

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 404 and 406 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.
Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph H. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. John's.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, scale measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.
Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
London, Ont.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you, and wishing you success,
Believe me, to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
+D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

London Saturday, August 3, 1901.

THAT OATH.

The discussion of the accession oath whereby the Sovereign of Great Britain is required, not only to declare himself a Protestant, but also to insult all Catholics in his dominions, has borne good fruit inasmuch as it has brought forth the acknowledgment from the highest and most prominent statesman of the Empire that the oath comprises a most wanton insult to Catholics, which ought to be eliminated.

The select committee appointed by the House of Lords, to consider the matter has made its report on the subject of modification, and though this report is far from being satisfactory, it may be regarded at least, as a vague promise that a satisfactory modification will be made in the near future. A great step has been taken whereas a committee composed of such prominent statesmen, and which includes the Premier of Great Britain, has pronounced so positively that the insult should be abolished, even though that Committee has not risen to the importance of the occasion which called it into existence. The members of that Committee are the Lord Chancellor, the Marquis of Salisbury, the Duke of Argyll, Earl Spencer, Earl Cadogan, the Earl of Crewe, the Earl of Dunraven, and Lord Tweedmouth.

The resolution passed by the Committee recommends a new form of oath to take the place of the old one, and is as follows:

"That the declaration required of the Sovereign on his accession by the Bill of Rights can be modified advantageously, and for the future should be as follows, viz:

I, by the Grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And I do believe that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass as they are now used in the Church of Rome are contrary to the Protestant religion. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof unreservedly."

This is the complete report of the Committee; but the change proposed is in no sense less objectionable than the oath which it is proposed to supersede.

It is true, the clause stating that the doctrines above repudiated are superstitious and idolatrous, is omitted; and so far there might seem to be a slight improvement in the wording; but it is still stated that the Church of Rome uses "adoration of the Virgin Mary" and "other Saints," which is an insulting falsehood.

It may be said that the term adoration is not always used for the supreme or divine honor which is paid only to God; and for this statement there is some foundation. Thus it has been said: "the people of England adored Queen Victoria, and still adore her memory," but it is the present usage of the word adore to refer it to the honor which is paid to God alone; and thus the books of synonyms in use say: "Adoration can with propriety be paid only to the one true God." (See Crabbe.)

And, further, it is in this sense of supreme adoration that the oath de-

clares that the adoration of the Virgin Mary and other Saints is a practice of the Church of Rome, which is not the case. The Council of Trent declares that we "adore God, and venerate the Saints;" and when the assertion is made that the Catholics thus adore the Saints, a gross falsehood is told, which is the more insulting when it is wantonly confirmed by the oath of the king.

If such a falsehood is to be tolerated, it might just as well be added that such adoration is superstitious and idolatrous. The superstition and idolatry are implied in the fact that this teaching which Catholics repudiate, is asserted to be the teaching of the Catholic Church.

We are glad to notice that the Catholic peers have already expressed their indignation against the form adopted by the Lords' Committee, and we sincerely hope that with one voice they will oppose the proposed change. If the future Kings of Great Britain are to be still obliged by a Protestant majority in Parliament to take a false oath, it is just as well that the perjury should be as glaring as it has been hitherto; but it would not be well that the Catholic peers or Commons should appear to approve the new perjury by voting for it under any circumstances, or on any pretext. By doing so, they would actually incur the guilt of approving this perjury, a guilt which so far is on the consciences of the Protestant members of Parliament only to whom the old oath is attributable, and of those who support the equally objectionable new form.

There are certain Protestant papers which formerly expressed themselves in favor of removing the insulting words of the accession oath, but which now declare that if Catholics are not satisfied with the proposed change, no further satisfaction should be offered. This is the position which has been virtually taken by the Montreal Witness, which says in a recent issue that in the first instance, the Catholics

"Were led in their protests that they had no thought of assailing the purpose of the oath or reducing the supposed safeguard to the realm which it was designed to be. They only wished to remove from it the uncalled for offensiveness of its form in denouncing as damnable certain doctrines which were to them in the highest degree sacred. With this moderate request we were in the utmost sympathy. In the argument which asserted that the oath of the Roman Catholic Bishops should be remodelled before that of the King, we saw no sense, etc."

"Carefully, however, as the advocates of change guarded themselves against being understood to object to anything but the uncalled for offensiveness of the form of the oath, it could hardly be but that their real objection was to the thing itself. The bringing in of the report of the modification Committee has consequently been the signal for the throwing off the cloak, and in some cases of the coat also, and roundly demanding that the Protestant oath should be abandoned altogether. This is a quite different thing, though there may be something said even for this."

The first sentence of this extract is somewhat mixed, but we can understand what the writer meant to say. He wishes to tell us that in the beginning the Catholics who objected to the oath professed to be quite willing that the King should make a strong profession of Protestantism as might be required of him by his Protestant subjects, provided the insult to Catholics were omitted; but that in our captiousness and over-sensitiveness we are now not to be satisfied unless the profession of Protestantism be itself abandoned: that, in fact, we are demanding more now than we asked in the beginning.

The Witness admits that even so, there is some reason in this more extensive demand, yet it advances certain reasons why this should not be granted. In a nutshell, these reasons are included in the statement that a little more than two centuries ago the Catholic King James "in spite of his oaths and promises did all he could to restore Romanism as the one and only Church in the realm."

If this accusation against James were absolutely correct, the crime would surely be no more grievous than the Protestant Sovereigns Henry VIII., Edward VI., Elizabeth, James I., Charles I. and II. and the Protector Oliver Cromwell were guilty of in imposing their special forms of Protestantism on the people. But in fact, it cannot be shown that James I. intended to establish the Catholic religion. The persecuting laws against Catholics, and even against non-Conformist Protestants, were barbarous in their rigor, and he aimed at moderating them, and ultimately, we may presume, at restoring liberty of conscience to Protestant non-Conformists

as well as Catholics; but there is no good reason to believe that in the temper of the English people at that time, he had any expectation of re-establishing the Catholic religion, even though he might have wished to do so, if there had been any fair prospect of success.

However, it is not worth our while to discuss what may have been the secret intentions of James II. They have no bearing upon the present fact that the King takes an oath which is grossly offensive to twelve millions of his subjects. The truth is indisputable that the accession oath is a surviving relic of a barbarous age—the same age in which the Presbyterians of Scotland swore with easy consciences that papistry is an idolatry which ought to be exterminated by means of the most cruel pains and penalties, that the Pope is the Man of Sin and the Antichrist mentioned in Scripture. But as Presbyterians are now recognizing that their creed is too vigorous and rigorous on these points, and propose to modify it, so the English people might also well admit that the time has gone by when their Sovereign should be forced to commit a perjury in order to secure himself on his throne.

It is a confession of weakness of Protestantism if no way can be found whereby the King can proclaim himself a Protestant without hurling a wanton insult against the whole Christian Church of nineteen centuries. It is an admission that there could be no Protestantism, if there were not already existing a Christian Church for it to protest against.

We would sooner see this humiliating confession of weakness and modernness remain as it is, than have it botched by the pretended concession to Catholic sensitiveness which the Lord's Committee proposes. It is no concession at all, and we hope and expect that every Catholic in Parliament will vote against it as an injury added to the contemptible insult already existing.

Since the above was written, the bill authorizing the new oath passed its second reading in the House of Lords by an overwhelming majority. We have no doubt that most of the Lords were well-intentioned in supporting it, being convinced that it would improve the case; but in this they are much mistaken. We are pleased to be able to add that the Catholic peers did not support the farcical measure, and there is every prospect that they will continue their opposition to the end.

AN EXTRAORDINARY MAYOR.

Mayor Morris, of Ottawa, is certainly entitled to be so termed. He gave permission to have the national emblem hoisted on the city hall flag on the 12th July, on the ground that it had as much right to fly to the breeze on that occasion as on the patronal days of St. Patrick, St. Andrew and St. George. To discuss this point would simply be waste of time. When the occasion arises again we trust the people of Ottawa will place Mayor Morris where he properly belongs. He is certainly a most unsuitable person to hold the position of chief magistrate of the capital of the Dominion.

In connection with this matter, we have much pleasure in publishing the following sensible and timely letter from Mr. D'Arcy Scott, son of Senator Scott:

Ottawa Citizen: In your issue of Monday a person signed "A. Irishman" commenting on my action in protesting against the flying of the flag on the city hall on July 12th, asks how it comes that I so identify myself with Irishmen, adding that I am not an Irishman but a Scotchman. It seems to me that any citizen, whatever his origin, or religious belief, who desires to see peace and harmony preserved in a mixed community such as this, would have been justified in pointing out to His Worship the Mayor how undesirable it was that the flag should fly on a public building like the city hall on a day set apart, as is July 12th, for the keeping alive of sectional and religious bitterness and animosity. The celebration of March 17th is far from being a parallel case—St. Patrick is the patron of all Ireland, and his day may be, and is, celebrated by Irishmen of every denomination. I hardly flatter myself that my nationality is a matter of public interest, but since your correspondent endeavors to make it one, let me say that I am both by birth and feelings, a Canadian—by origin, however, I am Irish. My father, like myself, was born in Canada, but his father belonged to the Scots of Cahoon, county Claire, Ireland—a family who have been settled in that county for upwards of two hundred and fifty years. If your correspondent wishes to delve still further back into the dust of history I may tell him that so far as I can learn the family was never Scotch—back at least to the time of Edward I. I am proud to say that a relative of mine, Mr. Richard Scott, a Dublin solicitor, was election agent for the great liberator, O'Connell, in the historic Clare elections, which brought about Catholic emancipation. Taking the other side of the house, my mother was born in Dublin of Irish parents. Let me add that while first of all a Canadian, I am in sympathy and feeling, intensely, and entirely Irish. With apologies for having been forced to make this letter so personal, I remain, D'ARCY SCOTT.

Ottawa, July 16, 1901.

He who is false to present duty breaks a thread in the loom and will see the defect when the weaving of a lifetime is unrolled.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

The Paris Univers states that the Pope has sent a sympathizing letter to the heads of the religious orders in France, expressing regret at the failure of his efforts to preserve them from the persecution with which they are threatened when the new law against religious orders is put into execution. His Holiness declares that this law is contrary to natural, evangelical and ecclesiastical rights, and that the cause of the persecution with which they are menaced is the world's hatred of the Catholic religion, and that this persecution is dictated by the desire to cause nations to apostatize. The Church must labor to counteract these works of darkness, and the orders are exhorted to conform themselves as far as possible to the requirements of the law, notwithstanding their injustice, and to remain firm, dignified and faithful to religion, overcoming evil by good. He concludes his letter with the words: "The Pope and the whole Church are with you. Remember Christ's words: 'I have conquered the world.'"

ANOTHER HIGH LOW WAR.

Is it advisable that a Church which is divided into two such factions as High and Low Churchism, which are diametrically opposed to each other on the most vital principles of Christianity, should ignore their differences, and by compromises made between them make a pretence of being in harmony and peace with each other?

That the difference between these two parties of the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, which is the name by which members of the Church of England call themselves when they go to the United States, are most vital, and concern the most important truths of Christianity, can scarcely be denied by any one, whether a member of that Church or not; and in fact the most prominent members of these Churches openly admit that the dissensions between the two parties mentioned are so important that no compromise is possible or reasonable.

The leading High Churchmen maintain that it is most important that the power of priestly absolution, which they claim belongs to the priests of the Church, ought to be exercised by them, whereas by the Low Church party it is generally maintained either that no such power exists in the clergy, or that, if it exists, it should be left to the will of individual members of the Church or Churches whether or not they shall ask their ministers to hear their confessions and give them absolution.

In regard to the sacrament which Anglicans call the Lord's Supper, the High Churchmen maintain that Christ is truly and bodily present therein, together with His soul and divinity, and that He must be therein adored; whereas the Low Churchmen assert that there is neither Transubstantiation nor a Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist by any of the modes as Consubstantiation orimpanation whereby Lutherans and some other sects maintain that Christ becomes present. In consequence of this belief they assert that the High Church teaching of Christ's real presence is what is asserted to be in the accession oath of the British Sovereign, "idolatrous and superstitious."

Strange to say, there are persons both within and without the Anglican and its sister churches who maintain that these two beliefs, so contrary to each other, and so irreconcilable, ought to be allowed to exist side by side in the Church, and that they who hold them should mutually tolerate each other, and should continue to dwell together in peace and harmony as members of the same Church. Thus only a few days ago the Rev. Dr. J. J. Wilkins of Los Angeles, California, Vicar of the Protestant Episcopal Church of that city, declared in the Pro Cathedral of which he has pastoral charge that "there is room and need for the High Churchman and Low Churchman both, in the university of souls, and there is no need for either of them to get worried or excited because the other thinks or worships differently."

There can be no doubt that in such an important pronouncement, officially made in the Pro Cathedral, Dr. Wilkins had the approbation of the Bishop of Los Angeles, and we are indeed aware that this is really the view taken of the matter by "the peace at any price party" both in the Anglican and the American Episcopal Churches.

The occasion which gave rise to the Rev. Dr. Wilkins' pronouncement is

that there is at the present moment an outbreak of bitter hostility between the High and Low Church parties in Los Angeles, and the middle or peace party is endeavoring to patch up a truce between them; but in spite of these efforts, the outburst of hatred between these two very distinct parties bids fair to rival even the hostilities which resulted from the physical force attacks made by John Kensit on the Ritualistic churches of London, England.

The present war between the two parties was precipitated in the diocesan convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Los Angeles diocese. The convention was controlled by the High Church party, who in the election of delegates to the general convention of the Church, which is soon to be held, refused to choose a single representative of Low Church proclivities.

Naturally enough, the Low Churchmen are highly indignant at this state of affairs, and on their behalf the Rev. Dr. Dowling, of Christ Church, Los Angeles, has, in consequence, sounded the tocsin of war by a sermon preached in his Church on July 14, in which he attacks vigorously the High Church position in regard to Confession, priestly absolution, the Lord's Supper, and the movement to give a new name to their church, rejecting the name Protestant.

He declares that the clergy of his own Church and of his own diocese who favor these doctrines are guilty of idolatry and superstition.

In another article in this issue, under the title "Sacerdotalism," we have something to say on the attack of Dr. Dowling on the Catholic doctrine in regard to the power and authority conferred by Christ on the priesthood. In the present article we confine ourselves to the consideration of the peace theory to which we have referred above, and which has been advanced by Dr. Wilkins.

This theory is evidently based upon the principle that Christ has not revealed any definite doctrine on the points at issue, so as to bind mankind to any belief in particular.

This theory is injurious to God, destructive of all Christian faith, and contrary to the plain teaching of Christ and His Apostles.

It is injurious to God because God is truth itself. Who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Reason itself teaches this independently of Holy Scripture; for God is necessarily infinite in all perfection, and as truth is a perfection, He must be infinitely true. And further, our rejection of any truth revealed by Him is a practical denial of His truthfulness, and a grievous injury to His essential character, which is equivalent to a denial of His existence. This doctrine is therefore practically Atheistic. This is everywhere taught in Holy Scripture; but it will suffice for us to quote the following passages:

"All the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth, to them that seek after His covenant and His testimonies." (Ps. cxiv, 10.) (Prot. Version; Ps. xxv.) This implies not only God's truth, but also our obligation to believe His testimonies.

"For all Thy works are true, and Thy ways right, and all thy judgments true." (Dan. iii, 27.)

"For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth by Jesus Christ." (St. John i, 17.)

From these passages it is also evident that the Christian faith is true in all its details. We may add here the obligation of our unhesitating belief in what Christ has taught:

"Without faith (belief in the truths He has revealed) it is impossible to please God." (Heb. xi, 6.)

"He that believeth not shall be condemned." (St. Mark xvi, 16.)

From all this we learn the teaching of Christ and His apostles. We need only add that St. Paul teaches that "the Church of the living God is the pillar and ground of truth." (1 Tim. iii, 15.) It is therefore impossible that God's Church should permit the teaching of the gross contradiction which Dr. Wilkins declares ought to be tolerated in the opposing parties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The whole dispute shows the state of confusion in which the Protestant Episcopal Church is involved, and places in a striking light the absurdity of which Dr. Dowling is guilty in taking advantage of this state of affairs to attack the Catholic Church. It is the drawing of a red herring across the track to put the bounds on a wrong scent.

The choir invisible! Who are the members of it, if not all those who in any quiet, simple way are doing the days' work, whatever it may be, as they know how; who are trying to make life pleasanter and happier for those to whom their lives are naturally bound?—John White Chadwick.

"SACERDOTALISM."

The great bugaboo of the Low Church Anglican party is "Sacerdotalism." This was the target for Archdeacon Farrer's darts when a few years ago he announced himself as the champion of Low Churchism vs. Ritualism, though since that time he appears to have fallen into comparative obscurity, inasmuch as in the Church of England the Ritualistic party has so progressed that so far as ability and zeal and influence are concerned, it has become the chief party in the Church, leaving Evangelicals, Neologues and Erastians completely in the shade.

In another column will be seen an account of a Ritualist war which has broken out at Los Angeles, California, in which a Rev. Dr. Dowling stands forth as the Evangelical champion who besides attacking "Romanists and Ritualists" for the doctrines therein mentioned, makes a special onslaught on what he called "Sacerdotalism."

By Sacerdotalism he explains that he means certain powers which the priests of the Church of God alone have authority to exercise. Among these powers are the granting of absolution to penitent sinners, the changing of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the ministry of the sacraments which Christ has instituted.

If these powers exist, Dr. Dowling says: "the priest stands between you and your God;" and this he regards as a sufficient reason for rejecting the doctrines which, according to him, constitute "Sacerdotalism;" and he appeals to all of his fellow churchmen, clergy and laity, to fight against this innovation in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, "for purity and freedom," and against "Romanism and the resulting priestly assumption of undue authority."

It would occupy too much space in this issue if we were to enter into a full and lengthy vindication of all the Catholic doctrines included by Dr. Dowling under what Low Churchmen term Sacerdotalism; but we shall point out that to maintain the position the doctor has taken, he appeals to the pride of the laity, and demands that they shall not permit the existence of a priesthood in the Church of Christ, having powers which the laity cannot exercise.

This is exactly the reasoning of Mary (Miriam) and Aaron when they attacked the authority of Moses, saying: "Hath the Lord spoken by Moses only? Hath he not also spoken to us in like manner?" (Num. xii, 2.) But God was angry because they "were not afraid to speak ill of His servant Moses who was most faithful in all His house." Mary was punished with a leprosy for seven days, from which she was delivered only through the prayers of Moses.

Core, Dathan, Abiron and Hon were also severely punished, together with two hundred and fifty leaders of Israel for rebelling against Moses, whose authority was from God.

The authority of the Catholic priesthood is also from God, and it is not for man to call it into question.

Christ chose His twelve apostles from among all His disciples and gave them powers which were not given to the disciples generally.

To Peter alone he said, "feed my lambs; feed my sheep." (St. John xxi, 15, 17.) This plenitude of authority could be exercised only by Peter's lawful successors.

To the Apostles alone Christ said: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations baptizing them, etc."

And behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt. xxviii, 19, 20.) To the Apostles alone it was said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained."

We might quote many other passages to show that the Sacerdotalism condemned so vigorously by Dr. Dowling was established by Almighty God both under the Old and under the New Law. We shall add only one more text to show that it is a presumption for any to assume the sacerdotal office who do not derive it from God through the priesthood which Christ instituted: "For neither doth any man take the honor to himself but he that is called by God as Aaron was."

The priesthood of the New Law does not depend on the fancy of Rev. Dr. Dowling, but on the institution of Christ, and it is by succession from the Apostles that the priests of the Catholic Church possess their authority. Of course, the so called clergy of the

Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, do not possess the same prerogative cause they have neither sacerdotal mission.

In answer to Dr. Dowling's appeal popular pride, we need not say more than to quote the sacred book of verbs, xv, 25:

"The Lord will destroy the pride of the proud."

THE POPULATION OF FRANCE.

For some years past there has been felt considerable anxiety among French statesmen arising out of the fact that the increase of the population of France had been growing less and less year after year, until it had down almost to nothing. A number of schemes had been proposed to remedy this state of affairs, none of which were practicable. The latest of these proposals was to induce a number of French Canadians to settle in the United States in order that new life should be infused thereto. It is needless to say that this proposal was fantastically absurd. But Mr. Waldeck-Rousseau, French Premier, has now introduced some French Senators that the declining decadence appears by the census returns to have ceased. In the last five years there has been an increase of 412,364 inhabitants, as during the five years previous the increase recorded was only 17,000, and during the ten years ending 1896 the increase was only 21,000. It is encouraging to know that the decadence, the evil consequence of which was a cause of consternation no longer to be feared.

LEAGUE OF THE SACRED HO.

General Intention for August.
THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY.

American Messenger Sacred Ho.

Sunday is fairly well observed in the United States. It is notable of rest from labor; business suspended, social intercourse limited to the most necessary duties are performed privately and in as brief a space as possible. The very atmosphere is still, even in our busy cities; less hurry in the movements; more care on the faces of the men and women; we meet in our thoroughfares calm demeanor and spiritual peace of mind tell why they are and whether they are going; it is a usual self-restraint of the day are not on the same errand; they are unwittingly on their tribute of respect to those who the day religiously.

No one can witness the observance of Sunday in America without being struck by the conclusion that Christ still a most powerful influence among our people; and this is borne in upon us more and more as we are described by and have come to regard our material, industrial and moral nation. Truly it requires super-human influence, more than the craving for a usual day of rest or pleasure, or rich and poor alike, agree a week to stop the vast and systems of machinery, which fortunes to set going again, our markets, to cease from going in great measure, and conveniences which would the laborious services of other discontinue, the disposition to pursue their daily avocations day or to spend it in bolstered leisurely relaxation.

The extent of this Christian observance of Sunday in the United States is the most remarkable when we reflect that fully fifty millions of people are not active members of the church, though they profess Christianity of one or other denomination; the twenty-five millions who are active members of the sects, very many, no doubt, Sunday in a worldly way, and worldly motive. Some Catholics, negligent in this as in other their religion. Still, fully to fill our churches from morning night every Sunday, and over millions of members of the various sects meet in their churches, at least, for their five forms of worship, and multitude of fifty millions of Protestants, the remainder, observe the precept of that day, out of respect for wish to keep it religious; can be no doubt that many of serve the day plausibly after fashion.

What makes this fact more notable still is that there is no ordinance for the institution of the observance of the Sunday at all. In an ecclesiastical institution, at the time of the Apostles would seem to be the "Lord's Day" mentioned in the Apocalypse. The first day of the week was day of meeting for common as we gather from the Acts from the First Epistle to the Thim 16, 1. Such passages report what was customary, that the observance of Sunday was obligatory from the first, except the tradition of the day. From this source we learn apostolic institution, a sub-