## The Salvation of Infants

Many are concerned about the fate of children who die in infancy or early childhood. Do they inherit the guilt of Adam, and if so, are they eternally condemned as a result? If they are saved, then on what basis are they considered right with God? This question is highly relevant in light of the fact that historically about half the human population has died in infancy.[[1]](#footnote-1)

We will begin our investigation by studying the development of this theme in church history, then we will describe and assess the views of various Christian denominations with the goal of determining the biblical teaching.

### А. Historical Survey

From his research on the topic, Warfield learned that the early Fathers did not doubt that children who died in infancy were saved.[[2]](#footnote-2) Aristides of Athens (2nd c.), for example, wrote, “If moreover (a child) happens to die in childhood, they give thanks to God the more, as for one who has passed through the world without sins” (*Апология*, *15*). Accordingly, Irenaeus (2nd c.) taught that Jesus is the Savior of every age group:

He came to save all through means of Himself – all, I say, who through Him are born again to God – infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age…” (*Against Heresies*, 2.22.4).

However, as we know, very early in church history the Church departed from the gospel of grace and fell into legalism – salvation by works. Correspondingly, the question of dying infants, who never performed good works, became problematic. Gregory Nazianzen, for example, taught that such infants deserved neither punishment nor reward.

Gregory of Nyssa, author of *On Infants’ Early Deaths*, affirmed the same, yet believed that departed infants were nonetheless saved. Gregory believed that persons’ relationship with God was ordered by the principle of “retribution.” In other words, people receive from the Lord according to their conduct in this life. However, departed infants can receive no retribution from God – neither for evil nor good. Gregory then theorized that God grants to each individual a certain “natural right” to enjoy eternal life. Since no personal sin interferes with infants inheriting this right, they will obtain it.

Nevertheless, such an infant’s condition in eternity will differ from those who successfully passed through the tests and trial of this life. Therefore, the latter’s enjoyment of God’s kingdom will exceed the former’s. However, in time the departed infants will gain spiritual experience in God’s presence resulting in increasing enjoyment of their eternal state.

Gregory attempted to delve into the mystery of why the Lord takes some infants home prematurely. He reasoned that God, who knew their future, in this way prevented them from falling into sin. If asked why God does not do so for all infants who eventually turn to evil as adults, Gregory responded that it is necessary for some people to be evil in order for God’s plan concerning the righteous to be fulfilled.

The Early Church’s conviction that baptism was necessary for salvation further complicated the picture. What happens, then, with unbaptized infants? Warfield comments, “The whole Patristic Church agreed that, martyrs excepted, no infant dying unbaptized could enter the kingdom of heaven.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

Ambrose also held to the party line: “No one ascends into the kingdom of heaven, except by means of the sacrament of baptism…. Moreover to this there is no exception, not the infant, nor he who is unavoidably prevented.” Yet, he adds, “They have however immunity from pains.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The definitive view in the Western Church was advanced by Augustine, who taught that unbaptized infants indeed do perish eternally because they inherit the guilt of Adam (i.e., original sin). Yet, their punishment is less severe. We cite several excerpts from Augustine’s *On the Baptism of Infants*:

Now, inasmuch as infants are only able to become His sheep by baptism, it must needs come to pass that they perish if they are not baptized, because they will not have that eternal life which He gives to His sheep (1:40).

Let there be then no eternal salvation promised to infants *out* of our own opinion, without Christ’s baptism (1.33).

Now, since their tender age could not possibly have contracted sin in its own life, it remains for us, even if we are as yet unable to understand, at least to believe that infants inherit original sin (3.7).

It may therefore be correctly affirmed, that such infants as quit the body without being baptized will be involved in the mildest condemnation of all (1.21).

Augustine’s views found support with Gregory I (6th c.), who affirmed, “Those who have done nothing here of themselves, but have not been freed by the sacrament of salvation, enter there into torments.”[[5]](#footnote-5) This verdict was confirmed at the Second Council of Lyons (13th c.) and the Council of Florence (14th c.).[[6]](#footnote-6)

Augustine’s protagonist, Pelagius, felt that unbaptized infants went to a “middle” zone between heaven and hell.[[7]](#footnote-7) According to Semi-Pelagianism, God judges departed infants on the basis of His foreknowledge, that is, based on His knowledge of what they would have done if they had lived on.[[8]](#footnote-8) It is also assumed that when such infants grow up in heaven, they must put their personal trust in the Savior.[[9]](#footnote-9)

In the Middle Ages, Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas made their contributions to this theme. Unlike Augustine and Gregory I, both Lombard and Aquinas taught that, although unbaptized infants forfeit the beatific vision of God, they suffer no punishment or torment. Even though limbo is a part of hell, it is better characterized as a “natural paradise.” Lombard differed from Aquinas, though, in that he felt that these infants do suffer from the knowledge that they cannot see God, while Aquinas denied this.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Next, we will examine various confessional views on the fate of departed infants, which, in fact, are simply the continuation of this doctrine’s development.

### B. Catholic Position

We have already received an introduction to the Catholic view, which we can sum up as follows. In traditional Catholic thought, the sin of Adam leaves its mark on all his descendants resulting in them inheriting of the guilt of his sin. Therefore, infants are guilty from birth of Adam’s transgression (original sin). Water baptism, though, provides forgiveness of original sin. For this reason, the Catholic Church baptizes infants.

If children die before receiving baptism, they depart to a place called “limbo,” which is a part of hell, but a place without torment. It is a sort of “natural paradise,” where all individuals who have committed no personal sin reside.[[11]](#footnote-11) Infants who go there have no access to God’s presence or the vision of His glory. They suffer no pain, but spend eternity without God.

The following except from the Catholic Encyclopedia details the Catholic view before Vatican II:

The Catholic teaching is uncompromising on this point, that all who depart this life without baptism be it of water, or blood, or desire, are perpetually excluded from the vision of God…. As to the exact state of these [infant] souls in the next world they are not agreed…. While it is certain that unbaptized infants must endure the pain of loss, it is not at all certain that they are subject to the pain of sense.... Since the twelfth century, the opinion of the majority of theologians has been that unbaptized infants are immune from all pain of sense.[[12]](#footnote-12)

In evaluation of this view, we first note that Catholics correctly acknowledge our participation in Adam’s sin and the resultant inherited guilt that it entails. This resonates with Paul’s teaching in Romans chapter 5. In addition, Catholics correctly stress that infants’ salvation must come through Christ and not by their personal innocence.

On the other hand, Catholics reduce the severity of inherited guilt. Personal sin can lead to condemnation in hell, while inherited guilt results only in confinement in limbo. Moreover, although infants do not experience pain in limbo, they will still spend eternity separated from the Lord. In addition, this teaching distorts the biblical doctrine of water baptism, asserting that by it God forgives original sin. Furthermore, the Catholic view has no biblical support. The Bible nowhere mentions a place called limbo. Finally, this teaching undervalues God’s mercy to departed infants, who had no opportunity to turn to Jesus. Even some Catholic theologians looked with suspicion on this doctrine.[[13]](#footnote-13)

These post-Vatican II declarations, though, offer more hope for the fate of unbaptized infants:

God has bound salvation to the sacrament of Baptism, but he himself is not bound by his sacraments.[[14]](#footnote-14)

As regards children who have died without Baptism, the Church can only entrust them to the mercy of God, as she does in her funeral rites for them. Indeed, the great mercy of God who desires that all men should be saved, and Jesus' tenderness toward children which caused him to say: “Let the children come to me, do not hinder them,” allow us to hope that there is a way of salvation for children who have died without Baptism. All the more urgent is the Church's call not to prevent little children coming to Christ through the gift of holy Baptism.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Interestingly, in the above cited statement no mention is made of limbo. In addition, the role of God’s mercy is accentuated. This new position resembles the Lutheran “agnostic” theory that we will soon discuss.

Many Catholics now embrace the “universal opportunity” view – that God grants departed infants at some future time after death opportunity to believe in the Savior.[[16]](#footnote-16) Some Protestants also hold to this teaching. Leckie, for example, claims that God allows infants to grow up in heaven until they are able to make a conscious decision to trust in Christ as Savior.[[17]](#footnote-17) However, Leckie’s theory encounters several problems. First, the Bible does not hold out the hope of an opportunity for salvation after death (see Heb 9:27). Second, these infants will be in heaven possessing an inborn sinful nature.[[18]](#footnote-18)

### C. Lutheran and Anglican View

As noted above, we may term the Lutheran position as “agnostic.” They concur with the Catholics that infants are born with original sin. Therefore, they need forgiveness through water baptism. The Augsburg Confession stats the following:

About original sin: our churches also teach that since Adam’s fall into sin, all men who are fathered in the normal physical way are conceived and born with sin. This means that they are born without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with evil desires. This disease, or original sin, truly is sin. It condemns and brings eternal death to those not born again through Baptism and the Holy Spirit (*Article 2*).

About Baptism our churches teach that it is necessary for salvation, and that through Baptism God offers us his grace. Also, children ought to be baptized. Those brought to God through Baptism are received into God’s grace (*Article 9*).

Yet, Lutherans reject the teaching of limbo. In answer to the question, “What happens to unbaptized infants who prematurely expire,” Lutheran faith has no definite response. In the case of infants of believing parents, Luther was ready to acknowledge a “baptism by desire,” which means that the unfulfilled desire and intent to baptize the child is acceptable to God as the act itself.[[19]](#footnote-19) In the seventeenth century, the Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard stated, “In the event of privation of impossibility the children of Christians are saved by an extraordinary and peculiar divine dispensation. For the necessity of baptism is not absolute, but ordinary.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

Luther comments on the fate of children of believing parents:

The Holy and Merciful God will think kindly of them. What he will do with them he has revealed to no one, that baptism may not be despised, but has reserved to his own mercy. God does wrong to no man.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

So then, the conventional Lutheran approach to the question infants’ fate is to consider it a mystery and to rely on God’s mercy. Lutherans hesitate to openly confess that departed infants are saved for fear of compromising the importance of water baptism.[[22]](#footnote-22)

The Lutheran theologian Mueller makes the following comments on departed infants from Christian homes: “It is best to commend them to God’s infinite mercy, who has power to work faith also without the ordained means of grace.” Concerning unbaptized infants from non-Christian homes, he states, “We dare not affirm that they are saved…. Here rather we confront the unsearchable judgments of God alone.”[[23]](#footnote-23)

The Anglican Church advances a similar view. Water baptism washes away the stain of original sin. Therefore, infants must be baptized. Originally, Anglicans denied that unbaptized infants could be saved. In time, however, they began to refrain from commenting on this topic and removed from their doctrinal statements references to the condemnation of unbaptized infants.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Some Anglicans are ready to defend the claim that God receives unbaptized infants. John Hooper, for example, comments, “It shall not be against the faith of a Christian to say, that Christ’s death and passion extendeth as far for the salvation of infants, as Adam’s fall made all his posterity culpable of damnation.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

In assessing the Lutheran and Anglican teaching, we note a proper appreciation of the biblical truth of inherited guilt from Adam and salvation through Christ. They also rightly reject the unscriptural doctrine of limbo. Unlike the biblical revelation, though, they regard that baptism saves infants from original sin. They are also unjustified in assuming the salvation of infants from Christian homes. Finally, many who are seeking a definite biblical answer to such a painful question would likely find the agnostic approach unsatisfactory.

### D. Reformed Understanding

Reformed theology is characterized by so-called “covenant theology,” according to which departed infants of believing parents are saved. Adherents of this view appeal to God’s dealings with His Old Testament people, Israel. From birth, children born into a Hebrew family are considered members of God’s people. Reformed thinkers also cite Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 7:14, where children of a believing parent are called “holy.”

On the other hand, we challenge the assumption that the Old Testament order transfers to the New. Israel’s inheritance was based on physical descent. New Testament salvation, on the other hand, is by faith. The physical descendants of Abraham received the inheritance. Yet, Jesus has no physical offspring. Co-heirs with Christ become so by believing in Him. Consequently, if salvation through Christ is not transmitted by physical means, then adherents of this theory have no basis for their claim.

Concerning 1 Corinthians 7:14, it is important to note that the same word that describes the condition of children of believing parents, that is ἁγία (*hagia)*, i.е., “holy,” is used in its verbal form in relation to the unbelieving spouse: “The unbelieving husband is *sanctified* through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is *sanctified* through her believing husband.” Yet, verse 16 informs us, “How do you know, O wife, whether you will save your husband? Or how do you know, O husband, whether you will save your wife?” So then, the “sanctification” of the unbelieving spouse does not mean he or she is saved. Similarly, the “sanctification” of the children of believers does not mean that they are saved. It simply refers to the fact that the believing spouse has a *sanctifying* *influence* on the family.

Another important aspect of Reformed theology is the doctrine of predestination. According to the Calvinistic teaching, God predestines all things. The elect are saved, and the non-elect perish. Therefore, the elect child, if dying in infancy, is saved, while the non-elect child perishes. The salvation of infants depends, then, not on personal faith or water baptism, but on God’s election. God unilaterally applies the redemptive work of Christ to elect children.

Most contemporary Calvinists propose that if an infant of believing parents dies, this is a sign from God that He elected this child for salvation. This interpretation is extended to apply to all children who perish in infancy. Therefore, it is thought that all departed infants are saved. This interpretation became generally accepted by Calvinists in the nineteenth century, but it dates back to Calvin himself.[[26]](#footnote-26) The great French reformer wrote, “I do not doubt that the infants whom the Lord gathers together from this life are regenerated by a secret operation of the Holy Spirit.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

Hodge supports this view in the following manner.[[28]](#footnote-28) First, according to Romans 5, God, who has already provided salvation in Christ, has the right to apply that salvation to any individual. Second, Jesus’ statement that few find the way to life (Matt 7:14) does not exclude the salvation of all infants – He was speaking here of adults. Third, this theory coincides with God’s nature – He takes no pleasure when a soul perishes.

We affirm along with Reformed theology that the human race in general is included in the guilt assigned to Adam’s sin as Paul clearly taught in Romans 5. We also agree that one may enter heaven only by virtue of Christ’s shed blood. However, Reformed theologians distort the true understanding of God’s love, claiming that God unconditionally elects who will be saved and who will perish. In their view, God does not will the salvation of all people. This conviction runs contrary to the biblical representation of God’s love for humanity and desire to save all.

We also note that the salvation of all infants is inconsistent with Calvinistic theology in general. Calvinists teach that God’s election is unconditional – it does not depend on any factors inherent to the elect. Yet, if the Lord saves all departed infants, then His election is conditioned upon the fact that they die in early childhood. In addition, they have no biblical support for the assertion that premature death is a sign of God’s election.

Moreover, according to this understanding God seemingly allows all non-elect individuals to reach the age of accountability, since those who died sooner than that are believed to be elect children. Yet, if, as Calvinists teach, God is ready to condemn the non-elect who survive to the age of accountability by withholding from them the grace to repent and believe, why would He hesitate to condemn the non-elect before they reach that age? The helpless situation of non-elect adults does not differ from the helpless condition of non-elect infants.[[29]](#footnote-29)

### E. Other Evangelical Views

The final theories for our examination basically reflect an Arminian perspective. The first of these is the so-called “theory of innocence,” and the other – “the unilateral application of Christ’s redemptive work.”[[30]](#footnote-30)

**1. Theory of Innocence**

This theory claims that departed infants are saved because they committed no personal sin and are therefore innocent before God. Infants are saved, then, thanks to their personal sinlessness. This theory also honors the concept of the “age of accountability,” which means that children are not held responsible for sins committed before the age when then can assesses the moral value of their actions. Before this age, children do sin in the sense of breaking God’s commandments. However, since they cannot conceptualize this as personal sin, God does not hold them accountable. Anabaptists are among those who held this view.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The Bible hints at the existence of the age of accountability (see Deut 1:39; Isa 7:14-16; Rom 9:11).[[32]](#footnote-32) Based on these passages, proponents of this teaching conclude that before children know how “to refuse evil and choose good,” they are not responsible for personal sin. Children who die before this time all go to heaven. So then, all departed infants are saved. In line with the theory, infants do not inherit Adam’s guilt. Each person is responsible only for his or her own sins.

The value of this theory lies in that it recognizes an age of accountability, which the Bible does support. Before reaching this age, children are not responsible for personal sin. On the other hand, this teaching contradicts Paul’s clear teaching on inherited guilt in Romans chapter 5.

Another difficulty with this view is that people can gain heaven based on their personal innocence and not by virtue of the blood of Christ. Such a person in not “redeemed,” and can never call Jesus “Savior” from the guilt of sin – only from depravity and mortality. However, Paul stated in 1 Timothy 4:10 that God is the “Savior of all men.” Warfield agrees that this teaching “is no less than a denial that Jesus is, in any proper sense, the Saviour of those who die infancy.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Finally, this approach violates the biblical concept of the believer’s union with Christ. Just as we are held liable for Adam’s sin, resulting in our condemnation, we receive through Christ the gift of righteousness, which leads to eternal life. If we reject inherited guilt from Adam, are we not in danger of rejecting the corresponding gift of righteousness in Christ?

If, in connection with our union with Christ, we receive only depravity of nature, then the following will result. Since we inherit depravity from Adam, we commit sins. Our personal sins, then, lead to condemnation. If this parallels with our union with Christ, then we receive from Christ only regeneration that leads to good works resulting in salvation. This scenario directly contradicts the biblical teaching of justification by faith and undermines the true gospel of grace. If we insist that we are justified by God’s grace in Christ, then it follows that we must affirm that we are condemned due to the guilt of another, namely, Adam.

Millard Erickson defends the theory of innocence as follows. He is ready to concede that Romans 5 teaches inherited guilt. Yet, he feels that children do not inherit Adam’s guilt until they commit their first personal transgression. In this way, they “approve” of their sinful nature inherited from Adam and thus become culpable both for their personal sin and for that of their father Adam.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Erickson’s approach is certainly creative, but boasts no support from Scripture. We read nowhere that people inherit guilt from Adam merely as a confirmation of their depraved human nature. In addition, if depravity and mortality are transmitted to Adam’s offspring, then why not his guilt as well? Moreover, what sense is there in adding Adam’s guilt to children only at the point when they are already guilty of personal sin?

**2. Unilateral Application of Christ’s Redemptive Work**

The final and most probable theory, which is also found among Evangelicals, affirms that people do indeed inherit the guilt of Adam’s transgression and on that basis are born in a state of condemnation. Yet, in His mercy God delivers those who die in infancy from the eternal consequences of Adam’s sin, i.e., from condemnation. God unilaterally applies to such individuals the redemptive work of Jesus without the requirement for personal repentance and faith. Departed infants are guilty of Adam’s sin, but also forgiven through Christ’s blood.

So then, children are not in danger of condemnation until they commit their first personal sin. Children inherit the other aspects of original sin as well, namely depravity and mortality. Yet, their depravity is removed at the time of their premature death, and new birth is imparted to them.

We can note several advantages to this approach. Paul’s teaching on inherited guilt in Romans 5 is duly recognized. Moreover, we preserve the parallel between our union with Adam in condemnation and our union with Christ in righteousness. In addition, departed infants are saved not by their own innocence, but by the blood of Jesus.

We also find support in the observation that during His earthly ministry, Jesus displayed a positive attitude toward children: “Let the children alone, and do not hinder them from coming to Me; for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these” (Matt 19:14). The primary thrust of Jesus’ words here is that God’s kingdom belongs to those who have childlike faith. At the same time, we would be amiss to dismiss the literal application of His favor to little ones.

Matthew 18:14 contains a similar thought: “So it is not {the} will of your Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones perish.” We recognized, of course, that Jesus was referring primarily to children “of faith.” Nevertheless, Hamilton points out that Jesus said these words after He set a child before the disciples, which may indicate a direct application to small children as well.[[35]](#footnote-35) Kendrick concurs that, although Jesus was referring to “spiritual children,” He could also be including literal ones:

The persons that thus, as a class, typify the subjects of God’s spiritual kingdom cannot be in themselves objects of indifference to him, or be regarded otherwise than with intense interest.… The class that in its very nature thus shadows forth the brightest features of Christian excellence must be subjects of God’s special concern and care.[[36]](#footnote-36)

Additionally, to support the claim of universal infant salvation, we can cite 2 Samuel 12:23, where we read that David expected to see his departed infant after his death.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Hamilton advances still another convincing proof.[[38]](#footnote-38) He relates that God’s love for humanity is so great that He gave His only begotten Son to redeem the world. It stands to reason, then, that He will work to ensure the salvation of many souls, including departed infants. Moreover, according to Romans 5:19, “Through the obedience of the One the many will be made righteous.” God has already provided salvation in Christ for all humanity and can apply the benefits of Christ’s work to any individual He pleases.

In the case of infants, God does not require personal faith to obtain salvation. Hamilton argues,

Since the Scriptures are intended to be read and heard by those capable of such functions, it is to be expected that the usual statement of the way of salvation includes the requirement of faith on the part of reader or hearer, but this must not outlaw the possibility that God is free, on the just basis of a salvation complete in Christ, to save whom He will.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Moreover, based on Paul’s statement in Romans 3:24, “Being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,” Hamilton concludes, “Salvation is provided for every man in the work of Christ; God is free on that ground to save apart from any cause in the individual sinner; therefore God can justly save those who die in infancy.”[[40]](#footnote-40)

Strong adds the following argument: “As without personal act of theirs infants inherited corruption from Adam, so without personal act of theirs salvation is provided for them in Christ.”[[41]](#footnote-41) Strong also asserts,

The condition of salvation for adults is personal faith. Infants are incapable of fulfilling this condition. Since Christ has died for all, we have reason to believe that provision is made for their reception of Christ in some other way.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Even as early as the fifteenth century, at the Council of Constance John Gerson stated,

“God… has not so tied the mercy of his salvation to common laws and sacraments, but without prejudice to his law he can sanctify children not yet born, by the baptism of his grace or the power of the Holy Ghost.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

If some object that the Bible requires faith for salvation, we can safely assume that faith is the *conventional* requirement for salvation, but not the *absolute* requirement. God is free to apply salvation unilaterally, if He so desires. If others object that God will not save infants against their will, we may respond that He does not save them *against* their will, but *regardless* of their will.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Warfield objects that if God unilaterally cancels the inherited guilt of infants, then why do the other effects of the fall still remain, i.e., depravity and mortality?[[45]](#footnote-45) We respond that God does not revoke any of the consequences of the Fall until the moment of infant death.

Warfield also argues that if Arminians are ready to accept that God unconditionally saves departed infants, then why do they reject the Calvinistic teaching of God’s unconditional election of adults?[[46]](#footnote-46) God saving departed infants in no way excludes others from salvation. The Calvinistic view of predestination, though, involves the exclusion of the non-elect from salvation. God accepts departed infants unconditionally, since they have no opportunity to personally believe.

We may also apply this solution to those afflicted with psychological illness or mental retardation to the degree that they never mentally progress beyond the level of small children. Because of their inability to conceptualize their sinfulness or God’s plan of salvation, we affirm that God, in His mercy, forgives their sins by virtue of Christ’s death.

### F. Conclusions

Since the Bible does not give a specific answer to the question of the fate of departed infants, many various theories appeared in the course of church history. We have discussed:

1. the theory of limbo
2. the theory of universal opportunity
3. the agnostic theory
4. the salvation of infants of believing parents
5. the salvation of elect infants
6. the theory of innocence
7. the unilateral application of Christ’s redemptive work.

Based on our discussion of this topic, we conclude that the most plausible theory is the final one – the unilateral application of Christ’s redemptive work. It enjoys more biblical support and avoids certain theological complications that characterize the other theories.

1. Sanders J. No Other Name. – Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001. – P. 288. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Warfield B. B. Two studies in the history of doctrine : Augustine and the Pelagian controversy : the development of the doctrine of infant salvation. – New York: Christian Literature Company, 1897. – P. 144-145. Sanders adds that the Fathers often refrained from commenting on this theme (Sanders J. No Other Name. – Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001. – P. 291). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Warfield, p. 148. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Infants, Salvation of // Geisler N. L. Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999. – P. 360. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Moralium*, 9 in Warfield, p. 150. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Warfield, p. 151. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Sanders, p. 292. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Warfield, p. 149. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Geisler, p. 362-363. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. McGrath A. Christian Theology. – 4th ed. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2007. – P. 442; Warfield, 1897, p. 152. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ibid., p. 165. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Catholic Encyclopedia, v. 2, p. 266-267, in Hamilton A. H. The Doctrine of Infant Salvation // Bibliotheca Sacra. 1944. Vol. 101. P. 353. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Geisler, p. 365. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Catechism of the Catholic Church. № 1257. https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\_INDEX.HTM. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Catechism of the Catholic Church, № 1261. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Horton S. The Last Things // Horton S. M. Systematic Theology. – Rev. Ed. – BookMasters. Kindle Edition. – P.

    692. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Sanders, p. 197. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Strong A. H. Systematic Theology. – Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907. – P. 664. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Sanders, p. 296. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Warfield, p. 169. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Ibid., p. 168. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Sanders, p. 297. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Mueller J. T. Christian Dogmatics. – St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1934. – P. 498. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Warfield, p. 175-189. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Ibid., c. 191. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Sanders, p. 294-295, 300-301. Sanders notes that Zwingli so taught. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. *The Works of John Calvin*, 8.522 (Amsterdam edition) in Strong, p. 663. Yet, Warfield (p. 200) and Sanders challenge the claim that Calvin believed all departed infants were saved. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Hodge C. Systematic Theology. – Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1997. – V. 1. – P. 26-27 [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Clark D. K. Warfield, Infant Salvation, and the Logic of Calvinism // Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society. 1984. Vol. 27.4. P. 461-462. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Warfield, p. 222-223. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Ibid., p. 167. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Strong, p. 661. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Warfield, p. 229. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Erickson M. J. How Shall They Be Saved? – Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996. – P. 251-252. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Hamilton A. H. The Doctrine of Infant Salvation // Bibliotheca Sacra. 1945. Vol. 102. P. 108. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Strong, p. 661. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Sanders notes the following objections to these arguments. First, we do not know the ages of the children that Jesus blessed. In addition, possibly David simply meant that he would be with his child in death (Sanders, p. 289-290). Geisler claims, though, that David anticipated the resurrection from the dead (Geisler, p. 363). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Hamilton, v. 102, p. 105-107. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Ibid., p. 106-107. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Ibid. p. 107. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Strong, p. 662. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Warfield, p. 153. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Geisler, p. 364. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Warfield, p. 227. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Ibid., p. 222. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)