

PAEDO BAPTISM

A Biblical, Historical (and truly) Reformed View of Baptism

1. Paedo-baptism (or more specifically, household baptism) is the provisional promise of the Old Testament that is prophesied, preserved and practiced as a part of the New Covenant:

1.1. Provisional: In the past God has set apart to Himself the households of His covenant people (especially children) making the following special provisional promise to all not outwardly refusing submission to Him regardless of their age, evidence of faith or knowledge of Him: ***ability to take the covenant sign and receive its subsequent blessings of entrance into the covenant community, justification and the hope of eternal life.***

1.1.1. (Gen 17:11-14, 23-27; Exo 20:5-6; Lev 12:3; Psa 90:16-17, 102:28, 103:17, 127:3, 139:14; Pro 14:26, 20:7; Isa 8:18, 29:23; Eze 16:20-21, 23:37; Joe 2:12-19; Gal 1:15).

1.1.2. (Psa 22:9-10)

“Note that David is not presenting his (situation) as a one-in-a-million case. After all, his description...was a part of Israel’s public hymnbook used in corporate worship. This is not a private prayer journal, but part of a covenantal liturgy. In public praise, every Israelite would have made the words of David his own and would have been expected to identify with them in some form or fashion.” – Rich Lusk

1.1.3. (Psa 71:5-6)

“If we take the framework of the psalmist seriously, the covenant child would never need to pose the question, ‘What must I do to be saved?’ That question would never occur to the child. Salvation has belonged to him from the beginning because of God’s covenant promise (71:6). He does not need a conversion experience when he reaches a mythical age of accountability. Instead he simply needs to continue maturing and growing in the trust of his youth (71:5). Indeed, the psalmist pledges himself to just this kind of faith-filled perseverance later on in his prayer (71:14-18).” – Rich Lusk

1.1.4. Consider also: God invited His people’s children to participate in the Passover feast – an event open only to those in covenant and ceremonially clean (Exo 12:24 w/43-48).

Though expressing no faith and possessing no extensive knowledge of the Divine, the children of God’s people are considered “set apart” to Him and made a part of the worshipping covenant community with its redemptive blessings (justification, forgiveness, sonship, etc.) through the covenant sign given at the time of their birth.

1.2. Promise of the Old Testament: This special provision of justified, covenant children is a ***key part of the blessings*** God promises to Abraham and his descendants in the Old Testament.

1.2.1. (Gen 17:1-10) (v7,8) – “...to be God to you and your offspring after you...I will be their God”

1.2.2. The blessings realized in the rest of the bible are nothing more than God fulfilling the promises originally made to Abraham and his descendants. This is why we find so much emphasis and reference to Abraham later in the bible; to be connected to him meant being a recipient of God’s blessings – including the promised blessing of justified, covenant children (e.g. Exo 2:24, 3:6, 15-17, *6:2-7, *32:12-13, 33:1; Deu 1:8; 1Chr 16:14-18; *2Chr 20:7; Neh 9:7-8; *Psa 105:6-8; *Isa 41:8-10; Mic 7:20; *Luk 1:54-55, 73-75; *Heb 2:16; *Gal 3:7; contra: Luk 3:8; Joh 8:39)!

1.2.3. God changing Abram’s name to Abraham (adding the “ha” portion changes the meaning of his name to “father of many nations”) also points to this special provisional promise since it is expected that children will inherit the blessings of their parents (or father – e.g. Gen 27:1-4; Luk 15:12). In this case, it is first and foremost the blessing of possessing Abraham’s God.

1.3. Prophesied: This special provision is prophesied in an upgraded form as part of the coming New Covenant: the anointing/outpouring of the Spirit upon all offspring as a Helpmate in understanding/obeying God’s commands (Isa 44:3, 54:13; Jer 32:36-41; Joe 2:28-29; Zech 10:7-9; Mal 4:6 w/Luk 1:17).

“The Bible teaches that one of the features of the New Covenant was to be the *restoration* of the covenantal parent/child relationship, not the *dissolution* of the covenantal parent/child relationship.” –Doug Wilson

1.4. Preserved:

1.4.1. (Luk 1:54-55, 73-75)

“Mary’s song includes future generations. Covenant succession is not coming to an end with the coming of Christ.” – Rich Lusk

1.4.2. (Act 2:39)

Imagine the outrage of these Jews, if what Peter just told them was, “though junior *was* in covenant with God, now he’s out”! Such thinking goes against what we know to be true about covenant expulsion – it only happens because of sin.

“If anyone at that time had seriously maintained (that Peter’s words) meant the children of believers were now to be excluded unless they came into covenant on their own as a separate individual, this would have been, in the first century, *an incomprehensible doctrine.*” – Doug Wilson

Recall the context of Peter’s words - the outpouring of the Spirit upon the disciples (1-21). The time of the New Covenant has come – and with it, the upgraded promise of the Spirit to God’s people **and their children** (i.e. the fulfillment of Joe 2:28-29; Isa 44:3; 54:13).

“We can see throughout the New Testament the controversy caused by the *inclusion* of believing but *uncircumcised* Gentiles (Gal 2:11-12). Where is the controversy caused by the exclusion of the *circumcised* infants of believing Jews? There is *no such controversy*. But is it reasonable to suppose that those who so loudly objected to the *inclusion* of uncircumcised Gentiles would somehow not object at all to the *exclusion* of their own *circumcised* children? Were the saints really being taught that additions to the olive tree were now all to be made by grafting alone, and that no one *grows* on the tree any more? *Not at all* (Rom 11:7).” – Doug Wilson

1.4.3. (2Co 1:20)

Clearly, the promises Paul has in mind are those given in the Old Testament –most specifically those given to Abraham, including the promise regarding households/children. The pressing question before us then is this: does the New Testament ever indicate that this particular promise has been cancelled or changed? (Never!). If so, Paul is not being completely truthful in his communication (“all the promises” really mean “only some”). Not only that, but for this particular promise to be cancelled means that one of the most important blessings offered by God has been removed (what parent would argue that?). As such, can we really say the New Covenant is better (Heb 8:6)?

“The New Covenant has better promises. But if such glorious *generational* and *covenantal* promises are ascribed to the Old Covenant, and are abandoned under the New, then how are the promises better?” – Doug Wilson

“The promise does *not* say that God will become a God to our children when they reach a certain age or level of intellectual and physical maturity; rather, the promise declares that *from the very beginning of their lives*, our children stand in the same covenantal relationship that we ourselves are in...” – Rich Lusk

1.4.4. (1Co 7:14)

So then, this is the crucial distinction that *must* be made between the children of unbelievers and believers. Though God commands all to repent and come into covenant relationship with Him (Act 17:30), He **expects** it from the households of His covenant people. Their children have been “set apart” with this as their destiny. Like the children of the Levite in the Old Testament, the children of the New Covenant Levite (us! – Rev 1:6; 1Pe 2:9) have also been born into their future occupation. They too have been called to carry the priestly mantle. As such, the children of believers will be under a stricter judgment (Rom 11:16-22).

1.5. Practiced as part of the New Covenant:

1.5.1. Baptism replaces circumcision, as the *new* seal of righteousness and covenant sign (Col 2:11-12; 1Co 12:13 w/28 – “body” = “church” = the New Covenant community). If the special provision promise has indeed been preserved, then it is to be expected that baptism was applied to the children of believers as the means to recognizing that promise (just as circumcision did in the past).

“In Col 2, Paul essentially says, ‘You were circumcised when you were baptized.’ Baptism swallows up the meaning and practice of circumcision as a covenant sign. If circumcision, a seal of righteousness (Rom 4) could be applied to infants [in the Old Testament without the need of them first expressing faith], then there (should be) no objection to baptizing the infants of God’s people today.” – Rich Lusk

“What circumcision was to the Jews, baptism is to our children. And for this reason the Apostle Paul calls baptism *the circumcision of Christ* (Col 2:11).” (Belgic Confession, Art. 34)

1.5.2. Several New Testament texts become almost nonsensical without the assumption that this practice of giving special provision to the children of God’s people (through baptism as the new circumcision) continues under the New Covenant (Luk 18:15-17 w/Mat 19:13-15 w/Mar 10:13-16; Eph 6:1-3; Tit 1:6).

1.5.3. The Scriptural concept or word “household” is never associated with the personal decisions of its members, but instead functions in the role of passive recipient to the actions and consequences of its representative head. In other words, the household (most esp. the children) receive either the special provision of blessing or curse, based on the actions/personal decisions of the parents. This has been God’s design/principle for households from the beginning (e.g. Rom 5:12; Exo 20:5; Num 16:32; Jos 7:24-25, 24:15). As such, this is how the household baptisms of (Act 11:14, 16:14-15 and 30-33) must be understood: as conveying the blessing of covenant relationship to the rest of the household simply because of the actions of its representative head, the believing parent.

1.5.4. As the “gate-keepers” to heaven (Mat 16:19, 18:18; Joh 20:23), the church is given the duty of **making** disciples, through baptism (Mat 28:19) all those God clearly identifies as His “elect” - i.e. those He is calling to Himself (2Ti 2:10) since this is what determines who enters His kingdom and receives His salvation promises (i.e. it is His choice –not theirs – Rom 9:15-16). As such, the expression of faith before baptism is only necessary in the case of those we are not clear God has chosen. In respect to the children of believers however, it is just the opposite. Their “election” is clear –not because of a prior expression of faith, but because God makes it clear through His special provisional promise (Gen 17:7-9).

2. There are essentially 6 problems suffered by credo-baptists which keep them from embracing the correct, biblical view of baptism and extending this divine promise (and blessing!) to their children:

2.1. PROBLEM #1 = ignorance of church history.

2.1.1. The witness of church history is strongly in favor of paedo-baptism from the earliest days.

“And first baptize the little ones; and if they can speak for themselves, they shall do so.” – Hippolytus (*The Apostolic Tradition*, A.D. 215-217)

“The church has a tradition from the apostles to give baptism to infants.” – Origen (*Commentary on Romans*, A.D. 233-244)

“If anyone should ask for divine authority in this matter, though that which the whole church practices (as infant baptism) – and was ever in use – is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered by authority of the apostles, yet we may besides take a true estimate, how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants...” – Augustine (*De Baptismo*, A.D. 400)

2.1.2. The first Credo-baptists (i.e. the Anabaptists) do not appear until the 16th century! Are we to believe the church got it wrong for sixteen hundred years?!

2.1.3. The Reformers not only rejected Credo-baptists as heretical, but made their condemnation a test of orthodoxy within their Confessionals. For example, the Belgic Confession, Article 34 states, “We detest the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with the one only baptism they have received (as infants), and moreover condemn the baptism of infants of believers, who we believe ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the covenant, as the children in Israel formerly were circumcised upon *the same promises* which are made unto our children.”

2.2. PROBLEM #2 = poor biblical theology.

Rather than seeing the continuity that must exist between all the covenants as the Reformers and those before them did, the credo-baptists view all of them (or at least the Old and New) as separate or independent of one another. In other words, God’s redemptive plan (and promises) under the New Covenant have no connection (or obligation) to the past covenants. The biblical theology (therefore) of the credo-baptist is essentially, “God’s redemptive plan is different through history (i.e. He is continually starting over)” with the following disastrous results:

2.2.1. A bible filled with multiple/different gospels (v. a singular gospel message).

2.2.2. A Marcionite approach to the Scriptures: the Old Testament holds no authority, nor does it inform us as to what the gospel looks like. It is instead treated as suspect (even evil). As such, the New Testament establishes its own precedent for what it means to follow God.

2.2.3. The standing promise of children receiving special provision in regard to covenant relationship with God is no longer assumed, nor is there a problem with the absence of any mention of its repeal.

Dispensationalism (the biblical theology of discontinuity and step-child of 19th century revivalist, lay/uneducated clergy) has done much to promote this kind of thinking today.

2.3. PROBLEM #3 = the influence of 19th century Revivalism.

The Revivalist movement of the 19th century (led in large part, by men with no formal bible training -e.g. Charles Finney) redefined (i.e. gave new unbiblical understandings/emphasis to) three very important Christian doctrines, which in turn, also helped to diminish the validity of the paedo-baptistic view and encourage people in the direction of the credo-baptist:

2.3.1. Church: The revivalists worked outside the church – and for the most part, were anti-church in their overall views of her authority, believing her to be unnecessary in the life of the Christian –or in becoming one. The long-standing historical proclamation, “There is no salvation outside the church” became, “There is no need for the church in salvation”.

As a result, the idea of covenant community and the special promises associated with her (i.e. paedo-baptism or children as part of the covenant community) became increasingly unpopular and incongruous with the plan of salvation .

2.3.2. Faith: Along with their rejection of the church/covenant community came a new way of thinking in relation to faith. Rather than it being simply the expression or visible sign of one God has chosen and called to Himself, it instead became the act of personal/individual choice. In other words, it was no longer about God’s Sovereign choice, but man’s (“will I choose God?” v. “Did God choose me?”). In this respect, the paedo position also suffered since there was no evidence of the baby (as an individual) choosing God.

2.3.3. Sacraments: Like the church, the sacraments (including baptism) were discounted by the revivalists as naked signs or symbols (i.e. memorial in nature only and not necessary). As such, the sacramental efficacy of paedo-baptism was rejected, becoming nothing more than “wet baby dedication”.

“The growth of the Baptist movement has largely coincided with America’s rejection of traditional, historic Christianity in favor of [Revivalism]: a democratized, egalitarian version of the gospel” – Rich Lusk

2.4. PROBLEM #4 = rejection of sacramental efficacy.

As implied in the prior point, credo-baptists tend to have a very low (unbiblical) view of the sacraments seeing them also as nothing more than “naked signs or symbols” empty of any real power in their administration. It is feared that attributing any efficacy to them places us squarely in the condemned corner of bible-deficient Roman Catholics. Ironically enough however, such tenacious avoidance of anything which “smacks of Rome” has caused such individuals to become just as bible deficient – and much worse (in their views of the sacraments). They have also become guilty of rejecting the very heritage which freed them from Rome’s grasp- the Protestant Reformers, since both Scripture and these great men paint a very different picture: the sacraments as effectual unto redemption when administered by God’s church. Consider:

2.4.1. The witness of Scripture to sacramental efficacy.

2.4.1.1. The sacramental feasts of the Old and New Covenant (Exo 12:1-13; 1Co 11:28-31)

2.4.1.2. The animal sacrifices (Lev 16:30; Heb 9:13)

2.4.1.3. Circumcision (Exo 4:24-25)

If circumcision was effectual in changing God’s disposition toward the children of His people under the Old Testament, why would we think it to be any different regarding baptism (it’s stated replacement – Col 2:11-12) under the New Covenant?

2.4.1.4. Baptism is portrayed as effectual for providing believer’s children (and us!) with what is necessary to gain salvation under the New Covenant - including faith (1Pe 3:21 = faith, cleansing/justification; Act 2:38 = forgiveness, gift of Holy Spirit; Act 22:16 = cleansing/justification/forgiveness, faith; Tit 3:5 = regeneration/gift of Holy Spirit, new life/birth; 1Co 12:13 = entrance into the covenant community).

“Our baptized children are not merely in the place of privilege, but a place the Bible calls ‘salvation’...

“The child of the covenant is not only given the promises, he is given the faith by which those promises are appropriated and made his own. The covenant child is included in a faith-based covenantal relationship with God. To deny the reality of (this) is to say the covenant promises only stretch halfway between God and the child. It implies covenant children are automatically covenant-breakers because they cannot fulfill the covenant conditions...

If red flags go up for us when we hear things like ‘God saved you in baptism’ (cf. 1Pe 3:20-21), we need to rethink our baptismal theology and bring it more in line with the teaching of God’s Word. At stake is our whole understanding of how God works salvation in the world.” – Rich Lusk

“Baptism in water does establish, *ex opera operato*, a binding relation to the covenant and the Lord of the covenant.” – Doug Wilson

“Redeeming grace is conferred through the instrumentality of baptism. The seal of baptism both ‘marks out’ a person in the outward sense of entering him or her into the covenant community, while conferring upon them the...saving grace effected by the Holy Spirit unto regeneration...To put it plainly, it seems very difficult to construe Scripture to say anything less about baptism than that God is, in a very real sense, ‘present’ in baptism. He is present not merely to watch it, witness it, or even receive praise from it, but also – and most especially – to transact his covenant...In short, God is, in a very real and special sense, effecting salvation through baptism...And as this will be applied to the proper recipients of baptism, we see no reason to believe that children are excluded from this promise...as they are entrusted by God into the covenant family.” – Preston Graham

2.4.1.5. Jesus is the ultimate proof of baptism’s efficacy (and the paradigm for our own). It was through the waters of baptism that He received the outpouring of the Spirit and the declaration of Sonship (Mat 3:16-17).

“With appropriate qualifications, this is what God does in our baptisms as well: He pours out his Spirit upon us and declares us to be his dearly beloved children. In context, none of (the passages on baptism) teach baptism automatically guarantee salvation. But they do teach that God *does a great work in baptism*.” – Rich Lusk

2.4.2. The beliefs of the Protestant Reformers.

2.4.2.1. John Calvin

Calvin’s Strasbourg catechism asks the student, “How do you know yourself to be a son of God in fact as well as in name?” To which the answer is supplied as, “Because I am baptized in the name of God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost.”

In Calvin’s Geneva Catechism he asks, “Is baptism nothing more than a mere symbol of cleansing?” The answer given, “I think it to be such a symbol that the reality is attached to it. For God does not disappoint us when he promises us his gifts. Hence, both pardon of sins and newness of life are certainly offered and received by us in baptism.”

2.4.2.2. Martin Bucer (Calvin’s mentor)

His liturgy for the church written in 1537 states, "Almighty God, heavenly Father, we give you eternal praise and thanks, that you have granted and bestowed upon this child your fellowship, that you have born him again to yourself through holy baptism."

2.4.2.3. Nicholas Ridley (English Reformer martyred by the Roman Catholics because of his Protestant Faith) wrote, "Water in baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration."

2.4.2.4. John Knox (Scottish Reformer and author of the 1560 Scots Confession) states, "we utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm the sacraments to be nothing else than naked and bare signs. No, we assuredly believe that by baptism we are engrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of his righteousness, by which our sins are covered and remitted."

2.4.2.5. Westminster Assembly

"There is in every sacrament, a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified: whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other." (Westminster Confession of Faith, 27.2)

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church; but also, to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life. Which sacrament is, by Christ's appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world." (WCF 28.1)

"The grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time." (WCF 28.6)

"The parts of the sacraments are two; the one an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's appointment; the other an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified." (Westminster Larger Catechism, 163)

2.4.2.6. Samuel Ward (one of the theologians who participated in the Westminster Assembly) wrote that "baptism regenerated infants" and all "infants were, without a doubt, justified through baptism." Ward also stated that the grace received in baptism was in every sense "provisional" –i.e. arranged or existing for the present, possibly to be changed later (Merriam Webster). In other words, he saw infant baptism as not guaranteeing salvation, but dependent upon that child persevering in faithful obedience (a subject to be considered more fully under 2.5.).

"The Westminster divines viewed baptism as the instrument and occasion of regeneration of the Spirit, of the remission of sins, of ingrafting into Christ. The Confession teaches baptismal regeneration." – David F. Wright

"The Reformed tradition, in its pristine form, linked baptism instrumentally to regeneration and justification, and thus, to the beginnings of salvation." – Rich Lusk

"The Reformed position (affirms) that through baptism salvation is conferred by the personal agent of grace, the Holy Spirit." – Preston Graham

2.5. PROBLEM #5 = the rise of permanent justification.

The London Baptist Confession of 1689 (one of the first credo-baptist confessionals in history), may also be the document most responsible for the heretical doctrine of, "once saved always saved" –or permanent justification .

Section 11, article 5 states,

"God continues to forgive the sins of those who are justified, and although they can never fall from the state of justification, yet they may because of their sins, fall under God's fatherly displeasure. In that condition they will not usually have the light of God's countenance restored to them until they humble themselves, confess their sins, ask for pardon, and renew their faith and repentance."

Based on this kind of thinking (and rightly so), the idea of babies receiving justification (which they cannot lose and did not choose) becomes odious. Such assurance cannot be offered to those who might apostasize (another truth rejected by most credo-baptists!).

The problem lies (however) not with the extension of justification to babies, but their view of justification as permanent. According to the bible, all those gaining justification through baptism (including those making use of God's special provisional promise) must maintain such justification through a life of faithful obedience if they are to continue reaping its blessings. In other words, the danger of loss (of justification) and apostasy are very real!

"As far as the blessings of covenant membership, the possibility of apostasy, and the demand to walk before God in persevering blamelessness, covenant children are in precisely the same position as their parents." – Rich Lusk

2.5.1. Consider again the analogy of being buried and raised in (Col 2:12)

Being buried-(i.e. gaining justification) is the easy part - and leads only to death, if we don't then walk by faith/faithfulness and are "raised with him" to life (think Jam 2:26).

2.5.2. This is also Paul's point in Rom 6. Baptism has gained us a right standing and the power to live for God (1-14), but we must maintain such standing through faithful obedience if we wish to realize its intended outcome of eternal life (22-23).

2.5.3. Consider again Psa 139:14. Though the psalmist declares God's special provision, he also admits to the conditionality of such provision: a life of faithful obedience (see v23-24):

"Verses twenty-three and twenty-four invite God to continue His examination all the length of the author's life, because the purging of his inner life from all impurity is the key to his remaining in the way of eternal blessedness." – C. John Collins

2.5.4. A helpful "test case": (1Pe 3:20) – This is what Peter uses to explain the efficacy of baptism in (v21), "eight people were saved" through the efficacious waters of the flood. Yet this did not guarantee a permanent place before the Lord for we know that Ham (Noah's son) later apostasized and was cursed (Gen 9:25). No doubt the principle applies to baptism as well since this (again) was the reason for Peter selecting this particular biblical account (to help us understand both the benefits *and demands* placed on us in baptism).

2.5.5. (Hos 4:6, 5:6-7) (Heb 6:7-8)

"If regeneration is taken in the Protestant scholastic sense, 'baptismal regeneration' is absurd, since it would mean that each and every person baptized was eternally elect and eternally saved. Obviously, the earlier Reformed theologians who spoke freely of 'baptismal regeneration' did not have this kind of monstrosity in mind. Instead, their understanding of regeneration was something less specific, more open ended. Regeneration, in the broader, generic (shall we say 'covenantal'?) sense can be found in passages like Matthew 13:21-22 and Hebrews 6:7-8. In the Parable of the Sower (Mat 13), the stony ground hearer receives the seed and new life springs forth. Something living is there that was not there before. But when crises come, that new life withers away. Similarly, Hebrews 6:7-8, in the context of issuing a warning against apostasy, speaks of earth (a natural allusion to humans, in light of Gen 2:7) drinking in rain (an obvious allusion to baptism) and producing a living plant. But the blessing of baptismal rain ('regeneration') is in itself no guarantee of a good crop. The new life may bear great fruit, unto blessing, or thorns and thistles, unto cursing. This then is the point: God blesses baptism with new life, though baptism itself does not guarantee perseverance. Thus we must combine the waters of baptism with enduring faith (1Co 10:1-12). If not, the heavenly waters God has poured out upon us will drown us in a flood of judgment...God never intended baptism to stand on its own. Rather, as we mix the waters of baptism with the obedience of faith and life in the church among the covenant people, we find that God has already given us and our children every blessing in Christ. Baptism is an act with eternal consequences for the faithful and the unfaithful, and covenant members who renounce their baptismal identity and fall from grace can only expect God's harshest judgment (Gal 5:4; Heb 10:26ff). [Therefore] a 'once saved always saved' doctrine in which a one-time conversion experience is said to secure salvation (apart) from a life of obedience ...contrasts with the biblical teaching on (regeneration) and perseverance." – Rich Lusk

"Everyone who is baptized – *every one* – is brought into the body of Christ, ordained to be a priest before God, married to Jesus, and brought into the family of the Father, into the circle of God's personal favor. Everyone who is baptized is shown favor simply by the fact of their being baptized, for being named with the Triune name and being planted in the body of Christ are undeserved favors. *But* that favor does not last, or it does not produce fruit, without faith. Only those who respond in faith fulfill their priestly role rightly, persevere in the marriage covenant with Christ, stay in the family, remain in the circle of God's favor." –Peter Leithart

2.6. PROBLEM #6 = the fear of change.

This (too) can be the kind of problem that keeps a credo-baptist from embracing the biblical position of paedobaptism –especially those whose views on baptism have been shown to be deficient and unbiblical! Fear of change is actually the most dangerous problem to have since fearing what God has promised to give us - for any reason (including change!), amounts to rebellion, despising and unbelief (e.g. Num 13:1-2, 31-14:12).