

them sensible of their folly in laughing at the saints' relics.

3. "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes of both men and women. Inasmuch, that they brought forth the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches; that, at the least, the shadow of Peter passing by, might overshadow some of them." *Acts*. v. 14, 15.

The holy Scripture here remarks, that the primitive Christians had a singular veneration for the very shadow of St Peter's body; may not Roman Catholics then, without superstition or idolatry, have as much veneration for the body itself of St Peter, now his soul is in glory, as those primitive Christians had for the shadow of it?

4. "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs and aprons; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." *Acts* xix. 11, 12.

When God works miracles at the shrines of the saints, either by their dead bodies, in the cure of diseases in the resurrection of the dead, &c., as he did at the sepulchre of the prophet Elizeus; or when he works a miracle in their dead bodies, by preserving them uncorrupted, we Catholics think such miracles to be a divine attestation of their sanctity and any part or particle of the saints' body, or what has touched the body, we esteem a relic. Now, whether those handkerchiefs and aprons which had touched the body of St Paul, mentioned in the text now cited, were not of this kind, and how far such relics may have a virtue against disease and evil spirits, let the plain words of the texts inform Protestants. And withal, let them consider well, whether their holy religion, which teaches them to scoff at the relics of saints, does, in this particular, agree with the written word of God?

POINT XII.

Many Protestants hold, that it is not lawful to keep graven images or pictures of Christ, or of the saints and angels in our churches: all Protestants maintain, that to have a veneration for such holy images for the sake of the prototypes or parties who are thereby represented, is absolutely unlawful: nay, that such veneration of holy images is idolatry.

Contrary to their Bible. 1. "And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold: of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat." *Exod.* xxv. 18.

2 "And within the oracle, he made two cherubims of olive tree, each ten cubits high." *I Kings* vi. 23.

3. "And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubims," &c. *ver.* 29.

4. "All this the Lord made me understand in writing, by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern." *1 Chron.* xxviii. 19.

These texts, which inform us that there were holy images (and that by a pattern from God himself) as well in the *Mosaic* tabernacle as in *Solomon's* temple, are a sufficient justification of *Roman Catholics* retaining and keeping holy images in their churches, oratories, and houses; which pious practice, we see, is clearly grounded on the *written word of God*.

From the same texts we may gather, that these words: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing, that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down nor worship them:" (*Exod.* xx. 4.)—I say, it is plain, from the texts above cited, that these words, in their true meaning, did only forbid the making and worshipping of idols, or images of false gods, such as were adored at that time by the heathens; but the use of holy images was not forbidden, otherwise the carved cherubims had never been set up in the very temple of God by his own command.

The doctrine of the *Roman Catholic Church* concerning holy images, consists in two points, and is fully expressed in the words of the Council of *Trent*. *Sess.* xxv. *De Invocat.* &c.

First—"That the images of Christ, of the Virgin *Mary* Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be kept, especially in Churches."

Secondly—"That due honour and veneration is to be given them."

As to the first point: that holy images may be kept, especially in churches; this, from the written word is already fully proved.

As to the second point: *That due honour and veneration is to be given them*, will be no hard task to demonstrate; since all sides allow, that persons may be affronted or honoured in their images, and that the honour or affront which is done to images redounds naturally upon the prototypes or originals which are represented by them. For, the very being of images being relative, consequently, the honour, or respect, which is shewn to them, does not stop at the images themselves, but is referred to the parties they relate to, and is, therefore, by Catholics, called a relative honour. For instance, when we treat an image of our Saviour Christ with due respect, our thoughts do not stop at the image, but go higher; for no sooner have we his image before our eyes, but we have the thought or imagination of him in our mind; and to him the honour is done.

When the primitive Christians, as is related in the *Acts* (*Aets* v. 15) shewed a respect and veneration for the shadow of St Peter, as he walked the streets of *Jerusalem*, did the honour and respect they shewed, stop at his shadow, at his image and likeness, or was it referred to his person? And when we