

**Baptism Part 5:
An Intro to the Reformed Covenantal Argument
for Infant Baptism**

Goal of the Lesson: to clear away the haunting notion in the minds of some Baptists that however plausible believers' baptism may seem, at the end of the day infant baptism is simply more ancient, and since believers' baptism is new, it's probably not true, but simply a product of modern individualism.

I. Basic Definition of the Reformed Covenantal Argument

II. How Did the Pre-Reformation Church View the Relationship between Baptism, Faith, and Infants?

1. Vicarious faith
2. Infused faith
3. Infant faith

Conclusion: "It is crucial, especially for modern Baptists, to observe that in the medieval discussion, baptism was always regarded as...the sacrament of faith...nobody said that infants simply do not believe..."

-Jonathan Rainbow, "Confessor Baptism" in [*Believers Baptism*](#), edited by Schreiner and Wright

III. Anabaptists and the Reformed Church

"In this matter of baptism—if I may be pardoned for saying it—I can only conclude that all the doctors have been in error from the time of the apostles. This is a serious and weighty assertion, and I make it with such reluctance that had I not been compelled by contentious spirits (i.e. the Anabaptists) I would have preferred to keep silence...At many points we shall have to tread a different path from that taken by more ancient or more modern writers or by our own contemporaries..."

-Ulrich Zwingli, "On Baptism," (1525 A.D.)

Conclusion: Infant baptism is an ancient practice, but the Reformed covenantal rationale for infant baptism is not ancient. So if Reformed Baptists are to be intimidated by the weight of church history, let it be by Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox arguments from baptismal regeneration, not by Presbyterian and Reformed arguments from the covenant.