



but to rule “Therefore, in the interest of justice, Presbytery now nullifies any and all decisions of that judicial commission.” It was the interpretation of ARC elder Tom Shiffler in a private letter of clarification to Vern Crisler (dated March 5, 1987), that “The bottom line is this: If the plaintiffs were excommunicated on the ground of the contumacy judgment against them by the commission (and this is the clear statement of the Nelson-Chilton letter) then those excommunications are disemboweled.”

2. The ARC presbytery instructed the Westminster Presbyterian Church session (which passed the censures of excommunication) to review its censures. Whether or not the excommunications were acknowledged to be nullified by the Tyler session, they morally ought to have been, per the conclusion of the first point. The WPC session could not in justice maintain the censures in light of their Presbytery’s findings, nor institute the censures upon other grounds without a new trial with the accused present, which did not occur.

3. Between the time of the excommunications in 1983 and the Letter of Confession in 1986, other churches, including presbyterian congregations, knowing the nature of the proceedings and misconduct in Tyler, did not honor the alleged discipline practiced against certain individuals by that session. In particular, in the fall of 1983 Mr. Swearingen was admitted into membership of North Dallas Presbyterian Church (PCA) which later became First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett (PCA, now RPC). Mr. Seekamp and his family joined the next year.

4. Even if #1,2,3 were not the case, and they are beyond *reasonable* dispute, the Rowlett session is required to assess the conflicting claims about the previous affair and make their own good-faith judgment insofar as the facts relevant to that previous affair now bear on the life of its congregation.

5. And the FPCR session’s judgments are: “(a) Rowlett is not and never has been under the jurisdiction of the ARC, nor has it ever had denominational fraternal relations which would require it to acknowledge and implement the judicial decisions of the ARC; indeed, the ARC no longer exists even as a human organization; (b) Rowlett is ashamed of the (openly confessed) injustice and prejudice of the judicial proceedings within the ARC and does not

recognize them as legitimate or of any authority in Christ's church — any more than it must recognize Lutherans as schismatics based on the Pope’s excommunication of Luther; and (c) therefore the session finds Jordan’s allegation that David Seekamp and Gary Swearingen were “excommunicated from Christ's church” and have “never repented and been restored” to be false as to fact, abusive in effect, and presumptuous in character.”

If in knowledge of all these facts, Mr. Jordan proceeded to make these charges against FPCR and Deacon Swearingen and Elder Seekamp, it demonstrates a very malevolent spirit on his part. Evidently, he cannot just disagree, but must vilify those with whom he disagrees, and if he must disregard and distort facts in order to heap upon his opponent a particularly prejudicial charge, he apparently is all too willing to do so. ♦

TIME TABLE OF EVENTS	
<b>January 1981:</b>	The ARC forms as a presbytery made up of two small congregations, the main church being Westminster Presbyterian Church in Tyler, Texas (WPC).
<b>January 1983:</b>	Five men bring charges against the three elders making up the WPC session. A judicial commission is created to handle the case.
<b>February 1983:</b>	The five men along with their families are excommunicated by the <i>accused</i> for contumacy.
<b>Fall 1983:</b>	North Dallas PCA (later FPCR) finds the ARC in error and admits Mr. Swearingen into membership, overturning the excommunication. Mr. Seekamp and his family are admitted later. This decision has never been reversed by higher courts of the PCA.
<b>July 1986:</b>	Two members of the original judicial commission write a letter of confession of sin and error to the ARC presbytery requesting the nullification of the sentences against the five men. The ARC presbytery rules “Therefore, in the interest of justice, Presbytery now nullifies any and all decisions of that judicial commission.” One of the ARC’s own elders in a letter of clarification to another individual clearly interprets this decision to mean that the excommunications were nullified.

THE ARC ITSELF OVERTURNED THE UNJUST SENTENCES
<b>July 1986.</b> The ARC Presbytery itself ruled “Therefore, in the interest of justice, Presbytery now nullifies any and all decisions of that judicial commission.” <i>ARC Presbytery Response to the Chilton-Nelson Letter</i> , p. 5. ARC Elder Tom Shiffler interpreted this as: “The bottom line is this: If the plaintiffs were excommunicated on the ground of the contumacy judgment against them by the commission (and this is the clear statement of the Nelson-Chilton letter) then those excommunications are disemboweled.”

**Letter of Confession of Sin and Error  
By David Chilton and Charles Nelson  
ARC Judicial Commissioners**

July 10, 1986

To the Presbytery of the Association of Reformation Churches:

Reverend Presbyters:

After much reflection and discussion with one another, we, David Chilton and Charles Nelson, former members of a Judicial Commission of the ARC, hereby submit to you this confession of sin and error with regard to the judicial proceedings in which we were involved from January 9, 1983 to February 26, 1983. We respectfully request Presbytery to receive this letter, first, as a sincere attempt to clear our consciences; and, second, as a plaint of nullity against the judgments rendered by our Commission (and thus against any and all judgments, by other courts, resulting from the Commission's judgments).

Note: The appended documents are referred to by their original numbers as they appear in the complete set of Documents appended to the Final Report of the Judicial Commission. [Ed. Note: These are not reprinted].

1. Document No. 5 is a statement drawn up by Mr. John Martin (the third member of the Commission, and its Chairman), which he presented to the Complainants for their signatures. The Complainants were required to state, in part:

I understand and acknowledge that the court before which I am a complainant [margin: or a defendant] or a witness is the highest court in the ARC; and I will abide by its' [sic] judgments and obey its' [sic] verdicts. I also understand and acknowledge that, if the occasion of an appeal to any judgment should arise, that said appeal would have to be made to the same court; and the court would have the final word as to whether the appeal would be in order.

The plain meaning of this statement is that the Judicial Commission itself is claiming to be "the highest court in the ARC," and that no appeal may be made to any other body; in effect, rendering any true appeal impossible. This requirement was written and issued by Mr. Martin without the knowledge or consent of the other two members of the Commission. Later, when this requirement became a matter of controversy, we wrongfully attempted to cover up the error, claiming that the Complainants "knew what we meant," and that of course they would have had opportunity to appeal our court's decisions; but, in fact, this erroneous document was not corrected in writing until the Complainants had been excommunicated. Objectively, all they had to go on was our written statement that they would have no opportunity to lodge a true appeal with any other body.

This same document goes on to require the Complainants to make the following promise:

I also solemnly pledge before the Lord and King of the Church, that I will not, for any reason, take this case or any development from this case to the civil authorities for adjudication.

We agree with the Complainants (as expressed in their letter to us, Document No. 6, pp. 4-6) that there are serious flaws in this requirement, and that they should not have been ordered (or even requested) to sign it. In sum, Doc. No. 5 constitutes a most serious offense against justice by the Judicial Commission.

2. Document No. 6 is the Complainants' letter to the Judicial Commission, requesting us to step down, and requesting further that, in view of the small size of the ARC, an outside and impartial panel of judges be established to hear the case. We believe that this was a reasonable request; in fact, we did not regard it as unreasonable when it was originally proposed. Mr. Martin, however, was greatly angered by it (perhaps in view of the fact that it was occasioned by statements which he had authored), and we joined him in signing a statement to the Complainants (Document No. 7) which deemed their letter to us to be "a meddling intrusion into the court's process, and which exhibits contempt for the court." This statement goes on to instruct the Complainants "to follow the court rulings explicitly or forfeit all claims to due process in the ARC."

At the very least, our response to the Complainants' letter should have acknowledged our material and procedural errors, seeking in the fear of God to establish justice in both fact and appearance; and we probably should have disqualified ourselves, as they requested. Instead, we high-handedly and arrogantly refused even to consider the merits of their request.

3. Document No. 9 is another letter from the Complainants, apologizing for their failure to follow the steps of Matthew 18:15-17 and requesting that the Commission "not deem us as having any charges before them at this

time,” in order that they might go back through the Matthew 18 process with their complaints. The Commission rejected this request, and demanded that the Complainants must either completely repudiate their charges, or proceed to a formal trial. Our reasons for this rejection were based on our acceptance of the arguments of the Accused (Document No. 12), which in turn were based on the assumption that the charges had been made “public,” and that the Accused must have a public opportunity to clear their names. In retrospect, however, we believe that the matter was not in fact “public,” and that the Complainants’ request should have been accepted (cf. the comments in Document No. 10, Mr. Greg Bahnsen’s letter to one of the Complainants). Our rejection of this request by the Complainants appears to indicate a desire more for vengeance and retribution than for a peaceable resolution of the issues.

4. Out of a sincere feeling of our own inadequacy to deal with this case (both of us being relative novices in presbyterian judicial procedures), we made the mistake of seeking the advice of the Accused themselves on all matters pertaining to the case. This very rapidly degenerated into a daily practice of “hanging around” with the Accused, enjoying their company as friends, watching movies together and so on. At the very least, this bore the appearance of evil; and, in fact, it did have the effect of swaying our judgment in their favor, and prejudicing us against the Complainants. **This glaring injustice alone disqualifies us, and should render our official decisions invalid.** [Ed. Note: emphasis added.]

5. Our subtle adoption of the viewpoint of the Accused led to another error: that of considering the charges in the “wrong” order. We were persuaded to view the long list of accusations in terms of a simple conspiracy to overthrow the Session of Westminster Church, and thus (in the words of one of the Accused) as “a grab-bag of charges ... as though somebody had sat down and said, ‘Let’s see how far back we can go and what we can find.’” Upon further reflection, and in the light of later events, we believe that this perception on our part may have been seriously mistaken. An equally, if not more, plausible explanation would be that the issue of what took place with regard to the Cash Exchange was the central charge; and that the other charges were supplementary to this, in order to demonstrate that the alleged improprieties at the Cash Exchange were indicative of ongoing attitudes and activities by the Session.

But, because we chose to view the charges as a “grab-bag,” we dealt with those that were unrelated to the Cash Exchange first, as independent charges in themselves, rather than as radiating outward from the central hub. Then, having dismissed these charges, we reasoned from them (and their apparently frivolous nature) to the question of the improprieties at the Cash Exchange. For example, we reasoned that, if the Complainants had had to reach all the way back to 1 ½ years before in bringing up charges about advertising practices and so on, then there must not have been much substance to the charges with regard to the Cash Exchange; thus we were able to dismiss the Cash Exchange questions as just so many more “frivolous” charges.

The fact is, however, that the alleged activities at the Cash Exchange were central to the concerns of the Complainants, as is evident in Document No. 1, the list of the original charges. By considering the charges in an order the precise reverse of that presented by the Complainants, and thus effectively disregarding the central accusations, the Commission committed another injustice, compounding its manifold errors.

6. None of the above is intended as support of the Complainants’ accusations with regard to the Cash Exchange. The Judicial Commission never examined the documents of the Cash Exchange, Inc., and thus could not make any determination of what their contents may or may not have proved. Therefore, as we stated in our Findings, “the Judicial Commission found no grounds for Presbytery to bring charges against Messrs. Bulkeley, Dwelle, Sutton, or Young.” Moreover, as our Findings went on to state, Mr. Adams apparently did act unlawfully in revealing corporate documents to unauthorized persons without the express permission of its shareholders, in bringing charges against an officer and employee of the Cash Exchange, and in bringing such charges in the name of the Cash Exchange (see Documents No. 11, 13, 14, and 16).

Nevertheless, on the grounds of the numerous injustices perpetrated by the Judicial Commission, we respectfully request Presbytery to declare its Findings null and void, and further to nullify the excommunications of Messrs. Adams, Brach, Kemp, Seekamp, and Swearingen, and that of Miss Roth (now Mrs. Kemp), and that of their families, since they were excommunicated on the grounds of contumacy – a judgment rendered against them by the Commission.

Sincerely yours in the Peace of Christ,

Charles Nelson David Chilton ♦

# PAEDOCOMMUNION: LEE VS. JORDAN

The following exchange embodies a “debate” of sorts between Dr. Francis Nigel Lee (Th.D.) of Queensland Presbyterian Theological College, and James B. Jordan of Niceville, FL. The comments are taken from Lee’s *Dr. Lee’s 1995 Observations on Jim Jordan’s 1994 Paidocommunion Tapes* and *A Briefer Reply to Jim B. Jordan’s Brief Reply in June to Dr. Lee’s 1995 Observations in May on JBJ’s 1994 Paidocommunion Tapes*. The citations from Jordan are from *A Brief Reply to Dr. Lee’s 1995 Observations on Jim Jordan’s Paidocommunion Tapes* (June 1995).

## Tape 1

1. LEE: In these four cassette tapes, Jim Jordan (hereinafter referred to as JBJ) not only discloses his considerable rhetorical skills. The tapes also reflect his very unique pilgrimage through a constantly-changing ecclesiastical landscape. For, more or less successively, JBJ has been: a Lutheran; a Presbyterian; a Puritan; and a PCA-Theonomist. At some stage, at least loosely, he was associated with the rather congregationalistic ARC. Under Eastern Orthodox influence, also *via* St. Vladimir’s Russian-Orthodox Seminary, he has for some two decades been a solid Paidocommunionist.

JORDAN: I was a paedocommunionist long before I ever heard of Schmemmann, and have never been “under Eastern Orthodox influence.” Unfortunately, in my experience the 9th Commandment is pretty universally ignored in Theonomic circles.

LEE: It is not in Lee’s but in JBJ’s own writings that Eastern Orthodox Scholars like Schmemmann are adulated.

2. LEE: Donning a dog-collar, JBJ became one of the founders of what later became an Episcopalian Church in Tyler (Texas). Thereafter, he renounced Theonomy; relinquished Puritanism; reentered the PCA; and is currently in the OPC. The above rich kaleidoscope colours his very creative though eclectic theologizing. Throughout, JBJ has remained consistently Anti-Baptist. In his fourth tape he calls himself not a Calvinist but a “Neo-Presbyterian” — moving away from Puritanism and strict adherence to the *Westminster Standards* toward what he regards as a more consistent Covenantalism.

JORDAN: What is a dog-collar? I did not so much renounce Theonomy as outgrow it. Theonomy was developed by Greg Bahnsen when he was about 20 years old, and it has never grown an inch since. Thus, those of us who have moved forward in our knowledge and understanding have been forced to leave Theonomy behind.

LEE: JBJ asks: “What is a dog-collar?” It is a ritualistic ring around the neck, like that worn by JBJ as shown on his photograph on the inside back flap of the dustcover of his commentary *Judges*.

3. JBJ’s arguments are clearly presented, and easy to follow. His demeanour is usually polite and tolerant. His

discussion of the positions of his opponents is generally respectful — except as regards some of the anti-paedocommunionistic views of my friends the modern Puritan Rev. Richard Bacon and the Old Testamentarian Dr. Leonard Coppes (about whom later).

JORDAN: No comment.

LEE: No comment.

4. JBJ starts off by defining what he calls ‘Paedocommunion.’ There he argues that not at all the completion of catechizing but merely receiving the initiatory sacrament of (infant) baptism alone is the sole entrance requirement for admission also to the eucharist. But then he strangely adds he does not advise that the second sacrament be given to baptized babies — until they first begin to eat at home (presumably after being weaned).

JORDAN: What is strange about saying a person who cannot eat, cannot eat? If a person is sick at home, he will miss the Lord’s Supper. Is that “strange”?

LEE: No comment.

5. This advice, however, undermines JBJ’s own entrance requirement. For between baptism and their weaning, it ‘deprives’ covenant babies of the benefit which JBJ calls ‘feeding on Christ’ or ‘feasting with Jesus’ — until such time as those infants themselves grab at the elements during eucharist services. However, JBJ would be more consistent to urge that all baptized babies be intincted and force-fed — especially seeing his hypercovenantal emphasis on what he calls an ‘anti-works salvation’ minimizes any communing infant’s need to understand even his own immature desire to manducate.

JORDAN: No, force-feeding is not more consistent. As always with anti-paedocommunionists, Dr. Lee has not bothered to understand our position, and thus cannot effectively argue against it. We believe that the covenant restores the natural fabric of life. It is not something strange and weird.

LEE: No comment.

6. JBJ states that “Presbyterian children are born dead” and “have to be brought to life again in the Church.” Yet, he adds, “from baptism on the children belong to Jesus.” We ourselves cannot easily distinguish this position from that of baptismal regenerationism. In any case, we regard JBJ’s view here as diametrically opposed both to Holy Scriptures such as Ps. 22:9f & I Cor. 7:14 as well as to the *Westminster Directory for Publick Worship* (which insists that the children of believers themselves “are Christians and federally holy **before** baptism”).

JORDAN: It is evident that Dr. Lee does not distinguish covenantal Reformed thought from baptismal regeneration. Man looks on the outward appearance, and baptism puts our children into the covenant from that point of view. I Corinthians 7:14 says that unbelieving spouses are holy; obviously this has nothing to do with baptism or communion. We don’t baptize

unbelieving spouses because they are “holy” in some sense, and we don't baptize babies because they are “holy” in some sense. We baptize them because they are born dead in trespasses and sins, and need to be put into the covenant.

LEE: Notwithstanding JBJ's allegation it is evident Lee very clearly does distinguish Reformed thought from baptismal regeneration. This is obvious even from a superficial reading especially of his 150-pp. M.Div. (*Baptism Does Not Cleanse*); his 224-pp. M.A. Theol. (*Infant Salvation*); his 540-pp. D.R.E. (*Baby Belief Before Baptism*); or his 656-pp. S.T.D. (*Rebaptism Impossible*).

7. Nevertheless, seemingly contradicting himself, JBJ clearly believes that even baptism alone is not quite enough to bring bairns to the Holy Table. In addition — “each according to his eating” **at home** — it is rather the **physical ability** to chew bread and consume wine at a very early age, that signals a baptized infant's ripeness to receive the eucharist.

JORDAN: No comment.

LEE: No Comment.

8. From that perspective, it is not so much the elders but rather the infant's own parents who decide when **they** think he is ready to manducate at the Holy Table for the first time. Yet this is not only at variance with Ex. 12:21-27 & 12:37. It also clearly confuses the role of the parents with that of the elders — and further betrays the influence upon both the parents and the elders of that very Baptist individualism which JBJ himself deplors.

JORDAN: There is no confusion here. What is Lee talking about?

LEE: No Comment.

9. JBJ's discussion of what he calls the “History of Paedocommunion” is disappointing indeed. His statement that the Early Church was always paido-communionistic, is simply not true. For there is no trace of it whatsoever before the rise of a neo-paganizing sacramentalism at the time of Cyprian in A.D. 250, and very little of it even from then till Augustine around A.D. 400.

JORDAN: False.

LEE: Studying even the unexpanded 343-pp. text of Lee's Ed.D. (*Catechism Before Communion*), would confirm there is no trace at all of Christian paidocommunionism before A.D. 250. That is long after Calvary and the completion of the Protestant Canon. Nor can one trace the beginnings of even Judaism's paidopassoverism before A.D. 75 (and till after the final fall of Jerusalem).

10. JBJ omits to mention that the mediaeval Waldensians catechized their own youth before admitting them to the Lord's Table after Confirmation by the laying on of hands. He also ignores the evidence that the Wycliffite Bohemians presented their own well-catechized offspring to make their pre-communion public Profession of Faith before the church only when they were about twelve years old (Ex. 12:3,26f,37 cf. Lk. 2:40-47). JBJ boldly alleges that among Bohemia's Hussites “children were **always** at the Table”; and those “Hussites have **always** had child communion.” Yet the Hussite *Bohemian Confession* itself rejects communion without prior catechizing.

Indeed, its art. 13 declares: “Those who lead us in the church, must not admit anyone to this sacrament who has not first, as much as he can, tested and examined himself.”

JORDAN: Interesting. I'll leave it to historians to fight it out.

LEE: No comment.

11. JBJ's next heading is: “When and why paedocommunion ceased being practised.” Neglecting to point out it was unknown even in the East before 250 A.D., JBJ as St. Vladimir's Russian Orthodox Ambassador states it “stopped only in the Western Church.” When? At, and because of, the adoption of the doctrine of transubstantiation in 1215, says JBJ. Now that the eucharistic wine was to be regarded as Christ's blood, it must no longer be given to children who might spill it on the floor. Now that eucharistic bread-crumbs were to be regarded as bits of Christ's flesh, lest they crumble and fall on the floor it was de-leavenized and waferized and also henceforth withheld from children. Thus JBJ, who here tells us he himself grew up in a 'Wafer Church.'

JORDAN: More falsehoods about my supposed relationship to Eastern Orthodoxy. On all this history generally: There are a lot of historical studies of paedocommunion floating around in various journals. I used to collect them, but I no longer live near a seminary and cannot continue to do so. If Dr. Lee is right in his view of this history, then everybody else is wrong.

LEE: No comment.

12. JBJ's convoluted reasoning here has the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 'deprive' Christian children of what he regards as 'receiving Jesus' — lest they should thenceforth spill Him on the ground. However, this does not explain why also adults would thenceforth be denied the cup; nor why also the then allegedly-new and non-crumbling wafers too would thenceforth be withheld from children. Nor does it explain why the arguments for and against the use of leavened bread — which had raged in the Church since centuries earlier — should have resulted in its denial to Western children only at and after the 1215 Fourth Lateran Council.

JORDAN: This is all pretty irrelevant, and much of it is false and scurrilous.

LEE: No comment.

13. JBJ seems to forget that especially the paidocommunionistic Eastern Church itself was from many centuries before then and even till today very thoroughly transubstantiationistic! Already the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 taught that the eucharist after consecration became the real body and blood of Jesus. John of Damascus, the chief Eastern Orthodox Theologian, said substantially the same. Indeed, the paidocommunionistic Greek Church itself upholds the theory of transubstantiation (under the name *metousiosis*). It did so long before the antipaidocommunionistic Mediaeval Western Church itself started to do so — and even then tried to enlist the support of earlier Eastern Theologians such as Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom of Constantinople, Cyril of Alexandria, and (later) the 730f A.D. John of Damascus.

JORDAN: [Ed note: See 12 above].

LEE: No comment.

14. Only in 831 did a Westerner, Radbertus, propound

transubstantiation. He was, however, stoutly opposed in this by a whole string of Western Theologians — such as Ratramnus, Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, and Berengarius (all before the 1054 *Filioque*-schism between Eastern and Western Churches). JBJ forgets that the East's Anti-Western Photius of Constantinople as early as 867 denounced any distinction between Baptism for unweaned infants and Holy Communion for those only of later years — as one of the 'heterodoxies' (*sic*) of the **Western** Mediaeval Church. Mercifully, it was also one of the very happy 'heterodoxies' of the Mediaeval Proto-Protestant Waldensians (from France in the West to Bohemia in the East) — preparing the way just across the British Channel from France for the antipaidocommunionistic Wycliffe and his disciples the Hussites in Bohemia and their later influence on Luther.

JORDAN: [Ed note: See 12 above].

LEE: No comment.

15. To his credit, JBJ concedes that not just Luther and Calvin but also **all** of the Protestant Reformers (save Musculus) **opposed** paidocommunionism — even though JBJ neglects to mention that Calvin: denied that children used the Passover; advocated the propriety of confirmation at adolescence; and insisted that Paidocommunionists were thus giving “poison” to their children. Even the maverick and semi-mystical Musculus did not **persuasively** argue **for** paidocommunion. Nor did certain sacramentalistic early Anglicans — to whom JBJ alludes, but does not name. Today, however, this Anti-Protestant and indeed also Anti-Western doctrine of the Eastern Church has entered even the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. (*via* converts to the O.P.C. from migrants to Washington from Africa who were there formerly members of the paidocommunionistic Coptic-Orthodox Church in Ethiopia, as JBJ himself rightly remarks).

JORDAN: [Ed note: See 12 above].

LEE: No comment.

16. JBJ's next section on his “Trinitarian view of humanity and society” is very stimulating. We heartily concur with most of his observations here regarding the societal implications of trinitarian baptism, and societal bonds being grounded in the bond between the various Persons of the Ontological Trinity of the Triune God Himself. Yet JBJ over-reacts against U.S. and especially Southern-Baptist individualism. He has not grasped that all Persons within the Trinity are non-infantile and everlastingly-mature. Nor has he understood that the bond between a mature husband and a mature wife differs to the bond between mature parents and their immature children. Nor does he yet appreciate the bond between God and even immature baptizees is different to that between God and mature communicants.

JORDAN: No comment.

LEE: No comment.

17. Under the somewhat ambiguous heading “Children start out believing from their parents” — JBJ (from Lk. 1:39-44) develops the well-known theme of fetal faith. It is important to understand, however, that the fetal John himself believed — quite discretely from the distinctly-different belief of his pregnant mother. Hence a believing fetus within a believing and eucharizing mother does not himself eucharize together with and

just because his pregnant mother does — any more than a believing fetus gets baptized while and just because his believing pregnant mother might get herself baptized. Incidentally, JBJ's correct perception regarding believing fetuses is irreconcilable with his earlier assertions (in paragraph 6 above) that “Presbyterian children are born dead” and “have to be brought to life again in the Church” — so that only “from baptism on, the children belong to Jesus.”

JORDAN: First, Lee may be right that a foetus no more participates in communion in his mother than he does in the mother's baptism, except that he must now deal with Judges 13. Second, Lee apparently won't distinguish between regeneration, which is God's business, and the covenant, which is partly our business. God can and does regenerate some infants in the womb. The Church counts and treats as members only those who have been baptized.

LEE: As for 6 & 9 (in which latter Judg. 13 is dealt with).

18. JBJ bizarrely alleges “we baptize children **because** we presume they are **unregenerate**.” Even if JBJ were here to be correct — unless he opts for baptismal regeneration — it would follow that **more** than 'just baptism' would be needed to qualify baptized babies to eucharize. However, while it is true that not all modern Calvinists presume the regeneratedness of covenant babies prior to their infant baptism — we have never before encountered the argument that such children should be baptized **because** presumed **unregenerate**!

JORDAN: Too bad.

LEE: [Ed. note: see 17 above.]

19. Yet even if JBJ were here to be correct, he should still realize that unless he believes that infants are being regenerated during or because of their baptism — he is at the very least approving that those should be baptized whom he deems still to be unregenerate (and thus as those he must regard still to be enemies of Christ). On this basis, however, he is casting Christ's pearl of holy baptism precisely before those whom JBJ himself would then need to consider to be 'swine.' Compare *Westminster Confession* 28:1e & 5p with 29:8q.

JORDAN: Lee has an inadequate understanding of the covenant. For him, everything is mystical. In fact, though, the administration of regeneration is God's business; the administration of baptism is our business. Baptism is not a pearl cast before anybody. Baptism is an act of God, wherein He transfers a person formerly out of the covenant and the Church into the covenant and the Church. From that point on, the person is expected to live in faith. If he does not, he must be cast back out by excommunication. Whether the person is regenerate or not, or elect or not, and when and where he becomes regenerate (in the womb, at the point of baptism, or 50 years later), is not our business, but is exclusively God's business. If Dr. Lee understood covenant theology, and Biblical theology, he would not have so many problems here.

LEE: Calvin(ism) & Lee affirm children of believers are in covenant from conception onward. Romanism, Eastern Orthodoxy & JBJ affirm children are in covenant only from their post-conceptual infant baptism onward. This sacramentalistically if not magically confuses the sign with the thing signified.

20. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same should apply also to JBJ's practice of paidocommunion. For, unlike Classic Calvinists, JBJ sees no real distinction between the (passive!) subjects of baptism and the (active!) subjects at the eucharist. The *Westminster Confession* (29:8), however, says that those who are unregenerate or even simply "unworthy of the Lord's Table...cannot without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of those holy mysteries **or be admitted thereunto....** 'Neither cast ye your pearls before swine' (Matt. 7:6)!"

JORDAN: Where does the Bible teach this active/passive distinction? It is purely human and, my guess is, Aristotelian.

LEE: Why can't JBJ see the Biblical distinction between parents **getting** their infants circumcised or baptized **passively** — and those offspring *themselves* (at whatever age) **wanting** to manducate either at the Passover or at the Lord's Supper **actively**? But till such time as he might yet see this, to be consistent he should either delay the baptism of infants until they later actively baptize themselves — or alternatively he should passively force-feed them with the eucharist from right after their infant baptism onward.

21. JBJ's next section — headed "Covenantal view of history: fathers and sons" — is quite good. Here we would only remark that it is God the Spirit and not God the Son Who proceeds from God the Father — and that all Three Persons are co-eternal and co-mature. This, however, is not the situation in Christ's human families. There, the communing mature husbands and wives carefully need to be distinguished from their non-existent future children. There again, even communing mature fathers and mothers — need to be distinguished from their immature and non-communing children (until the latter hopefully become communicants when they reach maturity at adolescence).

JORDAN: I can agree with this, except that children are not "non-communing." They are "under tutors and governors," as the Bible puts it, but nowhere does the Bible teach that they are not to be fed, either by their parents or in Church.

LEE: Good. Now we're making a little progress!

### **Tape 2**

22. At the end of his Tape 1 and again at the beginning of his Tape 2, JBJ deals with "Old Creation baptisms" and "Old Creation festivals" — all of which he apparently sacramentalizes. Here, against any relevant statement in Scripture whatsoever, the pansacramentalizing Anti-Baptist JBJ amazingly claims that the Bible begins with a 'baptism' already at Gen. 1:2 — when our whole world, but nobody in it, was totally under water. Perhaps the Spirit of God then indeed did 'rain-storm' or *m<sup>e</sup>rachefeth* upon the surface of the waters. But this is no more a 'baptism' than when any of the sprinkled animals of the Israelites or the submersed horses of the Egyptians were moistened at the Red Sea in terms of Ex. 14:22f and JBJ's beloved I Cor. 10:1-2!

JORDAN: Lee's mystical and restricted understanding of "sacrament" (a non-Biblical term) is implied throughout this paragraph. What makes some meals with God sacramental and others not? Are there degrees of "sacramentality"?

LEE: What JBJ calls Lee's "restricted understanding of

'sacrament' is derived from the *Westminster Confession* 7:5f & 27:4f & 28:3f. There, one encounters no paedocommunionizing pansacramentalization of meals and feasts.

23. JBJ then presents a convoluted argument from Leviticus, anent the alleged 'baptism' of (apparently-adult) lepers by priests. He then goes on to speak of similar post-menstrual 'baptisms' of post-childhood menstruants and also of post-childhood men after their seminal emissions. Such so-called 'baptisms' JBJ claims re-admit recipients to manducation at sacrificial feasts. Even if this argument were sound, it would at the most prove that only those old enough to be capable of menstruating or of having seminal emissions could manducate (after receiving what the Anti-Baptist JBJ might himself call their 'adult baptism').

JORDAN: Ditto. Also, children in contact with dead bodies needed to be baptized. Hebrews 9: 101t. relates all these rites to baptism, and calls them baptisms.

LEE: [Ed. Note: See 22.]

24. JBJ further claims that not just the Passover but also all of the Old Testament feasts and meals — including Purim and even the eating of the tree of life — were replaced by the Lord's Supper. Reasonably assuming that also children ate food at or at least during those Old Testament feasts or meals, he irrationally concludes they also manducated sacramentally there — and should thus also manducate sacramentally at the Lord's Supper. Here, however, JBJ forgets that there were no babies nor even children to partake of the tree of life before the fall — and that neither their not eating of leavened bread at the time of the Passover nor their non-sacramental eating of pieces of meat **after** their fathers had brought such sacrifices to the Lord — in any way constitutes sacramental manducation by those children themselves.

JORDAN: Sacramental versus non-sacramental eating? Where does the Bible make this distinction in connection with covenant meals? Good grief!! Moreover, surely Adam and Eve were non-mature babies in the Garden, in some sense. There are no arguments here; only assertions.

LEE: "Adam and Eve were non-mature babies in the Garden" (says JBJ). Good grief indeed! But wow! What now? Now we've got even baby marriage! Fortunately, however, paedomarrriages — like paidocommunions — are void!

25. JBJ is right to assume that children and adult women ate unleavened bread at the time of the Passover, but is wrong to assume that uncircumcisable women could ever sacramentally manducate at the Passover where "**no** uncircumcised person shall eat thereof" (Ex. 12:48). For that matter, it seems JBJ has forgotten even his own statement (at the end of paragraph 4 above) that he does not encourage baptized infants to eucharize until they themselves have first begun to eat such solid food at home (after being weaned). At any rate, he has here certainly departed from the teaching of the *Westminster Confession* (7:5-6 & 29:8). For it is Calvary which has fulfilled all of the O.T. ordinances — and it is the Lord's Supper which has replaced precisely the Passover. Matthew 26:19-30 & Luke 22:1-21 and I Cor. 5:6-8.

JORDAN: Women are counted as circumcised under the authority of their fathers and husbands. Exodus 4:25-26

specifically associates the man's circumcision with the woman's covering. Lee needs to re-study the theology of circumcision in the Bible. Second, whether or not the WCF intends to limit the Lord's Supper to Passover only, (a) the WCF also says that creeds and councils can err, and (b) the practice of Reformed theologizing goes a lot farther than merely quoting a summary statement originally written as a national constitution! We expect Biblical argument. Unfortunately, far too many anti-paedocommunionists hide behind these summary creedal statements, which are themselves open to more than one interpretation, instead of interacting with the Bible in a serious and mature fashion.

Passover was instituted about one month before the other feasts, not "long before" it. Lee is right that at Passover all the men were to eat of the Passover Peace Offering, and that at the other feasts, eating sacrifices was not required. But the priests ate sacrifices at those feasts, and represented Israel, just as the men represented their families at Passover. If Lee wants to return to male representation, he should also return to priestly representation, and join the Roman Catholic church, where the priest drinks the wine on behalf of the whole congregation. If not, Lee should become more consistent with the New Covenant.

LEE: Lee's study on Ex. 4:25-26 is set out in his (British Reformed Fellowship) pamphlet *Have You Been Neglecting Your Baby?* There, Lee sees in that text not a "woman's covering" *a la* JBJ (nor the latter's paidocommunionism) — but Calvinism's antipaidocommunionistic pro-paidobaptism, as in the *Westminster Confession* at its 28:5n. We must indeed never return to O.T. rituals (*W.C.F.* 19:3), but instead move on from the Calvary fulfilment thereof — and **therefore** avoid all sacramentalizations such as paidocommunionism.

26. JBJ is right to regard Calvary (and in a certain sense also the Lord's Supper which points to it) as the fulfilment not just of the Passover but also of the entire Old Testament sacrificial system. However, he fails to see that the Passover is fundamentally a blood sacrifice that was performed only by mature males — while the other Old Testament meals were rather festivities. He also fails to see that the Passover was not only instituted long before the other Feasts; that it was more important and had more permanent features; and that it was pre-eminently a **sacrifice** performed by mature males, rather than a family meal. He also fails to see it was a '**must**' for all mature males to manducate sacramentally at the Passover (and also to participate in the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles) — whereas it was **never mandatory** for women and for pre-adolescent male children to partake even of the left-overs nor to be in attendance at any of those Feasts.

JORDAN: More of this notion that two people can be at the same meal, while one participates sacramentally and the other non-sacramentally. This is interesting, but is nowhere found in the Bible. Everyone participates the same way; it is a savor of life to some, and a savor of death to others. It is not neutral for anybody.

LEE: Let's study Dt. 12:10-18 & 16:10-15 & I Sam. 1:4f **exactly** as is!

27. Indeed, the various 'Feast Texts' JBJ himself adduces do not at all suggest **sacramental** manducation there by infants or by women and children. Thus, Deut. 16:10-15 on a man's

"rejoicing" with his family at the Feast of Weeks has nothing to do with either his sacrificing or even with their sacramentally partaking of food there — and still less with any giving of "corn" and "wine" to unweaned infants. Seeing God Himself **never required** women and children **even to attend** such Feasts, why are some paidocommunionists tearing certain antipaidocommunionistic churches apart today by **urging** that at least their own toddlers should manducate there **sacramentally**?

JORDAN: . So what? Sure, priests represented Israel in the Old Creation, and men represented their families. So? Who denies this? The point I am making is that they did not participate for themselves alone, and in the New Covenant, when Christ is Priest, all participate.

LEE: [Ed. Note: See 26.]

28. The same applies to Deut. 12:10-13, which JBJ also quotes. He should also have quoted verse 18 — though even that teaches only family participation in eating and rejoicing, and not at all in sacrificing (as earlier in 12:10-14). Similarly, it is unclear why JBJ quotes Lev. 22:1-16, which deals with matters such as outflowings or issues from **mature** human bodies, and the eating of a priest's meat by his widowed or divorced daughter. For all such cases are obviously dealing with **non**-preadolescent persons. Incidentally, I Sam. 1:4f — which JBJ also quotes — does not at all say that Elkanah's sons and daughters themselves offered at the unnamed feast. It says that the priest "Elkanah offered"; and that **he** then gave portions of some of what he had offered "to Penninah his wife and to all her sons and her daughters" — and that "to Hannah **he** gave a worthy portion."

JORDAN: Because the Bible nowhere hints at such an "age of discretion."

LEE: If there is no "age of discretion" at all — *per contra* Luke 2:40f & *Westminster Larger Catechism* Q. & A. 177 — then why does even JBJ himself withhold paidocommunion from just-baptized infants until they later grab it?

29. JBJ then becomes pre-occupied with death, and with the need for (infantly-circumcised) communicants who might handle corpses and thereby become 'ex-communicated' — to get themselves 're-baptized' before they may freely 're-communicate.' Here we might observe that if sin 'ex-communicates' infantly-baptized covenanters until their later mature repentance — why doesn't JBJ wait till 're-baptizing' them at an 'age of discretion' before attempting to re-communicate them?

JORDAN: Lee needs to get a grip on the difference between the Old and New Creations. In the Old, there were many baptisms and re-baptisms. All of these are fulfilled in the one baptism, performed once, in the New. Until he gets this straight, he is never going to understand the argument I am making, which is that we learn much about New Creation baptism by studying Old Creation baptisms. By the way, the old Episcopal rite is not really based on Leviticus 12, but is rather an offering of thanks to God because the woman has survived the trauma of child-bearing. Before the modern era, women routinely died giving birth, and thus an offering of special thanks was considered a good thing.

LEE: *Touché!* I now stand corrected in my understanding of

Episcopalian eccentricities. After all, the previously-episcopalianized JBJ should surely understand Lev. 12:1-8's "churched of women" (!) better than I.

30. JBJ refers also to Lev. 12:1-8 anent what Episcopalians call the 're-churched' of post-parturient women. But he fails to realize that, if relevant to the eucharist, this passage too suggests adult communion (of those who are already mothers) rather than paidocommunion. Indeed, what JBJ would here call a 're-baptism' — we would call a post-baptismal but non-rebaptismal fulfillment of baptism at mature-age confirmation and admission to the Lord's Table (not before the age one becomes capable of bearing children).

JORDAN: What does Eastern Orthodoxy have to do with anything here? And as regards Numbers 9:10-14 - what? What is Lee talking about? Circumcision was the door to Passover. Only if a person became unclean did he need to be cleansed.

LEE: Even Eastern Orthodoxy is more consistent than is the eclectic JBJ.

31. Moreover, if as JBJ suggests post-baptismal sin after infant baptism itself 'ex-communicates' (until re-communicated by what he calls 're-baptism') — it is very clear that infant baptism alone does **not** admit one to the Lord's Table. For even in the Greek 'Orthodox' Church, the baptized infant sins anew right before he is then intincted for the very first time! Besides, as even JBJ admits, Num. 9:10-14 proves that infant circumcision alone does not qualify one to manducate at the Passover — without a further cleansing. The same applies also in respect of II Chron. 30:17-19. Indeed, **both** of these passages are antipaidopassoveristic.

JORDAN: Since Lee has already several times made a distinction between mature and immature images of God (adults and children), it seems strange that he would go to a passage addressing adult concerns and capabilities, and use it to reject children at the Lord's Supper.

LEE: Contrast here, on Heb. 5:12 to 6:2, John Calvin *vs.* Jim B. Jordan.

32. We shall not dwell on JBJ's 're-baptizings' of those who touch dead lizards and rodents (in Lev. 11:31-39). Nor shall we digress into his excursus on corpses and the ashes of the red heifer in Num. 19 — which he finds to be relevant, in view of the various washings mentioned at Heb. 9:10. More important to the subject of the eucharist, however, is the antipaidocommunionistic Heb. 5:12 to 6:2. This passage JBJ ignores — even though Calvin finds it to be important evidence for the confirmation of infantly-baptized covenant children and their admission to the Lord's Table at adolescence.

JORDAN: *Touché!* I did not know of Dr. Lee's work on the subject. I am aware of his earlier writings, but he has been in Australia for over a decade and I have not been aware of his later works. Moreover, his dissertation is certainly not widely distributed or available. So I think I can be excused. At any rate, those who want to pursue the matter further will have to get hold of his work. And I am certainly glad that, unlike others, Dr. Lee has tried to deal with I Corinthians 10.

LEE: This is progress — even though JBJ's insistence that at least one "animal was indeed baptized" (sacramentally?!), indeed boggles the mind.

33. We now come to I Corinthians 10:1-6. JBJ rightly refers to it — according to his (mis)interpretation thereof — as **the** "proof-text of paidocommunion." JBJ alleges no antipaidocommunionists he has ever heard of, have to his knowledge ever addressed this passage. Well, seeing JBJ has heard of me (and even briefly mentions me by name in his Tape 4), it is strange that he is not aware of my own 'Addendum D' where I spent several pages discussing this very passage in my Ed.D. dissertation *Catechism Before Communion* (obtainable from either Whitefield Theological Seminary in Florida or from Rev. Dr. Joe Morecraft in Atlanta).

JORDAN: Okay, it says "fathers." I suppose Lee would say that the father ate "sacramentally" while everyone else ate "non-sacramentally," but that is a non-Biblical distinction. We have seen that men ate the Passover *representationally*, just as the priests at the Sin Offering *representationally*; but that does not mean others did not eat Passover *at all*, or that their participation was some how non-sacramental. Lee says animals were not baptized. Yet, in the sacrificial system, the sacrificed animal was indeed baptized in the laver of cleansing before being sent up to God (Lev. 1; etc.). Also, the firstborn of animals were claimed by God. So the distinction is not as clear as Lee wants to make it.

LEE: [Ed. Note: See 32.]

34. Here we shall merely observe that I Cor. 10:1-4 does not say that "all our mothers" or "all our children" and still less that "all their animals" were "all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" — but only that "all our **fathers**" were, and that **they** "did all eat the same spiritual food and did all drink the same spiritual drink." It is true, of course, that also the woman and the children and the animals all went through the sea. But Paul does not here say that those woman and children and animals were "baptized." Indeed, at least the animals certainly **were not**.

JORDAN: Okay, Paul refers to "fathers," but he applies what happened to the "fathers" to *everyone*. Or does Lee, wish to argue that I Corinthians 10:6ff. only applies to men, or to fathers? Thus, let us say that Lee is right to press the term "fathers" so that it excludes everyone else. Accordingly, only fathers ate the manna "sacramentally." Well, Paul applies this to the Church to include everyone. Thus, even if only the "fathers" ate back then, now everyone eats.

LEE: But I Cor. 10:1f's "fathers" were capable of whoremongering at the time they ate and drank! They were therefore **then** all adolescents or adults — whether married, or whether childless. Similarly, wherever Biblical, we follow the teachings of our "fathers and brethren" (Acts 7:2,9,39,45,52 & 22:1) and indeed also of the "church fathers" — yet only at the time they were **mature** (even if then but celibate bachelors or childless husbands). Ditto as regards participation in the Lord's Supper. Thus, I Cor. 10 to 11

35. It is no doubt also true that while in the wilderness also the women and some of the children and perhaps too some of the animals ate the manna and maybe even some of the quails. But Paul is here only saying that "all our **fathers**" ate and drank. Indeed, he will soon go on to say (I Cor. 10:7f) that "many" of those very **fathers** committed idolatry and **whoredom**. Yet especially such whoremongering could not possibly have been

committed by any of the tiny and pre-adolescent children — nor by any of the animals.

JORDAN: Lee presses too much out of the word “father.” Paul speaks of “fathers” because he is referring to Israel as the predecessor of the Church, not because he is referring to male adults who have children. In other words, in this universe of discourse, “fathers” are not contrasted with “mothers, children, bachelors, and childless parents,” but with “you, today.” It would be entirely proper to translate “fathers” as “ancestors,” especially since obviously mothers, children, and bachelors also ate the manna and drank the water. The Greek apparently has no separate word for “ancestor,” and Bauer's NT Greek Dictionary shows *that pater* can mean ancestor, originator, and ruler, as well as father.

In conclusion, while I don't have access to Lee's full discussion in his dissertation, his summary here is very unconvincing. The “fathers” in 1 Corinthians 10 are the ancestors, not just married men with children.

LEE: [Ed. Note: Lee skips comment on 35.]

36. Even JBJ himself does not believe that the **unweaned** among those children ate *quails* (or even manna) in the wilderness. Hence, neither the children nor the animals are here under discussion in respect of **eating** the **spiritual** meat and *drinking* the **spiritual** drink — even if one were to take this eating and drinking as *sacramental* manducation akin to the Lord's Supper. JBJ and his paidocommunionistic supporters tirelessly point out that the *caveat's* in I Cor. 11:20 do not apply to children. For different reasons, we agree. Indeed, the same is true of this previous chapter I Cor. 10. This merits drawing the conclusion that there was never any paidocommunion either in the Old nor the New Testament dispensations of the same covenant of grace.

JORDAN: Please! Does Lee think that Paul has no reference, *to adult bachelors, and to married men without children?*

Does he think that such men did not drink (sacramentally) from the Spiritual rock? His attempt to squeeze “adult male” out of Paul's use of *pater* must carry him into absurdity.

LEE: Calvin and Lee and also the *Talmud* would all maintain that the O.T. Passover was eaten not just by married men but also by unmarried adolescent & adult males (at least some of whom either then or later became “our fathers”).

### **Tape 3**

37. JBJ **assumes** the quail (and the manna?) was “**spiritual meat**.” He further observes that “everybody got [to eating] the quail — including the children.” Yet even JBJ would not include the unweaned babies in this. So he should see that the word “all” in I Cor. 10:1's phrase “all our fathers” cannot possibly apply to the unweaned babies in the wilderness — even though many of them later became ‘our fathers.’ Consequently, Paul's phrase “all our fathers” can here only refer to those who were *already* fathers at the time they thus ate and also drank and also committed whoredom. Clearly, infant ‘communion’ and even child communion is here precluded.

JORDAN: Lee does not understand our position. We do not say that a child must be weaned to come to the Lord's Supper. He may still be going to his mother, but when he is capable of eating and drinking from a cup, he (and she) should be fed at the

Supper, provided he is baptized, of course.

LEE: While obviously disagreeing with JBJ's practice, Lee applauds JBJ's admission that even unweaned babies of paedocommunionists might indeed be permitted to paedocommune at paedocommunionized eucharists. Yet this is now even closer to Eastern Orthodoxy than communion for infants only when weaned.

38. If, as JBJ alleges, infant “baptism is a ticket to a meal” — **all** baptized infants without exception and not just *only* those weaned could (and should) eat **that** meal. Yet the obvious fact that also unweaned babies consume food, does not cause JBJ to conclude they too should also feast at the Lord's Table. So neither should he conclude that their merely being weaned, impels them to eucharize. We ourselves would encourage even unweaned babies to be brought to eucharist services — also before their birth. But it does not at all follow from their presence there that they should, or even could, themselves manducate by sacramentally consuming the elements. Thus JBJ's observation that Ex. 16's manna precedes Ex. 20's ‘catechizing’ is irrelevant.

JORDAN: [Ed. Note: Jordan has no comment on point 38.]

LEE: [Ed. Note: Lee has no comment.]

39. Following the Eastern Church, JBJ tries to argue for paidocommunion from John 6:31-65. He rightly admits that this passage does not directly address the issue. Nevertheless, he does find indirect evidence for paido-communion here. However, if there is any indirect evidence here at all — it clearly favours antipaidocommunionism. For the mature men who were then **counted** as having eaten the bread at Christ's feeding of the multitude, very clearly **excluded** any others present. As Matthew 14:14-21 insists: “They that ate, were about five thousand **men** — **beside women and children.**” Here, the parallel with the “**count**” of the mature “**men**” at the first Passover “*beside* children” and uncircumcisable women (Ex. 12:3f & 12:37 & 12:48) is striking.

JORDAN: I am not following the Eastern Church here. I have no idea what the Eastern Church says about this passage.

Yes, the men are counted, and the women and children are not. This is because under the Old Creation, Israelite men are priests and thus are measured, as the dimensions of the Tabernacle and Temple are measured, and as the 144,000 Jews are measured (symbolically) in Revelation 7, while the gentiles are unmeasured. The measuring does not mean that women and children were not fed, nor does it mean that they did not partake “sacramentally,” a distinction for which, please note, Lee has never offered any Biblical evidence.

LEE: JBJ says he has “no idea what the Eastern Church says about this passage” (John 6:31f). Well, read all about it in the *Greek Confession* of Metrophanes Critophanes Hieromonarchus *et al.*

40. Strangely, JBJ then goes to Mark 10:13-16 (where Jesus blesses infants). Although the passage has nothing at all to do with the Passover or the Supper or eating or circumcision or baptism, JBJ nevertheless concludes from it that if we keep our children from the Lord's Supper we are going against this special blessing. Frankly, JBJ here seems to be attaching an importance to receiving the eucharist greater than does Rome or

even the paidocommunionistic Eastern Church! Here, we fear JBJ uses his excessive Anti-Zwinglianism as a smokescreen to camouflage a hyper-sacramentalistic eucharisticism in some respects more radical than even the Romish Mass.

JORDAN: What?!!!! All I'm saying is that Jesus blesses us in the Lord's Supper. Does Lee disagree?

LEE: Jesus both blesses worthy and punishes unworthy eucharizers. More importantly, he blesses much, also elsewhere — including the many infants who neither then nor later ever get to eucharize. However, paidomarrriage (and paidocommunion?) is not a blessing. Calvin says the latter is “poison.”

41. JBJ then asks whether there are any texts which keep children from certain blessings. Yes, we believe that Gen. 1:28 & 2:24 keep them from the blessing (if not indeed also the *mysterion*) of marriage. Cf. Eph. 5:31f. We believe Ex. 12:3-27 keeps them from the Passover. We believe Ezekiel 18:5-20 exempts them from incurring some of the blessings and most of the curses incurred by their parents. And we believe I Cor. chapters 10 & 11 preclude them from the blessings of the Lord's Supper (and from the curses incurable by careless or unworthy manducation thereat).

JORDAN: None of these passages speaks of children. All Biblical passages that speak of children, or that include children in the horizon of discussion, speak of them as included in the covenant if they have been given the covenant sign.

Lee misappropriates Ezekiel 18. If that passage means what he seems to think it does, it contradicts the Second Commandment. Rather, Ezekiel says that if a child grows up and breaks with his father, then the blessing or curse from the father is also broken. Clearly, small children do participate in the blessings and curses of their parents. Ask the child of any drunkard, or the child of any sexual molester!

LEE: Uncircumcisable (female) Israelitesses were in covenant — as too were uncircumcised (male) Israelites, **before** they were eight days old. For the covenant **precedes** the administration of its sign (Gen. 6:18f & 9:9-17 & 15:6f 17:2-27). All Calvin wrote on infant salvation, clarifies this.

42. This leads JBJ into an useful discussion of I Cor. 11 under the heading: “What is participation in the Lord's Supper?” In general, we agree with most of what he says here — and also that the *emphasis* should be experiential (and not just rational). Yet JBJ has here still over-reacted toward irrationalism — in his attempt to promote a rather antirational paidocommunionism. Thus JBJ insists that a person may manducate at the eucharist even two days after his (infant?) baptism. This notion however, clashes even with the idea of seven days of preparation for the feasts in Lev. 23:3-9f. It also clashes with Christ's institution of the Lord's Supper not for all baptizees but only for His disciples (or His **'taught** ones'). Mark 14:16 cf. Matt. 28:19f.

JORDAN: How does Leviticus 23:3-9f. teach seven days of preparation before the feasts of Israel? This is a new one for me, and I cannot see anything in the text that even hints at it.

If a person must be a disciple in the sense of “having been taught” rather than in the sense of “being in the process of being taught,” then how long does a new convert have to wait before being admitted to the Lord's Supper? How much do we have to know? Don't say “the Shorter Catechism,” because that is not in

the Bible. Obviously, a disciple is someone in the process of being taught by Christ, something that begins at baptism and lasts our whole life.

LEE: JBJ says “seven days of preparation before the feast...is a **new** one” for him. Well, a comparison of Lev. 23:3-9f with Acts 20:6f will show that the **old** wine is better! So too would a deeper acquaintance with Classic Reformed Theology, and also with the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*. That latter states in respect of the “Sacrament of the Lord's Supper...it is requisite that publick warning be given the sabbath-day **before** the administration thereof and that either then or on some day of that **week** something concerning that ordinance and the due **preparation** thereunto and participation therefor be taught” — so that all who then manducate “may come better **prepared** to that heavenly feast.”

43. Such discipling or teaching implies catechizing toward teenage (cf. Proverbs 22:6). JBJ argues that it is Paganism which offers its 'sacrament' (of consorting with a prostitute) not during infancy but only at adolescence. I would reply that even Paganism here rests on a perversion of the great truth that none should enter into the *mysterion* of marriage before teenage (Eph. 5:31). JBJ says if children have to eat at all — then they should also be able to eat at the eucharist. I respond: then why does even JBJ dis advise food-consuming pre-weaned baptizees from being brought to manducate at the Lord's Table? JBJ says Rome regards the eucharist primarily as a prayer, and Protestants regard it primarily as something understood — rather than regarding it primarily as a meal. Yet we regard this latter view of his as essentially irrational, mysticistic, Greek-Orthodoxistic, and Non-Protestant.

JORDAN: Again, Lee misunderstands our position, assuming that we teach a child must be weaned in the full sense before coming to the Table. As regards Lee's last sentence: Well, Jesus did not say “understand this as My memorial,” but “do this . . . .” Action precedes understanding in this case.

LEE: See Lee's point 47, and the texts cited at *WLC* 177.

44. JBJ next insists: “Any rule that excludes children also excludes the feeble-minded and the senile” from the Lord's Supper. Regarding the feeble-minded, he says all churches would admit an infantly-baptized 30-year-old with the mind of a 4-year-old to the Lord's Supper even if he could not distinguish say transubstantiation from Zwinglianism *etc.* We would respond that this retarded 30-year-old has at least reached puberty, the attainment of which we regard as a very essential prerequisite for admission to the Lord's Supper. Moreover, this retarded man should first be catechised to the extent of his ability to understand — as too would all normal adolescents (regardless of the difference degrees of their intelligences *vis-a-vis* one another).

JORDAN: Puberty? Where does the Bible hint at such a thing as prerequisite for the Lord's Supper?

LEE: See Lee's point 47, and the texts cited at *WLC* 177.

45. Regarding the senile, JBJ forgets that they once did learn and understand adequately — and that even old men can still dream dreams (or recycled knowledge previously acquired). Acts 2:17. JBJ's example of Dr. Cornelius Van Til in his senility, is particular unfortunate. In 1980, I myself had the pleasure and

privilege of having him in our home for several days during his senility. In spite of then sometimes rambling while lecturing, his mind was still unusually sharp — and his intellectual grasp of the true presence of Christ at His Table even then was still superior to that of many paidocommunionists. Psalm 92:12-15!

JORDAN: So? Can a senile man recall enough to practice “self-examination”? Lee has avoided rather than deal with the problem his position raises.

LEE: a) Yes. b) No. c) Where is JBJ's raptured 't' (“deal~~t~~”)?!

46. JBJ has not appreciated that the prerequisites for one's first admission to the Table, are not the same as those for one's ongoing manducation thereat. He has not seen that it is chiefly the development of the intellect which admits one to the Table, but chiefly the deterioration of morals which may later bar one from it. *Westminster Confession* 29:3 & 29:8 & 30:3f and *Larger Catechism* 169 & 173. JBJ may well know of some irresponsible (*paido-communionistic*?) Missionaries that admit *uncatechised* adolescent or adult Ex-Pagans to the Table right after their baptism. However, *Consistent-Calvinist* Missionaries would first *catechise* such converts *before baptizing* them — and only *then* admit them to the Table, and precisely as *catechised* converts.

JORDAN: “Development of the intellect.” Where does the Bible teach this? The fact that the Supper is a *meal*, and not a theological discussion, points to the fact that those who eat are able to partake. If Jesus had wanted to do what Lee thinks He should have done, He would have set up a memorial rite that involved intellectual discussion.

Catechism before baptism. Too bad Paul did not know about this in connection with the Philippian jailer! No, baptism is the doorway *into* catechism. Lee is playing Baptist here.

LEE: “Reformed Baptists” (like Al Martin & Erroll Hulse) are often preferable to uncatechized de(re)formed sacramentalizing paidocommunionists!

47. LEE: JBJ fulminates against the Talmudic *bar mitzvaah* ceremony at the minimum age of 13 — as if it were *devoid* of Biblical background! Proper consideration of Gen. 17:25, of Ex. 12:3's *'iysh* with *'uush* (alias 'a mature man' with 'virility'), of Prov. 22:6's *yazqiyn* ('when his beard begins to grow'), and of Lk. 2:40-47's description of the twelve-year-old Jesus at the Passover — would have given JBJ more respect for the *bar mitzvaah*. So too would an acquaintance with the mature-age Passover practices of the Essenes, the Pharisees, the Karaites, and the Chassidim. While it is indeed true that there are some serious errors in parts of the Talmud — to write off all of it as an almost totally worthless perversion of the Old Testament and even of Intertestamental practice — betrays a great unfamiliarity with the Talmud.

JORDAN: Yes, I think that the oral law of the Jews is the “doctrine of demons” that Paul and Jesus “fulminate” against repeatedly. I'm not saying that everything in the Mishnah and Talmud is wrong, just that we cannot go to them to build a case against everything else the Bible teaches about children.

Genesis 17:3 - what is the point here?

Exodus 12:3 - yes, the man takes a lamb *for his household*, not just for himself!

Proverbs 22:6 - what does this have to do with Passover or the Lord's Supper?

Luke 2:40-47 - ditto. Also, was it a normal part of catechizing for children to stay behind in the Temple after their parents had departed for home? Clearly, Luke 2 has to do with Jesus' unique mission, and is not a proof-text for some supposed catechism or confirmation at age 12.

Look: The Bible always mentions households and children in connection with the “meals with God.” It never hints that children are excluded. All Lee and his friends can do is pull some verses out of context and try to build a case from them, verses that have nothing to do with the issue and that don't even hint at what Lee and Co. want them to say.

LEE: The antipaidocommunionistic and encyclopaedic Christian Hebraists and Westminster divines Lightfoot and Selden knew and appreciated the *Talmud* more than JBJ, who sees “demons” there under its beds and behind its bushes! Incidentally, Lee appealed to Moses's Gen. 17:25 — not to JBJ's “17:3”(!)?!

#### Tape 4

48. Finally, JBJ tries to deal with “Arguments Against Paidocommunion.” Here we can be rather brief. His description of the paidocommunionistic view of I Cor. 11:28-31 discloses an inability to recognize the difference between the sacrament of baptism (with its passive recipients) and the different sacrament of the Supper (with its active participants). JBJ's misperception of the antipaidocommunionistic view of Rom. 10:13-14 fails to recognize that the word “call” is not there said to be vocal — so that a saved fetus has indeed already non-vocally “called” upon the Name of the Lord and thus been saved. Similarly, JBJ has not realized that II Thess. 3:10 does not imply that those who **do not work** shall not eat — but only those who **do not want** to work. Clearly, the fetal John not only wanted to but in fact also joyously did work — in giving a non-vocal testimony about Jesus to his mother Elisabeth from whom he also received pre-natal but non-eucharistic food.

JORDAN: Active and passive? Where is this in the Bible? Also, Romans 10:13-14 certainly does refer to a vocal call, since it comes from a preacher. Sure, I agree on 2 Thessalonians 3:10; Lee makes my point for me.

LEE: See point 20 above.

49. JBJ is right that the context of I Cor. 11:28-31 is indeed “body wars” between the various would-be manducators within the body of communicants. As JBJ himself recognizes, these squabblers were not warring infants nor children — but warring adolescents and adults. From this, he should have drawn the correct conclusion — namely that the body of communicants consists of adolescents and adults alone. It is unfortunate JBJ has not rightly “discerned” the “body” of communicants! However, to argue that the word “body” is here only the communicants and not at all the physical body of Jesus Christ Himself (presently in heaven) — is to be in danger of lapsing toward either Romish or Eastern-Orthodox transubstantiation if not even toward the further heresy of deifying the Church itself.

JORDAN: No, my conclusion is right: that the passage says nothing about child communicants at all. There is no hint that children are excluded from communion, only that Paul is not addressing them here. In Ephesians 6 Paul does address children

as members of the Church.

LEE: Totally agreed! I Cor. 11:28-31 indeed “says nothing about child communicants at all” — because there were no child communicants, at all.

50. To argue that I Cor. 11:18-34 does not apply to children, but then still to **include** children as manducators at the eucharist — is as irrational as contrariwise to argue that the **inclusion** of “children” at Acts 2:38f **excludes** them from baptism. To argue that I Cor. 11’s “body” is only the Church but not also and pre-eminently Christ’s different and physical body — is to ignore the usage of the word “blood” in verse 27’s phrase: “shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.”

JORDAN: Lee needs to listen again to my distinction between “body” and “body & blood.”

LEE: I Cor. 11:27’s “blood” supports antipaidocommunist view of “body.”

51. In the subsequent section concerning spiritual gifts, I Cor. 12:13 is not talking about communicants but about the greater number of baptizees. The sense of that verse is: “You have **all** been baptized” in that “you have all been drenched.” Thus Luther and Calvin. To misapply this verse only to communicants, would require a consistent JBJ either to force-feed even all unweaned infant-baptizees or alternatively to abandon infant baptism.

JORDAN: Irrelevant.

LEE: Very relevant, in the context (I Cor. 11:28f; 12:13; 13:10; 14:20).

52. To “the argument that children were not at Passover” JBJ replies: “So what?” This is quite a concession. Yet JBJ then goes on to allege that all of the other ‘eatings’ in the Bible — from the ‘eating of the tree of life in the garden of Eden to eating of the fruits of the trees of life on the new earth (Gen. 2 to Rev. 22) — all presuppose manducation also by children.

JORDAN: I made no concession here, save for the sake of argument.

LEE: Viewing participants at other manducations in the Bible as being irrelevant to the Lord’s Supper, JBJ almost docetizes and idolizes the latter.

53. With this, we must take issue. First, only adults could have eaten of the tree of life in Eden (where there were no children). Second, even JBJ concedes that children may very well not have manducated at the Passover —hence his: “So What?” Third, even JBJ must concede unweaned babies did not consume quail or even manna but only mother’s milk. Fourth, even JBJ should concede that the Lord’s Supper comes in the place of the Passover (albeit not exclusively so). Fifth, even JBJ should concede it is in an **adult** body like the one of Jesus Himself that we too shall be resurrected and then thus feast on the fruit of the tree of life (I John 3:2f cf. Rev. 22:2-17). Sixth, even JBJ prays the Lord’s Prayer: “Thy will be done **on earth** as it is **in heaven!**” And seventh, even JBJ’s Bible has the eucharistic I Cor. 11 soon followed by 13:10’s “I put away childish things” and 14:20’s “be mature in understanding!”

JORDAN: I don’t see anything here that argues against our position. Nothing Lee quotes or refers to hints at the exclusion of baptized children from the Lord’s Supper.

LEE: [Ed. Note: See point 52.]

54. JBJ then addresses “Bacon’s book *What Mean Ye By This Service?*” with something less than respect. He cavalierly assails Bacon’s antipaidocommunionistic contrasting of “ye” and “our” in Ex. 12:26-27 — conveniently overlooking the fact that Bacon got this argument from Calvin himself. JBJ also assails Bacon’s careful argument from Ex. 12:48-50 against Passover manducation by women — ignoring the force of verse 3’s “mature man”; of verse 37’s “beside children”; of verse 42’s “all the **sons** [not daughters] of Israel”; of verse 48g’s “no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof” — and the Talmud’s assertion that boys became “**sons** of the law” precisely at their *bar mitzvaah* (meaning ‘son of the law’) when they had been catechised successfully at an age no younger than thirteen years and one day.

JORDAN: Yes, I think Bacon’s “exegesis” is preposterous. “Sons of Israel” is routinely translated “children of Israel,” because it clearly includes women as well as men. Exodus 12:37 says that men and children left Egypt. Women did not? And of course, eventually Bacon and Lee have to run to the doctrine of demons to substantiate their misinterpretation.

LEE: Also women and children left Egypt at Ex. 12:37. Yet neither were counted — **nor** included in the 12:4f “count” of the Passover manducators. Lee is offended JBJ writes that Richard “Bacon’s ‘exegesis’ is preposterous.” Richard too might be offended — also to see JBJ’s statement that “Bacon and Lee have to run to the doctrine of demons to substantiate their misinterpretation.” Such remarks really are unworthy of JBJ, and lessen his credibility.

55. JBJ also attacks Richard Bacon’s antipaidocommunionistic exposition of Num. 9, without refuting it. Yet he concedes, *de facto*, the strength of Bacon’s argument that a monthly-menstruating woman would remain unable to manducate at the Passover at least until menopause (if not until Calvary). Indeed, JBJ apparently does not realize his own argument that “all baptizees may take the Lord’s Supper” — must also imply that “all circumcisees might take the Passover” (thus admitting to it even **unweaned** male circumcisees but excluding uncircumcisable females). I Cor. 5:6-8 & Col. 2:11-13.

JORDAN: Bacon and Lee seem to think that because men were required to come to Passover, women and children were *excluded*. This does not follow. The men *who* were *required* to come were 20 years old and older (Numbers 1). Others were clearly *permitted* to come, as Jesus’ mother did in Luke 2.

LEE: How does JBJ’s reference to “Numbers 1” apply to the Passover?

56. JBJ also misses the power of Bacon’s argument at II Chr. 30:17-19, regarding the need antipaido-communionistically to cleanse oneself before manducating at the Passover. He also ridicules the notion of four cups of wine at Christ’s last Passover and first Supper — totally ignoring the intertestamental evidence in a fresh diatribe against the Talmud. With some sarcasm, JBJ also assails Bacon’s argument that only mature males like Abram brought sacrifices (Gen. 12:7 & 13:4 *etc.*) — while not recognizing the same is also the case throughout the Old Testament (whether in respect of Abel, or Noah, or Isaac, or

Jacob, or Moses; or the men of Israel at their Passover). Gen. 4:4f; 8:20f; 26:25; 28:18f; 35:7f; Ex. 3:18; 12:3f,26f,37,48.

JORDAN: Only those who were unclean had to cleanse themselves before Passover. What does this have to do with small children? The only way a baby would become unclean would be through corpse contamination, and according to Numbers 19, this particular cleansing was administered by a second party. Thus, the baby would be cleansed by someone else. The other cases, which require self-cleansing, all apply to those old enough to do it themselves.

Lee and Bacon can lean on un-Biblical traditions if they want; my interest is in the Bible's teaching.

Women offered sacrifices in Leviticus 12

LEE: Here, JBJ seems to question the general defilability of babies.

57. Finally, JBJ attacks Bacon's exegesis of Luke 2:41-47 — which Bacon in turn got from exegetical giants like Edersheim. To JBJ, Luke 2:42 means that from His being weaned onward — Jesus accompanied Joseph and Mary every year on their journey to Jerusalem where they all three then manducated at the Passover for many years before Jesus turned twelve. But the verse in its context (2:41-47) obviously suggests that even though the child Jesus and Mary probably both went to Jerusalem every year at Passover-time for many years, it was only when He had turned twelve that He then and there was catechised by the teachers in the temple — with a view to His disciplined admission to the Passover the next year after He had turned thirteen. JBJ's Anti-Talmudic attacks against the *bar mitzvaah* at thirteen years of age, make the statements “when He was *twelve* years old...according to the **custom** of *the feast*” and His “*asking them questions*” and the teachers' being “astonished at His understanding and *answers*” — almost meaningless.

JORDAN: Give me a break! Where does Luke 2:41-47 even hint at this notion?

LEE: *De contradictionibus non disputandum est.*

58. JBJ's final section discusses “the Argument from Yom Kippur: Leonard Coppes's *Daddy, May I Take Communion?*” Here, JBJ says Coppes's view is “convoluted” — because Coppes piles up argument after argument against paidocommunion from the offerings of the twenty-four elders (Ex. 24:4f cf. Lk. 22:1f & Rev. 19:4-9); from Yom Kippur (Lev. 16:3-12f); and from the last Passover at the institution of the Lord's Supper, where all of those who manducated were mature male apostles alone (Lk. 22:1f); *etc.*

JORDAN: Coppes's argument is “convoluted” because it is unreadable and cannot be followed except with tremendous difficulty. He does not pile up any arguments, and has been completely refuted by Peter Leithart's book, *Daddy, Why Was I Excommunicated?*

LEE: Copperhead Coppes cops it copiously! *O mores! O tempora!*

59. JBJ here suggests that Dr. Coppes (an accomplished Old Testamentian with a doctoral knowledge of Hebrew) has misunderstood the nature of the Old Testament. “Take it from me, as someone who has dealt with this for twenty years!” — pontificates the much-less-learned and much-less-experienced

and much-less-aged but indeed much-more-fluid JBJ. We have already seen in our first two paragraphs how JBJ's very fluidity has caused him to meander from Lutheranism through Puritanism and Presbyterianism into Theonomy; from there on, from somewhere between the Scylla of ARC Congregationalism and the Charybdis of Eastern-Orthodoxy's Paidocommunionism toward Episcopalianism — and thenceforth, again rebounding, back to the PCA and then on into the OPC.

JORDAN: This *ad hominem* attack upon me is unworthy of Dr. Lee. It is also untrue. The ARC was not congregationalistic. I have never meandered toward Eastern Orthodoxy. I have never “rebounded” back to the PCA or the OPC.

LEE: Is Gal. 4:16 *ad hominem* or *ad rem* to JBJ? It should be noted in his *Institutes* IV:16:31 that the orthodox antipaidocommunionistic Calvin was both *ad hominem* and *ad rem* toward the heterodox paidocommunionizing Servetus!

60. Yet apparently even this is not the end of his road. For JBJ then hastens to inform us: “I'm moving away from a Puritan toward a 'more covenantal' position.” We ourselves cannot imagine any position more 'covenantal' than that of the Puritanism of the *Westminster Standards*! Yet it is clear to us that JBJ is currently far from the covenantal teaching of at least the *Westminster Confession of Faith* at 7:5f & 19:4-7 & 27:4f & 29:3 & 29:8 & 30:3f and the *Westminster Larger Catechism* QQ. & AA. 169, 173 & 177. JBJ knows the ecclesiastical landscape. May God then graciously move JBJ yet further — and cause him to return fully to what Jeremiah 6:16 calls “the old paths” and “the good way” of Classic Calvinism, alias Consistent Christianity!

JORDAN: As someone familiar with Dutch theology, Dr. Lee should be aware that covenant theology has made great strides since the time of the Puritans.

LEE: Strict subscriptionists to either the Dutch Reformed or the even more exacting Westminster Standards will defend their Confessions *quia* against JBJ's *quatenus*. See *Larger Catechism*, QQ. & AA. 161-177. Declares the latter: “The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper differ, in that baptism is to be administered but once, with water, to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants; whereas the Lord's supper is to be administered often in the elements of bread and wine, to represent and exhibit Christ as spiritual nourishment to the soul, and to confirm our continuance and growth in Him, and that **only** to such as are **of years** and ability to **examine** themselves. First Corinthians 11:28-29.”

CONCLUSION: JORDAN: All we get is tradition-mongering. If anyone is like the Eastern Orthodox traditionalists, it is Dr. Lee and his associates. His position is a tradition in search of support. As has been shown by me and others for years, this tradition has no Biblical support. Thankfully, serious Reformed scholars, including many of the most conservative theologians in the PCA and OPC, are now going back to the Bible to see what it says.

LEE: Jim Jordan still has this obsession,  
for paidocommunion's regression.  
May he yet leave that feast  
of the heterodox East,  
and come back to Westminster's *Confession!* ♦

## The Blue Banner

*The Blue Banner* is published by The First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett, Texas (RPC). This work is supported by gifts. The cost to produce and mail a subscription is about \$15.00 per year. If you are able, please consider giving a gift of \$30.00 to support your subscription and one other.

All material in this issue Copyright © 1995 by *The Blue Banner*, a ministry of First Presbyterian Church Rowlett, unless otherwise noted. ♦

subscribe fully and strictly to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*.

Session: Pastor Richard Bacon. Elder David Seekamp.  
*The Blue Banner* Editor: Christopher Coldwell. Publisher:  
Deacon Gary Swearingen. ♦

The Blue Banner

P O Box 141084

Dallas, TX 75214

800-484-9377 ext. 3727

Email: BlueBanner@aol.com

## The First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett

First Presbyterian Rowlett, TX is a member church of the Reformation Presbyterian Church (RPC), a new Presbyterian denomination begun in 1994 by several churches in the United States and Canada. The subordinate standards of the RPC are the "whole doctrine contained in the *Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms* as approved by Acts of General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland in 1647 and 1648 respectively." The Worship of the RPC is that authorized in the *Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God*, and all elements of worship are limited to those described in *Westminster Confession* chapter 21. Officers of the RPC

## Complimentary Issue

**Your may be receiving *The Blue Banner* for the first time with this complimentary issue. This newsletter's scope is to promote the truths of the reformed faith, particularly those doctrines of the Westminster Standards under dispute today. Please see the subscription information at the top of the left-hand column of this page, and write to us if you wish to continue receiving *The Blue Banner*.**

## *The Blue Banner*

A Publication of  
First Presbyterian Church Rowlett  
P O Box 141084  
Dallas, TX 75214

### CONTENTS

Tyranny in Tyler, p. 1.



Letter of Confession of Sin by ARC  
Judicial Commissioners, p. 3.



Paedocommuion: Lee vs. Jordan, p. 5.



- *Tyranny in Tyler, p. 1*  
*Paedocommunion: Lee vs. Jordan, p. 5.*