



# Catholic Conversation Concerning Infant Baptism – Oct 24, 2014

I have been going back and forth with a Catholic on the necessity of Adult Baptism and not Infant Baptism. The Catholic insisted that infant baptism is the correct method but has never responded with any convincing scripture to back up his assertions. The response would always be some ones writing outside of the bible.

He sent me a link that I would assume that he believe to be the most convincing, irrefutable arguments to show that infant baptism is biblical.

<http://taylormarshall.us6.list-manage.com/track/click?u=8c3419ef22aaa45aea4663ebb&id=6691dd76ac&e=bd959bff56>

Dr. Taylor Marshall gives 3 areas where he believes Infant Baptism can be proven.

- 1) **Covenantal/Testamental** which he said is the "slam dunk" of the 3 arguments
- 2) **Household** which he said is "less convincing"
- 3) **Church History** which is what "Catholic tradition" states.

## **Church History**

I'm ignoring the Catholic traditions since Jesus said to the Pharisees in Mark 7:13 that they destroy God's word by their traditions. If a tradition overturns the bible then that tradition is a false one.

RSV Mark 7:13 thus **making void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on.** And many such things you do."

## **Household**

The Household argument is all conjecture and assumptions. Dr. Taylor Marshall makes a statement that he want to be taken as fact then proves his argument based on his statement.

He said that there wasn't any birth control back then so there would be a lot of children. The household were obedient to God so God would bless them with a lot of children.

Then he mentions in Acts 10 that Cornelius feared God with his entire household and Peter baptized all of them after the Holy Spirit fell on them. Interesting with this event in Acts is that the faith only Protestants use this passage to show that you don't need to be water baptized first before receiving the Holy Spirit. Both cases the scripture is being twisted.

RSV Acts 10:2 **a devout man who feared God with all his household,** gave alms liberally to the people, and prayed constantly to God.

RSV Acts 10:44-48

44 While Peter was still saying this, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word.

45 And the believers from among the circumcised who came with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles.

46 For they heard them speaking in tongues and extolling God. Then Peter declared,

47 **"Can any one forbid water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?"**

48 And **he commanded them to be baptized** in the name of Jesus Christ. Then they asked him to remain for some days.

2 other places in Acts were also given; Lydia was baptized with her household and the prison guard and his whole family was baptized. Dr Marshall's assumption that household equals babies isn't sound. He is making an assumption without any biblical verses to back up his claim and then using that assumption to prove his argument. No verse shows that there were children present at those 3 baptisms. I agree with Dr. Marshall that this household argument is "less convincing".

RSV Acts 16:14-15

14 One who heard us was a woman named **Lydia**, from the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple goods, who was a worshiper of God. The Lord opened her heart to give heed to what was said by Paul.

15 And when **she was baptized, with her household**, she besought us, saying, "If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come to my house and stay." And she prevailed upon us.

RSV Acts 16:31-33

31 And they said, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and **you will be saved, you and your household.**"

32 And they spoke the word of the Lord to him and to **all that were in his house.**

33 And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their wounds, and **he was baptized at once, with all his family.**

### Covenential/Testamental

The "slam dunk" argument that he said would be "robust, convincing, biblical theology of the baptism of infants" is the conventional/testamental evidence.

This too Dr. Marshall changes definitions. He spends some time on circumcision; why it was important, when it was to be done (on the 8th day) and now that it's no longer required. He then claims that circumcision requirements are now transferred to baptism.

He shows in Rm4:11 that circumcision is a seal of righteousness. He uses Col2:10-12 to link circumcision with baptism and then Acts2:38-39 to link baptism to children and then uses Luke1:59 to define the child's age of circumcision (which he has redefined as baptism). In the end he said Catholics should baptize their children on the 8th day or within the first few weeks after birth based on Catholic tradition.

RSV Romans 4:11 He received **circumcision as a sign or seal of the righteousness** which he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. The purpose was to make him the father of all who believe without being circumcised and who thus have righteousness reckoned to them,

RSV Colossians 2:10-12

10 and you have come to fulness of life in him, who is the head of all rule and authority.

11 In him also **you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands**, by putting off the body of flesh in the circumcision of Christ;

12 and you were **buried with him in baptism**, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead.

RSV Acts 2:38-39

38 And Peter said to them, "**Repent, and be baptized** every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

39 **For the promise is to you and to your children** [#5043 teknon: a child (used as: child, daughter, son)] and to all that are far off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him."

RSV Luke 1:59 And on the **eighth day they came to circumcise the child** [#3813 paidion: an infant, half-grown boy or girl]; and they would have named him Zechariah after his father,

Foreskin circumcision wasn't redefined to baptism in the bible - the location of the circumcision was. In Rm 2:29 it's stated that circumcision is **on the heart**. Philippians 3:3 state that the true circumcision are those who worships God in spirit – reiterating what Paul had mentioned in Rm2:29 .

RSV Romans 2:29 He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and **real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal**. His praise is not from men but from God.

RSV Philippians 3:3 **For we are the true circumcision, who worship God in spirit, and glory in Christ Jesus**, and put no confidence in the flesh.

Circumcision wasn't transformed into baptism. If Dr Marshall can't use his redefinition of circumcision then his whole "slam dunk" argument disappears and he has no evidence, no facts, no scripture to show that infant baptism is biblically sound.

This leaves all infant baptized persons in danger of the judgment.