

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
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- 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
- 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.
- Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- 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

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

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
								✓			

THE CROSS.



NEW

SERIES.

VOL. 2.

No. 37.

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, SEPTEMBER 12, 1846.

CALENDAR.

- SEPTEMBER 13—XV after Pentecost, 3rd Sept. M. Holy name of Mary.
- 14—Exaltation of the Cross.
 - 15—Octave Day of the Nativity.
 - 16—Ember Fast S S Cornelius P and Cyprian BMM
 - 17—Stigmata of St Francis.
 - 18—Ember Fast St Joseph Cupertino.
 - 19—Ember-Fast S S Jannarius and Comp.

TENETS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH FAIRLY EXPLAINED.

CHAPTER VII.

ON SATISFACTION, INDULGENCES, AND PURGATORY.

If we consult the faithful pages of ecclesiastical history, we shall readily discover, that the sacrament of penance is of no modern date, or modern introduction into the church. Its existence and practice remounts to the earliest days of Christianity, and the writings of every successive age bear testimony to them. Even the spirit of pretended reformation, which went abroad in the sixteenth century, and gave to several countries of Europe, other religious features than those which they had been accustomed to wear, cast many a lingering look at the sacrament, before she rejected it. Something of it was long retained by the Episcopal church of England, and I doubt much if every vestige of it be even yet entirely obliterated. Considering it in another point of view than as a divine institution, penance is pregnant with the best advantages. What can be a more powerful restraint to vice, or is more efficacious in relieving the tortures of a troubled conscience, than the confidential com-

munication of this tribunal? Or who's more capable of advising in difficulties, than the confessor, who, by his profession, is well acquainted with all the inlets and outlets of the map of human nature! Much indeed has been said, and much written, in opposition to confession; but the noble mind, superior to prejudice, will neither listen to calumny, bigotry, nor ignorance, but boldly dare to think for itself, and calmly investigate the matter.

The Catholic church has been frequently accused of insulting the mediatorship of the Redeemer, by supposing that Christ has not sufficiently satisfied for sin; "for Catholics must suppose this," observe our opponents, "or why should they deem other satisfactions necessary?" We do not, however, make this supposition: we know that the sufferings of the Man-God are of infinite value, capable of atoning for every possible transgression; and that, therefore, his satisfaction for mankind was complete and perfect. By this satisfaction he has, in a peculiar manner, acquired an entire dominion over the redeemed descendants of Adam and Eve; and surely he can apply this satisfaction to us, under such conditions, as he may please. In baptism, we believe, that he applies this satisfaction so, as to abolish the sins entirely, without any reserved punishment. But, in regard to sins committed after baptism, or those sins which are subject to the sacrament of penance, we believe, that he requires something of satisfaction or punishment, as the general condition of forgiveness. Every crime, we believe infers two distinct objects—the guilt, and the punishment due to that guilt; and we know that the guilt of crime is frequently remitted, and the eternal punishment due to it, changed into a temporal chastisement, which still remains to be endured. Hence

we conclude, that God justly requires some satisfaction on our part. It is evident that God forgave Adam and Eve the guilt of their disobedience, but they smarted under the punishment of that disobedience; all the evils which we endure, or which will afflict their guilty descendants to the end of time, are strong and irrefragable demonstrations, that although the guilt of their apostacy was pardoned, its punishment was not remitted. So, too, it happened with Moses and Aaron. God had forgiven those just souls the faults which they had committed at the *waters of contradiction*; but he afterwards punished them for it, for he declared, that they should never enter the land of promise, but only view it at an envying distance. (vide Dent. ch. xxiii.) The same punishment he inflicted on the more guilty of the Israelites, although he told Moses, that he had forgiven them, according to his request. (vide Numb. ch. xiv.) Such also was the case with David; for when the royal penitent acknowledged his crime to the prophet, 'The Lord has taken away thy sin,' replied the inspired seer, 'but because thou hast caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme on account of this word, the son, who is born to thee, shall die.' (2 Kings, ch. xii.)

It ought then to be admitted as a principle, that God generally expects some satisfaction for sin, even after the guilt is removed or forgiven. For this reason the church deems satisfaction a part of the sacrament of penance; and hence it is the confessor's duty to impose some satisfaction on the penitent, proportionate, in some respect, to the confessed crimes. This atones wholly or in part for the punishment due, and generally consists of one or more of these good works, recorded in the book of Tobias; "*Bona est oratio cum jejuniis et elemosynis.*" *Prayer is good, with alms deeds and fasting.* (Tob. xii.) It is just, and even advantageous to us, that in pardoning sin, with the eternal chastisement due to it, God shall require some temporal punishment, to retain us within the sphere of our duty; lest being disengaged too speedily from the demands of justice, we abandon ourselves to false confidence and presumption, and prevent his facility in pardoning to our own destruction.

Since to every sin, a degree of temporal punishment is generally attached, after the guilt is pardoned, the church in former days subjected public sinners to public penance during a period of time, more or less protracted, according to their guilt. The bishops, however, then exercised the privilege of abridging the time, or mitigating the severity of the punishment, as the fervour and circumstances of the penitent might require. They claimed the same in private penances. And this abridgement or mitigation was termed an indulgence, and was a real remission of temporal punishment due to sin. It is not, as our adversaries have said, a license to

sin, but always presupposes that true repentance has taken away the guilt of sin, or if not, an indulgence is of no avail. To this power of indulgence may be referred the power of changing one penitential work for another, more useful, or pious, or charitable, which the church claims. In regard to indulgences, little is defined by the church. Private divines assert and maintain their opinions on the subject, but the Catholic is not bound to believe any thing more, than that 'the power of indulgences was left by Christ in his church, and that their use is very salutary to the faithful.' (Symb. Pii. iv. et Conc. Trid.) We read in 2 Cor. ii. of St. Paul conferring an indulgence on the repentant Corinthian. The church deems herself now in possession of the same spiritual power, which St. Paul exercised then; for she believes, that it is as necessary now, as it was in the Apostle's age, and consequently, that the providence of God has not left his church destitute of it. Catholics acknowledge that this power has been sometimes abused; but this cannot militate against its existence. St. Peter writes, that some people *abused and perverted the scripture*, to their own perdition, but this can be no reason why we should reject its authenticity or doubt of its veracity.

Should the repenting sinner die, before he has fulfilled the satisfaction due to his sins, we believe that, though just, he cannot enter heaven, for he is in some sense as yet defiled with sin, and "nothing defiled can enter heaven." (Apoc. xxi.) Catholics believe, that he remains in the state of punishment, until this be accomplished, and this state they term Purgatory. They believe that those only enter that state, who die without having fully expiated those crimes, of which they have repented, or who die guilty of small transgressions, which they denominate venial sins. The doctrine of Purgatory is most consonant to religion and reason. Suppose that a person, who whole life had been spent in the performance of virtuous deeds, and had never been stained by a fault, were, the moment before he expired, to commit the smallest of all possible faults, but still a real offence against God, and die before he repented of it. The supposition is very possible, and therefore can be adopted as a basis of legitimate argumentation. Can the merciful Creator of mankind sentence that man to eternal torments? Would it be just? That judge would certainly act unjustly, who should sentence a man to *capital* punishment for the *least* of legal offences. Human justice is an emanation from that divine perfection, which exists in God, and if this act would be unjust, surely God cannot condemn a man for the smallest offence to undergo the greatest of punishments. And yet, as nothing defiled can enter heaven, so this man cannot. What must become of him? He must unquestionably be somewhere, and this place, our adversaries may call it what they please,) we can

Purgatory. There we believe he will remain, until having expiated his sins, he take possession of heaven. By consequence we deem it, in the language of scripture, "a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosened from their sins." (2 Mac. vii.) The idea of praying for the dead seems to flow from pure nature herself. Who, when he has caught the last breath that quivered on the lip of his departed friend, can help addressing a prayer, that "God may have mercy on his soul?" And yet this would be folly, if there were no middle state; for if his soul were even in heaven or hell, it would be useless. Why is it unnatural to commit a corpse to the grave without prayer, or some religious ceremony? All this would be useless, if there were no Purgatory.

The subjects of this chapter are among those, which are most odious to our dissenting brethren, and which have been most frequently misrepresented. I hope this candid and unadorned statement may remove some of the prejudices, which hang round them, and enable them to view these tenets through a fairer and purer medium.

A CHARITABLE APPEAL

FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

In favour of the doctrines of

The Catholic Church.

"Return back to judgment."—Dan. xiii. 49
"To the law and to the testimony."—Isa. viii. 20.

NOTE.—The scriptural quotations by which this appeal is enforced, are taken from the Protestant Bible.

POINT XV.

Protestants hold, That in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, the elements of the bread and wine, after consecration, remain still in their very natural substances; and that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not truly, really, and substantially present in that Sacrament. (Rubric at the end of the common service in the Book of Common Prayer.)

Contrary to all the four gospels.—1. "And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said: Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of it: For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

2. "And, as they did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to them, and said: Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And, he said unto them, This is my blood of the New Testament

which is shed for many." Mark xiv. 23, 23, 24,

3 "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise, also, the cup after supper, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke xxii. 19.

Note, In the Greek it is still plainer; which cup is shed for you.

4. "For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, but the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat; this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye in remembrance of me. 1 Cor. xi. 23.

Now, the pretension of Protestants is, that these most plain words of Christ, This is my body, This is my blood, are not to be taken in the literal sense, but to be expounded in a figurative sense: viz. That it is his body and blood in figure only: or a sacrament of his body and blood to be taken in remembrance of his death. In like manner, as the eating of the Paschal-lamb is said in Scripture, to the Lord's passover. (Exod. xii. 11.) yet the Paschal lamb was not the Lord's passover itself, but only a sacrament of the old law, instituted in remembrance of the passover.

To this Roman Catholics reply: that although some phrases in Scripture are to be expounded in a figurative sense, yet the general rule allowed, even by Protestants, is, that the literal sense of God's word, is not to be forsaken, and a figurative sense introduced without evident reasons, and an absolute necessity for so doing. These reasons are now to be examined. First, What reasons are produced by Protestants for wresting so many plain sentences of Scripture to a figure. Secondly, What reasons Roman Catholics give for expounding these words of our Saviour in the obvious literal sense.

When we challenge a Protestant to assign his evident reasons why he expounds the plain words of our Saviour above cited in a figurative sense, his answer, and only answer is, that several other expressions of Holy Scriptures, as for instance: I am the Door; I am the true vine; (John x. 7.) The Rock was Christ, (John xv. 1.) are figuratively to be understood; therefore, why not also these words; This is my body, this is my blood? 1 Cor. x. 4.

But, this is so far from giving evident reasons for their figurative interpretation, that in truth, it is giving us no reason at all. For, because some expressions of Holy Scripture are to be figurative-

ly expounded, it is a consequence that any other part of Holy Writ may be expounded so too, to make it square with our opinions? At this rate, an Arian heretic might pretend, that when our Saviour in Holy Scripture is called God, and the Son of God, it is only figuratively, because he is in other places, figuratively called a Door, or a Vine. In like manner may some other heretic pretend, that Christ's death, burial, resurrection and ascension, are to be understood not literally but figuratively; because his sitting at the right hand of God is a figurative saying.

As to those expressions; I am the door; I am the true vine; the Rock of Christ, and the like the evident absurdity of the literal sense, determines us to understand them in a figurative one; for who will pretend that our Saviour was a door, of a vine tree, or that a Rock of stone was Christ in a literal sense? Then, as the Paschal-lamb being called the Lord's passover, we know this to be figurative, because the scripture so expounds it in the same chapter, saying, that it is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover. Exodus, xii. 27.

But in no part of Scripture do we find these words of our Saviour; This is my body, This is my blood, expounded in a figurative sense; not one of the sacred writers has warned not to understand them literally of the true and real body and blood of our Saviour. Neither do we find any figure of speech like this in Scripture, or in any other writing whatsoever; nor, in word, is there any evident absurdity in the literal sense, which may oblige us to have recourse to a figurative meaning; since there is nothing in transubstantiation but what is clearly within the sphere of infinite power; nay, it is an easier thing to comprehend; that God can change one substance into another substance, than make all substances out of nothing. The Protestant then remains destitute of all proof for his figurative sense, and he must own his interpretation of the text in question is purely arbitrary which if once allowed, the literal sense of all other parts of Scripture too, may, by the same rule, be, by heretics and freethinkers, allegorized and explained all away in figures.

If, on the other hand, Protestants challenge Roman Catholics to give reasons, why they take these words of our Saviour in the obvious literal sense, it is much the same thing as to ask a person who is travelling to London on the public high road, why he goes that way? No one will put the question to him why he goes that way; because it is plain he goes the right way; but as to those who take bye paths, and have left the right road to follow private paths, to them it belongs to look to themselves, and consider well whither such ways lead them. However, to give satisfaction to every one who asks us the reason of our

belief, let Protestants know that we expound these words of our Saviour; This is my body, This is my blood, not without many substantial reasons, in the obvious literal sense.

First reason, Because our Saviour speaks of that body which was given for our redemption; This is my body which is given for you; He speaks also of that blood which was shed for remission of our sins; This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for remission of sins. Either then, Protestants will be forced to maintain with Roman Catholics, that the true and real body and blood of our Saviour Christ are really present in this sacrament, or that it was not his true and real body that was given for our redemption, nor his true and real blood that was shed for our sins, but in figure only.

Second reason, Because our Saviour himself, in the sixth chapter of St. John, has so fully explained the matter, as to leave no room to doubt, that his body and blood are truly and really present in this sacrament. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove amongst themselves, saying, how can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: He that eateth of this bread shall live forever. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum. Many, therefore, of his disciples when they had heard this, said: This is a hard saying who can hear it? From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. John vi. 51, 52, &c.

Here our Saviour declares the true meaning of his doctrine of the eucharist. If you ask what is that bread which we receive in this sacrament? He himself answers, that it is his own flesh; his flesh indeed, and his blood indeed, which is eaten and drank in the eucharist. And, here Protestants are desired to remark, that our Saviour spoke this with an express design to explain this mystery of our faith, being urged to interpret his doctrine by the Jews, who were highly scandalized at his saying: the bread which I will give is my own flesh and exclaimed against it as a thing impossible to

be done ; how can this man, say they, give us his flesh to eat ? So that, on the one hand, we cannot doubt but our saviour here intended to explain this mystery of our faith ; and to declare clearly what we are to believe of it : and on the other hand we find, that when he comes to explain it, instead of correcting his doctrine of the real presence by a figurative sense, he repeats the same doctrine again and again in stronger words than before ; nor does he once so much as hint, that it is figuratively to be understood. Now, I appeal to all sincere Protestants, if it be not utterly incredible and impossible, that the Holy Scriptures in every place where this sacrament is spoken of, should teach in plain words, that it is the body and blood of Christ ; (supposing as Protestants do, that it is not really his body and blood) and never once unfold the truth of this mystery, by giving us to understand in words as plain, that it is his body and blood in figure only, supposing that were the true meaning of his words.

Third reason, Because St. Paul too explains this mystery of our faith altogether in favour of those who take our Saviour's words in the literal sense. For, if the question be put, what the eucharist is ? Whether the apostle resolves it for Catholics ; not for the opinion of Protestants. "The cup of blessing (says he), which we bless is not the communion of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?" 1 Cor. x. 16.

Again if we put the question, Whether the body and blood of Christ are present by faith only to the worthy receiver ? The apostle gives it clearly against the Protestant's opinion : "Wherefore (says he), whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi. 27.

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi. 29. Now, according to this doctrine of the apostle it is exceeding plain, that the body and blood of our Lord are truly and really received by the unworthy, as by the worthy communicant, and consequently, truly and really present to all who receive ; and not by faith only, to the worthy receiver : for, if the unworthy do not receive the true body and blood of Christ in this sacrament, how can they be said to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ ? or, not to discern the Lord's body.

Fourth reason, When God, in Holy Scripture, speaks with an express design to make known to us some new institution or command upon which our salvation depends ; or to discover some high mystery of faith, which was entirely new to the world, which was necessary for the world to know

and which could only be known from his words ; then, if ever, we have good reason to believe, the word of God speaks plainly, and ought to be taken in the obvious natural sense of the words : now, here our Saviour spoke those words, This is my body. This is my blood, at the institution of a great sacrament, upon which our salvation depends with an express design to reveal a high mystery of faith which was entirely new to the world ; which was necessary for the world to know ; and which could be known from his disciples only from his words ; we conclude then that his words, upon such an occasion, ought in all reason to be understood in the plain obvious literal sense. Add to these reasons, that the Church of Christ, the Catholic Church, in all ages, has ever expounded these words of our Saviour in the literal sense, and ever condemned those for heretics, who have at any time attempted to wrest them to a figure.

The only reply Protestants can make to this weight of proofs for the real presence and transubstantiation, is from the words of our Saviour, Do this in remembrance of me. From whence they pretend to conclude, that the eucharist is only a sacrament instituted in bread and wine to be taken in remembrance of his death ; and that his body and blood are not really and substantially present in it.

To whom we answer that the words, Do this in remembrance of me, do not furnish the least shadow of a proof against the *real presence*, because the eucharist as it is believed by Catholics, is a much more lively remembrance of Christ, than as it is held by Protestants. For Catholics who hold transubstantiation, and the real presence, and firmly believe that, as often as they partake of this sacrament, they really receive the same body of Christ that was crucified, the same blood of Christ that was shed for their redemption, do certainly with much more lively sentiments of devotion, renew in themselves the remembrance of our Saviour's death and passion, than Protestants can do who believe, that they only receive bread and wine, in their natural substances, in remembrance of him. It is, therefore, very bad and false reasoning, to conclude, that the body and blood of Christ are not really present in the eucharist, from the words,—Do this in remembrance of me, when those words are more clearly consistent with the Catholic belief of the *real presence*, than with the contrary opinion of Protestants.

Is it not enough then to stagger all who are serious among them, when they reflect that the literal obvious plain sense of the word of God is in all the four Gospels, and in St. Paul, full and clear against them in this important controversy ; and more full and clear, for the Catholic's belief of the *real presence*, than any text that can be produced

by Protestants for the belief even of the Trinity or Incarnation? especially if they reflect again, that all antiquity too is full against them, that the ancient fathers, Greek and Latin, all Christian Churches, both east and west have ever believed the real presence and transubstantiation with Catholics, as Catholic writers have demonstrated beyond reply (see Perron and Mr Arnaud, *Perpetuite de la Foi*); and that Protestants have none to uphold them in their unbelief, but the unbelieving Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum, who protested against the doctrine of the real presence, the moment the mouth of the Eternal Truth had taught it, and disputed with him, as Protestants do now with his Church, the possibility of it, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Let not Protestants, at least, pretend they have the written word on their side in this great controversy; but let them fairly own the truth, that as for texts from the word of God, they can produce none for their opinion, and that their true and only reason for not holding transubstantiation and the real presence, is their natural difficulty in believing a hard and high mystery of faith above their comprehension (which has ever been the case of those that have not faith). But if the incomprehensibility of this mystery be a sufficient reason for them to reject it they may, for the same reason, with free thinkers and infidels, deny the mystery of the Trinity, the incarnation, the eternity of the pains of hell, the resurrection of the dead, and all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion.

LITERATURE.

THE SOUVENIR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPOILED CHILD.

"What a misfortune!" said a Maltese counsellor, as he returned from the cemetery whither he had gone to deposite in the family vault, his wife, the young and virtuous Madeleine—"to die so young, after being married only eighteen months!" He dried up his tears and began to kiss his son, only ten days old, whose birth had caused his mother's death. This child was the only memorial that his wife had left him; for Madeleine had brought him no other dowry than her virtues. The whole town had shared in the grief of this afflicted father, who intrusted his little Frederic to a young lady of the neighbourhood to be nursed and raised. He had placed him near his own house, in order that he might have the happiness of seeing him often; and indeed he used to go very frequently to see him, lavished on him a thousand marks of his love, and

esteemed himself happy when he saw him answer his caresses with smiles, or stretch out his little hands as if to tell his father to carry him with him.

The death of Madeleine had left a frightful void in the heart of this good father. He had been tenderly attached to his virtuous spouse; and although he foresaw that it would not be easy for him to find one possessing the amiable qualities of his first wife, yet he resolved to marry again—his happiness and the care of his house demanding the presence of a wife. He had a fine fortune, was nearly forty-eight years of age, and enjoyed the esteem and confidence of all. He fixed his mind on Sophia Fallen, a lady in her thirty-sixth year, whose character resembled his own. He obtained her without difficulty. One year after, Sophia had a son, whom she named Ely.

From the day of his marriage with Sophia, the counsellor had taken home Frederic, whose features reminded him of his poor Madeline, whom he always lamented. Sophia seemed at first to take a liking to him, and loaded him with kindness in order to please her husband; but when she became a mother, she neglected Frederic, whom she regarded, if I may so speak, as a stranger in the family, and called him the child of a beggar, because she was richer than Madeline. Thus she became from day to day, more cold towards him, and finally treated him as a cruel step-mother. Ely, on the contrary became the object of all her attention; whatever he desired was given him, she even went beyond his desires, applauded him in every thing, and even praised his defects, whilst poor Frederic, experienced nothing but severity, and lived in continual dread; for the least faults, even when they were involuntary, he was treated with unexampled cruelty. Their educations which were so different, produced corresponding fruits. Ely became a spoiled child, a little cheat, a hypocrite, a conceited fellow, and a liar. It is true, he improved at school, because he had an extraordinary memory; he was always well dressed, behaved well at home, and thus kept up appearances. Frederic, without neglecting any thing essential, was more timid, and did not boast so much as his brother; he had more judgement than Ely, but the ill treatment that he constantly experienced seemed to paralyze the vivacity of his mind; and because he spoke but little, they took him for an idiot. His courteous countenance pleased every one. Ely, on the contrary, was frightfully ugly; his features were irregular in the extreme, and his whole body was badly proportioned. But the defects of nature were compensated by his wit and pleasantry: whenever he could, without exposing himself, play a trick on his companions, he never failed to do so. He knew so well how to make his plans, that the fault would fall on another, and very often Frede-

ric suffered the punishment ; then Ely would rub his hands with joy and run away as if he knew not what had happened. At school he would pour ink into the pockets of his companions, hide their pens or find some other means of annoying them ; at home, he would take one of his mother's caps, dress the house dog with it, and set him loose or play some other foolish trick still more wicked—on all these occasions, he was as much pleased as if he had performed the best action in the world ; and he immediately meditated some new mischief.

Frederick was the model of the children of the town. Candor and innocence were painted on his countenance ; every thing spoke his virtue. An enemy to every kind of duplicity, he did not endeavour to conceal any of his actions ; and his frankness led him to own his faults with sincerity ; but the ill-will and jealousy of his step-mother always exaggerated them. Mr. Maltame, on the repeated complaints of Sophia, took Frederic for a bad boy, and often scolded him. When this unfortunate little boy wished to defend himself, Sophia and Ely leagued together against him, treated him as a liar and a hypocrite, and his father being deceived, gave credit to their infamous calumnies. Frederic was obliged to keep silence, happy to escape punishment ; but what was deferred on one day, was not lost on another ; and although he escaped a whipping, he still had to feel the resentment of his step-mother. A piece of dry bread was all he had for his dinner, and Ely added to his grief, by eating before him the most dainty morsels.

These hardships that Frederic suffered at so tender an age, for he was scarcely twelve years old taught him at an early period to submit to the trials of adversity, and formed his character. Seeing that there was nothing to hope from men, the amiable child placed his hopes in God, and addressed himself to him in his affliction : he had learned in sacred history that the innocent Abel fell a victim to the jealousy of Cain, that the virtuous Joseph had been sold by his brothers, that Daniel had been cast into a lion's den ; all these examples strengthened his courage and inspired him with confidence in him who knows how to turn even evil into good, and to avenge sooner or later persecuted innocence. He did not envy the favors that his brother enjoyed home. His conscience supplied the place of every thing for him, and not being able to undeceive his father with regard to the prejudices, that he, otherwise so amiable a man, entertained against him, he contented himself with lamenting in secret the ill-treatment that he suffered, and prayed with increased fervor for the author of his being.

Frederic had made his first communion with an angelic-piety, and had received in the Holy Eucharist new strength to support the yoke with

which he was loaded. Every month he approached the holy table ; his soul, nourished by the bread of angels, was replenished in this intimate union with God, the protector of infancy, and confirmed in the pious resolutions which he had taken. If, on the one hand, Frederic suffered with resignation the ill treatment of Sophia and Ely, on the other he avoided the company of such children of his age as might corrupt his innocence. He had only one friend, with whom he had become acquainted at catechism : this was Bernard, of the same age with himself, the son of a poor widow who lived out of the town, in a small house which she had rented at a little distance from the river ; she was a washer-woman, and gained a livelihood with great difficulty.

The virtuous Frederic went every week to visit his friend Bernard ; he never left him without slipping some cents into his pocket, and he immediately gave them to his mother ; who every time blessed the good heart of the young Maltese.

One day, Frederic and Ely went together out of the town ; they met Bernard who came to them holding under his arm a bundle of white linen which his mother had sent him to carry to a lady for whom she worked. Frederic, who had not seen his little friend for some days, put his hand in his pocket to give him some cents ; but he had no money with him ; so he said to Ely : ' Lend me ten or twelve cents for this poor little boy ; I will pay you when we get home.'

' Ten or twelve cents ! ' cried his wicked brother, ' do you wish to give them to that little vagabond ? It seems that you know him. Be silent : I'll tell father. Why do you keep company with a bad boy like this ?'

' Bernard is not a bad companion,' replied Frederic with animation, ' he is poor, but honest.'

Ely made no answer, but pushed Bernard with so much violence, that the poor boy fell flat on the ground, and his bundle rolled in the dirt.

The mischievous Ely, running away with all his speed, laughed very heartily. Frederick picked up the bundle, returned it to Bernard, who had risen, consoled him, and accompanied him to his mother's house, to whom he related all that had happened. This unlucky accident annoyed her not a little ; she was obliged to wash again the articles of dress that she had sent to the city ; and she feared that the delay would draw upon her the reproaches of the lady who was thus deprived of the clothes for some days.

When Frederic returned home he found the whole family angry against him. His father seized a stick and gave him several blows ; his mother scolded him ; and Ely, who pretended to tremble in all his limbs, tormented him with his tricks. According to his report, Frederic had induced a wicked boy, by giving him money, to beat the in-

nocent. the good Ely. Frederic in his turn, tried to justify himself, and related the malicious conduct of his brother; but Ely denied everything, and was believed; he exculpated himself completely, and his brother alone suffered.

From that day, Sophia had no more repose and warmly urged her husband to send Frederic from home, as he was the disturber of their domestic tranquility, and the cause of much wrangling in the family. Frederic had already completed the course of studies taught in the little town in which his father resided; and as he desired to go one day to the University, and study surgery the thing seemed less difficult for Sophia. His father had made secret inquiries to find a college where his son might finish his studies before going to the University. But the time seemed too long for Sophia and Ely, who were anxious to get rid of the troublesome Frederic immediately.

One day, his father was invited to a public dinner given to the nobles of the town. He put on a richly ornamented dress, silk stockings, shoes with buckles, and above all, did not forget his fine wig, which he had bought several years before, and which never left the band box except on great occasions. To complete his dress he buckled on his sword, put on his gloves and viewed himself before the glass;—he seemed to be ten years younger. Sophia admired the taste which he had displayed at his toilet, put on her husband's spectacles, accompanied him as far as the door, and wished him much pleasure. Frederic also saluted his father from the window of his room and Ely fondled about him to prove how much he loved him.

Sophia locked up the clothes that her husband had taken off. Ely slipped behind her into the little room where she had put them, stole away his father's old wig and morning gown, and hid them until evening; then climbing up to the top of the roof, at the risk of falling and breaking his arms and legs, he reached the lightning-rod, hung on it the morning-gown and the wig, and descended without being perceived. He played this prank so quickly, that no one had even taken notice of his absence.

To be Continued.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

To Country Subscribers—we have this to say— all papers must be paid for in **ADVANCE**, after the expiration of the present year, all papers not so paid for, will be discontinued. It is impossible to collect subscriptions of **FIVE SHILLINGS** scattered

over a whole Province. The man who cannot pay this sum for his paper in advance, is not more likely to do so at the end of the year. We pay **CASH** for paper and labour weekly, and we must be paid **CASH** by our subscribers, to enable us to continue to do so.

A. J. RITCHIE.

BIRTHS RECORDED.

AT ST. MARY'S.

- SEPTR. 6—Mrs. Horn of a Son.
 7—Mrs. Dunphy of a Son.
 8—Mrs. Foley of a Daughter.
 “—Mrs. Fitzgerald of a Daughter.
 10—Mrs. Duggan of a Son.
 “—Mrs. Frierman of a Son.

MARRIAGE RECORD.

- SEPTR. 7—John Manning to Maria Kelly.
 9—Hugan O'Connor to Mary Ann Andrews.

INTERMENTS.

AT THE CEMETERY OF THE HOLY CROSS.

- SEPTR. 1—Eliza, daughter of John and Rachel Cantwell, aged 12 months.
 3—John, son of Patrick & Johanna Mooney aged 7 months.
 5—Jane, daughter of David and Johanna Whelan, aged 12 months.
 6—David, son of Patrick and Johanna Hogan, aged 11 months.
 7—Patrick McNutty, a native of Ireland, aged 43 years.
 10—Simon Williams, a native of Ireland, aged 30 years.
 11—Ann Catherine, infant daughter of William and Sophia Barden, aged 11 months and 20 days.

Published by A. J. RITCHIE, 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.