

# THE CROSS.



Is the Church likened unto a house? It is a placed on the foundation of a rock, which is Peter. Will you behold our Redeemer paying the tribute as its master, and after him comes Peter as his representative. Is the Church a bark? Peter is its pilot; and it is our Redeemer who instructs him. Is the doctrine by which we are drawn from the gulph of Sin represented by a fisher's net? It is Peter who casts it; Peter who draws it, the other disciples left their sid, but it is Peter that presents the fishes to our Redeemer. Is the Church represented by an embassy? Saint Peter is at its head. Do you prefer the figure of a Kingdom? Saint Peter carries its keys. In fine, will you have it shadowed under the symbol of flock and fold? Saint Peter is the Shepherd, and Universal Pastor under Jesus Christ. S. Francis of Sales. Controv. Disc. 42.

Jesus said to his disciples. Whom do you say I am?

Simon Peter answered and said. Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answering, said to him. Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona. Because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee. Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

And I shall give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in Heaven. St. Matthew xvi. 13-19.

## CALENDAR.

- 23—Sunday—III after Epiphany, Desponsation of B. V. M. Gt Doub &c.
- 24—Monday—St Timothy B. M. Semid
- 25—Tuesday—Con. of St Paul Great Doub com &c.
- 26—Wednesday—St Polycarp B. M. D. J.
- 27—Thursday—St Vitilian P and Con Doub Sup.
- 28—Friday—St John Chrysnostom B. C. and Doct Doub comm. &c.
- 29—Saturday—IV after the Epiphany S Felix IV P and Conf Doub Sup.

From the Catholic Observer.

### THE TITLE OF MOTHER OF GOD.

Protestants profess to be shocked that we give the title to the Blessed Virgin Mary. It would appear strange to us if only Unitarians and other unbelievers in Christ's divinity protested against the use of this title. Denying that Christ was God, of course they must deny to his mother the appellation of Mother of God. But by far the larger portion of Protestants profess to believe that Christ was divinely and substantially God. This belief they regard as the foundation stone of their Church. All who deny it they regard as wanting in the essentials of Christianity and frequently style them Deists. Yet by a marvellous inconsistency, though they believe that Christ is the Son of God, they deny that she is the Mother of God. That is, they profess to believe that Christ is God, and deny it at the same time. We were the other day conversing with a minister who is a high-church Episcopalian, and happened to use the term Mother of God, speaking of the Virgin Mary, whereupon the minister lifted both hands, closed his eyes and looked like one suffering with the nightmare.

"My dear sir," he said, at length, "don't use such an expression—it is awful, it is blasphemous." "You surprise me," we replied, "I am not aware of having used any disrespectful language—at least I did not intend such. Pray inform me what it was that shocked you."

"O, Sir, the expression you have employed with regard to the Virgin Mary."

"Why, really, you must have misunderstood my words. After the universal practice of the Catholic Church I simply styled her Mother of God."

"O sir 'O sir' don't, don't, I beg of you say that again."

This time the former scene was re-acted with the additional embellishment of putting the fingers for a few seconds to the ears.

After a pause to give our worthy friend an opportunity to recover, we resumed the conversation.

"I thought, Mr. —, that you Episcopalian believed in the divinity of Christ."

"So we do."

"Yes, as a body, but do you individually believe that Christ is God and was always God?"

"I do most certainly."

"Then he was God in the womb of the Virgin Mary?"

"Yes he was God then—but his divinity was in Heaven until after his birth when it became united to the man Christ Jesus."

"Why, my dear sir, you are a Nestorian; you are no Episcopalian at all—I see a book of Common Prayer on your table—will you allow me to refer you to the Thirty-Nine Articles?"

We took up the Prayer Book and read aloud as follows:

"ART. II.—Of the Word, or Son of God

which was made very Man.—The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

"It would appear from this that it is the belief of the Protestant Episcopal Church that the very and eternal God took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one person, never to be divided. This is sound Catholic doctrine, and from this it follows that Mary was the mother of Christ not merely as a man, but also as God, inasmuch as God took man's nature in her womb and of her substance—and the Godhead and manhood were joined together never to be divided. You see therefore that you cannot deny to Mary the title of Mother of God without denying your own faith and siding with the old Nestorian heretics."

Our worthy friend endeavoured to escape from the difficulty by striving to show that we did not comprehend the language and drift of the above cited Second Article, and finding ourselves likely to be involved in a long controversy about the meaning of plain English words we pleaded some important business and retired.

The above conversation we regard as an index and illustration of the belief of Protestants in general on this subject. The fact is they have but a very vague idea, and knowledge of their own faith. They are Nestorians without being aware of it. They profess to believe in the divinity, by making her his mother only as regards his manhood; whereas if he was God at all, he must have been so at the moment of his conception, for it was at that moment that the Holy Ghost came down upon her and the power of the most high overshadowed her. When therefore she became a mother by giving birth to her Son, that Son was the God-man Christ our Lord—the eternal "Word, who was in the beginning with God, and was God." Consequently she was the Mother of God.

Protestants we repeat are Nestorians—hence it is that the most distinguished Protestant writers, who had shrewdness and knowledge enough to perceive this, have labored indefatigably to show that Nestorius was a very good man, sound in the faith, and was unjustly condemned, and condemned solely because of a mere word, an unimportant title—merely for refusing to call Mary Mother of God. The fact was that the ground of his refusing this title to Mary was unsoundness in the faith, in a most essential point, that of the incarnation. Nestorius maintained that Mary ought not to be called the Mother of God because God could not be born of a human being. He taught therefore that there were two persons in Christ, God and Man, that Man and not God was born of Mary, thereby wholly destroying the hypostatical or personal union held by the Catholic Church in all ages and laid down as an article of faith in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and we believe of nearly all Protestant churches, and cited above, as "two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and manhood, joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man." Thirty-Nine Articles, Article II. Nestorius wrote to Pope Celestin to obtain an approval

of his doctrine, but was convicted of heresy and was condemned by a council convened at Rome by that Pontiff—and afterwards was more solemnly condemned, and deposed from the See of Constantinople by the General Council of Ephesus held in the year 431, which council is regarded as a general one by Protestants themselves.

Modern Nestorians proceeded step by step as did the ancient followers of Nestorius. They pretend to extraordinary virtue and sanctity. They regard Catholics with contempt—they misrepresent their doctrines, and accuse them of idolatry. They affect to be shocked and scandalized at the honours offered the Virgin Mother of our Lord. They say it is impossible that God should be born of a creature, as though God could not if he pleased descend from Heaven and assume human nature in the womb of a created being. They virtually deny the hypostatical union of two natures, the human and the divine in the one person of the Word—and thereby render null the doctrine of the Incarnation. Thus they subject themselves to the same condemnation as did Nestorius, and place themselves within the reach of the anathema of a general council of the Christian Church—a council convened in an age when as they themselves acknowledge the Church was pure, and, therefore by them received and respected as Councils, so true it is that "he that believeth not is judged already, because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten Son of God"—John, 3, 18

The following article from a Protestant paper, the Sabbath Recorder, contains some suggestions which deserve to be pondered by all Protestants, although we do not undertake to endorse all that it says.

### THE CATHOLICS—THE SABBATH.

The rapid increase of the numbers and influence of the Catholics in this country, is regarded by many good Protestants as giving just occasion for alarm. If we mistake not, the editors of the orthodox newspapers, as a class, are particularly susceptible to fright upon this subject. Hence they gather up and publish, with appropriate comments, every item of intelligence relating to the Catholics, which shows a disregard of popular notions, and is likely, when presented in its worst light, to create prejudice against them. If a Catholic priest finds a bare-footed child in the street, and gives him a pair of new shoes, these sharp eyed guardians of the public weal think they see in the circumstance an incipient step towards the conversion of the child to Romanism. And if the same child, or any other, is offered the advantages of a Catholic school free of expense, the cry is raised as conclusively that a systematic attempt to proselytize has commenced. Now we do not doubt the zeal of the Romanists to make converts, nor the honesty of those who profess to see so much danger in their efforts. But we must confess that we question whether Catholics are so greatly distinguished from Protestants by their zeal as to lay them open to any very serious charges on that score; and hence we seriously doubt the policy, not to say the Christianty, of finding so much fault with them. It seems to us that a more excellent way would be to imitate them, in acts of charity and efforts to educate the ignorant. The mass of men will be much more likely to acknowledge the superiority of Protestantism over Catholicism when they see it illustrated in actions than when they see it asserted on paper.

But there is one point where a great deal of fault is found with the Catholics concerning which we have a word to say. It is in respect to their

regard for the first day of the week, sometimes called the Sabbath. In various ways, they are charged with inconsistencies and wickedness because they use this day for purposes which in New England are regarded as improper. Those lies before us a newspaper giving some account of the opening of a Catholic College in one of the Western States on Sunday. The ceremonies, it is said, were accompanied by the firing of cannon, and all the parade and noise of a military muster. The account closes by saying, "and this on the Sabbath!" We are not disposed to justify such a use of a day which is regarded as the Sabbath. But we venture to say, that the Catholic view of the first day is quite as near the truth as the view entertained by their condemners. The Scriptures do not command us to keep that day holy, nor do they give us a definite information as to the manner in which it was observed in the days of the apostles. If we look into church history for information upon the point, we shall find that it was regarded as a very different day from the Sabbath. It was a festival day, only a few hours of which were required for worship, while the remainder might be spent in labour or amusement, according to each man's inclination. In this light was it generally regarded through the first six centuries of the church. From that time until the Reformation, the day was if possible regarded as still less sacred. Some of the leading Reformers, among whom were Luther in Germany and Tyndale in England, denied that the first day had been substituted for the seventh as the Sabbath, and maintained that if any day should be kept with Sabbatic strictness, it must be the seventh of the week, or Saturday. Indeed, the notion of the first day's being the Sabbath, and observable with the strictness required in the fourth commandment, seems to have originated with the Puritans, some two hundred and fifty years ago, and is now received only by that portion of the world over which their influence has been extensively felt. Intelligent Catholics are well acquainted with these facts. They know that the only day to which the fourth commandment can apply is the seventh day of the week; and that the first day, according to the universal voice of the early church, was only a festival day. Under such circumstances, with what contempt, not to say suspicion of dishonesty, must they look upon the charges of inconsistency and wickedness which are so often preferred against them by their Protestant neighbors for observing the Sunday as a holiday. They know very well that to carry out their principles consistently, Protestants must either abandon the idea of a Sabbath, or return to the observance of the seventh day. They boldly assert, if we may declare, that "the Sunday is no more the Lord's day by the law of the fourth commandment, than the Friday, for the Lord's day of the fourth commandment is the Saturday."

From the Philadelphia Catholic Herald.

At the great meeting in favor of Pius IX., recently held in New York, letters were read from some of the most distinguished men of our country. In looking over these letters, we were much pleased with the strong expressions of respect and admiration for his Holiness, with which they abound. We would like to publish them in full, but as they would occupy more space than we can spare, we are compelled to content ourselves with giving an extract or two from each one. We shall select those passages which indicate the feelings alluded to.

Extract of the letter from the Honble John A. Dix:

"Pius IX. stands before the world amongst the