

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

ARCHBISHOP LYONS'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—IX.

On pages 32-4, his Grace takes the negative side of the question, "Does the Church of Rome suppress the second commandment?" His reasoning here, as in many other parts of his work, is extremely confused. He says (page 32), "All agree, both Protestant and Catholic, that the commandments are ten in number, but they don't agree in the division of them." Bad composition again, your Grace. You speak of two parties. It is, therefore, quite correct to use the word "both." But "all" is used in speaking of more than two. In writing, such contractions as "don't," should not be used. But to go on. He says, "The Catholics divide the commandments according to the sense or object of each, for instance the first commandment concerns the worship of God: of this commandment the Protestants make two, the Catholics only one. The second forbids to profane the holy name of God, etc.; this the Protestants say is the third, the Catholics hold that it is the second." On page 33, he says, "The Catholics therefore do not suppress the second commandment, but truly say, that it is comprised in the first, namely, 'Thou shalt not have strange Gods before Me, thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing,' etc. Here it is evident the worship of the true God is intended and the worship of false gods prohibited, and the making of images for the purpose of adoration." His Grace thinks that only the first commandment refers to the worship of God. Instead of that, every one belonging to the first table does so. The first refers to the *object* of worship, the second to the *manner*, the third to the *spirit*, and the fourth to the *time* of the worship of that object. The first commandment forbids us to worship any god but the God of the Bible—Jehovah. This, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants believe. The second forbids us to worship images. These images are clearly not of false gods, because the worship of the gods themselves is forbidden in the first. If we be forbidden to worship certain gods, we are, as a matter of course, forbidden to worship their images. The second commandment, therefore, forbids the worship of images of the true God. The two are perfectly distinct from each other. We can worship false gods without making images of them. Yea, we can believe in their being, without worshipping them, as do the Hindoos in the case of their supreme God Brahm. We can worship the true God by images. The calf which Aaron made, and those which Jeroboam made, were meant for emblems of the true God. Neither Aaron nor Jeroboam ever meant them to be used in the worship of false gods. They sinned not against the *first* commandment, but against the *second*. The latter is, therefore, not included in the former, but is wholly separate from it. The excuse which Romanists make for worshipping "sacred images," that they do so, only out of respect to those whom they represent, is of no force whatever, for God in the second commandment most plainly forbids us to do any bodily act of homage to them. It is a very remarkable fact that though the Romish Church has not yet dared to blot the second commandment out of the Bible, she never—or at the most in extremely few cases—takes any notice of it in her Catechisms, even as forming part of the first. These are used by her people unspeakably more than the Bible is. The plea of not wishing to burden the memory is of no force. She states at great length in these Catechisms many things not taught in Scripture.

Rome's treatment of the second commandment gives us—according to our view—only nine. But she believes there are ten in all. How then does she get the tenth? She makes two of our tenth. His Grace says that she does so "because the coveting of a wife is a different object from the coveting of a house, an ox, an ass, for Christ has said 'the coveting of thy neighbor's wife is equal to adultery' (Matt. v. 28). In the book of Deuteronomy, 5th chap., when the commandments are again enumerated, the coveting of a wife is put before the coveting of the house, the ox, and the ass. The Protestants by making one commandment of our ninth and tenth, falsely make the coveting of the wife, the house, the ox, and ass, the same or equal sin." When his Grace says that the coveting of a wife is a different "object" from the coveting of a house, etc., he means "sin," but he says so in a very clumsy

way. Christ does not say what the Archbishop here represents Him as saying. In Matt. v. 28, He says, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Under the Old Testament, God was pleased to permit polygamy. Consequently, a man could then wish to take his neighbor's wife and make her his own, without being guilty of adultery. The tenth commandment is directed against covetousness. Coveting one's neighbor's wife, his house, his ox, or his ass, are not different sins—as his Grace thinks—but only different forms of the same sin. The different things mentioned are merely specimens. "From one learn all." God mentions merely such things as a people like the Israelites, who were chiefly tillers of the ground were most apt to covet. The fact that a wife is first mentioned in the tenth commandment as we find it in Deuteronomy, helps the Archbishop nothing. If he interpret Exodus xx. by Deuteronomy v., we have the same right to interpret the latter by the former. Yea, we have a better. In Exodus xx., we have the commandments as they were written with the finger of God on stone. These were given the Israelites as members of the human family. In Deuteronomy v., we have them as they were given the Israelites as such. I have not space to point out the difference between the two passages, which, however, is not an essential one. In Leviticus xix. 2, God says, "Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father." Here, the mother is the first mentioned. Surely, his Grace would not infer from this, that it is a higher duty to fear or reverence one's mother, than it is to fear or reverence one's father. The fact that coveting a wife is not the first, but the second thing specified in the tenth commandment in Exodus xx., is a clear proof that it is a form of the same sin as coveting a house, etc. If coveting one's neighbor's wife be adultery, on the same principle, coveting his house, his ox, or his ass is theft. It follows then, that God has in two instances, given two commandments against the same sin. Let us then put the Romish ninth commandment into the seventh, and the tenth into the eighth. We have thus, only eight commandments. But following out the principle laid down by his Grace when he says that coveting one's wife is adultery, I now proceed to show that there is but one commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." (1) To have other gods before the true God is to rob Him. "Will a man rob God?" (Mal. iii. 8). (2) The second—according to his Grace—is included in the first. (3) To take God's name in vain is to rob Him. (4) To profane the Sabbath is to rob Him. (5) To treat one's father and mother disrespectfully is to rob them. (6) To take man's life unjustly is to rob him. (7) Adultery is a form of robbery. (8) To bear false witness against one's neighbor is to rob him. (9) The truth—as I have already shown—is included partly in the seventh, and partly in the eighth. The expression, "the same or equal sin," in the extract above given, is not a correct one. It should be, "the same sin, or equal sins." The "learned prelate" is quite orthodox when he says that the second commandment does not forbid "the making of images except for the purpose of adoration," using the last word in the Protestant sense. He says (pages 33-4), that the Queen of England has a remarkable devotion to her late husband, and takes great pleasure in exhibiting him to the love and veneration of her English subjects. Does she exhibit his dead body? Why speak of her *English* subjects? Does she think that her Scotch and Irish subjects do not revere his memory? But to go on. His Grace adds, "When his statue is unveiled, the people uncover their heads to express their esteem, and give loud hurrahs. It is not to the marble or bronze the honor is given, but to the Prince and Queen. Are religious people to be blamed and called idolaters when they express their esteem for Christ and His saints, by an occasional bow of the head?" It is considered to be "in bad taste" to hurrah for the dead. I once heard three cheers given for Lord Metcalfe after his death. This was done at a political meeting in Toronto. It was "not the correct thing." When a toast is drunk to the memory of the dead, it is drunk in "solemn silence." But even if hurrahing were quite proper in such a case as the one which his Grace mentions, he would not approve of it as a way of expressing reverence for Christ and the saints. But he thinks that if people be allowed to hurrah on such an occasion, and for such an object as those referred to, Christians should not be found fault with when they express their reverence for Christ and the saints by an occasional bow of

the head. What does he mean by an "occasional bow of the head?" Is it a bow of the head when one hears the name of Christ, or a saint uttered? Many bow the head when they hear the name of "Jesus" uttered in worship, though they take no notice of any other of His names, as "Christ," or "Emmanuel." But it is plain from the context that his Grace refers to "sacred images." Here, he represents the adoration of these as a very small matter—only occasionally bowing the head to them. He says nothing about bowing the knee, prostration, kissing, embracing, or burning candles or incense, to or before them. But God forbids us even to merely bow the head to them. That should be enough for us.

In my next paper I shall review what the highest Roman Catholic clergyman in Toronto says on the kindred subject of relic-worship. Several of his remarks thereon are very droll ones. T. F.

Metis, Que.

THE AIM OF THE SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHER IN HIS CLASS.

NOTES OF AN ADDRESS GIVEN TO THE OTTAWA SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHERS' NORMAL CLASS.

We cannot properly understand the aim of the Sabbath School teacher without having some clear idea about his office, and the material on which he has to work. We must, therefore, briefly state our position regarding these.

Workers in the Church of Christ may be divided into two classes, those who attend to the spiritual interests and those who attend to the temporal well-being of the Church, a distinction maintained in the two great classes of office-bearers in the Presbyterian Church, elders and deacons. Sabbath School teachers come under the class of those who are concerned with the spiritual interests of the Church: they may therefore find their place and work in Eph. iv. 11, 12. Just as ministers are pastors or shepherds, to bring the wandering sheep into the fold and to feed those that are within, Sabbath School teachers are under-shepherds to assist ministers and elders, especially in gathering and feeding the lambs.

Their work is with the children, as the work of ministers and elders is with all the flock: they do not supplant, but only assist the ordained office-bearers; and they do not interfere with the duty or work of parents any more than the minister does when in the full discharge of his labors.

Now the children—the material on which they have to work, the young of the flock with which as under-shepherds they have to do—are not all the same. Some are believers, some are not. There are children in whom, from earliest years, the prayers of their Christian parents have been answered. Dedicated to God in baptism, they have in answer to the faith and prayers of their parents been quickened by the Holy Ghost. Christ says "Feed My lambs;" there are lambs within the fold; and such we have among our Sabbath School pupils, children who, like Timothy, have been instructed in the faith of mother and of grandmother, and have been nourished from early childhood by the Word. These must be considered, and in the Sabbath School must receive appropriate food, that in due time they may be strong to witness a good confession for Christ.

There are others, again, among the children who do not thus trust and love Christ. Our first object with these is to lead them to trust Christ. Our work in the Sabbath School, so far as it affects these, should not be merely prospective, looking forward to some future day when they may be sufficiently informed and matured to put in practice the faith about which we now instruct them; it should have the direct and present purpose of leading them to trust Him now.

This division of the members of the Sabbath School into the believing and unbelieving is similar to that of the members of the congregation. But would it not be well to separate these two classes, that some teachers might specially direct their attention to the work of winning the unbelieving, and others to the work of building up the young believers? No: such division cannot be made either in the Sabbath School or in the general congregation, because the presence and influence of the believing may be very powerful in influencing the others; and, moreover, we could not make such a division with absolute accuracy on account of our inability to read the heart; and unless the division were absolutely accurate, the union of the two classes would still continue.

The work of the pastor contemplates both these