

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 41.—JULY, 1897.

I. PHILIP MELANCHTHON, SCHOLAR AND REFORMER.¹

OF the many brief descriptions of the Reformation, none is more striking than that which represents it as the return of Christendom to a book. Of course, so continental, profound and complex a movement cannot be described in a single sentence. But with a rough kind of truth it may be said, that when the hour of the great religious revolution struck, the various lines on which its historical causes had for centuries been moving converged and terminated in the Holy Bible. If we were limited to a single statement as to what the Reformation, in its inmost essence, was, and what, as it perpetuates itself in the Protestant churches, it still is; after all our study of the historical events which preceded it as coöperating agents—the papal schism, the reforming councils, the struggles between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, the classical revival, the destructive and constructive forces which tore down the mediæval and built up the modern society, as the inventions of printing, of gunpowder and of the mariner's compass and the great voyages of discovery, the religious labors of local and national reformers like Wicliff and Huss and Savonarola—if, I say, after all this study, we were called to select a single sentence in which to embody the idea of the Reformation, we could find no better sentence for the purpose than that of Wil-

¹An address delivered in the chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary on the occasion of the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Philip Melanchthon. The Rev. Dr. Green, Chairman of the Faculty, presided; and the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, took part in the services. The hymns sung were written by Melanchthon and Luther.

II. MARIOLATRY.

PAUL's spirit was painfully excited at seeing Athens full of idols. Moved by the same zeal for the honor of Christ and the same pity for duped souls, the Christian of to-day is filled with like sadness and indignation at seeing the Romish Church, which claims to be the sole repository and dispenser of grace, wholly given to idolatry, changing the truth of God into a lie, and worshipping the creature more than the Creator.

Her supreme idol is the mother of Jesus. Not merely "by the space of two hours" (Acts xix. 34), but incessantly, day and night, the world over, her refrain is: "Great is Mary; great is Mary, the mother of God." Several days in the year and the whole month of May have been set apart to do her special honor, to praise the beauty of her person, to extol her virtues, to magnify her power, to invoke her intercession, to give thanks for her protection, and to vow fealty in her service. Images of Mary, in gold, silver, bronze, plaster or wood, abound in churches, schools, convents, hospitals, asylums and private dwellings, and are bowed down to and worshipped. She is exalted, not to heavenly places in Christ, but, by virtue of her own sinlessness and merit, to the highest place in heaven itself, with the Father and the Son on either side, whom she commands to grant the petitions which ascend to her.

If glorified saints are cognizant of what takes place on earth, and are affected by it as they would certainly be were they still in the flesh, Mary, though in heaven, must be unutterably unhappy because of this idolatry, which not only makes her worthiness the ground of the sinner's acceptance and the plea of prevailing prayer, but ascribes to her the perfections of deity, and invests her with the gracious sovereignty of Almighty God.

Rome, "full of all subtlety and all mischief" (Acts xiii. 10), confounds and catches the ignorant and unwary by making a distinction in the kinds or degrees of worship. That which is offered to relics, images and ordinary saints, she calls *dulia*, a sort of pious

honor; that addressed to Mary, *hyperdulia*, profound reverence; that to the persons of the Trinity, *latria*, the worship with which none but God may be approached. That this is a distinction without a difference must be admitted, when one can see, even in this country, hundreds of Romanists on bended knees before a little image, with the same semblance of devotion and grateful affection and implicit trust that the cleansed leper exhibited at the feet of the Lord Jesus. More than this, it is a distinction that is ignored, not only in fact, but also in the authoritative teaching of the Romish Church. For example, one of the most eminent of her theologians, Thomas Aquinas, who has been elevated to saintship, says: "A cross of any material ought to be worshipped with *latria*, because not only the cross upon which Jesus Christ hung is worthy of that worship, for the reason that it touched Christ, but also because it is a cross, *i. e.*, a sign and image of Christ hanging on the cross." Another distinguished doctor of theology wrote: "Those things which by contact with our Lord partook of his holiness, as the cross, nails, spear, thorns, etc., are to be adored with *latria*." Accordingly, the Breviary, which is the manual of daily devotion, and the use of which is obligatory on every priest, prescribes the following prayer for the fourteenth of September: "O Cross, more splendid than the stars, illustrious throughout the world, much beloved by men, more holy than all things, who alone wast worthy to bear the treasure of the world, bearing sweet wood, sweet nails, a sweet burden, save the multitude assembled this day in thy praise." And as with the cross, so with the image of our Lord. The same writer already quoted, Thomas Aquinas, says: "Since Christ is to be adored with the worship of *latria*, the consequence is that his image is to be adored with the worship of *latria*."

The claim that the worship offered to Mary is only *hyperdulia* is bald pretence. If "those senseless material things, the cross, nails, spear, thorns, etc., which, by contact with our Lord, partook of his holiness, are therefore to be adored with *latria*," surely she, in whose womb he was conceived, at whose breasts he was nourished, in whose arms he nestled, and who was in "contact" with him times without number during his life of thirty-three years, is,

by the same reasoning, entitled to, and receives, the highest form of worship, precisely that which is paid to the persons of the Trinity, only, in addition, it nauseates by its sickly sentimentality and shocks by its studied blasphemy.

The heathen Chinaman uses a rosary, or string of beads, to aid him in his devotions. On this he counts his prayers. As he passes each bead between his thumb and finger, he pronounces the name of his god, "Oma-da-vo," repeating it until he gets to the end of the string. This is his prayer. The Romanist, also, from the pope down to the baptized savage, says his prayers with the help of a string of beads, which is called the "rosary of the Blessed Virgin," because most of the prayers counted off by means of it are addressed to her. It may be seen dangling ostentatiously from the girdle of the "sisters" who are ever begging in our markets, places of business, and from house to house, and most successfully from gullible Protestants. It consists of one hundred and sixty-five beads, fifteen of which are larger than the others, and are placed upon the string so as to divide the smaller ones into blocks of ten. After kissing the attached crucifix, and making the sign of the cross on his face and breast, the worshipper recites the Apostles' Creed, the "Gloria," and the Lord's Prayer, and then repeats the following ten times, with each repetition grasping one of the smaller beads:

"Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen."

This brings him to the next of the larger beads, when he recites again the "Gloria" and "Our Father," and then repeats ten "Hail Marys." So the performance goes on, ten "Hail Marys" succeeding one "Gloria" and "Our Father," until he, too, like the "heathen Chinese," gets to the end of his string, when he will have repeated the Lord's Prayer fifteen times, and the prayer to Mary one hundred and fifty times; that is, in this religious exercise, the creature is worshipped tenfold more than the Creator; and it is simply absurd to pretend that this worship is on the zig-zag order, by which the devotee first offers *latría* to God, and then drops down to *hyperdulía* to Mary, and repeats this marvellous spiritual gymnastics until the beads are all counted.

When two or more persons repeat the rosary together, one recites the first half of the prayer, and the others respond with the second. The first half will be recognized as composed of the salutation of Gabriel and of Elizabeth to Mary, except that the angel's words, "highly favored," are perverted into ascribing to Mary "fulness of grace." What this means may be learned from a work entitled *Real Principles of Catholics*, written by a bishop and approved by bishops, among others, by the late Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia. In reply to the question, "Why is Mary said to be full of grace?" the answer is given as follows:

"By grace are understood all supernatural gifts which made her acceptable to God and preferable to all other creatures; and this is expressed by fulness; . . . but most especially the fulness of grace consists in the particularity of graces, viz., she was not only *sanctified in her mother's womb*, as some few others had been, *but was exempt from the guilt of original sin*, and, as a consequence of that, from concupiscence of the flesh, and never was guilty of the least sin. Besides, she possessed all divine gifts in the most eminent degree, viz., faith, hope, charity, humility, obedience, chastity, with all the moral virtues," etc.

The second half of the "Hail Mary" is entirely of man's concocting, and is pure blasphemy, in that it makes Mary, not only a mediator, but the mother of God. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (Eph. ii. 5.) "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John ii. 1.) "Through him we have access by the Spirit unto the Father." (Eph. ii. 18.) "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John xiv. 6.) "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. vii. 25.) "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." (John i. 1, 3, 14.) It was this "flesh," the human body of our Lord, not his eternal Godhead, of which Mary was the mother.

Furthermore, the Romish Church attaches expiatory virtue to the prayer, "Hail, Mary." The repetition of it so many times is often assigned as a penance, the performance of which is the condition on which pardon of sin hangs. The absolution granted by

the priest to the confessing penitent becomes effective only on the rendering of "satisfaction" by the latter, which "satisfaction" is the reciting of a prayer a prescribed number of times, or the performance of some other "penance."

Similar repetition of the "Hail Mary" accrues merit to the reciter, which is put to his credit, or to that of some departed soul whom he wishes to serve, and the effect of which is to shorten the stay of himself or of that other soul in the dismal mythical place of purifying torment called "purgatory."

Additional proof that the highest form of worship is offered to Mary is found in Deharbe's *Catechism*, page 132:

"Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our Life, our Sweetness, and our Hope! To thee do we cry, poor banished sons of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning, and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious Advocate, thine eyes of mercy toward us, and, after this our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus, O clement, O loving, O sweet Virgin Mary." And page 135: "O Mary, my Queen and my Mother, I offer myself entirely to thee, and, in order to prove myself devoted to thee, I consecrate to thee this day my sight, my hearing, my speech, my heart, my whole being. Since, therefore, I am thine, O good Mother, preserve and defend me as thy property and possession."

The above may be found also in *The Christian's Guide to Heaven; a Manual for Catholics*, published some years ago by a Catholic bookseller in Baltimore, and under the sanction of the then archbishop in that city. From the same book, I quote:

"O Blessed Virgin, I come to offer thee my most humble homage, and to implore the aid of thy prayers and protection. Thou art all-powerful with the Almighty. Thou knowest that from my tender years I looked up to thee as my mother, my advocate, and patroness. Thou wert pleased to consider me from that time as one of thy children. I will henceforth serve, honor, and love thee. Accept my protestation of fidelity; look favorably on the confidence I have in thee; obtain for me, of thy dear Son, a lively faith, a firm hope, a tender, generous and constant love, that I may experience the power of thy protection at my death."

An archbishop of Florence, commenting on the words of Paul, says: "'Come boldly to the throne of grace.' Mary is the throne of grace; to her let us, therefore, come with boldness, that we may obtain mercy and grace in the time of need." Another commentator, Biel, declares: "The name of Mary, to us, affords a sweeter taste than that of her Son." In 1832 Pope Gregory exhorted

thus: "Let us raise our eyes to the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." Archbishop Gibbons, in his *Faith of our Fathers*, page 221, says:

"I find Jesus and Mary together at the manger, together in Egypt, together in Nazareth, together in the temple, together at the cross. I find their names side by side in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. It is fitting that they should both find a place in my heart, and that both names should flow successively from my lips. Inseparable in life and death, they should not be divorced in prayer. What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

In the *New Raccolta*, a Catholic prayer-book approved by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ryan, the following, known as St. Alphonsus Liguori's prayer, is found on page 285:

"Most holy and immaculate Virgin! O my mother! the queen of the world, the advocate, hope, and refuge of sinners! I, the most wretched among them, now come to thee. I worship thee, great queen, and give thee thanks for the many favors thou hast bestowed on me in the past; most of all do I thank thee for having saved me from hell, which I had so often deserved. I love thee, lady, most worthy of all love, and, by the love which I bear thee, I promise in the future ever to serve thee, and to do what in me lies to win others to thy love. In thee I put all my trust, all my hope of salvation. Receive me as thy servant, and cover me with the mantle of thy protection, thou who art the mother of mercy! And since thou hast so much power with God, deliver me from all temptations, or at least obtain for me the grace ever to overcome them. From thee I ask a true love of Jesus Christ, and the grace of a happy death. And, my mother! by thy love for God, I beseech thee to be at all times my helper, but, above all, at the last moment of my life. Leave me not until you see me safe in heaven, there for endless ages to bless thee, and sing thy praises. Amen."

The late Pope Pius IX. granted three hundred days' indulgence for each repetition of the foregoing prayer. That is, the utterance of the prayer would shorten the utterer's sojourn in purgatory by almost a year, and it is easy to calculate that a glib tongue could rattle off, in a few hours, sufficient repetitions of the prayer to "dock" his time in purgatory at least a thousand years, perhaps to secure his release altogether, though "the church" is conveniently unable to say how long one must stay there, or when one has been sufficiently purified by its fiery discipline to be set free.

Every prayer-book for priest and layman has a form called the Litany of the Blessed Virgin. It consists of senseless, ridiculous, most extravagant ascriptions to Mary, after each of which the person says: "Pray for us." Here are specimens: "Holy Mary: Pray for us."

“Holy Mother of God: Pray for us.” “Mother of Divine Grace: Pray for us.” “Mother undefiled,” “Mother unviolated,” “Mother most admirable,” “Mother of our Creator,” “Virgin most venerable,” “Virgin most powerful,” “Mirror of Justice,” “Seat of Wisdom,” “Spiritual Vessel,” “Vessel of Singular Devotion,” “Mystical Rose,” “Tower of David,” “Tower of Ivory,” “House of Gold,” “Ark of the Covenant,” “Gate of Heaven,” “Morning Star,” “Refuge of Sinners,” “Queen of Angels,” “Queen of Patriarchs,” “Queen of Apostles: Pray for us.”

A very popular prayer-book is entitled the *Glories of Mary*. It was approved by the late Bishop Hughes, of New York. I quote from the edition of 1891: “God has ordained that all graces should come to us through the hands of Mary.” “In every danger we may obtain salvation through the glorious Virgin.” “To honor the Queen of Angels is to acquire everlasting life.” “All graces are dispensed by the hand of Mary alone.” “All angels and men, all things that are in heaven and on the earth, are also subject to the dominion of the glorious Virgin.” “Let sinners who have lost grace flee to Mary; with her they will certainly find it. Therefore she is ordained to be the mediatrix of peace between the sinner and God.” “Sinners receive pardon only through the intercession of Mary.” “The soul cannot live without having recourse and commending itself to Mary.” “He falls and is lost who does not flee to Mary.” “The Virgin has all power in heaven and on earth.” “Omnipotent to save sinners.” “Mary is always before the divine tribunal to mitigate the sentence and punishment due to the sinner.”

Dr. Oswald, a German Catholic theologian, asserts:

“We maintain the co-presence of Mary in the Eucharist. This co-presence is a consequence of our Marian theory, and we must not shrink from any consequence. We believe that in the elements of the Eucharist the presence of Mary is complete; that she exists there entirely, body and soul. . . . We must familiarize ourselves with the idea of a mutual and permanent inter-penetration of the body of Christ with the body of the Virgin, and at the same place, that is, in the holy elements.”

This blasphemy is capped by Cardinal Bonaventura, who was canonized by Pope Sixtus IV., and his works published by order of a succeeding pope, by whom he was called the Seraphic Doctor.

Bonaventura adapted the Psalms to the worship of Mary by substituting her name for that of Jehovah, and her title of Lady for Lord. Thus: "In thee, O Lady, do I put my trust. Let me never be confounded." "Let our Lady arise: let her enemies be scattered." "O come, and let us sing unto our Lady, and make a joyful noise unto the Queen of our salvation." "The Lord said unto my Lady, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Praise our Lady of heaven, glorify her in the highest. Praise her, all ye men and cattle." "Let everything that hath breath praise our Lady."

Let us now see what foundation there is for this huge, grotesque structure of deceit and blasphemy. A priest in the city of New York, who has made quite a fortune by exhibiting for the adoration of the "faithful" what he avers to be a piece of the arm bone of the mother of Mary, but which those who have examined it pronounce a chicken bone, congratulates himself and his parishioners that they are so favored as to possess a portion of the body of the "grandmother of God." There is nothing true about this but its impious roguery. Who was Mary? Who were her parents? Where was she born? How long did she live? Where did she die? Where was she buried? Nobody knows. Her name occurs five times in Matthew (Matt. i. 16, 18, 20; ii. 11; xiii. 55), once in Mark (Mark vi. 3), twelve times in Luke (Luke i. 27, 30, 34, 38, 39, 41, 46, 56; ii. 5, 16, 19, 34), not at all in John, once in the Acts (Acts i. 14), and nowhere else in the New Testament. Besides, she is referred to without mention of her name, six times in Matthew (Matt. ii. 13, 14, 20, 21; xii. 46, 47), twice in Mark (Mark iii. 31, 32), seven times in Luke (Luke i. 43; ii. 33, 43, 48, 51; viii. 19, 20), and nine times in John (John ii. 1, 3, 5, 12; vi. 42; xix. 25, 26, 27). The reader is earnestly asked to turn to these passages of Scripture. He will find that there is nothing in them that distinguishes Mary, except the fact that she was honored to be the mother of Jesus of Nazareth. They record the message of Gabriel to her; her visit to Elizabeth; the removal of Joseph's hesitancy to take her to wife; the birth of the child in Bethlehem; the visit of the shepherds and the wise men to the new-born babe; the prayer of Simeon in the temple

and his words to Mary; the flight to, and return from, Egypt; the dwelling in Galilee; the going up to Jerusalem at the pass-over, when the lad remained behind; the miracle at the marriage in Cana; the interruption of his discourse by the announcement that his mother and brethren wished to speak to him; the wonderment of his neighbors who knew him as the carpenter's son; her presence at the crucifixion; our Lord's committing her to the care of John; and John's taking her to his home. This, I believe, is an accurate summary of the little that is said about her.

It is significant that the message of the angel to the shepherds was exclusively concerning the babe, and that, on their return from the manger, "they made known the saying that was told them concerning the child." It is significant that Simeon and Anna in the temple spoke of Jesus only, except that Simeon forewarned Mary of the anguish in store for her. It is significant that when the wise men saw the young child with his mother they worshipped him, not her, and offered gifts to him, not to her. It is significant that John, to whose filial care the dying Jesus committed her, never mentions her name, but merely refers to her as suggesting the lack of wine at the Cana marriage, as going down to Capernaum, as well known as the mother of Jesus and the wife of Joseph, as present at the crucifixion and as going thence to be a member of his household. This is absolutely all that the beloved disciple has to say about his precious charge.

Surely, if God meant Mary to be the queen of heaven, the tower of ivory, the house of gold, the refuge of sinners, the throne of grace, the entire ground of our hope and the dispenser of salvation, the Holy Spirit would have used her foster-son to give us some intimation of it. But from the time he took her to his own home she is wholly lost sight of, except Luke's incidental mention (Acts i. 14), that she with the other women and our Lord's brethren continued with the rest of the disciples in prayer and supplication.

It is significant that she is not mentioned as being at the sepulchre, and that the risen Jesus sent no message to her, except as she was included among the brethren. It is significant that during his sojourn on earth after his resurrection he did not single

her out for special personal interview, neither by act or word distinguished her above others, nor intimated that, either here or hereafter, she was to have any præeminence. It is significant that his answer to her at the Cana marriage, "Woman, what have I to with thee?" and in the temple, when he discoursed with the doctors of the law, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" implied that she was not a participant in that "business," and that her earthly relation to him must be held subordinate to the mission that brought him into the world. It is significant that the exclamation, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou has suckd," elicited the rejoinder, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," and that when his mother and brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him, he said: "My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it."

It is significant that in none of the epistles is her name mentioned or the slightest reference made to her. The expression (Gal. iv. 4), "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," means no more than that the Son took upon him human nature, and the omission to particularize the woman who gave him birth, when it might so naturally have been done, is the strongest presumption against Rome's impious exaggeration of the worthiness and power of the mother of Jesus. It is not conceivable that, if Mary is entitled to deification, the Holy Spirit would have neglected to move Paul, and Peter, and James, and John, and Jude to include this in their instructions to the believers in that day and in all time.

It is significant that in her praiseful response to Elisabeth's salutation, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" (Luke i. 46, 47), Mary confesses that she is a sinner, acknowledges her need of a Saviour, and rejoices in her Redeemer.

The foregoing testimony of Scripture is very contrary to the teachings of the Romish church, which is boldly set forth by a painting in St. Peter's Cathedral at Rome, an exact copy of which the New York *Churchman* caused to be made and gave to its readers a year or so ago. The Virgin is represented in heaven

with God the Father on her left, God the Son on her right, and God the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove above her. She is the most prominent person in the quaternity, and stands upon a serpent, as overcoming evil, while the world is under her feet. A similar picture has been seen in the Jesuit College, at Georgetown, D. C. One of the figures is an aged man, intended to represent God the Father, another is a young man, intended to represent God the Son. These two are in the act of placing a crown on the head of a female, intended to represent the mother of God, while above them all is the figure of a dove, intended to represent the Holy Spirit. This explanation of the picture was given by a priest in the College.

Further proof that Rome is wholly given to idolatry, that she is the church of Mary, not of Jesus, is furnished by the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. These are the words in which the dogma was promulgated by the late Pope Pius IX. :

“We declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, is to be firmly and constantly believed by the faithful. Wherefore should any presume, which God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know and, moreover, understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the church.”

Of course, there was no “revelation” in the case. Pius, during his exile from Rome, had a dream, so he said, in which Mary appeared to him and commanded that, when permitted to return to that city, he should declare her to have been conceived free from sin. Until then, it had not been a doctrine of the church, but merely an opinion on which the clergy and people were much divided. Pius, however, took the matter in his own hands and settled the question; and though preceding popes had forbidden those who denied Mary’s immaculate conception to be charged with heresy, he declared it an article of faith, and anathematized all who should reject it. The doctrine is simply a pious fraud to make surer and more intense the devotion of the faithful to the omnipotent Queen of Heaven. Had Mary been without taint of

original sin, she would have been exempt from the requirements which the Levitical law imposed on all women of Israel after childbirth; but we see that in her ceremonial uncleanness, symbolical of spiritual defilement, she brought a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons—the one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering, that the priest might make an atonement for her.

This tricky pretence of Mary's immaculate conception is in the face of the unvarying law which reigns over all the descendants of Adam by ordinary generation, and which was recited by our Lord himself: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Moreover, it both robs our Lord of the glory of his humiliation, in that he made himself of no reputation but stooped to our low estate, and takes away from us the ground of unspeakable comfort and bold confidence, in that not only it behooved him to be made like unto us, but that he condescended to be born of a woman whose first father brought sin and misery and death into the world, and some of whose succeeding ancestors were guilty of lying, adultery, incest, and murder. It is noteworthy that in Matthew's genealogy of the Saviour only three women are named, Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba, all of them of bad repute. "This," says Poole, "was one degree of our Lord's humiliation, and it was no way incongruous that he who came into the world to die for great sinners should be born of some that were such."

By solemn act of the sixth council of bishops at Baltimore, "the Blessed Virgin Mary, conceived without sin, was chosen as the patroness of the United States." And, the world over, "Great is Mary! Great is Mary, the Mother of God!" is the refrain of the Romish Church. But, as already said, if glorified saints are cognizant of what takes place on earth, and are affected by it as they would certainly be were they still in the flesh, the humble woman whom we with angels and men call blessed, because God chose her to incarnate his Son, must be unutterably unhappy even in heaven, at the idolatry which not only makes her merit the ground of the sinner's acceptance and the plea of prevailing prayer, but ascribes to her the perfections of deity and invests her with the gracious sovereignty of Almighty God.

ROBERT P. FARRIS.