

# Baptism Views

*Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.*

Date: 19 May 2024

Preacher: Nathan Raynor

[0:00] Thanks for being here. I'm glad you're here. Caleb's coming around and giving out just a simple handout that has a couple of words on one side of it, some space for notes, and then a similar drawing to what I put up on the board, which I know is hard to see, but hopefully the one on the back of this will serve you better and maybe look something like mine by the time we're done together this evening.

So, baptismal views. I have three goals for this evening. Number one, I want to bring some clarity to the two orthodox views of baptism.

There's a lot of varied views, little nuanced things out there, but big views understood by those that we would call faithful Christians.

That's number one. Just bring a bit of clarity to that. Secondly, I want to show that hermeneutics, or the way that we read the Bible, drive the varying understandings of baptism.

So, we're going to back up a bit from the issue of baptism itself to help us see why the conclusion has come to. Thirdly, to defend in brief the position that our church holds.

[1:26] So, I just, I find it impossible to present an entirely fair and balanced view. I'm hoping that you will see that Presbyterians are not insane.

So, Ty's here. Ty's the reason we're having this class tonight. Although, I think it's a good thing to do anyway. I want to help you see, there is a, or reasons that Ty has come to the conclusion that he's come to.

Because we want to wrap our minds around, how is it that people who believe a lot of the things that we believe might differ on something that we also hold to be true.

So, I want to give a little defense of credo-baptism, but I'm not even going to spend a ton of time on that. So, those are my three goals.

I have two hopes for this evening. Number one, that tonight will be the beginning of many fruitful conversations. And that's the clarifying word there, that we actually have conversations that are helpful to us and our faith.

[2:29] Concerning the ordinance of baptism, tonight will not be enough. There's much, much more that could be said. But perhaps we'll spark and engage you in some great Bible conversation concerning these ordinances.

Secondly, tonight, that I can help you to disagree agreeably. So, wherever you end up landing on this issue, just that you'll see there's reason for us to extend a lot of grace to one another as we're trying to navigate matters that aren't always as simple as we'd like for them to be.

So, those are my three goals. Those are my two hopes. I've got some caveats, but I want to pray that the Lord would help us with those things, and then we'll proceed together. So, let's pray together. Father God, we do thank you for today, for the opportunity to gather together with the church this morning, and the way that you blessed our time together as we prayed and sang and heard your word preached this morning.

We're glad now to be back together. And Father, I am grateful that we have any concern at all about what your word says about anything at all, and we recognize that this is a work of the Spirit on our behalf.

You have made us alive. We were once dead, cared nothing about the things that most concern you, and you have saved us.

[3:56] And we are so glad this evening that we have any reason at all to open up the word and to think about it and think about how we can be

obedient to it and to please you.

And so, Father, I pray you'll help me to be clear that we'll have minds that can comprehend this evening, that you'll help us to be those who disagree agreeably, that there will be something distinct about your people when we find ourselves not seeing eye to eye, that we do so in a way that even embraces those difference, and that we would do that for the glory of Christ.

And we pray this in His name. Amen. Okay, so two caveats for this evening. So first, and I mentioned this in brief already, but everything I will cover this evening could be given much more attention.

Really, when approaching stuff like this, it's not really the way I like to teach. I'd much rather have the text and just tell you everything the text says and move on. But when you're coming at something like this, there's so much that could be said in the matter of it all.

So I just thought it best to make every effort to handle it in a single evening, just because I know that our schedules are packed, and many of you don't really need to spend weeks on the matter.

[5:17] You don't need books and books presented to you. So I've tried to distill it down. I've tried to make it as simple and presentable as possible.

I'm confident I won't do the best job of that. So just so you know, there are better people who could do a better job of this. But maybe because you know me, this will be good. Secondly, I'm going to do my best to fairly represent each view.

But again, I'm just not an expert on the matter. So do ask good questions. Feel free to ask me questions. I'll do my very best to answer them. Do study on your own.

Yeah, let's work toward the truth together and keep us moving. I do know the question has been asked if this could be recorded. I do think it's being recorded, but we're going to be doing some things on a whiteboard, so that may not be super helpful.

So you might be able to be helpful to others. And I would encourage you to engage people in conversations about this very matter. Be wary of teachers and leaders who want to keep you from entertaining ideas and exploring truth.

[6:31] It's good, I think, for leaders to warn people like, hey, be careful with that, you know, that thing you're listening to or that doctrine of entertaining. There are certainly some very dangerous things that need to be shut down.

But things like this ought to be encouraged. Like, yeah, take your time with it. Really consider it. We're confessional people. Confessionalism, I will ongoingly argue for.

I think it's good for us to say what we think the Bible teaches about things and to summarize what we think the Bible teaches about things. It's a way to help us be faithful and continue to be faithful. And so I would rather have people in our church who are confessional. They believe something and they know why they believe something. I'd rather have that and go through the process, although it can be painful at times, of weeding through and disagreeing and finding ourselves, I hope, at some agreement at the end.

I'd rather go through all of that process and have people know, for example, in this case, why you're a Baptist versus just kind of going along with it because it's how you grew up and it's what you know and you just kind of boop-a-doo.

[7:41] And there's peace because you don't say anything at all, but you don't really know what you believe. I think it's important for us to know what we believe and to be able to defend what we believe. And, of course, to do so with a great deal of charity.

So, all right. So let's begin with some definition of terms. Now, I regret I had already pressed copy on this thing and realized, uh-uh, that's not the best way to do this. So there's three things I want to define for you just in brief.

Pado-baptism. Credo or credo, you'll hear some people say. And some people also say pedo-baptism, which just irks me. So, pedo-baptism. I'm going to say credo-baptism.

And then I realized that covenantalism, I made it look like this is a third view of baptism and it's not. We're going to talk about covenantalism to help us understand the other two views. So I just regret that looking like it's not a baptismal view.

So I just want to be clear on that as we start to get into this. So, pedo-baptism. First, it's derived from the Greek *pais*, child.

[8:43] So it means child baptism specifically. Anglicans, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians. There's a lot of faith traditions that are pedo-baptist.

Not my intention to denigrate any practitioners of pedo-baptism. Some of the aforementioned denominations do so, though, merely for tradition's sake.

They don't know why they do what they do. Some do so erroneously, believing doctrines like baptismal regeneration. There's some really, like, off-the-wall baptism stuff.

We're not addressing every single view of baptism tonight. There's no scope for that this evening. So if you came for that, I do apologize. We're not going to be addressing the heretical pedo-baptist views this evening.

Those that deny justification by grace through faith in Christ alone. The view I want to explain this evening is a wide-held view. Many who hold it do so out of an earnest desire to please the Lord by being faithful to His Word.

[9:50] So, I do think pedo-baptism is an error. But there's some comfort in the fact that it's an ancient error. There's been faithful Christians throughout time who have believed this, but also believe that we're justified by grace through faith in Christ alone.

That's who I'm talking about this evening when I say pedo-baptists. It's those whom we agree with on primary doctrine. So that's who I'm talking about.

But do know that when you use that term, there's also a lot of other stuff going on in that bigger and broader category. Now, to be clear, the name can be a little misleading because all pedo-baptists, that I know of.

You may correct me. I may be wrong. But I believe all pedo-baptists believe in believer's baptism. That is to say, they believe that if a person was not baptized as an infant, comes to faith in Christ as an adult, then they should be baptized.

So, it's a little misleading because it would make you think that they only baptized children. But that's not the case. If you come to faith as an adult and you were not baptized as a child, they all agree that you then should be baptized.

[11:05] The distinguishing factor is whether or not a child should be baptized. Who is the proper recipient? They would say those adults who profess faith in Christ and their children.

So, there's the term. Pedo-baptism. Or pedo. Credo-baptism comes from the Latin *credo* or I believe.

So, as a church, as a whole, we are credo-baptists. I want you to know that there are credo-baptistic practices that I do not agree with.

So, again, we have this broad categorical term, and there's things that happen under that banner that I do not agree with. An example of this that's happening in the Southern Baptist Convention right now is called spontaneous baptism.

And they will just set up the tank, and all you have to do is line up, and they'll put a cool t-shirt on you with their church logo on it and film the whole thing to be broadcast on the internet and count the numbers and then write the books and do all the other things.

[12:07] I think this is not a good practice at all. And I'm not defending that kind of a practice. Just because somebody claims to be a credo-baptist doesn't necessarily mean I agree with what they're up to.

We hold that the only proper recipients of baptism are those who have made credible professions of faith in Jesus Christ. And there's a lot that could be debated and talked about.

How do you determine that? We won't get into that this evening. But just simply put, we believe that those who should be baptized are those who make credible professions of faith in Jesus Christ.

And so this evening, when I say credo-baptist, it is to those with whom we agree closely on the doctrine at hand that I am referring to.

So not the erroneous stuff out there at the edges. So those are the two positions that we're going to look at this evening. You're probably in some measure familiar with them already.

[13:07] However, to help you, particularly when it comes to pedo-baptism, to understand the position, we need to talk a bit about covenantalism. So that's where covenantalism comes into this conversation.

So covenantalism can be set against dispensationalism. And I'm not going to explain all of that to you, but we are not, as a church, dispensationalists.

Dispensationalists believe that people were saved in different ages. That's what a dispensation is, in different ways. And that's an over-reduction of the terminology.

But we distinguish ourselves from dispensationalists, and that's kind of the water we swim in in American Christianity, just so that you're aware. A lot of stuff, a lot of understandings come out of dispensationalism.

But we, instead, are covenantalists. Our church, as a total, as a whole, we're covenantalists. But there's some different types, some different varieties of covenantalism.

[14:13] So three, I want to share with you, briefly. The first is Westminster federalism. Westminster federalism.

And that is to say, this is from the Westminster Confession, federalism just speaks to the fact that Adam was our federal head, and now Christ is our federal head if we're found in him.

This is also often called Reformed Covenantalism. And that's probably the term I'll use this evening. Westminster federalism is a mouthful.

So is Reformed Covenantalism. But, Reformed Covenantalism. So it's been rightly said of Baptists that it's difficult for us to use the term Reformed.

And I agree. I honestly don't think it's the best term for us. Often what we'll do is we'll call ourselves Reformed Baptists because we're making that distinguishing point there.

[15:13] But largely, the covenantalism of the Reformation was what we call Westminster Federalism or Reformed Covenantalism. Covenantalism. We're going to get into it.

That's what this diagram here is going to look like. So we're going to go there here in just a minute. So it's all stemming out of 17th century writing Westminster Federalism.

The second one is 1689 Federalism. 1689 refers to the Second London Baptist Confession. 1689 Federalism.

And yep, that's the official term for it. They have not come up with anything catchier than that. And that is a Baptist Covenantalism.

And then the third, which we're not going to talk about in detail tonight, but it's Progressive Covenantalism. Progressive Covenantalism is not really too far apart from 1689 Federalism.

[16:20] This is a thing I've been discovering as your elders are having a lot of conversations about 1689 Federalism versus Progressive Covenantalism. And I'm finding only in some small applications is there really much difference at all between the two views.

So both Baptist, so we're going to talk 1689 Federalism tonight. I may make some, this is not all noted, so I may make some off-the-wall comments addressing Progressive Covenantalism as well. But that's where we're coming from as a Baptist church, is at least one of these two covenantal views. So ways that we read the Scripture. Okay?

So Westminster Federalism, 1689 Federalism, Progressive Covenantalism. I'll stop there for just a quick second. Does anybody have any questions that are not like, what is 1689 Federalism?

I set the trajectory for you already, I hope. So, anybody have any, am I flying over anything that anybody's repeated? Or, yes, my love.

[17:26] Well, I'm worried about asking it because the example you just gave is similar to the question I'm about to ask, but is there a way to like just really quickly define Progressive, I know that the last one you said, like, because I know that's very similar to what you just said.

Is there anything that like, just if you ever try to write like a little bit of a definition, like a quick one, that would set it apart from the other two? Like, no taking any. No. Okay.

They're, they're, they're real similar. So, I'll, the, I actually think that they're so similar, except in a couple of applications, they, they just use language differently.

Okay. So, it's not, it's not something to be too fussed about. In fact, in my notes, I've got 1689 federalism and then as a, as a sub, as a sub category, I have Progressive Covenantalism just as

like a, also this.

Yeah. I, I think, I think we'll find that they agree on just about everything. So, okay. Anything else? [18:27] Yes, Lynn. Do you think you just have to do the tie-in to the part of? Yes. Yeah, I said that super fast, but I said, how we read the Bible.

Yeah. So, so how, as covenantalists, which we should be, right? It's good, good for us not to think that people were saved differently at different times, right?

So that's, the big, the big overarching, and again, it's more complicated than, than I'm making that out to be, but is that, that people have always been saved the same way.

There's not multiple ways in which people are saved. there are dispensationalists today that still believe that ethnic Jews are going to be saved differently than the rest of the world.

My father was sharing with me, I was talking a little bit about some of these views, and my dad, when he worked at the North American Mission Board, was making the case, just the really good, honest case, that we ought to be doing more evangelism amongst Jewish people.

[19:26] And he said, I kept getting just odd answers, and I just never, like, it's like they didn't, it felt like they didn't like Jewish people, but it's like they were weird about whether or not we should share the gospel with Jewish people.

I said, that was dispensationalism, that play. They were going, I don't know that we're supposed to. I think we're supposed to leave them alone because God's got a specific way that he's going to save them different than through faith in Christ.

And we would just flatly reject that. Like, no, no, just read the book of Romans, right? Like, we would just reject it. So, yes, but the way you understand, and I'm going to show you the difference here in a moment, brings you to some conclusions, whether Paedo or Credo Baptist conclusions. yeah. So, I found, and I've studied this to some degree, but especially in starting to have good conversations with Ty, going, oh, okay. Because for a lot of years, I was very frustrated by the Paedo Baptist argument.

And I'm going, okay, like, I get why you get there. And that's what my hope for you tonight is to kind of give you like my version of it. Like, oh, okay, I get why you get there. It makes more sense to me now, although I still disagree, but it makes more sense.

[20:43] So, yeah. Okay, so let's launch into it. Are you ready? All right, so, I feel like, this is not a thing I normally do, so bear with me as I try to write and talk and pull this off at the same time.

I have never been a seminary professor, so we're going to try to make this happen. So on the back of your sheet, you have the two things that I've drawn minus a couple of little details.

And so, I'm just going to let you write in and keep up with what you want to pull off as you do it.

Okay? So, we're going to talk specifically about Westminster Federalism, Reformed Covenantalism, which is this top line up here first.

And what this view sees in the Scripture is two overarching covenants. Okay? So just real quick, when I say the word covenant, what pops in your mind?

Marriage. Sure. Did Abraham a covenant? What else? Agreement. An agreement. An agreement. Okay. Yep.

[21:49] Maybe you have a deep, a deep promise kind of an agreement. Yeah, sure. But you're popping on those, there's things in the Bible where you're like, oh, that's a covenant, that's a covenant, the Abrahamic covenant, the Noachic covenant, the Davidic covenant, those types of things.

Covenantalism, particularly, the two we're going to talk about tonight, see two overarching covenants. There's the covenant of works. So this, this is my creation line right here.

This is my fall line there. And here you have the covenant of works.

Okay? So, Adam and Eve, right, created both able to sin and able to not sin. We're given commands, right?

So Adam's put in the garden to work it and to keep it. He's told one thing that he cannot do that we have a record of. This is Genesis 2, verses 15 through 17.

[22:55] The Lord God took the man, put him in the garden of Eden to work it and keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man saying, you may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die.

Right? So there's the covenant of works, right? He could have, he could have stayed in good condition with his God in the place in which he lived had he done what he was supposed to do. Right? So this is the covenant of works. And it all falls apart, right, when Eve and then Adam disobey. Right? So Westminster federalism starts with Adam as our representative, right? all of us now guilty in him for his sin. Okay? After this, so everything from this line, so I'll draw it up here, and on, it's called the covenant of grace.

everything happening after this, the covenant of grace.

[24:08] And we find the expression of this covenant in Genesis chapter 3, verse 15. Anyone just know off the top of their head what that verse is?

It's a big one. often called the proto-euangelion. I will put enmity between you and the woman and between your offspring and her offspring.

He shall bruise your head and you shall bruise his heel. Right? This is the very first, right, shadowed proclamation of the coming of Christ.

He's going to come. He's the snake crusher, right? We use that language with our kiddos quite a bit. Right? So the covenant of grace is given in Genesis chapter 3 and verse 15 in this view and then ratified.

So a covenant needs blood to be ratified either in Genesis 3.21 or anybody tell me what happens in Genesis 3.21?

[25:26] Yep. That's right. He clothes Adam and Eve so there's the sacrifice. This is the first physical death. An animal dies in order to be made into clothing for Adam and Eve. Okay? So either ratified Genesis 3.21 or in Genesis chapter 15 after that first giving of the Abrahamic covenant and then Abraham sees God he split animals in half and he makes the covenant and passes between them the smoking pot.

Okay? So there's some variance in what holders of this view when they think exactly this was ratified but either way early in Genesis ratified. Okay?

So there's the covenant of grace given here. Okay? Then you have so I've drawn little arrows because these are just pointing us along.

Right? These are all covenant of grace. So people here are saved by believing that somehow as this is being revealed somehow God by his grace is saving them.

Don't have the full realization yet of the cross of Christ but it's moving them in that direction. So you have the Noahic that's Genesis 8 you have the Abrahamic Genesis 15 and 17 you have the Mosaic Exodus 19 and 20 you have the Davidic 2 Samuel 7 you could put in here the Aaronic not ironic Aaronic the promise that there would be a lineage of priests that come from Aaron you could insert that one in there but these are the typical significant covenants that are made right pointing in this direction so moving toward covenant and then

[27:41] Christ Christ comes okay now what the holders of this view this reformed covenantalism will say is that there are there's one covenant covenant of grace under two administrations okay under two administrations so I'm going to write that up here and then I'm going to read to you from the Westminster Confession so this would be pre-Christ would be your first administration so from the fall and this ratified promise in Genesis 315 you have the first administration and after the cross of Christ you have the second administration the first administration!

called the old covenant that's where we get our term old testament from and then here the new covenant can somebody tell me a sign of the old covenant the first administration that would pertain to our conversation tonight circumcision okay so that's going to matter here in just a second I'll show you okay so here we go this is from the Westminster Confession chapter 7 section 5 and I do for a moment want to want to commend the Westminster standards to you really helpful in a lot of

ways disagree with a few things contained within but largely agree with a lot of it here I find myself disagreeing so heads up there but they say chapter 7 section 5 this covenant so referring to the covenant of grace was differently administered in the time of the law and in the time of the gospel under the law it was administered by promises prophecies sacrifices circumcision the paschal lamb and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews all for signifying Christ to come which were for that time sufficient and efficacious through the operation of the spirit to instruct and build up the elect in faith and the promised Messiah by whom they had full remission of sins and eternal salvation and it's called the Old Testament that's everything I was just saying right chapter 7 section 5 the Westminster confession so everything that's going on right from Genesis 3:15 all the way to the coming of Christ is all types shadows under this idea of an administration section 6 so the following section chapter 7 section 6 under the gospel when Christ the substance was exhibited the ordinances in which the covenant is dispensed are the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper which though fewer in number and administered with more simplicity and less outward glory yet in them it is held forth in more fullness evidence and spiritual efficacy to all nations both Jews and Gentiles and it's called the New Testament there are not therefore two covenants of grace differing in substance but one and the same under various dispensations and they don't mean dispensationalism they just mean ages right they're just saying look different administrations of the same so of the covenant of grace they see a lot of continuity between the old and the new testament!

covenant whatever word you like to insert there there's a lot of continuity between the two so you could write this and this is fair and I'm going to get Ty to confirm or deny this for me in just a second you could write it like this old testament israel equals new testament church and I'll explain church in a moment but Ty fair I'm not arguing against you right here I'm helping them understand lots of continuity is what's seen though between old testament israel and the new testament church specifically in this way right so again they're not all consistent but the consistent paedobaptist right the westminster paedobaptist is going to argue for both a visible church and an invisible church now as baptists we use that same language and we would use that language of invisible like throughout time and space so we would say the church invisible like the church that met all over the world this morning on sunday we can't see them they're invisible to us right they're not using that terminology the same way so perhaps you have read presbyterians before and maybe gone [33:15] I'm confused about what they're talking about that's why they're using the terms differently than we tend to use those terms so what they mean is old testament israel israel was a nation state right there's an ethnic so all throughout the old testament we've just done a bunch of dealing with this in romans 9 through 11 right and there paul talks about a remnant who's saved throughout that time that would be presbyterians are using the term invisible church so those those who are actually by faith right believing believing in these types and signs and promises that this covenant of grace is effectual for them they are actually converted and saved right so there's the nation there's the visible nation and that nation takes what sign in the old testament they take the sign of circumcision right the boys right which is a sign for the nation right the sign of the covenant for this nation they take that sign but within that there are those jewish people who actually believe right who have placed their faith signs types they're believing they're believing that somehow it's going to be saving for them in that in this

I'll use their language dispensation right of God's redemptive work so yes John yes yep yeah they certainly would I mean all the evidence is here for it right yeah for sure yeah okay so they will argue that today there is a a visible church which was made up of all those adults who profess faith in Jesus Christ and their children so they bring that language over so I've argued to you before that I think paedobaptism confused because I'm going what are you guys doing that really confusing the nature of the church what I didn't realize is we actually believe something different about the nature of the church of course it does because we actually believe something different about the nature of the church so there's going to be a visible church right it's those who are who are baptized but there's going to be a subset of that church who have placed believing faith in

Christ now for me something that was helpful right now your elders are thinking a lot about what we want to do with young people who are professing faith in Christ so we want to be so careful that we don't give false assurance to young people professing faith in Christ right Baptists have been bad at this in this past generation right I love Jesus like tally the number right and it's the common it's the common testimony of young people who come here and are baptized that they were baptized when they were seven or eight pretty pretty typical they come to later believe they weren't actually Christians at that time and I'm not saying that young people can't be saved I believe young people can be saved I think I was saved at a very young age let the children come to me we're not arguing that but we are we we do want to be really careful about that peace that credible profession of faith in Christ we want to be really careful about who who we bring in and call church okay so that's the perspective that we're coming from we intend to bring this to you have a big old conversation about what we think we should do and present it to the church to affirm or deny you could disagree with us we're okay with that

I think so I'm trying to think really carefully about that Presbyterians do this in various ways with a different ordinance they do a process of confirmation that goes on and again I'm arguing good good orthodox pedo-baptist churches that's where they're primarily concerned because they say you can't inspect yourself you can't approach the table carefully if you're not in Christ and so they go through a process at that point to be careful about who gets to receive that now there are some out there Doug Wilson who practice pedo-communion too and they have their kids eating and I just get I mean frankly it's more consistent but I get real uncomfortable with that but I digress so that helped me go okay we're we're both being careful baptists are being careful with a particular ordinance rather than the we're careful with the other one as well but we're really careful on the front end of that equation so yes

Jim why do you think that Doug will see what you point as ordinance! because he's equating the two things he's saying that they're part of a church therefore they should be able to receive the sacraments of the church it's more consistent with the Westminster language honestly before it gets there yes tie yeah sounds like pedo communion to me that's a very very very baptist thing to say okay yes yes yes it is okay so this is this this is the thing for me like this is why I'm backing you way up to covenant theology to reform covenant theology to go this is my case like

[39:11] I don't think it's crazy that they get there again I don't agree I do think it's an error but this is how they're getting to this place so I've heard R.C. Sproul say if you read the Bible from the front to the back you'll be a paedo baptist if you read it from the back to the front then you'll be a credo baptist that's what he means he's just basically saying you have to bring all of the Old Testament data to the New Testament and there would have been this understanding amongst this is the way he's reading the Bible and he's really studied it too feel free to try to punch holes don't wear them out he'll have answers for you he's really thought it through and he's convinced of this I do want to read to you just to give some help from the paedo baptist perspective they do believe in salvation by grace through faith in

Christ alone sometimes I find the language confusing it's a little even a little frustrating to me don't use the word that way if you don't mean baptism is salvific of children this is their chapter 28 section 1 this is a good statement on baptism 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 engraving into Christ of regeneration of remission of sins and of giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in the newness of life which sacrament is by Christ's own appointment to be continued in his church until the end of the world right so love chapter 28 section one if you understand what they mean by visible church but the rest of it I'm like yes yes yes yes and yes the language essentially even though you get into other articles it doesn't feel this way to us is what it's saying is there's the promise is offered for salvation and it's especially offered to the children of those who believe functionally we tend to agree right I mean we have a church that is big on having our kids with us and we see like as a pattern people tend to come to faith in large numbers in homes of Christian people there seems to be some generational faithfulness on God's part so from my best understanding and again I'm no expert on the matter and I can appeal to Ty but Ty is also not he's

not been in a Presbyterian church for a long time they're essentially using infant baptism like it's like a and this is going to sound so paltry so I don't mean for it to but it's like it's like a ramped up baby dedication right it's it's a baby dedication that they think has some some God ordination special work that's being done as the church being offered to that child as the child of believing parents in a church that's going to teach the gospel to them so that's not crazy not crazy it's an error I love you Ty but it's not crazy right okay are you guys leaving us are you just okay you're like you're like all right we heard the part on Westminster federalism we're out yeah so we would use the term invisible visible would be the local church like the church we might even expand that to like the churches down the street people we can know people we can see it's very like on the surface versus invisible would be the church that my grandparents went to they're all dead right like I can't see them or the church in China this morning I can't see them we would use the terms that way correct we do not mean that no do not mean that yeah the visible church for us because we're [44:05] Baptists would be the members of our church and and then I would suggest and I might extend it to those I hope like I see a lot of fruit in and I hope to see become members of our church because you're you know members somewhere perhaps coming from a place to a place etc so yes yes because there's lots of scripture that talks about I mean the work of discipline is to is to hopefully to minimize mitigate that as a problem in the church but we get parables like the wheat and the tares at the end God's going to have to do a sifting of us but we do I think are meant to be about the work of examining the soils and working no in fact the

Bible doesn't give us visible and invisible as categories I suggest so that make sense yeah we Baptist Baptist really like the thing that most distinguishes Baptist is Baptist people will go baptism nope not baptism it's regenerate church membership baptism we believe ties to that but regenerate church membership is what we believe to hold so will we do that with perfection absolutely not I mean how could we we can't see the heart but we're given tools by which we're to be about the work of doing the best we can by grace to see people into the church who are in fact as far as we can tell Christians and people out of the church who are as far as we can tell not Christians sure sure but they still have to do the work they can't again

I'm talking faithful Presbyterians won't just let adults be like I'm a member of the church and take communion and do all of those things without discipline they're going to still see people out of the church in the same way they're also concerned about it they're not as concerned about it early they're more concerned about it later but they don't want to give people false assurance either so the work still exists it puts regardless the main we're going to use the term ordinance as a Baptist church because it's to put!

you almost always will see Presbyterians you just use the word sacrament but they're using the Lord's Supper in that putting in order way as well and a lot of Presbyterians will go oh we're comfortable with the term ordinance so they're also doing it there as well we're using baptism as part of that process we know we have to do it here but let's also be careful!

about who we bring into that realm of having to do the discipline work with them so at the end of the day what do we believe the Bible teaches okay we're going to deal with it the way the Bible teaches it what you come down to okay now so I'm going to use the 1689 um second London Baptist confession I'm going to read a little bit of it and then I'm going to draw another picture for you up here um I will argue it's the finest of all Baptist confessions uh in the preface to the second London Baptist confession the particular Baptist is what they were called in their day it's probably a term we should we should recapture but stated that much of the content of their confession was taken directly from the Savoy Declaration which was written in 1658 by a group of congregationalists so they have some congregational language in 1689 and the

[48:28] Westminster Confession which was written in 1646 written ratified I don't know there's probably some difference in those years but adopted um okay so the second London Baptist was not not a ripoff because the Baptist didn't want to do their work right they used a lot of the language because they were trying to say we agree so much with you guys we've got some differences but man do we agree in a lot so just listen to this this is in the introduction to the second London Baptist we did like the Savoy declaration and the Westminster confession in making use of the

very same words with them both in these articles wherein our faith and doctrine is the same with theirs and this we did the more abundantly to manifest our consent with both in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion so I've been making this case to you for theological triage there

I think using the term fundamental articles for those first tier issues like those things that must be known and believed to be saved fundamental articles we agree on and that is huge right it's huge in their day it's huge in our day like let's recognize how much we agree on and if we all spent more time talking about the things we agree on in every realm we would be much better for it right seems like it's getting hard to disagree with people but so they were particularly mindful as they sat down to write this document that they pick up language they just said look let's be so so careful what we do with the second London Baptist the particular Baptist intentionally sought to unite with other English Christians in the fundamentals of the faith and to be distanced from the Sokinians and I won't get into who they were but they were Baptist but they denied the doctrine of the Trinity and other fundamental doctrines like Christ satisfaction they didn't believe that Christ paid the full penalty of debt for the church they were a mess and also Baptists so these Baptists were trying to go no no no we're not those guys please don't lump other just odd broad errors as well kind of all over the map they got some things right but they got some things terribly terribly wrong the 1699 states a few lines later than the aforementioned citation that they had I like this phrase no itch to clog religion with new words so they were trying to be careful like let's not let's not mess oh gosh like everyone's going to pour over every word so carefully when something as significant as this is adopted and published so we don't want to clog religion with new words we agree on almost everything together okay so they disagreed on covenantalism okay so there was a disagreement here they would not use the term one covenant of grace with two administrations although they did hold this covenant of works covenant of grace distinction a little side note for progressive covenantalism they don't want to use the term covenant of grace because it's not explicitly found in the scripture and I'm really sympathetic toward that that the idea of progressive covenantalism they're saying there's one plan of salvation and it's revealed progressively right it's fulfilled in Christ it's revealed progressively across the text and they wanted to avoid this kind of language but for tonight

I want to show you the things that are similar so same way we've got covenant of works we've got creation we've got the fall okay we've got oh man I wrote in my way I'm taking out Old Testament Israel equals New Testament church you guys okay with that I hope so because it's gone all right we have here also the covenant of grace which is spoken of here Genesis 3 15 but not yet ratified so it's not ratified here Genesis 3 21 or they would say in Genesis 15 so rather I think did I give you guys dotted lines and I think I drew an arrow on your page but really if I had color on your page I'd want to do this so can you see I just drew over that so here we have same thing we've got our not going to read any of this I know but I'm going to do it fast

Abrahamic Mosaic Davidic right similar similar to their paedobaptist brothers they're saying these things types shadows symbols right by faith that somehow somehow these promises right we believe are going to save us they're speaking to this covenant of grace so they're like this but it's not ratified until Christ comes so a text this is Hebrews 9 verse 11 through 15 but when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come then through the greater and more perfect tent not made with hands that is not of this creation he entered once for all into the holy places not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood thus securing an eternal blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish to

[55:14] God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance since the death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant.

Okay. So here's where you would find so you hear me, I wrote here ratified here covenant of grace ratified.

And it's what distinguishes this this as old covenant, like we're not using the administration language here but old covenant and new covenant.

The new covenant is really new is what some guys would argue and there's therefore less continuity. There's still some continuity but there's less continuity.

So the sign of circumcision points to the need for the circumcision of our hearts accomplished by Christ replaced.

[56:33] It's no longer. Now we have baptism as a different thing that points to what God has accomplished. It's pointing back to a reality that he has created in us.

Less continuity. And that's where the rub is. So hermeneutically how you read these and there's a lot of text and I just decided I can't get into it all tonight.

There's just no way. I don't even have the notes for it so don't ask me what all the texts are. There's a lot to be peeled through and understood. Read your Bibles over and over and over and over again.

But how you read the Bible how you approach these covenants God's redemptive purpose is going to tend you toward one conclusion or another.

Tend you one conclusion or another. Yes? Seal.

[57:33] The covenants of God all needed blood sacrifice to make them it's like the way that he signed them was with blood. Yeah. Is that a fair definition, Ty?

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Your brow looked furrowed that's why. Okay. Is that your listening face? I have yet I'm going to I'm going to figure out a way to draw the progressive covenantal thing.

I have not figured out how to make it look different than this one but I'm working on it. Maybe a less dashed line like big dashes I don't know.

Okay. Okay. So I'm going to I'm going to just press a little bit on credo baptism from the scripture why that's where I'm at where again as a total our church is at this is from the Second London Baptist Confession this is article 29 which is on baptism and it has has four sections so we're going to take each of those sections as a point so number one they write baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ that's Mark 1 9 to those baptized it is a sign of their fellowship with him and his death and resurrection of their being grafted into or united with him of remission of sins and of submitting themselves to God through Jesus Christ to live and walk in newness of life so baptism they're saying pictures a thing that has occurred symbolically pictures a thing that's already happened

Romans 6 3-5 do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death we were buried therefore with him by baptism into death in order that just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father we too might walk in newness of life for if we have been united with him in a death like his we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his so a thing that's happened baptism pictures it for us by the way Pato-Baptists have good good faithful explanations for a lot of these texts so yeah talk with one sometime see what they say about some of these things Colossians 2-12 having been buried with him in baptism in which you were also raised with him through faith in the powerful working of God who raised him from the dead Galatians 3-27 for as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ Mark 1-4

[60:23] John appeared baptizing in the wilderness and proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins people were being baptized who were repenting of their sins baptism became so synonymous with repentance that it is used interchangeably in the scripture with that term so a good example of that is Acts 22 and verse 16 Paul is speaking in Jerusalem and now why do you wait rise and be baptized and wash away your sins calling on his name second section they write those who personally profess repentance towards God and faith in and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ are the only proper subjects of this ordinance so again there's the issue at hand they're going to talk about mode here in just a minute I'm less concerned about mode I'm more concerned about who who is the proper recipient of the ordinance and I'm concerned about that because I'm concerned about how we define the nature of the church so first kind of concern as we think about applying baptism to infants

I believe that paedobaptism confuses the sufficiency of scripture and the doctrine of progressive revelation now that's just a belief I hold again Baptist if I said to Ty Ty do you believe in the sufficiency of scripture and the doctrine of progressive revelation he would say yes and I would believe him so I'm not saying they don't love their bibles one of the cries of the reformation sola scriptura 2 Timothy 3 16 and 17 you guys know this one all scripture breathed out by God profitable for teaching for reproof for correction and for training in righteousness that the man of God may be complete equipped for every good work and it's just maybe my own obtuseness but I have a difficult time thinking that just a plain average guy sitting down and reading the bible would arrive at the paedobaptist position it seems more clear repent believe be baptized in the new testament the regulative principle of worship was defined by John

Calvin as follows God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by his word and so we often say by command or example or deduced by good and necessary consequence an example of that is the trinity we want to apply plain reason or logic as we draw out of the bible what we are to do as we gather together so you'll find right with good well-meaning faithful paedobaptists that they come to different logical conclusions than we come to and again with Ty he'll go yeah I see your point this is what I think it means and I go I don't think that's what it means and we come to disagreement agreeably so and I just hope to this point that I've shown how paedobaptists arrive at their position they get there honestly they do get there honestly but I do fear that they read the Old

Testament into their New Testament rather in the light of it that it exposes that progressive revelation that it brings clarity to it feels like it brings it the other way around I mentioned the R.C. Sproul quote previously so that's a concern of mine secondly I believe that paedobaptism confuses the nature of the church although it confuses what I believe the nature of the church is a believer's church it does confuse that they hold the nature of the church a bit differently however Ephesians 5 verse 25 says that Christ loved the church and he gave himself up for her and I just want to be careful and clear about who church is because that's so important seems to me every New Testament reference concerning the universal church or the local church seems to be speaking of those in the faith whether past present or future and so that's why we like the term ordinances instead of sacraments believe that baptism and the Lord's supper put in order they're like a fence for who is and who isn't church and that that's good for the church it's good for the witness of Christ in the world and it's good for people who haven't placed their faith in

[65:03] Christ yet like how do we distinguish who is and who isn't church I think that's something we need to be clear and careful about thirdly I believe that paedobaptism actually confuses the meaning of believer's baptism I picked up an interesting book where a guy spends all of his time arguing from the Westminster confession against the Westminster confession!

He uses its words against it written I'd love for it to be a thing I could hand out but it's just bad writing but you need to go and read the entire article and you'll think yes yes wait what like you're like how did that get in there so Mark 16 16 whoever believes and is baptized will be saved but whoever does not believe will be condemned Acts 2 41 so those who received his word were baptized and they were out of that day about 3,000 souls Acts 8 12 when they believed Philip as he preached good news about the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ they were baptized both men and women Acts 18 8 Crispus the ruler of the synagogue believed in the Lord together with his entire household and many of the Corinthians here in Paul believed and were baptized and they wouldn't argue against this sure because these people believed!

I find it difficult to find that in the text I also want you to note an argument from silence which I will caution you to make but in this case I find it a very compelling argument from silence so in Acts 15 beginning in verse 1 some men came down from Judea and were teaching the brothers unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses!

you! cannot be saved and after Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and debate with them Paul and Barnabas and some of the others were appointed to go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and the elders about this question so they're saying we've been debating with these guys let's go make sure we're getting it right good for them right what a good practice so being sent on their way by the this question right authoritatively

These are apostles this council if you read further determines that it is not necessary for a Gentile to be circumcised in order to be saved but they do determine to instruct the Gentile believers so they send a letter they circulate a letter amongst Gentile believers as a result of this council and here's what they instruct them this is Acts 15 verse 20 to abstain from the things polluted by idols and from sexual immorality and from what has been strangled and from blood that's what they send out now we're not arguing that a person needs to be baptized to be saved but why at this crucial juncture in the life of the New Testament church when this important question has been raised about the nature of circumcision when a council has been called a letter written and dispersed do they mention nothing of baptism's correlation with circumcision it just seems like this was the time to do it that

[69:06] Luke would have recorded that for us I believe in the clarity of the Bible again I wouldn't put this as a fundamental doctrine but it's an ordinance of the church and I like to think that we can arrive fairly easily at what we ought to do and this is a place that man if God intended for us to replace one with the other it seems to me that it would have happened here but even as I say that I know that arguing from silence we should be careful with doing that type of thing third section the outward element to be used in this ordinance is water in which the individual is to be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and I'm going to skip over some of this because you guys know already number four immersion or dipping of the person in water is necessary for this ordinance to be administered!

to dunk repeatedly to drown this is the language like I said I'm not terribly fussed about mode but rather who the recipient of the baptism is I will be hard pressed to do it any other way it had to be some I don't know water becomes such a commodity and I don't know it's like Mad Max days and there's no way we can you know we're all getting our two drops of water per day ration it had to be pretty severe for me to stop immersing people as a picture of what has already happened in their life by the grace of God death to life for that to be really clear right so how we arrive at our credo baptist position has to do with how we understand covenant of grace the nature of the church and the conclusions that come as a result of that so okay

I will answer questions now but can I answer questions about things I've said and not all the possible questions that could be asked because I probably won't do a great job of answering them anyway and then maybe we have some continuing conversation because I have a feeling you'll ask questions I'll go I'll get back to you on that let me go run that down but anything that I've said that needs to be clarified a bit repeated etc yes I don't anybody know the answer to that congregational Quakers yeah yeah yeah there you go there's a handful yeah I should probably know more yep yep yep yep yep so again lots of agreement a lot of agreement going on here it really has to do with with the covenant of grace's activity so here you've got covenant of grace with two administrations I'd say this is the most distinct thing going on two administrations and here they're saying it wasn't ratified until Christ so it's it just it just sees more discontinuity something different is happening here these these covenants are doing things right they're active they're involved in God's redemptive plan but as as pointing covenant of grace covenant of grace covenant of grace there's just more discontinuity in the process of it all it's really that simple what do you mean by administration Ty you want to define administration yes so we all know about presidential administration so matter of presidential administration not administration administration there's a direct presidential administration there's someone covering it and there's speaking and there's people in that administration like handling it or yeah so for example if you're just talking about these covenants a good example is the law whenever you're reading that message

I see that when the wrong is presented in the Christian that wrong is Christ and instead of revealing Christ I see that mission offering Christ and in doing that music so these different types of promises are being offered and in that administration you have the old testament administration but even in that it's coming in different ways these things are offered and interacted with the overarching one is the big two yeah in a lot of ways and I don't mean this as a to cut this down but it just flattens it simplifies it even maybe that's appealing to some people it's a little simpler as it makes reading old testament promises to Israel easy just to go oh they're talking about the church it's nice when you read it simpler that way

[74:45] I don't find my reading of the old testament that easy I don't think it's I think it's a little too simple but Lynn who are the hands so it said that the old testament is equal to the testament church but in the moral of fact to 1689 we could just see that as the church not a direct correlation between the actual nation so yeah so 1689 federals would be really happy to call would be really happy to call those who were saved in the old testament church we would be happy to do that we would say church and we would be happy to draw like I don't know how to draw it on here but there's been a church through the age right so I'm okay with the language of the age of the church I don't mind saying that post christ god's people but we would we would take all these people and go yeah come with us like we're all part of the same family and in that correct yeah correct um uh

I would say um I'm I'm because I've not thought carefully about how I'd want to use this language um old testament redeemed people could equal church so what um westminster folks are going to want to take they'll take the invisible church I could transport that language down here I just don't want to bring it over here but I would say invisible church here is church that does that clarify it okay okay Sally administration administration like you're five years old um it's not I think you're probably over complicating it in your thinking I'm I'm late I'm trying to lay it out I'm trying to lay it out to give you um their language so so types symbols uh sacraments that uh

I mean yeah uh that orders things here and and different ones here but it's but it's flat this way just a lot of continuity so they're they're one they're one for one swapping some things out across and this and this language is just not language that's used here because we want to be more clear about the discontinuity between the two yeah we just tend not to so so that helps two different ages two different ages same covenant of grace yeah these these are all communicating something about the covenant of grace yeah so a redeemed jew in the old testament or before christ so obviously they would only believe that there is a god the father because they don't know of christ yet a redeemed jew is going to be believing truly in god and they're going to be sacrificing for their sins and they a truly redeemed person might be actually recognizing that there's going to be something else they're actually going to be picking out the old testament all things that point to christ is that yeah but but wouldn't wouldn't fully comprehend we because we believe in progressive revelation i mean maybe given maybe maybe the spirit gave some insight into it but i think i think they're believing somehow god is going be faithful to his!

promise somehow these this constant sacrificial system never go on how could i possibly make atonement for all of my sin how could it how could it ever be that this would save me but god god said right that i do these things i'm pursuing i'm somehow somehow this is all going to come together which is the i think the frustrating thing for the reader of the bible when you get to the new testament and the jews reject jesus so you're!

there like all the stuff that you it should have been like we see it now but is yeah yeah so we get we get all the like i mean the light is like spotlighted back on it in the new testament all these and the rock was christ you know you go whoa the rock was christ um but like paul uses abraham as the like example of being justified by faith and when you look at what did what did he believe right he he looked out and he saw the stars and god said your offspring is going to be like that number and this is genesis 15 it's right after that so shall your offspring be and he believed the lord and he counted it to him as righteousness somehow somehow you're going to make my offspring that and that was credited to him as righteousness so it's this belief in the future somehow of all of this coming to be and then now we know exactly what it is we're believing in one plan of salvation so

[81:18] I'm going to go here and then here sorry thank you Matthew but your I will raise up one you will build my time and we know that was saying you're not solemnly but ultimately he was really saying Christ and David did do that in his prayer following that he prophesied us right how did that fit in with these two views of the covenant of grace of him living that out right so where would it and how it was practically like the the idea of the covenant of grace like the

Davidic covenant was made yes he knew God was talking about his offspring to come but practically what's the difference between the two views when you look at something it doesn't

change anything I think what it changes is where you're looking like if David is looking forward to the new covenant being repealed that hence leads to the church baptistic thinking and then the present here is saying that saving covenant of grace is being administered given since chapter 15 so the view of the church is it starts there so the difference is how that covenant of grace is going is it going like this and then shooting this way and David is looking there or is it actually being given right there offered to read the two confessions you'll see how they lay out the first and second covenant but the west bishop says the first covenant which Adam fell and sinned the second covenant Christ is freely offered and given and use that language specifically to try to get this two covenant distinction beginning in one after another where the 1689 would say that after this is fallen through progressive revelation to promises the first covenant of grace what it's basically saying is God turning past selected people Adam failed in bringing eternal life therefore God bringing about his people and those people are saved and so the two distinguishes it all ages the new covenant is it being dispensed both ways or is it only dispensed at this point times forward so one other real quick thing that might help me make sense so the example we're talking about when I read that and then I read what the apostles say about that instance my understanding is that it was meant to point to Christ it was for them in that time so for example God told Moses to strike the rock and water would come out so he did and there is that in a way it's a prophecy

Christ being struck put to death on the cross for a sin and out from that is floating in the water the second time when he told Moses to speak to the rock was that Christ crucifying and dying would be put to death our sins bringing us living water that's happened and now God is saying in faith ask and receive but Moses didn't do that he disobeyed God and I guess if I'm understanding it right I guess the talk people would say that those that saw that as prophetic that there somehow an administering of their salvation through that faith in the what was to come versus the lower view which is simply saying that's just prophetic

Christ but it doesn't administer anything to salvation is that there's still salvation comes through faith but how does that example practically come together I guess yeah when I hear the questions what I think they're asking about is that required self-dific knowledge base like it's about Jesus and I would just say don't conflate those two things that that's a ruling target what's a progressive revelation implies is that people know more over time so it's not like you believe that's how we identify that you're redeemed but that one covenant of grace would entail a specific amount of knowledge at various points in time does that help at all yeah I fear I drew a picture and it complicated it for you instead of simplifying it for you that that story of a faithful paedo-baptist and a faithful credo-baptist would preach the same way

[86:53] I don't think we would have I mean it would be so minute in maybe some of the language we would use perhaps but yeah I think that's my knee-jerk response is nothing it doesn't change anything there's so much agreement between the two the big thing is really when is this ratified and therefore the conclusion that there's more or less continuity between old and new but the people of god believe god and old and new testament they believe whatever he had revealed up to that point even if they didn't fully understand it that's the distinction that's the unity of the matter yep yep yep yep okay Matthew this is the last one and then I'm going to pray and let you guys go if you want to go and you can hang out and talk if you want to as long as you want to it depends it depends broadly so you're going to have one end of the spectrum spontaneous even make a profession baptized and then there's some traditions or even just churches individually that have big examination processes for that to take place so it's a spectrum all over the place so yeah

I said one more go ahead okay okay thank y'all for coming let me pray for us and I'll dismiss you and again hang out you can convene around the board if you want to and I will regret drawing pictures so yeah let's pray