

Samuel, when the Sabbath *must* be observed, we have no record mention of it. Then as to heathen authors, the very oldest of them cannot be considered as anything but a baby beside these sacred authors; Herodotus, the father of profane history, and Socrates, the great reformer of philosophy, being probably both contemporaries of Malachi, the last of the writers of the Old Testament.

In the Decalogue, the Lord constituted Israel the special guardians of, and witnesses for, his holy day; beginning with the word—"Remember" it. Other nations were forgetting and forsaking it, to their own injury and to God's dishonour; Israel was to receive, guard, and transmit it to the times to come. Hence the alternation in the Decalogue, as given in Deuteronomy to Israel, from that given on Sinai to mankind.

On this period of its history we need not dwell. The Jewish Sabbath was not a day of austerity and gloom. It was completely the opposite of this: a day of rest, of gladness, of mercy, of worship, and of family re-union (Nehem. viii. 9; Isaiah lviii. 5, 7, 13, 14). He whose day it was, was the God of salvation, not Moloch or Juggernaut. These might be gratified by their worshippers *walking mournfully* before them; God protests against this as being defamation of his character (Malachi iii. 13, 14).

We come to a period more interesting and practically important to ourselves—that of the Christian Sabbath. We are quite aware that the growl against our calling the first day of the week Sabbath is terrific. And it is so far justifiable in that the word of God never once calls the Lord's-day, Sabbath. At least, we hope it does not; it would be a serious matter if it did, for our principle, for Paul spurns Sabbath away: of that there can be no possible doubt (Coloss. ii. 16). What harm can there be in calling our weekly rest *Sabbath*, more than there would have been in the Jews calling their weekly rest the *Lord's day*? Why dispute about the name? First-day, Sunday, Lord's-day, Sabbath, we know what day is meant; and for common purposes we may use any of the names, or lump them together in one if any body should prefer that course.

The question about the name, however, is well known to belong to the controversy concerning the thing; like *altar* and *table* in another controversy. The pith of the matter in question is—Are we warranted to put our weekly day of rest fully and completely in the position of the Sabbath of the Old Testament? If we are, why not call it Sabbath? If we are not, then it is very wrong to call it by that name. The Puritans persisted in the use of the name, meaning to maintain, without ceasing, their protest, that to the Lord's-day is to be applied what the Fourth Commandment in particular, and the whole law, the prophets, and also the Lawgiver, the Lord of Prophets, Jesus Christ, have taught concerning the right observance of the Sabbath-day. Therefore do we also retain the name Sabbath. It is a handy shibboleth, and it is an intelligible protest; and we mean to abide by the custom, though we cannot justify it by Scripture.

The New Testament speaks of "the Lord's day." What is the meaning of that phrase? "The Lord's Table" means that which Christ instituted and separated; does this exactly similar phrase imply, that the Lord sanctified for us the first day of the week? Nothing is more probable; for we find it observed from on the very day on which the event it commemorates occurred. On the very day of our Lord's resurrection, he appeared to the assembled disciples; that day week they were again assembled, and again blessed with his presence; on Pentecost, which fell on the Lord's-day, they were again assembled, and were blessed with the descent of the Holy Ghost. But whether our Lord did actually set apart the first day of the week as *His holy day* or not, certain it is that the Apostles called it "The Lord's-day" (Rev. i. 10);