

who had dared to transfer the obnoxious thing from the outside to the inside of the church, would require for their protection a better defence than the logic of the schoolmen, or the liberal opinions of the moderns. Nor would the Cathari spend time in inquiring whether the thing that has so offended them underwent any change in its nature by changing its position.—It is enough that it is now found in the inside of the church. On the top of the spire it was regarded with indifference—on the top of the pulpit it is viewed with intolerable aversion, and out it is thrown with becoming Christian indignation.

Now, were we standing by, we should say, this is right—this is a piece of church reform—out with it—smash it—burn it—it ought not to be there. Papists may call this impiety. High Churchmen may sneer at it, and if they choose, call it the wicked fanaticism of Knox. While those who pretend to liberal views may hint, that a cross can do no more harm on the top of a pulpit than on the church spire. This may be true; but our question is, why should it be on either—what have Protestant churches to do with crosses? For is a cross not the same thing, to all intents and purposes, whether placed on the summit of a mountain or above the altar in a cathedral? The Papist thinks it the same sacred thing—a thing to be adored wherever it is seen. In this he is consistent. The views we hold are widely different from this; and our views are also consistent; for we regard it as a mere piece of wood, yet withal very wise ironous; and even when gilded, or were it solid gold, we have no reverence for it, but hate the very sight of it wherever it is seen, but never so intensely as when we happen to see it in Protestant places of worship. Let it not be inferred that crosses are frequently seen on Presbyterian churches. Indeed, we do not know a single Presbyterian church in the province that has a cross on it. We wish we could say the same thing regarding all Presbyterian places of worship in other parts of the world. Yet we are not aware that the thing is very common with our denomination in any country. With the Episcopal church, nothing is more common. And we perceive, in this province, the custom we are reprehending is obtaining countenance, or rather, we should say, is giving countenance to others from a very high quarter. We were truly grieved, when lately in the city, to see that the splendid Episcopal cathedral desecrated by a flaming gilded cross placed on the top of the spire. We do not take upon us to say what the motives were of those

who put up that cross. But we repeat, to us it would not be more offensive had it been placed in any part of the inside of the building.—The thing is the same wherever it is placed.—Protestants ought not to have crosses in their places of worship. Conventional authority is in all cases something, and in many cases it is much. Now, by conventional authority—and all the world knows this—the cross is the *sign of the beast*, the *armorial bearings* of Popish Rome. Surely all good Protestants ought to avoid the *badge* of that corrupt and persecuting church. And this will be done by all who are sincere in the *grand protest* that has been made.

It is true, that those who are but partially Protestant in their hearts will see little harm, and possibly some good, in crosses in churches. If they have leanings to Popery, they may find this a suitable way of expressing their affection. We do fear this, in many cases, is the true explanation of the matter. Without any reference to individuals, may we not suppose, that the cross on a Protestant church is used, not unfrequently, as a sort of telegraph by which a communication is delicately kept up with the Old Lady of the Seven Hills. May she not in this way be informed, that although some of her children have departed far, very far, from her maternal care, still they have not forgotten *all* the lessons she has taught them, and in good time may yet—return. This telegraphic power of the cross may do more than the simple are aware of. But the thing may work in another way. Suppose a poor ignorant Papist, who hardly knows anything more of his religion than to make the sign of the cross, and who regards it with reverence when he sees it, such a man cannot but look with some degree of respect at Protestant places of worship on which the object is placed, and must surely look upon such Protestants as not very far from the *true faith*, and no very bad heretics, at least, not nearly so bad as those who have no crosses on their churches. How far this may tend to confirm the man in his errors, will depend upon circumstances which we do not stop to notice. This, however, seems plain, that it may afford no small consolation to the Papist, if he ever needs such consolation, that he is so much safer, who has the whole of the spiritual apparatus at his service, than those who have only a part.—But then, in the eyes of many, it is a main part. Let those who choose, talk of the sister church of Rome, and put up the symbol of relationship—we repudiate both the language and the sign, and in this case, the thing signified. Yet symbols tend more to union than the simple