

WHAT THINK YE OF MARY?"

Answer to Critics of Catholic Position

LON FRANCIS

Nihil Obstat:

REV. EDWARD A. MILLER

Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:

JOHN FRANCIS NOLL, D.D. Bishop of Fort Wayne

First Edition, 5,000

No. 145

Printed In U.S.A. February 25, 1954

By OUR SUNDAY VISITOR PRESS Huntington, Indiana

Deacidified



"What Think Ye of Mary?"

Introduction

YOU will recall that our Divine Lord asked His Apostles on one occasion what ideas the people had about Him. The Apostles answered that some thought "You are one of the old prophets returned to earth, such as Jeremias and Elias, some think you are John the Baptist." Then Christ asked the Apostles the same question: "Who do you say that I am?" Whereupon Peter, always the spokesman for the twelve, responded, "Thou art Christ, Son of the Living God." (Matt. 16:14-17.)

Now those who thought Christ was human were right insofar as He did possess a human nature, and Peter was right when declaring Christ also possessed a divine nature. He was the God-man.

Now the same question is asked quite frequently by non-Catholics concerning Mary. "Is she the mother of Jesus' human nature only, or is she 'Mother of God?"

Read this little pamphlet and you will find out.

WE have just received two tracts, published by the American Tract Society of New York, one of them entitled "The Virgin Mary," and the other "Queen of Heaven." Both cover pretty much the same ground, and while the author asserts that Protestants honor Mary because of her choice by God as the instrument of the Incarnation, he attacks her Immaculate Conception, her perpetual virginity, her Assumption, and her right to be called "Mother of God," and "Queen of Heaven."

The author declares that several Catholic theologians, presently honored as saints, rejected the Immaculate Conception of Mary; that the Council of Ephesus was wrong when it declared Mary to be the Mother of God; that the Bible proves that she was not a "perpetual virgin," etc.

The Tract begins by informing the reader that on November 1, 1950, Pope Pius XII proclaimed the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary into Heaven, and noticed that this action has "awakened in the minds of many Protestants certain questions regarding the Mother of Jesus. Is the Catholic representation according to the Scriptures? What, if anything, do we have to say regarding

the Roman Catholic teaching about her? What do Protestants think of Mary?"

What the Bible Says About Mary

The Scriptures say a great deal about Mary. They refer to her in Genesis, the first book of the Bible (Gen. 3:15); in Revelations, the last book of the Bible (Revel. 12:1); in Matthew and Luke in the middle of the Bible. In Luke, beginning with verse 26 of Chapter one, and running up to verse 56, the whole story is about Mary, and Mary is associated with what is written in the balance of that chapter. The entire chapter two deals with her.

The first chapter of St. Matthew deals with Mary and the Divine Son, Whom she would bear. The entire second chapter of Matthew also deals with Mary and the child and Joseph.

St. Luke makes it very clear that he interviewed Mary on the great mystery of the Incarnation and that, in her humility, she was unwilling to reveal much. Twice St. Luke tells us "Mary kept all these things in her heart."

The whole Bible, if devoted to Mary,

could not express more forcibly her position than the words of St. Matthew: "of whom was born Jesus, Who was called Christ" (Matt. 1:16).

We do not appraise the value of a painting by the number of square feet it occupies on the canvas. One single sentence or a phrase might be more significant than a whole chapter or an entire book.

Mary Immaculate

Now Catholics do hold that if Mary was the Mother of God she could not have been a sinner. Christ came into the world precisely to atone for sin. While Mary needed redemption through the merits of Christ, the Church teaches that these merits were applied to her soul at the moment of her creation, just as they were applied to Jeremias and John the Baptist in their mother's womb after creation, but before they were born.

Surely the woman who gave to Christ the very flesh and blood with which He was to redeem all mankind, could not herself have been for one moment under the dominion of the Evil One, whose head she was to crush (Gen. 3:15). The translation of that text in the Protestant Bible would convey the impression that Christ would crush the head of the serpent, but God, speaking to the devil, told him that both she, Mary, and her Seed, Christ, would be at enmity with him. That would not be true if Mary's soul were, at anytime, tainted by sin.

Most exegetes refer to the text in the last book of the Bible (Rev. 12:1) to Mary assumed into Heaven, because St. John, in vision, saw her in Heaven with her body, "clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and around her head a crown of twelve stars." The same exegetes read into that text her crowning as the Queen of the Apostles, and inferentially, the Queen of all saints and angels.

Many ask why Mary's death and assumption are not recorded in the Bible. The answer is that most of the New Testament was written before Mary died, and hence nothing could have been recorded about her death.

God would certainly provide a worthy mother for His beloved Son, and reason itself suggests that He would have preserved her soul from the stain of Original Sin—or she would not have been worthy of Him.

The author of the Tract sent to us

may belong to a religious body, some of whose members believe in Original Sin, but the generality of Protestants do not believe in it. Therefore, they must believe that they and everybody else were created immaculate. This was disclosed in a poll taken by a professor at Northwestern University, Chicago. If *every one* was born immaculate, why deny the privilege to Mary?

The author makes a great deal about the absence of evidence among Christians in the third and fourth centuries. But that is very easy to explain. The Church lived in the Catacombs, even the Popes who ruled it, for three centuries, and there was no definition on any doctrine until the Church was liberated under Constantine. He called the first General Council at Nicea in the year 325 (the fourth century) over which legates of the Pope presided. At that time the divinity of Christ was defined against the Arians, who called it in question.

Then the Council of Ephesus, called in the year 431, dealt with the heresy taught by Nestorius, who held Mary was not entitled to the designation "Mother of God" (Theotokos). The Nestorian teaching was condemned by that Council. The Nestorians had not

rejected belief in the Immaculate Conception.

Founders of all Protestant churches accepted the first six Councils of the Church, including Ephesus which was only the third Council. The teaching of the Church is that Christ had only a divine Person, while He had two natures, namely, that of God and that of man. We often refer to Christ as the "God-man." If Mary was the Mother of Him Whose person was God, then she is entitled to be called "the Mother of God." Of course every Catholic is taught, even the child in his Catechism, that Mary was not the Mother of the Holy Trinity, or of the Godhead in Heaven.

Didn't Elizabeth, under divine inspiration, address Mary with the words "The Mother of my Lord" (Luke 1:43)? It was certainly not a human Lord; and the Archangel Gabriel told her "the Lord is with thee" (Luke 1:28)—in the special sense that the person of the Eternal Son of God was united to her very body. He, God's beloved Son, as God-man, would be the "fruit of thy womb" (Luke 1:28).

"God," says the minister, "is a spirit, infinite and eternal spirit. It is simply

absurd speaking of God as having a mother."

Every Catholic believes and every Catholic book of instruction teaches that the nature of God Himself is "Spirit, infinite and eternal." But one of the three Persons of God willed to become incarnate, and if the Heavenly Father (as we learn He did from St. Luke) desired that His divine Son take a human nature from a holy maiden, then He would have both the nature of God and the nature of man—but the Person only of God. Hence the maidenmother would be the Mother of that God-man.

It was not Christ's human nature that redeemed us, but His divine Person. Hence Mary deserves to be called the "Mother of God"—the Mother of Him Who did not cease to be a divine Person by assuming human nature. God demanded INFINITE reparation for our redemption. Hence we can truly say that God died for us on the cross, and not merely the human nature of Christ. Every rational act is attributed to the Person who performs it.

The minister quotes the Nicene Creed to support his contention that Mary was only the Mother of the manhood of Jesus, but the Catholic Church wrote that Creed and certainly had no thought of contradicting herself. Mary was the Mother of Christ's manhood, but He Who assumed it from her was God.

Why Can't He?

The minister who wrote the Tracts, observes: "A Protestant should yield to no one in the high regard he has for Mary, the Mother of Jesus . . . on the other hand no Protestant can, in good conscience, accept the teaching of the Church of Rome about her."

We question that "high regard" because it is never manifested despite Mary's prophecy that "from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke 1:48).

If four-fifths of all Christians accept "the teaching of the Church of Rome about Mary," why can't he? Does he ever call her "blessed," as the Holy Spirit inspired her to say "all generations" would? Catholics do it every day, Protestants seldom. In fact, it is rare for any Protestant body, except the Anglicans, even to name a church after her. They name their churches after the Apostles and saints, and after the streets on which they are located, but not after the Mother of Jesus. In

none of their public devotions do they ever pay her honor, although some Anglicans, and many Lutherans in Germany still observe certain Marian feasts celebrated by Catholics, such as the Purification and the Annunciation.

Many Protestant churchmen actually teach their people that to honor Mary would be to withdraw honor from Christ. Would they reason in the same manner if their own mother were honored? Would that represent dishonor to themselves?

If Protestants read Catholic official works, they would discover that we honor Mary ONLY because of her divine Son, and certainly do not honor her in the same way.

Catholics distinguish between adoration or worship, which is due only to God, and the special veneration due to His Mother, and honor paid to those who were His best friends while on earth—the many saints and martyrs now associated with Him in Heaven.

What can a minister mean when he reads with his congregation: "I believe in the Communion of Saints"? That the first Christians understood that article of the Apostles' Creed as Catholics do today we learn from a visit to the ancient catacombs.

We Ask Mary to Pray for Us

Catholics pray to God to grant them spiritual and temporal favors; and because Christ had merited infinitely for human beings, they pray to God in the name of Christ, "the one Mediator between man and God" as Redeemer. They pray to Mary and the Saints to join them in prayer to God.

Verse six of St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy (1 Tim. 2:5-6) explains verse five. When Catholics call Mary the "mediatrix of grace," they mean a mediatrix with the Redeemer, her divine Son; who gave Himself *in redemption* for all."

If I can go to Christ through your prayers, why cannot I go to Him through Mary's prayers? His own mother is much interested in our salvation, and if Christ is with any "two or three who are gathered together in My name" (Matt. 18:20), isn't it more likely that He would be with you or me gathered together in prayer with Mary, His own Mother?

The minister, therefore, is inconsistent when he observes: "No Protestant can, in good conscience, accept the teaching of the Church of Rome about her." If four-fifths of all the Christians of the world accept it now; if fivefifths of all the Christians of the world did it for centuries, then why cannot modern Protestants? The small minority has become dissenters, but have not changed the attitude of the great majority, over fifteen centuries.

The Assumption of Mary

Against the common belief of all Christians for centuries-even though the doctrine had not been defined-the writer of the Tract under examination quotes a single Protestant theologian against the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary's body into Heaven. Of course, there have been many criticisms of this latest promulgated doctrine, yet for one who believes in the Immaculate Conception of Mary, her Assumption is a logical corollary. According to St. Paul "by one man sin came into the world and by sin death" (Rom. 5:12), which would imply that if Mary was conceived immaculate, and remained immaculate, she needed not to have died. Early Christian writers declare that Mary wished to die in imitation of her Divine Son, Who also died because He willed it. He could have redeemed mankind by any one of His thousand

humiliating acts, because each had infinite value.

The best argument for the belief of all Christians in Mary's Assumption, from the fifth century among the Greeks, and from the sixth among the Latins is its observance since that time as a special feast. In the fifth century St. Andrew of Crete, St. John Damascene, St. Modestus of Jerusalem refer to the wide belief in Mary's Assumption.

The promulgation of a Catholic doctrine, such as that of the Immaculate Conception as late as 1854, and that of the Assumption as late as 1950, does not mean the introduction of a new doctrine—although before the promulgation theologians had a certain liberty to believe differently. This would explain what the minister says about St. Augustine and St. Anselm believing Mary not to have been conceived immaculate.

But we could quote a great many early century writers who expressly believed in the Immaculate Conception.

St. Iranaeus, who lived in the second century, speaks of Christ as a second Adam and Mary as a second Eve. Both

were associated in the Incarnation, which related to the Redemption.

The same ideas are expressed by St. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ephrem of Syria, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and others. Cardinal Newman quotes from all these in his letter to Dr. Pusey.

St. Ephrem (306-373) speaks of Mary's Immaculateness as follows: "She was as innocent as Eve before her fall, a Virgin most estranged from every stain of sin, more holy than the Seraphim . . . ever in body and in mind intact and immaculate (Carmina Nisibena).

St. Gregory of Tours, who died in the year 593, writes: "The Lord had the most holy body of the Virgin taken into Heaven where, reunited to her soul, it now enjoys, with the elect, happiness without end" (De Gloria Mart. I, 109).

St. Augustine wrote: "There are many things which the Universal Church maintains and that we reasonably believe were preached by the Apostles, although they never have been put in writing" (De Bart. V, 23).

Because of the almost universal belief in both Mary's Immaculateness and her Assumption even by the Oriental Churches, no longer in union with Rome, there had been no reason to make an earlier pronouncement.

The opponent of a doctrine looks everywhere for quotations favorable to his position, while ignoring those which are both more numerous and more convincing.

Cardinal Newman, the great English scholar, before his conversion to the Catholic Church, held the same ideas expressed by the author of the tract; but after his conversion, and after a thorough study of the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, he preached a sermon on the "Congruity of the Assumption." Even in St. Anselm's time England had many churches dedicated to the Assumption of Mary.

Universal Belief

It is the common consent of all Christians over a period of many centuries that gives validity to a belief. St. Augustine wrote: "The whole world judges safely" (securus judicat orbis terrarum). He also wrote "all of Christendom could not be wrong," and held with other philosophers that "universal belief is a criterion of truth."

Debaters will often select a single

opponent to match a score of the most brilliant theologians who defend the belief which he attacks.

The minister quotes an ex-priest presently teaching at Princeton Theological Seminary, writing in *The Christian Century* on August 3, 1949. That would have no more weight with Catholics than a quotation from *The Converted Catholic*, published by one who, while claiming to have been a priest and a monk, never had been either, and by his associates who were dropped from the priesthood by their respective Bishops.

Queen of Heaven

In his tract "The Queen of Heaven" the Rev. Stephen F. Slocum refers to a Marian Congress held in Ottawa, Canada, in June 1947, and notes that a massive tower was erected in that city which showed her as the "Queen of Heaven, crowned with stars and with a new moon under her feet. The image was captioned with the Latin motto "To Jesus through Mary."

Then he observes: "This motto reveals in four words the modern trend of the Catholic world which must exalt Mary to the place of mediatrix between man and God." What was wrong with the inscription on the tower "To Jesus through Mary"? Is it more wrong to go to Jesus through Mary than through a friend whom you might ask to pray to your Savior for you? Did not Jesus come to us through Mary? Did not the wedded party at Cana go to Jesus through Mary, even though Jesus was present personally?

No matter how high the tower was; no matter what words were placed on it, it is the official teaching of the Catholic Church that no divine worship may be paid to Mary. We wonder why the minister does not regard as divine worship the honor paid to a president on the occasion of his inauguration; or to the Queen of England on the occasion of her crowning. In fact any visitor to the King or Queen must approach by three genuflections.

A General of the United States Army must be saluted with 20 cannon shots. It is plain, therefore, that it is the office one holds, and not the person, which is paid recognition on the occasion of a Congress, Inauguration, Parade, etc.

If Catholics have processions in honor of Mary, it is not different from a parade formed and executed in honor of a President or a General returning triumphant at the end of a war. In passing we can only say that St. John, our Lord's most beloved disciple, said he saw Mary in Heaven "crowned with 12 stars and with the moon under her feet."

Did the Marian Congress at Ottawa honor Mary through that big tower more than God Himself honored her? He not only, back in eternity, decreed to select her as an instrument by which His beloved Son would become man, but He sent an Archangel from Heaven as *His own personal representative* to pay her honor. The text reads: "The angel Gabriel was sent from Heaven by God."

The words "worship" and "honor" were interchangeable in the English language until a century ago; even the Commandment which now reads "honor thy father and thy mother," appeared in English instruction books "worship thy father and thy mother."

Protestants often refer to St. Alphonsus in his work on the Blessed Virgin to prove that Catholics do "worship" her. In Italian the words "worship" and "veneration" were also interchangeable.

The position of the Catholic Church must be gathered from her official teaching and that is, as we have already remarked, that no one under God Himself may be paid divine honor.

Our critics condemn shrines to Mary, such as those at Lourdes and Fatima. But haven't we a Shrine to George Washington at Mount Vernon, Virginia, and to Lincoln at Springfield, Illinois, which are visited by thousands of people every year?

Mary Slighted by Jesus?

Then the minister quotes texts from Holy Scripture in which he says Christ Himself not only slighted His mother, but rebuked her. For the proper interpretation of these texts they must not be lifted out of the context. When they are not, they rather show Christ paying unusual honor to Mary. For instance, the minister notices Christ's words to Mary in the Temple of Jerusalem, after He had let her go home without Him. Mary made the natural inquiry: "Why hast Thou done so to us?," and His answer was: "Did you not know that I must be about My Father's business?" (Luke 2:49).

Evidently Mary knew by that time what Christ came into the world to do, but she did not know that He would reveal Himself at the age of 12. Christ wanted to make clear to her that whenever He had an opportunity to do "His Father's business," he should take advantage of it.

But taking the context as a whole we read that He went home with them (Mary and Joseph) and was "subject to them." It were strange if the Commandment which reads "Honor thy father and thy mother" would be violated by the Legislator Himself.

Another occasion on which the minister believes he has Bible support for "slighting Mary" is the Marriage Feast of Cana. Christ had already left home and went to St. John the Baptist, to be baptized by him, and then went to the wilderness to fast and abstain for 40 days. This was preparatory to the beginning of His public life. He and His disciples had been invited to the wedding performed at Cana, which is only a short distance from Nazareth, and Mary, as a friend of the bride, was also invited to the wedding.

The minister sees a slight in the use of the word "Woman" directed to her by her Son. He assumes that the English word "woman" in Hebrew and Greek has the same connotation that it has among us. The word was one containing just as much respect as our word

"lady." That word was used by God even back in Genesis when God pointed out that a "woman" par excellence, after thousands of years, would bring into the world the Seed which would crush the devil's head. She was to be THE woman, and not just an ordinary woman.

The text translated "What is that to thee and Me?" (John 2:4) was also very natural, even though that phrase had a little different meaning among the people of that time. In other words, if the wedded couple had no wine it was their own fault and should not be the concern of Christ or Mary.

But in the context we must arrive at a conclusion quite opposite to that drawn by the minister. Mary merely hinted to Christ that they had no wine. She did not even ask Him to do anything about it, but after uttering those words Mary was sure the miracle would be wrought even though Christ's "time had not yet come." Did she not say to the stewards "whatsoever He shall say to ye do ye"? And Christ said: "Fill the pots with water." They did that and Christ answered the request which was contained in Mary's hint, even though He had not intended to work a miracle at that first step in His public life.

Another text which he quotes means the very opposite to that which the minister gives (Luke 11:27-28). A woman, in Christ's audience, had exclaimed "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee," and Jesus' answer was: "Yea rather blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it." Is it to be assumed from those words that Mary had not heard the word of God, that she had not kept it? That rebuke was directed to the crowd, and not to Mary. It was this crowd, constituted chiefly of enemies, who refused to hear "the word of God and keep it" that was rebuked.

Still another text is misinterpreted. It is quite similar to the last we quoted. Some had said to Jesus: "Thy Mother and Thy brethren stand without desiring to see Thee." His reply was "My mother and My brethren are they who hear the word of God and do it" (Luke 8:20-21). That rebuke was also intended for those to whom He was talking. If you will read the first part of this chapter you will note that many another, including Mary Magdalen, had heard His word and followed it, but most of those who came to listen to Him had no disposition to keep His word.

We must ask again: Is it to be

assumed that Mary above all others would refuse to keep His word, or even to listen to it?

The reason Christ did not see Mary was the reason which we gave above, namely, that Christ had left home to give the rest of His life to His ministry away from home. Did not Christ require of the Apostles, whom He personally chose, that they leave their homes and follow Him? Did not St. Peter tell Christ on one occasion: "Lord we have left all things and followed Thee" (Matt. 19:27)? Did not Christ in answer to Peter say: "Every one who has left house, or brothers or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for My name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold and shall possess life everlasting" (Luke 19:29-30)? Christ wanted to set an example to those He asked to do that, by leaving His own home and His mother. It does not mean that He lost any respect for His mother.

The author of the Tract even sees a "slight" of His Mother by Jesus when hanging on the cross, because He called her "woman" and notes "by calling His mother 'woman' Jesus emphasized her humanity, the fact that she was the human agency of the Incarnation 'whereby God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin hath condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom. 8:3)."

Who questions Mary's humanity? Catholics certainly do not claim that she possesses divinity.

Then he draws from the words in the text just quoted "in the likeness of sinful flesh," that Mary could not have been immaculate. Sin is not in the flesh but in the soul. How about the message sent directly by God through the Archangel to Mary that she would conceive of the Holy Ghost? Mary herself, of course, was born of one who inherited Original Sin, but she herself was preserved from it precisely because Christ wanted a sinless mother.

The minister brings up the question again of Mary's title of "Mother of God," claiming that "it is sufficient honor for Mary that she was the Mother of Jesus; it is blasphemous to deify her as the Mother of God." We repeat that Catholics do not deify her, but with God's messenger, the Archangel Gabriel; with Elizabeth, and with the Council of Ephesus held early in the fifth century, they honor her.

Mary Ever Virgin

The author of a Protestant tract says he cannot bring himselg to believe in the virginity of Mary because there is reference in Holy Scripture to Christ's brothers and sisters.

He can learn from many sources that neither the Aramaic, which was the language of Christ, nor the Hebrew language had a word for "cousin" or other relative. Even back in the Old Testament we hear Abraham speak of Lot as his "brother" when he was actually his "nephew," and there are a dozen instances in the Old Testament where "brethren" is used for one's relatives, near and far.

Even today a minister addresses his whole congregation as "brethren," but no one would infer that all the members are blood brothers or sisters of the minister.

Among themselves the members of the parish call one another "brother" as is the custom in fraternal organizations.

The author quotes Origen and Tertullian as holding that Mary had other children, based on four references to "Christ and His brethren" in the New Testament. But a very large number of the early Fathers held to the contrary. Among them St. Justin Martyr, Aristides, St. Irenaeus, Origen, whom he places on the other side; St. Hilary, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome.

The early Fathers gave four reasons why the word "brethren" was to be understood as "other relatives." They observe:

1) Her virginity was implied by her answer to the angel: "How can this be done because I know not man" (Luke 1:34).

2) If Mary had other children why was Jesus so emphatically called "the Son of Mary" (Mark 6:3)?

3) Why is Mary never called "the Mother of the brethren of the Lord"?

4) If Mary had other children, why should Jesus, dying on the cross, have entrusted His Mother to the care of St. John (John 19:26-27)?

The Hebrew word for brother is "AH," and it relates to different degrees of kindred. For instance Jacob speaking of his cousin Rachel, calls himself her father's brother, rather than the son of her father's sister. It that she was on a plane with the one God existing in three Persons, but was the only way he could, in Hebrew, describe his real relationship. (Gen. 29:12).

For centuries the Sacrifice of the Mass has been preceded by the Confiteor (the Confession of Sins) in which Mary is called "Blessed Mary, EVER virgin."

The minister objects strenuously to reference to Mary as "Queen of Heaven." He claims it is a pagan title found in the Old Testament in Jeremias (7:18; 44:17-19, 25). Here he seems to refer to the ancient goddess Aristide, and that designation can be found in writings of other pagan religions, such as those which existed in Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and in pagan Rome.

We know quite well that pagans had both gods and goddesses; but they were made of wood and stone; they had a plurality of gods, the greatest among them for which we named our planets, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, etc. But the people knew nothing about their deities, and it was natural to have a Queen as well as a King among them.

But Catholics mean something entirely different when they call Mary "Queen of Heaven." They do not mean rather that she was Queen over the creature inhabitants of Heaven, because she was fashioned more perfectly than they, owing to the purpose for which God intended to use her.

We have told you that St. John saw her in vision in Heaven, in her body, with the moon, the symbol of sin, because it is ever waxing and waning, under her feet; clothed with the sun, which compares with the designation "full of grace," given to her by God's own representative, the Archangel Gabriel; and a crown of 12 stars on her head, representing her as at least Queen of the Apostles, who were Christ's chosen ones, of whom before His return to Heaven said: "I shall no longer call you servants, but friends." How about His Mother, was she not closer to Him than His friends?

Mary is not a Queen to be "adored," but the perfect creature for our imitation, for our love and veneration, because she was so close to Christ.

They Overlook The Right Texts

It is very strange that enemies of the Catholic Church look for texts which, by some forced construction, might imply that Christ did not want His Mother treated with respect. Why don't they consider how near she was to Christ; see what suffering she endured to bring Him into the world in a stable in Bethlehem; her fleeing with Him into Egypt, to escape the designs of Herod, the suffering in privations she endured in that pagan land; her journey from Egypt to Nazareth; her thirty years in the same home with Him, where He was "subject" to her; the risk of her own life by following Him on the way of the cross; her martyrdom while standing for three hours under His cross, listening to the insults, mocks and jeers of the rabble?

When Christ began His public life it is very true that He was leaving home for good; just as He told His Apostles that they must leave home for good. It was not because His love for Mary had waned, but rather because He wanted her to have sorrows as He Himself was called "the man of sorrows." Did He not tell His disciples while they walked to Emmaus "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into His glory" (Luke 24:26)? Critics never refer to Mary's own words, uttered under inspiration: "Behold henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke 1:48).

Preachers by the thousands believe that every one is conceived immaculate, yet they become shocked when we say that Mary was conceived immaculate. If she was born without sin, lived without sin and died without sin, the Assumption flows logically. If Mary had not been assumed into Heaven bodily, how is it the Church never claimed to have any relic of her, as she has of all twelve apostles?

It never occurs to the critic of the Catholic religion that many of the greatest scholars in the world became Catholics for the precise reasons which the former gives for opposing the Catholic religion. No scholar in England had been more bigoted as a Protestant minister than Cardinal Newman: but in his studies of the early Christian writers, he was sure that he discovered what is essentially the Catholic religion today and nothing of Protestantism. But because of his prejudice, he moved slowly and prayed in the words of his hymn, which is sung frequently in many Protestant churches, "Lead, kindly Light, lead Thou me on." That prayer, together with the knowledge he received converted him and he became a great apologist for the Catholic Church-and of the Blessed Mother.

Cardinal Manning of England, who also had been a Protestant minister,

through his thorough study of history concluded that Christianity and Catholicity throughout the ages were identical.

We could cite a great many who were heads of the department of history in many universities who became Catholics by a thorough, impartial research work in history. We would recommend that all scholar-critics of the Catholic Church would imitate them, because it is through impartial study that they could become convinced, as Cardinals Newman and Manning did. History, as written particularly by English and German writers until the past century, was not impartial. This is frequently told by most modern reputable historians.

Confound Love With Duty

We might remind the author of the tract once more that no Catholic is ever obligated to pray to Mary; that no Catholic may worship Mary in the sense of *paying her divine honors* without committing sin; that all honor paid to Mary is because of her Divine Son, and is supposed to redound to His glory.

The Catholic Church in all her official prayers prays directly to God "through

Jesus Christ our Lord," as the one Mediator by redemption. People pray to Christ through His mother, as the most powerful *intercessor*. The whole Catholic position is most logical and coherent. That it has survived for 19 centuries against the opposition of rival religions, and even of the most violent persecutors, is evidence of its truth.

The religions which have split from the parent religions of the Reformation, founded by Luther and Calvin, can hardly be called their followers because both Luther and Calvin advocated veneration of the Blessed Virgin.

We would ask the minister and all critics of devotion to Mary to try it, after apologizing to Christ for their repudiation of His own mother. Arguments will never change the position of the Catholic people themselves because they have personally experienced the power of Mary's prayers to her Divine Son.



