

## Infant Baptism

The real motive for baptizing babies is not found in support for any biblical truth but was instituted to promote an agenda. In the very early days of the Catholic Church, bishops had the advantage over a relatively ignorant population. Priests gave their “sermons” in Latin, which left their listeners in the dark. Only the clergy had access to a bible, so there was no way for anyone to confirm what they were being told. In fact, when Martin Luther translated the Bible into German, the church sought to have him put to death. Why? Because he had given the man on the street access to the truth—something the church didn’t want them to have.

After Constantine made Christianity the official religion, the church became a powerful political entity. Church leaders quickly figured out that real estate and money made for political clout. Money and land came from the people. Historians tell us that giving land to the church became so common, the secular government feared for its own survival. The church had more political influence than any other entity. The church decided what person was elected king. The church decided what laws were instituted. The church decided what was to be taught in the universities. The church decided what science could and could not examine. The church made decisions on how children were to be delivered during birth.

To establish a base of faithful givers, one of the doctrines the Catholic Church used to scare them into obedience was infant baptism. While evidence suggests infant baptism was practiced before the Catholic Church, the reason for it had been quite benign. Regional bishops vied for control of the country, seeking to broaden their political boundaries and influence. The competition was fierce and very un-Christ-like. To prevent followers from migrating to a competing church, subtle changes in certain doctrines and practices began taking shape. Infant baptism was a perfect tool.

Infant baptism became a potent tool for getting followers to “stay in line.” You had folks locked in for life when their child’s soul was on the chopping block. The bishops modified the doctrine to teach that a baby would roast in the fires of eternity if it died before being baptized. It didn’t take much convincing to make it a routine practice. As the decades turned into centuries, no one questioned the practice. At least no one in the Catholic Church.

Today, the doctrine of infant baptism is a secondary issue. The real problem is one of scriptural authority. When one denies that authority, as many churches do, you end up with these types of teachings.

This study uses some of [Jordan Bajis’ article](#) to present the other side of the story, so to speak. My comments are not intended as an attack on Mr. Bajis’ beliefs, but I use his reasoning as a representation of those who endorse the doctrine. His dissertation is concise, scholarly, but easy to digest.

The *only* authority we can use to support a teaching is the Word of God. Quoting from Jordan Bajis’ article, “There is not one Church Father who denies or even questions the validity of infant baptism.” Not surprising, since priests and ministers bow to the Mother Church regarding what’s being forced down the parishioners’ throats.

From its inception—and even while under the apostles’ divine guidance—the early church was riddled with false teachers like ticks on a hound. And like the poor dog, no matter how much it scratched to rid itself of these teachers, they just kept coming back. After the apostles died, certain men sought to establish themselves as self-appointed heirs to the apostolic office. Jude wrote that “certain men whose condemnation was written about long ago have secretly slipped in among you.” (Jude 4) These men

weren't "slipping in" to take advantage of the fried chicken potluck; their intentions were more sinister.

There were also false prophets among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you. They will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the sovereign Lord who bought them—bringing swift destruction on themselves. Many will follow their shameful ways and will bring the way of truth into disrepute. **In their greed, these teachers will exploit you with stories they have made up.** (2 Peter 2:1-3) (Emphasis mine)

The assumptions arguing *for* infant baptism are presented in bold face and taken from Mr. Bajis' article. They were developed and refined long after infant baptism was introduced into the church. In other words, the popes and bishops had to go back, dig them out of the bible, and then dress them up so that they sounded reasonable and well thought out.

Mr. Bajis wrote, **On the Day of Pentecost, Peter said, "the promise is for you and your children." That means infants were included in the 3,000 who were baptized.**

The phrase, "the promise is for you and your children" refers to Christianity spreading across the centuries, from one generation to the next. Under the Old Testament (OT), children were heirs of the promise made to Abraham, where they inherited their parents' physical property. Christian parents pass on to their children a *spiritual* inheritance, "raising them up in the training and instruction of the Lord." (Eph 6:4)

The word 'children' also doesn't mean infants. The bible defines 'children' as:

- Jesus addressed His disciples as children. (Mark 10:24)
- Paul referred to Timothy as his child (1 Tim 1:2), and also to Onesimus. (Philem 10)
- John designated the disciples to whom he was writing as his children. (2 John 4)
- Disciples are sometimes called "little children."
- Jesus called His disciples "children." (John 13:33)
- Paul addressed the Galatians as "children." (Gal 4:19)
- John uses it extensively in his letters. (1 John 2:1; 4:4; 5:21)
- Jesus used the term "babes," or "little ones" in addressing His disciples after His resurrection (John 21:5)
- John also used this term in saluting those to whom he was writing. (1 John 2:18)

When Mr. Bajis says, "it becomes *reasonable to assume* that these children to whom Peter refers were young juveniles or, *at the very least*, in their preadolescence," it underscores his own uncertainty.

It's "reasonable to assume" anything, but that doesn't make it true. It may be "reasonable to assume" that the mark of the beast in Revelation 13 is social security numbers (as was once thought). Time and history usually prove that we cannot rely on reasoning to determine the truth. If God's Word can't validate it, we need to disregard it. Let's look at what Acts 2 says:

When the people heard this, they were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the other apostles, "Brothers, what shall we do?" Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call." With many other words he warned them; and he

pleaded with them, "Save yourselves from this corrupt generation." Those who accepted his message were baptized, and about three thousand were added to their number that day. (Acts 2:37-41) NIV

These were Jews who were in Jerusalem, celebrating Pentecost and other Mosaic observances. When they heard Peter's sermon, it says "they were cut to the heart." Why? Because Peter said, "you, with the help of other scumbags, put him to death by nailing him to the cross." (Acts 2:23) These weren't innocent kids, but grown men who'd had a hand in Jesus' crucifixion. Convicted of their guilt, they asked Peter what they might do to relieve their guilt and be saved.

Additionally, the statement, "for all whom the Lord our God will call" implies *understanding* that call, something an innocent child is not going to grasp.

**The fact that the bible mentions entire "households" were baptized does make it seem probable that children and infants were included.**

Again, what "seems probable" cannot be used to form hard doctrine. Mark records that "*all* the country of Judea was going out to (John the Baptist), and *all* the people of Jerusalem; and they were being baptized by him in the Jordan River, confessing their sins." (Mark 1:5) Does this mean that every man, woman, and child—about 3 million people—was baptized by John? No. Simply put, John was the "Billy Graham" of his day. He was famous. Everyone for miles around knew of John. If one was going to be baptized, the Baptizer was the one to see.

**We know that the Greek word *oikos*, translated 'house' or 'household,' has traditionally included infants and children in its meaning for several reasons. There is no evidence of this word being used either in secular Greek, Biblical Greek or in the writing of Hellenistic Judaism in a way which would restrict its meaning only to adults.**

Even if *oikos* does include infants, scripture and context *must* support it. Men do with the ancient languages what they do with the bible—they use subtle twists and innuendo to persuade the unwary. I could give you some examples, but it would make this study longer than necessary. Suffice to say, the Bible was written to fishermen, shepherds, carpenters, and farmers. The language is straightforward and economical. Greek can expose some of the precious gems buried in scripture, but you've built a very wobbly doctrine if it's the sole proof of your teaching.

**Romans 3:23 says, "all have sinned," and that includes infants.**

Lifting verses out of context has led to 99% of the false doctrines taught within Christendom. Let's see what a bit more context reveals:

...apart from the Law, the righteousness of God has been manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all those who believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God... (Rom 3:21-23)

Using this verse, how is God's righteousness revealed? Through faith in Christ *for all those who believe*. Can infants believe? Can they understand or have any concept of their state before God?

How does one garner that righteousness? They first have to believe. "Those who *believe* and are

baptized will be saved.” (Mark 16:16) Belief precedes baptism. To the extent a baby believes anything, it is the love it feels from its mother.

If you want to use the “all in the household” argument to include infants, you may as well throw in any disabled people in the family. Don’t forget grandpa who sits in his rocker with Alzheimer’s. The point is, a person has to be *cognizant* of their sin and make a *conscious* decision to do something about it. Baptizing someone who doesn’t know night from day isn’t going to circumvent what the bible plainly teaches.

### Jesus and Children—Using Syllogism<sup>1</sup>

We can use logic against those who like to draw logical conclusions from scripture instead of the truth. But notice how it can backfire on you:

Truly I say to you, unless you are converted and become like children, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven. (Matt 18:3-4)

Taking that verse, along with the assumption that babies need to be baptized, we can extrapolate the following:

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Supposition 1: | We must be like children to enter heaven.           |
| Supposition 2: | Children are sinners. (According to the Catholics.) |
| Conclusion:    | We must be like sinners to enter heaven.            |

Thus, the verse becomes:

Truly I say to you, unless you become like little sinners, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven.

The point is, children are *not* sinners—they are innocent. Jesus was making a point that a person had to be child-like to enter into heaven.

### The Bottom Line

Peter wrote that false teachers “will bring the way of truth into disrepute.” Said literally, truth has lost its reputation. People have muddied up the truth to the point that no one can believe anything unless hard study has been done. These men have made it smell so bad no one wants to bother with the bible anymore. Too much of a hassle. As a result, truth has become relative. What I believe to be true is true, and what you believe to be true is also true. As long as we’re all waving our arms in a Christian rock concert, who cares.

Know this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation, for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God. (2 Peter 1:20-21) NAS

This is where the religious leaders of Jesus’ day got into trouble. Instead of simply obeying the scriptures, they relied on legalistic interpretations provided by their scribes. Many today have formed

---

<sup>1</sup> An extremely subtle, sophisticated, or deceptive argument.

“hard” doctrine based on human interpretation and tradition. Unwilling to humble themselves before God’s Word, they tightly clench their beliefs in proud fists, not realizing they are on an express train to Hell.

When Jesus answered the Jews’ religious arguments, He typically used one or two scriptures and left it at that. Nowadays, no one wins an argument, even though volumes are written on a given subject. Men are unwilling to change due to ego. Doctrines dictated by the “mother church” stand like concrete barriers.

When David lost his baby son, he said that he would meet him in heaven (2 Sam 12:23). Concerning Jeroboam’s child, he was the only one in the house of Jeroboam in whom God found anything good (1 Kings 14:13). Neither one had been baptized because the practice didn’t come along until centuries later. What made those two babies good? Their innocence.

Paul wrote that such teachings—teachings that fly in the face of nature and God’s design—are “doctrines of demons.” (1 Timothy 4:1)

Terry DeLaney  
August 2017