Is Infant Baptism Scriptural?	Major Premise	MINOR Premise	Conclusion	IMPLICATION
ARGUMENT FROM THE NATURE OF CIRCUMCISION	OT circumcision was an obligatory ¹ sign and seal ² of God's everlasting ³ covenant of grace ⁴ , whereby professing believers ⁵ and their households ⁶ were admitted into the visible church ⁷ , reminded of the necessity of regeneration ⁸ , and strengthened in their faith ⁹ .	NT baptism has essentially replaced OT circumcision.	NT baptism is an obligatory sign & seal of God's everlasting covenant of grace, whereby professing believers and their households are admitted into the visible church, reminded of the necessity of conversion, and strengthened in their faith.	The Scriptural practice of infant baptism is a clear and non-negotiable ordinance of Christ, the neglect of which evokes God's fatherly displeasure.
SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE	 Obligatory (Gen. 17:10, 14; Ex. 4:24-26; Lk. 2:21) Sign/Seal (Gen. 17:10, 13; Rom. 4:11; Mt. 26:26; Lk. 22:20) Everlasting (Gen. 17:13; Rom. 4:11-13; Gal. 3:29; Heb. 11:13f) Covenant of Grace (Blood, Ex. 4:25; 8th = 1st Day, Gen. 17:12; Foreskin, Ps. 51:5; Removal of Flesh, Dt. 10:15-16; 30:6) Professing Believers (Gen. 17:24; Ex. 12:48-50; Rom. 4:11) Their Households (Gen. 17:12, 26-27; Oikia vs. Oikos) Admitted into Visible Church (Gen. 17:13-14; Ex. 12:48-50) Necessity of Regeneration (Jer. 4:4; Ezek. 44:9; Rom. 2:25-3:4) Strengthened in their Faith (Gen. 17:13; Rom. 4:11; Col. 3:9-11) 	 Everlasting (Rom. 6:3-5) Covenant of Grace (Mt. 28:18-20) Professing Believers (Acts 8:37) Their Households (Acts 16:15) Admitted into Visible Church (Acts 2:41, 47; 8:12-23) Necessity of Regeneration (Col. 2:11-13; Tit. 3:5; 2 Pet. 1:8-11) 	Necessarily Implied by Scriptural Premises	Gen. 17:14, And the uncircumcised male child, who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that person shall be cut off from his people; he has broken My covenant. Ex. 4:24-26, And it came to pass on the way, at the encampment, that the LORD met him and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone and cut off the foreskin of her son and cast it at Moses' feet, and said, "Surely you are a husband of blood to me!" So He let him go. Then she said, "You are a husband of blood!" – because of the circumcision.
BAPTIST OBJECTIONS	Against #3 – Sacrifices = Eternal? (Lev. 16:32-34) Against #4 – Land Promise = C.O.G.? (Gen. 17:7-8)	General Objection – Regeneration, not baptism, <i>fulfills</i> circumcision. Against C-2 – Galatians 3:28 refers to Spirit baptism, not water baptism. Against C-5 – Circumc. = merit (Gal. 5:3); baptism = grace (Acts 2:38).	No Known Objections	Many great, wise, and godly men have done otherwise!
SCRIPTURAL RESPONSES	For #3 – Sacrifices fulfilled (Col. 2:17; Heb. 10:1a) and abolished (Heb. 10:18), yet replaced (Mt. 26:28; 1Cor. 10:16-18). For #4 – Abrahamic Promises in Gen. 12:1-3: (1) Land = World/Heaven, Rom. 4:13; Heb. 11:9-16; (2) Seed = Christ/Church, Gal. 3:16, 29; (3) Global Blessing = Great Comm., Acts 3:25-26; (4) God, 2 Cor. 6:16.	General Objection – Regeneration fulfills both circumcision and baptism, but baptism replaces circumcision. For C-2 – (1) 'put on Christ' = badge (2) Paul's argument: (a) circumcision never justified (b) circumcision now	No Response Required	Yes, and, for a time, <i>Moses</i> himself was among them!