

*The*  
SMITH-SHULER DEBATE

on

*The Law . . .*

*. . . The Sabbath . . .*

*. . . The Lord's Day*

A BIBLE DISCUSSION

Between

EUGENE S. SMITH

*of the*

Church of Christ

*and*

J. L. SHULER

*of the*

Seventh-day Adventists

REST

BV

110

.565

1946

c. 2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proposition No. 1.....Page 7

Resolved: The scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day, and should be observed by Christians of today.

Affirmative—Eugene S. Smith

Negative—J. L. Shuler

Proposition No. 2.....Page 81

Resolved: The New Testament teaches that the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life and duty upon Christians of today.

Affirmative—J. L. Shuler

Negative—Eugene S. Smith

Proposition No. 3.....Page 153

Resolved: The scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, now known as Saturday, is the Sabbath and should be observed by Christians of today.

Affirmative—J. L. Shuler

Negative—Eugene S. Smith

Upon agreement as to the propositions for discussion between Eugene S. Smith and J. L. Shuler the following rules were drawn up by Mr. Shuler and accepted by Mr. Smith for government of the discussion.

### Rules Governing Proposed Debate

1. Two two-hour sessions shall be devoted to each of the above propositions in the order as mentioned. The first two of the two-hour sessions shall be held in the main to proposition number one, the third and fourth of the two-hour sessions shall be held in the main to proposition number two, and the fifth and sixth of the two-hour sessions shall be held in the main to the third proposition.

2. The King James, or the American Revised versions of the Bible shall be the standard authority by which all phases of the discussion shall be settled. The debater, under the rules of the debate, shall not be permitted to quote or cause to be quoted any writer whose writings do not appear in the Bible, or to make any reference to any other beliefs, or practices, or history of the church represented by his opponent, aside from those specifically stated in the three propositions. Only statements from the Bible shall be recognized as having any definite bearing upon the subject under discussion.

3. The debaters shall not indulge in personal thrusts and unkind Christian antagonism of any kind whatsoever.

4. The basic expense of the debate shall be reckoned as the rental of the auditorium, and an advertisement in the newspaper of a size as may be mutually agreed upon, and all offerings taken shall be applied upon this basic expense total until sufficient is in hand to meet it. If there is a deficit each side shall share equally in meeting said deficit.

5. Each two-hour session shall be divided as follows: The affirmative shall have the first thirty minutes, then the negative thirty minutes, then the affirmative fifteen minutes, then the negative fifteen minutes, then the affirmative ten minutes, and the negative ten minutes.

6. No debater shall be asked to yield the floor while occupying his allotted time in the debate, provided his speech is in keeping with the rules of the debate. Should either debater desire to put a question to the opponent, he shall have the privilege to do so, but the opponent shall not answer the question until he secures the floor for his next speech as provided for in the rules of the debate.

7. There shall be no booing, hissing, or overt demonstrations on the part of any who shall attend any of the sessions of this debate,

and if such should occur the Moderator shall stop the debate until such persons either leave the hall, or refrain from such conduct.

8. One man having no church affiliation shall act as Moderator or chairman of the debate. It shall be the duty of the said Moderator to read the rules of the debate to the audience at the first session, then to announce each speaker, call time on each speaker, and decide any issue which may be appealed to him by either opponent, in case the other opponent does not conform to the rules of this debate.

9. Each of the Principals in the proposed debate shall be permitted to select only one colleague with whom to counsel while the debate is in session. The said colleague shall give private counsel only, and shall not take part orally in the discussion of the propositions being debated.

10. A substitute speaker may be used by either side subject to all these rules in case of sickness, or a voice impairment by either of the men whose names are signed to these propositions.

11. Further details as to the mutual agreement upon the person for Moderator, and of the place for the debate, and the month and date of the debate shall be worked out to the mutual satisfaction of both parties, when due notification is received of the acceptance of the three above-mentioned propositions and the acceptance of these ten rules above mentioned.

## SMITH-SHULER DEBATE

### Proposition No. 1

Sunday Afternoon, December 29, 1946

Radio Theater, Des Moines, Iowa

---

#### Session I.

Chairman: This afternoon the proposition for discussion is:

Resolved: The scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day, and should be observed by Christians of today.

Mr. Eugene S. Smith speaks in the affirmative, and Mr. J. L. Shuler the negative. Mr. Smith will speak first in affirmation of this proposition. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Smith.

#### Mr. Smith's First Affirmative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure for me, this afternoon, to come before you to give a reason for the hope that is within me. Not only within me but within hundreds of millions of people now living and those who have lived, through nineteen centuries that have passed. I am glad to affirm this afternoon that "the scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's Day and should be observed by Christians of today." Opening the discussion, I want to first give a brief definition of the terms of the proposition, for that is always the obligation of the affirmative. By "the scriptures" we mean the Old and the New Testaments, these sixty-six books, we call the Bible. These words were given by holy men of old who were moved by the Holy Spirit. By "teach," we mean they impart information. By "the first day of the week," we mean this day upon which we are now meeting, commonly called Sunday, the Lord's Day. This part of the proposition needs no further explanation or definition for the explanation is given within the proposition.

"The first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's Day." By "to be observed," we mean something is to be done by the Lord's command or teaching. Please notice that in the proposition I am not required to show *where* this is to be done but simply that it is to be done upon this day. By "Christians" we mean children of God, those who have been redeemed by the blood of the Son of God, who died for us upon the cross of Calvary. By "today" we mean in this dispensation. In these last days this dispensation of time which began on the Pentecost following the resurrection of Christ and continuing until the Son of God shall appear once more in the clouds of Heaven, coming the second time unto salvation for all those who put their trust in Him and walk by faith to live in Him.

With this definition of the proposition we shall proceed to the arguments in the affirmation of the same. As you have noticed by the rules we are bound to the scriptures alone in this discussion. It is not a question of what history or historians teach but simply what is the will of God. I believe this afternoon that we can and will definitely establish by the will of God, the fact that Christians should observe the first day of the week according to the Lord's teaching.

I want you first of all to remember what this day means, according to the Bible. If you go to the Old Testament you find that it was upon the first day of the week the morrow after the Sabbath that the first fruits of the harvest of the earth were waved before the Lord (Leviticus 23:10, 11). Coming to the New Testament we find that Christ is the first fruits of them that sleep. So as the symbolic offering was made upon this day it was upon this day that Christ, the first fruits of them that are asleep, arose from the dead, triumphant over death, hell, and the grave. Thus significance is given to this day.

This day was the beginning of that age of regeneration spoken of by the Christ in Matthew 19:29. This day, the first day of the week is the beginning of New Testament authority when Christ triumphant over the grave came from the dead to forever reign at the right hand of God. This day, the first day of the week, the day upon which the gospel

began to be preached, the day of Pentecost mentioned in the second Chapter of Acts, is the Lord's Day.

Here for the first time the gospel in fact was preached. So it is the beginning of the gospel. Not only the beginning of the gospel but the beginning of the church. The Apostle Peter speaks of all these things; the beginning of the authority of Christ; the beginning of the gospel; the beginning of the church; as in Acts 11:15, he refers to this day—the day of Pentecost following the resurrection of Christ, which was the first day of the week—as the beginning. Upon this day Jesus for the first time was proclaimed both Lord and Christ as Peter in that memorable sermon in the city of Jerusalem before a great multitude from fifteen different nations said "God hath made this same Jesus whom you have crucified both Lord and Christ." It was the first day of the week when that historic fact—that fact which gives hope and assurance of life to everyone who will put their trust in Him, was first proclaimed.

It was upon the first day of the week that Christ arose from the dead and therefore was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead" (Romans 1:4). By that resurrection, "declared to be the Son of God with power." The stamp of God's approval was placed upon Jesus of Nazareth upon this day, as by the power of God he came from the tomb triumphant. It was upon this, the first day of the week, that the Holy Spirit came to the disciples of the Lord. In the second Chapter of Acts, the fourth verse, "When the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. Suddenly there came from Heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as fire; and it sat upon each one of them." This, again, was the first day of the week and the promise of Christ, that "I will not leave you but will send a comforter unto you," was fulfilled to his Apostles.

It was upon the first day of the week that the Holy Spirit gave to the church, which is the body of Christ, life and vitality. Before that time if it existed, even in preparation

or whatever state you may want to say, it was as the body of Adam molded from the dust of the earth, but inert, without life, without vitality, without strength, until God came and breathed into that body and it became a living soul. So it was upon the first day of the week that the Holy Spirit came to the church, came to give life and power and vitality to the body of Christ. It caused it to live and breath and be in the world the most tremendous force that has ever exerted its power among the sons and daughters of men.

It was upon the first day of the week that the Apostles first used the keys of the kingdom which Christ had entrusted to them (Mathew 16:19). It was upon the first day of the week that they first preached "repentance and remission of sins in his name" in the City of Jerusalem as he had said they would (Luke 24:49). It was on this day that baptism, by his authority was first administered (Acts 2:38).

It was upon this day that the prophecy spoken by Isaiah was fulfilled. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established and shall be exalted above the hills and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths" (Isa. 2:2-4). It was upon this day that all nations began to flow into the house of God, the kingdom of the living God.

It was upon this day that the disciples of Christ could first ask in his name. As he was ready to leave them, he said "hitherto have you asked nothing in my name. But now ask whatsoever you will and it shall be done." On this day that privilege of prayer became a reality to the disciples. Prayer through the name of Christ with him as an advocate and as an intercessor at the right hand of God became a reality. All of this and more began upon the first day of the week, the day of Pentecost of which you read in the second Chapter of Acts, so we talk to you about a day that is memorable in Christian history.

We are talking about a day that is memorable in God's

working among the sons and daughters of men and this, my friend, is the day of which John speaks in Revelation 1:10 when he says "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." Yea, it was upon that day on the Isle of Patmos that John, banished from home, from friends and from loved ones, there in lonely exile to spend the days that God allotted him on this earth, it was upon this day, the first day of the week, that John says "I was in the Spirit" and was caught up into heaven and saw the things that God had prepared to reveal, that greatest of all revelations. This was the Lord's day, the first day of the week.

But perhaps someone says now, you are assuming the proposition and therefore we require proof at this point, that this day, the first day of the week, is the Lord's day. I am happy to turn your attention to that. I want you to notice that when he speaks of the Lord's day, it is not a day distinguished by Christ being its Lord as someone might say because of the words of Christ in Mark 2:28 where Christ said, "The Son of man is lord even (or also) of the sabbath," depending upon which version you are reading. The King James version says "also of the sabbath," the American Standard version says "even of the sabbath" and either of these are authority in this discussion. Now it is not that day of which Christ is the Lord, for that would not distinguish any day. He is Lord of every day.

There are seven days, beginning with Sunday, and on through Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. Christ is the Lord of all these days and it was of this he spoke in the Second Chapter of Mark, the 28th verse when he said, "The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." Lord of all the other days and even of the sabbath. Then the same thing can be said concerning the seventh day or the first day of the week or any other day. He was simply saying to some people who did not think he had the right to act contrary to the law concerning the Jewish Sabbath, that he was lord even of that day.

That is his use of the word "even" or the word "also" depending upon which version you read. We have his statement that he is Lord of every day and Lord even of the

sabbath day, so that gives no distinction to that day. That is it is not set above any other day in the Lord's estimation or in our use of the day. The Lord was simply stating a fact that he was Lord of that day as of every other day.

But I want to tell you of a prophecy concerning a day that was to be given, a day that was to be made. In the 118th Psalm, we have the psalmist, the sweet singer of Israel speaking prophetically by the spirit of God concerning this day of which we are talking as he says "this is the day which the Lord hath made." Turn and read will you please. "I will give thanks unto thee for thou hath answered me and art become my salvation." He is speaking prophetically, he is speaking of that which was to come. "Thou hath answered me," the longing and the crying of the soul of David in those days before Christ came to bring life and immortality to light through the gospel. The dark dread question seized upon every mind, "if a man die shall he live again."

David looking forward to the time when Christ should come and should bring life and immortality to light through the gospel said, "I will give thanks unto thee for thou hath answered me and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner." Of course we know from Peter's use of this in the 4th Chapter of Acts and his use of it again in the 2nd Chapter of I Peter, that this speaks of the resurrection of Christ. Christ, rejected of men, spurned and scorned by the sons of men, brought from the tomb by the power of God and declared to be the Son of God with power by that resurrection from the dead. The stone that the builders rejected, the same has become the head of the corner. There can be nothing contemplated by David or the Holy Spirit that spoke through him at this time, but the resurrection of Jesus Christ, when he was made the head of the corner. This is Jehovah's doings. It is marvelous in our eyes; indeed it is.

Before Christ came from the tomb there was a dread, there was a fear, there was a loneliness as men went down to death. But when Christ had triumphed over death, it was marvelous in the eyes of men. It was the doing of Jehovah that he should unlock the gates of death and let

man see the other side of the river of death and let him know that there was life and immortality beyond that dark dread moment we call death. This is Jehovah's doing. It is marvelous in our eyes. How did he do it? By bringing Christ forth from the tomb. What then does he say? "This is the day which Jehovah hath made. We will rejoice and be glad in it." This is the day. What day? The day in which Jesus was declared to be the head of the corner; the day when Jehovah, by his power, brought him from the tomb. The first day of the week. Hundreds of years before it came, by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, they could see that day, could thank God for the salvation of that day, could thank Jehovah for the blessings of that day and could say "this is the day which the Lord hath made."

Not "made" in the sense of "creation," for he didn't create a new day. There were seven days before David spoke that and there were seven days afterward. There were seven days in the week before Christ came from the tomb and there were seven days afterward. It was not when a new day was to be created but "this is the day which the Lord hath made." He hath made it of a special importance in the eyes of the children of God. He hath made it forever a day to be remembered by the people of God. He hath made it above and beyond all other days henceforth by that which he hath done, upon this day. "This is the day which Jehovah hath made. We will rejoice and be glad in it."

We notice the character of observance of this day. It is not to be as the keeping of the Sabbath under the old law. It is not to be as the keeping of the Sabbath was by the Jews for almost fifteen hundred years, but this is to be a day of joy, a day of gladness, a day when the hearts of men shall sing, a day when all the world shall be glad because of that which has happened. He made it a special day, that it might be his day. He made it so by special events upon that day. This is the day which Jehovah made. We will rejoice and be glad in it. No more need be said.

I could stop here and my proposition is sustained. The Lord prophesied certain events would take place upon a day and that by this the day would be made in the eyes

of God and of man. That should be enough, for all of God's prophecies are fulfilled and therefore the prophecy alone is enough to assure all mankind and all ages to come that following those events this day was to be a historic day, was to be a memorable day, was to be a day of rejoicing and gladness when the children of God shall thank him and rejoice for his goodness to them.

However, when Christ had come from the tomb he gave us an example, a use of this day. In this I move on to my second argument in affirmation of the proposition which has been presented.

Upon this day, after Christ was risen from the tomb, he met with his disciples and gave us an example to follow. Turning now to the 20th Chapter of the Gospel according to John in the 19th verse of this chapter we notice that Christ gave us that example.

Now notice it carefully, the 19th verse, the 20th Chapter of John. "When therefore it was evening, on that day." On what day? "On that day." I would like to say on that day "which Jehovah had made" in which the children of God should ever after rejoice and sing his praises and worship his holy name. God had brought Christ from the tomb and upon that very day at evening time Jesus came to his disciples. "When therefore it was evening on that day, the first day of the week and when the doors were shut where the disciples were for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in their midst and said unto them, "Peace be unto you." Jesus came upon that day, the very day of his resurrection.

As evening drew near, and night was ready to fold its sable wings about those disciples he came to be with them. Upon what day? Upon that day in which he was raised from the tomb, the first day of the week.

Looking farther in the 26th verse we find his second meeting with them. "After eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Jesus cometh, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." Now that is the next Sunday, that is the next first day of the week. For the language is plain, "after eight days." Someone will say, "after eight days," that could not be Sunday for we

must count out eight days and then it is sometime after that. No, that was not the manner in which the Jews spoke, was not the manner in which they used their language. It is not the manner in which we have it in the Bible. I want to call your attention to something so familiar to everyone that no one can possibly deny it. In the 16th Chapter of Matthew, we have Christ speaking of the crucifixion and the resurrection, and here he says he shall be raised from the tomb "on the third day." Now notice it, "on the third day." But if you turn to the eighth chapter of Mark, the 31st verse, we find the parallel statement concerning his crucifixion and his resurrection. "He began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." Now what does that show? It shows that in the language of that time, in the language in which the Bible was written that "on the third day" and "after three days" mean identically the same thing and that example could be supplemented by every single word of God, that speak of days in a similar way but one example is sufficient now. "On the third day" and "after three days" means the same thing in the manner of speaking the Jews had in those days. In the language in which the Bible was written, it is one and the same thing, therefore, to say after eight days or on the eighth day.

Jesus being raised from the tomb on the first day of the week met with his disciples. That was the first day and then there was Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday. But nothing was said of Jesus meeting with his disciples upon that day, the Sabbath, after he was risen from the dead. However in the 26th verse "after eight days" or "on the eighth day", Sunday, again he met with his disciples. He met with them upon the day in which he was raised from the tomb. Upon the next Sunday he again met with these disciples and the record is given in the word of God. The fact is that Jesus met with his disciples on two consecutive first days of the week after he came from the tomb. The example of my Lord with his disciples is enough for me and I believe it is for everyone who believes in him.

But there is more than that, for turning on to the second Chapter of Acts, the first verse, and "when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all together in one place." And what is the day of Pentecost, pray tell me? If you go back to the 23rd Chapter of Leviticus, the 15th and 16th verses, you will find that Pentecost always came on the morrow after the sabbath. After the passover they kept the sabbath and beginning with the next day they numbered unto themselves seven sabbaths, seven Saturdays and Saturday was the sabbath day and is the sabbath day now as far as that is concerned.

We are not talking of a sabbath in our proposition today. We are talking of the first day of the week, the day which the Lord hath made, the Lord's day, a new day. As there is a new gospel, as there is a new mediator, as there is a new law, so there is also a new day. A day which the Lord hath made and in which we rejoice and are glad.

The Jews numbered unto themselves seven Sabbaths, seven Saturdays, seven seventh days of the week and on the morrow after the seventh Sabbath was Pentecost. What is the next day after Saturday? What is the next day after the seventh day? Always the first day of the week. So Pentecost always came on the first day of the week.

In Acts 2:1, and "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," the first day of the week if you please, upon which many memorable events occurred concerning the church and our redemption by the Christ. Upon that day they were all together in one place. We have the example of the Apostles gathering themselves together, assembling themselves together upon the first day of the week.

Here is a fact that it might help you to think about, After the resurrection of Christ when any day of meeting is mentioned or when any day is set forth as a day in which Christians assembled as Christians it is always the first day of the week and never the Sabbath day. They may have met upon every day so far as that is concerned, for various things but whenever the day is set forth and specifically mentioned it is always the first day of the week.

Here they had gathered together upon that day. Not only do we have the example of Christ meeting with his disciples,

but the example of his disciples after he had ascended into heaven.

In the 20th Chapter of Acts, the 7th verse, when Paul was in the City of Troas, we will remember that he had tarried with them seven days. There we read "Upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, intending to depart on the morrow." Not intending to make a journey on Sunday but intending to depart on the morrow. What is the morrow after the first day of the week? It is the second day of the week. What did they do on the first day of the week? Paul and those disciples at Troas met together. They assembled together and my friend, from the grammatical construction of the language of the 20th Chapter of Acts, the 7th verse, it can be most conclusively shown and will be most conclusively shown that this was a regular meeting of the disciples and not a special meeting of the disciples.

Nor was it an incidental meeting but it was, from the language in which the record is given, the regular meeting of those disciples and Paul tarried there seven days that upon that day he might meet with those disciples, that he might thus have the opportunity of preaching in their Christian assembly.

Friend of mine, do you realize that this example of Paul constitutes a command to you and me. In the 4th Chapter of Philippians, the 9th verse, Paul said, "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do; and the God of peace shall be with you." Now we see Paul assembling with the children of God upon the first day of the week. He says, that which you see in me do and the God of peace shall be with you. We see Christ assembling with the children of God, the disciples upon the first day of the week and the Apostle Paul following that same pattern, finally the Apostle Paul saying in I Cor. 11:1, be imitators of me, as I am of Christ and this again commands us to meet upon the first day of the week.

**Mr. Shuler's First Negative**

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Lord's day is mentioned only once in the entire Bible and that is in Revelation 1:10, where John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." If I heard Mr. Smith correctly, he said that upon the first day of the week John was caught up into heaven. Revelation 1:10 doesn't say a word about this taking place upon the first day of the week. John simply says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."

According to the rules of this discussion the propositions are to be proven by statements from the Bible. There is no Bible statement that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. John simply says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," and he doesn't specify, he does not define, what day of the week it was.

When we look into the Bible we find that there is no text in all the Bible where Christ has ever claimed that the first day of the week is His holy day. I call you to witness that since there is no text in the Bible where Christ has ever claimed the first day of the week as His holy day, then the first day of the week, or Sunday, cannot be Christ's day, or the Lord's day.

Our brother referred us to Psalms 118:24, "This is the day which the Lord hath made." There isn't a word in this text that says that this day which the Lord has made is the first day of the week.

As a matter of fact the word "day" in this text doesn't mean a period of twenty-four hours. It refers to an indefinite period of time. I'll give you an example. In John 8:56, Jesus says, "Abraham rejoiced to see My day." In this case "day" meant the time when Jesus was on earth.

The Bible says, "now is the day of salvation." Is that twenty-four hours? No. It is an indefinite period of time. So when the psalmist said, "this is the day that the Lord hath made," he was not using the word "day" as referring to any certain day of the week, or to some specific twenty-four hour period, but rather as Jesus said, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day and was glad."

Brother Smith referred us to John 20:19 as proof for keeping Sunday. Had Christ's disciples gathered to worship upon the first day of the week? Brother Smith said that they had come together to have a meeting for worship.

Now what are the facts? Look at Mark 16:14. Mark's account is parallel to that of John's and Mark tells us why they had come together. Mark 16:14 refers to the same meeting mentioned in John 20:19. "Afterward he (referring to Christ) appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat."

They had gathered to eat their supper at the close of the day. When Christ appeared they were terrified. To assure them He said, "Look at me. I am not a ghost. Handle Me. I am flesh and bone." Then he said, "Have you any food?" They had just gotten up from the supper table when Christ appeared. They handed Him a piece of honey comb and broiled fish and he ate it.

They had gathered to eat their supper. This is certainly no proof that we should keep the first day of the week, simply because Christ appeared to His disciples, as they were eating their supper upon the first day of the week. These disciples had refused to believe the eye witnesses of His resurrection. When Mary Magdalene told them, "The Lord is risen," they said, "not so." Those men did not believe Christ was risen and Christ appeared to them upon the evening of the day He rose, as mentioned in John 20:19, to convince them that He was risen. Christ appeared to them this Sunday evening not to honor the first day of the week, but to convince them that He was risen from the dead.

Our brother says that John 20:28 proves that they were together again the next Sunday and Christ appeared to them the next Sunday. The rules of this debate are that we follow the Bible. The Bible declares that it was after eight days. Our brother assumes that this was the next Sunday.

If I came to your house Sunday night about 7 o'clock and said that after eight days I'll be back, when would you expect me? Certainly not the next Sunday. You would expect me about Monday or Tuesday.

To place this meeting on the next Sunday, Brother Smith will have to put eight days between two Sundays. I've never

seen a man who could put eight days between two Sundays, have you? I don't see how you can put eight days between two Sundays.

The Bible never contradicts itself. If Mr. Smith will put down these two references, if he will compare I Chronicles 9:25 with 2 Kings 11:5, he will find that "after seven days" is the Scriptural expression for defining a week. Since the Bible is ever in harmony with itself, it could not and would not use "after eight days" to mean a week in John 20:19, 26.

The object of this second appearance of Christ was not to honor the first day of the week. If it had been so, God would have been specific and said upon the next first day of the week Christ appeared to them. The purpose of this second meeting was to convince Thomas, who still refused to believe that Jesus was risen.

What about the third time Christ appeared to His disciples? Brother Smith didn't tell you about this, but I will tell you about it. The third time that Christ met with His disciples, when was this? You put down John 21:3-14 and you will find that the third time He appeared to them they were out fishing. Was that on Sunday? If this was on Sunday, it shows that Sunday is not the day for Christians to keep. This is sufficient to show that every time Christ appeared was not to honor the first day of the week. If this third time was on Sunday, then the whole argument for Sunday is gone by the board.

Our brother referred to the day of Pentecost. Acts 2:1 simply says, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come". It doesn't say that it was the first day of the week. It simply says, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come". If the Scripture had designed to honor the first day of the week in Acts 2:1 the record would have been specific in stating that it was upon the first day of the week.

If Pentecost happened to come upon Sunday in that year, that was no proof for keeping Sunday. If you will read the book of Acts you will find that the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the disciples on all the various days of the week.

The divine purpose was to fulfill a certain type without regard to any day of the week. The crucifixion of Jesus Christ

took place on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month to fulfill the type of the paschal lamb. His resurrection took place on the sixteenth day of the first month to fulfill the waving of the sheaf of the first fruit. The outpouring of the Spirit took place on the fiftieth day, the day of Pentecost, to fulfill the type of the feasts of weeks, or Pentecost.

Christ was with His disciples forty days after His resurrection and then He ascended to heaven. Pentecost was the fiftieth day. There were ten days between the day of His ascension and the day of Pentecost and there were two Sundays in those ten days. If the purpose of the outpouring of the Spirit was to honor the first day of the week, then why was that first Sunday which followed His ascension passed by in silence? The answer is, that it was not the purpose of God to honor any particular day of the week in this, but the outpouring of the Spirit was to fulfill one of these great types from the former dispensation.

The proposition before us is: "Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day, and should be observed by Christians of today." According to the rules of this debate the propositions are to be proven by statements from the Bible. Mr. Smith has been talking to us for thirty minutes and he hasn't produced one text from the Bible which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.

I have a question for Brother Smith and I'll hand it to him on a card. Here is the question: Will you please read to the audience one text during your next speech which says the first day of the week is the Lord's day? Unless you can show such a text, then you have lost your case on the proposition before us. And we can tell you now that he will not produce such a text, because no such text can be found in the Bible.

We do have plain, positive evidence that Christ has claimed the seventh day of the week as His holy day. Put down Isaiah 58:13. In this text the Lord calls the sabbath His holy day. This audience can see that since the seventh-day sabbath according to God's statement is the Lord's holy day, it must therefore be the Lord's day.

The New Testament shows that the eternal Son of God,

Jesus Christ our Lord, is the Creator of this world. I refer you to John 1:10, "He was in the world and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." Christ then is the One Who made this world in six days. Christ is the One who rested upon the seventh day, after He made the world in six days.

Genesis 2:3 shows that the Creator blessed and sanctified the seventh day after He had rested upon it. I turn to Genesis 2:3. "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." Since Christ is the Creator and He blessed and sanctified the seventh day, then the seventh day is bound to be Christ's special day, the Lord's day.

There is no text in the Word of God that says that the first day of the week is to be kept in honor of our Lord's resurrection. Since there is no statement in the Bible that the first day of the week is to be kept in honor of the Lord's resurrection, that shows that there is no Bible authority for keeping the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection.

The Lord's supper did come in as a new ordinance under the new dispensation. We are not left to guess at that. We are not left to build up a lot of inferences in an attempt to establish the Lord's Supper as a Christian ordinance. No. We have plain Scripture for this. We have plain Scriptural records of its observance again and again.

I have another question for Brother Smith and I'll hand it to him on a card. Here it is. If the first day of the week came in as a new sacred day for Christians to keep under the new dispensation, like the Lord's Supper and Baptism came in as new items under the new dispensation, why doesn't the Bible give a plain record how the keeping of the first day of the week was instituted, observed and commanded, as in the case of the Lord's supper and baptism?

The facts are that there is no record whatsoever of the institution of the keeping of the first day of the week as a holy day. There is no record of it being observed as a weekly holy day. There is no command for its observance. This

proves that it did not come in as a new day to be kept under the new dispensation.

Everybody knows that when a new institution or a new law comes in, it must be fully explained. If the keeping of the first day of the week had been instituted in the day of the apostles as a new day in the place of the seventh day which had been kept for centuries, it certainly would have been mentioned, explained and set forth in the New Testament. Amos 3:7 tells us that "the Lord God will do nothing but He revealeth His secrets unto His servants the prophets."

According to the New Testament it is no more necessary to keep Sunday every week, to honor the Lord's resurrection, than it is to keep Friday every week to honor His crucifixion. Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's supper as a memorial of His death. Paul declares that as oft as you eat this bread and drink this cup you show the Lord's death until He comes. Jesus Christ did not institute the keeping of Friday every week as a means of commemorating His death. The God-ordained way of honoring Christ's death is by eating the Lord's supper. Jesus Christ likewise instituted Christian baptism as a memorial of His burial and resurrection. Colossians 2:12 declares that we are buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him. Baptism is the God-ordained way of commemorating Christ's resurrection.

There is no text to show that Jesus instituted the keeping of the first day of the week to honor His resurrection. The God-ordained way of honoring the resurrection is by Christian baptism. There is plain Scripture for this. Hence it is literally true according to the New Testament that it is no more necessary to keep Sunday every week to honor the Lord's resurrection than it is to keep Friday every week to honor his crucifixion.

I have another question for Brother Smith. He referred us to Acts 20:7. I would like to ask, Brother Smith, was this meeting at Troas upon the first day of the week, held upon what we call Saturday night, or was it upon what we call Sunday night? Please answer this question for us in your next speech.

The first day of the week is mentioned eight times in the

New Testament. There isn't any statement in any of these eight texts to the effect that we should keep the first day of the week in honor of His resurrection. The first six of these texts speak of the first day of the week in connection with the identical first day on which the Lord arose. Mark this well. Six of those first-day texts mention the first day in direct connection with the identical day on which Jesus arose. These texts were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, years after the resurrection had taken place. If the first day had come into use as the Lord's day, in honor of the resurrection, wouldn't these men have mentioned that the keeping of the first day had taken the place of the keeping of the seventh day on the part of Christians? Certainly. The fact that they wrote years after the Lord's resurrection and yet make no mention whatsoever of the first day of the week, having become by that time, a holy day, or the Lord's day, in honor of the resurrection, makes those six texts, six mighty witnesses to show that Sunday is not the Lord's day.

The Apostle John wrote about A.D. 95, or more than sixty years after the resurrection of Christ. If the keeping of the first day of the week had been established for Christians beginning with Christ's resurrection wouldn't John have found out about it in sixty years? Certainly. When he wrote about the first day of the week, he said that on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene came to the tomb. Not even a hint is given about the first day having become the Lord's day.

When John wrote about other things, he did throw in a parenthetical note in the light of what happened later on. I refer you to John 7, where he speaks about the coming of the Holy Ghost. He was writing about something which took place during the ministry of Christ before the Holy Ghost was poured out following Christ's ascension. In John 7, verses 37 to 39 I read, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." Then notice John throws in a parenthetical note to interpret this in the light of what happened later on when the Holy Ghost did come. Here is his note in verse 39. "But this he

spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

When he wrote his gospel some sixty years after Christ's resurrection and mentioned the first day of the week in John 20:1, 19 in connection with Christ's resurrection, why didn't he throw in a parenthetical note that the first day of the week was henceforth to be observed as the Lord's day? If the first day of the week is the Lord's day, he would have said so. The fact is, Sunday is not the Lord's day according to the Scriptures, and there was nothing that John could say about this or needed to say about it.

I think I have answered Brother Smith's arguments. I do have considerable to say about Acts 20:7. I'll say what I can in the time that I have left, then I can pick it up again later on. In Acts 20:7, we have a record of a meeting held upon the first day of the week at Troas. It says, that the disciples came together to break bread. The mere holding of one meeting at Troas upon the first day of the week, or the breaking of bread upon that particular day of the week cannot be sufficient evidence as to why Christians today should keep the first day of the week. As a matter of fact, back there in those early days, they broke bread daily. Here it is in Acts 2:46. "They continued *daily* with one accord in the temple breaking bread from house to house, and did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." Acts 20 shows that this meeting that was held at Troas upon the first day of the week was Paul's farewell meeting with these believers, and that is why Paul preached all night long. The record doesn't state that it was a regular custom for the believers to meet every first day of the week. It distinctly shows that it was an all-night meeting.

We read verses 7 and 8. "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together."

About midnight a young man who went to sleep fell out

of the window. Paul preached a long sermon. Even Paul couldn't keep everybody awake. This young man went to sleep and fell out of the window and he was taken up dead. Paul did some things that we can't do. He was able to bring that man back to life and they went up again into this upper room and they broke bread and Paul kept on preaching until the break of day.

#### **Mr. Smith's Second Affirmative**

I am happy to continue this very fine discussion which we are having. I am confident that no discussion of this nature, carried on this plane, can be anything but good or can result in anything but good. Of course, in this speech I shall only have fifteen minutes and therefore, it will not probably be possible for me to review all the things and answer the questions that Mr. Shuler has asked but I have another speech of ten minutes yet this afternoon and then tonight there is another full session and I am sure that ere we have concluded the discussion of this proposition today, we shall have given full satisfaction to him on all these matters that he has suggested.

Now I want to take up for just a very few minutes with you some of the things that he said. Somewhere in the Bible there is a line, "the last shall be first and the first shall be last" so let's begin where he left off and follow right down the trail with a brief notice of some of those things. Of course I should call to your attention that this is not seriously my obligation this afternoon for I'm in the affirmative here. It is not Mr. Shuler's job to make affirmative arguments or to ask me questions necessarily but rather to examine and follow the arguments that I have made. But I am glad, because this is an investigation in which we seek the truth, to notice those things which he has said that I had not introduced but first of all one that I had introduced.

On the 20th Chapter of Acts, the 7th verse, he says that one meeting is not enough to establish this. It would take more than that. Now that is his assertion, that is his statement. But my friends, who am I or who is he or who is anyone else to decide how much the Lord shall say upon a subject

or how many times he shall give an example. I want to impress upon your minds one thing. The Lord's religion is a religion of faith and wherever I have gone to preach the word of God, wherever I have talked with the sons and daughters of men I have found that objection among people who did not want to believe what God had said. "There is not enough said upon this subject," it might be any one of a thousand subjects but "there is not enough". It will always appear to my mind that God did not make too full a revelation upon many things because he wanted to test the faith of individuals. I have always stood upon one firm foundation that if God said a thing one time to me or for me in this dispensation in which I live or gave me one divine example of what he wanted me to do, I should never afterward question him further and I should never ask him for more proof. The Lord has spoken and it is enough for his servant to obey.

Thus in the 20th Chapter of Acts he said this was not a regular meeting. Let me suggest to you this one thing, the definite article, "the", "the first day of the week", indicates that it was a regular stated meeting. Now if it had been otherwise, if it had an incidental meeting, or a special meeting then the Lord would have said "Upon *a* first day of the week when we were gathered together." That's a special meeting but when he said, "upon *the* first day of the week"; when the definite article was placed there he thereby showed that it was for all time to come to be considered a regular meeting.

And he asked, why did not John give a parenthetical statement to say that this first day of the week is a day of worship? Well, not a parenthetical, my friends, but a principal statement. The custom and the manner of worship of the early church is set forth. "Upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together", not to bid Paul farewell, not to have a farewell supper, but "when we were gathered together to break bread". As in Acts, the second chapter, the 42nd verse, "the disciples continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching, the fellowship, the breaking of bread and the prayers".

He asked the question, was it upon Saturday night or was it upon Sunday night that this meeting took place? Upon that I will stay with the Bible, I'll stay with Luke and the Holy

Spirit, it was upon the first day of the week. If Mr. Shuler knows when that is and I'm sure he does, then he knows when the meeting was. Upon the first day of the week. That, my friends, is enough and God has revealed this matter to us as he mentioned Amos 3:7. God has revealed it to his prophets and did reveal it to them in that day and they met upon that day according to God's revelation.

Now, he asks, if the first day came as a sacred day for Christians to keep under the new dispensation like the Lord's supper and baptism came, under the new dispensation, why doesn't he give a plain record, how it was instituted, observed and commanded. Now I set forth to you in my first speech this afternoon how that the Lord met with his disciples on that day and how that after that time they met upon that day. Then the command from the Apostle, "the things ye have seen in me, these things do and the God of peace shall be with you." (Phil. 4:9)

He showed the institution of worship as he met with his disciples. He showed us the observance of the day as his disciples met upon it. He showed us what they did upon that day. They came together to break bread, to eat the Lord's supper. Upon this day the Lord's supper was eaten and it was a new institution upon a new day, the Lord's day and the Lord's supper.

Then Mr. Shuler had to get in one argument on the Sabbath and it's well and good that he began for it will take a lot of work for him to put over his idea on that, but there will be plenty of time to discuss the Sabbath. "The Sabbath", Isaiah said, "is God's holy day". Yes, but not necessarily that it was always to be God's holy day. The law under which it was God's holy day and the law which made it God's holy day and set it forth and proclaimed it to man and commanded the observance of it as God's holy day, was taken out of the way, being nailed to the cross. Isaiah spoke while that law was in effect. It was God's holy day then, there is no question of that, but the question before us is, "is it God's holy day now," not was it God's holy day in Isaiah's time, but is it God's holy day in our time?

Jesus, the creator of the earth, created the earth and all

things in it and rested on the seventh day. That is the statement of course, according to scripture. We don't deny that God rested upon that day, upon that seventh day. I wonder if he can find the verse of scripture which says man rested on it with God. Did Adam and Eve rest that day? Where is the verse of scripture? The scriptures plainly indicate that that day was not kept as a day of rest or as a holy day by man for approximately twenty-five hundred years.

He asked me to read one text that says that the first day is the Lord's day and then in the next moment he began to argue from Isaiah 58; John 1:10; Genesis 2:3 that the seventh day is bound to be Christ's day, the Lord's day. I wonder why Mr. Shuler didn't just read one verse of scripture that said the seventh day is the Lord's day. I gave plenty of scriptural evidence, plenty of Bible proof that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. He wouldn't accept that but then he turned around and wanted you and me to accept his proof that Saturday is the Lord's day and he followed over a circuitous path and it wasn't nearly as complete as the one that I had given.

The Lord's day is mentioned but once in the Bible, Revelation 1:10. The scriptures I read in the first thirty minute speech surely demonstrate that this is the Lord's day. The first day of the week is the Lord's day. Not one verse which states it in so many words, but plenty of biblical proof and scriptural evidence that it is the Lord's day.

Of John 20:19, he asks, had they gathered for worship? Why no, he says, they had gathered to eat and they were frightened. Of course this was the day upon which Christ was raised from the dead. These people had not kept the first day of the week, they had not observed it in any way. They did not know the meaning or the plans of God in that day, but Christ knew and Christ came to meet with them. He found the place where they were gathered together and he came to be with them. Not only upon that day but also upon the following first day of the week.

He says the Bible says after eight days, "so you will have to have", said he, "eight days between two Sundays". I want to call your attention to something else. I mentioned it before,

but just a repetition of this, in order to keep it clearly before you, in the 16th Chapter of Matthew, the 21st verse, we have Christ speaking, "From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples, that he must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed and the third day be raised up." "And the third day be raised up", and you will remember Mr. Shuler said Christ was crucified on the fourteenth day of the first month and he was raised from the tomb on the sixteenth day of the first month. Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, there are just three days and on the third Christ is to be raised and you remember the two disciples that walked along the way to Emmaus and said, "this is the third day." All right, fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth. But I turn now to the 8th chapter of Mark and the 31st verse and here you have the Christ also speaking of this very matter. In this verse as he was talking to his disciples he began to teach them that "the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and the scribes and be killed and after three days rise." Now you see where Mr. Shuler is. This is Bible proof and that is what the rules of our discussion called for, Bible proof. After three days, what does it mean? On the third day. After eight days, what does it mean? According to the Bible, on the eighth day. The first day of the week as it came again, the first, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, the eighth day was the first day of the week again and upon that day Christ met with his disciples.

They met and they worshipped him and there is a command to the disciples of Christ, to the children of God, to observe this day in the command to perform a certain act of worship on this day. We have authority for its observance. An act of worship is commanded. In 1st Corinthians 16:1, 2 Paul said, "as I have given order to the churches of Galatia so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by in store as the Lord has prospered you that there be no collections when I come." Now without entering, at this time, into any argument as to where they were to do the laying by, here is a religious act of worship which is commanded

to be done upon this day, therefore, they were to observe this day, and my proposition does not say how it is to be observed, simply that it is observed. Here is an act of worship commanded for this day, the first day of the week and therefore by divine command and by divine example as these people kept that command, we have authority for Christians to observe the first day of the week today.

Paul did not only teach that to those of Corinth but he said as I have given order in the churches of Galatia and more than that, in the second verse of the first chapter he said to all Christians. This letter was addressed, not only to those in Corinth, but to "all in every place who call upon the name, Jesus Christ our Lord both theirs and ours." And according to 1st Cor. 4:7 he said what I teach to Corinth I teach to all the churches. According to 1st Cor. 7:17, what I ordain to you, I ordain all. Now those churches in that day and time were commanded to lay by in store upon the first day of the week to perform an act of religious worship. Where are churches or Christians at home or in congregations ever taught to give on the sabbath day?

#### Mr. Shuler's Second Negative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Smith thinks that the use of that little word "THE" means a lot in Acts 20:7. The first day of the week is mentioned six times in the four gospels and so far as I recall every time it uses this definite article "the" in the same way as it does in Acts 20:7.

How else could Luke write? He was writing a record. If the meeting had been held upon the second day of the week, he would have said upon THE second day of the week. The only natural way to speak was to use the definite article. This doesn't prove anything so far as giving us any scriptural evidence for keeping the first day of the week.

You will notice that Brother Smith evidently doesn't care to answer my question as to whether this meeting at Troas upon the first day of the week took place on what we call

Saturday night, or what we call Sunday night. Perhaps I had better answer it for him and let him take his choice.

I think his church takes the position that this meeting at Troas occurred upon Sunday night. If the meeting occurred on Sunday night, as they claim, then I want you to notice that the breaking of bread didn't take place until after midnight. If the day is measured by the Roman method from midnight to midnight then the first day of the week would have been from Saturday night midnight until midnight Sunday night. The record definitely states that Paul preached until midnight. Then the young man fell out of the window. Paul raised him from the dead. Then sometime after midnight they assembled again in the upper room and broke bread. This is what the record says in Acts 20:7-11.

Brother Smith, if this meeting at Troas was on what we call Sunday night, then you haven't even one recorded instance where they ever broke bread on the first day of the week, because the breaking of bread in this case took place after midnight. If the first day of the week closed at midnight Sunday night and the meeting was on Sunday night, then the breaking of bread, as anybody can see, took place in the early hours of what we now call Monday.

In the Bible time is measured according to the Biblical method, and the Bible day of twenty-four hours is measured from sunset to sunset. On that basis the first day of the week would be from sunset Saturday night until sunset Sunday night. In order for Paul to preach all night long upon the first day of the week, you can see he preached all night Saturday night, and then took about a twenty mile walk Sunday morning.

While he was preaching all night long on Saturday night, Luke and Paul's other co-workers were working hard to pull that boat around that peninsula, because Paul had appointed that he would meet them at a place called Assos. They were to go ahead with the ship. He was to stay there at Troas and preach all night. Then walk across the peninsula on foot in the morning and join them in the ship.

Notice that in the place of Acts 20:7 proving anything in favor of the first day of the week, it is absolutely against the keeping of the first day of the week. It shows that the

Apostles used that day as an ordinary working day and did not keep it as a holy day. Those disciples were working hard on the first day of the week to pull that boat around the peninsula. Paul worked hard in taking that twenty mile walk on Sunday morning. If our first-day brethren feel that Acts 20:7 is such a wonderful proof, then they had better preach all night on Saturday night and take a twenty mile walk on Sunday.

I'll have more to say about Acts 20:7 later on. And now a word about the claim that the Sabbath wasn't kept until twenty-five hundred years after creation. I shall not go into that now, because we will have two nights on the Sabbath question this week. When that time comes, we will take this up from the Bible.

The Holy Spirit guided these men in writing the sixty-six books of the Bible. The Holy Spirit never contradicts Himself. If "after eight days" in John 20:26 means the next Sunday, then tell me why is it that in I Chronicles 29:5 when God speaks of the period between two successive Sabbaths, He uses the expression, "after seven days". If you will compare I Chronicles 9:25 with 2 Kings 11:5 you will find that God uses the expression, "after seven days", to denote the period between two successive Sabbaths. The Bible would be out of harmony with its own way of reckoning, if it used "after eight days" in John 20:26 to denote the period between two successive Sundays.

The day on which this second meeting took place meant nothing for that day. What about that third meeting, Brother Smith? They were out fishing. Was that to honor Sunday? There was no more about that third meeting to honor any certain day of the week, than there was about this second meeting after eight days. It was not to honor any day. This second meeting was to convince Thomas, that Christ was indeed risen from the dead.

Some have claimed that Christ's disciples met on the identical Sunday on which Jesus arose to worship in honor of His resurrection. As a matter of fact, those disciples didn't believe Jesus had risen. Hence they couldn't have met to honor an event which they did not believe had occurred. They met to

eat their supper, and Christ appeared to them to convince them that He was risen.

What about I Corinthians 16:2? It says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him". This doesn't say that they were meeting on every first day of the week. It doesn't say, that they were keeping the first day of the week. It doesn't show that this was a public collection.

When we passed these baskets a little while ago, you didn't lay that money by yourself. Mr. Smith and I have that money. You haven't got it. It wasn't laid by you, brother. We've got it to pay this \$250 rent plus other things today.

Paul says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store." How can anybody read into that idea of a public collection at church? It was simply a private laying by at home.

Does this show that they were keeping the first day of the week as a holy day? No, indeed. It proves just the reverse. These people had worked the first six days of the week. Then they kept the seventh day holy according to God's command. Then upon the first day of the next week, before they began their labors for another week, they figured up their accounts, so they could lay aside a certain amount as an offering according to the amount of their gain. This meant a casting up of accounts from their books. Anybody knows that spending time on books, figuring, is not an act of worship. This shows that they were not keeping the first day of the week as a holy day. They used Sunday as a business day. It was to them an ordinary working day like the second day of the week. Sunday is merely one of the six working days.

Paul was making a tour of the churches. He was on his way to Jerusalem. There were poor saints at Jerusalem, who had given their all to start the gospel work in the early days. Paul was anxious to help those people.

So he wrote to these churches, that each one should lay by something at home every Sunday for this relief fund. Then when Paul arrived, they could turn it over to him, and he would take it on to Jerusalem to help these poor saints, who had given their all to start the work of the gospel. There

is absolutely no proof in this, that we should keep the first day of the week. In fact it proves just the reverse. It shows that the first day of the week is a business day.

These arguments for Sunday are merely flimsy supports of the most dubious kind. The keeping of Sunday is not founded upon the Scriptures. It rests only upon the sand of human tradition and reasoning.

Jesus declares that the house built upon the sand will not stand. Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Christ never planted the keeping of Sunday. If He had done so, there would have been a plain scriptural record that He instituted it for Christians, and that they were to keep it.

When it comes to keeping the seventh day, we are not left to build up our case by uncertain inferences. No. The Bible gives a plain, positive record of its institution and of God's command that we should keep it holy.

God never changes. He is the same yesterday, today and forever. If He had planned or designed that the keeping of the first day should take the place of the seventh day, He would have plainly told us so in the Bible. He would have given a plain record of how and when the keeping of the first day was instituted for Christians.

He would have given instances of its observance. He would have told us how to keep it. He would have told us not to work on the first day of the week. Since these flimsy supports are all that Sunday has, then it has no scriptural support at all.

In this discussion, the proposition is to be proven by statements from the Bible. I am still waiting to hear any text which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. It has not been read, and I say to you, that it will not be read in this debate, because there isn't one text in entire Bible that says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. There isn't one text that says the first day of the week is to be kept in honor of the resurrection. There isn't one text where the first day of the week is ever given any sacred title. There isn't one text which declares that the first day of the week is to be kept as a holy day by Christians.

**Mr. Smith's Third Affirmative**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen, I come before you for my final speech this afternoon but there will be another full session on this same proposition tonight and many other things will be introduced during that session as time has not afforded opportunity to bring them all into this. We have wanted to present one thing at a time and to keep it well established before you.

Mr. Shuler has his idea of how the Lord should have ordained the day and how he should set it apart; how he should have commanded it; how he should have shown the observance of it. I let God do things in his own way and God did upon this day raise his Son from the tomb. Upon this day Christ met with his disciples; upon this day the disciples met; upon this day they gathered together to break bread; upon this day they were to lay by in store. These are religious acts, these are all items of worship of the early Christian and therefore, I think we have shown how Christ gave his example and showed how this day is to be observed.

Now he asked about I Cor. 16:2, "Lay by him in store" but Paul said so there would "be no collections when I come". Now if you had put your money in your pocket this afternoon or in a tin box at home, or wherever you might want to put it, when Mr. Shuler wanted it to pay the expense on the auditorium we would have had to come around and make a collection. Paul said what I command you to do upon this day, (and by the way it was done for probably a year or more before Paul arrived there). What I command to do upon this day, upon the first day of the week, that is as often as the first day of the week comes, is in order that I won't have to make a collection when I come. Therefore, it was an act of worship and it was commanded by the Apostle.

He asked about the third meeting in the Gospel of John. The 21st Chapter of John, 3rd and 14th verses. Of course there is nothing special about that and the day is not told. It doesn't say whether it is Tuesday, Friday, Sunday or what day. It isn't set forth. I said he might have met with them every day but every time the day is specified; every time they tell what day it is, it is always the first day of the week.

Every time any mention is made of the day it is always the first day of the week.

He says, now the Bible to be in harmony must follow itself. Well, what is he going to do about Matthew 16:21 and Mark 8:31? "On the third day" and "after three days", means the same thing. He hasn't mentioned that yet.

And then he said concerning the meeting in Troas. While the disciples were pulling a boat around a peninsula, I haven't found that yet. The thirteenth verse of the 20th chapter of Acts says they sailed. It says they sailed. He said they pulled the boat, well now I might like a little evidence on that. My Bible says they sailed around and so we have that.

But he tried to show that this meeting was on Sunday night or it was on Saturday night. Paul took a twenty mile journey on foot on Sunday or else they didn't eat the Lord's supper on Sunday after all. Now, you know, I think I'll just leave that with Luke and the Holy Spirit. "Upon the first day of the week they gathered together to break bread." I believe they broke bread on the first day of the week because the Holy Spirit says they came together on that day to do that thing and that's enough.

Now, as to the article, "the" or "a", the definite article is there, "The first day of the week". It's there in the King James Version, it's there in the revised version, go to any version you want, it's there. But these are our authorities. If I could speak Greek, I could read it to you in the Greek, it's there, "THE first day of the week". But he says, how else could he have said it? Why very easily, "upon A first day of the week". That shows an incidental or a special meeting, but "upon THE first day of the week", that indicates every first day of the week, a regular meeting.

I call to your attention when the Lord said, "remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." He wasn't talking about one was he? He wasn't talking about an incidental one or special one. "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," when he said that to the Jews, fifteen hundred years before Christ they were to keep every Sabbath day for fifteen hundred years, so long as that law which commanded it, stood. That, my friends, is definite. There is the definite article there

and so when we have the statement that "upon the first day of the week when the disciples were gathered to break bread" we have a statement of a definite and a regular meeting, which they observed.

I call your attention, in a brief summation, at this time, that this day, the first day of the week is "the day that the Lord hath made", by making upon this day the stone which was rejected the head of the corner. Upon this day Christ met with his disciples. Upon at least two occasions the disciples gathered upon this day and upon this day they engaged in acts of religious worship, the breaking of bread, the Lord's supper. Not the eating of meat, as in Acts 2:46, for that explains their meeting every day. They were eating meat or their common meal but this is a religious act of worship, the eating of the Lord's supper upon the first day of the week.

When they were gathered together, Paul says over in I Cor. 11 that they gathered together to eat the Lord's supper. They gathered together in Acts 20:7 to break bread, to eat the Lord's supper and upon the first day of the week they were to "lay by in store". Thus we have the divine example of the Christ and his disciples, example of the early church, the command from Christ, the command from Paul and therefore, all things that are necessary to show us that we should observe the first day of the week today.

Just what does the first day of the week have to offer and what does Saturday have to offer? I want to call your mind to the end of the Sabbath, to the last Sabbath that was kept under the Jewish law. What kind of a day is that for Christians to remember with Christ in the tomb; the soldiers keeping their watch by his tomb, the cloak of sable gloom that hung over all, the pall of death casting its shadow over the land; Christ's body in the grave, and his soul in Hades; his disciples disconsolate with their hope gone and dead; a day of mourning and a day of sorrows, the disciples weeping, the mother heartbroken. If ever there was a day when the angels grieved it was this day. If ever there was a day when hell rejoiced and the imps of hell shouted in glee, it was this day. Memories of the anguish of the cross, the agonies of death, the bitter cries, the expiring groans, the mournful tomb, the

gambling soldiers as they gambled for his robe, and the heart-breaking scene of Jesus upon the Cross as He looked down upon His own mother and gave her away to that beloved disciple and said, "Mother behold thy Son, Son behold thy mother." Thus all the anguish of all the ages is to be remembered, when we remember that Sabbath day when Jesus lay in the tomb, when Jesus was taken from his disciples.

But as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, lo! the glorious sunlight as the Son of righteousness, riseth with healing in his wings. As comes the dawn God's strong angel descends from heaven as lightning from on high and the rock is rolled away. The guards stand as dead men there and the tomb is open. Christ rises in victory over death, over hell, and over the grave.

The disciples run for joy and Satan's hope for victory over Christ is gone forever. The angels rejoice and according to Psalms 24:9 they sing, "O lift up your heads, O ye gates and lift them up, ye everlasting doors that the King of Glory may come in. Who is the King of Glory? the Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory." Upon this day the angels sang, for Christ had come from the dead.

Salvation has come to the world. The Son of righteousness has arisen with healing in his wings. Rejoice and be glad in this day, this day the Lord has risen. The light has come and blotted out the death upon the cross and all the memories of that day. The song of the angels, the words of life, the joyous Saviour's face, the adoring disciples are forever our remembrance.

Upon this day gladness, joy, victory and liberty have come to the world for Christ has risen from the dead. He gives to the world life and immortality through the gospel which he has now made a fact and a reality.

#### Mr. Shuler's Third Negative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I turn again to Acts, the 20th chapter and the 7th verse. I will not finish with it now. At the Hoyt Sherman Place tonight we will go a little further with it.

The 20th chapter of Acts shows that in this meeting at Troas the breaking of bread took place sometime between midnight and dawn. This is what the record shows. Paul preached until midnight. Then this young man fell out of a window. Paul raised him from the dead. Then he went back into the upper room. They broke bread, and Paul preached until the break of day.

Here are the facts. Facts are stubborn things and you can't get around them. Let us face the facts as per the Bible record. The facts are that the breaking of bread at this meeting at Troas took place between midnight and dawn.

Who can believe that it was a custom in the days of the apostles to break bread between midnight and dawn? There isn't anybody who could believe that. There you have if you please a sample of the kind of proof that we are offered why we should keep the first day of the week.

The next place that Paul stopped after he left Troas was Miletus. At that place he met the elders of the church of Ephesus. I read a verse in Acts 20:25. "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more."

He reminds them that it was a farewell tour, so far as he was concerned. They would never see his face again. This is why he preached all night long at Troas. It was not an ordinary, regular meeting on the first day of the week at Troas. Paul was there on a farewell visit, and being a farewell occasion, those people were willing to stay all night long to hear him preach.

Paul told these Ephesian elders that the ones among whom he was now traveling would see his face no more. We read in Acts 20:36-38 about his farewell meeting with these Ephesian elders.

"And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down and prayed with them all." This describes the meeting at Miletus. But the same principle applies to the meeting at Troas as to being a farewell meeting. "They all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck, and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more."

This shows that the meeting Paul held at Troas upon the first day of the week was merely an incidental farewell meeting. This is why it lasted all night long. There is absolutely nothing in this to show that anybody today should keep the first day of the week, merely because Paul held an all-night farewell meeting on a certain Sunday.

I Corinthians 16:2 says, "Let every one of you lay by him in store." Mr. Smith interprets this as a public collection. Many versions of the Bible like the Portuguese, Italian, and Spanish and others even use the words "lay by him at home". Laying the money by yourself must have meant laying it aside at home.

Mr. Smith says, that if they put the money in a tin box at home, this wouldn't meet what the text says. Let us get the facts. Paul was writing on ahead. This was months before he would see them. He would meet with these people when he arrived. He was endeavoring to guard against these people not having any money ready for this relief fund.

Paul simply wrote ahead, and told them to lay something aside on each first day of the week, so that when he arrived they would have the money ready to turn over to him. This is absolutely no proof that we should keep Sunday. I remind you again that laying by as God has prospered him involved business reckoning. And this shows that they were not keeping the first day of the week as a weekly holy day.

This was rather a custom which had come over from Judaism. The Jews worked each day until sundown on Friday. Then they kept the Sabbath. Then on Sunday morning, they figured up their accounts as to their gain, and laid aside an offering. There is no proof here as to why anybody today should keep Sunday.

I can't lay aside the plain command of God for keeping the seventh day on the basis of such flimsy evidences as these. I can't desert the plain Scripture record where the Son of God blessed and sanctified the seventh day. We are not left to guess at it. We are not left to build up a lot of far-fetched inferences. The Bible proof for the seventh day is specific, direct, and positive. It is unequivocal. There is the plain

record from the Scriptures that the Son of God blessed and sanctified the seventh day.

Mr. Smith cannot produce any text to show that Christ ever blessed, or sanctified, or hallowed the first day of the week. There is no text that says so. I must stand by the Bible. I cannot desert the plain, solid rock of Scripture evidence and get over on the sinking sands of his flimsy arguments, where it is entirely a matter of unreliable inferences. He unwisely interprets the Bible in the light of present custom, instead of first getting back to the Bible and obeying the plain statements of Scripture respecting the seventh day.

The proposition before us is, "Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day and should be observed by Christians of today." I am still waiting for one text that says the first day of the week is the Lord's day. If our brother will read one text that says this we will close this debate now. I'll pay all the rest of the expenses, and I will give up the keeping of the seventh day and will keep the first day of the week.

I do not ask for two texts. I ask for one text that says the first day of the week is the Lord's day according to this proposition. There is no such text in the sixty-six books of the Bible. There is not one text where the first day of the week is ever called the Lord's day. There is not one text where the first day of the week was ever appointed to be kept as the Lord's day. There is not one text that shows that the first day of the week is to be kept in honor of the resurrection. There isn't one text where the apostles ever kept the first day of the week as a holy day, or ever taught Christians to keep it as a holy day. There isn't one text where Christ ever claimed the first day of the week as his day. There is not one text where Christ ever blessed, hallowed or sanctified the first day of the week or Sunday. And this is sufficient to show that there is no Bible authority for the keeping of the first day of the week.

**Smith-Shuler Debate****Session II. Sunday Night, December 29, 1946****Hoyt Sherman Auditorium, Des Moines, Iowa**

Chairman: This evening Mr. Smith and Mr. Shuler continue the discussion begun in the afternoon session.

The proposition is the same as in our first session.

Resolved: The scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day and should be observed by Christians of today.

Ladies and Gentlemen, your affirmative speaker, Mr. Smith.

**Mr. Smith's Fourth Affirmative**

I am happy tonight to come before you continuing the discussion of this proposition which has been under discussion in the previous session today. "The scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day and should be observed by Christians of today." It is a proposition, that I am confident is upheld by the word of God. We shall proceed in the affirmative of that proposition by the word of God.

As mentioned this afternoon, Psalms 118: 21-24 speaks of a day which the Lord would make. It was in prophecy then and this day was to be made by certain events; it was to be made by the resurrection of Christ. When the stone rejected of the builders was made head of the corner, this day was made. And we know from Matthew 28:1 that it was upon the first day of the week that Christ came from the tomb, therefore, declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:4).

Upon this day, the same day he met with his disciples, some of them did not know that he was risen from the tomb. Some of them were not convinced that there had been a resurrection. When he appeared they were terrified but Jesus made it a point to begin upon this day a meeting with his disciples upon the first day of the week. From that day

unto this he has not ceased to meet with his disciples upon the first day of the week, for he has said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in midst of them" (Matt. 18:20).

He met with them upon that first day, he met with them upon the next first day of the week, which was eight days from the day of his resurrection. Thus he gave an example of meeting with his disciples upon that day.

We later find, after his ascension into heaven, that upon the first day of the week which was the day of Pentecost, Jesus met with his disciples. Now this afternoon it was said that I would have to prove that the day of Pentecost was the first day of the week. I am turning to Leviticus, the 23rd Chapter, verses 15 and 16, "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven sabbaths shall there be complete; even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meal-offering unto Jehovah." Now we know that beginning with the morrow after the sabbath and numbering seven sabbaths, you begin with the first day of the week in the numbering. The first day of the week is one, the seventh day of the week is seven. That is that week, but you have to number unto seven sabbaths, so seven times seven, seven days in each week, seven times seven. The forty-ninth day is again the sabbath and that is the seventh sabbath. The morrow after that seventh sabbath, the fiftieth day, you have Pentecost. That is literally the meaning of Pentecost, fiftieth. It was the fiftieth day from the time they began that numbering and it was always the morrow after the sabbath. Now I know that everyone of you can understand that the Jews, speaking of their seventh day sabbath, as they always observed it under the law, numbering seven of those sabbaths and the morrow after the sabbath could be no day but the first day of the week.

So when the day of Pentecost was fully come, that being the first day of the week, the disciples were gathered together and there the Holy Spirit came upon them. Whenever the disciples were gathered together Jesus had said he would

be in the midst of them, so he was with them then. Then coming on down through the history of the church, we never find in all the history of the early church and all that is given in the Bible, one time where the church as a church, where Christians as Christians, gathered together upon the sabbath. That was done away, was gone. The law that had enjoined it had been taken out of the way and had been nailed to the cross and never do we find a meeting of Christians or of disciples of the Lord, arranged by them and conducted by them for the worship of God upon the sabbath day.

You find Paul and some others going into the Jewish Synagogue on the Jewish sabbath for those people did not think the law had been done away or that Christ was the Son of God. They continued to keep the sabbath, the seventh day sabbath and Paul at times and other preachers at times went into those synagogues upon that day to preach but these were Jewish meetings. You never find a meeting of Christians as Christians meeting to worship God upon the sabbath day after the cross of Christ, never. But you do find in the 20th Chapter of Acts that upon the first day of the week when the disciples were gathered to break bread, Paul preached unto them.

I want to turn now to that particular passage of scripture and I want you to notice a number of things that are in it. Much was said about it this afternoon and Mr. Shuler promised a great deal more to be said about it, so let's just see what is there. Beginning with the sixth verse "we sailed from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we tarried seven days." Now notice that Paul stayed here in Troas seven days. He was there over the seventh day, the old Jewish sabbath, but do you notice that the Bible does not say that "upon the sabbath day we gather together to break bread." It isn't there. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find Christians meeting upon the sabbath to break bread, but contrariwise you do find here that "upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together to break bread."

They were gathered together. Here is a gathering of the children of God. It is a gathering for which Paul had waited

seven days. It is a gathering which did not take place upon the seventh day sabbath for that sabbath is passed by without a mention. That day has no significance to the Christian for it is not a day of worship for a Christian and nothing is said of it. Now, surely if that had been the day for Christians to meet and eat the Lord's supper and have their religious services that would have been the day that Paul met with them; that would have been the day that Paul spoke to them. Nothing is said of any meeting upon that day, but instead upon the first day of the week, the day that is commonly called Sunday today, the day that is the Lord's day because he made by his resurrection and by being made the head of the corner upon that day, upon that day the disciples were gathered together to break bread.

Now Mr. Shuler this afternoon had a good deal to say about that particular verse and asked me a question as to whether they met on Sunday night or on Saturday night. I simply answered that I was going to stand with the Bible, that I was going to take what Luke said, that the Holy Spirit of God said, that "upon the first day of the week they met," upon the first day of the week. I wonder if Mr. Shuler will take that too. I wonder if everyone in this house will accept what the Bible says that "upon the first day of the week they were gathered together" and there was a purpose in that gathering that day. They gathered together upon the first day of the week to break bread. Now I believe they met upon the first day of the week, whether you have that day beginning at sundown or beginning at midnight. That is not important in this discussion at this time. The Bible says "upon the first day of the week" and whatever way they measure, whatever reckoning of time they used, it was according to the Spirit of God upon the first day of the week that they met. They met upon the first day of the week for a specific purpose, to break bread.

Now, I want to know if those who worship upon the sabbath, those who think we should keep the old Jewish sabbath, those who think we should keep the seventh day of the week holy ever follow this example and meet upon the first day of the week to break bread. This is our example that upon

the first day of the week we gather together to break bread. Now, I believe they did what the Bible says they did, that they gathered on the first day of the week. Whether you begin the day at sundown or midnight, I believe they gathered on the first day of the week and I believe the purpose of their gathering was to break bread.

Mr. Shuler, I want to ask you a question tonight and I want you to answer it before this audience when you come to the stand to speak. Do you believe they did what they came together to do? Do you believe they met on the first day of the week or do you think it was on the seventh day or the second day? Did they meet, Mr. Shuler, on the first day of the week, or did they meet on the seventh, or did they meet on the second day? What day did they come together on? And when they came together on that day to break bread, did they do what they came together for or did they do something else? An answer to those questions will help right here.

The Bible says that upon the first day of the week they were together to break bread. Here, my friends, is the example of a church and an apostle led by the Spirit of God, giving us an example for all time to come. The church meeting for the worship of God for the Lord's supper upon that day.

What was the purpose of their gathering together? To break bread. To show that that was not to have a great basket dinner, let me read you a line from the 11th chapter of I Corinthian letter where Paul says "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" They were to eat their ordinary meals at home, from house to house. In their homes, in their houses. Not when they were gathered together. Paul says that "when you gather yourselves together it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper," that is in the condition they were in. The purpose of their gathering together was to eat the Lord's supper. He condemned them for not being able to do it. He said, ye have houses to eat and drink in, therefore, this gathering together in the 20th Chapter of Acts, the seventh verse, can be for no purpose in the world but to eat the Lord's supper.

Paul being with them that day was an incidental matter.

It didn't matter whether he was there or not. They gathered together upon the first day of the week to break bread, to eat the Lord's supper. It was the Lord's day and time for the Lord's supper. They came together for that. Paul knowing that they would thus come together as all early Christians did upon that day to eat the Lord's supper waited until that day that he might have the opportunity of speaking to them and upon that day he did thus speak.

Now, Paul speaking to them and Paul being with them was an incidental matter. Yes, perhaps so. To say farewell to them, grant that this is true. Moreover, to speak the word of God to them. But that was not their purpose of gathering together. It was the established custom of these people, of these disciples, to meet upon the first day of the week to break bread. Paul simply waited until the day of their meeting that he might have them together and talk to them.

When Paul went to talk to the Jews in the synagogue, he went in to talk to them on the sabbath day, the seventh day, of the week. Why? Because that was the day that they were gathered together. When Paul wanted to address an assembly of Christians, he waited until the first day of the week. Why? Because that was the day they gathered together.

Mr. Shuler tried to even say this afternoon that this meal was not eaten until Monday sometime. Wanted to read at length to show that and read on down that "there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together and there sat in the window a certain young man named Eutychus, borne down with deep sleep; and as Paul discoursed yet longer, being borne down by his sleep he fell down from the third story and was taken up dead. And Paul went down and fell on him, and embracing him said, Make ye no ado; for his life is in him. And when he was gone up, and had broken the bread."

"They met," said the Holy Spirit through Luke, "to break bread." Did they do it? Their gathering together, says Paul according to the 11th chapter of I Corinthians was to eat the Lord's supper, to worship the Lord according to his commandment. Did they do what they met to do, Mr. Shuler? If they did then, my friends, the proposition is established

but he says, "no they didn't break bread until Monday morning" and he puts it away over there.

But will you notice something, my friend, that last reference in the 11th verse, "when he was gone up and had broken the bread and had eaten," that does not refer to the Lord's supper. That is not the eating of the Lord's supper by the congregation of the disciples for it cannot be. It says he had gone up and broken and eaten. Who is it that is eating there? (Early on Monday morning if he wants to say that.) That is Paul partaking of an ordinary meal by himself before he sets out on the journey twenty miles across to the place where he was to embark in the ship. Notice the difference in the seventh verse, "upon the first day of the week when WE were gathered together to break bread." Here is the congregation, all of those disciples, "WE were gathered together to break bread." In the 11th verse you do not have that but you have that "when HE had eaten." There is just one who partakes of that meal on Monday morning.

The disciples, the church, the Christians at Troas, met together upon the first day of the week to break bread and I believe they did what they came together to do. Therefore, in this example, we have the Christians of the first century doing exactly what we do today, observing this day as a day of religious worship.

Mr. Shuler said "you see, it was way after midnight along in the morning, Monday morning" and thus he intimated that the disciples did not do on the first day of the week what they met to do. I'm asking Mr. Shuler, do you think, Mr. Shuler, that the disciples did on the first day of the week what the Holy Spirit says they met to do?

Paul said, "be imitators of me as I am of Christ." Christ met with the disciples upon the first day of the week, not once but twice, at least, according to the Bible. Paul met with the disciples upon the first day of the week. He says, "be ye imitators of me, as I am of Christ." Paul imitated the example of Christ in meeting with the disciples upon the first day of the week.

If we imitate Paul we will not forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is. We will upon

that day of assembly be where the children of God are. We will assemble ourselves together to eat the Lord's supper, to worship him in spirit and in truth and will do it upon the first day of the week because that is the day Christ met with his disciples; that is the day Paul met with the disciples; that, my friends, is the day that they observed as a day of religious worship.

We turn to the 16th chapter of the I Corinthian letter, which was introduced this afternoon that we may also give a few things about that. "Now concerning the collection for the saints," when there is a collection it signifies a gathering together. You can't take a collection, one putting it over here on Woodland, another over on High Street, another Keosauqua Way, another out on Beaver Avenue. You can't do that. Paul said, "I am writing to you concerning the collection." What does that mean? That means the putting of things together. The gathering of things together.

"Now concerning the collection, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia," I have not only written this to you at Corinth, I am not only writing this to the church in Corinth, but I have given orders in the same way to all the churches of Galatia, throughout all the province of Galatia. Every church has had orders about this, it is a matter commanded, that upon the first day of the week. What is he talking about? He is talking about a collection. When is it to be? Upon the first day of the week. What are you to do? You are to lay by in store. "Upon the first of the week let each one of you lay by him in store."

Mr. Shuler says that means that he should put it in a separate place at home. Lay by him, lay it by wherever he is. Then there is no collection and that wasn't the thing about which Paul was writing. He said, I am writing about the collection, another act of worship, in serving the living God and in worshipping the Christ. Here is an act of worship and I am writing to you about it. I want you upon the first day of the week to take thought for this matter and to do what I am commanding you to do; what I have ordered all churches throughout Galatia to do.

Paul said in I Corinthians, 4th chapter and 17th verse and

I Corinthians, 7th chapter and 17th verse, that as I teach the church of Corinth so teach I all the churches. As I ordain in the church at Corinth, so I ordain in all the churches. And he said in I Corinthians, 1st chapter, and 1st and 2nd verses, "to the church of God which is at Corinth, sanctified in Christ Jesus with all that in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours." This order that he gave was to the church in Corinth. It was to all the churches in Galatia. It was to every one in every place who called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, who was sanctified in him. Therefore, here was a universal order for Christians upon the first day of the week to engage in an act of religious worship, the contribution of their means according to their prosperity.

I wonder if Mr. Shuler can find in the Bible where Christians were ever commanded to engage in an act of religious worship upon the sabbath, the seventh day of the week. I wonder where it is. You know friends, I sincerely believe this tonight. If Mr. Shuler could find in the Bible anywhere a verse which said, upon the seventh day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as the Lord has prospered, that there be no gatherings when I come, I believe that Mr. Shuler would definitely use that verse and would emphasize that verse and would read it over and over and over again. I believe he would give ten dollars for a verse like that tonight. If he could just find one that said upon the seventh day of the week, or upon the sabbath day do this, I believe he would give ten dollars for it and would read it over and over again.

Well, I've not only found a verse, in which it says upon the first day of the week, let each one of you lay by him in store; that is engage in worship of God in the giving of your means. But I have also found where it also says upon the first day of the week that the disciples gathered together and engaged in religious worship. That my friends, is enough to establish this matter. For every fair minded man and woman, that is enough of the word of God to forever establish it in the heart of every person.

But there was some question this afternoon about the ex-

pression, after eight days, and Mr. Shuler gave a reference in 2 Kings, the 11th chapter, I believe it was, and the 5th verse and again in I Chronicles, the 9th chapter, the 25th verse. I want to turn to those because I want to examine everything that is presented here. I am looking for the truth. If I don't have it and if that phrase, after eight days, doesn't mean that he met with them on the next Sunday, the next first day of the week, I want to know about it.

When I got home I took my Bible and looked up these passages. I think I had read them before, I'm confident of that, but I went to them to see because you remember I made the argument today, this afternoon, that when John said to Christ, after eight days, in John 20:26, when he said that he was speaking of the next first day of the week. Christ met with them on the first day of the week and after eight days they met again. I said with those people of that time, in their way of speaking, "after eight days" and "on the eighth day" was the same thing. Mr. Shuler agreed with me, I am sure because of an illustration he gave. He said that Christ was crucified on the fourteenth of the first month and was raised from the dead on the sixteenth of the first month. Well now, friends of mine, in the eighth chapter of Mark, the 31st verse, Christ said that he would be raised after three days. How are you going to get more than three days from the fourteenth to the sixteenth? Fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, where is any more? But Christ said in Mark 8:31 "after three days." He said "after three days" and that meant definitely and positively the third day. You turn to the 24th chapter of Luke, the 31st verse, those disciples talking of this matter said "this is the third day." He had said I will be raised "after three days." They said "this is the third day" and it was on that day that Christ was raised from the dead. In fact Christ himself speaking of it at one time said "on the third day." "On the third" and "after three days," means the same thing. Well "on the eighth day" and "after eight days" means the same thing and when therefore, John said that Christ met with his disciples "after eight days" it was "on the eighth day,"

just as when he was raised from the dead "after three days," it was "on the third day."

But Mr. Shuler cited another example of the use of these words and asked me to turn here and realize that I was mistaken, so I turned and I read and I want to read it to you. In the 25th verse, the 9th chapter of I Chronicles, "and their brethren in their villages were to come in every seventh day," or the King James Version says "after seven days." They were to come in when? After seven days. They were to come in every seven days from time to time to be with them.

Now he wanted me to compare that with 2 Kings, 11th chapter and the 5th verse, and he commanded them saying, "this is the thing that ye shall do: a third part of you that come in on the Sabbath." On what? "On the sabbath." What day was the sabbath to those people? Seventh day wasn't it. The sabbath was the seventh day. You all agree with me that the sabbath was the seventh day. It says he commanded them, saying, "this is the thing a third part of you that come in on the sabbath shall be keepers of the watch of the king's house. They were to come in when? On the sabbath, on the seventh day. But the other reference said "after seven days."

Why that's the very thing that I've been arguing all day. "After eight days" and "on the eighth day" is the same thing and he gave me another example. He gave two more scriptures just to add to what we already had. He gave me two verses and says these compare together and here you have "after seven days" and "on the sabbath." On the seventh day, it is the same thing.

That is the way those people spoke at that time. That is the way they used the words. That is the thing that I have been contending for all the time and Mr. Shuler has given me more proof. "On the eighth day" and "after eight days" mean identically the same thing. Just as "on the third day" and "after three days" mean identically the same thing. Just as "on the sabbath" and "after seven days" mean identically the same thing.

I grant that we today don't use the language quite that

way but these illustrations are too plain in the Bible for anyone to think that they didn't use it that way then. So when Christ met with his disciples on the first day of the week, the day that he was raised from the dead and then met with them "after eight days," that was "on the eighth day" and therefore, you have two meetings of Christ with his disciples upon consecutive Sundays. You don't have to go into the purpose of it. He met with his disciples. His disciples were together and he came and met with them. Perhaps Mr. Shuler will say that that wasn't a religious meeting. I wonder if he will say it was an irreligious meeting? It was a meeting wasn't it? They were together weren't they? They were in a room meeting together and Christ met with his disciples. Was it an irreligious meeting? Do you think Christ met with them in an irreligious way? I'm not going to say it.

Then I find the disciples later gathering upon the first day of the week to break bread; to worship the Lord as he has commanded; to eat the Lord's supper. I find them commanded to perform a religious act of worship in laying by in store as the Lord has prospered. What other conclusion can we come to, except that this day, the first day of the week, is the Lord's day and that upon it from the day that Christ was raised from the tomb until now Christians have been meeting to worship God. Christians have been worshipping God in spirit and in truth and Christ has been meeting with them because he said where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst. And may I close with this question, "Where does Mr. Shuler ever find them so meeting upon the Sabbath day for Christian worship?"

#### Mr. Shuler's Fourth Negative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Now about this after eight days. Brother Smith, I have a text for you, and I want you to carry out your interpretation. Will you open your Bible to the 17th chapter of Matthew, verses 1 and 2? "And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James

and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart. And was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light."

Now Brother Smith, this says "after six days." Was this on the sixth day? You must follow your rule of interpretation. You say that after eight days meant the eighth day. If we follow your rule, after six days means that this happened on the sixth day. But was that the case? No.

It is true that in some texts the Bible declares that after three days Christ would rise again. But we are not left to interpret this "after three days" according to our own ideas. The Bible definitely gives other texts which speak of the same event, and declare that He would rise on the third day. So in this case we have the Bible interpreting itself, and making it clear, that after three days does mean the third day.

But where the Bible is silent, we should be silent. We have no right to go beyond the written Word. When the Scriptures declare that Christ would rise after three days, I know that this means the third day, because the Bible definitely tells me so. But Mr. Smith cannot find any text where this after eight days of John 20:26 is interpreted to be the eighth day in any declaration of Scripture. He has not produced a statement from the Bible which says that "after eight days" in John 20:26 means the eighth day.

In the case of "after three days" we have the Scripture interpreting itself. There we are safe, but a man is on unsafe ground when he takes another phrase, "after eight days," and says that this is bound to mean the eighth day. If that were so, this "after six days" in Matthew 17:1 according to Mr. Smith's own rule of interpretation would have to mean the sixth day.

Was it? No. Here is the positive proof for this. All you need to do is to compare the Scriptures together. I'll turn to Luke the 9th chapter which speaks about this very same event—the transfiguration of Christ. Notice how indefinite this after six days becomes in the light of Luke's account.

I turn to Luke, the 9th chapter, 28th and 29th verses. "And it came to pass about an eight days after these saying he took Peter" (see it is talking about the same event) "he took Peter and John and James and went up into a mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening."

There you have Scripture speaking. Where Scripture is silent, we had better be silent.

In this case you see his interpretation falls down. It is proven to be unsound. It is proven to be untrue. According to his argument, "after six days" would have to be the sixth day. But was it? No. Luke 9:28 says that this took place about an eight days after the time specified. So "after six days" became an indefinite period without any specific Scripture to show that it meant the sixth day. In the case of the three days, we have the specific Scripture to interpret that as meaning the third day. But in the case of John 20:26 there is no other Scripture which says it took place on the eighth day. Since there is no Scripture to say that after eight days meant the eighth day, no man can definitely state that this meeting after eight days from the previous meeting was on Sunday.

To say so, is merely the man's own assumption. This discussion is to be settled by statements from the Bible. Mr. Smith has not given any statement from the Bible, which says, that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.

The proposition is: "Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day, and should be observed by Christians of today." Not one text has been given which says what this proposition affirms. It is not what Mr. Smith says. The real point is, Where does the Scripture say that the first day of the week is the Lord's day? I repeat the question which I asked him in my first speech. Where is one Scripture that says the first day of the week is the Lord's day?

In regard to this after eight days, if you will take the time to read carefully John 20:24-29 you will find that the purpose of that second meeting was not to honor any certain day. If God had wanted to honor the first day of the week

in this case, then He certainly would have told us, on the next first day of the week the disciples were together. It would have been just as easy to say, "upon the next first day of the week," as to say "after eight days." Without any definite interpretation in the Bible itself, this after eight days may be an indefinite period of time like the after six days in Matthew 17:1.

Without exact scriptures to guide us, we had better leave it alone. Without exact scripture to guide us, we can't build up any argument on it.

John 20:24-29 makes it clear that Thomas wasn't in that first meeting when Christ came to convince them He was risen. He wouldn't believe that the Lord was risen unless he could put his finger into the nail prints. Then it says, "after eight days" Christ appeared and told Thomas to come now and make good what he had said. It is clear that the purpose of the meeting was to convince Thomas, and not to honor any particular day.

Another notable meeting that Jesus had with His disciples was on the day that He went back to heaven. Was that on Sunday? No. It is generally agreed that the ascension of Christ took place on Thursday. It was certainly a notable meeting. It was the last meeting in which He appeared to them.

Was this meeting on Sunday? Absolutely not. You can see that this idea that every meeting of Christ with His disciples between His resurrection and the ascension was held on Sunday falls to the ground of its own accord. It doesn't stand the test of scripture. One of the most notable meetings of all on the day of the ascension was not on the first day of the week.

Now about Acts, the 20th chapter and the 7th verse. I want Mr. Smith to take note that I believe just what the Bible says. The meeting was held upon the first day of the week. I take the Bible just as it reads and I don't try to read into it something that isn't there.

This meeting was on the first day of the week. The Bible measures the day of twenty-four hours from sunset to sunset. There is no question about that. The 1st chapter of Genesis

says the evening and the morning were the first day, second day, third day, fourth day, fifth day, and sixth day. Each day was from evening to evening.

Paul preached all night long upon the first day of the week. Anybody can see according to the Bible rule, the first day of the week began at sunset on what we call Saturday night, and it would close at sunset on Sunday night. In order for Paul to preach all night long on the first day of the week, it could not have been any other time according to the Bible way of measuring the day, except what we call Saturday night.

The record shows that Paul took this journey the next morning, which must have been Sunday morning. This proves that Paul did not keep Sunday as a rest day. He regarded Sunday as an ordinary working day. So in the place of Mr. Smith finding any proof in Acts the 20th chapter and the 7th verse, it is all against him on the question of Sunday being observed as a holy day.

Paul took a nineteen or twenty mile walk on Sunday morning, which is certainly some work. We have evidence in this same chapter that the rest of Paul's party worked with the boat on this same first day of the week. Mr. Smith questioned my statement about them pulling the boat. In those days they had sails and oars. Sometimes there was no wind and they had to pull the oars. Regardless of whether the wind blew that night or not, these fellow-workers of Paul used the first day of the week as a working day. Paul regarded it as a working day and that is all that it is.

Our brother said, that Paul told them that they were to be imitators of him, as he was an imitator of Jesus. Well Brother Smith, if we will let Jesus settle this debate as to which day we ought to keep, and if both of us will follow the example of Jesus in the day that we keep, we can close this discussion at this point. Jesus kept the seventh day. So we could rest the issue at this point, if we will both follow the Lord Jesus Christ.

Jesus is the only perfect pattern. Paul said, "Be imitators of me as I am an imitator of Jesus." We are perfectly willing to rest our case with Jesus, the incomparable Jesus. Jesus kept the seventh day, Mr. Smith knows that. Jesus never

kept the first day of the week. I am willing to risk my case in keeping the same day that my blessed Lord kept.

I am not ashamed to keep the seventh day when Jesus kept it. He is our perfect example. We are to walk in His footsteps. If we will keep the day which Jesus kept, then this debate is settled now. If we will all agree to keep the day that Jesus kept, it is settled now, and we will all keep the seventh day. Then there will be a lot more seventh day people in Des Moines.

Paul said, "Be imitators of me." What day did Paul keep? Acts 28:17 presents clear evidence that Paul kept the seventh day. I read Acts 28:17, "And it came to pass that after three days Paul called the chief of the Jews together; and when they were come together, he said unto them, Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers."

Did you get that? Paul told the Jews, "I have committed nothing against the customs of our fathers." Mr. Smith himself will have to admit that one of the leading customs of the Jews was to keep the seventh day. Paul told the Jews that he had not gone contrary to the customs of their fathers. This is tantamount to saying that Paul kept the seventh day. If he had not kept the seventh day, he would have been guilty of a serious breach of the customs of the Jews.

How quickly the Jews would have accused Paul of breaking the sabbath, if he had not kept the seventh day. But nowhere do we find them ever accusing Paul of not keeping the Sabbath. Paul could look the Jews in the eye, and declare that he had committed nothing against the customs of their fathers. This makes Paul a seventh-day sabbath keeper.

Here is a chart with some facts from the book of Acts. According to the specific record in Acts, Paul preached at Antioch on the seventh day, or Saturday Sabbath, on which the Jews met for worship. According to Acts 13:42-44 Paul preached there on two successive sabbaths. At Philippi in Acts 16:13 he preached on one sabbath. At Thessalonica according to Acts 17:1-3 he preached on three successive sabbaths. At Corinth he reasoned every sabbath day with the Jews and the Greeks in the synagogue.

Acts 18:11 declares that he stayed in Corinth one year and six months. In one year there are fifty-two sabbaths and in six months there are twenty-six. Twenty-six and fifty-two are seventy-eight. This would make seventy-eight sabbath meetings which Paul conducted at Corinth. This makes a total of eighty-four sabbath meetings by Paul as mentioned in the book of Acts.

In Acts 20:7 we have the record of the only meeting that Paul ever conducted on the first day of the week, as mentioned in the Scriptural record. Here is the record of eighty-four meetings on the Sabbath and of only one meeting on the first day of the week. The score is eighty-four to one. If you went to a baseball game, or a football game, and the score was eighty-four to one, would you have any doubt about who won? The score in this discussion is eighty-four for the seventh day, one for the first day.

Our brother has laid great stress on this meeting upon the first day of the week at Troas as mentioned in Acts 20:7. If the mere holding of a meeting is proof of which is the right day for Christians, then there is eighty-three times as much proof in the Acts of the Apostles for keeping the seventh day, as there is for keeping the first day of the week.

Brother Smith has appealed to the Book of Acts to show which day Christians should keep. I would like to notice another fact or two from the book of Acts. I will turn to Acts 15:21. This verse is a part of a speech that the Apostle James made at a general council of the apostles, elders and leaders of the Christian church. This council was held about A.D. 52, or about twenty years after the resurrection of Christ. Mark this well. This verse tells what day of the week the Christian church in the days of the Apostles recognized as God's holy day for His people.

Brother Smith has had a good deal to say about what day the church recognized. Here is something to think about. I read Acts 15:21. "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day."

Notice that this verse doesn't apply to some apostle going into the Jewish synagogue to preach to the unbelieving Jews

on the seventh day. This sentence is part of a speech that James, the presiding officer, is making before the first general council of the Christian church. The Apostles and the elders and the leaders were there. James is making a speech. In the midst of this speech he refers to the Sabbath.

Mark this point. When he refers to the Sabbath before these Christian apostles and elders, he identifies the Sabbath, or God's holy day at that time, as being on the regular meeting day of the Jews. Brother Smith knows, as well as I do, that this was on the seventh day, the day we now call Saturday. I want you to notice that here is proof, that the Christian Church recognized the seventh day as being God's holy day for His people.

Mr. Smith calls the seventh day the Jewish Sabbath. The Bible never uses the expression, Jewish sabbath. We settle questions here by what the Bible says. The Scripture doesn't say, it was the old abolished sabbath, or the old Jewish sabbath, or the former sabbath, but James in his speech identifies the sabbath day in the days of the apostles, twenty years after Christ's resurrection, as being the seventh day on which the Jews met every week for their weekly worship. I submit to you that this is positive proof that the Apostolic church recognized the seventh day of the week as being the sabbath day in the days of the apostles.

This also disproves Mr. Smith's statement that the sabbath was nailed to the cross. If Christ took the sabbath out of the way at the cross, then the seventh day would not and could not have continued to be the sabbath in the book of Acts long after the cross.

Remember that this is the Holy Spirit speaking in the book of Acts. The Holy Spirit doesn't make any mistakes. The Holy Spirit in speaking through Luke identifies the seventh day on which the Jews met for their weekly worship as the seventh day in the days of the apostles.

Mr. Smith wants proof that the Christians kept the seventh day. Here it is. Here is proof that the Christians in the days of the apostles were not keeping the first day of the week but were keeping the seventh day. James would not refer to the seventh day as being the sabbath day, if it was

not the sabbath day. If the Christian people had begun to keep the first day of the week in the place of the seventh day, then certainly he wouldn't refer to the seventh day on which the Jews met as still being the sabbath day.

This book of Acts mentions the sabbath in eight different places. In every case it identifies the sabbath as being on the seventh day of the week, on which the Jews met every week. Mr. Smith must admit that this was no other day than the day we call Saturday.

What are the facts in the book of Acts, as to which day Christians should keep? The first day of the week is mentioned only one time. It is given no sacred title. It is designated by the secular title of "the first day of the week." This is the title that the Bible gives to it as a working day. It is not once referred to as being a holy day of any kind.

#### **Mr. Smith's Fifth Affirmative**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure to be back with you to continue this discussion. A few weeks ago, and I'm sure Mr. Shuler will pardon this reference, he spoke to one of the ministers of the city, saying that there was not enough on the first day of the week in the scriptures to debate for two two-hour sessions. Well, friends, I'm still on the first day of the week, but Mr. Shuler has gone to the sabbath day which is a proposition for later discussion. He has run out and he has gone to another proposition and that proposition will be plainly and positively and sufficiently dealt with in due time and I want you to continue with us from night to night and bring your friends and hear this discussion as it continues.

In the II Corinthian letter, the 3rd chapter, the apostle Paul says, "their minds were hardened. For until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed to them that it is done away in Christ. But unto this day when-so-ever Moses is read a veil lieth upon their heart but whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away." If we could just get them to turn to the Lord instead of Moses, the veil would be taken away and they would no longer worship upon the sabbath

day, the day which Moses gave, the day which was commanded by Moses and through Moses and by the Lord through Moses, but would worship upon the first day of the week, the day in which we have Christ's example.

My proposition is not to prove that Sunday is the sabbath and Mr. Shuler spent a good part of his time showing that because James spoke of the seventh day as the sabbath that it was the sabbath. Why of course, no one has denied that. I'm not affirming that Sunday is the sabbath; I'm not affirming that it is the Christian sabbath. Sunday, the first day of the week, is never called the sabbath. I know that and I'm not debating that proposition at all. I'm simply affirming that this first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day and is to be observed by Christians today. Now I didn't say as a sabbath or as a day of rest or anything else but simply to be observed. I have shown conclusively and positively that the early Christians whose record is given in the book of Acts did observe this day by meeting and by worshipping God upon this day.

The things that Mr. Shuler has said about the sabbath and about the times in which it was mentioned in the book of Acts and the number of sabbaths in which meetings were held and James' statement in the 15th chapter of Acts and the 21st verse, are of references to the meetings of Jews and not to Christians. Notice with me please Acts 15:21 again, "For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him." He is not talking about Christians; he is not talking about the church, those that preach Christ and live in Christ. He says that in every city there are synagogues. What is a synagogue? The Jewish place of meeting and in those synagogues who do they preach, Christ? No, but Moses. In every city there are many that preach Moses, said James and read his word every sabbath day.

They met on the sabbath day because the veil was upon their heart. They thought they were still under the old covenant. They didn't realize that it had been taken away. Now he says that it doesn't say Jewish sabbath, well that is a small matter and will be brought out in detail when we come to the discussion of the sabbath but I might say

in like manner to Mr. Shuler, where does the Bible say Christian church? He mentioned it more than a dozen times in three minutes. Where does the Bible say Christian church? It isn't in the Bible. And yet I'm not objecting to him saying it especially at this time but it simply is not there, so why should he object to my saying Jewish sabbath. Explanatory of the thing that we are talking about. He used it in that way and I'm not making serious objection to his using it that way. I never refer to the church of Christ as the Christian Church but I'm not objecting to him referring to it as he did, but it isn't in the Bible. He can't find it there.

Then to his chart. According to the record in Acts, (1) In Antioch, the 13th chapter two sabbaths; (2) in Philippi, the 16th chapter of Acts, one sabbath; (3) in Thessalonica, three sabbaths. Now how many is that? That's six and then, (4) he got seventy-eight in the eighteenth chapter of Acts because he concluded that Paul preached on the sabbath day for a year and so many months. Well now, I want the proof.

I'm going to read from the 18th chapter of Acts. "He reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath." Now where did he reason every sabbath? In the synagogue but did you know that he really didn't go to that synagogue every sabbath for a year and a half. Now Mr. Shuler has it that he did. Seventy-eight sabbaths, he was trying to build up his score of eighty-four. It really wouldn't matter if it was eight hundred and forty to one. He has not yet found one assembly of Christians on the sabbath day, not one. We are winning one to nothing, if you want to get down to scores. We are winning one to nothing and that is a win in any man's ball game.

But notice what he has, seventy-eight, he says. Now Paul reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath and persuaded Jews and Greeks. But if you will read right on down, when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia and that was not long after Paul got there. I don't know just how long and he doesn't either, but when they came down Paul was "constrained by the word, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. And when they opposed themselves and

blasphemed, he shook out his raiment and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. And he departed thence." He left their synagogue, he left reasoning with them on the sabbath in the synagogue when Silas and Timothy came down and the Jews blasphemed the word that he spoke. He was no longer in the synagogue and all that it says of the sabbath is in connection with the synagogue.

You never find the word sabbath in connection with the meeting of the church. You never find the word sabbath in connection with a meeting of the disciples of Christ. It is always in connection with Jewry; it is always in connection with the synagogue; it is always in connection with the rites and ceremonies of the old law, which Christ nailed to the cross.

Paul went out of that synagogue, he did not reason in that synagogue for seventy-eight sabbaths but when Silas and Timothy came down he left them, and the 7th verse says, "And he departed thence, and went into the house of a certain man named Titus Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue." Went over into a private house and there taught the word of God and was there teaching the word of God for a year and six months. There is never a mention of sabbath observance or of a meeting on the sabbath day in the house of Justus. It just isn't found. The score is still one to nothing.

Acts the 28th chapter the 17th verse, Paul speaking to the Jews said, "I have done nothing against the custom of our fathers." What had Paul done about circumcision? What had Paul done about the feast of the Jews? You know and I know that Paul was not keeping the old law and was not living as a Jew but was living as a Christian and that will be brought out in full, in due time.

Now the 20th chapter of Acts. That's a good place to stay, that's where we got our run and as long as we can hold the lead we are all right. One to nothing. Paul preached all night, yes that's what the Bible says. What night did he preach? Well what day did they meet? They met on the first day of the week, didn't they? And after they met on the first

day of the week now it doesn't say they met on the first night of the week. You notice that, it says they met on the first day of the week and Paul preached all night. If that doesn't get them over to Monday morning for him to begin that journey I don't know how to count time.

I want to show you that Mr. Shuler's idea that Paul left on a twenty-mile journey on the first day of the week cannot be in accordance with the scripture. Paul preached unto them intending to depart on the morrow. Now taking his computation of time; which he says is Bible computation and I'm not arguing about that at all but take it his way; the first day of the week began with the evening of Saturday as we now reckon time and if Paul preached to them that night and preached to them all night, he intended to depart on the morrow. Now the first day of the week began Saturday night at six o'clock, that's according to his reckoning and I'm not arguing that now. Taking it as he believes it, he began to preach and he preached to them intending to depart on the morrow. Is Sunday morning the morrow? It's the same day according to his count, it isn't the morrow. The morrow is the next day and if the first day of the week began Saturday evening at six o'clock, Sunday morning is still the same day and it's not the morrow. That's right isn't it, exactly right, it's not the morrow. If next Friday evening some of you people who worship upon the Sabbath day about seven o'clock say I intend tomorrow to do thus and so, do you mean you intend to do it Saturday morning? You do not, of course you do not. You know that the morrow is the next day. This day which you now enjoy must come to an end and another begins before it is the morrow. If the day begins at six o'clock in the evening you can't have the morrow before six o'clock of the next evening. That's definite. I wonder if Mr. Shuler can find where the disciples ever met on the sabbath to break bread?

He says that it's generally agreed that the ascension was on Thursday. I grant that it's generally agreed, but where does the Bible say it, Mr. Shuler? Can you find me a verse that says that the ascension was on Thursday? I'm not

arguing with you about the day, I just want a verse of scripture that says that.

He seems to think that because I cannot find where the Bible says that Sunday is the first day of the week in just that many words that it can't be. Well now, what is the Lord's day? I believe that Sunday is the Lord's day. What is the Lord's day? Well, it's either Sunday or Saturday, isn't it? It's one or the other; it isn't any of the other five. You are going to say it's one or the other of these two. I believe that everyone in the house will say that it's one or the other. The Lord's day is either Saturday or Sunday. Now if the fact that I cannot find a verse of scripture which says that Sunday is the Lord's day in so many words proves that Sunday is not the Lord's day, how are you going to prove that it is on Saturday? Where are you going to find a verse of scripture that says in so many words that Saturday is the Lord's day?

I gave abundance of scripture as proof to show that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. I didn't attempt to give a verse that says it in so many words and Mr. Shuler arguing that Saturday is the Lord's day cannot find such a verse either. But still it has to be settled one way or the other by the collection of various scriptures together. Either way it will have to be settled that way and therefore neither side can provide a text of scripture which specifically states it in so many words.

After six days he says must mean on the sixth day, definitely and positively. He didn't find anything contrary to that in the 9th chapter of Luke. When Luke wrote about it, Luke didn't try to be specific. Matthew did, Matthew said after six days and coming all the way from Chronicles and Kings on through to the Gospel you find that "after seven days," and "on the seventh day," is the same. It's the same all the way through the Bible. Now "after six days" means "on the sixth day." Luke didn't try to be specific, he says "about eight days." He didn't try to say it was eight days, he says "about" and you know what that means.

Now, upon this day, the eighth day from the resurrection, Christ met with his disciples and that was the first day of

the week and what happened? Thomas was converted and said, "My Lord and my God." Upon the first day of the week from then until now the gospel has been preached. Many have believed and God has blessed the ministry of the word upon this day, the first day of the week, which is the day that the Lord hath made.

#### Mr. Shuler's Fifth Negative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen: Brother Smith said that in the book of Acts the Sabbath is always mentioned in connection with the Jewish synagogue. There is one text in Acts that evidently he doesn't know about. Turn to Acts 16:13. You can't get a synagogue in that verse in connection with the Sabbath. The verse says, "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

There is no synagogue mentioned in connection with this sabbath meeting. There was no synagogue outside the city by the river side where the sabbath meeting was held. Brother Smith said that the sabbath is always mentioned in connection with the synagogue. Here is one time that the sabbath is referred to and no synagogue is mentioned.

Brother Smith declared that there wasn't any place where people met on the Sabbath except in the Jewish synagogue. Here in Acts 16:13 is a meeting on the Sabbath and it wasn't held in a Jewish synagogue at all. I'll let him wrestle with that the next time he speaks.

I go back again to Acts 15:21. It is true that James mentions about them preaching Moses in the synagogue. But this doesn't change the fact, that James before this assembly of the apostles and the elders and the Christian leaders, identifies the seventh day of the week on which the Jews held their regular meeting as being the sabbath day at that time. Not the sabbath day up until the cross as our brother reasons. This was twenty years after the crucifixion.

These Christian leaders were all agreed that the seventh day is the Sabbath for Christians, and that it is the day which

God commands man to keep, and the day that we should keep. And so Mr. Smith's argument about the synagogue and about preaching Moses, is beside the point. The point is, What day did the Christians recognize as the Sabbath day? Since they recognized the seventh day as being the sabbath, this shows where they stood on this question.

We have talked here about the score. I am perfectly willing to cut that down, even take off the seventy-eight sabbath meetings at Corinth. You can take off these seventy-eight. The score is still six to one. I never went to a baseball game in my life where the score was six to one, where I had any doubt about who won.

Take off the seventy-eight and it is still six to one. This means that there is six times as much proof for the keeping of the seventh day in the book of Acts as there is for keeping the first day.

I accept Brother Smith's suggestion that this sabbath question should be settled according to the preponderance of the evidence. I want to tell you that when we finish this debate, there will be no question in most people's minds as to where the preponderance of the evidence lies. There will be no doubt about that.

Yes, let us by all means decide this thing on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence. It stands here in the book of Acts as six to one in favor of the seventh day. The preponderance of evidence is certainly for the seventh day sabbath.

Let us take the book of Acts. What are the facts in the book of Acts? The first day of the week is mentioned just one time and when it is mentioned, it is called by its secular title, as a working day. There is no suggestion of it being a holy day. It doesn't say that it was the Lord's day. It doesn't mention commemorating the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week. It doesn't say that Christians were keeping it in honor of the resurrection. It is not once referred to as being a holy day. There is no record of anybody keeping it as a holy day.

Now take the other side, if you want the preponderance of the evidence. This same book of Acts, which mentions

the first day of the week one time, mentions the Sabbath eight times. In every case it identifies the Sabbath with the seventh day. It shows that the church in the days of the Apostles recognized the seventh day as the Sabbath. The Holy Spirit, Who makes no mistakes, calls the seventh day the Sabbath in these eight different places in the book of Acts.

Now I'll leave it to you, whether his church, or my church is in line with the book of Acts, as to the day which we keep. He has one lone reference for the books of Acts. We have eight references for the Sabbath in the book of Acts. Now the score is eight to one.

Now about that meeting at Troas. I believe that the Bible is in harmony with itself. I believe that the day was measured there by the Bible method. The Bible way of measuring the day was from sunset to sunset. From midnight to midnight is the Roman method.

According to the Bible measurement of the day, the first day of the week was bound to be from sunset, on what we call Saturday night to sunset Sunday night, regardless of anything Mr. Smith may say to the contrary. There is no way Paul could preach all night long unless he preached all night long on what we commonly call Saturday night. This does make his journey on Sunday morning, which shows that he did not keep it as a holy day.

Now about that collection in I Corinthians 16:2. I read, "Now concerning the collection for the saints". Notice that it was not a collection for the preacher. It was not taking up money for church expense. Mr. Smith would have us believe that the people were gathered together and that this was an act of worship, because they were at church. It doesn't say so.

This was a collection for the saints. It was making up a sum of money for Paul to take up to Jerusalem. It was not a collection for the preacher, not a collection for church expenses. It was a collection for the saints. Paul said, "Upon the first day of the week let everyone of you lay by him in store". How can any man figure that to be a meeting at church, and the collection basket being passed and the people putting money in a collection basket?

If this is all the proof there is for the first day of the week, it is certainly the most flimsy evidence. It shows that our brother is hard pressed, when he must bring forward such arguments as this to sustain the day which he represents.

It is so flimsy to try to put into those words any idea of passing a collection basket at church. "Let everyone of you lay by him in store." It is clear that it was a private laying by at home.

The point about there being no gatherings when Paul arrived, is easily explained. If everybody had been laying by at home for months before Paul arrived, there would be no trouble about not having their offering ready to hand to Paul. There would be no rushing around in an attempt to raise the money. When Paul came to have his meeting, they would bring the money in, and Paul would take it on to Jerusalem.

Where does Mr. Smith find any proof where they were to take up a collection after this time? This was only a collection for the immediate relief of the poor saints at Jerusalem. There is no suggestion that this was anything to be carried on after Paul would arrive and go on his journey. I would like to have Mr. Smith find a text where they were to take up a collection every Sunday after Paul came. Where is there any evidence that they were to take up a collection every Sunday after Paul came?

After Paul would come and take the money on, there was no more to be done about that matter. Again we see that there is a complete lack of any proof for the keeping of the first day of the week.

Now about the ascension. Christ was with his disciples forty days after His resurrection. He ascended at the end of those forty days. Whatever we know, or whatever we don't know, we do know that it wasn't on Sunday; because reckoning from the day of the resurrection, which was on Sunday, you can't take forty days and make it Sunday on the other end. That is one thing you can't do. Our brother may try to juggle in eight days between two Sundays, but he cannot take forty days, and begin on a Sunday, and make the other end of it on Sunday.

This is evidence that one of the most notable meetings Christ ever held with His disciples was not on Sunday. Whether or not it was Thursday, is beside the point. This notable meeting on the day of the ascension, forty days after the resurrection was not on Sunday.

All Mr. Smith has done on his proposition is a list of inferences and assumptions of his own devising. This matter must be settled by what the Scriptures teach. He has not produced any scripture which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. Psalms 118:21-24 was one of his chief texts. But take it down and read it for yourself. Psalms 118:21-24 does not mention the first day of the week at all. To say that this refers to the first day of the week is supposition and assumption. All questions here are to be settled by statements from the Bible. The first day is mentioned eight times in the New Testament but not once is it ever connected with the Lord's day. If the first day of the week is the Lord's day, why did God mention the first day of the week eight times and never once connect the Lord's day with the first day of the week?

#### **Mr. Smith's Sixth Affirmative**

Mr. Shuler, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I'm still waiting for that one scripture that says anything about Christians meeting as Christians or as a church upon the sabbath day. There is not one to be found. He reduced his number here from eighty-four to six but the six he has left are still Jewish days, Jewish meetings into which Paul went and preached and tried to convert them.

He referred to the 16th chapter of Acts, where Paul was in the city of Philippi. There is one of his six and he said that has no reference to a synagogue but it had reference to a place where the Jews were gathered for worship and I would like for Mr. Shuler to prove that wasn't a synagogue. I am not going to try to prove that it was but he said it wasn't. I want him to prove that it wasn't. I would like a little proof instead of just assertion. He said that it wasn't a synagogue, and I want him to prove it.

They went out to a place of prayer. Well, wasn't a synagogue

a place of prayer? What was the place where the Jews in these various cities did come upon the sabbath day? Wasn't it to the synagogue? Now there might be lots of supposition that it was a synagogue and I might say that it would have to be supposition. I'm not trying to prove it but I do think that he ought to do more than just say that it wasn't. I think he should show some proof. At least it was a place of meeting of Jewish people who were living in that city. They met upon their day, the sabbath day and Paul went out and preached to them and converted some of them and baptized them. They weren't Christians when they were meeting out there on the sabbath day. He hasn't got one yet.

Paul preached in the synagogue on the sabbath day. Surely he did. Mr. Shuler has been preaching in Des Moines on the first day of the week for how many months now. He preached today didn't he? Does that mean that he is keeping Sunday now instead of the seventh day sabbath? Well, if it would prove that Paul kept the sabbath; the fact that he went to a people who gathered together and preached to them on the sabbath day, if that proves he was keeping the sabbath, then wouldn't the fact that Mr. Shuler preached today, on the first day of the week, prove that he is keeping the first day of the week? If not, why not? He hasn't found one verse where a Christian as a Christian or any church, or any group of Christians met for the worship of the Lord upon the sabbath day.

We still recognize the Jews meeting upon the sabbath and they called it the sabbath and I'll call it the sabbath too. I recognize that as the sabbath but it isn't for Christians. There is not a command and never was a command for a Gentile to keep it. There never was a command for a Christian to keep it and Mr. Shuler in two hours today has been unable to find one single solitary verse where any Christian ever met to worship God, according to the commands of Christ, upon that day.

Synagogue meetings; places where Jews were gathered together are found we know, but never once where the Christians or the church was meeting upon the Sabbath. That is the proposition, that Christians are to worship upon the

first day of the week, not Jews, not infidels or anyone but Christians. Where is the proof that they met upon the sabbath day? If he could find one text he would have it here. He hasn't found it yet. It would be contrary to the honorable rules of discussion for him to introduce a text in his last speech, when there is no opportunity to reply to it. I know he will never produce that while we are discussing this proposition. It just simply isn't there. I've asked for it from the first until now. Therefore, the preponderance of evidence is that Christians met upon the first day of the week because we have definitely found where they met with Christ or Christ met with them, where they met together on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week where they met in the city of Troas to break bread, where they were commanded to perform a religious act in making a contribution upon the first day. They observed the day as a day to do something religious.

Mr. Shuler says, where is the scripture that says you are to continue? I wonder if he could find one where they were ever told one time to take up a collection on the sabbath day. One time even. The church recognized the seventh day as the sabbath day, he says. The holy spirit recognized the seventh day as the sabbath. Sure, but where did the church ever meet on the seventh day as a church to worship Christ? That's the thing that we need here.

The first day of the week is the Lord's day because it is the day that the Lord hath made. In Psalms, the 118th chapter, Lord's day is not mentioned. It is the day the Lord made. How did he make it? Not in the sense of creating a day because it had been made. There have been the seven days all along before that time. How did he make it? By some event. What was the event? The stone rejected of the builders who was made the head of the corner. By that event he made that day different from other days. What day did he do that? On what day did Christ become the head of the corner? You know and I know that it was upon the first day of the week when he was raised from the tomb by the power of God and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness. Upon that day and until this time

the hearts of Christians have been glad for that which was done.

They have worshipped their God and their Christ who died that they might live and who upon this day came forth from the tomb that He might bring life and immortality to light; that it might be proclaimed in the gospel that he sent his apostles and disciples forth to preach.

My friends, this is the day that the Lord hath made. He made it by the resurrection of his Son. Therefore the psalmist was speaking of the first day of the week, the day on which that happened and beginning from that time, beginning from that day, we do not find any time specified when Christ met with his disciples or with his people upon any day except the first day of the week. In the 20th chapter of John we have two meetings of Christ upon the first day of the week. We have a third meeting in the 21st chapter but the day is not specified. The day when he ascended, the day is not specified. It isn't in the Bible. Mr. Shuler doesn't say what day but said it isn't Sunday. Well I'm not saying that it is. I said that he met them perhaps every day but every time the day is named, every time the day is specified, it is the first day of the week.

The disciples met upon the first day of the week, the day of Pentecost. They were all together in one place. The disciples met upon the first day of the week when at Troas, they gathered together to break bread. The disciples, my friends, met upon the first day of the week in every place where we have the record of them meeting as disciples. All of them were gathered together. Whenever the day is specified or when any act of worship for the church as a church is set forth it is always in connection with the first day of the week.

That, my friends, is our authority for observing the first day of the week today for the Christ is our example. He met with his disciples, but Mr. Shuler says he worshipped upon the sabbath day. Surely while he lived under the law but find where Christ met with his disciples after his resurrection. Find where he observed the sabbath after his resurrection. Find where his people, his disciples, the church, observed the sabbath after his resurrection. Find, my friend, just one

and let's talk about that but I've called for it all day and it has not been presented. Every meeting of Christ with his disciples and every meeting of his disciples as a church or as a body together is upon the first day of the week. And Paul says "the things that ye both received and heard and learned and saw in me, these things do and the God of peace shall be with you" (Phil. 4:8-10).

#### Mr. Shuler's Sixth Negative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question before us is not this or that. It is not eight days. It is not forty days. It is not after six days. It is not whether this meeting or that meeting was on the first day of the week. It is not whether they ate the Lord's supper, or whether they ate an ordinary meal. The proposition is, "Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Lord's day and is to be observed by Christians of today."

No text has been cited from the Scriptures which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. Mr. Smith has been talking now for about two hours. Surely he could find it in two hours. But he has not produced one text that shows that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.

The first day of the week is mentioned eight times in the New Testament. If the first day of the week is the Lord's day, then why didn't the Scriptures in talking about the first day of the week eight times, say at least one time, that it was the Lord's day. Where the Bible is silent, we should be silent.

If Jesus Christ had wanted us to keep the first day of the week, wouldn't He have told us so in the Bible? The Bible is the only guide for the Christian. I repeat my question, If Jesus Christ had wanted us to keep the first day of the week, wouldn't He have told us so in His Word? Wouldn't He have told us that the seventh day was no longer to be kept after His death and from that time on people should keep the first day in honor of His resurrection?

Christ has never told us to keep the first day of the week.

But He has told us to keep the seventh day. We will deal with this Wednesday and Thursday night.

Can anyone cite one text where the first day of the week is in any way connected with the Lord's day? No. He hasn't done it. To use a great many texts and then assume without proof that they refer to the first day of the week is not Biblical proof. We cannot settle this question with inferences. All that we have heard on the affirmative for the first day of the week is a lot of inferences. Show us a "thus saith the Lord."

A great doctrine like the keeping of a certain day every week is to be settled, not by a few suppositions, a few far-fetched arguments. It must be settled by a command of God. We do have the command of God for the seventh day. But where is the command for the first day? There is none.

The word "covenant" is sometimes used synonymous with the word "testament" in the Scriptures. In Hebrews 9:15 the first, or old covenant, is called the first testament. The new covenant is sometimes called the new testament.

The word "testament" is often used in connection with making a will. We speak of a person's last will, or testament. Everybody knows that whatever a man wished to place in his will, he must put it in before he dies. He can make whatever changes he wants while he lives, but when the man dies, his will is sealed forever.

Galations 3:15 tells how a man's covenant, or testament, cannot be added to after he dies. Nothing can be lawfully added to a man's will after he dies. If somebody does add something, it is a forgery. It will not stand in court.

When Jesus Christ died He sealed the new covenant with His blood. The items which He designed His people to observe, He put into His will before He died. He put in the Lord's supper on the night of His betrayal. He put in the ordinance of service, or feet washing at the same time He put in the Lord's supper. He put in baptism by being baptized as our example. He put in the seventh day Sabbath as one of the commandments, which are written upon the Christian's heart under the new covenant.

But where did He ever put in the keeping of the first day of the week? He never said one word about the first day of

the week being kept. Then He sealed His will with His blood. This idea of keeping Sunday in honor of the resurrection of Christ was two days late to get into Christ's will or testament. It shows that this idea of keeping Sunday is something that somebody has added on to Christ's will.

It must be a forgery and as a forgery we should have nothing to do with it. Christ sealed His will with His death and the doctrine of keeping Sunday in honor of the resurrection came in two days too late to get into His will. The Scriptures tells us, that in vain do they worship Christ, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

You will find that in Matthew 15:9. The doctrine of keeping Sunday is a doctrine of man. It is not the doctrine of the word of God. There is not one text that says that we should keep the first day of the week for any reason whatsoever. Jesus says, "Every plant that My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."

Since there is no scriptural authority for keeping the first day of the week, why not follow the Bible in keeping the seventh day that Jesus did bless, hallow and sanctify for man? I stand tonight where I stood when this sabbath light came to me. If a man will show one text which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, or that the first day of the week is to be kept in honor of the resurrection, or that the first day of the week is to be kept as a holy day, then I will gladly obey it, and close the discussion. But such a text has not been produced in the two hours that Brother Smith has talked and it will not be found. If this debate should continue from New Year's Day 1947 until December 31, 1947 Brother Smith would not be able to find one text in the New Testament, where Jesus Christ or the apostles ever told Christians to keep the first day of the week for any reason whatsoever.

There is no text where we are told to keep it in honor of Christ's resurrection. There is no text to show where anybody ever kept it as a holy day. There is no text where Christ ever claimed it as His holy day. There is no text where Christ ever blessed it or hallowed it, or sanctified it.

Mr. Smith's proposition is, "Resolved that the Scriptures

teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's day." But there is no scripture that shows this. Therefore his case on this proposition is lost. My brother has failed to produce any scripture which says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. With the absence of scripture, it is settled that there is no scriptural proof for keeping the first day of the week.

Every plant that My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Some day his keeping of the first day of the week will be rooted up. Some day the whole world, not this world in its present condition, but in the earth made new, will come back to God's true day, as we read in Isaiah 66:22-23, and from one sabbath to another shall come to worship before Him.

## SMITH-SHULER DEBATE

### Proposition No. 2

Monday Night, December 30, 1946

Hoyt Sherman Auditorium, Des Moines, Iowa

---

#### Session III.

Chairman: This evening Mr. Shuler and Mr. Smith begin discussion of the second proposition in the series. Mr. Shuler has the affirmative and Mr. Smith the negative. The Proposition is:

Resolved: The New Testament teaches that the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life and duty upon Christians of today.

Ladies and Gentlemen, your affirmative speaker, Mr. Shuler.

#### Mr. Shuler's First Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The proposition before us tonight is: "Resolved that the New Testament teaches that the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life and duty upon Christians of today." I am happy to affirm this proposition.

I want you to please notice that according to this proposition we are not dealing with the issue as to whether the keeping of the Ten Commandments should be regarded as a means of salvation, or a way of obtaining righteousness or justification.

Salvation is only by grace. Seventh-day Adventists believe and teach in harmony with Ephesians 2:8-9 that "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

Salvation is all of faith in Jesus Christ, and not of works. No man ever has been saved by keeping the Ten Commandments. No man ever will be saved by keeping the Ten

Commandments. God has decreed in Romans 3:20, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight."

Scripture has settled this matter once for all. In Galatians 2:16 scripture declares that man is not justified by the works of the law, but by faith in Christ Jesus. In Galatians 2:21, scripture says, that if righteousness came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

If men could have been made righteous by the Ten Commandments there was no need for the Lord Jesus Christ to come and die upon the cross. In Galatians 5:4 we read, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace."

There is only one way that any person can ever be saved and that is by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. There is only one way that any person can be justified and that is by faith in Christ. There is only one way any man can ever obtain righteousness and that is through faith in the Son of God.

So the issue before us is not the keeping of the Ten Commandments as a means of salvation, or as a way of securing justification. No. The proposition is: Are the Ten Commandments binding upon Christians as a rule of life and duty? What did the apostles teach on this point? Are Christians to live according to the Ten Commandments after they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ?

I shall first call the Apostle Paul to the witness stand. Paul, what did you teach about the relation of Christians to the Ten Commandments? I fear, Paul, you have been accused of teaching things that you never taught. Some say, Paul taught that the Ten Commandment were nailed to the cross. Paul, I want you to tell this audience what you really taught about the Ten Commandments.

Paul refers us to his Epistle to the Romans. He wrote Romans about A.D. 60, or about twenty-nine years after the crucifixion and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. I turn to Romans 13:8-9. "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." What law is Paul talking about? He is recommending some

certain law to Christians. This law is fulfilled by love. What law is he talking about?

The next verse tells us and tells us beyond any question. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

This audience knows without any preacher telling them that Paul is quoting from the Ten Commandments. In fact he cites words from the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth of the Ten Commandments. This shows beyond all question that he is talking about the law of Ten Commandments.

Mark this well. Paul cites the Ten Commandments as a rule of life and duty for Christians in A.D.60. If Paul thought that the Ten Commandments had been nailed to the cross twenty-nine years before he wrote the Epistle of Romans, he would not and could not have cited the Ten Commandments as a rule of life for Christians.

I turn now and let Paul speak in Romans 7:12. "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." There was some law that Paul regarded as just and good for Christians in A.D. 60. What law is this? Let Paul tell us in verse 7 of this same chapter.

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Tell me, what is the only law that said, "Thou shalt not covet?" It is the law of the Ten Commandments.

Paul is talking about the Ten Commandments. Paul taught that the Ten Commandments are holy and just and good for Christians. I stand tonight with the Apostle Paul. He taught that the Ten Commandments are a rule of life and conduct for Christians.

Are Christians to live according to the Ten Commandments after they have believed on Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour? Mr. Smith says "No". He is on the negative side. He isn't standing with the Apostle Paul. He says the Ten Commandments are not binding on Christians as a rule

of life and duty. He is on the negative. I'm on the affirmative. I'm standing with the Apostle Paul. I've given you two citations from Paul to establish my proposition.

The real issue in this debate for the next two nights is set forth in Romans 3:31. The issue before us is, "Do we then make void the law?" The law he is talking about is the same law he mentions in the 7th chapter.

In this 3rd chapter in the 20th verse, he says, "by the law is the knowledge of sin." We compare this with Romans 7:7. He said, "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." It is self-evident that he is talking about the Ten Commandments.

The issue is, Are the Ten Commandments binding on Christians as a rule of life and duty? Brother Smith says, "No". What does Paul say? I read Romans 3:31. "Do we then make void the law through faith?" What is Paul's answer? Where does Paul stand in this debate tonight? He is on the affirmative side. He summoned the strongest negative he could to answer this question about faith in Christ making void the keeping of the Ten Commandments.

"Do we then make void the law through faith?" Now comes his mightiest negative. "God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Since the law of the Ten Commandments is established by faith in Christ, it certainly isn't nailed to the cross. You know that and I know that. When a law is established it certainly hasn't been done away with. This is twenty-nine years after the cross of Christ. Instead of faith in Jesus Christ doing away with the keeping of the Ten Commandments, it actually establishes the keeping of the commandments in the Christian's life by bringing into his heart an indwelling Saviour, Who lives in him a life of obedience to the commandments of God.

I thank God tonight for an indwelling Saviour who comes and dwells in men's hearts today, and lives in them a life of obedience. He can do in us what we can't do of ourselves. He comes into our hearts and lives in us a life of obedience. Thus the righteousness of the law is fulfilled not by us, but in us, when we walk, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Next I want to call the Apostle James to the witness stand. James was the presiding officer at the first Christian council of the apostles and the elders. He wrote a general epistle addressed to all Christians about A.D. 60. This was about twenty-nine years after the cross of Christ.

He refers us to James 2:10, 11. Remember that this is from a general epistle, not addressed to a certain group of Christians in a certain city, but to all Christians everywhere, a general epistle. In the 11th verse James tells what law he is talking about. He is careful to make it plain.

"For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." He is talking about some law which said, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery. This cannot be any other law except the Ten Commandments. It is the Ten Commandments which say, Do not kill, and Do not commit adultery.

James, how many of these Ten Commandments are binding on Christians as a rule of life and duty? James bids us look at verse 10, "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." This shows that James taught that all of the Ten Commandments; not just nine of them, but that all of the Ten Commandments are binding on Christians as a rule of life and conduct. And this means that the fourth commandment about the keeping of the seventh day is binding on Christians as a rule of life and conduct.

Next I want to call the Apostle John to the witness stand. He is the beloved apostle, the one who wrote so much about love; the one who was so near to Jesus. John, what is your idea about the Christian's relations to the Ten Commandments? He refers us to I John 3:4. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."

Of what law is sin the transgression? Compare this with Romans 7:7. Paul says, "I had not known sin but by the law." What law? He says, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." It is plain as ABC that he is talking about the Ten Commandments. Romans 7:7

shows that the law of which sin is the transgression is the decalogue, or the law of the Ten Commandments.

This shows that John taught the Ten Commandments as a rule of life. He taught that Christians should not practice sin. He said "sin is the transgression of the law". This means that Christians should live according to the Ten Commandments.

It also proves that the Ten Commandments will continue binding as long as sin exists. The Apostle Paul confirms this by telling us in Romans 4:15 that where no law is, there is no transgression. It is plain that the Ten Commandments are binding, just as long as sin exists in this world.

Mr. Smith can't deny that sin is in this world. He believes in preaching Christ; to save men from sin. Just as sure as sin is in the world the Ten Commandments are binding. Sin is the transgression of the Ten Commandments. "Where no law is," said Paul, "there is no transgression." In Romans 5:13 he says, "sin is not imputed when there is no law."

I call you to witness, ladies and gentlemen, that I have proved my proposition. I could rest my case right here. The proposition is that the Ten Commandments are binding on Christians as a rule of life and duty. I have read testimonies from Paul, James, and John to show that the Ten Commandments are to be regarded by Christians as a rule of life and duty.

You know, I know, everybody else knows, that Paul never contradicted himself in his epistle. I have read to you plain statements from the Apostle Paul where he regarded the Ten Commandments as a binding rule of life on Christians. Do you think scripture ever contradicts itself? No, not when rightly put together.

In 2 Timothy 2:15 we read, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, rightly dividing the word of truth." If a man doesn't rightly divide the Word of God, scripture will apparently contradict itself. In the next thirty minutes you will see that. Just watch and you will see it in the next thirty minutes. It is only when scripture is not rightly divided that it apparently contradicts itself. If it is rightly divided, it does not contradict itself.

You will see that the affirmative tonight does not contradict scripture. When all the Scriptures are made to harmonize you will have the real truth.

Paul has plainly spoken in the texts I have given, that he regarded the Ten Commandments as a binding rule of life and duty. This proves that those texts where Paul speaks about certain laws being abolished, or of certain laws being nailed to the cross, he does not refer to the Ten Commandments, because Paul does not contradict himself. He wouldn't nail the Ten Commandments to the cross with one hand and with the other hand preach that the Ten Commandments reveal sin and are to be regarded as a rule of life and duty for Christians. Paul under the guidance of the Holy Spirit would not thus contradict himself.

Mr. Smith will likely try to use Ephesians 2:15, Colossians 2:14-17, Galatians 3:19-24, and II Corinthians 3:7 to prove that the Ten Commandments were abolished at the cross. These four texts are from Paul's writings. If he uses these to prove that the Ten Commandments are not binding on Christians as a rule of life and duty, he is making Paul contradict himself. The laws which were abolished at the cross did not include the Ten Commandments. The laws which were abolished at the cross were the ceremonial regulations, which were a shadow of Christ as our Saviour. But the Ten Commandments continued binding as a rule of life and duty after the cross.

Paul is careful to define what law was abolished. I turn to Ephesians 2:15, and read. "Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments." If you stopped there you might think he meant the Ten Commandments. But read on. "Having abolished in His flesh, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances."

The commandments which Jesus Christ abolished were the commandments respecting ordinances. Now what is an ordinance? The dictionary says that an ordinance is a religious rite or ceremony. Thus Paul carefully defines that the laws which were abolished at the cross were the ceremonial regulations, or the law of commandments contained in ordinances.

He is just as explicit in Colossians 2:14. "Blotting out

the handwriting of ordinances." He is specifically talking about the regulations of the ordinances of the Mosaic age. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."

It is crystal clear that he is talking about ceremonial regulations, or the ordinances, which were ordained for the age of types and shadows. Ephesians 2:15 and Colossians 2:14-16 have no reference at all to the Ten Commandments.

The discussions of the law question as recorded in Galatians, Romans and Acts, do not relate in any wise as to whether or not Christians should live according to the Ten Commandments. This question was never debated back in the days of the Apostles. It is being debated here tonight. But it was not debated in Acts 15 in that first Christian council. There was a controversy as to whether or not the ceremonial regulations of Moses should be imposed upon Christians and especially on the Gentile believers. There was a controversy whether or not the Ten Commandments are a means of securing salvation, or a means of securing righteousness. But there was no question whether or not Christians should live according to the Ten Commandments.

The real truth about this law question is summed up in three propositions. The ceremonial observances of the Mosaic law were abolished at the cross and are not binding on Christians. The keeping of the Ten Commandments must never be regarded as a means of securing salvation or justification. The Ten Commandments are God's standard of righteousness, and are binding upon Christians as a rule of life and duty.

Notice that Jesus Christ stands on the side of the affirmative. Put down Matthew 19:16-22. A young man came to Him and asked Him what he must do to have eternal life. He said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." What commandments? Jesus in His reply showed that He meant the Ten Commandments by quoting a number of the Ten Commandments.

#### Mr. Smith's First Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish Mr. Shuler would read one verse of scripture, just one verse

of scripture that says the ten commandments are a rule of life and duty for Christians today. Just get that verse, just bring that verse before his audience, just read that verse in the New Testament which says the ten commandments are a rule of life and duty for Christians today and I can see the proposition. His proposition is that the New Testament teaches that the ten commandments are a rule of life and duty for Christians today. Now if he had had a verse like that, you know that he would have read it. You know that he would have presented it.

It is not a question of whether or not Christians have a law today or are amenable to law today. I know that they are, but I know that they are not under the ten commandments. Mr. Shuler, were not the Israelites for fifteen hundred years under that law? Was not that the law that God gave to Israel and by which he judged them for fifteen hundred years? Paul said in the 7th chapter of Hebrews, the 12th verse, "there being a change of the priesthood, there is made of necessity a change of the law" . . . Therefore, Christians cannot be under the same law that the Israelites were under for fifteen hundred years. When the priesthood was changed the law says Paul had to be changed.

I want you to notice, the law that Paul says we are under in the 9th chapter of the I Corinthian letter, the 20th verse, "And to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law." "I became," said Paul, "as one under the law," but when we say we are *as* something, we do not mean we are that very thing but are like it. That would have been sufficient, but Paul said more. Lest someone in the latter day might be confused and think that he said that we were still as Christians under the law that the Jews had been under and which they are still trying to stay under. Lest someone should think that, said Paul, I want to make myself clear by saying "to those that are under the law as being under the law, not being," now get that, "not being myself under the law." Did Paul consider the ten commandments a rule of life and duty for him as a Christian? No.

He said the Jews so consider it and when I go to them

I speak to them as one who knows all of their inner thoughts. I one time thought as they think; I one time lived as they lived; I one time gave heed to that law as the finest thing in the world, but I learned better. I can go to them as one with my heart thinking as their heart thinketh, knowing their reasoning on it. I can go to them placing myself in their position, recognizing their thoughts along this line, as under the law I can reason with them not being myself under the law.

However, it seems he thought, I must make that clear. I must forever tell men that I am not under the law. Now isn't that plain enough? Paul doesn't contradict, I know that. He doesn't contradict, but he said, I speak to them as one under the law, as being under the law, not being myself under the law.

To them that are without law as without law. I go to the Gentiles, to those who were never under this law and I speak to them in a different way. I try to place myself in their position and to speak to them as people who have never known this law that the Jews have known. I speak to them in a different way. I approach them in a different attitude and I reason with them along different lines. I speak to them as people who have never had a law, as being without law, not being without law to God but under law to Christ.

That's the law that Paul says we are under today, and not the law that the Jews considered themselves under. Not under the law that the Jews hold as the law of God. That is the way Paul put it and that is where I stand tonight. I wonder why Mr. Shuler didn't find one verse of scripture somewhere in the New Testament, for that is what the proposition calls for, that says that we as Christians are under the ten commandments as a rule of life and duty.

He says this question was never debated in the days of the apostles. Of course not, for they knew this law was nailed to the cross and it was hundreds of years before men came with the doctrine that you are hearing tonight from the affirmative on this proposition. He is trying to take men back into the bondage of that ministration of death.

He knows full well the force of Ephesians 2, Colossians 2,

Galatians 3 and II Corinthians 3, so he thought it better to prejudice your minds against those scriptures which so completely refute his proposition. Anyone believing them can never, never accept the proposition which he affirms tonight but we will get to all of those in due time.

He said Colossians 2nd chapter, 14th verse, speaks of the ceremonial regulations, as in Ephesians 2, Galatians 3 and so on. Well, friends, if you will just look down to the 16th verse, after Paul has spoken of that which was blotted out, of that which was nailed to the cross, according to Ephesians, he said, "Therefore, let no man judge you with respect to meat," ceremonial, "feast day," ceremonial, "new moon", ceremonial. Then because he knew and the Holy Spirit knew that sometime man would come along and say "only ceremonials", where God did not say *only*, he said "or a sabbath day". That wasn't ceremonial was it? That's your fourth of the ten commandments and he puts it in and says don't let them judge you "in meat, in drink in respect of a new moon or a feast day or a sabbath day."

Paul knew that someone would try to divorce the ten commandments from the rest of the law and would try to establish the ten commandments as the law. The ten commandments were in the law but they were not the whole law. We will see plenty of that as we proceed along the line. Yes that law was abolished, that law was nailed to the cross. Ceremonies, ordinances and commandments all of it was nailed to the cross. Paul said there being a change of the priesthood there is made of necessity a change of the law.

Now let's notice some of these arguments that he has presented tonight. At least he has called them arguments. He referred to Romans 13:8, 9; Romans 7:12. He says these refer to the proposition. Paul shows, he says, that we are under the ten commandments. No, my brother, Paul did not quote the ten commandments. He did not quote the ten commandments. Mr. Shuler said he quoted the sixth, the seventh, the eighth, the ninth and the tenth. But, I say, he didn't quote the ten commandments. Did he? It is Mr. Shuler's obligation to show that the ten commandments, not five of them, but that the ten commandments constitute a rule of life and duty for

Christians today and that the New Testament so teaches. Mr. Shuler has not done it and cannot do it because that would make the Bible contradict itself. Paul enumerated certain moral principles, but he didn't enumerate them because they were in the ten commandments or because they were a part of the old law. He gave them because the Holy Spirit and the Lord moved him to give them as a part of the new covenant, of the new testament for Paul was not a minister of the old law. Paul was a minister of the new covenant, the new testament and not of the old.

Now I have some questions for Mr. Shuler tonight. I'm going to hand him a copy of these and then I am going to talk about them for a little while. I wish Mr. Shuler would answer this list of questions when he comes back to the platform. "Are the new testament and the ten commandments the same?" Paul said in II Corinthians 3:6 "who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant". Do we need something else with it? Do we need the ten commandments with it? "He made us sufficient", said Paul, "as ministers of a new covenant". Is it the old one? Is it the old one brought over revamped? Is it the old one redecorated? Is it the old one revitalized? No, it is not. "He hath made us sufficient as ministers of a new testament".

Mr. Shuler, is that new testament the same as the ten commandments? I want to know. If Paul was sufficient as a minister of the new testament and the new testament is not the same as the ten commandments, then my friends, Paul was made sufficient as a minister of a testament without the ten commandments. A testament that is not the same as the ten commandments.

But to the next question, "Were the ten commandments written and engraven on stone?" Paul speaks of a "ministration written and engraven on stone." Is that the ten commandments? Is that the ten commandments, the Decalogue written and engraven on stone? I don't suppose that there is one in the house who would not answer "yes, it is." I wonder if Mr. Shuler will have the courage to say "yes" to this audience. That is all he will need to say when he comes to the platform. Just "yes", one word will be an answer. As all of you already

know I wonder if he will have the courage to say "yes" to that question.

Now the third question, "Was anything else, anything except these ten commandments said to be written and engraven on stone by Moses?" I'm not talking about anyone else. I'm not talking about some stone structure over in England. I'm not talking about a stone mason in Des Moines or any other man of any other time but "Was there anything else said to be written and engraven on stone by Moses", or is that the only one?

The fourth question "Were the ten commandments called the ministration of death?" Let me read you again this 7th verse, "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones." Do you see what I mean, "the ministration of death written and engraven on stones"? Were the ten commandments called the ministration of death? Oh, let him not say, it's clear enough in the scripture, read the scripture and find out. Let him answer yes or no. Let him tell this audience if the ten commandments were not called a ministration of death written and engraven on stones.

Then the next, "Were the ten commandments written and engraven on stones and called the ministration of death said to be glorious?" That ministration of death written and engraven on stones was glorious, *was* glorious. Notice Paul didn't say is but he said *was*, "was glorious".

Question seven. Was that which was written and engraven in stones and glorious said to be passing away?" "For verily that which hath been made glorious hath not been made glorious in this respect by reason of the glory that surpasseth, for if that which passeth away was glorious" . . . What "was glorious"? The ministration of death written and engraven on stones was glorious and that which was glorious was passing away. Let him answer. I'll read the scripture to you but let him answer. He cannot answer those questions with a forthright clear answer to this audience and maintain the position that he has affirmed here tonight.

The Bible says ministration of death written and engraven on stones, which no one can deny was the ten commandments, was glorious and that that ministration of death written and

engraven on stones which was glorious and which was the ten commandments was passing away. What can Mr. Shuler say?

In view of II Corinthians 3: 11, "For if that which passeth away was glorious". If he can say in view of that, that the ten commandments are still of force and effect and have not passed away, I want to know how. It could only be that they have been put back in force. Passed away and then somewhere put back in force. Now if he says they are still in force, in view of that and in view of the only answers that he can give to these questions, where, when and by whom were they brought back into force? Please give place, time and authority and I don't mean some man's writings, I mean what the Bible says. Give me Bible on it; time, place and authority where they were put back in force.

Now to Romans the 3rd chapter and the 31st verse, "Do we make void the law, God forbid, we establish the law." What is Paul talking about? That we are still under the law? Of course not. For Paul said there being a change of the priesthood there is made of necessity a change of the law. He wasn't talking then about living under that law. He was speaking there the same thing that he said in the 4th chapter of Galatians to some people who tried to get back under the law.

In the 4th chapter of Galatians he said, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Why he said I want you to know that the law foretold its own end. The law recognized its own limitations. The law recognized its imperfection. Imperfections which Mr. Shuler has spoken of here tonight. He may quote from Psalms 19:7, and say, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." But friends, that law God gave through Moses, Mr. Shuler tonight said, did not convert the soul. That is not the one that David is talking about. The law back there, said Mr. Shuler, cannot convert the soul. Conversion, justification, salvation must come through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That law was imperfect. It had its imperfections. In that law its own shortcomings were recognized and therefore, within that law the idea is set forth that it was only for a time and afterwhile it was to be cast out.

Even as there were two wives of Abraham, or at least two who bore children to Abraham, Hagar and Sarah. These are two covenants said Paul. The "one from mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage, which is Hagar." What was to happen to her or what did happen to her? She was cast out, sent away and no longer recognized as Abraham's wife and Paul said that's the covenant that came at Sinai. The law itself recognized the limitation and the faults that were within it. The imperfection of the law was that it could make no one perfect.

It was not a means of justification. Mr. Shuler began his speech tonight with that very thought. So what does Paul say? Do we make void the law? No, by this doctrine of justification, by faith and through the obedience of faith which he was preaching to those people at Rome. He says by this idea he established the law. We show that this system of faith is the perfect complement of the law and that "what the law could not do in that it was weak: Christ's coming in the likeness of sinful flesh" did for man. Thus He gave to the world salvation, a thing the law could never do. A thing which the law contemplated; the thing which the law foreshadowed and therefore as we preach the obedience of faith unto all the nation; as we declare the gospel of the Son of God, as the power of God unto salvation, we are simply by that establishing the law. Showing that even its final prediction that it would one day pass away, would one day be cast out as Hagar, is now fulfilled. The perfect complement of the law has come and in Christ we have justification, redemption and remission of sins. Yea, we establish the law for its own time and purpose.

"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, will ye not hear the law?" Paul said that the casting out of Hagar meant the casting out of that law and Paul said there being a change in the priesthood there was made a necessity a change in the law.

But he came then to his second witness, James the apostle and I want to turn to James and show you what James is talking about. Not the ten commandments or being under that. He enumerates certain moral principles which God made a part of the old law. God has also placed these in his new covenant, but not because they were in the old at all.

God wanted them in the new. James quoted certain principles of morality there but read on and see what he says. You notice Mr. Shuler stopped too soon. For beginning with the 10th verse, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty." Not a ministration of death written and engraven on stones, not ten commandments which came with smoking fire upon shaking Sinai, but are to be judged by a "law of liberty."

Turning back to the first chapter of the book of James, the 25th verse, He says, "but he that looketh into the perfect law." That old covenant, that which the Jews had for fifteen hundred years was not perfect. But according to the 8th chapter of Hebrews, the apostle Paul said, "Now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by how much he is also the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for a second." Paul says it was imperfect, it was faulty in that it would not finally bring the justification of man before God. Now James is talking about another law; a law that is not imperfect; a law that is not faulty in any sense; but a law which he says is perfect, "whoso looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty." That is the one according to James 2:12 by which we are to be judged.

"Looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty and continuing therein." In what law? In the law of liberty; in the perfect law. Not the old, but the new which is better because the old was imperfect and therefore, another had to be given. The first had to be taken out of the way and there being a change of the priesthood there was made of necessity a change of the law.

That perfect law was being given by the apostles and the Holy Spirit and was not a law which came upon smoking Sinai. In the 13th chapter, the I Corinthian letter, the Apostle Paul speaks of that perfect law of which the Apostle James is

writing in the 1st and 2nd chapters. I want you to notice that he says in the 8th verse, "Love never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part" . . . He spoke of those miraculous gifts common to many members of the church in the first century. Gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed according to the will of God through the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts 8:18). Gifts of the Holy Spirit that differed as bestowed where they were needed. According to the 12th chapter of I Corinthian he names those and said in I Cor. 13:8 these shall pass away.

Tongues, prophecies, knowledge, miraculous knowledge that is bestowed as a gift of the spirit, he has just been speaking of that in the 12th chapter, these shall pass away, but love shall not. But he said, "we know in part, we prophesy in part but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." When the perfect law, the law of liberty, the new covenant was completed was completely revealed by the spirit through those men selected of God for that purpose. Then those miraculous powers and manifestations of the spirit were done away. They were given for a time in the infancy of the church. God, by those gifts and powers, confirmed his words spoken by these men whom he had selected but "when that which is perfect was come, that which was in part was done away."

We today looking into the perfect law, the new testament, the new covenant; the one that came to supplant and to take the place of the old because it was imperfect. Looking into the perfect law, the new covenant and being sufficient as ministers of a new testament, We, looking into that law today and continuing therein are justified before God and are to be judged, not by ten commandments but by the law of liberty; the law of Christ under which we serve today.

He began an argument concerning Jesus and the law and the rich young ruler. We will wait until he completes that and see what he has to say about it. Paul does not contradict James, no indeed. James does not contradict Paul. And neither contradicts themselves. They all agreed upon this

but they are teaching that we are under the law of Christ and not under the ten commandments, remember that. There is no way that we can properly divide the word of truth unless we know that. Mr. Shuler says there is no knowledge of sin without the law because sin is the transgression of the law. In Romans, the 1st chapter and 3rd verse we have the Apostle Paul saying that they that sinned without law were judged without law. Here people both sinned and were judged without the law.

#### Mr. Shuler's Second Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I call you to witness that I proved my proposition in my first speech. My arguments all stand. Really I haven't anything to do so far as establishing my arguments.

Mr. Smith is confused about the law. This will be more evident the further we go.

Take this law in Hebrews 7:12. What law is it? Anyone who will take time to read the context will find that it is talking about the priesthood. Under the Mosaic law no one could be a priest unless he was a Levite. The writer of Hebrews is building up the great proposition; Jesus Christ, as our high priest. But Christ came from the tribe of Judah. If that Mosaic law about the priesthood still stood Christ could not be our priest.

This is what he means about the priesthood being changed from the Levitical priesthood to the priesthood of Christ. There had to be a change in the law of the priesthood. It is clear that he is talking about the ceremonial regulations; the ritual law that made men priests who belonged to the tribe of Levi. Hence this text in Hebrews 7:12 has no bearing whatsoever on the question whether or not the Ten Commandments are binding on Christians as a rule of life.

You have seen exactly what I said you would see. Mr. Smith's doctrine of the law makes Paul contradict himself. Mr. Smith declares that the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross. If the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross, then how could Paul in Romans 7:12, twenty-nine years after

the cross, speak about the Ten Commandments as the law which is holy, just and good for Christians? Will Mr. Smith tell us how God abolished a law that is holy and just and good? If it is holy and just and good, will he tell us why did it have to be abolished?

Mr. Smith will you please take note of Romans 7:12, and look at the verb there. Is it "was"? It ought to be "was" according to your doctrine. Paul didn't subscribe to Mr. Smith's doctrine. Twenty-nine years after the crucifixion of Christ, twenty-nine years after Mr. Smith says the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross, Paul says that this law *is* holy, and the commandment holy and just and good. Then in the 14th verse you have another one, "the law *is* spiritual."

Mr. Smith raised some questions about 2 Corinthians 3:7. Brother Smith, I have one for you, and when you answer mine, then we will proceed to deal with yours about 2 Corinthians 3:7. In your next speech will you tell us if the Ten Commandments were the only law that was ever written on stone?

He talked about Colossians 2:16, 17. I'm not going to discuss that tonight at length, because on Wednesday and Thursday nights we will discuss the Sabbath and then I will deal with the sabbath days of Colossians 2:16,17. I will say however, that in the Kings James version it doesn't say a sabbath day.

Look it up for yourself. The King James version doesn't say a sabbath day. The Greek is plural. It is "sabbath days." It's the "sabbath days" which were a shadow of things to come. This is the reading of the King James version. We will deal with this further later on.

Mr. Smith talked about Paul not being under the law. He is confused as to what Paul meant there by the law. Paul didn't contradict himself. When he said he would not have known sin but by the law, he quoted from the Ten Commandments, which shows that he regarded them as a rule of life for Christians. He said, "I have not known sin but by the law and I had not known lust except the law said, "Thou shalt not covet."

Certainly Paul didn't contradict himself. He did not in one place give us to understand that this law is holy, and that these Ten Commandments are holy, just and good, and then turn around in another place and teach that he was not under the Ten Commandments as a rule of life.

I believe just what Mr. Smith read from I Corinthians 9:21. Christians are under the law as it is in Christ. They are under the Ten Commandments as they are in Christ. In fact this is what Paul says. In I Corinthians 9:21, he says not without law to God, but under the law in Christ.

When his time was called, Mr. Smith was about to read from Romans 2 about the Gentiles being without law. That simply means that they were without the written law. They were without the written revelation of the law which the Jews had. It doesn't mean that the Gentiles were not amenable to the Ten Commandments, but that they were simply without the written revelation of that law.

Now about that law of liberty. The Ten Commandments are the law of liberty. Just think it through, who are the free citizens of Des Moines? Who are free from the laws of Des Moines? It is the people who obey the laws. The man who has violated the laws of Des Moines and the police have arrested him, and got him in jail, he is the man who is under the law.

I am free from the law of Des Moines. Why? Because I keep them. I am not afraid to meet a policeman. It is the man who keeps the law that is free, and the man who breaks it, is under bondage. David said, "I walk at liberty, because I seek thy precepts."

The Ten Commandments are the law of liberty to the Christian, as he is in Christ. Christ living in his heart, keeping him from stealing, from lying, from swearing and from coveting and from hating anybody and from being impure. Christ lives in him these requirements of the Ten Commandments and makes him free from the condemnations of that law. He is under the law as it is in Christ.

A Christian is not under the law in the sense of being condemned by it. He isn't above the law that he can defy God and go contrary to the Ten Commandments. But he is

with the law in Christ Jesus. He is walking with Jesus day by day in the way of the Ten Commandments.

Where did Christ stand on this question? I will furnish that argument now about the young man who asked Jesus what he must do to have eternal life. I take Jesus as the supreme authority. I am glad that I have Jesus standing on my side tonight in this discussion. We are discussing whether the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life.

Jesus told this young man, that if he wanted to enter into eternal life, that he must keep the commandments. The man said, "What commandments?" Jesus began to quote certain of the Ten Commandments. This proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that Jesus was talking about the Ten Commandments. Jesus taught that the keeping of the Ten Commandments was necessary and that men should live according to them. I am happy that I have the Lord Jesus on my side. I will leave Mr. Smith to reconcile his position with the position of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mr. Smith said, that the law was imperfect. We will drop the Ten Commandments on this chart before the view of this audience. I challenge you in your next speech to read those commandments one by one to this intelligent audience, show them which one of these Ten Commandments are imperfect. I'm going to rest my case right here. Let us see what he does about this. I ask you to read these commandments one by one, and show this audience where any of those commandments are imperfect.

I turn to another text in Romans, the 8th chapter, which our brother referred to. Romans 8:3, 4, "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." (Now why did God send His Son? This text says, "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Some versions in the margins give the word "requirement". That the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in Christians. And one of the requirements of the Ten Commandment law is to keep the seventh-day sabbath. God sent his own Son, that the requirement of the law might

be fulfilled in Christians, as they walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Does that look like the law is done away with? Certainly not.

#### Mr. Smith's Second Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy to come before you again. The first thing I want to do is to call upon Mr. Shuler for the fulfillment of a promise that he has made. I asked him ten questions in my first speech and I didn't think he would answer them and he didn't, but he made me a promise. He is a fine man and I think he will keep that promise I'm going to call upon him to keep.

He said, "I'll ask Mr. Smith a question and when he answers this then we will attend to his questions." I'm answering Mr. Shuler's question first. He asked me the question, "were the ten commandments the only law ever written on stone?" I am happy to give him the answer and say "no". In the 8th chapter of Joshua, 32nd verse we find where Joshua wrote upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses which he wrote in the presence of Israel. There is another writing upon stones. There is my answer, Mr. Shuler—Joshua 8:32.

But remember my question to Mr. Shuler was this: "Was anything else said to be written and engraven on stones by Moses?" If you remember I said "not by a stone mason in Des Moines or by some sculptor in England or by anyone else anywhere but was there anything else written and engraven on stones by Moses?" That of which Paul speaks in the 3rd chapter of II Corinthian letter was written by Moses. That, my friend, is what we are talking about tonight. The ten commandments, written and engraven on stones which "came with glory" and "was glorious," which glory was passing away. Let him give attention now to those questions.

I call to your mind that it is his obligation to prove the proposition. He has asked me to read this list of ten commandments which he did not take time to read. He wants me to consume my time in reading them and point out which is imperfect or which is faulty. This will be sufficient along that line. You can read them, I'm confident of that. I have read them many times. Mr. Shuler has read them. There

is no need to go through them point by point, but I will read to you just this much. In the 34th chapter of Exodus, the 28th verse, we might drop back just a line and begin with the 27th verse to emphasize what I said about Moses writing upon the stones. "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with Jehovah forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Paul said in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, "if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for a second, but finding fault with them." God found the fault, it was not me. God said they were not faultless. If that covenant had been faultless; if that covenant had been perfect then God would have sought no place for a second. "But finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the day is come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant, with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with them in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. For my covenant they brake and I regarded them not saith the Lord." God said that it was not perfect and therefore was giving another.

I am not under any obligations to point out any particular point at which it was imperfect any more than to say as Mr. Shuler said, in the beginning of his speech that the first covenant, the law, the ten commandments could never bring man to salvation. That was the imperfect thing about it. It wasn't complete. It provided only for activities on this earth and had nothing to do with salvation eternally in the presence of God and could never make the comers thereunto perfect. Paul said that by the law nothing was made perfect. It could never make those under it perfect so God had to give another one that would. It wasn't for the purpose of making men perfect, it was "added because of transgressions" said Paul in the Galatian letter, until the seed should come. It was just given for a limited time, for a limited purpose. It wasn't perfect in that it would not do all the plan of God.

He said he wanted to take the example of Jesus. I wonder,

Mr. Shuler, how long it has been since you ate the passover? Jesus went up to Jerusalem for the passover when he was twelve years of age. How long, Mr. Shuler, since you have eaten the passover? Jesus did it, Jesus ate the passover with his disciples the night on which he was betrayed. He ate the passover with his disciples. How long, Mr. Shuler, since you have eaten the passover? If you want to follow the example of Jesus you should eat the Passover. He quoted a verse a while ago, II Timothy 2:15 which says, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Mr. Shuler is ashamed right now. He is shamed before this audience for failing to rightly divide the word of truth. For going back under the old law and finding an example and saying I want to follow the example of Jesus, who said to the rich young ruler, if thou would enter into life, keep the commandments, and He names certain ones. That young man was living as was Jesus at that time under those ten commandments. It had not yet been done away; had not yet been taken away; had not yet been nailed to the cross; had not yet been abolished. The people of that day who were the people of God were living under that imperfect law.

Jesus' new testament of which we are made sufficient as ministers today had not been given and had not become of force and effect and was not yet a rule of life and duty for the children of God. A testament is of force after men are dead and therefore so long as Jesus was living his testament could not come of force and effect. Hebrews 9th chapter, 15th through 17th verses, there must be the death of the testator before a testament can become of force or effect. Therefore, while Jesus was living he kept that law, he lived under it and he taught others to do so. But my friends, when he died upon the cross, look this side that time. I want you to find where the Bible says that it was made a rule of life and duty for Christians of today.

Paul says it is a ministration of death. I see a great difference between death and liberty. I see on one hand the bondage of death, dragging them down, a law which the apostles said was a yoke which "neither we or our fathers were ever able

to bear." I see bondage there and the law of bondage. Men struggled in that bondage and yearned for freedom and liberty. They seek a law of liberty, not a law of bondage, not a yoke which "neither we nor our fathers were ever able to bear." Oh not that, but a law of liberty. Don't let anyone confuse you, thinking that the ten commandments were a law of liberty. It was a ministration of death, written and engraven on tables of stone.

The notice how he misconstrued, unintentionally perhaps because I was hurried in finishing it or rather stopped before I finished what I started to say about the 2nd chapter of Romans. He tried to tell you what I was going to say and he missed the point entirely. He said "he is talking about the Gentiles that have not the law. They do by nature the things of the law." That is the 14th verse and that is not the one I was talking about.

I was talking about and beginning to quote the 12th verse and I want you to notice, "for as many as have sinned without the law." Now Mr. Shuler said without the law, there is no knowledge of sin, without the law you can't have sin. That was his argument in his first speech. Paul said "as many as have sinned without the law." Mr. Shuler says "they have the law written in their hearts and they do it anyhow. The ten commandments were in their heart but they didn't have it in written form." If that is so, they had it nevertheless. But Paul says they were without it. He didn't say they were "without it in written form," he said they were "without the law." They didn't have the law.

I want you to notice that they didn't have it in their hearts because God looks on the heart, not on the outward man, not the outward appearance but on the heart. But read on, "for as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law." They perish and they still didn't have it. They sinned without the law, they perished without the law. Mr. Shuler says it was in their hearts. Paul says they didn't have it in life, they didn't have it in death, they didn't have it in judgment. They sinned without the law and they perished without the law.

But what of the 7th chapter of Romans where Paul says,

"I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." What of that? Paul at one time lived under that law. Paul was born under that law as Christ was. Paul had lived under that law, had been reared and brought up under that law, had studied in the school of Gamaliel, a great teacher of that law. He had known that law and had constructed his life by it. That was the beginning of my teaching he says and I had no knowledge of what is sin or lust was except that law had revealed it to me. That is the thing that revealed it to me.

I'm not going to say it's unholy; I'm not going to say it's not just; I'm going to say it's not good. But Paul said later on by the Holy Spirit because God did not hold it as faultless He took it away and gave another one. Everything in the law was holy and in its time all right. There were many holy days under the old covenant. Days of holy convocation were holy days but does Mr. Shuler teach them today? They were holy, just as the law was holy. You can look at it and say it was holy but God said it wasn't faultless and He was going to give another one.

But look at the 7th chapter of Romans for just a moment. The Apostle Paul is saying something there that I am sure we ought to see before we go any further in this discussion. In the 4th verse, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also made to live by the law." Is that what it says? Is that the way it reads in your Bible, you folks that have Bibles there that are reading with me. "So ye brethren ye also are to live by the law," is that what it says? It says "made dead to the law," that's what it says. "Made dead to the law."

What is death anyhow? Death is a separation. The separation of spirit and body is what we call death. When the spirit goes out of this body, that's death. God said to Adam and Eve, in the day thou eatest thou shall surely die. The day they ate of that fruit they were separated from him. He drove them out of the garden and they no longer walked in his presence, there was a separation. It was death. What is death? It is a separation so Paul says you are dead to the law, you are separated from the law. Why? Because you are a Christian, because you are in Christ. So then "the

law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." I am not under that law but I am under the law of Christ. I live by the spirit of life as it is in Christ Jesus and live under that spiritual law, that perfect law by which I have been made free from the law of sin and death. I am delivered from the ministration of death written and engraven on tables of stone because I am dead to that law which was thus written and engraven.

#### Mr. Shuler's Third Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Smith read a text from Hebrews about finding fault with them. Who is the "them"? He inferred, that it was the Ten Commandments. That is not true. It was finding fault with the people. God never found any fault with the Ten Commandments, which He spoke with His own voice and wrote upon stone. I call upon Mr. Smith to clarify this matter and make clear to this audience that the "them" refers to the people, and not the Ten Commandments.

Mr. Smith hasn't shown any fault in any of these Ten Commandments. I ask him again to show us any faults in the Ten Commandments. He says, they were imperfect and faulty. All right, just show us one fault in them.

He said in Romans 2, it didn't speak about the law being written in their hearts. He didn't read far enough. Put down Romans 2:15. It actually says, the law being written in their hearts.

He also said, that "without the law" couldn't possibly mean without the written law. There is another text Mr. Smith evidently hasn't found in his Bible. Mr. Smith turn to II Chronicles 15:3. This was long after the Jews had all the laws of Moses and all the Ten Commandments. Turn Mr. Smith to II Chronicles 15:3.

Remember this is the Chronicles, hundred of years after they all had the law of Moses and the Ten Commandments. "Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law."

What does that mean? Does that mean that they didn't

have any law at all? Mr. Smith says that without law means that they didn't have any law. But without the law doesn't mean that.

The Ten Commandments were never nailed to the cross. I can well understand why my opponent has such a hard time. He is trying to drive nails through stone. Get two pieces of marble and take your little hammer and start to drive the nails. He is trying to nail the tables of stone to the cross. No wonder he has a hard time.

The last text he used was Romans 7:4. I want you to see what is dead. Is it the law that is dead? Let us take the Bible as it reads. There isn't a word there about the law being dead. It tells you, what is dead. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are become dead." Who is dead? Why it is the man who receives Christ, and dies to sin. The man who dies to the old man of sin. "Ye are become dead to the law." It doesn't say that the law is dead. The man who receives Christ and is married to Christ, goes on with Christ in obedience, and he becomes dead to the transgression of the law. But the law isn't dead.

In this same chapter, Paul says, "for sin taking occasion by the commandment deceived me and it slew me." He says, the law slew him. He didn't slay the law. Mr. Smith has got Paul slaying the law. But he has things wrong end to. The Ten Commandments slew Paul and brought him to Christ. But Paul didn't slay the Ten Commandments. He said, the law slew him.

Now I want to go into II Corinthians 3:7. I think I can deal with that in five minutes. First of all I want you to notice that II Corinthians 3:7 doesn't say that what was written and engraven in stones was abolished. It was the ministration of death for the violation of what was written and engraven in stones that was done away. The ministration of death is what was done away.

II Corinthians 3 is simply a contrast between the ministrations of the two covenants. It is a contrast between the ministration of death and ministration of the Spirit, between the ministration of condemnation and the ministration of righteousness. The ministration was changed when the

new covenant took the place of the old covenant, but that did not abolish the Ten Commandments.

When the administration of American affairs changes from a Democratic administration, to a Republican administration, does that do away with the United States constitution? According to Mr. Smith's argument the answer would be "yes." He claims that the change from the ministration of the old covenant to the new covenant abolished the Ten Commandments. But anybody knows that the change from the Democratic administration to a Republican administration doesn't do away with the Constitution. So the change from the ministration of death to the ministration of the Spirit, does not abolish God's standard of righteousness in the Ten Commandments.

Hebrews 8:10 in talking about the new covenant says, that under the new covenant God will write His law in the heart. Here is the whole story. Under the old covenant they had the Ten Commandments on tables of stone, and they didn't keep them. If the Ten Commandments never get any nearer to you than being on two tables of stone, you will never keep them. But when God writes them on your heart, by the Holy Spirit you will keep them. Under the new covenant God writes the Ten Commandments on the believer's heart.

Under the old covenant they had them on two tables of stone. The Ten Commandments were outside the man. Under the new covenant God put them inside the man, on the man's heart. God stamps on that man's heart honesty, purity, love, kindness and reverence and then the man keeps the law. He keeps it, because Christ lives in his heart and makes him honest and pure and kind and true. He makes him just what the Ten Commandments require him to be.

Therefore, the doing away with the old covenant did not do away with the Ten Commandments. It established them, because under the old covenant they had them on tables of stone and didn't keep them; under the new covenant God writes them on the heart, so we can obey them.

Remember that this quotation in Hebrews 8:10 is not something new in the New Testament. It is a direct citation

from the Old Testament in Jeremiah 31:31-34. Therefore it is speaking about what was regarded as the law of God in the days of Jeremiah. My brother's great trouble is, that he is confused over the law.

#### Mr. Smith's Third Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I come before you for the final summation of the argument tonight, but of course we shall continue on this same proposition tomorrow night. Mr. Shuler began by saying that the fault was with the people, not with the covenant. As you remember, I read from the 34th chapter of Exodus, the 28th verse, that "he wrote on the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Paul said here in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, "if that first covenant had been faultless." If the covenant had been faultless, "then should no place have been sought for the second." Again, in the 10th chapter of Hebrews, the 9th verse "it is written in the volume of the book, Lo, I come to do thy will. He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." Christ came to take away the first. Why? Because it was not faultless. If it had been faultless no place would have been sought for the second, but Christ came to take away the first. Why? Because it was faulty, and there can be nothing else to that.

Romans the 7th chapter, he says that "ye are become dead to the law." Mr. Shuler agreed that the American Standard version should be authority in this debate as well as the King James. The American Standard version reads as I read it to you but let me ask will Mr. Shuler even take his own version? Mr. Shuler, are you dead to the law, are you dead to the law? Or are you still trying to live under it and be joined to it and even saying that you have that law written in your heart and so put within you rather than separated from you? Are you dead to the law, are you separated from the law?

The revised version says that the law is dead and the King James version says ye are dead to the law. Take it either way, you are separated from it whether it is the law that is dead or you that is dead, you are separated from that law. He says the law slew Paul. Of course, I said that Paul

lived for many, many years under that law and therefore it could not be that Paul was referring to his life as a Christian. As a Christian he said I am not under the law, but under law to Christ. That's the law I'm under, "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2).

Then to II Corinthians, the 3rd chapter and the 7th verse he says that "it doesn't say the ten commandments were done away but the ministration was done away." I have time to just turn and read that to you very clearly. I want you to carry it home with you tonight, I want you to think about it as you meditate upon these things and come back again tomorrow. "But if the ministration of death written and engraven on stones." Paul speaks of a ministration of death written and engraven on stones, whatever it was that was written and engraven on stones is the ministration of death or you can't read your Bible and know what it is talking about. That's what it said, the ministration written and engraven on stones. Mr. Shuler said that that ministration of death was done away. When you go home and read your Bible and see that the law was a ministration of death, written and engraven on stones you will know that he has said it. Though he wouldn't come up to answer those questions like he promised me, he has said that the ministration of death is the ten commandments, for he said that which was written on stones was done away. Therefore, the ten commandments are done away.

Now notice one other thing that he said of this, that it is now written in our hearts instead of on the tables of stones. Friend of mine, if that is all that is written in your heart, bless your soul, I have doubts about your getting to heaven. Did you know that, yes I do. Where is even faith in Jesus Christ commanded? A man could believe all those ten commandments and get drunk every day of his life. Nothing is said about drunkenness there, nor is anything said about faith in Jesus Christ. That, my friends, is not a sufficient testament. It was faulty and it was taken away.

To show very plainly that the law is not the thing that Paul is talking of and that the law is not the thing God

spoke of through Jeremiah, as written in our hearts, let me just turn again to the 8th chapter of Hebrews. "But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by so much as he is also the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them . . ." and it matters not what the "them" is whether it is the people or the commandments. He has already said the covenant is not faultless, therefore, it has faults in it. The "them" is immaterial and I wasn't emphasizing that. I was emphasizing that the covenant was not faultless. "Finding fault with them, he said, Behold the day comes when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt for my covenant they break and I regarded them not, saith the Lord but this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days." It is not according to the first covenant. Mr. Shuler said the difference is that back there it was written on stones and now it is written in the heart. Same covenant, just written in a different place. God said "not according to the covenant that I made with them in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt."

What was the covenant that he made with them in those days? We know from the 34th chapter of Exodus, the 28th verse that it was the ten commandments written upon the tables of stones. We know that. From the 34th chapter of Exodus and the 28th verse God made that covenant with Israel. It was written and engraven on stones and it was called a ministration of death. It was not faultless and therefore, God in due time took it away through the Christ who came to do the will of God; that by taking away the first he might establish the second.

For one final thought tonight I turn to the 2nd chapter of Colossian letter and with this we shall conclude our discussion upon this particular matter. In the 2nd chapter of Colossians we have the statement concerning this old law;

this law which was taken out of the way; this law which was nailed to the cross; this law which was done away and is not our law today.

Here the apostle says, "having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." Nailing it to the cross and I didn't have to drive the nails, friends. Christ drove them there, Christ drove them there, nailing it to the cross. Who did it? Christ did it, he took it out of the way, he nailed it to the cross "having despoiled the principalities and the powers. He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day." I am reading the American Standard version, which is authority in this discussion and it says "let no man judge you in respect to a sabbath day." That my friends, puts the ten commandments right in as God always put it in with all the laws concerning ceremonies, ordinances, feast days and everything else.

There was but one law, and that was the law of God, the law that he gave through Moses, sometimes the law of God, sometimes the law of the Lord, and sometimes the law of Moses. Always the same law, including all the ceremonies, all the rites, all the rituals and the ten commandments. Paul put it in there and it is all nailed to the cross. Therefore, we should not let any man judge us in meat, in drink, in respect to a feast day, new moon or a sabbath day. Did you notice he violated the rules of discussion by appealing to the original Greek and says there it is in the plural? One hundred and one of the finest Greek scholars upon the face of the earth gave the American Standard version of the testament and those men said "a sabbath day." Are you going to take their scholarship or Mr. Shuler's? But have it either way. Take the King James version and there it simply says sabbath days. I have in the revised version you can't judge me in one. He has it in his that you can't judge me in many. So one or many the thing is gone. Every child of God is dead to it and therefore we are not under it today and I thank you.

**Smith-Shuler Debate****Session IV. Tuesday Night, December 31, 1946****Hoyt Sherman Auditorium, Des Moines, Iowa**

Chairman: This evening Mr. Smith and Mr. Shuler continue discussion of the second proposition which they began last night. Mr. Shuler has the affirmative and Mr. Smith the negative. The proposition is:

Resolved: The New Testament teaches that the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life and duty upon Christians of today.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Your affirmative speaker, Mr. Shuler:

**Mr. Shuler's Fourth Affirmative**

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The proposition before us is, "Resolved that the New Testament teaches that the Ten Commandments are binding as a rule of life and duty on Christians of today." I affirm that this is true. Brother Smith denies it.

Brother Smith said last night that there was but one law and that it was all nailed to the cross and abolished. I want you to notice that his doctrine of one law is entirely out of harmony with the Bible.

Notice Deuteronomy 33, verses 2 to 4. The 2nd verse tells of the time when God came down upon Mount Sinai and proclaimed the Ten Commandments with His own voice. I read, "And he said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints," (and now notice), "from His right hand went a fiery law for them." He doesn't say a part of a law. He says from God's right hand went a fiery law. Now there is one distinct law. Then verse 4 in addition to this says, "Moses commanded us a law."

Don't you see that there are two laws mentioned and not simply one? One law is a fiery law from God's right hand. Then another law, "Moses commanded us a law." Please

tell me, one and one equals how many? It certainly makes two laws.

Mr. Smith says, there is but one law. The facts are, that Brother Smith goes directly against the scriptures when he says there is only one law, and that is why he is so confused on this law question. He thinks there is only one law, when there are two.

A man in an automobile one day pulled up to an intersection, he looked and thought he saw only one car and that it was too far away to bother him, so he started to cross the intersection. He got in the middle of the intersection and another car, which he had not noticed from the other direction smashed him broadside. Now what was the trouble? He thought he saw only one car, but there were two. So it is dangerous to see only one law, when there are two.

By teaching that there is only one law he makes the Bible contradict itself. Here is one example of many that might be cited. In Romans 3:31 Paul says that the law is established by faith in Jesus Christ. In Ephesians 2:15 Paul says the law of commandments contained in ordinances was abolished at the cross. How could the same set of laws be both established and abolished at the same time? It shows that Paul recognized the two divisions of the law. The law of the Ten Commandments, which reveal sin, and is established by faith in Jesus Christ. The ceremonial ordinances which were abolished by Jesus Christ at the cross.

Here are some Scriptures which I want Brother Smith to read, and he will see that there are two laws. Exodus 24:14; Deuteronomy 5:22; Deuteronomy 4:11-13.

In Exodus 24:14 God refers to the Ten Commandments as being a law by themselves. He makes it very clear that what He wrote on the two tables of stone was a law by itself.

Next I go a step further and show by the Scriptures that the Ten Commandments constitute a complete law composed of ten precepts, to which no others were to be added. Here is the evidence in Deuteronomy 5:22. Moses tells of the time when God spoke the Ten Commandments. Then in the 22nd verse he tells that after God had spoken the ten precepts He added no more. God Himself marked off the Ten Com-

mandments as a separate law, by speaking just the Ten Commandments with His own voice to the people. Then He stopped. He added no more.

Brother Smith tries to do something that God himself refrained from doing. He tries to add on the hundreds of commandments that Moses wrote concerning meat offerings, drink offerings, animal sacrifices, feast days, and yearly sabbaths, and then says it was all one law.

In Deuteronomy 4:11-13, the Ten Commandments are spoken of as God's commanded covenant. Then it mentions the other laws as the statutes and judgments that Moses taught the people.

Brother Smith says, there was only one law and it was all nailed to the cross. This is why his teachings make the Bible contradict itself. The Scriptures clearly recognize that the Ten Commandments are a separate law from the statutes of Moses. The ceremonial regulations of Moses were abolished at the cross, but the Ten Commandments being separate, continued binding after the cross and are binding on Christians as a rule of life and duty.

I have a question for Mr. Smith tonight. I will read it and pass it to him on a card. Do you teach that after the first set of the tables of stones containing the Ten Commandments were broken by Moses, that the second set of the tables of stones, which were finally placed in the ark, were written by Moses?

We have a chart which shows what the Ten Commandments really teach. We have a good reason to take note what the Ten Commandments really do teach, because this discussion is about the Ten Commandments. What do the Ten Commandments really teach?

The first commandment teaches us to worship God only and supremely. The second commandment to worship God spiritually and directly. The third commandment teaches us to be reverent. The fourth commandment to keep the Sabbath. The fifth commandment really teaches us, not only to honor father and mother, but to respect every form of lawful authority. The sixth commandment teaches us to be kind. The seventh means to be pure. The eighth means to

be honest. The ninth commandment to be truthful. The tenth commandment to be content.

This is what the Ten Commandments really teach. They are great principles of righteousness. When God said, "Thou shalt not kill," in the light of the interpretation that Jesus placed on this, it becomes a commandment to be kind, to love one another. When God said, "Thou shalt not steal," that means to be honest. When God said, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," that means, be truthful.

Have such commandments as these passed away? This audience knows better than that. You know that it is just as binding on men today to be kind, pure, honest, truthful and reverent and worship God only and supremely and spiritually and directly as it ever was in the days of Moses.

Why would a man want to do away with the Ten Commandments? I am glad to affirm that such a law is binding. Mr. Smith said, a man could keep the Ten Commandments and get drunk every day. Will he show us one man that ever did that? Do you think a man could be kind, pure, honest, truthful and worship God only and supremely and spiritually and directly and be reverent and still get drunk? I don't. Let Mr. Smith show us any man, who ever kept the Ten Commandments and got drunk every day.

There is nothing about Jesus dying on the cross that could bring an end to any of the Ten Commandments. Man is just as obligated to not steal, nor kill, nor lie, nor covet, nor swear, nor worship idols after Jesus died upon the cross as he was before Jesus died. The death of Christ did bring to an end the ceremonial regulations, but the death of Christ could not and did not set aside any of the Ten Commandments.

I have two other questions for Brother Smith. If, as you stated there was only one law and it was all nailed to the cross and abolished, will you please read to this audience when or what is the new law which came in after the cross? Tell us when it came in, and where this is found in the Scriptures.

Then I have another question. Were the commandments, thou shalt love God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as

thyself, nailed to the cross? All the commandments that were ever given before the cross, according to our brother's argument, were nailed to the cross. I would like for him to answer this question, if these two commandments, to love God with all your heart and your neighbor as yourself, were nailed to the cross.

Now about those questions on II Corinthians 3. I'll answer his questions by simply reading what the Bible says and that is sufficient. I turn to II Corinthians 3:7. I noticed that Mr. Smith didn't read all this text last night. If he had read all the text, it would have spoiled his argument. Anybody who reads all of the 7th verse, and looks at it carefully, will see that this text doesn't say that what was written and engraven on stones was abolished, but it was the ministration of death for the violation of what was written and engraven on stones that was done away.

I read the text. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away." What is done away? It says, "which glory was to be done away." That is what scripture says. I'm taking the Bible as it reads. "Which glory was to be done away."

Under that old covenant there was the ministration of death to the animal substitute. When a man sinned he had to bring a lamb and kill the lamb. Its blood was taken to cancel his sins. It was death to the animal substitute. It was also death to the willful, presumptuous, defiant sinner.

It was the ministration of death for the violation of what was written and engraven on stones that was abolished. It doesn't say, and Mr. Smith can't make the text say, that what was written and engraven on stones was abolished.

This is a contrast between the ministrations of the two covenants. When the new covenant took the place of the old covenant, there was a change of ministration from the ministration of death to the ministration of the Spirit, or from the ministration of condemnation to the ministration of righteousness. But this did not abolish the Ten Commandments, because in Hebrews 8:8-10, which is cited directly from Jere-

miah 31:31-34, there is evidence that the same Ten Commandment-law which was written upon tables of stones under the old covenant is written by the Holy Spirit on the Christian's heart under the new covenant.

It doesn't say that some new law would come in under the new covenant. Jeremiah declares that the law respecting man's duty to God and to his fellow man, that great law that God spoke from heaven and wrote on stone, was to be written upon the heart under the new covenant.

When a man accepts Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour, Christ then lives in that man's heart. Christ gives that man a new heart and he is born again. This new heart is honest, pure, kind, and truthful. It is just what these commandments require. Christ stamps on that man's moral nature the principles of the Ten Commandments, and thus the righteousness of the law is fulfilled not by us, but in us, when we walk, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Now about those sabbath days in Colossians 2. Those sabbath days spoken of in Colossians 2:16, 17 were the yearly sabbaths of the Mosiac law. I refer to Leviticus 23, verses 23 and 24. It declares that the first day of the seventh month shall be to you a sabbath. This was a yearly sabbath. It came on the first day of the seventh month every year. It came on a different day of the week every year.

Leviticus 23 is a part of the ceremonial regulations. Read Leviticus 23 and you will find that the Jews had seven yearly sabbaths. They were like what we call holidays, like Christmas, New Year's, Fourth of July, etc. These are holidays no matter what day of the week they come on. The Jews called them holy days.

The Jews had seven of these which Moses commanded. These seven yearly sabbaths were entirely separate and distinct from the seventh-day Sabbath commanded in the Ten Commandments. Put down Leviticus 23:37, 38. After Moses enumerated these yearly sabbaths, he says these are besides the sabbaths of the Lord.

There is nothing in the Ten Commandments about meats or drinks, new moons, feast days, or annual sabbath days. Colossians 2:17 clearly refers to the ceremonial regulations,

because there is nothing in the Ten Commandments about meats or drinks, new moons, feast days, or annual sabbath days.

Paul is careful to define which sabbath days he is talking about. He says, "the sabbath days which are a shadow." He is talking about the sabbath days that are a shadow, pointing forward to Christ's redemptive work, pointing forward to the cross. The seventh-day sabbath is a memorial of creation. The fourth commandment teaches that.

The seventh-day sabbath looks back to the time when God made the world in six days and on the seventh day He rested and after He rested, He blessed and sanctified the seventh day. Hence the seventh-day sabbath is not a typical shadow. A shadow points forward, while a memorial points back.

The sabbath is a memorial of creation. The seventh day was sanctified before man ever sinned. See Genesis 2:3. Hence it could not be a shadow of redemption from sin.

If you were working for some ranch man and he said out there in a field are two kinds of cattle. They are marked in two different ways. In this big field are some cattle that are marked SL. They are branded SL. There are also some cattle in this field that are branded IS. Now I want you to go out there and round up all the cattle that are marked IS. Wouldn't you leave alone the cattle that were marked SL? The distinction between the yearly sabbaths of the ceremonial regulations and the seventh-day Sabbath of the decalogue is just as clear as this.

In Colossians 2:14 Paul declares that the items which were abolished at the cross were certain items which were against us, and contrary to us. Now use your good common sense. Would it be contrary to Christian faith and against Christian principle to live according to the Ten Commandments? Would it be contrary to Christian faith and against Christian principle to refrain from idolatry and profanity, sabbath desecration, murder, theft, adultery, lying and coveting? No, indeed. This shows that Paul was not including the Ten Commandments in what he was talking about. He was talking about certain ceremonial regulations which enjoined meat offerings,

drink offerings, and the observance of feast days, new moons and yearly sabbath days.

Mr. Smith said, that the old covenant was the Ten Commandments, and when the old covenant passed away, the Ten Commandments ceased to be binding. I have another question for him. He read the text himself—Hebrews 8:7. It shows that the old covenant was faulty. If the Ten Commandments are the old covenant, as Brother Smith says, then there must be some faults in the Ten Commandments. Again I invite him, to read these commandments one by one to this audience and show where there is any faults in them. My position is that these Ten Commandments are perfect.

To be sure they couldn't save man from sin. But the commandments in themselves are perfect. They are a perfect rule of life and duty.

I invite Brother Smith to read the Ten Commandments. Here they are on this chart. Read them one by one and show where the faults are. If he can't show any faults in the Ten Commandments his argument is overthrown. Let him come on and show where the faults are in them.

Hebrews 8:6 shows that the old covenant contained promises that were weak. If the Ten Commandments are the old covenant then there must be some weak promises in the Ten Commandments. Where are they? Will Mr. Smith read the Ten Commandments to this audience and point out where the weak promises are in the Ten Commandments?

Paul commends the promise in the fifth commandment. Here is another good proof for my position. Put down Ephesians 6:2, 3. Paul quotes the fifth commandment some twenty-nine years after Christ was crucified, as being binding on Christians. Long after our brother says, it was nailed to the cross, Paul quotes it and urges obedience to it.

Exodus 19:3-8 we find that the old covenant is not the Ten Commandments, but it is an agreement made between God and Israel when they came to Sinai. This old covenant, at least that verbal contract was made, three days before the Ten Commandments were ever spoken at mount Sinai.

In Deuteronomy 4:13 we have a key that harmonizes the Scriptures on the covenant question. The Ten Commandments

are never called the old covenant. They are by themselves God's commanded covenant of right, and truth and duty.

The trouble with Brother Smith is that he says, there is only one law. He fails to distinguish that the Ten Commandments are a separate law. This is why his teachings make the Bible contradict itself. On the covenant question he fails to distinguish between the Ten Commandments as God's covenant and the old covenant that was an agreement or contract made concerning the Ten Commandments.

Deuteronomy 4:13 plainly shows us that the Ten Commandments are God commanded covenant, but not the old covenant. The Ten Commandments are God's commanded covenant of right and truth and duty.

Referring back to Hebrews 8:8-10, which is a direct quotation as I said from Jeremiah 31:31-34, there we have proof that the same Ten Commandments, which were written on stones under the old covenant is written upon the Christian's heart under the new covenant, so they will obey it. Scripture never contradicts itself when rightly divided. Any interpretation which teaches that the Ten Commandments were abolished with the old covenant is not rightly dividing the word of truth. It is simply a failure to distinguish between the God's commanded covenant and the old covenant.

#### Mr. Smith's Fourth Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy to come before you tonight, continuing the discussion of the proposition we began on last night. Last night I asked Mr. Shuler a list of eight questions. He is in the affirmative and he should answer those questions. He has a serious and solemn obligation to bring out the truth of the proposition. When he came back in his next speech, he made a promise to the audience that was here. Many of you were here, and he promised me as he said, "I am giving Mr. Smith a question and when he answers it I'll attend to his." I call upon those of you who were here last night to witness that I answered his question in the first thirty seconds I was on the platform after his speech. He has been on the platform twice since that and he has not yet answered my questions.

In fulfillment of the solemn obligation that rests upon him, in the first place, and in view of the promise he made to this audience and to me in the second place, he should answer. Instead of answering them he brings other questions to ask me tonight. I'm going to answer these questions again, but you notice he didn't connect a promise with it tonight. I don't think he intends to answer those questions and he thought he was going to get me in a spot in that way and thus wouldn't have to keep that promise. But I knew the answer to his question. I knew right where the Bible gave it and I gave it to him in thirty seconds when I came to the floor. I am going to answer these that he has asked tonight.

"Do you teach that after the first set of the tables of stones containing the ten commandments were broken by Moses that the second set of the tables of stones which were finally placed in the Ark were written upon by Moses?" I am turning in the word of God, to the 34th chapter of Exodus beginning with the 27th verse. The word of God is the answer and there can be no denying it, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." That, my friends, is the answer to the question. I'm not evading his question, I answer it with a forthright YES, for the word of God says that he did just that.

Question No. 2. "If, as you stated there was only one law and it was all nailed to the cross and abolished, then will you please read to this audience what the new law was that came in after the cross and tell them when it came in and who promulgated it and where all this is found in the scripture?" Definitely in the 9th chapter of Hebrews we have the Apostle Paul speaking of that and I am beginning to read with the 15th verse that we may get just what he has said upon this subject. The 15th verse of the 9th chapter of the book of Hebrews, "And for this cause He . . ." and that is Christ, who promulgated it. Christ gave it, for this cause He, Christ, "is the mediator of the new testament, that by means

of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament . . ." And that, my friends, is the weakness and shortcomings of that first testament or that first covenant.

There was no way by which the transgressions that were committed under that covenant could be forgiven. It provided no means of atonement and therefore it was imperfect. No man ever lived except the Lord Jesus Christ who kept them perfectly in the day in which they were in force and those that fell under their condemnation realized that this indeed was a ministration of death written and engraven on stones. Those who fell under that condemnation knew that there was no way of justification for them under it. Christ died even for those that transgressed under that covenant, for that covenant could never make the comers thereunto perfect. It could never make those who trusted it and those who obeyed it perfect; for there was no means of justification in it and therefore it was weak and faulty. Another had to be given that would justify and redeem man.

He died for the redemption of transgressions that were under the first testament that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance for "where a testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator but a testament is of force after men are dead. Otherwise it is of the strength of all while the testator liveth." Christ gave this new covenant, this new testament, Christ is the mediator of it. It became of force and effect when he died, for at his death he took that first covenant out of the way and established the second. As in Hebrews 10:9 it is written, "Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." When he took the first away, when he nailed it to the cross, he established the second. That is when and by whom.

Then Christ sent his apostles, the twelve whom he had selected. He sent them forth indeed, endowed with the Holy Spirit that they might be ministers, "sufficient as ministers of a new testament not of the letter which killeth but of the spirit which giveth life." That, my friends, is when that covenant was given and that, my friends, is the time it became

of force and effect. That is the way it was promulgated in the beginning and that is the way it is still being spread abroad.

Question No. 3, "Were the commandments, thou shalt love God with all your heart and your neighbor nailed to the cross?" Well, Mr. Shuler said they were. Mr. Shuler said they were and then he asked me. Do you remember he read from 5th chapter of Deuteronomy, the 22nd verse and said, "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness with a great voice: and he added no more." He added no more, do you remember his emphasizing that? These, he said, pointing to the ten commandments.

I wonder why he didn't put that record from the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy up there. I wonder why he put up the record from Exodus. I wonder if Mr. Shuler fears that he could not deceive the unsuspecting people of this community if he put up the record of those ten commandments as given in Deuteronomy. Let him remember that question and let him make up a chart with these commandments as given in Deuteronomy and see if he can put them before this audience and make them stand. Let's see if he can, he wants to go to Deuteronomy for some things but he won't take the record there. Why? Because when it comes down to that fourth commandment God said in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy that they were to remember certain things. That they were to remember, he says, "that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt." I don't know, Mr. Shuler may have traveled much, he may have sometime visited the land. There are many of you people here who are willingly and knowingly trying to keep those commandments. Were you ever a servant in Egypt? Even if Mr. Shuler visited Egypt, was he a servant there? Remember when you are keeping this fourth commandment, said Jehovah in Deuteronomy "that thou wast a servant in Egypt." The fifth chapter of Deuteronomy definitely shows that the Ten Commandments were not given to Gentiles. They were for the Jews who were servants in Egypt and to their children. But let us get back to the answer to his question.

He said "this stands eternally, this stands eternally, it was the rest, it was these other words the Lord spoke that were

nailed to the cross." Well, right on down here in the next chapter in the 6th chapter of Deuteronomy we read beginning with the 4th verse, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all your heart." We find the one, "love your neighbor as yourself" not in these ten commandments but somewhere else. He says all that was nailed to the cross. He has answered his own question. He is right but with that these ten were also nailed to the cross and we are not under the old covenant, we are not under the old law, we are not under the law.

Speaking of these ten commandments and all the things that went with them, we are not under those at all today. They have been taken out of the way and we are living today under a better covenant. But he wants to know, where the faults were. The fault within this covenant was that it could never make those who lived under it perfect. It could never bring them justification. As I said last night, you could live by it, you could keep every one of those commandments and be a sinner. I didn't say that one did, but I said you could. Read them through and see. Which one would forbid drunkenness on the part of anyone? Which one of them would enjoin faith in the Lord Jesus Christ? A man can live according to those ten and never believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and there are millions in the world today who do not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, who profess that that is their law, with no belief in Christ, with no belief in His blood, with no belief in His resurrection. You can believe every one of those without knowing anything about Christ. That is the fault in them, they weren't complete, they weren't perfect. God found the fault, I didn't. Mr. Shuler ought to believe God and recognize the fault that God found in them.

Now he said just at the last of his speech, that the covenant that God made with the children of Israel was found in the 19th Chapter of Exodus. I've been waiting for him to decide where. In talking with Seven Day Adventists and in reading their books, I find first one says that 19th chapter and one says some other chapter. Here and there they go, anywhere in the world to find a covenant, but I want to show that what is written in the 19th chapter of Exodus was not the

covenant. I am going to turn again and read for you, in connection with this thought the verse that I read a few moments ago. The 34th chapter of Exodus, the 28th verse, I wouldn't mind reading it a hundred times in this discussion because if Mr. Shuler has ever met a Waterloo, this is it. When you take this and the things that are connected with it and the things that I am going to show you are, by the word of God connected with it, then my friend you will see why I delight in reading it to you often. In the 28th verse, the 34th chapter of Exodus, "And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words." The words of what? "The words of the covenant." What is on the tables? "The words of the covenant, the ten commandments." If anybody misunderstands the verse it isn't God's fault. "He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments."

Now I'm turning on from that to another reference. In I Kings, the 8th chapter and the 9th verse, we have another reference that joins right with this and I want you to see it just as God has given it. "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when Jehovah made a covenant with the children of Israel . . ." Now there was nothing in this ark save the two tables of stone, that's the only thing. But right here on the same page in the 21st verse of the same chapter we have this: "And there have I set a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of Jehovah . . ." What was in the ark? Nothing but two tables of stone. He might get to talking about Aaron's rod and the golden pot. Surely at one time they were in there, I'm confident of that for Paul says it and I believe what the Bible says. But at this time of which the writer was speaking in the 8th chapter of I Kings, there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone. "There have I set a place for the ark wherein is the covenant of Jehovah."

This covenant that is in the ark was upon the two tables of stone. We identify this covenant and if he wants to get up here and parade a hundred covenants across this stage, it won't matter at all for I am going to identify the covenant that was in the ark. The covenant that was in the ark was

the one on two tables of stones, but listen further, "there have I made a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of Jehovah, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." That covenant in the ark, that covenant on the two tables of stone was the covenant he made with their fathers when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.

Now turn to the 31st chapter of Jeremiah. He has talked much about me reading Paul's quotation of it from the 8th chapter of Hebrews and not reading the original from the 31st chapter of Jeremiah. Well here it is, "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." If he isn't talking about the one that I just read about here in I Kings, the 8th chapter, I want you people to tell me tonight what he was talking about. Listen to this in I Kings 8:21, "There have I set a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of Jehovah, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." Jeremiah 31, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with them in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." If that covenant to which he refers in Jeremiah 31 is not the covenant that is spoken of in I Kings 8:21, I want somebody to tell me how I can believe anything in that Bible, for it is in the same words.

In that ark was a covenant and there was nothing in the ark but two tables of stones, therefore, it was the covenant on the two tables of stones. It was then the ten commandments. In that ark was the covenant, that he made with them when he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt and that is the exact covenant that he said he was going to replace with a new covenant. Paul said in the 8th chapter of Hebrews that now "he is the mediator of a better covenant which hath been established upon better promises." But if the first had been faultless then should no place have

been sought for a second." My friends, God says that the first was faulty. If it had been faultless God would have never sought a place for a second. Let Mr. Shuler say that God was mistaken. I'll not. I'll say and I'll affirm until I die that God was right and that there were faults in that first covenant. Since I know definitely that these ten commandments were the covenant that God was talking about there, then my friends, I know that they were not perfect. I know therein we can find fault and I know that that covenant was taken away for that was the one that was to be done away.

What is wrong with what these ten commandments teach? He brought a chart out, and then he took it away. That is all right; I don't need it. He said they teach holiness, truthfulness, neighborliness and so on down the line. What is wrong with that? There is nothing wrong with eating the poorest kind of food if you don't have better. But when you have something better, why eat it? If I was hungry enough I imagine I would do like some people have in the past, who were suffering. They went down the alleys and scratched out of the garbage cans, food to keep body and soul together. Surely I'm not too good to do that and I would if I got hungry enough. Yes, I would and you would too. You might think you wouldn't now but you would if you got hungry enough. But I surely won't eat out of the garbage can when I have something better.

Now this law from God, the law that God gave to His people is a covenant that He made with His people. Then after fifteen hundred years when it had served his purpose, when it had filled its place, God gave a better one. Paul says why will you go back to that one when you have a better one. In the book of Hebrews and in the book of Galatians he is trying to keep people away from the error of going back under the faulty covenant that had been taken away. The covenant that had been replaced by a better covenant, established upon better promises.

Mr. Shuler says that the doctrine of one law is out of harmony with the Bible. He quoted Deuteronomy 33:2-3 and said here is a fiery law and verse 4, here is a law commanded by Moses. I wonder if Mr. Shuler has never read the 8th chapter of Nehemiah. I would turn your attention there

for just a moment, just to show you what God says about His law. In the 1st verse he speaks of "the book of the law of Moses." "All the people gathered themselves together as one man into the broad place that was before the water gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses." Now there is one name for the law. In the 2nd verse he speaks of it as "the law" and then the 8th verse, "in the book of the law" and in the 9th verse, "the words of the law" and in the 14th verse, in "the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses". In the 18th verse, "the book of the law of God" and in the 9th chapter and the 3rd verse, "in the book of the law of the Lord." There is no distinction made in the Bible between the law that God gave through Moses and any other law. Here in this one chapter and three verses over, we have seven references to one law and it is spoken of in seven different ways. Could it mean seven laws? Of course not. One time it says the law of Moses and another time it is the law of God. They were reading right on through. Day by day they read and they gave attention to in that time because it was God's law. Well friends, that is enough to establish the fact that when he spoke of the fiery law and the law that was given to Moses, he doesn't mean that there were two laws at all, just two ways of speaking of it. In fact the 31st chapter of Deuteronomy was a poetic expression of the whole matter by Moses as he was recounting the various blessings and experiences of the children of Israel. In poetry you know that many times we repeat thoughts and ideas in order to maintain the meter and the rhythm of the poetry. So in poetry it has no significance or even if not poetry it would have no significance for these things are used interchangeably here in the 8th chapter of Nehemiah.

Then he went back to Colossians 2:14 and I think that is bothering him a little bit. I don't blame him for being bothered by it. Frankly if I was trying to affirm the proposition he is and a fellow found that in the Bible and began to read it to me I would be bothered too. It would bother me greatly. It really would because I just don't know what I would do with it if I were on his side of the proposition. You folks can

see from what he said about it that he hardly knew what to do with it either. No he doesn't know what to do with it. He would like to strain it around some way and try to get by it somehow, but I tell you it is a hard thing to get by, it really is. Right in the Bible the Apostle Paul says, "having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, he hath taken it out of the way nailing it to the cross having destroyed the principalities and the powers. He made a show of them openly triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge in meat, drink or in respect to a feast day, a new moon or a sabbath day." He went running back in his Bible to the 23rd chapter of Leviticus to find the expression, "a sabbath day" and says this is one of the yearly sabbath days. It doesn't matter what kind of a sabbath that was back in Leviticus, the 23rd chapter. There is a sabbath that is the weekly seventh day sabbath, isn't there friend? There was one and there is one under discussion here. Isn't that right? Now Paul says don't let a man judge you in respect to a sabbath day, *a sabbath day*. Well that can be either a yearly one or a weekly one or any other kind. You are just not to let anybody judge you in respect to "a sabbath day." I don't care whether it is a yearly one or a weekly one, it doesn't make a particle of difference. You are just not to let anyone judge you in respect to that.

Which are a shadow of the things to come surely. Those things back under the law were a shadow of the things to come. There is no question about that and Mr. Shuler might be able, if he wanted to get into this thing and follow along the line of Adventist teaching, he might be able to tell you of what that sabbath, that weekly sabbath, was a shadow and of what he says it still is a shadow. He thinks it is still a shadow of something to come after awhile. He thinks that it is still a shadow.

I was talking with a fellow out in California a few years ago about the sabbath question and he said they will keep the sabbath in heaven. I think the man was a little mixed up. He went back to Isaiah, as Mr. Shuler did last night, and began to read about the new moons, and the feasts and the sabbaths in heaven. I turned over to the book of Revelation

and read where they didn't have any sun or any moon and there wasn't any day or any night and I said, "Pray tell me how are you going to find the seventh day when it comes around when there isn't day or night but only one eternal day and never a marking place between the days. How are you going to have your new moon celebration when there isn't any moon?" Do you know he just quit, he just quit talking and said, "I don't know what I am going to do about that." Well, I don't know either but now Paul says don't let any man judge you in respect to a sabbath day. I don't care whether it is yearly or weekly. Whenever you find a sabbath day don't let anyone judge you in respect to that.

Now we are coming to the closing minutes of this particular speech and I want to again place before Mr. Shuler the questions that I asked him last night. I want to emphasize these by the Bible as I did last night because there are some of you who are confused on this matter and you haven't heard these questions and Mr. Shuler won't answer them. He has stumbled around over one or two and said I didn't read all the passage. I may not have read all, but I read too much for him last night. He didn't answer them then, he hasn't answered them tonight and if I were a prophet, (of course I could be wrong,) I don't believe he is going to answer all eight of these. I wish he would, I would like to see what he has to say about them.

The first one is this: "Are the New Testament and the Ten Commandments the same?" I want to know. He got pretty close to it last night when he said that this same law, these ten commandments are what God has written and put in the heart. Paul said he "made us sufficient as ministers of a new testament." I want him to answer plainly to this audience, is that new testament the same as the ten commandments? When he answers we will have interesting developments. Now, he can just answer in one word, just yes or no. That is all it takes, just let him tell you. Are they the same? Yes or no and that would be all it would take.

Then, "were the ten commandments written and engraven on stones?" It is against the rules for the audience to speak up and answer but I believe there are a lot of you people out

there who could answer easier than Mr. Shuler can. You would say "yes, they were". But do you know you can't get him to say that? Paul speaks here, in the 7th verse of the 3rd chapter of II Corinthians, of a ministration of death written and engraven on stones. Now he said, did you hear a while ago while he was stumbling around trying to keep away from these questions, did you hear him say that "the ministration of death was done away?" Well, Paul says "the ministration of death written and engraven on stones." Whatever that ministration of death is it was on those stones. It wasn't something about those stones, it was the thing written and engraven on those stones.

Then I asked him, "was anything else said to be written and engraven on by Moses except those ten commandments, which Paul says is a ministration of death written and engraven on stones?" Then I asked him "were not the ten commandments therefore called a ministration of death and were the ten commandments written and engraven on stones and called the ministration of death said to be glorious?" That is what the Apostle Paul said in the 7th verse. He says that "if the ministration of death written and engraven on stones was glorious." That's what he said. Then in the 11th verse he says "for if that which passeth away was glorious."

Now here is a ministration of death, ten commandments, written on tables of stones, which was glorious and that which was glorious was passing away. "How then can you say in view of II Cor. 3:11 that the ten commandments are still of force and effect and have not passed away?" "Since they have passed away one time where, when and by whom were they put back into force and effect?" When Mr. Shuler answers those questions there will be interesting developments then and I promise you that for sure. Thank you.

#### Mr. Shuler's Fifth Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

All the real points that there are in that long list of questions, which Mr. Smith handed to me, revolve around II Corinthians 3:7. I have already commented upon this and Mr. Smith has not overthrown my argument.

This text doesn't say that what was written and engraven on stones was abolished. Read it in your own Bible and you will see what was abolished. Paul says, "If the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away."

It was the ministration of death for the violation of what was written and engraven on stones that was done away. This was the Mosaic system that brought death upon the animal substitute and death to the willful, defiant sinner.

Paul gives us in other epistles the plain Scriptures which I used last night, where he recognized the Ten Commandments as a binding rule of life and duty upon Christians. We know that Paul did not contradict himself by teaching in II Corinthians that the Ten Commandments are abolished.

Mr. Smith didn't touch Ephesians 6:1-3. Paul quotes the fifth commandment and recognizes it as binding long after the cross. He shows that it is the first commandment of promise under the new covenant. Mr. Smith says, it was good only until the cross. Paul didn't teach that. When he wrote to the Ephesians, he recognized it as a binding commandment.

Mr. Smith read Hebrews 9:15-17 to show this audience that some new law came in at the cross. But it doesn't say a word there about a new law. The new covenant was ushered in at the cross, but where is the new law? It doesn't say a word in that scripture about any new law coming in at the cross.

I didn't say in my first speech tonight that all the laws aside from the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross. I challenge Mr. Smith to let this record containing my first speech be transcribed by three different stenographers. That first speech does not contain any such statement from me. Mr. Smith, I think you owe this audience an apology.

I didn't say that all the laws aside from the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross. I know better than that.

The distinction between the laws of the Old Testament is not based on the idea that all the laws of Moses passed at the cross and the Ten Commandments alone continuing binding. The law of Moses said in Exodus 23:2, "Thou shalt

not follow a multitude to do evil." I would like to ask Mr. Smith, if that is still binding. It is just as wrong to follow a crowd to do wrong tonight, as it was in the days of Moses.

The law of Moses said, "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." I believe these are just as binding, as when Moses spoke them.

You see this proves that his argument is wrong. It isn't true that all the laws of Moses passed away at the cross. The only laws of Moses that passed away at the cross were the laws regarding animal sacrifices, circumcision, ordinances connected with the earthly temple, feast days, yearly sabbaths and judgments and statutes, which were intended only for that typical system.

The distinction in the law, as to the moral laws, which continued binding after the ceremonial law passed away at the cross, is settled by the very nature of the laws themselves. The ceremonial laws of Moses consisted of rites and ceremonies, which were designed to be binding only until Christ would die upon the cross. The moral laws pertained to duties applicable to all people in all lands and in all ages. These duties of the Ten Commandments about being kind, pure, honest, truthful, content, reverent and to worship God only and supremely, and to worship God directly and spiritually, and to honor our parents, are binding upon all the people in the world.

This is what the Ten Commandments teach. And that is what Mr. Smith is trying to do away with. One of the great perils of our day is lawlessness. Some of this lawlessness comes from just such anti-law teachings as we have heard here in the Hoyt Sherman Place these two nights.

The criminals of America would be glad to know that the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross. I thank God I don't preach that kind of a doctrine.

When any man lays hold upon the Ten Commandments to do away with them, do you know what he is doing? Here it is. Put down Psalms 40:8-10. This is a prophecy about the Lord Jesus Christ. "Sacrifices and offering thou didst not desire: then said I, Lo, I come, (This refers to the coming of Jesus into the world) in the volume of the book it is written

of Me. (Notice what was written of Jesus) I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart."

The law was within the heart of Jesus. When Mr. Smith lays hands on the Ten Commandments to do away with them, he is touching the heart of Jesus Christ. I refuse to have anything to do with such teaching.

Mr. Smith said that Moses was the one that wrote the Ten Commandments upon the second set of tables. Will you open your Bibles to Deuteronomy 10:2? I have a question for Mr. Smith. It says, "At that time the Lord said unto me, (referring to Moses) Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest and thou shalt put them in the ark."

Does Mr. Smith believe that God did what He said He would do? Mr. Smith said that he believed God always does what He says He will do. Now he has something to wrestle with. God told Moses to hew two tables like unto the first, and God said that He Himself would write on the tables the words that were on the first tables.

I believe exactly what is said in Exodus 34:28. But no man has a right to take a pronoun there and interpret that text to contradict some other part of the Bible. That is the trouble with my brother's teachings. He contradicts the Bible all along the line, because he fails to rightly divide the word of truth.

No man has a right to take that text in Exodus 34:28 and apply that antecedent in a way that makes it contrary to anything else in the Bible. We should explain the Scriptures in a way to harmonize all the way.

How could anything that God wrote with His own fingers be faulty or imperfect? Notice that Mr. Smith has not found any faults in the Ten Commandments. The old covenant was faulty. But this doesn't mean that the Ten Commandments were faulty. My brother has yet to find the faults in the Ten Commandments.

God wrote on those tables the words of the covenant, but what covenant? He says, the covenant means the old covenant. But I will let the Bible speak for itself. I read from Deuteronomy 4:13. "And He declared unto you, His covenant (not

the old covenant, but God's covenant) which He commanded you to perform, even Ten Commandments: and He wrote them upon two tables of stone."

Mr. Smith gets into difficulty, because he fails to distinguish between the old covenant, which was an agreement or contract made respecting the Ten Commandments, and the Ten Commandments, as God's covenant, or the covenant of the Lord. I agree that in the ark was the covenant of the Lord, God's commanded covenant of truth and right and duty, or His Ten Commandments. But this was not the old covenant.

In Romans 3:20 Paul says, "by the law is the knowledge of sin." He didn't say that by the law used to be the knowledge of sin. In A.D. 60, twenty-nine years after our brother says that it was all nailed to the cross, Paul says by the law *is* the knowledge of sin.

The law is needed to convince men of sin and the blood of Christ is needed to save men from sin. The law and the gospel go together. The law to convince men of sin and the gospel to save them from sin.

Mr. Smith divorces the Ten Commandments from the gospel. But God does not do this in His Word. Notice in the last book of the Bible in Revelation 14:12, "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." God had joined the keeping of the commandments with the faith of Jesus, and what God has joined together let no man put asunder.

In Colossians 2:16 my argument still stands unmoved. Those sabbath days are the yearly sabbaths which are a shadow of the cross. These sabbaths were connected with the ceremonial system, which taught those people about the Saviour to come. The seventh-day sabbath is a memorial of creation.

Brother Smith wants me to give him a text that says in the new earth there will be a sun and a moon. The text in Revelation 21 about not needing the sun or moon refers only to the New Jerusalem. The text in Isaiah 66:23 is talking about the new earth. We can easily show that there will be a sun and a moon in the new earth.

I didn't say that Deuteronomy 5 was the original version of the Ten Commandments. The original version of the Ten Commandments is in Exodus 20. Deuteronomy is a second giving of the law. Moses was rehearsing some of the law for the benefit of a new generation that had grown up since God spoke the law at Sinai. We never have claimed that Deuteronomy 5 is the original version of the Ten Commandments. But what Moses wrote in Deuteronomy 5:22 about God not adding anything to the Ten Commandments is true. They stand as a separate law by themselves.

**Mr. Smith's Fifth Negative**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wonder if Moses didn't tell the truth when he rehearsed the law for the next generation. I wonder if he missed the truth and therefore, the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy is not a faithful record. He called to mind the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy and said here is what the Lord said, He spake no word more. He wanted to use it until he found out that he was caught in a trap. Then he said that isn't the original, that is the rehearsing of it. I wonder if Moses didn't tell the truth.

He speaks of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ, as though those ten were the only commandments that God ever spoke. Of course, we keep the commandments of God today, we keep those commandments which he has given to us, but Mr. Shuler doesn't keep all the commandments of God today. I read in the Bible where God said, "build an ark of gopher wood." I read in the Bible where God said, "take now thy son, thine only son to the land of Moriah and offer him for a sacrifice." Mr. Shuler does not obey those commands. Is he, according to the 14th chapter of Revelation, not keeping the commandments of God along with the faith of Jesus Christ and therefore condemned and has no blessing? Oh, you say "brother Smith, that's silly, because one of those commandments was given to Abram and the other was given to Noah." I know that and these ten were given to Israel and never to a Gentile like Mr. Shuler or myself or you people who are out here tonight. They never were given for us. Mr. Shuler has somebody else's mail and started reading it and thinks it is his. Something addressed to somebody else. Turn

to the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy and Moses is speaking of these ten commandments that Mr. Shuler thinks should be bound upon people today. "And Jehovah, our God, made a covenant" says Moses. He called it a covenant and then recited the ten commandments. "Jehovah, our God, made a covenant with us in Horeb." With whom? With us, said Moses to these children of the next generation. So Mr. Shuler, "he made a covenant with us," said Moses. "Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." I wonder where he got that second generation business. Moses said right here in the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy he made a covenant "not with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." He made a covenant with us, he didn't make it with your fathers. Mr. Shuler says he was rehearsing it for another generation, who weren't there when the covenant was made. I wonder which you will take—Mr. Shuler or Moses? As for me and my house, I know which I am going to take.

God made this covenant. This covenant that you see on his chart. This covenant that was written on tables of stone. This covenant which was placed in the ark. This covenant which they break, and which Christ came to take away and did take away. He made that covenant with Israel and there was not a Gentile in the earth and never has been a Gentile in the earth under it unless back in the days that the covenant was in force he was proselyted to the Jewish religion and thus became a Jew and not a Gentile. There never was a Gentile and never will be a Gentile to whom that covenant or that law was applicable any more than God's commandment to Abram, "Take now thine son, thine only son" is applicable to Mr. Shuler or God's command to Noah, "build an ark of gopher wood" is applicable to Mr. Shuler.

God has many commandments but they are not all for me today; they are not all for Mr. Shuler; they are not all for you, yet they are the commandments of God. He said that by the law is the knowledge of sin and that the law is here to convict men of sin. I'm turning to the 16th chapter of John. Mr. Shuler needs an introduction to some things from Christ. You know John said in the 1st chapter of John, "the law came

by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ." Here in the 16th chapter of John, Christ said "but he, the spirit of truth, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin." How is it to be done? Christ says "by the spirit of truth." Mr. Shuler says by the ten commandments. Which will you take—Mr. Shuler or Christ? As for me and my house, I know who I will take. You also will take Christ and he says that "by the spirit" it is to be done. Mr. Shuler says by the law.

Paul one time asked Galatian brethren a question, saying, "How did you receive the spirit?" Where did it come from, "by the hearing of faith or by the law?" How did it come? Here are people tonight troubled just like they were in Paul's day in the province of Galatia. They are going back under the law and do you know one reason why they are going back there? I sincerely believe a good many of you good people are deceived by the claim that if you do away with these ten commandments all the criminals will have a Roman holiday. "There would never be anything more to hurt these bad fellows of the earth that just go out and kill and steal and lie and covet and commit adultery and do every ungodly thing if you take away the ten commandments," says Mr. Shuler. That is the most ridiculous thing, it is so ridiculous and so preposterous that I have hardly thought it deserving answer, but he has talked so much about it tonight. Friends, we are under a better covenant than those ten commandments. The old couldn't do the job so God said I'll make a better covenant than those. They weren't able to do what needed to be done.

The commandment said, "Thou shall not kill," but it did not prohibit a man's heart being filled with hate and letting that hate boil and boil within him day after day until he finally went out and broke the law. Christ came to give a better one and he said you shall not even hate. He went down into the heart of man with his covenant and prohibited the thought and the emotion that would lead to the killing in the end. He gave a better covenant which when accepted by men and women of this time, will make in them a new heart and they will not kill, they will not steal, they will not lie, they will not do it because God has put a new

covenant in their hearts. The old one was never able to do that. The new one makes better men and better women than the old one ever could. The old covenant was faulty.

But Mr. Shuler says the ten commandments were not faulty. Now you know what God said about that covenant and I am going to bring that out again in just a moment. That covenant which God said was "not faultless" was the ten commandments. It was the one that was in the ark. Did you notice how he studiously avoided I Kings 8:21, I Kings 8:9, connected with Jeremiah 31:31 and Hebrews 8? Did you notice how he kept away from that? Why? Because there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone and there was in that ark the covenant that God made with the children of Israel in the day that he brought them out of the land of Egypt.

In Jeremiah 31, he said I'll make a new covenant, not according to the one that I made with them when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. Therefore Paul says that new covenant has now come and "in that he saith a new covenant," said Paul, in the 13th verse, the 8th chapter of Hebrews, "he hath made the first old." Now that first covenant was made old, when and how? By God saying I'll make a new covenant. When he said a new covenant, he made the first old. What was the first? It was the one that he made with them in the days that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. Where was that? It was in the ark of the covenant. What was it upon? It was upon two tables of stone in the ark. What was it called? It was called a ministration of death, written and engraven on stones which was glorious and he says that which was glorious is passing away.

I wonder if I could borrow Mr. Shuler's Bible. I use the American Standard version. It is authority in this discussion but so is the King James and Mr. Shuler uses the King James. I want to turn over here to II Corinthians, the 3rd chapter and see if I have missed this thing anywhere. I don't believe I have but I am going to see. Now in the seventh verse and I am reading from his Bible and I am going to read it just as it is in his Bible so that you people will see

just how he has it there. Beginning with the 7th verse, "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious". Yes, was glorious. What was glorious? The ministration of death written and engraven on tables of stones was glorious. That is what it says, "so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away:" Surely the glory of Moses' countenance was to be done away, I'm not questioning that and Mr. Shuler tries to say that is all the glory, all that was glorious that was to be done away but read on down now. Just read the whole passage here and take time for it because I have the time, to get this clearly before you. I'll read it from his Bible so I'll not get it wrong and so he will have it just like I read it to you. "How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of the condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious has no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious . . ." Paul goes right back to the 7th verse. There was a ministration of death written and engraven in stones which "was glorious" and here in the 11th verse, reading right on down to it he is still talking of the same subject and he said "that which was glorious." Now you notice, I want you to get that, "for if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." That which was glorious was the ministration of death written and engraven on stones. It was glorious and that is done away, said Paul, which was glorious. There is now a ministration of the spirit, a new covenant. That, my friends, is the covenant that we live under.

He said I didn't touch Ephesians 6:1-3. I referred to that along with other things, as for instance the one he gave last night, Romans 13:9. Surely there are things quoted from the ten commandments in the new covenant but that doesn't say the ten commandments are binding upon Christians as a rule of life and duty.

I asked Mr. Shuler last night and I want ask ask him again for a text. Only find one verse somewhere that says that

the ten commandments are a rule of life and duty for Christians of today. Just one verse that says it, somewhere in the new testament. In these twenty-seven books. Read them through and find one text somewhere that will say it.

Mr. Shuler says he didn't say that all laws except the ten commandments were nailed to the cross. All right, I apologize to him. I misunderstood him. I understood him to say that these ten are what the Lord spake and this is the thing that is kept and the other is done away.. But if he didn't say it, I'm happy to find it out. Now he is not only going to bind the ten commandments but he is going to bind all the other things that Moses said. He is going to put what Moses said on top of the ten commandments now.

Friend of mine, the law came through Moses, but grace and truth through Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ has given us everything that is profitable, everything that is worthwhile for us to live by here in this world. Moses indeed, being a prophet and knowing his word was not to be everlasting, said, that in the days to come "the Lord God shall raise up unto you from among your brethren a prophet like unto me and to him shall you hearken and it shall come to pass that every one who shall not hear his voice shall be cut off from among the people." The Apostle Peter, in the 3rd chapter of Acts said that this is fulfilled in Christ. On the mount of transfiguration as Christ was transfigured before Peter, James and John, Moses and Elijah appeared talking with him and Peter said "it is good for us to be here, let us make three tabernacles; one for Moses, one for Elijah, and one for me. While he was speaking a bright cloud overshadowed the place. He heard a voice out of the cloud saying, 'this is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him' and looking up they saw no man save Jesus only." My friends, Jesus has given us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, II Peter 1:3. Therefore in those things that Jesus has given we have all that we need to live the Christian life; all that we need to make us holy, to make us righteous, to make us just, to make us honest, to make us what God wants us to be and we live under the brightness of that new covenant

today in the glory that excelleth that which passed away. Thank you.

#### Mr. Shuler's Sixth Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

There was an interval of forty years between Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. Let Mr. Smith deny that if he can.

I believe in the work of the Holy Spirit in convincing of sin. But what does the Holy Spirit use in convincing of sin?

I stand exactly with Paul. Write down now Romans 7:7. We will see what convinces of sin. Paul says, "I had not known sin but by the law." Brother Smith doesn't believe that. He says that this law was all done away with.

Paul does not agree with Brother Smith. He says, "I had not known sin, but by the law, for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Every man and woman in this audience knows it was the Ten Commandment law that said, "Thou shalt not covet." And of that law Paul said, "I had not known sin but by that law."

Again I refer you to Romans 3:20 where he says, "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Brother Smith says, that law was abolished at the cross. An abolished law couldn't convince anybody of sin. But Paul declares that by the law is the knowledge of sin after the cross.

Again in James 2:9, James says, "Ye are convinced of the law as transgressors." What convinces people of sin? "Ye are convinced of the law as transgressors." And he definitely shows in verses 10 and 11, that he is referring to the Ten Commandments, which say, "Do not kill," and "Do not commit adultery."

Mr. Smith talks about the Gentiles not being amenable to the Ten Commandments. I wish he would listen to Romans 3:19. Paul knows more about this than Brother Shuler or Brother Smith. "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." The law of the Ten Commandments proves all the world guilty of sin, and that includes the Gentiles.

There were two words that my brother left out of I Kings 8:9. I am not afraid of I Kings 8, nor Exodus 34:28, nor II Corinthians 3. They harmonize perfectly with the doctrine which I am teaching in these meetings.

In I Kings 8:21 we read, "I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant . . ." That is as far as Mr. Smith got. The next three words would have destroyed his whole argument. "Wherein is the *covenant of the Lord.*" It was the covenant of the Lord that was in the ark. Just put that with Deuteronomy 4:13, where it says, "And he declared unto you His covenant," (that is God's covenant) "which He commanded you to perform, even Ten Commandments and He wrote them upon two tables of stone."

Again I remind you that my brother fails to distinguish between the old covenant and God's commanded covenant. The old covenant has been abolished. It was superseded by the new covenant at the cross. But God's commanded covenant of the Ten Commandments has not been done away with. He has failed to produce one single text to show that God's commanded covenant has been done away.

In II Corinthians 3, it was the ministration of death, the inflicting of death upon the animal substitute and death to the willful sinner that was done away. II Corinthians 3:7 does not say, that which was written engraved upon the stones was done away.

I noticed that our brother is now going back before the cross. He first got everything nailed to the cross. Now he goes back and says that what Jesus taught before the cross is pretty good.

I do take what Jesus said. When a man asked Jesus, "What shall I do?" Jesus told him to keep the Ten Commandments. I stand tonight with Jesus. Jesus is on my side in this discussion.

Jesus had this law in His own heart. I pray God that He will put it in your heart. I pray God will give you a new heart, and write His holy law upon your heart, that you, like Jesus, will say, "I delight to do Thy will, O My God, yea, Thy law is within my heart."

I am happy that Jesus is on my side in this discussion.

We also have the Apostle Paul on our side. Over and over again we have quoted Scriptures from Paul, where he quotes from the Ten Commandments as a binding rule of life and duty.

The Ten Commandments regulate man's duty to his Creator and to his fellow man. The first four commandments regulate man's duty to God and the last six regulate his duty to his fellow men. This means that these Ten Commandments which regulate man's duty to God and to his fellow men are binding as long as God is God, and man is man.

The Ten Commandments are summed up in the two great commandments, Love God with all your heart and your neighbor as yourself. So long as it is the duty of men to love God with all their heart and their neighbor as themselves, the Ten Commandments are binding.

The Ten Commandments deal with great spiritual and moral duties that are of perpetual obligation. Go into the future, as long as men shall live upon this world. There will never be a time, that it will be right to steal, or lie, or swear, or thieve, or hate, or covet, or worship idols. This shows that these Ten Commandments are of perpetual obligation and will continue binding, as long as God is God, and man is man.

Mr. Smith said that I was putting all the laws of Moses on people today. The record will show what I said in my former speech. I was very careful what I said about what passed away.

I cited two or three things that Moses uttered, where he said, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," and "Thou shall love the Lord with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." I said that such laws as those are binding forever.

We rest our case on the side of Jesus, on the side of the Apostle Paul, on the side of the Apostle John, and on the side of the new covenant where this blessed law is written upon the hearts of men.

#### Mr. Smith's Sixth Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: We come to the final speech on this proposition and I am willing to rest the evidence that has been presented, and trust to

the minds of this splendid audience to decide what God would have you do today. I do not believe that Mr. Shuler can find one commandment, anywhere, that God wants his people to keep which is not written in the new testament. You don't have to go anywhere else. In the new testament we have all that God wants man to keep. We don't keep it because it was in the ten commandments or because Moses said it, but because it was put in the new covenant, in the new testament and made of force and effect by the Christ.

Now he wants to set up an arbitrary division of the old law and of what Moses said. Certain things that Moses said are done away, ceremonies, rituals, this, that and the other. Other things that Moses said are to be kept. Surely if God had intended poor, suffering, human men and women here in this world to take this book and to know which part they were to keep and which they were not, He would have told us. Of all of that old testament which of Moses' statements were to be kept forever and which were not? Surely somewhere he should have said and not left it for every man to decide.

Mr. Shuler will say one night this, and one night that, and one night this and one night that, and so we never know where we are. God has said the old was done away completely, abolished at the cross, nailed to the cross. The new became of force and effect and God told us what he wanted us to do. What is in the new we are to keep and it is a sufficient rule of life and duty. What is in the old is no longer our law. Mr. Shuler says God uses it and the spirit uses it to convict of sin. It is not so, but if it were so that would not prove his proposition. His proposition was to prove that the ten commandments were a rule of life and duty for Christians.

Do you notice that three fourths of his argument has been to show that the ten commandments were the thing that was used to convict a sinner of his sins and turns him to Christ. That, my friends, is not a rule of life and duty for Christians. If he could prove that the law did convict men of sin, his time is wasted so far as the proposition is concerned because that is not the proposition. I could say let

it be so and let the law convince men of sin. Those who need to be convicted of sin are not Christians and therefore, it is not a rule of life and duty for Christians in that way.

However the law does not serve in that way. That isn't the thing that Paul was talking about. In the 7th chapter of Romans where he quoted the 7th verse, Paul had said, "I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." Paul, of course, had been a Jew and had lived under that law and he said "I *had* not known," not "I do not know" but "I had not known." Paul learned what lust was and what coveting was and how simple it was when he, as a boy, lived under that law and studied it at the feet of Gamaliel, a teacher of the law. But now he said in the 4th verse "we have been made dead to the law through the body of Christ that we should be married to another even to him who is raised from the dead." Dead to the law, dead to that wherein we were once held, no longer under it.

In James, 2nd chapter, the 9th verse, he says we are convinced of the law and Mr. Shuler said it was the ten commandments. James said, as we noted last night, that it was the law of liberty, not a ministration of death, but a law of liberty James is talking about. In the 1st chapter, the 25th verse he said "whoso looketh into that law of liberty and continueth therein." It is not the old ten commandments but a law of liberty. We have been made free from the law of sin and death. By what? By a law of liberty. What is it? Paul said in Romans 8:2, it is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which has made me free from the law of sin and death."

Then Mr. Shuler said that God wrote this, Moses wrote that, endeavoring to make a distinction, not knowing that God wrote and spoke through Moses. Then he set up a contradiction between Exodus 34 and Deuteronomy 10 and said I was the one who set up the contradiction. He said that one of them says one thing and one says the other. Therefore, he declared, if God wrote it Moses didn't. But friends, I have a stenographer over there in my office and sometimes someone calls me about a matter and I say, "I'll write you a letter." I simply dictate that letter to that stenographer

and she types it out. She actually writes it and mails it to someone, whoever it is going to, and if they call me about it two or three days later I say, "I wrote you a letter on such and such a day." Surely I wrote it and yet the stenographer wrote it. God said I'll write but later he tells us in the book of Exodus that Moses did the actual writing. Moses wrote by the commandment of God and that which Moses did by the commandment of God is what God did. He did it through Moses. God did it regardless of the hand that he used. He used Moses' hand and there you have harmony.

But one final thing before we run out of time here. He said that I didn't quote I Kings 8:21. I surely wanted to and I thought I did. I would like to call your attention to this one thing he said as he was reading it. "And there have I set a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant." He said I stopped there and it says "of the Lord." Now I wish I could ask Mr. Shuler a question. We can ask questions but this is the last speech on the proposition. I wrote down just what he said then. He said this was the ten commandments. I wish Mr. Shuler would just nod his head yes or no. I don't want to misrepresent him in the last speech. Was this covenant of the Lord the ten commandments, Mr. Shuler? (Mr. Shuler speaks saying, "That is the commanded covenant, Deuteronomy 4:13, the same covenant.") I'll just turn to that verse and read it because I want to get this straight. I think this is a good place to bring this out, "And he declared unto you this covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments;" Now that in that ark is the ten commandments. Mr. Shuler said it and I wanted to get it straight because I didn't want to misrepresent him in this last speech.

I know now I read all that verse the first time. I read all that verse and I'm going to read it again. I'm going to close this debate on this proposition right here with the defeat of the affirmative by his own admission. "There have I set a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of Jehovah." (Or of the Lord the King James version says.) It doesn't make any difference. Now in that ark was this covenant and it is the covenant, he says that is spoken of in Deuter-

onomy 4:13. I wanted to be sure before I finally wound this thing up with this. It is the ten commandments there and notice moreover what he says about it. ". . . which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." Now that covenant that was in the ark, that ten commandments was the covenant that he made with our fathers, said this writer, in the day that he brought them out of the land of Egypt. Now turning to Jeremiah 31:31, I want to read you about that covenant that he made with their fathers in the days that he brought them out of the land of Egypt. I want you to read what God said through Jeremiah about that covenant, therefore about the ten commandments. "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." As per Mr. Shuler's own admission, the new covenant that he was to make was not according to the ten commandments. It was to be something different than the ten commandments and Paul said in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, "now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry by how much he is also the mediator of a better covenant which hath been established upon better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for a second but finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come saith the Lord that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, for my covenant they break and I regarded them not saith the Lord but this is the covenant that I will make and after those days saith the Lord. I will put my laws in their heart and write them in their mind, I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people. In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old but that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away," said Paul. My friends, it's gone, the one that was

in the ark was the first one that he made. It is gone forever and we are not under it now. The ten commandments do not stand as a rule of life and duty for us today but we live in the newness of the spirit, under the new testament, which Christ gave us and put in force and effect by his death upon the cross and I thank you.

## SMITH-SHULER DEBATE

### Proposition No. 3

Wednesday Night, January 1, 1947

Hoyt Sherman Auditorium, Des Moines, Iowa

---

#### Session V.

Chairman: We come now to the discussion of the final proposition in this series between Mr. Shuler of the Seventh Day Adventist Church and Mr. Smith of the Church of Christ. Again tonight Mr. Shuler has the affirmative side and Mr. Smith the negative. The proposition for discussion is:

Resolved: The scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, now known as Saturday, is the sabbath and should be observed by Christians of today.

Ladies and Gentlemen, your affirmative speaker, Mr. Shuler.

#### Mr. Shuler's First Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The proposition before us is, "Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, now called Saturday, is the Sabbath and should be observed by Christians of today." According to the rules of this discussion the proposition is to be proven by statements from the Bible. I have a statement from the Supreme Authority of the Universe, which directly affirms the first part of my proposition.

"Resolved that the seventh day is the Sabbath." Here it is from God in just so many words. Put down Exodus 20, the 1st verse, and verses 8 to 11. The words that I read here about the Sabbath are not the words of Moses; they are the words of God. God spoke these words with His own voice direct from heaven to His people.

"And God spake all these words . . . Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work."

There is the first part of my proposition in the direct words of Almighty God. The seventh day is the Sabbath. When God speaks doesn't that settle the question? Why should this man want to argue with God? He isn't arguing with me tonight, he is arguing with God. When God speaks, it settles the matter for me. I take what God says and obey His Word.

Brother Smith claims that the Sabbath was given only for the Jews. I want to say that the seventh day Sabbath is no more limited to the literal Jews, than the new covenant is limited to the literal Jews. Brother Smith has had much to say about the new covenant. But I want you to notice that the new covenant is made with Israel and let him deny it if he can.

I turn to Hebrews, the 8th chapter and the 8th verse, "For finding fault with them," (not finding fault with the Ten Commandments, but with the people who failed to keep them) "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant," with whom? It doesn't say with the Gentiles. Mr. Smith would have you believe that the old covenant was made with the Jews, and that the new covenant is made with the Gentiles. The Bible doesn't say so. God says, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."

The seventh day Sabbath is no more to be limited to the literal Jew than the new covenant, which was made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, is limited to the literal Jew. Does this mean that the literal Jews are the only ones who have part in the new covenant? No. Galatians 3:29. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." When a Gentile accepts Jesus Christ he becomes a spiritual Israelite, a Jew inwardly. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." And the seventh day Sabbath is for every spiritual Israelite.

Brother Smith claims that God caused the keeping of the

seventh day to be laid aside after the resurrection of Jesus Christ by instituting the keeping of the first day of the week for Christians. Brother Smith says this. But where did God ever say it? He hasn't found such a text in the Bible and he never will find it.

There isn't any text where God, or Christ, ever told the people to keep the first day of the week. But here is a text in Exodus 20:8-11, where God does say, "the seventh day is the Sabbath, in it thou shalt not do any work." Where is there any text that says the first day of the week is the Lord's day? He has not produced it. And he will not produce it. There is no such text in the Bible.

Here is a question I would like to have you folks think through. If it was God's plan, that the keeping of the seventh day should be laid aside at the cross, as Brother Smith says, and that His people should take up the keeping of the first day of the week, then why didn't God put this in the Bible? Amos 3:7 says, "The Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."

The Bible is the only guide for the Christian. Hence the very fact that, according to the scripture record, God never told any person to keep the first day of the week for any reason whatsoever, shows that God never designed His people to lay aside the keeping of the seventh day and take up the keeping of the first day.

Brother Smith claims that the seventh day Sabbath was nailed to the cross and abolished at that time. This is a wrong interpretation of the Word of God. The Holy Spirit knew that such false ideas would come up. God so ordered matters that the fourth commandment is expressly recognized as being binding after the cross.

Here it is set forth in Luke 23, verses 52 to 56. Jesus Christ was crucified on the sixth day of the week, the day we now call Friday. Mark 15:42 shows he was crucified the day before the Sabbath. What did Christ's followers do? Mr. Smith talked about there being no record of Christians keeping the Sabbath. Christ's followers certainly were Christians. What did Christ's closest followers, those that

were closest to Him and loved Him best, what did they do on the day after the crucifixion?

Here it is in Luke 23:56. "They returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the sabbath day, according to the commandment." According to what? According to the commandment. What commandment? This cannot mean any other commandment than the fourth commandment of the ten, the command to keep the seventh day. Here is plain proof the keeping of the seventh day was binding the day after the crucifixion.

Brother Smith goes directly against the word of God, when he says that the Sabbath commandment was nailed to the cross. Here we have the Sabbath commandment binding the day after the cross. Since the Sabbath commandment was binding the day after the cross, it is binding now.

At the present time the first Monday in September is Labor Day. If the United States government should adopt a law that the second Monday in September is Labor Day beginning with 1947, then the first day in September of 1947 could not be Labor Day according to the United States law. So, if as Brother Smith argued, some new law with the seventh day Sabbath left out of it, took the place of the old law at the crucifixion, then the day after crucifixion, or the seventh day of the week, could not have been the Sabbath according to the commandment. If the Sabbath had been nailed to the cross on Friday, the Holy Spirit would not have recognized the Sabbath as being binding the day after the cross.

I have proved the first part of my proposition by the direct words of Almighty God. Now what about the second part? "Should be observed by Christians today." Christians should obey the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ has commanded the keeping of the seventh day.

Here it is. Compare Nehemiah 9:12, 13 with I Corinthians 10:4, and then with Exodus 20:8-11. In Nehemiah 9:12 and 13 we learn that the Lord God who led the Israelites through the wilderness by the pillar of cloud by day, and by the pillar of fire by night, is the same One who spoke the Ten

Commandments at Sinai. In I Corinthians 10:4, Paul makes it plain that the One who led the Israelites through the wilderness was none other than the eternal Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. He says that the Israelites drank of that spiritual Rock that went with them, and that Rock was Christ.

This proves that it was God the Son, the eternal Son of God, who spoke the Ten Commandments. This means that the commandment "the seventh day is the Sabbath"—is a commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ, who spoke the Ten Commandments. And as Christians should obey Jesus Christ, Christians should keep the seventh day that Jesus Christ has commanded in the Ten Commandments.

Christians should follow Christ. I believe in following Christ as my perfect example. I Peter 2:21 says that He left us an example, that we should walk in His steps.

I have a suggestion. What do you say, friends, that we let Jesus Christ settle this debate? I am willing. Is Brother Smith willing? I'm willing to let Jesus Christ settle this debate.

I gladly keep the seventh day, according to the perfect example of the Lord Jesus Christ. Friends, when I walk in the footsteps of Jesus Christ, in respect to the day that I keep, I know I can't be wrong. When you follow Jesus, you are sure to be right.

Brother Smith says, if we follow Jesus Christ, why don't we keep the Passover, be circumcised, etc. That is all beside the point. We are not debating the point of the Passover or circumcision, or feast days, or new moons, or the yearly sabbath days of Leviticus 23. The New Testament plainly shows that these ceremonial regulations passed away at the cross. I have given many scriptural proofs to show that the Ten Commandments continued binding after the cross. And as surely the Ten Commandments continued binding after the cross the seventh day Sabbath continued binding after the cross.

There is one question I want everyone to think through. What Scriptures did the Christians have to guide them for the first twenty years or so, after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ? The answer is, the only Scrip-

ture that they had to guide them was the Old Testament. None of the New Testament was written until about twenty years after Christ's crucifixion. We know that these first Christians were true to the Scriptures which they had. Since the Old Testament was the only Scriptures that they had until a score or more years after the crucifixion and the resurrection, they surely kept the seventh day, as specified in the only Scriptures, which they did have, namely, the Old Testament.

I want to forever explode the idea that when Christ's people came to the day of Pentecost in Acts 2, that they left off following the Old Testament, and began to follow the New Testament Scriptures. This is entirely wrong, because they didn't have any New Testament scripture to follow on this Pentecost. It was not until many years after the day of Pentecost that the first book of the New Testament was written.

Hebrews 9:15 says that Jesus Christ is the mediator of the new testament. The words "new testament" in this text simply means new covenant.

All these arguments we have heard here about the seventh-day Sabbath and the Ten Commandments passing away at the cross with the old covenant, are like a man shooting boiled peas at the Rock of Gibraltar. The rock is still there.

If Brother Smith would take all that the Bible says about the covenants, and let the Bible speak for itself, he wouldn't fall into the error of claiming that the seventh-day Sabbath was nailed to the cross. The Bible clearly distinguishes between the old covenant as a contract or agreement, between God and Israel, and the Ten Commandments as God's commanded covenant of Israel's duty.

The words on the two tables are the words of the covenant. But what covenant? I have no right to say. Brother Smith has no right to say. The Bible must speak and settle that question. And the Bible speaks on that question in Deuteronomy 4:13 and shows, that the words on the two tables were God's commanded covenant of their duty and not the old covenant.

How long is God's commanded covenant to continue? Just

until the cross? No. Put down Psalms 111:9th verse, "He sent redemption unto His people, He hath commanded His covenant forever." This refers to God's commanded covenant. It says, He has commanded His covenant forever.

We agree with I Kings 8 that there was nothing in the ark save the two tables on which were written the Ten Commandments, which are the Lord's covenant, which He made with Israel when He brought them out of the land of Egypt. The Ten Commandments by themselves, apart from anything else, without anything added to, or taking anything away, are God's commanded covenant of man's duty.

The Ten Commandments, as God's commanded covenant, were the basis of man's duty, under the old covenant, or agreement, or contract between God and Israel. But man's duty to God did not cease with the passing of the old covenant at the cross.

I have a simple illustration that will make that so plain that everyone will see it. Here are two men. One man has a forty-acre farm. The other man wants to buy it. The one agrees to sell for \$10,000. The other man says, "I'll take it and here is a deposit of \$500." Then those men make a covenant or contract, or an agreement. The owner agrees that for \$10,000 he will deliver a merchantable deed to the other man. The prospective buyer agrees that within thirty days he will pay the balance of \$9,500.

Now, the forty acres is not the covenant. It is the basis of the covenant. The covenant is the contract about the forty acres. Now suppose this buyer doesn't live up to his promise. The covenant is broken. Does that do away with the forty acres of land? Certainly not. When the owner sells the farm to another man later on, the same forty acres becomes the basis of a second or new covenant to the selling of that land.

The Ten Commandments are God's commanded covenant of man's duty. The Ten Commandments, as God's commanded covenant of man's duty, were the basis of the old covenant, or agreement between God and Israel at Sinai. The people breaking their contract didn't abolish the Ten Commandments as the basis of man's duty. The passing of

the old covenant could not abolish the Ten Commandments as God's commanded covenant of man's duty.

Mr. Smith fails to distinguish between the old covenant, as an agreement, or contract, between God and Israel, and the Ten Commandments as God's covenant of man's duty. The Ten Commandments continue as the basis of man's duty under the new covenant. Therefore the keeping of the seventh day as a part of the Ten Commandments is a part of Christian's duty under the new covenant.

In regard to that list of questions that Brother Smith handed me, I say again that they all centered around II Corinthians 3:7 and that my comments on this verse are a sufficient answer to his questions.

There is not a line in the Bible where Jesus Christ ever commanded people to keep the first day of the week, but here is scriptural evidence that the Lord Jesus Christ, in the Ten Commandments, commands the keeping of the seventh day.

The New Testament shows that the eternal Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, is the Creator of this world. John 1:10, "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." This means that Christ is the One Who made this world in six days and rested on the seventh day. This means that Christ, the Son of God, as the Creator is the One Who sanctified the seventh day after He had rested upon it. We read in Genesis 2:3, "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."

These texts clearly prove that Jesus Christ, as the Creator, as the eternal Son of God, sanctified or set apart the seventh day. There isn't a line in the Bible where Jesus Christ ever sanctified the first day of the week. We have direct scripture proof that Christ sanctified the seventh day. Christians should obey Jesus Christ in keeping the seventh day which He sanctified for man.

What are the facts as to which day Jesus Christ wants us to keep? Here are two facts, which Mr. Smith can never

overthrow even if this debate went on for one hundred nights. And these two facts settle this whole question once for all. The seventh day is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever commanded man to keep. The seventh day is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever sanctified for man.

These two scriptural facts settle the entire question. It settles it for me. I love Christ. I want to do His will. In view of the fact that the seventh day of the week is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever sanctified or set apart for man to keep, and that the seventh day is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever commanded man to keep, settles this whole question, so you don't need to have any doubt about it.

No matter how much dust is thrown in the air tonight (and there will be plenty of dust), but when the dust settles, and it is all over, it will still be true that the seventh day of the week is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever commanded, and that it is the only day of weekly observance He ever sanctified for man. This will stand true when we are all done. These two great facts are sufficient to settle this debate in favor of the seventh day.

If we would all follow Jesus, it would be settled. Jesus is the Way. There isn't any other. Jesus never marked out the keeping of the first day of the week, so far as the scripture record speaks. But Christ has marked out the keeping of the seventh day in His Word. He sanctified it in the beginning as Creator. He came down upon Sinai and commanded it. Then when He came here as a man, He kept it.

Friends, I am glad to stand with Jesus tonight on the seventh day. I want to appeal to you to take the way of Jesus on the sabbath question. The way of Jesus is the only true way.

If you walk in the footsteps of Jesus, you will not find any first-day observance steps in His life. There are seventh-day observance steps in His life. He is our example. We should walk in His steps. Why not just take the way of Jesus on this great issue that is before us?

Christians ought to follow the book of Acts in the day which they keep. The first day of the week is mentioned only once in the book of Acts. It is given no sacred title. It is not once called the Lord's day. There is no indication that it is regarded as a holy day. The book of Acts mentions the Sabbath eight times. Every time it mentions the seventh day it refers to it by the sacred title of the Sabbath. This was years after the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus.

The book of Acts shows that the apostles and the early Christians recognized the seventh day as the Sabbath day in the days of the apostles. They were true to the Scriptures which they had, and during those early years the only Scriptures they had were the Old Testament Scriptures. They were true to those Scriptures and followed those Scriptures in keeping the seventh day.

#### Mr. Smith's First Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are tonight discussing the question of the sabbath. Mr. Shuler is in the affirmative and I suppose has done the best that he can do. A man should put out his best first. Mr. Shuler is a national representative of the Seventh Day Adventist people. I am sure he can do as well as any of them can do. You have heard the best they have tonight and therefore I am confident that you are going to realize that the best they have is not enough in just a few minutes.

He ended talking about the conference in Jerusalem and I am going to turn to that fifteenth chapter of Acts to begin. I always like to begin with the thing that is fresh in my mind. There was a conference in Jerusalem. In the twenty-first verse he read a statement made by James in which he mentioned the sabbath. He seems to think that every time anyone mentions the sabbath that that just means you have to keep the seventh day of the week as a day of worship and as a holy day.

I want you to know that when the sabbath keeping is mentioned in the Bible it talks about keeping a day in a way that Mr. Shuler has never kept it. I want to know by what law he does keep it. I want to know what his law

of keeping it is. I want to know if he puts to death those who violate it, as the Bible said they should. I want to know if he is allowed to pick up sticks on the sabbath day, as they were not. A man was put to death for doing that in the fifteenth chapter of Numbers. I want to know if they are allowed to build a fire in their home upon his sabbath day. I want to know if they are allowed to travel more than seven eighths of a mile upon the sabbath day. When the sabbath was commanded to a people God told them how to keep it. If they are still keeping that sabbath which God commanded in that covenant, that he has on his chart there, then they will have to keep it as God said that sabbath was to be kept or else they will have to find a law which tells them to keep it in a different way. I want to know where that law is that commands them to keep it in a different way, if they are to keep it.

He seems to think that every time the word sabbath is mentioned, it is for Christians. Read what James says here in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, the 21st verse. He was speaking at that time to a gathering of the apostles, and elders and other people in Jerusalem and he said, "For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him." I'm not a preacher of Moses but it seems that Mr. Shuler would like to be a preacher of Moses. I am a preacher of Christ and God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ. I am going to preach Christ and him crucified and not Moses with his two tables of stone when I get up to preach. James said, "Moses hath in every city them that preach him." Sure he did. Who were they? Christians, no for no Christian preacher ever preached Moses as our law giver. Every Christian preacher has from the time Christ died upon the cross, preached Christ as the one to be heard. At the time of his transfiguration, Matthew 17:1-5, there appeared Moses and Elijah with the Christ talking with him of his decease and Peter thought it good and said, "Shall we make you three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses and one for Elijah?" But a bright cloud overshadowed the place and a voice out of the cloud spake saying, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him," and

looking up they saw no man save Jesus only. "God having," according to Paul in Hebrews 1:1-2, "in olden time and in divers manner spoken unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in the end of these days or in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." We ought to hear him and we ought to preach him. James is talking about a people who didn't believe in him. He is talking about a people who had not accepted him. He is talking about a people who still had a veil over their heart. Is Mr. Shuler classifying himself and those who are with him along with those people with the veil over their heart yet? James said "Moses hath in every city them that preach him." Now that is not Christianity. It is not the preaching of Christ.

But James further says, "being read in the synagogues." Not in the churches, but in the synagogues which were the meeting place of Jews. "Being read in the synagogues every Sabbath." Of course the Jews met on the sabbath and they still do. The seventh day of the week is their meeting day, is their sabbath. Always was and always will be for those under the law. Since God gave that law on Sinai they have been keeping that day as the sabbath but my friends when we are liberated from the bondage of that law and become free men in Christ we are no longer under that.

I want to read on down a little bit farther here and show you what it says these apostles and elders in Jerusalem decided. I am reading right on the 22nd verse, "then it seemed good for the apostles and the elders of the whole church to choose men out of their company and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas called Barsabbas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren and they wrote thus by them, "The apostles and the elders, brethren, unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting: Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment; it seemed good unto us, having come to one accord, to choose out men and send them unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of

our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Here are the necessary things, says James, says the apostles, says the elders of the church in Jerusalem, says the whole church of Jerusalem. We thought it good to lay upon you nothing but these necessary things.

What are they? "That you keep the ten commandments." It isn't there. What a wonderful place to have put it in. If God had intended for Christians to keep the ten commandments and to remember the sabbath day as a holy day, what a wonderful place to put it in but not one word. It is not included in these necessary things. Out of that conference at Jerusalem among the apostles and the elders and the whole church there came instruction concerning these necessary things. "To abstain from idols, from things sacrificed to idols and from blood, and from things strangled and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you. Fare ye well." That conference at Jerusalem did not sanction sabbath keeping and did not command sabbath keeping. Don't ever let him make you think that.

He says that in the book of Acts we have the first day of the week mentioned only once, 20th chapter of Acts, 7th verse and he has nightmares about that verse. I'm sure he has been having them ever since he arranged this debate but it is mentioned again. I wonder if Mr. Shuler hasn't yet come to the realization that in the second chapter of Acts when the word of God says "now when the day of Pentecost was fully come" that the first day of the week is mentioned there also. The day of Pentecost was the first day of the week. The most historic events that this world has seen, this side of the cross of Christ and excepting the cross of Christ, in all history. Among these historic events coming upon that day of Pentecost are the coming of the Holy Spirit, the establishment of the church, the beginning of the gospel, the beginning of remission of sins in Christ. All upon that day, the first day of the week, and the disciples were gathered together upon

that day too when it was come as we gather together today upon the first day of the week.

He says Christians are to follow the book of Acts. I agree Christians are to follow the book of Acts and I challenge Mr. Shuler tonight to find one place, just one single solitary place in the book of Acts where Christians ever met as Christians upon the seventh day sabbath. I have found for him and he knows where it is, the 20th chapter of Acts, the 7th verse, where the disciples and they were called Christians first at Antioch Acts 11:26, where these Christians met upon the first day of the week to break bread. Now let him find for me one place where Christians as Christians ever met upon the sabbath day in the book of Acts, just one. Sure we ought to follow the book of Acts but be sure you know what is in the book of Acts.

Again he says we ought to follow Jesus. That is right, Jesus is our example and if we were living under the law that Jesus was born and lived under, we would keep the commandments of that law. We are not under that law, for Jesus when he died upon the cross took that law out of the way. He came to take away the first covenant and that is the covenant the ten commandments.

That is "God's commanded covenant," says Mr. Shuler. I wonder if he had a covenant that wasn't commanded. I wonder who commanded the other. Did God command the other or did he just throw it out without any command? Was there any command to it? Did he command them to keep the passover, or did he just leave that to their own judgment? What about such things as that? What is that other covenant? He says here is "God's commanded covenant." What other kind of covenant did God ever make with anybody? "God's commandment covenant," the covenant that was in the ark is the covenant, according to I Kings 8:21, that he made with them in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. That is the covenant my friend that Jeremiah 31:32 says was to be supplanted by a new covenant. That is the covenant, according to Hebrews the 8th chapter, Paul says has been supplanted by

a new covenant. That is the first covenant that God made with his people. Christ came to take away the first that he might establish the second.

We don't live under the covenant that Christ lived under. Christ kept the passover, but Mr. Shuler says, "Oh, that's of no importance." Christ was circumcised, they offered two turtle doves as a sacrifice when Christ was eight days old and was taken into the temple but that is of no importance at all. If you are going to follow Christ, if you are going to say that his example in the years that he lived on this earth is our example today it becomes important. He did those things and it's just as logical to say that we must do those things today as it is to say we must keep the sabbath day because he kept it.

The law under which we live, the new covenant that Christ made, took the place of the first. This was not of force and effect until he died. A testament is not of force while the testator liveth, therefore, Christ had to die to put his commandment and his testament into effect. While he lived he taught men to live under the covenant under which he was born and under which he was living but we are not under that today. When he took that covenant out of the way at the cross what then was his example? I want Mr. Shuler to find in the Bible one place where Christ ever kept the sabbath after he ever arose from the tomb. After the resurrection day find one place where Christ kept the sabbath.

I can find for you where he met with disciples upon the first day of the week, upon two occasions at least. Two occasions are mentioned and in fact the only time that the day of a meeting of Christ and his disciples is specified and specifically mentioned, it's the first day of the week. The 19th chapter of John, the 21st verse, "upon the same day," that day that he was raised from the tomb, Christ met with His disciples. The 26th verse, "After eight days" and Mr. Shuler learned last Sunday that the expression after eight days and on the eighth day means exactly the same thing. He even conceded it because in the 16th chapter of Matthew,

the 21st verse we have "on the third day" and in the 8th chapter of Mark, the 31st verse, we have "after three days." Mr. Shuler said Christ was crucified on the fourteenth of the first month and was raised from the dead on the sixteenth of the same month. Thereby he said Mark 8:31 which says "after three days" means "on the third day" then "after eight days" means "on the eighth day." He gave us another example over in Kings and Chronicles and asked me to compare them and one of them said "after seven days" and the other said "on the sabbath day," which is the seventh day so "on the seventh day" and "after seven days" was the same thing. Therefore we have two meetings of Christ with his disciples after his resurrection. These meetings were upon the first day of the week and I challenge him to find one, just one, only one single solitary time where Christ met with his disciples on the sabbath after he was raised from the tomb.

We will follow Christ and we will follow the book of Acts. We will meet as Christians did in the book of Acts and we will meet as the disciples of Christ and Christ did after his resurrection from the tomb. But we will not go back under a law of bondage, a yoke which James said "neither we nor our fathers were ever able to bear." We will not go back into the bondage of that law and thus turn away from Christ. He that would seek to be justified by the law is fallen from grace, said Paul. So we will not go to that law but will remain free under Christ and will live in Christ in the freedom that he has given us, under the new testament, and keep the new covenant, and meet as Christians who were given that covenant did meet. Thus my friends we shall be following the book of Acts and following Christ.

Now he says Jesus did not mark out the keeping of the first day of the week. I wonder how he would have gone about it. He met with his disciples upon that day and then they under the guidance of His Spirit met upon that day. How would He have gone about it in such a way that He could convince a man like Mr. Shuler? If that would not convince him what could he have done and what would he have had to do? Mr. Shuler can say, "if he had said this, that or the other." Really Mr. Shuler would know how to

write the Bible and how to command the thing better than the Lord it seems. The Lord commanded it and showed it in His own way. He showed it and commanded it by His example and by the example of His disciples.

The Apostle Paul said, "be ye imitators of me as I am of Christ." We are to imitate the example of Paul and of Christ. Paul met with the disciples upon the first day of the week. Christ met with the disciples upon the first day of the week. Be imitators of Paul as he was of Christ and therein you cannot be wrong my friends.

Mr. Shuler says; "the seventh day is the only day of commandment." He cannot find a command for Christians to keep that day and that is the proposition here tonight. He cannot find a day where it was sanctified or set apart for Christians. He cannot find it in the new covenant, it isn't in the new covenant. The new covenant is not that covenant, which was the first covenant. In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old.

"Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is nigh unto vanishing away," said Paul, Hebrews 8:13. The first covenant isn't the new covenant and he can't find the command in the new covenant. He can't find where the seventh day sabbath was sanctified or hallowed in the new covenant. It just isn't there and therefore he is depending upon something from the old covenant, the first covenant that has been done away.

Now he says, according to John 1:1-2, Jesus is the creator. I believe that and according to Genesis 2:2, he rested upon the seventh day and that's all right. What if he did? He hasn't commanded Christians to do it. That's the proposition. I'm not denying Genesis 2:2. Of course God created the earth in six days and rested upon the seventh and blessed it and sanctified it or hallowed it but where did he command Christians to keep it?

Did you ever stop to realize that the same God that gave these commandments also commanded the keeping of the passover. Now he says Jesus is the one that gave these commandments. I'm not disposed to argue about that, about the identity, as to whether it was the Father or the Son.

If it were Jesus that gave these commandments then it was Jesus who commanded the keeping of the passover. He quoted I Cor. 10:2 to prove that Christ was that Lord that led them out of Egypt. Well that's the one that commanded the keeping of the passover. If because the Lord commanded the keeping of the seventh day sabbath back there it becomes binding upon Christians, then the command to keep the passover back there makes it binding upon Christians. Also the fact that he commanded many other feasts, ceremonies and rituals make them binding upon Christians. If not, why not? He gave an illustration using forty acres of land and a covenant. He got so twisted up before he got through that no one could tell where he was going, which end he went in and which he came out or what happened while he was in the middle. I wrote down one statement, "The ten commandments were the agreement at Sinai." He says the ten commandments were the agreement. He had just said before that that the agreement was the covenant. He said the forty acres of land is not the covenant, that's the basis he said but then he said the ten commandments were the agreement and I think that's right. God spoke these and the people said "we will do them," and so there is the agreement. That is the things upon which they all agreed. But he came on a little bit later and said the ten commandments were the basis and he tried to make them equal to the forty acres of land instead of the covenant. He said the forty acres of land is not the covenant but God said these ten commandments are the covenant and Mr. Shuler said according to Deut. 4:14 that these are the commanded covenant.

These are the first covenant, that God first made with his people when he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. Therefore, my friends when that covenant was broken, was taken out of the way, we are not under it any longer. No one is under it. I never was under it. Neither was any other Gentile but I'll get to that in just a moment.

But he came again to those questions on II Cor. 3. He feels he has said enough about them. He made a promise to this audience night before last that if I answered his

questions that he gave me then he would answer mine. He has yet to fulfill that promise to me and to this audience. Those questions on II Cor. 3 cannot be answered before this audience with a forthright answer and the proposition of this evening or of yesterday evening be upheld. They just cannot be. He cannot and will not come before this audience and answer this first question even. "Are the new testament and the ten commandments the same?" He hasn't answered it yet, he hasn't even made a pretense at answering it. He hasn't said anything that was sufficient upon it. Again, "were the ten commandments written and engraven on stone?" "Was anything else said to be written and engraven on stones by Moses?" He has never answered that second question, he has never said anything about it that could be construed as an answer. "Were the ten commandments called the ministration of death?" The Apostle Paul says the "ministration of death written and engraven on stone." Now, my friend, if those ten commandments were on stones, they are called a ministration of death. Will he say they were or does he deny the scripture and say they were not? "Were the ten commandments written and engraven on stones and called the ministration of death said to be glorious?" That is what the Bible says about them. I wonder if he will agree with the Bible. "Was that which was written and engraven in stones and glorious said to be passing away?" That's what the Bible says about it. They were passing away. That which was glorious was to pass away and Paul said that which was glorious has passed away. That which came with glory was to be done away and that which comes with glory was done away. Take either version you want, the American Standard or the King James and the thing is the same. He cannot escape that. How then can he say in view of II Cor. 3:11 which says that "that which was glorious is passed away," how can he say that the ten commandments are still of force and effect and have not passed away? Since they were to pass away, if he contends they are still in force he is under an obligation to answer this question to this audience and tell, "where, when, by whom were they brought back into force?" The place, the time and the authority and

that from the word of God. I'm still waiting for an answer to those questions and I'll ask them every night until this debate is over.

He will not escape from that and he knows that it is something too hard for him. He knows that it is something he cannot answer, he knows there is something that he had better not tamper with. He knows that it is something that is going to destroy his position if he ever attempts to give an answer to this audience upon those questions. He will evade them even though he definitely promised that he would answer them if I would answer his question. You folks know I did answer his question too.

Now because he can read in Psalms 109:111, that "I have commanded my covenant forever," he thinks that it is still binding just because of that. I wonder if Jonah is still in the belly of the whale. You say what in the world does that have to do with this? Over in the 2nd chapter of Jonah, when Jonah was in the belly of the whale, Jonah started praying. He was like a lot of other Christians running away from their duty. That's when they start praying, when the Lord gets hold of them. But anyhow, Jonah says, "I went down to the bottom of the mountains." Now I've been to the top of some, but Jonah said, "I went down to the bottom." I don't know how far down he went but he wasn't enjoying his ride. He said he was in the belly of the whale *forever*. Now get it, the 2nd chapter of Jonah says that he was there *forever*. I want you to just get that. I don't want any question about it in your mind. I want you to see just how it is and I'll take the time to just turn because I heard somebody whistle as though that were almost unbelievable. As though they just couldn't quite believe that was right. Right over here in the 2nd chapter of Jonah and the 6th verse, "I went down to the bottom of the mountains. The earth with its bars closed upon me for ever:" Came back up three days later though didn't he? Three days were forever. Did you know that forever is a word that is used with no limitations in the Bible? He quotes a verse from the poetry of David to show that these commandments are still binding because

David said thy covenant that I have commanded is forever. It was, for that purpose, and that time that was contemplated by the writer. The word forever is always so used in the Bible. How often, Mr. Shuler talks about that when he gets upon another phase of his doctrine which I'm not permitted to mention here.

Words on the tables of stone are the words of the covenant. What covenant? God's commanded covenant, Deut. 4:13. What other covenant did God have than a commanded covenant? Did he have one that wasn't commanded? Did somebody else command the other one? I want to find that out but I am confused right here.

He says there was no new testament for twenty years after the crucifixion. Please read with me from the second chapter of Acts. "Now when the day of pentecost was fully come the disciples were together in one place. Suddenly there came from heaven the sound of a rushing mighty wind. It filled all the house in which they were sitting and there appeared cloven tongues parting asunder, like as of fire and sat upon each of them. They were all filled with the holy spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Now my friends they were speaking by the spirit that day. What were they speaking then? Christ said, "Howbeit when he the spirit of truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth. For He shall not speak from Himself but what things soever He shall hear these shall He speak and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me but he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you." (John 16:13-15) Upon that day the holy spirit came. Upon that day the Apostles spake by the spirit. The holy spirit was revealing the words of Christ, therefore the testament, the new testament, the testament of Christ and they had the word in spoken form. Though it wasn't written for ten million years afterwards they had it that day. It was of force and effect. In the third chapter of Acts Peter quotes the prophesy that Moses had made. That "the Lord God shall raise up unto you from among your brethren

a prophet like unto me, to him shall ye hearken and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall not hear this prophet shall be cut off from among the people." Peter, by the spirit of God was preaching the word of Christ, the new covenant and people were commanded to hear it and the condemnation of God was upon the one who would not hear it.

Now he turns to Nehemiah 9:12-14 and I wonder why he brought that in. In the 9th chapter of Nehemiah we read that it was at Sinai that God made known his sabbath. I've heard some people say that they kept the sabbath all the way from Adam on down. But you mark it my friends in the reference that he gave, Nehemiah 9:12-14, the sabbath was made known at Sinai. They did not keep it for twenty-five hundred years before. It was commanded and was kept for about fifteen hundred years. The command to keep it was taken away and it hasn't been kept since by the authority of God.

Now he says that the validity of the fourth commandment is shown by Luke 23:56. Those people upon that day had no hope. They didn't know what to do. They had lived all their lives under the old law. Jesus died and they said, "we had hoped that it was He that would have redeemed Israel." They turned away, saddened, disheartened, bruised and bleeding. They went their way with their hearts dripping blood almost as they walked. They rested on the sabbath day because his new law had not been given. He had not come from the tomb and they did not know what to expect. The question was still before the mind of a man, "If a man die, shall he live again?" They could see no victory for the Christ and no way now to heed the things that He had taught them. Their King was dead and they, sorrowing, go their way. And Mr. Shuler says that is authority.

Why doesn't he get the authority after Christ came from the tomb? Why doesn't he notice the example of Christ with his disciples after that time when he made a new covenant with Israel, the Israel of God. Paul says "But he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he is one whose circumcision is of the heart." The Israel of God, the spiritual Israel, with that Israel God made his new covenant. He made the

old with Israel of the flesh, but we are not under the old. Thank God we are under the new and do not keep the seventh day sabbath.

#### Mr. Shuler's Second Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The further Brother Smith goes, the more tangled up he gets. I want to begin where he stopped. He has referred to Nehemiah 9:13, 14, and said that this proved the Sabbath was not made known until Israel came to Mt. Sinai.

You people who have Bibles, just take the 16th chapter of Exodus and you will see where he misinterprets the word of God. The 19th and 20th chapters deal with Israel at Mount Sinai. The Sabbath was certainly revealed when the manna began to fall, and this was before they came to Sinai. In fact this was thirty-three days before they ever came to Sinai. So you can see how twisted up Mr. Smith is, when he claims the Sabbath was not made known until Israel came to Mount Sinai.

Mr. Smith said that there was a law in the Bible that you couldn't travel over seven eighths of a mile on the Sabbath day. I challenge him in his next speech to read to this audience any law in the Bible that you couldn't travel over seven eighths of a mile on the sabbath day.

He said the first day of the week is mentioned in Acts 2:1, in connection with the day of Pentecost, but Acts 2:1 doesn't mention the first day of the week. He is putting something into the Bible that isn't there. Read it for yourself. It says, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come." That is all it says about the day. It doesn't say upon the first day of the week.

It stands true, as I said, that the first day of the week is mentioned only once in the book of Acts. I challenge him to find where the first day of the week is mentioned in any other place in Acts aside from Acts 20:7.

I wasn't talking at random tonight when I made my first speech. I did not say, as Brother Smith asserted, that the

Ten Commandments are the agreement. I didn't say that and I call upon this audience to bear witness that I didn't say it.

I said that the old covenant was the agreement or contract made between God and Israel, and that the Ten Commandments are God's commanded covenant of man's duty. This is what I said.

Now about those questions Mr. Smith handed to me. I have dealt with them in my comments on II Corinthians 3:7. Here is a text on those questions and you can draw your own conclusions. There were people back in Christ's day that asked questions, just about like some of these questions. In Mathew 22:15, "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle Him in His talk."

When those questions were passed to me, I didn't have time to read them before I made my next speech. I was busy taking notes on Mr. Smith's speech. When I promised to deal with them, I had not had time to read them because of taking notes on Mr. Smith's speech. When I read them, I found they were questions that were not designed to meet the real issue, but simply tricky questions.

For instance, I could ask him a question and say answer it "yes", or "no", and he will not answer it. Have you stopped beating your wife? Mr. Smith couldn't answer this question, "yes" or "no". If he said, "yes", it would mean that he had been beating his wife. If he said, "no", it would mean he was continuing to beat her. Some questions cannot be answered with a "yes" or a "no".

What I have said about II Corinthians 3:7 speaks for itself.

Mr. Smith holds that the Sabbath was not made for Christians. I think Christ knows more about this than anybody else. Christ says in Mark 2:27, "The sabbath was made for man." Is a Christian a man? Then the Sabbath was made for him.

All that argument about the passover is beside the point, because we have definite scripture to show that those ceremonial regulations passed away at the cross.

Now about that council in Acts 15. I want you to notice that there were only four items mentioned in that decision. Mr. Smith says, this was all that was required of the Gentiles. There wasn't a word in that decision about not stealing, or not lying, or not killing anyone. Will Mr. Smith dare say that because stealing and lying are not mentioned in that decision, that the Gentile Christians could go ahead and do these things? He argued that because the keeping of the Sabbath was not mentioned, that it was not binding. This argument falls down completely. The fact that only four items are mentioned doesn't mean that these were all the duties which were binding on the Gentiles.

We might raise the question, What a wonderful place that was to tell the Gentile Christian that he shouldn't steal or that he shouldn't lie! This question is just as sensible as his question about what a wonderful place that was to tell the Gentile Christian he should keep the Sabbath.

Now about that death penalty. The death penalty for breaking the Sabbath is not mentioned in the fourth commandment. In the days of Moses under the theocracy, the Ten Commandments were enforced with a death penalty. This was the ministration of death. Shall we argue that it is permissible today to worship idols, because the death penalty against worshipping idols has been done away with? You can see that this is no sound argument. Mr. Smith admits that nine of these duties covered in the Ten Commandments do now exist without the death penalty. If nine of those precepts can exist without the death penalty, then the fourth one also exists.

Now about that new covenant. I am turning to the original scripture where this new covenant is mentioned from which it is repeated in Hebrews. Jeremiah the 31st chapter, 31st to 34th verses. God says, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."

Notice Mr. Smith didn't say a word about the new covenant being made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. He leaves this alone, doesn't he? He is stuck there, because the same argument he makes against the Sabbath being

only for the Jews would put all Gentiles out of the new covenant.

In the 33rd verse God says this about the new covenant. "This shall be the covenant that I will make; I will put My law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." God didn't say, "I'll give you a new law under the new covenant." God didn't say, "I'll revise the Ten Commandments and leave the Sabbath out of it." He said, "I'll write My law in your hearts." The same Ten Commandments that they had written on stones under the old covenant and did not keep them, God by His blessed Holy Spirit gives us new hearts under the new covenant, and writes this law on our hearts, so we can keep it.

The blessed Lord Jesus Christ lives in us and keeps us from sin. The man who has Christ in his heart, doesn't want to steal, or lie. He doesn't want to hate anybody. He doesn't want to dishonor his parents, or to do any of these things which the Ten Commandments forbid. Christ in him, keeps him in harmony with the commandments.

I want to raise a question and let God answer it. Mr. Smith has tried to answer it. What does it take to make a certain day of the week the right day for Christians to keep? Mr. Smith argued that the breaking of bread on the first day made the first day the right day for Christians. He argued that Jesus Christ meeting with His disciples on the first day of the week made the first day the right day. He argued that the laying aside of an offering on the first day of the week made it the right day. He argued that the resurrection of Jesus Christ on the first day of the week made the first day of the week the right day.

All of those arguments are beside the point. The breaking of bread, the meeting of Jesus Christ with His disciples, the laying aside of an offering, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, are not Biblical proofs that the first day is the right day to keep. In fact they have nothing to do with making it the right day for man to keep today.

What does it take to make a particular day of the week the right day? I don't know what it takes. Mr. Smith doesn't

know either. God only knows and we will let Him answer this question.

God has answered it Himself in His own words. I turn to Exodus, the 20th chapter. We will let God tell us what it takes to make a particular day of the week the right day for man to keep. In the 20th chapter, and the 10th verse, I read, "But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God." Then notice the 11th verse, where God Himself tells us what it takes to make a particular day of the week the right day to keep. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Notice that it takes two acts of God to make a particular day the right day to keep. First, the act of the Lord in appointing, or commanding, that this particular day shall be kept holy. Second, the act of God in sanctifying, or setting apart, this particular day for man. Mark this. The first day of the week, or Sunday, lacks both these essential divine acts for making it the right day for Christians.

There is not one text where God ever appointed the first day of the week to be kept. Christ never sanctified it. Since the seventh day is the only day of the week to which these two essential divine acts of God's commandment and sanctification apply, the seventh day is bound to be the only right day for Christians to keep.

A man may as well try to get you to take a round piece of lead the size of a dollar, for a dollar, as to get you to accept the first day of the week in the place of the seventh. The round piece of lead lacks two essential qualities of being a dollar. It is lead, not silver. It was not made by the order of the federal government. So the first day of the week lacks the silver of God's sanctification, appointment and commandment. It is a man-made holy day, and not of divine origin.

#### Mr. Smith's Second Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: If this debate had many more nights to run Mr. Shuler would run clear out. If you can take the record of that speech of fifteen

minutes and find within it one, even the resemblance of one argument in the affirmative of this proposition, I don't know what logic is, I don't know what debating is, I don't know what reasoning is or anything else. Not one time did he come to the New Testament. Not one time did he attempt to prove his proposition.

When he wanted to find what made a day right for Christians to keep, you see where he went, the 20th chapter of Exodus. We are not talking about what is in the 20th chapter of Exodus because it wasn't given to Christians.

I've been wondering for a couple of nights and wanted to get around to ask about a certain matter and this is as good a time as any. Why didn't he start his chart up here with the first of that 20th chapter of Exodus and show to whom it was written? I want to read you the first two verses of that 20th chapter of Exodus which he used to show that this is a day to be kept by Christians by divine command. He doesn't, it seems, know the difference between an Israelite of the flesh, a fleshly descendant of Abraham through Isaac and through Jacob, and a Christian.

His proposition is not that the Israelites, of the old testament, of the flesh, were to keep the sabbath, but that a Christian is to keep it today. He says in order to set this day aside to make it a day for Christians to keep you have to have command and here he goes. If he was going to make an argument to show that Christians should keep this day he would have to go to the New Testament for that is the word that is directed to Christians. "God having in olden times and in divers manners spoken unto the fathers by the prophets hath in the end of these days spoken unto us by his Son." (Heb. 1:1, 2). I want you to notice what he has here. In the 20th chapter of Exodus God spake all these words saying, "I am Jehovah thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." That ten commandment covenant was commanded to a people who had been in Egypt, who had been brought out of bondage, who were the fleshly descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob. It was not given to Christians. When Christ in the 26th chapter of Matthew, the 28th verse said, "for this is the blood of the

new covenant," can you even imagine that he was talking about a covenant that had been in existence for fifteen hundred years? I have asked him that question. Friend, did you hear any answer from him?

But remember with me now what he said about answering my questions. Mr. Shuler said when I gave him those questions, he didn't have time to read them. Well, I read them for him and for everyone. I read them carefully to you before I handed them to him. I used, I expect, more than five minutes, maybe ten, to read those questions and to comment upon them before I handed him a copy of them. If he is listening to a thing, I say he must have heard what was in them. He came right back to this platform and he said he promised to answer them. He was honest about that and I appreciate that, Mr. Shuler. I believe he is an honest man trying to teach what he believes is right. I think he is going to see this and change one of these days because I think he is honest and I commend him for that honesty. He didn't try to get out of that, he said he actually promised to answer them. But when he really read them he just saw he couldn't afford to do it. So, says Mr. Shuler, "I'm not going to answer them." Now that is the sum and substance of the whole thing. And remember they are on the proposition too. They are on what happened to this covenant that was written and engraven on stones. That is the only thing they are about and that was the proposition and that is the proposition and they are on that.

Now Mr. Shuler says he can ask me a question which I can't answer yes or no. How does he know that I can't answer that question? If we were having a debate on the merits of wife beating the question would be quite in order. If I were in the affirmative on the proposition, affirming that it was a right and good pastime to beat wives I would be obligated to answer that question because it would be on the proposition, but we are not on that proposition tonight. We are on one concerning the sabbath and the law that God gave which commanded the keeping of that sabbath and he has received questions which are upon that and he will

not answer them. Why? He, himself, confessed, because it just wouldn't do for him to answer them.

Just like I said, those questions cannot be answered by one in the affirmative of this proposition and he still maintain his position which he is solemnly obligated to affirm. It just cannot be done. If I were in his position, I wouldn't answer them either. I would read them over and decide as he has, that I couldn't afford to answer them, that it would be better just to have them hammered over my head every night for as long as the debate lasts. Just let them be hammered, it isn't as bad as trying to answer them. It is sure bad, but it isn't that bad. I think I would decide the same way. Just say I can't afford to answer them and I'll just have to take it. I made my mistake and therefore I'll just have to take it.

Now God gave this law to Israel and he didn't give it to anybody else. He made this law, he gave this covenant, he commanded his covenant or however you want to put it. He commanded this covenant to Israel of the flesh to that nation and to no other. I want to turn to the fourth chapter of Deuteronomy just to show you that is the truth. The 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, the 8th verse, we have this from the lips of Moses, himself, as he was speaking to those people and he said, "What great nation is there, that hath statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" That day he gave them ten commandments, as we read them in the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy. Just read right on for this law he set before them. He said, "What nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day." They had a law and no other nation had one to even compare with it. Yet, Mr. Shuler would say that this was a law and became an obligation for all people of all times. Moses said this covenant was made with Israel that came up out of bondage and no other nation in all the world had anything to compare with it. Then Mr. Shuler would try to tell you that it is for all men of all times. It never was for a Gentile. It isn't for anybody today because we have a new covenant and Christ shed his blood to sanctify that new covenant and to set it

apart, and everything in it. In that new covenant you find the example of Christ and in that new covenant you find the example of the disciples keeping the will of God under that new covenant, meeting upon the first day of the week. It is sanctified not as the old one was by the blood of bulls and goats, but by the blood of a precious lamb. Even our Saviour who died for us and by his blood sanctified that covenant.

But he may ask, "Was not the first covenant sanctified?" The old covenant was sanctified and set apart and made holy only by blood of bulls and goats. The new covenant was sanctified, was made holy by the blood of Jesus Christ himself.

Shall we worship idols, Mr. Shuler asked, because the penalty is gone for that too? That was as near as he could get to an answer on my question concerning the penalty for breaking the sabbath. If you have a sabbath commandment what is going to happen if you break it? What is going to happen if you don't keep it? God gave a penalty back there. God commanded them to put anybody to death who didn't keep that sabbath, anyone who even so much as picked up a stick on a sabbath day or one who went on a journey beyond the limits prescribed. In the first chapter of Acts, the 12th verse, while we are thinking of it, we have mentioned "a sabbath day's journey." If Mr. Shuler would just study a little bit, he would find that with the Jews that was seven eighths of a mile. They had set that as "a sabbath day's journey." I didn't say God gave a law. I asked him a question, "do you go more than seven eighths of a mile on the sabbath day?" I didn't say anything about what God said and he jumped up and said that I said God gave a law. I didn't say anything about that. I just asked him a question, "do you go more than seven eighths of a mile on the sabbath day?" He knew what was coming later on and he jumped up here and charged me with saying something I had not said.

Now notice he says "will the fact that the penalty is done away with let us worship idols today?" Of course we do not worship idols today, but not because of the ten commandments. That commandment concerning idols isn't for us today, that was for Israel. Why don't I worship idols today and why

don't you? Because the new covenant that God gave by his spirit and sanctified by the blood of his Son, forbids the worshipping of idols. In the 17th chapter of Acts, "The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he served by men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." We have a commandment from God. The 4th chapter of John, Christ said God is spirit and he seeketh those who worship in spirit and in truth to be his worshippers. He commands us to worship God. Over in Revelations the angel said to John, "I am one of thy fellow servants; worship God." We have a commandment to worship God. We don't worship idols today.

Then he said that I was in trouble about that house of Israel and the house of Judah. He said I was in trouble about that. I didn't know it if I was. I thought I made all that clear, but I call your attention to the 2nd chapter of Romans again. Paul says, "he is not a Jew, who is one outwardly."

The 6th chapter of Galatians, the 16th verse Paul speaks of "the Israel of God." Does Mr. Shuler know that today God does not deal with Jew and Gentile as before, for when he took out of the way that law of commandments contained in ordinances, he made of the two one new man so making peace. The Israel of God today is those who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ. That is the Israel of God today and the one to whom God is fulfilling his promises, the one with whom he has made his covenant. Does Mr. Shuler not know that? I am sure he does for he mentions the 29th verse of the 3rd chapter of Galatians, when he was making his first speech tonight. That just says the same thing. Mr. Shuler knows that but he is just trying to say, "now I know this, but Mr. Smith can't know this and therefore when he says that this new covenant was made with the house of Israel, he must mean the same old fleshly Israel with whom the first covenant was made." Let's read beginning with the 25th verse, "but now that faith is come we are no

longer under a tutor or schoolmaster, the law is our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, but now that faith is come we are no longer under the schoolmaster." But what is the reason you are not under that? "You are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." And in the 6th chapter, the 16th verse, "And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

Now friends, let's just remember this tonight that he says this covenant here, this same covenant that God made fifteen hundred years before Christ came, that it is the covenant that is now written in the heart of man and that the only difference is that back there it was written on stone and now it is written in the heart of man. Now God said in I Kings 8:21 that "there was nothing in the ark save the covenant which God made with the children of Israel when he led them out of Egypt." God said in Jeremiah 31:31, "I'll make a new covenant, not according to the one that I made with them when I led them out of Egypt." Now Mr. Shuler says it's the same covenant, God says it is a different covenant and is not even according to the other covenant. I'm not debating with Mr. Shuler as to whether the seventh day is the sabbath or not. That's not the question any more than whether the first day of the week is Sunday as stated in the first proposition we debated last Sunday. The question is whether or not Christians should observe the seventh day sabbath. They should not, because they are not under that law which God gave, which God made known to his people in the wilderness of Sinai. That is not our covenant today because we have been given a new one, written in our hearts and it has been sealed and sanctified and made holy by the blood of Christ himself and nowhere in it can we find a commandment to keep the sabbath.

**Mr. Shuler's Third Affirmative**

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We will start where Brother Smith stopped. He emphasized, "Not according to the covenant that I made with them when I took them out of the land of Egypt." This merely means, not according to the old covenant, or agreement. But God's commanded covenant of man's duty as set forth in the Ten Commandments is clearly marked out in the Scriptures as being separate from the old covenant. So Mr. Smith's point doesn't stand.

Jeremiah 31 is contrasting the old covenant with the new covenant. When God says, "not according to the covenant", that means not according to the old covenant. Any intelligent man can read the text and see for himself. It does not have any reference, to not being according to God's commanded covenant of man's duty to God and to his fellowmen.

Now about that list of questions Mr. Smith handed me. I said, that I would deal with the questions, and I have dealt with them in what I presented on II Corinthians 3:7.

God says in the Bible that He is the God of Israel. Does this mean that He is the God of the Jews only? Mr. Smith argues that, because God committed the Sabbath to the Jews for a time, that therefore it is only for the Jews. God chose the Jews and made Himself, the God of Israel. Does that mean that He isn't our God? Christ was a Jew. Shall we have nothing to do with Christ, because He was a Jew?

Now about that sabbath day's journey. Mr. Smith didn't read to you out of the Bible about it being seven-eighths of a mile. The expression "a sabbath day's journey" is mentioned in Acts 1:12. But it was a man-made law.

This was one of these burdensome man-made laws, that Christ brushed out of the way when He came. They were such sticklers, that they argued for weeks on the question—If a hen lays an egg on Saturday, should the egg be eaten? Christ brushed these man-made laws aside. Things like this are not worthy of mention in this debate.

Mr. Smith tried to find his new law. I asked him to produce that new law which he said came in at the cross. He never has produced it. Tonight he made a feeble attempt to start on the first commandment. He went to the 17th chapter of Acts to find something against worshipping idols.

This 17th chapter of Acts wasn't given until at least twenty years after the cross, where he claims that all the Ten Commandments were abolished. This means that he has got twenty years in there, where there was no law against idols. Just think of such foolishness! Where there is no law, there is no transgression.

Mr. Smith has never yet produced that new law. He says, the old one was nailed to the cross and a new law came in. Then let him produce that new law. Where there is no law, there is no transgression. God would not give a new law, without telling what the law is. Let Mr. Smith produce that new law.

Mr. Smith said, that Christians are God's Israel today. I want to say, "Amen" and "Amen." He has now given us one of the strongest arguments he can for the Sabbath. I turn to Exodus, the 31st chapter and the 16th and 17th verses, "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath."

Remember Mr. Smith says, that Christians are now God's Israel. God says, that the Sabbath is to be observed by Israel as a perpetual covenant. "It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel forever." If Christians are God's Israel today, the Sabbath still continues between God and Israel forever. It is a sign between God and Israel forever. I believe it and accept it.

This becomes one of the strongest proofs that Christians should keep the Sabbath. They are God's Israel. There is no question about it. Christians are God's Israel, and being God's Israel, the seventh-day Sabbath continues between God and Israel as a sign forever.

Brother Smith asked me in the first session of this discussion, "What has the Sabbath to offer?" Take your pencils and put down some items.

The Sabbath offers the rest of Jesus. In Matthew 11:28, He says, "Come unto Me and I will give you rest." It was Christ

the Lord, the Eternal Son of God, Who rested on the seventh day. This is His rest day and we can enter into His spiritual rest in keeping this day. So the Sabbath offers the rest of Jesus.

It offers the blessing of Jesus. Genesis 2:3 says, "God blessed the seventh day." The Son of God placed a special blessing on the seventh day. It offers the blessing of Jesus.

It offers divine delight. In Isaiah 58:13, God says, if you will take your foot off of the Sabbath and call the Sabbath a delight, then you will delight yourself in the Lord. It offers divine delight. It offers special fellowship with Jesus.

The Sabbath is a two-fold sign of Jesus, as Creator and Recreator, or Redeemer, or Saviour. I read in Exodus 31:16,17, that it is a sign between God and Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested, and was refreshed."

The Sabbath is a sign that Christ the Lord made the world in six days of twenty-four hours each. The Sabbath is Christ's answer to evolution. I appeal to this fundamental ministerial association. Let us be real fundamentalists and give the world God's answer to evolution, what do you say?

The Sabbath is God's answer to evolution. The Sabbath is God's sign that the world was not evolved through millions of years, but that God made it in 144 hours, six days of twenty-four hours each. It is His chosen sign that He made the world in six days.

It takes the same power to give a man a new heart as to make a man in the beginning. This is why nobody can save himself. Redemption is recreation. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature", or a new creation.

Hence in Ezekiel the 20th chapter, the 12th verse, God says, "Moreover I gave them My sabbaths, to be a sign that they might know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify them." You see the Sabbath is a sign of creation, and it is a sign of sanctification. It is a great double sign that points to Jesus Christ as Creator and the only Saviour. I love the Sabbath, because it points me to the Son of God as my Creator and as my Saviour.

**Mr. Smith's Third Negative**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad to come before you again tonight. This is the last speech on this proposition at this time, but we have another full session upon it tomorrow night. I'm sure Mr. Shuler is going to have an interesting day tomorrow, trying to get up something a little better than he got up tonight for all of this line of things that he has been giving has nothing whatsoever to do with Christians.

That is all of the old covenant spoken through Moses and the other prophets of that time and not through the Son of God in these last days. This is no part of the new covenant. This is no part of the covenant that God has made with his people. Mr. Shuler has said that this covenant is found in the book of Exodus and that in Exodus 31 it is between God and Israel. It seems he is unable to distinguish yet between the Israel of the flesh with whom God made his first covenant and the Israel of the spirit of today with which he has made a new covenant. He still is not able to understand that.

He thinks that because for twenty years after the resurrection of Christ the new covenant was not written that it was not in force and effect. Yet if he will get down to Adventist doctrine and say here what he has been preaching in this auditorium for nights and nights and nights, he will tell you that this sabbath was kept for twenty-five hundred years before that law was given. I wonder what kind of written law they had then. He will tell that they had no written law back there and yet they kept that law. Well now he wants to find fault with the new covenant because it wasn't written for twenty years, when he tries to justify the old one in being kept for twenty-five hundred years without being written. Now let's get down to this thing and examine it. The only difference in these two, one twenty-five hundred years and the other twenty. In the first one he cannot even find one reference anywhere to anyone ever keeping the sabbath during that twenty-five hundred years and therefore it is entirely supposition upon his part that there was such a law. I can, in the new testament, show that during those twenty years no one

ever did worship idols or keep the sabbath. Therefore, I have the new testament, the written part of it, when it was written confirming what I am saying about their practice during the twenty years, when it was not written. But his old law, when it is written in the old testament fails to sustain his argument on their practice during the twenty-five hundred years when it was not written.

He is concerned about that sabbath day's journey. I asked him about three things and he keeps talking about one. What about kindling a fire? I asked him about kindling a fire. (Exodus 35:3.) I asked him about picking up sticks on the sabbath day. (Numbers 15.) What's he going to do about those? The only one he has talked about is the sabbath day's journey. That's in the Bible too and he knows that it is.

Do you kindle a fire Mr. Shuler on the sabbath day? Exodus 35:3 says you had better not. I'd hate to be around some of your houses about Saturday if this cold wave keeps up. Then he comes back to this commanded covenant. In the 31st chapter of Jeremiah Mr. Shuler says, he is not talking about the commanded covenant. He is saying that the new covenant is not according to the old covenant, but this has no reference to God's commanded covenant. Now we have an old covenant, a commanded covenant and a new covenant. I'd like for him to get me the text that tells us that. I'd like for him to get me the text that speaks of these three, the old, the commanded, and the new. Set the text up here Mr. Shuler and let me examine them.

Now I'm going to examine all that he has given so far. Jeremiah, the 31st chapter definitely identifies the covenant that the new was not to be like. Now notice this, "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they break, and I regarded them not saith the Lord." The new covenant is not to be according to the one he made with their fathers in the day that he led them out of the land of Egypt. If I can find out what one that one is, then I've got the thing settled.

If I can find out what covenant it was that he made with them in the day that he brought them out of the land of Egypt, then I have the thing settled and here it is. Mr. Shuler told us last night just what it was. "And there have I set a place for the ark," this is I Kings 8:21, "there have I set a place for the ark wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." Now the one that Jeremiah is talking about is the one that was in the ark. And Mr. Shuler said last night before all the audience here that the one in the ark was "God's commanded covenant" and therefore the one that Jeremiah is talking about is God's commanded covenant as per Mr. Shuler, as per the Bible, and as per everything else.

Jeremiah said, and Paul said, that the new one would not be according to the one that was in the ark, which is the one he made with their fathers in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt and that was the one that commanded them to remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Do you know those people back there under that covenant, broke that covenant, they despised it. Over in the 2nd chapter of Hosea, in the 11th verse I read where God says a certain thing about the observances of these people and he says, "I will cause all her mirth," speaking of Israel, "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths." God says He will cause her new moons, her feasts, her sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies to cease. Now God said that. Now when is he going to do it? I'm turning right on over here to the 8th chapter of Amos and beginning with the 4th verse, I have just time to read a paragraph and emphasize it as it ought to be emphasized. "Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fail saying." Here is what they were saying and here is the question they were asking. God had said, I'm going to make the sabbaths cease and the new moon cease. Now they ask the question, When? "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell grain? And the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely

with balances of deceit." God had said, Hosea 2:11, "I will cause the new moon, feast days, solemn assembly and sabbaths to cease." In Amos the 8th chapter, the 4th and 5th verses they ask when. When will you do this? When will you make them to cease and God through his prophet, reading right on down in that same chapter, when they ask of that, that "we may make the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with balances of deceit; that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes, and sell the refuse of the wheat? Jehovah hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, "Surely I will never forget any of their works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein? Yea, it shall rise up wholly like the River; and it shall be troubled and sink again, like the River of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day." Now he is telling them, they have asked the question. He said there is coming a time in Hosea 2:11 when sabbath, new moon, feast, and solemn assemblies shall cease. In Amos 8:5, they said when will the new moon be gone and when will the sabbath be gone so we can carry on business on that time? Now, he says "it shall come to pass in that day," in the 9th verse, "it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord and I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." And so it never is to happen? Oh, yes it is, for the sun refused to shine. As Jesus hung upon the cross of calvary, the sun darkened its face and refused to shine upon this earth. In that day the sun went down at mid-day and for three hours as Jesus hung upon the cross refused to shine upon him. In that day the land was dark, in that day, to the cross, Jesus nailed that first covenant, that old covenant, which was a shadow of things to God and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Therefore, we today are living under the new covenant, which is not according to that old covenant. Therefore, let no man judge us concerning a feast day, a new moon, or a sabbath day because we are living under the new covenant which is my friends the fulfillment and the realization of the things that were shown in shadows under the old law. I thank you. Come back tomorrow night.

## Smith-Shuler Debate

Session VI. Thursday Night, January 2, 1947

Hoyt Sherman Auditorium, Des Moines, Iowa

Chairman: Tonight we continue and conclude the discussion of the final proposition in this series between Mr. Shuler of the Seventh Day Adventist church and Mr. Smith of the Church of Christ. Again tonight Mr. Shuler has the affirmative side and Mr. Smith the negative.

The proposition for discussion is:

Resolved.

The scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, now known as Saturday, is the sabbath and should be observed by Christians of today.

Ladies and Gentlemen, your affirmative speaker, Mr. Shuler.

### Mr. Shuler's Fourth Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Smith wants evidence that Christians kept the seventh-day Sabbath after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. All right, here it is. Put down Acts 13:14, 42, 43, 44, "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down."

In this instance the book of Acts plainly identifies the seventh day of the week on which the Jews met for their weekly worship as being the Sabbath day long after the resurrection of Christ. Brother Smith tells us that Paul entered the Jewish synagogues on the Sabbath to preach Christ to the unbelieving Jews. I'll grant this. But this doesn't offset the fact that the Holy Spirit speaking through Luke, calls the seventh day on which the Jews met the Sabbath day, long after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The Holy Spirit makes no mistakes. If the Sabbath was nailed to the cross, as Brother Smith says, then the Holy Spirit

could not have truthfully called the seventh day, THE sabbath day of God fifteen years after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

If Brother Smith came over to the Adventist Church at East 13th and Des Moines Avenue some Saturday, and preached to the Adventist people, would he go away and say that he met with the Adventists on the Sabbath day? No. He might say that he met with those Adventists on Saturday, or on their Sabbath, or on what they think is the Sabbath. But he wouldn't say that it was the Sabbath of the Lord.

Notice that there were other people in this synagogue beside Jews. Mr. Smith says that nobody but the Jews kept the seventh day. Notice verse 42, "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." Yes, the Gentiles were in the synagogues on the Sabbath day. The Gentiles were keeping the seventh-day Sabbath. The Gentiles were in the synagogue worshipping God on the Sabbath day.

Who were these Gentiles? Were they Christians in connection with these Sabbath meetings? Look at the next verse. Mr. Smith will say that these Gentiles hadn't yet accepted Christ. How long does it take a man to accept Christ? Paul preached in his sermon on the first of these two Sabbaths mentioned in Acts 13 and these Gentiles became Christians.

Look what happened after Paul's first sermon. Acts 13:43. "Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God."

A man who is in the grace of God is certainly a Christian. Let Brother Smith deny that if he can. These people heard Paul preach. They accepted Christ. They became Christians, and they went on keeping the seventh day. So here is evidence of Christians keeping the seventh day.

Paul preached to them on one certain seventh day, or Saturday. The Gentiles begged Paul to preach to them the next Sabbath. If Brother Smith's doctrine was true, Paul would

have said, "The seventh day isn't the day for Gentiles to keep. Tomorrow is the first day of the week, you can meet tomorrow and I'll preach to you." But there was nothing of this kind.

These people waited a whole week, until the next seventh day. Look at verse 44. "And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." There were Christians in that congregation. Mr. Smith will say that this was still in a Jewish synagogue. This is true. But it doesn't offset the fact, that Christians were there worshipping God on the seventh day.

Mr. Smith challenged us to find any instance where Christians kept the seventh day. Here it is in Acts 13:42-44. There were Christians in that congregation. They had accepted the grace of God and they were keeping the seventh day. Here is evidence that Christians were keeping the seventh day after the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Now I will give a text on this from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He is supreme authority in religion. The Lord Jesus Christ identifies the seventh day as being the Sabbath day thirty-nine years after His crucifixion and resurrection. In Matthew 24, Christ made a prophecy about the impending destruction of Jerusalem, which took place in A.D. 70, thirty-nine years after He was crucified.

In the midst of this prophecy about the destruction of Jerusalem, He mentions the Sabbath. You will find this in Matthew 24:20. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day."

Jesus identifies the same seventh day that was the Sabbath before He was crucified, as still being the Sabbath day thirty-nine years after Mr. Smith says that it was nailed to the cross and abolished. Mr. Smith will say that Jesus told them to do this, because the fanatical Jews would kill them if they tried to flee on the Sabbath, and that the gates of Jerusalem would be closed on the seventh day. Suppose we grant this to be the case. This still doesn't offset the basic fact, that Christ recognized that the seventh day would still

be the Sabbath thirty-nine years after the time Mr. Smith says it was nailed to the cross.

You can take your choice between Mr. Smith's side and Jesus'. I am glad to have Jesus on my side tonight. Now I am going to show that the Apostle Paul, the Apostle James, and Luke, the beloved physician, are on the side of the seventh day.

I refer you to Acts 13:27. In the midst of a sermon Paul refers to the every seventh day as being every Sabbath day. In Acts 15:21, James does the same thing. He refers to every seventh day on which the Jews were meeting at that time as being every Sabbath day that there was.

Then we have Luke's testimony in Acts 13 where he identifies the seventh day on which the Jews met as being the Sabbath day. It would have been just as easy for him to have said every seventh day, as to say, "every sabbath day". There are no more words involved. If the Sabbath had been nailed to the cross and abolished, then certainly James and Paul would have known about it. If the Sabbath ceased at the cross, it could not have been the Sabbath twenty years after the crucifixion.

If it said every seventh day, then Mr. Smith would have his case. But no, it says every Sabbath day. This is not merely the language of a man. It is the great Spirit of truth speaking, and He makes no mistakes. He doesn't call things by wrong names. The Holy Spirit certainly would have known if the Sabbath had been nailed to the cross and done away with. If such had been the case, He certainly would not have held up the seventh day as still being the Sabbath day twenty years after the time when Mr. Smith says that the Sabbath ceased at the cross.

Brother Smith referred us to Exodus 35:3, about not building fires on the Sabbath day. What are the facts in this case? This was only a temporary rule binding during their stay in the wilderness. They were in a warm country. No fires were needed to keep them warm. Their food—the manna from heaven was cooked the day before the Sabbath. Hence no fires were needed on the seventh day of the week.

After they crossed over Jordan into Palestine, where it was quite cold in the winter, they built fires on the Sabbath day with God's approval. The passing of this temporary rule about not building fires on the Sabbath did not abolish the keeping of the seventh day. Here is an illustration. In 1944 there was a temporary rule, which said, that you couldn't buy a gallon of gasoline without a ration stamp. This rule had passed away. Does this mean that the buying of gasoline has been abolished?

Brother Smith's argument would mean that the buying of gasoline is now abolished, because that temporary rule has passed. But you know that you can buy all the gas you want now without ration stamps. So the keeping of the Sabbath continues without that temporary rule about not building fires.

I want to inform Brother Smith that we don't look to Moses to learn our duty today. We have only one perfect example, the Lord Jesus Christ. By His grace we follow the seventh-day Sabbath and all the Ten Commandments, as interpreted for us in the life and teachings of our blessed Lord Jesus. I will leave it to this congregation, if the life and teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ are not a safe guide for you and me, then please tell us what would be safe and right. By the grace of God we follow the seventh-day Sabbath and the Ten Commandments, as interpreted for us, not by Moses, but in the life and teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Brother Smith claims that Christ did away with the Ten Commandments by nailing them to the cross. What does the Bible say? Put down Isaiah 42:21. This is a prophecy about the coming of Christ at His first advent. "The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness' sake." Notice what Jesus was to do with the law of righteousness! This prophecy says, "He will magnify the law."

When you magnify a thing do you do away with it? Certainly not. What do you do? You make it larger. This is just the reverse of doing away with it. This is what Christ did with the Ten Commandments.

He taught that the command, "thou shalt not kill" included

that if you hate someone, you are a murderer. He took the various commandments and magnified them. Think how unreasonable Brother Smith's arguments are. He would have you believe that Christ made the law bigger, so he could do away with it.

Brother Smith has the biggest job on his hand in this debate which he ever undertook. There is only one way he can succeed. I don't say that he can do it, but Luke 16:17 tells the only way that it can be done.

"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Before Brother Smith can establish that these Ten Commandments are abolished, he must be able to cause heaven and earth to pass away. Can he do this? It is absolutely impossible for him to cause heaven and earth to pass. Jesus says, "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." This law of Ten Commandments will stand as long as this present heaven and earth stand. They must stand as long as sin is the transgression of that law.

I challenge Mr. Smith again to prove, that I John 3:4 does not refer to the Ten Commandments. "Sin is the transgression of the law." Paul said, "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law said, Thou shalt not covet." This cannot refer to any other law except the Ten Commandments. This is the law, of which sin is the transgression. This law stands as long as sin exists. Because according to Romans 4:15, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression."

We are still waiting to see those commandments in that new law which Brother Smith claims came in at the cross, to take the place of the old law. God gave a written record of the Ten Commandments, which He commanded with His own voice. If God gave a new law at the cross, where is the record of that new law? Bring on the chapter and verse Mr. Smith. Where is the record of what commandments it contained? Bring on your chapters and verses.

I have affirmed that the Ten Commandments are still binding as a rule of life. I have hung them up in the plain

sight of the audience. He claims that a new law came in at the cross to take the place of these Ten Commandments. The burden of proof is on him in this debate to show from the Scriptures that such a new law did come in at the cross, and to show what commandments it contained. Bring on your chapters and verses. Unless he does this, his whole argument has failed.

A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Until he gives the chapters and verses from the Bible to show what this new law was that came in at the cross, and what commandments it contained, I advise you to follow these Ten Commandments which God did speak and write for man.

Mr. Smith attempted to show that this new law is from Jeremiah 31:31-34 and Hebrew 8:8-10. But his effort was an utter failure. He will have to go elsewhere.

The word "covenant" is often used in the Bible in the sense of a contract, or an agreement. Sometimes the word "covenant" is used in the sense of a law or a rule. The Bible speaks of a number of covenants. But there are in particular three covenants connected with this discussion.

Here are three references for this: Exodus 19; verses 5 to 8; Deuteronomy 4:13, and Hebrews 8:8-10. Exodus 19:5-8 tells of an agreement, or contract, between God and Israel at Sinai. The people agreed to obey the voice of God. God agreed, that if they would obey His voice He would make them His peculiar treasure. This was the old covenant.

Deuteronomy 4:13 shows that the Ten Commandments by themselves, with nothing added thereto, or nothing taken away, are God's commanded covenant of man's duty.

Hebrews 8:8-10 show that the new covenant is God's agreement to save those who accept the blood of His Son, and to give them new hearts, and write His law upon their hearts. The first of these three covenants, or the old covenant has passed away. It was superseded by the new covenant at the cross. The other two covenants, the Ten Commandments, as God's commanded covenant, and the new covenant, under which God forgives our sins, and makes us His sons, and writes His law upon our hearts, still stand.

The trouble with Brother Smith is, that he sees only one covenant at Sinai, when there were two. God made two covenants with Israel at Sinai. They are mentioned side by side in two successive chapters. Exodus 19 tells of the covenant of the mutual promises between God and Israel. Exodus 20 gives God's commanded covenant of man's duty in the Ten Commandments.

The passing of the old covenant, the one set forth in Exodus 19, did not abolish God's commanded covenant of Exodus 20:1-17. The Ten Commandments are God's moral and spiritual standard for men under the new covenant, as they were God's moral standard for men under the old covenant. They are God's covenant of man's duty, which will continue so long as sin exists. Sin is the transgression of the law, and where no law is, there is no transgression.

If Brother Smith will read Jeremiah 31:31-34 in his American Standard Revised version, he will find these covenants mentioned. Here they are. It speaks of a new covenant. This is one covenant. It says, "not according to the covenant I made with their fathers." This covenant was the mutual promises of God and His people as mentioned in Exodus 19. This makes covenant number 2.

Then you read on. God says, "My covenant they brake." Notice the pronoun. "*My* covenant they brake." There is the third covenant—God's commanded covenant, the Ten Commandments.

God says, "not according to the covenant I made with their fathers", and then He goes on to say, "which My covenant they brake." He doesn't say, not which covenant they break. He says "My covenant they brake." This refers to God's commanded covenant, the Ten Commandments as set forth in Deuteronomy 4:13. So there you have three covenants. The old has passed away. The other two stand. And in God's commanded covenant is the command that the seventh day is the Sabbath.

Brother Smith claims that the fourth commandment was nailed to the cross. But in spite of all he has said, Luke 23:56 shows that the fourth commandment was binding the day

after the cross. Hence we know that it was not nailed to the cross.

Do you know that the Acts of the Apostles proves that Brother Smith's doctrine is wrong eight times over? Everything in Acts took place after the cross and after the resurrection. Eight times over in the book of Acts it refers to the seventh day being the Sabbath day. I have given four of the references. I will now give them all. Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; Acts 15:21; 16:13; 17-1-2; and 18:4.

He cannot parry the force of these eight texts by saying, "Sure, the seventh day is still the Sabbath." If he says the seventh day is not the Sabbath after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, he contradicts the book of Acts in eight places. If he says, "sure the seventh day is still the Sabbath," then he has killed his own argument about it being nailed to the cross. If it was nailed to the cross, it could not have been the Sabbath after the cross.

Brother Smith used a text in Hosea 2:11 in an effort to prove that the Sabbath came to an end at the cross. Hosea 2:11 does not refer to the seventh-day Sabbath. It speaks of "*her sabbaths*." I challenge him to find any text where the seventh-day Sabbath is called "*her sabbaths*."

He used a text in Amos 8:4-8 about the end of the Sabbath, to show that the Sabbath would come to an end at the crucifixion of Christ. Take your Bible after this debate is over, and quietly read Amos 8:4-8, and you will find it does not refer to the end of the Sabbath as an institution, but to the practice of certain hypocritical Jews, who wished that the sun would hurry and go down and bring the end of the Sabbath, so that they could hurry to their deceitful ways of getting gain.

Brother Smith claims the sun went down at noon on the day of the Lord's death. Luke 23:45 says the sun was darkened. It doesn't say anything about the sun going down. Mark and Matthew simply speak about a darkness. Luke says the sun was darkened, which proves that it did not go down, but was only darkened. This could only be the case since it showed up three hours later. A man is in desperate

straits, when he goes to Amos 8 and picks up a text like this to try to get rid of the seventh-day Sabbath.

#### Mr. Smith's Fourth Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy to be here again tonight and to see this splendid audience assembled under most adverse circumstances. I want to present to Mr. Shuler tonight, in the beginning of this speech, three questions. The other night I gave him eight, which he has never answered, notwithstanding his very sincere promises to answer them when I had answered one of his, which I did answer. Last night he told us why and I know that he told the truth about that. He said "I said that I would answer them, but when I read them over I didn't see where I could. I just had to leave them out."

Well, I'm going to give him three more and I'll pass by all of the seven of those others if he will only answer one of them for me. I ask him to answer only the first one which is, "Is the new testament and the ten commandments the same?" I'd like for him to just answer that one for me forthrightly so that this audience can understand what he is saying. Is the New Testament and the Ten Commandments the same?

But now on the proposition tonight I want to ask these questions. 1. Can you give one text which speaks of man keeping the sabbath between creation and the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage? 2. Since he says that this law is God's moral law and therefore sets these up as moral commandments this question, Is a man immoral if he keeps all of God's commandments except the fourth of the ten commandments? 3. Does the man have the mark of the beast if he does not worship on the sabbath, the seventh day sabbath? If Mr. Shuler will answer those questions I think we will get some distance on this proposition tonight.

He said a while ago that the burden of truth was upon me. That's the most ridiculous statement among many ridiculous statements that he made in this debate for surely he knows enough about debating to realize that the burden of truth

rests upon the affirmative in a debate. If he has ever studied the rules of debating or knows the first principal of debating, he knows that it is the obligation of the affirmative to establish his own proposition. There is no burden of proof upon me in regard to this proposition. I am simply here to follow and to examine the things that he sets forth to sustain his proposition and he has done very little of that. He has talked a good deal and began his speech with statements and references in the book of Acts, the 13th chapter, 14th, 43rd and 44th verses and others to show that the seventh day of the week is the sabbath. I told him the other night that that wasn't the issue between us. I told him that I know that Saturday is the sabbath, always has been as long as there has been a sabbath and always will be. I told him on Sunday that the first day of the week was not the sabbath. I told him that and he knows that and he brought it up in his speech and said, Oh he will say this as he said it the other night. Well friends, that's not the issue in this debate.

The issue is to whether Christians today are obligated to observe that seventh day sabbath. That's the question. I'm not affirming that Sunday is the sabbath and I haven't affirmed it in this series of discussion. I am no more denying that the seventh day of the week is the sabbath than Mr. Shuler denied that the first day of the week is Sunday. He has read a part of his proposition and said that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, is the sabbath and he thinks that's the thing that we differ upon. That's not it any more than when I affirmed the first proposition of the series which read in part that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Was he denying that the first day of the week was commonly called Sunday? Not at all. We were agreed upon that. That is simply setting forth and identifying the day we are talking about. The issue is, which day are Christians to observe? That's the issue. It is not whether the sabbath is Saturday or Sunday, that's not the issue, for we are agreed upon that.

He agrees with me that Sunday is not the sabbath and I agree with him that Saturday is the sabbath. Every time

he reads a verse of scripture along that line, he is just wasting time because he hasn't anything to prove his proposition with. He is just filling in time. He is just wasting time, so far as the discussion of the proposition is concerned. The seventh day of the week was the sabbath because God called it the sabbath and it always will be the sabbath, but my friend, Christians are under no obligations to keep the sabbath today.

It wasn't the sabbath that was nailed to the cross, it was the law that enjoined sabbath observance that was nailed to the cross. That "law of commandments contained in ordinances," that's the thing that was nailed to the cross and we do not keep the seventh day sabbath. We do not observe the sabbath today. We worship our God and Christ upon the Lord's day, the first day of the week, which is commonly called Sunday. Call the seventh day the sabbath, we are not denying that. He says "now Mr. Smith has asked for the scripture where Christians kept the sabbath." He went, you remember, to the 13th chapter of Acts and there found where Paul went into the synagogue on a sabbath day. Don't you know that if he could have found the scripture that I asked for that he would have read it. If it had been anywhere in that Bible he would have read it. I asked him and I have asked him for these six sessions now for one scripture anywhere that showed Christians as Christians meeting upon the Sabbath day and he hasn't found it yet. The only thing he has ever found is reference to a Jewish synagogue and the keeping of the sabbath in services connected with those synagogues. He has never found a meeting of the disciples of Christ upon the sabbath day.

He said if Mr. Smith came over and preached for the Adventists on the seventh day sabbath, would he go away and say I was over and preached to them on the sabbath. I wouldn't mind at all because I know that is the sabbath, but tell me would that make a sabbath keeper of me because I went over there to preach to them? We are here meeting in the Woman's Club Auditorium and a beautiful auditorium it is. Very comfortable and quite the thing for such a meet-

ing as this and here we are meeting on Thursday. What does that mean? We are preaching on Thursday, does it mean that we are members of the Woman's Club? Not at all. I'm not anyhow. Does it mean that we have adopted Thursday as our day of worship exclusively? Not at all. Well neither did the fact that Paul and some other Christians went into the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath day, make of them either Jews or sabbath keepers.

I want him to find where they as Christians ever met upon the sabbath day. Mr. Shuler says they went on keeping the sabbath day. I want him to find that. We find where they went to the synagogue on the Jewish day to hear Paul as he preached there until they ran him out of that synagogue for preaching contrary to their belief. But find for me where they as Christians met upon the sabbath day.

Then he turned to Matthew 24. I have been waiting for that. He has a lot of arguments, hasn't he, that he hasn't brought out. You folks who are Seventh Day Adventists know that. I've heard them all before, I've read them, read them from some of your men who had given up the keeping of the seventh day sabbath. Heard some of them in debates with your men and read them from some of your own books and tracts. I know a number of arguments that he hasn't brought out. I wonder if he is keeping those back so that as you people see his defeat here in this discussion, you will go away and say, "Oh well, yes, we lost but if Brother Shuler had brought out this, or this, or this, then he would have defeated him completely." He is evidently trying to give you something to fall back upon with which you may ease your conscience after the defeat and think that you are still justified. Do you suppose that's the reason?

He has a lot of arguments that he hasn't brought out here. He hasn't said anything about them for he knows though that they will not stand the light of investigation. He has preached them in time past quite sincerely and quite earnestly from this very platform when no one could step up here to engage him in discussion and to question the validity of his statements and to question the references that

he gave and the use of those references. But now when there is someone coming right along to examine all of that he will not introduce them. I wonder why. I'll tell you why. Every one of those arguments that he doesn't introduce he knows would fall even easier than the ones that he does introduce. He is bringing out what he considers the best and you can know that if these others would stand investigation he would bring them out. They won't stand investigation, that's why he is keeping them out of sight.

He turned to Matthew 24, "pray that your flight be not on the sabbath or in the winter." "Or in the winter," I wonder he didn't emphasize that? We are having a little winter and this would be a great time for worship right now. This is really winter. Pray that your flight be not in the winter or upon the sabbath day. What is it talking about? He is talking about things that would hinder them. I tell you I'd hate to start out on foot for the mountains right now, the way things are outside here. I had to change a tire on my car this afternoon about six o'clock and I'd hate to stay out very long in this kind of weather and make a trip on foot to the mountains. So Christ said pray that your flight be not in the winter, pray that it be not on the sabbath. Why? There will be things to hinder you. He was talking to those who would be living in Jerusalem which was under the control of Jews who would have the gates of the city closed upon the sabbath day. They couldn't get out if they tried to and therefore, he said pray that you will not see the sign that signals the time of your flight upon that day for you'll not be able to get away. Pray also that it will not be in the winter for that would be a time of great hardship, if you tried to flee then. That verse makes winter as holy a season as it makes the sabbath a holy day for Christians. It proves just as much about one as it does about the other. Mr. Shuler is saying that "pray that your flight be not on the sabbath," proves that they were going to be keeping the sabbath. Then saying "pray that your flight be not in the winter," proves that they were going to be keeping the winter as a holy season. If it proves one it proves both for he said as much of one as he said of the other. There is no question about that.

Mr. Shuler said "Jesus is on my side." Do you know it would be a fine thing if Mr. Shuler would just get over on Jesus' side. If he would just get over on Jesus' side and realize with Jesus that that law which enjoins sabbath keeping ended at the cross. Realize that this side the cross Jesus never met with his disciples so far as Mr. Shuler can find upon the sabbath day. Realize that in every occasion of his meeting with them where the day is specified it was the first day of the week. Realize that this side the cross where Jesus nailed that law there is not one example of Christians as Christians or of a church of the Lord Jesus Christ meeting upon the sabbath day. It would be fine if Mr. Shuler would just get over on Jesus' side and quit trying to pull Jesus over on Mr. Shuler's side.

In Acts 13:27 and Act 15:21 he reads, "every sabbath day." Now we are not discussing that at all. We know the Holy Spirit refers to it as the sabbath. The seventh day is the sabbath, that's not the issue of the debate at all. The issue of the debate is whether or not Christians should observe the seventh day. He has dragged that red herring across the trail night after night through this discussion and I have answered it time after time, but I'll answer it every time he drags it out because I'm not going to let you people be deceived into thinking that we teach that Sunday is the sabbath. Some people may have called it that, but I'm not affirming that in this discussion. That isn't the basis of the proposition at all.

The New Testament teaches that Christ met with his disciples on the first day of the week after his resurrection. The New Testament teaches that the early church, the disciples of the Lord in the book of Acts, met upon the first day of the week to break bread. The New Testament teaches that the early church was enjoined by apostolic command to observe the first day of the week in a religious way by making an offering for religious work upon that day. That's what the New Testament teaches and that's the thing that I am affirming in this debate and that's the thing that Mr. Shuler is denying. He can never find where the church met for any kind of religious service or was ever commanded to

perform any sort of a religious service upon the sabbath day. This side of the cross of Christ there is no such commandment and if he could find one he would bring it out.

Then did you hear what he said about Exodus 35:3, "a temporary rule which said do not kindle a fire." I'd like for Mr. Shuler to find where the Bible says "a temporary rule." I'd like for him to find in the Bible where it says that rule was done away, until he gets to the cross of Christ where the whole thing was done away.

He compared that with a temporary rule we had about gasoline rationing. Had to have a stamp to buy gasoline. Well, you ladies do know that you still have to have a stamp to buy sugar, don't you? Now do you know why? Have you ever stopped to think why you can buy gasoline now without the stamp but you still have to have it to buy sugar? Can you figure out why? I'll tell you why, there was a law enacted, there was a decree sent forth from the head of our government which said you no longer have to keep this rule concerning the stamp on gasoline. The decree has not been sent forth concerning the stamp on sugar so you still have to have it. Now if Mr. Shuler is going to say that this was a temporary rule and that it was only kept for a limited time and then was done away as the gasoline ration stamp was, he will have to find where it was done away. If he can find it, I'll be happy for him to read it to you and if not it will stand as long as the rest of that law of which it was a part and it will perish with all the rest of it including the ten commandments.

He turned to Isaiah, the 42nd chapter and the 21st verse and he said this refers to the coming of Christ in the world and it tells what Christ was going to do. I turned over there and read that and I just kept on reading and I read and I read and I read. I wish you people would go home and read the whole chapter. I just wish that you would read it and see if that is talking about the second coming of Christ or about the coming of Christ. Here I'm going to begin with the 18th verse, "Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind that ye may see." He is talking about those people who were wor-

shipping their idols and he called them deaf and blind. "Hear ye deaf, and look ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I send? Who is blind as he that is at peace with me, and blind as Jehovah's servant? Thou seest many things, but thou observest not." He is talking to those people in that day because of their blindness in not seeing his word. "His ears are open, but he heareth not. It pleased Jehovah, or the Lord, for his righteousness' sake, to magnify the law and make it honorable." What was the 42nd chapter of Isaiah? Simply an exhortation on the part of God, through Isaiah to the people of that day, to keep His law which He had magnified to them and which He was magnifying to them. Not a word about Christians or the dispensation in which Christ is to rule.

Then he turned to Luke 16:17. Where not one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass from the law. He read from Luke the 16th chapter and the 17th verse and I want to turn and read to you just as he did. I want to show you just how it is. "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail." That's true and the parallel statement is in the book of Matthew and another phrase is added here by the Holy Spirit. In Matthew, 5th chapter and the 18th verse, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished." Now there was not to be the dot of an i nor the cross of a t pass from the law until all should be fulfilled or accomplished. When Christ came from the tomb after his resurrection He said, "These are My words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must need be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets and the Psalms concerning me" (Luke 24:44). He came to fulfill something. According to the 19th chapter of John, the 29th verse, upon the cross he said, "it is finished." What is finished? The work He came to do. What did He come to do? Hebrews 10:9 it is written in the volume of the book, "Lo, I am come to do Thy will. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second." Jesus came to fulfill

that law. He fulfilled it, all things were accomplished and He said, "it is finished." He nailed it to the cross and it died with Him that day on Calvary. We are not under the old law that enjoined sabbath keeping.

Sabbath keeping was never enjoined upon man until God led the children out of Egypt. It was only then enjoined upon those to whom He gave that law and I read to you last night from the 1st and 2nd verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus that that law was given to those who had been in Egypt and who were delivered out of Egypt. The same thing is true of the record as given in the book of Deuteronomy. That law was given to those delivered from Egypt and never to anyone else. It was never enjoined upon anyone else. The people before that generation did not have that law. They were not under it. And as I read to you last night from Deuteronomy 4:8 there was no other nation that had that law, no nation that had anything to compare with it. Moses said that law was given to that generation of Israel and not to those before and was given to no other nation then. When that law was nailed to the cross it ceased to be a law for any people.

We today are under the new covenant, but he says "where is the written record of that law?" "Where is the written record of this new covenant that he talks about?" I had Mr. Shuler's Bible in my hand the other night and he has it here tonight. In it he will find a part called "The New Testament of the Lord Jesus Christ." If he would get into that and begin to read and get the veil off his heart and from over his eyes, he would get along all right. He still has the old veil over his heart and still trying to look at Moses through the veil and he can't see Christ.

Here is what Paul had to say about this. "Having therefore such a hope we use great boldness of speech and are not as Moses who put a veil upon his face that the children of Israel should not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away. But their minds were hardened for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed to them that it is done away in Christ." When the old covenant is read

because they have the veil over their face, it is not revealed to them that it, this old covenant, is done away in Christ. Now don't let him dare say this was the veil on Moses, for Moses took that veil off before very long. He didn't wear that even all his life and Paul said, "here is something done away in Christ." What was it? That old covenant which when they read they could not realize is done away because of the veil they had over their face. "But unto this day whensoever Moses is read a veil lieth upon their heart but whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away." Now the New Testament of the Lord Jesus Christ is the written rule of that new covenant and whenever Mr. Shuler and every other one who is under the same delusion, holding that same idea, whenever they get the veil off their hearts they will see the new testament, the new covenant.

He said Smith attempted to show what the new covenant is from Jeremiah 31 and Hebrew 8. No, I did not. No, I did not, but Mr. Shuler wants you to think that's what I was reading over there. He wants to get away from the idea that I presented to you, when I used those scriptures. He knows that's not the thing that I said about that at all. He knows that I used Jeremiah 31:31 to show what the old covenant was and he wants you to get away from that. I'm going to turn over there again though because he goes on to say now there is 1. God's commanded covenant, Deuteronomy 4:13 and, 2. the covenant of promises, Exodus 19:5-8, an agreement or contract of promises and then, 3. a new covenant mentioned Hebrews 8:10. He said I see only one covenant at Sinai. It doesn't matter if he gets a hundred of them back there. When I turn to Jeremiah 31:31 I find out exactly which one was to be done away and that's the only one that we are discussing here. He can line up a hundred of them across here and I'm not paying any attention to ninety-nine of them. There is the one that I'm talking about, there is the one the Bible says is done away. The one that he says is still here, the one that enjoined the keeping of the sabbath is the one done away. He is not to get away with saying that I said that Jeremiah 31:31 told us what the new covenant was. I didn't say that. I said Jeremiah 31:31 told

us what the old covenant was, what the covenant that was done away was.

Now here is what it says, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt for my covenant they brake." God says I'm going to make a new one, "not according to the one that I made with them when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." I marked it on my Bible right here, when Mr. Shuler read that awhile ago "the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt" is the covenant of promises. "It is not God's commanded covenant," says Mr. Shuler. But my friends, he will remember and you will remember and I want it forever remembered that in I Kings the 8th chapter and the 21st verse we have the word of God that so definitely establishes the fact that this covenant, that he is talking about, which he made with them in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, that this covenant is the one that was upon the tables of stone. Get it now, in I Kings 8th chapter and 21st verse, "And there have I set a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of Jehovah, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." In the ark is the covenant which he made with our fathers in the day he brought them out of the land of Egypt. Now what was in the ark? Look at the 9th verse, "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, when Jehovah made a covenant with the children of Israel." What was in the ark? Two tables of stone upon which was a covenant and that covenant was the one God made with the children in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. The new covenant was not to be according to that first covenant and in the face of all that, Mr. Shuler has the audacity, before this intelligent audience tonight, to say that the new covenant is the same

one, the one that was written on tables of stone back there, now written in the hearts of men.

God said "not according to that one I made with them then" and then says in I Kings 8:21 and I Kings 8:9, that that one which he made with them then was the ten commandments written upon two tables of stone.

Then Mr. Shuler said Hosea 2:11 does not refer to the seventh day sabbath because it was her sabbath, speaking of Israel and of the sabbath she kept which were yearly sabbaths. Then Amos 8:4-8, he says that referred to the deceitful Jews and their desire to be rid of the sabbath. Friends, they asked the question, when shall the sabbath be gone and the new moon cease? God answered "when the sun goes down at noon and the day is darkened." He used the same expression that Luke does of the day of Christ's crucifixion. "The day was darkened" and that my friends is the day that God took away the law that enjoined the keeping of the sabbath and therefore we are not under it today.

#### Mr. Shuler's Fifth Affirmative

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I promised I would deal with Mr. Smith's questions and I have dealt with them. Now as to his first question. Any twelve-year-old child knows that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament are not identical with the Ten Commandments. That was his first question. Think of asking such questions!

Mr. Smith can't get anywhere by shouting assertions at this audience. This is what he has done for the most part. This is oratory and not proof. The burden of proof is on him when he makes a statement, to prove it by the Bible and he has not done this in many, many instances.

When he says that the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross and that a new law came in at the cross, the burden of the proof is on him to give Scripture for this. Where is the chapter and verse? What are the commandments in that new law? He has given no chapter or verse to show

that a new law was enacted. If a new law was enacted, who enacted it? Who was the law giver? How many commandments were there in it? Where is it recorded in the Bible? The burden of proof is on him.

Mr. Smith has killed his own argument. I don't have to kill it. He kills it himself. If the seventh day is the Sabbath in 1947, as he has admitted, how could it have been nailed to the cross and killed nineteen hundred years ago? Think that through. He kills his own argument. I don't have to kill it.

I challenge Mr. Smith in his next fifteen minutes to read any text in the Bible, which says that God's commanded covenant was done away with at the cross. The old covenant passed at the cross. But he has not read any text in the Bible, which says that God's commanded covenant was done away with at the cross. The old covenant passed at the cross. But he has not read, and he will not read a text, which says that, God's commanded covenant of Deuteronomy 4:13, or the Ten Commandments, have passed away. Mr. Smith fails to distinguish between the old covenant, as the contract, or agreement of mutual promises between God and Israel, and what scripture calls His covenant, His commanded covenant of the Ten Commandments.

Now about his questions. Does a man have the mark of the beast if he worships on Sunday? I answer, nobody has the mark of the beast now whether he keeps Sunday, or Saturday. Is a man immoral if he keeps all of God's commandments except the fourth of the ten? I answer, the first four of God's commandments deal with spiritual duties. The last six deal with moral duties. Therefore his question about it being immoral if a man keeps all of the commandments except the fourth is out of order. If he understood the truth about the law, he would never ask such a question.

Mr. Smith asks me to give one text that speaks of the keeping of the Sabbath between creation and the deliverance from Egyptian bondage. I turn to Genesis, the 2nd chapter, verses 1 to 3. This talks about the Creator. This Creator was the Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, God's eternal

Son by Whom the Father made all things. This tells how the Creator made the world in six days. Then it tells you that on the seventh day He rested. This was on the first seventh day of time.

God rested on the first seventh day of time. What did God do after He rested on the first seventh day of time? The third verse tells, "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because in He had rested."

Notice that the sanctification of the seventh day didn't come on the first seventh day of time. God sanctified the seventh day, because in it He *had* rested, from all His work which God created and made. After God had rested on the first seventh day, He sanctified, or set apart, every succeeding seventh day.

In referring to this act of God at creation, God in Exodus 20:11 identifies the seventh day as being the Sabbath when He blessed it in the beginning at the close of the first week of time. We find this is right here in the fourth commandment. It says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day." The seventh day was the Sabbath day when He blessed it. He refers us back to creation, and identifies the seventh day as being the Sabbath day, when He blessed and sanctified it.

You know perfectly well God doesn't need any certain day of the week to be sanctified for Himself. Please tell me, since God needs no day to be sanctified, or set apart for Himself, then for whom did God set it apart? The only answer is, that it was set apart for man at the close of creation.

Mr. Smith speaks about Christ meeting with His disciples. I remind you again, that Christ met with His disciples on the evening of the day He arose to convince them He was risen from the dead. Then a little later, He met with them again to convince Thomas, who was not present on the first occasion. Then the third time He met with them was when they were out fishing. Mr. Smith has just as much proof for keeping the first day of the week, in Christ meeting with His disciples when they were out fishing, as he has in the two meetings which preceded this.

This affords no real proof for him with one stroke to sweep aside a day, which God commanded and sanctified for man. There is no justification for a man to sweep away a day that God has commanded, on such little pretexts, as Christ meeting with His disciples to convince them that He was risen, and then a little later returning to convince Thomas, and then the third time meeting with them, when they were out fishing.

Mr. Smith talked about Matthew 5. "Think not, that I am come to destroy the law, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." He says, Christ fulfilled the law, and thus did away with it. Does the word fulfill mean to do away with? Put down Matthew 3:15. We must follow this brother's reasoning to its logical conclusion.

Jesus said, that in being baptized, "it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." If fulfilling the law means doing away with it, then Christ in fulfilling all righteousness, did away with all righteousness for all time to come. Think how foolish such arguments are. You can see that they don't stand the test of the Scriptures.

I turn now to Hebrews 4:9. I will read it from the American Standard Revised version, the one that Brother Smith seems to prefer. Hebrews 4:9. "There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God." Mr. Smith said that we couldn't find anything about the sabbath in the epistles. But here it is in Hebrews. "There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God."

Mr. Smith says, "The Sabbath was abolished at the cross." God's Word says "remaineth." It will remain when Mr. Smith finishes his last speech. It remains for the people of God.

What Sabbath is it that remains? Look at this fourth chapter of Hebrews. Put down Hebrews 4:4. Notice what it says in this same direct connection. "For He hath said somewhere of the seventh day on this wise, And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."

You can see what he is talking about. He identifies this Sabbath rest, as the seventh day on which God rested. This is New Testament evidence. Mr. Smith said, the New Testa-

ment does not enjoin the keeping of the seventh day. Will he take this?

"There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest." Suppose I had a two by four piece of lumber, ten feet long. I cut off two feet. Eight feet remains. What will this eight-foot remainder be like? Will it be a two by six or a two by eight or a one by four? No. It will be a continuation of the same size piece of wood as the two feet which I cut off. So the Sabbath which remains must be a continuation of the same weekly Sabbath which they had before the cross, which was none other than the seventh day.

Look at verse 10. "For he that is entered into his rest, hath himself rested from his works, as God did from His." The thought is, that a Christian is to rest as God rested. Now tell me, if a Christian rests as God rested on what day will he rest? Think that through.

It says, he is to rest as God rested. If a Christian rests as God rested, then on what day will he rest? The seventh day was set apart for man to keep, because of God's rest on that day. So this text in Hebrews 4:4-10 marks out the keeping of the seventh day for Christians.

Mr. Smith says, that we must have a command in the epistles for the keeping of the sabbath before he can accept it. God has spoken with His own voice from Heaven saying, "the seventh day is the sabbath; in it thou shalt not do any work." God has never said one word about keeping the first day of the week for any reason whatsoever. Yet Brother Smith wants God to speak twice from heaven before he will keep the seventh day, but he is perfectly willing to keep the first day when God hasn't said one word about keeping it. Is this consistent?

Brother Smith is utterly unable to read one word from the Bible where God told people to keep the first day of the week. See how much better the case is for the seventh day. We can read from the Word of God, the direct words of God, as to why we should keep the seventh day. Here it is in Exodus 20:10-11. God says, "the seventh day is the sabbath," "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth,

the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore God blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it."

#### Mr. Smith's Fifth Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: Well, he finally got around to trying to find one didn't he? And he could hardly read it for it just won't read like he wants it to read and he had to keep stopping and straightening himself out, lest he read it as God said it and leave the wrong impression and show you that the fourth chapter of Hebrews wasn't talking in any wise about the seventh day sabbath. We are going to turn to it right now while it is fresh in your mind. We are going to see just what he did there. He began with the 9th verse, the 4th chapter of Hebrews and the 9th verse, "There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God." Then he jumped back up to the 4th verse to get the seventh day in, "For he hath said somewhere of the seventh day on this wise." He wanted to get the seventh day in. I wonder why he didn't read the eighth verse while he was down there at the ninth, for in the eighth verse, "For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterwards of another day."

Now he is showing here that after Joshua's time and in fact tells you in the 7th verse "he again defineth a certain day, Today, saying in David so long a time afterward (even as hath been said before). Today if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Now the 8th verse said, "For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterward of another," now get it, "of another day." What day were they keeping in Joshua's time? Seventh day sabbath. What day were they keeping in David's time? Seventh day sabbath. And if that had been the rest that God was talking about, why would he have spoken, says the writer, of another day.

Then the 9th verse and we ought to read it. "There remaineth therefore," there remaineth, there is something that they haven't yet received, something they never have had, something they didn't receive in Joshua's day, something they didn't receive in David's day, something that Joshua was

pointing forward to, something that David was still pointing forward to. There remaineth now, there is something yet ahead, another day, a sabbath rest and when is that?

"For he that is entered into his rest." Did you notice his confusion about whether it was God's rest or whether it was the Christian's rest? "He that is entered into his rest." Into God's rest, and he almost said it and then backed up and said that won't fit that way, I'll have to say that's the Christian's rest day. He even changed it into Christian's rest on the sabbath day. That isn't what it says at all and I assure you from the same verse that it isn't what it says. "He that is entered into his rest hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from his." Now when we enter into that rest, we will have finished our work, for God had finished his.

God had finished his work of creation and rested upon the seventh day. When we enter into his rest, we, like God, will have finished our work and enter into his rest. He isn't talking about the seventh day at all. He speaks of the seventh day in the 5th verse to show that it is not the seventh day that he is talking about, that the seventh day has already been commanded back to the children of Israel, but that in Joshua's and again in David's time they pointed forward to another rest which was not the seventh day sabbath which they were keeping. Then Mr. Shuler in desperation in the closing minutes of this discussion would run to that passage and say here it is, but it isn't and it never will be.

In Deuteronomy the 6th chapter and 13th verse, do you know who was commanded to keep that seventh day sabbath? Those that were delivered out of Egypt. Mr. Shuler says that we were commanded to keep it because God rested upon that day. God sanctified that day because upon it he rested. He commanded the children of Israel and told them in two places that he was commanding them to keep that day because he had led them out of Egypt. They are the only ones he ever gave it to.

Notice again the introduction to his chart, which he has failed to put on. It would just ruin it if he put it on. He got down and started with the 3rd verse, instead of starting

with the first of the chapter because he would have ruined his whole discussion and his whole proposition if he had put it on. Listen, "and God spake all these words saying I am Jehovah, thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the house of bondage" (Exo. 20:1). That's the one to whom he gave that law. That's the one to whom he commanded that law.

And it says over in the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy that the children of Israel were to remember that. Beginning with the 12th verse, "Observe the sabbath day, to keep it holy, as Jehovah thy God commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates . . ." I wonder why God put that in, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. What about the stranger that is outside of his gates. He didn't keep the sabbath. Why? Because the law was never given to him. That stranger that was within their gates, that was visiting with them had to do as they did and keep the sabbath day, but when he was outside their gate, he didn't keep it because it was never given to him. It was not given those considered strangers by the children of Israel. "The stranger that is within thy gates, thy man-servant, thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm: therefore." What's the meaning of "therefore"? Therefore, because of this. Because of what? "Because thou wast a servant in Egypt and God brought thee by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." Why? Because you were in Egypt and God brought you out. The only ones to keep the sabbath were Israelites born in Egypt and their descendants on down to the time that that sabbath was done away along with all other things in the law.

Not that the day was done away, we still have the seventh

day of the week. God didn't shorten the week and say here is a week of six days. No, not that, he took away the law that commanded it. He nailed it to the cross and ever after that time Christ and his disciples met upon the first day of the week. Mr. Shuler used to argue with me about some of those meetings of Christ and his disciples, but now he has quit arguing about that. Christ met upon the day that he arose from the tomb, he met upon the next first day of the week. His disciples met on the day of Pentecost, 2nd chapter of Acts, which was the first day of the week. They met upon the first day of the week at Troas. They were commanded to lay by in store upon the first day of the week at Corinth and at all churches everywhere, wherever men called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

God gave the sabbath keeping commandment to Israel and Nehemiah 9:13-14, says, "thou camest down upon Sinai and madest known thy holy sabbath." Where did he make it known? At Sinai. I asked him to produce a text. "Give one text that speaks of man keeping the sabbath between creation and deliverance from Egyptian bondage." He twisted the question when he read it and the record will show it. I said give one text which speaks of man keeping the sabbath. The one he gave was that God rested on the seventh day. Sure He did, but where did a man ever rest?

I was glad to hear him say that the sanctification did not come on the first seventh day. I knew that all of the time, but I know a lot of seventh-day Adventists that haven't learned it yet and they have been debating and writing and putting out tracts and I have them all in which they say it was then sanctified. Also, some of them are not going to be too well pleased with Mr. Shuler saying that no one has the mark of the beast after they have been preaching it a long time. Be sure that you remember Mr. Shuler saying the seventh day was not sanctified on the first seventh day. Of course it was sanctified by God, but when? He cannot find one word of proof that it was ever sanctified by the Lord until he led the children out of bondage and he cannot find one line of proof that any man ever kept the sabbath until he led the

children out of bondage and commanded it to them in the 16th chapter of Exodus.

You remember that the record says that some of them went out on the 7th day and tried to find the Manna but they didn't find it. Why did they do that? Because they hadn't been keeping the sabbath. No one had ever kept the sabbath before the children of Israel were brought out of Egypt. He commanded them to keep it because he brought them out. No one but they and their children were ever commanded to keep it. I'm glad to learn that I don't have the mark of the beast anyhow.

Now he answered one question for me. "The New Testament is not the same as the ten commandments," says Mr. Shuler. Well, Paul said, "he made us sufficient as ministers of the New Testament," II Corinthians 3:6: "Sufficient as ministers of the New Testament." Mr. Shuler says he is not sufficient as a minister of the New Testament. He says he has to preach something that is not the New Testament. "I have to preach the old," says Mr. Shuler. "I have to get back to another covenant that God made in the day that he took the children of Israel by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. I wouldn't be able to keep my job, I wouldn't be able to fulfill my mission. I have something Paul didn't have. I have to preach something that Paul didn't preach. I have to preach the old covenant. I'm not sufficient as a minister of the new," says Mr. Shuler. He said the new is not the same as the ten commandments but he preaches the ten commandments. Paul said I am sufficient as a minister of the New Testament.

Now look in the 3rd chapter of II Corinthians for about a minute where the Apostle Paul is speaking of this and says, "who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant, not of the letter, but of the spirit for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, came with glory so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses for the glory of his face." There are two glories there. There was a law, a ministration of death, written upon tables of stone that came with glory. King James version says "was

glorious" and Revised version says "came with glory." There was that glory and then there was the glory upon Moses' face. Reading on down through "that, if the ministration of condemnation hath glory," 9th verse. The ministration of condemnation, the ministration of death, written and engraven upon stones hath glory. He said that it was the thing that had glory, he was not talking about the glory of Moses' face. Then in the 11th verse there is that which passeth away which was with glory. What is it that was with glory? Back in the 7th verse, the ministration of death written and engraven on stones came with glory. The 11th verse, that which passeth away came with glory. What passeth away? That which was written and engraven on the stones. Anyone knows that and everyone knows that.

That is the covenant that God made with the children of Israel in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. There was nothing in the ark save that covenant that he made with them at that time. There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stones. The new covenant of which Paul was sufficient as a minister was not according to that covenant which was in the ark, was not according to that which had passed away.

We turn again to Amos, the 8th chapter and the 4th verse before our time is gone for this particular speech. In the 8th chapter of Amos and the 4th verse we have the prophet speaking of a certain thing which was to come to pass. "Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell grain? When does Mr. Shuler say the new moon was taken away as a religious event? When Christ died upon the cross. But the question is, "When will the new moon be gone that we may sell grain *and the sabbath.*" Mr. Shuler wants to say one will go, the other will not. One went when Christ died upon the cross, the other not. God's prophet put them together, the new moons and the sabbath, ceremonial and moral, as Mr. Shuler has always spoken of it until tonight. Well, now when was this to happen? It should come to pass in that day saith the Lord that "I will cause the sun to go down at noon and I will darken the earth

in a clear day," that's when. When was that? When Christ died upon the cross he took away the observance of new moons and sabbaths and everything else. So Paul says he "blotted out the bond written in ordinances which was against and which was contrary to us and has taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Therefore, let no man judge you in respect to new moon, feast days, or a sabbath day." (Col. 2:14). Why? Because the law that enjoined all these things he commanded is forever gone, nailed to the cross.

#### **Mr. Shuler's Sixth Affirmative**

Mr. Shuler: Mr. Moderator, Mr. Smith, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Smith has misquoted my statement. Again I appeal for an impartial transcription of the record. I wrote down what I said. I said, any twelve-year-old child knows that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament are not identical with the Ten Commandments. He misrepresented my words. I ask Brother Smith to apologize to this audience.

He places another construction on what I said. I said, any twelve-year-old child knows that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament are not the same as the Ten Commandments.

When Paul speaks about being ministers of the new testament, the words "new testament" means new covenant. Brother Smith is in error in making "new testament" in II Corinthians 3 refer to the twenty-seven books, which comprise the part of the Bible known as the New Testament.

Hebrews 9:15 says, that Christ is the mediator of the new testament. This doesn't mean the twenty-seven books that constitute the New Testament. On the night that Jesus was betrayed, there wasn't one line of the New Testament in existence. But in Luke 22:20, He said, "This cup is the new testament in My blood." Does "new testament" here mean the twenty-seven books of the New Testament? No. It means the new covenant. But Mr. Smith would make it appear that where it says "new testament," it must mean the twenty-seven books of the New Testament.

I am a minister of the new testament, a minister of the

new covenant. But as a minister of the new covenant, thank God, I can preach both Old and New Testaments. Let the Jew take only the Old Testament. Let the Church of Christ take only the New Testament. I will take both of them.

The Church of God is built on both Testaments, on both the Old and New Testaments, so far as the Scriptures are concerned. Ephesians 2:20 says, they are built on the foundations of the apostles. That would take in the New Testament. It also says, Built on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets. This would take in the Old Testament. Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone that ties them both together. Thank God for a complete foundation, not a half foundation.

Mr. Smith claims that these Ten Commandments are only for the Jews. Just ask yourself the question, Were the Jews the only people that shouldn't lie, kill, steal and commit adultery and swear? That one question is enough to overthrow his argument.

Now about Deuteronomy 5:12-15. Deuteronomy 5:12-15 is not the original fourth commandment, and Brother Smith knows that it isn't. The same Bible which contains Deuteronomy 5:12-15, also contains Exodus 20:8-11, which is the original fourth commandment. Moses himself recognizes that he is not quoting the original fourth commandment. Listen to what he says. "Keep the sabbath day to sanctify it *as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.*" How had God commanded them? Back in Exodus 20:11 God plainly says, that they should keep the Sabbath primarily, because in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh day, therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

In Deuteronomy 5 Moses merely adds an additional reason. He appeals to these people, who had been delivered from bondage, and for whom God had cared for forty years in the wilderness. He appeals to them, as an additional reason, the deliverance from Egypt, that they should obey God.

This is another proof of the Sabbath as a sign of redemption. It took redemptive power to redeem them from Egyptian bondage. The Sabbath is a great double sign of Jesus Christ,

as Creator, and Redeemer. I thank God for the seventh-day Sabbath, a sign of the blessed Jesus as Redeemer and Creator.

Now about God coming down on Sinai in Nehemiah 9. There he is in trouble again. He said, God came down upon Mount Sinai and made known the Sabbath. He knows, if he knows his Bible at all, that the Sabbath was plainly marked out, when the manna began to fall, which was thirty-three days before Israel came to Sinai. Now if it was made known at Sinai, then it wasn't made known when the manna began to fall. So Mr. Smith doesn't know where he is. He is mixed up in his argument.

What are the facts? Where do we stand? Here are six facts about the first day of the week. There is not one text which says that the first day of the week, or Sunday, is to be kept as the Lord's day. There is not one text where Jesus or His apostles ever kept the first day of the week as a holy day, or ever taught Christians to keep it as a regular weekly holy day. There is not one text that tells us to keep the first day in honor of the resurrection of Christ. There is not one text where we are ever told to keep Sunday as a holy day. There is not one text where we are ever instructed not to work on the first day of the week. There is not one text where it says that God or Christ ever sanctified, or set apart the first day of the week, or Sunday, for man to keep.

In this discussion I have given direct scriptural evidence, to establish six great facts about the seventh day. The seventh day is the only day, according to the Bible, on which the Lord ever rested, so as to make it the rest day for man. The seventh day is the only day God ever blessed for man to keep. The seventh day is the only recurring weekly holy day that God ever set apart for man to observe. The seventh day is the only recurring weekly holy day to which God ever gave any sacred title. The seventh day is the only recurring weekly holy day that God ever made for man to keep. The seventh day is the only recurring weekly holy day that God ever commanded man to keep. These six facts forever prove that the seventh day is the only right day to keep according to the Bible.

When Mr. Smith gets all done, the words of Almighty God still stand, "The seventh day is the sabbath." Two great facts forever settle this question. The seventh day of the week is the only day of weekly observance that Christ the Lord, ever sanctified for man, and the seventh day of the week is the only day of weekly observance that Christ ever asked people to keep. Christ gave the Ten Commandments. Christ made the world. Christ sanctified the seventh day. As for me these two great facts settle the whole question. I gladly take the day that the Lord Jesus Christ, as Creator, sanctified for man, and the day that the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded man to keep. The seventh day is the only day of weekly observance that He ever sanctified or commanded. I gladly take it from His hand and keep it holy.

#### Mr. Smith's Sixth Negative

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuler, Ladies and Gentlemen: When Mr. Shuler says that the seventh day of the week is the only day that Christ has ever commanded, he just misstates the matter. When Mr. Shuler says that the seventh day of the week is the only day of weekly observance which Christ ever observed he misstates the matter. Christ gave the example and the Holy Spirit instructed his people to meet upon the first day of the week. He gave the example upon the only occasion where the day is specified in his meeting with them after his resurrection and in the only commands that he gives for religious observance and in the only assembly that we find recorded by the Holy Spirit. He shows by examples, by command and by example of the church that the first day of the week was a day of religious observance and the first day of the week is a weekly day and it has been kept by his disciples from the day of his resurrection from the tomb and when Mr. Shuler tries to muddy the water by saying the seventh day is the only day of weekly observance ever commanded by Christ, he misstates the matter and he knows it because we have presented the proof time after time until he has been driven away from every resemblance of an argument which is opposed to it.

I wonder if he thinks that Exodus, the 20th chapter and

Deuteronomy the 5th chapter are contradictory the one to the other? He says "I didn't quote Deuteronomy 5, I quoted Exodus 20 and Mr. Smith knows that Deuteronomy 5 is not the statement of the thing as given originally." Well, did Moses change it? Did Moses contradict what God said the other time? Are they contradictory? Mr. Shuler knows that they both say they were given to the people that came out of Egypt. The 2nd verse of the 20th chapter said for those that came out of Egypt. In the 5th of Deuteronomy and 16th verse said, "therefore the Lord God commanded you to keep the sabbath." Why? "Because thou wast the servant and he by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm delivered thee."

Then he tries again to pass the insinuation that those who do not keep the old covenant and live under the bondage of that law of death written and engraven on stones, lie, steal, commit adultery, covet and murder and do every other wicked thing. No, my friends, the new covenant is so far superior to the old that there is no comparison between the two. The old one was faulty. God said I'll make a better one. He has given a better covenant which is established upon better promises. Under that covenant we are, my friends, renewed and regenerated in heart and become a new creation in Christ Jesus. We are not bound to the letter of the law but we live in the newness of the spirit. Christ's spirit is in us and having written, not the old law, the ministration of death, upon our heart, but having written there the new law, the law of Christ, keeps us in the path of obedience.

Now Mr. Shuler said it was wrong for the other nations to lie, steal and so on. But they didn't have that law. Deuteronomy 4:8, Moses said "is there any other nation that has such a law as you have?" Not any other one had a law like Israel had and yet it was wrong for them to lie, steal, to murder. Then he admits that we, without that law, can still have a standard of morality that is equal to it, if not superior to that law for he said it was wrong in other nations and Moses said other nations didn't have that law. Therefore, we without that law, under a new, a superior and a better covenant can fulfill the will of God.

He says the church is built upon the foundation of the

apostles and the prophets and uses that as though Paul were speaking of the old testament prophets. Doesn't he know that there are new testament prophets as well as old and in that same Ephesian letter, the 3rd chapter and the 6th verse we have the Apostle Paul saying this, "how that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote before a few words, whereby when ye read, you can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ; which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit." There are the prophets he is talking about, not old testament prophets but upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets to whom it has now been revealed in the spirit. Not those of an age gone by. "God having of olden time, in divers manners spoken unto the fathers by the prophets hath at the end of these days spoken unto us by his Son" (Heb. 1:1, 2). He hath given us a new covenant, sanctified and sealed by His blood. Not the old one that was sanctified and sealed by the blood of bulls and goats but a new covenant.

He said I misquoted him, that I misrepresented him, concerning the answer he made to the question, Is the New Testament and the ten commandments the same? Well, friends, just get this, if I didn't represent him correctly then he dodged the question. I asked him "is the new testament and the ten commandments the same?" He got up and professed to be answering that question. If I misrepresented him on it, he dodged the question and hasn't answered a one of them yet. After he promised that he would answer them. If what he said wasn't talking about what was in the question, then he dodged the question and didn't answer it, as he has dodged every one of them.

My friends, in closing this speech tonight I want to contrast before your eyes two things. Jesus died upon the cross for the sins of the world and there nailed to his cross this old covenant. Therefore let no man judge you in respect to meat, drink or a holy day, a new moon, or a sabbath day. Why? Why not? Because that sabbath day is no longer a symbol of righteousness to man.

Instead that sabbath calls to mind Christ in the tomb, the

world in darkness as the soldiers kept their watch around that tomb, the cloak of sable gloom hung over all, the pall of death had cast its shadow upon the whole earth, Christ's body in the grave and his soul in Hades, his disconsolate disciples scattering to four winds of the earth, their hope dead, their eyes and their hearts saddened by mourning. As they went their way weeping, his mother, heart broken, the angels wept upon that day while the devils of hell danced and shouted in glee for the triumph they thought they had won over the Son of God. That day, the sabbath day, as it thus came to man for the last time, brings only memories of the anguish of the cross, the agonies of death, the bitter cries, expiring groans, the mournful tomb, the gambling soldiers as they gambled for his cloak beneath the cross and Christ as he breaks the heart of all the world looking down upon the beloved Mary, his mother, and saying "Mother, behold thy Son and Son behold thy Mother." All of these things are in the mind of man as he thinks upon the last sabbath.

But, thanks be to God, it was the end of the sabbath. Then came the glorious first day of the week. As comes the dawn, God's strong angel comes down as lightning from heaven. The rock is rolled away, the guards become as dead men, the tomb is opened, Christ arises victorious over death, over hell and the grave. The disciples run and shout for joy. The angels rejoice and sing, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be lifted up ye everlasting doors, that the King of Glory may come in." Salvation of the world has come, the Son of righteousness has risen with healing in his wings. Rejoice and be glad for now the agony of the cross is forgotten, life has blotted out death, the angels sing, the words of life are preached, the joyous Saviour's face shines forth to gladden all His disciples with whom He meets upon the first day of the week and Christ has brought God's gift to the world. My friends, that is the significance of the first day of the week as contrasted with the sabbath which has ended and the law which has enjoined it is forever taken away, is forever abolished by Christ's death upon the cross and we live in the newness of the spirit.