

## A TIMELY PAPER.

## DOES THE CATHOLIC CHURCH SUPPRESS THE SECOND COMMANDMENT?

[Published by the Catholic Truth Society of London, England.]

One of the charges most commonly made against the Catholic Church in Protestant countries—and that not by ignorant persons only, but often by writers who have some reputation for candour and learning,—is, that she encourages amongst her adherents an idolatrous use and "worship" of holy images, such as is plainly "forbidden in the Second Commandment"; and that, conscious of such image-worship being anti-Scriptural, she is guilty of "totally suppressing" that Commandment in most of her popular works of instruction; and—in order to preserve the number of the prohibitions in the Decalogue—of "splitting the Tenth into two separate commandments."

Before giving a direct answer to the Protestant charge that the Catholic Church "suppresses the Second Commandment,"—i.e., the words "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," etc., it is necessary to call attention to the following facts:—

1. That in the original Old Testament Scriptures there is no mention of the "Ten Commandments" at all, but merely of the "Ten Words" delivered to Moses.

2. That the original Hebrew had no division of these "Ten Words," and that many eminent Jewish authorities—e.g., Jonathan ben Uzziel, Maimonides, Aben Ezra, and Moses ben Nachman,—retain the combination of what Protestants call the First and Second Commandments (and so far sanction the Catholic division), but regard as the first "Word" the opening declaration:—"I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

3. That the reason why Catholics regard the Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," as distinct from that which forbids the coveting of his goods, is simply this:—That as the Commandment against "stealing" and that against "coveting one's neighbour's goods" distinguish the outward act and the inward desire,—so the Commandments against "adultery" and "coveting one's neighbour's wife" distinguish the outward act and the inward desire. Protestants themselves surely cannot maintain that the sin of coveting a man's ox or ass is similar in kind to the desire of seducing his wife.\*

"The Speaker's Commentary," a standard Protestant work, edited by the present Archbishop of York,—admits (vol. i. p. 337) that the Catholic division of the Commandments was formally advocated by Augustine fifteen centuries ago, and "universally adopted in the Western Church until the Reformation;" also that "it is still retained by the Lutheran as well as the Romish Church." Archdeacon Paley, the well-known Protestant author of a work on the "Evidence of Christianity," in a sermon on Exod. xx. 5 (published in his collected Works) says:—"The First and Second Commandments may be considered as one, inasmuch as they relate to the same subject, or nearly so. For many ages and by many Churches they were put together and considered as one Commandment. The subject to which both relate is false worship, or the worship of false gods.\*\*

In Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary* (p. 196) it is remarked, that the Catholic division has "the whole weight of Rabbinical tradition" on its side; and further, that is "the only one consistent

with the Hebrew text, as usually found in MSS. and printed editions. The text is divided into ten sections, which correspond precisely with our Catholic division. These sections are admitted to be very ancient, older even than the Masoretic text, and the Protestant scholar Kennicott found them so marked in 460 out of 494 MSS. which he collated."

Coming now to the Protestant charge of "suppression," I remark that every Catholic catechism or work of religious instruction which professes to give the commandments at length, contains, of course, the whole of what Protestants are pleased to call the "Second" Commandment. It is quite true, however, that in some small catechisms, intended for young children or very illiterate persons, the words referred to are wholly or partially omitted—and why? Simply because all the Commandments are given in the brief and concise form in which our Lord cited them, St. Matt. xix. 18, 19. St. Mark x. 19; and St. Paul in Rom. xiii. 9; and therefore about images—which are only a part of the First Commandment—are omitted; just in the same way and for the same reason that the sentence, following "Honour thy Father and Mother," and "Remember to keep holy the Seventh day," are also invariably omitted in the small Catechisms.

According to the *Speaker's Commentary* (i. p. 336), Ewald, a learned German Protestant, "supposes that the original Ten Commandments were all in the same terse and simple form of expression as appear in the (Prot.) 1st, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th, such as would be most suitable for recollection, and that passages in each copy (in Exod. and Deut.) in which the most important variations are found, where comments added when the books were written." Be this as it may, Protestants would find it difficult to produce, out of the whole Christian literature of the first 1,500 years, any work of instruction in which the Commandments are given at length, as in the Anglican Catechism. "In those copies of the Commandments," says the *Speaker's Commentary*, "which have been used in different branches of the Church for the instruction of its members, the form has almost always been more or less abbreviated of a part or the whole of those commandments which are the most expanded in Exodus and Deuteronomy."

Many eminent authorities—Protestant as well as Catholic—consider that the latter part of the First Commandment (the Protestant "Second") was, in the letter, intended only for the Jews. The late Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, says:—"The Second Commandment is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation."\* (Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, vol. i. p. 315). And again (vol. ii. p. 405), he writes during his "Tour to Rome and Naples through France and Italy":—"Now for Bourges a little more. In the crypt is a Calvary, and figures as large as life representing the burial of our Lord. The woman who showed us the crypt had her little girl with her; and she lifted up the child, about three years old, to kiss the feet of our Lord. Is this idolatry? Nay, verily it may be so; but it need not be; and assuredly it is in itself right and natural. I confess I rather envied the child. It is not idolatry to bend knee, lip, and heart to every thought and every image of Him, our manifested God!"

It seems very evident that, according to the letter, what Protestants call the "Second" Commandment forbids not only the worshipping, but even the "making" of "any graven image, or the likeness of anything that is in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth." "The Jews," says the *Speaker's Commentary* (p. 331), "have imagined Exod. xx. 4 to be a prohibition of the exercise of the arts of painting and sculpture... Josephus charges Solomon with a breach of the law, on account of the oxen which supported the golden sea, and the lions which adorned his throne (*Antiq.* viii. 7. § 4), and in direct contradiction of Exod. xxxvi. 31, he denies that the veil which

"It is manifest to every thinking person that the fact of the Incarnation is a virtual repeal of the Second Commandment. For in the person of Jesus Christ there was given us an image of God which we might and should represent to ourselves in our own mind; and what our thoughts and minds may lawfully and profitably dwell upon may clearly be no less lawfully and profitably presented to our bodily senses." After arguing the point fully, Dr. Arnold continues thus: "The Bible Society, and other societies of the same kind, can have circulated the Scriptures to little purpose, if the sight of the Cross and the Crucifix would indeed minister to superstition rather than to godliness." (Arnold's *Sermons*, vol. iii. p. 40, note. Quoted in the *Guardian*, Feb. 1, 1868).

concealed the most holy place was ornamented with living creatures" (*Antiq.* iii. 6, § 4). "From the time of the Maccabees," says another Protestant writer, "the Second Commandment was generally understood by the Jews to forbid not only the worship of the likeness of any living thing, but even the making of it. . . . Origen asserts that there was no maker of images among their citizens; neither painter nor sculptor was in their state" (*Adv. Celsum*, iv. 31. See Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 813). It would seem also, from the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others, that some of the early Christian Converts must have adopted this Jewish interpretation of the Commandment. "It appears that most of the Jewish converts would enter the church thoroughly imbued with a dislike of images; and it is probable that many of the heathens would be similarly affected towards them out of mere horror at the idolatry which they had forsaken."

No doubt the early converts from Judaism continued for some time to observe the Jewish Sabbath or "Seventh" day of the week (see Matt. xxiv. 20); and for a much longer period did they regard as still in force the prohibition against "eating blood and things strangled,"—a prohibition which was actually re-enforced by the Apostles in the first Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 20). After a time, the Church, exercising that power of "loosing" which had been given to her by Christ (St. Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18) entirely released the faithful from the obligation of observing these ordinances; and exercising the same power also in regard to the ceremonial part of the First Commandment, she declared that the prohibition of the arts of sculpture and painting was no longer binding on Christians. From the numerous paintings, sarcophagi, &c., discovered in the Catacombs at Rome, it is evident that these arts were exercised by the Christians, under certain necessary restrictions, from a very early period.\* Representations of our Lord as "the Good Shepherd," on the Eucharistic chalice, and mentioned by TERTULLIAN, who wrote at the end of the second century (*De Pudicitia*). It was not, however, until the fourth century,—when heathen persecutions had ceased, and the Christians were at liberty to erect everywhere large and stately churches in honour of God and His Saints,—that pictures and images began to be commonly employed as religious ornaments, and as aids and incentives to Christian piety and devotion.

\* See Northcote and Brownlow's *Roman Sarcophagi*.

## RELIGIOUS NEWS.

A woman's Catholic building has been dedicated by Archbishop Ryan.

There now remain unsold only seventy-five sets of the author's edition of Dr. John Gilmary Shea's "History of the Catholic Church in the United States."

The Marquis of Bute has arranged to address the members of the Scottish Society of Literature and Art in January on "St. Brendan's Miraculous Voyage."

Prince Malatesta, who took part in 1832 with Napoleon in the rising against the Pope in Romagna, has just died as a Trappist at Aiguebelle at the age of 86.

Monsieur Renon, the new bishop of Amiens, has been made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor for chivalrous conduct while acting as chaplain during the Prussian war.

Notwithstanding the vehement Orange opposition to every Catholic candidate for office in Michigan, two Catholics have been elected to Congress, Hon. James Gorman and Hon. Thomas Addis Emmet Weadock.

The Sisters of Good Shepherd, Chicago, have purchased a tract of land 300 feet square at Racine and Seminary avenues, for sixty-five thousand dollars. The site is a superb one, and on it the sisters intend erecting a fine building, the present one being overcrowded.

This is the tercentenary year of the Quarant' Ore or Forty Hours' Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. It was instituted by Pope Clement VIII., whr, by the Bull, "Graves et Diuturnae," of November 25, 1592, established the devotion in perpetuity in the Roman churches.

The Archbishop of Goa has issued a circular letter on sacred music to his clergy. He urges on the parish priests to instruct choir directors that all music which is too long, which savors of opera-

tic and worldly tunes, which contains a mutilated text and disgusting repetitions must be absolutely banished from the churches.

Father Martin, the new general of the Jesuits, is visiting Dublin, Ireland, on business connected with the Jesuits Order.

The "Life and Journalism of Mr. James A. McMaster," is about to be published by Very Rev. Mark S. Cross, of Portland, Oregon.

The silver jubilee of the Episcopal Consecration and the golden jubilee of the ordination of Bishop O'Hara was celebrated this week at Scranton, Pa.

The Most Rev. Dr. Murphy, Archbishop of Hobart, Tasmania, has secured four priests and three postulants of the Presentation Order, who will labor in his diocese.

A Greek priest, Rev. Constantinus Papayani, arrived in New York on last Tuesday, to assume charge of a Greek Catholic Church in that city. He is married and has four children.

Mrs. O'Neill, of Chicago, has deposited \$10,000 to the credit of Archbishop Feehan, on condition that a like sum be raised by friends for the erection of a new church in that city, for the colored people. The Archbishop has headed the subscription list with one thousand dollars.

Baron Ludwig von Weber, a recent convert to the Church, is now studying for the holy priesthood at the celebrated seminary at St. Meinrad, Spencer County, Indiana. After he has completed his divinity studies he will devote himself to the American missions.

The late Admiral Saint Bon, the founder of the modern ironclad navy of Italy was a practical Catholic, and in 1865, when he was a captain in the navy, he refused to fight a duel, publicly announcing that he took this course because he was a Christian and a Catholic.

Pere Bezombes, cure of Pibrac, has been elected Superior General of the French priests of the Sacred Heart, diocesan missionaries, in place of the late Very Rev. Father St. Paul; and Father Irat, his assistant, in place of the late Father Avignon.

Mr. Merwin-Marie Snell, who has for the past three years been private secretary to Right Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., rector of the Catholic University, has resigned his post and assumed the editorship of a new bi-monthly magazine to be called the *Oriental Review*.

If Archbishop Logue be chosen for the next Irish Cardinal, the Catholics of Dublin cannot well complain. The See of Armagh is the oldest of the Irish episcopates; its incumbent is the successor of St. Patrick, and if Dr. Walsh be the primate of Ireland, Dr. Logue is the primate of All Ireland. Then Dublin has had two cardinals already, so that it is only fair that Armagh should be honored now.

A cablegram from Rome to our esteemed contemporary, the *Catholic Times*, says: There is the most profound rejoicing in all circles over the announcement of the official notification of those who will be raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate. The important papers bearing the formal tenders have been sent to the Archbishops of Armagh, Westminster, Rouen, Tours, Cologne, Seville, Ferom, Messina, the Primate of Hungary, Bishop of Preslau, Monseignori Persico and Mocenni, Di Pietro, the Nuncio at Madrid and Galimberti, the Nuncio at Vienna. Congratulatory telegrams and letters have been sent to those so signally favored, and the papers publish many commendatory articles concerning them. The Archbishops or Westminster and Armagh will both come to Rome early in the new year.

Derangement of the liver, without constipation, injures the complexion, induce pimples, sallow skin. Remove the cause by using Carter's Little Liver Pills. One a dose. Try them.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS are the best, cheapest, and the most popular remedies at all seasons, and under all circumstances they may be used with safety and with the certainty of doing good. Eruptions, rashes, and all descriptions of skin diseases, sores, ulcerations and burns are presently benefited and ultimately cured by these healing, soothing, and purifying medicaments. The Ointment rubbed upon the abdomen checks all tendency to irritation in the bowels, and averts diarrhoea and other disorders of the intestines frequently prevailing through the summer and fruit seasons. Heat lumps, blotches, pimples, inflammations of the skin, muscular pains, neuralgic affections, and enlarged glands can be effectively overcome by using Holloway's remedies according to the instructions accompanying every packet.

\* It is objected that in the Hebrew of Exod. xx. 17, the words "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," precede the prohibition against coveting his wife; but the LXX. version places "wife" first, as in Deut. v. 21. The order of several of the Commandments, as cited in St. Mark x. 19; St. Luke xviii. 20, differs from the Hebrew text. It should be added that in Deut. a different word is used in reference to wife ("Thou shalt not desire"—thakmod—"thy neighbour's wife"), and in reference to the other objects ("neither shalt thou covet"—hithavvsh—"thy neighbour's house," &c.). This affords an additional argument in favour of Catholic division.

\*\* In Scripture the two prohibitions—of the worship of false gods, and the worship of their images—usually appear as one Commandment. This is evident from such passages as Exod. xx. 25; 1 Kings (Prot. Vers.) xiv. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 35, 41; Isaiah xlv. 15, 17; and all those texts, in which to "serve images" and to "serve other gods" is considered as the same crime, and, of course, as a violation of the same Commandment.

\*\*\* This is the single subject to which the prohibition of both Commandments relates—the single case of sins which is guarded against.