having a signification (quod significat) and not being a cause that makes a sacrament." Bellarmine says on Acts ii. 41, where we see that to be baptised is nothing else than to enter the Church: "Baptizari nihil esse aliud, quam ecclesiam intrare."—Controv. de Bap., lib. i., cap. 8.

From this, then, it appears that the *design* of Baptism, as administered in the Romish Church, is the same as that of Baptism with us, and as we believe it is laid down in Scripture and in our standards; and we must admit, that, in so far as it fulfils the proper end of Baptism, Romish Baptism is valid.

Indeed, to reject Romish Baptism because it teaches too much as to the design, would, if consistently carried out, necessitate the rejection of Baptism by the Church of England, strict Lutherans, and most of the Eastern Churches; as well as that of other Churches, which, holding too little as to the design of Baptism, maintain that it is a naked sign. But surely the most strenuous advocate for re-baptism will not go that length.

But let us next inquire, Is Baptism administered in the Church of Rome according to the ordinance of Christ? And here two points must be considered: 1st. The matter; 2nd. The form of Baptism.

Here observe, that this is the great question on which the validity of any ordinance, and particularly the ordinance of Baptism, depends. Is it Christ's ordinance? Is it administered according to his appointment? For being thus administered it has Christ's promise, "Lo I am with you," and so it is valid. We repeat it, *the validity of any Baptism may be determined by answering the question, "Was it administered according to the institution of Christ?"*

1. What is the matter of Baptism? Washing with water,—with nothing but water? Is this, then, the matter of Romish Baptism? Let Dens speak for his Church: "What is the matter of Baptism? Est omnis et sola aqua naturalis, seu elementaris. It is *wholly and only natural or plain water.* What kind of water may be used in Baptism? Sea-water, rain-water, water from a spring or river, or mineral water; whether muddy or clear, cold or warm, blessed or not blessed. On the contrary, Baptism cannot be administered with clay, or mire, or ale, or milk, or oil, or spittle, or sweat, or tears." This is plain language, and Romish Baptism is evidently right as regards the matter of it.

But, we are told, the rite is corrupted. The sign of the cross, anointing, application of a spittle, tasting of salt, &c., are introduced into the simple ordinance, so that it is destroyed. That these and many other such vain ceremonies accompany the administration of Baptism, we admit; but that they enter into the nature of Baptism, or form part of it, we deny. Even their own theologians distinguish, and speak of certain ceremonies which go before, certain which accompany, and certain which follow. But they are not Baptism: Baptism is the washing with water alone.

2. What is the form of Baptism? "Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"—such is Christ's commission. The use of this formula forms part of the sacrament. Augustine says, "Baptism is the washing with water by the Word; take away the water, it is not Baptism; take away the Word, it is not Baptism." This formula of institution, when applied to the person baptised, implies a solemn recognition of the authority of God in the ordinance; of the salvation of God as the work of the glorious Trinity; and of obligation lying on the recipient to serve God as Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. It is thus essential to baptise in the name of the Triune God.

For this reason we unhesitatingly reject, as all the Reformers and most of the Christian Fathers did, the baptism of heretics who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, such as modern Unitarians; because there cannot be in such baptism a