

vants; 'save Thy people;' 'lift them up for ever.'

The tone of triumph breaks forth once again, 'Day by day,' adopting the words of Psalm cxlv. 2, 'We bless Thee, and praise [worship] Thy Name for ever and ever.'

But even our highest tribute of praise and of prayer is most apt to be mingled with sin, our lower nature marring our best efforts, so that we cannot do the things that we would. And therefore we, the toiling and struggling portion of the Church, pray to be kept without sin, pray for mercy, such as was extended to the storm-tossed disciples, for our faith and trust is like to be as little as theirs.

And it is not without significance that the last verse is in the singular number. For every body of worshippers is made up of units, and each must enter into the worship of the whole, and the life and faith of each goes to make up the life and faith of the whole.

Thus, as we have seen, the 'Te Deum' unites us to the whole body of the Church in heaven and earth, and to Him in whom they are all named, so that the Apostle's words receive an ever-fresh significance. 'All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's'.*

* I Cor. iii., 23.

MAN AND THE SABBATH.

[By Rev. JOHN LOCKWARD, Rector of Port Medway, N.S.]

Among the minor events of our Blessed Lord's life on earth, as recorded in the Gospels, we might place the journey of Himself and His Apostles through the corn-fields on the Sabbath Day. But, even if we be right in thus classing that event as a *minor* incident, it nevertheless has been written for our instruction, and is as much an inspired Scripture as the Scripture account of our Lord's Passion and Death and Resurrection and Ascension. Thus there must be, yea, there certainly are, blessed lessons, gospel principles, to be learned from this Sabbath-day journey with its special incident and the circumstances which follow from it.

When our Lord and His disciples (Apostles) passed through the corn-fields on a certain Sabbath day, "His disciples began to pluck the ears of corn and to eat." St. Matthew, who was one of the disciples, also adds to this the reason of their doing so on the Sabbath Day, saying they "were an hungred." St. Mark tells us, "they began as they went, to pluck the ears of corn"; and St. Luke adds yet another slight circumstance, namely, "they did eat, *rubbing them* (the ears of corn) *in their hands*."

It is not necessary to our purpose to refer to the particular Sabbath Day on which this circumstance took place, for the objection seems to have been made merely because it was a Sabbath Day, and not because it was 'an high day,' or any particular Sabbath Day. Yet, because St. Luke seems to specify some certain Sabbath day, if not a special and 'high day,' we will briefly refer to the matter.

St. Luke says, 'And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first, that He went through the corn fields.' It was on 'the second Sabbath after the first.' Certainly, 'the Bible, and the Bible only' at least in the English version, will not settle the meaning of this description for us. The Revised Version has in the text simply, 'it came to pass on a Sabbath,' but in the margin we are told 'Many ancient authorities insert second-first.' Now as 'the Bible only' does not make clear what this expression means, so neither do our chief expositors and commentators agree as to its meaning. There are two very probable suggestions offered; the one that the Jews classed their

Sabbaths as we do our Festivals as greater and Lesser Sabbaths, or as First and Second Sabbaths; under which theory this particular Sabbath would be the Pentecostal Sabbath, the second of their chief Sabbaths or first-class Sabbaths, the first of that order being the Passover Sabbath. The other theory referred to is that this particular Sabbath was the second Sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread, or the second Sabbath in their Passover octave, on which day as well as on the first day, there was to be an holy convocation.

When it became known that our Lord's disciples had on that day plucked the ears of corn as they passed through the corn fields, the Pharisees at once took the matter up and began to question our Lord and His disciples as to the lawfulness of the act. According to St. Matthew and Mark they put their question to our Lord, but according to St. Luke they asked the question of the disciples themselves. There can be no doubt about the meaning of the question as found in St. Matthew and in St. Luke, but might not be so clearly understood from St. Mark's account. The fact of the disciples plucking the ears of corn under the circumstances, apart from the day being a Sabbath day, was not an unlawful act; but the Pharisees held that it was an unlawful to do so on the Sabbath day. It was not, then, in their eyes, an act of stealing, but an act of Sabbath-breaking. In Deut. xxiii. 25, we read: 'When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbor, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbour's standing corn.' But here no mention is made that such an act was not to be done on the Sabbath Day, and by connecting this verse with the former we are forced to infer that such a privilege was only to be exercised under the pressure of hunger. Thus, since our Lord's disciples did this when they 'were an hungred,' they had not exceeded their privilege, nor had they broken the strict commandments regarding the keeping of the Sabbath day holy. The Pharisees on the other hand had imposed many new commandments, and under the plea that to pluck with the hand was only a lesser way of reaping the corn, which was unlawful to do on the Sabbath day, would make the act of the Apostles an act of Sabbath breaking.

In answering their question our Lord referred them to two incidents or facts of their Scriptures, the one that which David once did, the other what the Priests in the Temple do every Sabbath day. David, when hungry, had entered into the Tabernacle and eaten the shewbread, which was not lawful for any one to eat, but the Priests only, and was guiltless; while the Priests in the temple, in the exercise of their duties, from a literal and exact interpretation of the law, 'profane the Sabbath and are blameless.' In this way our Lord shows them that in the matter of breaking the Sabbath there were possible circumstances under which exceptions must be permitted.

But without a doubt, the most important part of our Lord's answer, as regards ourselves, is that given us so fully by St. Mark: 'And He said unto them, the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.'

In these words we have two very important facts clearly revealed unto us: first, that 'the Sabbath was made for man'; and, second, that 'the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' Let us try to learn something definite and helpful for these times from each of these important facts. It would seem now that the truth of the first fact ought to have been clear to the minds of all as the account of the Creation tells us that man was made before the Sabbath was appointed, and hence most reasonably the Sabbath must be made for man.

In the first place the Sabbath was made as a

day of physical rest both for man and for beast. No labor may be done on that day, except that every one must eat. 'Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day he shall surely be put to death.' Ex. xxxv. 15. Again, 'Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day.' Ex. xxxv. 3. Then, too, it would seem from Acts i. 12, that only a journey of a certain length or distance could be made on the Sabbath day, and which was known as 'a Sabbath day's journey.' This journey is supposed to have been limited by the distance which each camp of the children of Israel occupied, or was stationed, from the Tabernacle, as from a centre, and which the Israelites must travel to go to the Tabernacle on the Sabbath day. But the Sabbath was not only a day of physical rest for the Jews, it was also a teaching factor in their God-given religion. It was part of that dispensation, which consisted of types and shadows. And in this respect it was among those things of the law which our Lord came to fulfil. 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' Thus, whatever be the strictures guarding the Sabbath day, neither it nor them have any peculiar binding character upon us. For just as the sacrifices of the Jews were fulfilled by the sacrifice of the true Lamb of God upon the Altar of the Cross, so the Sabbath day of the Jews was fulfilled by the rest of our Lord's Body in the Tomb on that high Sabbath Day. Hence it and them have passed away; and it can be only in ignorance or cant that so many Christians still speak of the Lord's Day as the Sabbath day, and of the Sunday-school as the Sabbath school. We have done with the day, and we should emphasize the fact by discarding the name.

I might mention in this connection that I have known a very old school Presbyterian minister who was indeed a true *Christian Sabbatarian*. He would not allow a fire to be kindled in his house on a Sunday, nor allow a dish or plate or any such like article to be washed, nor water to be drawn from his well or spring on that day. I know a member of his own congregation who, when walking past the said minister's house, and in whose grounds there was a clear, cool spring of water, went to the house and asked for a cup to dip a drink from the spring, but instead of getting a cup he received a severe reproof for thus thinking of breaking the Sabbath day. This stiff old Calvinist lived about two thousand years too late. He would have been an exemplary Jew, and so would many more! Thus one grand principle to remember is that 'the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.'

(To be Continued.)

ST. PATRICK'S LITURGY.

Many of us have been accustomed to have St. Patrick always presented to us as a sort of miscellaneous or motley popular Protestant—I believe the Presbyterians say he certainly belongs to them, and whether any others on lower rounds of the ecclesiastical ladder lay claim to him as a mere Bible Christian, I cannot venture to say. Very probably, if they did not altogether despise and ignore Church history, they would. But this erroneous estimate of St. Patrick, now referred to, has arisen in this way. Certain people have taken his "Confession" as if it were a full and complete systematic statement of his belief, which it most assuredly is not and have argued, in consequence, that he believed nothing but what is specified in it. The people referred to have, as a rule, little or no acquaintance with the belief and ritual of the Church of the fifth century, and they therefore, forget, or rather fail to recognize, that St. Patrick naturally believed and worshipped as his fellow-Churchmen of his own time believed