

like the Roman, have both an ecclesiastical and a vulgar tongue. In that of Abyssinia, the Ethiopic is the ecclesiastical, and the Amharic the vulgar. In the Syrian churches of Mesopotamia and of Malabar, or wherever else there may be Syrian churches, the Syriac is the ecclesiastical tongue—while in Mesopotamia, the vulgar is the Arabic; and, in Malabar, it is the Malayalim; and, elsewhere, it is the vernacular language of the country. Among the Copts in Egypt, the Coptic is the church language, but the Arabic that of the people. In the Greek church, the ancient Greek is still used in the offices, and the Old Testament read in the version of the Septuagint, and the New in the original text—while Romaic, or modern Greek, Arabic, or Turkish, is spoken by the people. In the Armenian church, the scriptures are read in a language but ill understood by the people—and this is the case in the Russian church.”*

Mr. Crawley's reference to the plurality of *biblical translations*, that render *baptizo* immerse, suggests a strong collateral argument, derived from the purest source of that species now extant, strongly opposed to Immersionists. Waving at present the institution of any minute inquiry, into the practice of the ancient church, *subsequent* to the days of the *Apostolical* fathers, in relation to the mode of baptism,—it is abundantly sufficient for our present purpose, to observe, that *to the highest point* to which authentic history traces immersion, it attests the shameful and humiliating fact that the candidates received the ordinance (*in puris naturalibus*,) naked! and that greater importance was attached to *no one circumstance* connected with the rite, than that the recipient should be thus stripped, in order to its performance. *In some cases* those fathers, who have been often triumphantly referred to, as preserving the Apostolic mode, *would* dispense with the subjects being immersed or bathed, but *never*, with *his* or *her* being naked, because they thought, (in perfect accordance with Apostolic sentiment and usage of course,) that, as Wall remarks, in his history of Baptism, “it better represented the putting off the old man, and also the nakedness of Christ upon the cross; moreover as baptism is washing, they judged it should be the washing of the *body*, not of the *clothes*.” This is the *result* of the testimony;—the details which fully illustrate this matter, will be exhibited hereafter. In the mean time I merely allude to it, to show, that immersion can no more be evinced, from the practice of all antiquity upon which authorised history throws any light, to have been the Apostolic

* Eighteenth Rep. of the Church Miss. Soc.