

In early 1985 an article titled “Children at the Lord’s Supper?” appeared in the magazine *New Horizons* in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. It related some of the problems in ministering to Ethiopian exiles who had been accustomed to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper being administered to newly-baptized infants. Partially as a result of these “problems” an OPC presbytery overtured the OPC’s General Assembly “to study the issue of paedocommunion and provide voluntary guidelines [sic] for determining the age children might be allowed to come to the Lord’s Supper.”

That same year a majority report and a minority report were presented to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America by a committee appointed for the purpose of studying paedocommunion. The majority report concluded, “The PCA is well advised to continue the classic reformed practice of delaying the admission of children to the Lord’s Table — until they reach a level of maturity at which they can profess their faith and partake of the elements with discernment”

What the report did not say is that not only is anti-paedocommunion “the classic reformed practice;” it has been the orthodox view of the entire western church, including Roman, Lutheran, Reformed and Baptist; it is the view of the Old Testament, of inter-testamental Judaism, of Christ and His apostles, of the patristic church until after 250 AD, and continues to be the view even of Karaite Jews, who broke away from Rabbinic tradition to follow a Jewish version of *Sola Scriptura*. If the practice has been so widely spurned, then how has it earned itself such a following now? In a 1975 issue of the *Westminster Theological Seminary Journal*, Chris Keidel wrote an important article on the subject titled, “Is the Lord’s Supper for Children?” In that article, Mr. Keidel made some very attractive arguments in favor of paedocommunion. The arguments were refuted by Roger Beckwith in a subsequent article in the same journal, but the opening salvo in the debate was fired.

However, it should be noted that in that very article Keidel himself admitted, “at a certain age the Jewish male became responsible to God for observing this ordinance of the covenant Aboth 5:21 makes thirteen the age at which children become subject to commandments of this kind. Thirteen was probably the age at the time of Christ. But if thirteen was the age of accountability, why is Christ mentioned as having gone up at the age of twelve? It may be because Luke wanted to show that Christ’s parents were training their Son in observing the fast connected with the Passover (Pesachim 99b) — a kind of training Yoma 82a says should be done a year or two beforehand The phrase: ‘according to the custom of the Feast’ (Luke 2:42), therefore, could refer . . . to the requirement of going at the age when one becomes an adult Deuteronomy 16:16.” This is quite an admission from one who advocates child communion. Keidel allows that child communion prior to catechizing was unknown in the Passover of Christ’s day.

It is a well established belief among Reformed Christians that New Testament baptism has replaced Old Testament circumcision. It is also well established that Old Testament Passover prefigured (and was replaced by) New Testament Communion. Passover was an Old Testament covenantal and sacramental meal. There are both similarities and differences between the former sacrament and the current sacrament.

The supposed point of similarity between the Passover and the Lord’s Supper that is disputed in this paper is whether infants or young children should be admitted to either or both. As Keidel himself has admitted, “thirteen was probably the age at the time of Christ.” It will therefore be profitable to look at the practice of paedocommunion in light of the Passover.

There are a few technical or specialized terms used throughout this paper. Some definitions may be in order for those not previously familiar with this particular controversy. Paedobaptism is the view

that the infant children of Church members are entitled to baptism. The opposite view is commonly called anti-paedobaptism. By the same token, paedocommunion is the view that the infants and young children of Church members are entitled to the elements of the Lord's Supper. Anti-paedocommunion teaches that the Lord's Supper is to be eaten only by those who are "of years and ability to examine themselves."

It is common in controversies of this nature for the language to become heated and even immoderate. I have made a number of re-writes of this booklet for the purpose of removing any such language. It is not my intention to "paint with too wide a brush." I realize that there are a number of men who regard themselves as paedocommunionists solely because they think that this is what the Bible teaches. Many of them are committed to the Reformed principle of Sola Scriptura or what is often called the regulative principle. It is to these men that the following pages are addressed. I, too, believe that Scripture alone should regulate all that we do, particularly in the areas of faith and worship. I have attempted throughout this paper to remain true to the teaching of the various passages involved and to interpret all of them in a proper historical-grammatical-theological manner.

INTRODUCTION

How has it come to pass that Presbyterians have historically insisted that the infants of believers are to be baptized but are not to receive the elements of the Lord's Supper? Are they guilty of inconsistency at this point? Are they simply and blindly following mere traditions received from the Reformers? Paedocommunionists charge anti-paedocommunionists with either or both of these faults. Modern paedocommunionists claim that the Reformers, in fact, "never had to deal seriously" with this issue.

Anti-paedobaptists, such as Baptists, baptistic Charismatics and Bible Churches, accuse Presbyterians of inconsistency in claiming that Presbyterians have a correct view as to who should receive the Lord's Supper, but not as to who should be baptized. If Presbyterians would apply the same principle to baptism that they apply to the Lord's Supper, the argument goes, they would also refuse the water of baptism to children. This charge fails, however, because anti-paedobaptists fail to show that baptism and the Lord's Supper both have the same import to the same people. Furthermore, as we shall see, Presbyterians do not deny their infants the elements of the Lord's Supper for the same reason that anti-paedobaptists deny the elements to their infants.

Paedocommunionists also accuse Presbyterians of inconsistency and for much the same reason. The paedocommunionist generally approves of baptizing the infants of believers. They see that there is a one to one correspondence in Scripture between circumcision and baptism. The infants of church members were clearly to be circumcised in the Old Testament and so the infants of church members are to be baptized today.

By analogy, the Lord's Supper has replaced the Passover of the Old Testament. Paedocommunionists argue that the infants and young children of Israel were admitted to the Passover, and without specific command to the contrary, the covenant children should be admitted to the Lord's Supper today. If Presbyterians would only apply the same rule of interpretation to both sacraments, surely they would see that they are inconsistent in denying the elements of the Lord's Supper to their children. Or so the argument goes.

Recently, the charges against those who hold the position of the Westminster Standards have escalated. Writing in *Journey Magazine* (Nov.-Dec. 1988), Vance Lemasters makes the following charges: "[I]t is an issue that calls for repentance on the part of those who forbid covenant children to partake of the Lord's Supper. The church has too long practiced spiritual infanticide on its own covenant children The practice of covenant children appearing before session before being allowed communion smacks of incipient Arminianism." As strange as it seems, Mr. Lemasters here accuses the position of John Calvin of smacking of incipient Arminianism! But Lemasters does not content himself with attacking the position of John Calvin. He has additionally adjudged the church guilty of "spiritual infanticide." If Mr. Lemasters actually thinks the charge of "spiritual infanticide" is meaningful with respect to the Lord's Supper, then I must caution him that his opinion is dangerously close to sacramentalism. At any rate, with such excessive charges in print, a defense of the Reformed position must be provided.

While not bowing to the charge of inconsistency, let us confirm that the truths of God form a single fabric. A supposed truth which is inconsistent with (or even contradictory to) an accepted truth must be regarded as suspect. But anti-paedocommunion is not inconsistent with paedobaptism, as I hope we will see.

What paedocommunionists must prove is that infants and young children were routinely admitted to the Passover. Lacking that, they must show that infants or young children were admitted to the Lord's Supper. They do not have to prove both. If they can show from Scripture that the infants of Israel were admitted to the Passover, then the anti-paedocommunionist must show a later command

INTRODUCTION

prohibiting the practice from being applied to the Lord's Supper. Or if they can show the case of an infant being admitted to the Lord's Supper they will have demonstrated their case.

Another accusation often brought by paedocommunionists against the Biblical doctrine is that the only reference against the practice consists of a misunderstanding or misapplication of I Corinthians 11:27-30. There we read, "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." While they would agree that an adult is to examine himself, since a child is incapable of doing this, he is not to be included in Paul's injunction.

They argue that I Corinthians 11:27-30 is similar in intent to II Thessalonians 3:10, where Paul says that if a man does not work, neither should he eat. Children are incapable of working, so this injunction simply does not apply to them. In the same way, since children are incapable of examining themselves, the examination requirement of I Corinthians 11:27-30 simply does not apply to them.

Remember that the paedocommunionist argues that since children were admitted to the Passover meal, by analogy they ought to also be admitted to the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper shows forth the death of Christ; and we believe that our children are included in the covenant of grace; so we should allow them all the means of grace that God has given. Their point is well taken if they mean to drive us to a covenantal approach to Scripture. We should approach the question of paedocommunion from the first page of Scripture and proceed historically. Anti-paedocommunionists, it is true, often utilize I Corinthians 11:27-30 to show the error of the paedocommunionist's position. But this does not mean that they reject the historical approach to Scripture. We must beware of letting the heat of controversy cause us to become uncharitable or make false accusations against brethren. In the New Testament (John 1:29; I Corinthians 5:7; etc.) we find that Christ Himself is our Passover. For a correct understanding of what that means, we must begin our study in the Old Testament and then apply the words of the New Testament to our covenantal understanding of the Passover and the Lord's Supper.

Genesis 4:3 is the first recorded instance of a sacrifice by human hands to God. We are told there that Cain and Abel brought their sacrifices “in the process of time.” The underlying Hebrew phrase is actually *miqetz yamim* or “the end of days.”

This phrase is used nowhere else in Scripture to refer to an ongoing process or course. However, this phrase or phrases similar to it are multiplied throughout Scripture to refer to the end of a specific period of time. It is used in numerous cases to refer to the end of a period of time that has been specifically set aside by prophecy or command.

Also, in Genesis 4:3, an end of something (specifically a predetermined number of days) is in view; not simply an undeterminable on-going process or course of events. It is in this context of the end of days, not the beginning of days, that we have the first example of a sacrifice offered by human hands to Jehovah, the covenant God. Let us note a few things about the partakers in the sacrifice.

They were old enough to have chosen professions (Genesis 4:2) in which they were already actively engaged. “And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.” There is no reason for us to suppose that they were old men by this time, but neither are we told that Abel was keeping his father’s sheep. The point to notice is that they were old enough to accept the responsibilities involved in adult vocations.

It seems that Cain was old enough to be married. Verse 17 refers to a wife that he either already had when making the sacrifice or married shortly thereafter. Once again, this does not necessarily indicate that Cain was an old man, but he was certainly at least an adolescent. When he “knew” his wife, he was mature enough that she conceived a son as a result. So we have evidence within the passage that Cain and Abel were both physically and mentally mature and responsible.

Abel had enough spiritual discernment to be regarded as a prophet of God (Matthew 23:34-35). Additionally, the manner of their sacrifices supposes that they were both rational and discerning.

First, there was a difference in their motives (v. 5b). Abel was capable of rational obedience to the commandments of God and brought his offering to God in faithful obedience (Hebrews 11:4). Yet Abel was the younger of the two, so we can infer that Cain was also “of years to discern” the commandments of God. Also, it is important for the purpose of our study to note that Abel brought the fruit of his adult obedient behavior. He was not sitting on his mother’s lap, but actively engaged in adult worship. Finally, the fact that Abel worshipped God both inwardly by faith and outwardly in the manner ordained by God (Hebrews 11:4; 12:24) speaks directly to the root of the whole paedocommunion issue.

These offerings, then, speak to the Church in the twentieth century in such a way as to help us to place the teaching of paedocommunion in its proper context.

God had no respect to Cain’s offering in that he worshipped God after his own imagination. God apparently required that the sacrifice be a firstfruit offering. Cain worshipped God after his own imagination and God regarded it as no worship at all.

Today we are still responsible to worship God only as He has commanded. The regulative principle of *Sola Scriptura* is the fundamental issue involved in the entire paedocommunion debate. Thus, the purpose of this study is to search the Scriptures for God’s commandments concerning how He will have us worship Him. When we have discerned from Scripture what it is that God requires, then we are to follow the example of righteous Abel and worship God properly.

We have been examining the sacrifices brought by Cain and Abel to Jehovah, the covenant Lord. It might be objected that this was neither Passover nor the Lord’s Supper and therefore bears no relation to this topic. Obviously the Passover was not ordained until many generations later and the Lord’s Supper many generations after that. So why bother examining Abel’s sacrifice at all?

In order to understand the Passover, we must see it in its nature as a sacrifice. The Lord's Supper, while not a sacrifice as such, is a commemoration of the once for all sacrifice of Christ. In fact, the Passover also pointed to this once for all sacrifice, as did Abel's sacrifice in Genesis 4. For us to take a redemptive-historical view of the Passover we must first understand the redemptive background in which God placed it. Paedocommunionists rightly insist that we take an historical view of the Lord's Supper by first examining the Passover. But even the Passover does not occur in a non-historical setting. It is first and foremost a sacrifice. The Bible does not begin with the book of Matthew, but neither does it begin with the book of Exodus.

There are numerous other sacrifices throughout the book of Genesis (8:20f.; 12:7f.; 13:4f.; etc.). In each case an adult male brought his sacrifice to the Lord. Thus, the principle was established by the time of the Exodus that these sacrifices were to be made by those males capable of being heads of households.

In the next section of this study we will examine the Passover as it relates to its participants. As we examine what is necessary for the proper observance of the Passover, however, we must bring with us what we have learned from this passage regarding by whom and how sacrifices were to be made. All that we have learned regarding Cain and Abel and their respective sacrifices should speak to us with respect to the Passover sacrifice. If infants and young children are to have any part in the Passover, we should expect the Bible to tell us what that part is. We will see in Exodus 12 precisely what role the covenant children played in the Passover, but we will search in vain for a commandment that infants are to partake of adult food.

The night before God delivered Israel from Egypt He gave them the Passover meal (Numbers 33:3). Today in most Jewish homes a so-called Passover meal (or seder) is eaten by the entire family, including even some very young children if they happen to be present. Yet, we should not let this practice by itself influence our thinking. Rather, we should return to Scripture to see how and why the Passover was instituted by God, and what aspects of Passover are carried forward into the new covenant meal of the Lord's Supper.

As instituted by God through Moses, the lamb was the centerpiece of the Passover meal. Its blood was sprinkled on the doorposts of the house to protect the inhabitants of the house from the angel of death (Exodus 12:6-7).

Of course, after entering the land, the lamb was no longer to be sacrificed any place the people happened to be. Deuteronomy 16:2 says that the Passover was to be sacrificed in the place where God had set His name. This place was at Shiloh, until the ark was moved to Jerusalem and it was at Zion after that. This command is the basis for the distinction that the Mishnah places between the "Egyptian" Passover and the "Permanent" Passover.

Note also according to Deuteronomy 16 that the Passover was one of the three times in the year that all adult males were to appear before the Lord. "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles: and they shall not appear before the Lord empty" (Deuteronomy 16: 16).

Today there is no longer a temple in Jerusalem where God has placed His name; thus, since 70 A.D. there has been no Passover sacrifice and therefore no Passover. In fact, Christ instituted the Lord's Supper the night before He went to the cross and thus put the Passover behind us forever. The only lamb involved in the Lord's Supper is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29).

But Exodus 12:3-4 speaks of a lamb for a house. Does this mean that everyone in the house is eating the lamb? It is to be "according to the number of souls" or persons. So does this settle the "fact" that all in the house partook of the meal? Let us examine this passage more closely. Let us start with a comparison of verses 6 and 21. In verse 6, Moses said that the whole assembly of the congregation was to slay the Passover. But in verse 21 he gave the actual mechanics of how that was done. The elders (i.e., heads of tribes or houses) actually drew out the lambs. This establishes the covenantal principle of heads acting for those under their charge. The elders made the count and it was "according to their eating" or according to the count that the lambs were slain. In their counting they were to assure that no "stranger" was among those counted (vv. 43, 45). Note here the importance of the elders "fencing" the table even in this prototypical meal.

What part do the children play in this meal? Does God simply leave it to our imagination? Does the Church have "discretion" as to what part the children take? No, for in verses 26-27 God informs us that the children are to serve a catechetical role. "When your children shall say, 'What mean ye by this service,'" etc. The children are not told to ask, "What do we mean by the fact that we are eating." That would then indicate that they actually partook of the meal. Rather, they are to ask, "What do you mean by your eating in this service?"

The paedocommunionist's best argument is a syllogism to this effect:

"[Major:] If infants partook of the Passover, then they are also to partake of the Lord's Supper.

[Minor:] Infants partook of the Passover.

[Conclusion:] Therefore, infants are also to partake of the Lord's Supper."

This is a perfectly valid argument and, if the premises are true, then the conclusion must also be true. But here we see that the minor premise above, that infants and young children partook of the

Passover, is not merely unsubstantiated; the evidence of the pronouns is positively contrary to the premise given.

The paedocommunionist is required to prove either that infants were admitted as participants to the Passover or that they were admitted as participants to the Lord's Supper. The regulative principle does not require that the anti-paedocommunionist demonstrate beyond any shadow of doubt that infants were not partakers. Jordan, Lemasters, Keidel, et al. have apparently assumed that infants and young children actually partook sacramentally of the Passover. But, as we have seen, the Scriptural evidence does not indicate this.

In Exodus 12:43ff., Moses describes "the ordinance of the Passover." First, no strangers may eat it because it is a covenantal meal (43). Second, slaves may eat the meal only after they have been circumcised — thus receiving the sign of the covenant (44). Third, it is no ordinary meal (as a so-called agape feast would be), but a sacramental meal. The elements are therefore not to be treated as ordinary or common food (46). Finally, a stranger may partake if and after he accepts covenantal responsibilities (48-49). In verse 48, all his males must be circumcised, but only he (as an adult male covenantal head of the household) draws near and partakes. Upon drawing near and partaking of the sacramental meal, he is subject to the very same laws of God as the covenant people (49).

These four concepts contained in the ordinance of the Passover are quite instructive with respect to the subject of paedocommunion. We learn that the Passover is a covenantal meal and so the table is to be fenced. Neither strangers nor household servants were to partake of the meal until first receiving the sign of the covenant. Additionally, all their male offspring were required to receive the token of the covenant. But if there were household servants and strangers "within the gate" who had not previously been circumcised and "drawn near" then they were not to partake of the meal. Although it is a common practice for American Jews to invite "Gentiles" to their homes to participate in the seder, it is a practice clearly prohibited by God. Thus we should not lean very heavily upon the understanding of modern Jewry for insights into how the Passover was to be eaten.

But just as importantly, it shows the extent to which paedocommunionist Vance Lemasters has misread the ordinance. He states in his Journey Magazine article, "the text [Exodus 12:12] is specifically meaning the basic family structure: husband, wife, children and servants." But verse 44 expressly tells us that servants were not to partake of the Passover on the basis of their masters' inclusion in the covenant. They were not to partake, in fact, until they themselves were confirmed in the covenant by accepting circumcision as adults. Lemasters goes on to ask with apparent irony if the rest of the family fasted while watching Dad stuff himself. The answer is not precisely what Lemasters might expect. The servant neither partook nor fasted. The same can readily be said of the rest of the family.

Much is also implied here with regard to the "specialness" of the meal. James Jordan, in his two articles, "A Letter on Paedocommunion" and "Theses on Paedocommunion," tries to make a strong argument for paedocommunion from an argument for the non-special character of the sacrament. Mr. Lemasters seems to follow this line of argument when he states, "it becomes evident that the Reformers and writers of the Westminster Confession allowed the influence of the Roman Catholic tradition to shape their view of not allowing children to receive the elements." The implication in the article seems to be that if orthodox churches deny the elements of the Lord's Supper to their children, then they are guilty of a view as false as that of transubstantiation. Lemasters implies this by his approving quotation of Jordan that "with the growth of a superstitious view of the sacrament, people feared to spill so much as a single drop of the transubstantiated [sic] blood of Christ."

But the fact that a sacrament is special does not necessarily imply superstition. A view would be superstitious only to the extent that it is false, not to the extent to which it sees the sacrament as special or non-special. Exodus 12:10 informs us that this was not an ordinary meal. God told the Israelites that they were to hold nothing over until the next day, but were to burn “leftovers” rather than consuming them at another time. If we were to follow Jordan’s reasoning in his “A Letter on Paedocommunion” in *Journey Magazine*, we would ask, “Do we keep leftovers until the next opportunity to eat them?” With an ordinary meal we do, but with the Passover Israel was instructed not to so do. One of the questions that a Jewish boy asks at the seder is, “How is this meal different from all others?” When our Westminster Larger Catechism (# 162) states that a sacrament is “an holy ordinance,” it makes reference to the very fact that it is not common or profane.

Jordan additionally implies in his article, “Theses on Paedocommunion,” that “infrequent communion” follows logically and necessarily from a view of the specialness of the sacrament. That this is not the case can be seen from a very simple example. Modern Baptists have an extreme view of the non-special character of the Lord’s Supper and yet tend to celebrate it quite infrequently. The Westminster divines, on the other hand, who held that the Lord’s Supper was special in that it was “an holy ordinance” also maintained that “the Lord’s Supper is to be administered often” (Larger Catechism, # 177).

Accusing orthodox Christians of superstition is tantamount to accusing them of idolatry. Charity alone, not to mention wisdom, would seem to dictate that a doctrinal position be absolutely irrefutable before accusing a brother of superstition because he differs.

The institution of the “second-month” Passover is found in Numbers 9. It is here that we learn the Passover had a significance which required examination of the would-be participants. The Passover was to be kept when and how God Himself instituted it (v. 3). But certain men had been present at a funeral, so by reason of ceremonial or Levitical uncleanness they were not permitted to keep the Passover (cf. Numbers 5:2-3). Both men and women contracted ceremonial uncleanness (Numbers 5:3), so we must suppose that either (1) no women were at the funeral or (2) that women were not required to keep Passover anyway, so being at the funeral made no difference. Since women were never circumcised in Israel and only the circumcised could partake of the meal, it seems more likely that the latter is the case.

In fact, if women had partaken of the Passover, we should expect roughly twenty-five per cent of the women of Israel to be approaching Moses with the same kind of question that these men had, for twenty-five percent of the women of Israel in each of the four weeks of every month would have been unqualified to partake (if for no other reason) due to their menstrual period (Leviticus 15:19-30). Additionally, because Israel observed a lunar month, the solution that God gave to Moses would have been absolutely no relief for menstruating women. They would have been unclean on the fourteenth of the following month as well.

However, there is no such complaint to Moses in Numbers 9. Are we to believe that these unclean mothers cooked and served the Passover to their Levitically clean infants? Surely this is a thought so completely out of keeping with the nature of the meal that even paedocommunionists will reject it. Rather, it makes much more sense both theologically and hermeneutically to maintain that neither the mothers nor the children ate the meal sacramentally.

Now God Himself made a provision for a Passover to be held a month later for those who were ceremonially unclean on the fourteenth of Abib (Nisan). Moses did not simply make something a new tradition, but instead consulted God for His Word on the matter. The application for today is obvious. Neither are we to simply add ceremonies and rituals and traditions to the worship of God

in order to make ourselves feel good. Rather, we must worship God as He has ordained in His Word.

This provision for a Passover in the second month was actually used for the entire nation of Israel during the reign of Hezekiah (II Chronicles 30:2-3). We learn in that account that it is not merely for ceremonial uncleanness that a person is prohibited from partaking of the sacramental meal. The instruction in verse 8 is “yield yourselves unto the Lord . . . and serve the Lord your God.” This account teaches us that something more than ceremonial uncleanness could keep an ancient Israelite from the feast. An unyielded heart also disqualified the ancient Israelite from partaking of the sacrament of the Passover meal, even though he had been previously circumcised. Note also the “fencing” that took place in vv. 17-19.

What we have learned from Exodus, Numbers, and II Chronicles so far is that Passover was not eaten indiscriminately by every member of the nation. In fact, at least three things could exclude someone from eating the meal: uncircumcision (Exodus 12:48), ceremonial uncleanness (Numbers 9:6; cf. 5:2), and an unyielded heart (II Chronicles 30:8).

But a person could not simply and independently determine on his own whether or not to eat the meal. For the same sanction against uncircumcision found in Genesis 17:14, that of being cut-off from the covenant community, is also given against the willful non-communer in Numbers 9:13. This is a covenant meal and is thus to be eaten covenantally.

This covenantal aspect of the Passover is brought out more fully in Deuteronomy 16:5 ff., where it is moved out of private houses and ultimately to the temple in Jerusalem. The Passover in the land was not to be killed within the gates of the home (v. 5). Rather, it was to be killed and eaten near the tabernacle and later the temple (v. 6). Furthermore, the people who partook were not to return home until the next day (v. 7).

The covenantal aspect of the Passover becomes especially apparent when we contrast it to the offering of the firstborn found in the previous chapter (Deuteronomy 15:19-23). In the case of that offering, the entire household (including even the unclean) was allowed to eat it (vv. 20, 22). Additionally, rather than being eaten at the temple in Jerusalem, it was to be eaten within the gates of the home (v. 22). These distinctions are placed back to back by God in Scripture. One type of sacrifice was to be eaten in homes by everyone. The other, the Passover, was to be eaten outside the home by circumcised, ceremonially clean, yielded adult males (Deuteronomy 16:2; Exodus 12:48; Numbers 9:6; II Chronicles 30:8).

Another Old Testament passage that paedocommunionist Lemasters brings into the discussion is I Samuel 1:1-28. Lemasters claims that this passage reveals “how the devout Jew kept the yearly feasts, including Passover.” The fact that Passover is not mentioned even one time in the entire passage should cause us to wonder why Lemasters thinks that it is normative; but there are even greater questions involved.

First, we learn that this “devout” Jew was a polygamist contrary to God’s commands in Genesis 2:24 and Deuteronomy 17:17. Then we learn that he went to Shiloh yearly rather than the three times per year, as was required by Deuteronomy 16:16. This hardly seems like an example from which we should learn obedience to God! But let us suppose that the prohibition against polygamy in Genesis 2:24 and Deuteronomy 17:17 applied exclusively to the king; and let us further suppose that when this passage says “yearly” that we are to understand that as meaning “three times per year.” That is giving Lemasters much, but it is necessary in order to say that we have the example before us of a “devout Jew.”

The question remains as to whether the portion given to Hannah had anything to do with a sacramental meal. On what authority would a “devout Jew” have been allowed to give someone a

double portion of a sacramental meal? Lemasters simply begs the question at this point. We know he was a devout Jew because he went to Shiloh three times per year. And we know that he went to Shiloh three times per year rather than merely once per year because he was a devout Jew. Furthermore we know that this was Passover because a devout Jew would be required to be at Shiloh for Passover and we know that it was right for him to give Hannah and the others portions because he did it. We are told in verse seven that whatever Elkanah was giving to Hannah, she did not want to eat it. But then what are we to say about Hannah in light of Numbers 9:13?! This non-eating on Hannah's part previous to verse 8 evidently took place "year by year, when she went up to the house of the Lord." Would Lemasters here claim that Hannah was committing "spiritual suicide?"

The "Permanent" Passover included four cups of wine, yet Hannah informed Eli in verse 15 that she had neither "drunk wine nor strong drink." This does not prove absolutely that Hannah did not partake of the Passover meal, but it raises some very serious questions. Once again, it is necessary for the paedocommunionist, if he wishes to use this passage, to prove that this was in fact Passover, that it was being observed properly, and that Hannah actually ate the sacramental meal. None of these are supported by the text. Lemasters faults Dr. Francis Nigel Lee (of Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary) for saying that this was the same feast as the three-bullock feast of verse 24. Lemasters admits three times in a few paragraphs that no mention is made in the text as to which feast is being observed by Elkanah, yet insists that only bullocks being mentioned — at a feast which requires a lamb — presents him with no difficulties.

Dr. Lee is quite wise in refraining from any attempt to name which feast is in view in I Samuel 1. In fact, in referring to it as a three-bullock feast, Dr. Lee is not attempting to add a feast to those required by Scripture. He is simply acknowledging that we are not specifically told in Scripture which feast is in view, and is naming it for the specific offering that Hannah brought in I Samuel 1:24.

The onus remains with the paedocommunionist to prove that this was Passover. However, if there was an occasion given in the Old Testament at which an Israelite was to appear "before the Lord" to worship and sacrifice (v. 3) on an annual basis (vv. 3, 7, 21, etc.) and to pay vows (v. 21), then we should at least examine the possibility that it was that occasion rather than Passover that brought Elkanah to Shiloh.

Actually, there was a specific occasion, in addition to the three times annually, in which the ancient adult male Israelite was to appear before the Lord. The "devout Jew" was to go to the tabernacle for "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flock, nor any of thy vows which thou vowest, nor thy freewill offerings, or heave offering of thy hand: but thou must eat them before the Lord God in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates: and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God in all that thou puttest thy hands unto" (Deuteronomy 12:17-18).

This passage should be taken together with Deuteronomy 14:22, 26b, "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year [emphasis added] . . . and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou, and thine household." In other words, a "devout Jew" was to go up to Shiloh (and later to Jerusalem) annually (i.e., year by year — the exact wording of Deuteronomy 14:22 and 1 Samuel 1:3, 7, 21) to pay his tithes and vows. This is precisely what we are told Elkanah was doing. And at that feast, the entire household (including women, children and servants) was to partake of the offerings.

Now in conclusion, Lemasters has not shown that this is the Passover. We have learned of a probable reason for Elkanah's pilgrimage, however, and that reason is most certainly not the Passover. Again, the Reformed position does not have to prove what offering this was. It is sufficient to prove that there were offerings other than Passover that this could have been. It is incumbent upon those who insist that it is Passover to prove it from the context or from another reference to it.

The reader must now decide for himself if he thinks that this has been a fair treatment of the Old Testament texts. Some may object that nothing has been said about the manna of Exodus 16. The gathering and eating of manna was never tied to the Passover either in Exodus 16 or in subsequent redemptive history. Therefore it will suffice to observe that (1) this meal was not a sacrament, and (2) therefore all who could eat it were welcome to do so.

We may now approach the New Testament meal of the Lord's Supper with an Old Testament understanding of the Passover. If our model (hypothesis) regarding the Passover is correct, then we should expect to find certain features surrounding it in the New Testament. Additionally, we would be surprised (based on our model) if we found certain other features incorporated.

For instance, on the basis of Deuteronomy 16:2, we would expect to see participants (covenantal adult males) going to Jerusalem to keep the Passover. Additionally, on the basis of our understanding of Exodus 12:26-27, we would expect to see the children of the participants involved in catechism. Moreover, based on Exodus 12:3-4 and 12:21, we would expect to see a counting of adult males (a.k.a. "men") taking place around the time of the Passover. Finally, based on Numbers 9:1-6 and II Chronicles 30:8, we would expect to see an increased awareness and concern over ceremonial cleanness.

On the other hand, if our understanding of Scripture is correct, we would be surprised to find women partaking of the Passover meal. Additionally, our model would be falsified if we found children partaking of the Passover apart from catechetical activity. We would have cause to suspect our hypothesis if we saw the Passover taking place outside Jerusalem. Finally, if there were little or no concern over ceremonial cleanness on the part of Passover participants we would be required to find a reason for the lack of concern. So then, let us take a look at the New Testament based on our model and see if our hypothesis accounts for the facts that we find there.

We are told very little in Scripture about the childhood of Jesus. However, the one incident that the Holy Spirit has chosen to tell us, in Luke 2:40 ff., regards the Passover and Christ as a child. In this account we see at least two of the features associated with the Passover that we would expect to find. We see both a "pilgrimage" to Jerusalem on the part of Passover participants and catechism of children being associated with the meal.

At this point in His life, Jesus was no longer a young child, but was about twelve years old (vv. 40, 42). It was obvious that the grace of God was upon Him. That is, He was no longer a child so young that He could not discern between good and evil (v. 40). His parents went up to the feast of the Passover every year, but it is recorded that Jesus went up to the Passover at Jerusalem when He was twelve (vv. 41-42).

There is no evidence whatsoever in this passage that Christ Himself partook of the Passover at the age of twelve. Luke records the fact that He went up to Jerusalem and that His parents first missed Him when they were some distance from Jerusalem during their trip home (vv. 44-45). Even if it were the case that Jesus actually partook of the Passover at the age of twelve, the passage clearly tells us that previous to going up to Jerusalem at the age of twelve, He had already "waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him." This was no infant at the Passover; not even the infant Savior.

When Joseph and Mary finally found Christ after three days, He was involved in what we would today call a catechism class (vv. 46-47). Christ was both hearing and answering questions from the doctors in verse 46. More than that, He astonished His hearers by posing questions and indicating His understanding of the answers to both His questions and the doctors'. Here we have an excellent example of what our Larger Catechism calls "years and ability to discern the Lord's body" (Larger Catechism, # 177). Christ had reached an age at which it was apparent to all who knew Him that the grace of God was upon Him. At that time, He went to Jerusalem and there He demonstrated by questions and answers His ability to understand what the Passover entailed.

Luke concludes this incident in the life of Christ with the information that the child Jesus continued subject to His parents. He continued to grow in wisdom. He did not simply begin to grow in grace and wisdom and favor at that time. The wisdom had obviously been there previously, both

before going to Jerusalem and while in Jerusalem. We can therefore say that in the case of our Savior, His first Passover meal was eaten after He had shown both years and ability. Our model caused us to expect that in the case of children being admitted to the Passover we would see prior or contemporary catechetical instruction. That is precisely what we find in the New Testament, even in the case of our Lord.

Our model requires us to expect more than pilgrimages and catechism, however. Our model additionally requires that there would be a counting near the Passover, and that it would specifically be a counting of adult males (men). For an examination of that aspect, we must turn to some parallel passages in the New Testament: John 6:1-13 together with Matthew 14:15-21, Mark 6:30-44, and Luke 9:12-17. These are definitely parallel passages, because in each we find 5,000 men, five loaves, two fishes and twelve baskets full of fragments.

Many paedocommunionists make the claim that the count that was commanded in Exodus 12 was to include the entire family and that the entire family, including women and children, was to partake of the Passover with the adult males. They produce as evidence for this the fact that everyone ate the manna in the wilderness and that Elkanah's family partook of the offering in I Samuel chapter one.

But if paedocommunionists want to know how the counting for lambs worked, the best and irrefutable way to do it would be to find an example in Scripture of that very counting taking place, and not to resort to the eating of manna or bullocks. Does Scripture contain such an example? If the paedocommunionist cannot produce an example from Scripture of either infants or young children taking part in the Passover or the Lord's Supper, then he has no argument. But he claims that the counting that is to take place for the lambs is precisely that example. If we show that the counting that took place was of men only and not of entire families regardless of age or sex, then the paedocommunionist has no further argument.

John tells us in John 6:4 that the Passover was near. John apparently included this information to let us know why such a large company was following the Lord on this occasion. Because it was near the Passover, we can understand why such a large crowd would be walking through the Galilean wilderness. They were on their way to Jerusalem; and they had a count of the number of men in the party. We do not have scriptural information on the age of the lad in the party who gave his lunch to Andrew, but from Luke 2:40 ff. we can surmise that he was at least twelve years old. The Greek word that is translated "lad" in John 6:9 is paidavrion which, according to Bauer's Greek-English Lexicon, means "a youth who is no longer a child" or "a young slave."

In John 6:10, the disciples (i.e., the apostles) made the men sit down on the grass; and we are told that the men numbered about five thousand. The disciples then distributed fish and barley loaves to them that were set down (v. 11). After gathering up twelve baskets full of fragments, the passage tells us, "then those men, when they had seen . . ." (v. 14). The parallel passage in Matthew is even clearer, for in Matthew 14:21 we read, "And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children." It is very clear that the count was of men only (not because this was Passover, but because Passover was nigh).

The word used in Matthew 14:21 is often made to read besides, as though the men were in addition to women and children who were also present but uncounted. Although that alone would be sufficient to prove that the counting for the lambs was a counting of men only, the underlying Greek is even more devastating to the paedocommunionist's view. The Greek of v. 21 is *chôris gunaikon*, i.e. *chôris* plus genitive. The primary meaning of *chôris* plus genitive is "separated from someone, far from someone, without someone" (e.g. I Corinthians 11:11, which reads, "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the

Lord” [emphasis added]). Note also that the cognates of this preposition have similar meanings. The verb means “divide” or “separate” and the noun, *chôrismos*, means “a division.” So Matthew 14:21 at least teaches that the men (only) were numbered for the Passover feast.

Mark 6:44 seems also to bear this out, for Mark informs us “they that did eat of the loaves were about five thousand men.” Period! Also Luke 9:13-14 says that “all this people” consisted of “about five thousand men.” The only gospel that mentions women and children insists that the men were apart from them with the Passover nigh (Matthew 14:21; cf. John 6:4).

A further confirmation of our Old Testament model is found in the concern, particularly just prior to Passover, on the part of many people in the New Testament. During the last week of Christ’s earthly ministry, for example, He referred to the Pharisees as “whited sepulchres.” Alfred Edersheim, in his book *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services as They Were at the Time of Christ*, explains the background for this (pp. 216-217).

“In general, cemeteries were outside the cities; but any dead body found in the field was (according to an ordinance which tradition traces up to Joshua) to be buried on the spot where it had been discovered. Now, as the festive pilgrims [to the Passover] might have contracted ‘uncleanness’ by unwitting contact with such graves, it was ordered that all ‘sepulchres’ should be ‘whitened’ a month before the Passover. It was, therefore, evidently in reference to what He actually saw going on around Him at the time He spoke, that Jesus compared the Pharisees ‘unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness.’”

Similar examples are found throughout the gospels, but particularly in John, of meticulous attention to the details of ceremonial or Levitical cleanness at the time of the Passover. In John 11:55, many of the Jews of that day “went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the Passover, to purify themselves.” We are told that when the Chief Priests took Jesus to Pilate, “they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover” (John 18:28b). This purification, or preparation, continued through the entirety of the week of the feast of unleavened bread. In fact, that entire week was known as Passover at that time because the commencement of it was the Passover day. John chapter nineteen affords several examples of the attention to this preparation or purification (see John 19:14, 31, 42).

We find in the New Testament, then, exactly what our model or hypothesis would suggest, viz., meticulous attention to the details of Levitical cleanness at the time of the Passover. The tragic part of this detailed attention on the part of the Pharisees is that they had great concern over the typical but not for what was being represented by the types. Their concern, in other words, was only for the outward ceremonies and not for the inward heart relationship toward God that was required by II Chronicles 30:6-8.

The Pharisees, Chief Priests and Scribes had perverted the meaning and intent of God’s law. That should come as no surprise, because they had also perverted the meaning of the Sabbath (Matthew 12:2, 7; John 5:16, 18; 7:23-24), honoring father and mother (Matthew 15:4-9; Mark 7:8-13) and the righteousness of the law in general (Matthew 5:20; 20:18; etc.). But the fact that the Pharisees perverted God’s law should not cause us to lose sight of the fact that God’s law enjoined the Jews to examine themselves and to discern the proper applications of God’s law. This is a requirement that was placed only on adult males at the sacrament of the Passover (Deuteronomy 16:2, 16-17). With the advent of Christ, we no longer have priests to examine us with respect to God’s law (cf. Numbers 9:1-13), but are required to examine ourselves. This should shed some additional light on Paul’s intention in I Corinthians 11:27-30 when we come to that place in Scripture.

We come now to the actual institution of the Lord's Supper by Christ. Significantly, the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper took place at Christ's last Passover. In becoming our Passover the next day (I Corinthians 5:7; 11:23 ff.), Christ additionally abrogated the Passover together with all the Old Testament ceremonial feasts (Hebrews 8:4-5; Colossians 2:14-17; cf. Westminster Confession 19:3).

Luke identifies the feast of unleavened bread with the Passover in Luke 22:1, "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover." The original institution of the Passover included not only the actual Passover meal, but an entire week of eating no leaven (see Exodus 12:15-17 and Leviticus 23:5-8). This will become evident when we examine Paul's injunction in I Corinthians 5:7 to "purge out the old leaven."

In Luke 22:7 we read that "the day of unleavened bread" is identical to the day in which the "Passover must be killed." Luke goes on in verse 13 to inform us that after finding an appropriate place within the city of Jerusalem "they made ready the Passover." Christ then proceeded at that very Passover meal to institute the Lord's Supper in verses 19-20.

At this meal we see precisely what our Old Testament model led us to expect. Although Christ had shown supreme love for His female disciples and for children during His earthly ministry, at this Passover meal only adult males were invited. The meal did not take place in His hometown of Nazareth nor in His adopted hometown of Capernaum, nor even in His birthplace of Bethlehem, but in Jerusalem within sight of the temple.

At this point we know from scriptural testimony that at least Peter was married, for Matthew 8:14-15 refers to his mother-in-law. But not only are no children present, there are no wives present either. We would additionally expect from Exodus 12:45 that no servants would be present, and we learn from John 13:4 ff. that such was the case. Moreover, the Passover was to be an evening meal, and we learn from Matthew 26:20 that "when even was come, He sat down with the twelve."

We should additionally expect a count of adult males for the meal. Matthew 26:20 informs us that "He sat down with the twelve." Mark 14:17 tells us "And in the evening He cometh with the twelve." Luke 22:14 refers to the fact that "He sat down and the twelve apostles with Him."

There was a heightened concern also on the part of Christ and His apostles over ceremonial cleanness as represented by the purging of leaven from the entire dwelling in which the meal took place. Matthew 26:17 clearly indicates that the preparation for Passover involved more than simply buying the provisions. The disciples came to Jesus on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread and asked, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Passover?" If we had no Old Testament background for this question, we might suppose that the disciples were merely asking Christ where they should rent a room. But we know that as part of the preparation for Passover, Exodus 12:15 commanded, "even the first day [of the feast of unleavened bread] ye shall put away leaven out of your houses."

The ancient Israelites were commanded not to eat any leaven for the entire period of the feast. But more than that, they were required to purge out the leaven from their houses on the first day of the feast. This typified their responsibility to remain pure during their entire lives, but especially during Passover week (Leviticus 2:4-5, 11; cf. Matthew 16:6, 11-12). This, of course, is also typified by the required Levitical cleanness of Numbers 9:1-13.

So at the final Passover and first Lord's Supper we have found exactly what our model demanded that we find. There was a counting of adult males only, household servants were not present, no women or children were present, there was a heightened concern over ceremonial cleanness and it was eaten on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, during the evening meal.

Someone might object at this point that this could not have been Passover because John 18:28 tells us that the servants of the high priest had not yet eaten the Passover. Furthermore, it was still the “preparation of the Passover” when Pilate delivered Christ for crucifixion (John 19:14 ff.). Also, John 19:31 and 42 inform us that it was still the “Jews’ preparation day” when Jesus died and was laid in His sepulchre. All of these events took place after Christ had instituted the Lord’s Supper, so if it was still the “preparation,” surely the Lord’s Supper was not instituted during the Passover meal.

The difficulty with leaning so heavily on John’s testimony taken alone is that the synoptic gospels are unanimous in their claim that the supper was, in fact, the Passover meal. The difficulty, in other words, does not lie in harmonizing all four gospels, but only in harmonizing John’s gospel with the other three. Specifically, John 13:29; 18:28; 19:14; 19:31 and 19:42 seem to indicate that the Passover meal was still future right up to the time of Christ’s entombment. But this objection misses the importance of Luke 22:1, in which the entire feast of unleavened bread is called the Passover.

Luke, though possibly a Gentile convert himself, is following Old Testament usage by referring to the entire seven-day festival as Passover. Deuteronomy 16:2-3 speaks of sacrificing the Passover and “seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith.” When the Passover was eaten in the days of King Josiah, it again was kept for seven days, as it had been in the days of Hezekiah (II Chronicles 35:17; 30:21).

The “preparation of the Passover,” then, could be referring to the remainder or some part of the remainder of the feast of unleavened bread. According to Alfred Edersheim, in the work cited earlier, a special Chagigah was offered on the day after Passover. “It is this second Chagigah which the Jews were afraid they might be unable to eat, if they contracted defilement in the judgment-hall of Pilate” (p. 218). This would also explain that the feast mentioned in John 13:29 is not merely the Passover meal, but the entire feast of unleavened bread (Exodus 12:15-17; Leviticus 23:6-8; etc.).

We have learned previously that the Passover and subsequent feast of unleavened bread required a detailed knowledge of God’s law. The participants were to “examine themselves” for conformity to the law and to refrain from eating if they were in any way ceremonially defiled. Although the Pharisees had polluted this requirement with their own leaven, or impure doctrine, nevertheless they still had respect to the letter of God’s requirement. Paul has not added a new requirement of self-examination to the Old Testament sacrament, but has stated the Old Testament principle in New Testament terms.

Anti-paedocommunionists today do not, properly speaking, add a requirement to the New Testament sacrament which was not present already for the people of God in the Old Testament. Westminster Confessional Presbyterians do not narrow the covenant of grace as do anti-paedobaptists. The infants of the Church enjoy all the privileges of the covenant under the new economy that they did under the old. As they were circumcised, so are they baptized. As they were taught to examine themselves and then confirmed by catechism before partaking of Passover, so are they before partaking of the Lord’s Supper.

This brings us finally to Paul’s interpretation of Passover in light of the death and resurrection of Christ. The paedocommunionists are correct when they say that Paul gives no separate instructions for children. What they fail to observe is that the reason no separate instructions are needed is that the children never rightfully partook of the Passover. Without so much as a single example of children partaking of Passover apart from catechism in either the Old Testament or Gospels, we should not expect Paul to repeat the requirement that children are to ask meaningful questions and

receive understandable answers. Rather, what we should expect is an explanation from Paul of the spiritual significance of the Passover (II Corinthians 3:6). Such is just what we find in the three places in I Corinthians in which Paul treats of the Passover and Lord's Supper.

As we have learned, Passover was the first day of the feast of unleavened bread (Exodus 12:15-17; Leviticus 23:6-8; John 13:29; etc.). We saw that the Israelites were to refrain from eating leaven, but also that they were required to "put away leaven out of your houses." Furthermore, we saw that the Old Testament meal offering was without leaven (Leviticus 2:11; 6:17; etc.). Leaven is obviously typical of something beyond itself.

Numbers 9:1-13 taught us that any sort of Levitical uncleanness would disqualify even a circumcised adult male from keeping Passover. The men who approached Moses and Aaron in Numbers 9 were apparently aware of their state of ceremonial uncleanness (Numbers 5:2) and thus they asked, "Wherefore are we kept back" from the Passover? The question is a legitimate one in those circumstances. Exactly one year earlier the men of Israel had been commanded to slay the Passover, "and this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever" (Exodus 12:14; cf. vv. 17, 24, 42;

13:10). Now a second time God commanded Israel to keep the Passover "in his appointed season: according to all the rites of it, and according to all the ceremonies thereof, shall ye keep it" (Numbers 9:4).

These men desired to offer an offering to the Lord, but were unqualified to do so. Their awareness of their condition in light of God's law prevented them from partaking of Passover at that time. The spiritual significance of a people sanctified to the Lord was to be maintained. Just as there was a spiritual significance to purging out the leaven from their houses, so was there a spiritual significance to each man examining himself in light of God's law.

Both Christ and Paul speak in the New Testament of the true spiritual significance of leaven. Christ warns us of the leaven of false doctrine (Matthew 16:6) and Paul warns us of the leaven of a defective life (I Corinthians 5:6-8). These two cannot be separated, for the Scriptures principally teach "what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man" (Shorter Catechism, # 3, emphasis added).

Paul used the illustration of the Passover to insist that the Church is to discipline those whose lives continue out of accord with the teaching of God's law. Paul asked the Corinthian Church in I Corinthians 5:6, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" All leaven is dangerous, Paul insisted. Even one fornicator in the Church will corrupt the entire Church, just as a little leaven in the house disqualified the ancient Israelite from the feast. The command that Paul then gives us is not a new command, but the obvious application of Exodus 12:15 and Leviticus 2:11. Purge out the leaven and keep the feast! But notice that the unleavened bread of our lives is "sincerity and truth." Sincerity is here used for pure motives, as it is in II Corinthians 2:17. We saw the importance of pure motives in offering sacrifices when we looked at the offerings of Cain and Abel. We saw that one of the things that made the offering of Abel acceptable to God was that it was offered from pure motives. Now here, Paul insists that the Lord's Supper must also be celebrated with the unleavened bread of sincerity or purity of motive. This is an obviously adult requirement, even as it was in the case of Abel's sacrifice.

The word for "truth" is also a term that implies rationality at least to the extent necessary to discern the true from the false. Paul in verse 8 insists that the feast of unleavened bread was and still is to be observed with the adult-like qualities of pure godly motivation and the discernment to know truth from error. If it should be objected at this point that Paul applies sincerity and truth only to

adult participants, then we must once again remind the reader that any children present at the Passover were to ask, "What mean ye by this service?"

Any children present at the service were required to be sufficiently rational to ask and, we suppose, understand the meaning of the service. But Paul additionally informs us that the meaning of unleavened bread has to do with motives and discernment. Here then we see the reason for children being held back until such time as they demonstrate sufficient lucidity to inquire into the actual meaning of the ordinance. The men in Numbers 9:1-13 were held back because after examining themselves in light of God's law, they found themselves unclean. They had the years and ability to make that discernment. Paul declared in I Corinthians 5:8 that all who keep the feast must do so with pure motives and discernment.

Paul makes his next reference to the Lord's Supper (table) in I Corinthians 10. He introduces his subject with the reminder, "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (v. 15). He begins his reference to the table by speaking of the cup of blessing.

This was the third cup of wine at the "Permanent" Passover. Remember that the Passover usually was accompanied by four cups of wine; hardly a beverage or quantity fitting for infants. Although it is not mentioned in Exodus 12, the wine was an integral part of the meal as seen from the institution of the Lord's Supper and from Paul's reference to it here in I Corinthians 10:16. The implication is unmistakable that wine is part and parcel of the Lord's Supper and furthermore that in drinking it we also bless it. This matter of "blessing" is also important for our discussion.

The term "we bless" is present indicative active of the verb eulogeô, "speak well of." The Lord's Supper, in other words, requires rational speech on the part of the participant. This is precisely the sort of rational speech used in the catechetical exercise required in Exodus 12:26-27. When children finally became old enough to take a catechetical role in the Passover, they were required to ask, "What mean ye by this service?" They did not simply ask what their fathers were doing. That would be obvious enough. Rather, they asked about the spiritual significance of what they saw their fathers doing. Then, as the fathers answered that it was the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, the people would bow their heads and worship (or "speak well of" or "bless") the Lord Himself (Exodus 12:27). It is also the rational speech in which our Savior was engaged in Luke 2:47 where "all that heard Him were astonished at His understanding and answers" [emphasis added], at the age of twelve. Therefore, when the apostle Paul provides instruction respecting the Lord's Supper, it is unnecessary for him to state that infants are not participants; rather, he presupposes that they are not.

We come finally to the passage to which anti-paedocommunionists usually and naturally refer first. "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (I Corinthians 11:27-32).

It was a general principle of Old Testament Levitical cleanness that the unclean person was to be examined and then undergo whatever ritual was appropriate for his cleansing. This was so much a part of the Old Testament economy that God told Israel through Moses and Aaron, "But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord" (Numbers 19:20).

For example, a suspected leper was brought to the priest for examination. This was not because the priest was a doctor, but because the priest was expected to know the details of the law of God sufficiently to be able to examine and verify a case of leprosy. “When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh a rising . . . then he shall be brought unto Aaron the priest, or unto one of his sons the priests . . . then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is a leprosy” (Leviticus 13:2, 8).

There are no longer specific persons set aside as priests in the New Testament. Instead, each professor is a priest unto God (I Peter 2:9). Along with this privilege comes the responsibility of knowing the law sufficiently to be able to examine oneself. The laws regarding leprosy have passed with the passing of the ceremonial law, but the weightier matters of God’s moral law remain (Westminster Confession, ch. 19). The partakers of the Lord’s Supper are now responsible before God to “examine themselves of their knowledge to discern the Lord’s body, of their faith to feed upon Him, of their repentance, love, and new obedience; lest coming unworthily, they eat and drink judgment to themselves” (Shorter Catechism, # 97).

Paul requires the same thing of the partaker of the Lord’s Supper that was required of the partaker of the Passover in the Old Testament. There are some differences, obviously, between the Old Testament sacrament and the New Testament sacrament. But the spiritual aspects of the meals are the same and Paul insists throughout the book of First Corinthians that those spiritual aspects be acknowledged. This is not an ordinary meal, but a sacramental meal which points beyond itself. Paul requires that we understand that there is a spiritual significance to the meal and that we be able to understand what the spiritual significance is.

Just as the unrepentant were disqualified from the Passover, they are also disqualified from the Lord’s Supper. Just as the uncircumcised were disqualified from the Passover, the unbaptized are disqualified from the Lord’s Supper. Just as the uncatechized were disqualified from the Passover, they are also disqualified from the Lord’s Supper. Partakers must be able to examine themselves and in order to do that they must have a reasonable understanding of God’s law.

In the Old Testament, a priest was required for the examination due to his specialized knowledge of the law of God. Today we are to examine ourselves by the same standard. Such examination presupposes a knowledge of the law and the ability to apply it properly. In short, it requires previous catechetical instruction.

This should not be used as a discouragement to the young children in the church. Rather, it should be an encouragement to them to learn and properly apply the means that God has given for holy living. “But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people: because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin” (Numbers 9:13). It is not simply desirable to partake of the sacrament, it is as important as is baptism (Genesis 17:14). Avoiding the sacramental meal does not avoid judgment.

Our children should be encouraged to partake in their appointed season. When the child has learned enough to make a good confession he should fear God and partake of the meal. But how does a session know that the child is truly confirmed in the faith (the session does not confirm, but acknowledges the confirmation of the child)? The answer is that the child must exhibit an understanding of what it is to partake of the sacrament worthily. To the parents of such children, this means catechize, catechize, catechize your children. To the children of the Church this means catechize, catechize, diligently catechize and ask until you understand the answer to the question, “What mean ye by this service?”

On the basis of the Shorter Catechism (# 97), just as adults in the church do, the children should continue to ask themselves these four questions:

- (1) Am I a believer?
- (2) Do I judge my actions by God's law?
- (3) Do I love God and my neighbor?
- (4) Am I dealing with the sin that God has revealed?

These are the issues of life and it is to these very issues that the Lord's Supper calls each of us: "It is required of them that would worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, that they examine themselves of their knowledge to discern the Lord's body, of their faith to feed upon him, of their repentance, love, and new obedience; lest, coming unworthily, they eat and drink judgment to themselves" (Shorter Catechism, # 97).

Some perceptive readers may now be asking an interesting question. This paper has shown that only adult males communed at the Passover. While that clearly eliminates infants and young children from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it seems also to eliminate female participation. The pursuant question may be expressed, "Does the Church have any biblical warrant for allowing women to the Lord's Supper?"

Exodus chapter twelve limited Passover participants to circumcised adults. Because women were never circumcised in Israel, they never rightfully partook of the Passover. Additionally, the problem and solution presented in Numbers chapter nine treated even adult females as non-participants. An objection could be raised at this point that if this paper is correct, then women as well as children should be kept back from the Lord's Supper. However, such is not the teaching of Scripture, the Westminster Confession, or this paper.

This appendix is not a study of the role of women in the Church. That may be a worthwhile study in itself, but the purpose of this appendix is to clarify that women should not be barred from the Lord's Supper solely on the basis of their sex. As baptized adult members of Christ's Church, they are subject to the same restrictions regarding the sacraments as are men.

In the Old Testament women never received the token of the covenant. In the New Testament Church, however, women as well as men (or girls as well as boys) receive the covenantal seal. It is at least possible that John the Baptizer baptized women as well as men. Luke 3:21 informs us, "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened . . ." There is also an intimation of female baptism in the great commission of Matthew 28:19-20, where the risen Christ told His apostles, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you . . ."

By Acts chapter eight, however, the apostolic example is clear. Acts 8:12 explains, "But when they believed Phillip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." These were, of course, Samaritans. But Gentile women also received the sign of the covenant upon believing, as in the case of Lydia in Acts 16:15. From these specific examples we can surmise that "he and all his" includes the jailor's wife and female children as well as his male children (Acts 16:33).

The apostolic example is further confirmed by apostolic teaching in Galatians 3:27-28. There Paul teaches, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Paul explains that for those who have received the sacrament of baptism, the former distinction between the Jew and the stranger as established by Exodus 12:43 is passed away. Furthermore, the "hired servant" who has been baptized into Christ is no longer to be excluded from the covenant on the basis of such a text as Exodus 12:45. Finally Paul teaches that females who have been baptized into Christ are also communicant members of the Church.

But Paul does not say that there is neither child nor adult. He leaves in place the prohibition against infants and young children partaking of the sacrament. In fact, Paul uses the distinction between adult understanding and childish "understanding" to illustrate spiritual truths in I Corinthians 3:1-3 and I Corinthians 13:11. The writer of Hebrews has a similar distinction in mind in Hebrews 5:12-6:2.

In the New Testament, the scope of the gospel expanded into the whole world (cf. Matthew 28:19-20). In that context women first began to receive baptism as the new token of the covenant. Infant males, even in the Old Testament, were first circumcised and then communed after demonstrating that they understood the meaning of the Passover (Exodus 12:26, etc.). Just as circumcision was

APPENDIX A: FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE LORD'S SUPPER

one of the prerequisites for eating the Passover, baptism is now one of the prerequisites for eating the Lord's Supper. But understanding and discernment were then and continue to be further prerequisites to communing. While an adult female (woman) is therefore potentially qualified to partake of the Lord's Supper, neither infant males nor infant females can be thus qualified.

The question which we sought to answer was, "Does the Church have any biblical warrant for allowing women to the Lord's Supper?" We found upon examination that apostolic example and teaching extended the sacraments to females. The answer is therefore, "Yes, the Church does have biblical warrant for allowing women to the Lord's Supper."

Vance Lemasters, in concluding his Journey Magazine article, “A Position Paper on Paedocommunion,” made a number of charges against the Westminster Confessional position against paedocommunion. He claimed that repentance is required “on the part of those who forbid covenant children to partake of the Lord’s Supper.” The body of this paper addressed that issue. While a defense of the Reformed view may be in order, it has been demonstrated that the view is a biblical one. Additionally, however, Lemasters made some unsupportable charges against the Reformers themselves.

Earlier in that article Mr. Lemasters stated, “. . . it becomes evident that the Reformers and writers of the Westminster Confession allowed the influence of the Roman Catholic tradition to shape their view of not allowing children to receive the elements [of the Lord’s Supper].” Although Mr. Lemasters called this “evident,” he supplied not one bit of “evidence” apart from noticing that in chapter 29 of the Westminster Confession of Faith “no mention is made of the inclusion of infants and children.” Perhaps Mr. Lemasters is aware of evidence, but he presents it nowhere in his article.

This argument in a slightly different form is often used by anti-paedobaptists to justify withholding baptism from their children. They claim that the Reformers simply adopted the practice of Rome in baptizing their children. This claim is as unsupportable as is Lemasters’ claim that the Reformers, including Calvin and the Westminster divines, simply adopted the view of Romanism with respect to forbidding infants and young children to the Lord’s Supper.

This charge must fight uphill against the evidence, for Calvin himself had nothing but disdain for the traditions of Romanism. With reference to Paul’s statement in Colossians 2:23, Calvin says “human traditions . . . deceive under the appearance of wisdom” (Institutes of the Christian Religion, IV:x:11). Furthermore, Calvin went on to say, “Now, this is the reason why Paul so urgently warns us not to be deceived by the traditions of men” (Institutes, IV:x:24). Accusing the Reformed position of merely inheriting traditions from Rome denies what the Reformers were doing. In fact, with specific reference to the sacraments, Calvin stated, “What, therefore, was practiced under Papal tyranny involved a monstrous profanation of the mysteries. For they thought it enough if the priest mumbled the formula of consecration while the people looked on bewildered and without comprehension” (Institutes, IV:xiv:4, emphasis added). This hardly sounds like someone who is “allowing the influence of Roman Catholic tradition to shape his view!”

Calvin continued to explain his difference from Romanism, “You see how the sacrament requires preaching to beget faith. And we need not labor to prove this when it is perfectly clear what Christ did, what He commanded us to do, what the apostles followed, and what the purer church observed. Indeed, it was known even from the beginning of the world that whenever God gave a sign to the holy patriarchs it was inseparably linked to doctrine, without which our senses would have been stunned in looking at the bare sign. Accordingly, when we hear the sacramental word mentioned, let us understand the promise, proclaimed in a clear voice by the minister, to lead the people by the hand wherever the sign tends and directs us” (Institutes, IV:xiv:4, emphasis added). These again are not the words of one who is simply, blindly and vainly following the traditions of men.

The Romanist doctrine of the sacraments is that they work grace *ex opere operato*. This is the view of sacramentalism — that the sacraments work grace of their own accord. It really implies that the sacraments have a magical, or at least miraculous, effect by some virtue that is present in them. Calvin and the Westminster Standards warn against this. Westminster Shorter Catechism # 91 states, “The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them; but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of His Spirit in them that by faith receive them.”

Calvin said much the same thing when he refuted the traditions of Romanist sacramentalism. “But the sacraments properly fulfill their office only when the Spirit, that inward teacher, comes to them, by whose power alone hearts are penetrated and affections moved and our souls opened for the sacraments to enter in” (Institutes, IV:xiv:9). Calvin went on to say “any man is deceived who thinks anything more is conferred upon him through the sacraments than what is offered by God’s Word and received by him in true faith” (Institutes, IV:xiv:14). Calvin accounted it vice, “by not lifting our minds beyond the visible sign, to transfer to it the credit for those benefits which are conferred upon us by Christ alone” (Institutes, IV:xiv:16, emphasis added).

Having established (as though such were truly necessary) that Calvin was not inclined blindly and vainly to receive Popish traditions, especially concerning the sacraments, let us examine Calvin’s words on the subject of paedocommunion. Calvin was a careful student of ecclesiastical history and was fully cognizant of the fact that paedocommunion had begun to be practiced in approximately 250 A.D. Nevertheless he applauded its discontinuance as being scriptural (Institutes, IV:xvi:30). Furthermore, Calvin did not cite Popish authorities or traditions for excluding infants from the Lord’s Supper, but cited the fact that infants and young children were excluded from the Passover. “Circumcision, which is known to correspond to our baptism, had been appointed for infants [Genesis 17:12]. But the Passover, the place of which has been taken by the Supper, did not admit all guests indiscriminately, but was duly eaten only by those who were old enough to be able to inquire into its meaning [Exodus 12:26]. If these men had a particle of sound brain left, would they be blind to a thing so clear and obvious?” These are not the words of one who “allowed the influence of Roman Catholic tradition to shape his view of not allowing children to receive the elements,” nor of one who “never had to deal seriously with the issue.”

Lemasters goes on to accuse anti-paedocommunionists of “faulty exegesis” of I Corinthians 11:27-29. He insists that the causes for eating and drinking unworthily be limited to those specific sins and excesses “listed in vv. 17-22.” But this is not the Reformed understanding of the passage, nor does it accord with the principle of analogy of the Scripture. Fornication with one’s stepmother is not specifically mentioned in vv. 17-22, but we know from chapter five of the same epistle that such an one is to be suspended from the Supper (I Corinthians 5:1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13). Mr. Lemasters is himself guilty of “faulty exegesis” if he wishes to limit “suspendable offences” to those listed in vv. 17-22. Paul is rather laying down a principle and the sins listed in vv. 17-22 served as the occasion for it.

According to Calvin, here is the principle that Paul enjoined upon the Corinthians:

“By this (as I interpret it), he meant that each man descend into himself, and ponder with himself whether he rests with inward assurance of heart upon the salvation purchased by Christ; whether he acknowledges it by confession of mouth; then, whether he aspires to the imitation of Christ with the zeal of innocence and holiness; whether, after Christ’s example, he is prepared to give himself for his brethren and to communicate himself to those with whom he shares Christ in common; whether, as he is counted a member by Christ, he in turn so holds all his brethren as members of his body; whether he desires to cherish, protect, and help them as his own members” (Institutes, IV:xviii:40).

It is also in this context that Lemasters approvingly draws our attention to James B. Jordan’s statement, “Once the sacrament becomes ‘special,’ however, people want to keep it ‘special’ by having it only infrequently The exclusion of children is part and parcel of this error of viewing the sacrament as something ‘special.’” Jordan is right in saying that anti-paedocommunionists view the Lord’s Supper as “something special.” However, he is incorrect in saying that infrequent communion follows necessarily from this view and that the view is erroneous. The Lord’s Supper is a holy ordinance and Westminster Confession (29:3) teaches us, “The Lord Jesus hath, in this

ordinance, appointed His ministers to declare His Word of institution to the people, to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to a holy use . . .” (emphasis added — see also Larger Catechism # 169).

Yet our Presbyterian standards teach quite the opposite of infrequent communion. The Larger Catechism (# 175) exhorts us to the duty of “frequent attendance on that ordinance” and explains that “the Lord’s Supper is to be administered often” (#177). This is in full agreement with Calvin who said of the sacrament, “It was ordained to be frequently used among all Christians in order that they might frequently return in memory to Christ’s Passion, by such remembrance to sustain and strengthen their faith, and urge themselves to sing thanksgiving to God and to proclaim His goodness” (Institutes, IV:xvii:44).

Lemasters also complains “the practice of covenant children appearing before session before being allowed communion smacks of incipient Arminianism.” He equates this practice with that of “making a personal decision for Christ.” Hopefully a covenant child brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord will make countless personal decisions for Christ, but that is not the issue. The issue is the same as it was in the case of the child in Exodus 12:26 who was to inquire into the meaning of the sacrament.

Here is Calvin’s advice to sessions: “Not that it would be a confirmation such as they [Papists] fancy, which cannot be named without doing injustice to baptism; but a catechizing, in which children or those near adolescence would give an account of their faith before the Church.” Notice that Calvin here presumes the faith — the children are not “deciding” to believe, but giving account of their faith.

Calvin continued, “A child of ten would present himself to the Church to declare his confession of faith, would be examined in each article, and answer to each; if he were ignorant of anything or insufficiently understood it, he would be taught. Thus, while the Church looks on as a witness, he would profess the one true and sincere faith, in which the believing folk with one mind worship the one God” (Institutes, IV:xix:13).

In conclusion, we have examined the words of John Calvin and the Westminster Standards and learned that Vance Lemasters made a number of accusations in his article that are either untrue or based on a misunderstanding of the Reformers. Although Lemasters claimed that the Reformers “allowed the influence of Roman Catholic tradition to shape their view,” Calvin rejected the Romanist understanding of tradition and based his exclusion of infants from the Lord’s Supper on Exodus 12:26 and I Corinthians 11:27-32.

Lemasters faulted anti-paedocommunionists with faulty exegesis of I Corinthians 11:27-32, insisting that only those sins listed in vv. 17-22 of that passage were sufficient to cause one to partake unworthily. But we found in chapter five of the same epistle that the sins listed in vv. 17-22 were the occasion, but not the exclusive cause, of being held back from the Supper.

Finally, we showed from Confession, Catechism and Calvin that a proper view of the sacrament requires both that we see the Supper as holy and that we celebrate it frequently. Each of Lemasters’ accusations fails. Reformed Churches should continue to fence the sacramental table as has been done from at least the institution of the Passover. They should continue to encourage their covenant children to inquire into the meaning of the sacrament. And parents and Churches should together continue to catechize their covenant children until such time as they “are of years and ability to examine themselves.”

In the main body of this paper an allusion was made to the fact that paedocommunionists such as Chris Keidel have adduced the fact that young children ate the manna in the wilderness as an argument in support of their position. The initial gathering of the manna is recorded in Exodus chapter sixteen. However, the event is of such a nature in the history of redemption that it is recalled several times in Scripture and reference is made to it as late as the book of Revelation.

There was no indication when the manna was given that it was in any way sacramental. However, Christ in the Gospel of John and Paul in First Corinthians indicated that the eating of manna was typical of spiritual truth. Furthermore, Paul mentioned the manna in a context between a baptism and a subsequent consideration of the Lord's Supper. This has apparently caused a certain amount of confusion on the part of some. The purpose of this appendix is to clarify the relationship between manna and the Lord's Supper.

1 Corinthians 10:1-4

Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.

The word translated “moreover” and appearing as the first word in the AV is the Greek word *gar*. This word is a conjunction which, according to the Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich lexicon, is “used to express cause, inference, continuation, or to explain.” We can therefore expect in what follows it a continuation or explanation of what has preceded it.

But what has preceded it? Paul's statement in First Corinthians 9:27, “I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.” Paul was not running an uncertain race; he was not merely “shadow-boxing.” He knew that not everyone who begins a race finishes it and that not every runner receives a prize. Paul intended to proceed in First Corinthians 10:1-14 to explain by example what he meant by “castaway” (*adokimos* —unable to stand the test, rejected, refuse, worthless, disqualified).

The tenth chapter of First Corinthians presents us with several illustrations or “examples” for the church. The first is the one-time instance of Israel (*qua* Israel and not *qua* individuals) being baptized unto Moses. This reference is not to individual water baptisms, but to the day of Pentecost. Note the later reference in First Corinthians 12:13 that all have been made to drink into one spirit (literally, “have all been drenched in one spirit” on the day of Pentecost when the Spirit was poured upon the church and drenched her).

The important thing to understand for the purpose of this study is that each event occurred once in redemptive history. In the case of Old Testament Israel, the one-time event was the crossing of the Red Sea from captivity to freedom as a nation. New Testament Israel was likewise baptized on the day of Pentecost. Paul alluded not to individual water baptism, but to the baptism of the church once for all on the day of Pentecost. If individual water baptism were in view, then the analogy would not be fitting, for individual Israelites did not “get themselves baptized” (middle voice) unto Moses by crossing the Red Sea as individuals.

In First Corinthians 10:6 Paul claimed that Israel's experiences happened as our examples (*tupoi hêmôn*). In English, the word “example” can mean that which we are required to emulate. However, the Greek word *tupos* can equally be translated as “type.” In fact, that is precisely the translation preferred in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich Lexicon. This further evidences the assertion that the crossing of the Red Sea has a typological significance. If the proper significance of the crossing of the Red Sea is typological, then we should look for an event in the New Testament that corresponds

to as many of the significant factors of the crossing of the Red Sea as possible. Ideally, it would be an event that: 1) takes place only once in history; 2) marks the beginning of the “exodus people”; and 3) is miraculous in its nature (i.e., it is a supernatural occurrence setting God’s people apart from His enemies). The only event that fits all these criteria fully is the descent (baptism) of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

What we have seen at this point requires us to expect that verses 3-4 would have a significance for God’s people as covenant people moreso than as individuals. Obviously we have not ruled-out individualization, but we see it as an outgrowth of God’s dealing with his people covenantally.

Note that not only were infants carried through the Red Sea, but animals were led through it as well. Had Paul intended to make reference to an initiatory sacrament which announced inclusion in the covenant for a new-born infant, then the rite of circumcision would have been the appropriate model. Further, circumcision of the entire nation did take place in Joshua 5:2-9 when the entire nation was circumcised by the Old Testament “Jesus” (cf. Hebrews 4:8). Both the model and the occasion existed for Paul to make reference to individual water baptism if that had been his intent.

Therefore, due to the fact that a more appropriate anti-type (Pentecost) exists for Paul’s typical language and due to the fact that a more appropriate type exists for the would-be anti-type of water baptism, we should conclude (by Occam’s razor) that Paul’s reference in First Corinthians 10:1-2 finds its primary fulfillment in the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

These considerations “set the stage” for the actual verses in controversy, viz. 3-4 “and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink.” There is no question that the reference in verse 3 is to manna and the reference in verse 4a is to water from a rock. The word translated “meat” in verse 3 is *brōma*, which Paul earlier told the Corinthians they were unable to bear. The reference in First Corinthians 3:2 is to solid food as opposed to milk. In other words, the food referenced in First Corinthians 10:3 was food unfit for babes! This is also the word translated “victuals” in Matthew 14:15 at which time only grown men were present (see the discussion above in the body of the paper).

However, I mention the use of *brōma* (solid food) only to indicate that there is nothing in the definition of the word that forces us to conclude that children, much less infants, must have been partakers of the manna. While I think that very small children were likely partakers of the manna, I would be unable to prove that exegetically (the paedocommunionists are equally unable to prove it, but I am willing to concede the point).

We have already demonstrated that there is no reason to think that crossing the Red Sea was analogous to New Testament water baptism. At this point, the paedocommunionist has an uphill battle to prove that eating manna and drinking water (not wine) points to the New Testament sacrament of the Lord’s Supper because the parallelism has been lost. Note that not only did the Israelites drink water rather than wine, it was at a totally different time than the giving of the manna in Exodus 16. There is not even a similarity of purpose between the manna and the (bread of the) Lord’s Supper. The purpose of the manna was to satisfy physical hunger (it was an answer to the murmuring of Exodus 16:3, “ye have brought us forth into this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger” [emphasis added]). This is also the inspired interpretation of Nehemiah, who prayed “and gavest them bread from heaven for their hunger” (Nehemiah 9:15, emphasis added).

A paedocommunionist might object at this point, “But Paul here claims that the bread was spiritual bread. It certainly satisfied their hunger, but it fed them spiritually as well. They fed spiritually on manna just as we feed spiritually on the bread of the Lord’s Supper.” But that is not what Paul said in First Corinthians 10:3. He did not say that they ate spiritually (*pneumatikōs*), but that they ate

spiritual (pneumatikos) food. The things of the Spirit must be discerned spiritually (pneumatikôs) according to Paul in First Corinthians 2:14. But this is done by comparing spiritual things with spiritual (pneumatikos). The latter word is the one used in First Corinthians 10:3.

The word pneumatikos in First Corinthians 10:3 means “superior in process to the natural course of things, miraculous, or having the Holy Spirit as its source.” The manna was certainly miraculous. If it was left overnight it turned into worms . . . except on the day before the Sabbath. It fell every morning . . . except on the morning of the Sabbath. Keil and Delitzsch spent several pages of their Old Testament Commentary writing of a sort of manna that could still (mid nineteenth century) be harvested in that area. But it did not fall on the Sabbath, nor did it fall in double quantities on the previous day, nor did it turn into worms. No, the manna of Exodus 16 was miraculous (pneumatikos) manna! It was, in fact, the “food of the angels” (Psalm 78:24-25).

The primary purpose of the manna for the people of God was to satisfy physical hunger. Secondly, due to the miraculous provision of both quail and manna, “ye shall know that I the Lord am your God.” But the Lord’s Supper is for precisely the opposite purpose, for Paul said to the Corinthians, “If any man hunger, let him eat at home” (First Corinthians 11:34, emphasis added). The point here is that there is no indication in either Exodus 16 or First Corinthians 10 that the manna had any sacramental significance. God has done numerous “wonderful works” for his people in redemptive history (Exodus 15:11) so that they will know that the Lord is God. But that does not make them repeatable sacraments. There is actually more exegetical evidence for foot-washing as a sacrament in John 13:14 than there is for paedocommunion in all of Scripture.

John 6 has numerous parallels (including the manna/Jesus parallel) to the wilderness wanderings of Old Testament Israel. In fact, the wilderness wanderings period is possibly the best established “type” in the entire Old Testament (First Corinthians 10:1-14; Hebrews 3:15-4:12; etc.).

Note that John 6 begins with people following Christ into the wilderness. Christ then fed them “miraculously” with fish and barley bread. Nevertheless, Christ perceived that the people continued to follow Him, not due to their correct understanding of the miracle (that ye may know that I the Lord am God), but because their hunger had been satisfied (John 6:26). Just like the wilderness generation, the people who followed Christ murmured (verses 30, 31, 34, 41, 52, 60-61, 66). But Christ warned them with the same warning that Paul echoed in First Corinthians 10. “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead” (verse 49). Christ was not so much comparing faith to eating manna as He was contrasting it! For in verse 51 He went on to say, “if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever.”

It is common for Roman Catholic commentators to use this passage to support their sacramentalism, for Christ went on to say, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you” (verse 53). If the eating and drinking spoken of in this passage does, in fact, refer to the Lord’s Supper, then it is obvious on the face of it that receiving the Lord’s Supper is a necessary condition to salvation.

A modus ponens can be formed thus:

Major: If you do not eat & drink the sacrament, then you have no life in you (p implies q)

Minor: But you do not eat & drink the sacrament (assert the antecedent p) Conclusion:

Therefore you have no life in you (therefore the consequent necessarily follows)

Valid as this argument is (and it is valid), it is unsound if the major premise is false. The minor premise will be true for some but not for others. But the Scriptures do not say in John 6:53 that if we do not partake of the sacraments, then we have no life. Rather, the Bible claims that if we do not eat Christ’s flesh and drink His blood, then we have no life in us. The Lord’s Supper was not yet

instituted (it seems to have been instituted between John 13:1 & John 13:2), so it requires a “reading back” in order to come up with anything like sacramentalism.

But there is a positive refutation of sacramentalism (and a definition of what it is to eat Christ’s flesh and drink His blood) within the passage. Note that in verse 54, Christ claimed “whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” In that verse, Christ indicated that the eating and drinking was not only necessary (verse 53), but also sufficient for eternal life. Indeed, if this speaks of the Lord’s Supper, then sacramentalism is true. However, Christ went on to refute sacramentalism.

In John 6:63, Christ said, “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” Note well - the flesh is not what is profitable; it is the words (propositional truth) that are spirit and life. And, of course, Peter went on to confess in verse 68, “Thou hast the words of eternal life.”

So here are Christ’s words: the manna did not profit (your fathers ate it and died). The flesh does not profit (only propositional truth professed in words are spirit and life). What then can this eating and drinking be?

Once again, the context supplies the answer. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life” (verse 47). Christ committed Himself by an oath (verily, verily) that anyone who believes on Him (i.e., “hungers and thirsts after righteousness”) has the everlasting life that eluded the manna-eating fathers who entered not God’s rest due to unbelief (Hebrews 3:18-19; 4:2; cf. Psalm 95:10-11).

Finally, in First Corinthians 10:4, Paul said that the people all drank the same spiritual (pneumatikos) drink. This is apparently a conflation of two incidents that took place during the wilderness wanderings. The first was in Exodus 17 and the second was in Numbers 20. Paul said in verse 4 that the people all drank it once (second aorist tense) when first provided and that they continued to drink it (imperfect tense) because the rock followed them. There was nothing sacramental about drinking this water any more than eating the manna was sacramental. Just as the manna and quails were given to satisfy physical hunger, so the water was given to satisfy physical thirst. What Paul wanted to bring to our attention is that if they had hungered and thirsted after righteousness, they also would have been filled spiritually (cf. Matthew 5:6).

Psalm 106:32 clearly teaches that when the Israelites murmured for water at Kadesh, God was angry with them. Yes, God supplied them with water, but overthrew them for their unbelief. This is the same lesson Paul wanted the Corinthians to learn. The lesson of First Corinthians 10 is the danger of unbelief. Any attempt to read paedocommunion into the passage depends upon superficial similarities and not careful exegesis.

Paedocommunionists often accuse non-paedocommunionists of logical inconsistency. But the view is not really inconsistent at all. Paedobaptism (and paedocircumcision before it) is appropriate to an infant. In much the same way, our children bear our names as soon as they are born. But they do not come into fullness of inheritance until much later. So, in the same way, a covenant child bears the name of Christ as soon as he or she is baptized (Revelation 14:1; 7:3; etc.). But they come into their full inheritance after training. There are, for instance, among the male infants of the church, roughly one in ten who will eventually become elders (Deuteronomy 1:15), but only after proving themselves faithful and being properly trained (Second Timothy 2:2). This teaching establishes that at least some of the fullness of church membership is reserved for mature members. The same thing could be said of teachers. But there is no claim that we are denying anything to our infants if we require that they wait until an appropriate time before considering them for elders. So the charge of

logical inconsistency would only be applicable if baptism and the Lord's Supper were identical sacraments. But if they were identical, then one of them would be unnecessary.

When paedocommunionists were claiming that infants partook of the Passover and are therefore entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper, the controversy was on totally different grounds. The Passover was obviously a sacramental meal and it was obviously replaced by the Lord's Supper. But the manna has nothing to do with any sacrament of either the Old Testament or the New Testament. Why then do paedocommunionists want to bring it into the debate? Their best and only Scriptural argument rests on the Passover. However, that argument has been refuted in the body of this paper.

Before introducing innovations into the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ we must be totally certain that they meet the test of Sola Scriptura. The fact that the argument has shifted from a sacramental meal to a nonsacramental meal gives the impression that it is the practice of the paedocommunionist that is being defended rather than a covenantal hermeneutic.

As I have admitted to paedocommunionists and non-paedocommunionists alike, I find the doctrine very attractive. What I find unattractive is its lack of scriptural or historical support. There is no evidence for the practice prior to 250 AD and none in the western church until nearly 200 years after that. In fact, the rise of paedocommunion took place at the same time as the rise of sacramentalism in the western church.

The infants at Kadesh may or may not have drunk of the miraculous water. We are not told. But we are told that the animals drank of the water (Numbers 20:4, 8, 11). We have water instead of wine and beasts instead of infants, but we are supposed to think that the passage teaches paedocommunion?! In Genesis 14:18 Melchizedek, as priest of the most high God, brought bread and wine to Abram and Abram paid tithes to Melchizedek. There is an obvious foreshadowing of the Lord's Supper. It is served by a priest; it is a sacramental meal; and it consists of bread and wine. Why should we expect a meal that took place fully 430 years later that has none of these elements to be more typical or informative? The doctrine of progressive revelation would insist that a sacramental meal taking place 430 years later would be more informative of Christ, not less. Yet that is the case if the manna and water are considered as sacraments.