

and (as you know) on Easter day, it was carried for the first time.

So you see, I, the Rector of the Parish, and I alone, am the responsible person, from first to last, in this matter. There has been no wire-pulling; no underhand influence at work (as some have hinted) connected with it, from beginning to end.

I sincerely wish, my friends, that anything I could say might disarm the prejudices of those who, so strangely dislike the symbol of our Redemption. I fear, however, it would be useless to attempt it, and to such I am not now, chiefly, addressing myself. I speak mainly to those who may have been at all disquieted by the foolish and reckless statements which have been used (as I firmly believe) for no other purpose than, wantonly, to stir up strife. Certainly, I never anticipated such a disturbance as has been made,—not, I mean, by you,—about so harmless, nay, so edifying a symbol. For it seems to me that the Cross, borne on high, should naturally head all our processions; to the font, or the altar, the wedding or the funeral. We have lived down the prejudice that crosses in our cemeteries, or on our churches, are distinctive of any party—much less of Romanism—why should we not use them in all our church processions?

If you, my friends, have not got over your pious horror of a cross carried with the choir, why how can you sit comfortably in a church, where there is one of metal on the altar; and another of wood, on the chancel screen?

And if the cross offends you, what would you put into its place? I can think of nothing. A staff with a silver knob (such as I have seen) is meaningless. We used to have a brass verge (surmounted by a fleur-de-lys) carried by a verger, which we discontinued on account of its want of meaning. The Bishop has a silver mitre carried before him in the Cathedral; that would be manifestly unsuitable for a parish Church.