

1831

An argument delivered before the Bangor Forensic Club on the question "ought the law requiring the opening of our post-offices and the transportation of our mails on the Christian Sabbath to be repealed?" Thursday evening, Jan. 6, 1831

Ebenezer Mattoon Chamberlain

Follow this and additional works at: https://digicom.bpl.lib.me.us/books_pubs

Recommended Citation

Chamberlain, Ebenezer Mattoon, "An argument delivered before the Bangor Forensic Club on the question "ought the law requiring the opening of our post-offices and the transportation of our mails on the Christian Sabbath to be repealed?" Thursday evening, Jan. 6, 1831" (1831). *Books and Publications*. 128.

https://digicom.bpl.lib.me.us/books_pubs/128

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections at Bangor Community: Digital Commons@bpl. It has been accepted for inclusion in Books and Publications by an authorized administrator of Bangor Community: Digital Commons@bpl. For more information, please contact ccoombs@bpl.lib.me.us.

263.4.C35

Wm Jordan
" /AN

7 100

ARGUMENT

DELIVERED BEFORE

75-70

THE

BANGOR FORENSIC CLUB,

ON

Chamberlain, E. M.

THE QUESTION,

Warrant

“ OUGHT THE LAW, REQUIRING THE OPENING OF OUR POST-OFFICES, AND THE TRANSPORTATION OF OUR MAILS, ON THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH, TO BE REPEALED ?”

THURSDAY EVENING, JAN. 6, 1831.

Bangor :

BURTON & CARTER, PRINTERS.

.....
1831.

+

+

52216

TO THE PUBLIC.

HAVING no expectation whatever, at the time I drew up the following hastily prepared arguments, that they would ever make their appearance before the public ; I rely on that circumstance as a sufficient apology for their unfinished state. But inasmuch as they have been made the fruitful source of invective, in the street, by the fireside, and in the pulpit—anal of misrepresentation, by those, who have made them content with second-hand knowledge, and judged without hearing them ; I deem the call imperious to lay them before the public, as they were delivered, with but few alterations even in matters irrelevant, that they may speak for themselves, in order to free myself, from the uncharitable imputations, which have been lavished upon me—so far, and no farther than my proofs and deductions shall merit the approbation of the candid reader.

EBENEZER M. CHAMBERLAIN.

ARGUMENT.

MR. PRESIDENT,

THE gentlemen on the affirmative of this question, demand the repeal of that law, which requires the opening of our Post Offices, and the transportation of our Mails, upon the Christian Sabbath.

Though it is not true, in point of fact, that any such law does in reality exist, yet, for the purposes of this discussion, we are willing to make the admission.

It is unnecessary for me, here, to dwell upon the vast importance of unrestrained energy and uninterrupted activity, in that department of our government, which is the great conservator of our civil and religious rights, the mainspring of mercantile success, and the lifespring of social order. For, as in these respects, it embraces the dearest interests of fifteen millions of freemen, so its importance is familiar to *all*, as it comes home to the business and bosoms of *all*.

To pass in silence the want of power in Congress to do it, I ask, why should we, as individuals, wish to deprive ourselves of one-seventh part of the privileges and blessings, which this arrangement secures to us, and that too at the hazard of involving the whole system in confusion?

This, sir, brings us to the shape, in which the question under consideration presents itself. It is contended that this law is an infringement of the laws of God, inasmuch as it violates the *sanctity* of the Christian Sabbath. Could this be *proved*, no conviction would sooner strike me dumb. Hence, then, the true question arises,—*Is the Christian Sabbath a Divine Institution?* In the discussion of this momentous question, I am emboldened to proceed, only from the reflection that I rely on God's own word to prove his will. And let those beware, who would presume to prove *more*, by arguments drawn from other sources than those of infallible truth.

It has been a received opinion among us, that the Christian Sabbath was a day of divine appointment, and I much regret that those, who demand its punctilious observance, as such, have driven us to prove the reverse: Since, by this imprudent attempt to attach to this portion of God's time, more sanctity than he requires, they have elicited a discussion of this question, throughout this country, in a spirit which must and will produce results widely different from their expectations, and different from the wishes of all good citizens. Many, I fear, in throwing off those salutary restraints, which even this error has imposed upon them,

2645

will be urged on to the fearful extreme of not attaching that importance to the day, which it actually demands from the Christian.

Although we all concur in ascribing to the day many of the greatest blessings we enjoy, yet we must remember that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." And now to prove that the Christian Sabbath was not only made for man, but was also made by man, I shall proceed to show,

First, That the Jewish Sabbath was known to no other people, and its observance required of no other people than the Jews.

Secondly, That the Jewish Sabbath was abrogated by our Saviour; and

Thirdly, That our present Sabbath, which it is contended was substituted in its stead, was not appointed by him.

Let no one suppose that these points have been rashly assumed. No!—the BIBLE is the rock on which I build my faith. And the Lord has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away."

Relying on holy writ, then, for our proof, we assert, without fear of contradiction, that no Sabbath was observed by the antediluvian world, or by Noah's posterity, till after the children of Israel had passed the Red Sea. If during this space of two thousand five hundred years, the Almighty designed that this day should be kept holy, how will the gentlemen account for his having failed to communicate his will to mankind? Especially, since during all this period, man held familiar converse with his Maker. Even in the minute and circumstantial history of the three first Jewish Patriarchs, not the slightest allusion to the day is made. Nor could a correct tradition of the day have failed to reach them, had it ever existed; for the genealogy of the times exhibits the singular fact, that there were but three ages between the creation and them. Adam lived two hundred and forty-six years after the birth of Methuselah; Methuselah lived one hundred years after the birth of Shem; Shem outlived Abraham thirty-five years—he lived until one hundred and ten years after the birth of Isaac, and fifty years after the birth of Jacob. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were the direct progeny of Shem, through the line of the eldest son—Shem of Methuselah, and Methuselah of Adam. Hence we infer that Adam was acquainted with Methuselah, Methuselah with Shem, and Shem with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. These were the living chronicles of ancient days, through whom were handed down to the sacred historian, the traditions of the events and institutions of those long ages, with undoubted accuracy. And as we look in vain to the records of those times for any such institution as a holy Sabbath, I ask if the Almighty would have failed to promulgate, and if those holy men would have failed to observe, and if Moses would have failed to record, so important an institution; if Deity had design-

ed it for the whole family of man, from creation through all coming time? Surely not: And the failure of all these, is proof indubitable that no such design existed in the Divine Mind.

But at length, after the lapse of two thousand five hundred years, when God had chosen and consecrated to himself a people, from whom the Messiah was to come, we find the institution of a Sabbath given to them, for "a sign between him and their generations forever, that they might know that he was the Lord who had sanctified them."

Having shown that until *this time*, and in *this manner*, and for *this purpose*, no Sabbath had been given to man, I now proceed to show that this institution was designed exclusively for the Jews.

First, then, touching the origin of the Sabbath: The first mention made of it as a day to be observed, will be found in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. And it seems to have been given together with the manna: for the circumstance of there having been a double portion of that miraculous food given on the sixth day of the week, was the first intimation to the people that the seventh was to be observed as a Sabbath. When the manna was promised to Moses, "It shall come to pass, saith the Lord, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread; two omers for one man." Now it is very evident, sir, that the people did not even yet know the object of this extraordinary preparation; for it is added, "And all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade. And Moses said, eat that to day; *for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord*; to-day ye shall not find it in the field." This, sir, appears like an appointment of a Sabbath. Not a continuation, nor a renewal, but the first appointment of a Sabbath day. And in confirmation of this, "The Lord said unto Moses, see, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Such was its *origin*; and as it regards the *object* of the day, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying; speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, verily my Sabbaths shall ye keep; for it is a sign between me and you, throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord, that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for *it is holy unto you*. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Wherefore, *the Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel forever.*"

I can not well conceive how language can be more explicit or clear than this ; and the import of the fourth commandment is evidently the same,—“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger *that is within thy gates.*” Perhaps I shall be asked if it does not appear from this, that the Sabbath was binding on the stranger ? I answer, *not till he was within the jurisdiction of the Jews.*

And now sir, from the law we will turn to the prophets, and see what the Lord says by the mouth of Ezekiel, concerning the origin and object of the Sabbath. In the twentieth chapter, where he again informs us, that he gave them his Sabbaths *after* he brought them into the wilderness, he then repeats the same reason, for requiring its observance of them which was mentioned in Exodus :—“that it was a *sign between him and them*, that they might know that he was the Lord that sanctified them.”

It requires I think, no ordinary degree of affrontery Mr. President, for any one, with these declarations of the Almighty, ringing in his ears, to assert that this day was of universal application. Having, in my opinion clearly shown the reverse of this, I now come to the second point in this question, viz. that the Sabbath, with the other Jewish rites and ceremonies, was abolished by our Saviour.

In the third chapter of Corinthians, the Jewish laws, written and engraven in stones, among which were those for the observance of this day, being the ministration of death, St. Paul informs us were to be done away, for a more glorious ministration ; or in his own words, “If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones was glorious, which glory *was to be done away*, how shall not the ministration of the spirit, be rather glorious ? for if that, which was done away, was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.” And that this promised abolition was accomplished, the terrors of that day bear witness, on which the dying Saviour cried “It is finished.”

Sir, I envy not the consolations of those, who are disbelievers of this fact. Being still under the law, to them Christ has died in vain. To this effect St. Paul writes to the Gallatians, “Christ has become of no effect unto you, whomsoever of you are justified by the law ; *ye are fallen from grace.* For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse, but that no man is justified by the law, in the sight of God, it is evident, for the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith, but the man that doth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Wherefore serveth the law then ? it was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his son made of a woman, made under the law, *to redeem them that were under*

the law." I trust there are none who would reject the authority of St. Paul on this subject, and certain I am that none can mistake his meaning.

I shall now introduce the authority of Him, who spake as never man spake. The whole gospel being but a continued series of the examples, by which Christ taught us the light in which the Jewish Sabbath was viewed by him; numerous instances need not be quoted from this unquestionable authority. In the ninth chapter of John, we find that because he healed a blind man on the Sabbath, "therefore, said some of the Pharisees, this man is not of God, because *he keepeth not the Sabbath day.*" Again in the fifth of John, on the Sabbath day, he said to the impotent man, who lay at the pool of Bethesda, "take up thy bed and walk. And therefore the Jews persecuted Jesus and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the *Sabbath day.* But Jesus answered them, my Father worketh hitherto and I work." Also in the second chapter of Mark—"And it came to pass that he went through the corn fields on the Sabbath day, and his disciples began as they went to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto him, behold why do they that on the *Sabbath day*, which is not lawful?" In justification of these things "he said unto them, the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." These are selected as a very few only from among the multiplicity of similar examples, by which he taught us to regard all days alike.

Here, I would remark sir, that it behooves the gentlemen on the affirmative, to exercise great prudence and caution, lest by endeavoring to prove too much they advance on dangerous ground. If they deny the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, and the annihilation of all its rites and ceremonies and purposes, they would appear to exhibit our Saviour in the light of a transgressor, and seem to justify his executioners in inflicting the penalty for the broken law. Also, if they construe its abrogation into a mere transition of its sanctity from that day to another, they still virtually contend for its holy import at that very time, when Christ was teaching us, both by precept and example, that these types and shadows were done away; for certainly as yet no other day had been substituted. Thus likewise, by leaving the penalty for its violation just, they would convert into hypocrisy that holy aspiration, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." Therefore, whether they deny the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath at the advent of Christ, or attempt to establish a substitution for that day, the gentlemen have but a choice of positions in this dilemma, in either of which, they will find themselves equally ill at ease. Admitting for a moment, that Christ has appointed the first day of the week, to be observed as he observed the day for which it was substituted; shall we not be permitted in the performance of our duty on that day, to fol-

low the example which he has set us on this? But since such an appointment can not be made to appear; does reason, does religion require us to venerate the first day of the week as time peculiarly holy, merely for its having been substituted by human authority, for the day, which Christ has taught us to regard as other days? Sir, 'tis preposterous! 'tis a derogation from the authority of Christ's example!

Should the gentlemen concede the point as to the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, and their own practice seems to declare their convictions of this fact; I ask them, on what they rely to show us that another day was substituted in its stead, by divine authority? On this point, negative proof alone fully sustains us; for the universal absence of a thing is incontestible proof of its nonexistence. The admissibility of this testimony being unquestionable, every page of the bible is a witness for us. On the other hand, the positive injunctions of Christ can alone be received as divine authority, for such substitution. Unfortunately for the gentlemen on the affirmative, not a single passage of scripture can be quoted, in which even the slightest hint of such an injunction can be found. Whereas, on our part, we have the clearest proof, that in Christ's instructions to his followers, no such thing was taught. In the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, may be found a summary of all his doctrines; where it appears that the observance of a Sabbath forms no part of the character of a perfect christian. "And behold one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him why callest thou me good? there is none good but one that is God; but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. And he said unto him *which?* Jesus said thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man said unto him, all these things have I kept from my youth up: *what lack I yet?*" Perhaps it is anticipated that the answer to this inquiry will be—thou shalt keep holy my Sabbath day. But no sir, "Jesus said unto him, if thou wilt be *perfect*, go and sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me." We learn, from these explicit instructions of our divine master, that the command to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," has no place in the christian ritual.

These precepts are the basis, also, of the Apostles practice; as may be seen in their instructions to their Gentile brethren in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. In which instructions it appears, that it did "not seem good to the Holy Ghost and to them, that, among necessary things," their followers should regard one day more than another. We do not deny the fact, that they frequently assembled on the first day of the week; neither do we question the propriety of their so doing, as a memento

of the Lord's resurrection. So far were they, however, from considering one portion of time as more holy than another, that St. Paul, in a tone of the severest upbraidings, reprov'd the Galatians, the Colossians and the Romans, for their adherence to the abolished law, and their superstitious observance of days.—That this salutary reproof may not be lost to those who are equally superstitious at the present day, they shall have the benefit of a quotation or two. To the Galatians he says—"Oh foolish Galatians, who hath bewitch'd you, that ye should not obey the truth; before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? *Ye observe days and months and times and years!*" He cautions his Colossian brethren—"Beware lest any man spoil you, through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. Let no man therefore judge you, in meat or in drink, or in respect of an *holy day*, or of the new moon, or of the *sabbath days*." He enquires of the Romans—"Who art thou, that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another, *another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*"

Mr. President; let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. And if from these unaltered and unalterable truths of the bible, he is persuaded that in the selection of his time to worship, God has left him to the freedom of his own will, and that for its exercise, he is only amenable at the tribunal of his Maker; let him look with prudent distrust on every insidious attempt to wrest from him his birthright, notwithstanding the specious pretence, that it is all for the glory of God. Let him remember that not one century has passed, since even here in New England, the prison, the scourge and the gallows, were brought into requisition, by our Puritan Fathers, for the accomplishment of the same object, to which these measures tend.

Astonished, no doubt, that such motives should be attributed to them, the gentlemen on the affirmative, kindling with holy indignation, will exclaim with Hazael—"But what! is thy servant a *dog*, that he should do this great thing?" I presume not to affirm, sir, that they are not *invulnerable* to the allurements of ambition: yet the dictates of prudence demand that we lead them not into temptation, by entrusting *even them*, and consequently those who come after them, with power, to follow out Hazael's example. Should we at any time feel disposed to listen complacently to the fawning suppliant for ecclesiastic power, or yield submissive to the imperious tone of him who demands it, while we look in prospective upon the mischief which must flow, from the indulgence of this dangerous and dastardly spirit, the

imagination, alarmed for the well being of posterity, bids us beware : For coming generations, pleading the precedents of generations gone, will yield by degrees to the impulses of ambition, till at last that infernal Monster, which now lies concealed from sight, will again stride this fair land, marking the progress of his career in traces of waste and woe.

Therefore I repeat it, sir ; let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. And let him fearlessly express his convictions too. What was it that so long awed mankind into passive silence, and imposed upon them an almost involuntary suppression of those convictions, which were in any way an innovation on prevalent religious maxims ? It was that want of charity for others' motives, and that jealousy of power, in those from whom any dared to differ, which branded with the epithets of heretics and infidels, or inflicted all the tortures of implacable vengeance on those, who strove to break the chains of ecclesiastical despotism. But, thank God, the spell is broken ; and as those agents of inquisitorial terror—racks, dungeons and faggots—prey on no victims here, words being harmless things, the hazard of being called heretic or infidel, awes me not, nor will prevent the declaration of my convictions, that no three points can be more clearly proved from holy writ, than the three here assumed, viz :

First, That the seventh day Sabbath was designed for the Jews alone ;

Second, That it was abrogated by our Saviour ; and

Third, That no other Sabbath was appointed in its stead by him.

Many of the most eminent Judges and Divines, both of Europe and America, seem to have been persuaded of the same fact : among whom are Chief Justice Parker and Arch Deacon Paley.

I leave every one to the convictions of his own reason and experience, as to the incalculable importance of our daily mails. And as no one can, by arguments drawn from *earth* or *heaven*, prove their transportation to be a violation of any divine law ; I shall consider this appeal to Congress in its true light, as the entering wedge, to make way for that desolater of earth, that destroyer of human life, happiness and liberty—A UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE !

REJOINDER.

[The following rejoinder was made to the replication* of the affirmative, in answer to the foregoing Argument.]

I rise, Mr. President, not to express any regret for having, in this discussion, become the humble instrument of an exposition of truth ; although in so doing, if I may judge from what I witnessed on a former occasion, I have incurred the pharisaical displeasure of those who are wise in their own conceit.

Sir, if I wrest or pervert the word of God, let me stand convicted. But if in the use I *have* made or *shall* make of it in this discussion, its application shall be found correct, and the conclusions drawn from it just, let those on whose countenances shall be seen the smile of derision, be made to feel that condemnation which their conduct deserves. Though they may disfigure their faces, and thank their God that they are not like other men ; though in my recurrence to the bible, they may again brand my sentiments and convictions with the epithet of infidelity ; though they may call my touch contamination, and my researches sacrilege ; yet still, sir, for their edification, shall I again open and read from this book of books. On this and this alone do I rely. Since the gentleman on the affirmative harps so loudly upon the incidental use I have made of Arch Deacon Paley's name, I will now inform him, once for all, that the authority of Paley, or any other human name or names, however numerous and celebrated, is not *my* dependence, though he has made it *his* chief support. I repeat it, sir, on the bible is my sole reliance, and if here I fail, I fall. The gentleman, also, in his own argument, should have known that this is not the age, in which, mere human names, declamation or verbosity, sneering or sarcasm would be received either as proof or argument, on a subject so solemn and important as this.

In answer to his inquiry, why I leave all other arguments, and direct my attention wholly to those touching the Sabbath, I reply, that two of the three points we have assumed, in defence of the negative of this question, need no clearer vindication than they have received from the gentlemen associated with me in this discussion, who have embarked in their defence. The first of which is, that public convenience requires the daily transportation of our mail. And the third, that the constitution of the United States, being founded solely on political rights, Congress has no authority to legislate on religious affairs. It only remains for me to attempt to repel the assault against our second point, the position assigned to me, viz :—that such transportation vio-

* By a member of the Bangor Theological Seminary.

lates no divine law. Should I fail in this attempt, then very gratefully will I accept that assistance, which the extraordinary generosity of my opponent has prompted him so kindly and so repeatedly to proffer. Considering, however, the nature of the proof on which he relies, he will do well to remember that charity's first dictates require him to provide for his own household. And since, very unlike him, in the discussion of this question, I rely solely on the bible for guidance and support: on that do I confidently rest the issue.

You will recollect, that in defence of this central point of attack, my positions were three.

First, That the Jewish Sabbath was given to and designed for that people alone.

Second, That it was abrogated by our Saviour; and

Third, That our Sunday, which it is contended was substituted in its stead, was not appointed by him.

The gentleman has assailed my first position by mere assertions, my second by sophistry, and my third by presumptions.

He asserts (the word of God to the contrary notwithstanding) that the Almighty designed that the seventh day should be kept holy by all mankind, because on that day he rested from his labors, and sanctified it. That no objection may be left unanswered, I will begin with the second chapter of Genesis, where it says, "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." Again, we are told that "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

It will be remembered that this description was given thousands of years after the events, which were recorded, had transpired, and not till the day here spoken of, was applied to the object for which it was designed. And by mingling in their description, an association of ideas with what was passing around them,—which was the accustomed and only mode of explanation known to the sacred penmen,—we receive the impression, that after the progressive work of creation was completed, the Deity rested from actual toil, and refreshed himself, by assembling the hosts of heaven and commemorating the great event in a joyous festival.

But shall we adopt those contracted views of the Almighty artisan, which represent him as a human being at his toils, who, having performed six days manual labor, being weary on the seventh, rested and was refreshed? Shall we suppose, that on the consummation of this work, vocal anthems really echoed from sphere to sphere?

Sir, shall we not rather suppose, that this description, taken as it is from sensible objects, resulted from the narrow conceptions of finite beings, at that early age, when man had no other thought than that in the creation of this little earth, the utmost attribute of Almighty power was exhausted? though in the im-

mensity of God's works, 'tis but as the dust in the balance.— Though these views perfectly correspond with the light and knowledge of those ages, yet, if they are adopted in a literal sense by any one now, when it is known that this earth is but one of the least among the myriads of worlds that surround us, I can only say that his credulity is greater than his faith. But since, for the purposes of this argument, it is a matter quite immaterial, we will admit the consistency of those views. And as “the Sabbath was made for man,” it appears that God sanctified the day to himself, for the particular object to which it was afterwards applied. Christ, while on earth, declared that he shared the glory of the Father, before the world was. And here at the creation of the world, the omniscient God, knowing among what people his son must appear, in his errand of mercy to earth, sanctified to himself this day, to be given as a *peculiar* sign between himself and that *peculiar* people, from whose seed was to spring the root of Jesse, to bear that immortal fruit the second Adam, that we might eat and live, and thus stand redeemed from the curse denounced against the first Adam, for profaning “that forbidden fruit, whose mortal taste brought death into the world.”

When this day, thus *sanctified*, was given for a sign of the covenant, between God and this people whom he *sanctified*, it was given with the express declaration, that it was *holy unto them*—that is, consecrated and sacred to them alone. “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak thou unto the children of Israel, saying, verily my Sabbaths shall ye keep, for it is a *sign between me and you, throughout your generations*, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth *sanctify you*. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for IT IS HOLY UNTO YOU.” God's own word for it, sir, that this day was dedicated solely to the Jews. As well may it be denied, that Jehovah ever made a covenant with Israel, as to cavil at his meaning, in this most explicit declaration. But who can deny the former existence of that covenant? Who can deny that this day was given as the sign of that covenant? Who can deny that it was *holy* to that people, with whom that covenant was made, and devoted to that object alone, without exposing himself to the imputation of infidelity? What conclusion then can be drawn from this, but the plain, unsophisticated inference, that God not only did not design the observance of this day by any other people, but that he would have regarded such a diversion of this sign, from the object to which it had been consecrated by him, as impious profanation.

To this clear expression of God's design, as revealed in holy writ, what has the gentleman opposed to show us, either that this day was known and observed before the sojourning of the Israelites in the wilderness, or that, during and after that event, it was observed by other nations in common with them? Strange to tell! he relies solely on the heathenish division of time to prove the former, and heathenish legends and traditions, as gathered

from profane historians, to prove the latter. And now I appeal to this audience, and I appeal to you, as you reverence your God, which shall we believe, his word, or heathenish legends and traditions ?

Such are the unhallowed weapons, by which, if he but knew it, he is striving to dissolve the covenants of God, and undermine the very foundations of the christians hope. Our hope of redemption is in the Messiah. The Messiah was to come from the seed of Abraham, and the root of Jesse. In order that there should be no doubt, as to Christ being the true Messiah ; God sanctified, or hallowed to himself that peculiar people, from whom he was to come. And in order to form the widest possible distinction, between them and all other people, he made an exclusive covenant, between himself and them, as the following passage clearly shows,—“ Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my *covenant* then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me, *above all people.*” Mark the fact, that in all his covenants, to strengthen and perpetuate their remembrance, God gave a sign, in magnitude and durability, corresponding with the magnitude and durability of the covenant, of which it was the token. Here then, was the most stupendous of all covenants, ratified by the most sacred of all signs. It was the covenant of the Redeemer, who was “ slain from the foundation of the world.” It was ratified by that *hallowed sign*, which for this purpose, God set apart, at “ the foundation of the world.” From the profanation of this sign, by diverting it from the *sacred* purpose to which it was consecrated and holy, there is but one and an inevitable result. And from this result, would be selected the choicest and most deadly weapons, for subverting the christians hope. For if their is no sign, there is no covenant, if no covenant, there is no Redeemer ; if no Redeemer, there is no hope.

Who in his senses, and with a mind unclouded by prejudice, can doubt that this was the object and end, for which God gave his Sabbath to the children of Israel ?

But since it is contended that this day was of universal application, and that it was observed before this period ; I ask, where and when shall be fixed the era of its commencement ? The gentleman tells us, that there was a seventh day Sabbath observed, by our first parents in Paradise. If so, will he favor us with a specimen of his prolific imagination, by giving us a description of the manner in which it was there observed. The appropriate employments of such a day, are those of extraordinary praise and joy. And how can he still exalt the perfect aspirations of their *daily* praise ? How can he add new pleasure to their joys *already full* ? Fan'd as they were, by the first waking airs of Eden, wafting odors around them, from Elysian fields, and every sense regaled, with all the opening beauties of a new born world ! Methinks, while every faculty, both of bliss, and adoration, enjoyed but one perpetual fullness of fruition ; the in-

roduction of a Jewish Sabbath could have added nothing to the joys of Paradise.

Where then I repeat, will the gentleman begin, with the holy keeping of this hallowed day? Will he fix the era of its commencement in the time of Noah? For, as with him was made the first covenant with man after the creation, we might discover if any Sabbath was yet known on earth. I have said that in all his covenants with men, the Almighty left some sensible object as a sign, to strengthen and perpetuate their remembrance. And in the ninth chapter of Genesis, we find that the sign of the covenant with Noah, was a very different object from that of the Sabbath day.

“And God spake unto Noah and his sons with him saying; And I, behold I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you. And God said, this is the token of the covenant, which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations. I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.”

Such, Mr. President, is the language of a universal and perpetual covenant, and we bye and bye shall see how plain is the distinction, between this, and one that is but limited and partial. Here too Sir, (if the gentleman will take no exceptions to the word of God as proof) was introduced a symbol, which hitherto had not existed, for a sign of this “everlasting covenant, between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth, for perpetual generations.” And at this language, I presume he will neither cavil nor doubt; for in addition to its being so full and explicit, we are all living witnesses of the fulfilment as yet, of this universal and perpetual covenant. For we read the attributes of the unchangable God, while we behold this resplendent symbol of his promise, “striding earth and air.”

Our search hitherto being in vain, where next will the gentleman lead us, to find the introduction of a Sabbath day. The next covenant made between God and man, having been made with Abraham, we will now see if he was required to keep the Sabbath.—As this covenant was binding only on Abraham and his seed, throughout *their* generations; so also was the token given as its sign, only of partial application; as will be found to have been the case, both in the covenant, and the sign given to Moses. And here it will again be observed, that the symbol given for a sign, had hitherto been unknown to man.

In the seventeenth chap. of Genesis, the Lord said unto Abraham, “I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in *their* generations,

for an everlasting covenant ; to be a God unto thee, and seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee ; every man-child among you shall be circumcised : And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you." Still unfortunately for my opponent, not having yet found the object of our search ; I will next show *him* where it may be found. In the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, where the first mention of the Sabbath is made ; speaking of the children of Israel in the wilderness, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departure out of Egypt, when the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron, and accused them of having brought them into the wilderness, to kill them with hunger ; we find this, " Then said the Lord unto Moses, behold I will rain bread from heaven for you. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day, they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. And it came to pass that on the sixth day, they gathered twice as much bread ; two omers for one man ; and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said, *To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord* ; bake that ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe ; and that which remaineth ever lay up for you, to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade. And Moses said, eat that to-day ; *for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord* ; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days shall ye gather it, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.— And the Lord said unto Moses, see, for that the Lord *hath given you the Sabbath*, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

This was evidently the first time the children of Israel rested on the seventh day, or had any knowledge of such an institution as was here commenced.

And now the question as to the origin of the day being settled, a quotation from the thirty-first chapter of Exodus will show its object. " And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, verily my Sabbaths shall ye keep : *for it is a sign between me and you, throughout your generations*, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you : ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is *holy unto you* : every one that defileth it, shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the

Sabbath, throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant ;
 and is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever."

Here also, let it be observed, that as was the case in the covenants with Abraham and with Noah, the symbol given as the sign, was, until so given, utterly unknown on earth. Did this not so manifestly appear from what has been said, I would ask whether it be reasonable to suppose, that as a sign of distinction between the Jews and all other people, God would have given them a day already universally observed? Could such a day be a sign of distinction to any people? No: the idea is not only unreasonable but absurd! In a comparison of these three covenants, of which a view has been taken, mark, Mr. President, how different is the language in the covenant with Abraham, from that with Noah; but how similar to this with Moses. *That* being universal, extending to all flesh upon the face of the earth, for perpetual generations. *This* being limited and partial, having clearly an exclusive application to the *children of Israel alone*, throughout their generations.

But if this language be not sufficiently explicit, we find in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, a recapitulation of the law, in which the origin of this covenant and object of this sign, are still more clearly demonstrated. "And Moses called all Israel and said unto them, the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with *us*, even *us*, who are all of us alive here this day. Keep the Sabbath to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath." Now, sir, let it be remembered that Moses here says to Israel, "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with *us*, even *us*, who are all of us here alive this day." And he urges it upon them, as an additional inducement to obedience, that the Lord commanded them to keep the Sabbath, because he brought them out of Egypt. How evident it is, that this command was not given to the Jews until after their deliverance; unless every principle of right reason be subverted, and effects follow not their causes. Here the inspired leader of Israel shows this command to be one of the effects of their miraculous deliverance. How then could this effect have existed previous to the cause which produced it? If this kind of reasoning can be reconciled by the gentleman, it verily must be done on some embryo principle of logic, which has not yet escaped his brain.

Mr. President, I really hope that my opponent's construction of the fourth commandment, and his perversion of that which I put upon it, arose not from any serious intention of his to wrest the scriptures from their obvious meaning, by an imprudent attempt at cunning. For I should scorn, sir, seriously to contend against arguments urged in favor of a cause so wretched, as to drive its advocates to such a miserable resort. Reading from the decalogue, he thus proceeds—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy

son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger"—and here he stops. Then, after a very significant pause, with a still more significant tone and manner, he demands—"Is not this law binding on the stranger as well as the Jew?" Sir, had he shown as much candor as he has cunning, and read out in full that law, which he pretended to quote, he would have found a satisfactory solution of this question, in that very clause which he so shrewdly suppressed. But here, superomniscient in legislation! he virtually proposes an amendment to the laws of God, by striking out all after the word "stranger," in the fourth commandment to the Jews. I, however, regard the sacred volume as quite too inviolable to be thus garbled at will; and, strictly adhering to the letter of the law, as promulgated by the divine Lawgiver, from this suppressed clause—"thy stranger *that is within thy gates*"—I drew the only obvious and rational inference, that it was only binding on the stranger while within the jurisdiction of the Jews.

If the gentleman be yet skeptical, as to the *reality* of this distinction between the Jews and all other people, he will find an antidote to his doubts, in the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy; for Moses tells them—"Thou art a *holy people* unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a *special people* unto himself, *above all people that are upon the face of the earth.*" So also does David inform us that "He shewed his word unto Jacob; his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation, and as for his judgments they have not known them." And, finally, on this point, Jehovah declares, by the mouth of Ezekiel, "I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them. Moreover *I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them; that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them*"

The first point I think being made sufficiently clear, viz: that God gave the children of Israel his Sabbath, *after* he brought them into the wilderness, to be a sign between him and them; it is next incumbent on me to prove the abolition of the Sabbath; and in order that nothing may be left ambiguous, I will first show *when* and by *what authority* it was abolished. This was accomplished *when* "in the fulness of time, the seed was come to whom the promise was made. Now to Abram and his seed, which is Christ, were the promises made. But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." And Jesus says—"I came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but *to fulfil*; for the things concerning me have an end." This prophet, the Messiah, is the *authority* by which it was accomplished, of whom Moses testified that *he should come*, and that to him should we hearken, rather than to himself. And as if to put the skeptic to utter silence, when at his transfiguration on the mount, God himself declared that this was *he*, and that *we* should hear *him*, Moses was there, a witness to the declaration. Christ

also testifies of himself, that if they believed Moses, they should believe him, for he wrote of him. In confirmation of all this, St. Stephen has added his testimony :—" This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord thy God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me, *him* shall ye hear."

Having shewn that Christ must be heard rather than Moses ; before I introduce his testimony of his own work, I would inquire of those who hold that the seventh day of the week was sanctified by the Almighty for universal observation, and was rendered perpetually sacred by its promulgation in the Mosaic law ; why they do not themselves observe it ? Therefore, by their own works shall they be justified or condemned. But to avoid the dilemma, the gentleman attempts, by arguments most fallacious, to substitute another day. Yes, sir, since on the authority of a divine command, he has been striving to prove that the law requiring the observance of the seventh day, was obligatory on all mankind, yet, when called upon to show, (inasmuch as he does not himself observe the seventh,) how it is, that without the authority of a divine command, he *presumes* to substitute another day in its stead ; you doubtless remember with what difficulty he was spurred to the presumptuous attempt. But when with much reluctance he was at last brought to the point, in order to reconcile his preaching with his practice, we have seen him abandon the seventh day of the week, and, after winding and wandering through all the dark mazes of sophistry, come out upon the first. And where has he begun, and what has he exhibited, to prove the divine authority for this change of days ? When we look to see him open the word of God for his authority, lo ! a newspaper is the first document he reads. When, in proof of his theory, we listen with deepning awe, to hear him announce the name of God ; forsooth he announces the name of a modern divine. This is his starting point. Here he strikes his tents, and takes up the line of his retrograde march. In his career, he ransacks the pages of profane history, and, like the witch of Endor, with her incantations, he opens the tombs of the departed, to array around him an host of human names. With this formidable array, does he approach the apostolic age. Here, as proof positive of the *divine* appointment of the christian Sabbath, he urges, with peculiar emphasis, the examples of the apostles and early christians. This, Mr. President, we gladly admit as high human authority ; because we all rejoice in the appropriate observance of the day. But *divine* authority is the object of this inquiry ; and how, with due reverence to Deity, can we regard human authority as divine ? Nevertheless, knowing this to be the very hinge on which the question turns, the gentleman makes a most unprecedented effort to sustain his position, by asserting that the apostles received *private* instructions from their divine master, to keep holy the first day of the week, instead of the seventh. Knowing also, that no instructions to this effect can be found in the New Testament, he finally and frankly confesses, that no public, explicit command was given. And for his own

reputation, as a teacher of the christian faith, I would that oblivion might cover the rest ! For, what reason has he assigned for this all-important omission on the part of our Redeemer ? Why, verily, sir, because the Jews, rejecting his dispensation, still pertinaciously adhered to that law which required the observance of their Sabbath—and that too when it had been already fulfilled, Christ durst not openly appoint another day in its stead, lest he should thereby offend the Jews ! Mr. President, I confess the difficulty which I have had, in the course of this discussion, to distinguish between the gentleman's irony and his arguments. Will he seriously presume, first to feign, and then attempt to fill deficiencies in Christ's mission ; and thus make it appear that He, who came to redeem us ; who laid down his life for us ; who had power to lay it down, and power to take it again ; and who, to deliver himself from these self-same Jews, could have prayed to his Father, and he would have sent him " twelve legions of angels ;" shunned to declare the whole counsel of God ? Whatever may have prompted the gentleman to this ill-chosen argument, surely, all, who are devoted to the cause of christianity, must blush for the presumption of its advocate ! Therefore, sir, in irony or in earnest, I leave him to his own conscience and its condemnation ! This sophistry cannot avail him. The seventh day Sabbath is either abolished, or is yet in force ; and substitution is not abolition. At the coming of Christ, the blessings of his gospel, instead of being partially conferred on the posterity of Abraham, were universally proposed to all nations and all classes ; to the freeman and the slave, the wise and the unwise, the Greek and barbarian, the Jew and the Gentile. Thus, therefore, the distinction between the Jews and all other nations, was totally abolished ; and the *law*, requiring the observance of the Sabbath, (the sign of that distinction,) being thus fulfilled, the sign itself naturally came to naught. Though this conclusion is irresistible and sufficient, yet, that not a doubt may remain on the mind of any one, we will now hearken to Him, of whom Moses wrote, and God testified, and the Apostles preached.

Speaking of this law, Christ says—" The law and the prophets were until John : since that time the kingdom of God is preached." And in the fifth chapter of Matthew he says—" Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to *fulfil*. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, *till all be fulfilled*. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." There was a law which said—" Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." Nevertheless, when our Saviour was accused of breaking the Sabbath, he did not deny having worked on that day, but justified himself for so doing :—" My Father worketh hitherto and I work." Now, sir, unless the gentleman grant that this sign of the covenant between God and the Jews was abolished, and the law requiring its observance was thus *fulfilled*, will he not make it appear that Christ

here broke one of the commandments and taught men so? I think that, on more mature reflection, he must be induced to relinquish such erroneous views, and frankly to acknowledge the previous fulfilment and abrogation of that law. The gentleman asks, "If we abolish the fourth commandment, why not abolish the whole?" Is it not surprising that any one of his profession, should have such vague and inconsistent views of the scriptures? But the fact is, by confounding Judaism with Christianity, he forgets that it is by "the *Gospel* that life and immortality are brought to light."

I will answer his question in this very conclusive manner:—that, taking Christ for my teacher instead of Moses, I would abolish only such commandments as Christ abolished, and would retain only such as he retained. And on this subject we need not mistake our duty. For Jesus says—"All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you; and if ye love me you will keep my commandments." Now to ascertain the sum and substance of all things that Christ hath made known, we have only to turn to the nineteenth chapter of Matthew: "And behold one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God; but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. And he saith unto him, *Which?* Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: *what lack I yet?* Jesus said unto him, *if thou wilt be perfect*, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." To his disciples he says—"A new commandment give I unto you. This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." Is this the *private* command, of which the gentleman has spoken? And does he find any private instructions in this for the Apostles to keep a Sabbath? But he seems to insinuate that Christ was not sincere in what he said to the young man; because, he says, there are one or two others of the commandments which are not mentioned there. Very well, sir, he may keep the Mosaic commandments: My prayer is, that I may be enabled to keep those of Christ; for to such is the promise of eternal life, and Jesus calls them *perfect!*

From these instructions, we learn that our Saviour did not consider one portion of time more holy than another. And instead of enjoining the observance of that day, or any substitute for that day—which was but the *abolished* sign of the *abolished* covenant, between Israel and Israel's God—he enjoined the exercise of greater charity and love. Hence we must conclude, that God has not commanded us to keep holy the first day of the week, or else we must agree with my opponent, that Christ made a very essential omission. I apprehend, however, that he must

have forgotten that approving voice from the cloud, which said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."

Should the gentleman still remain unconvinced of the fact that Christ's abrogation of one commandment, need not necessarily derogate from the authority of others; then superstition is too mild an epithet, by which to define his misconstruction of the scriptures. And for his special edification, I must quote one passage from St. Paul, whose views, both with regard to what was done away, and what remained of the law, are very different from his. For, this which remained, he considered the more glorious, since that which was the ministration of death, had been taken away. It is with feigned surprise, I presume, that he asks, if it be possible that the Sabbath could have been the ministration of death? I answer, that it is not possible for any one, with common sense and common honesty, to understand it otherwise. The law concerning the Sabbath was *written and engraven in stones*. The penalty of its violation was *death*. Hence Paul says—"But if the ministration of death, *written and engraven in stones*, was glorious, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that *which is abolished*. But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away, in the reading of the Old Testament; *which veil is taken away in Christ*. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts." St. Paul, who had read Moses with a veil upon his heart, until his memorable journey to Damascus, knew full well, from sad experience, the force of this metaphor of blindness. And I know not why it is not equally applicable to many of those, who read Moses at the present day.

It is so very clear, that no precept of our Saviour can be quoted, as authority for our substituting the first day of the week for the seventh, that the gentleman flies to the practice of Christ and his disciples, to find tacit proof of that, for which he has failed to shew us any command. Here too, he is equally unfortunate. For there is but one instance recorded of their being extraordinarily assembled, on the first day of the week, from the time Jesus was laid in the manger till he was received up into glory. And a moment's attention to the cause of their being thus assembled on the day of his resurrection, exposes the exceeding futility of any arguments founded on that fact. It was not to commemorate his resurrection that they were together; for that disciple, whom Jesus loved, tells us that "as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." But in the twentieth chapter of John, we find that it was "through fear of the Jews that they were assembled."

If this accidental meeting of the apostles is to be received as divine authority for keeping holy the first day of the week; we

are under the same obligation to keep the second day also in the same manner ; for we have the same authority for it in the twenty-sixth verse of this chapter. " And *after* eight days, again his disciples were within." This being after eight days, from the first day of the week, brought it to the second day of the next week ; and any other construction of it, is an imposition on common sense.

There is but one other instance of Christ's being with the apostles after his resurrection ; and whether this was on the first, second, or seventh day of the week, is quite immaterial ; for, as it was a day on which the Apostles went a fishing, the gentleman is at liberty to make the most of it.

Such being the testimony of the word of God upon the subject before us, where is the proof that Sunday is a divine institution ? Is there a passage in the Old Testament, which proves it such ? Not one. Is there a passage in the New Testament, which proves it such ? Not one. Is there a precept or example of Christ, which proves it such ? Not one. What then, I ask its defenders as such, is your authority ? Sir, 'tis like the authority of those to whom Christ said—" In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men."

I am aware, Mr. President, that the claims of respect, for the patience of this audience, demand that I here should quit the theme. But since we all recognize the day, I may be asked by what authority we do observe it. This, sir, is merely an acknowledgement of the authority of the apostolic custom. And their reasons for its observance, being those only of propriety and expediency, need no explanation.

Let me not be misunderstood. Let no one suppose that I am contending for the demolition of the Christian Sabbath, or that I would detract from it one iota of that respect, which is its due, as an excellent human institution. I do not expect, by this concession, to stand justified in the eyes of those whose predilections have locked up their hearts against conviction : yet I claim what is happily the privilege of all—FREE EXERCISE OF FAITH. Tho' this sacred privilege has often been wrested from the outraged victims of oppression ; yet observation has invariably taught us the folly of the interference of human power, to regulate matters of conscience or prescribe rules of faith on that subject, which rests only between each individual and his God. As it is a subject on which all may honestly err, I respect the religious sentiments of all, though all may widely differ. Therefore, aware of the reluctance with which religious predilections are abandoned, however sacred by some the Christian Sabbath may be deemed, I would encroach upon the privilege of no one ; inasmuch as I would not disrobe this object of their conscientious regard, of one of its virtues. I am only desirous that it should be divested of that superstitious reverence, which calls for our self-immolation in the same unhallowed spirit, with which the dumb idol Juggernaut claims the sacrifice of the wretch under its wheels.

Fortunately for me, in the sentiments I have advanced, I am

not alone. The Rev. Dr. M'Night, whose religious sentiments, agreeing with those of the gentleman on the affirmative, I presume will not be stigmatized with infidelity—comments on this subject with equal plainness and honesty. On the fourteenth verse of the second chapter of Colossians, he says—"Since the apostle hath taught us in his epistle to the Ephesians, that the ritual precepts of the law of Moses, which formed the middle wall of separation between the Jews and the Gentiles, were abolished by Christ: also, since he hath taught us, in his epistle to the Colossians, that he hath by the same means, blotted out the hand writing of ordinances, that is, the *whole of the moral precepts of the same law*, as sanctioned by the curse, and hath taken it from among Jews and Gentiles, it is evident that the law of Moses, *in all its parts*, is now abolished and taken away. Consequently, that Christians are under no obligation to obey even the *moral precepts* of the law, on account of their having been delivered to the Jews by Moses: For if the obligation of the moral precepts of his law is still continued, mankind are still under its curse." On the sixteenth verse of this chapter, the commentator proceeds—"The whole law of Moses being abrogated by Christ, Christians are under no obligation to observe any of the Jewish holidays, not even the seventh day Sabbath. Wherefore, if any teacher made the observance of the seventh day a necessary duty, the Colossians were to resist him. But though the brethren, in the first age, paid no regard to the Jewish seventh-day Sabbath, they set apart the first day of the week for public worship, and for commemorating the death and resurrection of their master, by eating his supper on that day; also for the private exercise of devotion. This they did, either by the precept or by the example of the apostles; and not by virtue of any injunction in the law of Moses. Besides, they did not sanctify the first day of the week in the Jewish manner, by a total abstinence from bodily labor of every kind. That practice was condemned by the Council of Laodicea, as *Judaizing*."

The similarity between this modern *Judaism*, against which we are contending, and that condemned by the Council of Laodicea, is too striking to need a labored comparison.

The sentiments of the Rev. Dr. Wayland, also, an eminent Baptist divine, should silence all clamor against our Sunday Mails, among those of his faith. In his late letter on the Sabbath, which the gentleman on the affirmative, for what reason I know not, unless to make "confusion worse confounded," introduced into his argument, Dr. Wayland says—"And we are free to admit, that we do not perceive, that the New Testament appoints which day in seven is to be observed. And here we believe that this is left, under the new dispensation, to the conscience of the worshipper. He, who worships in the spirit, worships acceptably to God, whether he choose the seventh day or the first."

Just so we say, Mr. President. Yet the gentleman tells you, that it is but the *croaking of infidelity*! Whatever qualification may be found to this language, in other parts of Dr. Wayland's

letter, yet, as it regards the Sunday mail question, the admission of this doctrine is all we ask or need. And the pretence of the gentleman on the affirmative, that the law still requires the observance of one seventh *portion* of time, though its precise *period* need not (because it cannot) be determined, is at best a miserable sophism. And any attempt, founded on this pretence, to dictate to us when we may go out, and when we *must* go in; when we may travel, and when we *must* stay at home; is an assumption of power well worthy of the despotism of Popery!

Mr. President, I cannot pass unheeded the shameless obloquy which has been heaped upon the name of that venerable christian and veteran soldier, Col. R. M. Johnson. A mere allusion to his name or sentiments, by some one on the negative of the question, has been sufficient to draw on his head, from the affirmative, the most venomous aspersions. Though similar feelings may prompt some not only to countenance but encourage such calumny, yet I doubt if the calumniator can expect the complaisance of those worthy members of the Baptist connexion, who were present and heard their friend traduced. For, be it known to the shame of his revilers, that Col. Johnson is a bright ornament in the Baptist church.

Having shown that the idea of there being a certain period of time, which men are required to regard as peculiarly sacred to devotion, by a divine injunction, is a theory unsustained by scripture; I come now to speak of its adoption as a manifest impossibility.

If a certain period of time has been sanctified by the command of God, and thus rendered more holy than other time, and he requires the observance of this particular period by all mankind, then the operation of this universal law must be simultaneous throughout the whole habitable globe, during the *precise period thus sanctified*. Now, sir, look at its absurdity. Suppose to the antipodes, the commencement of this holy time be at sunrise, what a gloomy scene must be our devotions! For while they are engaged in theirs at noonday, we in this western hemisphere must worship our God either in darkness or by moonlight. Thus while on one portion of the globe they are at their *matins*, on another we must be chanting our *vespers*.

But, sir, there are others situated still worse than we are. And as charity and sympathy are distinguishing christian attributes, what should be our distress while we think on the condition of the poor Norwegian, the Laplander, and others, who dwell within the Arctic circle, and whom the gentleman would consign to perdition, for the violation of that divine law, which nature's God has placed it out of their power to observe!—Whelmed as they are in almost midnight darkness, during six months in the year, I doubt if they could always so accurately determine the approach of holy time, as to know the precise moment in which their more favored fellow beings were at their devotion. But as the *day* only is required to be observed, and they have but *one day* in the year, perhaps the gentleman, in the plenitude of his mercy, would remedy all these inconveniences,

by substituting for the seventh day Sabbath, the old Jewish seventh year Sabbath, for their particular use. In this case, though their Sabbaths would be long indeed, yet they would be "few and far between."

Is it not irreverent to contend for the adoption of a theory, so apparently at variance with the institutions of that religion, whose divine founder commanded his followers to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature?" A theory altogether inapplicable to those institutions, which are in no wise inconsistent with the circumstances of any portion of mankind.

The gentleman being now driven to his *dernier resort*, which is, the practice of the Apostles and early christians, as divine authority for the Sabbath; on this point I have only to say once more, that this is *human* authority and not *divine*. So far as this authority binds us, we are under as much obligation to keep the Jewish Passover, or day of Pentecost, or seventh day of the week, as the first. For on a careful perusal of the Acts and the Epistles, we find that they improved every opportunity to preach, whenever and wherever they found the most people together. "But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost, (says St. Paul,) for a great door and an effectual is opened to me." And it appears that on whatsoever occasion or day they preached, they used the day to glorify God's name, instead of God's name to glorify the day.

So it would now be, had the christian religion been preserved in her primeval purity. But alas! how did unhallowed ambition gradually despoil her of all that was divine, until it dyed her once spotless mantle in blood! Be it remembered, sir, that the cause of this deterioration in religion, slow and imperceptible at first, was the interference of the civil power. Like those we witness at the present day, sly and insidious were its first approaches. But however unobserved was its progress, yet still its work was sure. The christian religion was kept entirely unsullied by ambition, only during that brief space while Christ's Apostles, those first watchmen on Zion's hill, yet lived. In less than one century, the better sounding names of Presbyters and Prelates were given to those who watched over the flock. To watch over these watchmen, Presidencies were soon created, and those who exercised these functions were invested with superior power. In two hundred years provincial synods were convened, whence the assembled representatives of the Church, promulgated their canons, prescribing rules of faith and discipline. So great were the allurements which these synods held out to ambition and interest, that they were soon instituted throughout the whole Roman Empire; and the Catholic Church became one great federative Republic. Thus in three hundred years, the profession of the christian faith, opened new prospects of grandeur and power, even to imperial ambition.

At this era, Constantine ascended the throne, and by effecting a union of church and state, prepared those chains for after ages, which Leo riveted on the souls of men. Under the reign of Constantine, of whose christian faith and meekness, the robe and

the diadem were the visible symbols, the Roman Prelates, assuming to be the vicegerents of Christ, and pretending to receive episcopal authority from Deity, changed the language of exhortation into command.

Here the Sabbath, which had hitherto been an agent of *spiritual worship*—now seized on as an agent of *spiritual power*—was set up like a pagan idol, for the superstitious veneration of man. Civil laws were promulgated for its observance, in which, though indeed, “those settled in the country were at full liberty to attend to the business of agriculture, lest the most favorable opportunity for planting, &c. might be lost, yet the Judges and all town’s people were *commanded to rest*, on this holy day of the sun.”

The christian church having thus become a christian empire, Rome, as it was the seat of the civil power, so it was thought should also be the seat of its handmaid the spiritual power.—Therefore, the Roman Pontiff seeing new allurements for his insatiable ambition, attempted the usurpation of the primacy over this sublunary spiritual kingdom. But meeting the invincible defiance of Cyprian, the Pontiff of Carthage, they gave melancholy proof of the baleful influence, which ambition and civil power exert over religion, by hurling at each other, with equal fury and devotion, those spiritual weapons, anathemas, invectives and excommunications.

The vast wealth of the church, being in the hands of the Bishops, who were its natural stewards, became so powerful an agent of ambition, that contempt for their authority was made an inexpiable crime; and to despise their censure, was far more dangerous for the disciple of Christ, than to neglect the observance of all moral precepts. And to enforce passive obedience to their imperious requirements, those monsters impiously arrogated to themselves the keys of *heaven and hell!*

Such was the spirit of the age, when, in 469, Pope Leo, improving on Constantine’s laws for the observance of Sunday, and to throw around this day a halo of perfect holiness, issued his mandate, that “*all, whether husbandmen or others, should forbear work on this holy day of the resurrection.*”

Here, Mr. President, mankind were blessed with that perfect *consecration* of the Sabbath, for which the gentleman on the affirmative is contending. And this, sir, was in fact its perfect *desecration* from every thing sacred and divine. For here were riveted on the consciences and souls of men, those ministerial chains, which the union of church and state, under Constantine, had prepared.

The simple, unassuming names of *apostles, prophets and teachers*, had long been lost in the grandeur of presbyters, bishops, primates and popes. That meekness and humility, which once graced the brow of devotion, had given place to the proud mitre; and the helmet of faith was discarded, for the tiara of the Roman Pontiff.

Thus did the commandments of men and the rudiments and maxims of the world, usurp by degrees the holy seat of religion,

and were strengthened and perpetuated from generation to generation. Those, who were once called disciples, having now become the wretched victims of power, bowed in stupid devotion to the mandates of their spiritual tyrants, who exacted this impious worship, while they passed by the weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and the love of God!

Who will not say, that the gradual interference of civil power, produced this final union of *church and state*? Who will not say that this union of *church and state*, produced the final ruin of both civil and religious freedom? Who will not say that this ruin of *religious freedom*, well nigh produced the extinction of the pure spirit of religion herself?

But thanks to the great Preserver, the Dove of Peace, which for so many ages wandered an outcast and a pilgrim in her own native land, abandoning at last those devoted regions, sought an asylum this side of the Atlantic, and here on our shores perched upon the cottages of the poor. Here, restored to herself, unopinioned, and free to exercise her benign influence on all; both high and low have found refuge under the shadow of her wings. And now are our eyes to behold her again fluttering in the snares of priestcraft? Must we indeed, yet see her spell bound by the enchantments of ambition? Is this generation doomed to witness her union with that fiend, which would entail on our posterity all the miseries of the old world, and result in her final expulsion from this her adopted home? God forbid! But if we would not witness a repetition of such scenes, let us beware how we listen to those syren songs, whose enchantments are but a prelude to ruin. Yes, sir, ruin—ruin forever, to the religious liberties of America, will as certainly ensue, if there be not a timely check to these encroachments of priestly ambition, as this result has been already witnessed in another land!

Is this heresy? Is this infidelity? Is this blasphemy? Sir, where is the heresy, when *truth* sustains us? Where is the infidelity, when *God* approves? Where is the blasphemy, when *Christ* hath taught? Yet heresy, infidelity and blasphemy, are epithets with which earth has been made familiar, from the cross of Christ to the stake of Servetus; yea, sir, to the present moment. Even here there are those who have opened upon us these batteries of ecclesiastical artillery.

To such I have only to remark, in conclusion, that to allay their fears, appease their anger, enlighten their understanding, and convince their reason; let them go and *read their bibles*—and in so doing, beware that they add nothing to the word of God!

7570
184