

## Understanding the Assumption and Queenship of Mary

By Steve Ray ([www.CatholicConvert.com](http://www.CatholicConvert.com))

On August 15<sup>th</sup> I posted a [blog](#) about the Assumption of Mary. I did not try to *prove* the Assumption. My goal was much more humble—to show that there was biblical precedent for the Assumption and the Queenship of Mary. It was written for those who have eyes to see and ears to hear and for those who have a proper appreciation for and knowledge of the Old Testament and the institutions of Israel.

Of course there are always the anti-Catholic naysayers who want to jump in with red-faced indignation. This was no exception. A Protestant apologist named James White posted a [blog](#) to challenge my original post. It is surrounded by a lot of ranting and raving but I think I've summarize his basic objections as I explain the biblical precedent for the Assumption and Queenship of Mary.

Usually I don't have time for this kind of response any more, and I would certainly not waste my time because of one anti-Catholic website, but Sunday was a quiet, rainy day and I had finished many projects and thought it would be fun to delve deeper into the topic for my own learning and edification and for those who love the Blessed Mother and the Catholic Church. I also admit that I love doing this kind of writing when I have the time.

Please don't feel obligated to read all the footnotes. I love footnotes! They are provided to give further documentation to statements I make for those who want to research a little more deeply. I was accused of not answering the questions posed. Now I will probably be accused of answering too much and too long. Oh well!

I want to thank Gary Michuta for some wise advice and suggestions. He was kind enough to donate some of his valuable time, ideas and brilliant expertise. You can visit his website at [www.HandsOnApologetics.com](http://www.HandsOnApologetics.com) and you can learn more about his and his debate with James White on my website [here](#).

This is basically divided into three parts: 1) discussion of authority and why we believe what we do; 2) biblical precedents for the Assumption and Queenship of Mary; and 3) a direct response to the specific objections.

So, here we go.

### **PART I:**

#### **Must Everything be Explicitly in the Bible?**

It is not unusual, especially when the Feast of the Assumption rolls around each August 15<sup>th</sup>, to hear the familiar chorus again begin to chant “Your Marian doctrines are unbiblical! You Catholics worship Mary! Your Church has invented these doctrines as the traditions of men!”

I understand these folks and their opposition. I used to parrot the same things in my past life. I was taught that the Catholic Church was the whore of Babylon that worshiped Mary instead of God. I learned all the usual clichés along with my mother’s milk. Until I was 39 years old I had joined the anti-Catholic slogans and mantras, especially against the teachings on Mary.

The first part of this “treatise” will contain a discussion of authority and how doctrines are developed. Those opposing Catholic teaching<sup>1</sup> generally hold to the newly-invented doctrine of *sola Scriptura* and expect everyone else to join them marching in lockstep. They want every doctrine and teaching to be clearly and explicitly spelled out in Scripture before it can be raised to the level of doctrine. Frankly, the doctrine of the Assumption and the Queenship of Mary are *not* explicitly stated in the Bible which is one reason why they are attacked so vigorously.

### **Everyone has a Tradition**

But then not everything Catholics or even Protestants believe is explicitly spelled out in Scripture. Formulating doctrine requires that we find and fit the puzzle pieces together. In the process of understanding the Bible and formulating doctrine *tradition* effects and colors the end result. Catholics happily admit that they have a Sacred Tradition, but others often delude themselves into thinking they are completely objective and have no tradition at all.

I was *saturated* with Baptist tradition from my days in diapers. The Baptist tradition was drilled into me through years of sermons, Sunday School, Daily Vacation Bible School, WMUZ Christian radio, books upon books and daily by my mom and dad.

I also used to claim that—“I do not have tradition; I come to the Bible objectively and let it speak for itself!” I was wrong. No one comes to the Bible without a preconceived tradition, engrained presuppositions or influence from other preachers, writers and opinions. Many people “catch” their traditions like one catches the measles, by being close to someone else that has them.<sup>2</sup>

But why would we expect everything to be clearly delineated in Scripture? If the Bible were designed to be a Church Manual or a comprehensive Theology Course, then that would be expected. But the Bible is a “random” collection of writings which were

---

<sup>1</sup> By the way, the Marian teachings and beliefs held by the Catholic Church are not uniquely Catholic but wide spread in all the ancient churches in the east and the west. Actually, the opposition to them is what is unique. If you were to view all of Christianity over the centuries—Catholic, Coptic, Eastern Orthodox, Protestant, etc. you would find that the vast majority have always believed these things about Mary. They may not have made them “dogmas” but they believed them. It is only a very small sliver of the “Christian pie” that has reacted in a negative way.

<sup>2</sup> Many people who are strong Christians today are usually so because of their environment. They were raised in Christian homes and discovered the truth of the Gospel. But, if they had been raised in a hard-core Muslim family in Egypt or Iran, the chances are they would be bowing to Allah, not Jesus Christ. No matter how one might object, our family, schools, countries, and other influences shape our ideas and provide a *tradition* through which we understand reality. It is the rare person in the general scheme of things who actually chooses his religion and tradition, but even then, their chosen tradition is the lens through which they understand reality.

recognized by the Church over the centuries as authoritative and inspired by God.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, after recognizing and determining which writings belonged in the final canon of Scripture, the Church was obligated to work with the text—and the tradition that preceded and accompanied the text—to ponder, understand, define and teach the fullness of the faith delivered once and for all to the saints (Jude 3).

### **Sola Scriptura or Sola Ecclesia?**

Catholics do not believe in *sola Scriptura*—and for good reason. Nor do they believe in *sola ecclesia*—the “church alone,” as is sometimes sarcastically suggested. We Catholics have a much more comprehensive and historical view of authority. Based in part on the model God established among the Israelites, the Church—the new Israel—from the very beginning understood authority as basically residing in three entities: Sacred Scripture, Sacred Tradition and the Magisterium.<sup>4</sup> It takes three legs for a stool to stand and these three legs have withstood the test of time. But looking at Protestantism one can see what happens if you rip two legs off the stool!

Our source of authority is *not* the Bible alone. We can thank God and the Catholic Church for that. Just look at the mass confusion this invented doctrine of *sola Scriptura* has inflicted upon Protestants as they’ve split and scattered into over 33,000 different competing groups with biblical interpretations that go all over the map.<sup>5</sup> But while we Catholics do not accept *sola Scriptura*, we also cannot be painted into a corned named *sola Ecclesia*—the Church alone.

---

<sup>3</sup> Protestant historian Henry Chadwick writes, “In later Christian debate the history of the formation of the biblical canon has at times become a sensitive issue: were the books admitted to the church’s canon because they were self-authenticating, and a passive act of the community was to acknowledge their inherent authority? Or did the church actively create the canon in response to Marcion and other sectarian leaders whose inspired writings were either more or less than the church accepted? Both questions have to receive affirmative answers, and they are not mutually exclusive. The books were acknowledged because of their content as witnesses to the apostolic gospel; their formal acceptance as canonical scripture was a matter of discussion and decision by gradual consensus among the communities of the late second century and afterwards. But the term canon was being used for the standard of authentic teaching given by the baptismal confession of faith well before it came to be used for the list of accepted books. *The criterion for admission was not so much that traditions vindicated an apostolic authorship as that the content of the books was in line with the apostolic proclamation received by the second-century churches*” (*The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity*, ed. by John McManners, pg. 29. Emphasis mine). The “communities” he refers to were of course Catholic and it was the councils both local and universal that over time codified the NT canon now accepted also by Protestants who piggy-back off the determination made by the Catholic Church.

<sup>4</sup> Though “magisterium” may sound like an intimidating word, it simply means “office of teacher.” “Magisterium (from the Latin *magister*, ‘teacher’) is a technical ecclesiastical term in Roman Catholic Church referring to the teaching authority of the church. This authority is understood to be embodied in the episcopacy, which is the aggregation of the current bishops of the church, led by the Bishop of Rome (the Pope) who serves as *primus inter pares* (‘first among equals’) within the episcopacy. According to Catholic doctrine, the Magisterium is able to teach or interpret the truths of the Faith, and it does so infallibly within the Sacred[citation needed] Magisterium. ‘The task of interpreting the Word of God authentically has been entrusted solely to the Magisterium of the Church, that is, to the Pope and to the bishops in communion with him.’ (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed. 1997, pt. 1, sect. 1, ch. 2, art. 2, III [#100]).”

<sup>5</sup> *World Christian Encyclopedia* (Oxford University Press, 2001), pg. 10.

## **Why Catholics Trust the Catholic Church**

But though we don't believe in *sola ecclesia*, we DO trust the Church. I will give you two biblical reasons why, though the reasons could easily be multiplied.

**First**, when Jesus said “Farewell” and ascended into heaven, he did not leave us a book. In fact, there is no record of him instructing the disciples to ever write a book, nor was there an expectation that someday there would be a collection of writings attached to the Hebrew Scripture and considered equally inspired. Nor did Jesus leave a detailed manual or cataloged tradition.<sup>6</sup>

What DID Jesus leave as an authority for the Church He was building? He left us Twelve Men—one with the Keys of the Kingdom and all Twelve with the authority to bind and loose (Matt 16:18-19; 18:15-18). He promised them the Holy Spirit to lead and teach them (John 14:25-26; 15:26; 16:7). He also promised that the decisions and judgments they made regarding the Kingdom would be ratified by King Jesus in heaven.<sup>7</sup> He gave them the power to forgive and retain sins (John 20:20-23). He also promised them that he would be with them—and presumably their successors in the Church as the keys were successively passed on—until the end of time (Matt 28:19-20). Our religion is not based on a book alone, though the Bible is essential to our faith. Our Lord did not leave us a book—He left us a Church with a Twelve-man Magisterium.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> For more on this, see my 36 “[Questions for ‘Bible Christians’](#)” by clicking on the link or by going here [www.CatholicConvert.com](http://www.CatholicConvert.com) > Resources > Writings > Steve’s Writings > About the Bible.

<sup>7</sup> For more on the meaning of “the keys” and the authority to bind and loose, see my book [Upon this Rock](#). Here are a few excerpts. Here is one of many, this excerpt quoting Protestant scholar R. T. France, “These terms [binding and loosing] thus refer to a teaching function, and more specifically one of making *halakhic* [legal or relating to custom and tradition] pronouncements which are to be binding on the people of God. In that case Peter’s “power of the keys” declared in [Matthew] 16:19 is not so much that of the doorkeeper, who decides who may or may not be admitted to the kingdom of heaven, but that of the steward (as in Is 22:22, generally regarded as the Old Testament background to the metaphor of the keys here), of the household’ (*Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989], 247).”

“Those opposed to the Catholic Church often try to reduce ‘binding’ and ‘loosing’ simply to the opening of the gates of heaven to the Gentiles. However, in so doing they ignore the culturally understood meaning of the words at the time of Jesus. ‘Rabbinic terms used in Mt. 16:19 of Peter’s doctrinal authority to declare things forbidden or permitted; and in Mt. 18:18 of the disciples’ disciplinary authority to condemn and absolve’ (*The Illustrated Bible Dictionary* ed. by J. D. Douglas [Wheaton, IL: IVP and Tyndale House Publ., 1980], 1:199).”

“Aramaic biblical scholar George Lamsa writes of binding and loosing: “‘He has the key,’ means he can declare certain things to be lawful and others unlawful; that is to bind or to loose, or to prohibit or to permit, or to forgive” (*Old Testament Light* [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1964], 657). William Barclay informs us that “To loose and bind were very common Jewish phrases. They were used especially of the decisions of the great teachers and the great Rabbis. Their regular sense, which any Jew would recognize was to allow and to forbid. To bind something was to declare it forbidden; to loose was to declare it allowed. These were the regular phrases for taking decisions in regard to the law. That is in fact the only thing these phrases in such a context would mean” (*The Gospel of Matthew* [Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1975], 2:145–146).”

<sup>8</sup> Of course at the time it was only Eleven since Judas has hanged himself. But we can speculate that Matthias, soon to be appointed to fill Judas’ “bishoprick” was a witness to the Ascension, thus actually in theory all Twelve of the final group of apostles were there. One of the first things Peter would do as physical head and pastor of the Church would be to elect Matthias through lots as number 12 to replace Judas in his bishoprick. Then there would again be 12 men who received the promises of Our Lord.

Apart from the Hebrew Scriptures, the magisterium preceded both the New Testament and the Sacred Tradition. Both would develop from the Apostolic Tradition.<sup>9</sup> A new thing had begun as the Twelve (Eleven) stood on the Mount of Olives looking into the clouds and as the fire descended ten days later. The “New Israel” was being established. It would have many similarities with the “Old Israel,” as we will soon see.

Peter began making authoritative decisions from the very get-go— replacing Judas’ office of “bishoprick” (KJV), preaching the need for baptism for remission of sins (not *faith alone*), and establishing the office of deacons (Acts 1:20; 2:38; 6:1-7). We have no knowledge of Jesus commanding these things before His ascension, but we see Peter exercising the authority of the keys and the power to bind and loose.

Under Peter’s God-ordained headship, these Twelve Men exercised the authority of “binding and loosing” from the very beginning. They even held a Church council (prototype of future Ecumenical Councils) in Acts 15. In Acts 16:4 we find that this council delivered a binding decision which was even called a *dogma* (Greek here for “decrees” or “decisions” is *dogma*). Thus, long before a book with 27 writings was ever collected and codified the Church exercised authoritative leadership with a mandate from Christ.

The early Church concurs. I could amass multiple examples, but this one will suffice. Listen to the words of St. Irenaeus (c. 130–c. 200):

Since therefore we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the Church; since the apostles, like a rich man [depositing his money] in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she [the Church] is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers. On this account are we bound to avoid *them*, but to make choice of the thing pertaining to the Church with the utmost diligence, and to lay hold of the tradition of the truth (Irenaeus, *Heresies* 3, 4 in ANF 1:416-417).

**Second**, it is also interesting that St. Paul refers to the *Church* as the “pillar and foundation of the truth” (1 Tim 3:14-15). Many wish that Paul had given this honor to the *Bible*, but no—it is the *Church*! If this passage HAD declared that the Bible was the pillar and foundation of the truth, it would be splashed on the home page of every anti-Catholic website! The Bible never teaches or even implies *sola Scriptura* so if Paul had declared the *Bible* to be the “pillar and foundation of the truth” you better believe that the whole crew of anti-Catholics would parade the verse around on their shoulders chanting

---

<sup>9</sup> Though many try to turn “tradition” in a dirty word—the dreaded “T” word—the Bible is not so negative. Notice these three passages in particular that mention the existence and importance of the apostolic tradition: “So then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the *traditions* which you were taught, whether by word of mouth or by letter from us.” (2 Thess 2:15); “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you keep away from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the *tradition* which you received from us.” (2 Thess 3:6); “Now I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the *traditions*, just as I delivered them to you.” (1 Cor 11:2).

the mantra. But because it is the *Church* that fills that roll, you hear nary a word. Funny, eh? In fact, many live as though this verse had been cut out of their Bibles.

But Paul clearly states:

I am writing these things to you, hoping to come to you before long; but in case I am delayed, I write so that you will know how one ought to conduct himself in the household of God, which is *the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth*. (1 Tim 3:14-15, NASB95, emphasis mine).

The Fathers of the Church from earliest times understood what this meant. Notice the words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (c.315–87):

‘For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name is glorified among the Gentiles’ [Mal 1:11]. Concerning this Holy Catholic Church Paul writes to Timothy, ‘That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.’<sup>10</sup>

And as long as we mention Paul, remember that he did not just go out and start his own independent Baptist congregations. He was ordained, commissioned, and sent out by the Holy Spirit through the Church with the laying on of hands. Later he submitted his teachings to the Church in Jerusalem to assure that “he was not preaching in vain.” He visited Peter for two weeks and received the right hand of fellowship from the Apostles and elders in Jerusalem.

I could go on and on, but this is enough to show that we Catholics are not *too* far off track on the issue of authority—our trust in the Church is not misplaced. Our opponents of course want us to follow *their unique interpretations* and they expect everything believed to be explicitly stated in the Bible. I think the two examples I have given provide enough grounds to at least prove we have *some* biblical basis for our Catholic beliefs (tongue in cheek).

So, our trust in the Church is biblically-based—even if it is demanded that we justify it with *proof texts* from the Bible. Of course, the opponents don’t want to believe what these passages teach so they will dance around them to avoid the obvious conclusions.

### **Marian Dogmas Clearly Spelled Out in Scripture?**

Having lain a bit of a foundation, now let’s look at the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin and her Queenship in Heaven.

Are these Marian dogmas explicitly spelled out in the Bible? No. But ask yourself this—are all Protestant “dogmas” clearly spelled out in the Bible? No. There is often a double

---

<sup>10</sup>Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII*. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen. Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans Publ., pg. 140.

standard thrown in our faces. “You Catholics cannot prove your doctrines from the Bible alone! You made them up!”

But good grief, where do they find their favorite doctrine of *sola Scriptura* explicitly stated in Scripture? We certainly have more warrant for trusting the authority of the Church and the need for Tradition (2 Thess 2:15; 3:6, etc.), than they have to prove their unbiblical doctrine of *sola Scriptura*. Where do we find their intricate “Rapture” theologies clearly stated? It is obvious they are *not* clearly stated because there are as many permutations on that Fundamentalist doctrine as there are heads. Where is the word “trinity” in the Bible, or where do we see it explicitly stated and explained.

The fact is, there are multitudes of “Protestant Magisteriums” and independent competing petty “popes” developing their own theologies—many of which cannot be found explicitly in the Bible. There confusion and fragmentation can be demonstrated simply by the utter lack of uniformity among them. They disagree on just about everything. And when they read this they will probably cover their eyes and ears shouting—“No, it is only Catholics who do that!”

The Magisterium that was given the keys and the authority to bind and loose has spoken through the centuries, just as it did on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) and at the Council of Jerusalem in 49 AD (Acts 15).<sup>11</sup> The Church *can, should, and appropriately does* preserve, interpret, define, expound and spread the word of God contained in Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition until the end of time.

So, what about Mary? The Church has defined certain doctrines about the Mother of Our Lord. Does everything they define have to be explicitly stated in the Bible? No. The Church defined the extent of the New Testament canon with nothing in the canon itself to direct them. The Bible’s *Table of Contents* is not inspired.<sup>12</sup> Protestants should

---

<sup>11</sup> Of course at this point the objection arises—“There is no apostolic succession!” I have written much on that topic and you can again see it in my book [\*Upon this Rock: Peter and the Primacy of Rome in Scripture and the Early Church\*](#) and in my talk “[\*Apostolic Succession: You Can Trust the Church.\*](#)” So, I will not dwell on it here other than to say it is real and valid and ordained by Christ so that his keys would not be abandoned or thrown away but the office would be passed on through the centuries until the last day when He comes as king and judge and the keys will be returned to Him who delegated them to Peter and his successors. We will be with Jesus in heaven and the keys of the Royal Steward will no longer be needed on earth.

<sup>12</sup> “The Catholic Church teaches that the primary author of the New Testament writings is the Holy Spirit—God is the author. Our current argument in no way minimizes this fact. The writers were a part of the Church, and the Church had the authority to recognize the inspired books and the authority to close the canon. Without the authority of the Catholic Church, how does a Protestant know which books belong in the New Testament? Reformed theologian, R. C. Sproul, honestly admits that the Protestant position can at best claim “a fallible collection of infallible books” (*Essential Truths of the Christian Faith* [Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1992], 22). That is not very reassuring. How do we know that a fallible book didn’t slip into the collection by mistake? How do we know that we are not missing an essential book? If Christ wanted us to have an infallible collection of writings, he needed to do one of two things: (1) give us an authoritative list of writings, dictated by an apostle, that would form the canon to provide certainty, so there would be no confusion, or (2) establish an infallible Church that could give us a list of infallible writings so we could be certain. He did not do the first, and the Protestant denies the second, leaving the Protestant position weak” (*Crossing the Tiber*, pg. 53).

acknowledge that they “piggy-back” off the Catholic councils in order to know what books comprise their New Testament—though “Reformer” John Calvin had his own inadequate theories to avoid the obvious.<sup>13</sup>

So Catholics, with good and sufficient reasons to trust the Church. After all it was Jesus who has to keep the promises that He gave when He entrusted His Church with the keys, through the office of Peter. Through the exercise of this power, Jesus has promised to protect and ratify what the Church officially teaches, judges and defines. Just as the early Church trusted Peter, so we trust him and his successors today because that is the way Jesus set up His Church.

For those who want to get into the real nitty-gritty of the dogma of the Assumption—its sources, history, detailed dates and names, opposition, etc.—visit this web page “[The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary](#).” Actually I could have just cut and pasted this article and used it as my explanation, but [here](#) it is for your enjoyment and edification.<sup>14</sup>

## **PART II:**

### **Is there Scriptural Precedent for the Assumption?**

So, having finished PART I on authority and having provided the above link for the whole history of the definition of the Dogma of the Assumption—and its corollary, the Queenship of Mary—I will now advance to the matter specifically at hand—does Scripture deny or forbid the idea of Mary being assumed into heaven as Queen. Or, just as importantly, is there warrant within Scripture to support the understanding of Mary as the Queen of Heaven, having been assumed by her Son to a throne in heaven.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> From my book [Crossing the Tiber](#): “Swiss Reformer John Calvin 1509-64), writes, ‘Let it therefore be held as fixed, that those who are inwardly taught by the Holy Spirit acquiesce implicitly in Scripture; that Scripture, carrying its own evidence along with it [self-authenticating], deigns not to submit to proofs and arguments; but owes the full conviction with which we ought to receive it to the testimony of the Spirit. Enlightened by him, we no longer believe, either on our own judgment or that of others, that the Scriptures are from God; but in a way superior to human judgment, feel perfectly assured . . . in holding it, [that] we hold unassailable truth; not like miserable men, whose minds are enslaved by superstition, but because we feel a divine energy living and breathing in it’ (*Institutes of the Christian Religion* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983], 1: vii, 3). He says that the knowledge of what is Scripture comes to each individual from ‘heavenly revelation.’ On Calvin’s principles, should each person have the authority to determine their own canon of Scripture? This is the means used by Mormons to verify the inspiration of the *Book of Mormon*. They claim to know the *Book of Mormon* is true and inspired by God, because when they read it, they get a ‘burning in the bosom’, which is an internal witness to verify the inspiration. In the *Book of Mormon* we read, ‘And when you shall receive these things, I would exhort you that ye would ask God, the Eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Spirit. And by the power of the Holy Ghost ye may know the truth of all things’ (Moroni 10:4, 5 [Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints, 1981], 529). How are these two ‘self-authenticating’ procedures different? The Mormons authenticate their *Book of Mormon* using Calvin’s methodology of an internal witness. Based on this subjective method alone, it is difficult to dispute their conclusions that the *Book of Mormon* is God’s word” (*Crossing the Tiber*, pg. 50-51).

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.bringyou.to/apologetics/AssumptionMaryJuniperCarolMariology.htm>.

<sup>15</sup> There are some who will immediately say that our veneration of Mary as Queen of Heaven is of pagan origin and a violation of Jeremiah’s prophecy condemning the Israelites and their worship of the “Queen of



My blog [Assumption of the Blessed Virgin – August 15](#) ended with an 8-point conclusion. Several people objected with great huffing and puffing. But let's look at what I wrote and later we'll look at their specific objections (PART III). Here is the conclusion to the full blog entry I posted on my blog:

**Follow the logic:** **1)** The kings of Judah, following Solomon who raised his mother to Queenship, had their mothers as queens which became established as an official office; **2)** the mothers were referred to as the Queen Mothers or the Great Lady; **3)** they sat on a throne near their sons (1 Ki 2:19); **4)** Jesus is the quintessential Jewish King with an eternal kingdom; **5)** Jesus is the fulfillment of the Israelite offices of Prophet, Priest & King; **6)** As the Davidic king, Jesus would honor his mother more than earthy kings honored their mothers; **7)** It is biblical, historical, and reasonable to expect the perfect Jewish king to follow in the stead of the kingdom and his fathers by assuming his mother to a throne at his right hand. **8)** It is proper and biblical to consider Mary in a position of intercessor.

Is my line of reasoning unbiblical, ridiculous, or laughable as some anti-Catholic bloggers immediately asserted? Let's see.

### **Biblical Types, Precedents & Analogies**

St. Paul twice informs us that the Old Testament was given for our instruction (Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 10:11). Paul saw types and analogies in the Old Testament that helped explain and illuminate New Testament truth. Paul uses typology to show the parallels and fulfillments between the first man Adam, and Jesus Christ the last Adam (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:45). He sees much in the institutions and Law of Israel that is instructive about Christ and the Church.

St. Paul "allegorically" ponders Sarah and Hagar and their sons in the Old Testament as he was developing and defining doctrine (Gal 4:22-26).<sup>16</sup> The average reader of Genesis might not come to the same "fantastic" conclusions Paul came to (seeing Sarah as freedom and the heavenly Jerusalem while Hagar is Mount Sinai and bondage to the law). Funny that our opponent does not accuse Paul of "wide-eyed allegorical or typological interpretation" (words he uses later as you will see). Paul's practice of analyzing the Old to help explain the New is obvious and certainly a hermeneutical practice the Church can follow.

---

Heaven" in Jeremiah 44. To explain and debunk this argument as used against Catholics, you can read my blog entry [Jeremiah Condemns Worship of Queen of Heaven](#).

<sup>16</sup> "For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondwoman and one by the free woman. But the son by the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and the son by the free woman through the promise. This is allegorically speaking, for these women are two covenants: one proceeding from Mount Sinai bearing children who are to be slaves; she is Hagar. Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free; she is our mother." (Galatians 4:22-26, NASB95).

St. Augustine follows Paul's practice with this famous statement:

The Old Testament is the New concealed, but the New Testament is the Old revealed (*Catechizing of the Uninstructed* 4:8).

Let's look at the Psalms too. They were literally interpreted within their contemporary setting and context—written about real events in ancient times. But in a prophetic way some of them have a double meaning and apply also to the coming Messiah (e.g., Psa 22 and 69). It is abundantly clear that we can learn much about Christ, the Church, Mary, and our own salvation by referring to the types, analogies, institutions and instructions in the Old Testament. I don't think anyone is willing to deny this, though many will deny certain *aspects* of it—especially when Catholics incorporate the Old Testament in the development and understanding of doctrine. Such opponents tend to be rather selective—inconsistently applying a double standard.

The Catholic Church has used various and sundry sources to develop and define the Dogma of the Assumption. Is there biblical precedent for such a teaching? Of course, and it is easy to find if one does not cover their ears and close their eyes.

### **Enoch and Elijah**

Let's look at two men in the Old Testament who were both assumed into heaven body and soul. I would suggest that they set a precedent. First Enoch. The Bible states:

Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him. (Gen 5:24, NASB95).

The book of Hebrews follows up by saying:

By faith Enoch was *taken up* so that he would not see death; and he was not found because God *took him up*; for he obtained the witness that before his being *taken up* he was pleasing to God (Heb 11:5, NASB95, emphasis mine).

This seems like a clear biblical precedent for the Assumption to me—seeing as it WAS an assumption. Someone in the Old Testament was pleasing to God and as a result, or even as a reward, he was “taken up” body and soul into heaven. If Mary was the ultimate one pleasing to God, how much more would the loving Son “take her up” to be with Him in heaven?

Interestingly enough, the Greek word for “took him up” in Hebrews relates to the word *assumption*.<sup>17</sup> My friend Fr. Paul Haffner, PhD with multiple degrees, has written a

---

<sup>17</sup> The *New Jerusalem Bible* translates the Greek for “took him up” as *assumption*.

*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature*: “μετατίθημι . . . change (the position of). 1. literally convey to another place, put in another place, transfer . . . Of Enoch be taken up, translated Hb 11:5a” (Arndt, W., Gingrich, F. W., Danker, F. W., & Bauer, W. (1996, c1979). (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*: “μετατίθημι metatithēmi: bring to another place, move, transport, change . . . Heb 11:5a (pass.) and 5b (act.), of the translation of Enoch” (Balz, H. R., & Schneider, G. (1990-c1993).. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans).

marvelous book entitled *The Mystery of Mary* in which he gives great biblical and historical evidence of the Catholic Church's doctrines on Mary. In discussing the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin he writes:

In the Old Testament, there were some mysterious departures from this life. God granted a special privilege of not dying to Enoch and Elijah. The first case concerns Enoch, referred to in the book of Genesis: "Enoch walked with God, then was no more, because God took him" (Gen 5:24). The letter to the Hebrews furnishes more information: "It was because of his faith that Enoch was taken up and did not experience death: he was no more, because God took him; because before his assumption he was acknowledged to have pleased God" (Heb 11:5, NJB). Significantly the word *assumption* is adopted [by the author of Hebrews]" (Paul Haffner. [\*The Mystery of Mary\*](#) [Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 2004], pg. 208).

It seems as though we have one clear precedent. Though one would certainly be enough to make my point, is there *another* precedent for the Assumption? Sure! Let's look at Elijah who was also taken into heaven—body and soul. Remember that Elijah also met with Jesus at the Mount of Transfiguration along with a "dead guy" named Moses who seemed to still be very much alive and interested in what was going on on earth. Here's what the Bible tells us about Elijah:

As [Elijah and Elisha] were going along and talking, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire which separated the two of them. *And Elijah went up by a whirlwind to heaven.* Elisha saw it and cried out, 'My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and its horsemen!' And he saw Elijah no more. Then he took hold of his own clothes and tore them in two pieces (2 Kings 2:11-12, NASB95, emphasis mine).

Again, another precedent for the Assumption! A prophet pleasing to God is transported into heaven—assumed into glory—with an eyewitness named Elisha looking on and testifying that it really happened.

So why is it considered so repugnant and impossible that the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of Our Lord would also be granted a privilege already granted to lesser people? Why is the whole concept denigrated as unbiblical? It must simply be that Mary's Assumption goes contrary to some peoples' anti-Catholic prejudices so they have to stand up and protest.

But are there *other* biblical texts that demonstrate that the Assumption is not unprecedented? Of course! Remember what Paul told the Thessalonians would take place at the end of time? Seems that all of us will have our *own* Assumption!

For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are alive and remain will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet

the Lord in the air, and so we shall always be with the Lord (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17, NASB95).

Mary was the first to believe and the one uniquely overshadowed with the Holy Spirit. It was Mary whom under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit said “all generations shall me blessed” (Lk 1:48): She is the Ark of the New Covenant which carried the Word of God—not engraved in stone—but engraved in flesh (Oops, there I go again with those wide-eyed allegories ☺; see *Catechism* paragraph 2676). As chosen Daughter of Jerusalem and Daughter of the Father, Mother of the Son and Mother of the Church, and Spouse of the Holy Spirit by whom she gave birth to the Holy One of God—would it not be appropriate that she proceed us to glory as a model and hope? If not, why not? Is it just Fundamentalist tradition and anti-Catholic bias that makes it impossible?

### **Historical Curiosity?**

I can't help but mentioning one historical fact that screams out at us. All the Apostles and great saints of the first centuries have tombs and relics and churches built in their honor. But what about Mary?

The biblical witness for the truth of the Assumption is complemented by the witness of history. It is a remarkable fact that there is no tradition or legend whatsoever about either the physical relics of the Blessed Mother or of a tomb in which she presently lies buried. The earthly resting places of all the other Apostles and of holy Christians through the ages have inspired shrines and pilgrimages; relics associated with them have been treasured by the faithful. Is it conceivable that the greatest saint of them all, the Mother of God, would not have been thus honored if there had been even the slightest inkling that she was buried somewhere in this world? Like “the empty tomb” that testified so strongly to the resurrection of Our Lord, the absence of belief in a tomb holding Mary's remains testifies powerfully to the truth that she was assumed into Heaven (of course there are traditions of the tomb where her body was laid prior to the Assumption much as Jesus too was laid in a tomb prior to His Resurrection) (Robert Payesko. *The Truth about Mary: vol 2*. Santa Barbara, CA: Queenship Publishing, 1996), pgs. 260-261).

The Assumption is certainly not unprecedented, nor would it be surprising. It is also not unbiblical or contrary to Scripture.

### **The Woman Clothed with the Sun**

Another passage in Scripture provides a window into heaven were we see a Queen Mother giving birth to a royal son. In Revelation 12 we see Mary revealed as Queen of Heaven. Fundamentalists dismiss this passage in various ways (which we will discuss later), but even if one wants to deny it is actually Mary, it is still obvious that the *idea* of a Queen Mother giving birth to a royal son was not abhorred or condemned in the first century of Christianity—even by the Apostles. This is, for heaven's sake (no pun intended) part of the Bible. In fact, the book of Revelation was included in the canon of Scripture *even though* it graphically portrayed a Queen Mother in Heaven.

Here is the passage starting with Rev 11:19 and going through 12:5. Remember, chapter and verse divisions were not part of the original writings. They were added only recently.

And the temple of God which is in heaven was opened; and *the ark of His covenant appeared in His temple*, and there were flashes of lightning and sounds and peals of thunder and an earthquake and a great hailstorm. *A great sign appeared in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars; and she was with child; and she cried out, being in labor and in pain to give birth. Then another sign appeared in heaven: and behold, a great red dragon having seven heads and ten horns, and on his heads were seven diadems. And his tail swept away a third of the stars of heaven and threw them to the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman who was about to give birth, so that when she gave birth he might devour her child. And she gave birth to a son, a male child, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up to God and to His throne.* (Revelation 12:1-5, NASB95, emphasis mine).

So many things to say! We cannot be too dogmatic about some of these matters in Revelation. John writes about real things and writes using symbols. There are many interpretations of details within the Revelation. John writes of history, often with great symbolism. I would suggest that people read Scott Hahn's book [Hail, Holy Queen](#) to better understand Mary's place and honor, especially here in the Revelation of John. What I am saying below I believe is in agreement with Scott's assessment.

*First*, notice that John says he saw an ARK in the Temple (11:19). The next thing he says is he saw the Queen with the Word of God in her womb. Is their proximity by chance? The real ark was lost long ago. This *may* be the real ark from the Temple, mentioned as a symbol of Mary, just like the real Mary is revealed to symbolize the Church or Israel. Mary is seen in heaven not only as a Queen Mother with the Word of God within her, but she is also revealed as the Ark of the New Covenant with the living Word of God within her. For more about Mary as the Ark of the New Covenant, read my article [here](#),<sup>18</sup> and for a list of quotations from the early Church Fathers, click [here](#).<sup>19</sup>

Mary is seen as the Ark with the Word of God within her and the Queen pregnant with the Royal Son. It is not by accident that the Holy Spirit of God placed these two images immediately together. Scott Hahn comments:

The woman of the Apocalypse is the ark of the covenant in the heavenly temple; and that woman is the Virgin Mary. This does not, however, preclude other readings of Revelation 12. Scripture, after all, is not a code to be cracked, but a mystery we could never plumb in a lifetime.

In the fourth century, for example, Saint Ambrose saw the woman clearly as the Virgin Mary, "because she is mother of the Church, for she brought forth Him who is

---

<sup>18</sup> [www.CatholicConvert.com](http://www.CatholicConvert.com) > Resources > Writings > Steve's Writings > Apologetics > Mary, Ark of the Covenant.

<sup>19</sup> [www.CatholicConvert.com](http://www.CatholicConvert.com) > Resources > Writings > Steve's Writings > Apologetics > Mary, Ark of the Covenant – Quotes from the Fathers.

the Head of the church”; yet Ambrose also saw Revelation’s woman as an allegory of the church herself. Saint Ephrem of Syria reached the same conclusion, fearing no contradictions: “the virgin Mary is, again, the figure of the Church . . . . Let us call the Church by the name of Mary; for she is worthy of the double name.” Saint Augustine, too, held that the woman of the Apocalypse “signifies Mary, who, being spotless, brought forth our spotless Head. Who herself also showed forth in herself a figure of holy Church, so that as she in bringing forth a Son remained a virgin, so the Church also should during the whole of time be bringing forth His members, and yet not lose her virgin estate.” (*Hail, Holy Queen*. [New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001], pgs. 65-65).

*Second*, some people complain that the Assumption has no precedent in early Catholic tradition. Granted, the first clear mention of the Assumption come several centuries later. However, the belief was there and readily received when it began to be understood. One thing that must be remembered: Revelation was resisted as part of the canon for almost 400 years so many in the early Church were deprived of its inspired instruction, especially regarding the Queenship of Mary as revealed in Revelation 12.<sup>20</sup>

Cardinal John Henry Newman also commented thus:

It is sometimes asked, Why do not the sacred writers mention our Lady’s greatness? I answer, she was, or maybe have been alive, when the apostles and evangelists wrote; there was just one book of Scripture certainly written after her death and that book [the book of Revelation] does (so to say) canonize and crown her (*Hail, Holy Queen*. [New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001], pgs. 64-65).

*Third*, Revelation 12 undercuts the arguments that a Queen in Heaven is condemned by Scripture or that it is impossible for there to be a Queen in heaven. The fact is, here in Scripture we see a Queen in Heaven giving birth to a royal son. Some say that such an idea is pagan idolatry, but it is actually a biblical reality and revealed by Jesus himself through his servant St. John.

*Fourth*, the only real objection that can be raised to deny that the “woman” (Queen in Heaven) is Mary is to say the woman is merely symbolic—she represents Israel or the Church through whom the Messiah was to come. Now we are in deep waters and we can admit that like many of the Fathers, we see the woman as a symbol of Israel or the Church, but as Scott Hahn says in his book *Hail, Holy Queen* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001), pg. 60:

---

<sup>20</sup> So much for John Calvin’s claim that the canon was easily recognized because the “sheep recognize the Shepherd’s voice.” If it was so simple for Christians to recognize the voice of God in the twenty-seven exclusively inspired texts, why did it take almost 400 years for the canon to be recognized and collected into a final authoritative collection?

John clearly intends for the woman of the Apocalypse to evoke Eve, the mother of all the living, and the New Eve, the person he identifies as “woman” in the gospel.”<sup>21</sup>

The “woman” in John’s gospel is Mary, the mother of Jesus. But is the woman also symbolic? Of course she is symbolic! John is the eagle; he flies high and dives deep. He is constantly writing on several levels. I learned this when I wrote my commentary on the [St. John’s Gospel](#). But *primarily* the woman is Mary as every first century reader would have recognized.

*Fifth*, Revelation is the last book in the Bible and the culmination of God’s revelation. In order to fully understand the Apocalypse one must especially understand the first book in the Bible—Genesis. In Genesis the story of salvation begins with a real man (Adam), real snake (the Devil), and a real woman (Eve). And Genesis contains the *Protoevangelium* which promises:

And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head, And you shall bruise him on the heel.  
(Genesis 3:15, NASB95)

---

<sup>21</sup> [The Navarre Bible: Revelation](#) comments: “The mysterious figure of the woman has been interpreted ever since the time of the Fathers of the Church as referring to the ancient people of Israel, or the Church of Jesus Christ, or the Blessed Virgin. [After explaining how the Woman can represent Israel and the Church, it continues] . . . The passage can also refer to the Virgin Mary because it was she who truly and historically gave birth to the Messiah, Jesus Christ our Lord (cf. v. 5). St Bernard comments: ‘The sun contains permanent colour and splendour; whereas the moon’s brightness is unpredictable and changeable, for it never stays the same. It is quite right, then, for Mary to be depicted as clothed with the sun, for she entered the profundity of divine wisdom much much further than one can possibly conceive’ (De B. Virgine, 2).

So, the inspired text of the Apocalypse is open to interpreting this woman as a direct reference to the Blessed Virgin who, as mother, shares in the pain of Calvary (cf. Lk 2:35) and who was earlier prophesied in Isaiah 7:14 as a ‘sign’ (cf. Mt 1:22-23). At the same time the woman can be interpreted as standing for the people of God, the Church, whom the figure of Mary represents.

The Second Vatican Council has solemnly taught that Mary is a ‘type’ or symbol of the Church, for ‘in the mystery of the Church, which is itself rightly called mother and virgin, the Blessed Virgin stands out in eminent and singular fashion as exemplar both of virgin and mother. Through her faith and obedience she gave birth on earth to the very Son of the Father, not through the knowledge of man but by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, in the manner of a new Eve who placed her faith, not in the serpent of old but in God’s messenger, without wavering in doubt. The Son whom she brought forth is he whom God placed as the first-born among many brethren (cf. Rom 8:29), that is, the faithful, in whose generation and formation she cooperates with a mother’s love’ (Vatican II, *Lumen gentium*, 63).

The description of the woman indicates her heavenly glory, and the twelve stars of her victorious crown symbolize the people of God—the twelve patriarchs (cf. Gen 37:9) and the twelve apostles. And so, independently of the chronological aspects of the text, the Church sees in this heavenly woman the Blessed Virgin, ‘taken up body and soul into heavenly glory, when her earthly life was over, and exalted by the Lord as Queen over all things, that she might be the more fully conformed to her Son, the Lord of lords (cf. Rev 19:16) and conqueror of sin and death’ (*Lumen gentium*, 59). The Blessed Virgin is indeed the great sign, for, as St Bonaventure says, ‘God could have made none greater. He could have made a greater world and a greater heaven; but not a woman greater than his own mother’ (*Speculum*, 8) (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1993), pgs, 97-98.

In Revelation, the last book of the Bible, the end of the salvation story is revealed—and again we see a real man (Jesus, the Last Adam), a real snake (the Devil, Rev 12:9) and a real woman (Mary the New Eve). No one would deny that the Man-child is real, nor that the Serpent is real—so why do they deny that the Woman is real? Why segregate the woman and reduce her to mere symbolism? There is a long history of discussion on what this all means, but on the literal level John, whom Jesus assigned as the caretaker of his Mother, now reveals where the Lady is—she is in heaven as a Queen.

### **1 Kings 2:19, Queen Mothers and the Institutions of Judah**

But now, is there anything in the Bible that would support the early tradition of the Assumption, the multitude of teachings on it from the East and the West and any corollaries from Scripture to support or even help explain the Church’s dogmatic definition of the Assumption of Mary? Again, the answer is “Of course!”

But at this point some anti-Catholics cover their ears and close their eyes since they want to be the only ones that can use analogies and types from the Old Testament—they want to use the Bible to prove *their* doctrines, but they want to ridicule Catholics for doing the same.

On my blog I quoted 1 Kings 2:19, which tells of a significant event in beginning of young Solomon’s reign over Israel. What he does may be thought a bit unusual—an act that effected the royal household of Judah from that point on, and thus the ancestral line of Jesus Christ. In fact, his action carries on through all eternity since Jesus sits on the throne of his ancestral fathers David and Solomon.

Here is the quote I used from 1 Kings:

So Bathsheba went to King Solomon to speak to him for Adonijah. And the king arose to meet her, bowed before her, and sat on his throne; then *he had a throne set for the king’s mother, and she sat on his right* (1 Kings 2:19, NASB95).

Whose throne did Solomon sit upon? The throne of his father David. Whose throne would Jesus sit upon? The same, the throne of his father David. The Archangel Gabriel told Mary:

‘And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall name Him Jesus. He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will *give Him the throne of His father David*; and He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and His kingdom will have no end.’ (Luke 1:31-33, NASB95).

Question: What was Solomon and how was he known? Answer: The son of David, King of Israel (2 Chron 30:26). Solomon sat upon the throne of his father David. When people spoke of the coming Messiah, one of the Messianic titles was “Son of David” (e.g., Matt 12:23). Isaiah prophesied about the coming Messiah in this way:



For a child will be born to us, a son will be given to us; And the government will rest on His shoulders; And His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace. There will be no end to the increase of His government or of peace, *On the throne of David and over his kingdom*, To establish it and to uphold it with justice and righteousness From then on and forevermore. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish this. (Isaiah 9:6-7, NASB95).

One would expect Jesus, the ultimate Son of David, carrying the title of Solomon to fulfill the office perfectly and to be the “New Solomon” without the flaws and sins of the First Solomon.

So, what was one of the first things that Solomon did upon ascending the throne? He assumed his mother up to sit on a throne at his right hand (1 Kings 2:10).<sup>22</sup>

Solomon, who sat on the throne of his father David, would soon relinquish that throne to the ULTIMATE Son of David—Jesus Christ, the eternal king. And learning what we can about Solomon and his reign will help us better understand Jesus and His reign.

There will be much more on this matter of the Queen Mother in PART III under the specific objections.

### **PART III:**

Now we will address James White’s specific objections to my 8-point summary. I will explain further my biblical and logical process to help understand the Assumption and Queenship of Mary from the Old Testament.

We will now look at each of my points individually along with each objection that White made—even though some of his objections are foolish and even border on . . . well, I should try to be charitable here.

Follow the logic: **1)** The kings of Judah, following Solomon who raised his mother to Queenship, had their mothers as queens which became established as an official office; **2)** the mothers were referred to as the Queen Mothers or the Great Lady; **3)** they sat on a throne near their sons (1 Ki 2:19); **4)** Jesus is the quintessential Jewish

---

<sup>22</sup> According to the scholarly Protestant *Word Biblical Commentary: 1 Kings*, “‘King Solomon’: the full official title hints that Solomon will now act in his official capacity; from the endearing scene in which his words encourage his mother he suddenly leaps up like a tiger aroused from sleep. ‘Arose to meet her . . . did homage to her . . . had a chair placed’: showing the respect and affection bred into him through his former life of close intimacy. ‘The king’s mother’: mistress of the harem and acting executive in the king’s absence (cf. Jezebel). ‘Sit at his right side’: a common custom throughout the ancient world was to make this the place of honor and of delegated authority (hence to speak of Christ at the right hand of the Father should never be taken literally, for it simply means enjoying the position of chief delegated authority) (DeVries, S. J. (2003). *Vol. 12: Word Biblical Commentary : 1 Kings*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, pg. 37). So Bathsheba is given the throne of a Queen Mother, a place of honor where she exercises delegated authority. The analogy is clear. Jesus is the New Solomon and as the ultimate king of Judah, what do you think He would do for His mother?”

King with an eternal kingdom; **5)** Jesus is the fulfillment of the Israelite offices of Prophet, Priest & King; **6)** As the Davidic king, Jesus would honor his mother more than earthy kings honored their mothers; **7)** It is biblical, historical, and reasonable to expect the perfect Jewish king to follow in the stead of the kingdom and his fathers by assuming his mother to a throne at his right hand. **8)** It is proper and biblical to consider Mary in a position of intercessor.

In each case I will present my Assertion, the Objection, and finally my Response.

**My assertion #1:**

“The kings of Judah, following Solomon who raised his mother to Queenship, had their mothers as queens which became established as an official office (revised).”

**The Objection:**

“We have very little evidence to support any kind of normative position of governmental authority for the mothers of kings in Israel or Judah. 1 Kings 2 is actually an argument against this, as the throne was not normally there, and, there is no evidence that there was any further elevation of the king's mother in this fashion after this point.”

**My Response:**

Interestingly enough, in other countries it was usually the wife that sat as queen (e.g., 1 Kings 11:19). One need only read the history of the Kingdom of Judah in the Old Testament to see the normative position of the Queen Mother. How many passages of Scripture are necessary to prove that the office of Queen Mother was normative? How about 2? Would two references to the Queen Mother of Judah be enough? That is far more than our opponents have to prove *sola Scriptura!*

Actually, on a computer if you do a search for “Queen Mother” in the Protestant NASB you will come up with five references, including for example Jeremiah 13:18 “Say to *the king and the queen mother*, “Take a lowly seat, For your beautiful crown Has come down from your head.” But these 5 hits do not even include 1 Kings 2:19 and a good number of other references. I don’t know how many verses would be necessary to prove to our naysayer that the office of Queen Mother was “normative” in Judah, the line of Christ. Do a search for “queen mother” in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* and you get 78 hits in 40 articles; in the much smaller *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* you get 17 hits in 11 articles. I would say this is hardly unsubstantiated— and that maybe we are on to something 😊

I would also add that the earliest Christians recognized the institution of the Queen Mother since the “woman” of Revelation 12 is clearly a Queen Mother. No matter how you understand the Queen Mother in Revelation 12 John does depicted the “woman” as a legitimate Queen Mother in heaven. She gives birth to the Messiah-King and she has a crown. Hardly something an inspired writer would include in Scripture if it were unbiblical, blasphemous or irrelevant.

I will not go into great detail to prove the point, but archaeologist and scholar Roland de Vaux—with much more credibility in this matter than our objector—provides documentation in his landmark book *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* after decades of studying the history and culture on location. To read his section on the Great Lady, the *Gebirah*, the Queen Mother of Judah, click [here](#). If someone wants to argue the point, let them argue with Dr. Roland de Vaux! If push comes to shove, should I trust *White* on this one, or a scholar who has lived and dug in Israel studying this for a lifetime—a man who is recognized the world over as an expert on the history and institutions of Israel and Judah. And remember, De Vaux does not limit his argument to 1 Kings 2:19—not even close.

The Protestant *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible* comments on the office of Queen Mother and says in part:

The powerful role was that of queen mother. She not only ruled over the royal household, but was held in respect both by the court and by the monarch (cf. Ex 20:12). Her requests were unlikely to be denied (1 Kgs 2:20). As the mother of the king, she was unique, whereas his wives might share their position with several others. Maacah, queen mother of Abijam, even retained her authority during much of her grandson's reign (1 Kgs 15:2, 10, 13; 2 Chr 15:16). The queen mother was crowned (Jer 13:18), and Bathsheba, powerful enough as queen, was seated at the right hand of King Solomon when she became queen mother (1 Kgs 2:19) (Elwell, W. A., & Beitzel, B. J. (1988). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, in the article on "Queen, Queen Mother").<sup>23</sup>

But, let's be very generous and give our opponent the benefit of the doubt. Let's say, for the sake of argument, that the throne of Queen Mother was *not* normative (which of course it is!) and see what it gains our opponent.

Solomon sat on the throne of his father David and one of his first acts was to assume his mother up to a throne which he established for her. Here she sat at his right hand in the kingdom with her son as divinely revealed in Sacred Scripture. Jesus is now sits on that throne! He is sitting on the chair of his father David just like Solomon did long ago. Solomon honored his mother and established a throne for her. Who was a better Jewish king—Solomon or Jesus? Who would honor their mother more—Solomon or Jesus? That is a rhetorical question, by the way.

If Jesus sits on the throne of David and Solomon, then we can safely say that even if there were NO other mention of a Queen Mother in the land of Judah it would do nothing to negate the fact that Solomon, a forerunner of Christ, DID raise his mother up to a throne.

---

<sup>23</sup> A few other sources are provided for good measure. "The extent to which the queen mother exercised a significant or powerful role in judicial, economic or social matters would have depended on the personality of the individual. The fact that the mother is named for nearly every king of Judah (though not for kings of Israel) suggests that the role of queen mother was an important one throughout the Davidic monarchy" (Matthews, V. H., Chavalas, M. W., & Walton, J. H. (2000). *The IVP Bible background commentary : Old Testament* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

In this particular instance we have the Son of David *assuming* his mother up to a throne to sit at his right hand. The Catholic Church teaches that Jesus, like Solomon, assumed His mother up to sit at His right hand. Not unbiblical, not unreasonable—something well within biblical typology and analogy. Certainly not something to ridicule and toss out without at least a suggestion it might have a modicum of credibility. But we are just getting started!

Now our opponent says “1 Kings 2 is actually an argument against this [throne of Queen Mother], as the throne was not normally there, and, there is no evidence that there was any further elevation of the king's mother in this fashion after this point.

Why would he expect the throne to already be there? David was a warrior and did not even establish his official palace until the end of his life when presumably his mother was dead. Other kings in other lands had wives as queen—Solomon, the type of Christ, seems to have started something new which carried on until the exile into Babylon and the end of the kings of Judah.

One may also argue that the institution of the Queen Mother was an innovation (and not normative) since Solomon had to set up a throne where there was none before. But let's look at the situation closer. The Queen Mother is the mother of the dynastic heir to the throne. Saul, Judah's first king, did not have an heir that survived to take the throne of his father—Jonathan was killed on Mount Gilboa. Therefore, there was no Queen Mother. David, who is the son of Jesse, not Saul, took the throne. It was only after Solomon, the son of David, was enthroned that the institution of the Queen Mother could be established. Indeed, almost immediately after acceding to the throne, Solomon enthrones his mother at his right hand.

So the fact that Solomon established a throne for his mother the queen is not a difficulty for the establishing of Mary's Queenship; rather, it proves my point all the more! If it was Solomon who established this unique office in Israel; it is the ultimate Son of David who continues that unique office in the New Israel, as the Son of David sitting on the Throne of David.<sup>24</sup>

Lastly our naysayer says “there is no evidence that there was any further elevation of the king's mother in this fashion after this point.” He is correct. No other king of Judah HAD

---

<sup>24</sup> For those who appreciate typology, you can see it there as well, though I am not using typology here to make my case. But if we did look at typology, it is very interesting. David is a type of Christ. Solomon is a type of Christ. This is not disputed. But to see the fullness of the typology one must look to David and Solomon together. David represents the suffering Christ, rejected by his own people, at war, betrayed by his friend who ate with him (Ahithophel, David's Judas), etc. Solomon of the other hand represents the glorified Christ immediately ushered to his throne, the Prince of Peace, no need for war, glorified, assumes his mother to the throne, marries a bride (like Jesus the Church), etc.

It was Solomon, the Son of David, who raised his mother up to the throne just as it was the glorified Christ, who after fulfilling the type of the suffering *David*, fulfills the typology of *Solomon* by taking up the throne of Solomon (see Psalm 110). Ascending to heaven Jesus begins fulfilling the typology as the New Solomon. Here he is given the throne without warfare, he puts his enemies under his feet, he raises his mother up as queen, builds the Temple (the Church), expands the empire and fills all three offices of Israel: prophet, priest and king. Actually both David and Solomon fulfilled the offices of prophet, priest and king.

to elevate their mothers as a unique act since the throne was already there, already assumed (no pun intended), already filled—it was dynastic just like the throne of the king. Solomon established the office and it remained until the exile into Babylon about 500 years later.

Finally, let me pose this question. If the Queen Mother was not normative for ancient Judah and Solomon's mother's throne was an innovation, when was the throne removed? Where is the evidence that this practice was abolished? When was the office suppressed by the prophets? I don't see it anywhere. What the Holy Spirit has consigned to writing is that this office was instituted, approved, and continued and there is no mention of it being abolished or condemned.

**My assertion #2:**

“2) The mothers were referred to as the Queen Mothers or the Great Lady.”

**The Objection:**

“And Bill Clinton my be called the Great Guy if Hillary wins the White House. So?”

**My Response:**

Now here James White shows his real brilliance. Was this an attempt at humor or just stupid comment made because he had nothing better to say? I'm not sure, but for the sake of all the other readers, let's assume he really meant to say something profound here.

What our opponent may fail to realize is that there were offices within the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, just as there are in governments today. In the United States we have the offices of president, vice-president, Secretary of State, Defense, etc. It was the same in the kingdoms of the East. First was the king, then there were other offices like Queen Mother, Royal Steward, Friend of the King, Captain of the Army, etc. For more on this, again refer to *Ancient Israel* by Roland de Vaux.

To joke that Bill Clinton might someday be called the Great Guy is not only a sad proposition, but it is a silly comment by White. The Queen Mother was an official office or position in Judah and the mother of the King was made queen by virtue of her relationship with her son.

**My assertion #3:**

“3) The queen sat on a throne near their sons (1 Ki 2:19)”

**The Objection:**

“One did, and it was unusual, and she did not obtain from her son what she wished.”

**My Response:**

Another embarrassing statement which might have been intended as brilliant, but is actually uninformed and sloppy.

Yes, one did—Solomon. And following him the kings of Judah had queens and the queens were not their wives—they were their mothers. In one case it was a grandmother. I would suggest that our opponent do a little word study on the matter through the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament.

The Holy Spirit deemed to record this fact in Holy Scripture. As to whether the throne remained for subsequent kings, we have additional Scripture to verify. Knowing a few Jewish mothers, I strongly doubt any new king would have the nerve to remove it. : ) Again, if anyone could show me in Scripture where it is removed, I would appreciate it. Otherwise, it appears that the Holy Spirit has left the impression that it remained.

If a king with a Queen Mother WAS unusual then it is *all the more significant for my case!* If the kings of Judah had wives for queens, like other nations, then we would have no analogy, but the fact that it might be so unusual, makes it all the more stunning. That the kings in the ancestral line of Jesus had mothers for queens is all the more appropriate that Jesus continue this “unusual practice” and make his mother the queen according to the same pattern of his predecessors.

One CANNOT deny that Solomon, the Son of David who sat on the throne of his father David—Solomon DID have his mother for a queen. And he DID set up the throne for her at his right hand. If it is unusual, it only makes my case all the stronger.

One CANNOT deny that Jesus sits on the throne of his father Solomon. Jesus is the ultimate Son of David who sits on the throne of David (and Solomon) and it would *not* be unbiblical or irrational or astounding to think that Jesus would do for his mother what Solomon did for his. UNLESS of course, you don’t want to believe it, or you think Jesus couldn’t do, or wouldn’t do it, or that it has to so explicit in Scripture that it bites you on the nose. All of this is your problem, not the problem of the Bible giving precedent and room for the Catholic conclusion.

Now our naysayer comes up with the same tired old argument I heard as a child. He says “**she did not obtain from her son what she wished**” as if that proved there could not be a Queen Mother. I remember my dad telling me that Mary could not be the queen of heaven—using the same argument—because Bathsheba did not get the request she asked for. I guess my question to that is “So what, what does that prove?”

Solomon was a type of Christ even though he was a sinner. Bathsheba was also a sinner. She asked for something unwise and Solomon refused.<sup>25</sup> Just because Bathsheba asked

---

<sup>25</sup> "So Bathsheba went to King Solomon to speak to him for Adonijah. And the king arose to meet her, bowed before her, and sat on his throne; then he had a throne set for the king’s mother, and she sat on his right. Then she said, “I am making one small request of you; do not refuse me.” And the king said to her, “Ask, my mother, for I will not refuse you.” So she said, “Let Abishag the Shunammite be given to Adonijah your brother as a wife.” King Solomon answered and said to his mother, “And why are you asking Abishag the Shunammite for Adonijah? Ask for him also the kingdom—for he is my older brother—even for him, for Abiathar the priest, and for Joab the son of Zeruiah!” Then King Solomon swore by the Lord, saying, “May God do so to me and more also, if Adonijah has not spoken this word against his own life. “Now therefore, as the Lord lives, who has established me and set me on the throne of David my

for something unwise and it was not granted to her by her son Solomon, it does not mean she didn't have the office of Queen Mother. It simply means she was unwise and didn't receive her request.

Mary is not unwise and would not ask for something inappropriate. But even if she did (for the sake of argument), it would not invalidate the position of Queen Mother, or prove that she was not in heaven as the queen.

But didn't Solomon reject his mother's request? Yes, he did. But that in no way detracts from the fact that this office existed anymore than the presence of false prophets proves that prophets did not exist. It should be noted that all three parties, Adonijah (v. 17), Bathsheba (v. 18), and Solomon (v. 20), believed that because Bathsheba was the Queen Mother that she *could* intercede on others' behalf with the reasonable expectation of a favorable answer. No one's sensibilities are shocked by Bathsheba's actions. The negative answer does not invalidate the fact that Bathsheba could ask and that there was an expectation that whatever was asked would receive a favorable hearing.

Silly arguments like the one proposed by our antagonist disprove nothing. For example, one may say that the Queen Mothers were terrible sinners and therefore how could Mary be seen as a Queen Mother? This is a terrible argument.

First, whether or not office holders are sinners is irrelevant to whether an office exists. Indeed, an evil office holder may lower the prestige of an office, but it doesn't invalid it any more than a bad president proves that the office of president doesn't exist. We've seen that in our lifetime, unfortunately.

Second, the objector assumes that this argument is typological, which it is not. It is analogical. But even if it were a typological argument (which it is not), Mary would be the antitype to Bathsheba by opposition, which is one of the most common anti-typical fulfillments in the Bible. But since this is a argument from the analogy of the institution, it doesn't matter who the particular office-holder was as long as it was the king's mother.

God, in his providential care, guided the Old Covenant people to develop certain institutions so that when Christ came, we would, by analogy, have something to help understand Him and his Mission, his office and his Church. For example, the Old Covenant has the institution of the priesthood so that we may understand, by analogy, Christ's priesthood and how it relates to us and our redemption. Despite the fact that there were false prophets, sinful priests and evil kings in the Old Testament the institutions themselves aid us in understanding Christ, His relationship to God, and his relationship to everyone else since he is the true prophet, priest and king.

---

father and who has made me a house as He promised, surely Adonijah shall be put to death today.'" (1 Kings 2:19-24, NASB95).

**My assertion #4:**

“4) Jesus is the quintessential Jewish King with an eternal kingdom.”

**The Objection:**

“He sure is, which makes me wonder why folks have such a hard time with His kingly freedom to save His elect powerfully and perfectly apart from Rome's sacraments.

**My Response:**

Here our opponent is not addressing the substance of the argument in question, but goes off to one of his favorite hobby horses. This is not an argument about man's free will, the sovereignty of God, or the sacraments. I think he didn't know what to say and since he always has to say *something*, and so this is what he blurted out. He doesn't want to deal with the issue at hand, but mine is an essential and pertinent point.

The New Testament applies the institution of Davidic Kingship to Jesus. He is the true Son of David and one who is greater than Solomon. As I mentioned in point one, by this institution we can better understand Jesus, His mission and His relationship to others. Therefore, the Jewish understanding of the King, with his courts, officers and mission provides us with a biblical insight into how Jesus is as Messiah-King and what he might do as the Messiah-King.

**My assertion #5:**

“5) Jesus is the fulfillment of the Israelite offices of Prophet, Priest & King.”

**The Objection:**

“Yes, which makes me wonder why you have sacramental priests when the priesthood role has been fulfilled in Christ!”

**My Response:** Again the opponent's comments have nothing to do with the argument at hand. He had to say something, so again this is what he blurted out, though it is not germane to the topic.

Why we have sacramental priests has been clearly explained many times. This is not the time to remind him of the rational, biblical passages, or the unanimous consent of the very first Christians. If anyone wants to see it laid out nicely, they can read the debate on the Priesthood between Jimmy Akin and Anthony Pezzotta [here](#).<sup>26</sup> You can also buy a copy [here](#).<sup>27</sup> It is worth the time.

**My assertion #6:**

“6) As the Davidic king, Jesus would honor his mother more than earthy kings honored their mothers.”

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.ewtn.com/library/ANSWERS/PRIEST3.htm>

<sup>27</sup> <http://shop.catholic.com/cgi-local/SoftCart.exe/online-store/scstore/p-CA145.html?L+scstore+rqbr3791ff204420+1200111216>



**The Objection:**

“This is part and parcel of the circularity of the Roman position. That is, the goal is already defined by the Roman dogmas, so now all you do is posit that Jesus “would do X” which just happens to fit the dogma you already believe and are trying to substantiate. Never mind that what it means for Jesus to honor Mary in light of her being one of His redeemed servants is completely different than anything one might extrapolate from a single instance in the OT of a king honoring his mother!

**My Response:** Circular reasoning? Good grief, for a guy who holds to the circular reasoning of *sola Scriptura*, he shouldn’t be pointing fingers. They believe in *sola Scriptura* because they reject tradition and Church authority so they HAVE to believe in the Bible alone or they are left with nothing. But there is NO teaching or grounds in Scripture for the doctrine of *sola Scriptura*—it in itself is unbiblical. But just watch them rush to the Bible pulling out every straw to try and prove this doctrine of men.

But back to the point at hand. Now that we have argued thus far we see how utterly weak and silly is the argument above.

I have already established that we do not believe in *sola Scriptura*. We DO trust the Church, but not apart from Scripture and Tradition. In using the illustration of Queen Mother I am not trying to *prove* the Assumption or the Queenship of Mary. We are already fully persuaded of the fact. The fact that the Assumption and Queenship of Mary does not contradict Scripture (if they did our opponent would certainly have provided the proof texts) has already been discussed.

What I have done is simply show that what we believe about King Jesus and his mother Mary is fully in line with what we know about the kings of Judah and their queens—nothing more. What we believe about the Assumption and Queenship of Mary are fully in line with what we know about Jewish kings, Queen Mothers, and the history and institutions of Israel as revealed by God in the inspired Scriptures.

On one hand the naysayer says, “Show it to me in the Bible!” They when you show him a logical, biblical, and substantial passage and line of reasoning demonstrating biblical facts and history, then we are accused of circular reasoning and condemned for going to the Bible to explain our position. They want it both ways, but don’t come close to living up to what they demand of others. Can’t win for losing with some of these self-important know-it-alls.

Here is where the rubber meets the road. How do we understand Jesus’ relationship to his mother in light of His kingship? If the kings of Judah had thrones for their Queen Mothers, upon what basis can one say that the true Messiah-King would not or did not have the same? Catholics are sometimes accused of speculating what Jesus would do. We are accused of thinking “Us Catholics would honor Mary, I bet Jesus would too.” But this is far from case.

We recognized that God has set up or approved certain institutions and that these institutions are applied to Jesus. The New Testament's use of the Old makes this abundantly clear. All we are doing is asking what does the application of Solomon and Bathsheba to Jesus tell us about Mary and we follow the obvious conclusion. Mary is Jesus' Queen Mother, because Jesus is the King of Judah. To honor her as such is to honor Jesus as King. If we are to be accused of anything, it should be that we are taking Jesus' titles too seriously—we are taking the Bible and its history too seriously or too literally.

Referring to 1 Kings 2:19, Protestant commentators R. Dilday and L. J. Ogilvie comment on Solomon and Bathsheba:

Notice the respect Solomon paid his mother when she sought an audience in his throne room (vv. 19–20). In ancient oriental courts, the queen mother was the first lady of the realm, taking precedence over any other woman in the royal harem. Solomon's respect toward his mother, however, goes beyond the traditional throne room protocol. He stood, bowed down, ordered a throne for her, and seated her on his right, the place of honor. Even though he was caught up in the heady atmosphere of national leadership, Solomon did not forget what he owed his mother. Just as he had shown due honor for his noble father, so the young king boldly demonstrates to the gathered royal court his love and respect for Bathsheba. (Dilday, R., & Ogilvie, L. J. (1987). *The Preacher's Commentary Series, Volume 9: 1, 2 Kings*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Inc., pg. 54).

Jesus also honored his Father and His Mother. He did it not only because the Law required it but because it was the right thing to do. If Solomon—though a sinner and simply human—would do this much for his mother, how much more Jesus the King for His Mother.

Jesus honored his mother—He fulfilled the Law completely and it commanded that one “honor your father and mother.” Jesus would have done this better than anyone else—better than Solomon. Should we honor her less than Jesus? If I have to err on one side or the other, I will err on the side of honoring the Queen.

**My assertion #7:**

“7) It is biblical, historical, and reasonable to expect the perfect Jewish king to follow in the stead of the kingdom and his fathers by assuming his mother to a throne at his right hand.”

**The Objection:**

“If this is “biblical” then any kind of wide-eyed allegorical or typological interpretation is likewise “biblical.” All of the factors regarding the unique glory of Christ vs. that of an entire line of kings, for example, the different relationship that exists between Mary as redeemed and Jesus as redeemer--all these things just get brushed under the rug in the service of Rome and her dogmas. But to call this kind of eisegesis “biblical” is to strip the word of all rational and logical meaning.

### **My Response:**

What I have proposed and demonstrated is not “wide-eyed allegorical or typological interpretation.” I have not said it was allegory or that Bathsheba and Mary are type and antitype. I have carefully refrained from that language yet our opponent seems to not notice that. What I have used is something different. It is an analogy and it is perfectly biblical and reasonable with much precedent.

If we want to talk about “wide-eyed allegorical and typological interpretations” St. Paul would seem a better candidate than me (tongue in cheek). He talks about Hagar being Mount Sinai and Sarah being our mother who is Jerusalem above which is free. I have done nothing this “wild.” I have simply shown what the institution of Judah practiced and since Jesus was a king of Judah what He could be expected to do.

Nothing wild-eyed here. What is wild-eyed is the reaction of our opponent. Our opponent can't stand the Catholic Church or her teachings and gets livid, even red-faced when a Catholic uses the Bible to demonstrate our teachings. Anti-Catholics cannot accept the fact that this analogy from the Old Testament and the kings of Judah could apply to Christ and Mary because then they have to admit that there is biblical precedent for the Assumption and Queenship of Mary and they simply CAN'T do that—some people hate the Catholic Church more than they love the Bible and the truth.

Jesus is redeemer and Mary was redeemed—prevented from sin by the merits of her son, but that has nothing to do with whether Jesus would assume his mother. It is a smokescreen. Nothing is brushed under the rug. We do love the Church of Rome and we do believe her dogmas, just as the Gentile churches believed and obeyed the “dogmas” sent to them by the apostles and elders in Jerusalem in Acts 15-16.

We also love and believe the Bible as the inspired word of God and we find that our dogmas fit Scripture just fine—at least for those who are willing to see and hear and not blinded and deaf because of their hatred of the Church.

It seems as if some Calvinist-tainted idea of God might have snuck into the objection, viewing God more as a despot than a loving Father, and Jesus a cold redeemer and not a loving son—kind of like saying “You woman are just a servant, redeemed by me, so step aside. You're not important; I am!” This is not the kind of Lord we serve and that is not the way he would treat his Mother.

By the way, our opponent accused me of *eisegesis* which means reading one's own ideas into the text whereas *exegesis* is letting the text speak for itself.<sup>28</sup> This is quite an amazing

---

<sup>28</sup> **Eisegesis** (from the Greek εἰσῆγεῖσθαι; 'to lead in') is the process of interpretation of an existing text in such a way as to introduce one's own ideas. This is best understood when contrasted with exegesis. While exegesis draws out the meaning from the text, **eisegesis** occurs when a reader reads his/her interpretation into the text. As a result, exegesis tends to be objective when employed effectively while eisegesis is regarded as highly subjective. An individual who practices eisegesis is known as an *eisegete*, as someone who practices exegesis is known as an *exegete*. The term eisegete is often used in a mildly derogative fashion” (*Wikipedia*).

charge from a guy who has to do this every day to even begin his work. He assumes *sola Scriptura* which is nowhere taught in Scripture. He gets the notion from his Fundamentalist Protestant tradition and then he goes to the Bible to try and prove it. This is a classic case of eisegesis.

What I have done is quite different. I know that St. Augustine is correct when he stated, and I paraphrase, “The Old Testament is the New concealed; the New Testament is the Old revealed.” With this in mind, it is perfectly acceptable and proper to look at the Old Testament through the lens of the New Testament. The Old sheds great light on the New, on Jesus, on the kingdom and the Church, on Mary and on every other aspect. For example the Red Sea prefigures baptism (1 Cor 10:1-4) as does Noah’s flood (1 Peter 3:18-21). We can better understand our Christian faith by looking at the Old Testament.

The same is true with Mary. Since she is very literally the mother of the ultimate king ever, would it be unwise to go back to the Old Testament to see how the kings treated their mothers? Might it not shed light on Jesus and Mary? Of course it would. To deny it would be foolish.

#### **My assertion #8:**

“8) It is proper and biblical to consider Mary in a position of intercessor.”

#### **The Objection:**

“Even if all that came before actually made sense, this last assertion is such a massive leap from what came before it leaves one breathless, and I say that as one who is fully aware of Miravalle's writings in defense of Mary as mediatrix, for example. There is nothing at all in what came before that even begins to give a basis for this final conclusion regarding intercession, *absolutely nothing*. But in the wonderful world of Roman Mariology, even the word "logic" gets a make-over, just as such words as "brother" and "sister" do as well!”

#### **My Response:**

Maybe our opponent did not read what was written or can’t follow an argument logically, but to say that nothing stated above leads to the concluding comment about Mary being an intercessor is simply wrong. The blindness to this logical conclusion is the refusal to see the tie in with the ancient institutions of Judah and Jesus’ fulfillment of those institutions. The Queen Mother of the kingdom of Judah was an intercessor. She did not always get what she requested (we’ve dealt with all that earlier). But she was an intercessor.

One well-respected Protestant commentary says this of Bathsheba as Queen Mother:

“**Bath-sheba ... went unto King Solomon**—The filial reverence and the particular act of respect, which Solomon rendered, were quite in accordance with the sentiments and customs of the East. The right hand is the place of honor; and as it expressly said to have been assigned to “the king’s mother,” it is necessary to remark that, when a husband dies, his widow acquires a higher dignity and power, as a mother over her

son, than she ever possessed before. Besides, the dignity of “king’s mother” is a state office, to which certain revenues are attached. The holder has a separate palace or court, as well as *possesses great influence in public affairs*; and as the dignity is held for life, it sometimes happens, in consequence of deaths, that the person enjoying it may not be related to the reigning sovereign by natural maternity. Bath-sheba had evidently been invested with this honorable office” (Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. R., Fausset, A. R., Brown, D., & Brown, D. (1997). *A commentary, critical and explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments*).<sup>29</sup>

The reason that the Queen Mother could “possess great influence in public affairs” was because of her great authority by virtue of her position as queen. She had authority by virtue of being the mother of the king and sitting at this right hand.

Even in this instance Bathsheba is bringing an intercession to the king on behalf of another. The fact that Bathsheba’s request was not granted is irrelevant for the matter at hand. I hope our opponent can recognize that. What *is* relevant and important for the analogy is that even this instance shows the Queen Mother approaching the King as an intercessor.

And of course this is not the only case of a mother being an intercessor. Mary the mother of King Jesus came to her son as an intercessor in Cana (John 2:1-11). She interceded for the wedding family and Jesus granted her request and provided over 100 gallons of the finest wine. Many of the Fathers of the Church saw this as a picture of Jesus at the great Wedding Feast in glory with the Queen Mother interceding for all the wedding guests.

The office of Queen Mother was a honorable place of dignity at the right hand of the king. She was one who interceded for others.

Now I don’t expect our adversary to like the conclusion or to even agree with it, but I do expect him to be rational and intelligent enough to follow the logic. It doesn’t after all take a degree in rocket science ☺

So, I conclude where I began: We trust the Church for good reason and we accept the Church’s teaching not only because we trust the Church but also because what she defines is not contrary to Scripture and can be explained and demonstrated from

---

<sup>29</sup> Matthew Henry also sees clearly the intercessory role of Bathsheba and how it was exercised with the king. Again, that it was an unwise requests has no effect on the fact that she was actually an intercessor: “Bathsheba’s address to Solomon on [Adonijah’s] behalf. She promised to speak to the king for him (v. 18) and did so, v. 19. Solomon received her with all the respect that was due to a mother, though he himself was a king: He *rose up to meet her, bowed himself to her*, and caused her *to sit on his right hand*, according to the law of the fifth commandment. Children, not only when grown up, but when grown great, must give honor to their parents, and behave dutifully and respectfully towards them. *Despise not thy mother when she is old*. As a further instance of the deference he paid to his mother’s wisdom and authority, when he understood she had a petition to present to him, he promised not to say her nay, a promise which both he and she understood with this necessary limitation, provided it be just and reasonable and fit to be granted; but, if it were otherwise, he was sure he should convince her that it was so, and that then she would withdraw it” (Henry, M. (1996, c1991). *Matthew Henry’s commentary on the whole Bible : Complete and unabridged in one volume*. Peabody: Hendrickson).

Scripture. The Church has been given the Keys of the Kingdom and the authority to “bind and to lose”. She has exercised that authority in obedience to her mandate. What the Church defines may not always be explicitly stated in Scripture, but it does not contradict Scripture and is certainly biblical. At times we may better understand the life and ministry of Our Lord through typology, analogy, and even allegory. Paul was our example of this, and we are right to carefully and prudently follow his lead.

I never set out with my original blog to “prove” the Assumption of Mary or her Queenship. I simply set out to show that it was not contrary to Scripture but even more, that if one understood that Jesus was the ultimate King of Judah, the Son of David, sitting on the eternal throne of David, the New Solomon—that from that certain things could be understood about what that kingship meant and how it would be expressed.

God had appointed or at least approved the institutions of Israel. Jesus fulfilled the office of prophet, priest and king. These were institutions that if we go back and study them we can understand more fully who Jesus is and what it means that He is prophet, priest and king. The Old Testament means something. It points to Jesus and his kingdom, it teaches us about Jesus.

It also teaches us something about the mother of the king and how she was treated, how she was honored and how she was enthroned. This is not a proof of the Assumption, but it gives ample evidence for how a king and his mother would function together. The Old Testament institutions tell us much about Jesus, his Mother, his Kingdom, the Church, salvation, our position in the kingdom and much, much more.

To refuse to acknowledge that 1 Kings 2:19 along with all the other passages in Scripture can lead us to better understand Mary is to be foolish, or worse to be dishonest or blind.

Mary has been assumed into heaven. She is the Queen of Heaven as even Scripture displays (Rev 12) and we do well to honor her as the Mother of God. She is the one that all generation will call blessed.

I for one am proud to be Catholic and proud to have Mary as my Queen with her divine Son as my king.

Blessed be God forever.