

do we read so of Cornelius in Acts x; nor of the jailor baptized near midnight, in Acts xvi. But In Acts viii, 35-39, we read of the Enoch's ~~going~~ *going into* the water. *Into* does not mean *under*. May a person not go *into* the water without being immersed? Moreover the same word which is translated *into* in Acts viii, 38, is translated *unto* in both St. Matthew xxii, 4, and St. John xi, 31.

It must be plain to every unprejudiced person that restricting to one mode or one age the blessings of a Sacrament, made "generally necessary" to Salvation by Jesus Christ is "watering down" His wide, world-embracing covenant to a greater thinness than that of the Mosaic dispensation. For when God first established His Church on earth, he decided for reasons which it does not become us to question, that His Church should be composed of *adults* and *infants*. By His explicit command little children at the age of eight days (*Gen.* xvii, 12) were to be made members of His Church (*Acts* vii, 38) by receiving the Seal of the Covenant. Are these things so? Search and see. To say that an unconscious child is not a fit subject for membership in the Church of the living God is to accuse the Almighty of folly. The idea of infant membership was not a *suggestion* of Abraham, but a *command* from God.

It may be objected that Christ came to do away with the Mosaic dispensation and all that pertained to it. If we grant this (though He was to do away with it by absorption and improvement, not by annihilation), the claim of this argument is not long enough to reach *Infant* Baptism, for the Church membership of infants was not *Mosaic* but *Abrahamic*, a covenant older than the birth of Moses by 300 years.

Brethren, let us remember, whether our Baptism be ~~infant~~ or adult, by immersion or affusion, that in Baptism we are