

# LATRIA/DULIA

## *the Bible, the Early Church, and Faith Affirmed*

**Written by William Albrecht**

**a response for the Faithful**

The following essay will be an in depth study on the issue of Latria and Dulia, Latin terms of which are derived from the Greek Latreia and Douleuo.

The goal is to provide a cogent response to the Protestant objection that it is improper to offer Dulia to a glorified Saint. The Catholic position has always been that we offer veneration and pure respect to the Saints who have gone to their heavenly rest in Christ. The Saints, now being even more alive in Christ are honored by the living. The bowing before a statue of a saint is direct respect to the saint the image represents. The body of Christ is eternally connected (1 Cor 12) and thus we view it as holy and useful to ask for our departed brethren to help pray for us so that one day, we too can achieve the crown that they have achieved.

**St. Jerome, in the early 5th century** gives us the Historical Catholic position when he says:

**"You say, in your pamphlet, that so long as we are alive we can pray for one another; but once we die, the prayer of no person for another can be heard, and all the more because the martyrs, though they(2) cry for the avenging of their blood, have never been able to obtain their request. If Apostles and martyrs while still in the body can pray for others, when they ought still to be anxious for themselves, how much more will they do so after their crowns, victories, and triumphs?"**

*AGAINST VIGILANTIUS 6*

In order to define the Catholic position in a clearer way, I have provided the following below:

**"The veneration of the saints is called "Absolute Dulia". The Council of Trent declared in connection with the veneration of images, that "through images we honor the saints which they represent."**

As regards the invocation of the saints the Council declared

"It is good and profitable to appeal to them for help." '

*p 319--Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma-Ott*

The New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia:

## Dulia

(Greek *doulia*; [Latin](#) *servitus*), a [theological](#) term signifying the [honour](#) paid to the [saints](#), while *latria* means worship given to [God](#) alone, and *hyperdulia* the veneration offered to the [Blessed Virgin Mary](#). St. Augustine ([City of God X.2](#)) distinguishes two kinds of *servitus*: "one which is due to [men](#) . . . which in Greek is called *dulia*; the other, *latria*, which is the service pertaining to the worship of [God](#)". St. Thomas ([II-II:103:3](#)) bases the distinction on the difference between [God's](#) supreme dominion and that which one man may exercise over another. [Catholic theologians](#) insist that the difference is one of kind and not merely of degree; *dulia* and *latria* being as far apart as are the creature and the Creator. [Leibniz](#), though a [Protestant](#), recognizes the "*discrimen infinitum atque immensum* between the [honour](#) which is due to [God](#) and that which is shown to the [saints](#), the one being called by [theologians](#), after [Augustine's](#) example, *latria*, the other *dulia*"; and he further declares that this difference should "not only be inculcated in the [minds](#) of hearers and learners, but should also be manifested as far as possible by outward [signs](#)" (Syst. theol., p. 184). A further distinction is made between *dulia* in the absolute sense, the [honour](#) paid to [persons](#), and *dulia* in the relative sense, the [honour](#) paid to inanimate objects, such as images and [relics](#). With regard to the [saints](#), *dulia* includes veneration and invocation; the former being the [honour](#) paid directly to them, the latter having primarily in view the petitioner's advantage.

From the New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia

## LATRIA

"..worship called forth by [God](#), and given exclusively to Him as [God](#), is designated by the Greek name *latreia* (latinized, *latria*)"

Now that we have defined some of the terms that we will be dealing with we are able to get a clear understanding of the Catholic position. We will now move on to the objections that are levied by our Protestant brethren, particularly those that are being circulated by James White of AOMIN. James White has borrowed these arguments from John Calvin, the creator of the religious thought of Calvinism. James White argues that the Catholic is incorrect. He argues that there is no distinction between Latria and Dulia. At

first he doesn't use the term "religious" or "divine" as a qualifier of the distinction, but he adds it later. This in turn, he claims, makes it obvious that any form of *Dulia* that Catholics give Mary is translated into actual worship of her. Bowing before a representation of Mary to the Catholic is bowing to Mary or to ANY saint for that matter is worship to James White. He has made his objections very clear in the blog posts that I have listed below. These blog posts are all dated and can be found on Mr. White's website. We will examine them before moving forward.

### **The following objections to the Catholic position of *Latria* and *Dulia* can be found on the website of James White, director of AOMIN**

09/09/2006 - James White

Actually, I have addressed the issue in *The Roman Catholic Controversy* and in my debate with Patrick Madrid on Long Island relative to the veneration of saints and angels. The topic illustrates, very clearly, the difference between deriving your theology from God's divine revelation in Scripture and deriving it from other sources. There simply is no *biblical* basis for saying it is acceptable to give service to created beings but only worship to God, for both concepts are part and parcel of the single meaning of "worship" in Scripture. "You shall worship and serve God alone" cannot be changed into "you shall worship God alone; but as long as you call your religious devotion 'service' you can 'serve' Mary and angels and saints, too." The Bible not only does not recognize such a distinction, it denies it, both lexicographically (both *latria* and *dulia* trace back to biblical usages and both terms refer to divine worship) as well as by direct assertion. Paul refers to the idolatry that marked the pagan past of the Galatians as "service" in Galatians 4:8 ("However at that time, when you did not know God, you were slaves ["served," ἐδουλεύσατε, root term being *douleuo*, leading to *dulia* in Latin] to those which by nature are no gods"). So if one begins with the Word as your ultimate authority, no amount of quibbling from later sources will change the reality of the definition of worship. And believe me, ask Uzzah if God is serious about the topic of worship (2 Samuel 6:3-7). Aquinas does not define biblical terms, and his comments are not reflective of biblical usage. Later uses of "worship" in any language are, likewise, utterly irrelevant, of course, as that would lead to the common error of anachronism, reading later uses back into the biblical context. Of course, that is exactly what Rome does. I have heard many an apologist use old or middle English uses of "worship" as if this is somehow relevant to the matter at hand, and, of course, it is not. Can you picture it? A man is caught bowing down before a Baal in Moses' day in his tent. He is brought before Moses, and when asked for a reason for his idolatry, the man replies, "Oh, that wasn't idolatry. Don't you know that someday, in a language that will come into broad use in about 3,000 years, you will be able to argue for a less strict use of the term?" I'm sure that would go over about

as well as the, "Oh, I wasn't worshipping the idol by bowing down and lighting candles before it, I was giving it *dulia* instead" excuse. Both excuses would go with the idolater under a pile of rocks.

So the better question to ask would be, upon what basis does any Roman Catholic believe the distinction he or she embraces that allows him or her to bow down before a statue and light candles and repeat prayers will stand before the holy God who gave us His Word and who has revealed that He seeks pure worship?

06/23/2008 - James White

Since Rome *claims* to be guided by "Scripture and Tradition," but that Tradition never contradicts Scripture, the fact that *there is no latria/dulia distinction in the biblical teaching concerning service and worship* should be, for the Christian, absolutely final in its definitions. But Rome says otherwise

08/21/2006 - James White

..Rome's refusal to be submitted to biblical authority, and to the fact that her tradition "makes void" the Word of God in vital issues such as the nature of worship and that fact that there is no biblical basis for differentiating between *latria* and *dulia* as Rome does.

**In fact, it was these very blog statements that caused me to wonder what kind of scholarship AOMIN was using. It was indeed a very odd type. Seemingly the people that follow James White, I've tended to dub WHITE-CRONIES(due to their disdain of the title WHITEHEAD) have almost ALL adopted this silly argumentation. I have seen individuals from James Swan to another follower of his that seemingly has a great veneration for Turretin that is a blogger for James White all adopt such argumentation. I seriously do not think that these individuals have any clue whatsoever as to what James White is truly claiming. The White-cronies parrot Mr. White nearly word for word when you attempt to dialogue with them. I must be clear, not all Protestants hold to this level of argumentation. There are numerous Biblical scholars that don't even understand such a false type of verbiage.**

**I thought it would be necessary to have a dialogue with Mr. White. I figured that my dialogue would help Mr. White's people as well as Catholics better understand why it was so fallacious. I thought that calling in to his show would help allow us to use Scripture to be able to get down to the issues at hand. James White had previously notified me before that he would hold a slot open for me to call in so that we could speak. He claimed that he was going to be able to definitively prove to me that Catholics worship Mary. I was definitely interested in calling in now!**

**the Encounter with James White of Alpha and Omega Ministries.**

**On November the 4th of 2008 I decided that I was going to call in on the Dividing**

**Line to have a conversation with Mr. White. Our conversation would have to do with him presenting me with evidence that Catholics worship Mary. Mr. White's only contention was that since Catholics bow to Mary that this must entail that latria is being offered towards her. Now that we have gotten passed the charges made by Mr. White above and the definition of the terms by the Catholic Church we will now cover more of the claims that are being made by Mr. White.**

**As we went on in our conversation Mr. White implied that Patrick Madrid simply did not touch upon his arguments in their debate on the Veneration of the Saints. I was very familiar with the debate, having listened to it nearly 7 times already. I thought that Madrid was very well aware that the Greek terms *douleia* and *latreia* were different words used in different contexts at times. James White simply would not accept this, clearly objecting by resorting to the fact that when *Dulia* is offered to a human being or to a "roman centurion" then it's simply fine, but Catholics cannot say we are offering *dulia* towards Mary because it's in a RELIGIOUS context and this form of *Dulia* equals to worship. This is an odd argument.**

**It's also an argument that I presented to Mr. White on the Dividing Line show, an argument he clearly didn't get. I will reiterate the argument here.**

James White, in his debate against Patrick Madrid, and also in his interview with me, claimed that the bowing given to a centurion was perfectly fine because it was not in a religious context.

This setup allowed me to parallel a Catholic bowing before a representation of Mary.

It allowed me to parallel the comment to us bowing before a representation of Mary. The bowing goes to Mary and is a form of respect. That is it.

Similar to the bowing that a soldier gives to a his higher authority because the higher authority deserves that honor.

Mary similarly is closer to GOD than we are and has achieved that crown that we strive to one day also achieve.

This is why we honor her.

Mary also, like that centurion was a HUMAN, not a GOD. That is the plain and simple fact. Mary is NOT the EXACT same thing as a Roman Centurion, but BOTH are creatures of GOD and BOTH are deserving of HONOR and RESPECT.

We bow to her and respect and honor and acknowledge the beauty of GOD's creation. Not in the statue itself, but the honor goes to Mary which ultimately goes to GOD.

Mary and the Centurion were BOTH human beings. Yet Mr. White has claimed that bowing before a centurion is completely fine because it's not in a religious context. Mr. White has set himself up as the judge of what is fine and what is not fine. In Mr. White's eyes, bowing down before any human being in a form of respect is simply not wrong, UNLESS..the person is Mary(or any other glorified saint). Why is this so?

Because Mr. White believes that if a Catholic offers this form of service to Mary that it's in a religious context therefore making this a form of worship. We would have to wonder if Mr. White would object to such Biblical passages listed below.

## **Joshua 5:14 (New International Version)**

[New International Version](#) (NIV)

Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by [International Bible Society](#)

[http://www.biblegateway.com/bg\\_versions/bgclick.php?what=22](http://www.biblegateway.com/bg_versions/bgclick.php?what=22)14 "Neither," he replied, "but as commander of the army of the LORD I have now come." Then Joshua fell facedown to the ground in reverence, and asked him, "What message does my Lord <sup>[a]</sup> have for his servant?"

## **1 Chronicles 29:20 (New International Version)**

[New International Version](#) (NIV)

Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by [International Bible Society](#)

[http://www.biblegateway.com/bg\\_versions/bgclick.php?what=22](http://www.biblegateway.com/bg_versions/bgclick.php?what=22)20 Then David said to the whole assembly, "Praise the LORD your God." So they all praised the LORD, the God of their fathers; they bowed low and fell prostrate before the LORD and the king

**FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT DULIA and LATRIA ARE TWO DISTINCT WORDS, USED DIFFERENTLY AT TIMES. SURE DULIA IS AND SHOULD ALWAYS BE RENDERED TO GOD BUT IT'S ALSO SHOWN AS BEING RENDERED ELSEWHERE IN REFERENCES THAT ARE NOT DIRECTED TOWARDS GOD.**

**LATRIA IS NEVER SHOWN AS PROPER TOWARDS ANYONE OTHER THAN GOD, THAT IS CLEAR. BUT DULIA IS DIFFERENT, OF COURSE IT SHOULD BE RENDERED TO GOD, IT'S SERVICE AND WE ARE TO OBEY AND SERVE OUR GOD. THAT IS CLEAR.**

***But NOT that clear to some individuals as we can tell***

## **a RELIGIOUS CONTEXT?**

**The error Mr. White makes is when he claims that certain words are in a "RELIGIOUS" context ONLY when he thinks they are. So for Mr. White, to BOW down before a person is NEVER in a religious context, unless you are specifically told that worship is being directed to the individuals. We would agree as the Apostles agreed. Bowing down and offering worship to a mere**

**man is NOT acceptable. But clearly NOT all bowing down with the intention of giving honor and respect is tantamount to worship. But in Mr. White's mind he seemingly doesn't have a good grasp of Biblical terms. Instead of slinging his "religious" context around, Mr. White should say that BOWING down before a human is NEVER USED in a WORSHIP context that is acceptable. That would correct. Otherwise you have yourself making a fallacious argument.**

In fact, Mr. White goes as far as to say (in our DL conversation--25 minutes into the show)

"..in a NON-religious context *proskuneo* could be used of something that was not worship.."

Then Mr. White immediately says,

"..however *proskuneo* when it is used in a RELIGIOUS context always DOES mean worship..."

So in Mr. White's mind, offering respect to a person cannot be in a religious context because that would be tantamount to saying that you are worshipping that individual.

Mr. White's false argument fails immediately upon examination of the Biblical Greek.

1 Chronicles 29:20 reads

20 Then David said to the whole assembly, "Praise the LORD your God." So they all praised the LORD, the God of their fathers; they bowed low and fell prostrate before the LORD and the king

**and in the Greek it is rendered**

**1 Chronicles 29:20** καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ πᾶσιν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εὐλογήσατε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν καὶ εὐλόγησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία κύριον τὸν θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν καὶ κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνησαν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ

**We must give careful attention to the Greek word προσεκύνησαν**

**This being the 3rd person plural form of προσκυνέω**

*προσκυνέω* (fall down and) worship, do obeisance to, prostrate oneself before, do reverence to, welcome respectfully depending on the object

English=PROSKUNEO

What is most interesting about this passage is the clear evidence that the whole assembly falls to bow and worship GOD, but they also bow and reverence the KING

Mr. White would not be able to contend that PROSKUNEO is NEVER offered to ANYONE in a RELIGIOUS context. We would agree that PROSKUNEO is never given to mankind in a

WORSHIP sense, EVER. But to claim that all religious contexts in the Bible deal with worship is just plain silly.

**This IS a religious context and the people are NOT worshipping the KING in any sense whatsoever.**

They bow down before GOD and offer respect to the king. It doesn't get MORE religious than this, context wise.

We must remember Mr. White's words

**"..however proskuneo when it is used in a RELIGIOUS context always DOES mean worship..."**

**The reason Mr. White has to set up this false interpretation of Biblical words is because it then allows him to say that DULIA IS indeed used towards mankind, but NEVER in a religious context.**

**What Mr. White means to say, is that DULIA is NEVER used towards mankind in a WORSHIP context as it is of GOD in the OT. We would NOT argue with that, we DO NOT contend that we give the RELIGIOUS DULIA to Mary that amounts to worship.**

**Mr. White's word games can confuse some, but once examined they seem anything but serious. They're silly little word games that attempt to confuse the mind of the individual.**

**For example, take this fictional scenario.**

**Person A.: You worship Mary, cause there is no Biblical distinction between LATRIA and DULIA**

**Person B.: Huh? Uhm, DULIA is used towards mankind, how could you say that there is NO distinction?**

**Person A.: Yeah! It is, but it's NEVER used towards mankind in a RELIGIOUS context and you give to Mary in a religious context**

**Person B. I don't get it...the Bible shows it's used and acceptable at times towards mere human beings. Latria and Dulia are different**

**Person A.: NO! Both have the same root word, and whenever DULIA is used in religious contexts it's ALWAYS worship! So you worship Mary**

**Person B.: But who are you to say one usage is a RELIGIOUS context and the other isn't? The fact is that DULIA is used at times towards worship when directed to GOD but at times it does NOT mean worship at all!**

**Person A.: I'm a reformed theologian! So I say that anytime DULIA is used towards mankind it CANNOT be a religious context. Therefore since bowing before a statue of Mary IS in a religious context, you are**

**WORSHIPING her!**

**Person B.: Does any Church Father or Greek Dictionary or Lexicon support your view?**

**Person A.: What an amazing question! I will ask you! Does any NOT support me?!**

**This is the level of silliness that such verbiage has lead some sincere hearted individuals who, not knowing better, seemingly cut and paste this argument.**

**The reality is that this argument cannot be found in any individual before John Calvin, the founder of the religious system of Calvinism.**

***John Calvin surely must not have taken the Early Church into consideration when he made such a false argument. In fact, we must question if Calvin even cared what the Early Church thought about the distinction of Latria and Dulia. John Calvin was famous for his rejection of the Ignatian epistles(Ignatius of Antioch (d. c.107), bishop and martyr. Of Syrian origin, Ignatius became bishop of Antioch c.69.) claiming that all of them were spurious due to their Catholic doctrines that were so clearly taught within them.***

-----

**LatriaDuliaLatriaDuliaLatriaDuliaLatriaDulia**

**Nevertheless as I further dialogued with Mr. White, I was able to ask him if he could provide a few things for me. It should have been a simple task for Mr. White**

**I asked him if he could give me ONE Greek Lexicon that showed me that his argument even existed. It should have been easy to find one of the Lexicons Mr. White has used so often for his debates.**

**Mr. White's comment:(laugh)(laugh)**

**"Give me one Lexicon that says what YOU are affirming!"**

I guess we can give Mr. White just that. What's more. We'll give Mr. White the Early Church, we'll give Mr. White Greek Dictionaries, and we'll give Mr. White Greek Lexicons

## Friberg Lexicon

7163 δουλεύω fut. δουλεύσω; 1aor. ἐδούλευσα; pf. δεδούλευκα; (1) of relationship *be a slave, be subjected* ([JN 8.33](#)); (2) of action or behavior *perform the duties of a slave, serve, obey* ([MT 6.24](#)); (3) figuratively, of spiritual service to God *serve, obey* ([AC 20.19](#)); of spiritual or moral enslavement to sin, appetites, etc. *be a slave to, be controlled by* ([RO 6.6](#))

## Barclay and Newman Greek to English Dictionary

1665 δουλεία , ας f slavery; δουλείας ἔνοχος enslaved ([He 2.15](#))

1666 δουλεύω serve (as a slave); be a slave, be enslaved

## Louw and Nida

1665 δουλεία , ας f slavery; δουλείας ἔνοχος enslaved ([He 2.15](#))

1666 δουλεύω serve (as a slave); be a slave, be enslaved

## Liddell and Scott Lexicon

11078 δουλεύω

δουλεύω, f. σω, (δοῦλος) *to be a slave*, τινί to one, Plat., etc.; παρά τινι Dem.; c. acc. cogn., δουλείαν δ.

## Thayer's Greek Lexicon

1475 δουλεύω

δουλεύω; future δουλεύσω; 1 aorist ἐδούλευσα; perfect δεδούλευκά; (δοῦλος); the Septuagint for **טַבַּעַ**;

1. properly, *to be a slave, serve, do service*: absolutely, [Eph. 6:7](#); [1 Tim. 6:2](#); τίνι [Matt. 6:24](#); [Luke 16:13](#); [Rom. 9:12](#); said of nations in subjection to other nations, [John 8:33](#); [Acts 7:7](#); men are said δουλεύειν who bear the yoke of the Mosaic law, [Gal. 4:25](#) (see δουλεία).

2. metaphorically, *to obey, submit to*; a. in a good sense: absolutely, *to yield obedience*, [Rom. 7:6](#); τίνι, *to obey one's commands and render to him the services due*, [Luke 15:29](#); God: [Matt. 6:24](#); [Luke 16:13](#); [1 Thess. 1:9](#); κυρίῳ and τῷ κυρίῳ, [Acts 20:19](#); [Rom. 12:11](#) (not Rec. <sup>st</sup>, see below); [Eph. 6:7](#); Christ: [Rom. 14:18](#); [Col. 3:24](#); νόμῳ Θεοῦ, according to the context, *feel myself bound to*, [Rom. 7:25](#); τοῖς θεοῖς, to worship gods, [Gal. 4:8](#); τῷ καιρῷ (Anth. 9, 441, 6), wisely

adapt oneself to, [Rom. 12:11](#) Rec.<sup>st</sup> (see above), cf. Fritzsche at the passage; perform services of kindness and Christian love: ἀλλήλοις,

## BDAG

### 087 δουλεύω

\* δουλεύω fut. δουλεύσω; 1 aor. ἐδούλευσα; pf. δεδούλευκα **J 8:33**, ptc. δεδουλευκώς 2 Cl 17:7 (Aeschyl., Hdt.+; the basic diff. between master and slave is stated Aeschyl., Pr. 927).

#### 1. to be owned by another, *be a slave, be subjected*

a. lit., of Hagar and Jerusalem **Gal 4:25**. τινί *to someone* (Jos., Ant. 4, 115.--C. Ap. 2, 128 the Egyptians claim τὸ μηδενὶ δουλεύσαι. Likew. in Appian, Bell. Civ. 4, 67 §286 the Rhodians are proud ἔνεκα τύχης ἐς τὸ νῦν ἀδουλώτου; Diod. S. 5, 15, 3 the Iolaë of Sardinia have maintained their freedom ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα ... μέχρι τοῦ νῦν; in 5, 15, 4 even the Carthaginians οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν [αὐτοῦς] ... καταδουλώσασθαι) **J 8:33**; **Ac 7:7** ([Gen 15:14](#)); **Ro 9:12**; B 13:2 (both [Gen 25:23](#); cp. Jos., Ant. 1, 275); 13:5 (Gen 48:19 altered after 25:23); 1 Cl 31:4 (Jacob by Laban [Gen 29:15, 20]; cp. Just., D. 134, 3).

b. in imagery: of a change in masters **Ro 7:6**.

#### 2. to act or conduct oneself as one in total service to another, *perform the duties of a slave, serve, obey*.

a. be in service to personal beings

α. to humans, w. dat. of pers. (PHal 1, 219 [III BC] ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ Ἀλεξανδρεὶ μὴ δουλεύετω) **Mt 6:24**; **Lk 16:13**; 2 Cl 6:1 (on being a slave to more than one master s. Billerb. on Mt 6:24; Mitt-Wilck. I/2, 203 II, 13f; 206, 16ff). τοσαῦτα ἔτη δ. σοι *I have slaved for you so many years* **Lk 15:29**, a statement about toil rather than actual status (cp. [Gen 31:41](#)). Abs. ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ 2 Cl 11:1; μᾶλλον δ. *let them be all the better slaves* **1 Ti 6:2**; πλέον δ. IPol 4:3. On **Eph 6:7**, see β. Fig., of loving service ἀλλήλοις **Gal 5:13**. δίκαιον εἶ δουλεύοντα πόλλοις 1 Cl 16:12 (Is 53:11).

β. to transcendent beings, esp. in expressions relating to God or Jesus Christ as recipients of undivided allegiance, for, as indicated in α, a slave can take orders from only one master δ. τῷ θεῷ *serve God*, where God is thought of as κύριος, and a human as δοῦλος (Eur., Or. 418; [Ex 23:33](#); Philo, Cher. 107, Somn. 2, 100; Jos., Ant. 7, 367; 8, 257; SibOr 3, 740; Orig., C. Cels. 8, 8, 17; cp. τοῖ κτισθεῖσιν ἀντὶ θεοῦ 3, 15, 17): **Mt 6:24**; **Lk 16:13** (on both cp. Sextus 574 οὐκ ἔστιν ἅμα δουλεύειν ἡδονῇ κ. θεῷ); **1 Th 1:9**; 2 Cl 11:1; 17:7; Pol 2:1 ([Ps 2:11](#)); 6:3; MPol 9:3; Hm 8:6; 12, 6, 2; s 4:2; Dg 2:5 τῷ δημιουργῷ; 1 Cl 26:1. τῷ Χριστῷ **Ro 14:18**; cp. **16:18**; **Col 3:24**; abs. μετ' εὐνοίας δ. *render service* (to your masters) w. *good will* **Eph 6:7** (through wordplay Jesus Christ, as κύριος, is here viewed as the ultimate recipient of the slave's service); τῷ κυρίῳ ([Judg 2:7](#); [1 Km 7:4](#); [12:20](#)) **Ac 20:19**; **Ro 12:11** (v.l. τῷ καιρῷ.--δ. τῷ καιρῷ means 'accommodate oneself to the occasion' [Plut., Arat. 1047 [43, 2]; Pallad.: Anth. Pal. 9, 441; Procop. Soph., Ep. 113 H. δουλεύειν τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ πείθεσθαι τῷ καιρῷ. The contrast is with πράττειν ὅσα τις βούλεται, or Herodas 2, 9f: ζῶμεν οὐχ ὡς βουλόμεσθ', ἀλλ' ὡς ἡμέας ὁ καιρὸς ἔλκει], and can have the unfavorable connotation 'be an opportunist'; for this reason it is expressly rejected for this pass. by Athanas., Origen-Rufinus, and Jerome, but they may be interested in sanitizing the text. S. Ltzm. ad loc.); Hv 4, 2, 5; s 1:7; 4:5ff; 6, 3, 6; 8, 6, 2; the Holy Spirit 5, 6, 5; 7; elements or elemental spirits **Gal 4:9**, cp. vs. 8 (in a relig. sense also PGM 13, 72

κύριε, δουλεύω ὑπὸ τὸν σὸν κόσμον τῷ σῷ ἀγγέλῳ; lesser divinities [δαίμονες] Just., D. 83, 4; Tat. 17, 3).

## Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church

*Latria*=

As contrasted with *dulia*, that fullness of Divine worship which may be paid to God alone

## What does St. Augustine have to say on the Distinction between Latreia and Douleia?

The City of God (Book X)

### Chapter 1

For this is the worship which is due to the Divinity, or, to speak more accurately, to the Deity; and, to express this worship in a single word as there does not occur to me any Latin term sufficiently exact, I shall avail myself, whenever necessary, of a Greek word. Λατρεία, whenever it occurs in Scripture, is rendered by the word service. But that service which is due to [men](#), and in reference to which the apostle writes that servants must be subject to their own masters, [Ephesians 6:5](#) (uses douloi) is usually designated by another word in Greek, whereas the service which is paid to God alone by worship, is always, or almost always, called λατρεία in the usage of those who wrote from the divine oracles.

**Covering the details once more, the claim put before us is that in a RELIGIOUS context, latria and dulia have no biblical distinction.**

**Mr. White really means that when used in a worship context that latria and dulia are not distinct. But to claim that in a RELIGIOUS context that such terms have no distinction simply does not hold water, and we will examine a few Biblical passages below that are clearly in a religious context and in which we have Mr. White contradicted by Holy Writ.**

### Galatians 5:13-14

13You, my brothers, were called to be free. But do not use your freedom to indulge the sinful nature<sup>[a]</sup>; rather, serve one another in love. 14The entire law is summed

**up in a single command: "Love your neighbor as yourself."**

This passage is quite clear, SERVE one another in LOVE.

δουλεύετε **is the Greek term being used here, and it is the** 2nd person plural from δουλεύω

**Douleuo can and IS used in a RELIGIOUS context when it's referring to the WORSHIP of GOD but in such passages as these, where the strict order to SERVE your fellow Christians in Christ is given we must also yield to the fact that such a religious context is ever so present.**

**We are to SERVE one another in love.**

**Is the service given to Mary WORSHIP then? All we are doing is admiring GOD's creation. It is GOD that we have given our hearts over to. Therefore it is proper to SERVE God's creation in LOVE.**

**It is a Biblical concept that cannot be escaped.**

**The argument put forth by Mr. White is fallacious on many grounds as we have already seen.**

***It is quite suspect that not a single Church Father that was proficient in Greek or Hebrew or even Latin for that matter, would agree with Mr. White's interpretation of Latria and Dulia !***

**There is not a single Father, Greek theologian, Greek Lexicon, Greek Dictionary, or even heretic that would back up Mr. White's outlandish claim!**

**It was something that I was able to realize upon closer of examination of Mr. White's words. He clearly wants the Catholic to use DULIA in his own parameters of what "RELIGIOUS" means. So for example, when I used the Biblical passage of ACTS 7:7 which uses the Greek term δουλεύωσιν he simply objects that this Biblical passage is in reference to a "RELIGIOUS" context because the ISRAELITES were NOT worshipping the EGYPTIANS.**

**Mr. White simply didn't understand why I used this passage.**

**Acts 7:7 is yet ANOTHER clear distinction that the terms of latria and dulia**

are used in different contexts and CAN be rendered to mere man. And as we have seen above, his false "religious" context doesn't hold water. The terms are ALSO used in very religious contexts(yes DULIA which Mr. White claims is NEVER used in a religious context absolutely is), particularly of ORDERING us to SERVE our brethren in LOVE.

**LOVE is a very important aspect in the Bible as we will briefly examine below**

### **Matthew 22:36-40**

36"Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the Law?" 37Jesus replied: " **Love** the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.<sup>[a]</sup> 38This is the first and greatest commandment. 39And the second is like it: **Love** your neighbor as yourself.<sup>[b]</sup> 40All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments."

### **Romans 13:9-10**

9The commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not murder," "Do not steal," "Do not covet,"<sup>[a]</sup> and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: "**Love** your neighbor as yourself."<sup>[b]</sup> 10**Love** does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore **love** is the fulfillment of the law.

### **Galatians 5:6**

6For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision has any value. The only thing that matters is faith working through **love**.

**----->The usage of DULIA in a religious context does NOT equal that of worship <-----**

**I must be completely honest, upon first hearing this argumentation I sat down and I began to try and understand where Mr. White was coming from.**

**Upon listening to his debates over and over and reading his articles I finally understood completely what he was attempting to say. Which is quite unfortunate. I would have not expected such amazing blunders to come from a man of Mr. White's stature. It seems as if Mr. White's arguments have even baffled the Orthodox.**

**In order to see if our Orthodox brethren understood the silliness and absurdity of this argument, I contacted**

**Father Steven P. Tsichlis, a Greek Orthodox Priest who has a Masters of Divinity from**

**the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology and who is fluent in Greek.**

**I asked Father Steven if he understood the logic of such a distinction and he had this to say:**

"Dear William, I'm not exactly certain what is meant by saying that "in Greek, *dulia* and *latria* have no DIVINE distinction." You are quite right: this is indeed "odd." However, what I can say is that in Greek Orthodox theology there is a clear distinction drawn between *latreia*, a word reserved for the worship of God alone and *douleia*, a term often translated as "veneration" in English, and reserved to describe our relationship with the saints.

...Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians worship the one true and living God and not the saints. Period."

I don't blame Father Steven. Having known Greek nearly his whole life and using it each and every single day in and out of his worship he could not fathom such an argument. It simply was not logical to ask that question.(I COPIED AND PASTED White's EXACT argument WORD for WORD so as to NOT misrepresent him)

**Father Steven, of course, is absolutely correct. As we can see the Greek Dictionaries, the Greek Lexicons, the Greek Fathers, or ANYTHING else Greek you wanna toss in to the mix would not substantiate the false argument that Mr. White has adopted from John Calvin.**

**The cold hard facts are there.**

**The Bible distinguishes between LATRIA and between DULIA.**

**DULIA can and IS and always SHOULD be used in a WORSHIP context when referring to GOD**

**Latria NO DOUBT is to be directed to GOD and GOD alone.**

**But DULIA is also shown as being proper towards mankind. Even if one sets up the false parameters of a "RELIGIOUS context", DULIA is STILL offered to man.**

**Unfortunately for Mr. White, he will need a new line of argumentation. He will now need to try and either answer away the Biblical passages presented before him, or he will need to prove that bowing before Mary and giving her honor and respect as the MOTHER of our GOD is improper.**

**If bowing before a representation of our Holy THEOTOKOS, of whom ultimately this respect goes towards Mary and not the marble or plaster of the statue , is wrong then we must ask why bowing before a centurion is proper.**

**Will we still hear that it was "NOT In a RELIGIOUS context!" How could we? We've already shown PROSKUNEO and DULIA both used in religious contexts when referring to mankind. Not given to them as WORSHIP, but yes used towards them in a RELIGIOUS context.**

**Will Mr. White now begin to assume that no matter what, all of this ultimately STILL is idolatry because we offer prayers towards Mary?**

**If Mr. White were to take up such an argument he would have the burden of proof laid upon his shoulders to prove that the Body of Christ is cut off after the Saints enter their eternal rest in CHRIST in heaven.**

**Until then, I believe it is safe to say that this little argument has been put to rest. Once again the Catholic faith has been affirmed from the Scriptures and from the Early Church's testimony.**

**This is the faith that Jesus Christ left us**

**This is the faith of our Fathers**

**This is the Catholic Church**

**καθολικός**

**-End**