

# The Church.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1847.

VOLUME X.—No. 27.]

## Poetry.

### DREAMLAND.

A lay, a lay, good Christians!  
I have a tale to tell,  
Though I have ne'er a palmer's staff,  
Nor has my scullcap shell;  
And though I never went astray,  
From this mine own countree,  
I'll tell what never gospel told  
That ever rode the sea.

A lay, a lay, good Christians!  
My boyish hap is faint  
To chaunt our Mother's loveliness,  
An eternal strain;

And true it is I never stayed  
Beside her careful hand,  
And yet my lay, good Christians,  
Is of a Holy Land.

In Dreamland once I saw a Church;  
A church in its streets—tower  
Above the sweet greenwood;  
And then I heard a Dreamland chime,  
Peal out from Dreamland tower,  
And saw how Dreamland Christian-folk  
Can keep the matin-hour.

And Dreamland Church was decent all,  
And green the churchyard round;

The Dreamland sections never keep  
Their kine in holy ground;

And not the twinkling cobell there  
The poet's walk becomes;

But where the dew in Christ repose,

The bells ring holy psalm.

And Dreamland folk do love their dead,  
For every mound I saw,

Had flowers, and wreaths, and garlands such

As painters love to draw!

I asked what seeds made such fair buds,

And—sorrows I trust my ears,

The Dreamland folk averted such things

Do only grow—tears.

And while I hung the graves around,

I heard the organ pour;

Was the only Christian man

Without that sacred door?

A rock by yon morn—but Church was full;

And felt the clashing choir,

For Dreamland music is for God,

And not for man and—life.

I saw the Dreamland minister

In snowy vestments pray;

He seems to think 'twas natural

That prayer was right the day;

And Dreamland folk responded loud

To blessings in God's name;

And the praises of the Lord,

They had no sense of shame!

And Dreamland folk, they knew them down

Right on the stony floor;

I saw they were uncivilized,

Nor knew how we adore;

And yet I taught them not, I own,

Our native curve refined,

For well I knew the picturesque

Scars suite the savage mind.

And Dreamland folks do lowly bow

To own that Christ is God,

And I confess I taught them not

The fashionable nod;

And Dreamland folks sing Gloria

At every anthem's close,

But save not learn'd its value yet

They stir them from a daze.

I saw a Dreamland babe baptized

With all the church to see,

And strange as 'twas—the blessed sight,

'Twas beautiful to me!

For many a voice cried Amen,

When o'er its streaming brain,

The pure cross was characterized,

To seal its Christian vowe.

I loved that Dreamland children all,

As though young sparrows averse

To Bishop's hands are duly brought,

To Eucharist and pray;

And Dreamland maid's wear snow-white veils

At confirmation hour;

For such, an old apostle wrote,

Should clothe their heads with power.

The Dreamland folk they wed in Church;

They deem the Lord is there,

And of old, in Galilee,

May bless a bridal pair;

And strange enough, simple ones,

They see in wedded love,

Sweet emblems of their Mother Church,

And Christ her Lord above.

I saw a Dreamland funeral

Come up the shadow'd way;

The Dreamland priest was surplice-clad

To meet us all,

As when his little flock drew nigh,

To give the dast their dead,

His voice went soothingly before,

As if a sleeped led.

In earth they laid the Dreamland man;

And in a chariot went he,

So sweet, so calm, so full belief,

I heard a voice from heaven:

And singing children o'er the grave

Like Cherubim clanging stood,

Pouring their angel lullabies,

To make its slumber good.

And Dreamland folk count seasons four

All winter into one!

'Tis Advent, Lent, or Easter-time,

Or Trinity begin;

The first is green as emerald,

The next of Cypress hue,

The third is glorious all as gold,

The fourth is sapphire-blue.

The Dreamland folk are simple ones!

Who know but these are they,

Described in ancient chronicle,

As Children of the Day!

They seemed no means of earth,

But more—a pilgrim band,

With no abiding city here,

Who seek a better land.

So ends my lay, good Christians;

And ye that gave me ear,

Confess that twas of Holy Land,

I beckoned you to hear:

Confess bring us to your bosom,

Unto our own countree!

And no more, good Christians,

Of Dreamland or of me.

### THE CHURCH AND THE ROMISH COMMUNION IN THE UNITED STATES.

(From Bishop Wibberforce's History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.)

True to the ordinary conduct of the papacy, the Roman pontiff founded the rival bishopric of Baltimore two years after the consecration of Bishop White and Provoost; and by the subsequent erection of the sees of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Beardstown, set up altar against altar through the West.

Thus the episcopal communion has always had to bear her protest against papal superstitions. But a severe strife is yet to be encountered. With the keen-eyed policy which has always distinguished the schemes of Rome, she has turned her main attention to the valley of the Mississippi. There a vast population is multiplying with unprecedented speed. The European emigrants to this quarter are, by a large majority, from papist countries; and if not already of the Romish faith, no pains are spared to make them so. There, on the outskirts of civilised life, the adventurous settler, having left behind him the forms and opportunities of Christian worship, seizes eagerly upon a soil of unbounded fertility, and devotes all his thoughts to making it his own; and there the enchanter meets him with her cup of sorcery, and wins

\* "At St. Louis the Jesuits have lately erected, in addition to their cathedral, a spacious church and a university, with a library of ten thousand volumes, towards which only about eight thousand dollars were raised at St. Louis, the remainder of the funds coming chiefly from Lyons."—Private Letter of the Rev. H. Caswell.

† M. de Tocqueville.

‡ Voice from America, by an American Gentleman, p. 161.

§ Where the King's Chapel now stands the See Bishopric of New England, in New England, was erected in 1679. It was built of wood, but was replaced in 1749 by a stone church, which cost little less than £10,000. It was distinguished by a succession of royal gifts. In 1679, communion-table was given to it by King William and Queen Mary; and in 1722 together gifts from Georges II. and III. Only eleven years after this, the first fatal step was openly taken, by the adoption of an altered liturgy, from which the Athanasian Creed and the opening sentences of the litany were formally excluded. From this time its descent has been rapid; and now, with a mutilated and heretical creed, it is an avowedly Socinian congregation."—From Dr. Greenwood's History of King's Chapel, quoted by Buckingham, vol. iii. p. 447.

\* There are serious difficulties affecting the regularity, and even the validity, of the ordination of the above-mentioned Carol, and all the authority of the United States derived from him, in consequence of his ordination having been performed by only one titular Bishop, who appears to have been bound under a similar irregularity and deficiency himself."

Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 305, note.

him over, whilst there is no other near to whisper to him words of caution, or to shame the fallen Church with open rebuke. No expense is grudged in this peculiar work; funds are supplied, without any limit, from the Leopold Society of Austria, and from the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the headquarters of which are fixed at Lyons.\* The population is becoming largely Romish; and this, beyond all doubt, is to be the future seat of empire. The best-informed Americans expect that, after one more struggle, the West will command the elections of the Union; and thus the center of power will have been forestalled by Rome. But even now, and without waiting this accomplishment, her power is not to be contended. Many peculiarities of life in America already tend to establish her dominion. The revolution of feeling, which ever drives men from one extreme to another, naturally leads those who have been wearied out by the fierce excitement of the various sects to seek for shelter in her delusive quietness. Her claim of infallibility seems to be a blessing to spirits which are utterly hopeless of finding out any truth amidst the conflicting claims of ten thousand contesting teachers; whilst by her doctrine of the sacraments, her practical management of penances, and her perilous medicine of enforced auricular confession, with its attendant absolution, she heals slightly the wounds of many a morbid and diseased conscience. The Romanists, moreover, have always known how to modify their doctrines and discipline, so as to turn to the best advantage the political circumstances of the country and the times. Thus, whilst under an absolute monarchy they are the greatest enemies of rational and lawful liberty, in republican America they are the most thoroughly democratic of all sects. At first sight it may be difficult to conceive how the popish discipline can be made to harmonise with an equalising democracy; but, upon looking more closely, it will be seen, as has been remarked by a keen observer of American society,† that Romanism is really most favourable to democracy; for that under its system "the religious community is composed of only two elements, the priest and the people. The priest alone rises above the rank of his people, and all are equal below him." Now know better than the adherents of the papacy how to profit by the state of society.—Already they have tasted the sweets of political power. "They have grown," we are told in 1839, "to an important political influence, by the acquisition of Louisiana and by emigration from Europe, so as to be capable of turning a vote for a national administration in whichever scale they cast their weight, in the present nearly equal balance of political parties. They are generally found on one side, namely the most thoroughly democratic and radical; and as that is at present the dominant party, it may be said that they govern the country so far as that they are the means of keeping in power the party to which they are attached."\*

A. Yes, certainly. Ethelbert gave him permission to land, and to preach in his realm. Even his place at Canterbury is a proof of the exercise of the royal power; for Ethelbert placed him at Canterbury (as being the *civil Metropolis* of his kingdom) and not at London, which Gregory had desired; and he endowed the Cathedral Churches of Canterbury, London, and Rochester, which were the only Episcopal Sees founded or restored in England in the life of Augustine.

Q. You therefore consider St. Augustine and his successors as occupying the place and as inheriting the rights of the ancient Metropolitans and Patriarchs of England, and succeeding to the privileges secured to them by the canons of the Church?

A. Yes; and since it cannot be pleaded that any act of a General or Provincial Council canonically done with the sovereign's consent has ever placed Britain in the patriarchate of Rome, in which it never was before the landing of Augustine, the Bishop of Rome's subsequent usurpation of the metropolitan and patriarchal rights of the English Primate, is an invasion of the Royal Prerogative, and an infraction of the Canons of the Universal Church, and a violation of the precept of Scripture concerning the removal of a neighbour's land-mark.

Q. And therefore the Patriarch of Rome cannot claim jurisdiction over the Patriarch of England, on the alleged ground of the mission and ordination of St. Augustine or any other?

A. No; all Patriarchs are independent of each other (p. 96); and with respect to this plea of ordination, the Bishop of Rome might as well have claimed jurisdiction over the Patriarch of Alexandria, and over the Bishops of his patriarchate, on the ground of St. Mark, the first Bishop of Alexandria, having been sent by Egypt to St. Peter, as over the Patriarch of England, (and such the Archbishop of Canterbury was acknowledged by Pope Urban II. to be,) and over his patriarchate, on the ground of the mission of St. Augustine by St. Gregory.

Q. Did the Pope obtain any Patriarchal authority by the ordination of St. Augustine, and of those who were ordained by him?

A. No. This plea is, under another form, the same as that of conversion, for that supposes an planting of a Church, and a Church supposes an ordained ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and, besides, as Britain had never been under the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction, but had been always governed by her own Bishops, the assertion of such authority on the part of the Popes of Rome is an infraction of the Canon of the General Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431); which Pope Gregory himself declared that he regarded, as he did the three other General Councils, with the highest veneration.

Q. What is the tenor of that Epistles Canon?

A. It is expressed as follows: "Rheginus and his fellow Bishops of the province of CYPRUS, Zeno and Evagrius, having brought under our notice an innovation against the laws of the Church and the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and affecting the liberty of all; This holy Synod, seeing that public disorders require greater remedies, inasmuch as they bring greater damage, decrees that, if no ancient custom has prevailed for the Bishop of Antioch to ordain in CYPRUS—as the depositions made to us attest there has—not—the Prelates of the Cyprian Churches shall, according to the decrees of the Holy Fathers and to ancient practice, exercise the right of ordaining in the said Churches unmeasured and inviolable. And the same rule shall be observed in all other dioceses and provinces whatsoever, so that no Bishop shall occupy another province which has not been subject to him from the beginning; and if he shall have made any such occupation or seizure, let him make restitution, lest the Canons of the Holy Fathers be transgressed; and lest under pretence of sacerdotal pride of power should creep in, and thus we should, by little and little, lose the liberty which the Liberator of all men, Jesus Christ, has purchased for us with His own blood."—By this right, which is called the *Jus CYPRUM*, the Church of England is independent of all foreign jurisdiction.

Q. What is the tenor of that of Ephesus?

A. It is expressed as follows: "Twinibus etiam et discipulis suis, quae sunt fratres, ut eis discipulis, et non ut frat