

Should Children Eat the Lord's Supper?

A Defense of Believer's Communion

By Rev. Matthew J. Stanghelle

April 7, 2023¹

INTRODUCTION: WHO IS WORTHY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE LORD'S SUPPER?

Can my child take the Lord's Supper? That is one of the most common questions that young, Bible-believing parents ask me as a pastor. Our parental instincts say 'yes.' Moreover, a widespread practice in many parts of the church today would also suggest that 'yes' is the obvious answer. Indeed, Norwegian Christians report that child communion, the practice of letting any child take the Lord's Supper, is a nearly universal practice in Norwegian churches. With such widespread support, is there any reason to think otherwise?

Despite the widespread practice of letting children go to the Lord's Table, the Bible and church history testify to the importance of requiring a profession of faith before a person, child or adult, can participate in the Lord's Supper. The Bible uses the language of worthy and unworthy participation. That language runs against our modern sense of liberality and individual rights, but that is the biblical language. As we study the Bible, we discover the seriousness of coming to the Table unworthily and the consequences that follow. There are indeed biblical categories for worthy and unworthy participation.

In light of these dangers, the Reformed and Presbyterian community has been virtually unanimous in the belief that the Bible requires a profession of faith to be worthy of participation in the Lord's Table. Only in the last forty years has a small but vocal minority from the Reformed community opposed this historical belief. This group says that baptism is the only requirement for worthy participation. So who is right? Or, to put the question more accurately, which position is faithful to Scripture?

DEFINITIONS

Let's start with definitions. First, we will call the historic Reformed and Presbyterian view "believer's communion." Believer's communion—sometimes called *credocommunion*—is the position that requires a baptized person, child or adult, to make a profession of faith to the church before they can be admitted to the Lord's Table. Second, we will call the opposing view "child communion." Child communion—sometimes called *paedocommunion*—is the practice that allows baptized and sometimes unbaptized children to consume the elements of the Lord's Supper. But in this article, we will assume that the advocates for child communion allow only baptized children, but all baptized children, to participate in the Lord's Supper without making a profession of faith to the church.

¹ Revised May 9, 2023.

ARGUMENTS FOR CHILD COMMUNION

Advocates for child communion (paedocommunion) make their case along several lines of argument. This section will state some common appeals that have been made concerning debates within Den Presbyterianske Kirken i Norge. Rebuttals are included in each section.

Appeal to the Old Testament Passover

First, Child communion advocates appeal to family participation in the Old Testament Passover (e.g., Exod. 12:24, 47). As the Lord redeemed Israel from Egypt, entire families participated in the Passover meal. The Passover celebrated their collective, national deliverance from slavery in Egypt, and males were required circumcision to participate (i.e., Exod. 12:48). Pointing to this passage, child communion advocates argue that because the Lord's Supper is the New Testament equivalent of Passover, it logically follows that all baptized children have a right to fully participate in the Lord's Supper. As persuasive as this appeal may sound, an Old Testament shadow does not control the interpretation of the New Testament substance (viz. Col. 2:17; Heb. 8:5; 10:1). As in law, so in Scripture, the general is modified by the specific. We will see in the arguments below that the specifics of the New Testament forbid a baptized person to participate in the Lord's Supper without faith.

A further argument undercutting the child communion appeal to the Old Testament Passover is actual Jewish practice. While an exhaustive study of Jewish tradition is not possible here, it is noteworthy that the Jewish understanding of the Seder (i.e., the Passover meal) requires children to reach some level of training before they begin to participate in the Seder meal.² Moreover, Jewish children are not viewed as full members obligated to the covenant until they reach the age of majority—boys become Bar Mitzvah at age 13 and girls become Bat Mitzvah at age 12.³ Paedocommunionists wrongly appeal to Jewish practice because the Jews themselves recognize that full covenant membership requires a person to reach the age of majority, and full participation in the Seder is not simply a matter of circumcision.

Appeal to the Faith of John the Baptist in the Womb

Second, advocates for child communion appeal to *the faith of John the Baptist in the womb* (Luke 1:41). Some advocates point to John the Baptist leaping in the womb in the presence of Jesus as evidence that infants can have faith. This argument is weak. Let's say that God did indeed regenerate John the Baptist in the womb, which he probably did, but that still does not prove that God regenerates all children in the womb. Nor does it prove that God regenerates all children of believers in the womb. Indeed, the Scriptures and history prove that this is not so. Some advocates of child communion want to say that the children coming to the Table

² For example, writing about historic Jewish religious practice, Isaac Klein records that “when they have reached the age of being trained in the performance of religious commandments,” a child can have a small cup of wine during the Seder (Isaac Klein, *The Guide to Jewish Religious Practice*, The Jewish and Theological Seminary of America, New York and Jerusalem, 1979, 1992, cited from <<https://www.jtsa.edu/torah/the-laws-of-passover/#The%20Seder>> accessed May 9, 2023). Klein's statement shows that Jewish children are involved in the Seder meal but they do not fully partake in it. Seder participation is not merely a matter of circumcision.

³ See Shmuel Kogan, “At What Age Does a Child's Torah Education Begin” <https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/585406/jewish/At-what-age-does-Torah-education-begin.htm> accessed May 9, 2023.

have saving faith. The problem is that while young children can have saving faith, it does not follow that *all* young children have saving faith.

Appeal to Jesus' Welcome of Children

Third, advocates for child communion appeal to *Jesus' welcome of children* (e.g., Matt. 19:14). Jesus welcomed the children that parents brought to him, even infants (cf. Luke 18:15)! Jesus rebuked the disciples who were keeping them away, saying, "Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of God. Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it" (Luke 18:16-17).⁴ The problem with this appeal is that advocates for child communion misunderstand Jesus's point. Jesus describes the kind of faith required to enter the kingdom of heaven. Anyone trying to enter the kingdom of heaven on their own merits as an independent, self-reliant adult will not enter it. Entrance into the kingdom requires complete dependence on Christ, like a child depends entirely on their parents for life and survival.⁵

Appeal to Church History, Namely Eastern Orthodoxy

Fourth, child communion advocates appeal to *church history, specifically Eastern Orthodoxy*. Church historians generally grant that it was a common practice in the Eastern church to let all baptized children participate in the Lord's Supper from the fourth century A.D. onwards. Therefore, child communion advocates argue we should too. The problem with this line of argument is that it wants to accept the practice while rejecting the theology of those who practice it. Eastern Orthodox Christians let their children, even their infants, consume the elements of the Lord's Supper because they believe in baptismal regeneration. They believe that God removes original sin in baptism and that the Lord's Supper is an "actualization" of salvation for every person who consumes it. This view of the Sacraments is radically different from the Protestant doctrine. Until recently, most churches outside of the Eastern Orthodox tradition have required confirmation of faith before a baptized person takes first communion.⁶

Appeal to the Judgment of Parents for a Child's Readiness

Fifth, advocates sometimes argue that if participation in the Lord's Table requires faith, it is up to the parents to decide when that is for their child. However, there is no biblical warrant for such an assertion. God does not give the parents the right to guard and assess the church's standard of faith and determine its membership. Christ gave that role to the apostles (cf. Matt.

⁴ All Scripture quotations are from *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2016).

⁵ This text can be used by parents who bring their children to Christ in baptism or dedication, as the parents in this text brought their children to Jesus, but it is improper to use this passage to argue that Jesus welcomes all children to the Table. We will see that this interpretation is improper because the Bible shows in another passage, discussed below, that not all baptized people are worthy of the Table, namely those who are baptized but do not come with repentant faith.

⁶ For example, Baptists confirm candidates through the vows taken in believer's baptism. Roman Catholics and Lutherans, though apparently not Norwegian Lutherans, require confirmation before first communion. Reformed and Protestant churches require a profession of faith at least before the Elders of the church, sometimes including catechism classes beforehand and a public profession before the church afterwards.

16:19), which he later entrusted to the church (cf. Matt. 18:18). Who holds the “keys of the kingdom” depends on which form of government you believe is biblical. Roman Catholics believe the pope has the keys. Baptists believe that the congregation holds the keys. The Presbyterian and Continental Reformed churches believe that the church elders (Greek: *presbyters*) hold the keys of the kingdom. Regardless of which position is correct, in the post-apostolic church, the responsibility of screening candidates for communing membership is given to the overseers of the church, not individual parents.

An objection is sometimes made at this point by child communion advocates. They say that believer’s communion reduces faith to a ‘mere profession.’ They argue that parents are better positioned to assess their child’s faith than church elders. The problem with this objection is that it misunderstands the point. No one can infallibly discern if a person’s profession of faith is genuine—not the pope, the congregation, the elders, and certainly not the parents. Even so, Scripture gives the keys to the overseers of the church. God never gives the keys of the kingdom to individual parents or families. Moreover, church history is void of any tradition that believes that the Scriptures teach that parents should let the church know if their child is a professing believer. The normative practice in churches, from Roman Catholic to Protestant, has been to require a confirmation of faith by the church before a person can take the Lord’s Supper for the first time.⁷

Rejection of the Reformed and Presbyterian Position

Finally, advocates of child communion *reject the Reformed and Presbyterian position*, which believes that Scripture teaches that faith, not baptism, is the fundamental requirement for participation in the Lord’s Supper (cf. WCF 29.7; WLC Q. 177; WSC Qs. 91, 96, 97). The Westminster Larger Catechism demonstrates this classic distinction:

Q. 177. Wherein do the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper differ?

A. 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.

Even advocates for child communion acknowledge that a faith requirement has been the near-universal position among the Reformed and Presbyterian denominations.⁸ Moreover, the Reformed and Presbyterian churches began to debate child communion (paedocommunion) in the late 1980s. All denominations in the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) ultimately rejected the practice of child communion as a novelty unsupported by Scripture. None of the historic Reformed or Presbyterian denominations

⁷ See note above.

⁸ For an example, see the Presbyterian Church in America’s (PCA) Report of the Ad-Interim Committee to Study the Question of Paedocommunion, p. 503.

allow the practice of paedocommunion today.⁹ Despite this, advocates for child communion argue that the entire Reformed and Presbyterian tradition has read the Scriptures wrong. While not impossible, this argument falls flat on the balance of probabilities.

As a result of these appeals, advocates for child communion teach that baptism alone is the basis for one's worthiness to participate in the Lord's Supper. However, these appeals, considered individually and as a whole, do not stand the test of Scripture.

THE CASE FOR BELIEVER'S COMMUNION

In what follows, I argue that believer's communion (credocommunion) is what the Bible teaches. Moreover, as stated above, this position is the uniform confessional belief of the historic Reformed and Presbyterian churches, representing both the confessional positions of the Westminster and Continental Reformed traditions.¹⁰

The case for believer's communion is as follows:

1. The Bible Teaches That All Children Are Born in Sin

The Bible teaches that all children are born in sin. In other words, God's Word teaches that there are no innocent children. David writes in Psalm 51:5, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Our sinful nature does not begin with the sins we commit; our very nature from the womb is an offense to God. This teaching is called "original sin." Our relation to Adam means that each one of us is born sinful. Paul expresses this view in Rom. 5:12, "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned."

2. The Bible Teaches That Baptism Doesn't Save You Without Faith

The Bible teaches that baptism does not save a person *without faith*. At Pentecost, Peter proclaims, "Repent and be baptized...for the forgiveness of your sins" (Acts 2:38). Repentance is an act of faith, and baptism is only the external testimony of that repentant faith. Indeed, faith is the hallmark of true Christians. Just a few verses later, Luke writes, "And all who believed were together..." (Acts. 2:44). In his first letter, it is true that Peter says, "Baptism...now saves you" (1 Peter 3:21a). But Peter goes on to clarify the substance of what saves you—"an appeal to God for a good conscience..." (1 Pet. 3:21b). Peter says that the act of washing with water does not save you. Instead, appealing to God for a clean conscience is an act of repentant faith. It is that faith that saves you. Baptism is merely the external symbol of that saving faith. Likewise, Paul points to faith, not baptism for salvation, "if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9; see also Eph. 2:8-9). Paul builds his entire ministry around "the obedience of faith" (cf. Rom. 1:5; 16:26). John has the same goal: "But

⁹ In response to NAPARC's rejection of child communion, a small break away denomination of dissenters has emerged called the Communion of Reformed Evangelical Churches (CREC).

¹⁰ For the Presbyterian tradition see the Westminster Confession of Faith 29.8; the Westminster Larger Catechism Q. 177; the Westminster Shorter Catechism Qs. 91, 96, 97; for the Continental Reformed tradition see the Belgic Confession Article 35, and the Heidelberg Catechism Qs. 81-82.

these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name” (John 20:31). The apostles’ consistent message is that faith, not baptism, saves us. Or stated another way, baptism symbolizes faith, but it is not faith itself. Without faith, the symbol of baptism is meaningless.

3. The Bible Teaches That the Sacraments Do Not Create Faith

The first two points help us to see that the Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord’s Supper—do not create faith. The Sacraments can only strengthen the faith that is already there. The Sacraments cannot do anything if the Spirit does not choose to work in a person. Jesus says to Nicodemus in John 3:7-8, “Do not marvel that I said to you, ‘You must be born again.’ The wind blows where it wishes, and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes from or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit.” Evangelism would be easy if baptism were the only thing needed to make them born again. But that’s not how it works. “Faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ” (Rom. 10:17). Paul shows us in this text that the normative means of salvation is faith through preaching and hearing the gospel. Now, a young child can be regenerate, perhaps like John the Baptist (see above), but the Holy Spirit renewing the heart when a person hears the gospel is the normative way God saves his people. The act of being born again is not the act of baptism but the action of the Spirit, who works when and how he wishes. Knowing that the Spirit saves through preaching, Paul’s primary mission is to preach the gospel, not baptize: “For Christ did not send me to baptize but to preach the gospel” (1 Cor. 1:17). Likewise, we will see below that the Lord’s Supper does not create faith either. Where faith is absent, the Lord’s Supper can only bring judgment. To summarize, the Sacraments are symbols of faith; they cannot create faith.

4. The Bible Teaches That Faith Is Intelligible and Intellectual

But what is faith? Isn’t a child walking up to the Lord’s Table an act of young faith? Maybe. But not necessarily. Advocates for child communion criticize the believer’s communion position of intellectualizing faith, but they are wrong to do so. The Bible teaches that faith is intellectual and capable of responding intelligibly. Salvation comes from a heart that believes and a mouth that confesses (Rom. 10:10). But what do they believe and confess? Saving faith is built on content that a person can understand and communicate: “If you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved.” Saving faith has the intellectual ability to confess the basics of the gospel. In Romans, Paul describes faith as the law of the mind and the need to strengthen faith as the renewal of the mind (Rom. 7:23; 12:2). Faith, by its definition, is intellectual and intelligible. But this doesn’t mean that each person has the same intellect or ability to intelligibly communicate the faith (cf. Rom. 12:3). A child can have faith. But where faith is present, there will be a growing ability to understand and communicate the basics of the gospel, especially the ability to repent sin and trust in Jesus as the means of salvation (viz. Mark 1:15).¹¹

5. The Bible Teaches That Faith Is Essential

Not only is faith intelligible, but it is also essential. Confronting the Jews in Jerusalem, Peter proclaims that faith in the name of Jesus healed the paralytic (Acts 3:16). He accuses the

¹¹ Regarding infants and the mentally handicapped consider the Westminster Confession of Faith 10:3.

Jews of acting in ignorance. He calls them to repent so that God may forgive their sins (Acts 3:19). When the Jews brought him before the council, Peter proclaimed that faith in the name of Jesus is essential: “and there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). Later in the book of Acts, Peter links the essential requirement of faith to the Old Testament prophets too: “To him all the prophets bear witness that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name” (Acts 10:43).

So is baptism for salvation enough? No. The Bible is emphatic that salvation comes through faith. Faith is the work of the Holy Spirit. Faith comes from hearing the gospel. Faith is repenting and believing in the gospel. And faith is essential for salvation. As the apostle Paul writes in Ephesians 2:8-9, “For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God, not a result of works, so that no one may boast.” A pastor or priest who baptizes a child cannot produce faith in that child. Nor can a parent who dedicates their child to Christ create faith in that child. Faith is a gift of grace that man cannot force, manipulate, or control. It is the gift of God so that no one may boast.

Having established the necessity of faith for salvation, we must now turn to the question of what the Bible requires for worthy participation in the Lord’s Supper.

6. The Bible Teaches That Baptism Doesn’t Make You Automatically Worthy of the Table

Faith is the objective marker of the true people of God. However, advocates for child communion argue for a different objective marker. The “objectivity of the covenant” is a core teaching for advocates of child communion. The objectivity of the covenant is part of a larger body of teaching known as Federal Vision which the churches of the historic Reformed and Presbyterian traditions have soundly rejected.¹² The idea behind the objectivity of the covenant, proponents say, is that the covenant marker of baptism objectively shows us who is visibly elect and united to Christ. The logic follows that those united to Christ, meaning those baptized, have an obvious right to participate in the Lord’s Supper. This concept may sound logical, but it is not what the Bible teaches. Baptism does not make you automatically worthy of the Lord’s Table. Aside from an unorthodox understanding of union with Christ, advocates for child communion wrongly look to baptism as the objective requirement for baptism.

The Bible teaches that baptism does not make a person automatically or objectively worthy of the Table. Baptism is a big deal in the Corinthian church (cf. 1 Cor. 1:14). Given what Paul says at the start of the letter, it is safe to assume that everyone he is writing to has been baptized. Indeed, scholars generally agree that the New Testament has no category for an unbaptized Christian. To be a Christian is to be a baptized Christian (e.g., Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12; Rom. 6:4; Eph. 4:5; Col. 2:12). Understanding that all Christians are normatively baptized in the New Testament, including those in Corinth, we see that the Bible teaches that not all baptized Christians are worthy to participate in the Lord’s Table. The basis for this argument is what Paul writes to the Corinthian church:

¹² All of the Presbyterian and Reformed churches in NAPARC reject Federal Vision theology. For example, see the PCA’s Report of the Ad-Interim Study Committee on Federal Vision, New Perspective, and Auburn Avenue Theology.

Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup.—1 Corinthians 11:27-28

A personal examination is necessary for worthy participation in the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:28). In other words, baptism is not an automatic or objective ticket for approaching the Table. As in Corinth, so today, baptism is not enough. Due to a lack of personal examination and repentant faith, the church includes baptized people who are not worthy to participate in the Lord's Supper.

The scholar, Frank Thielman, writes about unworthy participation and personal examination in the ESV Study Bible. He writes, "Unworthy manner probably refers to the incompatibility of the Corinthians' divisive arrogance as compared to the sacrificial, others-oriented nature of Jesus' death. A broader application of this principle would encourage believers to examine their own lives (see v. 28) and to repent and ask forgiveness for any unconfessed sin before partaking in the Lord's Supper."¹³ And regarding a personal examination, he writes, "Whoever partakes of the Lord's Supper must examine himself to see whether he has properly understood the unselfish, atoning nature of Jesus' death "for" others, and how that should be imitated in his own life."¹⁴

Worthy participation in the Lord's Supper requires that baptized Christians approach the Table with repentant faith. As Thielman writes, worthy participation includes the ability to repent of unconfessed sins and ask forgiveness before coming to the Lord's Table. Therefore, we conclude that repentant faith, not baptism, is the objective marker for coming to the Lord's Table.

7. The Bible Teaches That Unworthy Participation in the Table Brings Judgment

Finally, the consequence of unworthy participation is severe. A baptized person who participates in the Lord's Supper without personal examination "will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:27). Such guilt produces grave consequences. Paul goes on to say in verse 29:

For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself.—1 Corinthians 11:29

This warning understands the vital importance of fencing the Table. Fencing the Table means screening or warning those who approach the Table. Those who come to the Table without personal examination, or as Paul says in this verse, "without discerning the body"—eat and drink judgment on themselves.

¹³ Crossway Bibles, *The ESV Study Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2008), 2208.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

“Without discerning the body” is understood in one of two ways. Some argue that Paul means ‘without understanding that the bread and wine represent Christ’s sacrifice on the cross.’ Others say that Paul means ‘an inability to understand what it means to act like Christ as members of his body.’ “On either view,” Thielman writes, “these people do not recognize the spiritual reality of what is happening at the Lord’s Supper, and therefore they are acting in a way that dishonors Christ.”¹⁵ Thielman writes, “Eats and drinks judgment on himself is a sober warning that the Lord will discipline those who dishonor the Lord’s Supper (see 11:30), and therefore it should not be entered into lightly.”¹⁶

Fatally, advocates of child communion argue that 1 Corinthians 11 simply does not apply to baptized children. But there is no warrant in the text for such a dismissal. Paul’s pronouns in this passage—“whoever” (v. 27) and “anyone” (v. 29)—refer to *every* baptized person in the Corinthians church—man, woman, and child.

CONCLUSION

We have been asking whether or not children should eat and drink the elements of the Lord’s Supper. The biblical case has been made to show that Believer’s Communion is the most faithful interpretation of Scripture. We have seen that Children do not come to the Lord’s Table as innocent souls, and while baptism points them to faith, it does not save them. The Bible teaches that Children are born in sin. Baptism does not save without faith. The Sacraments do not create faith. Faith is intelligible and intellectual. Faith is essential. The Bible is clear that baptism does not automatically make a candidate worthy to participate in the Lord’s Supper, and to participate without a personal examination and discernment of the Lord’s body is to eat and drink judgment on yourself. The objective requirement for participation in the Lord’s Supper is not baptism but repentant faith.

To let children eat the bread and drink the wine of communion before they understand sin and faith in Jesus is a grave mistake. Based on the strict warnings of Scripture, encouraging people to go to the Table without requiring a profession of faith constitutes spiritual abuse. Fencing the Table is an essential element of the Lord’s Supper. Fencing helps prevent church members from eating and drinking judgment on themselves. Neglecting or denying this element promotes serious harm and endangers the well-being of the church and the participants themselves. Church ministers and elders are stewards of the sacraments, and encouraging such abuse of the Table is a grave dereliction of duty.

While churches can decide when a baptized person is *ready* to participate in the Lord’s Supper, they do not have the right to *remove* the biblical requirement of repentant faith for worthy participation.¹⁷ To remove the biblical need for repentant faith is both a mockery of Christ’s sacrifice and an endangerment to the unworthy participant.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ The “how” question is addressed for First Presbyterian Church of Norway by its denominational requirements, which are available online and can be read in chapter 57 of the Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in America. The same Book of Church Order has been adopted by Den Presbyterianske Kirken i Norge and is applicable to Berøa Presbyterianske Kirke.

As Bible-believing Christians, we must hold fast to what the Bible commands, no matter our parental or personal inclinations. That is why this author affirms the teaching of our doctrinal standards as being faithful to Scripture when it says in the Westminster Larger Catechism:

Q. 177. Wherein do the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper differ?

A. 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.* (emphasis mine)

Likewise, we affirm as biblically faithful the broader Reformed Tradition as expressed in the Belgic Confession, Article 35:

Lastly, we receive this holy sacrament in the assembly of the people of God, with humility and reverence, keeping up among us a holy remembrance of the death of Christ our Savior, with thanksgiving, making there confession of our faith and of the Christian religion. *Therefore no one ought to come to this Table without having previously rightly examined himself, lest by eating of this bread and drinking of this cup he eat and drink judgment to himself.* In a word, we are moved by the use of this holy sacrament to a fervent love towards God and our neighbor. (emphasis mine)
