

“Baptism: Putting on the Armor of Light”

Acts 8:26-39; Romans 13:11-14 ¹

This afternoon, as we celebrate the baptisms of Roslyn, Nassrin, Chavosh, and Saba, I thought it might be good for us to think together once again about how we Baptists understand baptism. Although baptism is not the most important Christian doctrine, it is easily the foremost Christian ceremony, and with the exception of the Quakers and the Salvation Army, all Christian denominations baptize.

Indeed, it's obviously from this issue that we Baptists take our name. We come from the line of the “Anabaptists,” which means “to baptize again,” and the title refers to our commitment to believer's baptism as distinct from infant baptism. Some of our forebears literally gave their lives for this distinction.

We sometimes say that “we believe what the Bible says about baptism” . . . but what *does* it say? And why do Christians—and especially Baptists—put the emphasis on baptism that we do?

Well, for starters, Jesus Himself was baptized (Matthew 3:13-17). He told His disciples to baptize (John 4:2), and He told us to baptize (Matthew 28:19); so the authority for baptizing is very strong, resting on the command of the Risen Lord, integrated with His commission to preach the Good News to all the world, and enforced by His own example at the beginning of His public ministry.

So what did Jesus mean for us to do when He told us to “baptize”? As is the case with all words, this word—βαπτίζω (“baptidzo”)—has a meaning. For 400 years on either side of the New Testament, the word “baptize” had a definite, consistent, and universally-understood meaning that applied in all fields, not just to religious affairs. This meaning was basically “to submerge” or “to immerse,” and βαπτίζω was actually the word used to describe the sinking of a ship.

There was no question in those days about sprinkling or pouring. Greek has words for these actions, but those words are never used in the Bible to refer to baptism. Indeed, scholars of nearly all Christian groups agree that what the New Testament practices and teaches is **believer's baptism by immersion**.

As we consider what the Bible says about baptism, the book of Acts is our primary source for what the early Church did, while the writings of Paul are our primary sources for how the early Church understood what it did. In the book of Acts, repentance, faith, baptism, and the receiving of the Holy Spirit are always found in close relation to one another. While each situation was different, and there is some variation in the order of things, the New Testament knows of no other baptism but that of a believer—a person who has placed his or her faith in Jesus of Nazareth, crucified, buried, risen, reigning, and coming again to claim His own.²

Believer's baptism is an act that draws its meaning from the person of Jesus and from the relationship that a believer establishes with Jesus through repentance and faith. Though propositional Truth is certainly involved in New Testament faith—that is, we affirm that certain statements are, in fact, True—New Testament faith is not simply agreement that certain

¹ A sermon by Dr. David C. Stancil, delivered at the Columbia Baptist Fellowship of Columbia, Maryland on December 6, 2015.

² Further, when the New Testament is taken as a whole, it's clear that receiving the Holy Spirit—also called “the baptism of the Holy Spirit”—is a distinct act of God's grace at the time of conversion, whether separate in time from water baptism or not.

propositions are true. New Testament faith has to do with the establishment of a deep relationship with, of love for and obedience to the Risen Christ as Lord of all of life.

The act of being baptized is a public proclamation that our sins have been covered by the Blood of **God the Son**, that by this means we have entered into a New Covenant with **God the Father**, and that this Covenant has been sealed by the arrival of the indwelling presence of **God the Spirit** in our lives. Baptism by immersion is a theological symbol of our *participation* in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus and of our *rebirth* into a New Life in Him.

Baptism is also a public identification with and a public commitment to all other persons who acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God—those persons across the ages, past, present, and future, who constitute the spiritual, invisible Church, the Bride of Christ. And baptism has always marked the boundary between who is and who is not a member of the visible Church, the Body of Christ in the world today.

Such identification with the visible Church has, from the very beginning and even to this present moment, often meant certain persecution and an increasingly likely death. In the early church, those who were about to receive baptism often spent the preceding night in a vigil of fasting and prayer, knowing that great suffering lay ahead.

All of this is to say that **believer's baptism is a symbol of a rebirth that cuts life in two**. Unbelievers and believers of other faiths alike understand very clearly that the baptism of a follower of Jesus is the sign of a commitment that changes life completely. Before conversion, Paul wrote, we "*lived in this world without God and without hope. But now [we] belong to Christ Jesus. Though [we] once were far away from God, now [we] have been brought near to him because of the blood of Christ*" (Ephesians 2:12-13, NLT).

It is because of this symbolism that candidates for baptism are frequently dressed in white robes as Roslyn, Nassrin, Chavosh, and Saba were today. There are several levels of symbolism in such dress. First of all, the robes represent grave clothes, even as the process of immersion in water symbolizes death and burial. Baptism is a public statement that, as Paul put it, "*I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I now live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me*" (Galatians 2:20).

Second, the white robes represent "putting on" or "clothing ourselves with the righteousness of Christ," as Paul put it in Romans: "*The night is nearly over; the day is almost here. So let us put aside the deeds of darkness and **put on the armor of light**. Let us behave decently, as in the daytime, not in carousing and drunkenness, not in sexual immorality and debauchery, not in dissension and jealousy. Rather, **clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ**, and do not think about how to gratify the desires of the flesh*" (Romans 13:11-14).

Finally, the white robes represent the white garments promised by the Risen Christ to the righteous in the life to come: "*The one who is victorious will . . . be dressed in white. I will never blot out the name of that person from the book of life, but will acknowledge that name before my Father and his angels*" (Revelation 3:5).

In the beginning, believer's baptism by immersion was universal in the Church. Everyone was a first-generation believer, so infant baptism wasn't an issue at all. Occasionally, though, the situation arose that a dying person sought baptism and was baptized by pouring for reasons of health and safety. Such baptism was considered valid, but it was also considered highly irregular,

and if these persons recovered from their illnesses, their irregular baptism prevented them from serving as elders in the church.³

This occasional death-bed pouring led to confusion about both the purpose of and the mode for baptism. Some persons began to believe that baptism was necessary for salvation,⁴ and as increasing numbers of Christians became confused in this way, moving away from a commitment to believer's baptism and moving toward the idea of what's called "baptismal regeneration," they understandably began to be concerned about their children. It's hardly a coincidence that infant baptism began to be practiced in the third century, soon after the idea of baptismal regeneration began to gain headway.

Now if babies and the sick need to be baptized, with immersion being dangerous in these situations, then someone has to decide which of the various modes of baptism—immersion, sprinkling, or pouring—is authorized in a given instance. Church leaders and officials began to assume this duty, and little by little the Church became the sole custodian of baptism as a "saving sacrament." Things had now moved a long way from the instructions of Jesus, and considerable confusion now surrounded both the purpose of and the procedure for the baptism Jesus commanded.

It's significant that the oldest rituals for infant baptism actually require the administrator to ask the child if it repents, believes in Christ, and renounces the ways of the world, with the sponsor or parent answering for the child. The presence of such an exchange, however artificial, demonstrates that the early church *required faith before baptism*. Much later, the great reformers, Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, permitted infant baptism only because otherwise they would have excommunicated the whole church (!) . . . but they had real problems explaining why they kept it.

Taken together, the inevitable result of all this has been that the distinction between the Church and the world has become more and more fuzzy and indistinct over time. Through infant baptism, people were admitted to the Church without being born again. These persons had not experienced God's redemption. They did not have a new heart and mind. They did not have the presence of the indwelling Holy Spirit. And they did not understand that **membership in a church is not the same thing as being born again**.

As Baptists understand it, the New Testament teaches that *personal* repentance for *personal* sin followed by *personal* faith in the Lord Jesus Christ must precede baptism in every instance. The issue here has nothing to do with infants or adults. The issue is not a question of age in any sense, but of intelligent, freely-chosen faith, unprompted by adults who confuse baptism with salvation. For Baptists, the central issue in baptism is not infant baptism vs. adult baptism. **The central issue is FAITH baptism vs. NON-FAITH baptism.**

Confusing the issue even more, some Christian groups baptize infants but do not hold that this saves them, requiring later instruction and confirmation to complete this work. Such baptism is apparently done to secure the effect it has on the parents, but more often than not such baptism generates a false sense of security that leads to less religious instruction in the home, not to more. Baptists are much more comfortable with a process of infant or child *dedication* in which the

³ As centuries passed and new structures developed, such irregular baptism also prevented its recipients from entering "holy orders."

⁴ This conclusion was based on selective reading of Scripture (e.g., Acts 2:38) rather than on thorough-going study and interpretation of the entire New Testament.

parents are the participants, not the child, maintaining a clear distinction between such dedication by parents and the later development of repentance and faith in the child's own heart.

Having said all this, I suggest to you that there are three crucial alternatives with respect to baptism:

1. Either baptism is for those who can understand and believe the Gospel for themselves, or else it isn't, and infants and other unbelievers are valid subjects for baptism.
2. Either salvation is by faith alone, and doesn't depend on baptism at all, or else salvation depends in some way on baptism and is incomplete without it.
3. Either baptism finds its significance in the mind and heart of the one receiving it, or else it takes its meaning from the understanding and qualifications of the *administrator*, and what the *recipient* believes and understands is irrelevant.⁵

With respect to the third alternative, if the sufficiency of our baptism depended on the faithful character of the administrator more than on our own personal faith in Jesus, as it does in some faith groups, we'd need to keep that person under surveillance as long as he or she lived in order to be sure that we ourselves ended life with a "baptism that worked." You and I can be very glad that the validity of our baptism depends, not on the administrator, but on the faith of the baptized and on the faithful mercies of God!

Even so, we Baptists sometimes find ourselves contending inadvertently for the qualifications of the administrator when we insist on "rebaptizing" persons who come to us from other Christian denominations, and who have already been baptized as believers. The question then is whether we're contending for "Baptist Baptism" or for *biblical* baptism.⁶

Much of life hangs on being able to ask the right questions, and as I understand the matter, the right question here is never one of "**rebaptism**," but is rather a question about the nature of biblical baptism. Baptists generally understand New Testament baptism to have three components:

1. The candidate is baptized by immersion, preserving the New Testament practice as well as the visual and physical symbolism of the act.
2. The candidate is so baptized after her or his personal, intelligent, and uncoerced confession of faith in Christ, and not before.
3. The candidate understands that baptism has no saving effect—we are saved by grace alone (Ephesians 2:8-9)—and baptism is therefore a symbol, an act of obedience, not a sacrament, or an act of salvation.

If these three requirements have been met, no matter when or where or by whom, then a person has experienced New Testament baptism, and that baptism should be accepted as such.

There is one more thing that needs to be clearly stated here: our Christian faith does not rise or fall on the question of baptism by immersion. **Our Christian faith is anchored, not in water,**

⁵ We might also add a fourth alternative: "Either the New Testament teaches baptism by immersion, preserving the symbolism of death, burial, and resurrection, or else it doesn't, and any amount of water, applied in any fashion, will get the job done." At the same time, the first identifiable "Baptist" congregation that practiced believer's baptism was an English congregation in Amsterdam led by John Smyth. Smyth baptized himself by pouring in 1609, and then similarly baptized the other confessing Christians in the group. It was not until 1641 that a recovery of baptism by immersion took place.

⁶ This practice took its rise from J.R. Graves and the "Landmark Controversy" that began in 1854.

but in the saving blood of Jesus, and while we Baptists may keep closer company with those who share our understanding of baptism, any persons who lift up the Name of Jesus, our crucified and risen Savior, the Lord of the Universe and our soon-coming King— *any such persons*—are our brothers and sisters in Christ, and we gladly make common cause with them for the Kingdom of God. Happily, our membership documents here at CBF reflect these truths.

In that ecumenical spirit, when we conclude this service in a little while, I will invite you to join me in reading *The Apostles' Creed*. One of the very earliest Christian confessions of faith, *The Apostles' Creed* is still in weekly use in many Christian congregations around the world, and as we read it together, we will join our hearts with brothers and sisters around the world who are members of The Body of Christ across the ages, the Church Universal (here, "catholic" means "universal").

The Apostles' Creed

I believe in God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried; he descended to the dead. On the third day he rose again; he ascended into heaven, where he sits at the right hand of the Father, and he will come to judge the living and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

Amen.

Soli Deo Gloria.

