

Covenant Children and Covenant Meals: Biblical Evidence for Infant Communion

Matthew W. Mason

Amongst Anglican evangelicals, the issue of infant communion is controversial. Whilst some advocate welcoming children to communion¹, a number who have written on the subject are vigorously opposed.² This article is intended as a constructive, biblical contribution to these debates. I offer four lines of evidence that baptised children should be welcomed to the Lord's Table as soon as they are physically able to consume bread and wine. I shall examine in turn the Passover meal, peace offerings, the wilderness manna, and the Bread of the Presence.³ In each case I shall examine the relationship between the Old Covenant meal and the Lord's Supper, who participated in the meal, and what that implies for infant communion.

Passover and the Lord's Supper

In the Synoptic Gospels, the Last Supper, at which Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper, is presented as a Passover meal:⁴ 'they date it; they have Jesus and the disciples speak of "eating the Passover"; they have the disciples "preparing the Passover-meal".'⁵ As Christ's death typologically fulfilled the redemptive sacrifice of the Passover lamb and so brought about a new exodus, so the Church's memorial meal, the Lord's Supper, typologically fulfils Israel's memorial meal, the annual Passover.

Exodus 12 indicates that all Israel, young and old, ate the Egyptian Passover. The head of each household was to kill a lamb for his house to eat (v. 3), but if the household was too small for a whole lamb, then neighbours were to share one. The amount required was to be calculated 'according to the number of persons; according to what each can eat' (v. 4; lit: 'each one according to the mouth of his eating'. *'is l'pî 'oklō*) In other words, the amount of lamb was calculated according to the number of mouths that needed feeding, and according to how much they would eat. The qualification for participation was

not a certain level of spiritual maturity or understanding, but the possession of a mouth that needed filling with the only food available that evening. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the only other place where this Hebrew phrase appears is Exodus 16, where it occurs three times (vv. 16, 18, 21) in relation to the collection of the manna for each household. Clearly infants and small children were included here, as manna was the only food available to the people at that time.⁶

Exodus 12 restricts who may participate in the Passover in subsequent generations (Exod. 12:43-49): one must be a covenant member. All the congregation of Israel are to keep the Passover (v. 47), but foreigners and hired servants are excluded (vv. 43, 45). Any slave bought into a household was welcome to eat the Passover after he had been circumcised, and similarly any sojourner wishing to participate in the Passover had to be circumcised along with all the males of his household (v. 48). These regulations provide an echo of Genesis 17, in which males brought into a household are to be circumcised and so brought into the covenant, whilst any uncircumcised male is to be cut off from the people for breaking the covenant (vv. 13f). The implication is clear: any covenant member, but only covenant members, may participate in the meal that memorialises covenant redemption. And this included children.

Nevertheless, Calvin argues that Exodus 12:26 undercuts this conclusion. He claims that here is evidence that the annual Passover was only eaten ‘by those who were old enough to be able to inquire into its meaning’.⁷ However, there is no indication in the verse that children were excluded until such time as they were capable of asking about the meaning of the Passover. A more natural reading would be that the children, who were present, had their curiosity aroused by the rite, and so began to ask about the meaning of what they were already doing.⁸ Children ask a similar question of their fathers concerning God’s words in Deuteronomy 6:20: ‘What is the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes and the rules the Yahweh our God has commanded you?’ On Calvin’s logic, presumably one should refrain from teaching one’s children anything from God’s Word until such time as they begin to ask about it themselves; but no responsible Christian parent would dream of such a thing.

More recently, Michael Lefebvre, noting the differences between the Egyptian Passover, and later commemorative Passovers, has cautiously suggested that

the second person singular pronoun: ‘what do *you* mean by this service’ suggests that only the fathers were eating the annual Passover; the children were simply observers.⁹ However, this reads too much into the one pronoun, not least when one considers Deuteronomy 6:20-24, where children ask their fathers about the meaning of the testimonies that Yahweh ‘has commanded *you*’. There is no thought here that the second person plural pronoun indicates that the children are not bound by Yahweh’s commands, and the fathers in their response are to speak of what Yahweh commanded *us*, which we may presume includes their children.

Thus there is no reason from Exodus 12 to believe that any covenant member in good standing was excluded from the annual Passover. There are no age-related restrictions, no hint of the need for a certain level of understanding or spiritual maturity. The only restriction is whether or not one is a member of the covenant people, which, as we have seen, covenant children are. However, although Exodus 12 legislates for all covenant members to participate in the Passover, Deuteronomy 16 suggests to some a narrowing of participants.¹⁰

Deuteronomy 16—a change in requirements?

The chapter deals with the three major annual feasts in Israel’s calendar: Passover (vv. 1-8), Weeks (vv. 9-12), and Booths (vv. 13-15), giving instructions on how Israel are to celebrate them once they enter the Land. There are two major differences between the Deuteronomic instructions for the annual Passover and the original Egyptian one. First, whereas the original Passover was eaten family by family, once Israel entered the land they were expressly forbidden to eat it in their towns. Rather, they were to sacrifice and eat the Passover only at the place Yahweh chose (vv. 5-7, 16), that is, at the tabernacle and later the Temple. Secondly, whereas originally all of the people participated in the Passover, now only Israel’s males are commanded to attend (vv. 16f). Roger Beckwith claims that although women and children are not excluded by Deuteronomy 16, their participation ‘does not seem to be either expected or encouraged’.¹¹ Lefebvre is stronger: ‘This [chapter], it seems to me, offers a decisive indication of the Passover gathering as male adults’.¹²

However, these conclusions do not follow. The instruction in verse 16 applies not simply to the Passover, but also to the two other feasts, and we know from earlier in the chapter that at the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Booths many

more people than simply the men of Israel were able to participate (vv. 11, 14). Thus, the instruction that all males shall appear before Yahweh cannot, at least in these cases, be taken to mean that men *and only men* can attend. Rather, only the men of Israel were *commanded* to attend, whilst women and children were *permitted* to attend.

However, Lefebvre notes that of the three feasts, only Passover does not include instructions to include children, widows and others in the provision. He concludes that therefore it does not have the same participants. He also correctly argues that we cannot directly transfer the participation lists of the feasts of Weeks and Booths to Passover, because uncircumcised sojourners are included in the observance of the former two, but were explicitly excluded from the Passover (Deut. 16:11, 14; cf. Exod. 12:43ff); Passover participation is more restrictive. However, we have already been told who may participate in the Passover (Exod. 12), but until Deuteronomy 16 have had no similar instructions regarding Weeks and Booths. Thus, although the Passover participation is more restrictive, there is no reason to think it is limited to men. Rather, Israel would have known from Exodus 12 who was permitted to celebrate the Passover meal; the only modification of that in Deuteronomy 16 is that they are told that only adult males are *compelled* to attend. The reason is probably as follows: as we have seen, once Israel enters the Land, the Passover celebration is centralised at the sanctuary; it might therefore be difficult for the sick, young children, or pregnant women to attend the Feast, so only adult males are obliged to go. Nevertheless, the rest of the family had the right and privilege to attend were they able so to do.¹³ Under the New Covenant, believers no longer need make a long journey to participate in the Lord's Supper, and so therefore this temporary modification of Passover, because of geography, is no longer required.

Lefebvre does not say that Exodus 12 and Deuteronomy 16 provide concrete evidence as to who participates; he simply claims that they do not expressly include women and children, and, given that other feasts *do*, then the silence concerning the Passover is strengthened.¹⁴ Moreover, he claims that at Passover the men were the offerers of the sacrifice, and so it is unsurprising that they and they alone, should be the ones who eat of it. He argues that this does not exclude women and children from the benefits of the meal, because in some sense they participate in their representative, the head of their family.

However, Deuteronomy 12:4-7 deals with the centralised sanctuary and shows that, although men were the offerers of the sacrifices and offerings, they ate before Yahweh *with their households*. In other words, the Old Testament makes it clear that male representation in certain aspects of sacrificial meals does not imply male only participation, quite the reverse: they feast with their family. There is no reason why this principle should not also apply to the Passover. In the first Passover meal, all the family participated, even though it was the household head who slaughtered the lamb. And the text of Exodus 12 makes it explicit that the size of lamb was calculated to enable everyone with a mouth to participate; the only restriction placed is (for males) one of circumcision.

Thus, we can conclude that, although it was not compulsory for children to participate in the Passover meal once Israel were in the Land, they had the right and privilege of so doing. Therefore, given the typological relationship between the Passover meal and the Lord's Supper, we can conclude that once a baptised child is physically capable of consuming the elements (that is, once he can eat solids) there is no reason to exclude him from the Lord's Supper. Indeed, there is every reason to include him. Lefebvre is surely correct to state that Jesus' death and resurrection led to expanded participation in the sacraments of the covenant: Gentiles can now participate as Gentiles, girls as well as boys can be baptised. Thus, 'it would be problematic to devise a New Testament doctrine of communion that adds restrictions to the Table unknown in the Old Testament.' Therefore, if children participated in the Old Testament Passover, we would need 'extremely clear Apostolic instruction' to impose tighter restrictions. At the very least, this places the burden of proof firmly on those who would bar the infant children of believers from the Lord's Supper.¹⁵

The Peace Offering

The Peace Offering was one of the five major sacrifices in the Levitical system. It was the one animal sacrifice of which the lay worshipper could eat (Lev. 7:15-17). Whereas in the burnt, sin, and guilt offerings, the priest made atonement (Lev. 1:4; 4:20; 5:6; Heb. *kipër*), this was not the case with the grain and peace offerings. The blood of the peace offering still enabled the worshipper to draw near, but the main focus was the meal, expressing joy and intimate fellowship with Yahweh. As part of the sacrificial system, it pointed forward to the perfect sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 10:5-10). However, as the sacrifice of which the worshipper ate, it also pointed forward to the Lord's Supper.¹⁶

The Peace Offering and the Lord's Supper

The evidence that the Lord's Supper fulfils and transforms the Peace Offering is perhaps less clear than that relating to the Passover. Nevertheless, the Passover was itself a particular type of peace offering.¹⁷ The Passover was a *zebah*, the common name for a peace offering. Both included a communal meal and directions for disposing of leftovers (Exod. 12:10; Lev. 7:15); and the daubing of the Passover blood around the doorframe corresponded to the sprinkled blood of the peace offering.

In the New Testament, there are a number of echoes of the peace offering in passages relating to the Lord's Supper.¹⁸ First, 1 Corinthians 10:18 draws a parallel between eating the Lord's Supper and the Old Covenant worshippers 'eating the sacrifices', a reference to Leviticus 7:11-18. The peace offering was the one most commonly described as a sacrifice (*zebah*), and as we have seen, it was the only offering that the worshipper ate. In eating the peace offerings, the worshippers were participants (κοινωνοὶ) in the altar (1 Cor. 10:18), just as eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper is a participation (κοινωνία) in the body and blood of Christ (10:16). Secondly, at the Last Supper, Jesus spoke of his blood as 'the blood of the covenant' (Matt. 26:28), an echo of the blood of the covenant sprinkled on the people by Moses (Exod. 24:8). But this blood came from peace offerings (24:5, 11). Thirdly, in the words of institution Jesus instructed his disciples to 'do this as my memorial' (εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). As we shall see below, this phrase is used in the LXX of the Bread of the Presence (Lev. 24:7). However, it is also a reference to the trumpets that were blown over the peace offering (Num. 10:10). The verb μνησθῆναι ('to remember'), which is closely related to the noun ἀνάμνησις ('memorial'), is also used of peace offerings themselves (Dt. 16:3; Ps. 20:3 [Heb. 20:4; LXX 19:4]). Thus, the New Testament writers, and Jesus himself, seem to have regarded the Lord's Supper as fulfilling the peace offering. It is fair to assume, therefore, that in the absence of instructions to the contrary, regulations for participation in the peace offering should also govern participation in the Lord's Supper.

Who ate the Peace Offering?

As we have seen, the peace offering was the one offering in the Levitical system where the lay worshipper could eat. However, as with the Passover, not only the man who slaughtered the animal, but also his whole family, was permitted to feast on the sacrificial meat (Deut. 12:4-7). Once again, this passage evokes the

Abrahamic covenant when the worshippers are told to eat and rejoice before Yahweh, ‘you and your household’ when they bring, among other things, their sacrifices (i.e. peace offerings). There is no age restriction placed upon who may or may not be considered part of the household, and, given the Abrahamic covenant, it seems that the youngest children would have been included. Once again, when they were physically mature enough to eat, covenant children ate.

This appears to have been the pattern followed year on year by Elkanah (1 Sam. 1:3-8). After sacrificing, he would give portions of the meat to his wives, Hannah and Penninah, and also to his children by Penninah. Given that this happened every year, and given that no mention is made of an age when the children began to participate, there is every reason to think that even the youngest of his children were included in the family’s sacrificial feast.

Therefore, as with the Passover meal, the evidence of the peace offering points firmly in the direction of infant and child inclusion in the covenant meals of the Old Covenant, and so also of the New.

1 Corinthians 10:1-5: Manna in the Wilderness

In 1 Corinthians 8–10, the presenting issue with which Paul is dealing is that of whether, and in what circumstances, Christians can eat food that has been offered to idols (8:1). In chapter 10, he compares participating in idol worship with participating in Christ at the Lord’s Table, and Israel’s participation in the altar of the Temple. However, first he draws a parallel between Israel and the Church. He uses Israel in the wilderness as a warning to Corinthian arrogance (10:11-13). The Corinthians should beware, for just as they have been baptised and participate in Christ, so too had the people of Israel, and yet God was not pleased with them and so they fell in the wilderness. Paul’s argument depends on an implicit sacramental parallelism between baptism into Christ (cf. 12:12f) and Israel’s baptism into Moses (10:2), and between participation in the body and blood of Christ in the Supper (10:16) and Israel’s eating spiritual food and water in the wilderness, during which time they drank from Christ (10:4).

As Glenn Davies notes, it is hard not to infer that Paul regarded Israel’s wilderness food and drink as sacramental in character, ‘for the manna was not merely supernaturally provided for Israel, it was “spiritual” food’, an adjective that typically refers to ‘an object or person that is a bearer or agent of the Holy Spirit

(cf. 2:13, 15; 3:1; 9:11; 12:1; 14:1, 37; 15:44, 46).¹⁹ Similarly they drank spiritual drink as they drank water from the spiritual Rock. Why? Because the Rock was Christ. The Holy Spirit enabled the people of Israel to feed on Christ in the wilderness. And yet they fell. This is a direct warning to the ‘spiritual’ Corinthian Christians, a warning that one can partake of the Spirit and still fall to destruction.

However, for our purposes, it is important to note who was baptised and ate spiritual food and drank spiritual drink. Five times, Paul emphasises that it was all the Israelites. Although Daunton-Fear rightly observes that Paul’s primary intention at this point is not to discuss whether or not children are included in the Supper,²⁰ the repeated ‘all’ does, by implication, include the infants and children of Israel.²¹ They too passed through the sea and were baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea. As we noted above, manna was to be gathered according to the number of mouths to be fed, including children. It was the only food available, just as the only drink available was water from the Rock, which was Christ. Thus, it seems fair to conclude that the children of Israel also fed spiritually on the manna, and drank spiritually of Christ. Paul certainly makes no move to *exclude* them at this point, and this in a letter where he stresses that the children of believers are holy (7:14). Moreover, we should note the contrast in verse 5, where Paul says that ‘with *most* of them God was not pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness.’ Who was excepted from God’s wrath? Joshua, Caleb, and anyone under the age of 20 at the time of the rebellion. The children of Israel are not entirely absent from these verses. Therefore, given the parallel between the manna and Rock and the Lord’s Supper, it seems fair to infer that children can still eat and drink spiritually of Christ, when they receive bread and wine.

The Bread of the Presence

A final piece of Old Testament evidence for infant communion is somewhat different. This was not a holy meal that children ate, nor even one that laymen could eat. The Bread of the Presence was restricted to the priests, who consumed it on the Sabbath (Lev. 24:5-9). However, I shall argue that it nevertheless indicates that baptised infants should be permitted to participate in the Lord’s Supper.

The Bread of the Presence and the Lord’s Supper

The LXX translation of Leviticus 24:5-9 has clear verbal links with the Synoptic accounts of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. Just as the bread in

the Lord's Supper is given by Jesus as a memorial (εις ἀνάμνησιν; Luke 22:19), so frankincense is placed on each pile of the Bread of the Presence as a memorial portion (εις ἀνάμνησιν Lev. 24:7). The cup of the Supper is the new covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) in Christ's blood (Luke 22:20). Similarly, the Bread of the Presence is given as a covenant forever (διαθήκη αἰώνιον; Lev. 24:8). These allusions indicate that the Supper typologically fulfils and replaces the Bread of the Presence. This would also make sense of the early church's practice of celebrating the Supper each week (Acts 20:7) for, unlike the Passover, the Bread of the Presence was consumed weekly (Lev. 24:8f). The difficulty is that only the priests could eat the Bread of the Presence. How then can it point to the meal for the whole of the New Covenant family?

Bread of the Presence, Priests, and Baptism

Peter Leithart has argued that Christian baptism and Old Covenant priestly ordination are typologically related, so that baptism fulfils ordination, and that therefore all the baptised are priests.²² Theologically this fits with the fact that Christ is our High Priest. Baptism is into Christ (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27), and so therefore, in him all the baptised are priests. Secondly, as the Reformed tradition has always acknowledged, baptism initiates one into the visible church. But, the church is a royal priesthood (1 Pet. 2:9f; Rev. 1:6; 5:10; 20:6), and so therefore all the baptised are, by their baptism, inducted into this priesthood to serve as priests. Exegetically, Leithart examines a number of New Testament passages.²³ Here we shall briefly consider one: Hebrews 10:19-22.²⁴

Most commentators regard the washing of bodies in Hebrews 10:22 as a reference to baptism,²⁵ and λούω or its cognates can be used in reference to baptism elsewhere in the New Testament (Acts 22:16). However, the question arises as to the source of the dual imagery of washing and sprinkling. Leithart, following the majority of commentators, suggests that it is drawn from the rite of priestly ordination, which is one of the rare occasions in the Old Testament where one must come under both blood and water (Exod. 29:4, 21; Lev. 8:6, 30).²⁶ The same words are used as in Hebrews 10:22: Aaron and his sons are washed (λούω) in water (Exod. 29:5) and sprinkled (ῥαντίζω) with blood (Exod. 29:21). Although blood is not mentioned in Hebrews 10:22, in the epistle as a whole, sprinkling (ῥαντίζω) generally refers to sprinkling with blood (9:9, 21-22; 12:24). Even sprinkling with the ashes of the red heifer is

no exception (9:13), because the heifer's blood was burned and mixed with water (Num. 19:5). Thus, the verse speaks of baptism using language borrowed from Old Covenant priestly ordinations. This makes good sense in the context, which speaks of drawing near into the holy places through the work of Jesus, the high priest. Thus, baptism is seen as a form of priestly ordination. Hebrews 8–10 contrasts the restricted sanctuary access of the Old Covenant with the unrestricted access for all under the New Covenant, access not merely into a copy or shadow, but into the heavenly reality itself. Baptism has replaced priestly ordination, and has dissolved the previous distinctions between priests and people. All the baptised are priests with full sanctuary access.

As we have seen, the priests in the Old Covenant ate the Bread of the Presence, which is typologically fulfilled in the Lord's Supper. Therefore we can conclude that, as all the baptised are priests, they should all eat of the Supper. Thus, paedobaptists should also be paedocommunionists. If we are to be consistent, we should treat them as priests, and so feed them at the Lord's Table.

Conclusion

The Old Testament evidence thus points strongly to the fact that covenant children had access to all of the Old Covenant meals to which their parents had access, including the Passover meal, the peace offering, and the wilderness manna. These meals are all typologically related to the Lord's Supper, such that, under the New Covenant, the Supper fulfils and replaces them. Therefore, given that the covenant status of children is same under both Old Covenant and New Covenant, the evidence that covenant children should have access to the Lord's Supper is overwhelming. Further, given that baptism typologically fulfils priestly ordination, so that all the baptised are priests, the fact that Old Covenant priests ate the Bread of the Presence, another type of the Lord's Supper, also indicates the propriety of infant communion. To deny the loaf and the cup to children is to deny their status as priests in the household of God, and directly to contradict their baptismal identity. In other words, if the arguments advanced in this article are correct, paedobaptism and paedocommunion belong together.

MATTHEW W. MASON is curate of St. John's Church, Tunbridge Wells.

ENDNOTES

1. E.g., Colin Buchanan, *Children in Communion*, Grove Worship Series 112 (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1990); Glenn N. Davies, 'The Lord's Supper for the Lord's Children', *Reformed Theological Review* 50 (1991): 12-20; Alan Ward, 'Communion Before Confirmation: A Response to "Admitting Children to Holy Communion" in *Churchman* 113/4 (1999)', *Churchman* 114/4 (2000): pp. 295-299.
2. E.g., Donald Allister, 'Admitting Children to Holy Communion', *Churchman* 113/3 (1999): pp. 195-306; Roger Beckwith, 'Age of Admission to Communion', *Churchman* 85/1 (1971): pp. 13-31; idem, 'The Age of Admission to the Lord's Supper', *Westminster Theological Journal* 38 (1976): pp. 123-51; Roger Beckwith and Andrew Daunton-Fear, *The Water and the Wine: A Contribution to the Debate on Children and Holy Communion*, Latimer Studies 61 (London: Latimer Trust, 2005); A. A. Langdon, *Communion for Children? The Current Debate*, Latimer Studies 28 (Oxford: Latimer House, 1988); Melvin Tinker, *Infant Communion or Instant Confusion?* (Church Society Ireland, n.d.).
3. For a broad-brush treatment of the issue, covering a wide variety of OT texts and meals, see James B. Jordan, 'Children and the Religious Meals of the Old Creation', in Gregg Strawbridge, ed., *The Case for Covenant Communion* (Monroe, LA: Athanasius Press, 2006): pp. 49-68.
4. There are some difficulties regarding the timing of the Passover, as John indicates that Jesus died as the Passover lambs were being slaughtered. This has led some scholars to deny that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. I cannot here discuss this issue. For a defence of the Last Supper as a Passover meal, see Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 41-62; I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1980), pp. 57-75; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God, Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 2 (London: SPCK, 1996), pp. 555-59.
5. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 555.
6. Cf. Christian L. Keidel, 'Is the Lord's Supper for Children?' *Westminster Theological Journal* 37 (1975): pp. 301-41, at p. 307f.
7. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols, Library of Christian Classics, vols. 20-21 (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1960), VI.xvi.30.
8. Tim Gallant, *Feed My Lambs: Why the Lord's Table Should be Restored to Covenant Children* (Grande Prairie, Alberta: Pactum Reformanda Publishing, 2002), pp. 44-46.
9. Michael Lefebvre, 'Communion: Who Participates? A Working Position-Paper on

- the Question of Paedocommunion (2005)', www.mlefevre.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/communion.pdf (accessed 5 November 2005), p. 11.
10. E.g., Beckwith 'Age of Admission to Communion, p. 21f; idem, 'The Age of Admission to the Lord's Supper, p. 132; Lefebvre, 'Communion', pp. 14-18; Brian M. Schwertley, *Paedocommunion: A Biblical Examination*, www.entrewave.com/view/reformedonline/Paedocommunion.htm (accessed 27 July 2005).
 11. Beckwith, 'The Age of Admission to the Lord's Supper', p. 132.
 12. Lefebvre, 'Communion', p. 16.
 13. Keidel, 'Lord's Supper for Children?', p. 313.
 14. Lefebvre, 'Communion', p. 17.
 15. Lefebvre, 'Communion', p. 6.
 16. Cf. John C. Collins, 'The Eucharist As Christian Sacrifice: How Patristic Authors Can Help Us Read the Bible', *Westminster Theological Journal* 66 (2004): pp. 1-23.
 17. Cf. Collins, 'Eucharist', p. 3, n. 5; Gordon J. Wenham, *Leviticus*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 82, n. 15; NIDOTTE, 4:141.
 18. Cf. Collins, 'Eucharist', p. 18-19.
 19. Glenn. N. Davies, 'The Lord's Supper for the Lord's Children', *Reformed Theological Review* 50 (1991): pp. 12-20, at p. 13f.
 20. Beckwith and Daunton-Fear, *The Water and the Wine*, p. 36.
 21. Contra Peter J. Leithart, 'Sacramental Hermeneutics and the Ceremonies of Israel', in Gregg Strawbridge, ed., *The Case for Covenant Communion* (Monroe, LA): pp. 111-29, at p. 119-20.
 22. Peter J. Leithart, *The Priesthood of the Plebs: A Theology of Baptism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003). The structure and details of this section are heavily indebted to Leithart's arguments.
 23. Viz., Heb. 10:19-22; Gal. 3:27; 1 Cor. 6:11; Lk. 3:21-23; 2 Cor. 1:21f (Leithart, *Priesthood of the Plebs*, pp. 96-132).
 24. For a fuller treatment, see Leithart, *Priesthood of the Plebs*, pp. 96-102.
 25. E.g., Harold W. Attridge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), p. 289; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, New International Commentary on the New Testament, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), p. 250-251; Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), p. 412; William L. Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, Word Biblical Commentary 47B (Waco: Word, 1991), p. 287. Leithart lists a number of others (*Priesthood of the Plebs*, p. 96, n. 14).
 26. Leithart, *Priesthood of the Plebs*, p. 99f.