

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

# THE CROSS.



NEW

SERIES.

VOL. 3.

No. 16.

God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is Crucified to me, and I to the world.—St. Paul, Gal. vi. 14.

HALIFAX, APRIL 17, 1847.

## CALENDAR.

- APRIL 18—Sunday—II Sunday after Easter.  
19—Monday—St. Leo IX., P. C.  
20—Tuesday—St. Vincent Ferrer, C.  
21—Wednesday—St. Anselm, B. C. and Doct.  
22—Thursday—SS. Soter and Caus, Popes and Mart.  
23—Friday—St. George, M.  
24—Saturday—St. Fidelis of Sigmaringa, M.

## THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH.

“THE BIBLE ALONE IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS.”

We have addressed some questions to our opponents on this important subject, because, after all, the Rule of Faith is the Cardinal point upon which all minor controversies depend. If the Rule of Faith proposed by any Church be sound, it may be safely followed; but if this rule be obscure, doubtful, contradictory, and productive of all manner of conflicting creeds it cannot be that “royal way” spoken of by the Prophet, which is so plain and straight that “even fools cannot err therein.” Reason tells us that religion must be true, simple and indivisible; that if God has revealed his will to man, there cannot be two revelations contradicting each other; that the truth of God is always one and the same; that he could not have established two creeds, two religions, or two Churches, essentially different from each other; that he could not justly require the assent of his creatures to the truths or mysteries of faith, unless he had left them some means, some rule for ascertaining what that faith really is; that this rule must be one adapted to all times and places, and people; one equally applicable to the rich and poor the learned and the unlearned, the people who lived for fifteen centuries before the invention of printing, as well as those who have lived for three hundred years after it, to the poor man who cannot read, as well as to the abstruse philosopher. Now we say that the Protestant Rule has none of these properties. It is obscure; it is difficult; it has been, and is unattainable to millions: it does not lead to oneness of belief, to simplicity of faith; it has produced and must necessarily produce conflicting

creeds and opinions; it leads to diversity, and not to unity in religion. It excludes the poor man, and the ignorant man, and the man of weak capacity, it proscribes nearly sixty generations of the people of Christendom, from the time of the Apostles to the sixteenth century; it shuts out the countless millions who could not read, or could not comprehend the Bible, or who could not procure a copy of the Bible, no, not even one of the Gospels, because the excessive rarity and high price of the Scriptures for fifteen centuries, placed them far beyond the reach of the great bulk of mankind. It places on the shoulders of millions a task of enormous difficulty, and to which not one in a million is equal—to search, to examine, to collate, to compare, to deduce, to find satisfactory reasons for the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, for their integrity, for their accurate translation into the language in which he reads them, and above all, for his correct interpretation of them.

The Protestant Rule cannot be the Rule, for instead of humbling fallen man, it elates and puffs him up with notions of his own importance; it exalts his pride of understanding; it allows him “to think what he pleases, and to say what he thinks;” it teaches him to look upon himself as equal to the most wise and learned men on earth all put together, nay, as their superior, and authorises him to follow his own judgment in preference to theirs; it destroys all authority and levels all disjunctions, and instead of a living, speaking voice with power to decide and interpret, makes the dead letter of the most incomprehensible volume ever written, the rule of belief, and thus produces not only hundreds of different religions, but as many creeds as there are individuals who follow this rule.

We say that on this ground alone, the Protestant Rule cannot be the rule left by Christ. For, as faith is essential to salvation and as Faith can be but one, and undivided, the Rule of Faith must necessarily tend to that unity of Faith and Truth, or otherwise it would defeat its purpose, and become a rule of confusion contradiction and error. We maintain that the Protestant Rule has not only actually led to this confusion and disagreement in doctrine, has not only been most likely to produce disunion, but that it necessarily does so, and that in the nature of things i

could not produce *any thing else*, and that it will continue to create disunion, and separation, and contradiction of creeds, as long as it shall be applied. Suppose the Laws of the Land were published in one large volume, and mysteriously written, and that no Judges, or Magistrates, or Lawyers, were appointed to interpret or expound them, or to decide between those who expounded them differently, but that each subject was told to get a copy of the Laws, and read them for himself, and interpret them for himself, and regulate all his social and civil conduct according to his own interpretation, how long could society exist in peace? How would the rights of property be respected, or the duties of the subject performed, or the integrity of the social compact be preserved?

And yet, if we admit the Protestant Rule of Faith, we must own that Christ has acted with less wisdom and foresight than all human legislators—that though he wished to establish one Church, one Law, one common code of faith and morals, by which all his children should be united, and one, even as he and his Father are one, he established a Rule which defeats all his objects, which makes men even more divided than they were before his coming, and which in a word, considering the nature of man, renders all religious union impossible.

We beseech the enemies of the Church to ponder seriously on those things, and their common sense will tell them that a God of goodness and justice, a God who wills the salvation of all mankind, a God who died for all, a God who is no respecter of persons, a God who loves union, harmony, and peace, a God who descended from Heaven to bring Peace and Good will on earth, could not have been the author of such a Rule.

The questions which we have lately put on the authenticity and inspiration of the Bible, have as yet received no answer. One of the Journals indeed, tells us, that we are ourselves well acquainted with all the proofs in favour of the Bible, thereby insinuating that the Protestant and Catholic arguments are one and the same, on this point, and that they possess equal authority. We will never admit this. Our arguments in favour of the Scriptures and of our Religion deduced therefrom, are consistent and Catholic and capable of refuting all our adversaries, whether Christian, Jewish or Infidel. Not so with Protestant reasoning. It is the mantle of Catholicity stolen for an occasion. It is a Jackdaw in borrowed plumage: and therefore Protestantism should stand on its own merits, and not lean on Catholic support for the sustenance of its crazy creed. When you remove this adventitious aid, it tumbles to the ground:

—“Miserum est alienæ incumbere fame  
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tectâ columnis.”

We will now resume our questions on the Bible, the Protestant Rule of Faith:

Did not two of the Evangelists who were not Apostles write their Gospels from hearsay and tradition?\*

Why do we believe their testimony when they had not seen or witnessed the things which they relate?

How can any Protestant tell which books of Scripture, are canonical, and which not, on Protestant principles?

If it be easy to determine this question now, why was it so difficult in the early ages of the Church, and in the times next

\* “According as they have delivered them to us, who from the beginning were *eye witnesses* and ministers of the word.” Luke i. 2.

to the Apostles, during which the most learned of the Fathers doubted what was Scripture and what was not?

By what authority and on what Protestant grounds, does a Protestant receive the present canon of the English Bible?

In the times of early Christianity an Epistle was published said to be written by Christ himself to Abigaris, King of Edessa. Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical history tells us that he transcribed it from the public records of Edessa. (Lib. I. C. 13.) Count Darius alludes to it in a Letter to St. Augustine. St. Ephrem of Edessa quote it as universally received in his time (In Testam. Tom. II. 235.) Procopius, Evagrius, St. John Damasceno in Ancient times, and Dr. Cave, Bishop Montague Dr. Gravo and many other modern Protestant Divines admit its authenticity. Now we ask:

On what authority can any Protestant reject this Epistle from the Canon of the Scriptures?

How can they prove what is Scripture, and what is not, unless by their own judgment, or the testimony of others?

What satisfaction can their own private judgement give them in the great question that some Books are authentic and others not?

If they decide the question by the testimony of others what authority so strong as that of the Catholic Church, and how can they consistently appeal to her authority on this vital point?

If the Bible and nothing but the Bible was the sole rule of faith amongst the early Christians why did they not immediately get each part of the New Testament transcribed, after it was written, and together with the whole of the Old Testament distribute it amongst every body of the faithful?

Does Scripture itself give a list of all the inspired Books?

How can a reference from one Book of Scripture to another, prove that other to be inspired, when the Book in which the reference is made requires a proof of its own inspiration?

Baruch, Tobias, Judith, and Wisdom, are rejected by Protestants as Apocryphal, and why do they admit Micheas, Numbers or the Canticle of Canticles which contains not one word of God or Lord?

Are not the former books as remarkable as the latter for majesty of style, beauty of expression, and piety of feeling, and how is it possible for a Protestant to decide between them from internal evidence?

## “THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.”

“We now have the Editors of the Cross avowing that they have mutilated the Bible, and withheld from their people the knowledge of the Second Commandment.”

“The Romish Church has dared to say that God gave to Moses a commandment too much. . . . Again it seems that in the disposition of the ninth and tenth commandments, the all-wise giver of them did not pursue the proper course. The Church of Rome has taken upon herself to alter the arrangement of these also.”

We have extracted the above Protestant lies, from the columns of the Guardian, and we have done so for the purpose of stamping *falsehood* upon them. We request our readers to look back at what we have said in a former number on the lying Protestant objections about the Second Commandment, and we ask them is there *any truth* in the first sentence which we have quoted above? Did we ever avow that the Catholic Church mutilated the Bible, or kept from the people the knowledge of the second Commandment? Certainly not. What then are we to think of the cool assurance of the writer who asserts that we did! His impudent falsehood was not published for the benefit of Catholics, but for the deception of the readers of the Guar-

men, numbers of whom, he well knew, would never see the Cross, would have no opportunity of detecting the fraud, and would therefore swallow the lie with an easy credulity as a signal triumph of the Guardian over the Editors of the Cross.

To charge the "Roman Church" with saying that "God gave to Moses a commandment too much" is another Protestant lie of the same stamp. The Roman Church never said any such thing. The exact distribution of the Ten Commandments is not stated in Scripture itself. All we know is that that they were Ten, and on two Tables, but we cannot precisely determine what commandments were on one and the other, or how much of the sacred text formed each commandment. The Bible was not originally divided into chapters and verses, nor were the commandments numbered in such a manner that we could specify from the text where the precept begins, and where it ends. The division of the Commandments, which, after all, is a matter of inferior importance, has been made by the Church. St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome, divide the Ten Commandments into two parts. The first three which prescribed the worship of God, and the sanctification of his Sabbath, were according to them written on the first Tablet of Stone—and on the other were engraved the remaining seven which prescribe the duty of men to each other. Origen assigned four to the first table, and six to the second. We will now print the beginning of the Commandments according to the Catholic and the present Protestant division in order to shew more fully the absurdity of this outcry about the mutilation of the second Commandment.

First Commandment according to the Catholic division :

(I.) Thou shalt not have strange Gods in my sight. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any things that are in heaven above, or that are in the earth beneath or that abide in the waters or under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, and thou shalt not serve them. For I am the Lord thy God, a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon their children unto the third and fourth generation to them that hate me. And shewing mercy unto many thousands to them that love me, and keep my commandments.

First and second Commandment according to the present Protestant division.

(I.) Thou shalt have none other Gods but me.

(II.) Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them ; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shew mercy unto thousands in them that love me and keep my commandments.

Where we ask is the difference, or the mutilation here? Is not the whole substance of the two Protestant Commandments contained in our first? The numerals (I) and (I) and (II) are no part of the Scripture, and whether the same words have one or two numerals prefixed, their sense is not changed thereby.—Now we challenge our opponents to produce any copy of the Bible published in the Catholic Church from which any part of the above First Commandment is excluded. And if there be no omission of this kind, what becomes of the unfounded charge?

We will now turn the tables on our adversaries and accuse them of having changed the division of the Commandments since the Reformation. We termed their division of the First Commandment into two, the present Protestant division. We

did so, not without reason ; and although this question of the division of the Commandments, as we have said before, one of comparatively minor importance, we must enlighten the "Protestant ignorance" of our opponents by informing them that the Catholic mode of dividing the Commandments was observed throughout all Christendom before the Reformation itself, and that the Protestant division is by no means coeval with the change of religion. This latter assertion we shall prove on the authority of no less a personage than Cranmer himself, whose "noble example" has been so lately held up for our imitation. We will first quote from a rare work called *Dives et Pauper* from the press of the celebrated Wynkin de Worde, whose contents are explained at the end in these words—

"Here endeth a compendyouse treatyse dialooge of Dives and Pauper. That is to say, the ryche and the poore

"treatyge upon the X commaundementes, synnyshed the iij daye of Decembre. The yere of our lorde god M.CCC.LXXXVI. Empryntyd by me Wynkynde Worde at Westmoustre.

Deo Gracias."

Let us now see how the first and second Commandments are enumerated :

"Here begynneth the fyrste comaundmente *Dives*. In the fyrste comaundmente as I have lerned God sayth thus: Thou shalt have none other straunge goddes before me. Thou shalt make to the noo graven thyngge, noo maymeth, noo lykennesse that is in hoven above, ne that is hynethe in erthe, ne of ony thyngge that is in the water under therthe. Thou shalt not worship them with thy bodye outwarde, ne within thy herte inward." (Here follows an explanation of the commandment, after which he goes on.) "In the seconde comaundment god byddeth that we shoulde not take his name in vayne, for who so doth, shall be gylyt and shall not passe unpunysshed.

We shall next consider the division of the Commandments many years after the Catholic faith had been expelled, even in the palmy days of Protestantism, when

"Love first taught a monarch to be wise  
And gospel light first beawed from Boleyn's eyes."

We quote from a book "Imprinted at London in Flete street, by Robert Redman," and entitled "A playne and godly exposition or declaration of the comune Credo (which in the Latyn tonge is called Symbolum Apostolorum) and of the X commaundementes of godies law, &c., at the requeste of the moste honorable lorde, Thomas, Erle of Wyltshyre, father to the most gracious and vertuous (!) Queene Anne, wyfe to our moste gracious soverayne lorde Kyng Henry the viij cum privilegio."

"The fyrste. The fyrste precepte there is this comaundement. Thou shalt not have any strange Goddes in my syght thou shalt not make the any graven ymage, nor any maner, stilitude or likenes, which is in the firmament above, or which is in the erthe benethe, neyther of those thynges whiche are in the waters under the earth."

"The second precept. Thou shalt not take the name of god in vayne."

So far for Henry VIII and his pretended wife and daughter Anne Boleyn and her reputed father Sir Thomas Boleyn. We now come to the notorious Cranmer himself, and we shall find not only that he abridged the commandments "for the singular commoditie and prosper of the childre and yong people" but that his two first commandments are divided exactly according to the Catholic enumeration,

" 1548. These are the holy commandments of the Lord our God.

"The firste,

"I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have none other Goddes but me.

"The seconde,

"Thou shalt not take the name, &c.

.....

"The mynthe, 1

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house.

"The tenth,

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, &c.

*Catechismus.* That is to say, a shorte instruction into Christian religion, for the commoditie and prosper of childre and yong people. Set forth by the mooste reverend father in God, Thomas Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and metropolitan. Gwalterus Lynne excudebat.— Fol. V. VI. VII. XIX.

What will our "English Christians" say to these Protestant testimonies? They will come upon them no doubt with mortification and surprise, like so many other Protestant authorities which we have quoted against them.

They have charged us with a mutilation of the Bible, and a concealment of one of the commandments, and allege that our motive for doing so, is to prevent the people from reading the scriptural condemnation of Images.

We have *not* mutilated the Bible. We do *not* conceal the commandment, and above all we can have no such motive as the one assigned; for, the making of images is not only not condemned in Scripture, but actually sanctioned, nay commanded by God himself. The Israelites were forbidden to make them, and so are we, *for the purpose of adoring them, or setting them up as Gods or Idols in place of the true God.* But the making of images is sanctioned in Scripture. (Exod. xxx. xxvi. Numb. xxi. 8. 3 Kings vi. 23, 29.—1 Kings Prot. vers. Paralip xxviii 11, 19.) and therefore, if God had absolutely prohibited them on Mount Sinai, he would have contradicted himself afterwards, and in other parts of Scripture. He commanded Moses to place the two cherubim on the ark. Were not these images? He ordered him also to set up a brazen figure of the fiery serpent. Was not this an Image, and were not those who were mortally bitten restored to health by looking on this Image? Solomon made in the Oracle two Cherubim of olive tree, of ten cubits in height, and he carved the walls of the temple round about with divers figures and carvings." And did not Solomon build after the description of the porch and temple which was delivered to him by his father David, who declared he received it from God himself?—"All the things came to me written by the hand of the Lord, that I might understand all the works of the pattern."

The Catholic Church is falsely charged with adoring Images and transferring to them the worship which is due to God alone. Yes; we neither, pray to them, nor adore them. We are taught to believe that there is no divinity or virtue resident in them for which they should be revered. We are told that nothing is to be asked of them, nor any confidence placed in them, and that all the respect which we pay them is to be referred to those whom they represent. (Council of Trent xiv. Session.) Our very children are carefully taught in the Catechism that it is not lawful to pray to Images because

"they have neither life, nor sense, nor power to hear or help us." We hold that it would be detestable and damnable Idolatry to give to *any thing that is not God* the homage which is due to God alone, and we will pronounce as severe an anathema against those who are wicked enough to do so as our opponents themselves. Oh no! we do not adore any thing but God alone. We do not shew any respect to his saints, to his glorious mother, to his images or memorials, to his name, or to anything connected with him, unless an account of their connection with him and the relation they bear him and his holy service. Our love for him alone induces us to love and respect every thing that is associated with Him. We kiss the Book of the Gospels and incense it, out of respect to Him whose life-giving word it is. We bow with reverence when his Holy Name is pronounced, not for the letters which compose it, or the sound which beats the air, but because it is His Name, and therefore, endeared to us by the memory of his love. If any of our opponents can point out a single Catholic who is so stupid or ignorant, as to render any portion of that respect which belongs to God alone, to a Crucifix a picture or an image, we would not hesitate to tear the one, to break the other in pieces and to fling the fragments in the fire, to shew him the folly as well as the wickedness of his Idolatry, just as Ezechias broke the brazen serpent to destroy the superstitious reverence exhibited towards it by the Israelites.

But who are those that accuse us of Idolatry for the use of Images? Have they no Images in their own Churches, or no pictures in their own Prayer Books? We have seen pictures of the Saints in the Book of Common Prayer itself, and we considered their appearance there a genuine Protestant Bull, as grotesque as facetious. Thus it is no harm at all to pray from a Book with holy pictures or images in it; but it would be a terrible crime to pray in a Church which was decorated with either.

We must describe another great Protestant Bull which we have often seen and heard of,—the Images and pictures of *Moses* and *Aaron* set up in Protestant Churches, with the tables of the Law in their hands containing passages of Scripture in which it was pretended that all use of Images was forbidden! But a still more monstrous Bull is, that in Churches from which the sign of salvation—the Cross of Jesus Christ, had been banished—in which the appearance of a Saint or an Apostle would be considered rank idolatry,—we have often seen paintings and images of the Lion! and Unicorn!! and Dragons!!! and Dolphins!!!! and Griffins!!!! and all sorts of birds, beasts and fishes. We like menageries and collections in Natural History well enough in their proper place, but we cannot approve of the practice of turning a Church into a Zoological Garden, and especially a Church in which the use of all images is preached against. That heartless pedagogue and unnatural child James the First was of this opinion also. He wished to ornament his chapel at Edinburgh with statues and paintings; but the Scottish Episcopal Bishops objected. What was his reply to those holy humbugs? "You can endure Lions, and Dragons, and Devils" to be figured in your Churches, but will not allow the like place to Patriarchs and Prophets. (Spotswood's History, p. 530.)

We have thus shewn the absurdity of this charge of Image worship, and as we do not make nor set up Images to adore them, we could have no object in suppressing what is called

\* Lions and Dragons the supporters of the Royal arms—Devils, the armorial griffins of "Queen Bess."

the second Commandment especially with regard to children who are taught in their Catechism that it is unlawful to pray to Images for they have neither life, nor sense, nor power, to hear or help us. Nay more, it is certain that we have never suppressed it. Every copy of our Bible in every language contains it. So does every large Catholic Catechism and moral Treatise, and even in the Catechism of a few chapters only which is intended for young children, we repeat, that the whole substance of the Ten Commandments of God is given. We have been accused of an act, a motive, and a doctrine. We repudiate the doctrine, we deny the act, and we therefore declare that there is no foundation for the motive.

In Matthew xv. 4, and xix 19, Mark vii 10, and x 19 as well as in Luke xviii. 20, some of the Commandments are quoted and the precept "Honour thy father and thy mother" is given in this abridged form alone just as it is in our very small Catechisms for children. But will any one say that our Saviour himself mutilated the Commandments because he did not quote the entire of this precept, even when he was giving instructions on the Decalogue?

The last charge is the inversion of the order of the commandments with regard to the ninth and tenth. Upon this point Protestant ignorance impudently tells us. "It seems that in the disposition of the ninth and tenth commandments, the all-wise Giver of them did not pursue the proper course. The Church of Rome has taken upon herself to alter the arrangement of these also." This is a beautiful specimen of mingled irony and ignorance from our Protestant Bible Readers. We beg to direct their attention to the fifth chapter and twenty first verse of the Book of Deuteronomy, where we have good reason to believe they will read the following words:

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife;

Nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his." These words the *Lord spoke* to all the multitude &c." v. 22. What now becomes of the ironical cant about the "all-wise Giver" and alteration of the arrangement made by the Church of Rome? O Protestantism! Quousque tandem abutere patientia nostra? How long shall we be condemned to the painful duty of exposing thy manifold ignorance, and retorting thy powerless arguments!

### SOMETHING NEW FOR OUR READERS.

We declared some time since that the "Criminal" was "famous for his beautiful modesty" and we have a remarkable confirmation of the truth of our assertion in the Guardian of the 2nd of April. The Editor being on his "stilts" makes the following pompous announcement:

"We can read Greek and Latin as well the Catholic priests, and have some slight acquaintance also, with Ecclesiastical history."!!!!

At least the first part of this will be *news* to our readers, but we imagine they had a shrewd suspicion of the second before. "A slight acquaintance" indeed! Not a doubt of it. For once has the criminal spoken truth, and we thank him for the admission, whilst we countersign it by declaring from a perusal of the last six or eight numbers of the Guardian, that his knowledge of Ecclesiastical history is amazingly slight indeed, fully as much so, as his knowledge of English Grammar, or the laws of reasoning. But what shall we say of the "Greek and Latin?" Did any one ever hear of a genuine scholar making such a declaration before? "We can read Greek and Latin?" We are more than half inclined to doubt it. When we hear a man gravely publishing his own sobriety, our suspicions are at once aroused. We begin to conjecture that he is at least "three sheets in the wind." At all events we won't take him at his own assertion. Neither shall we believe the Editor of the Guardian as to the fact of his being able to read Greek or Latin. He has certainly given no proof of it, that we have ever heard, or seen. We would forgive him all his cruel calumnies against our creed, all his impious blasphemies against our mysteries, and all his pointless personalities against ourselves, for the satisfaction of seeing him examined for an hour or two in Tacitus, Pausanias, Demosthenes, or Homer; in a Book of Tertullian, or a

Homily of St. Chrysostom in Arnobius *contra gentes*, or St. Clement of Alexandria, *stromata*!

The Editor moreover can read Greek and Latin "as well as the Catholic Priests at St. Mary's!" Is not this modest! If this be not Greek and Latin, it is downright vanity. But how can he tell whether his knowledge of Greek and Latin is equal to that of the priests! The declaration, if true, is certainly a poor compliment to our clergy. We can read *plain English*, and draw conclusions from what we read, and our firm conviction is that if "the babe of grace" were brought home to the true fold at St. Mary's on the shoulders of one of the "Queen monks" the priests there could not only teach him Greek and Latin, and improve his slight acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History, but instruct him for years to come in many things of which he is now unhappily ignorant.

The "gentlemen and Christians" have given us three columns in their last Editorial by way of explanation of their conduct with regard to Mr. Uniacke. It is at the same time painful and amusing to behold their miserable attempts to escape from the dilemma in which we have placed them. They now admit that Mr Uniacke went to their Office—that one of them saw him and had a conversation with him (it matters not *where*) and that Mr. Uniacke remonstrated with them. We commend this admission to the tender mercies of their own readers. What hypocrisy to have affected in a former number, all ignorance of the matter!

We repeat deliberately that when they declared the Catholic Clergy wanted to embroil the community, they uttered a wilful falsehood, a lie which they knew to be false, because they knew well that themselves had begun the controversy, that they had written a series of articles offensive to the feelings of their Catholic fellow citizens before any notice was taken of them in the Catholic Press. They knew well that they planned those attacks with cool malice and for a base political purpose. We know it too, and so does a discerning community, and we will persist in maintaining and declaring our belief on this point, in opposition to all past and future howlings of the Times. Their last article is a proof of their guilt. It furnishes as much circumstantial evidence as would convict them in any court of reason. Truth and a good cause require no puff-blowing subtleties, no mean evasions, no meretricious glosses. The Times writhes and wriggles in such cruel distortion that the Editors evidently feel their uncomfortable position. Of the general controversy they say nothing, unless that the Editors of the Cross "are willing to accept the mercy" of the Times! in other words that if they took pity on us, and gave up the contest, we would gladly avail ourselves of their mercy. We commit this assertion also, to the judgment of our readers and the public. The *Cross afraid of the Times!* Not bad, English Christians! Any one who has read the last numbers of the Cross must see that we are petrified with fear, and quaking with apprehension of the "Episcopal Bishops" of the Times, and their leather whip. *Fear*, indeed! Our sides are shaking with laughter at the ludicrous position of the Times. The remark which called forth this vain-glorious boast was made by us in reference to a strong opinion expressed by some of our friends, that after having inflicted so terrible a castigation, we ought in pity to the "well-whipped hound" lay aside the scourge for some time.

It cannot be expected that we should notice the brainless effusions of a dozen cowards in masks who exhibit their Protestant ignorance through the columns of the Times, Guardian, and Co. In their discordant yells they have opened nearly every topic of religious controversy. And though not bound to notice anything unless what comes from the Editors, we have selected from time to time some of the most prominent of the calumnies of their correspondents, and exposed them for the edification of the public. No one attempts to reply to our arguments, or, to answer our questions, though they damage the very foundation of the Protestant faith. If we had given admission to articles and letters of correspondents, the Cross should have been enlarged to four times its present size. We have therefore been obliged to respectfully decline them. Our space is too limited for our own purposes, and we wish to preserve a unity of system in the mode of dealing with our

versaries. If the *Times*, *Guardian* &c., wished to blindfold the public, and to make "confusion worse founded" of all the points at issue, they could not have adopted a better course, than the admission of so many brawling anonymous scribblers, who "foam out their own confusion" and bellow forth their nonsense with such hideous roaring that we may apply to them a beautiful quotation from the Metrical Psalms of the Protestant Bible of 1683:

So many Bulls do compass us  
That ho full strong of head  
Yea, bulls so fat, as tho' they had  
In Bashan-field been fed." Ps. xxi. 19.

We will select the most "strong headed" of those "Bashan Bulls" of Protestantism, and "take them by the horns" after our own fashion, and at our own leisure, until their whisking tails and comical capers shall betray their bitter agony, and most impotent rage.

We are accused of disrespect to Mr. Unacke, but not by that gentleman himself, who feels, we are certain that we have sincerely endeavoured to do justice to his motives, and to set him right before the public, as far as this question is concerned. But, he has every reason to complain of the duplicity and tergiversation of the *Times* which has already done serious injury not only to Mr. Unacke, but to his whole political party.

We do not believe there is a SINGLE CATHOLIC in the Province who will be so DEGRADED in feeling, so lost to every sense of SHAME, so DEAD to all the insults which have been heaped on his creed, his clergy, and his brethren, as to give his vote or support at the approaching election to any Candidate, who is allied with the political party of the *Times*, *Guardian* and Co.

We know that this announcement will mortify them more than if they were defeated on fifty additional points of religious controversy. Let them not lay the flattering unction to their souls. They will find the Catholics banded as one man, and united with their truly liberal and tolerant neighbours of all creeds and countries, in putting down for ever the factious, exclusive, and intolerant bigots who are the political allies of the people of the *Times*. The eyes of the Catholics are now fully opened. They know that they have nothing to expect from the people of the *Times* but exclusion, contumely, and insult, and they will be prepared to act accordingly. Some of the recent articles of the *Times* and the *Guardian* have done more to extinguish their political party in this Province, than all the speeches made against them since the Election of 1843; and time will tell whether we are Prophets or not.

#### THE TIMES AND THE LIBERAL PRESS.

The *Times* having wantonly provoked a quarrel with the Catholics of the Province for political purposes, has not only been defeated in religious argument, but foiled in political speculation. The Editors have succeeded in uniting the Liberal party, and suffer the additional mortification of being laughed at by the discerning portion of the people. With an affectation of simplicity which can deceive no one, they have lately attacked the Liberal Protestant Papers, because, forsooth they did not come to the rescue. The *Morning Chronicle* has very properly replied, in an article which we subjoin. The *Chronicle* truly says that politics, and not religion induced the *Times* to begin the war. We say the same; and further that if the *Times* and other Protestant Papers which follow the same line of politics, had confined themselves to politics, exclusively, they never would have heard one word from us in reply. The promotion and defence of our religion was the main object of our Journal, or on mere politics therefore we should never quarrel with any Protestant in Nova Scotia:

#### THE TIMES.

The *Times* seems terribly bothered by the silence of the Liberal Press on the subject of the Religious Controversy, which

has been raging for some time between them and the *Cross*. There "must be a cause" for it, says our *Cotemporary*. There is—but as far as at least as we are concerned, it is not the one attributed. We are neither "afraid" to express our sentiments if need be—nor is there any "sacrifice of religious feeling" on our part, for the sake of "political advancement." When the interests of Protestants are in danger it will be time enough for us to act—but we have no idea of thrusting ourselves into a contraversion provoked by the Editors of the *Times*, as we believe, for the vilest political purposes. Our Journal is Political and not Religious. However strong our denominational feelings or prejudices may be, as a public Journalist we never have, nor do we ever intend to engage in religious controversy with any body of Christians. We hold that Christians of every denomination in this Country are entitled to equal political privileges; and while deprecating political advancement on party sectarian grounds, we maintain that no body of men should be excluded from office on account of their religious tenets. If any body of Christians has reason to complain of injustice, it is certainly not the one which for nearly a century has enjoyed a monopoly of office and emolument under Government, and whose mouthpiece, the *Times*, has always been. We understand the game that is playing—and tell our *Cotemporary* that it will not succeed.—*Morning Chronicle*.

#### THE IRISH FAMINE—CALUMNIES AGAINST THE IRISH PEOPLE.

We have hitherto generally refuted our opponents by the testimony of their own friends and adherents. We are enabled to do so respecting the Irish famine also, by the following article from the *Dublin Weekly Register*, which is most appropriately headed

"The Pharisees rebuked," and which we commend to the special perusal of all Ranters in Dutchtown and elsewhere who have made suffering Ireland the object of their saintly abuse. We hope we need not tell them that Dr. Whately is an Englishman and a Protestant Christian, though not of the same kidney as the "gentlemen" of the *Times*.

#### THE PHARISEES REBUKED.

His Grace the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin has published an "Address to the Clergy and other members of the Established Church on the use and abuse of the present occasion for the exercise of beneficence," in which, in the most Christian spirit, and with the most dignified reproof, he censures the conduct of those hard-hearted calculating bigots who would render the starvation of our people ancillary to their own proselyting designs. This portion of the Address is so full of liberality and truth that we cannot avoid quoting it:—

"There cannot be a more emphatically unsuitable occasion for urging any one to change his religion and adopt ours, than when we are proposing to relieve his physical distress; because all the grace of a charitable action, is in this way, destroyed, and we present ourselves to his mind as seeking to take an ungenerous advantage of his misery, and as converting our benefactions into a bribe to induce him to do violence to his conscience.

"The Good Samaritan in the parable, who recognised a "neighbour" in any one he was able to relieve, even in one who had been brought up to regard him as a heretic, is not represented as accompanying his careful kindness towards the wounded traveller, with exhortations to prefer the worship on Mount Gerizim to that at Jerusalem.

"The golden rule for guiding our judgment in any doubtful case is, to suppose oneself in another's place. Now what would be the feelings of any one of us, if, when residing in some foreign country of a different religion from his own, he saw his children starving around him, and if he were given to understand it was expected that, in consideration of the relief offered, he should receive himself, and allow his children to receive, such religious instruction as he had been taught to regard as erroneous? Surely, if any one of you were so situated and if you were driven by the extremity of distress to make a compromise of principle, it is likely that you would feel—at least when the present emergency was past—that your conduct



was pardonable, and that of your converters unpardonable. It is likely you would be filled with disgust both for them and also for the religion itself which they had thus attempted to forge upon you.

Regarding the blasphemous and bigoted nonsense which we had occasion to denounce in our last, his Grace is equally Christian and sensible in his views. The conduct of the presumptuous fanatics (or knaves) which his Grace reprobates is calculated to injure, in the eyes of the unreflecting, all religion, when they behold men with the reputation of morality imputing injustice to the Deity, and daringly assuming an acquaintance with the intents of the Eternal! Dr. Whately says:—

‘But advantage has been taken of the exulting clamour to inculcate, with a view to the conversion of persons whom I believe to be in error, doctrines which I cannot but think utterly unsound, and of dangerous tendency, by arguments which will not stand the test of calm and rational examination. There are some who represent the present famine (as indeed they did the cholera some years back) as a Divine judgment sent for the punishment of what they designated as national sins—especially the degree of toleration and favour shown to the members of the Church of Rome. Now this procedure—the attributing to such and such causes the supposed Divine wrath—is likely, when those of a different creed from those of our own are addressed, to be, by some of them, rejected as profane presumption, and by others *retorted*. When once men begin to take upon them the office of inspired prophets, and to pronounce boldly what are the counsels of the Most High, it is accessible to do this on the one side as on the other. Roman Catholics who are told that a pestilence or a famine are sent, as judgements on the land for the toleration of Romanism, may contend that, on the contrary, it is Protestantism that is the national sin. And without the evidence of a sensible miracle to appeal to, neither party can expect to convince the other.’

If all the State Church dignitaries possessed the good sense, or displayed the Christian feeling of Doctor Whately the memories of the myriad wrongs inflicted upon the Irish millions by a hostile establishment would lose at least some portion of their bitterness.

### GOOD NEWS FOR THE CHURCH.

There were sold at the Market-place, Berkhamstead, on Saturday last, a cart loaded with hay, a cart and load of straw, a bridle and saddle, a sack of wheat, a sack of oats, and two loaves of good sugar, all of which were legally stolen in broad daylight by the officers of justice, from members of the Society of Friends, for the benefit of the ever blessed Church of our native land; and we understand, the blessing of God was not asked upon the solemn occasion!—*Aylesbury News*.

### ANOTHER PROTESTANT THUMPER.

A literary assassin in the last Times prints a terrible oath, and subjoins a more terrible comment, and then tells his “fellow citizens to bear in mind” that this Oath has been ‘swallowed’ by the ‘Right Rev. Father in God’ the Catholic Bishop of this Diocess. We distinctly put our brand on this, and proclaim it to be a Big Protestant Lie, and one concocted without a shadow of proof to sustain it. Will the Times have the common honesty to tell its readers that the Catholic Bishop did not swallow this Oath?

What calumny is to be issued next from that forging establishment?

### THE CHAPEL OF EASE!

On dit, that the gentry, or lay Bishops connected with this small tower of Babel, goaded by the taunts of the Cross, have resolved on completing the edifice without delay. Nay more, it is said they are to take down the large gilt Cross and Ball from the spire in compliance with our request. This is both gratifying to us, and consistent in them. They cannot abide either the name or sign of the Cross. We hope they will follow out our advice by the substitution of the weathercock. Nothing could possibly be in better taste. It would *veer* about most convenient! with “ever wind of doctrine.” He must erect

an expensive scaffold for the occasion, and we hope they will give notice of the day of taking down, in order that all the Christians in Halifax may be present on the occasion.—We will not fail to attend, and report the proceedings, which we think will be highly interesting. We should certainly like to get a peep in broad day light at those “Enemies of the Cross of Christ.” We are tempted to envy the workmen who shall be employed in hauling down the Cross, as no doubt they will acquire a cheap and glorious immortality by this illustrious deed. But, we have not heard what they intend to do with the Cross after it shall be taken down. This will be a puzzler. They must either burn it, hew it with Protestant axes, or make a present of it to the Catholics. We would feel much obliged for the gift: we would preserve it with care, because we know the day will come when we can replace it on the spire with all due solemnity. More unlikely things have come to pass even in Halifax. We protest against this Cross’s being taken down at night, or at an early hour in the morning. Don’t be ashamed good people to perform this affecting and instructive ceremony of the Protestant religion in broad day light, and before your fellow-citizens.

Only think of a Protestant tradesman sharpening his axe to cut down the Cross of Christ!!! O Lord! O Lord! O Lord! O Envy of surrounding nations and admiration of the world!

After taking down and disposing of the Cross the Chapel of Easeites ought in consistency to look out for a discreet layman, ordain him themselves, or give him a call (with a silver whistle!) and induct him as a hector of the Crossless Church without any reference to their good Bishop. The sign of the Cross should also be omitted in all Baptisms to be administered in the New Church, and the rector should receive orders to that effect, under pain of being unfrocked.

The Guardian publishes from the London Record an account of the collections made by the English Pharisees for the conversion of the famishing people of Ireland. We direct the Editor’s attention to the sentiments contained in Archbishop Whately’s pastoral. Why does not the Criminal get up a similar collection here, if he so warmly approves of the object?

There was an Ordination at our Cathedral on Easter Sunday when Rev. Edward Daly received the order of Deaconship.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are obliged to decline several communications for the reasons mentioned elsewhere, with many thanks to our numerous friends. Our task is so light and pleasant, that we do not suffer the smallest inconvenience. In fact as our readers may perceive, it is all mere child’s play, with those contemptible Protestant mice.

### MORE CONVERTS.

Amongst the converts to the Catholic faith in Oregon, says the Catholic Herald, we are delighted to see announced the names of Doctor Long and family, and also of Judge Burnet and family. These two gentlemen had emigrated from the United States to the valley of the Columbia.



## General Intelligence.

### CHARITABLE ASSOCIATIONS AT ROME.

There are probably few communities in the world which can equal that of Rome in charitable associations. They are called confraternities, and are formed by the voluntary union of individuals, often at high rank, who, in the midst of all the wretchedness around them, devote a portion of their time to its relief. Many of these are never seen by the mere traveller, or their existence even suspected, for their sphere of labour is private; yet it would be difficult to estimate the amount of happiness they must diffuse. One fraternity, for example, is intended to seek out humble but respectable families who would not be likely to apply for alms, and in some delicate way to relieve their necessities. The members of another visit the hospitals, learn the situation of the patients, and often personally attend to them. Others visit the gaols, and furnish comfort and support to prisoners who are without friends or means. Others, by voluntary donations, pay debts which the poor have unavoidably contracted, and thus relieve their minds from trouble. Others seek the sick through the abodes of wretchedness in the city, supply them with food, medicine, and professional assistance, and attend through their illness. Others come in when the last hour is over, defray the expenses of the burial, attend to the performance of the religious rites, and themselves bear the body to the grave. Such are their self-denying labours for the relief of suffering humanity. The wretched need no other claim upon them, except that they share in common nature. No "anniversary" is required to awaken their flagging zeal. No "report" is on the wings of the press, to trumpet forth their doings to the world. No "list of subscribers" publishes their charities through the land. The members, indeed, scarcely know each other, for their visits are made in the dress of the fraternity so that none could recognise the individuals. But year after year they labour on, uncheered by the voice of human praise, their good deeds known only to their Father who seeth in secret.—*Rev. W. J. Kip's Christmas Holidays in Rome.*

### BIRTHS RECORDED.

#### AT ST. MARY'S.

MARCH 6,	Mrs. Holland of a Son.
7,	" Ellis of a Son.
8,	" Stokes of a Daughter.
9,	" Savage of a Son.
10,	" Campbell of a Son.
10,	" Provot of a Daughter.
10,	" Jerome of a Daughter.
10,	" Nowlan of a Daughter.
11,	" Bredgoe of a Daughter.
11,	" Mofect of a Son.
13,	" Ray of a Daughter.
17,	" Curtis of a Daughter.
17,	" Nugent of a Daughter.
17,	" Egan of a Daughter.
19,	" Doyle of a Daughter.
20,	" Heretage of a Son.
21,	" Gorman of a Son.
21,	" Dec of a Son.
21,	" Barrett of a Son and Daughter.
21,	" Hely of a Daughter.
21,	" Shea of a Daughter.
24,	" Fleming of a Daughter.
25,	" Connelly of a Son.
26,	" Ahern of a Daughter.
26,	" McStravick of a Son.
27,	" Elwort of a Son.
28,	" Reynold of a Son.
28,	" McDonald of a Daughter.
29,	" Tobin of a Son.
29,	" Allan of a Son.
29,	" Johnson of a Son.

MARCH 20,	Mrs. Shine of a Son.
21,	" Murphy of a Son.
21,	" Carey of a Daughter.
APRIL 1,	" McGrath of a Daughter.
4,	" Breen of a Son.
4,	" Buckley of a Daughter.
5,	" Conroy of a Son.
6,	" Castello of a Daughter.
6,	" Doyle of a Son.
6,	" Laughlin of a Daughter.
6,	" Finch of a Daughter.
6,	" Gray of a Son.
6,	" Thenvas of a Daughter.
7,	" McGuire of a Son.
7,	" Whelan of a Son.
7,	" Kennedy of a Son.
8,	" Holland of a Son.
8,	" McKenna of a Daughter.
9,	" McDermott of a Son.
12,	" McCartney of a Son.
12,	" Flinn of a Daughter.
12,	" Monarty of a Daughter.
13,	" Braslow of a Son.
13,	" Alligan of a Son.
14,	" Burns of a Daughter.

### MARRIAGE RECORD.

APRIL 7—George Kehoe to Margaret Fahey.  
12—Thomas Westcott to Catharine Kennedy.

### INTERMENTS.

#### AT THE CEMETERY OF THE HOLY CROSS

MARCH 2—Edmond, Son of Thomas and Eleanor Durney, aged 3 years and 10 days.  
21—Catharine, Daughter of Michael and Elizabeth Keating aged 2 years and 2 months.  
23—Thomas, Son of Matthew and Catharine Stafford, aged 14 years.  
25—Ellen, Daughter of John and Mary Murphy, aged 8 months.  
26—Michael Whyte, Native of Ireland, aged 65 years.  
29—Patrick Needham, Native of Halifax, aged 18 years.  
21—Sarah Jones, Native of Ireland, aged 56.  
APRIL 12—Johanna Holit, Native of Newfoundland, aged 40 years.  
13—Francis, infant Son of Patrick and Mary McDermott aged 5 days.  
14—John, Son of Edward Shea, aged 1 year and 0 months.  
15—Anne, Daughter of the late George and Catharine Mulloy, Native of Ireland, aged 27 years.  
15—Mary Ann Vegnars, Native of Newfoundland, aged 58 years.  
16—Charlotte, Daughter of Martin and Johanna Walsh, aged 16 years.  
May they rest in peace!

Published by RITCHIE & NICHOLSON, No. 2, Upper Water Street, Halifax.—Terms—Five Shillings, in advance, exclusive of postage.

All communications for the Editors of the Cross are to be addressed (if by letter post paid) to No. 2, Upper Water Street Halifax.