

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1854.

---

No. II.

*Lyman A. Stewart*

---

ART. I.—*Modern Explanations of the Doctrine of Inability.*

*The Inability of the Sinner to comply with the Gospel, his inexcusable guilt in not complying with it, and the consistency of these with each other, illustrated, in two discourses on John vi. 44. By John Smalley, D. D. New York: 1811.*

THIS little treatise has long been accounted standard among those who attach importance to the distinction between natural and moral inability, which it elaborately explains and vindicates. It is for the most part characterized by candour and good judgment. It clearly and ably sets forth much important truth. If we were to indicate objections to it, we should call in question certain portions of it, which seem to represent the inability of the sinner as being of the same sort as that of a man to perform any outward act, which he is no way unable, but simply indisposed to do. (pp. 10, 11.)

These instances, however, are few, and aside of the main drift of the treatise. The grand principle which it maintains and successfully vindicates, is that men labour under a real inability to obey the gospel; that this inability is moral, and therefore culpable, yet not, for this reason, any the less real and invincible, except by divine grace. A still more material

*John Swan Plummer.*

ART. II.—*Is the Church of Rome Idolatrous?*

IDOLATRY consists in ascribing to creatures properties or honours which belong to God alone. Dr. Wiseman says it “is the giving to man or to anything created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God hath reserved unto himself.” The question now to be considered is, whether the Church of Rome is guilty of this sin. We allege that she does openly, habitually, and systematically, give to creatures honours due to none but God, and so is guilty of idolatry. This is indeed a grave charge. No good man can make it without sorrow of heart. It is grievous to a pure mind to believe such things, unless compelled by an overwhelming weight of evidence. We ask our readers to weigh the evidence in the case, and judge righteous judgment. Charity rejoiceth in the truth.

In proof that the Church of Rome gives to creatures honours due to God alone, we may cite the titles and powers ascribed to the pope. In a great Lateran Council, one member called the pope “Prince of the world;” another, “king of kings, and monarch of the earth;” another said of him that “he had power above all powers of heaven and earth.” Bishop Newton says: “He is styled, and pleased to be styled, ‘Our Lord God the Pope, Another God upon earth, King of kings, and Lord of lords.’ The same is the dominion of God and the pope. The power of the pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal. The pope doth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God.” Bellarmine says: “If the pope could or should so far err as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid virtuous actions, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad.” Nor was Bellarmine censured for this language. On the contrary, he was always a great favourite at Rome. If the pope receives such honours as these from his Church, is he not “that wicked one,” who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God?”

2 Thess. ii. 4. It is confessed that when a man calls a graven image a god, and does it seriously, he is guilty of idolatry. The pope is a worm of the dust, and if papal authors, such as Baronius, may be trusted, many popes have been monsters of depravity; yet these men, crushed before the moth, allow themselves to be styled God, our Lord God, &c. Is not this idolatry? In England it is treason to assume the king's titles; and is it not rebellion to arrogate the titles of the God of heaven?

But this idolatry does not stop here. In his turn the pope himself gives to a creature honours and worship peculiar to God. Hear pope Gregory XVI., who has not been dead many years. In his first Encyclical Letter, addressed to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, and printed in the Laity's Directory for 1833, and in various ways published all over this land, without one word of warning from any priest of Rome against its shocking idolatry, the pope calls upon all the clergy to implore "that she (the Virgin Mary) who has been, through every great calamity, our Patroness and Protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence, to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock." Could he, in this matter, have sought more from God himself? From the Scriptures we learn that He whose eyes never slumber nor sleep is a present help in trouble; but here the pope says that Mary is "our protectress through every great calamity." Could Jehovah himself do more than is here ascribed to a woman? He adds: "But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." Surely this is plain. Whoever maintains truth by destroying heresies, whoever is our *greatest* hope, yea, the *entire ground* of our hope, is to us a God. What pious man ever put higher honour upon Jehovah himself than by making him his *greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of his hope?* Thus we have seen what idolatry is, with permission of the pope, paid to him, and what idolatry is, without her permission, paid to the mother of our Lord.

It is not therefore strange that in popish books of devotion,

Mary is called upon more frequently than the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the Catholic Manual, published by Fielding Lucas, a popish bookseller still living in Baltimore, with the approbation of Archbishop Whitfield, we find on pp. 38 and 39 the following language in the Confiteor: "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned," &c. How diverse from this was the practice of holy men of old! Daniel said: "O Lord, the great and dreadful God . . . we have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts, and from thy judgments." Chap. ix. ver. 4, 5. Addressing God, David said: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." Ps. xxxii. 5, and li. 4. Ezra says: "I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God; and said, O my God, I am ashamed, and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities have increased over our head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. . . . O Lord God of Israel, thou art righteous: for we remain yet escaped, as it is this day: behold, we are before thee in our trespasses; for we cannot stand before thee, because of this." Chap. ix. 5, 6, 15. The publican prayed, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and went down justified. Romanists say their religion is older than ours, but in no good sense is this true; for ours agrees with that of Daniel, and David, and Ezra, and the penitent publican. These all lived before any pope, and they confessed their sins to God alone, and did not address angels and men, in their solemn acknowledgments of their wickedness.

Having finished the confession of sin, a Christian would have thought that the application should have been first and alone to God. That was the course pursued by all Bible saints. But in the Catholic Manual it is different. There we read thus: "Therefore, I beseech the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed John the

Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, to pray unto the Lord our God for me." Who could have believed that in this age and land men were thus taught, if the evidence was not before the world? Then follow two short petitions to God, and then comes the following invocation: "O Holy Virgin, mother of God! my advocate and patroness! pray for thy poor servant, and show thyself a mother to me." In the Doway Bible we read, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Just." 1 John ii. 1. This is the Scripture doctrine. But the devotee of popery is taught to call Mary his advocate. Jesus Christ taught us to pray to our *Father* which is in heaven, but when did God ever direct us to pray to our *Mother* in heaven, and to ask her to show herself such to us? The inspired writers never teach such idolatry as that. How can the Romish religion be older than ours, when ours agrees with the Lord's Prayer, and with the teachings of the beloved John? Jesus Christ the righteous is our sole, able, willing, prevailing advocate with God. To name another is an indignity to him—an attempt to take away the glory from his crown, the honour of his Mediatorship.

The next thing in the Manual is in these words: "And thou, O blessed Spirit!" The word *Spirit* begins with a capital letter, and is followed by a note of admiration. One would have supposed that the being here addressed was the Spirit infinite, eternal, unchangeable. But it is not so. "And thou, O blessed Spirit! whom God in his mercy hath appointed to watch over me, intercede for me this day, that I may not stray from the path of virtue." If any ask the meaning of this, he may look back a little, and he will see it is an invocation of "your angel guardian." The words next following are addressed to "your patron saint." "Thou also, O happy Spirit, whose name I bear, pray for me, that I may serve God faithfully in this life," &c. In the Doway Bible, acknowledged by Romanists to be correct, we read thus: "There is one God, and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." The Vulgate is no less explicit: "Unus enim Deus, unus et Mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. There is no legitimate way of expounding this passage that does not make its teachings as direct and strong

against a plurality of mediators, as it is against a plurality of Gods. If the words teach that there is but one God, they as explicitly teach that there is but one Mediator. Yet in the Manual, men are taught to call upon creatures, an angel, or a saint, to make intercession in heaven, the very highest work of Christ's priestly office, and thus is the one Mediator superseded, and his honours divided among a countless multitude of creatures. To rob Christ of this high honour is as wicked as to rob God of the glory of creating and preserving the world.

In the Doway Bible (Heb. iv. 15, 16) are these words: "We have not an high-priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities: but one tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin. Let us go therefore with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid." This reasoning is as strong as it can be. We have a tender-hearted intercessor at the throne above; therefore we need not be afraid to come boldly. Thanks be unto God, who has taught us this best, this only way. Does it look like coming "*with confidence*," to stand off, and cry to Mary, to Michael, to John the Baptist, to Peter and Paul, to a guardian angel of whose very name we are ignorant, and to a patron saint whose name we bear, and ask them to intercede for us? Where is there distrust in the fulness and sufficiency of the work of Christ as intercessor, if it be not in going to this long list of mediators? It does seem strange; it must be wicked to cry to Paul, when he has so strongly recommended "looking to Jesus," or, as the Doway Bible has it, "looking on Jesus," and when he has told us to "flee for refuge to the hope set before us in the gospel." In Heb. vii. 25, in the Doway Bible, we read concerning this same Jesus, that "He is able to save for ever them that come unto God by himself, always living to make intercession for us." If we are to come unto God by Christ *himself*, then we are not to come by his *mother*, nor by one of his *apostles*, nor by an *angel*, nor by any one else. Blessed be God, that when Jesus was yet with us on earth, he said, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by me." John xiv. 6. "All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me:"

[not to my mother, nor to the saints,] “and him that cometh to *me*, *I* will in no wise cast out.” John vi. 37. “Amen, amen, I say to you, *I* am the door of the sheep.” “*I* am the the door: if any one enter by *me*, he shall be saved; and he shall go in, and go out, and shall find pasture.” “Amen, amen, I say to you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber.” John x. 1, 7, 9. All these are the very words of the Doway Bible. Are they not clear? Should they not deter us from all attempts to approach God but through Jesus Christ alone?

It is but fair to say, that after all this invocation of a woman, of angels, and men, the Manual gives “the Litany to the holy name of Jesus,” but in the “Confiteor” his mother is addressed *three times before* him. So also in the Manual p. 44, are these words in *italics*: “*A prayer to the blessed Virgin;*” and under that prayer are these words: “*A prayer to invoke the life of Jesus Christ into ourselves.*” Here again the mother takes precedence of her Son, the Son of God. In this prayer to the Virgin are these words: “O Holy Mother of God, deliver us from all dangers.” As a Protector and Redeemer, could God himself do more than to “deliver us from all dangers?” To those who use and love this Manual, is not Mary put before God himself, before the *one* Mediator of God and men?

On the 45th page of the Manual is an address to Mary, in which she is styled, the “Bright Queen of Heaven.” The title “Queen of Heaven” is found in Scripture, but not applied to Mary. See Jeremiah xlv. 17, 25, 26. The whole connection is alarming. God there declares his displeasure against the people for “making vows to the Queen of Heaven.” In the Doway Bible is a note saying, that by the Queen of Heaven is meant the moon. Grant it; but Mary is as truly a creature as is the moon, and it is as dishonourable to God that we should pray to her, as that we should make vows to the moon. On the 46th page of the Manual we find this address to Mary: “O Holy Mother, my Sovereign Queen.” We all know that there is no power higher than a sovereign power. The heart over which any creature is sovereign, can-

not call Christ Lord, cannot esteem Jehovah as the only Judge of all the earth. Let us read further: "Receive me under thy blessed patronage, and special protection, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this day, and every day, and at the hour of my death. I recommend to thee my soul and body. I commit to thy care all my hopes and comforts, all my afflictions and miseries, my life and my death, that by thy intercession, and through thy merits, all my actions may be directed and disposed according to thy will and the will of thy blessed Son. Amen." We solemnly declare, that in our lives we never read a more idolatrous prayer, nor could we frame any sentences of the same length that should more effectually ascribe the whole of salvation, in life and in death, to the protection, mercy, care, intercession, and merits of a creature; for all these words are used. Christ, as man, never offered higher honour and worship to God than when in death he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Luke xxiii. 46. Christ in glory never received higher honour or worship from a holy martyr, than when dying Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Yet, in the Manual, all this honour and all this worship are offered to Mary. If any doubt, let them again read the prayer just quoted. In this Manual, Mary is called upon page after page. In one litany (pp. 51—53) she is invoked *forty-seven* times, and the three persons of the Trinity but *nineteen* times.

On page 56 of the Manual are these directions for going to sleep: "Compose yourself to rest in the arms of your Saviour, piously invoking the names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph." Here the entire "holy family" are "piously invoked." On pp. 101, 104, and 109, devotion to the Blessed Virgin is put down among the preservatives and remedies against sin. And on p. 103 she is thus addressed; "Thou art the Mother of grace and mercy, thou art the refuge of sinners." The Bible says that God is the FATHER of mercies, but it is silent about any MOTHER of grace and mercy. To be the Father of mercies, is to be their original and fountain. Is Mary the original and fountain of mercy? How very different are the teachings of Rome from those of Isaiah, (xxxii. 1, 2,) "Behold, a King [not a Queen] shall reign in righteousness. . . . and a man

[not a woman, but a man, the man Christ Jesus] shall be as a hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest, as rivers of water, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." Could a wider, a more striking difference between truth and error, true worship and idolatry, be found, than that between the Catholic Manual and the teachings of holy Scripture?

Nor is this shocking idolatry confined to one book of devotion in use among Romanists. In all that are in our possession, new and old, European and American, the same glaring error is found. One of the most favourite books of devotion among Papists is entitled "The Glories of Mary, Mother of God," &c. Its author is St. Alphonsus Ligori, who was canonized less than *forty* years ago. Our copy was published by Eugene Cumiskey, of Philadelphia, and is approved by Dr. Kenrick, then Bishop of Philadelphia, now Archbishop of Baltimore. The translator dedicates the work to Mary, "the Queen of angels and of men," "with all veneration and respect," and says it is "designed to increase the number and fervour of her clients." The table of contents is as follows: "Chapter I. How great should be our confidence in Mary, *Queen of mercy*. How great our confidence should be in Mary as our Mother. Mary is the refuge of repentant sinners. Chapter II. Mary is our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins. Mary is our life, because she obtains our perseverance. Mary renders death sweet to her servants. Chapter III. Mary is the hope of all the children of Adam. Mary is the hope of the sinner. Chapter IV. Mary's readiness to assist those who invoke her. The power of Mary to defend those who invoke her in temptations. Chapter V. Necessity of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation. Continuation of the same subject. Chapter VI. Mary is a powerful advocate. Mary is a compassionate advocate. Mary is Mediatrix of peace between God and sinners. Chapter VII. Mary is ever watchful to succour our miseries. Chapter VIII. Mary preserves her servants from hell. Mary succours her servants in purgatory. Mary conducts her servants to heaven. Chapter IX. The greatness of Mary's clemency and goodness. Chapter X. The sweetness of the holy name of Mary in life

and in death." Some tables of contents give but a poor idea of the book. Not so here. The filling up of these chapters in sections corresponding to each sentence above given, fully carries out all the idolatrous sentiments suggested by reading the contents. Indeed, the book abounds in stories and interpretations of the most idolatrous type. Yet this book is one of the most popular of the day, we mean, among Romanists.

Another book of devotion in general use in this country and elsewhere among Romanists, is the Ursuline Manual. It is published by Dunigan, and sent out by authority of Bishop Hughes.

On page 64 we read as follows:

"O happy Mary! chosen to be  
The Mother of grace and clemency,  
Protect us now; and at the hour of death,  
O bear to heaven our parting breath. Amen.

|                           |   |              |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|
| Holy Mary, Mother of God, | } | Pray for us. |
| St. Joseph,               |   |              |
| St. Patrick,              |   |              |
| St. Augustine,            |   |              |
| St. Charles,              |   |              |
| St. Angela,               |   |              |

St. Ursula and all your holy companions, all you angels and saints of God, *make intercession for us.*"

On p. 186 are these words: "Mother of God! Mother of Mercy! and Refuge of sinners! intercede for me." Just after: "Holy angel, to whose care I am committed, do not leave me, now that I so particularly require your charitable assistance." Indeed, what devotional book in this corrupt communion does not teach the same idolatrous practices? In the Catholic Manual, p. 188, it is said: "The psalters now in use among devout Christians are three. The first, David's, which contains thrice fifty psalms. The second is that of our Blessed Lady, commonly called the rosary, or beads, composed of thrice fifty Hail Marys. The third is the psalter or invocation of Jesus." Here the psalter of Mary is put before that of Jesus Christ. In the psalter of the Virgin, as given by some, we find the last two psalms of David thus thrown into parody, and applied to Mary instead of Jehovah:

“Sing unto our Lady a new song; let her praise be in the congregation of the just,” &c. Again: “Praise our Lady in her holiness, praise her in her virtues and miracles; praise her, ye choirs of patriarchs and prophets; praise her, ye army of martyrs; praise her, ye crowds of doctors and confessors; praise her, ye company of virgins and chaste ones; praise her, ye orders of monks and anchorites; let every thing that hath breath praise our Lady;” and in that form of devotion, which, it is audaciously pretended, was revealed by an angel to St. Bernard, offering worship to many members of her body, we find these among other words: “Adoro et benedico beatissimos pedes tuos.” I adore and bless thy most blessed feet.

The worship of saints and angels in the Church of Rome has for centuries fixed the mark of idolatry upon her. Thus, in the “Collects and Hymns to the Saints,” published in 1520, we find such petitions as the following: “May the holy assembly of the angels, and the illustrious troop of the archangels, now blot out our sins, by granting to us the glory of heaven. . . . O George, renowned martyr . . . . In our soul and inmost heart we beseech thee, that with all the faithful, we, being washed from our sins, may be joined to the citizens of heaven: that so, together with thee, we may joyfully be in glory, and that our lips with glory may render praises to Christ. . . . . O martyr Christopher, make us to be in mind worthy of the love of God. . . . O William, thou good shepherd, father, and patron of the clergy, cleanse us in our agony; grant us aid; remove the filthiness of our life, and grant the joys of a celestial crown. . . . O ye eleven thousand glorious maids, roses of martyrdom, defend me in life, by affording to me your assistance; and show yourselves to me in death, by bringing the last consolation.”

Well has it been said, that “as in the ancient heathen mythology, there were gods who presided over particular countries and districts, and gods who presided over particular trades and professions, so it is in the calendar of popish saints. We are all familiar with St. George of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, St. Patrick of Ireland; and in like manner we have St. Sebastian of Portugal, St. James of Spain, St. Denis of France, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Barbara of Ger-

many, and St. Mark of Venice; again, St. Luke is the patron of painters, St. Catherine of scholars, St. Austin of divines, St. Ivo of lawyers, St. Crispin of shoemakers, St. Magdalen and St. Afro of prostitutes; St. Anthony has the charge of swine, St. Eulogius of horses, St. Vendeline and St. Gallus of geese and sheep."

The effect of this state of corruption is manifest in all papal countries. Even pirates and robbers are often great worshippers of the saints. In Graham's "Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome," pp. 155 and 161, we read: "Every robber had a silver heart, containing a picture of the Madonna and child, suspended by a red ribbon to his neck, and fastened with another of the same colour to his side. . . . They talked pretty freely with their prisoners about themselves and their habits of life, which they maintained arose from necessity, rather than choice. They showed them the heart and picture of the Madonna, which each had suspended from his neck, saying, 'We know that we are likely to die a violent death, but in our hour of need we have these,' touching their rifles, 'to struggle for our lives with, and this,' kissing the image of the Virgin, 'to make our death easy.'"

All this is sometimes acknowledged by the priesthood itself. In his "Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome," pp. 104, 105, Seymour tells us of the defence given to himself by one of their learned men. He said: "The feeling of devotion to the Virgin has a mysterious something in it, that will ever linger about the heart of the man who has ever felt it. It is one of those feelings that, once admitted, can never afterward be totally obliterated. There it still clings around the heart; and though there may be coldness to all other religious impressions; though there may be infidelity or even scorn upon all our faith; though there may be the plunging into the wild vortex of every sin, yet still there will not unfrequently be found, even among the very worst of our people, a lingering feeling of devotion to the blessed Virgin. It is as a little thread that still keeps hold of the soul, and it will yet draw him back. All else may be broken, but this thread, by which the blessed Virgin holds him, still clings to his soul. Even in the most wild, wicked, and desperate men—even among the bandits in

their worst state—there is always retained this devotion to Mary.” How strange, that men do not see that adoration, which allows men to give their lives to murderous wickedness, can be of no avail! When Mary and sin may both be loved and served at the same time, how can it be good and wholesome to call upon her?

But besides ascribing titles and powers to the pope, which belong to none but God, and worshipping saints and angels without number, giving a woman great prominence therein, Romanists go further, and render to the cross the worship which is due to God alone. Bossuet admits that Thomas Aquinas says that the cross is to be worshipped with *Latria*. The Roman Pontifical expressly says, that “*Latria* is due to the cross.” The Missal enjoins on clergy and laity, “on bended knee to adore the cross.” In the mean time the whole choir sing, “Thy cross, O Lord, we adore.” Again, “O venerable cross, that hast brought salvation to the wretched, by what praise shall I extol thee?” In the service for Good Friday in the Roman Missal, a hymn to be sung to the cross is given. It begins thus:

“O Crux, ave spes unica,  
Auge piis justitiam,  
Reisque dona veniam.”

“O Cross, hail thou only hope. Increase righteousness to the pious. Give pardon to the guilty.”

The Church of Rome also requires the worship of the elements in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the mass. The Council of Trent expressly says: “There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *Latria*, which is due to the true God, according to the custom always observed in the Catholic Church. Neither is it to be less adored, because it was instituted by Christ our Lord, as has been stated.” Here is the very highest authority of the Church of Rome on the subject. The very highest worship [*latriæ cultum*] which is due to God, [*qui vero Deo debetur*], is to be rendered to the sacrament of the Eucharist. That Papists carry out this decree, none will dispute. Accordingly the people prostrate themselves when the host is elevated

or carried in procession. To justify all this, Trent teaches and Romanists believe, that the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, thus maintaining idolatry by the grossest absurdity—an absurdity which contradicts the testimony of four senses—for our sight, our taste, our smell, our feeling, all declare that these elements are still bread and wine, and nothing else. Thus Rome requires that a wheaten cake and the juice of the grape are to be worshipped with the very worship which we offer to God, and that under the most fearful anathema.

The Church of Rome is also guilty of idolatry in worshipping the relics, images, and pictures of saints, and images and pictures of Christ, and pictures of the Trinity. The Council of Trent enjoins the invocation of saints, teaches that to ask them to pray for us is not “idolatry,” “nor opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ,” nor “contrary to the word of God.” It strongly condemns those “who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints.” It further teaches “that the images of Christ, of the Virgin, mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration paid to them,” and that “great advantages are derived from all sacred images.” Sir Edward Coke informs us, that in England at one time, when Popery swayed that land, a law was passed, “that any persons who affirm images ought not to be worshipped, be holden in strong prison until they take an oath and swear to worship images.” In all countries where Romanism is established, the devotees are found kneeling or prostrating themselves before images. This is notorious. Even in the United States, Romanists have used a picture of the Trinity. There is now before us a printed engraving, copied from an original painting, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the Virgin Mary. This picture was recently, and no doubt still is, in the Jesuits’ College at Georgetown, District of Columbia. That it is not slander or fiction thus to assert, is proved by the certificates of the artist who sketched the copy of it, and by three clergymen, all of whom are still living, and two of whom still reside in Washington, District of Columbia. The

whole account of this shocking idolatry was published in the Protestant Vindicator of November 22, 1843.

All this is according to the teaching of the great doctors of the Church of Rome. Peter Dens discusses the question, "Are images of God and of the Most Holy Trinity proper?" He replies, "Yes; although this is not so certain as concerning the images of Christ and the saints, as this was determined at a later period.

"But it is to be observed that the divinity cannot be depicted, but those forms are depicted, under which God has sometimes appeared, or to which divine attributes are paid in some similitude; thus God THE FATHER is represented under the form of an old man, because (Dan. vii. 9) we read that he appeared thus: *And the ancient of days sat*; and the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, because he appeared thus, (Matt. iii. 16): *He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove*; or under the form of cloven tongues, such as he appeared on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 3): *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, as it were, of fire*. Therefore, images of this kind are not to be painted according to any one's will, but only under those forms in which they have sometimes appeared."

He afterwards discusses the question, "With what worship are the images of Christ and the saints to be worshipped?" He replies, "It is to be premised, with St. Thom. in corp. that images may be regarded in a two-fold manner.

"I. In so far as they are any thing or certain matter, any gold, or sculptured or painted wood; and in this respect they cannot be honoured.

"II. In so much as they are images or representations of Christ or the saints; and in this respect they may be honoured with relative or respective worship; so, doubtless, that they may not be honoured for the sake of a dignity intrinsic in themselves, but on account of the dignity of the prototype or pattern; and consequently the honour shown to an image redounds to the prototype as the formal reason of the worship, although the object which the representing image itself is, is not the reason why it is worshipped.

"III. Therefore St. Thomas replies to the question, that

images may be honoured with the same worship with which their prototype is honoured, but only with a relative or respective worship; therefore, the images of the saints are worshipped with the respective worship of *dulia*; of the Divine Virgin with the relative worship of *hyperdulia*; and of Christ and of God with the respective worship of *latria*; almost just as if by the same virtue we love God and our neighbour on account of the goodness of God in himself."

He then notices the decrees of the Seventh Synod against offering the worship of *latria* to images, and attempts some explanation, and thus concludes: "However this may be, it is sufficient for us against sectarians, that all Catholics teach and prove that the images of the saints are to be worshipped."

Nor is it at all a very modern usage to paint the Trinity. Cramp quotes from the "Catechism," p. 360, these words: "To represent the persons of the Holy Trinity by certain forms, under which, as we read in the Old and New Testaments, they deigned to appear, is not to be deemed contrary to religion." He says: "Hence, in the engravings found in some editions of the breviary, God the Father is represented as a venerable old man, (the Ancient of Days, Dan. vii. 13;) on his right hand the Saviour stands, in human form; above is the Holy Spirit, in the shape of a dove; at a little distance the Virgin Mary," &c.

We doubt not the feelings of pious men must be greatly shocked at the recital of such forms and figures used in the worship of Him, who is a Spirit, and requires that he be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Against all such practices the word of God is clear and explicit. Here are the very words of the Holy Ghost. In Deut. iv. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, Moses says, "And the LORD spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. . . . Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire): lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness

of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth." Clearer, stronger, more specific prohibitions to represent Jehovah, or any person of the Trinity, by statues or paintings, could not be well conceived.

In this worship of images may be found the secret of the opposition of Romanists, especially of the priesthood, to the second commandment. Their hostility is so great, that in their catechisms they often omit it altogether, so that their children are often not taught to say, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." This is found in Exodus xx. 4—6. Romish catechisms, published in purely Roman Catholic countries, seldom contain it. It is frequently omitted in catechisms published in this country. We recently saw two such. The editor of the *Comprehensive Commentary* says that he has in his possession a Latin, an Irish, and an English catechism, in each of which the second commandment is omitted. But even where the second commandment is given, it is put as a part of the first, and not as the second commandment. In this country, and in England, of late years, the catechisms are more apt to contain the words of the second commandment. This is quite a desirable improvement. Yet in none do we find it stated that it is wicked to bow down to images, or to prostrate ourselves before them.

Of course, any visible representation of the true God is forbidden by the second commandment. To represent God by the figure of an old man, is to make for religious use the likeness of something that is on the earth, and so is forbidden. Isaiah denounces all visible representations of God as utterly inadequate and impossible. After an appeal to the works of nature, as showing the greatness of God, he says, "To whom will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"

Isa. xl. 18; and then the prophet proceeds to describe the making of an idol, or graven image, (the word is the same as in Exod. xx. 4,) out of metal or wood, as a futile and ridiculous effort to represent God. After another sublime appeal to nature, God says, ver. 25, "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Lord?"

That Protestants give the right translation to the word rendered "bow down" in Exod. xx. 5, is most evident to a scholar. Even the Doway Bible elsewhere renders the word in the same way. In like manner, the word "serve" is properly given in our translation, as the Doway Bible admits, by using the same word. The only question is, what did a pious intelligent Jew understand by serving an idol? Calling upon it, making offerings to it, praying to it, trusting in it, prostrating himself before it, &c., were infallible signs of service.

The attempt to set aside the clear teachings of the second commandment by a note in the Doway Bible, is a mere contradiction of the text. The note says, "All such images or likenesses are forbidden by this commandment, as are made to be *adored* and *served*; according to that which immediately follows, *thou shalt not adore them nor serve them*. That is, all such as are designed for *idols, or image gods*, or are worshipped with *divine honour*. But otherwise, images, pictures, or representations, even in the house of God, and in the very sanctuary, so far from being forbidden, are expressly authorized by the word of God." In proof of this, reference is made to Exodus xxv. 15, and xxxviii. 7. What the staves or bars of satin wood, or the rings in the ark, have to do with image-worship, requires more ingenuity to discover than we possess. The other texts cited are Num. xxi. 8, 9, where the brazen serpent is spoken of, and 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, 19, and 2 Chron. iii. 10, where the cherubim are spoken of. But as these were never designed as objects of worship, and are never called by the same name as the graven images mentioned in Exod. xx. 4, it is obvious that no verse cited in the note has the slightest reference to the subject of image-worship.

The foregoing proofs of the idolatry of the worship of the church of Rome could easily have been multiplied fifty-fold. But we will not weary our readers. Yet something more

should be said concerning the idolatrous nature of the invocations, bowings, and worshippings, in the cases already stated. Papists themselves acknowledge that the pagan invocation of demons was idolatry. These demons were commonly dead men. And who are the saints in the Calendar? Commonly dead men and women. Where is the difference? The Pagan prayed to dead men. The Papist prays to dead men and women. The Romanist may say, I call upon *holy* creatures, whereas the Pagan called upon wicked ones. To this it is sufficient to reply that a *holy* creature is still a *creature*, and therefore it is idolatry to give divine honours to such. It is as truly idolatry to worship a holy as a fallen angel, a man saved as a man lost. Worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator is the great sin. To prove that all whose names are in the Calendar are holy beings, or that they all are or ever were in existence, is simply impossible. As to some of them, we know that they were regenerated, pardoned, justified, and glorified. Such were Joseph, Mary, John the Baptist, Paul, and Peter. Until the day of final judgment, we cannot *know* that any man is saved, unless God's word says so, or unless we are admitted to heaven, and see him there.

No one is canonized at Rome until he has been dead a long time, during which a superstitious people may conjure up any kind or amount of legend. The evidence on which the title to saintship is made to rest, is in many cases, of the slenderest kind. We may indeed entertain very strong hopes concerning the salvation of those who have led apparently pious lives on earth. But till God shall pronounce upon their characters, either by revealing to us on earth that they are saved, or by admitting us to glory, or by the sentence of the last day, how can we be sure that they are in glory? Therefore, there is danger that in invoking the saints in the Calendar, men may be calling on those who are not in heaven, never were there, and never shall be there. Nor is this fear uncharitable. Every one acquainted with the history of canonization, knows that nothing enters more largely into the claims of any one to that distinction, than reputation for miracles. Even if these miracles were genuine, they would not prove saintship. Christ himself said, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord,

have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name have done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. vii. 22, 23. Men may be prophets and yet not saints. They may cast devils out of others, and let pride and malice reign in their own hearts. They may work miracles, and yet work iniquity, and so perish in their sins. Balaam's prophecies were as true and as sublime as those of Moses, and there is as much evidence that before Christ's death Judas wrought miracles, as that any other disciple of Jesus did; yet neither Protestants nor Romanists believe that Balaam was a holy man, nor that Judas has gone home to glory. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

But some of those named in the Calendar cannot by any possibility be proved ever to have existed. No mortal can prove that there ever was such a person as St. Veronica. The course of reasoning by which such a thing should be attempted, would as well suit to establish the wildest fancies of heathen mythology. In his letter from Rome, Conyers Middleton gives the following account of the fabulous personage named above: "They pretend to show us at Rome two original impressions of our Saviour's face on two different handkerchiefs; the one sent a present by himself to Agbarus, Prince of Edessa, who by letter had desired a picture of him; the other given by him, at the time of his execution, to a saint or holy woman, Veronica, upon a handkerchief, which she had lent him to wipe his face on that occasion; both which handkerchiefs are still preserved, as they affirm, and now kept with the utmost reverence; the first in St. Silvester's church; the second in St. Peter's; where in honour of this sacred relic, there is a fine altar built by pope Urban VIII., with the statue of Veronica herself, with the following inscription:

SALVATORIS IMAGINEM VERONICÆ  
SUDARIO EXCEPTAM  
UT LOCI MAJESTAS DECENTER  
CUSTODIRET URBANUS VIII.  
PONT. MAX.  
MARMOREUM SIGNUM  
ET ALTARE ADDIDIT CONDITORIUM  
EXTRUXIT ET ORNAVIT.

“There is a prayer in their book of offices, ordered by the rubric, to be addressed to this sacred and miraculous picture, in the following terms: ‘Conduct us, O thou blessed figure, to our proper home, where we may behold the pure face of Christ.’

“But notwithstanding the authority of this pope, and his inscription, this VERONICA, as one of their best authors has shown, like Amphibolus, before mentioned, was not any real person, but the name given to the picture itself by old writers who mention it; being formed by blundering and confounding the words VERA ICON, or true image, the title inscribed perhaps, or given originally to the handkerchief, by the first contrivers of the imposture.” And he quotes Mabill. Iter. Ital. p. 88, as saying, “Hæc Christi imago a recentioribus Veronicæ dicitur: imaginem ipsam veteres Veronicam appellabant.”

But suppose all the saints named in the Calendar were in heaven, and we knew it, what then? If they are in heaven, they are not upon earth, and how can they hear, or help, or see, or save us? “Cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils.” Isa. ii. 22. If even a living man can give us no effectual aid, what can the dead do? If these saints are holy, they are yet finite. God’s people, when glorified, are still creatures, and possess not the attributes of Jehovah. For instance, they are not omnipresent. If they were here upon earth, no one of them could be in Rome, Vienna, Calcutta, Lima, Mexico, and Montreal, at the same time. If they are in heaven, they cannot at the same time be on earth. Such ubiquity belongs to but one being, the infinite, eternal, uncreated God. Therefore, to say or do anything which implies that the saints, like God, are or can be present everywhere, is to ascribe to them one of the incommunicable perfections of Jehovah, and that is idolatry.

Their knowledge is also limited. No finite creature (and all creatures are finite) could, even if upon earth, know all the wants, and fears, and sorrows of all the pious in the church militant. Nor is it more possible for them in heaven to know these things. Mary would need to have millions of ears and of understandings; she would require the possession of *infinite* intelligence; that is, she must be God, in order to know the

wants and wishes of all who now address her. But unlimited knowledge is one of the highest attributes of the God of heaven. To say, or do, or think anything which ascribes such knowledge to any creature, however exalted, is idolatry.

This praying to saints and begging them to intercede for us is founded upon the presumption that they pity us more tenderly and love us more strongly than the Lord Jesus Christ himself. That such is the tendency of the practice of invoking saints, might naturally be inferred. If the child presents its petition to its father through its mother, it must be because it regards the mother as most inclined to listen to its requests. That such is the actual belief of many Romanists does not admit of a doubt. It is also based on the presumption that God will hear the saints sooner than his Son. A learned priest, holding a high position at Rome, distinctly declared to the Rev. M. H. Seymour, "*that God hears our prayers more quickly when they are offered through the blessed Virgin, than when offered through any one else;*" and that "*even Christ himself was not so willing to hear our prayers, and did not hear them so quickly when offered simply to himself, as when they were offered through the blessed Virgin.*" See "Mornings among the Jesuits," pp. 101, 102, 106, &c. Now the Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ is infinitely condescending and kind, and that it is impossible any should be more compassionate and approachable than this "one Mediator." They say: "Greater love hath no *man* than this, that a man lay down his life for his *friend*; but God commendeth his love to us, that while we were yet *enemies*, *Christ* died for us." What wickedness it must be even to suppose that the compassions of any creature can compare with those of the glorious Son of God! When on earth, Jesus said: "Come unto *ME*, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest. Take *MY* yoke upon you, and learn of *ME*; for *I* am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For *MY* yoke is easy, and *MY* burden is light." In what contrast with this is the celebrated prayer to the Holy Virgin quoted at the end of "The Glories of Mary," and now in so common use in this country: "Remember, O meek and merciful Virgin Mary, that it was never heard of, that you abandoned those,

who, in their affliction or necessities, have placed themselves under your powerful protection, implored your aid, or solicited your assistance; therefore, animated with the same confidence, O Queen of Virgins, our tender Mother, I have recourse to you though a miserable sinner, I, sighing, prostrate myself at your feet. Refuse not, august Mother of my God, to listen favourably to my prayer; I humbly solicit your powerful intercession; deign to grant it to me, be propitious to the supplication of a wretched creature, who hopes to obtain every thing through your mediation. Amen." The poor publican said, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." Poor Romanists are taught to say, "O Mary, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this vale of tears." Dying Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The Papist is taught to say, "Holy Virgin . . . grant that I may never forget to invoke you, especially during my last combat, the most terrible of all." For these and other things like them, see "*Glories of Mary*," pp. 149, 150, 151, and 288. No contrast could be more striking than that between the Bible and Romish books of devotion. All this is the more monstrous, as Mary, when on earth, confessed herself a poor helpless sinner, like other humble servants of God. Listen to her words: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." Luke i. 46, 47. The translation of this passage in the *Doway Bible* is identical with that in our version. Now, if Mary had a Saviour, it was because she needed one, and if she needed a Saviour, it was because she was a lost sinner. That she felt her need, and felt that need supplied, we learn from her own lips.

The Romanist may ask if the Scriptures do not teach that all nations shall call Mary blessed. Certainly they do. They also say, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, Blessed are the pure in heart, Blessed are the meek," &c. Indeed, unspeakable blessings are pronounced on all the pious. But how can this prove that we are to call upon them, and not upon God alone? God has indeed conferred great blessings upon the pious of earth. In heaven those blessings are perfected, and others are bestowed. This should encourage us to go to God, and ask him to bless us, but it ought not to lead us to put our trust

in the grace, power, or intercession of those, who, though in heaven, are themselves but redeemed sinners. If any should ask if Mary was not the most highly favoured among women, the answer is, that when upon this earth God did put more honour upon her than upon any other woman, by making her the mother of his holy child Jesus. In this respect, she was the most highly privileged of her sex. But when Christ was upon earth, he was told, "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Christ could not more emphatically have declared that in his kingdom a new heart, leading to a holy life, infinitely exceeded in value all affinities of blood, even with himself. As to the Romish doctrine that Mary is queen of heaven, and has the highest throne of any of our race, it is a mere imagination, unsupported by God's word. Our Lord Jesus expressly declined saying who should be the greatest in his kingdom, stating, that to sit on his right hand and on his left hand should "be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." There is nothing in all God's word intimating that Mary, or Peter, or any other particular saint, personally or historically known to us, should be preferred before all the rest of the redeemed. But if we knew that Mary was and ever should be the most highly honoured of all the blessed in heaven, that would not make it lawful to invoke her; for her blessedness alone does not deify her. She would still be a helpless, dependent creature; and as it is as truly idolatry to worship the sun and moon, as it is to worship a candle or a glow-worm, so it is as truly idolatry to call upon the most exalted creature in heaven, as to offer our prayers to the weakest of all God's creatures on earth.

When an angel appeared to John, (Rev. xix. 10,) the apostle mistook his appearance for a manifestation of God, and fell at his feet to worship him; but the angel said, "See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that

have the testimony of Jesus. Worship God." We were curious to see how Romanists would dispose of this passage. Peter Dens says that "the angel refused this on account of the great holiness of John;" and the authors of the Notes in the Doway Bible say that he refused it "in consideration of the dignity to which our human nature had been raised by the incarnation of the Son of God, and the dignity of St. John, an apostle, prophet, and martyr." But the angel assigns no such reason, but a very different one: "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren," &c. This reason was sufficient for John. He required no other.

In Col. ii. 18, 23, are these words: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind. . . . Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body," &c. To this 18th verse the Doway Bible has a long note, in which it attempts to direct the force of what is here said against those philosophers who worshipped demons, and then against the Jews. But if it was wicked for Jews and Greeks to pay worship to demons, why is it not so for Romanists to do the same?

Protestants sometimes refer to Eccles. ix. 5, as discouraging our addresses to the dead: "The dead know nothing more." To this Dens says: "The best solution is, that these are the words of the foolish, and of those who say that the soul perishes with the body." But the note on this text in the Doway Bible is far more safe and reverent: "*Know nothing more*, viz., as to the transactions of this world, in which they have now no part, unless it be revealed to them; neither have they any knowledge or power now of doing any thing to secure their eternal state, (if they have not taken care of it in their lifetime;) nor can they now procure themselves any good, as the living always may do, by the grace of God." That is right and good. But why should we ask them to procure good for us by the grace of God, when they cannot do it for themselves? He who is not able to help himself, cannot be a very safe reliance for his fellow-creature.

To set aside all charges of idolatry brought against the

Church of Rome, her doctors have invented various devices and distinctions. One is, that worship is of three kinds: *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Latria*. These are again distinguished into absolute and respective or relative. So that we have six grades of worship, viz., Absolute *Dulia* and Respective *Dulia*, Absolute *Hyperdulia* and Respective *Hyperdulia*, Absolute *Latria* and Respective *Latria*. It must be obvious to the intelligent, that whatever some speculative minds may imagine, these distinctions are to the masses wholly unintelligible and impracticable. The great body of worshippers are confounded by any attempt to explain these distinctions. The plain people neither know them, nor understand them, nor practise them. Nor are these distinctions preserved in Romish books of devotion which have fallen under our notice. Not only is no warning given to the devotee that he is to use the Litany to Mary with less exalted feelings of piety, than those he exercises when using the Litany of the name of Jesus; but in many cases petitions are presented to mere creatures to do for us things which none but God can do. There is on earth no higher act of worship than committing our souls to God in death; yet in a prayer, sanctioned by the Pope in 1807, his followers are taught to say, "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony." So that these refinements are of no practical use; and Popish writers admit as much, as we have seen in a passage already quoted from Peter Dens. Ask any plain man to tell you whether the worship he is offering to a relic, an image, a cross, the Virgin, or God, be of any one of the six kinds before described, and he cannot tell you. Ask him what he understands by Respective *Hyperdulia*, and he has no answer to make. Besides, these distinctions are unnoticed in the Bible. It says, "Worship God." It says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv. 10. The distinction of worship into civil and religious is plain and clear. A child can make it. All men do make it. Civil worship is the respect and reverence we pay to civil authority or to worth in man. But religious worship belongs to God only—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. One is performed with the common sentiments of re-

spect, esteem, and good will. The other is only performed with heartfelt piety, humility, and love.

But Papists are very anxious to defend their worship of images, of saints, of the cross, and of the host, by some argument drawn from Scripture. In Heb. xi. 21, we read, "By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff." In the Doway Bible it reads thus: "By faith Jacob, when he was dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped the top of his rod;" and then there is a note, saying that Jacob paid a relative honour and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre or kingdom." Any one can easily understand the reason of this translation, and the note is a bold assertion.

In his Defence, pp. 129, 130, Gallitzin adopts another method of defending the practice of Rome. He says: "St. John the Baptist venerated the very latches of our Saviour's shoes. Mark i. 7."

He puts this remark in a paragraph by itself, showing that he attaches great weight to it. Now the whole verse referred to, reads in the Doway Bible, "There cometh after me one mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and loose." The plain sense of which is, that Christ was so glorious and exalted a person, that John did not esteem himself worthy to do for him the most menial office. This is the whole grammatical sense of the passage. Yet Gallitzin quotes this verse to vindicate the practice of the Church of Rome respecting "images, pictures, and relics." But he gives us another Scripture proof. He says:

"The Israelites venerated the brazen serpent, a type or figure of Christ, Numb. xxi. 9."

This also is put in a separate paragraph, as though it was a weighty affair. In the Doway Bible, Numb. xxi. 9, reads thus: "Moses therefore made a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign; which, when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed." If Romish idolatry can find support in such a verse, we see not why it should not also from Gen. i. 1. But we are not done with this serpent. Some of the ancient Israelites were of Gallitzin's mind, and thought it should be vene-

rated. In 2 Kings xviii. 4, we read of Hezekiah that "he removed the high places, and broke the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it." The Doway version has it, "and broke the brazen serpent which Moses had made: for till that time the children of Israel burnt incense to it." If Hezekiah were alive and had his way, papal images would fare as this brazen serpent. He was a great iconoclast.

A portion of Scripture sometimes brought forward to show that we may pray *to saints in heaven*, is that where Paul says, "Brethren, pray for us." But Paul never called on dead men and women to pray for him, nor did he say, Brethren, pray to dead men or women for me. The sense of what Paul said evidently is, "Pray to God for us;" and Romanists will admit as much, but then they say, if Paul asked men and women to whom he spake and wrote on earth to pray for him, we may ask the saints to do the same for us. The answer is, that if we and the saints whose prayers we solicit, are on earth, as Paul and those to whom he wrote were, we may safely do as he did. But how can the dead hear us when we cry? They are in the land of silence. They no longer hear the earthly wail of woe, the voice of the oppressor, or the cry of friendship. To say that they in heaven can hear us all over the earth, is to deify them.

If any ask how Romanists suppose that saints in glory become acquainted with their prayers, one of their greatest doctors, Bellarmine, shall answer. He says: "Concerning the manner in which they know what is said to them, there are four opinions among the doctors:

"1. Some say that they have it from the relation of the angels, who at one time ascend to heaven, and at another time descend thence to us.

"2. Others say that the souls of the saints, as also the angels, by a certain wonderful swiftness which is natural to them, are in some measure everywhere, and themselves hear the prayers of the supplicants.

"3. Others, that the saints see in God all things, from the beginning of their beatitude, which in any way appertain to

themselves; and hence even our prayers which are directed to them.

“4. Others, lastly, that the saints do not see in the Word our prayers from the beginning of their blessedness, but that our prayers are only then revealed to them by God, when we pour them forth.”

It is not our purpose to examine at length these several particulars. The first would make the employment of angels very different from any thing taught in Scripture. The second contains the absurdity that there is a limited kind of omnipresence. The third supposes a limited kind of omniscience. The fourth shows a very singular kind of process to be going on, and, if true, should lead us first to ask God to tell the saints what we wish them to ask God for us. The whole four are thoroughly fanciful, and without the shadow of support from any portion of Scripture.

But some say, Jacob wrestled with an angel, and would not let him go till he got the blessing. Let us look at this whole case. Where the history of this event is first given, in Gen. xxxii., this angel is called a man, that is, he had the appearance of a man. But no sooner did he leave Jacob than it is added: “And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, (*i. e.* the face of God,) for (said he) I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.” This appearance of a man, then, was a manifestation of God, and Jacob knew it was God before he left the place. Indeed, the angel said: “As a prince thou hast power with God.” As this was a memorable event in the life of the patriarch, he afterwards referred to it. When dying, he said, “God of my fathers, the God which fed me all my life long to this day, the *angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. And in Hosea xii. 4, 5, an explanation yet more full is found: “Jacob had power with God, yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him at Bethel, and there he spake with him, even thē Lord God of hosts: the Lord [Jehovah] is his memorial; therefore turn thou to thy God.” Nothing could be more clear than that Jacob spake that night with God. These passages infallibly determine who this man, this angel was; it was the angel

of the covenant, Jehovah, the Son of God, "the Lord God of hosts," who before his actual incarnation, more than once assumed the appearance of a man. And yet this praying to the angel, who by Hosea is called Jehovah, is brought forward by the great modern champion of Romanism, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," to establish the lawfulness of worshipping created angels. On p. 210 of Lucas's edition, he says: "That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is plain from Jacob's asking and obtaining the angel's blessing, with whom he had mystically wrestled, Gen. xxxii. 26, and from his invoking his own angel to bless Joseph's sons, Gen. xlvii. 16."

Romanists adduce other texts to evince the lawfulness of their idolatrous practices, such as this: "Render to all men their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour." Having quoted these words, the author of the preface to "The Glories of Mary," says that God "thus expressly sanctions our doing homage to the exalted dignity and transcendent splendour of his servants in heaven." p. x. But how does this prove that we should pray to saints or angels? Render to all men their *dues*. Religious worship is no man's due. That belongs to God alone. There are more than five hundred passages of Scripture in which religious worship, prayer, and supplication, are spoken of, and yet not in one of them is any such command given or implied as this: "Pray to the angels, call upon the saints for help or mediation." Learned Papists of high authority rely very much on other things than the word of God for most of their idolatrous practices. Thus Peter Dens says, "Prove that the images of Christ and the saints are to be worshipped. *Ans.* It is proved in the first place by the Council of Trent." The rest of his argument is of the same character.

That Romanists in the United States do approve of what their bishops and pope elsewhere appoint and enjoin, there is no room for doubt.

Enough has been proved to justify us in saying to all who would make salvation sure: "Come out of this Babylon and flee to Christ alone. Come out of her, that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 3. "For the rest of the men, which

have not been killed by her plagues, have not repented of the works of their hands, but worship idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk. Rev. ix. 20. Come out of her and flee to Christ. Forsake the pope and embrace the Lord Jesus. Leave the city of the Seven Hills, and escape to the mountain, to Calvary.

---

*John Henry Green.*

ART. III.—*Ebrard on the Apocalypse.*

*The Revelation of John,\* Explained by Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, etc. etc. 1853. 8vo. pp. 667.*

OUR readers have already been notified of the appearance of this volume. The evangelical sentiments of Dr. Ebrard, coupled with the ability, originality, and thoroughness which he has displayed in his former publications, particularly his Commentary on the Hebrews, his treatise on the Gospel History, and his Systematic Theology, naturally create an interest in his views upon the Revelation. It shall be the aim of this article merely to report, without commenting on them, the contents of the volume before us.

The introduction discusses in one hundred pages the authorship of the Apocalypse, the history of its interpretation, the principles upon which it ought to be interpreted, and those points of Old Testament prophecy which here find their fuller expansion. Ebrard maintains, in opposition to Lücke and others, that this book is from the pen of no other John than the apostle, to whose gospel it stands related, somewhat as the Acts of the Apostles to the Gospel by Luke, of which it is the continuation. The pretended lack of unison between the spirit and teachings of the Apocalypse and those of the Gospel and Epistles of John, from which a diversity of authorship has been

\* Die Offenbarung Johannes, erklärt von Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, Consistorialrath und Hauptprediger zu Speyer, Mitglied der historisch-theologischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig und der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.