

ROMANISM

In the Light of Scripture

by

J. Dwight Pentecost

Copyright © 1962

CHAPTER TWO

IS MARY THE MOTHER OF GOD?

SOME YEARS AGO it was my privilege to travel through the land of Mexico with my brother, who has been a missionary there for some years. We visited a number of the outstanding shrines and edifices erected by the Roman system to the praise and the glory of Mary. On one occasion my brother said to me, "If you want to see the theology of Mary in the Roman Church, come with me to a church where over the altar is a scene which, more than volumes could say, reveals their actual belief concerning the position of Mary."

He took me downtown and into a rather large church in the center of the old part of the city. We walked forward to the altar where we could look up and see a great painting based upon the twelfth chapter of the Book of the Revelation.

In describing the nation Israel that gave birth to the Messiah, who was to be the blessing of the world, John writes, "**There appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars.**"

The chapter gives a number of clues to let us know that the Apostle John is depicting the nation Israel under the form of a woman. The man child produced by that woman was none other than the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. But there over the altar, as the center of attention in that edifice, was the scene of a great blazing sun, with a picture of the Virgin Mary in the midst of that sun. According to this artist's conception, the woman of Revelation 12 was none other than Mary. Under that blazing sun, in lesser glory and light, was painted a moon and on that moon was the face of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mary was standing in that sun with her feet upon the head of the Lord Jesus Christ and He was bowed in submission and subservience to Mary who stood above Him. Around her head was the circlet of the twelve stars and within each of the twelve stars was painted one of the faces of the twelve apostles. They were bowing before her to give her all adoration and praise. Mary was elevated above the apostles, and above the Son of God Himself. She was occupying the place of pre-eminence and authority as the sun of the day rules over the moon and the stars of the night.

We might ask ourselves the question,

“How could a system arise which would center attention, not on the Son of God as the pre-eminent one, but on the mother of the Lord Jesus Christ, and ascribe to her that which belongs to the Son of God alone?”

It is our purpose to trace the development of this doctrine to see how the church that calls itself the bride of Christ can elevate a human being to a position of prominence and authority over God Himself. Is Mary the mother of God?

In a catechism published recently in Rome by Father Gabriele Roschini, considered the outstanding student of Mariology in Rome today, the author gives four basic propositions upon which the superiority of Mary rests: the principle of singularity, the principle of propriety, the principle of eminence, and the principle of likeness to Christ. As he develops these four, we see four successive steps in the elevation of Mary to the position which she holds in the Roman system today.

The principle of *singularity* says, “The most blessed Virgin, being a creature altogether singular, constituting an order apart, rightly claims for herself privileges entirely singular which can fit no other creature.”

Whereas the Word of God says that Jesus Christ was the only begotten one, the Roman system says the first basic principle is that Mary was begotten apart and occupied a place of singularity.

The principle of *propriety* says, “All the perfections must be attributed to the most blessed virgin which truly become the dignity of Mother of God and Mediatrix of Men, provided they have some basis in Revelation and are not contrary to faith and reason.”

By this second principle, this theologian asserts that anything that would seem to be fitting of God may rightly be attributed to Mary, the Mother of God.

The principle of *eminence* says, “All the principles of nature, grace, glory, granted by God to the other saints, must have been granted to the most blessed Virgin, queen of all the saints and so gathering together any honor or power or glory that belongs to the Son, Himself, may rightly be attributed to Mary, the Mother of God, on the basis of the principle of her pre-eminence.”

Discounting the fact that Colossians 1:18 says that He is the Pre- eminent one, this article of faith asserts she holds the place of pre-eminence.

The fourth is the principle of *analogy* or likeness to Christ in which it is affirmed, “Principles analogous to the various privileges of the humanity of Christ, are possessed, correspondingly, by the most blessed virgin.”

Here, in this fourth principle, based upon the other three, it is asserted that anything that is true of Jesus Christ of necessity must be true of Mary, the Mother of Christ.

On the basis of these four principles that are given as the logical reason for the elevation of Mary, the author says in conclusion,

“The divine maternity raises her to a dizzy height and places her immediately after God in the vast scale of things, causing her to be a member of the hypostatic order, an order superior to the order of nature and grace and glory. For this, the Fathers and the Scriptures have almost exhausted their resources of language in exalting her, in giving her the glory that becomes her. Her greatness borders on the *infinite*.”

There are two significant claims by this author: Mary is *divine*, and Mary in her person, attributes, and glory *borders on the infinite*.

In the index of a recent publication entitled *Mary in the Documents of the Church*, by Paul F. Palmer of the Society of Jesus, published by the Newman Press in 1952 and carrying the Imprimatur of the Archbishop of Baltimore, a list was made of the titles and names ascribed to Mary. From them you can see what the Romanist attributes to and recognizes in Mary. These are but a few of the vast number that were included but these were significant. Mary is called:

Adam’s Deliverer
The Advocate of Eve
The Advocate of Sinners
The Aqueduct of Grace
The Archetype of Purity and Innocence
The Ark, Gilded by the Holy Spirit
Ark of the Covenant
Born without Stain
Bride of the Father, Chosen before the Ages
Conceived without Original Sin
Consoler of the Afflicted
Co-Redemptrix
Deliverer of the Christian Nation
Deliverer from all the Wrath to Come
Dispenser of the Gifts of Redemption
Dispenser of Grace
Only Dwelling Place of God
The Dwelling Place of Christ
The Dwelling Place of the Spirit Today
Eastern Gate Through Which Christ Enters to Bring Salvation
Flower of Jesse’s Root
Fountain of Living Water
Free from Every Stain
Full of Grace
God’s Eden
Healing Balm of Integrity
Hope of Christians
Incorruptible Wood of the Ark
The Inventrix of Grace
Kingly Throne

Lamp Unquenchable
Life Giver
Light of Heaven
Living Temple of the Deity
Mediatrice and Conciliatrice
Mediatrice of all Graces
Mediatrice of Salvation
Mediatrice to Mediators
Minister of Light
More Glorious than Paradise
More Gracious than Grace
Neck of the Mystical Body
New Eve
Nourisher of God and Man
Only Bridge of God to Man
Paradise Fenced against the Serpent
Paradise of the Second Adam
Queen of Creation
Queen of Earth
Queen of Heaven
Queen of Martyrs
Refuge of Sinners
Repairatrice of the Lost World
The Second Eve
Soul's Salvation
Suppliant for Sinners
Temple Divine
Throne of God
Treasury of Immortality
Victor over the Serpent
Well of Remissions Waters

It seems almost blasphemous to give to Mary attributes which Scripture says belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to give to her names and titles that put her in a position superior to God, where she ministers to Almighty God her graces and dispenses salvation to men. How could such a system arise to possess and control the minds of men?

Let us look first of all into the scriptural account of Mary, the mother of our Lord. I trust that you understand that I am not trying to take away one whit from the rightful position which belongs to her as a servant who became subject to the will of God. Through her was given to the human race the Son of Man, true humanity, and the Son of God, true Deity, that we might have eternal life. But I do want to keep for the Lord and Saviour that which belongs to Him and to Him alone.

In Luke 1:27 a divine visitor, an angel of glory, came to the Virgin Mary and brought the strangest of greetings, "**Hail, thou that art highly favored,**" or as it might be literally translated from the Greek, "*Hail, thou that art endued with grace.*"

In the Romanist translations and the commentaries and interpretations of the Romanists, you will find that they read this verse, “Hail, thou that art full of Grace.”

There is a vast difference between the active voice and the passive voice in English as well as in Greek. If this had been active, “Hail, thou that art full of grace,” it would have meant that there was something in Mary that caused the angel to come to her and announce to her that she was to be rewarded for what was in her by becoming the mother of Christ. But this is the passive voice, “Hail, thou that hast been highly favored,” or, “Hail, thou upon whom grace has been bestowed by another.”

At the very outset we recognize that the angel did not come to Mary because of the worthiness that was in her, but because Almighty God by a sovereign act chose the instrument who was to be the one through whom His Son should be begotten among men.

Mary is perplexed at that announcement which the angel gives when he said, “Thou that hast received grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women.”

There is a vast difference between being the blessed and being the blesser. There was no blessing that went out from Mary then, nor was there ever any blessing that would proceed from her, but there was a blessing conferred upon her. She was privileged to cradle within her body the body of the Lord Jesus Christ until it should come to birth. She was blessed of God to be the channel through which God would send the Saviour into the world.

When Mary heard the announcement, she recognized that there was no merit in her. She felt her own unworthiness for “**she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be**” (v. 29).

Had there been holiness within Mary as the Romanists contend; had Mary been born sinless and lived a sinless life her natural response would have been, “God has recognized my worthiness and God is only dealing rightly with me when He makes me the channel of His salvation.” But Mary was troubled at the saying, recognizing her own unworthiness, and she cast in her mind for an interpretation of what these words meant.

The angel explains to her that she is to conceive and bear a son whose name shall be Jesus, who will be God’s Messiah to reign over Israel, and who will be God’s salvation.

In verse 35 the angel explains the method by which this miracle will take place. It is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, for “**The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.**”

While Mary was the cradle in which the Lord Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit and through whom He was born, yet Mary was not an active agent. It was not because of Mary that this great miracle took place, for that which was to be born was to be called the Son of God.

We can see something of the faith of Mary in her attitude and relationship to God as, in verse 38, Mary submits to this which the angel has announced. Mary recognizes full well that should she conceive before she is married to Joseph, she could be accused of fornication and, according to Mosaic Law, could be stoned to death. Mary knew that Joseph could “put her away” or divorce her before the marriage was consummated and thus break the betrothal. Mary would risk ostracism and estrangement from her family and the society in which she moved. And yet, in spite of all that would jeopardize her position and her relationship to Joseph, she was submissive to the will of God and said, **“Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word.”**

That which we observe in the annunciation is that the angel came not because of the worthiness of Mary, not because of the sinlessness of Mary that made her eligible to be the channel through which our Lord came, but because God gave special grace to her that she should be the mother of our Lord.

Mary went to the hill country of Judea to visit Elisabeth, in whom a miracle had been worked so that Elisabeth, who had been barren all her life, should conceive. When Mary stepped into the house Elisabeth said, **“Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?”** Elisabeth makes a pronouncement, **“Blessed is she that hath believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.”**

Mary’s faith in God had accomplished this miracle. It was not sinlessness nor the virtue of Mary, but her faith in the promise of the Lord.

Then follows the Magnificat in verses 46 to 56; **“My soul doth magnify the Lord.”**

Mary is putting herself in the position of the nation Israel and is offering a hymn of praise to God as one from among Israel, for God has been faithful to His promise and has sent a deliverer. You will notice in verse 54, **“He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.”**

This whole hymn is one that praises God, not because of what Mary is, nor for her worth, but because of what God has done. Mary professes her own need of this very salvation for she says, **“My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden”** (v. 46).

Mary sees nothing in herself that makes her worthy to be the mother of the Lord, but confesses it is God’s grace.

Next we go into the second chapter of Luke’s Gospel where, after the Lord has been born, we find Mary with Joseph, his foster father, going into the temple. They are presenting Christ for circumcision according to the Mosaic Law, and also (vv. 23, 24) offering the Levitical sacrifices to remove the defilement from the mother who has borne her first son. The law says that when a child opened the womb the mother was defiled and unclean before the Law.

Mary recognized her own defilement and went, according to Mosaic Law, to the temple to offer the sacrifices which will grant her cleansing and restoration to fellowship within the commonwealth of Israel. Mary confesses her uncleanness, her need of restoration, and offers a blood sacrifice. Had Mary been a sinless one, there would have been no uncleanness and no need to fulfill the requirements of the law.

In the second chapter of John's Gospel we have the record of Christ's first miracle in Cana of Galilee.

The Lord was invited to a marriage feast and when He arrived He found the wine had run out. Mary began to give orders and to tell the servants what to do. She then went to acquaint Christ with the need. Christ rebuked her in words that are familiar, "**Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come**" (v. 4).

When He addressed His mother as "**woman,**" our Lord was not using a title of disrespect, for He used that same word at the cross as He commended His mother to John: "**Woman, behold thy son.**" It is a term of endearment and respect. But the Lord is not controlled in this action by His mother, for the time is not yet come for Him to manifest Himself in His sovereign authority as King. There is no need for Him to do the King's work of providing the King's banquet until He has been placed on the throne.

What we observe in the second chapter of John is that, when Mary came to Christ with a petition, there was a soft word of rebuke for her because Christ was not in a position of subservience to His mother.

In Mark 3 we find our Lord pressed about by a great throng. The Pharisees were saying that Jesus Christ was insane. As He was being pressed upon by the multitude, His mother and brothers came and stood outside the house where He was ministering and asked Him to come out. His family came to deliver Him from the angry mob. The brothers, and it seems as though the mother of our Lord herself, recognized that something was wrong. They attempted to save Christ from Himself by enticing Him out of the house so that they can lead Him away.

I confess I am not able to understand this. Whether Mary was there passively, simply accompanying the brothers, or whether Mary was active, I do not know. In my opinion the passage reveals that Mary did not understand the purpose of Christ, nor His ministry, nor His nation's rejection of Him.

Mary was a partner in the plan of the brothers to deliver Christ from Himself because they had concluded, along with Israel, that He was insane and needed to be delivered from Himself. This incident scarcely supports Roman claims for Mary.

When you go into chapter 19 of John's Gospel, where the Lord is giving Himself to death for the sins of the world, we see His concern for His mother. Mary was there at the foot of the cross, and when Jesus saw His mother and the disciple standing by, whom He loved, He said to His mother, "**Woman, behold thy son,**" and to the disciple, "**Behold, thy mother.**"

Instead of seeing Mary in a position of authority, able to dispense blessing, our Lord recognized that His mother was one in need of care, of protection, of a home. He committed her into the tender keeping of John, the beloved disciple that he might minister to her, not that she might minister to him.

The next time we see Mary is in Acts 1:14, where the disciples are gathered together in the upper room and they are “**continuing with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.**”

- Mary is not in a place of prominence in this assembly of believers.
- She is not being addressed as the fountain of grace, as the well of salvation.
- She is there as a believer along with the others, for God has been her salvation and has raised up One who gave Himself for the sins of the world.

We see then that there is nothing in the Word of God that would warrant giving worship to Mary, or that would reckon Mary as one being sinless, being able to dispense all the grace and the benefits of redemption.

How then did this doctrine arise?

A brief glance through Church history from the time of our Lord down to the present day will reveal that this doctrine of Mariolatry is of a gradual development. Even to this very day it is not a doctrine which has been completed and defined by the Roman church but is being developed on the basis of the principles which were presented earlier from the Roman catechism.

The first question we face as we look into church history is “How did it happen that Mary was called ‘the mother of God’?”

There is no such title given her in the Word. She is called by Elisabeth, “**The mother of our Lord,**” and “**our Lord**” was David’s son. This was not a reference to any deity in Mary, but is a reference to the lineage which Mary’s son would have as David’s seed.

In the early period of church history, we find a great doctrinal controversy which threatened to split the church in two.

It was the controversy between Arius and Athanasius.

Arius taught that Jesus Christ possessed a true humanity but was not God, denying the deity of Christ. Athanasius, who was an outstanding champion of the scriptural doctrine, held that Jesus Christ possessed not only a true, complete, full humanity, but that He was no less undiminished deity. In the Council of Nicea in 325, three hundred eighteen bishops gathered to debate the issue between Arius and Athanasius: Is Jesus Christ man or is Jesus Christ God and man inseparably united in one person? The Council of Nicea decided in favor of Athanasian doctrine and condemned Arianism as a heresy, affirming the truth that Jesus Christ is God and man, forever united in one person.

From the time of the declaration of the Council of Nicea, Mary was referred to as the Mother of God, not to ascribe deity to her, not to glorify the Virgin Mary, but to explain, in terms that would be clear, impressive and popular, the fact of the deity of Mary's Son. This term was not to give pre-eminence to Mary, but to affirm the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. When Arius said, "Mary was the mother of a man as my mother was the mother of a man," the council said, "No, Mary was the mother of God-Man," and that expression came into use.

Doctrinal controversy continued in the church as they tried to define and explain the scriptural teaching on the person of Christ. You can understand something of the difficulty because never before had God come in the flesh, never before had true and complete deity been united with true and complete humanity in one person. That was the mystery of incarnation, the mystery of godliness.

The Eternal God, the Omnipresent One, the Omnipotent One, had come to dwell in a body. How could one body contain the Eternal God when the Heaven of heavens and the earth beneath and the waters of the ocean, and Hell itself could not contain God? For one hundred and fifty years the church debated and tried to define and explain the mystery of godliness, God come in the flesh.

Then came Nestorius who said he would not call Mary "the mother of God." He would rather call her "the mother of Christ," for Christ is not one person but two persons, God and man. They are as separate as husband and wife, two persons who are united in only a mystical way.

Now you will observe that if we have two separate persons and only one of them could die, we would not have a true Saviour. This was a subtle form of heresy but was heresy nonetheless. A council was called at Ephesus in the year 431. The Council at Ephesus tried to expound the former declaration of the Council of Nicea in order to define this doctrine. They adopted a creed which said:

"We confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, only begotten, is perfect God and perfect man of a rational soul and body. Before the ages He was begotten by the Father in His Divinity and in these last times for us and for our salvation, by Mary according to His humanity. He is consubstantial with the Father, according to Divinity and consubstantial (that is, one with us, united with us) according to humanity, since the union of two natures took place.

"Therefore, we confess only one Christ, only one Son, only one Lord, and through this union, free of all confusion, we confess that the virgin is mother of God by the fact that the Word of God is incarnated and made man and from her conception is united to His very Self, the temple taken from her."

There the affirmation was made that Mary was the mother of God. As in the case of the Council at Nicea, the affirmation was made not with a view to elevating Mary, but with the view to defining the person of Christ; Deity and humanity united on one person, forever.

About fifty years later, the Council of Chalcedon defined again that same doctrine:

“He was begotten before time by the Father by Divinity and in the last days, for us and for our salvation, by Mary, the virgin, the mother of God, according to his humanity.”

Hence, orthodox doctrine, as it was formulated in these great church councils, included the term mother of God, not to exalt Mary, but to defend the doctrine of the person of Christ from all errors which would make Him less than God so that His death did not have infinite worth or make Him more than man so that He was not our representative.

Following this period in church history, we observe the rise of asceticism.

Because of the corrupting influences around them, many were withdrawing from the world into a monastic form of society and were renouncing marriage in favor of celibacy and disdaining all forms of food except the barest essentials. They felt that spirituality was to be promoted by withdrawing from the world, by fasting, and by celibacy.

When this became a dominant thought in the life of the church, they began to raise the question, “If Mary is the mother of God, and is sinless, how could Mary know desire toward a husband and enter into a marriage with Joseph?”

Out of that background they began to preach the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary.

Because she was holy there was no desire within her for a husband. To justify their asceticism, monasticism, and celibacy, they promoted the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. This is contradicted by the Word of God. In Matthew 13:55-56 we have reference to Mary’s children, the brothers and sisters of our Lord, who were well known by the society in which they lived.

We thus find that to the affirmation that Mary is the mother of God was added the concept of the perpetual virginity of the mother of God.

The next step was the development of that which was called the Immaculate Conception.

The Immaculate Conception has nothing to do with the birth of Christ but rather is a Romanist doctrine concerning Mary’s relationship to sin. From the seventh century to the twelfth the Eastern church had observed a feast of St. Anne to celebrate the birth of Mary. In the twelfth century, a new feast was introduced in Lyons, France, called the feast of the Immaculate Conception. It was there in Lyons that the doctrine that Mary was conceived and consequently born without the corruption of original sin was first promulgated.

From the twelfth century to the Council of Trent which met from 1545 to 1563, this doctrine was debated and the groundwork was laid to systematize this as official teaching. The Council of Trent, in systematizing the doctrine of original sin, said,

“If anyone shall say that a man, once justified, on through the whole of life, can avoid all sins, even though they be venial, except by special privilege of God, as the church holds to have been the case of the blessed virgin, let him be anathema.”

There is the first indication in an official church pronouncement that Mary was born without the taint of original sin. Further, they said,

“This same Holy Synod declares that it is not its intention to include in this decree, where, when there is a question of original sin, the blessed and immaculate virgin Mary, the mother of God.”

When they are referring to her as immaculate they are saying that Mary is born without any original sin, and without a sin nature.

From this pronouncement of the Council of Trent came the movement to proclaim the Immaculate Conception a dogma. In the Papal Bull, *Sollicitudo Omnium* of Alexander VII, issued on December 8, 1661, it was said,

“Ancient is the piety of the Christian faithful to our Blessed Mother, the Virgin Mary. They believed that her soul, in the first moment of creation and infusion into the body, was, by a special grace and privilege of God and in the consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, her son, the Redeemer of the human race, preserved free from the stain of original sin.”

In the Papal Bull of Pius IX, entitled, *Ineffabilis Deus*, issued December 8, 1854, the immaculate conception was officially proclaimed a dogma, in the words,

“Where sin is treated, no question whatsoever, is to be raised concerning the Holy Virgin Mary, for to her an abundance of grace was given to conquer sin completely.

“It was altogether proper that as the only begotten had a Father in Heaven whom the seraphim extolled as thrice Holy, so He should have a mother on earth who has never lacked the splendor of Holiness. The Mother of God is not only immaculate, but entirely immaculate, not only innocent, but most innocent, not only spotless, but the most spotless.

“She is Holy and completely removed from every stain of sin. All pure and all but the very archetype of purity and innocence, more Holy than Holiness and alone Holy, most pure in soul and body who transcends all integrity, who alone and in her entirety has become the dwelling place of all the graces of the Holy Spirit and who is superior to all and by nature more fair, more beautiful and more Holy than the very cherubim and seraphim, than the entire angelic host. She, all the tongues of Heaven and earth cannot extol.

“To the honor of the Holy and undivided Trinity, to the glory and adornment of the Virgin Mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the increase of the Catholic religion, we, by the authority of Jesus Christ, our Lord, of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, 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 consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, was preserved from all stain of original sin has been revealed by God, therefore is to be firmly and constantly believed, by all the faithful.”

This pronouncement taught that Mary was born sinless.

They believe that Mary possesses the absolute holiness that belongs to God Himself; Mary, as a consequence, lived an absolutely sinless life; and because Mary possesses the holiness of God and lived an absolutely sinless life, she is qualified to be Redemptress or Mediatrix, between God and man.

If this be true, we might ask, “Why did Mary have to make an offering for her own cleansing from defilement according to Mosaic Law?”

We might add, “Why did Mary die if she was holy? For death is the result of sin.” If Mary did not partake of Adam’s sin and was not a sinner, death could not have laid its finger upon her and she could not have died physically. In spite of this, it is the affirmation of the Roman Church that Mary was born without sin and lived sinlessly.

That leads us to the final step which we will consider, the doctrine of the assumption of Mary.

This is the logical outgrowth of that proclamation that Mary was sinless. Recognizing that a sinless one could not die and see corruption, there came a movement in the church to proclaim as dogma the doctrine that Mary was taken into Heaven the moment of her death without her body seeing corruption, and that she is incorruptible in Heaven today.

On November 1, 1950, Pius XII, in his *Munificentissimus Deus* made the pronouncement:

“God does not will to grant the full effect of the victory of Christ over death to the just until the end of time shall come and so it is that even the bodies of the just are corrupted and that only on the last day will they be joined, each to its own glorious soul. Now, God has willed that the Blessed Virgin Mary should be exempt from this general rule. She, by an entirely unique privilege, completely overcame sin by her Immaculate Conception and, as a result, was not subject to the law of remaining in the corruption of the grave and she did not have to wait until the end of time for the redemption of her body. The revered Mother of God, is set, as it were, before our very eyes, most intimately joined to her divine Son and as always sharing His lot. Consequently, it seems impossible to think of her, the one who conceived Christ, brought Him forth, nursed Him, held Him in her arms, clasped Him to her bosom, as being apart from Him in body even though not in soul. And since our Redeemer is the son of Mary, He could not do otherwise, as the perfect observer of God’s law, than to honor not only His Eternal Father, but also His most beloved Mother and since it was within His power to grant her this great honor, to preserve her from corruption, we believe He really acted in this way.

“Hence, the revered Mother of God, from all eternity, joined in a hidden way to Christ, immaculate in her conception, a most perfect virgin in her divine motherhood, the noble associate of the divine Redeemer, who has won a complete triumph over sin and its consequences, was finally granted, as the supreme culmination of her privilege, that she should be preserved, free from the corruption of the tomb and that, like her son, having overcome death, she might be taken up body and soul into the glory of heaven where, as queen, she sits in splendor at the right hand of her Son, the Immortal King of the Ages.”

Then follows the official pronouncement,

“We pronounce, declare and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma, that the immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed, body and soul, into heavenly glory.”

The steps that have been followed to establish the Mariolatry of the Roman Church are plain:

- First, they pronounced her the Mother of God;
- To that they added the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary;
- From that they built the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception;
- Because she was immaculately conceived she was taken bodily into Heaven without her body seeing corruption;
- She is seated at the right hand of the Father, together with her Son, Jesus Christ.

There is only one step left, and that is the step of absolute deification.

I do not know how long it is going to take Rome to promulgate that doctrine. Some pope, claiming to speak as God, will pronounce that Mary is God.

In these statements that have been quoted, the basis has already been laid which will enable Rome, by the authority of the previous pronouncements of the pope, to declare Mary to be deity!

- They have called her the divine mother;
- They have ascribed to her the absolute holiness of God;
- They have prescribed to her pre-existence so that she might be called the pre-existent one;
- They have elevated her to a position on God's throne at the right hand of the Son.

The only remaining logical step is to make the pronouncement that she is God. At that time, unless the Lord comes first, instead of worshiping the triune God, the fourfold God—Father, Son, Holy Ghost, and Holy Mother will receive worship.

Leo XIII, in his Papal Bull, *Augustissimae Virginis*, September 12, 1897, made the pronouncement:

“God chose her from all eternity to be the mother of the Incarnate Word and, for that reason, so eminently distinguished her among all His most beautiful works in the triple order of nature, grace and glory, that the church justly applies to her these words, ‘I came out of the mouth of the Most High. I am the firstborn before all creatures.’”

- God has said of the Son, “**This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.**”
- Rome says Mary has the right to be called the firstborn before all creatures.

Leo XIII in his *Iucunda Semper*, September 18, 1894, said,

“It is impossible to measure the power and scope of Mary’s offices since the day she was taken up to that height of heavenly glory in the company of her Son, to which the dignity and luster of her merits entitle her. From her heavenly abode, she began, by God’s decree, to watch over the church, to assist and befriend us as our mother, so that she, who was so intimately associated with the mystery of human salvation, is just as closely associated with the distribution of the graces, which from all time will flow through her from redemption.”

God is a jealous God and He will not share His glory with another.

He has given to Mary the grace to be the channel through which the Lord Jesus Christ came. But God must pronounce judgment upon a system that takes one who confessed her sin and need of a Saviour and elevates her to a position above the Son of God, so that she has the right to rule and reign, not only over earth, but over Heaven itself.

Were there no other basis of judgment, the unscriptural doctrines of Mariolatry would be sufficient in itself.

~ end of chapter 2 ~

<http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/>
