

‘AVE MARIA’

(Plus ‘Mother’ Teresa’s Eucharistic and Rosary devotion)

Rummaging through my video archives I came across the video of a TV programme called ‘**Ave Maria**’ that looked at the actions of those devoted to **Mary** and the reaction of those either opposed to such devotion or who attempt to rationalise such devotion (such as psychiatrists, sociologists, feminists).

Being a secular TV programme there was never much chance of those who oppose such devotion on scriptural grounds being portrayed in a favourable light but there are moments when solid biblical rejection does get an airing (especially from a quietly-spoken elderly lady). I was also pleased to see a good friend, Pastor David Carson, and several supporters courageously adopting the ‘John the Baptist’ approach in witnessing (challenging ‘public’ sin irrespective of the consequences as we read in Matthew 14:4) when a statue of Mary was being paraded around the streets of London.

It was also revealing to see so-called Protestant ministers engaged in devotion and prayers to Mary but perhaps **for me, the thing that made the biggest impact, was to see people stating that redemption and salvation hinged on Mary supposedly giving her assent to God to allow Him to use her as ‘the vehicle’ for the birth of Christ.** They claimed that if she had withheld her consent, if she had objected, then God’s plan of salvation would have been thwarted.

Then in a final, separate short section of video lasting about 8 minutes or so you can see and hear **the misguided ‘Eucharistic and Rosary devotion’ of ‘Mother’ Teresa and her bizarre views on human suffering** – she regards such as evidence of ‘the love of Jesus’ whereas sadly it is one manifestation of God’s curse upon this world following the entrance of sin in Genesis 3.

At this point could I invite you to watch this programme by going to

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-dAE3r0T_KA

Let me now pose this question - **Could Mary really have said ‘no’?** (Cecil – in truth I struggle to find where she was actually supposedly asked to give consent, to say ‘yes’) To answer that I would simply like to direct you to a more than helpful article on the following link.

<http://thideology.wordpress.com/2010/12/15/could-mary-have-said-no-a-repost/http://thideology.wordpress.com/2010/12/15/could-mary-have-said-no-a-repost/>

Finally on this specific question, do I agree with the sentiments expressed and the conclusion reached in this article? – in a word – **‘yes’**. I would echo the words of **Dr Kenneth E Lawson** in his booklet **‘The Mary Movement’** when he wrote on pages 15-16

‘Roman Catholic theologian Ludwig Ott incorrectly asserted in *Fundamentals Of Catholic Dogma* that “the incarnation of the Son of God, and the redemption of mankind by the vicarious atonement of Christ **were dependent upon her assent... Mary’s response to the angelic announcement deserves special consideration (Luke 1:46-56). Her immediate reaction was to “magnify the Lord” and for her “spirit to rejoice in God my Saviour”... she identifies herself as a “handmaiden of low estate”’.**

Another aspect of Roman Catholic teaching on Mary that was referred to quite often was her supposed **‘Immaculate Conception’** - that not only did she not sin BUT that when born she was preserved free from the stain of ‘original sin’. The Bible makes it very plain that everyone born ‘naturally’ into this world, (unlike the Lord Jesus who was of course ‘supernaturally born’) after our first parents Adam and Eve, is ‘tainted’ with ‘original sin’ and that includes Mary – no exceptions. Rome declares otherwise but **not every authoritative ‘Doctor’ of the Roman Catholic Church believed this** and with the following quotation I finish. In his book **‘The Myth of Mary’** Cesar Vidal wrote (pp 120-121)

‘During the 13th century, scholastic theologians like the famous Thomas Aquinas, who was later consecrated as Doctor of the Catholic Church, believed that Mary had sinned. In the last work written by Aquinas *Brevis Summa de Fide* dedicated to his companion Fray Reinaldo, Thomas Aquinas specifically states “Certainly (Mary) was conceived with original sin, as is natural... If she would not have been born with original sin, she would not have needed to be redeemed by Christ, and, this being so, Christ would not be the universal Redeemer of men, which would abolish the dignity of Christ**”. Although Thomas Aquinas was influenced by the previous developments of the myth of Mary and believed that she had always been a virgin, he could not accept that she did not need redemption nor that she was free from original sin’.**