

good undertaking. Every one of our missions in Asia needs reinforcements; some of them are positively suffering for the want of them. If help be not sent speedily, the most serious consequences may be apprehended in the loss of past labors and the extinction of missions. Young men are offering themselves for the service, and shall not the means be furnished for sending them forth? Does not the Lord of the harvest expect of you a thank offering this year?

In behalf of the Executive Committee, I am yours fraternally, J. G. WARREN, Cor Secretary. MISSIONARY ROOMS, 12 Bedford st., Boston, June, 1863.

The following are items of intelligence from the same periodical.

PROME.

Mr. Kincaid reports, March 3, that he had recently been visiting in the districts south and east of Promé. A number of Karen converts came from a distance of ten or fifteen miles to attend the meetings, which, continued for two days, and were closed with the Lord's Supper. From a point still further south a messenger came from a place forty miles distant, asking that an ordained minister might come and baptize two or three converts. Worship had been established there by a convert from Enma. Twenty have been baptized as the result of the labors of young Karen preachers sent from Basscin, and supported by the Basscin churches.

Three assistants, Burman, Karen and Kyen, were about to set off on a preaching tour across the plains and into the mountains, expecting to be absent five or six weeks. They were provided with books and medicine.

During the months of January and February, two large meetings were held in Enma and Promé; and 20 Karens, 61 Burmans and 3 Kyens were baptized.

CHINA.

Tie Chiu Mission.—Mr. Johnston, March 3, gives the gratifying intelligence that a work of God seems to have commenced in a new place—Chiang Line. Three women from that region have been baptized,—one, the wife of a man previously baptized, the other two, widows. There are other applicants for baptism, and it is hoped that a church will soon be established in that region.

BURMAH.

More Shans Baptized.—Mr. Bixby, of the Mission to the Shans, communicates the encouraging fact that the work of grace still advances among the Shans. His letter is dated Jan. 16, 1863.

The new year comes in auspiciously. The first week seven were baptized, five of whom were Shans, and there are now before me several candidates, two of whom are women, the first female converts from among the Shans. Nearly all I have baptized are heads of families, who will bring many more under gospel influence. In two instances only have both husband and wife been baptized. Most of these Shan disciples belong to a village two miles out, where my Shan teacher resides and the work of grace there is of such a nature as to make a chapel necessary immediately; the work is now going forward, and we hope to open it for preaching next Lord's day.

EFFECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Mr. Thomas, of the Henthada Mission, has recently visited Thongzai, the region made fruitful and pleasant by the blessing of God on the labors of Mrs. Ingalls. He writes as follows:

Thongzai is only a day's march from Henthada, though a long day's walk. It is about four times as far from Rangoon.

Thongzai is not simply a village, but a region of country some ten miles square. It is a place of unusual beauty. There is a small river running through the place, the banks of which are adorned with villages—villages which can hardly be seen when at a small distance, for the houses are enveloped amid groves of mango and tamarind trees, while in the back ground are wide rice plains.

In passing through the little villages of Thongzai, one is impressed with the superiority of these houses to those of other villages in this country. Even the heathen inhabitants of these villages certainly appear far better than the most of heathen Burmans. This superiority may be owing, in part, to the presence of the missionary and his able preachers.

THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY.

The following letter from Dr. Wade announces the interesting fact that he has now been for forty years a missionary in Burmah.

Maulmain, Feb. 8, 1863.—When we first entered Burmah, we prayed earnestly that we might be permitted to labor for these dark degraded people ten years; and I begged that my sorrow in parting with beloved friends, country and civilized life, might be turned into joy by seeing my poor efforts blessed to the conversion of one soul. And now we look forward to June next, as the fortieth anniversary of our first sailing from Boston,—God having given us fourfold in length of days, and much more than the "hundred fold" in joy and rejoicing in our work.

Mr. Lechler, a German missionary, has at Hongkong five different places of worship, which are open on five days of the week. Mr. L. proposes to introduce the Roman alphabet into Chinese books; thus greatly facilitating the reading of the Scriptures, especially for women, who have not time to learn the national characters. The gospel of Matthew has appeared already in this character.

The natives of the various Christian churches in Ceylon have subscribed £100 for the relief of the distressed operatives in England, avowedly as a token of gratitude.

Colonial Bishops and Colonial Synods.

We have been favored with a copy of the Church Witness, the organ of the Episcopal Church in New Brunswick. It contains a full report of the recent judgment of the Judicial committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council in the case of the Rev. W. Long and the Bishop of Cape Town. As that judgement decides, by the highest authority, the question of Church Synods which recently excited so much attention in this province, we copy, by request, from that paper, the editors description of the case, and his editorial respecting the decision, for the information of our readers.

The following is a condensed view of the facts of the case:—

This was an appeal from the decision of the Court of the Cape of Good Hope in a suit between the appellant, the Rev. W. Long, claiming to be incumbent of the parish of Mowbray, in that colony, and the respondent, the Lord Bishop of Capetown. It appeared that the bishopric of Capetown was founded in 1847, when there were no ecclesiastical courts in the colony distinct from civil courts. Mr. Long had been previously officiating in the colony as a minister of the Church. He had at this time no other authority for discharging the duties of a minister in that Church than the Holy Orders which he had received from the Bishop of London, and the appointment of the Governor of the colony. He was ordained priest by the Bishop, and on being so ordained, took the usual oaths prescribed by the laws and usages in force in England, and among others the oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop. In the year 1856 the Bishop was of opinion that it would be desirable to convene a Synod of clergy and laymen; but Mr. Long and his parishioners were opposed to this measure, and they sent no delegate. In 1860 the Bishop convened a second Synod, to be held on the 17th of January, 1861. Mr. Long was of an opinion that the convening of this Synod without the authority either of the Crown or the local Legislature was an unlawful act, and he declined to take any steps for calling a meeting for the election of the delegates in his parish. In consequence of his acts, the Bishop, on the 8th of February, 1861, suspended the appellant from the cure of souls. Mr. Long considered the sentence to be a nullity, and continued to officiate as usual. He was afterwards cited to appear before the Bishop. Mr. Long declined to attend the summons, and on the 6th of March, 1861, the Bishop pronounced sentence of deprivation. Proceedings were then taken in the Supreme Court (of Cape Town) by Mr. Long and the church-wardens against the Bishop to try the validity of the sentences of suspension and deprivation. A majority of Judges below held that the defect of coercive jurisdiction under the letters patent had been supplied by the voluntary submission of Mr. Long, and that he was on that principle bound by the decision of the Bishop.

We would have been glad to have given the judgment of the Judicial Committee in extenso but the following editorial from the Church Witness contains the sum and substance of it, and will show how it is received by evangelical members of the Church of England generally, and in New Brunswick in particular.

"We published a week or so ago an abstract of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. W. Long and the Bishop of Capetown. We have since received a full report of it, and we have inserted it at length on our first page. It is a most important decision, for if the judgement of the Capetown Supreme Court had been sustained, Bishop Gray, and in fact all Colonial Bishops, would have possessed almost unlimited power in their respective dioceses, and their clergy would have been slaves. Thanks to the Lords of the Privy Council, the Colonial Church is delivered from this bondage. "It would have been in the last degree grievous," says an English contemporary, "if the tyrannical conduct of the Bishop of Capetown towards Mr. Long had been successfully vindicated, or if the extraordinary position laid down by the Supreme Court of the Colony had received the endorsement of the highest Court of the realm. It is hardly possible, indeed; to exaggerate the issues involved in the decree against which Mr. Long appealed. It swept away at a breath all the rights and privileges of members of the Church of England the instant they set foot within the colony. It amounted to this, that neither the Articles nor Formularies of the Church were necessarily binding in law on the Colonial Bishop and his clergy. The local Synod would have possessed the amplest liberty imaginable to alter, or add to, one or both of them without let or hindrance from the laws of England, ecclesiastical or civil. In fact, there would have been no limit to its power except such as might be self-imposed.— Happily, this state of things is not yet realized, and, for the present, members of the Church of England in the Colony have the satisfaction of knowing that they are not yet so entirely severed from the Mother Church as the Bishop would fain have made them.

"Nothing can be clearer than the judgment delivered by Lord Kingsdown in regard to the so-called acts and constitution of the Bishop's pet Synod. They are declared once for all to be illegal, and therefore destitute of all authority. The Synod is a mere voluntary assembly, without any power whatever to bind the ministers or members of the Church of England in the colony. The Bishop will now learn to his

cost that the doubts which he entertained ten or eleven years ago of the legality of a Colonial Church Synod, in the absence of a legislative imprimatur, were much better founded than he has since imagined, and that it was an evil day for him when, in his ambitious aspirations after an independent Church in South Africa, he allowed first thoughts to give place to second.— Mr. Long repudiated the Synod from the first, declined to attend its meetings or to call his congregation together for the election of a delegate expressly on the ground that it was an irresponsible and unauthorized body, and that its assumption of legislative power was illegal. The Judicial Committee has sustained him in his acts, and has pronounced the entire proceedings of the Bishop's Court, which first suspended and then deprived him, unwarrantable and illegal. He is therefore still Incumbent of Mowbray, the Bishop being mulcted in the costs both of the original suit and of the appeal to Her Majesty in Council.

"Again, nothing can be clearer than the definition given by the Judicial Committee of the canonical obedience which is due from a clergyman to his Bishop. This is a question which was gravely debated not long since in Convocation, and elicited a curious divergence of opinion from the Bishops present. The Bishop of Capetown, indeed, in his arbitrary proceedings against Mr. Long, laid marked stress on the Bishop of Oxford's published statements on the subject, not only reading them to that gentleman as a part of the "godly admonitions" which he administered with such vigour in the vestry of the Cathedral, but also quoting them in his legal argument for the special edification and direction of the Supreme Court. Alas for him, he was learning on a broken reed. The Bishop of Oxford, with all his learning ecclesiastical, is proved to be an unsafe guide. His favourite dogmas on the subject of canonical obedience are exploded, and the clergy may be thankful they are so, for they went far to countenance almost any amount of petty tyranny. According to the dictum now laid down by authority—a dictum not limited, be it remembered, to the circumstances of the Colonial Church, but of universal application in the Church of England—the oath of canonical obedience to a Bishop binds the clergyman to obey, not commands against which no enactment can be alleged to exist, but only those which are positively authorized by law. It is not sufficient for the Bishop to show that there is no law against his monitions, the onus lies on him to prove that the law distinctly sanctions them.— Thus is overturned at a stroke the stately fabric of autocratical power which Bishop Gray has been constructing with such persevering labour ever since he was appointed to the diocese of Capetown. The overbearing and unchristian conduct of which Mr. Long was the object has recoiled, with signal and deserved retribution, on the Bishop himself. The Episcopal jurisdiction and authority are regulated and limited on every side, and if a Bishop attempt to overpass these limits, as Bishop Gray has done, the law will protect the clergyman who refuses obedience to an edict which his diocese had no authority to issue. We do not care to enter into the question which was raised on the validity and value of the Letters Patent constituting the See, nor is it necessary to inquire who is to blame for the ambiguities which afforded the Bishop such a plausible excuse for his arbitrary proceedings. It is enough that, while on the one hand Episcopal jurisdiction is recognised and admitted over the clergy in the colony who accept the Episcopal licence and voluntarily submit to the Bishop's authority, no clergyman can be suspended or deprived except for lawful reasons, i. e., reasons which the law expressly sanctions. Mr. Long deserves all credit for the perseverance with which he has vindicated the rights of the colonial clergy, and resisted the attempt to impose a Synodical yoke upon them, unknown to their English brethren, and unrecognised by the laws of the realm."

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

The Lord's Supper a Church-ordinance.

MR. EDITOR,—

On two or three occasions, of late, I have been painfully convinced that some professed Baptists do not clearly understand the nature and proper application of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.

The error that I have met with in connection with this subject, is, it is true, the apparently most difficult one to dispose of. It has respect to baptized (or immersed) believers found in Pedobaptist churches. Why not invite them to communion in our churches?

I believe the reasons against such an invitation are clear, and of no trifling importance; and would like to spend an hour or two, at the expense of your and your readers' patience, in an attempt to present them at length and in detail.—As, however, I might thus weary my readers, and, besides, find myself this afternoon writing in necessary haste, will you allow space in the Messenger for a few extracts from authorities deserving much consideration? I shall quote chiefly from Arnold's "Scriptural Terms of Admission to the Lord's Supper"—a small work, as you are aware, recently written, and pronounced one of the best extant on this subject (albeit on

one half-page may be found essential statistical errors).

One would suppose that Baptists, who profess to rely exclusively on the New Testament for the model of Church-organization and ordinances, all agree that Scriptural baptism and Church-membership should always precede the Communion. Yet I have recently discovered a few who seem not established on that point.—The following are emphatic Pedobaptist testimonials. Says Baxter:—"What man dare go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath a full current of both? Yet they that will admit members into the visible Church without baptism do so." Dr. Dwight: "It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance, that the candidate for Communion be a member of the visible Church of Christ in full standing. By this, I mean that he should be a person of piety; that he should have made a public profession of religion; and that he should have been baptized."

Dr. Griffin says: "We ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and of course are not Church-members, even if we regard them as Christians. There is such a relationship between the two ordinances, that I have no right to separate them; in other words, I have no right to send the sacred elements out of the church." To the same effect, Dr. Hibbard, "a recognized authority" among Methodists. "In fact," says Dr. Arnold, "there is hardly any point on which there has been a more unanimous agreement of all churches, ancient and modern, than on the one now under consideration."

Now, if such be the law and example of the New Testament, in regard to the order in which the Lord's Supper should be observed; if the New Testament, rather than the Old, is the standard for the Constitution and Ordinances of Christian Churches; and if, on its authority, the only proper visible Church or kingdom of Christ on Earth is a scripturally organized congregation of immersed or baptized believers—all which points Baptists hold, and not a few Pedobaptists confessedly believe, it appears to me the whole argument respecting the reception by Baptist Churches of individual members of other societies, baptized on profession of their faith, is here found in a nutshell. The sacred and spiritual ordinance of the Lord's Supper is to be administered only to those who have made a satisfactory avowal of personal christian discipleship, have, on such profession, been immersed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, with a view and expressly in order to a church-membership consistent in faith and practice.

The Lord's Supper is a church-ordinance, by which we mean that the New Testament authorizes its administration only within, and to a Christian Church in its collective capacity; and by a Christian Church, when spoken of in such a connection, we mean no other than a visible society of Christians organized after the New Testament model.

But says one, does not Paul say: "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread &c?" True, but he does not thus affirm that course to be, in his or Christ's view, the sole essential pre-requisite to admission to the Communion of the body and blood of the Divine and crucified Redeemer. He in truth addresses those words exclusively to members of a visible Christian Church. Perhaps another replies, What harm or injury would, after all, result from our inviting baptized members of pedobaptist Churches or Christian Societies to sit at the Communion Table with us? "These members of Pedobaptist Churches," remarks Dr. Arnold, "though themselves baptized, are actively promoting, by the influence of their example, those errors against which our duty to protest is the only charter of our right to exist as a denomination." Says Dr. Hovey: "In all ordinary cases the walk of those who have been baptized and yet connect themselves with pedobaptist Churches must be pronounced disorderly; for they give the weight of their example and influence to set aside one of the ordinances of Christ. They give aid and comfort, character and power, to those who walk disorderly, and must therefore be esteemed partakers in their sins.— This, we say, must be true in all ordinary circumstances." Dr. Arnold adds: "If we say that the individual, not the Church, is to be the judge of his qualification for the Communion, we adopt a principle which is contrary to sound reason, and fatal to the very ends for which the Church of Christ was constituted. For if the conscience of the individual is to be the rule of the action of the Church in regard to his admission to the Lord's Supper, why not also in regard to his regeneration, and his doctrinal belief, and his obedience to Christ's commands generally? If we say that the Church has no responsibility