

government to insist upon the hanging of Achmed Agha, Fassoun Bey, Chelket Pacha, and another Achmed Agha; the disarming of the Mussulman population; the rebuilding of the burned villages at the Government expense, and payment for the stolen cattle. But the execution of these measures cannot be left to the Turkish authorities. He will therefore propose the appointment of a Foreign Commission to see the measures executed.

The Greek Consul, who is not friendly to the Bulgarians, tells of 12,000 wretched women and children marched into Tatar Basandjik, nearly all of whom suffered the vilest outrages. He tells of Bulgarian fathers who killed their wives and children in order to put them out of the reach of the ferocity of the Bashi-Bazouks. The German officials tell me of the bodies of men cut up and flung to the dogs in villages near their own railway stations; of little children of both sexes maltreated and brutalized until they died; of a priest whose wife and children were outraged and slaughtered before his eyes, and who was then put to death after the most fearful torture, the details of which are too abominable to be re-told.

But it has been said that the Bulgarians set the example of committing atrocities, and even Lord Derby, upon the authority of Sir Henry Elliott, made the statement before the house, that both sides had been equally guilty in this respect:—"It might be interesting to know where Sir Henry Elliott obtained his information. The English Government had no agent here capable of sending information until the arrival of Mr. Baring. He could not have obtained it from the Turkish Government, for the reason that even the Turkish authorities do not claim more than 500 Turks killed altogether, of whom the greater part they admit were killed in battle, with arms in their hands."

A correspondent who accompanied Mr. Schuyler, of the United States Legation, to the town of Botok, in describing what he saw, says:—"We entered the town. On every side were skulls and skeletons charred among the ruins, or lying entire where they fell in their clothing. There were skeletons of girls and women with long brown hair hanging to the skulls. We approached the church. There these remains were more frequent, until the ground was literally covered with skeletons, skulls, and putrifying bodies in clothing. Between the church and the school there were heaps. The stench was fearful. We entered the churchyard, the sight was more dreadful. The whole churchyard for three feet deep was festering with dead bodies partly covered—hands, legs, arms, and heads projected in ghastly confusion. I saw many little hands, heads and feet of little children of three years of age, and girls covered with heads of beautiful hair. The church was still worse. The floor was covered with rotting bodies quite uncovered. I never imagined anything so fearful. There were 3,000 bodies in the churchyard and church. In the school, a fine building, 200 women and children had been burnt alive."

It is asked:—How long would the Christians nations have tolerated such barbarous outrages upon an unarmed and unoffending population, had they not become the money-lenders to this brutal power?

WHAT an awful thing for a man to know that there is not a perfection in God but excludes him from bliss!

WILLIAM TYNDALL, the early translator of the Bible, in Henry VIII's time, is to have a statue on the Thames embankment in 1876. He got a stake in Flanders in 1536.

### THE LATE MRS. NEWBURN.

EXTRACT FROM A SERMON PREACHED IN ST. JOHN'S, STAMFORD, ON SUNDAY, SEPT. 3RD—THE 1ST AFTER THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE MRS. NEWBURN.

"I cannot omit to notice more particularly than usual, a bereavement which has befallen this congregation. We have to mourn the loss of one, who, from her long residence in the neighborhood, as well as from her urbanity of manner, entire Christian deportment, singleness of mind, meekness and gentleness of spirit, was endeared to each and every one of us. For nearly thirty years, Mrs. Newburn had more or less control of the musical portion of the services held in this part of the Parish. For nearly the same period she kept together a flourishing Sunday-school; and always endeavored to work for, and in conjunction with, the Rector in maintaining the religious services, and every good work in connection with St. John's Church; and it was not until compelled by natural infirmity that she ceased to take her part in whatever there was to do, that could be deputed to the Lay portion of the community. And even then, when it fell to younger hands to take her place in the active discharge of these duties, she continued to be looked upon as a controlling influence. Her house has, from the earliest days of her residence in Stamford, been the home of the clergy; where she, with her late affectionate and devoted husband, and the other members of her household, always welcomed the Priest of God. And I personally may say that now for nearly twenty-eight years I have had free access thereto, and have invariably found our dear departed friend the same in manner; and nothing appeared to ruffle her quiet unobtrusive disposition. May we not in some measure attribute her great longevity to the evenness of her temperament, which, under God, was the cause of her comfort and peace in her declining years. To her, 'to live was Christ,' and as she more than once said to me, while she could wish to have a longer time granted her for preparation for eternity, yet she felt 'to die would be gain.' Her Christian charity was very great; and, while she held closely to her own Church, as a pure branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and believed that ordinary grace only flowed through her blessed ordinances to those who faithfully partook thereof, and while she felt that those who walked not with us were without that which was necessary for the faithful disciple of Christ, yet she knew that God could and would show mercy to all those who lived up to the light that was in them, believing, as she did, that salvation would be attained by all those who 'loved our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' Brethren, our dear departed sister, after a sojourn in this place of nearly forty years, at the advanced age of ninety, as a shock of corn ripe for the harvest, has gone to her 'rest.' 'Her works do follow her.'—'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord.'—'She rests from her labours.'—Oh, may we who are left imitate her bright example! . . . Let us each pray that our faith in Christ may be ever a living faith, shining more and more unto the perfect day. Brethren, we cannot for a moment doubt that the soul of our departed sister is now in Paradise, awaiting the joyful resurrection when her soul and body shall be again united, and she shall arise to receive her full reward and be ever with the Lord. May we all now daily rise to newness of life, so that we 'with all those who are departed in the true faith of His holy name, may, through Christ, have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul.'"

### BAPTISM, ITS MODE, SUBJECTS, AND GRACE.

BY J. WALWORTH DAVIS, CURATE OF CAVAN.  
(Continued.)

The next point is the mode of administering this sacrament, whether it is only dipping, or whether pouring is equally baptism with dipping.

And on this point I start at once by showing how far we and the Anabaptists are agreed, and how far we differ. By reference to the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, it will be seen that the Church of England commands dipping, but in the case of sickly children permits pouring. The rubric for the baptism of those of riper years, leaves it optional in all cases either to dip or pour. We fully admit that the ancient mode of baptism was by immersion, as our Lord was baptized in Jordan, and St. Philip when he baptized the Eunuch went down into the water with him. But we deny that the essence of the sacrament lies in the mode of its administration; it rather lies in the use of water and the proper form of words, and so long as water be used in the name of the Holy Trinity, we hold it a matter of secondary importance whether the infant be immersed or poured on.

It hardly seems probable that S. Peter immersed the 3000 on the day of Pentecost, or that Cornelius who was baptized in his own house was immersed, or that the Philipian jailer and his family, who were baptized in a prison in the middle of the night, were immersed. In a country like Palestine where water is scarce, it would have been difficult to procure enough to baptize 3000 people, and very unlikely that there would have been sufficient water ready in the house of Cornelius. Or that there was either enough water or proper convenience for dipping the jailer and his family in the prison. However this may have been, the use of the baptism by affusion of water is very ancient. Nor can we admit that the word baptize invariably means dip; there are many cases in which it cannot have that meaning. The Anabaptists are very fond of appealing to Lexicons and Classical authors in proof of the undoubted fact that the primary meaning of the word baptize is to dip, but they might have saved themselves the trouble. We might grant that the primary meaning is to dip, but we should contend that the word has also secondary meanings, and that it is used in some connections when it would be impossible to render it by *dip*, without making the whole passage ridiculous.

About 800 years B.C., a translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew into Greek, was made by direction of Ptolemy Philadelphus, at Alexandria, for the use of foreign born Jews and Proselytes. It was the work of 70 or 72 learned men, who formed a college in the Isle of Pharos, near to Alexandria, and from the number of men employed in the work was called the Septuagint. A few examples from this version will serve to show that this word cannot always mean dip. It is used in the sense of to dye. Now the ancient way of dyeing was not by dipping, but by laying on of the colours with a brush, or by sprinkling them over the fabric, as in stencilling. The case of Naaman, 2 Kings, v. 14, affords an illustration of the use of this word. The English version says he dipped himself seven times in Jordan, the Septuagint reads he baptized himself. Now the 10, 12, and 13 verses speak of his act by another word, which is translated, wash, therefore the dipping in verse 14 is equivalent to the washing of v. v. 10, 12 and 13. The leprosy of Naaman was local not universal. Compare verse 11. What need therefore for a total immersion; is it not