



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Is it sinful to baptize babies?, on: 2013/11/15 10:08

I would assume most if not all sermonindex users are credobaptist: baptism is upon profession of faith. I was wondering , though, what you think of those who do baptize babies. Is it sinful? Is it okay if they are acting as they suppose in faith and good conscience?

Re: Is it sinful to baptize babies?, on: 2013/11/15 10:27

Hi Stephen. As an ex Catholic it seems to me that if one baptized a child in ignorance to the truth that would be one thing, but if one baptized a child knowing better but seeking to pacify religious pressure, to compromise, that would be quite something else.....bro Frank

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/15 13:40

Greetings Stephen

I am also an ex Catholic and I agree with what Frank shared here with you.

Just curious why do you ask?

God bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/11/15 13:55

An interesting thing to consider on this subject is that if we look to many of the significant leaders in 'church history' they seemed to been in darkness regarding this practice. Men such as Calvin, Luther, Wesley and Whitfield, etc all continued with the Roman Catholic doctrine of infant baptism.

edit: Also Jonathan Edwards. Of course we had the Anabaptist who at the time of the reformation held to biblical truth on this and were persecuted by some of those reformers.

Just shows you that you can't just assume past saint's had a full light on all things they did and taught. All things need to be tested by scripture!

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/11/15 14:26

I think a better question might be, is it "scriptural" to baptize babies.

Quote:
-----Just shows you that you can't just assume past saint's had a full light on all things they did and taught. All things need to be tested by scripture!

Amen.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Re: , on: 2013/11/15 15:48

As an ex-Catholic, I would agree with you, Paul.

Is it scriptural, is a much better question. And, I would add, does baptism regenerate a person, causing them to receive the Spirit of God? Does baptism bring repentance to an individual causing them to turn to the Lord with all their heart?

If the infant has repented and turned to the Lord Jesus Christ with all their heart and received Him (John 1:12), then of course, baptism is scriptural. But, I have never heard of an infant recognizing they are a sinner in need of a Savior, much less, in need of baptism. Usually, they are just looking for their Mommy and don't even know about Jesus Christ.

If it is just the will of the parents, then no regeneration has taken place within the child. Men cannot force the Spirit of God into other men, He is received by faith.

John 1:13 Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

A ceremony saves no one, only faith in Christ does.

John 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

Re: Is it sinful to baptize babies? - posted by Jeremy221, on: 2013/11/15 19:29

Is the question baptism or doing something in faith? Stephen2, is there something else on your heart other than the proposed infant baptism you present? The way you presented your question appears to be the foundation for another subject which is your real purpose.

If not and you are just promoting the arguing over words for the sake something to do, you and all the people who are tempted to 'debate' about this will be convicted by the Spirit for your unchristianity as has happened here many times before.

Re: Is it sinful to baptize babies? - posted by savannah, on: 2013/11/15 21:44

Your question - Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Answer: NO!

Another question - Is it sinful NOT to baptize babies?

Answer: YES!

As another poster has already mentioned, the scripturalness of the practice determines whether what I've stated above is true or false.

DO NOT dismiss the practice of infant baptism by falsely attributing it to being an invention of Romanism, as it was practiced prior to that harlot's birthing.

Search the Scriptures. As a Jew can find Jesus there, the Christian can also find the validity of infant baptism as well.

God's Word is no less than Genesis to Revelation.

DO NOT try to make it less.

The whole counsel of God is to be declared.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 10:04

///Is the question baptism or doing something in faith? Stephen2, is there something else on your heart other than the proposed infant baptism you present? The way you presented your question appears to be the foundation for another subject which is your real purpose.///

The reason for the question (and MaryJane was also curious) is that I am trying to understand how others here at SI understand sin. I chose the subject of baptism because I assumed there would be almost unanimous agreement. Perhaps the thread should have been titled, "When is it sin?"

PaulWest suggested the better question is whether or not the practice is biblical - which I think gets to the heart of what I'm actually after. I didn't raise this subject so that we could have a debate on the subject of infant baptism, though I do appreciate some of the thoughtful responses including Savannah's. What I'm after is a definition of sin. If it is unbiblical is it sinful?

What makes something sinful? Is it my conscience? If I sin against my conscience is it sinful then - so that baptizing babies would be ok so long as I did it in good conscience? If so, how far does that extend? Does that extend to telling lies in good conscience? (Don't worry I'm not going to bring this back to a subject we've already dealt with elsewhere...)

Savannah said, ///As another poster has already mentioned, the scripturalness of the practice determines whether what I've stated above is true or false.///

Do others agree? Paul, you were saying that it is better to ask if it is scriptural? Is that one and the same question or is it different?

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/16 10:28

Greetings Stephen

Thank you for answering my questions :) I think clearly there are things talked about in the Bible that we can call and agree are sin (adultery, fornication, idolatry, stealing, murder, hatred, unforgiveness, pride, bitterness, ect.) then I think there are things that are not as clear. For example I think dressing immodestly is sinful but then I let the Holy Spirit convict each on what is a modest way to dress. For example, some sisters may not feel led to wear pants only skirts while others may wear loose fitting pants and walk with the LORD with a clear conscience. Same goes for wearing makeup or jewelry. Now as for infant baptism I think the real point is why would you baptize the child, they can make no profession of faith and have no understanding of what it means to surrender their life unto CHRIST so it is meaning less ritual at that point. A tradition and nothing more.

Sin is whatever offends GOD. HIS standard of sin should be ours because HE sets the standard. Having said that I do believe by the power of the Holy Spirit He gives us understanding and guidance in our walk with HIM as well. This made me think of the verse with Peter when he is told to get up, kill and eat. I think we have to be careful not to call something unclean, we never fully know what work the LORD might be doing in the heart of another.

9 About noon the following day as they were on their journey and approaching the city, Peter went up on the roof to pray . 10 He became hungry and wanted something to eat, and while the meal was being prepared, he fell into a trance. 11 He saw heaven opened and something like a large sheet being let down to earth by its four corners. 12 It contained all kinds of four-footed animals, as well as reptiles and birds. 13 Then a voice told him, "Get up, Peter. Kill and eat." 14 "Surely not, Lord!" Peter replied. "I have never eaten anything impure or unclean." 15 The voice spoke to him a second time, "Do not call anything impure that God has made clean."

God bless
maryjane

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Re: - posted by Jeremy221, on: 2013/11/16 11:02

I'm going to call you out to confess the sin you have been playing with and your desire to come to the Light and be restored. You've seen the maturity and grace of the saints.

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 11:45

///I'm going to call you out to confess the sin you have been playing with and your desire to come to the Light and be restored. You've seen the maturity and grace of the saints.///

?

I appreciate you Jeremy for your boldness and your kindness, but in this case I think you have grossly misunderstood me. I am genuinely trying to understand how others here understand sin.

Thank you brother,

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2013/11/16 12:55

Quote:

----- A tradition and nothing more.

An important question has been raised - thought it may be a few centuries late. In past centuries the church was plagued by bitter disputes over baptism. Yet God probably does not even keep baptismal records in heaven!

As we all know, what counts is the long haul, not the beginning. There will always be many who receive the seed with joy (and are even baptized), who fall away in hard times. The soil is shallow.

Indisputably, Countless Christians, even dedicated, zealous Christians, put their trust in their baptism, (regardless of the form). I think God has a good track record for dealing with false trusts "in any religious tradition.

I'm convinced that it takes our entire Christian journey to learn the costly significance of baptism - as taught in scripture.

Do you agree?

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/16 13:21

by roadsign on 2013/11/16 9:55:58

Quote:

----- A tradition and nothing more.

An important question has been raised - thought it may be a few centuries late. In past centuries the church was plagued by bitter disputes over baptism. Yet God probably does not even keep baptismal records in heaven!

As we all know, what counts is the long haul, not the beginning. There will always be many who receive the seed with joy (and are even baptized), who fall away in hard times. The soil is shallow.

Indisputably, Countless Christians, even dedicated, zealous Christians, put their trust in their baptism, (regardless of the form). I think God has a good track record for dealing with false trusts "in any religious tradition.

I'm convinced that it takes our entire Christian journey to learn the costly significance of baptism - as taught in scripture.

Do you agree?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

To be clear when I said that baptism was a tradition and nothing more I was referencing that to a new born baby who could make no profession of faith. As for my views on baptism where an older child or adult are completely different. Baptism is an act of obedience, and submission unto the will of GOD. He does command us to repent of our sins and be baptized so as a new believer I would want to obey HIM and walk in that. Just wanted to make that clear.

God bless
mj

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 16:06

Quote:

-----by Stephen2 on 2013/11/16 11:45:58

I am genuinely trying to understand how others here understand sin.

It would have been helpful if you just said that.

Here are some excerpts from an article and a link to the full version. It has been very helpful to me.

The either/or of spiritual character derivation is very clear in the scriptures. Righteousness is derived ek theos, "out of God" by faith (Phil. 3:9). Goodness is derived ek theos, "out of God" (III John 11) by one who has "seen God". On the other hand, sin is derived ek diabolos, "out of the devil" (I John 3:8). Cain's murder of his brother, Abel, was derived "out of the Evil One" (I John 3:12). The apostle John explains that "the children of God and the children of the devil are obvious: every one not expressing righteousness is not ek theos, "out of God" (I John 3:10).

It is regrettable therefore, that many evangelical Christians cast a negative aspersion on man's humanness, as if there was something sinful about being human. What they fail to realize is that sin has a spiritual source (I John 3:8), and to be a "sinner" is a derived spiritual condition caused by Adam's act of disobedience (Rom. 5:19). There is nothing wrong with man's spiritual function, only that fallen mankind has the spirit (I Cor. 2:12; Eph. 2:2; I Jn. 4:6) of the Evil One inhabiting and functioning in their spirit. This sinful depravity of man's spiritual condition must not be projected or transferred into a condition of congenital psychological sinfulness. There is nothing about man's mind, reason, or intellect that is intrinsically bad, evil, or sinful. God created man, and creates every individual man, with a full set of a moral God-given desires, that are not inherently sinful or evil. There is nothing inherently flawed with man's decision-making, for man is a choosing creature, just as God created him to be. Christians must beware of negative overtones of implied sinfulness when referring to "human reason," "human wisdom," "human desires," "human affections," "human decisions," etc. It must be carefully explained that the sinfulness of fallen man's spiritual condition has led to the sinful and selfish orientation of unregenerate man's psychological function. The human creature's psychological function is as God created it to be. And we have just explained above that there is nothing sinful about man's physicality in his physical body. The physiological function of man is intact. Sinfulness is not intrinsic to man's humanness.

The British Bible teacher and author, W. Ian Thomas, expresses this dichotomy of derivation from either God or Satan so succinctly.

"As godliness is the direct and exclusive consequence of God's activity, and God's capacity to reproduce Himself in you, so all ungodliness is the direct and exclusive consequence of Satan's activity, and of his capacity to reproduce the devil in you! For iniquity is no more the consequence of your capacity to imitate the devil, than godliness is the consequence of your capacity to imitate God!"

Evangelicals, as a whole, are not willing to accept this clear-cut dichotomy of derivation, that "what man does, must be derived from a spirit-source." Instead, they insist that whenever sinful character is expressed, whether in the unregenerate or in the regenerate, it is generated ek eautos, "out of oneself," which effectively makes man a devil. A popular variation of the thesis explains that sinfulness is derived ek eautos from an intrinsic straw-man called "self."

What is this, but a variation of the humanistic premise that man is an "independent self" that can generate character and activity ek eautos, "out of himself" – the very premise that was explicitly denied at the beginning of this section, because God alone Self-generates His character ek eautos. If sinful expression is blamed on an alleged independent personal resource called "self," or on some "dirty old man" within, then religion can revert back to the self-effort of performance whereby man attempts to solve his own problems, for his alleged problem is a "self-problem." In evangelical humanism this often takes the form of masochistic attempts to beat oneself into moral conformity, or to psycho-suicidal attempts to "crucify self" or to "die to self." Though we are admonished by Jesus to "deny ourselves" (Luke 9:23), by disallowing self-oriented sinful expression in Christian behavior, this is not equivalent to the encouragement of evangelical humanism to become better Christians by crucifying or suppressing this alleged "self-resource" within that allegedly generates our sinfulness. What a con-game the Evil One has going on as he disguises his sin-activity under the cloak of "self," deceiving man into thinking that man himself is the devil-self who is producing sin, and prompting man to engage in masochistic self-effort to destroy or crucify this "self." Man is thus regarded to be his own devil and his own savior – this is the lie of evangelical humanism!

The derivation of the character expressed in human behavior is either ek theos or ek diabolos. There is no third option or alternative of derivative source, whether it be called "self," "old self," "sinful self," "natural self," "old nature," "sin-nature," "fallen nature," "carnal man," "carnality," "flesh," etc. This latter term, "flesh," is a Biblical term (Greek word, sarx), and our previous discussion denied that Paul's usage of the term behaviorally was to be equated with physicality, or with any inherent sinfulness of man's being. It is just as important to point out that the "flesh" is not a generative resource that effects sinful expression in either the Christian or the non-Christian. The "flesh" is Satan's patterning of his character of selfishness and sinfulness upon or within the desires of man's soul. It is not a substantive source of sin, a hidden hunk of evil, or a "dirty old man" within, driving us to dastardly deeds. "Flesh" patterns in the desires of our psyche are individuated tendencies and propensities to act and react in selfish and sinful ways. While the "flesh" is not a self-producing source of sin, it does provide a foothold for satanic temptation to sinful expression, in contrast to the Spirit's impulses to manifest goodly behavior in the Christian (Gal. 5:16-25).

It is important to reiterate that the character of man's behavior is not self-generated by anything within man. Man derives what he does from either God or Satan, and that by a choice of receptivity to such character expression. If, as evangelicalism tends to indicate, man can manufacture and produce his own sin and unrighteousness ek eautos, "out of himself," then it is logically imperative to likewise indicate that man is capable of generating his own righteousness and holiness ek eautos. If man is capable of the one, he is capable of the other. Ponder the logical consequences of such: If man is capable of self-generated unrighteousness, he becomes his own devil and is irredeemable. If man is capable of self-generated righteousness, then the incarnation of Jesus was superfluous and "Jesus died needlessly" (Gal. 2:21). If there is any truth in the humanistic premise that man is self-empowering and self-generative, then there is no "good news" of man's redemption – there is no Christian gospel! God forbid!

The repetitive and emphatic explanation of man's inability to be a god-like producer and actuator of behavioral character is necessary to formulate a firm foundation for understanding the gospel. That is why we have belabored the point over and over again in this article. It is only when we understand that "what man does, he derives from another," from a spirit-source other than himself, that we have a valid Christian premise that denies the humanistic premise en toto, and establishes a logical basis for understanding anthropological function.

Skipping ahead to Conclusion:
Conclusion

The Christian understanding of God was given much clarification early in Christian history as the various councils produced statements concerning Christology and the Trinitarian relationality of God. The Christian understanding of man, however, did not receive the same attention and scrutiny. Clear and comprehensive statements of the human creature's constitution and function were not provided in the creedal formulations of the early church. Throughout church history there have been particular systems of thought that have encroached upon a Christian understanding of man, such as Gnosticism, Pelagianism, Arminianism, etc., but the church's response to them did not produce a comprehensive anthropological understanding.

There is a dire need in our day to explain how the human creature functions – what he is and is not capable of. The philosophical premises of humanism have become the popular and accepted bases for anthropological understanding in contemporary society. To counter humanistic thought with an antithetical explanation of derivative man is to encounter much ridicule and rejection. Since humanism elevates man to a place of ultimate concern and deification, the explanation

of man as a dependent, contingent, and derivative creature appears to be a denigration of man that diminishes man's abilities, and projects humanity to be of lesser consequence. To proclaim a Christian understanding of man will be an iconoclastic effort of destroying the false and idolatrous concepts that man is a god unto himself.

The effort to explain that man is only and always a derivative creature is further complicated and countered by the fact that at most of Christian teaching has adopted many of the presuppositions of humanism. Many who call themselves Christians believe, in one form or another, that man is capable of generating his own character expression if not by human works of performance righteousness, then at least capable and responsible for self-generating his own sin and unrighteousness. Accepting the premise of a self that operates independently of a spirit source in either God or Satan, such religious teaching is forced into finding a solution to the alleged self-problem by encouraging the self-effort of self-suppression or the crucifying of self. The selfism prevalent in evangelical humanism today reacts strongly against the understanding of man as a derivative creature.

The outline for understanding man that we have presented in this article is intended to provide a complete antithesis to humanistic presuppositions of human potentiality, and to reject humanistic philosophy en toto. Instead of man having intrinsic self-generative ability, we have explained that man is a derivative creature designed by the Creator to be dependent upon the Creator and receptive to the character expression of the Creator, in order to be the human creature that the Creator intended the creature to be. Thereby, and only thereby, is man fulfilled as man, and God glorified as the God that He is.

Read the entire article:

TOWARD A CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF MAN
<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/understandman.html>

And to go with it, "Towards a Christian Understanding of God".
<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/understandgod.html>

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 16:25

Then perhaps another thread needs to be set up with that particular question. I was going to post in response to the infant baptism question. But see this thread going a different direction.

Bearmaster.

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 19:21

I think its helpful to entertain the question of the nature of sin in relation to something specific like baptism... and this thread has actually brought that out.

Savannah said,

///Your question - Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Answer: NO!

Another question - Is it sinful NOT to baptize babies?

Answer: YES!

As another poster has already mentioned, the scripturalness of the practice determines whether what I've stated above is true or false.///

So far most have posted saying that while infant baptism is not scriptural it is not sinful. Ironically, the only person posting in favour of infant baptism says it is sinful not to baptize them - I assume Savannah means not baptizing children of believers...

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

This highlights what may actually be a more fundamental difference. Are there those who do believe baptizing babies is sinful? On the other hand, if it is unscriptural (and I assume you don't mean in the same sense that driving cars would be considered a-scriptural because not discussed) then why isn't it also sinful?

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 19:42

Based on my understanding of Mathew 28:18-20. I would say pastors in the Reformed tradition are in serious error baptizing infants in the name of the Triune God. They are distorting a precious scriptural truth that baptism is for believers and believers only. Also I would say the baptism of infants is an ungodly practice. I cringe when a Reformed pastor baptizes an infant in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Without further reflection I am not going to say such Reformed pastors are in sin. But will maintain they are in serious error as infant baptism cannot be established in scripture

Now if you would like to ask were the Reformers in sin for putting the Anabaptists to death over the issue believers baptism? Several million times I will answer "yes". On that score the Reformers committed a grievous sin for putting other brethren to death over this issue of believers baptism.

Bearmaster.

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 19:59

Mark Dever: ///"In my article in the new 9Marks Journal, I wrote, "I have many dear paedo-baptists friends from whom I have learned much. Yet I see their practice as a sinful (though sincere) error from which God protects them by allowing for inconsistency in their doctrinal system, just as he graciously protects me from consistency with my own errors." That statement, much to my surprise, has caused concern among some. That a Baptist thinks infant baptism is wrong was no news to earlier generations of paedobaptists.///

Mark Dever's surprise is the point. Those on both sides of this have historically said that the other side was guilty of sin. Are we in this generation able to say that? If not, why not?

If something is ungodly and a serious error how can it not be sin? Sin is missing the mark... anything short of perfection.

Re: - posted by Benjamin7 (), on: 2013/11/16 20:24

This is the scripture that comes to mind when defining what sin is:

1 John 3:4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 20:36

Baptizing babies is wrong Stephen. Anything beyond that is mere sophistry.....bro Frank

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 21:50

///This is the scripture that comes to mind when defining what sin is: 1 John 3:4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.///

Amen.

If God says "do this" and we don't is that sinful? If we did it ignorantly are we excused?

Frank, if it's wrong is it sin? And how are you sure that it is wrong? Where is the Bible text that says so? I wouldn't call that sophistry. We have to be honest, the credobaptist argument is an argument from silence; which, of course, doesn't make it wrong, but we needn't put things quite the way you have.

Re: , on: 2013/11/16 23:55

Stephen, how is it possible to prove a negative? If you disagree with Scripture, if you believe that babies can repent of sin and be saved, and have Scripture to back that up then it is you who must show me what leads you to believe such a thing. Otherwise it is, like most Roman Catholic doctrine, extra biblical and falls into the same category as limbo and purgatory.

PS. Arguments from silence does not a doctrine make, just in case you are tempted to do that :)bro Frank

Re: babies - posted by savannah, on: 2013/11/17 7:42

apollus said, "...if you believe that babies can repent of sin and be saved..."

Can you prove that babies can't be saved?
Can you prove that babies can't have faith?

For he shall be great in the eyes of the Lord, and he shall not drink wine or strong drink. And he will be filled of the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. And it came to pass, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe did leap in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. Luke 1:15,41

And they brought infants to Him also, that He might touch them. But seeing, the disciples rebuked them. Luke 18:15

But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying out in the temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" they were indignant, and they said to him, "Do you hear what these are saying?" And Jesus said to them, "Yes; have you never read, "Out of the mouth of infants and nursing babies you have prepared praise'?" Matthew 21:15,16

But you must cling to the things which you have learnt and have been taught to believe, knowing from whom you learned, and that from infancy you have known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make you wise to obtain salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. 2 Timothy 3:14,15

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/11/17 8:33

Personally - I wouldn't baptize a child, as I understand what baptism represents.

But if a Father and Mother who don't understand baptism and they wanted to dedicate their child to God and get it baptized, I wouldn't judge them or the child as having sinned against God, simply because they don't know what baptism means.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/11/17 8:34

Quote:
-----For he shall be great in the eyes of the Lord, and he shall not drink wine or strong drink. And he will be filled of the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. And it came to pass, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe did leap in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. Luke 1:15,41

And they brought infants to Him also, that He might touch them. But seeing, the disciples rebuked them. Luke 18:15

But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying out in the temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" they were indignant, and they said to him, "Do you hear what these are saying?" And Jesus said to them, "Yes; have you never read, "Out of the mouth of infants and nursing babies you have prepared praise'?" Matthew 21:15,16

But do any of these indicate "salvific regeneration" of the children? One text simply says that Jesus took the children into His arms and "blessed them". We would have to make a strong exegetical case that "blessed them" denotes "saved the

m from their subsequent sin" which I find impossible to make. One significant hinderance to this is that you cannot read of infants being baptized for the remittance of sin post-calvary (as baptism follows conversion). Babies were dedicated to God in the OT, but even then, their dedications did not presuppose an upright, sanctified lifestyle (ala Nazarite). Take Samson for a good example.

The fact that children can praise God with perfected sounds, bespeaks of an innocency and undiluted devotion on their part - but, again, does this ensure a lifetime of sinless ablution in lieu of repentance? Another far cry, as God can make the rocks cry out "Hosanna" as well.

So, the paedobaptist must show his case from scripture, in full context of the verse, and with exegetical soundness.

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 8:36

One must ask, "Who are the candidates of baptism"?

Should an infant be baptized with water, or is this a freely chosen act by one who has received understanding (illumination of the Spirit) and made a determined choice to receive Jesus Christ?

Does the Bible teach that there are certain criteria of response that should precede water baptism, and to what extent can another Christian determine the validity of such for other people?

A quick reading of the New Testament indicates that those Christians who were baptized had first evidenced faith and repentance. This would seem to exempt infants who are not capable of responding on their own regarding what God has made available in His Son Jesus Christ. The argument of those who practice "paedo-baptism" that the "baptism of their households" (Acts 16:15; 33) included the children in the home is far from conclusive, because the reference may refer only to the adult members of the household, which could also include extended family members, servants and hired helpers, especially since children were not regarded as viable members of the household in those days.

This is another instance of not regarding the whole counsel of God in a matter, but rather isolating one or two scriptures to create a theological system of belief. When not excluding other truth that Jesus Christ and the Apostles taught, we understand that a person must be cognitively receptive to the Holy Spirit and understand that they are turning away from the world, the flesh and the Devil and turning towards Jesus Christ IN A DETERMINED FAITH (repentance).

Peter was not speaking to infants. Infants would not be able to understand the following:

Act_2:38 Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Those who "received the word" of Peter's preaching were baptized (Acts 2:41). Infants did not receive the word of his preaching. Those in Samaria who "believed the good news were baptized" (Acts 8:12). Infants did not believe the "good news". Concerning Cornelius and his family and friends, Peter said that "no one could refuse water for these to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit" (Acts 10:47). Infants did not receive the Holy Spirit. Jesus had previously commissioned Christians to "make disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19). You cannot make a disciple of a non-cognitive individual.

Therefore, those who profess repentance from sin and the receptivity of faith in Jesus Christ (John 1:12) are to be regarded as candidates for Christian baptism in water. If someone seeks and receives Christian baptism who has not been spiritually regenerated, then the act of baptism does not express the spiritual reality of regeneration and this will become evident in the "fruit" of their behavior.

But, Christian baptism should not be withheld from those who have exercised a SIMPLE FAITH RESPONSE to Jesus Christ, looking for other "requirements" in their lives.

This is the other side of the coin in Christendom. One extreme is that infants who have not received Jesus Christ in faith are baptized by their parents who think it is some kind of mystical, magical, ceremonial event that will produce the life of the Spirit in that infant (at best) and at the very least, save them from hell if they die as an infant. Of course, this presupposes that they are dying for someone else's sin since they could not have sinned, themselves.

So, the other side of the coin (other extreme) and what has happened down through the centuries is that Christians have instituted comprehensive man-made criteria of "genuine" conversion, "spirituality" and "maturity," which have been imposed upon those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and desire to be baptized.

1. "Disciples" are defined as those who have arrived at a certain behavior, conformity or ecclesiastical practice.
2. Others have demanded "repentance" from all visible uncharacteristic behaviors.
3. Many argue over what it means to "receive the Holy Spirit" and the criteria by which to determine such.
4. And still others have drawn up a litany of items that you must agree with which simply means you understand and believe all the major doctrines of "their church". And that a certain period is necessary for your instruction in those doctrines so that you can articulate them.

It is not man's responsibility to dictate such requirements which then become "works" necessary for baptism.

In short, both extremes are nothing more than WORKS. One extreme is the works of others imposed on you and the other extreme is your own works to the satisfaction of those who are withholding baptism from you as they gauge your performance.

BOTH EXTREMES ARE ABOUT WORKS and have nothing to do with SIMPLE, DETERMINED, UNDERSTANDING of FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST.

Re: Savannah and Stephen, on: 2013/11/17 8:44

Romans 10.8-10

But what does it say? "THE WORD IS NEAR YOU, in your mouth and in your heart," that is, the word of faith which we are preaching, that if you confess with your mouth Jesus as Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead; you will be saved; for with the heart a person believes, resulting in righteousness, and with the mouth he confesses, resulting in salvation.

Acts 8:36-38

As they went along the road they came to some water; the eunuch said, "Look! Water! What prevents me from being baptized?". And Phillip said "if you believe with all your heart you may.". And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.". And he ordered the chariot to stop and they both went down into the water, Phillip as well as the eunuch, and he baptized him.

.....
Brothers the above verses establish that baptism is for believers only upon profession of their faith in Jesus Christ. There are other instances throughout Acts where the gospel is preached. People believe and receive Christ. And they are baptized as believers in Christ. The first century church baptized believers and believers only. No where will you find in the Apostolic record that infants were baptized.

Going back to Matthew 28:18-20 it is those who are becoming disciples of Jesus Christ. Those who are making that choice to follow Christ who are to be baptized. Not babies.

A baby fresh out of its mother's womb does not have the heart capacity to choose to follow or reject Christ.

Savannah the verses you quoted nowhere substantiate the baptism of infants. You fail to take into context those verses. For example to say that John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit is a fulfillment of the prophecy the angel gave to Zechariah in Luke 1. This was a special case as John was to be the forerunner to Jesus. You can no more establish faith and repentance from an infant in John's case as you could from say the virgin birth.

You quote the scriptures out of Luke 10:21 about Jesus revealing truth to little infants. This is a figure of speech describing the disciples' faith as they were casting out demons and healing people. This is not establishing infants coming to faith and repentance in Christ. And thus being baptized.

I could go on. But infant baptism cannot be established from the scriptures. The early church never practiced it. Nor should

ould the church today practice it.

Bearmaster.

Re: "salvific regeneration" - posted by savannah, on: 2013/11/17 8:49

Neither "salvific regeneration" as Paul West has termed it, nor "baptismal regeneration" as others have termed it, is in view here. Just as a baptist wouldn't equate the two in regard to an adult.

It's not what we do for God but what God does for us.
Whether we are speaking of baptism or salvation.

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 8:52

All you have to ask is "What spiritual reality does infant baptism convey?"

Water baptism is not a necessary requirement for infants nor does it convey or actuate regeneration, forgiveness of sins, justification or salvation. It is not the means to salvation or becoming a Christian, and therefore does not determine one's eternal destiny.

The failure or refusal to be baptized in water may prevent you from being a member of some church organizations, but it does not keep one from being a member of the Body of Christ. So if a believer is not baptized in water, he is no less of a Christian and no less "spiritual," for these are determined solely by the indwelling presence of the Spirit of Christ, which is not dependent on water baptism.

Sadly, too much emphasis in Christendom is on the external act of water baptism, and not on the spiritual reality of Christ's indwelling presence received by faith. Scripture is very clear that believing into Christ, receiving His Spirit into our spirit, is the basis of salvation, not water baptism. Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved" (Acts 16:31). "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation for everyone who believes" (Rom. 1:16). "Having believed, you were sealed in Him with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13). John noted that "as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, even to those who believe in His name" (John 1:12).

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/11/17 8:56

Quote:
-----Neither "salvific regeneration" as Paul West has termed it, nor "baptismal regeneration" as others have termed it, is in view here. Just as a baptist wouldn't equate the two in regard to an adult.

Would you agree then that baptism follows conversion?

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 8:57

Then Savannah based on your last post why are you arguing for infant baptism?

Bear

Re: Constantine etc. - posted by savannah, on: 2013/11/17 9:01

In another thread Bearmaster said,

"Yet after the church became institutionalized under Constantine the practice of infant baptism became acceptable and babies were baptized..."

Constantine was Emperor of Rome from 306-337

Origen said in 248 A.D.,

“Every soul that is born into flesh is soiled by the filth of wickedness and sin. . . . In the Church, baptism is given for the remission of sins, and, according to the usage of the Church, baptism is given even to infants. If there were nothing in infants which required the remission of sins and nothing in them pertinent to forgiveness, the grace of baptism would seem superfluous.”

“The Church received from the apostles the tradition of giving baptism even to infants. The apostles, to whom were committed the secrets of the divine sacraments, knew there are in everyone innate strains of sin, which must be washed away through water and the Spirit.”

Cyprian of Carthage said in 253 A.D.,

“As to what pertains to the case of infants: You said that they ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, that the old law of circumcision must be taken into consideration, and that you did not think that one should be baptized and sanctified within the eighth day after his birth. In our council it seemed to us far otherwise. No one agreed to the course which you thought should be taken. Rather, we all judge that the mercy and grace of God ought to be denied to no man born.”

“I, in the case of the worst sinners and those who formerly sinned much against God, when afterwards they believe, the remission of their sins is granted and no one is held back from baptism and grace, how much more, then, should an infant not be held back, who, having but recently been born, has done no sin, except that, born of the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of that old death from his first being born. For this very reason does he approach more easily to receive the remission of sins: because the sins forgiven him are not his own but those of another.”

"We have presumptive and positive arguments for the apostolic origin and character of infant baptism, first, in the fact that circumcision as truly prefigured baptism, as the passover the holy Supper; then in the organic relation between Christ and his parents and children; in the nature of the new covenant, which is even more comprehensive than the old; in the universal virtue of Christ, as the Redeemer of all sexes, classes, and ages, and especially in the import of his own infancy, which he has redeemed and sanctified the infantile age; in his express invitation to children, whom he assures of a title to the kingdom of heaven, and whom, therefore, he certainly would not leave without the sign and seal of such membership; in the words, of institution, which plainly look to the Christianizing, not merely of individuals, but of whole nations, including, of course, the children; in the express declaration of Peter at the first administration of the ordinance, that this promise of forgiveness of sins and of the Holy Spirit was to the Jews "and to their children;" in the five instances in the New Testament of the baptism of whole families, where the presence of children in most of the cases is far more probable than the absence of children in all; and finally, in the universal practice of the early church, against which the isolated protest of Tertullian proves no more, than his other eccentricities and Montanistic peculiarities; on the contrary, his violent protest implies the prevailing practice of infant baptism. He advised delay of baptism as a measure of prudence, lest the baptized by sinning again might forever forfeit the benefit of this ordinance; but he nowhere denies the apostolic origin or right of early baptism." Philip Schaff

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 9:01

It sounds like she is saying that God saves us without us knowing about it or even participating in it.

Please correct my understanding if it is flawed.

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 9:02

Why are we going away from the scriptures and to Origen of all people?

Re: - posted by savannah, on: 2013/11/17 9:05

Would you agree then that baptism follows conversion?

In the case of adults...Yes!

That is to say, as far as we can tell from their profession anyway.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/11/17 9:07

Quote:

-----In the case of adults...Yes!

That is to say, as far as we can tell from their profession anyway.

Amen. I agree! When we come to children, babies, does the mode (order) change?

Re: Ssvannah, on: 2013/11/17 9:16

That is what many of us are seeing from the scriptures. That baptism follows a conversion experience to Christ. Generally resulting in a confession of faith in Jesus.

This is not the case with infants. They cannot confess faith in Christ.

Bear.

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 16:47

Tertullian, treatise on BAPTISM 18,4 (c. AD 200-206)

"According to circumstance and disposition and even age of the individual person, it may be better to delay Baptism; and especially so in the case of little children. Why, indeed, is it necessary -- if it be not a case of necessity -- that the sponsors to be thrust into danger, when they themselves may fail to fulfill their promises by reason of death, or when they may be disappointed by the growth of an evil disposition? Indeed the Lord says, 'Do not forbid them to come to me'

"Let them come, then, while they grow up, while they learn, while they are taught to whom to come; let them become Christians when they will have been able to know Christ! Why does the innocent age hasten to the remission of sins? ... For no less cause should the unmarried also be deferred, in whom there is an aptness to temptation -- in virgins on account of their ripeness as also in the widowed on account of their freedom -- until they are married or are better strengthened for continence. Anyone who understands the seriousness of Baptism will fear its reception more than its deferral. Sound faith is secure of its salvation!"

When the age of Constantine came, the church was split into two main groups. One group stood strong and many of them died through the most severe persecution the church ever saw between 303-311. Another group did not, they were called the catholics. Yet, Constantine favored the catholics and found in their favor in a council. They arose mightily in power and for the first time, "Christians," began to persecute other Christians, namely the Catholics persecuted the Donatists. The Apostolic church did not baptize infants, nor is their Scripture to suggest that we should. Paul did not fail to warn, night and day for three years that wolves would come into the church in sheep's clothing. We see the culmination and apparent victory of the wolves in the days of Constantine and beyond.....bro Frank

Re: , on: 2013/11/17 17:54

That is a very interesting "eyewitness" piece of history, Apollus. And it agrees with the Scriptures. Thanks for posting it.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/17 20:52

The practices of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland allow infant baptism but do not require it. Families are given freedom and discretion to decide for themselves. Members are allowed to determine the proper mode (dipping, pouring, sprinkling) and subjects (babies to adults at time of baptism).

The first sin of Adam and Eve was wanting to know too much about good and evil so they ate from the forbidden tree. We can go too far in wanting to create one rule to apply to everyone. There is a place for working some things out according to our own understanding and discernment. We spawn fewer divisions that way. We give more love that way to others who are different from ourselves. While the Bible contains the Ten Commandments and many commands of Christ, there are many issues where it does not explicitly declare good and evil. In one example, eating meat seems right for some and wrong for others (Romans 14:21ff).

Hebrews 5:14 explicitly tells us that there are areas where we need to apply discernment in determining good and evil and not look for one universal standard to govern both others and ourselves.

"But strong meat belongs to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." (Hebrews 5:14)

Happy Thanksgiving season to the USA (this month) and Canada (last month). Happy discernment to you all.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2013/11/18 10:15

Quote:

----- The first sin of Adam and Eve was wanting to know too much about good and evil so they ate from the forbidden tree.

Ahhhh! So this is why we say: Ignorance is bliss!

Just kidding. The first couple wanted to BE God - masters of their own lives, their destiny. They declared all out rebellion, and saw the forbidden tree as a means to that ends. Right?

Re baptism: I know plenty on both sides of the fence who are authentic and plenty who are not. It doesn't seem that baptismal views actually form the dividing line in Christendom - separating the sheep from the goats.

Perhaps this thread should be labelled: Can the Spirit work in and through the lives of those who practice something that I believe is wrong? OR RATHER:

DOES the Spirit work in people of either camps?

Remember - even in scripture, some of those who had it right - in the end, had it all wrong - because they didn't grasp the SPIRIT of the law.

Still today, it seems strange that God would baptize in the Spirit some who are not baptized in water. Yet isn't that what God does!?

God forbid that we put his dear ones in the "sinners" camp and thus ourselves be instruments of division.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/18 11:49

Actually, I learned / was indirectly rebuked by Zac Poonen on this. I think it's fair to say by observation that many of the questions that Zac receives are asking for his ruling on questions of good and evil. In the Garden of Eden, there was an other tree called the Tree of Life. As I understood it, Zac would actually like more questions like: How can I have life and have it more abundantly? Instead, he gets questions about issues of good and evil and discernment that divide professing Christians like baptism.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/18 19:42

IMHO, you might organize questions commonly raised on Christian forums or in church Q&A sessions like this:

Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil Questions:

- * What laws apply to Christians?
- * How should Christian women dress?
- * Should we use wine or grape juice when we observe the Lord's Supper?
- * What type of Christian music is best?
- * Do Christians need to keep the Sabbath?

Tree of Life Questions (seldom raised including by me)?

- * How can I have the abundant life promised by Jesus Christ?
- * How can I bear more fruit and bring greater glory to the Father in heaven?
- * How can I be more like Jesus?
- * How can I make more and better disciples?
- * How can I have more of the spirit of grace and supplications

Re: , on: 2013/11/18 22:43

Funny how we turn the most wonderful relationship into a code of do's and don'ts.

Our relationships with our husbands and wives and family and friends are built on love and mercy and grace, but somehow we want our relationship with Jesus Christ to be codified into a list of rules. Can anyone say, "PERFORMANCE" or "WORKS"?

The Life of the Spirit is not "rules" and "systems of living, thinking, speaking and performing".

The Life of the Spirit is supernaturally, natural.

Walk in Love before God and before men.

Re: , on: 2013/11/19 9:26

//That is what many of us are seeing from the scriptures. That baptism follows a conversion experience to Christ. Generally resulting in a confession of faith in Jesus.

This is not the case with infants. They cannot confess faith in Christ.//

I guess the question we would have to answer, first, is what is the meaning of baptism? Is it meant a public statement or declaration of faith; or is it a sign of the covenant. If it is the first it cannot be given to children because they cannot make profession of faith. If it is the second it must be given to whomever God wants it to be given.

Back to a more interesting phenomenon that I am observing. People here seem to be saying that sin is when I violate my conscience. So, although God has revealed that only those old enough to make profession of faith can be baptized if I in good conscience baptize a baby I haven't sinned. Brothers, that doesn't compute! Sin is transgression of the law. Sin is when we do something other than God wants. Knowing or not knowing is irrelevant. It may mean I am less culpable if I didn't know but it doesn't mean I'm innocent.

When I tell my children to do something and they don't I don't consult their conscience! There are consequences for dis

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

obedience in my home and disobedience in my home is directly related to the revealed will of mom and dad - the issue is never whether they did or didn't do what THEY thought best.

If baptism is a matter of indifference than lets admit it and stop dividing over baptism. We can put Baptists and Presbyterians and the Reformed churches all together. But, if baptism is not a matter of indifference, if God has revealed His will on this matter how can we say it isn't sin to go against His will?

edit: just-in a relationship cannot work without rules. One of the unspoken rules in our home is that pornography is not allowed. Happily, I can tell you that neither of us wants to view such filth, but the fact that I don't want it doesn't mean there isn't also a rule. It is antinomianism to deny rules in the Christian life! Yes, this thing called Christianity doesn't stop at rules and is fundamentally about a relationship but God has given us rules, so who are we to balk at them? In the NT we find a number of things that are now indifferent, and we are allowed to enjoy every creature of God. Food rules are gone! Does that mean all rules have been put away? If you say 'yes' than you have also said that God has not revealed His will to His people. If God has revealed His will than you have said "rules".

Edit 2: ///
* How can I have the abundant life promised by Jesus Christ?

* How can I bear more fruit and bring greater glory to the Father in heaven?

* How can I be more like Jesus?

* How can I make more and better disciples?

* How can I have more of the spirit of grace and supplications///
//

Answer: "Trust and obey for there's no other way to be happy in Jesus than to trust and obey." And if we say obey than we must (we absolutely MUST!) also examine that first list of questions you raised... unless of course God has not spoken on those things. The secret things belong to our LORD but the revealed things to us and to our children. If it is in His book it matters.

Re: , on: 2013/11/19 11:26

The sign of the new covenant is Jesus Christ indwelling an individual.

Christ in you, the Hope of Glory.

The sign of the New Covenant can never be anything less than the expression and life of Jesus Christ in His Church.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2013/11/19 12:47

Quote:

----- People here seem to be saying that sin is when I violate my conscience.

For example?

Re: , on: 2013/11/19 13:11

appolus: ///
As an ex Catholic it seems to me that if one baptized a child in ignorance to the truth that would be one thing, but if one baptized a child knowing better but seeking to pacify religious pressure, to compromise, that would be quite something else///
//

MaryJane: ///
I am also an ex Catholic and I agree with what Frank shared///
//

PaulWest: ///
I think a better question might be, is it "scriptural" to baptize babies///
//

just-in: ///
Is it scriptural, is a much better question.///
//

Bearmaster: ///
Based on my understanding of Mathew 28:18-20. I would say pastors in the Reformed tradition are in serious error baptizing infants in the name of the Triune God. They are distorting a precious scriptural truth that baptism is for believers and believers only. Also I would say the baptism of infants is an ungodly practice. I cringe when a Reformed pastor baptizes an infant in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

Without further reflection I am not going to say such Reformed pastors are in sin. But will maintain they are in serious error as infant baptism cannot be established in scripture///

colin: ///Personally - I wouldn't baptize a child, as I understand what baptism represents.

But if a Father and Mother who don't understand baptism and they wanted to dedicate their child to God and get it baptized, I wouldn't judge them or the child as having sinned against God, simply because they don't know what baptism means.///

roadsign: ///Re baptism: I know plenty on both sides of the fence who are authentic and plenty who are not. It doesn't seem that baptismal views actually form the dividing line in Christendom - separating the sheep from the goats.

Perhaps this thread should be labelled: Can the Spirit work in and through the lives of those who practice something that I believe is wrong? OR RATHER:

DOES the Spirit work in people of either camps?///

roadsign, why not just admit its sin? We can ask both questions. Is it sin and does the Spirit work in people of either camps? Why does it have to be either or? I never suggested this is a matter of separating sheep from goats. I suggested it was a matter of sin.

But rather than saying as Savannah did that its sin not to baptize children of believers or to say the opposite that it is sin to baptize children most posters are saying its a matter of conscience. Why is that?

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2013/11/19 13:33

Quote:

----- most posters are saying its a matter of conscience. Why is that?

I do not wish to be put in this category. That would be a misjudgment. My point is that God seems to pour his Spirit into people on both sides. My concern is over our judgment of others more than the ritual itself. I prefer to avoid a path towards either condemning or condoning others based on their practice - but instead to point to God and his radical ways of fulfilling his redemptive purposes in the lives of sinners and yes - even those who don't have it all correct.

To be honest, I am more concerned about assumptions that accompany the ritual than the ritual itself. Baptism easily becomes a tool by which a church organization absolves its members from seeing the need for further honesty and conviction in the "most" places. But then, I have no control over what other Christians practice. And I don't have access into their hearts.

John the Baptist's baptism was revolutionary and subversive. It meant that Rome wasn't your highest power anymore. And that meant, in all likelihood, that you would end up in the amphitheatres and eaten by ferocious dogs. On the contrary, we baptize people in the safety of our edifices, and consider it more a symbol of acceptance in our religious establishment (and maybe even our nation) than a costly calling to surrender all other trusts.

We can be sure that God judges the heart and in the end, that's what counts.

I'll bet we all agree on that point.

Diane

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/19 13:38

stephen wrote:But rather than saying as Savannah did that its sin not to baptize children of believers or to say the opposite that it is sin to baptize children most posters are saying its a matter of conscience. Why is that?

I can only answer you for myself. I have never really considered this a question of sin or not. I do consider it an error on the part of parents who baptize their infants because we are commanded in the WORD to repent of our sins and be baptized, a baby can not do that so baptizing them would mean nothing. It would be like circumcising a baby boy and thinking that it saves him when it does not. Now many parents do get their boys circumcised but I would not say they are in sin for doing so.

The only reason I mentioned that I was an ex-catholic is because there is such an importance placed on infant baptism in that religion and having come from there I know that being baptized as a baby did nothing for me. It was not until I came to Jesus and repented of my sins and submitted my life to HIM that I was saved.

God bless
mj

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/19 13:40

We can be sure that God judges the heart and in the end, that's what counts.

I'll bet we all agree on that point.
Diane

I can agree with you on that count Diane and I believe that was what Frank was saying and I agreed with.

God bless
mj

Re: , on: 2013/11/19 23:09

Hi MJ, that was my point..... bro Frank

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/20 9:45

The baptism issue is not always so simple so I would allow liberty for conscience and discernment. Yes, some scriptures seem to favor adult baptism by immersion but there's more to consider.

Jeremiah the Prophet and John the Baptist were both filled with the Holy Spirit when in their mother's womb. If someone was spirit-filled that early again, would you deny infant baptism to them?

In Acts 8:13, one Simon a magician is baptized. Ten verses later, Peter tells him that he is still in the bond of his sins. Simon was baptized when he was unsaved. Should Peter and the early church have repented for baptizing Simon?

In Revelation 3, Jesus tells the Laodicean church that He will spit them out of his mouth. As church members, I am sure the Laodiceans were baptized. Yet, Christ will reject them.

In the NT, there are multiple accounts of entire households being baptized and none of partial households being baptized. Will you divide households based on some arbitrary judgment about who is saved and who is not? You could be wrong. You could block some who are saved from obeying Jesus and his command to be baptized.

On the first Pentecost in Jerusalem, three thousand heard the preaching of Peter and were baptized that same day. No interviews or new member classes were described. Individuals came forth and were baptized (and followed Jesus).

In Matthew 28:10, the commandment is to disciple and baptize the nations. Infants and young children are disciples. W

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is it sinful to baptize babies?

hy hinder them? Paul's letter to Timothy tells how Timothy had been instructed in the Scriptures since he was an infant (2 Timothy 3:15). Timothy had been a disciple since the beginning of his life.

Is it loving to send a message over many years to children who are disciples in our churches that they are unfit for baptism?

False assurance can come to adults because church elders admitted them to baptism. They can lean upon a presumption that they were accepted by God because they were accepted by the elders at the time that they were admitted to baptism.

Jesus will say to many who were baptized: Depart from me. I never knew you (Matthew 7:23).

We should obey Jesus and baptize disciples and not try to make judgments about who is and isn't saved.

While personal assurance is possible, the LORD (only) knows for sure who else is saved (2 Timothy 2:19).

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/11/20 10:29

by turn on 2013/11/20 6:45:40

The baptism issue is not always so simple so I would allow liberty for conscience and discernment. Yes, some scriptures seem to favor adult baptism by immersion but there's more to consider.

Greetings turn

I still believe a child who is too little to speak for themselves and express a desire to submit their lives unto the LORD, to verbally repent of their sins and request to be baptized is not able to do so for themselves should not be baptized.(infants) Catholic's baptize when babies are only a few weeks old and I have yet to hear of an infant who has spoken, repented of their sins, cried out to the LORD, and asked to be baptized so no one is deny them anything...

Older children who come to know JESUS and display a heart and desire to be baptized is different but infant baptism is not something the child requests of its own accord, it is a parent making a choice for them which is not Biblical.

Of course it is true that an adult can be deceived into thinking they are just fine when they are not, but at least the adult can and does speak for themselves...

Just my thoughts
God bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/20 10:30

De facto practice that I observed in so called credo-baptism churches that applied the standard of "credible profession of faith" was that baptism was discouraged until youth approached their high school graduation.

Nothing was really changed in them but they were then accepted for baptism. They may have been in the Scriptures since infancy like Timothy was (2 Timothy 2:15).

For not a few of them, they then leave the church in young adulthood. They had been in the church for many years but had been rejected for many years and not been admitted to baptism until years later. Some leave the church after being disciples in the churches for many years but having never been baptized at all. It is sad.

Biblically, there is more ground for hindering access to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper than there is for hindering access to the Lord's sacrament of baptism.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/20 10:50

BTW, thank you, MJ, for your response.

If someone is a church member and goes astray, then you can apply church discipline. If someone is in your church for years as a young person but is never baptized and never recognized as a member, then you can't apply church discipline to them. You can't excommunicate from membership someone whom you never admitted into membership. God ordained church discipline to be a useful tool when needed.

Delaying baptism and church membership results in the unintended consequence of removing church discipline from the toolbox of available options in response to a wayward young disciple.

Re: , on: 2013/11/20 10:53

Thanks for clearing that up Diane. I didn't mean to overgeneralize or 'lump' you into a category to which you do not belong.

And thanks MaryJane for your response too.

Re: , on: 2013/11/20 11:21

Infant baptism breeds a false security, and condemnation down the road. It is not fair to tell young kids that they are Christian because they were baptized yet inwardly they know they are not.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/20 11:34

So, in practice, some of the believers' baptism people will forbid baptism to not only infants but also to 3 year olds and 5 years olds. Some will effectively forbid baptism until children are 7 or 9 or 12 or 14 or 17 or 18. Jesus commanded his disciples to be baptized but some are forbidding obedience to the command until a minimum age. This effectively arbitrary application of a minimum age before which baptism is forbidden is done in the free exercise of conscience and discernment.

Is it not?

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/11/20 11:36

It is not right to tell adults that they are Christians because they were baptized.

Re: , on: 2013/11/20 15:46

Yes, we are not very relational, are we. We turn everything into a formula. We don't take time to listen to the 9 year old who has had a experience with Christ.

But even the Scriptures say that we are only children of God by faith in Christ.

Gal_3:26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.