approaches nearer to their way of living..., his temper is tried for two more years.... If he appear to be worthy, they then admit him into their society" (cf. First Corinthians 11:29).
- Q. 99. Is this principle of three years' catechization among the Essenes found elsewhere?
- A. 99. It is rooted in Exodus 12:3f,21,26f,37,48f; First Samuel 2:11-18f; and Proverbs 22:6 -- and anticipates what is recorded in Acts 20:31 & Galatians 1:18. It further seems to be reflected in *Aboth* 5:21; Clement of Alexandria's *Paidogogue* 1:4-7 and *Stromata* II:18; the *Apostolic Constitutions* 7:2;24 & 8:4:32 -- and in John Calvin's *Institutes* 4:19:4-12f. Ideally, it best runs between the ages of ten and thirteen alias the attainment of puberty or adolescence (Exodus 12:3,26,37; Proverbs 22:6; Luke 2:40-52).
- Q. 100. What is the above-mentioned *Aboth* (or *Fathers*) 5:21?
- A. 100. In the *Talmud*, *Aboth* is the Pharisees' well-known text translated *Fathers* [cf. the word "fathers" in the Passover passage Exodus 12:3f]. It states: "At five years old, one is fit for Scripture; at ten years, for the *Mishnah*; at thirteen, for the fulfilling of the Commandments" (cf. '*Bar Mitzvaah*' Confirmation).

- Q. 101. Some Paedocommunionists say this is a Talmudic 'doctrine of demons'!
- A. 101. Well, Paul was a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee (Acts 23:6). He was born in Tarsus (Acts 22:3a), and later "brought up" and "taught [or catechized] at the feet of Gamaliel" (Acts 22:3b). Paul's being "taught" in Jerusalem would have started at the very time he became a "youth" (*cf.* Acts 26:4-5). He himself would thus have become a Passover Communicant in his "youth" -- and indeed at its onset (age thirteen). Genesis 17:25; Exodus 12:3-4,26f,37; First Chronicles 21:5; Proverbs 22:6; Luke 2:40-47.
- Q. 102. Is there any further evidence in the *Talmud* to this same effect?
- A. 102. That thirteen is the age when one ceases to be a child and becomes obligated to observe various ordinances, is clear also from many of the passages in the *Talmud* and the *Mishnah*. See: *Niddah* (5:6); *Yomah* (8:4); *Baba Kamma* (4:4 & 8:4); *Arakhin* (1:1); *Tohoroth* (3:6); and *Makshirin* (3:8 & 6:1). Furthermore, the fulfilment of various ordinances at years below this age of thirteen -- and notably manducation at the Passover by pre-pubescent children -- is actually forbidden. See: *Rosh Ha-Shanah* (3:8); *Menahoth* (9:8); *Hullin* (1:1); and *Parah* (5:4).

7. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the youth of Christ Himself

- Q. 103. But what has all this to do with the New Testament?
- A. 103. Note the catechizing of the twelve-year-old Jesus, before His first participation in the Passover (Luke 2:21,40-43,47)! The same was true of Paul (Acts 22:3; 23:6; Galatians 1:15f; Philippians 3:5f). And Timothy, son of a mixed marriage between a Non-Jewish Greek and a Jewess, is particularly significant. Growing up in a religious home, he was catechized and confirmed as a Communicant in Christ's Visible Church, perhaps even by the 'laying on' of the hands of Paul himself. Second Timothy 1:2-6; 3:14-17; First Timothy 4:12-14; 6:12,21. *Cf.* too: Hebrews 5:14 to 6:2; Proverbs 3:8; 22:6; 31:1f; First John 2:2-14.
- Q. 104. What does the Hebrew-Christian Scholar Dr. Alfred Edersheim say about this?
- A. 104. He claims the Passover 'Company' in Luke 2:44 consisted of a *minyan* count of at least "ten persons to every sacrificial lamb [*cf.* Genesis 18:32 and Exodus 12:3f & 12:37 with Ruth 4:2].... In such a festive 'Company,' the Joseph and Jesus' mother Mary went to and returned from this Feast 'every year' -- taking the 'Holy Child' with them after He had attained the age of twelve (Luke 2:41-49)." That was "the year before" a child "attained Jewish majority" at thirteen.
- Q. 105. What does the great Christian Scholar Dr. Emil Schürer say about this?
- A. 105. In his book *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, he refers to the Talmudic tract *Niddah* 5:6, which "explains that 'When a child is twelve years and one day old, his oaths are tested; when he is thirteen years and a day, they are valid.'
- Q. 106. And what does the Dutch Reformed Scholar Dr. R. Bijlsma say about this?
- A. 106. In his *Short Catechetics*, he says: "About the beginning of our Christian Era...there were Schools of Education established by the Jewish Congregation.... They were grouped around teachers of the Law, appointed for the purpose, to whom [circumcised]

children...were brought.... Teaching of the Law was given at a higher level in the 'House of Doctrine' (*Beth Ha-Midrash*). This instruction...is the forerunner of the Christian Catechism.... When the child was ten years old, the Doctrine (*Mishna*) came up. Then, at the age of twelve to thirteen, children were obligated to keep the Hebrew Legal Prescriptions (the *Mitzvoth*).... For many centuries [!], the fixed rule has been that a youth becomes *Bar-Mitzvah* [or 'Son of the Law' when an adolescent alias a 'little man'] as soon as he is thirteen years."

Q. 107. What happened when Jesus was twelve years old?

Q. 107. He then, approaching adolescence, accompanied a Passover "Company" or *Sunodia to Jerusalem* -- with the prospect of being admitted to manducation at that ordinance upon His *Bar Mitzvaah* at age thirteen.

Q. 108. Did He first start catechizing only then -- or even earlier?

A. 108. Already in Nazareth "the child grew and became strong in spirit -- becoming filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon Him" (Luke 2:40). As He passed through His late childhood toward His adolescence, He "became strong in spirit, becoming filled with wisdom." No doubt God used also the catechetical efforts of Joseph and Mary to deepen her son's wisdom. God would soon use also the ecclesiastical Teachers in Jerusalem to deepen it further, between Christ's twelfth and thirteenth birthday anniversaries. And immediately thereafter too, "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man" (Luke 2:40-52).

Q. 109. For how many years would Jesus probably have been catechized?

A. 109. In Luke 13:6-9, He describes a young fruit-tree being prepared to bear its first fruit when attaining maturity three years later. This suggests officially starting to groom and to catechize a ten-year-old covenant child for three years.

Q. 110. What does the A.D. 190 Church Father Clement of Alexandria say about this?

A. 110. In his *Miscellanies* II:18, Clement says: "From the Commandments spring both wisdom...and righteousness.... Farmers derived advantage from the Law in such things. For it orders newly-planted trees to be nourished three years in succession, and the superfluous growths to be cut off..., tilling and digging round them.... It does not allow imperfect fruit to be plucked from immature trees -- but after three years, in the fourth year dedicating the first-fruits to God after the tree has attained maturity. This type of farming may serve as a mode of instruction, teaching that we must cut the growths of sins, and the useless weeds of the mind that spring up round the vital fruit till the shoot of faith is perfected and becomes strong. For in the fourth year, since there is need of time to him that is solidly being catechized..., virtues are consecrated to God." Cf. Genesis 17:25 & Leviticus 19:23f & Deuteronomy 11:17-22 & 12:5-18 & 16:1-16 & Proverbs 3:9-13 & 9:1-16 & 22:6.

Q. 111. Why did Jesus at twelve accompany others on their way to the Passover (Luke 2:40f)?

A. 111. To be catechized by the Teachers in Jerusalem during the week-long Passover Feast. This was "after the custom of the Feast" -- with a view to being admitted to manducate thereat one year later soon after His thirteenth birthday in accordance with "the custom" or sacred puberty-rite of *Bar Mitzvaah*.

Q. 112. Though not manducating there when twelve, did Jesus then attend the Passover Feast?

A. 112. It was throughout that Feast assumed that also the twelve-year-old Jesus attended it. For it was supposed He was "in the Company" or *Sunodia* -- and accompanied the 'Number' or 'Count' or *minyán* of at least ten mature male Communicants needed to constitute a 'Congregation' of the 'Sons of Israel.' Luke 2:44-46 *cf.* Exodus 12:26-28. The following year, Jesus would turn thirteen, when becoming a man (*'iysh*). For only then, He would be confirmed as a 'Communicant Member' of that "Company." *Cf.* too Luke 2:41-44 & 22:11-15 with Exodus 12:3-4.

Q. 113. What does the great Baptist Theologian Dr. John Gill say about this?

A. 113. In his 1748 *Exposition of the New Testament*, on Luke 2:42 he rightly comments: "According to the maxims of the Jews, 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." However, the Hebrews "used to train up their children and inure them to religious exercises before" that -- and "especially throughout the twelfth year before they turned thirteen.... Joseph was obliged to go [*viz.* up to Jerusalem] three times a year, as were all males in Israel -- at the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Deuteronomy 16:16. The first of these is expressed here -- 'at the Feast of the Passover'.... The women, were not obliged to go up. For so it is said by the Jews [*T. Hieros. Kiddushin*, fol. 61.3]."

Q. 114. What is the meaning of Luke 2:46-47, when Jesus was beyond twelve years old?

A. 114. It says the Temple Teachers were then examining "His understanding and answers." For Luke 2:46-47 (*cf.* Acts 22:3 & Exodus 12:26f) suggests such Teachers regularly catechized and cross-examined Hebrew boys when the latter had turned twelve, and normally up to the time they turned thirteen years and one day old..

Q. 115. How does the Westminster Assembly's Theologian Rev. Dr. John Lightfoot, in his comments on Luke 2:40-47, stress the importance of the 12-year-old Christ's Passover visit to the Rabbis in Jerusalem?

A. 115. Lightfoot quotes first from 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.... But from that time, let him descend with him into his way of living. That is, says Lightfoot, "let him [the father] diligently and with severity (if need be) keep him [the twelve-year-old son] close to that way...by which he [the son] may get his living." Thus, "Christ being now twelve years old," He now "applies Himself to His proper work" -- *viz.* "to be about His Father's business." Even as "Moses, when he was 'twelve years old'" -- explained Rabbi Chama (in the *Shemoth Rabb.*) -- "was taken from his father's house." And even "Solomon when 'twelve years old' -- as also the Early Church Father Ignatius remarked in his *Epistle to the Magnesians* (chapter 3), and judged between two women."

Q. 116. Why does Matthew Henry insist males were not admitted to the Passover till thirteen?

A. 116. He says: "Jewish Doctors say that at twelve...children must begin to...learn..., [so] that at thirteen years old a child begins to be 'a Son of the Commandment' [or a *Bar Mitzvaah*] -- that is, obliged to the duties of Adult Church-Membership, having been from his infancy by virtue of his circumcision 'a Son of the Covenant' [or a *Ben B'riyth*]... Those children that were in their infancy dedicated to God, should be called upon when they are

grown up to come to the Gospel-Passover -- to the Lord's Supper -- [so] that they may make it their own act and deed to join themselves to the Lord."

Q. 117. What comment does the great Lutheran Theologian Dr. Rudolph Stier make here?

A. 117. In his famous book *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, he says that Joseph and Mary "took the youth Jesus with them to Jerusalem [Luke 2:41]. There is a latent proof in the 'twelve years' [Luke 2:42]..., that this was the first time.... The youth of Israel in that period [from twelve years of age onward] were reputed [to be] *B^enee Ha-Tooraah*, 'Sons of the Law'.... The mistaken idea that Jesus taught [others during that episode]...is refuted by verse 46. He sat as a learner -- hearing those who taught, and asking questions."

Q. 118. What does the Hebrew-Christian Dr. Alfred Edersheim here comment?

A. 118. He says some allege "that, on the occasion referred to, the Saviour had gone up, as being 'of age'...as a *Bar Mitzvah* or 'Son of the Commandment'.... But the legal age for this was not twelve, but thirteen (*Aboth*. 5:21). On the other hand, the Rabbinical Law enjoined (*Yoma* 82a) that even before that -- two years, or at least one year -- lads should be brought up to the Temple and made to observe [or bear witness without themselves manducating at] the festive rites.... In conformity with this universal custom..., Jesus went on the occasion named -- to the Temple." For Luke 2:42-47 gives the story of Jesus' "questioning the Rabbis in the Temple, the year before He attained Jewish majority" status at age thirteen. Then, next Passover, after His Confirmation once thirteen, He Himself would be able to manducate at that Sacrament.

8. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with teachings of the mature Christ

Q. 119. After He turned thirty, did our Priest Jesus give the Passover also to children?

A. 119. When the annual Passover then drew near, Jesus non-sacramentally broke bread for five thousand hungry men. John 6:4 *cf.* Matthew 14:14*f.* True to the Passover practice, the 'count' only of the adult males is stated. The women and children who were with them, whom Jesus also fed non-sacramentally (because hungry), did not manducate at the Passover. They were not counted, because the Hebrews were long accustomed to number only the men -- who alone would manducate at the Passover (*cf.* Exodus 12:3-4 & 12:37). "They that ate, were about five thousand men -- beside women and children." Matthew 14:14,15,20,21. Christ's feeding of the five thousand men at Passover-time, in decimal "Companies" (*Sumposia*) of hundreds and fifties, reflects the significance of at least ten mature males or multiplications thereof as the essential number or *minyán* needed for official meetings of Israel's Congregation of adult males alone.

Q. 120. What does Calvin comment on this passage John 6:26-53*f*?

A. 120. He says: "This sermon does not refer to the Lord's Supper, but to the continual communication which we have apart from the reception of the Lord's Supper.... As far as young children are concerned, Christ's ordinance forbids them to participate in the Lord's Supper -- because they cannot yet try [or test and examine] themselves, or celebrate the remembrance of the death of Christ [*cf.* First Corinthians 11:24*f*].... It is wrong to expound this whole passage as applying to the Lord's Supper!"

Q. 121. Does the same apply to Christ's later institution of the Lord's Supper?

A. 121. Christ turned His last mature male *Chebraah* or Passover 'Company' into His first Lord's Supper, where the absence of children was and is significant. In Matthew 23:1-8, it is probable that Christ the Teacher actually calls Himself 'The Catechist' or *Ho Kathegeetees*. Among "His Disciples" -- only those twelve who had at that time been instructed fully by that 'Great Catechist' were then admitted to His Holy Table.

Q. 122. What does Witsius say about this in his *Economy of the Covenants* (IV:9:13)?

A. 122. He says: "The guests who partook of the paschal lamb, are commanded to meet by houses or families. Exodus 12:3. If the house had not a 'Number' sufficient to consume a lamb, the neighbours were to be called in -- till a just 'Number' [alias a decimal 'Count'] was made up, verse 4. The Jewish masters took care that the 'Number' of [cleansed adult male] guests should not be under ten, nor above twenty [*cf.* Christ and His twelve Apostles]. In those 'Companies' or 'Societies' called *Phratrias* by Josephus (and called) by the Hebrews '*Chaburoth*,' men...sat down together -- old men and young; whole and sick; masters and servants"; excluding women and children.

Q. 123. And what does Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuiper Sr. say about this?

A. 123. In chapter 110 of his great work *Our Divine Worship Service*, Kuiper writes: "The Lord's Supper was instituted at the Passover Feast. In order to celebrate the Passover Feast, Jesus priorly got everything prepared in the Upper Room. The solemnity of the Passover Feast, which looked back upon Israel's redemption from Egypt, was indeed a symbolic prediction of the redemption which the Lamb of God would bring.... It was therefore not incidental that the Lord sat with His Disciples at a meal around a table. It was a Passover! Every man in Israel was required thus to celebrate the Passover [Exodus 12:3-37 & 23:14-17 & 34:23-25]. Jesus too subjected Himself to the ordinance of the Lord, and therein set an example for His Disciples.... It is true that the solemnity of the Passover was completed before Jesus went on to institute the Lord's Supper. But He then did so, directly in conjunction with the Passover Meal -- and without [first] standing up from the Passover Meal."

Q. 124. Why then do we **now** give the Lord's Supper not just to men but also to women?

A. 124. Calvary and the Resurrection were and are the hinge for the admission of women to the Sacrament of the Eucharist and also to Christian Baptism. For before Calvary -- though by implication even infant males probably received Baptism from John (*cf.* John 1:25 with First Kings 18:30-36 and Genesis 17:1-27) -- there is no indication any females were baptized. Yet after Christ's resurrection, it is clear that both infant girls and adult women were baptized (Acts 2:17f & 2:38f with 8:12 & 16:15 & 16:33 and Galatians 3:27-29). Yet no infants of either gender -- though, indeed, adult women! -- were then admitted to manducation at the Eucharist (First Corinthians 11:11-29).

Q. 125. What is the significance of giving the Lord's Supper to women but not to children?

A. 125. Once the promised mature male Messianic Seed of the woman had crushed Satan on Calvary (Genesis 3:15) -- saved women would be seen to be co-heirs, together with saved men. As such, also saved women would then be admitted also to the Lord's Table (First Peter 3:7 & Second Peter 2:13f). Thus, in the Old Testament, women and infant girls were uncircumcisable. After Calvary, Circumcision was replaced by Baptism which

could be and thenceforth would be administered also to women and infant girls. Galatians 3:27-29. So too, after Calvary -- manducation at the Passover (which till then was restricted solely to adult males), would in the Lord's Supper as its replacement thenceforth be extended also to catechizable adult females. Cf. Acts 20:7f & 21:9 and First Corinthians 11:11-34.

9. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the Acts of the Apostles

Q. 126. At Acts 2:42, did only adult converts who "continued in doctrine" -- eucharize?

Q. 126. Yes. The order of events in the life of these new converts is stated in Acts 2:37-42. It is: (1) baptism; (2) catechization; (3) comradeship; and (4) eucharization. For those converts were: (1), "baptized"; (2), then "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching" or *didachee* alias doctrine; (3), thus "they continued steadfastly in the...fellowship" or *koinoonia*; and finally (4), "they continued...in the breaking of bread" alias the Eucharist.

Q. 127. Does Acts 8:5-38 presuppose catechizing both the Samaritans and the Ethiopian?

A. 127. Yes. It illustrates the connection between the Infant Baptism of covenant children on the one hand and their later Confession of Faith and Confirmation in Christ on the other. Thus, comments Rev. Professor John Calvin, "when their age and ability to understand will allow, they yield themselves to Him as Disciples -- and...know, by the discernment of faith, His power which is represented in Baptism.... The children of the godly are born sons of the Church -- and are numbered among the Members of Christ from birth.... Christ initiates infants to Himself for this purpose so that, as soon as their age and ability to understand will allow, they yield themselves to Him as Disciples" -- alias catechized or 'taught ones.' Then it is that they better "know, by the discernment of faith, His power which is represented in Baptism." Cf. "discerning" in First Corinthians 11:29!

Q. 128. In Acts 10f, is there evidence that the household of Cornelius was catechized?

A. 128. Yes. Calvin comments that Cornelius was indeed 'devout and a God-fearer' long before meeting Peter. He says of Cornelius: "As a good family head, he took pains to instruct the family.... Cornelius had a church in his household." Godly Cornelius had sent two of his household servants and a 'devout soldier' to seek out Peter in Joppa. Calvin here commends Cornelius "for his diligence in instructing his household.... [However,] the Lord often inflicts just punishment on masters who have not been concerned about the instruction of their household.... They have neglected to educate them in piety!"

Q. 129. How does all this bear on Confirmation of Communicants after Profession of Faith?

A. 129. In Acts 10:47f, Peter baptizes both the believing adults and their infants. Here Calvin comments: "I admit that those who are outside the Church must be instructed before the symbol of adoption is conferred on them. But I maintain that believers' children, who are born within the Church, are Members of the family of the Kingdom of God from the womb.... God has adopted the children of believers before they are born.... When Luke says finally that Peter was asked by Cornelius and his relatives to stay for a few days [v. 48b], he is commending the desire they had to make progress. They were certainly endowed with the Holy Spirit; but they had not reached such a peak that 'Confirmation'

would be of no further use to them. Following their example, let us make diligent use of the opportunity to make progress!... Let us not grow swollen with pride; for it bars the entrance of teaching!"

- Q. 130. Did Timothy get the Lord's Supper before he professed his faith and got confirmed?
- A. 130. Timothy was the grandson of a pious woman and the son of a godly and believing mother. The latter had married a Greek, so that Timothy had not been circumcised in infancy. Later he heard the Gospel and became a Christian. Either then or later, Timothy was catechized, made his Profession of Faith, and was then confirmed as a Communicant Member of Christ's Church. Cf. Acts 16:1-3f; First Timothy. 4:12-14 & 6:12-21; Second Timothy 1:2-6 & 3:14-17; Hebrews 5:14 to 6:2 & 10:22-23 & 11:24-28 & 13:10-16; and First John 2:13-15..
- Q. 131. What happened in this regard in Northern Greece, according to Acts 17 to 20?
- A. 131. In Acts 17f, it seems Christians were catechized in Philippi, Berea, and Ephesus. On Acts 18, Calvin remarks that the previously-catechized Apollos received further instruction. In Acts 19, Paul catechized some twelve ignorant heretics in Ephesus. And in Acts 20, it seems the Disciples at Troas were catechized before they eucharized.
- Q. 132. Had all the Communicants in Troas previously been catechized (Acts 20:6-12)?
- A. 132. In "the days of Unleavened Bread," the catechized or 'taught ones' alias the "Disciples" there "came together to break bread." At some distance from the Communicants themselves -- and himself then sitting in "a window" at the side of the meeting-place -- was "a certain young man" called Eutychus. He was still a growing "boy"; apparently being "catechized" (cf. Exodus 12:26f); and does not seem to have "tasted" the sacramental food together with Paul and the others. According to many ancient Greek manuscript copies, it was not all of the Christians who then manducated -- but only the "Disciples" alias the 'ones who had been taught.'

10. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with First Corinthians one to ten

- Q. 133. What does it mean where Paul tells the childish Corinthians, he had fed them with milk and not with meat? That he had planted, but that Apollos had watered? And that God kept on giving the increase? First Corinthians 3:1-6.
- A. 133. It means Paul was the first to preach Christ to them; but baptized almost none of them. Apollos later baptized most of them. And only those catechized, who were of age -- were thereafter admitted to the Lord's Supper.
- Q. 134. How do you know that such was so?
- A. 134. Paul himself tells us as regards those Corinthian Christians: "I could not speak to you as to spiritual, but as to carnal ones -- even 'babes' in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat. For hitherto you were not able to bear it.... I have planted; Apollos watered; but God gave the increase."
- Q. 135. How does that First Corinthians 3:2 interdict Paedocommunion?
- A. 135. Calvin comments:⁶⁵⁷ "Christ is milk for babes; but solid food for adults." And

Witsius, relating this passage to the Lord's Supper, observes that "the words of our Lord's command are so expressed that they cannot belong to infants -- who can neither receive the bread, nor eat it.... For babes are fed with milk, and not with meat."

Q. 136. Does First Corinthians 5:1-8 also bear on this matter?

A. 136. There Paul, urging excommunication for adulterous incest, says: "Purge out thus the old leaven, so that you may become a new lump!... For even Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us. Therefore, let us observe the Feast not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness -- but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth!" This excludes at least non-adulterous pre-adolescents from the Christian Passover alias the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper.

Q. 137. What does Calvin comment on this?

A. 137. In his *Sermon on Deuteronomy 16:5f*, he refers to First Corinthians 5:8 and says: "Because our Easter lamb is offered up, we must now keep the Feast.... 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.**"

Q. 138. At First Corinthians 10:1-8, did children too eat the meat when our fathers did?

A. 138. This distinctly speaks of "our fathers." It does not say "our mothers." Nor does it even say our male ancestors when the latter were still infants. It says that, when fathers, "our fathers did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink." Yet, as pointed out next, some of those fathers, as fathers, were sadly also idolaters and fornicators -- which none of them were while previously still children!

Q. 139. Is this not stretching the meaning of the word "fathers" to exclude their infants?

A. 139. Hardly; for the use of the word "fathers" here needs to be compared to what Acts 7:19 says about Pharaoh -- namely, that he "mistreated our **fathers** so that **they** cast out their infants so that they [those infants] might not live." *Cf.* too Exodus 1:8 to 2:9.

Q. 140. But were their infants too not baptized in the Red Sea together with their fathers?

A. 140. Yes, but First Corinthians 10:2 does not say that their infants were baptized (passive voice). It says that their fathers actively got themselves baptized (middle voice). Nor does 10:3 say that the infants were fed; it says that the fathers fed themselves and (actively) ate meat.

Q. 141. Surely that means both fathers and toddlers ate the Passover and the manna?

A. 141. No, it says nothing about either the Passover or the manna. It is talking not about physical but about "spiritual meat." Just as 10:4 is talking not about the physical drink of either wine or even water or milk -- but about the "spiritual drink."

Q. 142. But surely also toddlers ate the manna, and drank water from the rock?

A. 142. Yes, and worms too ate the manna -- but non-sacramentally! Yet the "liquid" in 10:4 is neither wine nor water nor milk. For the Rock whence the fathers drank, was Christ!

Q. 143. What does Rev. Professor Dr. Charles Hodge comment on these verses?

A. 143. He says the interpretation that the manna was designed not only for the body but also

for the soul, "exalts the manna into a Sacrament -- which it was not. It was...ordinary food. As Nehemiah (9:15) says, 'Thou gavest them bread...for their hunger, and broughtest forth for them water out of the rock for their thirst'.... Our Lord represents it in the same light, when He said: 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.' John 6: 49. He **contrasts** Himself, as the True Bread from Heaven Who gives life to the soul -- with manna, which had no spiritual efficacy."

Q. 144. Couldn't pre-adolescents too have done all that Paul here says "our fathers" did?

A. 144. No, for he then goes on to say many of them 'lusted'; and 'idolized'; or 'fornicated.'

Q. 145. What does Calvin comment on First Corinthians 10:1-10?

A. 145. Among other things, he refers at 10:10 "to the story which we have in Numbers sixteen." There, he argues: "When God had punished the pride of Korah and Abiram, the people raised a tumult against Moses and Aaron.... God punished this uproar of the people with fire from Heaven which devoured more than fourteen thousand...rebels and trouble-makers." For they, unlike their babies, "raised their voices against Himself."

Q. 146. So First Corinthians 10:1-10 is then speaking exclusively about adults?

A. 146. Yes. And it goes on to state that "all these things happened to them, as examples.... They are written for our admonition.... Therefore my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry!" First Corinthians 10:11-14.

Q. 147. Are you then saying that Paul is here speaking only to the adults in Corinth?

A. 147. Yes, for he tells us in the very next verses: "I am speaking to **wise men** [alias to catechized adults with non-preadolescent wisdom teeth]. You need to **judge** about what I am saying! The cup of blessing which we bless -- is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we [**wise ones**] break -- is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" First Corinthians 10:15-16. The "**man**" and the "**woman**" but **no children** are then repeatedly mentioned till the end of the communion passage (11:3-15 & 11:29 & 11:34), and even beyond (13:11 & 14:2f & 14:20 & 14:27 & 14:34-37 *etc.*).

Q. 148. What does Calvin comment on these and the following verses?

A. 148: He says: "Since Paul was going to base his argument on the mystery of the Supper, he uses this little preface.... He might have expressed himself in this way: 'I am not speaking to beginners! You are well aware of the power of the Holy Supper. How shameful of you, then, to enter into the fellowship of unbelievers so as to become united in one body with them!' But he condemns their lack of thought. For, after being instructed in the School of Christ" -- thus, after being catechized -- "they were stupidly involving themselves in what was sinful." He also discusses Paul's words 'Behold Israel after the flesh!' -- in First Corinthians 10:18. He comments: "The Law of Moses allowed no-one to the sacrificial feast -- unless he **prepared himself properly**."

Q. 149. Why does Paul dwell so long on the Older Testament and on Grecian Pagan Feasts in First Corinthians ten and eleven, before going on later in First Corinthians eleven to deal with the required behaviour at the Lord's Supper?

A. 149. One needs to see the 'bridge' between the Communion passages in First Corinthians chapters 10 and 11. First Corinthians chapter eleven is indeed the 'classic chapter' on the

Sacrament of the Eucharist. Analysis thereof, after chapter ten, shows no approval of Paedocommunion whatsoever. For the Lord's Supper was to be no *Agapee*-meal.

11. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with First Corinthians eleven

Q. 150. What then does First Corinthians eleven principally teach?

A. 150. The passage has three parts. The first, First Corinthians 11:17-22, describes the awful way the sinful Corinthians had been 'celebrating' (*sic*) the Lord's Supper. The second part, First Corinthians 11:23-26, describes Paul's account of the Lord's Own instituting of the ordinance. The third part, First Corinthians 11:27-34, gives Paul's corrective.

Q. 151. What then does the first part, First Corinthians 11:17-22, principally teach?

A. 151. It precludes infants and toddlers and other unqualified persons from communing. For it deals with the relationships between men and women -- not with that between adults and children, nor that between boys and girls. Babies and children can neither promote nor counter the inevitable heresies which surround the Church and her Supper (11:18f).

Q. 152. What does the second part, First Corinthians 11:23-26, principally teach?

A. 152. It teaches how Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper only for His adult Disciples, and not for His younger believers. Those manducating were to do it in remembrance of Him, and also to proclaim the Lord's death till He comes. Infants and toddlers can't do such.

Q. 153. What does Calvin comment on this part?

A. 153. He says: "'Christ divides the bread among the [fully-catechized adult] Disciples... The memorial ought...to move us to praise Him openly -- so as to let men know...what we are aware of within ourselves in the presence of God....so that we on our part may acknowledge it before men.... In order that you may celebrate the Supper properly -- you must bear in mind that you will have to make 'Profession' of your faith."

Q. 154. Does 'Do this in **remembrance** of Me!' in First Corinthians 11:24, exclude children?

A. 154. Yes. As Professor Dr. Kamphuis here points out in his 1984 article *Infant Baptism and Infant Communion*: "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).... 'Do this in remembrance of Me!' (First Corinthians 11:24-25).... Article 35 of the *Belgic Confession*...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 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."

Q. 155. What does the third part, First Corinthians 11:27-34, principally teach?

A. 155. It teaches that "whosoever" (including pre-adolescents) eats and drinks unworthily -- shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (11:27). Babies and toddlers and children should not drink alcoholic wine. "Let a man examine himself" before drinking. But a pre-adolescent is not a "man," and cannot "examine himself." It says those who

don't, but yet drink -- drink unto their own condemnation, not discerning the Lord's body (11:28). It says those drinking, need to judge themselves -- which pre-adolescents can't do either (11:31). And it says those drinking need to "wait for one another" (11:33) -- which babies and toddlers don't do.

Q. 156. What does Calvin comment on First Corinthians 11:27f?

A. 156. He condemns those who "are putting a barrier between every single **man** and **woman** and the Supper.... Paul had already clearly pointed out...that those who 'eat unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord'.... He declares that this food, which is otherwise beneficial, will be turned into poison -- and cause the destruction of those who eat unworthily." In his *Institutes* IV:16:30, he insists with Paul -- that **God "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.... [For 'he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself -- not discerning the Lord's body'; and] 'Let a **man** examine himself' [yes, 'examine himself!'], and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup!' Indeed, if those communing "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?.... What is our Lord's injunction? 'Do this in remembrance of Me!' [Luke 22:14-19 cf. First Corinthians 11:24].... How, pray, can we require infants to commemorate any event of which they have **no understanding**?" See too at Questions and Answers 86 & 98 & 120 above and at 194f & 198f below.**

Q. 157. What did famous Lutheran Professor Dr. Walther say about the Lord's Supper?

A. 157. He said in *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*: "Whoever partakes of the Lord's Supper without the right faith..., unworthily...draws from it wrath instead of grace; death instead of life; curse instead of blessing. He becomes, as St. Paul writes [in First Corinthians 11:27-29], 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; he eats and drinks damnation unto himself, not discerning the Lord's body'.... Everyone who would approach the Lord's Table, should first examine himself and discern the Lord's body... **It will not do to give the Lord's Supper to children incapable of examining themselves.... Those...are not to be admitted to the Lord's Supper!**"

Q. 158. What did Walther's successor Lutheran Professor Dr. Pieper say about the Supper?

A. 158. He said in his *Christian Dogmatics*: "The divine promise guarantees the resurrection of the body to all who believe that they have the forgiveness of their sins in Christ. Even if...they have not eaten and drunk Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament -- as, for instance, in the case of believing children.... Christ preached the Gospel to the Jewish people generally.... But the first celebration of His Supper He held in the closed circle of His Disciples [alias His 'taught ones']...., **excluded...children.**"

Q. 159. What is the meaning of Paul's communion words 'Let a man examine himself!'?

Q. 159. In First Corinthians 11:28, the Apostle Paul enjoins each and every Communicant, as an **adult human being** (*anthropos*), to keep on examining himself. The command here is not: "Let all people keep on examining others!" Nor is it: "Let all men keep on examining one another!" Nor is it: "Let all persons, including babies and toddlers, keep on examining themselves!" It is: "Let a **man** keep on examining himself!"

Q. 160. What is Calvin's comment on these inspired words of the Apostle Paul?

A. 160. He says: "There is one 'vow' common to all Believers which, taken in Baptism, we 'confirm' and as it were sanction by our Catechism." We do so, "in making 'Profession of our Faith' and partaking of the Lord's [Supper].... "[It] 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.... The Lord...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; to examine their own conscience; to show forth the Lord's death; and to understand its power. Can we wish anything clearer than what the Apostle says, when he thus exhorts: 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup!' (First Corinthians 11:28)? Examination, therefore, must precede -- and this it were vain to expect from infants." See Calvin's *Institutes* IV:13:4-6; IV:16:30 & IV:19:4.

Q. 161. Doesn't First Corinthians 11:29's word 'discerning' imply prior catechizing?

A. 161. Obviously. In First Corinthians 11:29, Paul declares that "he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks a judgment upon himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Young children do not have this ability to be 'discerning' -- an ability which First Corinthians 11:29 here requires before anyone may eat and drink at the Lord's Supper.

Q. 162. What does Calvin say about this verse?

A. 162. In his *Institutes* IV:17:40, he says: "The Lord's Supper...is converted into the most noxious poison to all whom it does not nourish and confirm in the faith.... As Paul says, "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord"; "eats and drinks condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body" (First Corinthians 11:27-29).

Q. 163. But don't many Paedocommunionists claim that "discerning the Lord's body" in First Corinthians 11:29 is referring to the Church as the mystical body of Christ, rather than Christ's Own physical body and its relationship to the communion bread?

A. 163. That would still disqualify children from communing! For they still couldn't discern the relationship between the body of the whole Church and the body of Christ Himself -- could they? They first need catechizing, in order to be enabled so to distinguish!

Q. 164. Even so, can you prove they are wrong about what is here to be discerned?

Q. 164. Rev. Professor Dr. Kamphuis writes: "Paedocommunionists argue that verse 29 refers not to inability to discern the Lord's [physical] body in the sacramental elements, but to inability to discern that the congregation is the Lord's body. However, that cannot be what the inspired Paul here means. 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.... The reading 'to sooma tou Kuriou' [or 'the body of Christ'] has the strongest textual evidence.... 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.... Although the Church is indeed called 'the body of Christ' in First Corinthians, it is never called 'the body of the Lord.'"

Q. 165. Should Antipaedocommunionists then not de-eucharize undiscerning senile Communicants?

A. 165. First Corinthians 11:29's word 'discerning' certainly implies having **been** catechized **priorly**. A small child has never publically professed Christ as Saviour, **before** admission to the Lord's Supper. It is quite another thing, having done the above, later to become somewhat undiscerning of still professing in the same way. Also, even senile people can yet "dream dreams" about what they formerly learned when catechizing -- whereas babies and toddlers cannot. To **admit** [to the Eucharist], is **not** the opposite of **excommunicating** therefrom. Baptized covenant babies are then admitted to the citizenship of God's Kingdom. But they are not excommunicated therefrom later, just because becoming senile!

Q. 166. Is it only unworthy adults who are 'condemned' in First Corinthians 11:30f?

A. 166. In First Corinthians 11:30, Paul says that the lack of discernment of many participants at the Lord's Supper -- had caused some to be condemned to getting weak and sickly, and others even to die. Indeed, First Corinthians 11:31 says that if those who ate and drank at the Lord's Supper had only critiqued themselves -- they would not be undergoing such condemnation. Babies and toddlers cannot thus critique themselves. But the Paedocommunionists who encourage them to imbibe the sacramental bread and wine, shall surely undergo punishment at the hands of our holy God.

Q. 167. What does Calvin comment on this verse?

A. 167. He here blasts specifically the Romish Mass. He asks: "If, in Paul's time, an abuse of the Supper...could stir up the wrath of God against the Corinthians, so that He punished them so severely -- what are we to think about the situation in our own day? Throughout the range of Popery, we see not only horrible desecrations of the Supper -- but also a profane and detestable thing set up in its place." Only unworthy adults are 'condemned' in First Corinthians 11:30f -- precisely because only adults can eucharize (unworthily).

12. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with First Corinthians 12 to 16

Q. 168. But doesn't First Corinthians 12:13 say we are "all made to drink into one Spirit"?

A. 168. When First Corinthians 12:13 says that "all" have been "made to drink" -- it does not in any way mean, as some Paedocommunionists misallege, that also all of the baptized babies in the Church at Corinth had been "made to drink" alcoholic wine at the Lord's Table. Instead, it means that all those that had been baptized there or elsewhere -- had thereby *ipso facto* outwardly been **drenched** with the waters of Baptism (*cf.* 1:17 & 3:6 & 6:11 & 10:1 & 15:29). Thus Luther, Calvin, the *Westminster Standards*, Doddridge, Bloomfield, Kuyper, Robertson and others.

Q. 169. Is there further evidence in First Corinthians, that Paedocommunionists are wrong?

A. 169. First Corinthians 13:10f impugns Paedocommunionism, as too does 14:19f. Isaiah 28:7f bears antipaedocommunionistically on First Corinthians 14:20f -- as too do Calvin's "catechetical" comments on Isaiah 28:7f. First Corinthians 14:23 implies Catechumens not yet took Communion. And 16:13's "like men" implies Antipaedocommunionism -- as too does the 'ex-communi-catory' *Anathema* or cursing of 16:22.

13. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with Paul's other Epistles

- Q. 170. Of what antipaedocommunionistic importance is the passage Galatians 3:25 to 4:2?
- A. 170. Till Christ came, the Old Testament Church was under the 'child-discipline' or the teaching of the various ceremonial laws. These used to operate in the same way in which a minor heir is subject to his Schoolteacher (or Catechist alias Tutor). That tutelage of a young heir endures till he becomes of age" -- see the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177. Calvin comments that "a Schoolmaster is not appointed for a person's whole life, but only for childhood.... In training a boy, the object is to prepare him...for greater things." And a Catechist is one who catechizes a Catechumen toward admission unto manducation at the Lord's Supper, when deemed mature. Galatians 6:6.
- Q. 171. Of what antipaedocommunionistic importance are the verses Ephesians 4:11-15?
- A. 171. Paul there says Christ "gave some...as...Teachers for the equipping of the saints...till we all come...unto a **mature** man.... Lest we henceforth keep on being tossed about as **children**.... we are to keep on **growing up** in all things toward Him!" Calvin comments: "We ought not to be like children. He [Paul] thus sets an intervening period between childhood and maturity.... The life of believers...is like **adolescence**.... After being born in Christ, we ought to grow -- so as not to be [like] children in understanding."
- Q. 172. What do First and Second Timothy teach about Profession of Faith and Confirmation?
- A. 172. In addition to that which is already recorded in Questions & Answers 104 & 131 above, those Epistles teach not only faith within covenant children long before their adolescence -- but also that they need catechizing before their 'Confirmation' as Communicants. There, William Hendriksen comments: "Timothy must have reached a degree of maturity even during Paul's first missionary journey [Acts 16:1f] -- for it was then that he had 'confessed his faith'...in connection with his Baptism." And Gordon H. Clark comments that Timothy's 'confession before many witnesses' could well have been "his confession of faith when he was received as a Communicant Member."

14. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with the Book of Hebrews

- Q. 173. What does the Book of Hebrews teach about Profession of Faith, and Confirmation?
- A. 173. Hebrews 2:3 to 3:1f teaches 'Profession of Faith' before Communion. 3:1 to 4:14 urges us then to maintain our 'Profession of Faith.' 5:5-14 states that 'strong meat' (such as the holy bread and wine) is only for those completely catechized and who can "discern." 6:1-5 stresses the need for Confirmation before the Eucharist is first tasted. 10:19f refers to Christians making their "Profession of Faith" after being "washed." And 11:24-28 refers to Moses' faith after he had "come to years" and "observed the Passover" (cf. Exodus 12:1-4,21,37).
- Q. 174. What does Calvin comment on Hebrews 5:12f?
- A. 174. He says "we must progress in our learning -- so that we do not always stick at the first beginnings. We must let it happen that Isaiah's prophecy becomes fulfilled in us (28:10): 'It is precept upon precept, precept upon precept'" -- alias the questions and answers of

catechetical instruction. "Those who are of such tender years that they cannot receive the more advanced teaching, are called 'children'.... The true purpose of teaching, is to fit us together -- so that we grow up to a perfect man; to the measure of full maturity; so that we are not children tossed to and fro.... [The Holy Writer here] calls adults 'full-grown' -- setting them in opposition to babes."

Q. 175. What does Calvin comment on the progress mentioned in Hebrews 6:1?

A. 175. He says: "The Catechumen was admitted [in order to become able] to...make **confession of his faith**. There were certain cardinal matters about which the Pastor questioned the Catechumens, as clearly appears from the various evidences of the Fathers [in the Early Church]. This examination was concerned particularly with what is known as the Apostles' Creed" [alias what is here calls 'Faith toward God'].... The word 'Faith' [in Hebrews 6:1] means the short summary...called the 'Articles of Faith.'"

Q. 176. What does Calvin comment on Confirmation's 'laying on of hands' in Hebrews 6:2?

A. 176. He says: "The children of believers were baptized as infants -- since they were adopted from the womb and belonged to the body of the Church by right of the promise. Then, after their infancy was over -- and they had been instructed in the Faith -- they too offered themselves for a Catechumenate.... Another sign was then added, [viz.] the 'laying on of hands' [at their Confirmation]. This single passage is abundant evidence that the origin of this rite came from the Apostles...[as] a solemn ceremony of prayer.... They intended by this sign to '**confirm**' the 'Profession of Faith' -- which **adolescents** make when they pass from their childhood.... Today, we must retain the institution in its purity" -- viz. also as the rite of passage at **puberty**, unto admission to the Eucharist.

Q. 177. What does the Puritan Dr. John Owen comment on Hebrews 5:12f?

A. 177. Owen, writer of the greatest ever commentary on Hebrews, says at 5:12 that the holy writer "designs [or designates] the catechetical principles of Christian religion which also, as it is supposed, he reckons up in the beginning of the next chapter [6:1f] -- such principles as converts, or young children, are usually instructed and catechised in.... In those of full age, the...senses are *gegumnasmena* -- [viz.] 'exercised'.... They are not so in babes.... Persons of **full age** are such as are **meet to have the 'Mysteries'** [alias to manducate at the repeated Sacraments of the Eucharist] of the Gospel."

Q. 178. What does the Puritan Dr. John Owen comment on Hebrews 6:2f?

A. 178. He says: "There were two sorts of persons that were baptized -- namely those that were adult at their first hearing of the Gospel; and the infant children of believers, who were admitted to be Members of the Church.... Baptized in their infancy -- [the latter] were to be instructed in them [the principles], as they grew up unto years of understanding. Afterwards, when they were established in the knowledge of these necessary truths and had resolved on personal obedience unto the Gospel, they were offered unto the 'Fellowship of the Faithful' [viz. as Fellow-Communicants or Co-Communicants]. And hereon, [after] giving the same account of their faith and repentance which others had done before they were baptized -- they were **admitted** into the **Communion** of the Church, the Elders thereof laying their hands on them in token of their acceptance and praying for their **Confirmation** in the faith.... This was the state of things in the **apostolical** churches.... **It ought to be so in all others!**"

Q. 179. What does the later Puritan Matthew Henry comment on Hebrews 5:12 to 6:5?

A. 179. He says: "There are in the Church -- babes, and persons of full age.... There are, in the Gospel, milk -- and strong meat.... It is good...to pass the infant state.... The doctrine of Baptisms, that is, of being baptized by a Minister of Christ with water in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, [functions] as the initiating sign or seal of the covenant of grace -- strongly engaging the person so baptized to get acquainted with the New Covenant; to adhere to it; and prepare to renew it at the Table of the Lord.... This ordinance of Baptism is a foundation to be rightly laid and daily remembered -- but not [to be] repeated. [The] Laying of hands...on persons passing solemnly from their initiated state by Baptism to the confirmed state, [occurs] by returning the answer of a good conscience toward God and sitting down at the Lord's Table. Thus, passing from 'incomplete' to 'complete' Church Membership."

Q. 180. How does also Hebrews 10:19f bear witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 180. Christians are here reminded of "the blood of Jesus" -- which "new and living way He renewed for us through the veil, that is, His flesh." It continues: "Having a High Priest over the house of God -- let us keep on drawing near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having had the hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and having had the body washed with pure water! Let us keep on holding fast 'the Profession of our Hope without wavering!" Calvin comments that Hebrews here "demands **Confession** [alias 'Profession of Faith'], because there is no true faith that does not show itself to men [alias **mature adults**].... He therefore bids them not only to believe with their hearts, but also to show by their 'Profession' the real extent of their obedience to Christ."

15. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with writings of Luke and John

Q. 181. How does Luke's Gospel, around A.D. 65f, witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 181. Paul's companion Dr. Luke had collected together some of the evidence available about all that Jesus began to do, until the time of His ascension into Heaven. This included also Christ's institution of Communion Services. Luke wrote this down in his Gospel (1:1-4), intended especially for the further edification of a catechized Christian called Theophilus. At 2:40-47, Luke wanted the catechized Theophilus to know with "certainty" that even Jesus did not partake of the Passover until after being catechized subsequently to His reaching the age of twelve. Also, at 22:1-20, Luke wanted Theophilus to know Christ Himself had later, at its very institution, limited the Lord's Supper (which replaced that Passover) -- to His **'Mature Disciples'** alone (excluding the latter's pre-adolescent children). Indeed, the Disciples were they whom Christ Himself had previously catechized -- either in their adolescence, or during their adulthood.

Q. 182. How does Luke's Book of Acts -- around A.D. 66f-- witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 182. In a second treatise to the catechized Theophilus, Luke wanted him to know it was only after later mature converts had been 'instructed' -- starting on Pentecost Sunday -- that they were to be admitted to "the breaking of bread." Acts 1:1 to 2:42. Luke also told him that even the eloquent Apollos -- mighty in the Scriptures -- had, previously, already been "catechized in the way of the Lord." Acts 18:25. And he further reminded him that

among the believers (even at a place such as Troas) it was only those already catechized -- alias the "**Disciples**" -- who "came together to break bread" specifically for themselves. For they had then located the "young man" Eutychus at the side of the building -- keeping him "sitting" not on a central pew, but in the "window" (and apparently uncommuned). Acts 20:7-12.

Q. 183. How do John's writings -- around A.D. 67f -- witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 183. In John's Gospel at 21:15f, Christ urged His Apostles: "Keep on feeding My lambs!" -- and "My little sheep" -- which implies catechizing them. There is also a 'eucharistic' connection in First John 2:12-17. For First John's "tiny children" are not yet the "youths" or "fathers" who "keep on confessing the Son." The "youth" are those who had reached teen-age and who had then overcome Satan and the lusts of the flesh (arising especially at puberty). After being catechized, they were 'confirmed' and admitted to the Lord's Supper at teenage. Thus they were strengthened -- and, as it were, made into 'mature men' -- by the abiding Word of God. This was done when they became "strong" teenagers or "young men" alias adults. Compare '*iysh* (with '*uwsh* or *virility*) in Exodus 12:3f cf. 12:26f & 12:37f.

Q. 184. How does Owen's comment on First John 2:13f witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 184. "In a house where there dwell together old men and strong men and children or babes," comments Owen, "if they should be all of them bound up unto the same diet or food, some of them must necessarily perish!" This suggests giving 'strong meat' to 'babes' will choke them. Therefore we "ought to aim that they may all be[come] such...as may take in and thrive upon solid food, the deeper 'Mysteries' [or Sacraments] of the Gospel.... These truths...which the Apostle calls 'strong meat' for 'them that are of full age' -- are to be searched, inquired into, and preached." Yet meanwhile, "babes...have need of milk -- and are not capable of 'instruction' in the more heavenly 'Mysteries'.... Them that are 'of full age'...are persons adult; grown up; come to 'full age.'" Such are "those who have [had] their understandings enlarged and their minds settled in the knowledge of Christ or the 'Mysteries'.... Those of 'full age' are such as...[have been] instructed in the doctrine of the Gospel." Thus, "persons of full age are such as are meet to have the 'Mysteries'" -- and receive the holy bread and wine from the Lord's Table.

Q. 185. How does John's Revelation -- around A.D. 68f -- witness against Paedocommunion?

A. 185. In the Book of Revelation, 2:7-23 has implications against Paedocommunion -- and also 3:19f might imply the same. 7:14-17 seems to refer back to the Passover and also to the Eucharist, and in 19:1-9 the Lord's heavenly (all-adult) Marriage Supper of the Lamb seems to be its fulfilment. Indeed, on the very last page of the Bible -- at Revelation chapter 22 -- Christ in glory keeps on feeding His then-mature Church unto all eternity.

16. Paedocommunion irreconcilable with all the Patristic Fathers

Q. 186. Coming to the extant Apostolic Fathers, how many advocated Paedocommunion?

A. 186. None. Indeed, even among Post-Christian Judaists, there was no Paedopassoverism until A.D. 230. Paul's Christian friend Clement of Rome implicitly opposed it. The *Didachee* covered the catechizing of covenant children as well as of adult converts in

what must be seen as 'Careful Communion.' Ignatius insisted on Confirmation before Communion. Pliny says only non-adulterous adults were seen manducating at Communion Services. The *Shepherd of Hermas* affirms that only mature actions entitled Christians to receive the Supper. Justin Martyr required education before manducation at the Eucharist. To Theophilus and Athenagoras, it involved no cannibalistic or pagan transubstantiation. And to Irenaeus, there needed to be: Catechism during Christian childhood before Communion -- and Catechism and Confirmation before admission to the Lord's Supper.

Q. 187. What about the rest of the evidence till A.D. 250?

A. 187. The earliest extant Liturgy (of St. James), teaches that even Catechumens did not manducate there. Tertullian believed only heretics gave Communion to those merely half-catechized; that there was to be no Communion without prior catechizing; that the Paedocommunionism of the antecatechetical and repaganized apostate Marcion was to be opposed; and that a highly-catechetical Antipaedocommunionism was required by the Church Universal. In Clement of Alexandria -- there is no Eucharistic Communion before sexual maturity; and Communion only for those catechized for three years before their adolescence. Hippolytus sought to catechize only 'men and women,' but not children, for Communion. Origen taught only the catechized are 'competent' to commune, as too did Commodian and the Syrian *Didaskalia*.

Q. 188. What does Calvin say about the Early-Church's Antipaedocommunionism?

A. 188. He remarks in his *Institutes* IV:19:4 & IV:19:13: "It was anciently customary for the children of Christians, **after they had grown up**, to appear before the Overseer.... These sat among the Catechumens -- until they were duly instructed in the 'Mysteries' of the faith, and could make a 'Confession' of it before Overseer and people.... Those in boyhood or immediately beyond it, would give an account of their faith...in order to make a 'Profession of Faith'.... On adolescence," they "were examined by the Overseer in terms of the Catechism which was then in common use.... Thus the boy, on his faith being approved, was dismissed with a solemn blessing."

Q. 189. But didn't the A.D. 250 Church Father Cyprian approve of Paedocommunion?

A. 189. No. Colonized by the Ancient Phoenicians by way of Phrygia, Carthage practised Pagan Paedocommunionism both before and after the establishment of the Church there around A.D. 180. The great Christian Tertullian of Carthage resisted it. So too did his later Student Cyprian. At Paedocommunion's first infiltration from Paganism into the persecuted Carthaginian Church around A.D. 250, Cyprian (in his *Treatise III:25-26*) did **not accept** the novelty of a wayward Deacon's exorcistic **force-feeding an infant with communion wine** as a normal practice. To the contrary, that Early Church Father there was giving examples of God's vengeance falling upon individuals who were indiscriminately admitted to the Sacrament. **That infant** was indiscriminately admitted to the Sacrament -- and the judgment of God (a 'divine impulse') overcame her. Indeed, the communion practices Cyprian mentions right after that -- he clearly condemns. Cyprian's extant writings require **prior catechization** for admission to Communion. He was a paedobaptistic credo-eucharizing Antipaedocommunionist. He even demanded the re-catechization (over a **period of three years**) of such Communicants who had lapsed -- as a pre-condition before (re-)communicating them.

Q. 190. Was there Paedocommunion in the Church between Cyprian and Augustine?

A. 190. After the A.D. 248^f Decian persecution of Christians by pagan Paedocommunionists, the Patristic Christian Church yet stuck to Scripture's custom of Catechism before Communion. Thus: Dionysius of Alexandria; Victorinus; the Councils of Eliberis, Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Nicea and Laodicea; the *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*; Cyril; Athanasius; *Early Liturgies*; Gregory of Nyssa; Ambrose; Chrysostom; and Augustine. Athanasius, Ambrose and Chrysostom rigidly barred even Catechumens from the Eucharist. Indeed, they barred such Catechumens from even viewing the Supper. Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrose of Milan both taught the need to pre-catechize all who would eucharize for the first time. Chrysostom insisted that only the catechized are to commune. And also the A.D. 417 Augustine, in spite of his Sacramentalism, was adamant about pre-catechizing all would-be Communicants.

17. Paedocommunion withstood by some even in the Middle Ages

Q. 191. When did Pagan Paedocommunion then really infiltrate the Christian Church?

A. 191. After Augustine, and with the infantocommunionization of the Eastern Churches. Yet even the mediaeval Paedocommunion of the sacramentalizing East, disproves the claim that the later doctrine of **transubstantiation** caused Antipaedocommunionism in the West. For how could communing toddlers **understand** it?! Paedocommunionism took root in the Eastern Church especially from the time of the 600 A.D. heretic Evagrius onward. Eastern 'Infant-Intinction' was a much greater false doctrine than the Western Church's mediaeval decline into 'Child-Communion' after their catechization. Especially the Eastern Church got syncretized with Neo-Paganism. There was no Paedocommunion in the West among the Late-Mediaeval Waldensians, nor any pre-catechetical eucharizing even in the Late-Mediaeval Roman Catholic Church. In Wycliffe's Pre-Reformation, there was catechizing before eucharizing at puberty. His ideas spread to the Hussites who, once settled down, embraced anticatabaptistic and antipaedocommunionistic Protestantism. This can be seen from their *First Bohemian Confession* of 1502, as presented to King Ferdinand.

18. Paedocommunion withstood between Reformation and Westminster

Q. 192. What then was the Protestant Reformation's attitude toward Paedocommunion?

A. 192. Both Luther and Melancthon advocated Communion not before teenage and only after catechization. So too Zwingli, á Lasco, Bucer and Hyperius. The Anti-Protestant Contra-Reformation's Trent too favoured 'Confirmation' not before adolescence. Calvin gave the strongest statement. He favoured Infant-Baptism, yet adopted a firm position against both 'Infant-Intinction' and 'Child-Communion' -- and insisted on catechizing as an essential pre-requisite for sacramental manducation. In his *Selected Works* (V:191^f), he says "the Church of God will never preserve itself without a *Catechism*. For it is like seed which keeps the good grain from dying out, and causes it to multiply -- from age to age.... If you desire to build an edifice which shall be of long duration and which shall not soon fall into decay -- see to it that the children be educated by the hand of a good *Catechism* which...teaches them the meaning of true Christianity!"

Q. 193. How did Calvinists down to the Westminster Assembly view Paedocommunion?

A. 193. Calvin's friend Viret, and his successor Beza, taught that little children must not manducate at the Lord's Supper. It was the same in Early-Protestant 1540f England, and also in John Knox's First Book of Discipline and his 1560 Scots Confession. The 1561f Central and Western European Calvinistic Catechisms such as the Heidelberg and the Belgic and the Helvetic were also antipaedocommunionistic. So too the Convent of Wezel and the many various Dutch Reformed Catechisms and Synods of the sixteenth century. Strong was the antipaedocommunionism of the 1618f Synod of Dordt! This was stressed also in the Synopsis of Purer Theology of Polyander and Rivetus and Thysius and Walaeus; by Perkins, Ames, Voetius, and Wendelin; by the 1640f Alexander Henderson; and by the antipaedocommunionistic 1645 Polish Reformed Thorn Declaration.

Q. 194. Was the position also of the Westminster Standards antipaedocommunionistic?

A. 194. Yes, and that was enshrined also in Oliver Cromwell's Chaplain Thomas Manton's Recommendation of the Westminster Standards. The Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God provided in "the administration of the Lord's Supper" that "the ignorant and the scandalous are not fit to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper... It is requisite that publick warning be given the sabbath day before the administration thereof, and that...due preparation thereunto and participation therein be taught." Then, "when the day is come for administration," the Minister is again to stress, publically, "how great the danger to eat and drink unworthily... He is, in the Name of Christ..., to warn all such as are ignorant, scandalous, profane, or that live in any sin..., that they presume not to come to that Holy Table; shewing them that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself [First Corinthians 11:27-29]," etc.

Q. 195. State the Communion Doctrine of the 1645 Westminster Confession chapter 29:3-4.

A. 195. The Westminster Confession in its chapter on the Lord's Supper, says that "the Lord Jesus hath...appointed His Ministers...to break the bread, to take the cup, and...to give both [only] **to the Communicants**." Luke 22:19-20; Acts 20:7; First Corinthians 11:20-26.... Private masses [and all non-public communion services] or receiving this Sacrament with a priest or any other **alone**" such as when sick in hospital or at home **but devoid of the Congregation**, "are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament and to the institution of Christ." Matthew 15:9; First Corinthians 10:4-6 & 10:21-22

Q. 196. But seeing all are partly ignorant -- may such be barred from the Lord's Table?

C. 196. All ignorant and ungodly persons -- as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him" -- being "unworthy of the Lord's Table..., cannot without great sin against Christ...partake of these Holy Mysteries or be admitted thereunto. First Corinthians 5:6-13; Second Thessalonians 3:6-15; Matthew 7:6." For such "ignorant and wicked men..., by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation." Westminster Confession 29:8. This is why the next chapter requires there be a "purging out of that leaven" of obstinate sins, even from Communicants themselves. That is to be done by "admonition [or] suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper for a season" -- or even by "ex-communi-cation from the Church," if necessary. These chapters implicitly exclude the immature from eucharizing. For they all posit requirements with which pre-adolescents cannot possibly comply.

Q. 197. State the Communion Doctrine of Scotland's 1647 *Directory for Family Worship*.

A. 197. It provides that families-as-such should worship God "daily..., with catechising in a plain way." Exodus 12:26-27; Deuteronomy 32:7; Proverbs 1:8; 4:1-10; 22:6. After public worship on the Lord's Day, the head of the family is to see that his household "spend the rest of the time...catechising and in spiritual conferences upon the Word of God.... Persons of eminency (and all Kirk Elders) not only ought to stir themselves and [their] families to diligence herein, but also to concur effectually that in all other families where they have power and charge, the said exercises be conscionably performed."

Q. 198. State the Communion Doctrine of the 1647 Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

A. 198. It ordered the above *Directory* to be observed, and required "Ministers and Ruling Elders in each Congregation...to take special care that these directions be observed and followed.... The Assembly doth further require and appoint Ministers and Ruling Elders to make diligent search and enquiry in the Congregations..., whether there be among them...families which...neglect...this necessary duty [of family worship].... The head of the family is...to be...admonished privately to amend his fault.... In case of his continuing therein, he is to be gravely...reproved by the Session. After which..., if he be found still to neglect family worship -- let him be...suspended and debarred from the Lord's Supper!"

Q. 199. State the Communion Doctrine of the 1648 *Westminster Larger Catechism* 108-173.

A. 199. The *Westminster Larger Catechism* was approved by the Church's General Assembly. It provides for "the administration and receiving of the Sacraments (Matthew 28:19 & First Corinthians 11:23-30)" and for "Church Government and Discipline (Matthew 18:15-17 & 26:19 and First Corinthians 12:28)" *etc.* "Discipline"includes also the making and the rebuking of adolescent and adult Disciples, such as those for whom Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's Supper. It warns against "all superstitious devices" such as Paedocommunion. It admonishes against "corrupting the worship of God (Malachi 1:7,8,14)" *etc.* It disapproves of such -- regardless "whether invented and taken up by ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity (Matthew 15:9 & First Peter 1:18)." Such "corruptions" would include the A.D. 431f Paedocommunion of the Oriental 'Orthodox' Churches. For God's "Sacraments...[must] be holily and reverently used (First Corinthians 11:24-29).... Such as are found to be ignorant or scandalous -- notwithstanding their profession of faith and desire to come to the Lord's Supper -- may and ought to be kept from that Sacrament..., until they receive instruction and manifest their reformation. First Corinthians 11:27-34; Jude 23; First Timothy 5:22; Second Corinthians 2:7."

Q. 200. State the Communion Doctrine of the 1648 *Westminster Larger Catechism* 174-77.

A. 200. Question 174 declares that those who properly "receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" -- do so "with all holy reverence and attention. Leviticus 10:3; Hebrews 12:28; Psalm 10:7; First Corinthians 11:17,26-27." They must "diligently observe the sacramental elements and actions (Exodus 24:8 & Matthew 16:28); heedfully discern the Lord's body (First Corinthians 11:29); and affectionately meditate on His death and sufferings (Luke 22:19). Question 175 is even more difficult (if not impossible) of fulfilment -- by one not yet even a teenager. For it declares that "the duty of Christians -- after they have received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper -- is seriously to consider

how they have behaved themselves therein, and with what success.... First Corinthians 11:17,30,31." And, after Question 176 stresses the similarities between Baptism and the Lord's Supper -- Question 177 very clearly states "wherein" they "differ." Indeed, it rightly declares that whereas "Baptism is to be administered...even to infants" of the covenant -- "the Lord's Supper is to be administered...only to such as are of years and ability to examine themselves (First Corinthians 11:28-29)."

Q. 201. State the Communion Doctrine of the 1648 *Westminster Shorter Catechism*.

A. 201. Pre-teenage children of the covenant were to be instructed from the *Shorter Catechism* as "a Directory for catechising such as are of weaker capacity" alias who are immature. There, Question 97 addresses what answer Catechumens should give before communing. "It is required of them that would worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, that they examine themselves." Then they must testify "of their knowledge to discern the Lord's body; of their faith to feed upon Him; [and] of their repentance, love, and new obedience -- lest, coming unworthily, they eat and drink judgment to themselves."

19. Paedocommunion withstood after Westminster and till today

Q. 202. Are there any major Protestant Theologians, Lutheran or Calvinist, who have advocated Paedocommunion since the Westminster Assembly?

A. 202. No. Owen, Baxter, Matthew Henry and their successors continued to uphold Biblical Antipaedocommunionism. So too did Mastricht, Marckius, Witsius, Brakel, Turretin, Pictet, Heidegger, the *New England Catechism*; John Cotton; the three Mathers, Makemie, Stoddard, Jonathan Edwards Sr. and Jr., Samuel Miller, Thornwell, Andrew Murray, the Hodges, Dabney, Warfield, the three Kuypers, Bavinck, Bouwman, Polman, Dijk, Bijlsma, Van Ruler, Hoekstra, Waterink, D.W. de Villiers, G. & J. Vos, Buswell, Gerstner, Berkhof, John Murray, Kamphuis, Deddens, J.A. Heyns, Richard Bacon, Coppes, Gentry, Morton H. Smith, Danzfuss, Morecraft, and many others.

20. Conclusion: Paedocommunion is alien yesterday, today, and for ever

Before the fall, only adults had access to manducate of the fruit of the tree of life. After the fall, only adults had access to manducate at the Passover -- and at the Lord's Supper which replaced it. And in glory, where all of God's elect shall be resurrected precisely as adults for Christ's **Marriage Feast** -- only adults shall have access to manducate of the fruit of the tree of life on the New Earth and in the City of God, Who has always been mature.

Yes, God was always mature. In the beginning, as His images, He created but one elect and mature human pair. That pair, in its descendants, throughout history unfolds into an elect mature humanity. That, during history, grows from babyhood through adolescence unto maturity. But after its consummation, though yet aging, elect humanity never grows senile.

Thus say the Holy Scriptures. Thus say the Bible-believing Theologians of the Church of all ages. And therefore, thus must we too say!



ABOUT THE AUTHOR - - ->

Dr. Francis Nigel Lee was born in 1934 in Westmorland County. He is the great-grandson of a fiery preacher whose family disintegrated when he backslid. Dr. Lee's father was an Atheist, yet he married a Roman Catholic who raised her son Nigel in that faith. Yet, when Nigel was seven, his father led him into Atheism.

During the Second World War, the Navy appointed Nigel's father W.S. Lee Chief Radar Officer of the South Atlantic. So the family then moved to South Africa. There, Nigel became a Calvinist; had the great privilege of leading both of his parents to Christ; and then became a Minister of God's Word and Sacraments in the Dutch Reformed Church of Natal, External Examiner in Ethics for the Stellenbosch Theological Seminary, and a Barrister (or Trial Lawyer) of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

Moving to the U.S.A., Dr. Lee attended the very first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America; transferred his ministerial credentials to that denomination; and pastored Congregations in Mississippi and Florida. He was also Professor of Philosophy at Shelton College in N.J.; Visiting Lecturer in Apologetics at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson Miss.; Staley Distinguished Visiting Lecturer at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis Mo.; Research Scholar-in-Residence at the Christian Studies Center in Memphis Tenn.; Academic Dean of Graham Bible College in Bristol Tenn.; and incidental Lecturer at several other Colleges, Seminaries, and Universities. He was at that time the only person in the World serving on the Executives of both the British Lord's Day Observance Society and the Lord's Day Alliance of the U.S.

Preacher, Theologian, Lawyer, Educationist, Historian, Philosopher and Author, Lee has produced more than 191 publications (including many books) and also more than 534 long unpublished manuscripts. Apart from an honorary LL.D., he has 21 earned degrees -- including eleven earned doctorates for dissertations in Education, Law, Literature, Philosophy and Theology. After his father was murdered, Lee had the joy of leading the murderer in jail (and later also the latter's parents) to Christ. Though loving to study, Lee prefers to preach -- and to lead folk to Christ.

Lee rises early; reads God's Word in eleven languages; then walks a couple of miles before breakfast. He has been round the World seven times; has visited 110 countries (several repeatedly); and also every Continent (except Antarctica). He is in demand as a Promoter of Doctoral Students in Australia, England, Germany, South Africa and the United States. He has also lectured or preached in all those countries -- as well as in Brazil, Scotland, Korea, Japan, Namibia, New Zealand, and Zambia.

A diehard predestinarian, Lee now lives in the Commonwealth of Australia -- where he was for twenty years the Professor of Systematic Theology and Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College. He and his wife Nellie retired in 2000. They have two children, Johanna Paulina who teaches at Parkridge High School and Anna Marie who teaches at Earnshaw State College in Brisbane.

COMMENDATIONS OF DR. LEE'S 1672-PAGE CATECHISM BEFORE COMMUNION!

My good friend for many years, Dr. Francis Nigel Lee has now written the definitive answer to the error of Paedocommunionists. May the Lord be pleased to bless his efforts with a worldwide distribution of this work! It should be well-received by all those who take seriously the doctrine of the Sacraments believed by our Reformed and Puritan fathers in the faith.

-- Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon, Dallas Texas; author of *What Mean Ye by this Service? Paedocommunion in Light of the Passover* -- and *Manna and Manducation*.

Dr. Lee has written an exhaustive treatment of the issues involved in the Paedocommunion debate. This is a topic that has consumed congregations and caused division in the body of Christ. Dr. Lee's treatment provides a host of arguments demonstrating that Paedocommunion is unbiblical, and an unwarranted intrusion into the theological history of the Church.

-- Dr. Leonard J. Coppes, Thronton Colorado; author of *A Consideration of the Paedocommunion Position* -- and *Daddy, May I Take Communion? Paedocommunion versus the Bible*.

This is an excellent book written by one of the best scholars and advocates of the Reformation. It is without doubt the most comprehensive, up-to-date and probably also the most timely textbook of its kind in Reformed Theology. The author deserves admiration for his solid argumentation and his profound scholarship. May the Lord use this book to bring a large-scale repentance all over the world -- from Paedocommunion, to the sound Reformed and Biblical partaking of the Lord's Supper.

-- Rev. Theo Danzfuss, Benoni South Africa; author of *Child Communion. Reformation or Deformation?*

It is a chilling testimony Lee's *History of Antipaedocommunion B.C. 4004 to 2004 A.D.* needed to be written. Surrender of the Sacraments by late 20th Century Presbyterianism, nearly killed the Presbyterian remnant. Once more, Providence has sent an Athanasius in the nick of time.

-- Rev. Dr. Edwin Elliott, Manassas Virginia; Editor of the *Christian Observer*

"Dr. Lee has provided the church with an excellent and exhaustive defense of the historic Reformed view of paedocommunion. Dr. Lee's depth of knowledge in this area, is astounding."

-- Rev. Brian M. Schwertley, Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Church of Manawa Wisconsin, author of *Paedocommunion: A Biblical Examination*

This work will, no doubt, become a standard reference book on the important subject of Paedocommunion. Dr. Lee, with his usual thoroughness, presents the case against Paedocommunion from representatives of every age of the Church.

-- Rev. Professor Dr. Morton H. Smith, author of *Systematic Theology*; Founder of Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson Mississippi and Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Greenville South Carolina; and sometime Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America.

