

There is a high probability that every adult here this morning is aware of the unfortunate disagreement that the Christian Church has over Baptism. Godly, wise, and effective theologians and ministers in evangelical branches of Christ's church today do not all agree on the mode of baptism, the people of baptism, nor the definition or meaning of Baptism. As a result, many of you here today were baptized in various different modes, for various different reasons and at various different ages.

Nevertheless, you should not lose heart nor grow indifferent to the question of Baptism. Although the question must be studied, and discussed with humility and love, it nevertheless, must be studied and understood by God's people. Paul said in Romans 14:23, "...*whatever is not from faith is sin.*" And although God is a gracious Father and does not demand all Christians to have an equal amount of certainty about theological questions, all Christians should have a biblical basis for the version of Baptism that they practice. It is with these things in mind that we approach our passage this morning.

In Genesis 17:10-11 we clearly see two things. First, we see that God gave Abraham a sign of His covenant. And second, we see who received that sign. And what I would like to do this morning is take these two things which are clearly presented in these two verses and trace their significance through Scripture. This morning my two headings are: First, "What is the Sign of the Covenant?" and second, "Who gets the sign of the covenant?" And contrary to my usual practice of clearly stating my sermon lesson up front, I will, instead, try and answer these two questions and after doing so, I will state my sermon lesson at the end.

Look with me first at Genesis 17 verse 10, as we ponder the question, "What is the sign of the covenant?" The text says,

"This is My covenant which you shall keep, between Me and you and your descendants after you: Every male child among you shall be circumcised; ¹¹ and you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between Me and you."

Formally, circumcision was the sign of the covenant. That this was the case is clear. He says, "*This is My covenant which you shall keep ... every male child among you shall be circumcised... [and later] ... it shall be a sign of the covenant between Me and you.*" That this continued to be the sign of the covenant throughout the Mosaic and Davidic administrations of the covenant is also plain. All the way to the time of Christ, the Jewish people recognized this to be so. Even

to the point, where circumcision was falsely understood by the Jews to impart that which it signified. To the Pharisees of Jesus' day, to be circumcised was to be saved – which was not true and never was true. But the fact that Circumcision was the sign of the covenant, throughout the Mosaic and Davidic administrations is plan.

But what did circumcision mean? What was the thing that it signified? It was not merely a national badge, but in addition to marking off the children of Israel nationally, it also symbolized spiritual purification. If circumcision was merely a national badge then how could Moses say in Leviticus 19:23, "*When you come into the land, and have planted all kinds of trees for food, then you shall count their fruit as uncircumcised.*" If fruit can be uncircumcised, the term is clearly being used to denote something spiritual, something that is unclean or defiled. Thus, it would follow that to be circumcised would mean to be clean or purified.

This meaning of spiritual purification can be deepened to communicate a spiritual work of the Holy Spirit in the heart, which is also commonly called regeneration. Regeneration can be define generally speaking as the beginning of spiritual life. It implies the deadness of man's soul apart from God's grace and, although being distinction from faith and repentance, it will lead to those and to a life of holiness.

This deeper meaning for circumcision is used in Deuteronomy 30:6 Moses exhorted God's people saying, "*And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, that you may live.*" Here circumcision describes the spiritual work of God's spirit in the heart of God's people, a work so that they might be willing to obey.

However, when we turn to the New Testament, Paul gives us an additional and fuller meaning of circumcision. In Romans 4:11 he says, "*And he [that is Abraham] received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while still uncircumcised.*" Some Christians say that circumcision was a sign of faith. However, that is not true. This text says that circumcision, rather, is a sign and a seal of righteousness – a righteousness which comes by faith. Again, Romans 4:11 says, "*And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while still uncircumcised.*"

What is interesting to note is that Baptism includes this same idea. And when as we ask the question - what now is the sign of the covenant? - part of the

answer is determined by the fact that circumcision and baptism signified the very same thing. A point to which I will return shortly. But for now, what I would like for you to see, is that baptism is now the sign of the covenant.

This fact is not hotly debated - Baptism is clearly the sign of the covenant. Christ told His disciples at the great commission to go and make disciples and baptize them. In the book of Acts, the disciples are frequently calling on people to repent and be baptized for the forgiveness of sins.

But what is debated is that baptism replaced circumcision. It is not just that circumcision is now gone and baptism is in its place, but rather, that baptism is for the people of God now, what circumcision was for the people of God in the Old Testament. This is largely seen by the fact that both circumcision and baptism signified the same thing.

Part of the meaning of circumcision was how it was an initiatory rite. In other words, it was used to set aside the people of God from the rest of the world. In Exodus 12, Moses sets forth the basis for how a Gentile convert, could become an Israelite and be a member of God's people. He says in Exodus 12:48, "*And when a stranger dwells with you and wants to keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as a native of the land.*" What is implicit here, but in other places explicit is the faith of this stranger. He believes in the God of Israel, and thus has joined himself with them, much like Rahab the harlot or Ruth the Moabite or Uriah the Hittite. Thus, we see how circumcision was an initiatory rite, it signified entrance or membership into the people of God.

Now who would argue that Baptism does not do this very same thing? In Acts 2:40-41 we read, "*And with many other words he [that is Peter] testified and exhorted them, saying, 'Be saved from this perverse generation.'*"⁴¹ *Then those who gladly received his word were baptized; and that day about three thousand souls were added to them.*" The crowd in Acts 2 was presumably made up of Jews, but it was also true for Gentile converts, that those who believed were then baptized and the text specifically says that by this act of baptism they were "*added*" to the church.

What am I saying? I am showing you that baptism replaced circumcision. What circumcision was for God's people then, Baptism is for God's people now. This is seen largely by the fact they both signified the same thing. First, they both were initiatory rites, but secondly, they both signified regeneration.

We have already seen how circumcision signified regeneration from Deuteronomy 30:6 and the numerous places where God's people are exhorted to be circumcised in their heart. And this is the case also with baptism. In Titus 3:5, and in reference to God's work of salvation, Paul says, "...according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit..." Here Paul is referring to the spiritual work of the Holy Spirit to renew and regenerate dead hearts and yet, he uses the imagery of washing, which ought to be seen as a reference to Baptism. I have not covered the mode of baptism yet, but even if for those who immerse, baptism still can be referred to as a "washing".

Furthermore, that baptism signifies regeneration is seen by how Paul uses the word baptism in Romans 6:3-11. Paul connects baptism with the spiritual life that begins when the Holy Spirit regenerates the heart. In verse 4, Paul says, "*Therefore we were buried with Him through baptism into death, that just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*" Walking in newness of life is a reference to how Christians now are enabled to obey because they are spiritually alive – up from the dead.

In the New Testament, we learn that Baptism, in addition to regeneration, also had a reference to sin. Baptism also signifies the purification from the defilement and from the guilt of sin. In 1 Corinthians 6:11, after Paul makes mention of several troublesome and shameful sins, he says to the believing Corinthians, "*But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.*" And the import of this washing is to convey a cleansing from the defilement of those sins. This would also be the most common understanding of water going over someone's body. It washes the dirt of sin away.

Furthermore, baptism signified the washing of sin's guilt. Peter says in Acts 2:38, "*Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins...*" Peter is not suggesting that the actual act of baptism performs this spiritual act, nor do we today believe that the recipients of baptism are saved by the very waters of baptism but Peter is using this phrase to convey its meaning. As we interpret scripture with scripture we should see that only those who by faith believe in God will receive the things signified by the sign of baptism.

Now some might say that circumcision did not signify these same things, namely purification from sin's defilement and the remission of sins. However, that is not true. Circumcision also signified these things. By the cutting away of the foreskin, we are taught not only that something is wrong with man and needs to be removed, namely sin, but also that God has done that removal. Thus, circumcision pointed forward to the bloody cross, whereas baptism pointed back to the cross of Christ.

Now biblically speaking, circumcision is shown to have the same meaning in relation to sin as baptism by Paul's words in Col 2:11-12. And what may be helpful for you, in order to see not only that circumcision signified the same thing as baptism, but that baptism replaced circumcision is to point out how Paul uses both these words in Col 2:11-12. You can find Col 2:11-12 on page 749 of your pew bible and I invite you to turn there with me. I do not intend to explain every word or idea in these two verses, but rather, I intend only to show you that Paul used both baptism and circumcision to speak of the same thing and he did so fluidly without any hesitation and he did this because in his mind the one replaced the other.

He writes, *"¹¹ In Him you were also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, ¹² buried with Him in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead."* It is clear that in v.11, Paul is talking about a spiritual reality. He tells the Colossians that they were circumcised "without hands." This is the same usage of the term found in the Old Testament - the circumcision that the Holy Spirit did when He enabled them to obey from the heart.

However, the more difficult question is what does circumcision in v.11 have to do with the baptism in v.12, *"buried with Him in baptism."*? If Paul, who was a Hebrew of Hebrews, did not want us to see a connection between the two terms, he certainly could have been clearer. Instead, it is highly probable that Paul, a Hebrew of Hebrews, naturally sees a connection between the two, and that connection would be that this same work of regeneration which circumcision signified, is also signified by baptism for in baptism we are spiritually speaking buried and raised, and thus walk in newness of life. Therefore, the meaning of the passage is best communicated by rendering the verse, "You were circumcised with the circumcision made without hands ... when you were buried with him in Baptism." Or to paraphrase, Paul is saying this, "No longer should you desire - O Colossians! - the Jewish ordinance of circumcision for all that it signified is found in baptism."

Now I have said much about how baptism has replaced circumcision and I have said a few things about what both of them mean. But what is a baptism anyway? In its very essence, before one sees its spiritual meaning, we must know that baptism involves “the washing with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (WSC 94). It is to be performed by one who is ordained to proclaim God’s word, for that is exactly what the sacraments are - God’s word only in visible form. The sacraments are visible words. In addition, Baptism is to be administered by evoking the Triune name, as Christ appointed in the great commission and it is to be performed with water.

The mode of baptism is not essential. That is why in the RPCNA and in other Presbyterian churches we accept the baptism of those who were immersed. The mode is never stated in Scripture. It seems best to sprinkle or pour since those modes convey the idea of washing and are easily practiced in any part of the world. The term “baptism” does not necessitate immersion as is seen by its usage in several places, namely in Hebrews 9:10 where the author of Hebrews, with reference to the Old Testament ceremonies refers to them as “*various baptisms.*” But many of those baptisms were merely the sprinkling or pouring of blood upon a sacrifice and only some of them could be described as dipping or immersion.

If one wants to argue from the phrase “going down into the water” and “coming up from the water” a phrase common in the book of Acts and in the gospels, then in some cases this would mean that the person being baptized, as well as the one baptizing, was immersed in water. When Philip baptized the Ethiopian Eunuch in Acts 8:38-39, the text says, “*So he commanded the chariot to stand still. And both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and he baptized him.*”³⁹ *Now when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught Philip away,*” Now if this mandates immersion then we and our Baptist friends are both wrong because neither of us immerse both the baptizer and the one being baptized.

Furthermore, if we look at Paul’s baptism in Acts 9:18, the most natural understanding of what happened is that, after Ananias came into Paul’s room and they had finished their discussion, Paul simply stood up and Ananias baptized him. Acts 9:18 says, “*Immediately there fell from his eyes something like scales, and he received his sight at once; and he arose and was baptized.*” It is a forced reading to suggest that between Paul’s rising and his baptism, that a servant brought in a tub and they filled the tub with gallons of water and then immersed him.

Now if I still have your attention, I want to draw your attention to the coming baptism of Spencer Burns this morning. What should you be thinking about as you see Pastor McCracken come forward and sprinkle this young covenant child with water.

I am speaking to you as the people of God. I ask you this question. Are you not a sinner? Who here was not born in sin and was not conceived in iniquity? Who here has not broken God's law? Who here has not committed adultery by fantasizing about what it would be like to be married to a famous actor or actress? Which child here has never fussed about not having a chocolate cookie after dinner or about not getting to watch PAW Patrol on Nickelodeon? Who here loves God with all of their heart, not giving one slice to the god of a degree or to the god of an occupation or to the god of reputation or to the god of good looks or to the god of the bank account?

My dear congregation, if I have mentioned anything that you have done, then I point you to the God who forgives sinners through the person of Jesus Christ. And when you see the waters of baptism run off the head of Spencer Burns, know assuredly, that God has provided a means of forgiveness, a means of salvation to you who turn and believe in His son Jesus Christ. God tells you today, "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved.*" (Acts 16:31). He will take you, despite all your sin, and unite you to His son Jesus Christ. He will give you spiritual life. He will give you eyes to apprehend His mercy in Christ Jesus, eyes to see your own sin and the certainty of judgment, and a heart that willingly trusts Him. And He will wash away all the filth of your sin that you might be clean. And this is what you ought to be thinking about when you see the waters of baptism run off little Spencer's head.

But should Spencer Burns be baptized? Has he believed in Christ? Well, he should be baptized, even though he has not believed. Now, how do I explain this? Look back with me to Genesis 17 and let us ask the question, "Who gets the sign of the covenant?" We have seen that Baptism is now the sign of the covenant, but who is it to be administered to?

Again, Gen 17:10-11 says, "*... Every male child among you shall be circumcised; ¹¹ and you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins ...*"

Now in this text we see that God has made a covenant with Abraham, and naturally, He would be a member of that covenant. He also believed in the

promises of the covenant and in the God of the covenant. And it is also true that other people from other nations, who were not of the seed of Abraham, could join Israel and become members of Israel by professing faith in the God of Israel. We have seen this already in our discussion of circumcision being an initiatory rite, specifically from Exodus 12:48 concerning a stranger participating in the Passover meal.

Now who would deny this principle in the New Covenant administration? Nobody denies this. Everywhere in the book of Acts, we see Gentiles coming to faith and they are baptized.

But the members of the covenant were not just those who professed faith in the God of the covenant. In the Old Testament, it is clear, that the children were also members. We see that clearly in Gen 17:10, *"This is My covenant which you shall keep, between Me and you and your descendants after you..."* God did not just make a covenant with Abraham but with Abraham's descendants.

This principle is seen all throughout the Old Testament. In Psalms 105:8-10 the Psalmist writes, *"He remembers His covenant forever, The word which He commanded, for a thousand generations, ⁹ The covenant which He made with Abraham, And His oath to Isaac, ¹⁰ And confirmed it to Jacob for a statute, To Israel as an everlasting covenant,"* In Acts 3:25 Peter calls the men of Israel sons of the covenant made with Abraham.

Now the reason that I have elaborated on this point is not because our Baptist friends deny the children of Israelites were included among their number, but because they do not pay sufficient attention to it. The *"you and your descendants"* principle was deeply embedded in the mind of the Jews, in the mind of the writers of the New Testament, in Peter's mind, and in Paul's mind. These men were not influenced by the atomistic or individualistic mindset of the western world. Yes, God ultimately deals with individuals but He does so covenantally. God uses the family, and He uses the church to work His salvation in His people. And this principle is not abrogated in the New Testament. Instead it is assumed. I say again, this *"you and your descendants"* principle is never abrogated – something which we should expect if our Baptist friends are correct. It is a very significant silence. Instead, as we shall see, this principle is assumed in the minds of the New Testament authors.

In Matthew 19:14, Jesus says, *"Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of heaven."* Now, what is of

significance here is not that Jesus simply brings them near to himself and blesses them. It is not that He baptizes them, for He certainly does not do that, nor is water anywhere in the picture. But the significance rather is that Jesus specifically says that these children are members of the kingdom of heaven a term synonymous with the kingdom of God and virtually synonymous with the church – although the phrase “Kingdom of God” and “Kingdom of Heaven” do have an emphasis on the future consummation of salvation and return of Christ. But Christ is King now and His kingdom is at hand now. And Jesus includes these children in it. Again, He says, “... *for of such is the kingdom of heaven...*” Jesus does not refer to their child-like faith, instead, He is referring to their persons. And this would only be a natural continuation of what the Jewish people would have expected.

Another place where the New Testament writers assume that Children are included in the covenant occurs is in 1 Corinthians 7:14. Paul says to the Corinthians, “*For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy.*” Now, it is acknowledged that this verse has nothing directly to do with baptism, but that is not the point. Instead, we ought to see how Paul views children of believers. They are holy. They are not holy in their nature, for they are born in sin as the others. But neither does the text merely convey the idea of the children being “special.” One Baptist commentator says concerning his children, “our unsaved children are seen ... as special...”¹

The problem with the Baptist view of their children is found in passages such as these. Paul does not say that the child of at least one believing parent is special. He says they are HOLY! The same adjective used to describe the Spirit of God. And in order to do justice to this term then they must give this a covenantal meaning. They are holy in that they are included among the people of God and given membership in the church. They still must embrace the covenant by faith in order to be spiritually holy, but they nonetheless are members of the covenant. And as members they receive the sign, which is baptism.

I want to make this point especially clear by way of an example. Please bear with me. And before I give this example, I want to say that there are many godly and wise men who disagree with me on this issue. Baptists do have an explanation for such words, they do have a theological system. However, despite the arguments on both sides, I do believe the issue becomes clearer when you consider looking at

¹ Ware, p.75

it from the perspective of “Who does the best justice to all that data?” What do I mean?

Let me ask you a thought provoking question. If someone takes a Baptist view of the covenant, wherein children are excluded from membership until they are old enough to repent and believe, then can their parents teach them to say the Lord’s prayer? Can their children really say, “Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name?” They have not repented. They have not believed. Can their children say, “Jesus loves me, this I know, for the bible tells me so.” Can their children say that, given their theological system? Their children are Jebusites. They are Canaanites. They are philistines. The first prayer that God will hear from spiritual Philistines is the prayer of repentance wherein they plead the Savior’s name.

And my dear friends, I am not trying to be obnoxious. This is a fair and logical deduction from their system. Only one who has a covenantal understanding of the Bible can teach their children to say such things. It is not because, we presume they have faith, it is because God has declared them to be in His church. He has declared that He is their God. It is up to them to reject it or accept it. But until then, they are holy. They are not Philistines.

As he told Abraham in Genesis 17:7, “*And I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and your descendants after you.*” This same idea is expressed in the New Testament when Paul told the Philippian Jailer in Acts 16:31, “*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved, you and your household.*”

Now there are two objections commonly given to my conclusion about Children being members in the Covenant. First, our Baptist friends say that great significance of the New Covenant is an actual heart change worked within its members and they cite Jeremiah 31:33-34. You can find this verse on page 504 of your pew bible. Jeremiah says in chapter 31:33- 34 concerning the New Covenant,

“³³ But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. ³⁴ No more shall every man teach his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for they all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, says the Lord...”

What do we say to this objection, that the members of the New Covenant must have a heart change as described in Jeremiah 31? Well, first, if the words of Jeremiah are meant to be understood as completely fulfilled now, then my Baptist friends need to stop exhorting each other every Sunday, as we do, to know the Lord. And yet this is exactly what we both do every Sunday from the pulpit. We exhort one another to believe and to continue to believe. Additionally, in both Presbyterian and Baptist churches we discover the sin and the tragedy of apostasy. We do not all know the Lord. We are, therefore, not yet seeing the fulfillment of all that Jeremiah is saying here.

Secondly, whatever significance these words of Jeremiah have upon our children, it does not follow that he intended to exclude them from membership in the New Covenant because in Jeremiah 32:38-39, he includes the children in the New Covenant. He says, ³⁸ *They shall be My people, and I will be their God;* ³⁹ *then I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear Me forever, for the good of them and their children after them.*” Despite the mighty work of the Holy Spirit in the New Covenant, Jeremiah still has the children in his mind and we should also.

The second objection commonly raised against the practice of baptizing infants of the church is that there are no examples, nor direct commands to do so. Now, this is entirely true. If there was one clear example of an infant baptism in the New Testament or if Paul would have simply said, *“Baptize your infants”* then there would be no debate and I would not be preaching this very academic sermon. However, this objection does not prove what it seeks to prove. For if it did, then Baptists have no biblical warrant to allow women to partake of the Lord’s Supper. There is neither a direct command nor an example anywhere in Scripture of women participating in the Lord’s Supper. However, both Baptists and Presbyterians conclude that women are fit to partake of the Lord’s supper from the fact that women received baptism and from the meaning of the Supper itself. Therefore, although our Baptist friends do not believe in infant baptism they cannot do so merely on the ground that there is no example or no direct command.

Now, dear congregation, I hope that you are informed on why we are baptizing little Spencer this morning. But more than that, I hope you ponder more on the significance. Not just on the meaning of the washing of water over his head, but that God would have you present your children for this ordinance. What is God saying to you? Well, He is teaching you at least two things.

First, that He desires to build up His church by means of procreation. He wants you, His people, normally speaking, to get married and to have BABIES! Now, it is true that the Bible does not say you must have such and such a number of children. But it does say that Children are a reward (Ps 127:3). And does not this ordinance tell you that God wishes to give that which the sign signifies to your children? And if so, does it not follow that you, by having children, are bringing glory to Christ and adding to His church?

Dear congregation, take heed that you do not miss this significance in baptism. Take heed that you do not become worldly minded like so many who surround us in this city. They say, "I am going to have two children. So I can enjoy the rest of my life. I am tired of the diaper stage. Besides [they say] I want to be able to go on my vacations to the Bahamas, and buy my Lexus at age 45." Dear congregation, do you have this mind set? Are you stopping at 2 children or not even having children, because you want more of this world? Now, there are other reasons why good and faithful Christians do not have many children or only 2 children, to name but only two reasons – health and finances. But may it never be that you stop short of increasing God's church by procreation on the basis of worldly thinking and worldly desires.

My dear friends, I must say this. The Muslims are having children and they are having lots of children. The deadness of Europe is leaving an open door for the growth of Islam in that continent and it is merely due to procreation. There is something to be said about numbers and it is something that Muslims and Mormons and other false religions get, and yet it appears to me that the true church of God struggles to get it.

Secondly and more briefly, in this ordinance, God would have parents ponder rather or not they are being faithful to raise up the members of the church. I'm not asking you, fathers, if you put food on the table and give your kids college money. Yes do that too. In fact, Paul says in 1 Timothy 5:8, "*But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.*" But it is more than putting food on the table. Fathers, are you teaching your children about the Lord? Eph 6:4 says, "*And you, fathers, do not provoke your children to wrath, but bring them up in the training and admonition of the Lord.*"

The Old Testament is covered in similar exhortations. God, no doubt, requires fathers – to include mothers – to instruct their children in the ways of God. To rebuke them when they sin. To discipline them accordingly when they go

astray. To instruct and train them in the ways of God and in the ways of holiness. Psalm 78:5 *“For He established a testimony in Jacob, And appointed a law in Israel, Which He commanded our fathers, That they should make them known to their children...”* Are you depending on your elders to teach your children? Or on youth camps? My dear friends, if you, especially the fathers, are deficient in this area, then gather your family together and confess your sin and begin to read the scriptures and pray with your family. The time of repentance is always ripe. And God is always gracious to the one who repents.

I have intended this morning to answer the questions, “What is the sign of the covenant?” and “Who gets the sign of the covenant?” And my answer is this: Baptism is now the sign of the covenant and it is to be administered to all the members of it – to include the children of at least one believer.

And as we finish this morning, my final questions to you are these, “What kind of Baptist are you?” If you do not practice infant baptism, why not? May it never be because you have not studied it, or because you are not willing to go deeper into this topic. May it never be because you do fail to ask the question, “What do I do with my children?”

And If you do practice infant baptism then do you do so in faith, knowing something of the biblical explanation? And more importantly, do you see the significance it places on the family and on parenting? May God build up His church and may God give us the grace to love our children and the faith to have them. Amen.