

2

INFANTS CAN INDEED HAVE FAITH

Besides this, no one can show that little children do not possess faith. The practice of baptizing children has been received from the early church. So why should anyone change it, especially on the basis of such a doubtful principle?

If someone wants to alter or abolish an ancient practice, he ought, at least, to show that it is against the Bible. Christ said that what is not against us is for us (Luke 9:50). We ourselves have abolished the sacrifice of the Mass, monastic life, and clerical celibacy. But we have done this by showing how they are contrary to clear

and certain scripture. But lacking that, we certainly ought to have allowed them to continue.

How can they prove that infants are not able to have faith? What portion of the Bible can be the basis for

What portion of the Bible can be the basis for this belief of theirs?

this belief of theirs? They think it is true just because infants cannot yet speak or think like adults. But this is an unsure principle, no, an

entirely false one. It is nothing on which to base belief.

Meanwhile, we can produce all sorts of scripture to show that infants can indeed have faith. The Bible shows that they can have faith even when they can neither think like an adult nor speak. For example, we read that the Jews offered their sons and daughters as sacrifices to the false gods (Ps 106:37-8). In doing this, they were said to have poured out innocent blood. Now, if it was innocent blood, then the children must have been pure and holy. But how could they be pure and holy without faith and the Holy Spirit?

What about the slaughter of the innocents? The children Herod slaughtered were not more than two years old. Clearly, they lacked adult intellect or language. Yet they were holy and eternally saved.

Furthermore, Christ says in Matthew 19:14 that the kingdom belongs to little children. John the Baptist, even while yet in his mothers womb (Luke 1:41), was able to have faith. At least it certainly seems so to me.

Now, you might say that John the Baptist was a special case. You might believe that his situation does not prove

that all infants, when baptized, can have faith. But I'm not trying to show that all infants can have faith. All I have to show is that the basis for this re-baptizing is false.

That basis is that it can be proven that infants "cannot" have faith. But if John the Baptist, not yet born and without speech or thought, could have faith, then it must be directly contrary to the Bible to say that this is not possible.

***All I have to show is
that the basis for this
re-baptizing is false***

If it isn't against the Bible that an infant can have faith, but in fact, is in accord with it, then you have a problem: The very basis of this practice of re-baptizing, namely, that infants cannot have faith, must be the thing that is against Scripture. This must be recognized from the outset.

If I have proven to you, with these scriptures, that baptized infants may indeed have faith, who will convince you otherwise? And if you are not sure, why be so quick to say that the baptism of an infant is worthless? You don't know. You can't know.

-
-
1. Can anyone demonstrate that infants cannot possess faith?
 2. When did the practice of baptizing infants begin in the Church?

3. On what basis should an ancient practice in the Church be changed?
4. Even though they cannot think or speak like adults, does the Bible demonstrate that infants can have faith? Where?
5. Even if the case of John the Baptist is considered extraordinary, how does it compel us to baptize infants?