

Why Not Infant Baptism? Part 3¹

REVIEW

1. Reformed justification for the practice of infant baptism relies primarily on belief in Covenant Theology, specifically the Covenant of Grace that extends from Genesis to Revelation.
2. There are no *bona fide* scriptural examples of infant baptism.
3. The Bible overwhelmingly stresses the primacy of faith in Christ as a prerequisite for baptism.
4. There is no formal equivalence between OT circumcision and NT baptism.

Passages Used to Justify Infant Baptism

- (1) Colossians 2:11–12. This passage is frequently appealed to by pedobaptists as a virtual “proof text” of the link between OT circumcision and NT baptism.

Paul declares the reality of the believer’s spiritual circumcision by virtue of his standing in Christ.

Paul is arguing in these verses that physical circumcision as insisted upon by the heretics is wholly unnecessary, because a spiritual circumcision has already been performed by Christ.

- (2) Passages that speak of “whole households” being baptized. Note: None of these passages mention infant baptism explicitly. Also, the phrase “the whole household” does necessarily refer to every last person, including infants (1 Samuel 1:21–22; John 4:53; Acts 10:2; Titus 1:11).

- a. The men and children of Jerusalem (Acts 2:38–39).
- b. The household of Cornelius (Acts 10:1–2).
- c. The household of Lydia (Acts 16:13–15).
- d. The household of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:27–34).
- e. The household of Crispus (Acts 18:8).

The examples of whole households believing and then being baptized are not a *prescription* but rather a *description* of what happened by the grace of God in many instances. By no means are they guarantees that if the father or mother trusts Christ, that all the children will as well. In fact, Jesus tells us to expect the opposite (Matthew 10:34–36; Mark 13:12; Luke 12:51–53).

¹ Adapted from *The Baptism Debate: Understanding and Evaluating Reformed Infant Baptism* by Peter Goeman (2023).