

PLAIN SPEECH

Volume 3 – Issue 22 – 14 March 2010

“Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech” (2 Cor. 3:12)

BY SCOTT PARKER

DOES GOD APPROVE OF INFANT BAPTISM?

The practice of infant “baptism” (typically sprinkling or pouring a little water on a baby’s head) is something that the masses of ignorant, alienated and blind (**Eph. 4:17-18**) people in the world think God wants done. However, the practice of infant baptism is not something that God wants done. In this article, I will clearly demonstrate why infant baptism is unscriptural. I will also deal with some of the favorite arguments hoisted by those who claim that infant baptism is a scriptural practice.

Why is infant baptism not something that God approves of? Simple. God has never authorized infant baptism! Folks, we must follow God’s rules. Stated another way, we simply must have authority from God for all that we do (**Col. 3:17**). The rule book is the Bible (**1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Tim. 3:16-17**). The Bible authorizes things via commands, approved examples kept in context, and logical, necessary conclusions. Where in the New Testament is there a command to baptize infants? There’s not one (arguments not withstanding). Where in the New Testament is there an approved example of an infant being baptized? There’s not one (arguments not withstanding). Where in the New Testament is there an inescapable conclusion to authorize infant baptism? There’s not one (arguments not withstanding). Listen, when God wants something done He says so (**2 Sam. 7:1-7**). You may rest assured that if God wanted infants to be baptized He would have told us. It is, however, that many folks have all sorts of arguments they put forth in an attempt to justify infant baptism. Let’s knock down a few of their favorites.

THE PRACTICE HAS BEEN AROUND SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

Note the following statement taken from a Lutheran website: “*The Christian church [sic] has baptized infants from the earliest days of its history*” (<http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=2611>). Answer: if infant baptism has been around since the earliest days of the church then we would read about such in the book of Acts. Do we find infant baptism there? No. Instead, we learn that candidates for baptism must be people who are old enough to reach a reasoned decision relative to such (**Ax. 8:12; 5:14; 9:1-2**). Listen, I concur that infant baptism has been around for a long time. However, I also realize that the practice originated as but one result of the departure from the truth Paul spoke of (**2 Tim. 4:1-4; 2 Th. 2:3; Ax. 20:30**). Corrupt doctrine from men of corrupt minds – even if practiced for a long time – does not produce scriptural authorization for anything.

CHRIST COMMANDED INFANT BAPTISM

Notice what one Lutheran website had to say: “*Before He ascended, the Lord of the Church commanded us to baptize ‘all nations,’ a phrase the Church has always understood to mean everyone*” (<http://www.orlutheran.com/trinfbap.html>). Answer: the text referred to is **Mt. 28:19**. This in no way proves infant baptism. Said text teaches that those ready for baptism are those who have been taught to be disciples. Do infants fit the bill? Obviously not.

HOUSEHOLD BAPTISMS

Catholic.com, states: “*In these cases [Ax. 16:15; 1 Cor. 1:16], whole households were baptized. This means more than just the spouse; the children too were included...they could have been babes in arms.*” Answer: the whole argument is based upon presupposition and “*could have*” reasoning. Let’s think about another household Catholics often overlook; i.e. the household of Cornelius (**Ax. 11:14**). God is not a respecter of persons (**Ax. 10:34**). Thus, everyone in Cornelius’ house who was baptized that day had to do the same things. There was not one rule for older folks and one rule for infants. What was required of them? They all had to hear and accept what God had commanded (**Ax. 10:33, 44; 11:1**). Can infants do so? No.

INFANT BAPTISM IS NECESSARY TO REMOVE THE INHERITED SIN OF THE CHILD

Their theory runs like this. Ever since the fall of man (**Gen. 3:1ff**), every child born is stained with the sins of his/her parents. The way to remove these sins is to baptize the child. Answers: (1) sin is not inherited, it is a choice (**Rom. 5:12**), (2) sin comes from transgression, not transmission (**1 Jn. 3:4**), (3) children do not bear the iniquity of their parents (**Ez. 18:20**), (4) children are called innocent, not sinners, by God (**Ps. 106:34-38**), (5) Jesus likens kingdom citizens to infants (**Lk. 18:15-16**). Was the Lord saying that kingdom citizens are depraved sinners? C’mon.

JESUS SAID NOT TO DISALLOW CHILDREN, EVEN INFANTS, FROM BEING BROUGHT TO HIM

The passages referred to are: **Mt. 19:13-14; Mk. 10:13-14 & Lk. 18:15-16**. Answer: Jesus allowed children to be brought to Him so He could hold them and pray for them – NOT to baptize them. The Infant Baptists twist text (**2 Pet. 3:16**). The kiddos did not need to be baptized. They were *already* acceptable in His sight (**Js. 4:17**).