

gave Jesus the power not only to die on Calvary, but also to be immolated daily on our altars. If by that fiat, Mary expressed her willingness to accept the suffering and bear the burden of the Incarnation, and thereby consented to be Our Lady of Sorrows, we may safely say that, at least implicitly, she also consented to be Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament. Then, when she gave Jesus her likeness, by bearing Him in her womb for nine months; when she gave Him birth on Christmas night; when she nursed Him in His infancy, and cared for Him in His childhood and youth, was she not preparing the Man Who on that first Holy Thursday night took bread and wine and changed them into His Body and Blood, and gave us the Eucharist? The Church recognizes the Divine Maternity as the first and principal bond which unites Mary to the Eucharist, when she sings at benediction, *«Ave Verum Corpus Natum de Maria Virgine.»*—Hail true Body of the Lord born of the Virgin Mary! No one who has brought these truths home to himself, can refuse Mary the title of Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament.

A little comparison will help us to understand and appreciate a second argument. Suppose a king were to grant his mother a special favor, one that not only she, but all the king's subjects would profit by. Can you reasonably imagine the people speaking of this favor, or thanking the king for it, without mentioning the queen mother, who was the cause of its being granted? Apply this to the Holy Eucharist, and you have a reason for the devotion to Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament. The Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and the saints in general, are almost unanimous in declaring that the Holy Eucharist was instituted principally for the sake of our Blessed Lady. It is the Gift of the King, the crowning act of His love, intended in the first place for His